

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE DURATION OF A MEETING OF THE ATHENIAN *ECCLESIA*

Modern historians sometimes imply, without further discussion, that a meeting of the Athenian *ecclesia* usually lasted one whole day. What evidence can be produced in support of this assumption? According to one source, the amount of business dealt with by the assembly was so enormous that an applicant to the people sometimes had to wait more than a year before his case came up for decision (ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 3. 1). In connection with important issues we are informed that many speakers addressed the people during the debate (Thuc. 1. 139. 4, 3. 36. 6, 6. 15. 1; Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 12). From other sources we can infer that a politician was allowed to speak twice on the same subject,¹ and we do not know of any restriction on the speaking time. The waterclock seems to be a device designed for use in the courts in the Agora, not for assembly meetings on the Pnyx. Since Athenian loquacity is a commonplace (e.g., Thuc. 3. 38. 2-7, 3. 40. 2-3; Dem. 3. 14-15, etc.), it is tempting to think that a meeting which started early in the morning must usually have lasted all day and not have been closed until evening.

But do we possess any direct evidence that bears on the duration of a meeting of the Athenian assembly? Numerous passages in Aristophanes, most of them from the *Ecclesiazusae*, constitute sufficient proof that a meeting was opened early in the morning. At *Ecclesiazusae* 740-41 early meetings are described as a statutory requirement, and it is often mentioned that citizens have to set out before dawn to arrive in due time (*Eccl.* 283-84, 291, 390-91; cf. 20-21, 84-85). Other sources can also be cited (Ar. *Thesm.* 376; Plut. *Phocion* 15). The only evidence to the contrary is the introductory scene of the *Acharnians*, where Dicaeopolis sits in splendid isolation on the Pnyx, waiting for the opening of the session and looking down over the Agora, which is already packed with people (*Ach.* 19-22). But in this passage Aristophanes is making much of the Athenian citizens' apathy toward their political institutions: the comic effect is achieved by putting Dicaeopolis alone on the Pnyx although a *κυρία ἐκκλησία ἐωθινή* has been summoned.

It is much more difficult to find evidence for the assumption that a meeting was not closed until the day was over. To the best of my knowledge, only two sources can be cited.

- (1) Xenophon *Hellenica* 1. 7. 7: ἔδοξε δὲ ἀναβαλέσθαι εἰς ἑτέραν ἐκκλησίαν· τότε γὰρ ὅτ' ἦν καὶ τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἂν καθέωρων . . . This meeting took place shortly before the *Apaturia* (*Hell.* 1. 7. 8), which were celebrated some time in the second half of Pyanopsion (J. D. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* [Princeton,

1. Euryptolemus addressed the people twice during the second *ecclesia* held after the battle at Arginusae (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 12 and 16 ff.). Euktemon spoke twice during the *ecclesia* held in Skirophorion 354/353 (Dem. 24. 12 and 13).

A law quoted by Aeschines (1. 35) contains the provision that a *rhetor* is liable to a maximum fine of fifty drachmas ἐάν τις λέγῃ . . . δις περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁ αὐτὸς τῆς αὐτῆς . . . But the document inserted in Aeschines' speech is probably spurious (cf. E. Drerup, "Über die bei den attischen Rednern eingelegten Urkunden," *Jahrb. f. class. Phil.*, suppl. 24 [1898]: 307-8).

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

1975], p. 79), i.e., in the beginning of November. A continuous meeting from dawn to dusk at this time of the year must have lasted about eleven hours (W. Kubitschek, *Grundriss der antiken Zeitrechnung* [Munich, 1928], p. 182). It would, however, be rash to base a generalization on this piece of evidence, since it concerns a very special meeting of the assembly: the first hearing of the six generals put on trial after their victory at Arginusae.

