

REVIEW ARTICLE

A MAGISTERIAL INVENTORY OF ATHENIAN OFFICIALS*

This Athenian parallel to Broughton's *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* provides Greek historians with an invaluable working tool which for many years I have longed to have. For all who work with Athenian history on a prosopographical basis it opens up new perspectives and, I am happy to report, it seems to have been so meticulously and judiciously compiled that, in most cases, it can be used by others directly without a great number of checks or modifications or reservations. Before I set out listing my questions and quibbles I would like to congratulate Robert Develin on having completed a major study and emphasize that we are all greatly indebted to him for what he has done. By way of introduction I would also like to describe the scope of my review. I have been told that other reviewers in other journals will focus on archaic and fifth-century Athens. To balance this I will deal mainly with the years 403–332/1, the period in which some three fifths of all the names recorded in D.'s book belong.

I

The title of the book is *Athenian Officials, 648–321 B.C.*, but who are the Athenian officials? That question is addressed in the introduction, in which D. states his criteria for inclusion and exclusion and says: "The general criterion for inclusion has been those for whom we have names and who were subject to election, by whatever means, to positions in service of the state or sections thereof where there is some connection with the operation of state functions" (p. 1). So the "general criterion" is, in fact, three different criteria: (1) election (either by lot or by show of hands), (2) prosopographical information, i.e., for an office to be mentioned in the introduction and referred to in the main part of the book there must be at least one attestation of a named person who served on that board during the period covered by D., and (3) not only state officials, but even local officials are included if their tasks include administration on behalf of the state. Let us take a closer look at D.'s criteria and see how they work.

To choose election as the most important criterion for inclusion is basically sound and in agreement with Athenian practice (Aeschin. 3.13–14, 28–30) and democratic principles (Arist. *Pol.* 1317b17–1318a3). By this criterion we can include not just *archai*, i.e., magistrates in the technical sense, but also other officials (Arist. *Pol.* 1299a16–20) such as envoys, heralds, and architects (cf. *infra*). On the other hand, we can exclude most liturgists (*choregoi* excepted, cf. Dem. 21.13 and

* *Athenian Officials, 648–321 B.C.* By ROBERT DEVELIN. Cambridge–New York–New Rochelle–Melbourne–Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1989. Pp. 556.

Permission to reprint this review article may be obtained only from the author.

Arist. *Pol.* 1299a19), as well as *hoi boulomenoi*, i.e., citizens who volunteered as speakers or proposers in the assembly or before the *nomothetai* and as prosecutors or *synegoroi* (for the prosecution or for the defence) in public actions heard by the people's court.

D. consistently excludes all liturgists (already listed in J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* [Oxford, 1971]). But, contrary to his own principle, he includes quite a number of *hoi boulomenoi*. Of these only two categories ought to have been recorded in his book: (a) proposers of probouleumatic decrees who had to be members of the council of five hundred and must be registered in that capacity, and (b) the elected *kategoroi* (e.g., Pericles in 462 [Plut. *Per.* 10.6; *Cim.* 14.5], Lykourgos and Demosthenes in 325/4 [Dem. 25.13]) and the prosecutors in the Harpalos affair [Dinarchus 1.51]) as well as the *syndikoi* in the public action against Leptines' law in 356/5 (Dem. 20.146).

D. duly includes elected *kategoroi* and proposers of probouleumatic decrees, but he also includes all the known proposers of nonprobouleumatic decrees of the assembly, many of which must have been moved from the floor in the assembly, and that is in conflict with his own main criterion. As a result, however, we have got an extremely valuable section called "Council and Assembly" (for the period 403–322 including the *nomothetai*) in which D. year by year lists all known proposers of laws and decrees. He even includes those who are attested as speakers in the assembly without having proposed and carried a decree. On the other hand, apart from elected *kategoroi* and *syndikoi* he excludes prosecutors and defendants and *synegoroi* in trials heard by the people's court, and even the well-known political trials (*graphai paranomon*, *euthynai*, *probolai*, and *eisangeliai*, including those heard by the assembly) are passed over in silence. Why? He gives no reason, but his motives can be inferred from the nature of his book. Many trials heard by the people's court are known exclusively from the preserved forensic speeches. Many speeches can be dated only within a decade or so, and in most cases the name of the speaker is unknown; sometimes we are left in doubt even about the name and identity of the speaker's opponent. Since D. has composed an annalistically organized prosopography, much of the evidence we have for the administration of justice does not fit the other evidence he presents, and his decision to exclude the law courts is, in my opinion, well founded and dictated by his principle of common sense.

