

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN

DEMOGRAPHY AND DEMOCRACY ONCE AGAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 75 (1988) 189–193

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

DEMOGRAPHY AND DEMOCRACY ONCE AGAIN.

The following comments are in reply to E.Ruschenbusch, "Doch noch einmal die Bürgerzahl Athens im 4.Jh.v.Chr.", *ZPE* 72 (1988) 139-40, who argues for an Athenian citizen population of 21,000 in 323/2 B.C.

1. Ruschenbusch bases his calculations on the assumption that a year class of ephebes totalled ca. 500. But the recent publication of yet another roster of ephebes of Kekropis indicates that their numbers swelled during the decade attested in our sources (334/3 - 324/3). The new roster (of 332/1?)¹ combined with the information we have about an unpublished roster of 333/2² and with a restudy of the roster of 334/3³ provides us with the numbers and demotics of almost all the ephebes from Kekropis in three successive years. The evidence can be tabulated as follows:⁴

<u>Ephebes</u>	<u>334/3</u>	<u>333/2</u>	<u>332/1</u>	<u>Total</u>
Aixone (11)	7	7	15	29
Melite (7)	11	4	9	24
Xypete (7)	2	5	3	10
Halai Aix. (6)	5	17	13	35
Athmonon (6?)	?	5	8	13+
Phyla (5?)	?	7	9	16+
Pithos (2)	2	6	4?	12?
Sypalettos (2)	?	0	1	1+
Trinemeia n(2?)	?	1	2	3+
Daidalidai (1)	1	0	0	1
Epieikidai (1)	?	0	1?	1+
Total	28	52	65?	145+
	+14? = 42			= 159

(the numbers in brackets are the bouletic quotas)

¹ J.S.Traill, *Demos and Trittyis* (Toronto 1986) 1-13; an ephebic inscription of Kekropis from about 332/1 B.C.

² O.Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* (Leiden 1971) no.5, cf. M.H.Hansen, *Demography and Democracy. The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Herning 1985) 109 note 237.

³ *IG II² 1156* = Reinmuth (supra n.2) no.2.

⁴ For further information cf. M.H.Hansen, *Three Studies in Athenian Demography. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 56 (1988) I, "Ephebic Inscriptions as Evidence for the Number of Athenian Citizens 336-22." 3-4 with note 4.

First, it is worth noting that the number of ephebes goes up from year to year. Ca. 42 ephebes in 334/3 become 52 in 333/2 and even 65 in 332/1. The two preserved ephebic rosters of Leontis seem to reflect the same development: in 333/2 the tribe had ca. 44 ephebes as against 62 in 324/3.⁵ Also, the rather small tribe Oineis had more ephebes in 330/29 than the probably larger tribe Erechtheis had in 333/2 (56? from Oineis as against 48 from Erechtheis).⁶ The evidence we have for Pandionis, on the other hand, is too fragmentary to be of any value.⁷ The *ephebeia* was reshaped in 336/5⁸ and one result of the reform seems to have been an increased participation so that the number of ephebes after a few years was considerably higher than immediately after the reform. Thus, as a rough guess we may assume that the total number of ephebes may have been ca. 450-500 in the first years after the reform, but had risen to some 600 or more a decade later. For demographic purposes it is, of course, the higher figure that matters.

2. Ruschenbusch assumes that ephebic service was compulsory and that a citizen who did not serve was liable to punishment and could be put on trial by a *graphe astrateias* or *lipotaxiou*. There is no evidence, however, that absence from the *ephebeia* was a criminal offence, and a passage in Lykourgos' speech *Against Leokrates* suggests that it was not: ὑμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ὄρκος, ὃν ὁμνύουσι πάντες οἱ πολῖται, ἐπειδὴν εἰς τὸ ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον ἐγγραφῶσι καὶ ἔφηβοι γένωνται, ὃν εἰ μὲν ὁμώμοκε Λεωκράτης, φανερώς ἐπιώρκηκε, καὶ οὐ μόνον ὑμᾶς ἠδίκηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἠσέβηκεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ὁμώμοκεν εὐθὺς δῆλός ἐστι παρασκευασάμενος (ὡς) οὐδὲν ποιήσων τῶν δεόντων, ἀνθ' ὧν δικαίως ἂν αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν θεῶν τιμωρήσαισθε. First, the dilemma εἰ μὲν ... εἰ δέ contradicts πάντες and shows that not all citizens took the ephebic oath. Second, τὰ δεόντα followed by a potential ἂν indicates that to be an ephebe was a moral, but not a legal obligation.

This interpretation of Lycurg. 1.76 is strengthened by the epigraphical evidence which shows that the number of ephebes grew during the decade 334/3 - 324/3. If absence from the corps had been a criminal offence, as Ruschenbusch holds, the numbers would have been much more stable and as high in the mid thirties as they were a few years later. The increase of ephebes of Kekropis from 42 over 52 to 65 is in itself a strong indication that the *ephebeia* was not a compulsory "Wehrdienst", but a public military training which was felt to be a civic duty and caught on rapidly.

