

The Number of *Rhetores* in the Athenian *Ecclesia*, 355–322 B.C.

Mogens Herman Hansen

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION in ancient Athens is a complex problem, encompassing both the various forms of participation, the degree of participation, and the number of participants. Broadly speaking we can distinguish three kinds:¹ (a) an Athenian citizen might be a member of the *ecclesia* or of the panel of jurors who manned the courts and the legislative committees (the *nomothetai*); (b) he might fill an office (*arche*), either through election or sortition; (c) he might take an initiative and, as a *rhetor*, address the *ecclesia*, *boule*, *nomothetai*, or *dicasteria*. As to (a), as an *ecclesiastes* or a juror the average Athenian citizen would have only to listen and vote. He was anonymous and could not be held responsible for how he voted, and he was paid for his participation. As to (b), as a magistrate selected by lot the citizen would have little or no power to make decisions, but on the other hand he would have administrative duties for which he could be held responsible both when he was in office and when he resigned at the turn of the year. In most cases, however, he would share the responsibilities with his colleagues: he would be one of the five hundred *bouleutai* or a member of one of the numerous boards of ten. The elective offices (most of them military) are a case apart. To stand for election is more demanding than to take part in a sortition, and the elected *archai* had more powers than other magistrates. This applies especially to the *strategia*. As a commander-in-chief a *strategos* might often be personally responsible for the conduct of a campaign or some diplomatic activity, and, if unsuccessful, his risk of being prosecuted and convicted was considerable. In the fourth century most of the magistrates were probably unpaid, but some of them, and especially the *strategoï*, might profit by gifts and various kinds of perquisites. As to (c), as a *rhetor* an Athenian citizen was always responsible for his initiative, and this applies especially to proposers (of *nomoi* or *psephismata*) and

¹ I discuss only political activity based on volunteering, and do not include civic duties such as military service, performance of liturgies, or the duty to serve as an arbitrator in one's sixtieth year.

to prosecutors bringing an action. With a few notorious exceptions,² the *rhetor* was (in principle) unpaid, and any profit he made might easily be interpreted as a bribe and result in a criminal action.

Membership in the decision-making bodies was in the thousands; officeholding demanded the annual participation of more than one thousand citizens. But how many Athenians took it upon themselves to act as *rhetores*? Traditionally they are counted by the score and not by the hundred,³ and this narrowing down of political participation when we come to its highest level is sometimes viewed as an oligarchic element of Athenian democracy.⁴ In this paper I will argue that an astonishing number of Athenian citizens must have acted as *rhetores* and that active participation in the debate and in the formulation of proposals, though restricted to a minority of the attendants, must have been far more widespread than is usually assumed.⁵ By way of introduction I should state the limits of my investigation. (a) I confine my study to the period 355–322 B.C. (b) I examine only the *rhetores* in the *ecclesia* to the exclusion of those addressing the *boule*, the *nomothetai*, or the *dicasteria*. (c) Of the *rhetores* in the *ecclesia* I concentrate on the proposers of decrees (*psephismata*) and do not discuss *rhetores* who addressed the people supporting or opposing decrees proposed by other *rhetores*.

Re (a): lack of sources, both literary and epigraphical, is the principal reason for examining only the period 355–322. First the literary

² In a few types of public action, e.g. *apographe* and *phasis*, the prosecutor, if successful, received respectively 3/4 and 1/2 of the property at issue.

³ Cf. G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* II (Munich 1926) 999; G. Glotz, *The Greek City* (London 1929) 159; R. J. Bonner, *Aspects of Athenian Democracy* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1933) 49, 63–64; A. H. M. Jones, *Athenian Democracy* (Oxford 1957) 128–33; S. Perlman, "The Politicians in the Athenian Democracy of the Fourth Century B.C.," *Athenaeum* 41 (1963) 328–30, 340; M. I. Finley, *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (London 1981) 83. Of more special studies I may cite three examples. In "Callistratus of Aphidna and His Contemporaries," *Historia* 5 (1956) 202f, R. Sealey assumes that Athenian politics were conducted by a small number of small political groups. In "Les hommes politiques et la justice populaire dans l'Athènes du IV^e siècle," *Historia* 9 (1960), P. Cloché discusses "la carrière des quarante ou cinquante Athéniens qui s'occupèrent alors des affaires publiques" (81). And in "Isegoria in the Assembly at Athens," *Ancient Society and Institutions* (Oxford 1966), G. T. Griffith states, "no one will suppose that the invitation in the Assembly to *all* to speak . . . gave rise at any time to hundreds of ordinary Athenian citizens trying to accept it in turn" (124); cf. *infra* n.53.

⁴ Cf. e.g. W. Nippel, *Mischverfassungstheorie und Verfassungsrealität in Antike und früher Neuzeit* (Stuttgart 1980) 106–07.

⁵ A few historians take a more optimistic view of the use of *isegoria* than those mentioned *supra* n.3. They include A. G. Woodhead, "Ἰσηγορία and the Council of 500," *Historia* 16 (1967) 129; and W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens* (Princeton 1971) 68: "There were many politicians in Athens and only the most prominent are well known to us."

sources: names of many Athenian generals and ambassadors appear in Xenophon's *Hellenica* (III–VII) and in Diodoros (XIV–XV), both covering the first four decades of the fourth century. But the historians refer only infrequently to named *rhetores* and debates in the *ecclesia*. Some names can be found in Xenophon and in the *Hell. Oxy.*, but not many. For information about Athenian domestic policy and the democratic institutions we must, for the first two decades of the fourth century, turn to Andokides, Isokrates, and Lysias. Then we are faced with a deplorable gap in the literary sources between *ca* 380 and 355. The only speeches from this period are some by Isokrates (not dealing with Athenian politics) and Isaïos (relating to private law and giving very little information about public affairs). In 355 the greatest period of Attic rhetoric begins. For the next thirty-four years we have an unparalleled number of good sources relating to Athenian public life, primarily the speeches by Demosthenes, Aischines, Hypereides, Lykourgos, and Deinarchos, but also the late speeches of Isokrates. On the other hand, not a single speech is later than Antipatros' abolition of the democracy in 322/1. Lykourgos died in 324, Demosthenes, Hypereides, and Aischines (?) in 322, and of Deinarchos the three preserved speeches and most of the fragments antedate the Macedonian occupation of Athens. Of historians we have, apart from Diodoros XVI–XVIII, some valuable fragments of Philochoros, quoted by Didymos and Dionysios in their treatises on Demosthenes. And Plutarch provides some information in his lives of Phokion and Demosthenes. The abundance of literary sources is matched by a similar increase in the number of decrees of the people preserved on stone. In the epigraphical sources there is of course no gap between 380 and 355, but the number of preserved *psephismata* is remarkably higher for the period 355–321 than for the period 403–355. For the first forty-eight years we have some 175 decrees and fragments of decrees, for the following thirty-four years some 300. Furthermore, for our purpose the crucial piece of information is the name of the proposer of the decree, and in this an important reform took place in 354/3. Down to 355/4 the name of the proposer is always recorded without the patronymic and demotic.⁶ From the

⁶ Before 354/3 all proposers lack *patronymicon* and *demoticon*. The last unquestionable example of this practise is *IG* II² 134, passed in the third prytany of 354/3. The first examples of the new style are *IG* II² 136 and 137, both passed in the same year. Of possible exceptions to the new procedure I can mention *IG* II² 214, but Pečírka suggests 356/5 instead of 347/6 (*SEG* XXIV 88); *IG* II² 216, but Lewis suggests 365/4 instead of 346/5 (*SEG* XIV 47); *IG* II² 248, but Johnson suggests 358/7 instead of *ante a.* 343/2 (*CP* 9 [1914] 424); *IG* II² 265, but Johnson suggests a date before 354 (*SEG* XXIV 84). The only really problematic example is *IG* II² 366 passed in the archonship

autumn of 354/3 the patronymic and demotic are almost invariably added. The new style in the prescripts makes it much easier for us to identify the *rhetores* in the *ecclesia*. So both the constitutional development and the preservation of the sources mark off the years 355–322 as a well defined period: the democratic constitution was reformed after the end of the Social War in 355, and democracy was abolished in 322/1. The sources become much more abundant and precise after 355, but the literary sources dry up abruptly after 322. For the Hellenistic period we are left with epigraphical sources which (as usual) are insufficient for a proper understanding of how a constitution works.

Re (b): the council of five hundred was probably convened *ca* 250 times in a year, but we have no idea of the number of decrees passed in a session, and very few *psephismata tes boules* are preserved. Consequently it is impossible to estimate how many of the five hundred councillors took it upon themselves to act as *rhetores*.⁷ Similarly, the number of court days can be estimated at *ca* 150–200, but we do not know the number of political public actions heard by the *dicasteria*. In previous publications I argued that especially the *graphai paranomon* and the *eisangeliai eis ton demon* were numerous and may have been heard by the *dicastai* every prytany, but a quantification of trials and so of *rhetores* addressing the *dicasteria* is impossible.⁸ In 24.142 Demosthenes is probably exaggerating when he states that the Athenians passed new laws every month. There can be no doubt that the number of *nomoi* passed in a year was negligible compared with the number of *psephismata*, and very few proposers of laws are attested. The literary sources often refer to laws, but mention the proposer of the law only infrequently, and few *nomoi* are epigraphically preserved, presumably because new *nomoi* were recorded in the Metroon and not regularly published on *stelai* as many *psephismata* were.⁹ For the *ecclesia*, however, we have much better sources (*cf. infra* 132–34).

of Kephisodoros (366/5 or 323/2). Because of the letter forms Kirchner prefers the later year, but Johnson (425) suggests that the inscription is a republication of a decree passed in 366/5. The reform is briefly mentioned by A. S. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* (Leyden 1977) 32.

⁷ For decrees of the *boule* see P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 82–87, 271–72. Decrees of the *boule* only referred to in inscriptions or mentioned in literary sources are recorded in M. H. Hansen, *Initiative und Entscheidung* (Xenia 6 [Konstanz 1983] 31–32 n.39 (= *GRBS* 22 [1981] 353 n.24, but with some additions).

⁸ *Cf.* M. H. Hansen, “How Often Did Athenian *Dicasteria* Meet?” *GRBS* 20 (1979) 243–46; *The Sovereignty of the People’s Court* (Odense 1974) 25–26; *Eisangelia* (Odense 1975) 58–65.

⁹ *Cf.* Dem. 25.99, Lycurg. 1.66, Harp. s.v. Μητροῶν.

Re (c): the term *rhetor*, when used with reference to the *ecclesia*, denotes both the citizen who addresses the people and the citizen who moves a decree.¹⁰ The two types of *rhetor* are overlapping but not identical groups. It is well known that an Athenian who delivered a speech in the *ecclesia* did not have to move a proposal. He might support or oppose a proposal moved by another *rhetor*, or he might simply join a debate.¹¹ Historians never mention the reverse type of *rhetor*, an Athenian who moved a decree without addressing the *ecclesia* in support of his proposal. We do not know how common this type of *rhetor* was, but several sources testify to the existence of such *rhetoires*, e.g. Dem. 59.43: οὔτε γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας προσήει Στεφάνω τουτωῖ ἄξιον λόγου· 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. In this passage *rhetor* denotes the citizen who delivers a speech, and Stephanos was accordingly, in his first years, a man who did not address the assembly but was paid for moving decrees on behalf of other citizens.¹² Some general observations also point to the existence of *rhetoires* who moved proposals without addressing the assembly. Many probouleumatic decrees were probably passed in the *procheirotomia*, and so there was no debate.¹³ If a decree was debated, the proposer would probably speak in support of his proposal, but not necessarily:¹⁴ the debate of a proposal was

¹⁰ See Perlman (*supra* n.3) 341–46, and M. H. Hansen, “The Athenian ‘Politicians’, 403–322 B.C.,” *GRBS* 24 (1983) 39–42.

¹¹ In several of his symbouleutic speeches Demosthenes says explicitly that he does not intend to move a decree: Dem. 1.19; 3.10–13; 8.68, 73; 13.13–14.

