# Seven Hundred *Archai* in Classical Athens

## Mogens Herman Hansen

THE TOTAL NUMBER of magistrates in classical Athens is explicitly stated in only one source, Aristotle's *Ath.Pol.* 24.3: ἀρχαὶ δ' ἔνδημοι μὲν εἰς ἐπτακοσίους ἄνδρας, ὑπερόριοι δ' εἰς † ἐπτακοσίους. Thus, in the second half of the fifth century, the Athenians had, according to Aristotle, *ca* 700 magistrates at home and 700 abroad. The repetition, however, of εἰς ἐπτακοσίους is suspicious, and all editors obelize the second figure on the assumption that a careless scribe inadvertently copied the first figure twice.[1] Aristotle's information about the number of foreign magistrates is accordingly lost, owing to corruption of the text. But it seems the corruption of the second figure has influenced historians' faith in the first figure as well. No contemporary scholar seems to believe that the number of home magistrates in classical Athens amounted to *ca* 700. Aristotle's information is either passed over in silence or openly rejected. The accepted opinion is succinctly expressed by A. H. M. Jones: "The magistrates numbered about 350 in the later fourth century. . . . The number 350 is based on a count from Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 47–61, which is a fairly exhaustive list (compare Gilbert, *Greek Const. Ant.* pp. 230–65, Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, II, pp. 1081–1150). Our information for the fifth century is very incomplete, but known cases of old offices abolished and new offices created about cancel out. Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 24.3 . . . is certainly corrupt on linguistic grounds, apart from being statistically impossible; perhaps the author gave 350 as the total for each class, making a total of 700."[2]

The purpose of this paper is to argue that Aristotle is probably right and that the Athenians, both in the fifth and in the fourth century, had some 700 home magistrates in addition to the 500

---

[1] J. E. Sandys in the Macmillan edition (1912); F. G. Kenyon in *OCT* (1920); B. Haussoullier in the Budé edition (1922 and later); H. Oppermann in the Teubner edition (1968); K. von Fritz and E. Kapp in their translation, *Constitution of Athens* (New York 1950) 169 n.71.

[2] *Athenian Democracy* (Oxford 1957) 6 with n.9.

councillors, thus putting into effect the democratic concept of ἐλευθερία, that all citizens shall be made magistrates by turns.


# I


An evaluation of the statement that the Athenians had *ca* 700 ἔνδημοι ἀρχαί presupposes that we know the precise meaning of the term ἀρχή. If we turn from the *Constitution of Athens* to the *Politics*, Aristotle there emphasizes that not all officials elected by a show of hands or by lot are ἀρχαί in the technical sense of the word. Priests, for example, *choregoi*, heralds, and ambassadors are not *archai* (1299a16–20). Similarly, in Athenian laws and decrees, we find the following penalty clause: ἐὰν δέ τις μὴ ποιήσει, οἷς ἕκαστα προστέτακται, ἢ ἄρχων ἢ ἰδιώτης, κατὰ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα, ὀφειλέτω. . . .[3] Here ἄρχων denotes a magistrate in the technical sense, whereas ἰδιώτης denotes a citizen performing a public function without being a magistrate, *e.g.*, a trierarch.[4] αἱ ἀρχαί seems to be a well defined group of public officials, and in his speech *Against Ctesiphon* (3.29) Aeschines enumerates the different types of *arche*: ἔστι γάρ, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τῶν περὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς εἴδη τρία, ὧν ἓν μὲν καὶ φανερώτατον οἱ κληρωτοὶ καὶ οἱ χειροτονητοὶ ἄρχοντες, δεύτερον δὲ ὅσοι τι διαχειρίζουσι τῶν τῆς πόλεως ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ οἱ τῶν δημοσίων ἔργων ἐπιστάται, τρίτον δ' ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται, καὶ εἴ τινες ἄλλοι αἱρετοὶ ἡγεμονίας δικαστη-ρίων λαμβάνουσι, καὶ τούτους ἄρχειν δοκιμασθέντας. Aeschines, however, is guilty of a slight inaccuracy when he distinguishes between types of *arche*. His quotation reveals that the law he invokes is presumably more concerned with the different criteria for being an *arche* than with the different types of *arche*, and this

---

[3] *IG* II[2] 1629.233–36: same clause in Lys. 5.3; Dem. 23.62; Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 48.2; *IG* II[2] 43.52. The clause is convincingly interpreted by M. Piérart, "Les *euthynoi* athéniens," *AntCl* 40 (1971) 529–50.

[4] The regular term for an Athenian magistrate is ἀρχή, and ἄρχων usually denotes the archon (in the singular) or the nine archons (in the plural). But ἄρχων may refer to magistrates in general: Lys. 5.3, 6.33, 30.3; Isoc. 7.24–26; Dem. 24.54 (law), 42.13, 43.71 (law), *Prooem.* 48.2, 55.2; Aeschin. 3.9, 27–30; Lycurg. 1.79; Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 55.2. Or ἄρχων may denote a specific board of magistrates: οἱ ἕνδεκα (Dem. 22.26, 53.25), οἱ τετταράκοντα (Dem. 21.85, 45.87), ἀστυνόμοι (Isae. 1.14, 22, 25), σιτοφύλακες (Lys. 22.5–10), ἐπιμεληταὶ τοῦ ἐμπορίου (Dem. 58.8), τειχοποιοί (Aeschin. 3.31), and the στρατηγοί (Lys. 9.6, 14.21, 16.16, 28.5, 15; Aeschin. 3.146). In the law on silver coinage (*Hesperia* 43 [1974] 157–88 lines 24–25) οἱ ἄρχοντες refers back to three boards previously mentioned: σιτοφύλακες, οἱ τοῦ δήμου συλλογεῖς, and οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ τοῦ ἐμπορίου.

impression is confirmed by Aeschines' paraphrase of the same law earlier in the speech: ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς λόγους τοὺς τούτων νόμον ὑμέτερον παρέξομαι ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐνομοθετήσατε λύσειν ἡγούμενοι τὰς τοιαύτας προφάσεις, ἐν ᾧ διαρρήδην γέγραπται, "τὰς χειροτονητὰς" φησιν "ἀρχάς," ἁπάσας ἑνὶ περιλαβὼν ὀνόματι ὁ νομοθέτης, καὶ προσειπὼν ἁπάσας ἀρχὰς εἶναι ἃς ὁ δῆμος χειροτονεῖ, "καὶ τοὺς ἐπιστάτας" φησὶ "τῶν δημοσίων ἔργων." . . . "καὶ πάντας ὅσοι διαχειρίζουσί τι τῶν τῆς πόλεως πλέον ἢ τριάκονθ' ἡμέρας, καὶ ὅσοι λαμβάνουσιν ἡγεμονίας δικαστηρίων·" οἱ δὲ τῶν ἔργων ἐπιστάται πάντες ἡγεμονίᾳ χρῶνται δικαστηρίου· τί τούτους κελεύει ποιεῖν; οὐ διακονεῖν, ἀλλ' "ἄρχειν δοκιμασθέντας ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ," ἐπειδὴ καὶ αἱ κληρωταὶ ἀρχαὶ οὐκ ἀδοκίμαστοι, ἀλλὰ δοκιμασθεῖσαι ἄρχουσι, "καὶ λόγον καὶ εὐθύνας ἐγγράφειν πρὸς τοὺς λογιστάς," καθάπερ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς κελεύει. ὅτι δὲ ἀληθῆ λέγω, τοὺς νόμους αὐτοὺς ὑμῖν ἀναγνώσεται.[5]

So the Athenians had a special law delimiting the offices, probably a *nomos* about *dokimasia* defining *arche* in the technical sense. On the basis of Aeschines' description, supplemented with other sources, we can conclude that an *arche* was (a) a citizen of more than thirty years of age who was (b) elected either by lot or by a show of hands, (c) liable to *dokimasia* before assumption of office, (d) appointed for a period of more than thirty days, (e) empowered to preside over a court (ἡγεμονία δικαστηρίου), (f) empowered to impose minor fines (ἐπιβολὰς ἐπιβάλλειν), (g) empowered to manage public money and to supervise public works and public buildings, (h) liable to audit on the expiration of his office (εὔθυναι).[6]

Officials who fulfilled all these conditions, or at least (a)–(d) and (h), were *archai* in the technical sense. Accordingly, we must exclude from the number of *archai* the following groups of officials (see Appendix II): ἱερεῖς, πρέσβεις, most γραμματεῖς and ὑπο-

---

[5] Aeschin. 3.14–15. The law is read out to the jurors after 15. Aeschines returns to this law in 28–30 and, in an extended form(?), he has it read out once more after 30. Aeschines emphasizes in 14 that the purpose of the law is to delimit the concept of *arche* in order to counter objections of the type: "Admittedly I am an official, but I am not an *arche* and subject to the restrictions imposed on *archai*." Since this objection is precisely what can be expected from the defence, Aeschines' interpretation may of course be a distortion of the law. In the relevant section, however, of his speech for the defence, Demosthenes (18.110–25) does not accuse Aeschines of misquoting or misinterpreting the law, and this is a very strong indication that Aeschines' paraphrase is basically reliable.

