

Jacek Rzepka

THE LANGUAGE OF THE POPULAR ASSEMBLY IN XENOPHON'S *HELLENICA*: BETWEEN *DEMOS* AND *POLIS*

Abstract

The present study explores the words which Xenophon utilizes to describe the decision-making bodies in *Hellenica*. It demonstrates that both *demōs* and *polis* may have referred to people's assemblies of Greek states. Whereas *demōs* is utilized for the assembly in the opening books of *Hellenica*, later it is *polis* that usually implies an action of the assembly. The change coincides with a switch of Xenophon's focus from Athens and the Peloponnesian War to the wider Greek world (where one can observe a lot of cities with decree formulae with *polis* as a decision-making body). Acquaintance with such constitutional usage enabled Xenophon to highlight the contrast between good (*polis*) and bad (*demōs*) regimes in the post-Peloponnesian War narrative.

Keywords

Xenophon, *Hellenica* – Greek decrees, assemblies, documents in Greek historians

The main interest of this article is a way in which Xenophon reported legislative, diplomatic and judicial activity (or more generally decision-making) by popular assemblies of Greek states in *Hellenica*. I will try to highlight those references to the decisions of popular assemblies in *Hellenica* in which involvement of the assembly is not obvious due to at first glance imprecise wording. The results will enhance methods of identifying and analyzing references to the decision-making in Greek historians, but may be also of some relevance to literary studies of Xenophon's *Hellenica*, including a switch from the narrative of the Peloponnesian War, being a sequel to Thucydides, to the post-war narrative. The starting point of this study was an observation that in the opening books of *Hel-*

lenica δῆμος often appears as a decision-making body (or an assembly), whereas in the later part of the work πόλις replaces it in similar contexts. The paper will also reflect on whether Xenophon's change of usage may (consciously or not) mirror differences between official languages of various Greek states.

One has to start from recalling one difference between modern and ancient historians regarding the use of documents. Of course, there are many more differences and similarities between us and our predecessors, but this one is particularly important for studying constitutional usages of Greek historians. Modern historians describing decision-making processes like to rely on documents (texts of bills, protocols of ballot, sessional diaries, etc.) duly referred to in footnotes. Ancient Greek and Roman historians who did not graduate in history at modern universities had different methods.¹ They are believed to quote documents rather rarely (it does not matter whether verbatim or in paraphrase). When they do, it might be explained by their concern to prove something.² It is also possible that quotations from documents, especially word for word, imply a given author did not manage to elaborate raw material (perhaps the case of Thucydides in Book V). The generally unhelpful mode of quoting one's sources appears even worse in regard to documentary evidence and constitutional affairs peculiar to a given state and thus hardly interesting to an average Greek reader (usually an outsider to a city or a state in question). Instead of providing more or less precise quotations Classical historians used to refer to the decision-making processes of Greek states loosely, so we cannot be always sure whether they do it accurately.

The above refers to ancient historians in general, but some of them seem have worse press among their modern counterparts than the others. Xenophon is often among those who are blamed for being not a modern historian. According to most of modern commentators he did not consult original documents while writing his contemporary history.

Xenophon was also very much criticized for not being another Thucydides in spite of publishing the most influential sequel to Thucydides' unfinished *Histories*. Xenophon's *Hellenica* was thus described as a mixture of memoirs and history,³ and Xenophon himself, in spite of recent attempts at pardoning him, is

¹ Moreover, Classical Greek historians wrote – in spite of Thucydides' famous assertion at 1.22.4 – for their contemporaries, who had general knowledge of events, and did not need a narrative packed with quotes, references and cross-references; cf. Flower 2017: 306.

² For such purpose of citations in ancient authors, see Gray 2010: 560–561. For a widely accepted (and most likely correct) understanding of how ancient historians' attitude to quoting documents evolved, see: Lane Fox 2010: 26–29.

³ Expressed openly in Cawkwell 1979: 43–45, cf. Straßburger 1970: 668–669. Even scholars who appreciate the value of Xenophon as a historian, put stress on a role of his own memories in his narrative, see: Thomas 2009: lix.

not universally considered a particularly good 'professional' historian according to our standards. He is portrayed as a partisan pamphleteer or as a moralizing and didactic author,⁴ who missed the very sense of history, and who does not understand the method of great Thucydides, whom he pretended to follow.⁵ There are several reasons to balance this one-sided and clearly overcritical view of *Hellenica* and – more generally – of Xenophon's intellectual abilities.⁶ In fact, the recent two or perhaps already three decades brought a change in our viewing of Xenophon, whose acquaintance of his topic, as well as originality and contribution to the development of history as a genre are now acknowledged.⁷

My aim here is not restricted to reconsider Xenophon's knowledge (or ignorance) of documents. I will show that Xenophon was well acquainted with political usages of Greek states he wrote about, and that his language in *Hellenica* was much enriched by his awareness (it does not matter superficial or not) of political procedures in various cities. To illustrate my case I shall focus on these chapters

⁴ Hau 2016: 216–217.

