

STEPHEN C. TODD (MANCHESTER)

THE PUBLICATION OF VOTING-FIGURES IN THE  
ANCIENT GREEK WORLD:  
A RESPONSE TO ALBERTO MAFFI<sup>1</sup>

Alberto Maffi's wide-ranging and elegant paper explores how ancient Greek processes of political decision-making developed in ways that could serve both to authorise the agreed decision and to set sufficiently clear boundaries for legitimate disagreement. He focuses on the phenomenon of majority voting, rightly emphasising its absence in Homer, where decisions in the assembly (and perhaps in the trial scene at *Iliad* 18, 497-508) seem to emerge via consensus or acclamation. To use Larsen's term (1949, p. 164), majority voting is a post-Homeric "invention", and hardly an obvious one for an ancient society to have made, since it implies that opinions are to be counted and hence valued equally, rather than being weighed in accordance with the social standing of their holders.<sup>2</sup> Maffi argues that the existence of legislative assemblies in oligarchic as well as democratic cities implies that majority voting should be seen not as distinctively democratic but as the basis of both types of régime, with the difference between them lying e.g. in property qualifications for assembly membership; other differences could be added, e.g. in the relations between assembly and council or officials. At least within the assembly or law courts of an ancient Greek *polis*,<sup>3</sup> votes were reckoned by head rather than using the Roman system of differently-sized voting units.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> My thanks are due to Terry Abbott, Véronique Chankowski, Athina Dimopoulou, Michael Gagarin, Adriaan Lanni, Polly Low, Peter Liddel, Alberto Maffi, Robin Osborne, Peter Rhodes, Gerhard Thür and Bob Wallace, for suggestions and (esp. epigraphic) references. References in the form "A.1" or "B.2" are to the appendix.

<sup>2</sup> The Spartan system of voting by acclamation, both for elections (described as *paidariōdēs* or "childish" by Aristotle, *Politics* 2, 9 = 1271a, 10) and for policy decisions (Thuc. 1, 87, albeit in this case supplemented by physical division of the audience), could be held to privilege those with loud voices or strongly-held views.

<sup>3</sup> International decision-making, by contrast, operated through delegates. The fifth-century Spartan- and Athenian-led confederacies seem to have allocated one vote per state whatever its size, with the Delphian Amphiktyony retaining a system of two delegates per community. But two fourth-century inscriptions show variation in delegate numbers apparently on the basis of size (Rhodes-Osborne 2003, no. 32 [Arkadian Federation in the 360s] and no. 76b [League of Corinth in 338/7]). In a federal context, the Boiotian League in the early fourth century allocated one or more elevenths of its seats to each community or group of communities (*Hell. Ox.* 16[11], 2-4), presumably on the same

To legitimise political decision-making entails persuading losers to accept defeat. This applies particularly in ancient Greece, with its constant fear of *stasis* or civil strife, i.e. that defeated political groups may resort to violence.<sup>5</sup> As Maffi emphasises, the ancient world lacked the concept of “opposition” in its modern parliamentary sense,<sup>6</sup> which rests on a party-system where minority parties can oppose the current government and its policies while accepting its legitimacy as long as it can command a parliamentary majority.

It is in the context of legitimation that my contribution to this volume focuses on a different aspect of the voting process. Maffi has demonstrated that the majority principle was accepted throughout ancient Greece in both assemblies and also law courts (the latter unlike the modern common-law jury, which is designed in principle to deliberate until unanimity is reached).<sup>7</sup> But why, given such widespread acceptance, do our sources so rarely record or discuss voting-figures?

The evidence underlying my contribution is primarily epigraphic (literary references for Athenian trials are listed at n. 43 below). It has been examined by several scholars, including a notable paper by Hansen (1977), who used a limited dossier of nineteen<sup>8</sup> inscriptions to argue that Athenian assembly votes were normally not counted but estimated by show of hands (*kheirotonia*) unless too close to call,<sup>9</sup> and that counting was automatic only in those categories of decision which required a quorum of 6,000 voting by ballot (*psēphos*, sometimes specified as secret

principle, albeit the extra seats for Thebes after the destruction of Plataia look like a power-grab. But unlike Rome (see following n.), no system of voting blocs applied within the *polis*.

<sup>4</sup> The contrast with Roman practice is emphasised by Larsen 1949, p. 178: since each such unit in a Roman *comitium* counted equally, the greater size of the urban tribes in the *Comitia Tributa* and esp. of the non-élite centuries within the *Comitia Centuriata* served to dilute the impact of their constituent voters. (That is not to deny the importance of other factors, such as the voting-order of centuries.)

<sup>5</sup> Thucydides’ analysis of *stasis* at Corcyra begins with the democratic leader Peithias being assassinated by oligarchic opponents who had been sentenced to crippling fines in a tit-for-tat prosecution brought by Peithias himself (Thuc. 3, 70).

<sup>6</sup> In the UK, the phrase “His Majesty’s opposition” was first used by Sir John Cam Hobhouse in an 1826 parliamentary debate; the first case of a UK opposition winning election as an alternative government was Sir Robert Peel in 1841.

<sup>7</sup> Where majority jury verdicts are permitted, they tend to be of recent introduction (often to counter a perceived threat, such as intimidation) and of limited extent: in England and Wales, a majority of at least 10 to 2 has been admissible since 1967, but only at the discretion of the judge (Cornish 1968, p. 69).

<sup>8</sup> Nos. **A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.7, A.11, A.13, A.19, A.26, A.28, A.30, A.34, A.35, A.36, A.37, A.38, B.5, B.9** (plus **A.18** and **A.40**, which Hansen adds in his 1983 addenda as additional refs. supplied by P. J. Rhodes: see Hansen 1983, p. 118-21).

<sup>9</sup> He finds only one text that uses both terms (**A.34**), and argues that *kheirotonia* here is a loose usage.

ballot, as used also in law courts).<sup>10</sup> Hansen's conclusions were revisited by Rhodes (1981), with additional inscriptions and broader consideration e.g. of the secret ballot.<sup>11</sup> More briefly, Ruschenbusch (1983) used epigraphic voting-figures for some Hellenistic cities to test the plausibility of his estimates for population figures implied by fifth-century tribute payments to Athens.<sup>12</sup> A more detailed regional study by Gauthier (1990) focused on the requirement in many cities for a quorum, which he saw as designed not to discourage absenteeism but to establish symbolic consensus; although the majority of inscriptions with voting-figures are Hellenistic, he emphasises the fourth-century date of those from Delphi, and uses the classical date of Athenian quorum rules to argue against reading this requirement as a post-classical retreat from democracy.<sup>13</sup>

By far the fullest collection of relevant inscriptions is found in the regional catalogues which form the core of Rhodes-Lewis (1997),<sup>14</sup> with some local and some general discussion.<sup>15</sup> But naturally in such catalogues the texts are geographically scattered and must be tracked down via the indexes. Partly for that

---

<sup>10</sup> A law quoted at Andok. 1, 87 specifies that any *nomos ep'andri* ("law relating to an individual") required a quorum of 6,000 voting by secret ballot, though not all such texts are authentic. The need for a 6,000 quorum at Athens is attested for: [i] grants of immunity from prosecution or remission of judicial penalty (Dem. 24, 46); [ii] the second vote in citizenship grants according to Dem. 59, 89-90, which specifies a secret ballot and claims it as an original provision, though the epigraphic record shows a second vote only in the period c.385/4-c.229 BC with no mention of quorum (Osborne 1981-83, IV, p. 161-63 with refs., and see further n. 36 below); and [iii] ostracism, if one accepts the figure of 6,000 as a quorum (thus Plut., *Life of Aristides* 7), rather than Philokhoros' claim (*FGrH* 328 f20 Jacoby) that 6,000 votes had to be cast against the leading candidate.