- (2) Demosthenes 24. 9–15, on a meeting of the assembly held in Skirophorion 354/353 (Dem. 24. 15) or shortly before. Euktemon had moved a proposal concerning the collection of a debt to the state; a *graphe paranomon* was brought against the proposal, but it was upheld by the court (Dem. 24. 14). Euktemon describes the successive stages through which the proposal passed in the following words: ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν τῆς βουλῆς κατεγνωκυίας, εἵτα τοῦ δήμου μίαν ἡμέραν ὅλην ἐπὶ τοῖτοισ αὐτοῖς ἀναλώσαντος, πρὸς δὲ τοῖτοισ δικαστηρίοις δυοῖν εἰς ἓνα καὶ χιλίους ἐψηφισμένων . . . (Dem. 24. 9). This passage is difficult to interpret. First, μίαν ἡμέραν ὅλην need not mean more than that the *ecclesia* spent one whole meeting on this item on the agenda. Second, Euktemon is undoubtedly exaggerating, for he is eager to convey the impression that everybody approved of his proposal. We know from Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 43. 6) that the people usually had to deal with a minimum of nine items; it looks suspicious that in this case they discussed one single item for more than twelve hours. Moreover, Euktemon does not explicitly state that the assembly passed his proposal, probably because it was indicted as unconstitutional before it was put to the vote. So he emphasizes instead how thoroughly the matter was discussed. I admit, however, that the passage is open to a literal interpretation, and that, so interpreted, it gives us a second example of a special meeting of the assembly where one item was discussed from dawn to dusk.

On the other hand, numerous sources indicate that the meetings of the assembly were often considerably shorter.

- (3) When the first Athenian embassy to Philip, sent in the spring of 346, returned to Athens, Demosthenes proposed and carried a decree prescribing a meeting of the assembly on Elaphebolion 8. Aeschines criticizes Demosthenes' proposal: Δημοσθένης . . . γράφει ψήφισμα . . . ἐκκλησίαν ποιεῖν τοὺς πρυτάνεις τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἱσταμένου τοῦ Ἐλαφηβολίωνος μηνός, ὅτ' ἦν τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ ἡ θυσία καὶ ὁ προαγών, ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ ἡμέρᾳ . . . (Aeschin. 3. 67). Nothing in Aeschines' text indicates that the *proagon* and the sacrifice to Asclepius were postponed because of the *ecclesia*. Indeed, since the *ecclesia* held on Elaphebolion 18 was the second meeting of the assembly after the Dionysia and the Pandia, it is most unlikely that the festival had been adjourned and held one day later than usual (cf. M. H. Hansen, "How Often Did the *Ecclesia* Meet?" *GRBS* 18 [1977]: 57–58). We must accordingly assume that one day was sufficient time for a meeting of the assembly, the sacrifice to Asclepius, and the *proagon* of the Greater Dionysia. The *ecclesia* cannot have filled more than a part of the day.
- (4) After the conclusion of the peace with Philip on Elaphebolion 19, a meeting of the assembly was held on Elaphebolion 25 to discuss the oaths on the peace. Demosthenes was one of the *proedroi*, and Aeschines relates that Demosthenes put to the vote a proposal made by Philocrates that the oath on the peace be taken on the same day by the allies' representatives in Athens, the *synedroi*: ἀποδοῦναι δὲ τοὺς ὅρκους τοῖς πρέσβεσι τοῖς παρὰ Φιλίππου ἐν τῇδε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοὺς συνέδρους τῶν συμμάχων (Aeschin. 3. 74). We know from Aeschines' speech *On the Embassy* that the proposal was passed and put into effect: ὡς δ' ἡ παρούσα ἐκκλησία διελήθη, ἐξώρκιζον τοὺς συμμάχους οἱ τοῦ Φιλίππου πρέσβεις ἐν τῷ στρατηγίῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ (Aeschin. 2. 85). Once more, the conclusion is that the meeting of the assembly was over before the end of the day.
- (5) In 343 the Megarians applied secretly to Athens for military assistance. As a *strategos*,

Phocion arranged a meeting of the assembly and persuaded the Athenians to vote for his proposal to relieve the Megarians. Immediately after the *ecclesia*, the signal was given for calling up the army, and the Athenian forces set out the same day: τῶν δὲ Μεγαρέων ἐπικαλουμένων κρύφα, φοβούμενος ὁ Φωκίων τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς μὴ προαισθόμενοι φθάσωσι τὴν βοήθειαν, ἐκκλησίαν συνήγαγεν ἔωθεν, καὶ προσαγγείλας τὰ παρὰ τῶν Μεγαρέων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ὥς ἐληφίσαντο, τῇ σάλπιγγι σημήνας εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἤγεν αὐτοὺς τὰ ὅπλα λαβόντας (Plut. *Phocion* 15. 1). This piece of evidence points to one more occasion when the *ecclesia* must have concluded its business within a few hours.