One type of elected official, architects, is missing in D.'s inventory. Some were hired by the Athenians, as in *IG* 2².244.45–46, correctly omitted by D. But some were elected by the people. *IG* 2².1673.59–60 (cf. *SEG* 34.122) includes a reference to Athenodoros of Melite, an architect elected by show of hands and working on the Eleusinion. He was not technically a magistrate (an *arche*), but was an elected official and, with others like him, should have been included.

Conversely, to take election to be the main criterion for inclusion does in some cases lead to the inclusion of persons who ought to have been excluded: (a) Apart from architects, some other experts and professionals were elected, e.g., the *paidotribai* and *didaskaloi* who trained the ephebes (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 42.3); but they were not officials, and even metics could stand for election (O. W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* [Leiden, 1971], no. 9.i35–36). D. does include the known teachers of the ephebes, and the result has been that, for example, two metics from Methone and Syracuse turn up in the middle of an in-

ventory which is otherwise composed of citizens only (p. 384; p. 436, no. 36; and p. 517, no. 3332). (b) Many priests were elected but most are nevertheless omitted from D.'s inventory. D.'s excuse for omitting priests is that "we cannot be sure of the selection process or the duration of the priesthood" (p. 17). So the only one included is the priest of Aesculapius. Looking through the *tabula magistratum* in *IG* 2² in which the inventories of the sanctuary of Aesculapius constitute the last section of the chapter (1532–39), I can well understand why D. wanted to include the priests of Aesculapius; also by contrast with many other priests the priest of Aesculapius seems to have been in charge of the sanctuary himself, but I think D. should have resisted the temptation and excluded all priests. There are other priests whom we know were elected, e.g., the priestesses of Athena who had been elected (by lot) since the second half of the fifth century (Meiggs and Lewis 44.2–5; *SEG* 12.80). But to have women recorded in an inventory of full citizens would have been even more disturbing than to include an occasional metic. The polis was a male society, and the fact that many goddesses were served by priestesses and not by priests touches the problem about the relation between the religious sphere and the political sphere in a Greek polis. In many respects the two spheres were separated: religious rituals were mostly performed by priests or priestesses, who were not magistrates, whereas the sanctuaries were administered by magistrates (*epistatai* and *epimeletai*), who were not priests. But the two sectors do overlap, e.g., in the case of many boards of *hieropoioi*, who were magistrates entrusted with the performance of rituals (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.6; *IG* 2².1496.99, 129). As the evidence is, it would have been better to exclude all priests.

In addition to elected officials D. includes a number of persons who were not elected but either appointed by their superiors or simply hired: the *paredroi* of the archon, the king archon and the polemarch, the *lochagoi*, and many *grammateis* and *hypogrammateis*.

The *paredroi*, though appointed by the archons, had to undergo *dokimasia* (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 56.1), a procedure applied to *archai* only, and not to other types of elected officials such as priests (cf., e.g., Dem. 57.46) and envoys (cf. J. D. Mosley, *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 22 [Wiesbaden, 1973], p. 39). Thus the *paredroi* must have been magistrates and deserve inclusion. The *lochagoi* were noncommissioned officers appointed by the taxiarchs and not elected by the people. They are not listed by Aristotle in the *Athenaion Politeia* but only mentioned in passing (61.3), and they might have been excluded. Of the *grammateus* and *hypogrammateus* some were undoubtedly magistrates, but most were just paid assistants, often of metic or servile status (*IG* 2².1556.14, 1561.32). D. includes those who were citizens and may have been magistrates (e.g. [pp. 352–53], the *grammateus* and *hypogrammateus* recorded in *IG* 2².2825), whereas he excludes all others, and that is in agreement with his principle of common sense.

