

## The So-Called “Buleutic Ostracism” and the *Ekphyllophoria*: *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 and Other Late Byzantine Nonsensical Reports on the Athenian Ostracism<sup>1</sup>

Marek Węcowski

*Abstract:* In 1894, Leon Sternbach (1864-1940) published the *editio princeps* of the concluding part of the fifteenth-century Byzantine manuscript known as *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 (ff. 215v-225v), which contains an interesting collection of excerpts. *Excerptum* 213 reached the wider scholarly world only after being reprinted and interpreted in 1972 by John J. Kearney and Antony E. Raubitschek. Ever since the *Vaticanus* has occupied a very special place in scholarly debates about the law of ostracism in Athens, and it seems that in recent decades some scholars tend to take it as somehow trustworthy and hence attesting the existence of a law or custom predating the attested law of ostracism. Accordingly, the notion of the so-called “buleutic ostracism” has become increasingly popular. On this theory, Athenian ostracism was originally voted on by the *Boule* and only later transferred to the Athenian people at large. In my paper, I intend to show that *Excerptum* no. 213 on ostracism is a worthless (albeit highly interesting) mix of known pieces of information from other Roman and Byzantine sources and that it was conceived at some point in late Byzantine scholarship by misinterpreting, ingeniously manipulating, or conflating, well-known elements of the ancient lexicographical traditions. If I am right, the phantom of the “buleutic ostracism” should be laid to rest.

*Keywords:* Atthidography/Atthidographers (local historians of Athens); Athenian democracy; Athenian Boule (the Council of Five Hundred); ‘buleutic ostracism’ (so-

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper stems from a larger project on the original purpose of the Athenian ostracism, funded by Poland’s National Science Center (research grant no. 2012/05/B/HS3/03755). Earlier versions of this article were read at a meeting of the Committee for Classical Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, at the Institute of Archaeology at the University of Warsaw, at the Ca’ Foscari University in Venice (Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici) and as an *Eranos Vindobonensis-Vortrag*, at Vienna University (Institut für Klassische Philologie, Mittel- und Neulatein). I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Benedetto Bravo, John K. Davies, Adam Ziółkowski, an anonymous referee for this journal and to Jerzy Danielewicz for commenting upon my paper, and to my audiences at the above-mentioned occasions for their valuable comments and suggestions. Needless to say, all the remaining errors and shortcomings of this article are mine and mine only. As all contemporary studies on this issue, both this paper and the wider project on the Athenian ostracism (provisionally entitled *A Prisoner’s dilemma. Athenian ostracism and its original purpose*) build upon the monumental work by Peter Siewert and his collaborators, the *Ostrakismos-Testimonien I. Die Zeugnisse antiker Autoren, der Inschriften und Ostraka über das athenische Scherbengericht aus vorhellenistischer Zeit (487-322 v. Chr.)* (*Historia* Einzel. 155), ed. P. Siewert (Stuttgart 2002).

called); *demos* (the Athenian people); *ekphyllophoria* (*ekphyllophorēsis*); Byzantine erudition; Kleisthenes; Byzantine lexicography; Athenian ostracism

In the *Proceedings of the Philological Faculty of the [Polish] Academy of Learning* of 1894, Leon Sternbach (1864-1940) published the *editio princeps* of the concluding part of a fifteenth-century (or perhaps fourteenth-century) Byzantine manuscript known as *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 (foll. 215<sup>v</sup>-225<sup>v</sup>), an interesting but bizarre collection of excerpts (apophthegms, gnomae, and pieces of historical material).<sup>2</sup> The excerptum 213 has only reached wider scholarly world, and the students of the Athenian democracy in particular, almost eighty years later when reprinted and interpreted in 1972 by John J. Keaney and Antony E. Raubitschek.<sup>3</sup> Ever since, the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 no. 213 has occupied a very special place in the scholarly debates surrounding the law of ostracism in Athens and it seems that in recent decades some scholars tend to take it, however cautiously and not without hesitation, as somehow trustworthy and hence pointing to the existence of a law or custom predating the attested law of ostracism. Accordingly, the notion of the so-called “buleutic ostracism” has become increasingly popular. On this theory, the Athenian ostracism was originally voted by the Boule and only later transferred to the Athenian people at large.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, the majority approach is to abstain from judging the trustworthiness of this late Byzantine account.<sup>5</sup> Very rarely it is discarded altogether, but without giving any reason.<sup>6</sup>

The thrill of the account of the Vatican excerptum is obvious. If true, its historical implications would be far-reaching. As Antony Raubitschek put it, it

... resolves at once the questions whether the law was instituted after the expulsion of Hippias or after the victory of Marathon, and whether or not Cleisthenes was its author. Evidently, the law was introduced (in the boule?) by Cleisthenes in the short period between the end of tyranny and his own exile, and it was administered by the boule of Four Hundred. Its provisions were the same as those of the later law, except that a simple majority of the four hundred councillors determined the victim. After Cleisthenes returned and had his constitution enacted, nothing was said or done about the law of ostracism till the treason of Marathon raised the specter of tyranny again, and all of our more detailed accounts of ostracism describe the working of the law as it was renewed immediately after Marathon. ... It is also clear that the boule of the Four Hundred existed until it was

---

<sup>2</sup> Sternbach (1894a), 192.