- (6) In 339 Philip's capture of Elatea took the Athenians by surprise. The event was reported to Athens in the evening; the next day the citizens assembled on the Pnyx, without any summons, while the council in the *bouleuterion* discussed the situation and prepared the agenda. The meeting of the assembly was not opened until the council had finished its session in the *bouleuterion*: τῇ δ' ὕστεραία ἡμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ οἱ μὲν πρυτάνεις τὴν βουλὴν ἐκάλουν εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον, ὑμεῖς δ' εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπορεύεσθε, καὶ πρὶν ἐκείνην χρηματίσαι καὶ προβουλεύσαι πᾶς ὁ δῆμος ἄνω καθήτο (Dem. 18. 169).
- (7) In addition to these four examples ([3]–[6]) of *ecclesiai* held in the period 346–339, we have two descriptions in Aristophanes' comedies of meetings of the assembly. The *Acharnians* opens with an *ἐκκλησία κυρία* held on the Pnyx. Dicaeopolis hopes for a discussion of peace, but the debate instead is on the continuation of the war. In despair and disgust, Dicaeopolis avails himself of a simple device to stop the meeting: he interrupts, saying that he has felt a drop of rain. This is a sign from heaven that the *ecclesia* is inauspicious, and the *prytaneis* are bound to adjourn the meeting (*Ach.* 167–73). In the *Ecclesiazusae*, the decision to hand over the city to the women is made in an *ecclesia* packed with women who have stolen their husbands' clothes and disguised themselves as men. After the vote whereby the political power is transferred to the females, the assembly is closed. On his way home Chremes, one of the few male participants, meets Blepyrus, who is necessarily dressed in his wife's robe. Chremes describes how the meeting went, and Blepyrus is surprised to hear that the *ecclesia* is already over; but the dialogue between the two men does not convey the impression that the meeting normally would have lasted all day:

ΒΛ. ἀτὰρ πόθεν ἦκες ἐτεόν; Χρ. ἐξ ἐκκλησίας.

ΒΛ. ἥδη λέλυται γάρ; Χρ. νῆ Δί' ὄρθριον μὲν οὖν.

[*Eccl.* 376–77]

To summarize, we have four examples and two descriptions in comedy of *ecclesiai* that fill only a fraction of a day. Against the evidence presented, it may be objected that at least two of the examples, (5) and (6), and perhaps (3) and (4) as well, describe emergency meetings, where the session was curtailed because a prompt decision was required. Similarly, the *ecclesia* in the *Acharnians* is closed prematurely. And the assembly described in the *Ecclesiazusae* is unique. No generalizations can be based on emergency meetings and comic scenes.

However, it is possible to adduce other sources to show that even regular meetings must have been shorter than a whole day. We know from the *Constitution of Athens* that the *prytaneis* summoned the council each and every day, with the exception of ἡμέραι ἀφέσιμοι: οἱ . . . πρυτανεύοντες . . . συνάγουσιν καὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον, τὴν μὲν οὖν βουλὴν ὅσαι ἡμέραι, πλὴν ἐάν τις ἀφέσιμος ᾖ, τὸν δὲ δῆμον τετράκις τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκάστης (*Ath. Pol.* 43. 3). The word ἀφέσιμος is almost a *hapax* in Greek literature. It does not occur again until Aelius Aristides (*Orat.* 50[26]. 98), in a passage which does not provide any clue to the exact meaning of the word. Nor is it explained by any of the lexicographers. Since it is derived from ἀφίεναι, it certainly

denotes a day on which the council was not summoned, but which days were *ἀφέσιμοι*? The translation offered by LSJ is "holiday," which may be on the right lines but is no more than a guess. Neither the assembly (Aeschin. 3. 67) nor the court (schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 663) was summoned on festival days, and we may assume that the council's *ἡμέραι ἀφέσιμοι* included festival days. Mikalson's careful investigation of attested meeting days of the council (*Athenian Year*, pp. 193–97) points to the conclusion that the *boule* (like the *ecclesia*) did not meet on annual festival days but (unlike the *ecclesia*) was regularly summoned on monthly festival days. In one respect, then, the interpretation "festival days" is too comprehensive; in another, it is too narrow, since not only (annual) festival days, but also *ἡμέραι ἀποφράδες* were presumably *ἀφέσιμοι*.² On the other hand, there is nothing in Aristotle's text to indicate that the *ἡμέραι ἀφέσιμοι* included the assembly's meeting days—quite the contrary. Two passages in the orators do in fact substantiate the assumption that the forty days reserved for meetings of the assembly were meeting days of the council as well.