⁵ Schwarz 1907: col. 10 says Xenophon was not a proper historian, since he was very much different from Thucydides (rightly recognized as a problem in the assessment of *Hellenica*'s value in Tuplin 1993: 16). That view finds echoes from time to time in the German-speaking literature, see Nickel 1979: 52; Straßburger 1970: 675–676, sometimes in a slightly mollified form (*kein Systematiker* instead of *kein Historiker*, as Breitenbach 1967: col. 1699; followed by Schütrumpf 2003: col. 637, and repeated *verbatim* in Nickel 1979: 119). For Xenophon's possible distortion of the Thucydidean paradigm, see Grayson 1975: 40–41. I believe that here it is enough to recall a sound caveat that *continuations are not obliged to be imitations of what they continue*, see Gray 1989: 2. Yet, even scholars aware of Xenophon's ingenuity and his contribution to the development of historiography continue to explain Xenophon through comparison with Herodotus and – especially – Thucydides; see, e.g., Thomas 2009: xxiv–xxv. Christopher Tuplin in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, so in the most influential English-speaking reference, characterizes *Hellenica* as a curious amalgam of straight history and political pamphlet, see: Tuplin 1996: col. 1629; developing his earlier conclusions that the substance of *Hellenica* can 'be described as politico-military events' 'with a strong inclination towards didactic writing', see Tuplin, 1993: 163. The contributions to *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon* (Flower 2017 ed.) rehabilitate Xenophon as a historian, and more generally as an intellectual, see esp. Flower 2017: 302–322; Marincola 2017: 103–118. Flower suggests that 'omissions' in *Hellenica* should be explained by Xenophon's conscious choice 'not to narrate actions that had negligible consequences or little in the way of thematic value' (2017: 314), thus they should not be ascribed to his ignorance of facts.

⁶ E.g., for criticism of Xenophon's purported inability to follow Thucydides see Rood: 2004, 341–395, who shows that the level of Thucydidean interplay is much higher in the initial two books of *Hellenica* to the end of the Peloponnesian War. I also believe that in our approach to ancient historians we should follow sound skepticism about modern ways of reading Classical texts expressed in Rhodes 1994: 156–171 (with sound remarks on Xenophon on p. 167).

⁷ The recognition of Xenophon follows a more general trend to appreciate the value of hitherto despised authors (like Diodorus, Justin, Nepos), whose thought and contribution to ancient historiography now starts to be understood and recognized.

of Xenophon's *Hellenica* in which he reports decrees of Greek states or rather, more commonly, in which he alludes to the decision-making within the Greek states.

I would not go so far as to suggest Xenophon read carefully epigraphic documents available in public spaces of Greek cities (moreover that he consulted copies filed in local archives).⁸ Such a suggestion, even if we do not think it a mere absurdity, would be impossible to verify. Moreover, my stress on Xenophon's acquaintance with the documentary styles of Greek cities does not necessarily mean that he read documents in the contemporary Greek 'public domain' either. There were some true documents and some fake ones⁹ copied, disseminated, read and repeated across fourth-century Greece, but 'the decrees' were not so popular as a genre yet.¹⁰ It is also obvious that a considerable majority of decrees of Greek states were never written down and thus remained mere oral proclamations¹¹. No ancient contemporary historian could, therefore, dig through legislation of any Greek state in its entirety.

The decrees of the assembly the ancient Greeks used a number of enactment formulae of which ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ (or its probouleutic variation ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ) is the most widespread. A formula of this type was in use in Athens as well as in several states of the Greek world regardless of the technical appellation of the institution itself (*ekklesia*, *halia*, *agora* etc.). If we try to place on a map the cities that used this enactment formula, we will clearly see its dominance in the eastern part of Greek mainland, on most of the Aegean Islands (excluding Crete) and in Asia Minor.¹²

At the same time it is less known that a huge number of inscriptions have a different enactment formula: ἔδοξε τῇ πόλει.¹³ Documents with the latter formula come usually from Crete as well as vast areas of Western Peloponnese and Northern and North-Western Greece. Some (admittedly very few) of these

⁸ On the archives of the Greek states in the Classical period and the use of documents by Classical authors, see above all Rhodes 2001. On the influence of inscriptions, and especially of (funerary) monuments as records of human deeds on ancient historians, see Moles 1999: 27–69, and esp. 35–37.

⁹ It is impossible to guess how many texts were put into circulation, and how many of them did indeed come to public attention.

¹⁰ Still a number of more or less accurate copies of actual decrees circulated in Greece, often as propagandist materials, see Habicht 1961. It was also argued, quite convincingly, that Athenian politics very much relied on knowledge and manipulation of documents registering earlier activity of the assembly, see Aldrup-MacDonald 2018: 15–57.

¹¹ On various levels of formality and authenticity of documents in Greek historians, see Davie 1996: 29–39.

¹² The most complete and systematically arranged dossier to be found in Rhodes with Lewis 1997.

¹³ And if an actual decree does not survive, one can restore the official usage from its abbreviation or monuments associated with it, see: Rhodes with Lewis 1997: 3–7.

inscriptions include a kind of probouleutic formula that would force us irreversibly to understand *polis* as 'the assembly.' Δῆμος and πόλις, thus crucial terms of both formulae are often used by Greek historians with verbs that denote voting, decision-making, sending embassies, judging the lawsuits. It is believed that δῆμος mirrored technical or constitutional usages, whereas πόλις was more general a term for 'the city' in its entirety, 'the political community.'¹⁴

As it has been said, Xenophon, like other ancient historians, does not cite actual *psephismata* issued by Greek states. Sometimes, however, he refers to decisions taken by *poleis* or *ethne*, borrowing some words from the content. I think it may be valuable to survey traces of both decree formulae in *Hellenica*. The task is not so simple as one could expect, and cannot be restricted to a plain enumeration of examples. Although Xenophon quite often uses the word *polis* (according to the estimates made by the Copenhagen Polis Centre this word recurs more than 270 times in the sense of political community in *Hellenica*),¹⁵ only a small part of this total (about 10%) clearly alludes to active assemblies or polis' deliberating bodies (in the sense noted by *LSJ*, s.v. πόλις III.2).¹⁶ A comparison with Xenophon's use of the word δῆμος is not so easy. The latter occurs in *Hellenica* relatively rarely, about 60 times, with roughly two-thirds of all attestations grouped in Books I and II (the famous break at 2.3.10 may in fact be significant). Of course, as πόλις may denote a political community in general or just a city or a town, δῆμος may have meanings which are different from 'the decree-passing body' or 'the popular assembly'