¹² Other sources showing that some citizens were persuaded or paid to move decrees on behalf of others are: Dem. 20.132; 23.146–47, 201; 24.66, 201–03; 25.40–41; Aeschin. 3.125, 159, 242. For ἐπιγράφεισθαι in the sense ‘inscribe one’s name on a proposal’ see Aeschin. 1.188.

¹³ For this view of the *procheirotomia* (stated by Busolt and others) cf. M. H. Hansen, *The Athenian Ecclesia* (Copenhagen 1983) 123–30, 215–16. For a different view (taken by Wilamowitz and others) cf. P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 529–31. At the annual Normal Baynes Meeting of Ancient Historians, held in Birmingham on 25–26 September 1984, David Lewis read a paper, “M. H. Hansen on the Athenian *Ecclesia*.” Both Lewis and now Peter Rhodes (with reservations) accept my interpretation of the *procheirotomia*.

¹⁴ The formula used in all decrees about the proposer, ὁ δέινα εἶπεν, indicates that a proposal was originally read out to the people by the man who moved it. The formula cannot be taken to mean that he also delivered a speech in support. In the fourth century proposals were read out by the γραμματεὺς (τῇ βουλῇ καὶ) τῷ δήμῳ, cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.5 with Rhodes’ note (*supra* n.13). A somewhat similar reform in the *diacasteria* took place around 380: earlier a witness gave evidence orally in court, but after ca 380 his testimony was submitted in writing and read out by a clerk, cf. D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (London 1978) 242–43 with literature in n.545.

opened by the herald's invitation, *τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται*; There is no sign of an initial statement by the proposer.¹⁵ The literary sources mention *rhetores* of both types, speakers and proposers, but the numerous inscriptions record only proposers. So, once more, the nature of our sources forces us to concentrate on proposers to the exclusion of those who are only attested as speakers.

The Number of Proposals Moved in the *Ecclesia*, 355–322

After these introductory remarks on limitations I can define my investigation positively: I will attempt to estimate the (minimum) number of proposers of decrees in the Athenian *ecclesia* in the period 355–322 and to relate this figure to the total number of adult male citizens. The first problem is to calculate the total number of decrees passed by the Athenians in this period. In the period down to *ca* 350 I believe that the Athenians held 30 *ecclesiai* in a year, and in the following period 40 (no less but probably also no more).¹⁶ So in the 34 years from 355/4 to 322/1 the Athenians must have held a total of 1300 meetings of the assembly: and this is a minimum. Some historians prefer to believe that 40 *ecclesiai* were held already in the fifth century and that an *ecclesia synkletos* was an additional meeting and not one of the three (later four) meetings, convened in an emergency.¹⁷ They will have to assume a minimum of 1400 *ecclesiai*.

How many proposals were moved and how many decrees were passed in the course of a meeting of the *ecclesia*? According to the *Ath. Pol.*, two *ecclesiai* out of four had nine items on the agenda, three on sacred matters, three on heralds and envoys, and three on secular

¹⁵ The original invitation to speak was *τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται τῶν ὑπὲρ πεντήκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων*; This formula was still in use in 346/5 (Aeschin. 1.23, *cf.* 2.47), but by 330/329 it had been replaced by the simple question *τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται*; (Aeschin. 3.4). The shorter formula may have been in (common?) use already in the fifth century, see Ar. *Ach.* 45, *Eccl.* 130, Dem. 18.170; *cf.* Griffith (*supra* n.3) 119. The older formula precludes, and the later formula does not indicate, that the debate was opened by a statement of the proposer.

¹⁶ See M. H. Hansen and F. Mitchel, "The Number *Ecclesiai* in Fourth-Century Athens," *SymbO* 59 (1984) 13–19; Hansen (*supra* n.13) 37, 42–43, 57–59, 61–62, 83–84, 101–02. For a fuller treatment of this problem see M. H. Hansen, *Die athenische Volksversammlung im Zeitalter des Demosthenes* (Xenia 10 [Konstanz 1984]). Lewis (*supra* n.13) rejects the reconstruction suggested by Hansen and Mitchel. He admits that Dem. 24.21 and 25 point to no more than three *ecclesiai* in prytany I, but holds that it is illegitimate, on this evidence, to assume only three *ecclesiai* in prytanies II–X.

¹⁷ This is the traditional view, stated *e.g.* by Busolt (*supra* n.3); C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford 1952) 233; Jones (*supra* n.3) 108–09. It is still maintained (without argumentation) by Rhodes (*supra* n.13) 521–22.

matters.¹⁸ Do the 3×3 items constitute a maximum (so that regularly, say, only 4–5 items were debated) or a minimum (so that sometimes even more than 9 items were debated)? We have no evidence, but I prefer the second alternative for the following reason: about 350 B.C. the number of *ecclesiai* was probably raised from three to four in a prytany. The most reasonable explanation is that three *ecclesiai* in a prytany = thirty in a year did not suffice; there was too much business to be transacted. The inference seems to be that the agenda regularly comprised nine or more items. The agenda for the *ecclesia kyria* was considerably longer. We have no precise information about the number of items on the agenda for the fourth *ecclesia*,¹⁹ but from the *per diem* paid out we may infer that the three *ecclesiai* for which the allowance was 1 drachma were of the same duration whereas the *ecclesia kyria* was longer, compensated by an allowance of 1½ drachmas (*Ath.Pol.* 62.2). So a total of thirty-six to forty items on the agenda to be debated in the four *ecclesiai* held in a prytany is probably a minimum rather than a maximum. Some other historians, e.g. P. J. Rhodes, also take the 3×3 items to be a minimum, but for a reason I cannot accept: following Wilamowitz, Rhodes believes the *procheirotomia* to be a vote on the fixing of the agenda whereby the people decided how many items to put on the agenda, and which to accept in addition to the 3×3 items prescribed by law (*cf. supra* n.13).

What is the relation between the number of items on the agenda and the number of proposals moved by the *rhetores* and voted on by the people? First, one item on the agenda might lead to the passing of several decrees. We have preserved, for example, no less than four decrees passed by the people at the *ecclesia* held in the precinct of Dionysos on 19 Elaphebolion 332/1.²⁰ All are honorary decrees for

¹⁸ Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 43.6 with Rhodes' note (*supra* n.13) 529.

¹⁹ The agenda for the *ecclesia kyria* is described in *Ath.Pol.* 43.4, and the long list of items recorded here is not even complete: it does not, for example, include citizenship decrees and honorary decrees, which, however, as the epigraphical evidence shows, were often passed in an *ecclesia kyria* (*cf. e.g. IG II² 336, 448*). In the fourth *ecclesia* the people debated and voted on supplications (*Ath.Pol.* 43.6), but again Aristotle probably records only the obligatory item on the agenda for this meeting. On the other hand, we know that the people were not allowed to debate any matter at all at any (ordinary) meeting. According to Dem. 19.185, foreign policy could be debated only in some *ecclesiai* and not in others (unless the meeting was transformed into an *ecclesia synkletos*, *cf. Hansen [supra* n.13] 71).

²⁰ *IG II² 345* (moved by Lykourgos Lykophonos of Boutadai), 346 (moved by Demades Demeou of Paiania), 347 (moved by Aristoxenos Kephisodotou of [?] Peiraius), *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 26–27 no. 6 (moved by E— —, *cf. infra* 140 no. 28). This meeting must have been one of the three *ecclesiai* and not the *ecclesia kyria*; the only example of *ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν Διονύσειον* is totally restored, *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 35–37 no. 5. Furthermore, in the preceding year (333/2) the *ecclesia* reserved for supplications was held

foreigners, they are all non-probouleumatic, and they were proposed and carried by four different *rhetores*. Probably they were all moved in response to an open *probouleuma* inviting any Athenian who so wished to propose honours for foreigners of great merit. It is unlikely that the *boule* for this purpose presented four different open *probouleumata* (= four items on the agenda) or that the four decrees passed are alternatives to four detailed *probouleumata* submitted for ratification but all rejected and replaced with the decrees we have preserved.²¹ Similarly, “peace and alliance with Philip of Macedon” was probably one item on the agenda for the *ecclesiai* in Elaphebolion 347/6, but we know that this matter entailed the passing of several decrees in each of the *ecclesiai*.²²

Furthermore, several proposals might result in the passing of only one decree. About 10% of all decrees preserved on stone have a rider appended which was proposed and carried either by the *rhetor* who moved the principal proposal or by another *rhetor*.²³ And of the non-probouleumatic decrees some were passed in response to an open *probouleuma*, but others must be counterproposals to detailed *probouleumata*, and in this case the vote of the people was a choice between two or more proposals.²⁴

On the other hand, an item on the agenda introduced by an open *probouleuma* might result in a debate but not in the proposal of any decree. In several of his symbouleutic speeches Demosthenes emphasizes that he has no intention of moving a *psephisma* on the subject, but will simply advise the people (*cf. supra* 127 with n.11). Demosthenes’ speech may have been followed by a *psephisma* moved by another *rhetor*, but the impression is that a political debate was sometimes conducted in the *ecclesia* without any proposal being made and without any vote being taken.

on the last day of Elaphebolion (*cf. IG II² 336b and SEG XXI 278*). So the *ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσειον* held *ca* 16–22 Elaph. was presumably one of the two *ecclesiai* with 3×3 items on the agenda, and the debate on the festival was probably one of the three items relating to sacred matters (*hiera*). The four honorary decrees listed above may have been passed in connection with one of the three items on the agenda relating to secular matters (*hosia*) or in consequence of an extra item on the agenda.

²¹ For the definition of probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic decrees see Rhodes (*supra* n.7) 67–68. In his *Commentary* (*supra* n.13) 529 Rhodes seems to assume that each of the four honorary decrees required a separate item on the agenda.

²² For the numerous decrees on the conclusion of peace with Philip in Elaph. 347/6 see Hansen (*supra* n.13) 70–71.

²³ *Cf.* Rhodes (*supra* n.7) 65 and tables C (247–50) and D (259–62). It is worth noting that almost all the riders are to *probouleumata*, whereas a rider to a non-probouleumatic decree occurs only twice after 403/2 (71–72).

²⁴ *Cf.* Rhodes (*supra* n.7) 81.

In conclusion, I assume that each item on the agenda would, on average, result in the passing of one decree and that the number of proposals voted on, including riders, must have been somewhat higher than the number of decrees. So in an *ecclesia* the Athenians would pass no fewer than nine decrees and vote on more proposals. This is, I believe, a cautious estimate, and the total number of decrees passed in a session of the *ecclesia* was probably above rather than below this figure. In support, I may refer to an analogous institution. A Swiss *Landsgemeinde* is attended by 2000–6000 citizens who, in addition to elections, have to debate and vote on 15–20 laws and decrees during a meeting which usually lasts for 2–3 hours.²⁵

The result of the first part of my investigation is that the Athenians, in the period 355–322, convened no fewer than 1300 meetings of the *ecclesia*. In an *ecclesia* no fewer than 9 decrees were regularly passed, and the vote taken on more proposals. If we count riders separately, the minimal number of decrees passed in these thirty-four years must be 13,000. To suggest a maximum is impossible.

How many of these 13,000 or more decrees are known to us, and what is the relation between the number of decrees passed and decrees preserved? About 300 decrees are preserved on stone; *ca* 50 more are referred to in inscriptions, some in other decrees and some in inventories. The literary sources quote, paraphrase, or mention *ca* 150 more decrees.²⁶ A decree attested in the literary sources is hardly ever preserved on stone or referred to in inscriptions, and *vice versa*. The overlap between the different types of source is insignificant,²⁷ and so the total number of known decrees of the period 355–322 comes close to 500. The conclusion is that fewer than 4% of all decrees passed are preserved or referred to in our sources. And even this is a very optimistic figure. Most of the decrees preserved on stone are fragmentary. In several cases only a few letters of a standard formula is all we have. Most of the references in inscriptions to other decrees are of the type *κατὰ ψήφισμα δήμου*, sometimes with the addition: *ὁ ὁ δεινα εἶπεν*. In the literary sources references to decrees are often short and casual and give insufficient information

²⁵ Cf. Hansen (*supra* n.13) 209.