⁵ Leontis 333/2: Reinmuth no.9; 324/3: Reinmuth no.15. The ephebes of 324/3 were probably born in an intercalary year, cf. Hansen (*supra* n.2) 48; but the addition to the year of one month accounts for an increase of 4-5 ephebes only.

⁶ Oineis 330/29: Reinmuth no.12. Erechtheis 333/2: Reinmuth no.13, cf. *SEG* XXXI 162.

⁷ Pandionis 333/2: Reinmuth no.8. Pandionis 332/1: Reinmuth no.10.

⁸ Harp. s.v. *Epikrates*.

But what about πάντες in the first sentence of Lycurg. 1.76? Ruschenbusch insists on a literal interpretation: **all** were inscribed in the *lexiarchikon grammateion* whereafter **all** served as ephebes.⁹ Parallels from other speeches, however, show that a literal interpretation is unwarranted. We are often told that a session of the *ekklesia* was attend by all citizens, cf. for example Lys. 13.86: (Ἀγόρατος) ὅς) πρῶτον μὲν ἐναντίον πεντακοσίων ἐν τῇ βουλῇ, εἶτα πάλιν ἐναντίον Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ἀπογράφας τινὰς ἀποκτείνειε ...¹⁰ On a literal interpretation the inference is that 30,000 citizens¹¹ (according to Ruschenbusch 21,000) had listened to Agoratos; but when the speech against Agoratos was delivered the Pnyx could accommodate no more that 6-8,000 citizens.¹² Thus, from Lycurg. 1.76 we can only infer that every Athenian was entitled (and expected) to serve as an ephebe. There was no census by which the institution was restricted to the so-called "hoplite class". On this problem Ruschenbusch and I agree,¹³ but we cannot infer that every Athenian aged 18 and 19 did in fact serve.

3. Ruschenbusch's view of the Athenian *ephebeia* is incompatible with what we know about the council of five hundred. A citizen might serve twice in the *boule*, but prytany inscriptions and bouletic lists show that only a minority did.¹⁴ To be on the safe side I will here assume that no less than a third of all served twice.¹⁵ Thus, the council consisted, on average, of 375 first term and 125 second term *bouleutai*. Next, for the sake of argument I will follow Ruschenbusch and assume that all citizens actually served as ephebes and that a year class of 19 year old totalled ca. 500.- A citizen had to be 30 before he could serve in the *boule*, and the evidence we have suggests that the average age of first time *bouleutai* was certainly not 30, but rather ca. 40.¹⁶ How many of the 19 year old lived to be 30 or 40? On any demographic model which can reasonably be applied to ancient, medieval and early modern societies, the 500 young men aged 19 correspond to ca. 410 aged 30, and to ca. 320 aged 40.¹⁷ Since the running of the *boule* required 375 new councillors every year the

⁹ E.Ruschenbusch, "Die soziale Herkunft der Epheben um 330", *ZPE* 35 (1979) 174. πάντες is construed both with ἐγγραφῶσι and with γένωνται. It is worth noting that when an adjective goes with two verbs, it does not always fit both verbs equally well. Especially in rhetoric there is often a noticeable "zeugmatic" effect.

¹⁰ Cf. Lys. 13.32; 19,51; Xen. Hell. 1.7.9; Isoc. 15.190; Dem. 18.169; 21.2, 180, 194; 24.48; 25.95; 58.45; Aeschin. 2.13; 3.125, 224; Din. 1.4; 3.14.

¹¹ The impossible figure 30,000 is indeed mentioned at Hdt. 5.97.2 and Pl. *Axiochos* 369A.

¹² Cf. M.H.Hansen, *The Athenian Ecclesia* (Copenhagen 1983) 16-7.

¹³ Cf. Ruschenbusch (*supra* n.9) 173 & Hansen (*supra* n.2) 48; (*supra* n.4) 5.

¹⁴ Cf. Hansen (*supra* n.2) 51-5.

¹⁵ Cf. M.H.Hansen, "The Average Age of Athenian *Bouleutai* and the Proportion of *Bouleutai* Who Served Twice", *LCM* 13 (1988) 66ff.

¹⁶ Cf. Hansen (*supra* n.2) 55-56 with Appendix IV; (*supra* n.15) 66ff.

¹⁷ Cf. Hansen (*supra* n.2) 12, based on A.J.Coale & P.Demeny, *Regional Model Life Tables and Stable Populations* (Princeton 1966).

inference is that there must have been more citizens than Ruschenbusch assumes and that many Athenians served in the *boule* without having served as ephebes.¹⁸

4. If on the other hand, we adopt a total of 600 ephebes per year (cf. *supra* re.1) a year class of 40-year-olds must have numbered ca. 380, in which case it was just possible to run the *boule*, but only if, in all the 139 demes, there was a perfect correspondence between the deme's population and its bouleutic quota. The ephebic inscriptions reveal that in several demes the bouleutic quota did not match the number of ephebes. As an example take Xypete, cf. the table on page oo. Xypete had 2 ephebes in 334/3, 5 in 333/2 and 3 in 332/1, i.e. a total of ten in three years. The 10 Xypetaiones aged 19 correspond to some 8 aged 30 and to some 6 aged 40. But Xypete had 7 seats in the council, and there is no reason to doubt that the deme filled its quota. If a third of the Xypetaiones served twice in the council, the number of first time bouleutai required every year is 5-6, i.e. some 17 in a period of three years. The discrepancy between the 17 Xypetaiones required and the 6 to 8 available suggests that every second councillor from Xypete had not served as ephebe.