<sup>11</sup> In particular, Rhodes 1981 includes Athenian judicial texts or possible texts such as **B.1**, **B.2**, **B.3**, and epigraphic parallels collected by Robert (*REA* 65 [1963], p. 304-307) for linguistic usage in assembly texts from Kolophon.

<sup>12</sup> Ruschenbusch 1983, citing **A.13** for Anaphe, and **A.19**, **A.20**, **A.21**, **A.23**, **A.24**, **A.25** for Kolophon.

<sup>13</sup> Inscriptions recording judicial or arbitration decisions are discussed by Thür 1987, including several of the cases analysed here (**B.1**, **B.9**), but his primary focus is on other aspects of procedure rather than the recording of voting figures: in particular, he discusses the question of why particular judicial cases are recorded epigraphically (p. 480, where he notes the continuing significance of decisions involving public funds or hereditary *atimia*), and he argues (p. 483-84) that it is only in late cases of inter-state arbitration that the judges record reasons for their verdict.

<sup>14</sup> The catalogues in Rhodes-Lewis 1997 include almost all the legislative texts in my appendix (not **A.27** which was subsequently published, and not I think **A.17**). Those recording judicial decisions are, for obvious reasons, discussed only when they appear in legislative contexts (e.g. **B.5**, **B.7**, **B.8**, **B.9**).

<sup>15</sup> Regional discussions in Rhodes-Lewis 1997, p. 14 and p. 59 (both Athens), p. 340 (Iasos), p. 373 (Magnesia); general discussion at p. 510-11 (quorum and population size, discussing Ruschenbusch and Gauthier), p. 511-12 (votes recorded as unanimous vis-à-vis those with figures for and against), and p. 531 (voting in law courts).

reason, and partly because inscriptions are less easily accessible than literary texts, it has seemed sensible to present them in an appendix.<sup>16</sup> This contains only those inscriptions which specify numbers of votes cast, including those where a figure has been lost through damage to the stone. The Greek phrase is quoted in each case to indicate the extent of restoration,<sup>17</sup> with brief indication of whether the text recorded e.g. votes against the motion, and with voting-figures analysed. To save space, since this issue is not discussed here, the appendix does not include texts giving rules about voting-numbers in future decision-making,<sup>18</sup> nor those accounts of international arbitration where numbers are peripheral to the roll-call of voting states.<sup>19</sup> Also omitted are inscriptions which explicitly record a quorum, i.e. where a figure is worded in terms of numbers present rather than numbers voting,<sup>20</sup> those which probably record a quorum but phrase this as a record of votes cast are however included, to facilitate discussion of round numbers. Since it is not always possible either to distinguish the legislative decisions of sovereign bodies from those of sub-*polis* groups like demes and phratries, or to be precise about date, the appendix has been organised by region (ordered as on the website <<http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/>>). Judicial decisions including interstate arbitrations are catalogued separately, even when taken by plenary assemblies.

The dossier displays significant variation across time and place. Delphi, as Gauthier has noted, is the only Classical city to inscribe legislative voting-figures, which elsewhere are Hellenistic or later;<sup>21</sup> their absence from Classical Athens is discussed below. We find local variations in phrasing, including the tendency to describe votes in favour as “solid” in legislative and judicial inscriptions from

---

<sup>16</sup> Literary texts are not included in the appendix, since their corpus is more stable: by contrast, inscriptions are often re-edited with additional fragments or improved readings, so the same text is sometimes cited by successive scholars under different editions. (Previous editions are mentioned in the appendix only when discussions by previous scholars are explicitly cited.)

<sup>17</sup> To avoid confusion with acrophonic numbers, line divisions are indicated only where relevant to restoration.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. the three votes required to blackball an applicant for citizenship in the Hierapytna *isopoliteia* treaty (for which see Maffi’s discussion), or the penalties in a citizenship law from Miletos for a prosecutor failing to obtain one-fifth of the votes (*Miletos*, no. 37, lines 60-62, number restored).

<sup>19</sup> E.g. *FD* III.4, no. 280, col. B, lines 28-33, col. C, lines 1-7 (dispute between Delphi and Amphissa, 125 BC), where the Delphians list the states who had each cast their (typically two) votes against Amphissa in an earlier decision of the Amphiktyonic council (probably 338/7 BC).

<sup>20</sup> E.g. phrases like τριακατίων παριόντων (“300 people being present”) in several inscriptions from Gortyn, or ὑπὲρ ἑξακοσίων (assembly with “more than 600”) in various decrees from Magnesia: discussion with refs. in Rhodes-Lewis 1997, p. 511-12.

<sup>21</sup> Legislation at Delphi, cf. Gauthier 1990, p. 86-89: **A.7**, **A.8** (restored), **A.9**, **A.10**, and cf. **A.11** (phratry). Voting-figures for judicial decisions in the Classical period are found at Athens/Delos (**B.1**) and Eresos (**B.8**).

Athens or (with different terminology) in legislative inscriptions from Kos, or as “white” in those from North Africa,<sup>22</sup> while the recording of two sets of votes (*boulē* and assembly) is prominent in texts from Halikarnassos and Iasos, but attested otherwise only at Kos.<sup>23</sup> Patterns of similarity may of course be distorted by expectation, since the publication or restoration of a decree is inevitably influenced by parallels in other texts, especially those from the same place or period.<sup>24</sup>

Alongside local variations are significant structural similarities. These include the infrequency of recorded dissent, at least in legislative decisions. Given the size of ancient Greek judicial panels and the likelihood that (as at Athens) they voted without formal debate, it is no surprise that the clearly-attested cases in appendix section B normally record votes for both litigants, even if the majority is sometimes overwhelming.<sup>25</sup> Of the forty-one inscriptions in section A, however, only four record votes both for and against the motion;<sup>26</sup> the dominant pattern, barring those where the surviving traces are too incomplete to be sure, is to report unanimity. Sometimes this is made explicit, e.g. by recording “no” votes against the motion (eight cases), or by mentioning “all” alongside the number of votes in favour (three cases).<sup>27</sup> More commonly (at least twenty and possibly twenty-six cases), we are told only the number in favour without mention of those against.<sup>28</sup> In this context, we may note that although most entries in the legislative section of the dossier record irregular numbers, an implausibly frequent minority report round numbers of votes.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>22</sup> “Solid” (*stereai*) at Kos: **A.15**, **A.16**. “Solid” (*plēreis*) at Athens, including restorations implied by contrast with “hollow” (*tetrapēmenai*): **A.1**, **A.2**, **A.3**, **B.1**, and cf. the contested restoration at **B.2**. “White”: **A.40**, **A.41**.

