

## Ἐκκλησία Σύγκλητος in Hellenistic Athens

*Mogens Herman Hansen*

**I**N MY ARTICLE “How Often Did the *Ecclesia* Meet?”<sup>1</sup> I argued that the Athenians in the second half of the fourth century (355?–307/6 B.C.) convened a maximum of four assemblies during a prytany. One of the four meetings was the *ἐκκλησία κυρία* described by Aristotle in *Ath.Pol.* 43.4–5. The other three meetings were simply called *ἐκκλησίαι*, and no technical term existed for these meetings. Each of these four *ecclesiai* was an ordinary meeting if it was summoned by the *prytaneis* on their own initiative and at four days’ notice, whereas the meeting was an *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος* if it was summoned at short notice or prescribed by a decree passed in a previous meeting. An analysis of the term *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος* shows that it certainly denotes a meeting of the assembly summoned in a special way, but not a meeting held in addition to the four meetings summoned every prytany.

The only evidence that can be produced in support of the view that the term *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος* denotes an extra meeting is some notes in the scholia and lexica:

SCHOL. DEM. 18.73: *σύγκλητος ἐκκλησία λέγεται ἢ γενομένη διὰ τι ἐξαίφνης κατεπεύγον· τρεῖς γὰρ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ μηνὸς γίνονται ὠρισμένοι, ἢ δὲ σύγκλητος οὐχ ὠρισμένη.*<sup>2</sup>

SCHOL. DEM. 24.20: *ἰστέον γὰρ ὅτι κατὰ μῆνα τρεῖς ἐκκλησίας ἐποιοῦντο, . . . πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἀνάγκη τις κατέλαβε πολέμου, ὥστε καὶ περὶ ἐκείνου ἄλλην ἐκκλησίαν ποιῆσαι πλέον τῶν ὠρισμένων.*<sup>3</sup>

HARPOCRATION *s.v.* *σύγκλητος ἐκκλησία*: *τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν αἱ μὲν ἐξ ἔθους καὶ κατὰ μῆνα ἐγίνοντο· εἰ δὲ τι ἐξαίφνης κατεπέριξεῖεν ὥστε γενέσθαι ἐκκλησίαν, αὕτη ἐκαλεῖτο σύγκλητος ἐκκλησία· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατ’ Αἰσχίνου.*<sup>4</sup>

These notes are brought as comments on passages in Demosthenes and Aeschines; but, since they all mention three *ecclesiai* every month

<sup>1</sup> *GRBS* 18 (1977) 43–70.

<sup>2</sup> Same note in schol. Dem. 19.123.

<sup>3</sup> Similar notes in schol. Aeschin. 1.60; Phot. *s.v.* *κυρία ἐκκλησία*; schol. Ar. *Ach.* 19.

<sup>4</sup> Same note in *Suda* and *Etym.Magn.* *s.v.* *σύγκλητος*. Cf. furthermore Poll. 8.116.

instead of four *ecclesiai* every prytany, the information must bear on the period of twelve *phylai*, when a prytany in an ordinary year usually was concurrent with a month.<sup>5</sup>

In my article I did not exclude the possibility that the scholiasts and lexicographers might be right in describing *ἐκκλησίαι κύγκλητοι* as additional meetings if their information is applied to the period of twelve *phylai*. A change from ten prytanies (and four *ecclesiai* summoned during each prytany) to twelve prytanies (and three *ecclesiai* in a prytany) resulted in a reduction of the number of assemblies from forty to thirty-six. It is a reasonable guess that some *ἐκκλησίαι κύγκλητοι* could now be summoned as additional meetings in order to make up the difference. A closer inspection of the epigraphical evidence, however, indicates that the scholiasts are wrong and that—even in the Hellenistic period—an *ἐκκλησία κύγκλητος*, if summoned during a prytany, replaced one of the (three) regular meetings summoned by the *prytaneis* on their own authority. The term *κύγκλητος* means only that the meeting was summoned in a special way, either at short notice or by decree. There is no evidence that it was an extra meeting. Quite the contrary.