¹⁴ For the spread of ἔδοξε τῇ πόλει formula (and its variants) in the Greek world see: Rhodes with Lewis 1997: 87–91 (Arcadia); 92–95 (Elis; Rhodes notices a switch from early decrees indicating an action by the popular assembly – δῆμος to the decision-making in the name of πόλις only from the fourth century onwards, see p. 95); 97–98 (Achaia: Aigeira, Dyme, Patrai); 128–130 (full decrees of Delphi); 141 (Kytinion in Doris); 142–144 (the remaining cities of Phocis); 148–149 (Ozolian Locris); 151 (Aetolia); 160 (Acarnania). Most of the evidence is Hellenistic, but it does not matter here as simply the epigraphic habit was underdeveloped in those regions before. A few late Archaic or Classical attestations confirm that πόλις was a widespread label for the assembly in the West from 5th century at least. The most notable is a decree of an unknown city in the West Locrian – Aetolian borderland *IG IX,1² 3:609*, l. 9–11 (525–500 BC?): ὁστ|ις δὲ δαίμων ἐνφέροι ἔ|ψαφον διαφέρει ἐν|πρεῖγαι, ἐν|πόλει, ἐ|ν|ἀποκλεισῆαι κτλ. ('Anyone introducing a motion for division of land or votes for such a motion in the council of Elders, in the city, or in the elected council' etc.), where *the city* is one of the decision-making bodies of the city-state (see Rhodes and Lewis 2007: 149), but cf. also Stratus in Acarnania *IG IX,1² 2:390* (the 5th cent. BC). It is perhaps needless to say that variants of ἔδοξε τῇ πόλει formula dominated in Creta, and that well from the earliest times: the Datalis inscription from ca. 500 pretending to reproduce the even older text (*SEG* 27:631); the constitutional law of Dreros being the earliest surviving greek law on stone (*M&L* 2, from c. 650–600 BC), and perhaps, too, in the earliest (fragmentary) text from Gortyn (*IG IV 13 e2* from c. 600–525 BC).

¹⁵ Nielsen and Hansen 2007: 160.

¹⁶ Still, Thucydides uses πόλις in the sense of state or community much more often than Xenophon throughout *Hellenica*, see: Hansen, 2007: 135–155, counts 849 occurrences of the noun πόλις, 'mostly in its political sense'.

(as in *LSJ*, s.v. δῆμος III.3). Thus, another, equally popular meaning of the word in the Xenophontic corpus is ‘the common people’ (*LSJ*, s.v. δῆμος II). This meaning of the word is almost absent from the inscriptions, but it is obviously one of the most common in literary texts.¹⁷

As stated, δῆμος as the assembly appears more frequently in the earlier part of *Hellenica*, being a continuation to Thucydides. One of the main focuses of the opening part of *Hellenica* is the Athenian democracy with its social groups transformed into political factions. The word δῆμος occurs there in all possible meanings, sometimes in one single passage two or more meanings overlap or coincide (e.g. 1.7.20), occasionally Xenophon consciously leaves some doubts whether he means ‘the common people’ or ‘the assembly’ (the first occurrence of δῆμος in 1.7.12: τοῦ δὲ δήμου ἔνιοι ταῦτα ἐπῆνουν, τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἐβόα δεινὸν εἶναι εἰ μὴ τις ἐάσει τὸν δῆμον πράττειν ὃ ἂν βούληται, may be slightly equivocal). Within two first books the word is particularly frequent in the account of the Arginusae trial that for Xenophon seems to be a paradigm of democracy’s unpredictability.¹⁸ We may identify between seven and nine – depending on our interpretation of each *locus* – mentions of the δῆμος as ‘the assembly’ in 1.7.

I. Τιμοκράτους δ’ εἰπόντος ὅτι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους χρή δεθέντας εἰς τὸν δῆμον παραδοθῆναι, ἢ βουλὴ ἔδισε (‘and upon motion of Timocrates, that the others also should be imprisoned and handed over to the people, the council imprisoned them’, *Hell.* 1.7.3).¹⁹

II. (Theramenes) ἐπιστολὴν ἐπεδείκνυε μαρτύριον ἦν ἐπεμψαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ εἰς τὴν βουλὴν καὶ εἰς τὸν δῆμον (‘Theramenes showed a letter which the generals had sent to the council and to the people’, *Hell.* 1.7.4).

III: τοιαῦτα λέγοντες ἔπειθον τὸν δῆμον (‘Having said these they were on the point of persuading the people’, *Hell.* 1.7.6).

IV. τοῦ δὲ δήμου ἔνιοι ταῦτα ἐπῆνουν, τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἐβόα δεινὸν εἶναι εἰ μὴ τις ἐάσει τὸν δῆμον πράττειν ὃ ἂν βούληται (‘and some of the people applauded this act, but the greater number cried out that it was monstrous if the people was to be prevented from doing whatever it wished’, *Hell.* 1.7. 12).

¹⁷ In Thucydides the word δῆμος occurs almost twice as much as in the sequel (115 occurrences in singular). We should note, however that Thucydides uses δῆμος in the meaning of the assembly rarely. Most examples of this concentrate in sections of Books IV and V which contain documents both paraphrased/summarized by Thucydides or unprocessed. Peter Rhodes suggests a whole list of possible references to documents in Thuc. 4.117–5.81, see Rhodes 2007: 58.