[6] The right to impose minor fines is not discussed by Aeschines in his paraphrase of the law but mentioned in 27. The only criterion passed over in silence by Aeschines is the thirty-year age limit (probably because it was of no importance for his argument against Demosthenes). It is poorly attested in the sources: see *infra* Appendix I.

γραμματεῖς, πάρεδροι τοῖς ἄρχουσιν, κήρυκες, λοχαγοί, διαιτηταί, Ἀρεοπαγῖται, λειτουργοῦντες, and all local officials with the exception of the δήμαρχος εἰς Πειραιέα. But since I am concerned with the ἔνδημοι ἀρχαί I must make two further reservations: (1) Foreign magistrates must be excluded as, for example, ὁ ἄρχων εἰς Σαλαμῖνα, ὁ ἵππαρχος εἰς Λῆμνον, and οἱ ἀμφικτύονες εἰς Δῆλον.[7] (2) Since Aristotle, in Ath.Pol. 24.3, probably counted the ordinary officials only, I must leave out extraordinary officials as, for example, ἀποστολεῖς and τειχοποιοί.[8]

# II

Under this technical and restricted definition of arche, how many ἔνδημοι ἀρχαί did the Athenians have in the classical period? According to Jones, the magistrates numbered ca 350; admitting that our information for the fifth century is inadequate, he bases

---

[7] The ἄρχων εἰς Σαλαμῖνα was a magistrate elected by lot (Arist. Ath.Pol. 54.8). He received a salary of one dr. per day (62.2). The ἄρχων was probably the governor of Salamis, which was an Athenian cleruchy (IG I² 1.11 [Meiggs-Lewis 14]; IG II² 1008.75; 1227). The ἵππαρχος εἰς Λῆμνον was a magistrate elected by a show of hands (Ath.Pol. 61.6). He commanded the Athenian cavalry on Lemnos, an Athenian cleruchy recovered ca 392. He received misthos (62.2), probably paid by the cleruchs (Hyp. 2.17). Cf J. H. Kroll, Hesperia 46 (1977) 83–140, and Kroll and F. W. Mitchel, Hesperia 49 (1980) 86–96. The Ἀμφικτύονες εἰς Δῆλον was a board of five (IG II² 1634.2–4; 1635.60–63; 1637.3–5; 1653.1–4), probably with representatives from phylae I–V and VI–X in alternating terms of office (IG II² 1635.61–63). The tenure of office changed from two years (390/89–389/88, IG II² 1634.1–2) to four years (377/6–374/3, IG II² 1635.117, 122) to one year (ca 350, IG II² 1637.1). The board supervised Apollo's sanctuary on Delos (IG II² 1634–53), in the beginning of the century in collaboration with a board of ἀμφικτύονες from Andros (IG II² 1634.4–5; 1635.63, 75). The ἀμφικτύονες, their secretary, and undersecretary received one dr. per day (Ath.Pol. 62.2; IG II² 1635.49, 75). Cf. U. Kahrstedt, Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen II (Stuttgart 1936) 30, 77, 316.

[8] The ἀποστολεῖς was a board of ten elected by a show of hands when a squadron was to be sent out (IG II² 1629.251–58). The board collaborated with the council of five hundred and was empowered to imprison any disobedient Athenian (Dem. 18.107; 47.26. Cf. Philoch. FGrHist328F63 = Harp. s.v. ἀποστολεῖς; Lex.Seg. 435.29 Bekker). The τειχοποιοί was usually a board of ten with one representative from each tribe (IG II² 1658–61). Elected by a show of hands in the tribal assemblies (Aeschin. 3.27, 30), they supervised the construction or repair of the defences of Athens and the Piraeus (IG II² 244.31–45). They were empowered to impose fines and to preside over the people's court (Aeschin. 3.14, 27; IG II² 244.31–32). They were subject both to δοκιμασία (Aeschin. 3.14–15) and to εὔθυναι (Aeschin. 3.24). In the case of major constructions τειχοποιοί were probably appointed repeatedly in a succession of years (IG II² 1658–59 [394/3] and 1660–61 [393/2]).

his estimate on Aristotle's list in the second half of the *Constitution of Athens*, to which we must now turn. Aristotle's systematic account of the Athenian democracy after the restoration in 403/2 is organized into three parts: a short introduction about citizenship and the training of the *epheboï* (42), a very long section on all the *archai* (43–62), and a somewhat shorter section on the people's court (63–69). The middle section on *archai* is subdivided into four parts: first a short enumeration of officers of state elected by a show of hands (43.1), next a long survey of magistrates elected by lot (43.2–60), then a chapter on officers of the army (61), and finally an account of methods of allotment and *misthos* for magistrates (62). So all the various boards of magistrates are enumerated and described in 43–61, but outside this section Aristotle mentions the σωφρονισταί and the κοσμητής in 42, and the ἀμφικτύονες εἰς Δῆλον in his account of *misthos* in 62. Following Aristotle's arrangement I present a list of all the boards of magistrates mentioned by him in the systematic part of the *Constitution of Athens*:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10 σωφρονισταί | 42.2 | 1 γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν | 54.3 |
| 1 κοσμητής | 42.2 | 1 γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους | 54.4 |
| 1 ταμίας στρατιωτικῶν | 43.1 | 1 γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου | 54.5 |
| ? οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν | 43.1 | 10 ἱεροποιοὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα | 54.6 |
| 1 ὁ τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητής | 43.1 | 10 ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν | 54.7 |
| 500 βουλὴ οἱ πεντακόσιοι | 43.2–49 | 1 ἄρχων εἰς Σαλαμῖνα | 54.8 |
| 10 ταμίαι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς | 47.1 | 1 δήμαρχος εἰς Πειραιέα | 54.8 |
| 10 πωληταί | 47.2–5 | 1 γραμματεὺς τοῖς θεσμοθέταις | 55.1 |
| 10 ἀποδέκται | 48.1–2 | 1 ἄρχων | 56.1–7 |
| 10 καταλογεῖς | 49.2 | 10 ἐπιμεληταὶ εἰς Διονύσια | 56.4 |
| 1 ταμίας τοῖς ἀδυνάτοις | 49.4 | 4 ἐπιμεληταὶ μυστηρίων | 57.1 |
| 10 ἱερῶν ἐπισκευασταί | 50.1 | 1 βασιλεύς | 57.1–4 |
| 10 ἀστυνόμοι | 50.2 | 1 πολέμαρχος | 58.1–3 |
| 10 ἀγορανόμοι | 51.1 | 6 θεσμοθέται | 59.1–7 |
| 10 μετρονόμοι | 51.2 | 10 ἀθλοθέται | 60.1 |
| 35 σιτοφύλακες | 51.3 | 10 στρατηγοί | 61.1–2 |
| 10 ἐπιμεληταὶ τοῦ ἐμπορίου | 51.4 | 10 ταξίαρχοι | 61.3 |
| 11 οἱ ἕνδεκα | 52.1 | 2 ἵππαρχοι | 61.4 |
| 5 εἰσαγωγεῖς | 52.2 | 10 φύλαρχοι | 61.5 |
| 40 οἱ τετταράκοντα | 53.1–2 | 1 ἵππαρχος εἰς Λῆμνον | 61.6 |
| 5 ὁδοποιοί | 54.1 | 1 ταμίας τῆς Παράλου | 61.7 |
| 10 λογισταί | 54.2 | 1 ταμίας τῆς τοῦ Ἀμμωνος | 61.7 |
| 10 συνήγοροι τοῖς λογισταῖς | 54.2 | 5 ἀμφικτύονες εἰς Δῆλον | 62.2 |

This list comprises all the officials mentioned by Aristotle with the exception of (a) διαιτηταί, πάρεδροι τοῖς ἄρχουσιν, and λοχαγοί

(for reasons stated in Appendix I);[9] (b) those boards which are committees of the council of five hundred and not independent boards of magistrates—πρυτάνεις (43.3–4), πρόεδροι (44.2–3), τριηροποιοί (46.1), λογισταί (48.3), εὔθυνοι (48.4), and πάρεδροι τοῖς εὐθύνοις (48.4).[10]

Apart from the council of five hundred and its committees Aristotle lists 319 ἀρχαί plus οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν. We do not know the number of magistrates serving on this board, but assuming that it must have had at least three members and probably ten (one from each of the ten tribes), we arrive at a total of 322–329.[11]

## III

Jones' estimate of ca 350 magistrates in the later fourth century is based on the assumption that the list given by Aristotle is fairly exhaustive, omitting (to be precise) no more than ca 25 archai. An inspection of other sources, however, both literary and epigraphical, reveals that Jones' confidence in the completeness of Aristotle's list is unwarranted. Even in the fragmentary state of our knowledge, we must admit that at least ninety are left unmentioned by Aristotle, so that no conclusion as to the total number of magistrates can be based on his list. According to my investigations the following magistrates and boards of magistrates are passed over in silence by Aristotle.