D.'s second criterion is to include "those for whom we have names." That criterion is self-evident and unproblematical for the inventory itself, but not for the introduction. We must of course know the name of at least one person who served on a particular board before that board can appear in the main body of the book; the introduction, however, could have been a short but valuable survey of all the various (boards of) magistrates and other officials. It would have been a great

asset here to list even those boards of magistrates for whom no prosopographical information survives, and D.'s strict application of his criterion, even in the introduction, leaves us with a truncated list of boards of *archai* and other officials. There is, for example, no mention of the *poristai*, the *apodektai*, the *agoranomoi*, the *metronomoi*, the *astynomoi*, the *hodopoioi*, the *lexiarchoi*, the *nomophylakes*, and the *tamias tou demou*, or of several boards related to the cult, such as the *epistatai tou hierou tes agathes Tyches* (IG 2².333.20).

According to his third criterion, D. records not only state officials but also local officials "where there is some connection with the operation of state functions." As a result he includes known demarchs and *epimeletai tes phyles*, but not other local officials. That is, in my opinion, a problematical criterion. Today the prevailing view among historians is that, even in the classical period, citizens had to be inscribed not only in a deme but also in a phratry. Accordingly D., if he had applied his criterion consistently, ought to have included phratriarchs as well as demarchs; and several of the other local officials may well have assisted the demarch in the duties imposed on him by the polis. Next, as demonstrated both by Robin Osborne in *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 83–87; and by David Whitehead in *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca. 250 B.C.* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 315–24, there is a remarkable lack of overlap between citizens active in local politics and polis politics, and since demarchs are already listed and discussed in Whitehead's book (pp. 408–15) D. could easily have omitted them.

To sum up, apart from architects, I have not detected any official or board of officials erroneously omitted by D., but there are some whom he ought to have excluded if he wanted his prosopography to be well defined. However, instead of restricting himself to a complete list of attested magistrates, he has included a number of others and chosen the rather vague and elusive title *Athenian Officials*. By making his criteria for inclusion as loose as they are he has generously provided us with a greater mass of usable data, much of which we would have missed if the book had been better defined but narrower in its scope. On the other hand, it would have been another asset to his work if it had been opened with a longer and more explicit discussion of the criteria for inclusion and exclusion, something like what I have outlined above.

II

It is well known from many articles that D. loves to advocate provocative views, sometimes very persuasively, but not always. This book is meant to be a handbook, a working tool for all historians and not a place to defend a controversial position. Accordingly, D. is very modest and conservative in his interpretation of the huge mass of information he is dealing with. And even when he has an axe to grind he prefers to be extremely cautious and to say less rather than more than the evidence can bear. A case in point is the term of office given to the elected financial magistrates. In his article "From Panathenaia to Panathenaia," *ZPE* 57 (1984): 133–38, D. gave a brilliant interpretation of IG 2².338 (an honorary decree for an elected *epimeletes ton krenon*) and demonstrated, at least to my satisfaction, that the theoretic board and the treasurer of the stratotic fund served not just one year but four, i.e., from the Greater Panathenaia to the next Greater Panathenaia. Accordingly

Demades, though attested as *tamias stratotikon* in 334/3 only, is recorded as *tamias* in the three following years as well. It is unlikely that the quadrennial term of office was introduced in 334; it probably goes back to at least 338, a year with several constitutional reforms, and presumably it was introduced before 338/7. Nevertheless D. is so cautious in applying his own observation that Demosthenes is recorded as *epi to theorikon* in 337/6 only, but neither in the preceding year nor in the two following years. Similarly Kallias of Bate is recorded as *tamias ton stratotikon* in 338/7 only, and Nikeratos Nikiou Kydantides in 344/3 only. This is indeed to be very modest and cautious in applying an important new observation. Admittedly, Demosthenes was *sitones* in 338/7 (Dem. 18.248) and to serve on the theoric board in the same year would be a cumulation of offices. But to be *sitones* was either an extraordinary magistracy or no magistracy at all, and in 337/6 Demosthenes had no difficulty in filling his post *epi to theorikon* and being *teichoipoios* at the same time (Aeschin. 3.23–24).