5. In spite of my observation in *Demography and Democracy* 9-13 Ruschenbusch insists on using European population statistics 1750-1880 as a proper model for the age structure of ancient Athens. In order to combine a cohort of 500 aged 19 with an adult male population (18-80+) of 21,000 he asserts that the 19-year-olds in this particular case must have constituted ca. 2.65% of all adult males, and in corroboration of his assumption he notes that this percentage is occasionally attested in Mitchell's *European Historical Statistics*. But we must not forget that Mitchell's statistics reflect the first phase of the demographic transition when an annual population increase of sometimes 1.5-2% was combined with a life expectancy at birth of ca. 40 years. According to the Princeton tables a cohort of 19 year old men constituting 2.65 % of all adult males matches a life expectancy at birth of ca. 35 years (if the population is stationary) or ca. 50 years (if there is an annual increase of 1%).¹⁹ I do not know of any specialist in historical demography who will accept Mitchell's tables of 19th century European populations as a valid model for ancient or medieval populations. If we adopt a life expectancy at birth of 25-30 years and an annual growth rate of 0.5 - 1%, the 19 year old men constitute ca. 3.1 - 3.6% of all adult males.²⁰ Now, let us assume with Ruschenbusch that a year class of ephebes numbered ca. 500 and that there were ca. 10% unfit for military service.²¹ A cohort of 19-year-olds would then amount to 555 men. If this

¹⁸ Cf. Hansen (*supra* n.2) 49; (*supra* n.4) 4-5.

¹⁹ Cf. Coale & Demeny (*supra* n.17): 2.64% at mortality level 8 and growth rate 0; 2.80 at mortality level 14 and growth rate 1.0% (Model West).

²⁰ Cf. Coale & Demeny (*supra* n.17): 3.1% at mortality level 6 and growth rate 0.5%; 3.6% at mortality level 4 and growth rate 1.0% (Model West).

²¹ Ruschenbusch accepts only hesitatingly my assumption that at least 10% of the young citizens were unfit for military service. He notes: "Für den Satz von 10% beruft sich Hansen auf Militärstatistiken des 19.Jh. Dabei berücksichtigt er allerdings nicht, daß ... die gesundheitlichen Forderungen sehr hoch geschraubt werden konnten. Schon bei Kurzsichtigkeit oder bei Plattfüßen schon bei zu geringer Größe und zu geringem

cohort constituted 3.1 - 3.6% of all adult males, we arrive at a total of 15,4000 - 17,900 citizens. On the hypothesis that the adult male citizen population totalled 21,000, the inference is that, every year, some 3,000 - 5,000 able-bodied young Athenians did not serve as ephebes.²² Ruschenbusch escapes this conclusion by his implausible assumption that, in the 330s and 320s the cohorts of 19-year-olds were extraordinarily small and constituted only 2.65% of all adult males. The ephebes of 334/3 - 324/3 were born 354/3 - 344/3 and there is no basis for assuming that these birth cohorts were particularly small.

6. I conclude that, immediately after the reform of 336/5, a year class of ephebes numbered ca. 450- 500, but after a decade the total had risen to ca. 600 or even more. Ephebic service was not compulsory, and the ephebic inscriptions of Kekropis indicate that the attendance varied from deme to deme. In Halai Aixonides and Pithos, for example, the *ephebeia* seems to have caught on rapidly, whereas the institution was less popular in other demes, e.g. in Xypete and Athmonon. The inscriptions show that, in some cases, there were too few ephebes to match the deme's bouleutic quota, and the inference must be that some of the *bouleutai* from these demes were recruited from citizens who had not served as ephebes. Far from all able-bodied Athenians served as ephebes and all attempts to calculate the size of the Athenian citizen population on the basis of the number of ephebes attested in the inscriptions are doomed to fail. I first presented this reconstruction of the *ephebeia* in *Demography and Democracy* 47-50 and my case has only been strengthened by the recent publication of a third roster of Ephebes of Kekropis.

Kopenhagen

Mogens Herman Hansen

Gewicht war Wehruntauglichkeit gegeben (note 3). Ruschenbusch forgets that when the flatfooted and shortsighted were judged unfit for military service, the percentage of persons rejected for reasons of health was certainly not 10%, but at least 20%, often 30 and sometimes even 40%, cf. Hansen (*supra* n.2) 94 note 61 with further references.

²² Cf. Hansen (*supra* 2) 103 note 171.