Ἀναγραφεύς. Magistrate assisting the council of five hundred in the drafting (?) and recording of decrees (IG II² 415; The Athenian Councillors 43.229, 53.13–14, 62.231–32).[12]

---

[9] In addition to the σωφρονισταί and the κοσμητής Aristotle mentions in 42.3 two παιδοτρίβαι and an unknown number of διδάσκαλοι. We know, however, that the διδάσκαλοι were not archai, since the task might be performed by foreigners. One of the διδάσκαλοι for Leontis in 333/2 was a metic from Methone (O. Reinmuth, The Ephebic Inscriptions [Leyden 1971] no.9 col. i 35–36). Similarly I assume that the two παιδοτρίβαι were not archai.

[10] The following committees of the council are passed over in silence by Aristotle: ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσῖνι (IG II² 1672.280, 284, 289, 295, 296, 299; The Athenian Councillors 38.83–87); ἱεροποιοί of Dionysus and other gods (IG II² 410); συλλογεῖς τοῦ δήμου (IG II² 1257; 1496.82–83, 113–14; The Athenian Councillors 38.78–82; Hesperia 43 [1974] 158.20); οἱ ᾑρημένοι ἐπὶ τὰς νίκας καὶ τὰ πομπεῖα καὶ τὸν κόσμον τὸν κανηφορικόν (IG II² 1493.5; 1494.3–4; cf. IG II² 333; Ath.Pol. 49.3; Plut. Mor. 852B: discussed in F. W. Mitchel, "Demades of Paeania and IG II² 1493, 1494, 1495," TAPA 93 [1962] 213–29).

[11] Deducting the ἄρχων εἰς Σαλαμῖνα, the ἵππαρχος εἰς Λῆμνον, and the 5 ἀμφικτύονες εἰς Δῆλον gives a total of 315–22 ἀρχαὶ ἔνδημοι.

[12] In The Athenian Councillors 43.227–34 the ἀναγραφεύς is recorded among the officers

Ἀντιγραφεύς. Magistrate known in the beginning of the fourth century (*The Athenian Councillors* 12.66–67) and again in the 330s (*IG* II² 244.23; *The Athenian Councillors* 43.231). In the middle of the fourth century the office was temporarily abolished and its powers transferred to the Theoric Board (Aeschin. 3.25; *Lex.Seg.* 190.26 Bekker). The ἀντιγραφεύς certifies and records payments to the Treasury (Dem. 22.38, *cf*. 22.70 = 24.178; Harp. *s.v.*). According to Pollux (8.98), the ἀντιγραφεύς was originally elected by a show of hands, later by lot.[13]

Βοῶναι. Board of magistrates (*IG* II² 334.16–20; 1496.70–71, 80–81, 120, 133) elected by a show of hands (Dem. 21.171) and empowered to buy sacrificial animals for the Panathenaea, the Greater Dionysia, and other festivals.

Γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα. Magistrate elected by lot and assisting the council of five hundred in recording all decrees discussed in the council (*The Athenian Councillors* 34.3–4; 43.230).[14]

Ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων. Board of ten, one from each tribe; method of election unknown (*IG* II² 1604.1–3; 1607.1–2; 1623.1–5). The board is in charge of the Athenian warships, the naval equipment, and the arsenals. It collects arrears from debtors to the state (*IG* II² 1622.379ff) and presides over the people's court (*IG* II² 1631.353–55, *cf*. Dem. 22.63, 47.26). In the middle of the fourth century some of the board's powers were transferred to the Theoric Board (Aeschin. 3.25).[15] The board seems to have had little influence on the financial administration of the navy.

---

of the council. Since most of the other officers mentioned, perhaps all, are independent magistrates and not councillors, it seems probable that the ἀναγραφεύς is an independent magistrate as well.

[13] It is apparent from *The Athenian Councillors* 58.80–81 compared with .50–55 that the ἀντιγραφεύς is not a member of the council. The date of the inscription is 305/4, but a comparison with older sources strengthens the impression that the ἀντιγραφεύς was always an independent magistrate.

[14] My description of the γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα is based on an analogy with the γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους (Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 54.4). The γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα first appears in an inscription of 343/2 (*The Athenian Councillors* 34.3) but is not mentioned in the *Ath.Pol.* Previously commentators often assumed that γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους and ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα were two different labels for the same office. But in a recently discovered inscription of 303/2 the two secretaries are mentioned side by side (*The Athenian Councillors* 62.200–02, 235–36), and there can no longer be any doubt that they were distinct and independent.

[15] In order to explain Aristotle's omission of this important board of *archai* it has been suggested that the ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων in the 340s were replaced by ὁ ταμίας ἐς τὰ νεώρια and other ταμίαι, so that the board did not exist in the 320s: J. K. Davies, "The Date of *IG* II² 1609," *Historia* 18 (1969) 316 n.35; P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule*

'Επιμεληταὶ τοῦ 'Αμφιαρείου. Board of ten elected from all Athenians without tribal representation (*IG* VII 4254 [*Syll.*³ 298]). The board is in charge of the festival for Amphiaraos.

'Επιστάται Βραυρωνόθεν. Board of at least three magistrates (*IG* II² 1517.55–63); method of election unknown. The board manages the treasures belonging to Artemis Brauronia (*IG* II² 1514–25, 1528–31; *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 170ff, 8–10).[16]

'Επιστάται 'Ελευσινόθεν. Board of seven (*IG* II² 1666.1–6; 1543.1–6; 1544.1–11) in charge of the treasures (*IG* II² 1540–52) and the financial administration (*IG* II² 1666; 1672; 1673) of the Eleusinion. The seven ἐπιστάται, their γραμματεύς, and the two ταμίαι τοῖν θεοῖν may have formed a board of ten, but without any tribal representation (*IG* II² 1544.6–11 and 1672.249). The term of office is four years, an Olympiad.[17]

'Επιστάται τοῦ 'Αργυροκοπίου. Board of ten, one from each tribe.[18] The board is in charge of the Athenian coinage and the Mint (Meiggs-Lewis no.45).

'Επιστάται τοῦ 'Ασκληπιείου. Board of magistrates; method of election unknown. The board performs some sacrifices and takes part in the financial administration of the sanctuary (*IG* II² 47.28–32). We do not know whether the board collaborated with the

---

(Oxford 1972) 239–40, referring to an unpublished essay by D. M. Lewis. A new fragment of *IG* II² 1628, however, shows the contrary: *SEG* XXIV 159.504–10, [καὶ παρελά]βομεν παρὰ [νεωρίω]ν ἐπιμελητῶ[ν] τῶ[ν ἐφ' Ἡγ]ήμονος ἄρχον[τ]ος ΔΔ[ΔΗΗ ΙΙ] τοῦτο παρέδομεν [νεω]ρίων ἐπιμεληταῖς [τοῖ]ς ἐπὶ 'Αντικλέους ἄρχο[ντ]ος. Rhodes himself emphasized that it may be wholly accidental that the ἐπιμελῆται τῶν νεωρίων do not appear in the surviving texts of the 320s.

[16] Cf. T. Linders, *Studies in the Treasure Records of Artemis Brauronia Found in Athens* (Stockholm 1972) 34. The precise title of the board is unknown. At least three ἐπιστάται must have served on this board since they are styled ἐπιστάται . . . ὁ δεῖνα καὶ οἱ συνάρχοντες (*IG* II² 1517.55–57 and 60–62).

[17] Pace G. Busolt in *Griechische Staatskunde* II (Munich 1926) 1063 n.1. In Olympiad 112 (332/1–329/8) this 'board of ten' has the following composition: 7 ἐπιστάται (of tribes I, III, VI, VII, VII, IX, IX), a γραμματεύς (V: *IG* II² 1544.6–11), 2 ταμίαι (VII, X: *IG* II² 1672.249). And it is reasonable to assume that the ἐπιστάται 'Ελευσινόθεν are identical with the ἐπιστάται 'Ελευσινίου (*IG* II² 1541.6–7 compared with the plausible restoration in *IG* II² 1666.2–3). The board which assumes office in 336/5 (*IG* II² 1543.3–6 and 1544.1–6) is succeeded by the board which assumes office in 332/1 (*IG* II² 1544.6–11).

