

the second *Nekyia* was composed no earlier than the eighth century B.C. (and possibly much later) and that the Phoenicians began to settle the south coast of Spain not later than c. 750 B.C., and possibly as early as c. 800 B.C. (H. Schubart, op. cit. 218 ff., with references to excavations at Las Chorreras and the Morro de Mezquitilla near the mouth of the Rio Algarrobo; also see B. B. Shefton, 'Greeks and Greek Imports in the South of the Iberian Peninsula. The archaeological evidence', *ibid.*, 337 ff. for a review of Phoenician commerce in Greek pottery in Spain, especially pp. 342–3 for a fragment of an Attic Middle Geometric (c. 800–760 B.C.) krater found outside the Strait of Gibraltar at Huelva). Thus there is no chronological problem with assuming that a Phoenician report of Gibraltar communicated to Greek sailors or traders lies behind the *Λευκάς πέτρῃ* of the *Odyssey*.

IG II².2344 AND THE SIZE OF PHRATRIES IN CLASSICAL ATHENS¹

Little is known about phratries in ancient Athens. The few surviving pieces of evidence, both literary and epigraphical, do not provide an adequate basis for a convincing reconstruction of most details. It may be possible, however, to say something more about the number and size, even if not about the organization and function, of phratries in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

The purpose of this note is to show how IG II².2344 is relevant to the question of phratries. It is a list of twenty names with patronymics, comprising three families and two isolated individuals, under the heading,

Διὸς : Φρατρίο : Ἀθηνάας : Φρα[τρίας] | οἷδε φράτερες

The inscription is in the form of a dedication, and after *Διὸς : Φρατρίο : Ἀθηνάας : Φρα[τρίας]* one should understand *στήλη* or *ἱερὰ στήλη*. There are several other examples of this form of dedication, though none is exactly parallel.² The stele was most likely set up in the sanctuary of the phratry, and that would explain why a list of phratry members should be in the form of a dedication. In the absence of other criteria, the inscription is dated by letter forms to the early fourth century.

Surprisingly enough this inscription has been either ignored or curtly dismissed in the literature concerning the number and nature of Athenian phratries. In 1902 Alfred Körte concluded that this list of twenty names constituted the total membership of a phratry.³ But in 1910 Anton von Premerstein maintained that the list was only of a single thiasos within a phratry.⁴ We know that by the beginning of the fourth century phratries were subdivided into units called thiasoi, which are to be distinguished from the private religious associations of the same name. Von Premerstein argued that the constant appeals of the orators to the testimony of phratry members render it very unlikely that one phratry could be so small as to have only twenty members, even if there were more than twelve phratries altogether.

The view of von Premerstein seems to have been generally accepted.⁵ The main reason for this acceptance appears to be an assumption that the list is impossibly short for a full phratry.⁶ The text of the inscription itself, however, gives no support to the

¹ I would like to thank Professors Alan Boegehold, Charles Fornara, and Kurt Raafaub for their helpful criticisms and suggestions.

² See SIG 921 (= IG II².1237), note 1, where Dittenberger correctly cites as parallels SIG 1021 and SIG 1100 (= IG II².1325).

³ *Hermes* 37 (1902), 582–9.

⁴ *Ath. Mitt.* 35 (1910), 113.

⁵ C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1952), 60; Antony Andrewes, 'Philochorus on Phratries', *JHS* 81 (1961), 11. It was also accepted by Krichner (cf. his comments on IG II².2344).

⁶ To quote Andrewes, art. cit. 11, 'The list is impossibly short for a full phratry, and von Premerstein was very probably right to suggest that this was a single thiasos within a phratry.'

belief that it is a thiasos. In the first place, the inscription is headed 'These are the phrateres', and there is no mention of a thiasos or of thiasotai. And they do not make the dedication to a special deity of their own, as we might expect of a thiasos, but to the common gods of the phratry, Zeus Phratrrios and Athena Phratrria.⁷ It is indeed striking that the name of the phratry is not mentioned, but that in itself is not sufficient cause to consider the list a thiasos. Körte's explanation is very plausible: since the list was to be set up in the sanctuary of the phratry itself, it was unnecessary to put the name of the phratry on the stone.⁸ One should also keep in mind that no other intact phratry list survives. We do have, however, a phratry list which is broken at the top (*IG* II².2345), about which more will be said. The names on that list are divided into thiasoi, and these thiasoi are clearly labelled as such. For example, a group of 24 names comes under the heading