<sup>23</sup> Votes of *boulē* and of assembly: Halikarnassos (**A.26**, **A.27**, **A.28**), Iasos (**A.31**, **A.32**), Kos (**A.14**).

<sup>24</sup> E.g. the restoration of **A.8** modelled on **A.7**, or the pre-publication reporting of **A.23** and **A.24** as parallels for usage in other texts.

<sup>25</sup> Possible exceptions are **B.2** and **B.3** (but these may not be genuine cases) and the supplementary decision footnoted at **B.4** (unanimous but with unusually small number of judges).

<sup>26</sup> Normally just the number on each side (**A.1**, **A.30**, and **A.33**, the latter with both sets of numbers partially restored), but once with total as well (**A.25**).

<sup>27</sup> *Oudemia*: **A.2** (restored), **A.3**, **A.4**, **A.5** all from Athens; **A.15** (restored), **A.16**, **A.17** all from Kos; and **A.34**. *Pasai* (all the votes) or *pantes* (all the voters): **A.6**, **A.13**, **A.22** (and cf. **B.4 n.**).

<sup>28</sup> Inscriptions which leave no space for votes against the motion: **A.7**, **A.9**, **A.10**, **A.11**, **A.12**, **A.18**, **A.19**, **A.20**, **A.21**, **A.26**, **A.27**, **A.28**, **A.31**, **A.32**, **A.35**, **A.36**, **A.37**, **A.38**, **A.40**, **A.41** (20 cases). Inscriptions where there is no such surviving trace, but not enough to be certain: **A.8**, **A.14**, **A.23**, **A.24**, **A.29**, **A.39** (6 cases).

<sup>29</sup> Excluding texts with an incomplete number (**A.14**, **A.24**, **A.39**), we find figures of 4,000 (**A.26** assembly), 3,900 (**A.27** assembly), 2,000 (**A.22**), 1,200 (**A.28** assembly), “400 and more” (**A.9**), 350 (**A.18**), 100 (**A.26** *boulē*), and 75 (**A.6**, cult-association). Several of these are discussed by Gauthier 1990, p. 92, and by Rhodes-Lewis 1997, p. 510 n. 33. Note that three of the six cases (cf. n. 23 above) which record votes for *boulē* as well as

How should we interpret the round numbers and the absence of recorded dissent? The possibility that the latter may reflect consensus not inertia is emphasised by Rhodes-Lewis<sup>30</sup>, who describe the honouring of major foreign benefactors as “a context in which a genuinely active assembly can be unanimous”; the granting of honours (albeit without always specifying the provenance of the honorand) is indeed the most common subject of legislative texts in the dossier.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, voting by show of hands may discourage votes against a motion, especially where a clear majority is in favour, and we should note again the absence of a modern party system in which the opposition is expected to oppose. But despite such provisos, these texts do read differently from the voting records published in modern parliamentary proceedings:<sup>32</sup> whereas the latter provide continuing commentary on the balance of support vis-à-vis opposition to policies proposed by the executive, the legislative inscriptions in the dossier are for the most part statements of acclamation.<sup>33</sup> It is worth considering here the meaning of those texts which simply record a single voting-figure:<sup>34</sup> although meant to sound unanimous, the claim that a given number voted in favour does not formally deny that a smaller number may have voted against.

Hansen’s widely-accepted contention that votes in the Athenian assembly were normally not counted but estimated is surely correct. Whether it is sufficient to explain the absence of Classical Athens from the legislative dossier seems less certain. For one thing, it is possible at least in principle to record a numerical

assembly have round numbers for the latter (**A.26**, **A.27**, **A.28**), but that only one of these (**A.26**) has a round number also for the *boulē*. For discussion of quorum, see n. 35 below.

<sup>30</sup> Rhodes-Lewis 1997, p. 511-12.

<sup>31</sup> Twenty-seven honorific inscriptions (**A.4**, **A.6**, **A.13**, **A.14**, **A.15**, **A.16**, **A.17**, **A.19**, **A.20**, **A.21**, **A.22**, **A.23**, **A.24**, **A.25**, **A.26**, **A.27**, **A.30**, **A.31**, **A.32**, **A.33**, **A.34**, **A.35**, **A.36**, **A.37**, **A.39**, **A.40**, **A.41**, not counting e.g. **A.38** honours with grant of proxy), vis-à-vis only seven that record substantive legislation in the modern sense (**A.1**, **A.2**, **A.3**, **A.7**, **A.9**, **A.10**, **A.11**).

<sup>32</sup> Votes in English parliamentary proceedings are recorded from at least the seventeenth century (the earliest example known to me is in the *House of Commons Journal* of 30 May 1628, with a vote of 129-169: online at <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/>>), i.e. much older than the nineteenth-century party-system, and much earlier than the reporting of parliamentary debates (Thomas Hansard’s publication of Cobbett’s *Parliamentary Debates* began in 1812, but there are other unofficial attempts going back to the 1770s).

<sup>33</sup> For the possibilities of such rhetoric, see *SEG* 21, 505-506 (Athens, two copies of a bouleutic decree honouring M. Ulpus Eubiotus, c.230 AD: omitted from the dossier because no figures are given), which reports that “the *proedros* asked how many wished these things to be approved, and everybody raised a hand; he asked how many did not wish, and nobody raised”. For discussion, including the use of direct speech in one inscription and indirect in the other, see Oliver 1980, p. 111.

<sup>34</sup> I.e. the twenty or more inscriptions in n. 28 above which leave no space for votes against the motion, as opposed to the eleven in n. 27 which specify that these were all the votes or that there were none against.

estimate, which might help explain the frequency of round numbers.<sup>35</sup> More significantly, if this absence were simply a function of votes not having been counted, we might expect to find figures presented for those Athenian assembly decisions which did require counting of votes, as with naturalisation decrees. But in fact this does not happen: the standard formula in the period *c.*385/4-*c.*229 BC records the decision of the first assembly, where votes did not have to be counted, and orders the proposal to be confirmed at a second (but future) assembly where they did.<sup>36</sup> Nor do we find voting-figures in inscriptions recording laws made by *nomothetai*, several of which survive intact,<sup>37</sup> though there is dispute as to whether *nomothetai* voted by ballot like jurors<sup>38</sup> or by show of hands like the assembly.<sup>39</sup> Nor indeed – though this can only be indirect evidence for the absence of such detail from any contemporary record – do we hear discussion of the size of the majority in any of the narrative accounts of ostracism votes: not even the final ostracism of Hyperbolos, where Plutarch’s various narratives do suggest manipulation of the predicted voting patterns.