[18] *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 31–32 no.29 [*SEG* XXI 667]. The inscription is a dedication recording eleven names arranged in the reverse order of the *phylai* and with two representatives from Leontis IV. The most plausible explanation is that the board has ten members serving, one from each tribe, and a secretary whose name, in this case, is inserted among the names of the ἐπιστάται. Alternatively, one may assume that the ἐπιστάται form a board of eleven, but in that case it would be strange to allow the board in charge of the prison to be called οἱ ἕνδεκα without further specification.

priest of Asklepios, who was in charge of the treasures of the sanctuary (*IG* II² 1532–39).

Ἐπιστάται τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἀγαθῆς Τύχης. Board of magistrates; method of election unknown. The board is referred to only in *IG* II² 333(c)20.

Ἱεροποιοὶ εἰς Παναθήναια. Board of magistrates; method of election unknown. The board is known primarily from a decree of *ca* 330. The term of office is probably one year, so that the board every fourth year manages the Greater Panathenaea and the remaining three years the Lesser Panathenaea.[19] It cannot be precluded that the board is a committee of the council of five hundred. The board performs sacrifices (*IG* II² 1496.99, 129), supervises the festival, and is empowered to impose minor fines (*IG* II² 334.34).

Ἱεροποιοὶ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς. Board of three, elected by a show of hands from all Athenians. The board performs sacrifices to the Eumenides.[20] Between 346 and 325 the number of magistrates

[19] *IG* II² 334. In lines 6, 8, 12, and 17 the board is called ἱεροποιοί without further specification, but in lines 31–32 the title is οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ οἱ διοικοῦντες τὰ Παναθήναια τὰ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν. A comparison of πέμψαντες (18) with πέμπειν (33) shows that all passages refer to the same board. The decree regulates only the Lesser Panathenaea. If the board (as usually assumed) is in charge of the Greater Panathenaea as well, it must be different from the ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν (Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 54.7). *Cf.* L. Ziehen, "Die panathenäischen und eleusinischen *Hieropoioi*," *RhM* 51 (1896) 211–35.

[20] Dem. 21.115. Rhodes (*supra* n.15) assumes that the ἱεροποιοὶ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς is a committee of the council. In Dem. 21.114–15 we read that Midias, although he had charged Demosthenes with being an accessory to the murder of Nicodemus, nevertheless allowed him as a councillor to perform the εἰσιτητήρια, to be an ἀρχιθέωρος at the Nemean Games, and to serve as a ἱεροποιὸς ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς: now, Demosthenes' trial of Midias took place in 347/6 when Demosthenes was still a member of the council (H. Erbse, "Über die Midiana des Demosthenes," *Hermes* 84 [1956] 150); accordingly, Demosthenes must have served both as an ἀρχιθέωρος and as a ἱεροποιὸς ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς in his capacity of being a councillor. Against this reconstruction it must be objected that Demosthenes emphasizes that he has been elected from all Athenians (περιεῖδε δὲ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἱεροποιὸν αἱρεθέντ' ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἁπάντων τρίτον αὐτόν, 21.115). The inference is that the ἱεροποιοί must be an independent board and not a committee of the council. A further inference is that the three tasks mentioned by Demosthenes are not recorded chronologically. Moreover, the council of 347/6 presumably assumed office 6 July 347 (E. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World* [London 1968] 119). But the Nemean Games were probably celebrated before the turn of the Attic year (*Panamos* = June/July, *cf.* A. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology* [Munich 1972] 90, and Erbse 150). So both the ἀρχιθεωρία and the office as ἱεροποιός were probably prior to Demosthenes' membership of the council. It is important to bear in mind that the θεωροί at the Nemean Games were councillors, but that the ἀρχιθεωρία was a liturgy. The allegations against Demosthenes in connection with the murder of Nicodemus may have been made as early as in 349/8, *cf.* M. H. Hansen, *Apagoge, Endeixis and Ephegesis* (Odense 1976) Cat. no.23.

serving on the board was increased from three to ten (Din. fr.8.2 Conomis).

Ἱερομνήμων. Magistrate elected by lot for one year as the Athenian state's representative in the Amphictyonic Council (Ar. *Clouds* 623 with schol.; Dem. 24.150; Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 30.2). The ἱερομνήμων is assisted by three πυλάγοροι, who, however, are not *archai* but envoys elected by a show of hands before a session of the Amphictyonic Council (Aeschin. 3.115; Dem. 18.149).

Ληξίαρχοι. Board of six who, in collaboration with the συλλογεῖς τοῦ δήμου, have to check that only *epitimoi* participate in the ἐκκλησίαι (Poll. 8.104).

Ναυτοδίκαι. Board of magistrates empowered to preside over the court in maritime suits (Lys. 17.5, 8). The board is mentioned only in this speech by Lysias, and it may have been abolished when the ἡγεμονία δικαστηρίου in maritime suits was transferred to the εἰσαγωγεῖς (ca 355–342) or to the *thesmothetai* (ca 320).[21]

Νομοφύλακες. Board of eleven (*Anon.Arg.* 19–24) or seven (Philoch. *FGrHist* 328F64); method of election unknown. The creation of the board is assigned to Ephialtes by Philochorus, but the νομοφύλακες are unattested until the 320s. In fact, the only sources testifying to the existence of the board in the classical period are two fragments of lost speeches by Dinarchus, both delivered before the abolition of the democracy in 322.[22] According to Philochorus the board is empowered, in collaboration with the πρόεδροι, to intervene if an unconstitutional decree is proposed in the *ecclesia*. But this description of the board probably belongs in one of the years 317–307 when Athens was ruled by Demetrius of Phaleron, and we have no evidence that the powers of the νομοφύλακες were the same under the democracy.

Πράκτορες. Board of ten (?) elected by lot (*Lex.Seg.* 190.26 Bekker). The board keeps the register of all debtors to the state (Andoc. 1.77, 79; Dem. 25.28; 43.71; 58.20, 48; *IG* II² 45; new fragment of the law *SEG* XVI 50 [unpublished]; cf. Ant. 6.49; *IG* I² 75.49, 127.24. The law quoted in Aeschin. 1.35 is probably apocryphal). From the name of the board one might infer that the πράκτορες are empowered to collect debts to the state, but there is no evidence supporting this assumption.[23]

---

[21] Cf. E. E. Cohen, *Ancient Athenian Maritime Courts* (Princeton 1973) 162–84.

[22] Din. fr.6.12, 14.3. Cf. M. H. Hansen, *Eisangelia* (Odense 1975) Cat. nos.116 and 130.

[23] The restoration of *IG* I² 75.49 attesting this duty is arbitrary: [πραττόν]τον hoι πράκτ[ορες]. A more plausible restoration would be [ἐγγραφόν]τον hoι πράκτ[ορες].

*Ταμίαι τοῖν θεοῖν.* Two treasurers for Demeter and Persephone assisting the *ἐπιστάται 'Ελευσινόθεν* (*IG* II² 1672.1–3, 38, 114–15, 137–39, 211–14, 242–50).

*Ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν.* Board of ten elected by lot, one from each tribe. The Treasurers of the Other Gods exist as an independent board only in the period 386/5–347/6. After 346 the board is abolished and its powers are transferred to the Treasurers of Athena. The board manages treasures in the Opisthodomus belonging to other gods (than Athena)—*e.g.*, the Eleusinian goddesses and Artemis Brauronia (*IG* II² 1445–54).[24]

*Ταμίας εἰς τὰ νεώρια.* Treasurer attested for the years 377/6 (*IG* II² 1622. 435–43) and 347/6 (*IG* II² 1622.444–47). He is probably the treasurer assisting the *ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων* and identical with the *ταμίας* referred to in *IG* II² 1631.374ff (324/3).

*Ταμίας κρεμαστῶν.* Treasurer mentioned twice in the naval accounts (*SEG* XXIV 159.341 [new fragment of *IG* II² 1628] and *IG* II² 1629.464). He seems to have been in charge of various kinds of naval equipment.

*Ταμίας τριηροποιικῶν.* Treasurer for the board of *τριηροποιοί* (a committee of the council) referred to in the naval accounts (*IG* II² 1617.121; 1622.387, 566; 1631.504). It is apparent from Demosthenes 22.17–20 that the *ταμίας τριηροποιικῶν* is not himself a member of the council.[25] He may have been appointed in the *ecclesia* by a show of hands.[26]

*Ταμίας τῆς βουλῆς.* One treasurer (or two) of the council. In the beginning of the fourth century the council had only one treasurer (*IG* II² 24 b.9–10 [390/89]). Later in the century there were two (*The Athenian Councillors* 34 C.7–9 [343/2], *cf. IG* II² 120.20–21 [362/1]), but again, from *ca* 330, only one treasurer (*The Athenian Councillors* 49.31–32 [328/7]; 85.12–13, 86–88 [256/5]). In the third century the *ταμίας* was appointed from among the councillors (*The Athenian Councillors* 85), but in the fourth century the two treasurers may well have been independent magis-

---

[24] *Cf.* T. Linders, *The Treasurers of the Other Gods in Athens and their Functions* (Meisenheim am Glan 1975) 58–71. The only evidence for the precise title of the board is *IG* II² 1541.1–2.