¹⁸ Here δῆμος is certainly different from πλῆθος that – incited by Theramenes – hysterically drove towards the execution of the generals, see: Kapellos 2019: 168–170.

¹⁹ All translations of *Hellenica* are adapted from the *LCL* volumes by C.L. Brownson. The most important change remains the standardization of the rendering of the word πόλις in various passages of *Hellenica*.

V. τὸ Καννωνοῦ ψήφισμά ἐστιν ἰσχυρότατον, ὃ κελεύει, ἐάν τις τὸν τῶν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον ἀδικῇ, δεδεμένον ἀποδικεῖν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ('the decree of Cannonus is exceedingly severe: it provides that if anyone shall wrong the people of Athens, he shall be tried in fetters before the people', *Hell.* 1.7.20).

VI. Καλλιζένος τὴν βουλὴν ἔπεισεν εἰς τὸν δῆμον εἰσενεγκεῖν μὴ ψήφῳ ('as Callicleus persuaded the council to report to the people, by a single vote', *Hell.* 1.7.26).

VII. καὶ οὐ πολλῷ χρόνῳ ὕστερον μετέμελε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, καὶ ἐψηφίσαντο, οἵτινες τὸν δῆμον ἐξηπάτησαν κτλ. ('And not long afterwards the Athenians repented, and they voted that complaints be brought against any who had deceived the people' etc., *Hell.* 1.7.35).

Of these passages I, II, and VI clearly mirror the probouleutic procedure, as they mention the actions by the council prior to the ones by the people (technically the popular assembly). The passages III and VII have δῆμος that can be understood in two meanings at the same time ('the sovereign people, the free citizens' of LSJ III.1 and 'the popular assembly' of LSJ III.3). The passages IV and V are more nuanced as each of them contains two occurrences of δῆμος focusing on two different aspects of the word. Thus, in V the decree of Cannonus is directed against those who did wrong the whole citizenry of Athens (closely to 'the sovereign people, the free citizens' of LSJ III.1). It envisages their trial before the popular assembly (ἐν τῷ δήμῳ as in LSJ III.3). The passage IV implies a whole range of possible overtones of δῆμος, as it is impossible to discern here the sense of the popular assembly from that of the 'the whole citizenry.' Additionally, Xenophon contrasts τοῦ δήμου ἔνιοι ('some of the people') and τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ('the greater number')²⁰ which has here clearly a negative meaning close to the mob (as in LSJ IIB). Nevertheless of all nuances, it is clear that Xenophon's account of the trial reflects the technical language of the Athenian procedure with δῆμος to be understood mostly as 'the popular assembly'.

In the later books of *Hellenica*, even the Athenian assembly may be labeled as πόλις, unless the δόγμα τῆς πόλεως does not mean more generally a decree of the council and people (6.2.2: Εὐθύς δ' ἐκεῖθεν δύο τῶν πρέσβων πλεύσαντες κατὰ δόγμα τῆς πόλεως εἶπον τῷ Τιμοθέῳ ἀποπλεῖν οἴκαδε ὡς εἰρήνης οὔσης – 'Two of the Athenian ambassadors, acting in accordance with a decree of the state, sailed directly from there and gave orders to Timotheus to sail back home, inasmuch as there was peace').

Considering the high total of attestations of the noun πόλις in *Hellenica* (more than 270 as 'political community' and 489 overall)²¹, the number of passages

²⁰ Slightly later Xenophon replaces the shouting πλῆθος with yet another, more explicit synonym ὄχλος – Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.13.

²¹ Nielsen and Hansen 2007: 160–163.

in which I am able to identify this word as ‘the assembly’ beyond all doubt might seem unimpressive. Still it seems higher than in the case of Thucydides.

Sometimes πόλις is accompanied by verbs denoting decision-making or (judging) verdict-giving or persuading the citizens generally,²² sometimes it is linked to verbs meaning voting.²³ In a few *loci* with the word πόλις we would be inclined to understand it more generally as ‘the city’ or ‘the community’, unless the following sentence did not hint at ‘the assembly.’

There are a few such cases, especially in longer, pattern-providing narratives, like that of Phlius,²⁴ containing a lot of interplay with the meaning of πόλις (*Hell.* 5.3.10):

Ἡ δὲ τῶν Φλειασίων πόλις, ἐπαινεθεῖσα μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀγησιπόλειδος ὅτι πολλὰ καὶ ταχέως αὐτῷ χρήματα εἰς τὴν στρατιὰν ἔδοσαν, νομίζουσα δ’ ἔξω ὄντος Ἀγησιπόλειδος οὐκ ἂν ἐξελεθεῖν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς Ἀγησίλαον, οὐδ’ ἂν γενέσθαι ὥστε ἅμα ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς βασιλέας ἔξω Σπάρτης εἶναι θρασέως οὐδὲν τῶν δικαίων ἐποίουν τοῖς κατεληλυθόσιν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ δὴ φυγάδες ἤξιον τὰ ἀμφύλογα ἐν ἴσῳ δικαστηρίῳ κρίνεσθαι: οἱ δὲ ἡνάγκαζον ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει διαδικάζεσθαι. λεγόντων δὲ τῶν κατεληλυθότων καὶ τίς αὕτη δίκη εἴη ὅπου αὐτοὶ οἱ ἀδικοῦντες δικάζοιεν, οὐδὲν εἰσήκουον.

