

STEPHEN V. TRACY

EKKLESIA SYNKLETOS: A NOTE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 75 (1988) 186–188

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

EKKLESIA SYNKLETOS: A NOTE¹

There has been a lively exchange in the literature recently between E.M.Harris ("How Often Did the Athenian Assembly Meet?" CQ 36,1986,363-377) and M.H.Hansen ("How Often Did the Athenian *Ekklesia Meet* ? A Reply," GRBS 28,1987,35-50) concerning whether an *ekklesia synkletos* was an extra meeting of the assembly or one of the regular meetings called on very short notice. The present note makes no attempt to settle an issue so ably argued by others, although I see no reason why in the Hellenistic period the term cannot embrace both meanings. I wish here only to draw attention to the wording used in preambles to describe such meetings and to point out that one long-accepted formula is incorrect.

The term *synkletos* occurs seven times and is restored with certainty once in our evidence; thrice it is attached to meetings of the boule and five times to meetings of the assembly. A simple listing of these passages in chronological order, first of the boule and then of the ekklesia, will clarify matters.

BOULE

1. Lines 4-6 of IG II² 897 of 185/4
βουλή ἐμ βουλευτηρίῳι σύνκλητος στρατ[ηγῶν] παραγγειλάντων
καὶ ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία [κυρία] ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳι
2. Lines 3-4 of Agora I 6765 of 181/0 (Agora XV no.167)
βουλή ἐμ βουλευτηρίῳι σύνκλητος στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων
καὶ ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία κυρία ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳι
3. Lines 2-4 of IG II² 954 of (perhaps) 181/0 (M.J.Osborne, Naturalization in Athens no.D100)
[βουλή ἐμ] βουλευτηρίῳι[ι σύν]κλητος στρατη[γῶν παραγγειλά]ντων
κ[α]ὶ ἀπ[ὸ] βου[λ]ῆς ἐκκλησία ἀρ[χαίρειαι κατὰ τ]ὴν μαντε[ίαν τοῦ] θεοῦ

EKKLESIA

4. Lines 5-7 of IG II² 838 of 226/5
ἐκκλησί[α ἐν] τῷ θεάτρ[ῳι σύν]κλητος κατὰ ψήφισμα ὃ ...σίας θορ[ίκιος εἶπεν]
5. Lines 3-4 of Agora I 6103 of ca. a. 170 a. (Hesperia 36,1967,64)
[ἐκκλησ]ία σύν[κλητος ἀπὸ βουλῆς στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων]
6. Lines 5-7 of IG II² 911 of 169/8
ἐκκλησία σύν[κλητος ἀπὸ βουλῆς στρατη]γῶν παραγγ[ειλάντων]
7. Lines 5-6 of IG II² 945 of 168/7
ἐκκλησία σύνκλητος ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳι κατὰ ψήφισμα ὃ Ἄρις[τ --]

¹I am indebted to Ch.Habicht for discussions which helped materially in the genesis of this note.

σημαχίδης εἶπεν

8. Lines 39-40 of IDélos 1507 of 144/3

ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος ἐ[ν τ]ῶι θεάτρῳι [μετ]ά? στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων

Several observations follow, the principal one being that the phrase ἀπὸ βουλῆς is only attested when a meeting of the boule is coupled with a meeting of the ekklesia (nos. 1-3). Next, when the phrase does occur, it is conjoined with and comes before the word *ekklesia*, i.e., ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐκκλησία (nos. 1-3). Lastly, when the words next to ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος are actually preserved (nos. 4, 7-8), they always indicate the meeting place. It follows, therefore, that the formula ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος ἀπὸ βουλῆς (nos. 5-6), first proposed by U.Köhler in 1895 (IG II.5 441c) and universally accepted, must be recognized as never attested and very probably as not part of the language of Attic decrees.

IG II² 911 lines 5-7 should, therefore, be restored on the basis of another decree passed on the same day, Agora I 164 (Hesperia 5,1936,429-430),² as:

ἐκκλησία σύγκλητος ἐμ Πειραιεῖ στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων]

and Agora I 6103 lines 3-4 as:

[ἐκκλησί]α σύγκλητος ἐν τῶι θεάτρῳι? στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων]

Postscript

The reading of [μετ]ά? in IDélos 1507 line 40 is impossible as Roussel the editor recognized. The word [κυρί]α should probably be restored. If, however, κυρία was to be included, the cutter ought to have inscribed ἐκκλησία κυρία σύγκλητος ἐν τῶι θεάτρῳι στρατηγῶν παραγγειλάντων. It appears that he committed an haplography; that is, after inscribing IA of ἐκκλησία his eye jumped ahead to the IA of κυρία, with the result that he

² The preamble in Agora I 164 is unusual enough to deserve complete quotation:

Θ ε ο ί
Ἐπὶ Εὐνίκου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀτταλί-
δος δωδεκάτης πρυτανείας ἢ Ἱερώνυ-
μος Βοήθου Κηφισιεὺς ἐγραμμάτευεν·
Σκιροφοριῶνος ἐνεὶ καὶ νέαι, ἐνάτει
καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκκλη-
σία ἐμ Πειραιεῖ· τὸν προέδρων ἐπεψήφι-
ζεν
vacat
vacat
vacat

ἔδοξεν τεῖ βουλευεῖ καὶ τῶι δήμῳι

It clearly begins as a full preamble, describes the meeting simply as ἐκκλησία ἐμ Πειραιεῖ, and breaks off at the place where the chairman's name should come. The cutter left three lines vacant, as though he expected to put something in later, and picked up ἔδοξεν. He appears, in short, to have been working from a defective copy of the preamble.

Given this, it is uncertain how much we should make of the omission of *synkletos*. M.H.Hansen (GRBS 28,1987,49 n.37) takes it as proof that the word was optional. Since the cutter seems to have known the meeting place, I find the omission surprising, for this inscription reflects the important business for which the meeting was called on the last day of the year, namely to hear and react to the news of the Roman victory at Pydna. Hansen, *Ibid.* 49, looks at it differently.

initially omitted κυρία. When he reached the end of the line and discovered his omission, rather than erase, he simply inserted κυρία as the first word of the next line. Note, in support of this reconstruction, that this cutter was not particularly careful, for he omitted altogether ἐπεψήφισεν, the final word of line 41.

Princeton

Stephen V.Tracy