During the period of twelve *phylai*<sup>6</sup> the type of *ecclesia* is regularly stated in the prescript of all *ψηφίσματα τοῦ δήμου*. With a few exceptions<sup>7</sup> one of the terms *ἐκκλησία*, *ἐκκλησία κυρία* or (rarely) *ἐκκλησία ἀρχαιρεσίαι*<sup>8</sup> is recorded between the date of the decree and the mention of the *proedroi*. Sometimes the place of meeting is mentioned as well,<sup>9</sup> and in four instances the meeting is described as an *ἐκκλησία κύγκλητος*:<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Cf. W. K. Pritchett and O. Neugebauer, *The Calendars of Athens* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1947) 78.

<sup>6</sup> 307/6–224/3 and 201/0–A.D. 124/5. Cf. W. K. Pritchett, *The Five Attic Tribes after Kleisthenes* (Baltimore 1943) 13–23.

<sup>7</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 500, 545, 680, 774, 798. The type of *ecclesia* is of course omitted also in defective prescripts such as *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 467 and 903.

<sup>8</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 892 (cf. *SEG XXI* 433), 954 (cf. *infra*), 955.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. W. A. McDonald, *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks* (Baltimore 1943) 47–61. *ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσου* (Table I p.48), *ἐκκλησία ἐμ Πειραιεῖ* (Table II p.52), *ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ* (n.74 pp.56–58).

<sup>10</sup> A possible fifth example is *Hesperia* 17 (1948) 11, a decree of 246/5, which is restored by Meritt as follows: *ἐκ[κλη]σί[α ἐν Δι]ονύσου [κύγκλητος κατὰ ψήφισμα δ . . . . .<sup>14</sup> . . . . .] Ο [ . . .<sup>5</sup> . . εἰπ]εν*. The restoration is, however, so doubtful that I prefer to leave out the decree in my discussion of *ἐκκλησία κύγκλητος*. The term *ἐκκλησία κύγκλητος* is not discussed by A. S. Henry in *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* (Leyden 1977).

1. *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 911: ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος ἀπὸ βουλῆς στρατηγῶν παραγγ[ειλάντων (*ca a.* 169/8).
2. *SEG XXIV* 134: ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος ἀπὸ βουλῆς στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων (*init. s. II a.*)<sup>11</sup>
3. *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 945: ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ κατὰ ψήφισμα ὁ Ἄρισ[τ . . . .] Σημαχίδης εἶπεν (168/7).
4. *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 838: ἐκκλησί[α ἐν] τῷ θεάτρ[ῳ σύγκλητος] κατὰ ψήφισμα ὁ . . . cίας Θορ[ίκιος εἶπεν (226/5).

From this evidence we may conclude that an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος is either an assembly convened in accordance with a *psēphisma* or an assembly convened by order of the board of generals *via* the *boule*; apparently the board of generals requested the *boule* to pass a decree that an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος be summoned. An ordinary ἐκκλησία and ἐκκλησία κυρία, on the other hand, is probably, as in the fourth century, a meeting summoned by the *prytaneis* on their own initiative and at four (?) days' notice.<sup>12</sup>

Now the terms ἐκκλησία στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων, ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία and ἐκκλησία κατὰ ψήφισμα occur in other prescripts without the additional information that the meeting is an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος.