III

On the identification of the various offices D. is almost always to be trusted, though there is, as always, room for disagreement. On the one hand he is so cautious that he takes *PRyl* 3.489 col. 4. 100–108 to be evidence of a trierarch only and not of a *strategos* (p. 181; for a different interpretation, cf. O. Murray and S. Price, *The Greek City* [Oxford, 1990], p. 238 n. 105); on the other hand, he is prepared (p. 6) on very slender evidence to follow B. Jordan, *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1975), pp. 119–30, and believe that the Athenians had special nauarchs or *archontes tou nautikou*. The only solid evidence we have for the “office” is the public funeral monument of (probably) 410/09, *Agora* 17.23.103–10 (pp. 165–66), but if the monument is correctly dated, as it seems to be, one of the two men listed as *archon tou nautikou* (both from Leontis IV) must be identified with Pasiphon of Phrearrhioi, who represented Leontis as *strategos* in the very same year (so also D., p. 166). The inference is that *archon tou nautikou* was an ad hoc appointment held sometimes by a *strategos* and sometimes, perhaps, by trierarchs or taxiarchs, and that is in conformity with what we know about the nauarch, cf., e.g., Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.5. Thus, *nauarchoi*/archons of the fleet ought not to have been listed as a separate board of officials in the introduction (p. 6).

Turning from the offices to the individuals filling them, I have a quibble: all names are given in transliterated form, although the book is supposed to be used together with Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica* and Davies' *Athenian Propertied Families*, in which names are in Greek. I find it unnecessarily irksome that I have to look for á, ê, ñ, etc. under a separate letter H, and that all names with φ are placed in the middle of the letter P. Also the check of possible new identifications is made less easy by printing TH for θ, PH for φ etc. In the age of computers it cannot be much more expensive to print Greek instead of Latin characters, and any student who gets so far as to make profitable use of D.'s book will have learnt the Greek alphabet and be clever enough to read at least names and technical terms in the original.

Broken names present a major problem in any inventory based on epigraphical evidence. In general D.'s approach is cautious and judicious, but occasionally he is

too willing to accept a doubtful restoration suggested *exempli gratia* by the editor of the inscription in question. A case in point is *IG* 2².114, a decree of the people proposed and carried in 362/1 by a certain PHIL[. . .]S. Following Koehler and Kirchner, D. (p. 267) restores Phil[ippo]s, but there are so many alternatives (agro, aitho, argo, esio, iade, isko, isto, otheo, and okle, all attested in fourth-century sources as names of Athenian citizens) that the restoration must be taken *exempli gratia* and ought not to have been repeated in a prosopography. Another example is the public funeral monument commemorating those who died in battle in the year 394/3. Among the casualties are found two of the ten generals listed as MNE-SIKL[ES] of tribe VI and [THO]UKLE[IDES] of tribe IX. In the second case the restoration is fairly certain. The name Thoukleides is attested in *IG* 2².1009.76, and according to Dornseiff and Hansen the only alternative to Thoukleides is Boukleides, so far unattested in Attica. But MNESIKL[...] might just as well be Mnesikl[eides] (cf., e.g., *IG* 2².1250.18) and ought to have been left as a broken name. Other instances of what had better been recorded as broken names are: [EUA]N[DRON] (p. 219), [ARKE]TO[S] (p. 249), and A[UTOKLES] (p. 349), just to mention a few.

A constant source of disagreement among ancient historians is the question whether two attestations of the same name separated by thirty years or less should be taken to be evidence of two homonymous citizens or of one citizen attested twice. Again, D. avoids rash and superficial identifications and mostly but not always, when there is room for doubt, he prefers to take identical names to be evidence of homonymous persons. One example will suffice: Phokion seems to be a very rare name and it is tempting to identify Phokion the general with the Phokion of Potamos who served on the council in 336/5 (*Agora* 15.42.206). I suggested the identification in 1983, in *GRBS* 24 (1983): 178. D. cautiously avoids it and lists the general and the councillor as two different persons. He may well be right. But in a similar case he has been less cautious: the Emmenides who in ca. 333 proposed and carried the decree referred to in *IG* 2².1544.30 is, tentatively, identified with the Emmenides of Koile who chaired a meeting of the assembly in 349/8, cf. *IG* 2².208.4–5. But equally possible is Emmenides of Hekale, who is attested along with Phokion in the fragmentary list of councillors of 336/5 (*Agora* 15.42.263). Emmenides is as rare a name as Phokion and the identification of the proposer with the chairman seemed very persuasive until, in 1956, the discovery of the list of councillors of 336/5 forced us, in light of the obvious alternative, to give up the identification.