- (8) In the speech *Against Timarchus* Aeschines relates an event which took place in the archonship of Nicophemus (361/360). Timarchus was a member of the council that year; and, during a meeting of the assembly, he was charged with embezzlement and prostitution by Pamphilus of Acherdus, who proposed and carried a decree that the people at the end of the year bestow the usual honors on the council only if the councillors forthwith excluded and punished Timarchus. After the *ecclesia*, when the councillors returned to the *bouleuterion*, Timarchus was first excluded by the *ἐκφυλλοφορία*, but this preliminary condemnation was reversed in the subsequent vote taken by ballot. The change of scene from the *ecclesia* to the *bouleuterion* is described by Aeschines as follows: *μετὰ ταῦτα, ὡς ἐπανῆλθεν ἡ βουλὴ εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον . . .* (Aeschin. 1. 112). The phrase implies that the councillors went from the Pnyx to the *bouleuterion*, and that the meeting of the council was held on the same day as the *ecclesia*.
- (9) In 19. 70 Demosthenes refers to the curse proclaimed in the assembly against corrupt and treacherous politicians. He has the text read out to the jurors, whereupon he makes the following comment: *ταῦθ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καθ' ἐκαστην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὁ κήρυξ εὐχεται νόμῳ προστεταγμένα, καὶ ὅταν ἡ βουλὴ καθήται, παρ' ἐκείνῃ πάλιν*. The crucial word is *πάλιν*, by which Demosthenes stresses that the curse was, in some way or another, proclaimed twice. We miss the point if we take the passage to mean no more than that the curse was read out both to the people and to the councillors. What Demosthenes says rather is that, on a meeting day of the *ecclesia*, the curse was proclaimed first in the assembly and then, again, in the council.

Comparing passages (8) and (9) with Aristotle's statement (*Ath. Pol.* 43. 3), I conclude that the councillors were regularly summoned on the meeting days of the *ecclesia* and that the hours left after the *ecclesia* was concluded were sufficient for a session of the council.

The council probably met not only after, but also before, a meeting of the assembly. It is a well-known fact that the nine *proedroi* were picked by lot from among the 450 *bouleutai* who did not serve as *prytaneis*, one from each of the remaining *phylai*. The *proedroi* must have been chosen before the opening of the *ecclesia*, and the sortition must have been conducted in the presence of the councillors. So the *proedroi* were appointed during a meeting of the council held either

2. Cf. J. D. Mikalson, "Ἡμέρα ἀποφράς," *AJP* 96 (1975): 26–27.

early in the morning immediately before the *ecclesia* or late in the afternoon of the preceding day. No direct information allows us to make a choice between these two possibilities, but some circumstantial evidence can be produced. A study of the Athenian calendar seems to lend support to the view that the *proedroi* were appointed late in the afternoon of the preceding day. The Athenians reckoned the *ἡμέρα* (in the sense of a twenty-four-hour period) from sunset to sunset—not from sunrise to sunrise, as the Egyptians did, or from midnight to midnight, as we do (E. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World* [London, 1968], pp. 13–14; O. Neugebauer, *A History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy* [Berlin, 1975], 3:1067 ff.). So the *ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτάνεων*, who was in office for a twenty-four-hour period, was probably appointed at the beginning of the day, i.e., at sunset (G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* [Munich, 1920–26], p. 1029). Analogy would suggest that the *proedroi* were appointed during the meeting of the council held in the afternoon. The *proedroi*, however, did not serve continuously for twenty-four hours like the *ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτάνεων*. Their only task was to preside over the meetings of the council and of the assembly held within the period. Moreover, several sources show that the Athenians reckoned the day from sunset to sunset only for calendar purposes. For all other purposes, their day began at sunrise (G. Biffinger, *Der bürgerliche Tag* [Stuttgart, 1888], pp. 102–154). Meetings prolonged through the evening and the night were not rated as meetings over two days, and in such cases the word *ὑστεραία* is unambiguously applied to the period starting the next morning (e.g., Dem. 57. 9–15). Similarly, the elaborate sortition of the jurors took place in the morning immediately before the hearing of the cases (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 63–65). The analogy of the *proedroi* to the jurors is stronger than the analogy of the *proedroi* to the *ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτάνεων*. The principal reason for using the lot was to prevent corruption (cf. Aeschin. 3. 3). Sortition would not have produced the desired effect if the *proedroi* had been appointed twelve to sixteen hours before the opening of the meeting over which they were to preside. I therefore prefer the view that the *proedroi* were appointed during a short session of the council held at sunrise, immediately before the meeting of the assembly.