²⁶ For a survey of decrees of the fourth century see Hansen (*supra* n.13) 163–65 with nn.6 and 15, which covers the entire period from 403 to 322. My survey is no longer up to date, and minor corrections and additions will appear in a future article. Furthermore, the survey does not include decrees referred to in other decrees and in the inventories published by the various boards of magistrates. For a short survey of such references see my *Die athenische Volksversammlung* (*supra* n.16).

²⁷ Six decrees known from both epigraphical and literary sources are listed in Hansen (*supra* n.13) 188 n.16.

about the form and content of a decree. For our purpose the crucial piece of information is the name of the proposer, which is recorded for only 181 decrees (including riders).

Known Proposers of Decrees of the People, 355–322

In 69 decrees preserved on stone the name of the proposer can be read or confidently restored. For decrees only referred to in inscriptions the number is 16. Literary sources mention 98 decrees proposed by a named citizen. The sum is 183 decrees, but in two cases (only), a literary source refers to a decree preserved on stone,²⁸ and the total is accordingly 181 decrees moved by 82 citizens. I list here the known proposers:²⁹

- 'Αγωνίδης Νικοξένου Περγασῆθεν, 325/4 (*IG* II² 1629.13–15)
- 'Αλεξίμαχος Πήληξ, 347/6 (Aeschin. 2.83, 85)
- 'Αλκίμαχος . . .⁶. . . ου ἐγ Μυρρινούττης, 335/4 (EM 13067)
- 'Ανδροτίων Ἄνδρωνος Γαργήτιος, 347/6 (*IG* II² 212.8)
- 'Αντιμέδων, before 342 (Dem. 58.35)
- 'Απολλόδωρος Πασίωνος Ἀχαρνεύς, 349/8 (Dem. 59.4)
- 'Αριστογείτων Κυδιμάχου, 335–330 (Dem. 25.87, hypoth. 1; Din. 2.12)
- 'Αριστοκράτης, 353/2 (Dem. 23.1, 14)
- 'Αριστόνικος Ἀριστοτέλους Μαραθώνιος, 335/4 (*IG* II² 1623.280–83)
- 'Αριστόνικος Νικοφάνους Ἀναγυράσιος, 341/0 (Dem. 18.83, Plut. *Mor.* 848D)
- 'Αριστόξενος Κηφισοδότου Πειραιεύς (?), 332/1 (*IG* II² 347.9–11)
- 'Αριστοφῶν, 324–322 (*AthMitt* 72 [1957] 156–64 no. 1)
- 'Αριστοφῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀζηνιεύς (5 decrees: 2 in epigraphical, 3 in literary sources)³⁰
- 'Αριστώννμος Ἀριστονίκου, 345/4 (*IG* II² 220.7–8, 28–29)
- 'Αρχέδημος Ἀρχίου Παιονίδης, 349/8 (*IG* II² 208.5–6)
- Βλέπυρος Πειθάνδρου Παιονίδης, 354/3 (*IG* II² 189.7)
- Βράχυλλος Βαθύλλου Ἐρχιεύς, ca 330 (*IG* II² 408.5)
- Δημάδης Δημέου Παιανιεύς (21 decrees: 11 in epigraphical, 10 in literary sources)
- Δημέας Δημάδου Παιανιεύς, before 321 (*Hesperia* 13 [1944] 231–33 no. 5)
- Δημήτριος Εὐκτήμονος Ἀφιδναῖος, 332/1 (*Syll.*³ 287.9)
- Δημομέλης Δήμωνος Παιανιεύς, 339/8 (Dem. 18.222–23)

²⁸ Philokrates' decree concerning the *hiera orgas* in 352/1 (Androt. *FGrHist* 324F30, Philoch. 228F155; *IG* II² 204.54–55). Demades' citizenship decree for Alkimachos in 337/6 (Harp. s.v. Ἀλκίμαχος; *IG* II² 239, cf. Tod 180 and *SEG* XXI 267).

²⁹ For those who moved more than three decrees I refer to the documentation given in my inventory of *rhetores* and *strategoï* in *GRBS* 24 (1983) 159–79.

³⁰ In my catalogue (*supra* n.29) 161 last line, delete no. 13, *IG* II² 289, which I now take to have been moved by an unknown *rhetor* (cf. *infra* 138 no. 13).

- Δημοσθένης Δημοκλέους Λαμπτρεύς, 329/8 (*Syll.*³ 298.9–10), 325/4 (*IG II*² 360.5)
- Δημοσθένης Δημοσθένους Παιανιεύς (39 decrees: 1 in epigraphical, 38 in literary sources)
- Δημόφιλος, 346/5 (*Aeschin.* 1.86, *schol. Aeschin.* 1.77)
- Δημόφιλος Δημοφίλου Ἀχαρνεύς, 324/3 or earlier (*IG II*² 1631.655–58), before 318 (*IG II*² 421.3–4)
- Δήμων Δημομέλους Παιανιεύς, 323/2 (*Plut. Dem.* 27.6, *Mor.* 846D)
- Διοπίθης Διοπίθους Σφήττιος, 346/5 (*IG II*² 218.22–23), 346–340 (*Dem.* 18.70)
- Διόφαντος Φρασικλείδου Μυρρινούσιος, 337/6 (*IG II*² 242.6–7), 337/6 (*IG II*² 243.6–7)
- Διόφαντος Θρασυμήδους Σφήττιος, 353/2 (*Dem.* 19.86)
- Ἐμμενίδης ἐκ Κοίλης, 332/1 or earlier (*IG II*² 1544.30, *cf.* 208.4–5)
- Ἐπικράτης οτήτου Παλληνεύς, 353/2 (*Dem.* 24.27)
- Ἐπιτέλης Σωνόμου Περγασήθεν, 323/2 (*IG II*² 365.6)
- Ἐπιχάρης Κολλείδης, before 342 (*Dem.* 58.30–34)
- Εὐβουλίδης Ἀντιφίλου Ἀλμούσιος, 346/5 (*IG II*² 218.6–7)
- Εὐβουλος Σπινθάρου Προβαλίσσιος, 348/7 (*Dem.* 19.304), 346–340 (*Dem.* 18.70, 75)
- Εὐθύμαχος¹⁸, 353/2 (*IG II*² 138.4)
- Εὐκτήμων, 354/3 (*Dem.* 24.11–14)
- Εὐφίλητος Εὐφιλήτου Κηφισιεύς, 323/2 (*IG II*² 448.6)
- Ἐγῆσιππος Ἐγῆσιου Σουνιεύς (4 decrees: 1 in epigraphical, 3 in literary sources)
- Θεόδωρος Ἀντιφάνου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν, 335/4 (*IG II*² 330.5)
- Θεομένης Ὀῆθεν, before 324 (*IG II*² 3207)
- Θουκνίδης, before 342 (*Dem.* 58.36–38)
- Ἱεροκλείδης Τιμοστράτου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν, 349/8 (*IG II*² 206.5–7, 26–27), 349/8 (*IG II*² 209.5)
- Ἱερώνυμος Οἰκωφέλους Ῥαμνούσιος, *ca* 330 (*IG II*² 415.11)
- Ἱππόστρατος Ἐτεαρχίδου Παλληνεύς, 341/0 (*IG II*² 228.7–8)
- Ἱπποχάρης⁹ Ἀλωπεκῆθεν, 336/5 (*IG II*² 330.26, 50)
- Καλλικράτης Χαροπίδου Λαμπτρεύς, 346/5 (*IG II*² 215.5–6), 340/339 (*IG II*² 233.5)
- Καλλισθένης, 347/6 (*Dem.* 18.37, 19.86 with *schol.*)
- Κηφισόδοτος, 336/5 (*Lex.Patm.* 149f)
- Κηφισοφῶν Καλλιβίου Παιανιεύς (4 decrees: 2 in epigraphical, 2 in literary sources)
- Κηφισοφῶν Λυσιφῶντος Χολαργεύς, 325/4 (*IG II*² 1629.170)
- Κρατῖνος, 354/3 (*IG II*² 134.6), before 353 (*IG II*² 172.3–4)
- Κτησιφῶν, 337/6 (*Aeschin.* 3.12)
- Λυκούργος Λυκόφρονος Βουτάδης (11 decrees: 10 in epigraphical, 1 in literary sources)
- Μειδίας Μειδίου Ἀναγυράσιος, before 322 (*Hyp. fr.*150)
- Μοιροκλῆς Εὐθυδήμου Ἐλευσίνιος, before 342 (*Dem.* 58.53, 56)

- Ναυσικλῆς Κλεάρχου Ὁῆθεν, 334/3 (*IG II²* 1623.313)
 Νόθιππος Λυσίου Διομειεύς, 331/0 (*IG II²* 349.9–10)
 Πάμφιλος Εὐφιλήτου Κηφισιεύς, 323/2 (*IG II²* 448.31)
 Πολύευκτος Τιμοκράτους Κρωεύς, 347/6 (*IG II²* 212.65–66)
 Πολύευκτος Κυδαντίδης, 326/5 (*IG II²* 1628.38–39), 330–324 (Hyp.
 3.13–15)
 Πολύευκτος Σωστράτου Σφήττιος, 332/1 (*IG II²* 344.11–12), 332/1 (*IG*
II² 368.8), 324/3 (*IG II²* 363.7–8, *SEG XII* 89)
 Πολυκράτης Πολυεύκτου Φηγαιεύς, 349/8 (*IG II²* 207a.2)³¹
 Προκλείδης Πανταλέοντος ἐκ Κεραμέων, 328/7 (*IG II²* 354.8–9)
 Σκίτων, before 347 (Dem. 21.182)
 Σμίκρος, before 347 (Dem. 21.182)
 Στέφανος, before 336 (Din. fr. xviii)
 Στέφανος Ἀντιδωρίδου Ἐροιάδης, 347/6 (*IG II²* 213.5)
 Τηλέμαχος Θεαγγέλου Ἀχαρνεύς, 339/8 (*Hesperia* 7 [1938] 291–92 no.
 18), 330–328 (*IG II²* 360.28), 330–328 (*IG II²* 360.46)
 Τίμαρχος Ἀριζήλου Σφήττιος, 347/6 (Dem. 19.286–87), 347/6 (Aes-
 chin. 1.81)
 Τιμωνίδης¹², 353/2 (*IG II²* 139.6)
 Ὑπερείδης Γλαυκίππου Κολλυτεύς, 339/8 (Dem. 18.223), 338/7 (Dem.
 26.11, Hyp. fr. 32–33)
 Φανόδημος Διύλλου Θυμαϊτάδης, 332/1 (*IG VII* 4252.9–10)
 Φιλέας Ἀντιγένου Παιονίδης, 331/0 (*IG II²* 348.6)
 Φιλιππίδης, 336/5 (Hyp. 4.4–6)
 Φιλόδημος Ἀντοκλέους Ἐροιάδης, 340/339 (*IG II²* 232.18–19)
 Φιλοκλῆς Φορμίωνος Ἐροιάδης, 325/4 (Din. 3.2, 5)
 Φιλοκράτης Πυθοδώρου Ἀγνούσιος (7 decrees: 1 in epigraphical, 6 in
 literary sources)
 Φιλωτάδης Φιλοστράτου Παλληνεύς, 354/3 (*IG II²* 136.10–11)
 Φρύνων Ῥαμνούσιος, 348/7 (Aeschin. 2.12)
 Χαιριωνίδης Λυσανίου Φλυεύς, 333/2 (*IG II²* 338.6–7)
 Χαρικλείδης, 327/6 or earlier (*IG II²* 1673.9)

These 181 decrees moved by 82 citizens are what we have left of a total of probably 13,000+ proposals moved in the period 355–322. So the preserved decrees constitute less than 1.5% of all proposals. Let us imagine that we had perfect sources. The number of proposals with the name of the proposer attested would probably rise from 181 to 13,000+, but by multiplying the number of decrees by 75 or more, what will be the effect on the number of proposers? The multiplier to be used is of course less than 75, but is it 15, or 10, or 5, or only 2? Theoretically there is a continuum of possibilities be-

³¹ M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* (Brussels 1981) at D 12, suggests an earlier date (*ca* 361), but the recording of the patronymic (and the demotic) of the proposer shows that the decree cannot be earlier than 354/3 (*cf. supra* 125 with n.6).

tween extremes which can be described thus: (a) We know already a good many (perhaps even the majority) of the citizens who proposed decrees between 355 and 322, and access to more than 12,800 new decrees would probably give us only twice as many names, so that the total would be some 150–200 proposers for the entire period. (b) Political initiative was so widespread among the Athenian citizens that the discovery of 75 times as many decrees would provide us with the names of hundreds of new proposers, perhaps even more than a thousand. *A priori*, both positions are tenable (*cf. infra* 141–44), but in what follows I shall apply some tests and adduce some other sources which, I believe, will force us to move away from position (a) and towards position (b). Exact figures are of course impossible, but the general trend is significant: in fourth-century Athens proposers of decrees of the people must be counted by the hundred and not by the score.