This example leads to an observation of a more general nature. When Kirchner published his *Prosopographia Attica*, which covers the archaic, classical, and Hellenistic periods, the number of Athenians with known names and demotics totaled about twelve thousand. Since then we have come to know the names of at least five thousand more Athenians from the same periods; and whenever a new list of, e.g., *prytaneis* or *bouleutai* is recovered we get new attestations of rare names, and accordingly of plausible alternatives to identifications made and trusted when the source material was much smaller. When, in a few years, we can get access to one of the new updated prosopographies of Athenians, either the one compiled in Melbourne by M. Osborne et alii or the one compiled in Toronto by J. Traill et alii, several of the identifications found in Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica* or in Davies' *Athenian Propertied Families*, or in my inventory of *Rhetores kai Strategoi*, or in D.'s new book will have to be rejected or at least questioned.

IV

In order to check the completeness and reliability of D.'s work I selected two boards of magistrates, namely the nine archons and the council of five hundred.

A. For the nine archons (403/2–322/1) I compared D.'s entries with a list I drew up in 1980 (unpublished) and have occasionally updated, cf. most recently *C&M* 41 (1990): 77 n. 32. For most of the eponymous archons we know only the year and the name (without patronymic and demotic), but in the case of fourteen archons we have information about their patronymic and/or demotic, and we know the names (often with patronymic and demotic) of six king archons, three polemarchs, eleven *thesmothetai*, and three members of the council of the Areopagos. Finally, in one case the name of a *thesmothetes* is unknown, but he is referred to as the brother of a known person, i.e., Theokrines of Hybadai (Dem. 58.27–28). There are about one hundred entries altogether, and in four cases I disagree with D.'s presentation of the evidence:

1. In the *Deipnosophistai* Athenaeus (591D) mentions an Areopagite by the name Gryllion (*Prosop. Att.* 3093, med. s.iv). He does not appear in D.'s book, but ought to have been recorded in the appendix to section 7 or section 8 as one of the nine archons.

2. A lost speech of Dinarchus was entitled κατὰ Πολυεύκτου βασιλεύειν λαχόντος δοκιμασία (Din. fr. 1.1, Conomis). We do not know the outcome of the *dokimasia* of Polyeyktos, but since D. records that Leodamas in 382/1 was rejected at his *dokimasia* as candidate for the archonship, he ought likewise, in appendix 9, to have recorded Polyeyktos, at least as candidate for the office of king archon.

3. Chremes, the archon of 326/5, is recorded without demotic, but Philoktemon Chremetos Aixoneus, the proposer of *IG* 2².1198, was probably a son of the archon, cf. most recently D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7 to ca. 250 B.C.* (Princeton, 1986), p. 420, no. 96). Thus, the proper entry would have been Chremes of Aixone.

4. Since Autolykos the Areopagite was convicted in 338/7 (Lycurg. 1.53 and fr. 3, Conomis) it is most unlikely that he was identical with Autolykos of Thorikos (thus D., p. 290), who was *kosmetes* in the 330s (*SEG* 23.78.15). On the other hand, since Autolykos is not a common name, the Areopagite may well be identical with Autolykos of P . . . (demotic), who is recorded in 343/2 as leaser of sacred property (*SEG* 33.167 fr. d i.10).

To sum up, in about one hundred entries I found two omissions of a person, one of a demotic, and one questionable identification. Is that a good or a bad record? For my part I confess that I am impressed by D.'s accuracy and sound judgment and I will adduce a parallel to substantiate this view: in 1901–3 J. Kirchner published his *Prosopographia Attica*, which was a monument for its time and is still indispensable for all who work with Athenian history. But only six years later, in 1909, J. Sundwall could publish 170 pages of addenda and corrigenda and point out hundreds of omissions (*Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskabs-Societets Förhandlingar* 52 [1909–10] B, no. 1). In my opinion D.'s book is as good and reliable as Kirchner's was, and that is meant to be a compliment. Furthermore, I have to confess that, in appendix 9 on page 413, D. included one archon whom I missed, I don't know why, i.e., Timokrates son of T . . . , *thesmothetes* in ca. 325 (*Hesperia* 15 [1946]: 189, no. 35).