It may be useful to give a summary account of one of the forty meeting days of the assembly. At sunrise the *prytaneis* summoned the councillors to a short meeting, for the sole purpose of appointing the nine *proedroi* of the day and, among them, the *ἐπιστάτης τῶν προέδρων*. While this session was being held, the citizens ascended the Pnyx and entered the auditorium controlled by the six *ληξίαρχοι* (Poll. 8. 104) and the thirty *συλλογεῖς τοῦ δήμου* (ibid.; IG, 2–3². 1749B). Not long after sunrise the councillors went from the *bouleuterion* to the Pnyx for the opening of the *ecclesia*. We do not know how long a meeting lasted. It is apparent from Aristophanes that the citizens carried food and wine with them to the Pnyx (*Ecll.* 306–8), but even a meeting of five or six hours would have been long enough for a snack to be welcome. Admittedly, a public action heard by the jurors filled a whole day (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 28; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 67; Aeschin. 3. 197; cf. Busolt–Swoboda, *Staatskunde*, p. 1161), but it is significant that the courtrooms in the Agora were roofed (Antiphon 5. 11). The *ecclesiai* were open-air meetings where the citizens were exposed to the rain and the sun. We know from Aristophanes that a session was adjourned if it began to rain (*Ach.* 171), and I doubt that the Athenians, during the summer, extended their meetings over the afternoon. Only on

special occasions, during a political crisis, did a meeting continue until it was too dark to survey the hands raised when the vote was taken (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 7 and [perhaps] Dem. 24. 9).³ In the winter, when days were shorter, the meetings obviously began later, and a session of the same duration would have filled a greater part of the day. The principal business of the *ecclesia*, however, was foreign policy, as is evident from a survey of all decrees preserved on stone or referred to in the literary sources. It is a well-known fact that interstate relations were cut down to a minimum during the period from October to March. So the meetings of the assembly were probably considerably shorter between Boedromion and Anthesterion and may have been closed at noon or shortly afterward—just as, for other reasons, the summer meetings probably were.⁴ After the *ecclesia*, the councilors were summoned to their daily meeting in the *bouleuterion*. The other citizens who had attended the *ecclesia* in the morning had time left for half a day's work, at least, if they resided near the Pnyx, either in Athens or in the Piraeus.

This description of a typical meeting day must lead to a modification of two important statements usually made about Athenian democracy. If an *ecclesia* normally filled no more than part of the day, the number of man-days lost because of the democratic institutions was considerably smaller than is often assumed, and the subvention paid out for attendance was a full compensation for the lost working hours. A working day in Athens probably extended from sunrise to sunset.⁵ So it must have varied according to the season, from about nine hours in the winter to about fourteen hours in the summer (cf. Kubitschek, *Grundriss*, p. 182). But the duration of an *ecclesia* probably varied, too, in accordance with the business at hand, which was no doubt greatly reduced from late autumn to early spring. An *ecclesia* lasting, e.g., six to seven hours in the summer and four to five hours in the winter filled the same fraction of a working day, and most of the participants, who must have been town dwellers, would have had sufficient time left to supplement the dole paid out for attendance with half a day's wages. On

3. Νύξ ἐν μέσῳ at Aeschin. 3. 71 does not imply (*pace* R. A. De Laix, *Probouleusis at Athens* [Berkeley, 1973], p. 185, n. 68) that the meeting held on Elaphebolion 18 filled the whole day until sunset.

4. This assumption is supported by the epigraphical evidence. Mikalson (*Athenian Year*, p. 182) has counted all the exactly dated decrees. Dividing the year into two halves (Boedromion–Anthesterion and Elaphebolion–Metageitnion), we obtain the following figures: Boedromion–Anthesterion 52 decrees, Elaphebolion–Metageitnion 93 decrees. Mikalson, however, deals exclusively with the civil calendar, and accordingly he has no reference to decrees which record the number of the prytany but give no information about the day of the month. I have counted 79 fourth-century decrees (403–322) preserved on stone which record the number of the prytany. Following Mikalson, I have excluded all examples based on debatable restorations. Of these 79 decrees, 29 are passed within the period Pryt. 3–7, whereas no fewer than 50 can be assigned to the period Pryt. 8–2. Both these investigations indicate that the *ecclesia* passed many more decrees during the summer than during the winter. I admit, however, that the distribution within the two periods is remarkably uneven. Pryt. 8 (roughly equal to Elaphebolion) and Pryt. 10 (roughly equal to Skirophorion) are the two busiest periods; I have found very few examples from Pryt. 1 (roughly equal to Hekatombaion).