5. *SEG XXI* 440: βουλή ἐμ βουλευτηρίῳ σύνκλητος στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων καὶ ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ (193/2).<sup>13</sup>
6. *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 897: βουλή ἐμ βουλευτηρίῳ σύνκλητος στρατ[ηγῶν] παραγγειλάντων καὶ ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία [κυρία] ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ (*ca a.* 185/4).
7. *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 954: βουλή ἐμ] βουλευτηρίῳ[ι σύ]νκλητος στρατη[γῶν παραγγειλά]ντων κ[α]ὶ ἀπ[ὸ βουλ]ῆς ἐκκλησία ἀρ[χαιρεσία κατὰ τ]ῆν μαντ[είαν τοῦ] θεοῦ (166/5).<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Ed. B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 36 (1967) 64 n.9.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Phot. *s.v.* πρόπεμπτα: τὸ πρὸ πέντε ἡμερῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας προγράφειν ὅτι ἔσται ἡ ἐκκλησία εἰ τύχοι, ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς συνέλθωσι. Same note in *Lex.Seg.* 296.8. The lexicographers' note on πρόπεμπτα is in my opinion reliable since it is supported by Dem. 19.185, where Demosthenes complains of the slow procedure which entails that an *ecclesia* could not ordinarily be summoned overnight but only in accordance with the statutory requirements. Cf. Hansen, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 47.

<sup>13</sup> Ed. B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1961) 195–200. Cf. *The Athenian Agora* 15 = B. D. Meritt/J. S. Traill, *Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors* (Princeton 1974) no.167.

<sup>14</sup> Add *SEG XXV* 124, cf. S. V. Tracy, "Epigraphical Notes," *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 46–49. In *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 420 ἐκκλησία στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων has been restored by Meritt (*AJP* 85 [1964] 304–06; cf. *SEG XXII* 93). His restoration is, in my opinion, not convincing. (a) The date of *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 420 is 332/1(?), whereas there is no occurrence of the formula στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων before the second century B.C. (b) There is no example of the

8. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 554*: ἐκκλησία κατὰ ψήφισ]μα δήμου (306/5 *vel paullo post*).  
 9. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 857*: ἐκκλησία ἐ[ν τῶι θεάτρῳ κατὰ ψήφισμα δ. . . c]τρατος Ἐρχιεὺς  
 [εἶπεν<sup>15</sup> (*ante* 224/3).

Each of the decrees 5–7 is passed in a meeting of the *boule* and in a meeting of the *ecclesia* held on the same day.<sup>16</sup> There is nothing extraordinary about a meeting of the *boule* being held on an assembly day. I have argued elsewhere that the assembly days were not among the *ἡμέραι ἀφέσιμοι* of the *boule* and that a meeting of the assembly was regularly followed by a meeting of the council.<sup>17</sup> But in the three prescripts quoted above it is worth noting that the meeting of the *boule* is held before and not after the *ecclesia*. From the classical period we have one example of this practice, *viz.* the *ecclesia* held in the autumn of 339 after Philip's capture of Elateia. Demosthenes describes (18.168ff) how a meeting of the *boule* was followed immediately by an emergency meeting of the *ecclesia*, undoubtedly an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος.<sup>18</sup>

We know from numerous sources that an *ecclesia* in the classical period was opened at dawn.<sup>19</sup> On the assumption that the time of meeting was the same in the Hellenistic period, we cannot interpret these decrees as evidence of an extraordinary meeting of the *boule* (βουλή σύνκλητος) followed by an ordinary meeting of the *ecclesia*. Although the term σύνκλητος is applied to βουλή and not directly to ἐκκλησία, it seems reasonable to infer that in these cases a βουλή σύγκλητος convened by the *strategoí* was followed by an ἐκκλησία

