Vergina frieze are Xenophon's Indian hounds, but rather that these holding dogs are of a specialized physical type which would be of similar ability and usefulness. There is no way of knowing what the 4th century BC Macedonians called these Vergina holding dogs, or for that matter what they called the tracking hounds we have come to know as the Laconian. However, the five tracking hounds in the frieze are of one particular physical type, each like every other in every perceivable detail.[8] The three holding dogs comprise a second type. These eight examples represent two specific types of dog, each of which has been bred with a different purpose in mind.[9]

The dog throughout history has served man in many and varied ways. In the world today, there are hundreds of recognizable types of dogs marked by certain physical characteristics. These characteristics give them the ability to perform certain specific tasks. It is not my purpose to attempt to identify direct antecedents of modern breeds of dogs in ancient examples. There are, however, modern dogs of the same physical type and with capabilities similar to those of the two types of dogs in the Vergina hunt frieze. The tracking dog has many current counterparts in different parts of the world, since hunting is a widespread joint endeavor of dog and man. Some of these tracking dogs are larger, some are smaller, but all are of a generally similar physical type. There are close parallels in use and type in certain dogs seen commonly in Europe and the United States, and these are the Pharaoh Hound and the Ibizan Hound.[10] The holding dog has present day parallels in the Karelian Bear Dog of the Soviet Union, the Rhodesian Ridgeback, and the Japanese Akita.[11] These powerful canines still perform important baying functions in the hunts for large game in Asia and Africa.[12]

In examining the details of the hunting frieze at Vergina, we can see two canine members of the hunting roster of 4th century BC Macedonia. These are the long-familiar tracking dog, and the new holding dog. At present we can only wonder what other types of dogs may have been in use in that time and place, and what their abilities and assigned tasks may have been.

LINDA COLLINS REILLY
Department of Classical Studies,
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA
The American School of Classical Studies, Athens

[8] The colour of the tracking dogs varies, but their color is not related to their physical capabilities. On the color of hounds, see Xen. *Cyn.* 4. 7-8.

[9] On this point see J. K. Anderson, *Hunting in the ancient world* (Berkeley 1985) 93. He says, 'Hounds were, as in Xenophon's day, essentially of two types, with the light, keen-scented Laconian, or Spartan, hound used to track the quarry, and a heavier mastiff to bay it'. It is exactly these two types of dogs which are represented in the Vergina hunt scene.

[10] On these two modern breeds, see *The complete dog book* (New York 1985) 239-242 for the Pharaoh Hound, and 223-226 for the Ibizan, both with photographs.

[11] On these dogs, see G. Pugnetti, *Guide to dogs* (New York 1980). The Karelian is #127, the Rhodesian #174, and the Akita #87, all with photographs.

[12] For an example of dogs used in recent times in a large game hunt, see R. B. Lee and I. DeVore, eds., *Man the hunter* (Chicago 1968) 294-5.

Two choruses of frogs?

In September 1991 I came across two parties of frogs in the bulrushes on either side of a still little pool at the Ain Qilt, some ten miles east of Jerusalem. The two parties were calling to each other in turn, as though singing antiphonally. The remarkable fact which struck me was that each group had a different chant, the one distinctly chanting only βρεκεκεκέξ, while the other replied equally distinctly with a consistent κοάξ, κοάξ. I observed this phenomenon for some ten minutes, but was not able to ascertain other differences between the two groups, such as sex, age, or temperament; but I thought that this fact, whatever its explanation, might be a significant contribution to field-research on Aristophanes.

HENRY WANSBROUGH
St. Benet's Hall
Oxford

Kleisthenes and Athenian nomenclature

In the course of discussing Kleisthenes' reforms, the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* makes the following statement:

καὶ δημότας ἐποίησεν ἀλλήλων τοὺς οἰκο-
ῦντας ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν δήμων, ἵνα μὴ πατρό-
θεν προσαγορεύοντες ἐξελέγχωσιν τοὺς νεοπο-
λίτας, ἀλλὰ τῶν δήμων ἀναγορεύωσιν· ὅθεν
καὶ καλοῦσιν Ἀθηναῖοι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τῶν
δήμων.   *Ath. Pol.* 21.4[1]

And he made those who were currently living in each of the demes demesmen of one another, so that they would not examine the new citizens by calling out their patronymic, rather they would announce them by demes; and from this practice, the Athenians call themselves after their demes.