[25] Dem. 22.20 is corrupt and differently explained by different scholiasts. *Cf.* H. Weil, *Plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène* II (Paris 1886) 27. It is apparent, however, from Dem. 22.17 that the council makes an attempt to disclaim all responsibility by blaming the *ταμίας τριηροποιικῶν*, and so the *ταμίας* cannot have been a councillor.

[26] The interpretation of Dem. 22.20 preferred by O. Navarre in the Budé edition and by Rhodes [*supra* n.15] 121.

trates like the ταμίας τοῦ δήμου and the ταμίας τριηροποιικῶν.[27]
The treasurers manage the annual allowance given to the council
for expenses, e.g., for publication of decrees (IG II² 24).

Ταμίας τοῦ δήμου. Treasurer of the people; method of election
unknown. He first appears in the sources from the 370s (IG II²
21.5 and 102.12–13), and the office may have been created in
376. He manages the annual allowance given to the people for
expenses, e.g., in connection with publication of decrees (e.g., IG
II² 106.18–19). A. H. M. Jones identifies the annual allowance to
the treasurer of the people with 'the ten talents' referred to in
several inscriptions (e.g., in IG II² 43.68).[28]

Thus other sources attest many more than twenty-five fourth-
century magistrates and boards of magistrates left unmentioned
by Aristotle in the systematic part of the Constitution of Athens.
To be fair, since Aristotle describes the constitution of the 320s,
we must leave aside the ληξίαρχοι (perhaps belonging in the fifth
century only),[29] the ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν (fused with the ταμίαι
τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς in 346) and the ναυτοδίκαι (probably abolished before
330). Furthermore, it cannot be precluded that one or two of the
magistrates listed above may have been councillors serving on a
committee (e.g., the ἀναγραφεύς and the ταμίας τῆς βουλῆς). But,
even omitting the ληξίαρχοι, the ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν, and the
ναυτοδίκαι, we are left with an impressive list of magistrates passed
over in silence by Aristotle. It is impossible to make an exact cal-
culation because in several cases we do not know the number of
magistrates serving on a board, but, on the assumption that these
boards must have had no less than three members and probably
no more than ten, we can calculate a maximum and a minimum:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | ἀναγραφεύς | 1 | ἱερομνήμων |
| 1 | ἀντιγραφεύς | 3–10 | ἱεροποιοὶ εἰς Παναθήναια |
| 3–10 | βοῶναι | 10 | ἱεροποιοὶ ταῖς Σεμαῖς Θεαῖς |
| 1 | γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα | 7–11 | νομοφύλακες |
| 10 | ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων | 10? | πράκτορες |

[27] Cf. S. Dow, Prytaneis (Hesperia Suppl. 1, 1937) 18.

[28] Supra n.2: 102 with n.33. Cf. Rhodes (supra n.15) 101 with n.3 and 103 with n.7.

[29] The ληξίαρχοι form a board of six, like the θεσμοθέται, which is an indication that it is
an old board, probably created by Clisthenes. The board is mentioned only in connection
with the imposing of fines on citizens evading a meeting of the ecclesia (Poll. 8.104). Now
such fines are unknown in the fourth century after the introduction of the ἐκκλησιαστικόν:
cf. M. H. Hansen, "How Many Athenians Attended the Ecclesia?" GRBS 17 (1976) 132–
33. Accordingly, it may be suggested that the ληξίαρχοι were abolished ca 400 and their
remaining duties entrusted to the thirty συλλογεῖς τοῦ δήμου.

| 10 | ἐπιμεληταὶ τοῦ Ἀμφιαρείου | 2 | ταμίαι τοῖν θεοῖν |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3–10 | ἐπιστάται Βραυρωνόθεν | 1 | ταμίας εἰς τὰ νεώρια |
| 7 | ἐπιστάται Ἐλευσινόθεν | 1 | ταμίας κρεμαστῶν |
| 10 | ἐπιστάται τοῦ ἀργυροκοπίου | 1 | ταμίας τριηροποιικῶν |
| 3–10 | ἐπιστάται τοῦ Ἀσκληπιείου | 1 | ταμίας τῆς βουλῆς |
| 3–10 | ἐπιστάται τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἀγαθῆς Τύχης | 1 | ταμίας τοῦ δήμου |

This list comprises a minimum of 90 and a maximum of 129 magistrates left unmentioned by Aristotle. Moreover, the maximum is the more plausible figure, since boards of ten were much more common than boards of three. Adding these 90–129 magistrates to the 322–329 magistrates recorded by Aristotle, we arrive at a total of 412–458 magistrates, which is indeed many more than the *ca* 350 assumed by Jones. Moreover, my list of magistrates omitted by Aristotle is based on fragmentary sources, and it is reasonable to assume that the Athenians had many more boards of magistrates than those referred to in the preserved sources. Many of the sacral officials, for example, are known from inscriptions only: the ἐπιμεληταὶ τοῦ Ἀμφιαρείου, the ἐπιστάται τοῦ Ἀσκληπιείου, the ἐπιστάται Βραυρωνόθεν, the ἐπιστάται Ἐλευσινόθεν, the ἐπιστάται τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἀγαθῆς Τύχης, and the ταμίαι τοῖν θεοῖν.. In addition to these magistrates, however, several more boards are recorded in the inscriptions, but so vaguely that a precise identification and description is impossible. *IG* II² 1496 may serve as an example. This inscription consists of eight fragments and is probably an inventory published by the ταμίαι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. Now, fragments a–d *pars adversa* are inscribed with an account of the revenue from the δερματικόν (revenue derived from the sale of the skins of sacrificial animals) for the years 334/3–331/0. The money is paid to the treasurers of Athena by the στρατηγοί, the συλλογεῖς τοῦ δήμου, the βοῶναι, and various boards of ἱεροποιοί. Among the different boards of ἱεροποιοί we can identify the ἱεροποιοὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν (130, 139, cf. Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 54.7) and the ἱεροποιοὶ εἰς Παναθήναια (99, 129, cf. *IG* II² 334). But in addition to these we hear about ἱεροποιοί for Agathe Tyche (77, 108), ἱεροποιοί at the festival for Asklepios (79, 110, cf. *IG* II² 47.33ff), ἱεροποιοί at the festival for Bendis (86, 117), and ἱεροποιοί at the festival for Theseus (135, cf. *IG* II² 2832). Some of these ἱεροποιοί may be identical with the ἱεροποιοί κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, who, apart from the major penteteric festivals, were entrusted with some minor sacrifices not specified by Aristotle. Some of the ἱεροποιοί may have been committees of the council of five hundred, by analogy with the ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσῖνι (*The Athenian Councillors* 38.83–87) and

the ἱεροποιοί honoured in *IG* II² 410. But some were probably independent boards of magistrates, not mentioned by Aristotle. We know that he omitted the ἱεροποιοί εἰς Παναθήναια and the ἱεροποιοὶ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς. He may as well have omitted several other boards of ἱεροποιοί.[30]

Furthermore, the epigraphical evidence is insufficient in two respects. First, we have preserved only a random selection of the accounts and inventories published on stone. Second, many of the sacral officials undoubtedly recorded their transactions and drew up their lists of sacred property on some perishable material, so that public records on stone never existed. In the fifth century, for example, the treasurers of Athena published both accounts and inventories on stone. From the fourth century only inventories are extant. Of course, the treasurers were still obliged to keep accounts of the money they handled, but these accounts were no longer inscribed on marble tablets.[31] Apart from the inventories published by the treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods, the only preserved fourth-century documents about temple properties are the inventories concerning the sanctuaries for Artemis Brauronia, Asklepios, and Demeter/Persephone in Eleusis, and it is precisely from these inscriptions that we have our information about the sacral officials in charge of the sanctuaries. But Athens and Attica were dotted with sanctuaries administered by the state and not by some local community such as a tribe, a deme, or a phratry. This fact, too often ignored, has recently been emphasized by T. Linders, who in her monograph on the Treasurers of the Other Gods gives a list of sanctuaries which were probably administered by the state: Aphrodite in the Gardens, Artemis Brauronia, Dionysos, Zeus Polieus, Artemis Mounichia, Athena Pallenis, the Twelve Gods, Apollon Pythios, Artemis Agrotera, Theseus, Ge Olympia, Zeus Olympios, Meter at Agrai, Athena at the Palladion, Poseidon of Sounion, Bendis, Herakles of Kynosarges, the Anakes, Apollon Delios, Apollon Zoster, Hephaistos.[32] Now, state cults were per-

---

[30] A board of ἱεροποιοί is mentioned in *IG* II² 330.6, 13, 21, 33, 52, 59. In all six cases, however, the word ἱεροποιός (or ἱεροποιεῖν) has been restored *in toto*. Accordingly, I dismiss the inscription as a source for Athenian ἱεροποιοί.