As an alternative and perhaps additional explanation for the absence of voting-figures,<sup>40</sup> it may be worth considering Osborne’s suggestion (1999) that classical Athenian assembly inscriptions constitute not so much minutes of the meeting but a record of its decisions,<sup>41</sup> in ways that he sees as creating finality by making it hard to unpick the decision-making process. Osborne’s focus is on the ordering of material in substantive decrees and amendments, rather than the absence of voting-figures. But the latter could be explained on a similar basis, and perhaps in law courts also. In classical Athenian democracy, the public recording of votes in the permanent medium of an inscription may be undesirable because it invites losers (particularly those who have lost narrowly) to re-visit decisions that have been made.<sup>42</sup> By

---

<sup>35</sup> Many of the figures cited at n. 29 above can plausibly be read as declarations of quorum (e.g. 4,000 or 2,000 or “400 and more”); *prima facie* a number like 3,900 or 350 seems less plausible as a quorum, but we might imagine the presiding officer in **A.27** announcing his estimate with the words “shall we record it as 3,900?”.

<sup>36</sup> For naturalisation, see n. 10 above. The need to count votes at the second assembly is implied by Apollodoros’ statement about quorum (Dem. 59, 89-90), and is absent from the inscriptions (Osborne 1981-83, IV, p. 162). It seems odd that the process of inscription routinely takes place before the second assembly, unless this reflects a deliberate strategy (cf. below) not to be under any pressure to record voting-figures.

<sup>37</sup> E.g. Rhodes-Osborne 2003, no. 25 (silver coinage law of 375/4), Rhodes-Osborne 2003, no. 26 (grain tax law of 374/3).

<sup>38</sup> Thus Rhodes 1985, p. 58.

<sup>39</sup> Thus Hansen 1985, p. 365-66.

<sup>40</sup> This is not to deny that other factors may play a rôle: for instance, as Peter Rhodes suggests to me, inscriptions do tend to get procedurally more detailed over time.

<sup>41</sup> We are regularly told the identities of the presiding officials, presumably to demonstrate that the meeting fulfilled the constitutional proprieties.

<sup>42</sup> Such re-visiting does of course occur in the Mytilene debate, where the original decision was overturned by a second assembly held next day (Thuc. 3, 36-49), but Thucydides

contrast, in those *poleis* and at those dates when unanimous assembly votes are recorded, the aim is presumably not to report the cut-and-thrust of debate, but to affirm that proper procedure has been enthusiastically followed.

To support his argument that votes in the assembly were normally estimated, Hansen (1977) presents evidence for voting-figures in Athenian law courts.<sup>43</sup> Little of this evidence is epigraphic: Hansen himself claims three Athenian examples (**B.1**, **B.2**, **B.3**), but as noted in the dossier, only the first is clear-cut. Several epigraphic records of Athenian trials lack voting-figures, perhaps because the defendant failed to attend trial – the *Pōlētai* records include several sales of confiscated property, but Philokrates' is the only case where the previous conviction is reported in loving detail<sup>44</sup> – or perhaps because the litigation was not seriously contested, which would be my reading of the *phialai exeleutherikai* inscriptions.<sup>45</sup> But if Pseudo-Plutarch's version (*Life of Antiphon* 834a1-b8) of the conviction of Antiphon and Arkheptolemos for treason accurately reflects an epigraphic text, it is striking that it records condemnation and details of sentence but not voting-figures.

Hansen seems to regard as straightforward records the lawcourt voting-figures presented in literary sources, but this may underplay the context. Such passages tend to concern famous individuals, or else to report tiny majorities presented for rhetorical effect sometimes with playful manipulation. Voting-figures for Athenian trials were not only counted but also publicly announced after the count

---

clearly regards this as exceptional. One reason for recording an overwhelming decision might be to discourage re-visiting, which may help explain why two of two of the most decisive arbitration-decisions are narrated by the victorious party (**B.4**, **B.6**).

<sup>43</sup> Literary texts in Hansen 1977, p. 130 (= 1983, p. 110): Plato, *Apology* 36a3-b2 (Sokrates convicted by 60 votes: more detail in Diog. Laert., *Life of Sokrates* 2, 41-42, claiming 281 of 501 votes for conviction and 80 further votes for death sentence); Ps. Plut., *Life of Aiskhines* 840c (Aiskhines acquitted by 30 votes at Embassy trial); Dem. 23, 167 (3-vote majority: Kephisodotos escaped death sentence following conviction); Hyp., *Euxenippos* § 28 (2-vote majority: Aristophon acquitted at *eisangelia*); Aiskh., 3, 252 (equality of votes: Leokrates escaped death sentence). Additional refs. in Hansen 1983, p. 118 (*addenda*): Aristoph., *Wasps* 1206-1207 (2-vote majority: Philokleon's story of having convicted the runner Phayllos); Andok. 1, 17 (only 200 votes out of 6,000 won by prosecutor Speusippos); Isai. 3, 37 (4-vote majority: Nikodemos escaped loss of citizenship before phratry); Dem. 21, 75 (1-vote majority: Euaion convicted of homicide). Other passages that could be added: Isok. 18, 54 (no votes won by Kallimakhos); Dem. 23, 205 (3-vote majority: Kimon convicted but escaped death-sentence); Dem. 43, 10 (Theopompos won plurality of 3-4 votes over Phylomakhe in 5-way *diadikasia*).

<sup>44</sup> *Hesperia* (1936), no. 10 (Meritt), p. 404, lines 111-15 = *Agora* 19, no. P26 (Langdon), lines 456-60: "since Philokrates did not appear for [the trial] according to the public indictment which was brought against [him] by Hyperides, son of Glaukippos, of Kollyte, but was convicted *in absentia* by the court" (trans. Meritt).

<sup>45</sup> Note in particular *Hesperia* (1968), no. 50 (Lewis), p. 370, lines 12-21, which records the date of the month, the identity of the court, and the names of the individuals in charge of the water-clock and of the ballots, followed by a batch of at least seven cases but no voting-figures.



(*Ath. Pol.* 69, 1), so the rarity of lawcourt voting-figures in epigraphic texts may suggest a similar desire not to retain this information in a public record, at least under normal circumstances.<sup>46</sup> It is notable that none of the literary passages present the voting-figures as coming from an official record: what we have here is anecdote supported occasionally by witness testimony.

## APPENDIX

[A] Inscriptions with voting-figures for laws, decrees, etc.

[A.1] **Attica:** *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>, no. 1035 with *SEG* 26, 121, frags. a+c, line 3 (decree on restoration of sanctuaries, ? C1 BC):<sup>47</sup> [τῶν ψήφων αἱ πλήρεις, αἷς ἐδόκει τὴν ἐγφερομένην γνώμην κυρίαν εἶ]ναι *vac.* XXXHHHHHΠΔΙ *vac.* αἱ δὲ τετροπημέναι, αἷς οὐκ ἐδόκει *vac.* ΗΠΓΓ. (3,461 in favour, 155 against.)