Broken Names of Proposers Attested in Inscriptions

In the 85 decrees on stone listed above, the name of the proposer is either completely recorded or confidently restored.³² But we have also 30 more fragmentary preambles of popular decrees passed between 355 and 322 in which a few letters of the name of the proposer are still to be seen on the stone, but not enough to allow an identifi-

³² In my catalogue (*supra* n.29) I accepted most of the restorations printed in *IG II²* and not questioned in later epigraphical publications. I admit, however, that “confidently restored” in some cases is a very optimistic description of what Kirchner and his predecessors have done to broken names. Occasionally other attested names fit the lacuna as well as that suggested by the editor, not to speak of the possibility that the proposer is a hitherto unknown man. Most restorations in the Corpus are made on the (tacit) assumption that the proposer is more likely to be a citizen who is already attested as proposer *vel sim.* than a citizen whose name fits the open spaces but who is not (yet) known as politically active (in the *ecclesia*). But this assumption is questionable. Half of the decrees preserved on stone and listed above (42 out of 85) are moved by citizens attested only this once as a proposer and often completely unknown otherwise. So, whenever there is a choice between two or more names which equally well fill the gap, the name of the proposer would, in my opinion, better be left as a broken name and not restored to give the name of the most active citizen. The most important examples are the following. *IG II²* 172.3–4 [Κρατῖ]νος: alternatives are *e.g.* Φυρκῖνος (*PA* 15051), Εὔθουinos (*PA* 5505, 5508, 5509). *IG II²* 207a.2 Πολυκράτης Πολυ[εύκτου Φηγαεύς]: an alternative is Πολυκράτης Πολυαράτου Κρωεύς, *IG II²* 6551 (*PA* 12022), which is one letter shorter, but *IG II²* 207 is not *stoichedon* and some 44 letters are missing after Πολυ- (*cf.* now Osborne [*supra* n.31]). *IG II²* 209.5 [Ἱεροκλείδης Τιμοσ]τράτου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν: an alternative is – –στράτου Ἀλωπ[εκῆθεν, *IG II²* 5584. *IG II²* 237.5–6 [Ἡγή]σιππος [Ἡγησίου Σουνι]εύς: an alternative is Κτήσιππος Χαβρίου Αἰξωνεύς (*PA* 8885). *IG II²* 330.5 Θεόδωρος Ἀντιφάνου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν: an alternative is Θεόδωρος Δημοτίωνος Φηγούσιος, *IG II²* 7642 (*PA* 6909). *IG II²* 344.11–12 [Πολύενκτος Σωστράτου Σφήττιος]: the identification of the proposer is questionable in light of M. B. Walbank, *ZPE* 48 (1982) 264–66.

cation.³³ Sometimes we can establish only the number of spaces to be filled by the name of the proposer. Even broken names, however, can be valuable pieces of information. Although we cannot identify the proposer, we can often state that the letters preserved and the spaces to be filled do not fit any of the 82 known proposers. In other cases we can state that an identification is possible but unlikely. The 30 preambles are:

1. *IG II*² 131.5 (*SEG XXII* 89): ἔ[δοξεν τῶι δήμωι⁸. . . . ε]ἶπεν (355/4). Citizens with eight-letter names who in the period 355–322 proposed decrees are: Βλέπυρος Πειθάνδρου Παιονίδης, Ἐπιχάρης Χολλείδης, Εὐβουλος Σπινθάρου Προβαλίσιος, Εὐκτήμων, Θεόδωρος Ἀντιφάνου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν, Κρατῖνος, Κτησιφῶν, Νόθιππος Λυσίου Διομειεύς, Στέφανος, Στέφανος Ἀντιδωρίδου Ἐροιάδης, Τίμαρχος Ἀριζήλου Σφήττιος. *IG II*² 131 may have been moved by any of these, or by any of those who are recorded as proposers between 380 and 355: Ἀριστίων, Ἐπιχάρης, Εὐξίθεος, Στέφανος, Φίλιππος.

2. *IG II*² 132.2 (*SEG XXIV* 86): ἔδ[οξ]ε[εν τῶι δήμωι]ης εἶπ[εν] (355/4). Of the 82 known proposers only four have names that can fill the six spaces before -ης: Ἐπιχάρης Χολλείδης, Ἐπιτέλης Σωινόμου Περγασῆθεν, Θεομένης Ὀῆθεν, Φιλοκλῆς Φορμίωνος Ἐροιάδης. But the last three are attested as spokesmen in the late 320's and were probably too young in 355/4 to move a decree. If this decree was moved by a known *rhetor* the most likely candidate is Ἐπιχάρης Χολλείδης. Of the proposers active in the decades before 355 the only known candidate is Ἐπιχάρης.

3. *IG II*² 132.22 (*SEG XXIV* 86): ἔ[δοξεν τῶι δήμωι . . .]ΟΙ[. . . εἶπε]ν (355/4). Either *οι* or *οκ* may be read. Following Kirchner, Pećírka³⁴ prefers *οκ* and, on the assumption that the proposer is identical with that of the first decree on the stele (*cf. supra*), suggests a name of the type -οκλῆς. So Φιλοκλῆς Φορμίωνος Ἐροιάδης would be the only known *rhetor* of our period to

³³ *IG II*² includes several more examples of broken names than the 30 I record, but they are probably all earlier than 354/3 and fall outside the period discussed here. On *IG II*² 214, 216, 248, 265, and 366 see *supra* n.6. 263.4–5 is restored by Kirchner: — — — ἔγραμμ[άτενεν]¹⁴. ἐκ Κήδ]ων εἶπεν. But the sequence secretary–proposer is otherwise attested only in decrees from the beginning of the century (*cf. e.g. IG II*² 31, 72, 106). Furthermore, Kirchner allows only 23 spaces for the demotic of the *proedros* plus the name with patronymic and demotic of the secretary, which is barely possible. A preferable solution is to bring the decree back to the period before 354/3 and restore ἔγραμμ[άτενε ἐπεστάτει .^α.⁴.]ων εἶπεν (*cf. e.g. IG II*² 110, 112) or perhaps ἔγραμμ[άτενε(ν) ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμωι . . .⁵–⁶. . .]ων εἶπεν (*cf. e.g. IG II*² 96). In *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 1–2 no. 2 Meritt restored a fragmentary preamble: [ἐπὶ — — — ἄρχον]τος ἐπὶ [τῆς — — — πρυτανείας — — —]ων Λεωσ[— — — εἶπεν] (*ca* 350). Even if we assume that the prescript is short and several formulae are omitted (*cf. e.g. IG II*² 212, 215), the restoration of the name of the proposer in the line following the archon presupposes a line of some 100 letters, which is excessive for a decree. So the restoration of εἶπεν in line 2 is questionable.

³⁴ *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis* (Prague 1966) 37.

fill the lacunae. Because by 324 he had served on the board of generals more than ten times, he may have been born in 375 or earlier, and so there is a remote possibility that he was the proposer of this (and the previous) decree. I tend to doubt it.

4. *IG* II² 133.8–9: [ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμῳ]ίδης εἶπε[ν (355/4). This decree may have been moved by one of four citizens already attested as proposers: Εὐβουλίδης Ἀντιφίλου Προβαλίσσιος, Θουκυδίδης, Προκλείδης Πανταλέοντος ἐκ Κεραμέων, Φιλιππίδης.

5. *IG* II² 137.4–5: [ἐπεστάται⁹.]ης εἶπεν (354/3). This decree may have been moved by one of four attested proposers: Ἱεροκλείδης Τιμοστράτου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν, Καλλισθένης, Χαριωνίδης Λυσανίου Φλυεύς, Χαρικλείδης.

6. *IG* II² 205.8–9 (*SEG* XIV 51): [ἔδοξε]ν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ⁸. . . .]ς Ἀριστύλλο Στειριε[ύς εἶπεν] (351/0). This decree may have been moved by Δημόφιλος or Εὐθύμαχος. The inclusion of the last requires a note: Euthymachos is recorded as proposer of *IG* II² 138: Εὐθύμα[χος¹⁸. εἶπεν]. So the identification with the proposer of *IG* II² 205, hence Εὐθύμαχος Ἀριστύλλου Στειριεύς, presupposes that the patronymic, not only in *IG* II² 205 but also in 138, ended in -ο instead of -ου, which is indeed possible since 138.3 shows a patronymic in -ο for the secretary. It is more likely, however, that *IG* II² 205 was moved by a citizen not yet known as a proposer. One attested proposer of the 370's and 360's has a nine-letter name ending in -ς, Μενέξενος.

7. *IG* II² 219.8–9 (*Hesperia* 8 [1939] 172–73 no. 3): [ἔδοξεν τῆι β]ουλ[ῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ¹⁷.]εα[– – – εἶπεν] (345/4). No proposer whose patronymic and/or demotic is known has a name that fits. If we accept the restoration proposed by Schweigert (in *Hesperia*), the letters -εα- probably belong to the demotic, in which case we have a choice between [.¹⁵. Φρ]εά[ρριος and [.¹⁴. Εἰτ]εα[ίος.

8. *IG* II² 220.3–4: ἐπεψήφ]ιζε Ἴπποχ[.¹⁷.] Οἰνοβίο Πα[μνον εἶπεν] (344/3). The proposer may be identical with one of the seventeen proposers for whom neither patronymic nor demotic is known.

9. *IG* II² 229.6–7: [ἔ]δοξεν τῆι β[ολ]ῆι κα[ὶ τῶι δήμῳ¹⁴.]ο Φρε[ά]ρρι[ο]ς εἶπεν (341/0). This proposer must have a name of max. ten letters. Accordingly we can rule out: (a) all proposers whose patronymic and/or demotic we know; (b) all other proposers with names of eleven or twelve letters; (c) Euthymachos¹⁸. and Timonides¹².; (d) Skiton and Smikros, who had both, before 347, been fined ten talents (*Dem.* 21.182) and are unlikely to appear as proposers in this period. We are left with nine possible candidates: Ἀντιμέδων, Ἀριστοφῶν, Δημόφιλος, Εὐκτήμων, Θουκυδίδης, Κρατῖνος, Κτησιφῶν, Στέφανος, Φιλιππίδης. But the proposer was probably a citizen not yet recorded as spokesman, e.g. Ἀντίβιος Ἴσχυρίου Φρεάρριος (*PA* 982).

10. *IG II² 235.4–5*: ἔδοξεν τῶ[ι δήμῳ . . . κρ]άτης Ἀθην[. . . .¹¹. . . . ε]ὺς εἶπεν (340/339). The only known proposers having a ten-letter name ending in -κράτης are Πολυκράτης and Φιλοκράτης, but neither was son of Ἀθην-. Accordingly this rider must have been moved by a citizen not yet recorded as a proposer in our period.

11. *IG II² 253.1–2*: – – –]υς Σ[φ]ήττι[ος εἶπεν (before 336/5). This decree may be ascribed either to Διοπίθης Διοπίθους Σφήττιος or to Διόφαντος Θρασυμήδους Σφήττιος or to one of the proposers whose patronymic and demotic are unknown.

12. *IG II² 276.2–3 (Hesperia 9 [1940] 342)*: ἐπεψήφισεν Εὐθυκράτη[ς Ἀφιδναῖος¹⁵. Π]οτάμος ε[ἶπεν] (337/6). This decree may have been moved by one of the eleven known proposers who have a name of max. ten letters and for whom neither patronymic nor demotic is known.