5. Bickerman, *Chronology*, p. 13, without reference to any source. I am not able to produce evidence concerning the classical period, but I do not doubt that some important sources for Italy, Palestine, and Egypt in the Roman period can be applied to fourth-century Athens. (a) In Egyptian apprenticeship contracts, it is regularly stated that the working day extends from sunrise to sunset: ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου μέχρι δύσεως BGU, 4. 1021. 13; POxy. 725. 12, 1647. 20. (b) In the parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Matt. 20), the last group is hired during the eleventh hour and works for one hour only. The hour of the ancients was one-twelfth of the day from sunrise to sunset (Kubitschek, *Grundriss*, p. 182), and so the working day must have been coextensive with the daylight hours. (c) Columella *Rust.* 11. 1. 17–18.

this theory there is no longer any foundation for the assumption made by several historians that the *μισθὸς ἐκκλησιαστικός* only compensated the Athenian citizens in some measure for loss of working time,⁶ and we can reject the view that the poorer citizens even in the fourth century may have been debarred from attending the *ecclesia*. On the other hand, assuming that an *ecclesia* usually did not fill more than part of the day enables us to give a simple explanation of the higher rate for an *ἐκκλησία κυρία*. It is apparent from the *Constitution of Athens* (43. 3–6) that there were more items on the agenda for an *ἐκκλησία κυρία* than for other meetings of the assembly. Such a meeting was probably more time-consuming, and consequently the subvention paid for attendance had to be raised in order to provide full compensation for the working hours lost.

The thesis suggested in this article is based on a study of the scanty sources. I conclude my argument by anticipating an a priori objection which will doubtless be raised against my reconstruction: that it is impossible for six thousand participants, all of whom have the right to speak, to discuss and vote on a dozen decrees within a few hours. My answer is that it *is* possible: it happens in Switzerland today. In a few of the smaller cantons, magistrates are still elected and laws are still passed by the *Landsgemeinde*, which in Glarus, for example, is attended by about five thousand citizens who vote on all proposals by a show of hands. Every citizen is entitled to address the assembly, and the number of items on the agenda is comparable to the description found in the *Constitution of Athens* (43. 3–6). Nevertheless, such meetings last for no more than two to four hours.⁷

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN
University of Copenhagen

6. G. Glotz and R. Cohen, *Histoire grecque*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1936), p. 16; P. Cloché, *La démocratie athénienne* (Paris, 1951), p. 210; V. Ehrenberg, *The Greek State* (Oxford, 1960), p. 55; C. Mossé, *Les institutions politiques grecques* (Paris, 1967), p. 46; De Laix, *Probouleusis*, p. 176. Cautiously stated by A. H. M. Jones, *Athenian Democracy* (Oxford, 1957), p. 18.

7. W. Stauffacher, *Die Versammlungsdemokratie in Kanton Glarus* (Zurich, 1962), pp. 284–85; H. Ryffel, *Die Schweizerischen Landsgemeinden* (Zurich, 1903), pp. 80–109, 270–324.

For valuable discussions of various problems I should like to thank Dr. A. Bülow-Jacobsen, Prof. J. Christensen, Mr. J. A. Crook, Mr. G. T. Griffith, Dr. C. M. Taisbak, and the anonymous referees of *Classical Philology*.

A STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY IN LATIN

In a revealing passage of the *Institutiones grammaticae* (ed. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vol. 3, pp. 177–78, §§139–41), Priscian offers observations on the nature of reciprocal conjunction which point up some interesting usages in Latin syntax. He remarks that there are several means of expressing the reciprocal notion (“each other, one another”), giving the following examples:

- (1) Terence *Adelphoe* 827–28: “video amare inter se.”
“I see them loving each other.”
- (2) Terence *Adelphoe* 271: “age, inepte, quasi nunc non norimus nos inter nos, Ctesipho.”
“Carry on foolishly, Ctesiphon, as if we don’t now know each other.”
- (3) Vergil *Aeneid* 11. 121: “conversique oculos inter se atque ora tenebant.”
“They hold their eyes and faces turned on each other.”