[A.2] **Attica:** *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>, no. 1053 frag. c-d, lines 11-13 (decree on Lemnian cleruchy, late C1 BC): [τῶν ψήφων αἱ πλήρεις αἷς ἐδόκει τὴν ἐγφερομένην γνώμην κυρίαν εἶναι — —] τριάκοντα πέντε, αἱ τετροπημένα[ι αἷς οὐκ ἐδόκει οὐδεμία]. (Number sc. in thousands ending “35” in favour, none [restored] against.)

[A.3] **Attica:** *Agora* 16, no. 335, lines 65-67 (decree on Lemnian cleruchy, late C1 BC) [τῶν ψήφων αἱ] πλήρεις αἷς ἐδόκει τὴν ἐ[γφ]ερομένην γνώμην κυρίαν [εἶναι · · ca.7 · · ] (line 67) [ · · ]ΔΔΓΓ, αἱ δὲ τετροπημέ[ναι αἷς οὐκ ἐδόκει οὐδεμία]. (Number sc. in thousands ending “25” in favour, none against.)

[A.4] **Attica:** *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>, no. 1343, frag. b, lines 44-46 (decree of guild of Soteriastai, honouring Diodoros of Aphidna, 37/36 BC): τῶν ψήφων αἷς ἐδόκει τότε τὸ δόγμα κύριον εἶναι, ἐξήκον[τα]· αἷς δὲ οὐκ ἐδόκει οὐδεμία. (60 in favour, none against.)

[A.5] **Attica:** *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>, no. 1353, lines 5-6 (decree of guild, C2 AD; subject too lacunose to infer): [τῶν ψήφων αἷς ἐδόκε]ι τότε τὸ δόγ[μα κύριον εἶναι — — αἷς δὲ οὐκ ἐδόκε]ι οὐδεμία. (Non-surviving number in favour, none against.)

[A.6] **Peloponnese: Messene:** *SEG* 23, 208, line 29 (decree of Oupesia [probably a cult association, cf. Robert, *REG* (1966), p. 378-80] honouring Mnasistratos the *grammateus*, AD 42): ἀναδοθεισῶν ψάφων οε', ἔδοξε πάσαις. (75 in favour, specified as unanimous.)

<sup>46</sup> The one certain epigraphic case (**B.1**) has a substantial majority, but Stumpf 1987, p. 212-13, notes that it is a public prosecution within one vote of the 20 % below which prosecutors were penalised. It is possible that the religious context provides a motive for (exceptionally) recording the voting-figures here; the fact that the same text is recorded at Athens and on Delos may suggest an unusual desire for widespread publicity.

<sup>47</sup> Rhodes-Lewis 1997, p. 59 with n. 172, suggest a pre-Sullan date for **A.1**, and note that **A.2** and **A.3** are likely to be decrees of the assembly because spacing in each case encourages a restoration in the thousands.

[A.7] **Central Greece: Delphi:** *FD* III.1, no. 294 lines 2-3 (law on interest payments; c.400 BC): enacted at properly-constituted meeting (*agorai teleiōi*), in arkhonship of Kadys, [σὺμ ψά]φοις τετρακατί[α]ις πεντήκοντα τετόρε[σσι]. (454 in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.8] **Central Greece: Delphi:** Salviat-Vatin 1971, p. 52, uses A.7 as model for the lacunose *FD* III.1, no. 295 line 1, reading [σὺμ ψάφοις — ]ς τετρώκοντα. (Number including 40 in favour, no surviving trace of votes against.)

[A.9] **Central Greece: Delphi:** *CID* 1, no. 13, lines 32-37 (grant of privileges to Skiathos, C4 BC): τά[δ]ε ἔδοξ[ε]ν Δ[ε]λφοῖς πάτρια ἔμ[ε]ν τοῖς Σκιαθ[ί]οι[ς] σὺν τετρακα[τί]α[ι] ψήφωι καὶ πλ[έ]ον (“with the 400<sup>th</sup> vote and more”, i.e. presumably fulfilment of a quorum; no space for votes against).

[A.10] **Central Greece: Delphi:** *Revue de Philologie* (1943), p. 62 (Lerat), at lines 1-3 (law on obligations to parents, late C4 BC): agreed by *polis* at properly-constituted meeting (*agorai teleiōi*), σὺν ψάφοις τριακατίαις π[εν]τήκοντα τρίεσσι. (353 in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.11] **Central Greece: Delphi:** Rhodes-Osborne 2003, no. 1, side A, lines 21-23 (law of? phratry of Labyadai on receipt of sacred offerings by officials, c.400 BC): approved by Labyadai in assembly (*alia*), σὺμ ψά[φ]οις ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντ[α] δυοῖν. (182 in favour, no space for votes against.)<sup>48</sup>

[A.12] **Northern Greece (Epeiros): Nikopolis:** *Revue de Philologie* (1915) p. 24-28 (Haussoulier), at lines 20-21 (decision of assembly, subject too lacunose to infer): ψηφοφορη[σάντων, ἐπενέχθησαν ψήφοι ? χίλιαι ἐκ]ατὸν πεντήκοντα ἕξ· ἐκυρώ[θη]. ([1], 156 in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.13] **Aegean Islands: Anaphe:** *IG* XII/3, no. 249, line 39 (decree honouring Arkhonidas of Anaphe, C1 BC): ἔδοξε ἅ γνῶ[μ]α [ὑ]π[ε]ρ α[ὐ]τ[οῦ] ταῖς ψάφοις πάσαις ἐνενήκοντα πέντε. (95 votes in favour, specified as unanimous.)

[A.14] **Aegean Islands: Kos:** *SEG* 41, 687, lines 5-6 (honorary decree, beneficiary not preserved, C3/C2 BC): ψήφοι ἐγένοντ[ο ἐν τῇ βουλῇ — — , αἱ δὲ ἐν] τῷ δήμῳ τετρακισ[χί]λιαι — —]. (Number of votes sc. in favour in *boulē* is lost, number of votes in assembly begins with 4,000, with space for a slightly more complex number, but probably not enough to record votes against.)

[A.15] **Aegean Islands: Kos:** *SEG* 48, 1112, lines 47-48 (decree honouring Theogenes, *dikastagōgos*; early C2 BC): ψάφοι στερεαί ἐπιδιδούσα[ι] τὸν στέφανον ὡπεί, τετρυπαμένα[ι οὐδεμί]α. (885 “solid” votes i.e. in favour, none [restored] against.)

[A.16] **Aegean Islands: Kos:** *SEG* 41, 680, lines 53-55 (deme decree honouring Onosandros, doctor; C2 BC): ψάφοι ταὶ κυροῦσαι τῶν ναοποιῶν στερεαί· *vac.*

<sup>48</sup> The number voting is high in proportion to those voting in the Delphian assembly, cf. Rhodes-Osborne 2003, p. 8. The inscription mentions a quorum of 101 (side B, lines 9-10: παρέοντες μὴ μείο[ς] ἑλ[λ]νός καὶ ἑκατόν).

διακόσια τεσσαράκοντα ὀκτώ· ἐναντία οὐδεμία. (248 “solid” votes i.e. in favour, none against.)