²² Judicial activity: οἱ μὲν γὰρ δὴ φυγάδες ἤξιον τὰ ἀμφύλογα ἐν ἴσῳ δικαστηρίῳ κρίνεσθαι: οἱ δὲ ἡνάγκαζον ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει διαδικάζεσθαι (‘For while the exiles demanded that the questions in dispute should be brought to trial before an equal court, their policy was to compel them to plead their cases in the city itself’, *Hell.* 5.3.10, Phlius); ἀγανακτήσασα δὲ τούτοις τῶν Φλειασίων ἡ πόλις ἐξημίωσε πάντας ὅσοι μὴ πεμπούσης τῆς πόλεως ἦλθον εἰς Λακεδαίμονα (‘But the city of Phlius, angered at this, fined all who had gone to Lacedaemon without being sent by the city’, *Hell.* 5.3.11, Phlius).

Military appointments and orders: καὶ φρουρὰν μὲν οἱ ἔφοροι ἔφαινον, Ἀγησίλαον δ’ ἐκέλευεν ἡ πόλις ἡγεῖσθαι (‘The ephors accordingly called out the ban, and the city directed Agesilaus to act as commander’, *Hell.* 6.5.10, Sparta); ἐγὼ δ’ ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ τὰς ναὺς πεμφθεὶς (‘but it is I who have been sent by the city to command the fleet’, *Hell.* 1.6.5 Athens); εἰ καὶ πεμφθεῖη τις Λακεδαιμονίων ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως σὺν δυνάμει ταῦτα πράξων (‘some Lacedaemonians were in fact sent out by the city with an army to perform this task’, *Hell.* 3.2.8, Sparta); οὕτω δὲ γιγνωσκούσης τῆς πόλεως τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων φρουρὰν μὲν οἱ ἔφοροι ἔφαινον (‘The city of the Lacedaemonians being thus minded, the ephors called out the ban’ etc., *Hell.* 3.5.6, Sparta).

²³ I. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπεκρίναντο ὅτι ἀδύνατον εἶη ἐπισχεῖν, δόγματος γεγεννημένου πάσῃ τῇ πόλει ἤδη τευχίζεν κτλ. (‘And when they replied that it was impossible to desist, since a resolution to build at once had been adopted by the entire city’ etc., *Hell.* 6.5.5, Mantinea);

II. ὅτε γὰρ ψήφος ἐδίδото ἐν τῇ πόλει (‘when a vote was taken in the city’, *Hell.* 7.3.2, Sikyon); III. οὐ γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἐκεῖνα ἐψηφίσατο, ἀλλ’ εἷς ἀνὴρ εἶπεν, δς ἔτυχε τότε ἐν τοῖς συμμάχοις καθήμενος (‘for it was not the city which voted for those measures, but only the one individual who proposed them, a man who chanced at that time to have a seat in the assembly of the allies’, *Hell.* 3.5.8, Thebes);

IV. τότε ἅπανα ἡ πόλις ἀπεψηφίσατο μὴ συστρατεῦειν αὐτοῖς (‘then the whole city voted not to join them in the campaign’, *Hell.* 3.5.8, Thebes);

V. τοιαῦτα δὲ ἀκούσασα ἡ πόλις ἀμφοτέρων Ἀγησίλαον εἵλοντο βασιλεῖα (‘After hearing such arguments from both claimants the city chose Agesilaus king’, *Hell.* 3.3.4, Sparta).

²⁴ On Phlius as Xenophon’s paradigmatic community cf. Dillery 1995: 130–138; Rzepka 2011: 97–102.

Meanwhile the city of Phlius, partly because they had been commended by Agesipolis for giving him a large sum of money for his campaign and giving it speedily, partly because it (the city) thought that with Agesipolis abroad Agesilaus would not take the field against them, and that it never would happen that both the kings would be outside of Sparta at the same time, boldly refused to grant any of their rights to the restored exiles. For while the exiles demanded that the questions in dispute should be brought to trial before an equal court, their policy was to compel them to plead their cases in the city itself. And when the exiles asked what manner of trial that was, where the wrong-doers were themselves the judges, they refused to listen to them at all.

Let us note that Xenophon in one sentence describes τῶν Φλειασίων πόλις with verbs in singular (the participles ἐπαινέθεισα and νομίζουσα) and in plural (ἔδοσαν and ἐποίουν). It stresses unity/identity of the city (state) and the citizenry. More interestingly, the quoted passage contrasts πόλις with δικαστήριον (the court). Since one cannot conclude safely about the nature of that 'equal court', it is difficult to say with certainty whether πόλις is used here in a spatial sense or institutional (or both). Another, slightly later passage with mention of πόλις of Phlius in political and institutional sense (ἀγανακτήσασα δὲ τούτοις τῶν Φλειασίων ἡ πόλις ἐξημίωσε πάντας ὅσοι μὴ πεμπούσης τῆς πόλεως ἦλθον εἰς Λακεδαίμονα – 'But the city of Phlius, angered at this, fined all who had gone to Lacedaemon without being sent by the city', *Hell.* 5.3.11) hints on the institutional understanding of 5.3.10 as well (with πόλις that can mean 'the city', 'the state', but also 'the citizenry', 'the popular assembly', 'the assembly as court of justice').

We should also note that Xenophon puts together the officials and the city as equal institutions.²⁵ This may be a recollection of documentary style or constitutional practice of the Greek states– in the inscriptions it is the magistrates and the city that send or receive diplomatic correspondence, supervise public affairs. Last but not least, in states that did not follow the Athenian pattern of democracy officials might prepare drafts for the popular assembly, and thus fulfill similar tasks as probouleutic councils.