[31] *Cf.* W. S. Ferguson, *The Treasurers of Athena* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1932) 128–29.

[32] *Supra* n.24: 14–16. Linders' book has been rather severely reviewed by H. W. Pleket in *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978) 221–24. But Pleket's criticism is directed against Linders' denial of the transfer of temple treasures, whereas Pleket admits that all the sanctuaries were probably administered locally by individual boards even after the creation of the ταμίαι τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν and the transfer of temple treasures to them.

formed and state sanctuaries were administered by state officials, and Linders is certainly right in her statement that the creation of the Treasurers of the Other Gods did not entail a central administration by them of all cults and sanctuaries mentioned above. On the basis of Linders' investigations we must infer that the Athenians appointed ἱεροποιοί and ἐπιμεληταί or ἐπιστάται for all these deities and doubtless others about whom we have no knowledge. Like the ἀθλοθέται, the ἐπιστάται Βραυρωνόθεν, and all the other sacral officials listed above, these officials must have been *archai* in the technical sense. To the *ca* 412–458 *archai* known from Aristotle and from other sources we may thus add perhaps 100 to 200 sacral officials not expressly mentioned in any source but nevertheless implied by the information we have about state sanctuaries.

So much for sacral officials about whom our information may be especially unsatisfactory. But the sources for magistrates in the Civil Service are defective as well. The νομοφύλακες are attested through only a single reference to two lost speeches by Dinarchus, and the ἐπιστάται τοῦ ἀργυροκοπίου (mentioned in Meiggs-Lewis no.45) could not confidently be recognized as a regular board of ordinary officials until the publication of *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 31–32 no.29. Moreover, there are in fact in the preserved inscriptions indications of more magistrates than those listed above on pages 162–63. One example is ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει. Until a generation ago this office was not attested in classical sources, appearing first in *IG* II² 463.36 of 307/6. It is not mentioned by Aristotle in the *Constitution of Athens*, and accordingly most scholars denied that it existed before the restoration of democracy in 307. It has, however, been convincingly restored in an inscription recovered during the Agora excavations: κ<α>τ[ασταθεὶς δ' ἐ]πὶ τῆι διοι[κήσει τῆς π]όλεως. So ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει may have been an ordinary office in the late fourth century and presumably the office held by Lycurgus and his friends.[33] If such an important official was passed over in silence by Aristotle and only recently attested in an inscription, we have reason to suspect that our knowledge of the Athenian state officials is still insufficient and that my lists of magistrates may be considerably enlarged by future discoveries. Let me add one more example of a board of magistrates which is only just traceable in the extant sources. We know from *Ath.Pol.* 65.2 (*cf.* 68.2) that every juror chosen by lot on a court day received a

[33] *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 2–4 no.3.7–9. *Cf.* Rhodes (*supra* n.15) 108. The date of the inscription given by the editor is *ca* 336–24.

σύμβολον δη[μόσιον] (edd. δημοσίᾳ) παρὰ τοῦ εἰλη[χό]τος ταύτη[ν] τὴν ἀ[ρχήν]. Here *arche* probably has its usual meaning 'magistracy', in which case we must assume the existence of one more board of ten connected with the administration of justice. It is quite unwarranted for editors to assume that these officials were public slaves (*e.g.*, Sandys, Oppermann, *supra* n.1). My interpretation is supported by the scholiast on Aristophanes *Plutus* 277, who paraphrases the passage which is damaged in the papyrus: τοῖς λαχοῦσι δικάσαι εἰσελθοῦσιν ἑκάστῳ σύμβολον δίδοται δημόσιον παρὰ τῆς ἐπὶ τούτῳ εἰληχυίας ἀρχῆς (ed. Deubner 340a40ff).

# IV

In conclusion, the total number of Athenian magistrates in the second half of the fourth century may well have been 600–700, and with this in mind we may return to *Ath.Pol.* 24.3. I agree with Jones that "known cases of old offices abolished and new offices created about cancel out." In my lists of magistrates in the age of Aristotle there are several boards which did not exist in the fifth century or had fewer members. On the other hand, we have information about many fifth-century boards which were abolished in the last decade of the fifth century or in the first half of the fourth century. It is sufficient to mention the κολακρέται, the Ἑλληνοταμίαι, the πορισταί, the thirty λογισταί, and presumably the ληξίαρχοι. On balance, we know about more offices created than abolished, but we must bear in mind that our sources for the fifth century are indeed inferior to the fourth-century evidence. There may have been many boards replaced in the fourth century by other magistrates; we do not know. Usually historians reject the information given in *Ath.Pol.* 24.3 because they believe that the list in *Ath.Pol.* 42–62 is fairly exhaustive. My investigation leads to the opposite conclusion: in the systematic account of the Athenian constitution Aristotle mentions only about half of the existing boards of magistrates; on the other hand, he is probably right when he states in 24.3 that the total number of ἀρχαὶ ἔνδημοι was *ca* 700.

700 magistrates serving on all the minor boards plus 500 councillors amount to some 1,200 *archai* elected by lot or by a show of hands. On the assumption that Athens in the late fourth century had *ca* 21,000 adult male citizens, a simple calculation shows that more than 5% of all citizens had to be serving as magistrates, and

since the *archai* were reserved for citizens above thirty years of age, no less than *ca* 8% of the eligible citizens must have filled a magistracy or served on a board. In most cases the term of office was one year and iteration was prohibited, with the exception that councillors might serve twice and that the officers of the army might be re-elected. A small group of active citizens may have filled a comparatively great number of offices by being re-elected or by presenting themselves as candidates at the sortition every second year.[34] Nevertheless, the high number of posts to be filled must have entailed a considerable rotation and participation in the administration, justifying Aristotle's description in the *Politics* of democracy as a constitution in which all citizens have to take turns in filling the *archai* (1317b2–3, 19–20). On the other hand, the number of offices meant that to be a magistrate was in most cases a part-time job. The sources show that there were enormous variations in the duties imposed on magistrates. The archons must have been on duty almost daily, whereas many ἐπιστάται, ἐπιμεληταί, and ἱεροποιοί may have discharged their duties by serving a few days every prytany or a couple of days in the course of the year. Furthermore, the members of the various boards seem to have practiced a considerable division of labour.[35] Consequently most of the magistrates had plenty of time to earn a living, which was an absolute necessity for many of them because, in the fourth century, most offices were unpaid[36] and because only some of the magistrates had an opportunity to obtain some profit from their administration through various forms of perquisites.[37]

## APPENDIX I: THE MINIMUM AGE FOR *ARCHAI*

That Athenian *archai* had to be more than thirty years of age is frequently stated although not universally accepted. The age limit is, however, poorly attested and requires discussion. The problem must be split

---

[34] We have several sources stating that active citizens served frequently on the various boards of *archai*, e.g., Lys. 20.5, 21.18; Andoc. 1.147; Isae. 7.39; Aeschin. 1.106–07; Dem. 21.171ff.

[35] Cf. M. H. Hansen, *Embedsmaendene. Det Athenske Demokrati i 4. årh.* 5 (Copenhagen 1979) 46.

[36] Cf. M. H. Hansen, "Misthos for Magistrates in Classical Athens," *SymbOslo* 54 (1979) 5–22.

[37] Cf. M. H. Hansen, "Perquisites for Magistrates in Fourth-century Athens," *ClMed* 32 (1980).

up into two: (a) the age limit for βουλευταί and (b) the age limit for other ἀρχαί.

(a) One source explicitly states that a citizen had to be thirty years of age before he could be appointed a councillor, Xenophon *Mem.* 1.2.35. Charicles forbids Socrates to discourse with the young, whom he defines in the following terms: ὅσουπερ χρόνου βουλεύειν οὐκ ἔξεστιν, ὡς οὔπω φρονίμοις οὖσι· μηδὲ σὺ διαλέγου νεωτέροις τριάκοντα ἐτῶν. This piece of information, however, is not quite satisfactory because Xenophon speaks of the oligarchic regime of 404/3. Did the same age limit apply under the democracy? Two other sources indicate that it did. Dem. 22 hyp. 1.1 refers to a specific βουλευτικὴ ἡλικία; more important, the Athenian regulations for Erythrae (*IG* I² 10 [Meiggs-Lewis 40]) prescribe that councillors be chosen by lot from citizens aged thirty or above (line 11). Since the council "is to be installed on the Athenian model" (Meiggs-Lewis p.91), the inference is that the Athenian councillors were appointed from citizens above thirty.