B. A closer inspection of D.'s list of fourth-century councillors gave the following result:

1. I noted a number of instances of men who, both in the text and in indexes, are recorded as proposers only, although they ought, in the text, to have been described as proposers of probouleumatic decrees and thus, in index 1, to have been referred to as Boul.-prop., and, in index 2, to have been listed as both proposers and councillors: no. 462: Aristophon Aristophanous Azenieus, 357/6 (*IG* 2².121.9), 355/4 (*IG* 2².130.8). No. 854: Diogeiton, ca. 370 (*IG* 2².152.7–8). No. 1350: Hegesandros Hegesiou Sounieus, 357/6 (*IG* 2².123.7). No. 1564: Kallistratos Kallikratous Aphidnaios, 369/8 (*IG* 2².107.36). No. 1603: Kephisodotos ek Kerameon, 367/6 (Tod 137). No. 1731: Ktesiphon, 337/6 (Dem. 18.9, 53, 118–19). No. 2649: Pyrrhandros Anaphlystios, 378/7 (*IG* 2².44.7). No. 2981: Theozotides Athmoneus (on the demotic cf. *infra*), 403/2 (*SEG* 28.46). (The decrees recorded in this section are listed as probouleutic by P. J. Rhodes in *The Athenian Boule* [Oxford, 1972], table C246–58).

2. In two instances D. has left out a reference to a man who is attested as speaker in the *boule*: Eudoxos Theangelou Sypalettios, 343/2 (*IG* 2².223C 10–12). No. 2560: Polyeuktos Kydantides, ca. 330–22 (Din. fr. 2.2, Conomis).

3. In four cases D. has omitted (or tacitly rejected) an identification whereby a patronymic or a demotic can be added to the information we have about a councillor: No. 332: Archias (Akestoridou) Cholargeus, for the patronymic cf. *IG* 2².1624.93–94. No. 1307: Gnathios (Probalisios), for the demotic cf. *Hesperia* 15 (1946): 160, no. 17, line 7). No. 2981: Theozotides (Athmoneus), for the demotic cf. *SEG* 28.190. No. 2497: Phokion (Phokou) Potamios, for the patronymic cf. no. 2496 and above, p. 56.

4. Lykourgos Lykophronos Boutades is recorded as councillor no fewer than three times: in 338/7 (Lucian *Parasit.* 42), in 336/5 (*IG* 2².328), and in 329/8 (*IG* 2².1672.302–3). Since a citizen could be councillor only twice in his lifetime (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 62.3), one of the sources must be rejected, and obviously it is Lucian, who is notorious for giving untrustworthy information about classical Athenian institutions, cf. J. Delz, *Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten* (Freiburg, 1950).

In general, I am impressed by the reliability and completeness of D.'s inventory. The number of fourth-century councillors amounts to more than a thousand, and there can be no doubt that at least some of the examples I listed above are not oversights but deliberate omissions, open to discussion.

V

D.'s book opens up new perspectives for Greek historians. The very large number of individuals (3,925 are listed in index 1, including broken names) suggests that the book can be used not only in prosopographical, but also in demographic studies of Athenian history. To test that contention we can inspect D.'s index 2, where the individuals are listed by tribes in official order and by demes within tribes alphabetically.

The distribution of citizens over the tribes is a problem treated briefly by Gomme in *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Adding up all citizens with demotics recorded in Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica* and grouping the demes according to the ten Cleisthenic tribes, he got the following figures:

Erechtheis (I): 1,312; Aigeis (II): 1,540; Pandionis (III): 1,223; Leontis (IV): 1,502; Akamantis (V): 1,130; Oineis (VI): 1,125; Kekropis (VII): 1,333; Hippothontis (VIII): 1,077; Aiantis (IX): 979; and Antiochis (X): 1,058. Gomme was very cautious and almost abstained from using the figures, but both he and later historians (e.g., J. S. Traill in *The Political Organization of Attica* [Princeton, 1975], pp. 32, 64–65) made some inferences about the relative size of the ten tribes: since demotics are only infrequently recorded before ca. 400 B.C., the material included in the *Prosopographia Attica* suggests that in the fourth century the Cleisthenic tribes were no longer of equal size and that, e.g., Aigeis and Leontis must have been larger than the average, whereas Aiantis must have been the smallest of the tribes.