'ΑΓΝΟΘΕΟ ΘΙΑΣΟΣ

Secondly, the family interconnection should not be considered unusual. Since phratry membership was hereditary, a high degree of interrelation, whether in a long list or in a short list, is to be expected. The relationship between the individuals who are listed on the stone is not relevant, therefore, to the question of whether this list is a thiasos or a phratry. In sum, there is nothing about the inscription, except its length, which gives the slightest indication that it is anything but the dedication of a full phratry.⁹

This inscription, however, does not stand alone as being the only evidence that a phratry might be very small. There are two other indications that not all phratries were of the same size. Lines 71–8 of *IG* II².1237, the so-called 'Demotionid Decrees',

⁷ This was actually noted by Andrewes, *art. cit.* 11. Zeus Phratrrios and Athena Phratrria were the special deities of all Athenian phratries; for Zeus Phratrrios see *IG* II².1237, line 1, and Plato, *Timaeus* 21b. For both deities mentioned together see Plato, *Euthydemus* 28, and especially Schol. Aristophanes *Ach.* 146.

⁸ Körte, *art. cit.* 583. One might add that the designation of the phratry is so unclear in *IG* II².1237 that it has never been conclusively settled whether the phrateres in question are called the Demotionidae or the Dekeleieis.

⁹ An alternative possibility is that the list represents an *ad hoc* group of phrateres who are making a dedication on their own initiative; i.e. 'These phrateres (contributed to the dedication)'. This possibility was rejected by Körte: 'Die Ueberschrift mit dem charakteristischen οἷδε und die seitlich beigefügte Angabe Σώσιππος Σωσιπόλιδος ἀνέγραψεν machen es zweifellos, dass wir ein officielles Verzeichniss der Phrateren vor uns haben' (*art. cit.*, 583). Sosippus was most probably the *ἱερεὺς* of the phratry (cf. *IG* II².1237, lines 2–3, 64–8, and 123–6). οἷδε always introduces what is, in fact, the complete category of what it refers to. If a subgroup is intended, then some further qualification is necessary in the title containing οἷδε. The analogous τοῖδε Δελφῶν πρόξενοι of *SIG* 585 introduces a complete list of all the proxenoi of the Delphians for each year. But subgroups are always identified as such.

If a dedication only included the names of those who had contributed to the cost of the monument, I presume that it took the form of *Agora* 15.49, which inscription also demonstrates how subgroups are differentiated (lines 1–3, and 18):

οἷδε ἐπέδοσαν εἰς τὸ ἀνάθημα ὃ ἀνέθηκεν
ἡ βουλὴ ἢ ἐπ' Εὐθυκρίτου ἄρχοντος | βουλευταί...
οἷδε ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπέδοσαν

Agora 15.40. may be analogous (cf. οἷδε κατέθε [σαν]), but the inscription is too fragmentary to be certain. An apparent exception is *IG* I³.398 (= *Agora* 15.1), where, unless the inscription contained a fourth column, there is room for the names of only about thirty-seven of the fifty prytaneis.

make it clear that a thiasos might even have fewer than three members.¹⁰ *IG* II².2345, dated by letter forms to before the middle of the fourth century, is a list of names grouped under thiasoi, as was mentioned above. Ninety names grouped under at least five thiasoi are preserved, but unfortunately the stone is broken at the top. The number of names in each thiasos, however, varies considerably. The three fully preserved thiasoi contain 13, 24, and 26 members respectively. One might suspect from this lack of uniformity (the smallest thiasos having potentially 2 members, and the largest on record having 26) that not only thiasoi could vary greatly in size, but phratries as well.

If one accepts, therefore, that *IG* II².2344 does indeed represent the total membership of an Athenian phratry, that conclusion has an important implication for our understanding of the number and size of phratries. In the first place, it is now possible to demonstrate unequivocally what many scholars have long suspected, that fragment 3 of the *Athenaion Politeia*, which states that there were twelve phratries to match the twelve months of the year, is not relevant to the fifth or fourth century, and probably does not describe any historical situation.¹¹ It is still remarkable, however, that a phratry could only have twenty members, and two explanations seem possible: either that there had been a significant decline in the number of Athenians who belonged to phratries by 400 B.C., or that the number of phratries was far greater than is usually thought.

Before the reforms of Cleisthenes, every Athenian citizen belonged to a phratry, inasmuch as phratry membership was the sole criterion of citizenship. It has been argued that after Cleisthenes substituted deme membership for phratry membership as the criterion of citizenship, phratry membership would have declined among the less prosperous citizens. They would allegedly have sought to avoid the expense of the various sacrifices entailed in membership, especially of those at the initiation of children.¹² That, however, is mere speculation, and given that there is no evidence that membership declined, but much circumstantial evidence to the contrary,¹³ it is only reasonable to suppose that in the fifth and fourth centuries all, or at least most, Athenian citizens belonged to a phratry. That being the case, how many phratries do we need to postulate were in existence in c. 400 B.C. to make sense of the fact that one phratry had only twenty members?