---

formula *στρατηγῶν παραγγελάντων* being used without the term *σύγκλητος* and the formula *ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία*. As an alternative Meritt proposes *ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία κυρία σύγκλητος*, which is equally unconvincing for the same reasons. The forged decrees inserted in Demosthenes' speech *On the Crown* contain the formulae *σύγκλητος ἐκκλησία ὑπὸ στρατηγῶν καὶ πρυτάνεων* (Dem. 18.37) and *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος ὑπὸ στρατηγῶν* (Dem. 18.73). It has been suggested that the forger derived the content and style of his decrees from actual *psephismata* of the second century B.C. Cf. P. L. Schläpfer, *Untersuchungen zu den attischen Staatsurkunden und den Amphiktyonenbeschlüssen der Demosthenischen Kranzrede* (Paderborn 1939) 28–29 and 207.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *SEG XXI* 312 (*Hesperia* 7 [1938] 476–79 n.31), where a similar formula is found in a decree from the period of ten *phylai* (319/8): ἐ[κκ]λ[η]σία κατὰ ψ[ήφ]ισμα βουλῆς.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *SEG XVI* 84 (*AJP* 78 [1957] 375–81), where Meritt proposes the following restoration of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 893*: [βου]λῆ [καὶ ἐκκλησία ἐν τῶι] θεάτρῳ, μεταχθε[ε]ῖ[α] ἐκ [Παναθη]ναικοῦ σταδίου].

<sup>17</sup> "The Duration of a Meeting of the Athenian *Ecclesia*," *CP* 74 (1979) 43–49. Cf. Aeschin. 1.112.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Hansen, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 46–47.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Hansen, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.17) 43.

*εύκλητος* opened late in the morning or in the afternoon. The procedure adopted by the *strategoí* was undoubtedly necessitated by the probouleumatic procedure. Since no proposal could be brought before the *demos* without a *probouleuma*, an emergency decision by the *ecclesia* must be preceded by a meeting of the *boule* providing the *probouleuma*. So the *strategoí* had to summon an emergency meeting of the *boule* during which a decree was passed that an emergency meeting of the *ecclesia* be held later the same day. We know from the classical sources that an *ἐκκλησία εύκλητος* was an emergency meeting,<sup>20</sup> and, on the analogy of 1 and 2 above, the conclusion seems to be that the *ecclesiai* described in 5–7 were *ἐκκλησΐαι εύκλητοι*.

In the classical period an ordinary meeting of the *ecclesia* was warranted by law (Aeschin. 2.72; Dem. 19.185) and summoned by the *prytaneis* on their own initiative. On the assumption that the Athenians followed the same practice in the Hellenistic period,<sup>21</sup> any *ecclesia* warranted by a *psephisma* of the *boule* or of the *demos* must be a special meeting. In two of the decrees in which the term *ἐκκλησία κατὰ ψήφισμα* is found the meeting is expressly described as *εύκλητος* (1–2 above), and I suggest that the other two *ecclesiai* summoned by decree (8–9) were *ἐκκλησΐαι εύκλητοι* as well.

The date of the decrees may provide us with more information about the *ἐκκλησΐαι εύκλητοι*. If, by analogy with the fourth-century evidence, we accept for the Hellenistic period that an *ἐκκλησία εύκλητος* was *inter alia* an emergency meeting summoned at short notice whereas an ordinary meeting had to be summoned at four days' notice, we must conclude that any *psephisma* dated Pryt. (I–XII) 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th must have been passed in an *ἐκκλησία εύκλητος*.<sup>22</sup> I have come across the following examples:<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Dem. 19.122–23; Aeschin. 2.72.

<sup>21</sup> From the decrees honouring *prytaneis* it is apparent that the *prytaneis* in the Hellenistic period were still responsible for the *κυλλογή τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου*. Cf. P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 21.

<sup>22</sup> A further assumption is, of course, that the *prytaneis* had to preside over the meetings they had summoned and could not pass on the presidency over an assembly summoned by them to the subsequent board of *prytaneis*. I base this assumption on the fact that the *boule* was not allowed to pass on a *probouleuma* to the subsequent *boule* (Dem. 23.92; cf. Rhodes, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.21] 63) and that the *basileus* was not allowed to pass on a homicide trial to his successor (Ant. 6.42; cf. D. M. MacDowell, *Athenian Homicide Law* [Manchester 1963] 34–35).