In index 2 D.'s figures for the ten tribes are: Erechtheis (I): 345; Aigeis (II): 337; Pandionis (III): 414; Leontis (IV): 392; Akamantis (V): 260; Oineis (VI): 278; Kekropis (VII): 216; Hippothontis (VIII): 190; Aiantis (IX): 167; and Antiochis (X): 284. These updated figures that cover a part of the source material seem to corroborate the figures based on Kirchner, but the agreement between the two sets of figures is not reassuring. On the contrary it is worrying: the officials recorded by D. are mostly *archai* and most boards of magistrates were composed of the same number of citizens from each tribe, i.e., one (the *poletai*) or three (the *euthynoi* and their *paredroi*) or four (the *tettarakonta*) or fifty (the *bouleutai*). Thus, with minor variations, we should expect to have the same number of individuals in each of the ten tribes. The extremely uneven distribution attested in D.'s index 2 strongly indicates that the source material is skewed and cannot be used to say anything about the political organization of Attica and the demography of demes, *trittyes*, and tribes.

We may, however, get one step further by subdividing the officials listed by D. Of the 2,883 individuals included in his index 2 no fewer than 1,493 are councillors, and their distribution over the tribes is as follows: Erechtheis (I): 189; Aigeis (II): 199; Pandionis (III): 266; Leontis (IV): 244; Akamantis (V): 113; Oineis (VI): 137; Kekropis (VII): 86; Hippothontis (VIII): 70; Aiantis (IX): 41; and Antiochis (X): 148. The reason why Aiantis appears to be so small is that the tribe is almost unattested in the two large but fragmentary lists of *bouleutai* (*Agora* 15.42 and 43) and that the oldest preserved list of *prytaneis* from Aiantis is *Agora* 15.127 from 223/2. If we leave aside the councillors and list the other officials by tribe we get a very even distribution: Erechtheis (I): 156; Aigeis (II): 138; Pandionis (III): 148; Leontis (IV): 148; Akamantis (V): 147; Oineis (VI): 141; Kekropis (VII): 130; Hippothontis (VIII): 120; Aiantis (IX): 126; and Antiochis (X): 136. The small variations indicate that, apart from councillors, D.'s list of officials seems to give a reliable picture of the citizens' distribution over the tribes and so his figures, though small, may be used to say something about the relative size of *trittyes* and demes, where variations are to be expected and may be significant.

Returning to Kirchner's figures as counted by Gomme, it is worth noting that the large bouleutic lists in which Aiantis is poorly represented (*Agora* 15.42 and 43) were found after the publication of *PA*. So possibly Aiantis was in fact the smallest of the tribes; but that can be verified only by an updated count of all citizens with demotics and to do that we must await the completion of the gigantic prosopographies which are presently being composed in Melbourne by M. Osborne and in Toronto by J. Traill. For one type of inscription, though, there are updated figures: of all citizens recorded in fourth-century sepulchral inscriptions and with identifiable demotics (1,862) exactly one tenth (186) belong to the tribe

Aiantis, but this figure includes 89 from Rhamnous, a deme that is exceptionally rich in sepulchral monuments and has been exceptionally well excavated.¹ So the sepulchral inscriptions seem to support the contention that in the fourth century citizens belonging to Aiantis constituted less than one tenth of all. But that is a matter for further investigation and cannot be pursued further in a review of D.'s book. My purpose here has been only to demonstrate how important and useful the book is and how carefully his indexes have been drawn up.

VI

By far the majority of the individuals included in D.'s inventory were magistrates in the technical sense, i.e., *archai*, who accordingly shared a number of characteristics. They were all supposed to be full citizens who had not suffered any loss of rights (*atimia*); apart from the *paredroi* of the archons, they had all been either elected or selected by lot; they had all had to undergo a *dokimasia* before assuming office; and they must all have been above thirty years of age. In a prosopography an age limit is a very important characteristic and for that reason alone it would have been extremely helpful to have a third index comprising the *archai* grouped by boards and excluding everybody else. One reason why D. has not provided us with such an index is that he does not believe that there was an age limit of thirty years for Athenian *archai* (p. 1), and accordingly he will not insist on an age of thirty or more for an individual attested as magistrate unless he has specific information from other sources that the man had reached that age. But here I think he is wrong. He does not treat the problem in his introduction, but refers to his earlier discussion of it in "Age Qualifications for Athenian Magistrates," *ZPE* 61 (1985): 149–59, an article I will have to discuss here in some detail.