13. *IG II² 289.6 (SEG XXI 300, XXIII 60)*: [.¹⁹ or ²⁰.]ο[ν Ἀ]ζηνιε[ὺς εἶπε] (ca 352–336). Kirchner, following Wilhelm, suggested [Ἀριστοφῶν Ἀριστοφάν]ο[ς Ἀ]ζηνιε[ὺς, but Pečírka doubts the older spelling of the patronymic and shows that the line may have had 27 letters instead of 26. So the proposer of this rider is probably unknown and may be identified with one of the known proposers for whom neither patronymic nor demotic is recorded, or rather with a citizen not yet recorded as proposer. Note, however, the older spelling εἶπε, which apart from *IG II² 212.66 (347/6)* is not attested after 375/4 (*IG II² 96*). So there may still be a case for accepting Aristophon as the proposer (cf. the catalogue [*supra* n.29] 161 no. 13), but I prefer now to follow Pečírka in questioning the identification.

14. *IG II² 336a.5–6*: ἔδοξεν τῶ[ι δήμῳ⁸. . . .]όφρονος Λακι : εἶπεν (334/3). None of the 60 proposers with known demotics is of Lakiadai. In Athens the shortest name ending in -όφρων is Θεόφρων, and so the name of the proposer filled max. six spaces. Of the seventeen proposers whose patronymic and demotic are unknown, only Σκίτων fits the lacuna, but he is most unlikely to have been a proposer of a decree in 334/3 (cf. *supra ad* no. 9). This decree must have been moved by a citizen not yet recorded as proposer.

15. *IG II² 336b.13–14 (SEG XXI 278, Osborne D 23)*: Νίκης [.¹⁸.]ης Ἀριστάρχου Φ[. . . .⁷. . . . εἶπεν] (333/2). This decree may have been moved by any of the already known proposers whose names end in -ης and whose patronymic and demotic are unknown: Ἀριστοκράτης, Θουκυδίδης, Καλλισθένης, Τιμωνίδης, Φιλιππίδης, and Χαρικλείδης. I am inclined to believe that the decree was moved by a citizen not yet recorded as a proposer.

16. *IG II² 339b.1–2 (SEG XVI 54)*: – – –]N[.¹¹. εἶπεν] (ca 335–330?). At least three known proposers are possible: Ἀριστοφῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀζηνιεύς, but he was probably dead by the 330's; Δημήτριος Εὐκτῆμονος Ἀφιδναῖος; Φιλέας Ἀντιγένου Παιονίδης. Moreover, the decree

may have been proposed by one of the seventeen proposers of unknown patronymic and demotic.

17. *IG II² 343.2–3* (*SEG XXIV 103*): [ἐπεψήφισε]ν Ἐπαμεί[νων¹¹. . . .] ΚΕΡΔΗ[Σ?⁸. . . . Ἀναγυράσιο[ς εἶπ]ε[ν (333/2?). None of the 82 known proposers has a name ending in -κέρδης.

18. *IG II² 366.9–10*: [ἔδο]ξεν τῶι δῆ[μ]ωι Ἄρι[.] εἶπεν (323/2). The proposer of this decree may well have been the Ἄριστοφῶν who in 324–322 moved a decree relating to Samos, or his name may have been, e.g., Ἄριγνωτος, Ἄρισταῖος, or Ἄριφράδης.

19. *IG II² 367.9–10*: ἔδοξεν τῶι δ[ήμ]ωι⁹. . . .]δώρου Μελιτεὺς [εἶπεν (323/2). In Athens the shortest name in -δωρος is Θεόδωρος, which however is very common in all periods. So the proposer was presumably the son of Theodoros. In this case, he has a name of max. six letters. Among the known proposers, only Σκίτων can fill the lacuna, and he is most unlikely to appear as proposer in 323/2 (*cf. supra ad no. 9*). Alternatively, we cannot rule out the possibility that the patronymic was Δώρου (*cf. IG II² 1751.62*), in which case the proposer had a nine-letter name and may have been Ἀντιμέδων, Ἄριστοφῶν, or Δημόφιλος. But Δώρος seems to have been an extremely rare name, so I prefer to believe that this decree was moved by an unknown proposer.

20. *IG II² 403.4–5*: [ἐπεψήφισε⁸. . . .]ς ἐκ Κε[ρ]αμέ[ων.¹⁵.]ς [Λα]κιάδης [εἶ]πε[ν] (*ca* 350–320). This decree may have been moved by one of the proposers for whom neither patronymic nor demotic is known.

21. *IG II² 410.1–2* (*SEG XXII 94*): [– – –]κτο Σκ[αμβωνίδης εἶπεν] (*ca* 330). This decree may have been moved by one of the proposers for whom neither patronymic nor demotic is known.

22. *IG II² 420.5–6* (*SEG XXII 93*): [ἐπεψήφισεν¹². ἔδοξεν τῶι δῆμωι Εὐ]ρυκράτ[ης^{ca} ¹⁶. εἶπεν] (332/1). If we accept the restorations suggested by Meritt, this fragmentary decree gives us the name of a citizen who is not otherwise attested as proposer.

23. *IG II² 436.2–5*: [ἔδο]ξεν τ[ῶι δῆμωι – – –]ον Ἄν[– – –]εἶπεν – – – φυλ – – – (*post* 336/5). If we accept Koehler's restoration of line one to give 23 letters to the line, a possible restoration of the preamble is [ἔδο]ξεν τ[ῶι δῆμωι Μειδίας Μειδί]ου Ἄν[αγυράσιος εἶπεν· ἐπειδῆ] Φυλ[– – –].

24. *IG II² 454.8–9* (*SEG XXI 293*): [– – – ἔδοξεν τῶι δῆμωι – – – Θ?]η-ρι[- – –] (324/3). “The three letters of line 8 come at or near the place where the patronymic or the name of the spokesman should fall. The first two letters are clear; the third looks like *rho* corrected to *iota*, thus HPP to HPI, as in e.g. Θ]ηρι[κλέους, Θ]ηρι[ππίδου]” (S. Dow, *Hesperia* 32 [1963] 350). The combination -ηρι- does not occur in any demotic, and probably belongs to the patronymic as Dow suggests. None of the 57 attested patronymics of known proposers will fit -ηρι-, but the proposer may have been one of the 25 other citizens listed above.

25. *IG II²* 547 (*SEG XXI* 292.13–14): [ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμῳι . . .]πρ[.⁹.
 – – – εἶπεν – – –]δρ[.⁹. (324/3). The name of the proposer may
 have been e.g. Θεόπροπος, Λαμπροκλῆς, Λαμπρίας, *vel sim.* A short name is
 preferable since the entire name must have filled max. 26 spaces. None of the
 82 known proposers has a name of which the fourth and fifth letters are πρ.

26. *IG II²* 1623.240–42: κατὰ [ψήφ]ισμα δήμου [δ^{ca 8}.] εἶπεν (334/3
 or earlier). Some 50 of the 82 known proposers have names of 7–9 letters.

27. *Hesperia* 3 (1934) 3–4 no. 5: [ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμ]ωι [.¹⁷.]
 Θριά[σ]ιος εἶπ[εν] (327/6). The proposer was not one of the 65 spokesmen
 whose patronymic and/or demotic are known; he may be one of the twenty
 for whom neither is attested.

28. *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 26–27 no. 6: [ἔδοξεν τῶι δ]ήμῳι
 Ε[.²³.]άσιος εἶπεν (332/1). Schweigert restored
 Ε[ῦβ]οιος Κρατιστολέω Ἀναγυρ]άσιος (*PA* 5313), and this may well be
 right, giving evidence of a new proposer. If we leave the 23 spaces open,
 there is a remote possibility that the proposer was Εὐκτῆμων.

29. *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 327–28 no. 36: [.⁹.]Ν[.] Παιανιε[ὺς εἶπεν]
 (335/4). The proposer is of Paiania and cannot be identified with any of the 63
 proposers whose demotic is known. Moreover, there is no attested patronymic
 Ν[.]. So the patronymic must have filled at least one of the nine spaces to
 the left of the Ν, e.g. Ἐ[ν]δίου. The inference is that the name of the proposer
 filled max. eight spaces. Of the twenty proposers for whom neither patronymic
 nor demotic is known, six have names of 6–8 letters: Εὐκτῆμων, Κρατίνος,
 Κτησιφῶν, Σκίτων, Σμίκρος, Στέφανος. But Skiton and Smikros are unlikely
 to appear as proposers in 335/4 (*cf. supra ad* no. 9). There is a remote possibil-
 ity that the proposer is one of the four others, but this decree was in all proba-
 bility moved by a citizen who is not yet recorded as a proposer.

30. *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 332–33 no. 39: – – –]μο[.¹¹.]εἶπεν] (*ca* 330).
 The proposer may have been [Μοιροκλῆς Εὐθυδῆ]μο[ν Ἐλευσίνιος] or one
 of the seventeen proposers for whom neither patronymic nor demotic is
 known.

Thus, of these 30 decrees, seven must have been proposed by
 citizens not yet recorded as proposers (nos. 10, 14, 17, 19, 22, 25,
 28). And in seven more cases the decree was probably moved by
 someone other than the eighty-two attested proposers (nos. 2, 3, 4,
 5, 6, 15, 29). The proposer of nos. 2 and 3 may have been the same
 man, but in any case, by a study of the preambles recording broken
 names we can increase the total number of attested proposers of
 decrees of the people from 82 to at least 90 citizens.

New Proposers Attested in the Epigraphical Sources

If it were true that we have the names of at least half of the Athe-
 nians who proposed decrees in the period 355–322 and that only a

few scores of new names would be added if we had the 12,800+ decrees now lost, then almost every new decree found in future will give us the name of a citizen who is already known as a proposer, and only exceptionally will a new decree moved by an unknown proposer add a name to our list of 82. This hypothesis can be tested by an examination of the new sources recovered over the last hundred years. There has been no significant addition to our literary sources for decrees of the people of the period 355–322,³⁵ but the epigraphical evidence has grown every year, and a survey of the publications since the late nineteenth century will indicate what is to be expected as more decrees are found. For my investigation I presuppose information about all proposers mentioned in literary sources and move forward by three steps: the publication of *IG II* in 1877–83; the publication of *IG II.5* in 1895;³⁶ and later publication up to 1983.³⁷ The evidence is best presented in a diagram:

	<i>Number of decrees</i>	<i>Number of proposers</i>	<i>New proposers (epigr. sources)</i>	<i>New proposers (all sources)</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>IG II</i>	40	25	25	17	17:40 = 43%
<i>IG II.5</i>	32	28	22	20	20:32 = 63%
Later	13	11	7	6	6:13 = 46%

It is impossible to draw a graph on the basis of these figures, but they do show beyond dispute that it would be absurd to assume that new decrees will provide mostly new attestations of proposers already known from other decrees. On the contrary, we have every reason to infer that on average every second decree found in the future will reveal a citizen not yet known as a proposer (but perhaps as a trierarch or *bouleutes* or *diaitetes*, etc.). It is impossible to say when and how the proportion of new proposers will begin to drop drastically. The next 100 decrees may give the names of 40 new proposers, but the next 1000 decrees, if found, would undoubtedly reveal fewer than 400 new names. The only conclusion is that the epigraphical evidence, according to this test, favours the view that perfect sources would give us the names of many more proposers than are now recorded.

³⁵ The only additions are Kephisodotos' honorary decree for Demades (*Lex.Patm.* 149 s.v. *ἐκατόμπεδον*) and Philokrates' decree on the *ἱερὰ ὄργας* (*Didymos In Dem.* coll. 13.57 [Philoch. F155]) and 14.48 [Androt. F30]).

³⁶ With *IG II.5* I group three inscriptions from the Oropos district first published in 1891 and included in *IG VII* (1892), viz. 4252, 4253 (*Syll.*³ 287), 4254 (*Syll.*³ 298).

³⁷ This group comprises: *IG II*² 218.6–7; 218.22–23; 220.7–8, 28–29; 276.23–24; 408.5–6; 452.11 (*cf. SEG XXI* 284); *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 169–70 no. 32 (*cf. 9* [1940] 339–40); 7 (1938) 291–92 no. 18; 9 (1940) 325–27 no. 35; 13 (1944) 231–33 no. 5; 43 (1974) 322–24 no. 3; *AthMitt* 72 (1957) 156–64 no. 1; EM 13067, unpublished but *cf. SEG XXI* 272.