[A.17] **Aegean Islands: Kos:** *I.Cos*, no. 384, col. II, lines 18-20 (honorary decree of tribe for Perikles, former official; C2 BC): ψᾶφοι ἐπιδιδούσαι τὸν στέφανον [ . . . ] Δ[ . . . ], (line 20) [ἐ]ναν[τί]α οὐδεμία. (Number in favour including a “10”, none against.)

[A.18] **Ionian: Phygela:** *IK* 17/1, no. 3111, lines 11-13 (grant of citizenship, beneficiary not preserved; c.310 BC): ψῆφοι ἐγένοντο εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν στάμνον τριακόσια πεντήκοντα. (350 votes “in the same jar”, sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.19] **Ionian: Kolophon:** *I.Priene*, no. 57, lines 20-21, with Wilhelm 1974, p. 297-98 (decree of Kolophon honouring envoys from Priene, C2 BC): διεψηφίσθη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ ἐδόθη ψηφισαμένων χιλίων] εἴκοσι τριῶν. (1,023 sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.20] **Ionian: Kolophon:** *IK* 28, no. 81, lines 7-8 (decree of Kolophon honouring judge from Iasos, first half of C3 BC): [διεψηφίσθη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον [καὶ ἐδόθη ψηφισ]άντων χιλίων ἑκατὸν ὀγδοιήκοντα. (1,180 sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.21] **Ionian: Kolophon:** *IK* 6, no. 33, lines 39-41 (decree of Kolophon honouring judge from Lampsakos, C3 BC): διεψηφίσθη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ ἐδόθη ψηφισαμένων χιλίων διακοσίων ἑβδομήκοντα. (1,270 sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.22] **Ionian: Kolophon:** *BCH* (1992), p. 279-91 (ed. J. & L. Robert), lines 40-42 (decree of Kolophon honouring *chrēsmologos* from Smyrna; C2 BC): διεψηφίσθη ἐν [τῷ] δήμῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον. *vac.* οἱ ψηφίσαν[τες] δισχίλιοι. οὗτοι ἔδωκαν πάντες. (2,000 in favour [probably a notional number, cf. J. & L. Robert, p. 283], specified as unanimous.)

[A.23] **Ionian: Kolophon:** phrase from unpublished decree honouring Hermonax of Mytilene, C3 BC; quoted by Robert, *REA* (1963), p. 307: διεψηφίσθη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ ἐδόθη, ψηφισάντων ἑνακοσίων τριῶν. (903 sc. in favour; no indication of space to record votes against.)

[A.24] **Ionian: Kolophon:** phrase from unpublished decree honouring Philetairos, brother of Eumenes of Pergamon; early C2 BC; quoted by Robert, *REA* (1963), p. 307: [διεψηφίσθη] ἐν τῷ δήμῳ[ι κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ ἐδόθη, ψηφισάντων χιλ[ίων]. (Number sc. in favour begins with 1,000; no indication of space to record votes against.)

[A.25] **Ionian: Klaros, Kolophon:** *SEG* 39, 1244, col. iii, lines 48-51 (decree honouring Menippos; after 120/119 BC): οἱ ψηφίσαντες χίλιοι τριακόσιοι τεσσαράκοντα δύο, οἱ δόντες χίλιοι τριακόσιοι εἴκοσι ἔξι], οἱ μὴ δόντες δεκαέξ. (1,342 voting, 1,326 in favour, 16 against.)

[A.26] **Karia: Halikarnassos:** *ICos*, ED132, frag. b, lines 20-22 (decree honouring Hermias of Kos, C3 BC): ψῆφοι ἐγέ[νο]ντο ἐν τῇ βουλῇ ἑκατὸν, αἱ δ’

ἐν τῶι δήμῳι τε[τρ]ακισχίλιαι. (*Boulē* 100 sc. in favour, assembly 4,000 sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.27] **Karia: Halikarnassos:** *SEG* 48, 1108, lines 15-17 (decree honouring citizen of Kos; C3/C2 BC): ψῆφοι ἐγένον[το ἐν μὲν τῆι βουλῆι ἑκατὸν] δεκατρεῖς, αἱ δ' ἐν [τῶι δήμῳι τρισχίλιαι ἐνακό]σιαι. (*Boulē* 113 sc. in favour, assembly 3,900 sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.28] **Karia: Halikarnassos:** *BCH* 14 (1890), p. 95, no. 3, line 4 (arrangements for publication of decree; date unspecified): ψῆφοι ἐγένον[το ἐν τῆι βου]λῆι ἐνε[νῆκ]οντα δύο, αἱ δ[ὲ] ἐν τῶι δή]μῳι χίλιαι διακ[ό]σιαι. (*Boulē* 92 sc. in favour, assembly 1,200 sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.29] **Karia: Iasos:** *IK* 28, no. 28, lines 5-6 (resolution authorising expenditure; date unspecified): ἐψηφισμέν[ον ψήφοις — —] ἐνενήκοντα. (Number ending 90 votes sc. in favour, no surviving trace of votes against.)

[A.30] **Karia: Iasos:** *IK* 28, no. 93, line 23 (decree of *presbyteroi* honouring Kritios; Hellenistic date): ψῆφοι αἱ δ[ι]δοῦ[σαι] ἐβδ[ομ]ήκον[τα]· αἱ οὐ, τέσσαρες. (70 votes in favour, 4 against.)

[A.31] **Karia: Iasos:** *SEG* 41, 929, lines 34-35 (decree honouring foreign judges, mid-190s BC):<sup>49</sup> ψῆφοι αἱ διδοῦσαι ἐν τῆι βουλῆι ὀγδοήκοντα τρ[εῖς], ἐν δ[ὲ] τῶ[ι] δ[ή]μῳι [ὀκ]τακόσια πεντήκοντα ὀκτώ[ι]. (*Boulē* 83 in favour, assembly [8]58 in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.32] **Karia: Iasos:** *SEG* 41, 932, lines 10-14 (decree honouring foreign judges; after 189 BC): ψῆφοι αἱ διδοῦσαι ἐν τῆι βουλῆι ἐξήκον[τα] καὶ ὀκτώ, ἐν δὲ τῶι δήμῳι ὀκτακόσια τεσσαράκοντα μία. (*Boulē* 68 in favour, assembly 841 in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.33] **Karia: Keramos:** *IK* 30, no. 9, lines 26-28 (decree honouring son of Drakon; date unspecified): [ψῆφοι αἱς ἔδ]οξε δοῦναι τὰς τιμὰς ἐνακόσια [(e.g. πεντήκοντα)] μία, αἱς δὲ μὴ [?] ἑκατὸν τεσσ[α]ράκοντα τέσσαρες. (Sc. 9[5]1 in favour and sc. [1]44 against, both numbers partially restored.)