D.'s principal piece of evidence (p. 159) is a passage from Lysias' Oration 21, which he takes to be delivered in an *euthynai* by a citizen who was not yet thirty. In section 18 the speaker claims (οὐ γὰρ ἂν) τοῦτό γε εἰπεῖν ἔχοι τις, ὥς πολλάς ἀρχὰς ἄρξας ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων ὠφέλημα. D.'s translation is: "for no-one could say that I have profited from your funds having held many offices," and he takes the statement to be "evidence for a career in office on the part of a man in his 20s" (p. 156). But to insist that the phrase *πολλάς ἀρχὰς ἄρξας*, though depending on a negated verb, must have a positive sense is to misinterpret the Greek. From the speaker's statement it is simply impossible to say anything about whether or not he had actually served as a magistrate. For a preferable translation see the Loeb edition: "For it can never be alleged that I have profited at your expense by the tenure of many offices." Furthermore, we must keep in mind that we are interpreting a corrupted text, and that the negation is only a (brilliant) conjecture by Dobree. D.'s next piece of evidence is the information in Andocides 4.11 that Alcibiades, in 425, i.e., aged about 25, served on a commission entrusted with the reassessment of the allied cities (p. 153, cf. the inventory, p. 131). But Andocides 4 is a spurious speech, and even accepting the information at face value we must not forget that the speaker has nothing to say about whether Alcibiades and the

1. Source: the data base of Athenians recorded on private funeral monuments compiled at Copenhagen University, by L. Bjertrup, M. H. Hansen, T. Heine Nielsen, L. Rubinstein, and T. Vestergaard.; cf. *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 19 (1990): 25–44.

other nine commissioners who assessed the allied tribute were *archai* in the technical sense. They may just as well have had the status of envoys, for whom there does not seem to have been a generally acknowledged age limit. Again the answer is a *non liquet*. The other evidence presented by D. is even less convincing. In 393/2 Iphikrates, at the age of twenty, was a military commander near Corinth, but the source is not particularly trustworthy (Justin 6.5.2) and, more important, we do not know whether Iphikrates was a mercenary leader or an elected *strategos*. In 376/5 Phoikon, at the age of twenty-six, commanded the left wing of the Athenian fleet in the battle of Naxos, but presumably as a trierarch and not as an elected *strategos*.

So there is really no good evidence at all for magistrates in their twenties, and, conversely, there is some circumstantial evidence that the Athenians did require all candidates for magistracies to be over thirty. (1) We have plenty of reliable prosopographical information about citizens who served as *archai* in their thirties (e.g., Manti-theos Mantiou Thorikios, born c. 380, cf. *APF* 367; *taxiarchos* in 349/8, Dem. 39.17) or forties (e.g., Demosthenes Demosthenous Paianieus, born 384/3, *epi to theorikon* in 337/6, Aeschin. 3.24) or fifties (e.g., Phokion Phokou Potamios, born 402/1, Plut. *Phocion* 24.5; *strategos* 349/8, Dem. 21.164) or sixties (e.g., Aristophon Arizelou Azenieus, born in the 430s, Schol. Aeschin. 1.64; Dem. 20.148; Aeschin. 3.139; *strategos* in 363/2, Schol. Aeschin. 1.64). If it had been possible for a citizen in his twenties to serve on a board of *archai* there ought to be at least one indisputable attestation in the very good sources we have.

Next, there is no doubt that councillors had to be over thirty. But it is apparent from Demosthenes 39.10 that the same *pinakion* was used at the sortition of councillors and of other *archai*, and that is a strong indication that there was the same age limit for *archai* as for councillors. These and other arguments are set out in my discussion of the problem in "Seven Hundred Archai in Classical Athens," *GRBS* 20 (1979): 167–69, to which I refer for further discussion. I conclude that both councillors and other *archai* all were above thirty and that the bulk of prosopographical information presented in D.'s book must refer to the group of citizens who had reached that age.

VII

In conclusion, D.'s book is far more than just an inventory. On almost every page can be found a valuable discussion of some problem, and he is always very generous in adding references to other publications where an issue is treated in greater detail. His book has made life easier for all who study Athenian history; he has provided us with a tool that will make new studies possible in a whole range of fields, and every historian studying classical Athens must have D.'s *AO* (as I suggest calling it) within hand's reach standing next to Kirchner's *PA* and Davies' *APF*.

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN
University of Copenhagen