From the first, commentators on the *Ath. Pol.* have interpreted this passage to mean that Kleisthenes legislated a change in Athenian nomenclature from the patronymic to the demotic in an effort to promote equality among the citizens. F.G. Kenyon advanced this interpretation as early as 1891 in the second edition of the *Ath. Pol*: 'Cleisthenes introduced a large number of new citizens by enfranchisement of emancipated slaves and resident aliens, and he made their reception into the community easier by altering the official mode of designation.'[2] Wilamowitz, while concurring in general

[1] Aristoteles, *Athenaion Politeia* ed. M. Chambers (Leipzig 1986). All citations from the *Ath. Pol.* are taken from the Teubner text. I do not wish to enter into the thorny problem of the authorship of the text. The other two Greek writers who discuss Kleisthenes' reforms are Herodotos v 69 and Isocrates vii 6. Only the passage in *Ath. Pol.* has anything on nomenclature. I would like to thank Professors George Huxley, Stephen Tracy, John Traill, and A.G. Woodhead, as well as the anonymous referees, all of whom have read and commented on this article in various drafts. Of course, any errors which remain are my own.

[2] F.G. Kenyon, *Aristotle on the constitution of the Athenians*[3] (Oxford 1892) 69.

with Kenyon's view, insisted that it was Kleisthenes' intention not merely to add the deme name to Attic nomenclature, but to replace the patronymic with the demotic.[3] A study of subsequent commentators on *Ath. Pol.* 21.4 reveals widespread acceptance of Wilamowitz' interpretation.[4] It is almost universally agreed that the passage chronicles a change in the naming system, and recent scholars continue to assert that the demotic was instituted as a replacement for the patronymic. The difficulty with this view is twofold: 1) the epigraphical evidence does not support it; 2) the *Ath. Pol.* itself is notoriously inaccurate and anachronistic.

If we look for inscriptional evidence to support the suggested alteration by Kleisthenes of the Attic naming system, it is logical to begin with official documents of the period,[5] i.e. decrees, treaties, and financial records, which, we may assume, would have reflected such a name change necessarily. There remain from the years 510-451/0 BC some 44 inscriptions of this sort, most of them fragmentary, and of these, twenty preserve sufficient evidence to make observations concerning nomenclature.[6] While it would be unwise to draw any firm conclusions based on such a small sample of evidence, the remains which we do have seem to indicate that in official documents of the period 510-450 BC the standard practice when naming officials was to use only the

nomen.[7] Given the number and fragmentary condition of these official inscriptions, we must rely on other primary evidence, the dedications from the Athenian Akropolis and the ostraka, to provide a clearer indication of whether a legislated change in nomenclature occurred.

The Akropolis dedications were erected by private individuals as offerings to Athena, probably in commemoration of some outstanding event or achievement, and as a rule contained the name of the dedicator. Though not financed by the state and therefore not strictly official, they were nonetheless public monuments. Many were located in prominent positions on the Akropolis, flanking the Sacred Way or standing at the west end of the Parthenon. For the most part they were large stones with large lettering and were intended to be read by the privileged few who had constant access to the Akropolis, as well as by the common citizenry who would crowd the sanctuary on festival days. We may reasonably assume, then, that these inscriptions reflect the common or even official form (if any official form existed) of proper names at the time.[8]

In an appendix to *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*, A.E. Raubitschek notes that there are twenty-six dedications dated to the generation following Kleisthenes' reforms on which the name appears only with the demotic, while there are forty-nine with name and patronymic for the same period.[9] He adds that from 475 BC to the end of the fifth century there is only one dedication with name and demotic, while there are twenty with name, patronymic, and demotic.[10] In spite

---

[3] In his study of the *Ath. Pol.* he states dogmatically: 'der aristotelische Bericht hat keinen Sinn wenn nicht Kleisthenes den Vatersnamen durch den Demos hat ersetzen wollen'. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin 1893) 169. This exchange, demotic for patronymic, was necessary for the achievement of that perfect equality ('vollkommen gleich') which Wilamowitz perceived as the overriding priority of Kleisthenes' reforms. For a more recent statement of this idea see P. Manville (n. 4 below) 191 n. 104, where he accepts the standard interpretation and attempts to explain it in terms of egalitarianism.