[A.34] **Karia: Knidos:** *IK* 41, no. 74, lines 22-23 (honours including erection of statue, C1/C2 AD): ἐκυρώθη χειροτονία ἐν βουλᾷ· ἐκυρώθη καὶ ἐν τῶ [δ]άμῳ χειροτονία· ψᾶφοι αἱς ἔδοξε κυροῦν (line 24) . . . , αἱς δὲ μὴ, οὐδεμία. (Lost number of votes in favour, none against.)<sup>50</sup>

[A.35] **Karia: Magnesia:** *I.Magnesia*, no. 92a, line 15-16 (assembly decree honouring contributor towards building of theatre, early C2 BC): ψῆφοι ἐπηνέχθησαν τετρα[κισχίλια ἐξ]ακόσια ἐβδομήκοντα ὀκτώ. (4,678 votes sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

<sup>49</sup> For the dates of A.31 and A.32, see Crowther 1995, p. 118.

<sup>50</sup> For the oddity of the vote being described both as *kheirotonia* and as *psēphos*, see n. 9 above. It is odd that the text has space only for a single voting-figure (of three or four digits), despite having mentioned voting both in *boulē* and in assembly, unless it means that a ballot was taken e.g. only on the second occasion.

[A.36] **Karia: Magnesia:** *I.Magnesia*, no. 92b, line 43 (assembly decree honouring Apollonphanes, authorising erection of statue in theatre, early C2 BC): ψῆφοι ἐπηνέχθησαν δισχίλια ἑκατὸν δεκατρεῖς. (2,113 votes sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.37] **Karia: Magnesia:** *I.Magnesia*, no. 94, lines 14-15, with Robert 1969, p. 1500 n. 1 (assembly decree honouring Euphemos, early C2 BC): [ἐψηφοφόρησ]αν τρισχίλιοι πεντακόσιοι ὀγδο[ή]κοντα. (3,580 votes sc. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.38] **Karia: Theangela:** *IG XI/4*, no. 1054, frag. b, lines 21-22 (honorific decree with grant of proxeny; c.230-220 BC): ψῆφοι ἐγένοντο αἱ δίδουσαι ἑξακόσιοι εἰκοσιν. (620 votes in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.39] **Karia: Theangela:** *SEG 27*, 511, lines 5-6 (decree honouring a doctor, C3 BC): [ψηφοι ἐγένον]το· αἱ διδοῦσαι χίλι[αι — —]. (Number in favour begins with 1,000.)<sup>51</sup>

[A.40] **North Africa: Cyrene:** *SEG 9*, 354, line 26 (honorary decree, beneficiary not preserved, C1 BC), ends with λευκαὶ (sc. ψηφοι) νγ'. (53 “white” votes i.e. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[A.41] **North Africa: Arsinoe:** *SEG 26*, 1817, line 80 (honorary decree of *gerousia* and *boulē* for Aleximakhos, late C2/early C1 BC): λευκαὶ (sc. ψηφοι) vac. ρθ'. (109 “white” votes, i.e. in favour, no space for votes against.)

[B] Inscriptions with voting-figures for trials, including inter-state arbitration

[B.1] **Attica/Delos:** Chankowski 2008, nos. 29-30, face c, lines 7-10 (Delian Amphiktyony accounts of 351/0 BC: two copies, no. 29 from Athens, no. 30 from Delos), records the acquittal of a man from Ios on trial at the Stoa Poikile, i.e. in Athens. The well-preserved Athens copy reads: τῶν ψήφων αἱ τετρυπημένοι : Η : αἱ δὲ πλήρεις [:] ΗΗΗΠΔΔΔΔΓΓΙΙΙ. (100 for conviction, 399 for acquittal.)

[B.2] **Attica:** The Athenian copy of the Delian Naopoioi accounts for ?345/4 BC mentions the Parabuston court at Athens (line 12) and probably the defendant’s absence (οὐχ ὑπακ[ου-, line 6). Earlier editors restored [—]. ΗΗΗΗΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ (line 7) as e.g. πλήρει]ς (*IG ii*<sup>2</sup>, no. 1646) or τετρυπαμέν?]ας (*ID 2*, no. 104–22), i.e. as 444 votes for acquittal or conviction respectively. But Stumpf 1987, p. 214-15, argues that an absentee defendant would be convicted without voting and that the epigraphic traces would better fit a penalty (τιμῆ]ν or ἐπιβόλη]ν or ζημία]ν), a reading which is adopted by Chankowski 2008, no. 54, face b, line 8.

[B.3] **Attica:** *Hesperia* (1947), p. 155-57 (Meritt), no. 51, lines 56-60 (Pōlētai record of c.250/49 BC). References to judicial proceedings are discussed by Meritt,

<sup>51</sup> There is space for c.18-20 letters before the start of a second decree, but we can only guess how much of this contained greater complexity of the number in favour, and whether any of it referred to votes against.

including [—]ς ψηφοὶ πλήρεις : π[—] (“solid votes”, i.e. for the defendant, line 57), but it is not certain that what follows is a number, nor that this is a record of a particular trial.

**[B.4] Peloponnese: Messene:** Themelis 2008, lines 55-61 (Messenian account of victory in inter-state boundary dispute, recording an arbitration-decision by the *polis* of Aigion, after 182 BC):<sup>52</sup> ὄντων ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα ἐπτά τῶν κρινόντων καὶ ταυτῶν μεταλαβόντων Καλιατῶν καὶ Μεγαλοπολιτῶν ψάφους ἐπτά, ἀμῶν δὲ ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα (147 votes in total, 7 for Megalopolis and Kaliai, 140 for “us” i.e. Messene.)

**[B.5] Peloponnese: Olympia:** *SIG*<sup>3</sup>, no. 683, lines 66-70 (decision by tribunal at Miletos, arbitrating inter-state boundary dispute; found at Olympia; c.138 BC): τῶν ψήφων, αἷς ἔδοξεν κατεισ[χῆσθαι] ἡ χώρα ὑπὸ Μεσσηνίων καὶ ὅπως οὔτοι οὔτω[ς κα]τέχωσιν, πεντακόσια ὀγδοήκοντα τέσσαρες· αἷς κατεισχῆσθαι ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίω[ν], δεκαέξι. (584 for Messenia, 16 for Sparta.)

**[B.6] Central Greece: Delphi:** *FD* III.4, no. 38, lines 1-3 (Amphiktyonic Council’s arbitration over right to appoint representative, phrased as denunciation by Thronion of its defeated rival Skarphai, c.110 BC): νενικηκότα[ς τοὺς Θροινιάς κ]αὶ εἰ[λ]ηφότας ψήφους πενήκοντα ἐννέα, τοὺς δὲ Σκ[αρφέας εἰληφότ]ας ψήφους [δ]ύο. (59 votes to Thronion, 2 to Skarphai.)

**[B.7] Central Greece: Thessaly:** *IG* IX/2, no. 261, lines 5-6, 13-15, 20-22 (dossier of letters to the Roman governor, each reporting identical voting-figures for Thessalian Council’s arbitration in an inter-state boundary dispute, 13-35 AD): the figure of διακοσίας ἐνενήκοντα ὀκτώ for Kierion can be read intact at line 21 and restored elsewhere, as can τριάκοντα μία for Metropolis and ἄκυροι πέντε at line 6. (298 for Kierion; 31 for Metropolis; 5 *akuroi*, i.e. invalid or abstained.)