²⁵ As in two passages referring to Sparta: εἰ δὲ ἐκείνη ἐπιχειρήσειε τις τῶν ἐφόρων ἀντὶ τοῦ τοῖς πλείοσι πείθεσθαι ψέγειν τε τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐναντιοῦσθαι τοῖς πραττομένοις, οὐκ ἂν οἴεσθε αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐφόρων καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἄλλης ἀπάσης πόλεως τῆς μεγίστης τιμωρίας ἀξιοθῆναι ('Now in Lacedaemon if one of the ephors should undertake to find fault with the government and to oppose what was being done instead of yielding to the majority, do you not suppose that he would be regarded, not only by the ephors themselves but also by all the rest of the city, as having merited the severest punishment?', *Hell.* 2.3.34). Here πόλις is usually understood as 'all the rest of the state', but since 'the heaviest punishment' is mentioned, I would expect that at least one other aspect of the word (that of 'the popular assembly') is involved. The ephors and the whole of polis are juxtaposed in another, clearer place: ἦρε δ' ἐκεῖ τοὺς μὲν ἐφόρους καὶ τῆς πόλεως τὸ πλῆθος χαλεπῶς ἔχοντας τῷ Φοιβίδῃ, ὅτι οὐ προσταχθέντα ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ταῦτα ἐπεπράχει ('There he found the ephors and the majority of the city angry with Phoebidas because he had acted in this matter without authorization by the city', *Hell.* 5.2.32). The majority of the city is clearly the majority visible in the assembly.

Far more instructive might be the problem of geographical distribution of mentions of πόλις and δῆμος as ‘the assembly.’ As stated δῆμος appears in the Athenian context mainly, there are also less certain examples of this meaning at Rhodes (4.8.20 and 22),²⁶ Syracuse (1.1.27)²⁷ and Tegea (6.5.7),²⁸ where we cannot conclude safely whether ‘the common people’ as a social group or technically ‘the assemblies’ are mentioned. Perhaps Xenophon rendered a technical term for ‘the assembly’ in a purposely unclear way in order to create in his readers a feeling that Rhodian oligarchs were expelled from their country by democrats rather than by the entire δῆμος of the Rhodians, and that the case of the generals banished by the δῆμος of Syracuse was the same. Similarly, Xenophon may suggest that the anti-Spartan turn in Tegea was not approved by the lawful assembly, but resulted from a bloody upheaval. Clearer are mentions of assembled δῆμος in Sikyon and Mantinea. In Sikyon, in a story of Euphron’s constitutional coup, the word δῆμος occurs twice with συγκαλέω ‘to call’, ‘to convoke’, thus in the sense of assembly (7.1.44: ἐγὼ ἔσομαι ὁ συγκαλῶν τὸν δῆμον and 7.1.45: συνεκάλει τὸν δῆμον). In Mantinea (6.5.4) the leaders of the synoikised city refused Agesilaos to gather the assembly (τὸν μὲν δῆμον τῶν Μαντινέων οἱ ἄρχοντες οὐκ ἤθελον συλλέξει αὐτῷ – ‘the officials refused to assemble for him the Mantinean people’). Unfortunately, we do not have fourth-century inscriptions containing the decrees of either Sikyon or Mantinea.

²⁶ Xenophon uses the word δῆμος thrice in the description of the turmoil at Rhodes in 391–388/7, clearly stressing its partisan nature as a side in civil strife. For the civil strife in 391 at Rhodes, see Gehrke 1985: 137–139. On the other hand, the language depicting supremacy of δῆμος is not far from official proclamations regarding the place of δῆμος in a Greek democracy, e.g. τὸν ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ δῆμον πάντα κατέχοντα in 4.8.22, or close to judicial verdicts by the assemblies in Greek states, e.g. οἱ ἐκπεπωκότες Ῥοδίων ὑπὸ τοῦ δῆμου in 4.8.20. The decree formula of the city of Rhodes was ἔδοξε τῷ δάμῳ, see Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 265–267.

²⁷ Xenophon refers to a civil strife in Syracuse, and used language that can be both: a perfect rendering of a judicial decision by the popular assembly, and of a partisan, irregular act of civil strife: ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἠγγέλθη τοῖς τῶν Συρακοσίων στρατηγοῖς οἰκοθεν ὅτι φεύγειν ὑπὸ τοῦ δῆμου (‘At this time word came from home to the Syracusan generals that they had been banished by the democratic party’). Slightly later in the same passage Xenophon adds that the generals complained to have been exiled unjustly and illegally (ἀδίκως φεύγειν ἅπαντες παρὰ τὸν νόμον, *Hell.* 1.1.27). It has been suggested that Xenophon pairs this event with the execution of Athenian generals after Arginusae, see Krentz 1989: 102–103.

²⁸ Here Xenophon refers to *stasis* in Tegea, contrasting magistrates, the people, and the masses: ἡττώμενοι δὲ οἱ περὶ τὸν Πρόξενον καὶ Καλλίβιον ἐν τοῖς θεαροῖς, νομίσαντες, εἰ συνέλθοι ὁ δῆμος, πολλὸν ἂν τῷ πλήθει κρατῆσαι, ἐκφέρονται τὰ ὅπλα (‘Now the followers of Proxenus and Callibius, defeated in the council of the magistrates, and conceiving the thought that if the people came together they would prove far superior in numbers, gathered openly under arms’). So if δῆμος to be summoned here, was thought to be the assembly, it was irregular (not called upon by lawful magistrates), its meeting was under arms, and its participants were a fraction of the citizenry only. Xenophon may here utilize δῆμος in twofold meaning (of the assembly and of a social group). Cf. also Gehrke 1985: 153–155.