[4] Among those who have accepted the idea of a name change are: J. E. Sandys, *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens* (New York 1912) 85; M. A. Levi, *Commento storico alla Respublica Atheniensium di Aristotele* (Milan 1968) vi, 223; E. Vanderpool, 'Ostracism at Athens', in *Lectures in memory of Louise Taft Semple* (Oklahoma 1973) 220; D. Whitehead, *The demes of Attica 508/7 to c. 250 BC* (Princeton 1986) 11 and 69 ff; P. Manville, *The origins of citizenship in ancient Athens* (Princeton 1990) 190-191 and 188 n. 96; see also his cautionary note 104 on p. 191 where he explains more fully his position on the issue. There are of course others. Those who question the name change: P.J. Rhodes, *A commentary on the Aristotelian athenaion politeia* (Oxford 1981) 251-256; C.A. Hignett, *A history of the Athenian constitution to the end of the fifth century BC* (Oxford 1952) 131 and 137-140, hereafter referred to as *HAC*. J. Day and M.H. Chambers, *Aristotle's history of Athenian democracy* (Berkeley 1962) 116 including n. 55.

[5] I have set the lower limit of this study at 450 because Perikles' citizenship laws may have influenced habits of nomenclature following this date, and furthermore this allows for two full generations following the reforms, an ample amount of time for changes to become manifest.

[6] The stones which I have used are *IG* I[3] 1-31, 230-35, and 259-262. In one or two cases, e.g. *IG* I[3] 23 dated to a.447, I have allowed for a little variance in date. The stones which contain sufficient information are: *IG* I[3] 4a.14-15 & b.26; 5.1; 7.2; 8.3; 9.3-4; 10.3-4; 11.15; 12.1-2; 17.3A; 18.4-5 & 6-7; 21.2-3, 61 & 86; 23.3-5; 27.2-5; 30.2-3; 31.1,4,6; 259.1-2,3; 260.1; 261.1; 262.1.

[7] Meiggs and Lewis state that the patronymic and demotic are 'elements not found in Attic documents much before 350.' R. Meiggs and D. Lewis *A selection of Greek historical inscriptions* (Oxford 1969) 50. A. S. Henry has noted the lack of any single naming system in use on a certain class of inscription. He notes in a discussion of early naming formulae: '...a detailed discussion is not included of the form which the object takes when the honorand is an individual (name-patronymic-ethnic/demotic: pronoun) simply because there is no systematic development of this aspect of the formulation'. *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees* (Hildesheim 1983) 12 n. 2; see also p. 13 for some illuminating comments on later use of demotics. See further Henry's comments on the appearance of demotics on a few decrees from the early fifth century in *The prescripts of Athenian decrees* (Leiden 1977) where he notes that the appearance of demotics in the early period is sporadic at best. See also B. Meritt, 'Greek historical studies' in *Lectures in memory of Louise Taft Semple* 1st Series (Princeton 1967) 99-132, especially 121-22.

[8] In the absence of definite proof to the contrary, I have proceeded on the assumption that the majority of individuals named in the dedications from the Akropolis without demotic or ethnic are Athenian citizens. It is well known that some foreigners also set up dedications there (*DAA* 3 and 9, e.g.) and so we would not be surprised to learn that some of those dedications which lack demotic or ethnic were erected by foreigners. I feel quite certain that even allowing for the existence of such dedications, the findings of the following discussion would remain unchanged. I owe this observation to Professor John Traill, and am grateful that he brought it to my attention.

[9] A.E. Raubitschek, with L.H. Jeffery, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: a catalogue of inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries BC* (Cambridge, Mass. 1949) 474. This work is hereafter referred to as *DAA*.

[10] *DAA* 474. These statistics are Raubitschek's; my own investigations do not agree with his numbers; see below n.14.

of the preponderance of patronymics, Raubitschek states:'it is established beyond doubt that the Athenian name consisted, according to Kleisthenes' reforms, only of name and demotic; the epigraphical evidence shows that this form of the name was predominant throughout the fifth and fourth centuries.[11] This statement is extraordinary since it is not supported either by his own statistics or by the evidence. There are, according to his statistics, almost twice as many dedications with name and patronymic as there are with name and demotic for the period from 515 to 475 BC, while after that date there is only one with name and demotic.