<sup>23</sup> Restorations to give one of the first four days of a prytany can be found in: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 389* (*SEG XXI 354*); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 455, 791*; *SEG XIX 98*.

10. *Hesperia* 5 (1936) 414–16 n.12: Ποσειδεῶ[νος δευτέ]ραι μετ' [εἰ]κάδας, [πρ]ώτ[η] τῆς πρυτ[ανεί]α[ς ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσου] (302/1).
11. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 649: Μουν[ι]χιῶνος [ἔ]νηι [καὶ νέ]αι, πρῶτ[η]ι [τ]ῆς πρυτα[νε]ίας ἐκκλησία (293/2).<sup>24</sup>
12. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 896 (lines 30–32): Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος δεκάτει ὑστέραι, τετάρτει τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκκλησία ἐν Διονύσου (186/5).

Finally, meetings of the *ecclesia* occurring on festival days were probably ἐκκλησίαι σύγκλητοι. In his speech *Against Ctesiphon* Aeschines protests against a meeting of the assembly being held on a festival day (Aeschin. 3.67), and J. D. Mikalson has recently demonstrated that sessions of the *ecclesia* on annual festival days were most exceptional.<sup>25</sup> The Athenians may have had a law prohibiting meetings of the assembly on annual festival days, and even if no such law existed, it is still reasonable to assume that a meeting convoked on a festival day must have been an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος and not an ordinary meeting summoned by the *prytaneis* at four days' notice. So we may add to the list of possible examples of ἐκκλησίαι σύγκλητοι the following five decrees passed by the people on annual festival days:

13. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 644: Μουνιχ[ιῶν]ος ἔκ[τη] ἐπὶ δέ]κ[α], ἑβδόμη[ι τῆς π]ρυτα[νε]ίας ἐκκ[λη]σ[ι]α (296/5. Cf. Mikalson 144).
14. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 672: Μουνιχιῶ[ν]ος ἐνάτει ἐπὶ δέκα εἰκοστῆι τ[ῆς πρυτανείας] ἐκκλησία κυρία (279/8. Cf. Mikalson 146).
15. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 775 (lines 29–30): Μουνιχιῶνος ἐνάτει ἐπ[ὶ δέκα, ἑβδόμει καὶ εἰκο]στῆι τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκκλησία κυρία (241/40. Cf. Mikalson 146).
16. *Hesperia* 5 (1936) 419–28 n.15: Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος τρίτει ἐπὶ δέκα κατὰ θεὸν δὲ ὀγδόει καὶ εἰκοστῆι τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐμ Πειραιεῖ (196/5. Cf. Mikalson 128).
17. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1006 (lines 50–51): Πυαν[οφιῶνος] ἑνδεκάτηι, δεκάτηι τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκκ[λη]σ[ι]α κυρία ἐν τῶι θε[άτ]ρωι (122/1. Cf. Mikalson 72).

Since the term σύγκλητος does not occur in any of these decrees (10–17), the inference is (as in the case of 5–9 *supra*) that the indication of whether an ἐκκλησία was σύγκλητος or not was optional, as was the indication of the place of meeting.

On the basis of the epigraphical evidence we can form an opinion of what an ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος was in Hellenistic Athens.

<sup>24</sup> Reedited by W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1931) 3–15.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. J. D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton 1975) 7 and 186–93.

1. In 5 and 6 we have evidence of an *ἐκκλησία κυρία σύγκλητος*, and this is in my opinion a fatal blow to the theory that the *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος* was an additional meeting. This theory can be upheld only on the assumption that the Athenians might convene an additional *ἐκκλησία κυρία*, so that during a prytany two *ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι* might be held, one regular and one extraordinary.

2. Similarly in 7 we have evidence of an *ἐκκλησία ἀρχαιρεΐαι σύγκλητος*. Again, the *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος* cannot be an extra meeting but must be a regular meeting summoned at short notice, perhaps because the sacrifices favoured immediate action (*cf.* Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 44.4).