Similarly, it is difficult to find parallels to explicit cases of naming 'the assembly' πόλις. In *Hellenica*, apart from the single one Athenian example, we do meet πόλις as 'the decision-making body' in a number of states. The relevant passages are often translated metaphorically, i.e., *the city (state) decided, accepted, banished, sent, listened, chose, etc.* (as in Sparta: 3.2.8; 3.3.4; 3.4.26; 3.5.6; 4.2.2. 4.2.3; 4.2.9; 5.2.3; 5.2.32; 5.4.23; 5.4.30; 6.4.18. 6.5.10 or in Thebes: 5.2.37 and Phlius 5.2.8). Sometimes, even a reference to a vote or a decree by the city may be understood as a metaphor, like in Theban speech before the Athenian assembly in 395/4,²⁹ or in Mantinea in 371/2.³⁰ Yet there are formulations that leave a very little space to argue for a metaphor (like in Sikyon in 366/5: ὅτε γὰρ ψῆφος ἐδίδото ἐν τῇ πόλει – 'when a vote was taken in the city', 7.3.2),³¹ and Phlius in 381/0.³² Of these cities, in the Hellenistic documents, Sparta is known to use both terms in question,³³ and Thebes used formulae with δῆμος.³⁴ Phlius remains an enigma due to lack of evidence. Mantinea and Sikyon, both without epigraphic comparisons, had been mentioned above in the discussion of the cities for which Xenophon used δῆμος as a term for 'the assembly.' The case of Mantinea is unsolvable, but in Sikyon we may expect a special treatment of the city's internal affairs, and perhaps allusion of Xenophon to a rather unpleasant background of supporters of Euphron, denigrated by our writer as a tyrant.³⁵ In reality, Euphron may have fostered a coherent democratic program for his city – the stele sculptures of the Athenian decree in honour of Euphron's grandson Euphron (*IG* II² 448) with personified Democracy allude very likely to such a policy. Since the actual decrees of Sikyon were made in the name of πόλις (as in *Xen. Hell.* 7.3.2), Euphron's actions reported in Xenophon with a promise of rule to/for δῆμος may go back to actual ideas of democracy promoted by Euphron during a political crisis in Sikyon. Xenophon's summary (in reported speech) would mirror a well-known and widely commented proclamation of Euphron.

Thus, I am inclined to think that a number of occurrences of the word πόλις as the decision-making body in *Hellenica* may be explained by the constitutional patterns that Xenophon used to watch while living in Western Peloponnese for

²⁹ Cf. above, n. 21, examples III and IV.

³⁰ Cf. above, n. 21, Example I.

³¹ Cf. above, n. 21, Example I. See also remarks on the narrative of Euphron's rise in 7.1.44-45, where δῆμος occurs twice as 'the assembly'.

³² Cf. above, p. 10–11 with considerations on Xenophon's play with the meanings of the word πόλις in *Hell.* 5.3.10–11.

³³ Rhodes with Lewis: 1997: 80–82.

³⁴ Rhodes with Lewis: 1997: 119.

³⁵ Lewis 2004: 65–74. Pownall 2016: 68–70, shows how Xenophon obscured 'the legal basis of Euphron's power in order to portray him as a tyrant' (p. 68), but was unable to hide 'that Euphron was legally elected by the demos of Sikyon' (p. 69).

so many years. A contrast between the initial part, where δῆμος dominated in references of actions by popular assemblies, and the later follow-up books of *Hellenica* with πόλις used more frequently for assemblies drives me to a conclusion that Xenophon, was influenced by, then adopted and adapted the constitutional language of non-Athenian (and admittedly not overly Spartan) world in the West of Greece.³⁶ The switch of usage for the assemblies in *Hellenica* would be another example proving that to escape the lexical influence of the society in which one lives, was simply impossible even for a Greek intellectual. Admittedly, the intellectuals, even if influenced by certain modes, often tried to elaborate them further.³⁷

Observing the correlation between the use of δῆμος and πόλις for assemblies throughout Xenophon's narrative, I am still not certain, if the results, as sketched above, do facilitate the proper answer to a question how and when *Hellenica* were composed.³⁸ At first sight, the above findings may reinforce the analysts against the unitarians (the initial part conceived as a sequel of Thucydides, with the Athenian usage in mind; the composition of the later part resumed after many years under different linguistic influence). This is, however, anything but an impression. Rather, one should think that the 'post-war' books have not been written much later than purportedly adolescent books 1.1–2.3.10. In the opening books of the *Hellenica* Xenophon seems to reserve the use of the term δῆμος for contexts where he is highly critical of the governing democracy at Athens and Syracuse (respectively, the Arginusae trial and the expulsion of the generals). In the latter books, Xenophon starts to use πόλις for decisions made by Sparta or Sparta's like-minded allies (the pro-Spartan faction at Thebes and the Phliasians), whereas he continues to employ δῆμος in a negative way to refer to decisions enforced by popularizing factions during episodes of civil strife in Rhodes, Tegea, Sicyon, and Mantinea. It appears that acquaintance with the constitutional patterns of non-Athenian Greece allowed Xenophon to elaborate further his usage regarding the decision-making within Greek states, helping him to sharpen the contrast between good and bad regimes.

³⁶ It is to say that ancient Greeks, who grew up in the world of *polis*, tended to introduce deliberative decision-making everywhere, and Greek historians, too, used to present ad hoc bodies as *poleis* (including Xenophon himself in *Anabasis*), see Hornblower 2004: 243–263; Rzepka 2005: 119–142.

³⁷ Similarly, the composite words expressing collaboration (e.g., starting from the prefix συν-) are overrepresented in Polybius (as in official documents of his native Achaea). Still, Polybius consciously developed this language that certainly contributes to the rather low assessment of Polybius' style in Antiquity, see Rzepka, 2017: 45–51.

³⁸ In general, I would agree with Thomas 2009a: 419 that 'scholarly agreement is unlikely ever to be reached on this issue, unless perhaps yet more papyri are found with hitherto unknown texts from fourth-century historians to give us more context within which to place Xenophon's work'.