(b) An age limit of thirty years for other *archai* is recorded in only two reliable sources. In an inscription of the early fifth century it is explicitly stated for the *athlothetai* for the Herakleia at Marathon (*SEG* X 2.25–26), and an unpublished fragment of a law about the mysteries (*SEG* XVI 50) prescribes that two ἐπιμεληταί be elected from all Athenians aged at least thirty. Admittedly τριάκοντα is restored, but other numerals do not fit in the lacuna. What is worse, in both cases the information is ambiguous. It may be a reference to the regular age limit for all *archai* or it may be a regulation that these ἀθλοθέται and ἐπιμεληταί, exceptionally, are to be chosen from citizens aged thirty or above. In fact, some sources indicate that it was possible to become a magistrate from the age of eighteen. According to Just. *Epit.* 6.5.2 Iphicrates was appointed στρατηγός when he was twenty; but Justinus is not a reliable source. At Naxos in 376 Phocion (aged 26) commanded the left wing of the Athenian fleet (Plut. *Phoc.* 6.5), but presumably as a trierarch. Similarly, some lexicographers state that an Athenian citizen might serve as an *arche* as soon as he had been inscribed in his deme: Phot. *s.v.* ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον: Ἀθηναίων τῶν ἀστῶν τῶν ἐχόντων ἡλικίαν ἄρχειν ἀναγράφεται τὸ ὄνομα προστιθεμένων τῶν δήμων αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνων τῶν γραμματείων κληροῦσι τὰς ἀρχάς (same note in *Suda* III p.264 Adler). But this piece of information is undoubtedly no more than an etymological explanation of the term ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον itself: λῆξις means 'sortition' and ἀρχικόν is derived from ἀρχή, and so the ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον must mean the register of those eligible for an *arche*. Since ληξιαρχικόν is probably derived from ληξίαρχος,[38] the explanation offered by the lexicographers is not only unfounded but also wrong. More important is an *argumentum e silentio* based on our knowledge about the δοκιμασία. The

---

[38] *Cf.* H. van Effenterre, "Clisthène et les mesures de mobilisation," *REG* 89 (1976) 1–17.

council's examination of citizens enrolled in their demes is focused on the
question whether a candidate is younger than eighteen (Arist. *Ath.Pol.*
42.2). But in the descriptions of the council's examination of incoming
archons there is no indication that a candidate was asked and had to
confirm that he was at least thirty (*Ath.Pol.* 55.3; Din. 2.17). Why not?
Perhaps because the precise age of a citizen, when he had been inscribed
in his deme, could easily be checked from the central register of citizens
liable to military service organized in forty-two distinct year-groups from
eighteen to fifty-nine (*Ath.Pol.* 53.4, 7).

In support of the assumption that all *archai* had to be thirty I may first
adduce an argument *a fortiori*: it would be odd to allow citizens to serve
alone or on a board of ten from the age of eighteen and then to fix an age
limit of thirty for the five hundred councillors. More important, the
preserved bronze allotment plates indicate that the same age limit applied
to councillors and other *archai*. It is apparent from Demosthenes 39.10
that the same *pinakion* was used at the sortition of councillors and of
other *archai*. Now, if it was possible for citizens of eighteen to be candi-
dates for the other *archai*, whereas the council was reserved for citizens
of thirty or older, there must have existed two different types of *pinakion*
with different stamped seals (the Gorgo head), one for citizens between
18 and 29 (for minor boards) and one for those older (for all types of
*arche*). But no such difference can be detected on the numerous preserved
*pinakia* stamped with the Gorgo head, or without stamped seals,[39] and
accordingly the Athenians must have had the same age limit for all *archai*,
*viz.*, thirty years. Next, an *argumentum e silentio* carries some weight.
We have considerable and increasing prosopographical knowledge about
Athenian citizens of the fifth and fourth centuries. In some cases their
dates of birth and terms of office may be determined with some confi-
dence. To the best of my knowledge, there is no unquestionable example
of a citizen filling an *arche* before he was thirty (on Alcibiades *cf.* Gomme/
Andrewes/Dover on Thuc. 6.12.2). This is a strong indication that the
thirty years age limit applied to all *archai*. Moreover, we do have one
source that prescribes an age limit of thirty for all *archai*. In the begin-
ning of the *Constitution of Athens* (4.3) Aristotle gives a short account of
the so-called 'Dracontian constitution' and states that both councillors
and other *archai* had to be above thirty. Now, the Dracontian consti-
tution is probably a democratic version of the *Patrios Politeia* extrapo-
lating the institutions of the classical period. But in that case we have one
more piece of circumstantial evidence that the age limit for all *archai* was
thirty years. Finally, the thirty years age limit for *archai* is probably dis-
cussed by Theophrastus in the Vatican Fragment (*Vat.Gr.* 2306 Fr. B),[40]
but the passage does not bear on the Athenian constitution.

[39] *Cf.* J. H. Kroll, *Athenian Bronze Allotment Plates* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1972).

[40] *Cf.* J. H. Oliver, "The Vatican Fragments of Greek Political Theory," *GRBS* 18 (1977)
339.

## APPENDIX II: OFFICIALS WHO WERE NOT *ARCHAI*

On pp. 153–54 I enumerate the officials who, in my opinion, were not *archai* in the technical sense. In this appendix I shall discuss these and adduce my arguments for excluding them from the number of Athenian ἀρχαὶ ἔνδημοι.

1. ἱερεῖς. According to Aeschines the main task for a priest was to perform sacrifices and to say prayers.[41] Usually, a ἱερεύς had none of the powers characteristic of an *arche*: the right to impose fines, to preside over the court, and to handle public money.[42] The administration of the sacred properties and of the revenue of a sanctuary usually rested with a board of *archai*, e.g., ταμίαι or ἐπιμεληταί or ἐπιστάται. Sometimes, however, the magistrates may have collaborated with the priest.[43] The appointment of priests seems to have changed from the archaic to the classical period. The ancestral priesthoods were held for life and reserved for members of a specific *genos*. Priesthoods created in the fifth century or later were usually filled by ἱερεῖς chosen by lot from among all Athenian citizens and the tenure of office was one year only.[44] There is no indication of any examination of incoming priests (δοκιμασία), which was obligatory for all *archai*.[45] On the other hand, the priests were subject to audit at the end of the year (εὔθυναι),[46] but so were many other officials who were not *archai*. Moreover, many rites were performed by priestesses (ἱέρειαι) who, as women, cannot have been *archai* in the technical sense. Finally, accumulation of *archai* was prohibited,[47] but we have one example of a member of the council of five hundred who can probably be identified with the ἱεροφάντης.[48]

2. πρέσβεις. Envoys were elected in the *ecclesia* by a show of hands and had to submit to audit when they had completed their mission (e.g., Dem. 19.211). But they were not subject to δοκιμασία as were all *archai*,[49]

---

[41] Aeschin. 3.18 (the reading of *P.Oxy.* 1625).

[42] One exception is the Eumolpidae, who had some jurisdiction (probably involving ἡγεμονία δικαστηρίου) in connection with the Mysteries: cf. Dem. 22.27.

[43] The priest of Asklepios seems to have been in charge of the properties belonging to the sanctuary: *IG* II² 1532–39. Cf. J. Sundwall, *Epigraphische Beiträge zur sozialpolitischen Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter des Demosthenes* (*Klio* Suppl. 4, 1906) 47–48, 75–80.

[44] Cf. D. D. Feaver, "Historical Development in the Priesthoods of Athens," *YCS* 15 (1957) 123–58.

[45] Δοκιμασία is expressly mentioned in Dem. 57.46 in connection with an *arche* in the deme Halimous, but is passed over in silence in the references to the priesthood of Heracles.

[46] Aeschin. 3.18; cf. *IG* II² 354.21–22, 410.16–22.

[47] Dem. 24.150: οὐδὲ δύο ἀρχὰς ἄρξαι τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτῷ (the Heliastic Oath).

[48] *The Athenian Councillors* 43.155–56, Μνησίμαχος Νουφράδους (list of *bouleutai* 335/ 34); cf. *IG* II² 1934.6, ἱεροφάντην Νουφρ[άδ]ου Περιθοίδην. Cf. K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (*TAPS* n.s. 64.3 [1974]) 22.

[49] Cf. D. J. Mosley, *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece* (*Historia* Einzelschriften 22 [1973]) 39.

and sometimes they may have discharged their duties in less than thirty days, which was the minimum period for an *arche*.