The Distribution of Decrees among Proposers

The next test is also based on statistics, focused again on the epigraphical evidence. Let me say in advance that the test is inconclusive—which in itself, however, is an interesting conclusion. I presuppose that the epigraphical evidence gives us a fairly random sample of decrees moved by named citizens. Of the *ca* 13,000 decrees passed in the years 355–322, perhaps only a few thousand were inscribed on stone, primarily honorary decrees as is evident from the 85 extant which record the name of the proposer. In eight cases only the preamble is preserved and the content of the decree is unknown. Of the remaining 77 decrees, 54 are honorific (including citizenship decrees), and no more than 23 relate to other matters (*e.g.* the navy, cult, public works, and, occasionally, foreign affairs). The paucity of really important decrees preserved on stone is indeed significant, and it would be foolish to write a treatise on the powers of the *ecclesia* based on epigraphical sources. But this investigation is limited to the identity of the proposers, and for this purpose I believe that the decrees on stone are more representative. The *a priori* assumption that the moving of honorary decrees was usually left to minor *rhetores* is contradicted by the fact that, *e.g.*, Androtion, Aristophon, Demades, Demosthenes, Diopieithes of Sphettos, Hegesippos, Lykourgos, and Polyeuktos of Sphettos are attested as proposers of honorary decrees. Conversely, we find otherwise unattested citizens as proposers of rather important decrees, *e.g.* the dispatch of a squadron (Aristonikos of Marathon and Kephisophon of Cholargos). So I presume that the preserved decrees record political leaders and minor *rhetores* indiscriminately. I will go no further than that. The preservation of eleven decrees on stone moved by Demades and ten by Lykourgos as against only one by Demosthenes and none by Hyperides is a sufficient warning that no far-reaching conclusions can be drawn, but is in no way incompatible with a random transmission of decrees inscribed on stone (*cf.* n.39 *infra*).

The following table shows decrees distributed among proposers. The first column gives the number of proposers, the second the number of decrees moved by each, the third the total:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 42 \times 1 = 42 \\
 8 \times 2 = 16 \\
 2 \times 3 = 6 \\
 1 \times 10 = 10 \\
 1 \times 11 = 11 \\
 \hline
 \end{array}$$

54 proposers move 85 decrees

Is it possible on the basis of this small sample (less than 1% of all decrees) to say anything about the number of proposers involved? For my test I will suggest two models: (a) all 13,000 decrees were moved by 90 citizens of whom 10 moved 400 decrees each (= 4000 decrees), 20 moved 150 decrees each (= 3000), and 60 moved 100 decrees each (= 6000). (b) All 13,000 decrees were moved by 620 citizens of whom 10 moved 600 decrees each (= 6000 decrees), 10 moved 100 decrees each (= 1000), and 600 moved 10 decrees each (= 6000). In model (a) I suppose that we already know every proposer, from our literary and epigraphical sources (broken names included), and that the next 12,800 would not give us a single new name but only allow us to restore the minimum seven or eight broken names we have. In model (b) I suppose that the recovery of 150 times as many decrees as we have will reveal *ca* seven times as many named proposers. In order to test these two models against the 85 preserved decrees moved by 54 citizens, I have devised an experiment by which 85 random decrees can be drawn from a total of 13,000. All decrees are numbered 1–13,000 and all proposers are also numbered. In model (a) proposer 1 moves decrees 1–400, proposer 2 moves decrees 401–800, proposer 11 moves decrees 4001–4150, etc. In model (b) proposer 1 moves decrees 1–600, proposer 2 moves decrees 601–1200, proposer 11 moves decrees 6001–6100, etc. The drawing of 85 random numbers among 13,000 (one experiment) has been simulated by a calculation based on five-digit random numbers.³⁸ The results for the two models are as follows (the number of proposers, the decrees of each, and the total):

$$(A) \quad 31 \times 1 = 31$$

$$14 \times 2 = 28$$

$$2 \times 3 = 6$$

$$2 \times 4 = 8$$

$$1 \times 5 = 5$$

$$1 \times 7 = 7$$

51 proposers move 85 decrees

$$(B) \quad 40 \times 1 = 40$$

$$3 \times 2 = 6$$

$$3 \times 3 = 9$$

$$2 \times 4 = 8$$

$$1 \times 5 = 5$$

$$1 \times 8 = 8$$

$$1 \times 9 = 9$$

51 proposers move 85 decrees

The striking similarity between the results obtained for (a) and (b) strongly indicates that the experiment need not be repeated. So far as the total number of proposers is concerned, there is no difference between (a) and (b), and both models come very close to the 54 proposers actually attested in the decrees preserved on stone. An-

³⁸ Detailed information about the procedure can be obtained from the author. I should like to thank Lic. Scient. Niels Herman Hansen for his assistance.

other experiment based on the same models or a slight revision of them might easily give us 54 proposers instead of 51. As to the distribution of decrees among proposers, model (a) seems inferior to model (b), but even within a total of 90 proposers model (a) can easily be revised to give as good results as (b).³⁹

In conclusion: the hypothesis that the 85 preserved decrees moved by 54 citizens are a random sample of 13,000 decrees is compatible both with the hypothesis that we already know every single proposer, 90 citizens in all, and with the hypothesis that we know only a seventh of all proposers active between 355 and 322, *i.e.* 90 out of more than 600.

Circumstantial Evidence for Named Proposers

In addition to our direct evidence for *rhetores* who moved decrees of the people, we have a substantial amount of indirect evidence for politically active citizens who probably moved decrees between 355 and 322, but are not (yet) attested as proposers of known decrees passed within the period. The weightiest indirect evidence can be grouped under four headings: (1) citizens who were politically active in the period 355–322 but are attested as proposers of decrees only before 355 or after 322; (2) citizens attested in the period 355–322 as speakers in the *ecclesia* but not as proposers of decrees; (3) citizens attested as proposers of decrees of the *boule* during 355–322 but not as proposers of decrees of the people; (4) citizens attested as proposers of *nomoi* passed by the *nomothetai* but not as proposers of *psephismata* passed by the *ecclesia*.

1. Proposers of decrees attested before 355 and after 322

Some of the Athenian citizens who proposed and carried decrees before 355 were still politically active after 355/4 and are attested in this period as (*e.g.*) ambassadors or prosecutors. But my list of 82 proposers includes only citizens whose attested decrees fall within 355–322. Yet it is a fair assumption that a proposer of decrees before 355 who was still politically active after 355 would also continue to propose decrees. Similarly, some of the citizens attested as proposers only after 322 were already politically active before the overthrow of the democracy in 322/1 and may well have moved decrees in the last

³⁹ In (b) the ten most active citizens (600 proposals each) showed up as proposers of the following numbers of decrees: proposer no. 1, three decrees; no. 2, three; no. 3, eight; no. 4, one; no. 5, two; no. 6, four; no. 7, nine; no. 8, three; no. 9, five; no. 10, four. So the fact that the epigraphical evidence gives us eleven decrees by Demades, ten by Lykourgos, as against one by Demosthenes, is not necessarily incompatible with the hypothesis that the 85 decrees constitute a random sample of the 13,000 decrees.

years of our period. So in addition to the 82 attested proposers for 355–322, we can draw up a list of citizens attested as proposers only before 355 or after 322, but probably also active in the *ecclesia* in the period 355–322:⁴⁰

ante 355:

Αυτόλυκος (*IG II²* 107.30)

Ἐξηκεστίδης Χαρίων Θεορίκιος (*IG II²* 116.8)

Ἡγήσανδρος Ἡγησίου Σουινεύς (*IG II²* 123.7)

Κηφισόδοτος ἐκ Κεραμέων (*Xen. Hell.* 7.1.12–14; *Hesperia* 8 [1939] 5–12 no. 13; *IG II²* 141.30; *Arist. Rh.* 1411a6–11)

Μελάνωπος Λάχητος Αἰξωνεύς (*IG II²* 145.13)

Μερίτης Μένωνος Κυδαθηναίεύς (*ArchEph* 1971, 137–45)

Πάνδιος Σωκλέους ἐξ Οἴου (*IG II²* 103.6, 105.6, *cf.* 130–33)

Πύρρανδρος Ἀναφλύστιος (*IG II²* 44.7)

post 322:

Δημοχάρης Λάχητος Λευκονοεύς (*IG II²* 1492.126–27)

Ἡγήμων (*IG II²* 1469.121–22)

Στρατοκλῆς Εὐθυδήμων Διομειεύς (*cf.* Rhodes [*supra* n.7] 270)

If all the 13,000+ proposals were preserved, I do not doubt that we would find many of these citizens recorded as proposers of decrees in the period 355–322.

2. Speakers in the *ecclesia*

Not infrequently a literary source mentions a citizen who addressed the *ecclesia* during a debate but did not move a proposal. Some of these Athenians are well attested in other sources as proposers of decrees of the people, but the following twenty are known only as speakers and not as proposers:

Αἰσχίνης Ἀτρομήτου Κοθωκίδης (*Dem.* 18.136, 140, 285; 19.10, 35, 113, 209, 304, 310, etc.)

Ἀμεινιάδης (*Aeschin.* 3.130)

Ἀριστόμαχος Κριτοδήμου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (*Dem.* 23.13, 110)

Αυτόλυκος (*Aeschin.* 1.81ff)

Ἀφαρεὺς Ἰσοκράτους Ἐρχιεὺς (*Plut. Mor.* 839c)

Γλαυκότης (*Dem.* 24.13)

Δημοκράτης Δημοκλέους Ἀφιδναῖος (*Plut. Mor.* 803d)

Δημοχάρης Λάχητος Λευκονοεύς (*Plut. Mor.* 847d)

⁴⁰ For the political activity attested between 355 and 322 *cf.* the inventory (*supra* n.29). But for two of the men listed here the activity is not of the type recorded in the inventory: Exekestides was eponym of a naval symmory between 356 and 340 (*IG II²* 1617.40–41, *cf.* Davies, *APF* p.175), and Menites is probably the taxiarch mentioned at *Aeschin.* 2.169–70, *cf.* D. M. Lewis, *BSA* 50 (1955) 31.

Δίφιλος Διοπίθους Σουινεύς (Din. fr. xli)
 Εὐξένιππος Ἐθελοκράτους Λαμπτρεύς (Hyp. 3.14)
 Κηφισόδωρος (Timokles fr.17)
 Κτησιφῶν (Dem. 19.12)
 Μελάνωπος Λάχητος Αἰζωνεύς (Plut. *Dem.* 13.3; Dem. 24.13)
 Νεοπτόλεμος Σκύριος (Dem. 19.12, 315)
 Πάταικος Ἐλευσίνιος (Dem. *Ep.* 3.16)
 Πυθέας (Plut. *Mor.* 804b)
 Πυθοκλῆς Πυθοδώρου ἐκ Κήδων (Dem. 18.285)
 Ταυρέας (Dem. *Ep.* 3.16)
 Φυρκῖνος (Lycurg. 1.19)
 Φωκίων Φώκου Ποτάμιος (Plut. *Phoc.* 7.5–6)

We know that a political leader, *e.g.* Demosthenes, sometimes had his proposals moved by other citizens who were either paid or persuaded to act as proposers (Aeschin. 3.159). But I cannot believe that a political leader would consistently make use of others and never propose a decree in his own name. Moreover, I take a speech delivered in the *ecclesia* to be a more conspicuous and demanding political activity than the proposal of a decree or a rider. We may then assume, *a priori*, that citizens attested as speakers were also, at least occasionally, proposers of decrees. Melanopos and Autolykos, for example, who are attested as speakers in the period 355–322, are both recorded before 355 as proposers of decrees, and I find it unbelievable that Aischines never proposed and carried a decree of the people. So I suggest that most, perhaps all twenty *rhetores* listed above would also be known as proposers of decrees if we had perfect sources. On the other hand, Euxenippos, whom Hypereides describes as an *idiotes*, may be an example of an Athenian citizen who (once) had to address the *ecclesia* but never moved a single proposal.