Raubitschek's discussion of this problem is difficult to follow and at times confusing; he does not, for example, always state which inscriptions he is using for a specific statistic. At one point he mentions that 217 of the dedications are fragmentary and therefore not statistically useful, but nowhere does he say which 217 they are. Then he goes on to state that he will use some of them anyway because they contain artists' signatures.[12] Thus the reader is left uncertain as to which stones form Raubitschek's statistical base. Given such difficulties, I have examined first hand all of those dedications relevant to this period, and have drawn up my own statistics based on this examination and a close reading of DAA. According to my figures from those stones which I consider relevant for the period 510-475,[13] there are 42 with name only, 38 with name and patronymic, 14 with name and demotic, and 3 with name, patronymic and demotic. After 475 there are 12 with name only, 10 with name and patronymic, 2 with name and demotic, and 14 with the full three names. Clearly, the incidence in the dedications of name only or name and patronymic is far greater throughout the fifth century than the incidence of name and demotic or the full three names. The fact that so many more inscriptions occur with name and demotic between 508 and 475, i.e., in the first generation following Kleisthenes' deme legislation, than in the generations following, may be due to Kleisthenes' partisans demonstrating their support of his political re-organization. The greatest increase in the occurrence of the full name takes place in the second half of the fifth century, no doubt as a result of Perikles' citizenship laws.[14]

While it may be the case that demotics gained popularity only after Kleisthenes' reorganization of Attica gave the demes added importance,[15] that does not demand the further assumptions (a) that their use was legislated by Kleisthenes, or (b) that the demotic replaced the patronymic. Indeed the evidence fails to show any consistent pattern to suggest the idea of an official nomenclature. The evidence of the dedications does not, then, support the idea that Kleisthenes legislated a name change for Athenian citizens. Furthermore, it is possible to check this finding against another body of primary evidence, the ostraka.

The ostraka comprise a set of documents which are, like the Akropolis dedications, original source documents, many of them datable to the period under consideration. Moreover, while there may be some question about the citizenship of certain individuals who set up dedications on the Akropolis, only Athenian citizens were named on the ostraka. Although the names of the candidates for ostracism were not inscribed by the state, they were certainly written in an official context; therefore it is safe to assume that the forms in which the names appear on the ostraka reflect accepted usage.[16]

In the recent publication of the Ostraka volume in the Athenian Agora series, M. Lang publishes 1145 ostraka found in the Agora since the excavations were begun in 1931.[17] She has conveniently broken them down into those which are datable to the 480's, to the middle of the century, and to the end of the century. I have used those which Lang places in the 480's and the middle of the century, omitting only those which do not contain a definite form of a name, i.e. where the ostrakon is broken in such a way as to make the reading of the name uncertain. The total number of statistically useful ostraka is 965. The distribution of names is as follows: 191 with name and demotic, 664 with name and patronymic, 99 with name only, and 11 with the full name. The Themistokles ostraka comprise a special case since most were inscribed by only 7 or 8 hands.[18] The implication is that the sherds were prepared in advance by Themistokles' political opponents, and then given to voters as they entered the Agora. If we omit Themistokles altogether, we get the following numbers: 42 with name and demotic, 512 with name and patronymic, 42

---

[11] DAA 474.

[12] DAA 475.

[13] For my own figures see the appendix in Kleisthenes and Athenian Nomenclature (diss. Ohio State University, 1989). I have listed two dedications which date to the period after 475 BC and have name and demotic only. Raubitschek, however, states (DAA 474) that there is only one dedication with name and demotic dated to post 475 BC: DAA 287. I have added to this category DAA 143, a base comprised of two fragments. Raubitschek suggests the possibility that the two fragments do not belong together and he therefore excludes it from his count. The restoration [ΔEMET]PIOΣ ANE[ΘEKEN AΠAPXEN AΛO]ΠEKEΘEN seems quite reasonable, and for the sake of the argument I have included it. There are two other inscriptions dating to post 475 BC with traces of what may be demotics (DAA 119, which Raubitschek has mistakenly included in his count of name and patronymic, and DAA 363), but, since the restorations are highly uncertain, they are not included in my totals.

[14] For Perikles' citizenship laws see Ath. Pol. 26.4. Raubitschek recognized this as a possibility, DAA 476.

[15] Hignett, HAC 137-40.