Bibliography

- Aldrup-MacDonald, J.P. 2018: *Athenian Democracy on Paper*, Duke University diss.
- Breitenbach, H.R. 1967: 'Xenophon von Athen II A 2', *RE* 9A, coll. 1569–2052.
- Cawkwell, G.L. 1979: 'Introduction', in B. Warner (ed.), *Xenophon: A History of my Times*, Harmondsworth.
- Davies, J. K. 1996: 'Documents and "documents" in fourth-century historiography', in P. Carlier (ed.), *Le IV^e siècle av. J.-C. Approches historiographiques*, Nancy, Paris, 29–39.
- Delebecque, E. 1957 : *Essai sur la vie Xénophon*, Paris 1957.
- Dillery, J. 1995: *Xenophon and the History of his Times*, London.
- Flower, M.A. 2017: 'Xenophon as a Historian', in Flower, 2017: 302–322.
- Flower, M.A. 2017 (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, Cambridge.
- Gehrke, H.J. 1985: *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, München.
- Gray, V. 1989: *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*, London.
- Gray, V. 2010: 'Interventions and Citations in Xenophon's Hellenica and Anabasis', in V. Gray (ed.), *Xenophon: Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*, Oxford, 553–572.
- Grayson, C.H. 1975: 'Did Xenophon intend to write history?', in B. Levick (ed.), *The Ancient Historian and his Material*, Farnborough, 31–43.
- Habicht, Chr. 1961: 'Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege', *Hermes* 89, 1–35.
- Hansen M.H. 2007: 'Thucydides', in M.H. Hansen, 2007: 135–155.
- Hansen, M.H. 2007 (ed.): *The Return of the Polis: The Use and Meaning of the Word Polis in Archaic and Classical Sources Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 8*, Stuttgart.
- Hau, L.I. 2016: *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus*, Edinburgh.
- Hornblower, S. 2004: '"This was decided" (*edoxe tauta*): the army as polis in Xenophon's Anabasis', in R. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand*, New Haven, 243–263 (= S. Hornblower, *Thucydidean Themes*, Oxford 2011, 226–249).
- Kapellos, A. 2019: *Xenophon's Peloponnesian War*, Berlin, Boston.
- Krentz, P. 1989: *Xenophon, Hellenica I–II.3. 10. Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Warminster.
- Lane Fox, R. 2010: 'Thucydides and Documentary History', *CQ* 60, 11–29.
- Lewis, S. 2004: 'καὶ σαφῶς τύραννος ἦν: Xenophon's Account of Euphron of Sicyon', *JHS* 124, 65–74.
- Marincola, J. 2017: 'Xenophon's *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*', in Flower, 2017: 103–118.
- Moles, J. 1999: 'Ἀνάθημα καὶ κτῆμα: the inscriptional inheritance of ancient historiography', *Histos* 3, 27–69.
- Nickel, R. 1979: *Xenophon. Erträge der Forschung 111*, Darmstadt.

- Nielsen, T.H. and Hansen, M.H. 2007: 'Xenophon', in M.H. Hansen, 2007: 156–174.
- Pownall, F. 2016: 'Tyrants as Impious Leaders in Xenophon's *Hellenica*', *Histos Supplement* 5, 51–83.
- Rhodes, P.J. with Lewis, D.M. 1997: *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1994: 'In Defence of the Greek Historians', *Greece & Rome* 41.2, 156–171.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2001: 'Public Documents in the Greek States: Archives and Inscriptions: Part I', *Greece & Rome* 48, 33–44 and 'Public Documents in the Greek States: Archives and Inscriptions Part II', *Greece & Rome* 48, 136–153.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2007: 'Documents and the Greek Historians', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden, 56–66.
- Rood, T. 2004: 'Xenophon and Diodorus: Continuing Thucydides', in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and his World. Papers from a Conference held in July 1999 (Historia Einzelschriften 172)*, Stuttgart, 341–395.
- Rzepka J. 2005: 'Koine Ekklesia in Diodorus Siculus and the General Assemblies of the Macedonians', *Tyche* 20, 119–142.
- Rzepka, J. 2011: 'Xenophon and a Small «Polis». Phleoius in the *Hellenica*', in B. Burliga 2011 (ed.), *Xenophon: Greece, Persia and Beyond* (Monograph Series *Akanthina* no. 5), Gdańsk, 97–102.
- Rzepka, J. 2017: *Greek Federal Terminology*, Gdańsk.
- Schütrumpf, E.E. 2003: 'Xenophon', *DNP* 12.2, coll. 633–642.
- Schwarz, E., 1907: 'Ephoros', *RE* 6, coll. 1–16.
- Straßburger, G. 1970: 'Introduction', in *Xenophon: Hellenika Griechisch–Deutsch*, Zürich.
- Strassler, R.B. 2009 (ed.): *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika. A New Translation by John Marincola with Maps, Annotations, Appendices, and Encyclopedic Index*, New York.
- Thomas, D. 2009: 'Introduction', in Strassler 2009: ix–lxvi.
- Thomas, D. 2009a. 'Appendix N: Compositional Theories of Xenophon's *Hellenika*', in Strassler 2009: 417–419.
- Tuplin, C. 1993: *The Failings of Empire. A Reading of Xenophon Hellenica 2.3.11–7.5.27*, Stuttgart.
- Tuplin, C. 1996: 'Xenophon', *OCD*³, coll. 1628–1631.

Jacek Rzepka

jrzepka@uw.edu.pl

University of Warsaw
Faculty of History
Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28
00-927 Warsaw, Poland