3. γραμματεῖς καὶ ὑπογραμματεῖς. Most magistrates and boards of magistrates were assisted by secretaries and under-secretaries.[50] Some of the γραμματεῖς were *archai*, as for example the secretaries of the *boule* and the γραμματεὺς τοῖς θεσμοθέταις. But others were paid clerks appointed by the magistrates themselves and not elected by lot or by a show of hands. Some of them were slaves or metics. Others were citizens, as for example Aeschines. As soon as he had been inscribed in his deme he made a living as a γραμματεύς or ὑπογραμματεύς for various boards of *archai*.[51] On the assumption that all *archai* had to be above thirty, Aeschines cannot have served as an *arche*, but must have been a salaried official.

4. πάρεδροι. Each of the three first archons was assisted by two πάρεδροι. According to Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 56.1 these πάρεδροι were subject both to δοκιμασία and to εὔθυναι before the people's court. On the other hand, it is apparent from the speech *Against Neaera* that they were appointed by the archons and could be dismissed by the archons.[52] All other sources indicated that δοκιμασία was a characteristic of *archai*, and the inference seems to be that the πάρεδροι were *archai*. But if so, we are forced to admit that some *archai* were appointed by other *archai* and not elected by the people or chosen by lot at the annual sortition. Even worse, we must admit that some *archai* could be dismissed by other *archai* without reference to the people's court, and that is surely unbelievable. We are faced with a clash of principles; preferring the lesser of two evils, I assume that the πάρεδροι were not *archai*, but that the δοκιμασία exceptionally might be applied to officials who were not *archai*.

5. λοχαγοί. The λοχαγοί were appointed by the ταξίαρχοι and not by

[50] In addition to the secretaries of the *boule* and the *thesmothetai*, γραμματεῖς are mentioned in connection with the following boards of magistrates: ἄρχων (*IG* II² 2811), οἱ ἕνδεκα (*IG* II² 1631.389), πωληταί (*Hesperia* 10 [1941] 15–30 no.1), ταμίαι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν (*IG* II² 1370.5), ἐπιμεληταὶ τοῦ ἐμπορίου (Dem. 58.8), ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων (*IG* II² 1631.412), ἐπιστάται ἀργυροκοπίου (*SEG* XXI 667), ἐπιστάται Ἐλευσινόθεν (*IG* II² 1543.5–6; 1544.5, 10), ἀμφικτύονες εἰς Δῆλον (*IG* II² 1635.49, 74–75). In an inscription of *ca* 350 are recorded both a γραμματεύς and a ὑπογραμματεύς of an unknown board of ten (*IG* II² 2825). In his description of Aeschines' career Demosthenes uses the terms indiscriminately: γραμματεύς (18.127, 261; 19.95, 314), ὑπογραμματεύς (19.70, 200, 237, 249).

[51] In the polemarch's list of slaves manumitted through a δίκη ἀποστασίου we find both a γραμματεύς (*IG* II² 1556.14) and a ὑπογραμματεύς (*IG* II² 1561.32). So these officials were slaves who, after the manumission, became metics. It is apparent from Dem. 18.261 that Aeschines served as γραμματεύς immediately after he was inscribed in his deme. Demosthenes says that he was paid for the job (19.200, 249).

[52] The ἄρχων, the βασιλεύς, and the πολέμαρχος take each two πάρεδροι of their own choice (Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 56.1). One ἄρχων appointed his father (Dem. 21.178). The βασιλεύς Theogenes appointed Stephanus (Dem. 59.72) but dismissed him again on the advice of the

the people, and so they cannot have been *archai* for the same reason as stated above for the πάρεδροι (Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 61.3).

6. κήρυκες. In the *Politics* Aristotle says that κήρυκες are not *archai* (1299a19), and his general statement seems to apply to Athens. The most distinguished of the heralds was ὁ κῆρυξ τῆς βουλῆς. He was elected for life but citizenship was no requirement for being elected. In the first half of the fourth century the office was held by two metics, Eucles and his son Philocles.[53]

7. διαιτηταί. To be an arbitrator was a part of the military service. Case by case the arbitrators were chosen by lot from citizens in the last of the forty-two year classes (aged fifty-nine). The service was compulsory for all citizens registered, with the exception of those abroad and those who served as *archai*.[54] This last provision is sufficient proof that the διαιτηταί were not *archai* in the technical sense.

8. Ἀρεοπαγῖται. The council of the Areopagus was composed of ex-archons, and Aristotle states (*Ath.Pol.* 3.6) that, in his age, the Areopagites were the only *archai* who served for life. In this passage, however, ἀρχή must mean 'official' in a broader sense and not 'magistrate' as defined in the law quoted by Aeschines and discussed *supra* (p.152). If the members of the Areopagus had been *archai* in the strict sense, an Areopagite would have been precluded for the rest of his life from serving on any other board of *archai*, because of the ban on accumulation of *archai* (Dem. 24.150, quoted *supra* n.47). But we have several examples of ex-archons, *i.e.*, Areopagitai, serving as *archai*: Themistocles was archon in 493/2 but served on the board of generals in 481/0 and 480/79. Aristides was archon in 489/8 and one of the στρατηγοί in 479/8 and 478/7.[55] Both examples, however, are prior to the reform of the archonship in 487/6 (Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 22.5), and the rules about accumulation

council of the Areopagus (83). *Cf.* S. Dow, "Companionable Associates," in *Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities, in Memoriam Otto J. Brendel* (Mainz 1976) 80–84.

[53] Some heralds are citizens (Aeschin. 1.20; 3.44). For Eucles and Philocles see *IG* II² 145; Andoc.1. 112, 115; *cf. PA* 5732. The following κήρυκες are known: the κῆρυξ τῆς βουλῆς (elected for life and salaried): *IG* II² 145; *cf. IG* II² 112.6, 120.9–10, 1629.197; Dem. 19.70; 23.97; Aeschin. 1.23, 3.4. The κῆρυξ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν (only one herald assisting all the archons): Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 62.2; *IG* II² 1717. The κήρυκες assisting in the people's court (at least ten, one of each of the ten entrances): *Ath.Pol.* 64.3, 66.1, 68.4, 69.1. The κῆρυξ τῶν λογιστῶν: Aeschin. 3.23.

[54] Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 53.5: ὁ γὰρ νόμος, ἄν τις μὴ γένηται διαιτητὴς τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτῷ καθηκούσης, ἄτιμον εἶναι κελεύει, πλὴν ἐὰν τύχῃ ἀρχὴν ἄρχων τινὰ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἢ ἀποδημῶν. Kahrstedt (*supra* n.7) 9, 21, 39, 58, 64, etc., assumed that the διαιτηταί were *archai*, but his assertion is based on a misinterpretation of Dem. 29.58: the oath referred to in this passage is not the oath sworn by incoming magistrates, but the oath sworn by a διαιτητής whenever he has to pass a judgement.

[55] For Themistocles and Aristides as archons and *strategoi cf.* Samuel (*supra* n.20) 205, and C. W. Fornara, *The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404* (*Historia* Einzelschriften 16 [1971]) 42.

may have been different when the archons were elected and not appointed by lot. More important is a fourth-century example. In *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 25–29 no. 33 the names of all the archons of 370/69 are recorded. The fifth archon is Εὔβολος Προβαλ[ίσιος]. I agree with the editor, B. D. Meritt, that "Eubulus of Probalinthos was undoubtedly the famous politician (*PA* 5369) of the fourth century." So Eubulus was a member of the Areopagus, but not thereby an *arche*, when in the 350s he served on the Theoric Board (Aeschin. 3.25).

9. λειτουργοῦντες. Some of the λειτουργοῦντες were chosen by lot, others were appointed by the *archai*. They were not subject to δοκιμασία, but had to undergo an εὔθυναι when they had discharged their duties (*e.g.*, Aeschin. 3.19). Combination of a liturgy with an *arche* was of course possible, and the nine archons were the only *archai* who were exempted from the trierarchy during their year of office (Dem. 20.27–28).

10. *Local officials.* Only one of the local officials was an *arche*, the δήμαρχος εἰς Πειραιέα, who was appointed by the state and not by the deme.[56] In order to show that other local officials were not *archai*, it is sufficient to point out that combination with an *arche* was allowed. In 346/5, for example, the demarch in Halimous was simultaneously a member of the council of five hundred.[57]

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN
*August, 1980*

---

[56] Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 54.8. As a state official the δήμαρχος εἰς Πειραιέα was empowered to preside over the people's court, *cf. IG* II² 1177.14–17.

[57] Dem. 57.8. I should like to thank Dr Rhodes for drawing my attention to this source and for his careful comments on my typescript. With respect to n.20 *supra* he remarks that his discussion (*supra* n.15: 130) of the *bouleutai* as *hieropoioi* is based on ἱεροποιῆσαι only in the *first* part of the passage quoted from Dem. 21.115; he agrees that the ἱεροποιοὶ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς formed an independent board and were not a committee of the *boule*. Furthermore, I should like to thank Prof. J. K. Davies for his helpful comments.