[16] If one assumes a law was passed, then one must also assume some means of enforcement. The one area in which Kleisthenes could have hoped to enforce any kind of legislation about nomenclature would be in written official documents. E.g., he might have said that if an official inscription lacked the demotic, he would prevent it from being set up; or if an ostrakon were not properly inscribed with name and demotic, it would not be accepted as a valid vote. We have no indication that any such enforcement was in place.

[17] M. Lang, The Athenian Agora xxv: Ostraka (Princeton 1990). See Rhodes (n.4 267-271 for a recent discussion of the mechanics of ostracism. For all aspects of ostracism see now, A. Martin, 'L'Ostracisme athénien, un demi-siècle de découvertes et de recherches', REG cii (1989) 124-145.

[18] O. Broneer, 'Excavations on the north slope of the Acropolis 1937', Hesperia vii (1938) 228-243. See Broneer n. 8. It should be noted that in the group of ostraka which Broneer found bearing Themistokles' name, all of those which had the demotic were inscribed by one hand. See further Lang's comments in the catalogue of Themistokles ostraka in Ostraka (n. 18) 142-161.

with name only and 6 with the full name. In any event, the picture remains the same: the number of patronymics is far greater than the number of demotics.

Since the publication of the ostraka from the Kerameikos remains incomplete, these figures represent only the ostraka from the Agora excavations. Nevertheless, we may justifiably assume that they constitute a representative sample. From the statistics which we have, we can state with confidence that the ostraka do not support the notion that Kleisthenes legislated a change in Athenian nomenclature from patronymic to demotic. As future publications appear, we may be able to document this more precisely, but the basic conclusion will almost certainly receive definitive confirmation. So much for the primary inscriptional evidence. What, then, are we to make of the report in *Ath. Pol.* 21.4?

It has been acknowledged that the *Ath. Pol.* is not entirely reliable. K. Kinzl, for example, has questioned the accuracy of this section, 21.4, as regards Aristotle's treatment of the reform of the trittys system.[19] R. Wallace discusses the problem of anachronism with respect to the Areopagos council in Solon's time. Wallace argues that Aristotle has retrojected a later image of the Areopagos to its workings in the time of Solon.[20] It is possible that Aristotle has done the same

sort of thing in 21.4. We know that in Aristotle's day the practice was that an Athenian citizen, especially when named as an official on a decree, was given his name, patronymic, and demotic.[21] The inclusion of the demotic, he might have reasoned, must have been the work of one of the great lawmakers. Since Kleisthenes' reforms were mostly concerned with the demes, it would make sense for Aristotle to attribute such a change to Kleisthenes. The final sentence of 21.4 adds credence to such a notion: 'ὅθεν καὶ καλοῦσιν Ἀθηναῖοι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τῶν δήμων: from this practice, the Athenians also call themselves after their demes'. Here the demotic is clearly intended to be understood in the words τῶν δήμων, and the presence of the particle καὶ suggests that this clause refers to a practice different from and additional to that mentioned in the previous clause.

It must be acknowledged that there is simply no evidence to support the notion that demotics were 'mandatory and universal', replacing patronymics in Attic society.[22] In fact, there is no evidence to show that Kleisthenes ever intended to tamper with habits of nomenclature. What we must conclude is that either *Ath. Pol.* 21.4 is inaccurate on this point or the passage has been misinterpreted.

T.F. WINTERS

Department of Classics
Duquesne University

[19] K. Kinzl, 'On the consequences of following A.P. 21.4,' *AHB* I (1987) 25-33.

[20] R.W. Wallace, *The Areopagos council to 307 BC* (Baltimore 1989) 39 ff, particularly 45, and 73. See, in addition to Wallace's comments, *inter al.*, R. Sealey, *A history of the Greek city states 700-338 BC* (Berkeley 1976) 4-5, 90-91 and 105 n.1, and E. Badian, '*Archons* and Strategoi', *Antichthon* v (1971) 1-34, *passim* but for one specific example, see his comments on p. 19. On the idea that Aristotle is drawing an inference from the practice in his day, see Day and Chambers (n. 5) 116, and Rhodes (n. 5) 254.

[21] See Henry, *Honours and privileges* (n. 7) 13 f. Henry notes that after the mid-fourth century 'by far the commonest form is name plus patronymic plus demotic ...'.

[22] The phrase is D. Whitehead's in *Demes of Attica* (n. 4) 70.