3. Proposers of decrees of the *boule*

Proposers of decrees of the *boule* consist of spokesmen of probouleumatic decrees (decrees of the *boule* ratified by the *ecclesia*) and spokesmen of decrees of the *boule* (independent decrees of the *boule* and *probouleumata* resulting in a non-probouleumatic decree of the *ecclesia* moved by another man). Spokesmen of probouleumatic decrees are of course recorded above among the 82 proposers of decrees of the *ecclesia*. But we know also about twenty citizens who in the period 355–322 proposed and carried decrees of the *boule* in the second sense. Seven of these spokesmen are also known as proposers of decrees of the *ecclesia* (recorded above), but thirteen are attested only as spokesmen of decrees of the *boule*:

- Ἄγασίας Χειριγένους (?) Ἴκαριεύς (?), 336/5 (*IG* II² 330.32)
 Ἄντιδοτος Ἀπολλοδώρου Συπαλήττιος, 333/2 (*IG* II² 337.5–7), *probouleuma*
 Δεινόστρατος Δεινιάδου Ἀγκυλῆθεν, 343/2 (*IG* II² 223.4)
 Δημέας Σφήττιος, before 324 (*IG* II² 3207)
 Διοφάνης Κηφισιεύς, before 324 (*IG* II² 3207)
 Εὐετίων Αὐτοκλείδου Σφήττιος, 328/7 (*IG* II² 354.32), *probouleuma*
 Ἡγέμαχος Χαιρήμονος Περιθοίδης, 334/3 (*IG* II² 1156.36)
 Καλλισθένης Χαροπίδου Τρινεμεύς, 328/7 (*Agora* XV 49.41)
 Καλλίστρατος Θορίκιος, 330/329 or earlier (*IG* II² 1627.380 etc.)
 Κηφισόδοτος Εὐαρχίδου Ἀχαρνεύς, 329/8? (*IG* II² 360.51), *probouleuma*
 Κτησικλῆς Βατῆθεν, before 324 (*IG* II² 3207)
 Πολύευκτος Καλλικράτους Ἐστιαιόθεν, 324/3 (*IG* II² 1631.350–51)
 Φυλεὺς Πανσανίου Οἰναῖος, 325/4 (*IG* II² 360.66), *probouleuma*

Demosthenes states (22.36) that many councillors never moved any proposal and that the *boule* was in fact dominated by a comparatively small number of *rhetores*. So a citizen attested as a spokesman in the *boule* is very likely to have proposed and carried at least one probouleumatic decree during his year as a councillor. Accordingly I suggest that some of the thirteen citizens listed above, probably even most of them, were in fact proposers of probouleumatic decrees now lost. The same observation applies to the four citizens who are known as speakers in the *boule*, but not as proposers:

- Δημοκράτης Δημοκλέους Ἀφιδναῖος (Aeschin. 2.17)
 Εὐδοξος Θεαγγέλου Συπαλλήττιος (*IG* II² 223c.10–12)
 Ἰατροκλῆς Πασιφῶντος (Aeschin. 2.16)
 Λεωσθένης Λεωσθένους Κεφαλῆθεν (Diod. 17.111.3)⁴¹

4. Proposers of *nomoi*

Some Athenian political leaders are known as proposers of both *nomoi* and *psephismata*, viz. Aristophon, Euboulos, Demosthenes, Lykourgos, Aristonikos (of Marathon), Epikrates (of Peiraius), and Phanodemos (of Thymaitadai). But no preserved decree of the people can be ascribed to six citizens who however are all attested as proposers of *nomoi* in the period 355–322:

- Εὐκράτης Ἀριστοτίμου Πειραιεύς (*Hesperia* 21 [1952] 355–59 no. 5)
 Ἡγήμων (Aeschin. 3.25; *IG* II² 1628.300)
 Κηφισοφῶν Κεφαλιῶνος Ἀφιδναῖος (?; *IG* II² 244.1)

⁴¹ In the catalogue (*supra* n.29) 172 line 21, add: Addresses the *boule* (at a secret meeting) and applies for money and men, 324/3 (Diod. 17.111.3).

Λεπτίνης ἐκ Κοίλης (Dem. 20.95, 128)

Μειδίας Κηφισοδώρου Ἀναγυράσιος (Dem. 21.173)

Τιμοκράτης Ἀντιφῶντος Κριωεύς (Dem. 24.63; 24.39–40, 71)

To propose a law and defend it before the *nomothetai* was a much more demanding and complicated procedure than to move a decree in the *ecclesia*, and so it is reasonable to assume, *a fortiori*, that a citizen who took it upon himself to move a law is also likely to have been, at least occasionally, the proposer of a decree of the people. This assumption can be substantiated for some of the citizens listed above. In a late source Eukrates, who moved the tyranny law of 337/6, is mentioned as one of the political leaders in Athens in the 320's.⁴² Kephisophon, who may have moved the law on the repair of the wall in 337/6, is attested as a member of the Theoric Board in 343/2.⁴³ I cannot believe that political leaders like Leptines and Meidias never acted as spokesmen in the *ecclesia*, and Demosthenes accuses Timokrates of having been paid for moving decrees in the *ecclesia* (24.66, 201–03). The allegation of bribery may well be wrong, but there can be no doubt that Timokrates was a regular proposer of decrees in the assembly. So all the citizens listed above as proposers of laws would probably also appear as proposers of decrees if we had fuller sources.

Thus the examination of four different kinds of indirect evidence has provided us with the names of 48 citizens (some recorded more than once) who are not attested as proposers of decrees of the people during 355–322, but most of whom certainly would be if we had full knowledge of the 13,000+ proposals. And the indirect evidence is by no means exhausted by the names listed above. Twenty more citizens are attested as envoys elected by the people between 355 and 322,⁴⁴ and 25 other citizens are known as prosecutors or *synegoroi* in political public actions.⁴⁵ Furthermore, eight citizens are mentioned in

⁴² In Luc. *Dem.Laud.* 31 Eukrates of Peiraeus is mentioned along side Demosthenes, Himeraios of Phaleron, and Aristonikos of Marathon.

⁴³ Cf. the catalogue (*supra* n.29) 171. In the law *IG II² 244.2* an alternative restoration of the name of the proposer is [Δημήτριος Εὐκτήμονος] Ἀφιδναῖος, cf. *Syll.*³ 287.9.

⁴⁴ Ἄνδρων, Ἀριστογείτων (*PA* 1774), Ἀριστόδημος, Ἀφόβητος, Ἀχιλλεύς, Δέρκυλος, Δημήτριος Φανοστράτου Φαληρεὺς, Διόφαντος (*PA* 4421), Δρωπίδης, Εὐδίδακτος, Εὐκλείδης, Εὐφρόσυνος, Ἐφιάλτης, Θηβαγένης, Θρασυκλῆς ἐξ Οὔου, Ἴφικράτης (*PA* 7736), Κίμων, Κλειτόμαχος, Μενέλαος, Πολύξενος. For references see the inventory (*supra* n.29). Envoys who are also attested as *rhetores* in the *ecclesia* or in the *boule* are listed above and are not included in this note.

⁴⁵ Ἀρχίας, Ἀρίστων, Ἀψηφίαν, Δεινίας, Διόδωρος, Δώνδας, Εὐθυκλῆς, Εὐνομος Κυδιμάχου, Θεοκρίνης, Θεόφιλος, Ἴμεραῖος, Καλλικράτης, Λυκῖνος, Μελάντης, Μενέσαιχος, Πιστίας, Προκλῆς, Σωσικλῆς, Φανόστρατος, Φίλιππος (*PA* 14374), Φιλο-

the literary sources as political leaders, but not a single political activity can be ascribed to any of them.⁴⁶ Again, it is reasonable to assume that many citizens who were active as envoys or prosecutors in political public actions would also take an active part in the decision-making process in the *ecclesia*. So in addition to the 82 attested proposers, we know 48 citizens who probably were proposers and 53 more who may be presumed to be. Combining the direct and the indirect evidence, we can draw up a list of 183 citizens who either certainly or probably or presumably were proposers of decrees of the people during 355–322. Is this list fairly exhaustive? Or is it so defective that perfect sources would give us the names of three or five or ten times as many proposers of decrees of the people? *A priori*, it is remotely possible that the discovery of *ca* 12,800 more decrees, in addition to many more attestations of the 82 known proposers, would provide us mostly with names of the 101 who are known as having performed other forms of political activity, and that any new decree to be found only exceptionally would bring us an addition to the extended list of 183 certain, probable, and possible proposers. But this hypothesis can be ruled out by a closer inspection of the epigraphical evidence.

Over the years the recovery of documents on stone has provided us with the names of 54 citizens who between 355 and 322 proposed and carried decrees of the people. 43 names are new in the sense that these citizens are not attested in literary sources as proposers of decrees. I argued above that the future recovery of more decrees is likely to add many names to the list of 82 proposers now attested in literary and epigraphical sources. But then we have to ask the question: are these new proposers likely to be citizens already known as politically active in other fields (*i.e.* already recorded among the 101 men mentioned above)? Or will new epigraphical sources bring us the names of citizens who are either completely unknown or at least not known as politically active? Again, a glance at what has been found will indicate what to expect of future discoveries. Of the 43 new proposers attested in epigraphical sources, only seven names recur in the lists of 48 citizens recorded to have performed related forms of political activity, and if by including envoys, prosecutors,

κράτης Ἐπικράτου Ἐλευσίνιος, Φιλοχάρης Ἀτρομήτου Κοθωκίδης, Φορμίων (PA 14952), Χάρης, Χαρίνος. For references see the inventory (*supra* n.29). Prosecutors who are also attested as *rhetores* in the *ecclesia* or in the *boule* are listed above and are not included in this note.

⁴⁶ *Cf.* the inventory (*supra* n.29) 179, where three out of the eleven men listed fall outside the period 355–322 (Kallippos, Lykon, Xenotimos).

etc., we extend the investigation to cover all the 101 politically active citizens, only four more proposers can be identified with citizens who were politically active in other fields. So for 32 out of the 43 citizens the attestation as proposer in the *ecclesia* is the only recorded political activity. In conclusion, for the years to come, every second decree to be recovered will, on average, bring us the name of a new proposer. And, again on average, in three cases out of four this new proposer will be a citizen not previously attested as having performed any political activity.⁴⁷ The total number of proposers of decrees of the people in the period 355–322 is likely to have been much larger than the 183 citizens of whom 82 are attested and 101 are likely to have been active in the *ecclesia*.

The Number of Proposers of Probouleumatic Decrees

In his careful investigation of decrees of the *boule* and the *demos*, Rhodes argued convincingly that decrees of the *ecclesia* are fairly evenly divided between probouleumatic and non-probouleumatic.⁴⁸ Accepting a total of 13,000+ decrees in the period 355–322, we must infer that some 6500 decisions made by the people were ratifications of *probouleumata* proposed and carried in the *boule* by one of the councillors. Demosthenes states (22.36) that the decrees of the *boule* (including *probouleumata*) were moved by a minority of the councillors and that most members of the *boule* only listened to and voted on the proposals moved by the *rhetores*. Let us assume that only 25–50 councillors in the course of the year took it upon themselves to be spokesmen of *probouleumata*. This is, in my opinion, a modest estimate, but the conclusion is nevertheless that some 850–1700 councillors were responsible for the probouleumatic decrees ratified by the *demos* in the period 355–322. We know, however, that an Athenian citizen might serve twice on the *boule*, and if most councillors did serve a second year, the number of proposers is reduced to some 500–1000. But again I believe that Rhodes is right in assuming that most councillors served only once.⁴⁹ So a simple calculation of the probouleumatic decrees suggests that only some 50% of all decrees of the people in 355–322 were probably moved by no fewer than 700–1400 citizens, sometimes in collaboration with a *rhetor* in the *ecclesia* who persuaded (or paid) the councillor to act as a spokesman (*cf.*

⁴⁷ That is, political activity of the types listed in my inventory. New proposers may of course be identified with ordinary councillors listed in the *bouleutai* inscriptions or with trierarchs listed in the naval inscriptions.

⁴⁸ Rhodes (*supra* n.7) 79.

⁴⁹ Rhodes (*supra* n.13) 696, 769, and especially *ZPE* 38 (1980) 193.