During the past twenty-five years it has become increasingly common for scholars to argue that the number of phratries was rather great. Antony Andrewes has argued that there were probably as many phratries as there were aristocratic *gene*, the names of some 58 possible *gene* being known to us.¹⁴ More recently, Denis Roussel has

¹⁰ τὸς δὲ μάρτυρας τρεῖς ὅς εἴρη-
ται ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀνακρίσει παρέχεσθαι ἐκ τ-
ῶν ἐαυτῷ θιασωτῶν μαρτυρόντας τὰ ὑπερωτώμε(να)
καὶ ἐπομνύντας τὸν Δία τὸν φράτριον·
μαρτυρῆν δὲ τὸς μάρτυρας καὶ ἐπομνύ-
ναι ἐχομένος τῷ βωμῷ· ἐάν δὲ μὴ ᾧσι ἐν τ-
ῷ(ι) θιάσῳ τότε τοιοῦτοι τὸν ἀριθμόν, ἐ-
κ τῶν ἄλλων φρατέρων παρεχέσθω.

¹¹ Hignett, op. cit. 59, and especially P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981), 68–71.

¹² W. S. Ferguson, 'The Athenian Phratries', *C.P.* 5 (1910), 264.

¹³ Such as the frequent mention of phratries made by the orators, and the privilege of choosing one's phratry in decrees conferring Athenian citizenship (*IG* I².110 +, a decree of 409 B.C.; and *IG* II².237, a decree of 337 B.C.). The only explicit statement that every Athenian citizen did indeed belong to a phratry is Dem. 57.24.

¹⁴ Art. cit. 1–15.

conjectured that there was a very large number of phratries, ranging in size from a few dozen to several hundred members, and that there were perhaps as many phratries as there were demes.¹⁵ This suggestion seems to me to be quite reasonable, and it provides an explanation for a phratry of twenty members. But Roussel accepts without argument the conclusion of von Premerstein, that *IG* II².2344 is only the list of a single thiasos.¹⁶ The inscription, however, actually provides a confirmation of Roussel's own hypothesis. For as I have attempted to argue, there is no basis for von Premerstein's interpretation, other than the preconception that there could not have been more than about 20 phratries. Let us, however, suppose for the moment that there were as many phratries as there were demes, say 150 for the sake of argument. If in 400 B.C. there were approximately 20,000 Athenian citizens,¹⁷ that would give an average of 133 citizens per phratry. Now one might object that 20 is still far from an average of 133, and that such a small phratry is still an anomaly. It also might seem to strain credibility that the sole surviving intact list is from the low end of the spectrum.

One must not forget, however, that phratries were hereditary societies of pre-Solonian origin which had survived wars and plagues. It is not surprising, therefore, if such a phenomenon as large and small phratries should have arisen over time. Thus some phratries probably had many more than the hypothetical average of 133 members. Moreover, between 431 and 400 B.C. the citizen population of Athens was almost halved, and this loss would not have affected every phratry to the same degree. The combination of those two factors, when taken with the fact that the number of phratries may have been a hundred or more, diminishes the seeming improbability that one phratry had only 20 members. It is by chance that the record of a small phratry has survived. For all that we know, there may have been many such small phratries. But even if there were very few phratries as small as this, one cannot dismiss the evidence of this inscription simply because one believes that the odds are against the list of a small phratry, and of no other, having survived.

I conclude, therefore, that *IG* II².2344 is the dedication of a full phratry. That is the natural meaning of the text, and no evidence contravenes it. Given the present state of the evidence it is impossible to determine how many phratries existed at any particular time, but one can now confidently state that phratries greatly varied in size, from 20 members (or less?) to probably a few hundred.

Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

MICHAEL A. FLOWER

¹⁵ *Tribu et Cité* (Paris, 1976), 142–3.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* 149 n. 33.

¹⁷ A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Oxford, 1933); cf. the table on p. 26.

A HESIODIC REMINISCENCE IN VIRGIL, *E.* 9.11–13

At *W.D.* 202–12 Hesiod relates his *αἶνος* for the edification of the recalcitrant βασιλῆες, who must themselves admit the truth of the fable's moral (*φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς*).¹ A hawk has seized a nightingale, and crushes her cries of misery by saying that she is in the claws of one who is πολλὸν ἀρείων and who is therefore at liberty to dispense with her as he pleases: anyone who tries to resist κρείσσονες is mad, for he has no chance of winning and merely adds physical pain to the shame of defeat.

Just what were the βασιλῆες to have made of this? Hesiod's most recent editor (and

¹ So M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978) on 202.