3. As regards the contents of the decrees, it is worth noting that all are honorific.<sup>26</sup> Admittedly the vast majority of the preserved *pséphismata* are honorary decrees, but it is remarkable that such decisions were regularly on the agenda of an *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος*. We must assume that an *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος* was not an assembly reserved for some urgent matter. In addition to the important question which had caused the summoning of the people at short notice or by decree, the people were requested to discuss and take the vote on routine business such as honorary decrees. The urgent matter did not fill the whole meeting; it was only an extra item on the agenda, and the inference is that the *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος* was one of the three *ecclesiai* held during a prytany; it was summoned at short notice and/or by decree, but the epigraphical evidence does not support the assumption that it was an extra meeting. Quite the contrary.

The information derived from scholia and lexica carries no weight against the epigraphical evidence, especially since the notes on *ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος* are muddled and contradictory. (a) A description of the *ecclesia* in the period of twelve *phylai* is erroneously brought as a comment on passages in Demosthenes and Aeschines. (b) Although the summoning of the *ecclesia* followed the conciliar year (divided into prytanies), the lexicographers mention three *ecclesiai* every *month*. Admittedly in an ordinary year a prytany was probably concurrent with a month, but as regards intercalary years the information is misleading. (c) Some of the notes set off *ἐκκλησίαι*

<sup>26</sup> Of the decrees discussed above, nos. 3–9, 11–12 and 14–17 are honorific. Nos. 1–2, 10 and 13 are decrees of unknown contents.

σύγκλητοι against ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι,<sup>27</sup> which is manifestly wrong. The ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι constitute only a fraction of the stipulated meetings—in the classical period one-fourth and in the Hellenistic period probably one-third. (d) Two of the notes refer to fixed days for the meetings. Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 19 mentions the 1st, the 10th and the 30th, and schol. Dem. 24.20 the 11th, the *ca* 20th and the *ca* 30th. So the scholiasts contradict each other, and both are wrong. No *ecclesia* was usually held on the first day of a prytany or of a month,<sup>28</sup> whereas the people could be summoned on any other day during a prytany and on most days during a month. The 11th day of a prytany and of a month is frequently attested as an assembly day, but there was no regular distribution of the *ecclesiai* over the prytany or the month.

So the lexicographers' information about ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος does not inspire confidence. They may be right when they state that *three ecclesiai* were summoned during a month (read 'prytany'). If so, one of the three meetings was probably an ἐκκλησία κυρία. On this assumption twelve ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι were held every year in the Hellenistic period as against ten in the classical period.<sup>29</sup> On the other hand, the description of ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος as an additional meeting is unsupported and even contradicted by the epigraphical evidence and must, accordingly, be rejected.<sup>30</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

January, 1979

<sup>27</sup> Photius; schol. Ar. *Ach.* 19; schol. Aeschin. 1.60.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Mikalson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.25) 183–86.

<sup>29</sup> In the later fourth century the ratio of ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι to *ecclesiai* was 1:3 (Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 43.3–4). In the period of twelve *phylai* the ratio must have been 1:2 if one ἐκκλησία κυρία was summoned every prytany. Now in the decrees covering the period 307/6–130/29 (excluding the period 224/3–202/1), the term ἐκκλησία κυρία is found or restored in some sixty decrees, whereas the term ἐκκλησία occurs in about one hundred decrees. The ratio is approximately 2:3. This is a surprisingly high proportion of ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι, but, on the assumption that honorary decrees were frequently passed in an ἐκκλησία κυρία, the epigraphical evidence is not incompatible with the view that the ratio of ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι to *ecclesiai* in the Hellenistic period was 1:2. In any case, it is very likely that the proportion of ἐκκλησίαι κύριαι was higher than in the fourth century.

<sup>30</sup> I should like to thank Professor R. S. Stroud for reading and commenting on a draft of this paper.