Aeschin. 3.125). But that is a different matter to be discussed elsewhere. The non-probouleumatic decrees may have been moved by a much smaller number of citizens (who were also responsible for probouleumatic decrees during their one to two years in the *boule*). The epigraphical evidence supports this assumption: 21 attested probouleumatic decrees and riders are moved by twenty citizens, whereas 36 non-probouleumatic decrees and riders are moved by 24 citizens.⁵⁰ This is still a good rotation of proposers, but less marked.

In conclusion, the rule that no citizen could serve on the *boule* more than twice and that most did only once ensured a considerable rotation of *bouleutai* and so of proposers of probouleumatic decrees. Again, the high number of probouleumatic decrees (50% of all) ensured a very high number of proposers of decrees, and so a total of, say, 700–1400 proposers in the period 355–322.

The Number of Proposers Attending an *Ecclesia*

I have argued that *ca* 13,000 decrees passed by the people in 355–322 were presumably moved by no fewer than 700–1400 citizens. How can this figure (covering 34 years) be related to the total number of citizens at any given time and to the number of citizens attending a meeting of the *ecclesia*? We have reason to believe that the adult male citizen population (in any year of this period) amounted to some 21,000 men, and that every year some 600–750 eighteen-year-old Athenians would be inscribed as full citizens in the *lexiarchika grammateia*.⁵¹ So, in the 34 years between 355 and 322, *ca* 20,000–25,000 new citizens would be inscribed, and the total number of citizens recorded in the *lexiarchika grammateia* during 355–322 must have been *ca* 41,000–46,000, or, to strike an average, *ca* 43,500. The ratio of all citizens recorded during 355–322 to all citizens on record in any year is then 43.5:21.⁵² If we apply this ratio to the number of proposers, the inference is that 700–1400 proposers in 34 years is the equivalent of 340–680 proposers in any year. In this context,

⁵⁰ Of the 85 epigraphically attested decrees (*cf. supra* 132) 21 proposals and riders are probouleumatic, 36 are non-probouleumatic, and in 28 cases the significant formulae are lost and the decree cannot be classified.

⁵¹ *Cf.* A. J. Coale and P. Demeny, *Regional Model Life Tables and Stable Populations* (Princeton 1966). As a possible model for Athens I use Model West, males, mortality level II–VI, annual growth rate 0–½%. In these tables the 18-year-old men constitute min. 2.8% (Mortality level VI, annual growth rate 0%) and max. 3.6% (Mortality level II, annual growth rate ½%) of all males above 18. So the Athenian 18-year-old men must have numbered, on average, 600–750 out of 21,000 males above 18.

⁵² It makes no difference for the calculation of the fraction (43.5:21) whether we use 21,000 citizens as the starting point or 31,000 citizens (still maintained by some historians as the preferable number of male citizens in the later fourth century).

of course, 'proposer' means potential proposer. The high number of proposers means a small number of decrees moved by the average proposer. Consequently, several prytanies, perhaps even several years, might pass between two decrees moved by the same man. But he was a potential proposer in the sense that, in the *ecclesia*, he might always contemplate the possibility of intervening and handing in a proposal. In this sense, the number of 'proposers' attending a meeting of the *ecclesia* must be counted by the hundred rather than by the score.⁵³

Rhetores versus *Idiotai* as Proposers of Decrees

This very high number of proposers must now be related to the accepted view of Athenian politics, which is well stated by Jones,⁵⁴ that the Athenian assembly was dominated by a small group of full-time political leaders and a somewhat larger class of semi-professional 'politicians' who *i.a.* proposed motions in the council and in the assembly.⁵⁵ Let us spell out the consequences of this view: if we suppose that such a professional or semi-professional 'politician' would, on average, move one proposal every fourth *ecclesia* over a period of *ca* 25 years (which is indeed a moderate estimate on Jones' description of what it meant to be a 'politician' in fourth-century Athens), then in the period 355–322 slightly more than 50 *rhetores* would have moved all the 13,000 proposals discussed above. Even granted that 13,000 is probably a minimum, this picture of Athenian politics is incompatible both with the fact that access to less than two percent of all sources has already given us the names of at least 90 proposers (82 named proposers plus 8 or more others with broken names) and with the probability that more sources, if found, will bring us the names of hundreds of new proposers.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt that a few 'professional' or 'semi-professional politicians' did exist in Athens and did in fact move a considerable number of decrees in the *ecclesia*: the lexicographers report that Timarchos moved more than 100 decrees.⁵⁶ They may be exaggerating, but if the notes are based on good sources, they

⁵³ Griffith (*supra* n.3) is of course right in believing that the herald's question *τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται*; never resulted in a queue of hundreds of citizens wishing to address the *ecclesia*. According to my view there is an essential difference between the regular speaker and the occasional speaker, and therefore, in every session of the *ecclesia*, an essential difference between those who actually address the people and those who may or may not address the people.

⁵⁴ *Supra* n.3: 128–33.

⁵⁵ *Cf.* my comments on this distinction (*supra* n.10) 47 n.43.

⁵⁶ Aeschin. 1 hypoth. 1; Suda s.v. Τιμαρχος.

indicate that one hundred is a possible number of decrees moved by one political leader. Next, in the speech *Against Ktesiphon*, Aischines says that Aristophon was acquitted 75 times in a *graphe paranomon*. This is indeed a record, and it has recently been questioned.⁵⁷ One may suspect either a corruption of the text or a gross exaggeration. But even if we take this piece of information at face value, it is not out of proportion with the 100 decrees claimed for Timarchos. When Aischines made his remark, Aristophon had been politically active for some sixty years. If he met with much opposition and every third decree was appealed against to the *dicasteria*, he proposed 225 decrees in a period of 60 years, which is the equivalent of fewer than 100 decrees in 25 years. Third, for three named political leaders we have information about a very high number of datable decrees: Demosthenes 39, Demades 21 (+ 5 in the period 321–318),⁵⁸ Lykourgos 11. Given the fragmentary preservation of the sources, each of these three citizens was probably responsible for several hundred proposals. Furthermore, that Demosthenes was more or less a professional political leader is apparent from several sources, e.g. the speech *Against Zenothemis*: ἐμοὶ [Δημοσθένει] συμβέβηκεν, ἀφ' οὗ περὶ τῶν κοινῶν λέγειν ἠρξάμην, μηδὲ πρὸς ἐν πράγματι ἴδιον προσεληλυθέναι· ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς πολιτείας αὐτῆς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐξέστηκα . . . (the text breaks off) (Dem. 32.32). Finally, the scanty evidence we have shows that a *rhetor* sometimes proposed and carried decrees at two successive meetings of the *ecclesia*;⁵⁹ and a *rhetor* might even move two or more decrees at the same session of the *ecclesia*.⁶⁰

Summing up. (a) Some of the political leaders were almost professional, and a *rhetor* of this type was probably responsible for several hundred decrees in the course of his political career.⁶¹ (b) On the other hand, no fewer than 700–1400 citizens were probably active as proposers of decrees in the *ecclesia* in the period 355–322. A combination of (a) and (b) leads to two observations. (1) The average

⁵⁷ Aeschin. 3.194; cf. S. I. Oost, "Two Notes on Aristophon of Azenia," *CP* 72 (1977) 238–42.

⁵⁸ Cf. A. N. Oikonomides' list of Demades' decrees, *Platon* 8 (1956) 106.

⁵⁹ Philokrates of Hagnous moved the peace at the session held 19 Elaph. 347/6, and a decree about the oath on the peace at the following session held 25 Elaph. (Aeschin. 3.54, 74).

⁶⁰ E.g. Demades (*IG* II² 240, 241), Diophantos of Myrrhinous (242, 243), and Demosthenes, who at the two sessions held in the beginning of Elaphebolion 347/6 moved at least four decrees (cf. Hansen [*supra* n.13] 70).

⁶¹ In model (b) (*supra* 143) I suggested that 600 decrees were moved by each of the 10 most active political leaders. For Demosthenes (who was active throughout the period 355–322) a total of 600 decrees would mean that he, on average, moved a decree every second *ecclesia*, which is an impressive effort, but not impossible.

proposer must have moved very few decrees, probably fewer than ten and many citizens only one or two. (2) The number of 'professional' and 'semi-professional' politicians must have been very small, perhaps only some ten to twenty citizens. If we move from twenty to thirty or even forty political leaders, we will have great and increasing difficulties in finding room for the very high number of occasional proposers indicated by the sources. Thus, to Jones' two groups of professional and semi-professional 'politicians' we must add a third important group, mentioned neither by him nor by any other historian: the ordinary politically active citizen who occasionally took it upon himself to hand in a proposal and who took a pride in being an *idiotes* and a *rhetor* only in the legal but not in the political sense of this term.⁶² At any meeting of the *ecclesia* some 300–600 citizens out of more than 6000 attending may have been prepared, if necessary, to move a proposal, which is an indication that participation in politics, even at the highest level, was more widespread than assumed by most historians. On the other hand, the number of speakers who *regularly* addressed the people was probably much smaller. In this respect there seems to be an important contrast between the ideal democratic *isegoria* inviting any citizen to take an active part in the debate and a rather narrow group of *rhetores* in the political sense who tended to dominate the debate. But the unquestionable existence of a small group of political leaders has led many historians to draw a much too clear-cut distinction between 'politicians' (who addressed the people and moved the proposals) and ordinary citizens (who listened and voted). This dichotomy obliterates the very important and rather numerous group of citizens who sometimes acted as *rhetores* (in the legal sense) and who, combined, must have been responsible for a very high number of all decrees passed by the people, often perhaps on routine business (*e.g.*, honours) but sometimes at least on important matters. Some ordinary citizens collaborated with the political leaders, but some may also have been acting on their own initiative. Furthermore, it is wrong to draw sharp lines between the groups. The sources indicate instead a continuum with no rigid distinctions between the political leader, the minor *rhetor* (often attached to a political leader), the citizen who only occasionally acted as a *rhetor*, the citizen who only once or twice in his life proposed a decree, and the citizen who only listened and voted. Especially membership of the *boule*, involving the participation of almost all citizens older than thirty, secured a considerable rotation of pro-

⁶² Cf. my notes on political participation (*supra* n.10) 43–49, esp. 48.

posers of probouleumatic decrees which probably constituted about 50% of all decrees passed in the period.

Conclusion

Studies of 'politicians' in classical Athens and reconstructions of political groups are mostly based on three assumptions: (a) politics in Athens were in the hands of a group of 'professional' and 'semi-professional' politicians; (b) the number of 'politicians' involved was relatively small; (c) we know many and perhaps even most of the 'politicians' involved.⁶³ The evidence presented in this article points to three different assumptions: (a) in addition to the political leaders there was an important group of politically-minded citizens who were active, even as proposers, but only occasionally and not professionally; (b) the number of citizens involved in politics as proposers (and not only as voters) was much larger than usually believed, and there was no sharp distinction between the professional, the semi-professional, and the ordinary citizen; (c) hundreds of minor and probably also some major political figures are completely unknown to us, and several of those who are attested only once or twice and appear only as minor figures may well have been political leaders responsible for numerous important proposals, now lost.⁶⁴

THE UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN
April, 1984

⁶³ These three assumptions are made by almost all historians who have written in detail on politics and political groups in fourth-century Athens. See most notably K. J. Beloch, *Die attische Politik seit Perikles* (Leipzig 1884); P. Cloché, *La politique étrangère d'Athènes de 404 à 338 avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1934); and the very interesting studies by R. Sealey (*supra* n.3).

⁶⁴ This article and its predecessors on Athenian political leaders, *GRBS* 24 (1983) 33–55, 151–80, 227–38, all stem from a seminar held in March 1983 at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. I should like to thank the Institute for appointing me a visiting member for spring 1983, the Commission for Educational Exchange between Denmark and the United States for appointing me a Fulbright Scholar for the same period, and the Danish Research Council for the Humanities for supporting me with a grant-in-aid. I should also like to thank the other members of the informal B-Building seminars, held every evening after 10 p.m. over a bottle of wine, and attended by Fordyce Mitchel, Gerhard Thür, Bruce Frier, Egon Verheyen, and myself. Finally, I should like to thank David Lewis for some very helpful notes, especially on my lists of proposers (*supra* 132–40).