**[B.8] Aegean Islands (Lesbos): Eresos:** Rhodes-Osborne 2003, no. 83, stele γ front §ii, lines 30-32 (trial of tyrant Agonippos, 322 BC):<sup>53</sup> ἐδικάσθη· ὀκτωκόσιοι ὀγδοήκοντα τρεῖς· ἀπ[ὸ] ταύτων ἀπέλυσαν ἑπτα, αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι κατεδίκασσαν. (883 voters in total, 7 for acquittal, implying 876 for conviction.)

**[B.9] Karia: Knidos:** *IK* 41, no. 221 frag. b, lines 31-33 (arbitration by Knidos in loan dispute brought by two citizens of Kos against city of Kalymna, c.300-286 BC): ἀπεδικάσθη παρόντων. τῶν ψάφων ταὶ καταδικάζουσι ἐβδομήκοντα ἐπὶ δέκα, ταὶ δὲ ἀποδικάζουσαι ἑκατὸν ἵκατι ἕξι. (78 for conviction, 126 for acquittal, noting presence of defendants.)

<sup>52</sup> The text records a follow-up verdict given for Messene against Megalopolis by an evidently smaller tribunal of arbitrators from Miletos: no number is mentioned, but “our” victory is described as unanimous (ἐνίκασαμεν πάσαις ταῖς ψάφους, lines 80-81), and the six Milesian judges are honoured by name at lines 99-100.

<sup>53</sup> The procedure for Agonippos’ trial is specified as secret ballot at γ front § ii line 16, though open voting is envisaged for part of the trial of Eurysilaos at β § 1 lines 15-27.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agora 16*: A. G. Woodhead, *The Athenian Agora, 16. The Decrees*, Princeton.
- Agora 19*: G. V. Lalonde-M. K. Langdon-M. B. Walbank, *The Athenian Agora, 19*, Princeton.
- Chankowski 2008: V. Chankowski, *Athènes et Délos à l'époque classique: recherches sur l'administration du sanctuaire d'Apollon délien*, Athens.
- CID 1*: G. Rougemont (ed.), *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes, 1. Lois sacrées et règlements religieux*, Paris 1977.
- Cornish 1968: W. R. Cornish, *The Jury*, London.
- FD III.1*: É. Bourguet (ed.), *Fouilles de Delphes, III. Épigraphie, 1. De l'entrée du sanctuaire au trésor des Athéniens*, Paris 1910-29.
- FD III.4*: A. Plassart (ed.), *Fouilles de Delphes, III. Épigraphie, 4. Les inscriptions de la terrasse du temple et de la région nord du sanctuaire, 3. N<sup>os</sup> 276 à 350*, Paris 1970.
- Gauthier 1990: P. Gauthier, *Quorum et participation civique dans les démocraties grecques*, in C. Nicolet (ed.), *Du pouvoir dans l'Antiquité: mots et réalités*, Geneva, p. 73-99.
- Hansen 1977: M. H. Hansen, *How did the Athenian Ecclesia vote?*, *GRBS* 18/2, p. 123-37 (repr. in Hansen 1983, p. 103-17, with addenda on p. 118-21, and in P. J. Rhodes (ed.), *Athenian Democracy*, Edinburgh 2004, p. 40-55, with slightly fuller addenda on p. 55-61).
- Hansen 1983: M. H. Hansen, *The Athenian Ecclesia: a collection of articles, 1976-83*, Copenhagen.
- Hansen 1985: M. H. Hansen, *Athenian Nomothesia*, *GRBS* 26/4, p. 345-71.
- ICos*: M. Segre (ed.), *Iscrizioni di Cos*, Roma 1993.
- I.Cos*: W. R. Paton-E. L. Hicks (eds.), *The Inscriptions of Cos*, Oxford 1891.
- ID 2*: J. Coupry (ed.), *Inscriptions de Délos, 2. N<sup>os</sup> 89-10433. Amphictyonie attico-délienne, actes administratifs*, Paris 1972.
- IK 6*: P. Frisch (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos*, Bonn 1978.
- IK 17/1*: R. Meriç et al. (eds.), *Die Inschriften von Ephesos, VII.1*, Bonn 1981.
- IK 28*: W. Blümel (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Iasos, 2 vols.*, Bonn 1985.
- IK 30*: E. Varinlioglou (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Keramos*, Bonn 1986.
- IK 41*: W. Blümel (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Knidos*, Bonn 1992.
- I.Magnesia*: O. Kern (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin 1900.
- I.Priene*: F. Hiller von Gaertringen (ed.), *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin 1906.
- Larsen 1949: J. A. O. Larsen, *The Origin and Significance of the Counting of Votes*, *C.Phil.* 44, p. 164-81 (German trans. in F. Gschnitzer (ed.), *Zur griechischen Staatskunde*, Darmstadt 1969, p. 184-218).
- Milet*: A. Rehm (ed.), *Milet, I.3. Das Delphinion in Milet*, Berlin 1914.
- Osborne 1981-83: M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, 4 vols., Brussels.

- Osborne 1999: R. G. Osborne, *Inscribing Performance*, in S. D. Goldhill-R. G. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge, p. 341-58.
- Rhodes 1981: P. J. Rhodes, *Notes on Voting in Athens*, *GRBS* 21, p. 125-32.
- Rhodes 1985: P. J. Rhodes, *Nomothesia in Fourth-Century Athens*, *CQ* 35, p. 55-60.
- Rhodes-Lewis 1997: P. J. Rhodes-D. M. Lewis (eds.), *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford.
- Rhodes-Osborne 2003: P. J. Rhodes-R. Osborne (eds.), *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 BC*, Oxford.
- Robert 1969: L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta*, III, Amsterdam.
- Ruschenbusch 1983: E. Ruschenbusch, *Tribut und Bürgerzahl im ersten athenischen Seebund*, *ZPE* 53, p. 125-43.
- Salviat-Vatin 1971: F. Salviat-C. Vatin, *Inscriptions de Grèce centrale*, Paris.
- Stumpf 1987: G. Stumpf, *Zwei Gerichtsurteile aus Athen: IG II<sup>2</sup> 1641 B und 1646 a*, *Tyche* 2, p. 211-15.
- Themelis 2008: P. Themelis, Κρίμα περί χώρας Μεσσηνίων και Μεγαλοπολίτων, in G. A. Pikoulas (ed.), *Praktika. Proceedings of the International Symposium in Honour of James Roy*, Stemnitsa, p. 211-222.
- Thür 1987: G. Thür, *Neuere Untersuchungen zum Prozessrecht der griechischen Poleis: Formen des Urteils*, in D. Simon (ed.), *Akten des 26. Deutschen Rechtshistorikertages*, Frankfurt am Main, p. 467-484.
- Wilhelm 1974: A. Wilhelm, *Akademieschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde (1895-1951)*, I. *Neue Beiträge zur Inschriftenkunde, Attische Urkunden*, Leipzig (Opuscula 8).