<sup>3</sup> Keaney & Raubitschek (1972). Sternbach's edition of other pieces of historical material from the same manuscript, devoted inter alia to Alexander the Great, entered scholarly debates right away as they were published in a widely circulating Viennese journal: Sternbach (1894b).

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Develin (1977) (this scholar later rescinded his support to this theory in Develin 1985); Bicknell (1974), 817-819; McCargar (1976), 248-252; Longo (1980); Lehmann (1981); Doenges (1996); Forsdyke (2005), 283-284. Cf. Costa (2007), 230.

<sup>5</sup> Thus, for instance, Stein Hölkeskamp (1989), 194; Bleicken (1995), 525; Siewert (2002), 31.

<sup>6</sup> See esp. Rhodes (1992), 268 (with an addendum, p. 774).

replaced by that of the Five Hundred, and that Herodotus (V, 72, 2) speaks of its activities at that very time.<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, if one is willing to go one step further, one could even end up by interpreting a more general historical and cultural context of ostracism delving into its archaic “prehistory”, so to say.<sup>8</sup>

In what follows, I do not intend to discuss these scholarly theories, but to show that excerptum no. 213 regarding ostracism is a worthless mix of the pieces of information we otherwise know (save for one detail) from other Roman and Byzantine sources and that it was conceived at some point in late Byzantine scholarship by misinterpreting, ingeniously manipulating, or conflating, well-known elements of ancient lexicographical traditions. If I am right in what follows, the phantom of the “buleutic ostracism” should be laid to rest.

Let us take a closer look at the text itself (fol. 222<sup>v</sup>):

- 1 Κλεισθένης τὸν ἐξοστρακισμοῦ νόμον ἐς Ἀθήνας εἰσήνεγκεν.
- 2 ἣν δὲ τοιοῦτος·
- 3 τὴν βουλὴν τινῶν ἡμέραιν (βουλὴν τινῶν ἡμερῶν Sternbach) σκεψαμένων  
(σκεψαμένην Sternbach)
- 4 ἐπιγράφειν ἔθος <ἣν suppl. Sternbach> εἰς ὄστρακα
- 5 ὄντινα δέοι τῶν πολιτῶν φυγαδευθῆναι
- 6 καὶ ταῦτα ρίπτειν εἰς τὸ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου περίφραγμα.
- 7 ὅτῳ δὲ ἂν ὑπὲρ διακόσια γένηται τὰ ὄστρακα
- 8 φεύγειν ἔτη δέκα,
- 9 τὰ ἐκείνου (ἐαυτοῦ Sternbach) καρπούμενον.
- 10 ὕστερον δὲ τὸν δῆμον (τῷ δήμῳ Sternbach τοῦ δήμου Develin) ἔδοξε  
νομοθετῆσαι
- 11 ὑπὲρ ἑξακισχίλια γίνεσθαι τὰ ὄστρακα τοῦ φυγαδευθῆναι μέλλοντος.

(1) It was Kleisthenes who introduced the law of ostracism to Athens. (2) The law was as follows: (3) During certain days of deliberation [or perhaps: ‘after certain days of deliberation’ — M.W.], the Council (4) had the habit to write down on potsherd (5) [the name of] the one among the citizens whom it was necessary to exile (6) and to throw [the ostraka] into the enclosure of the Bouleuterion. (7) The one who received more than two hundred ostraka, (8) had to go to exile for ten years, (9) with the right of using his own property [in Attica]. (10) Later, the *demos* decided to introduce a law<sup>9</sup> (11) that the ostraka should amount to six thousand if a man was to go to exile.

<sup>7</sup> Keaney & Raubitschek (1972), 90. Cf. also Longo (1980).

<sup>8</sup> Thus e.g. Develin (1977) and Mossé & Schnapp Gourbeillon (1994).

<sup>9</sup> Develin (1977), 13, wanted to emend τὸν δῆμον into τοῦ δήμου, and translated it as follows: ‘it was decided to establish a law that the ostraka of the demos [stressed] should amount to 6000 if a man was to go into exile’, while admitting it would be “a compressed statement”.

Regrettably, we cannot establish the historical value of this text based on external criteria. On the one hand, scholarly attempts at identifying the ultimate ancient source of this account in its present form are not likely to succeed.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, its relative authority among our extant ancient sources is again difficult to establish. While it is true that *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 no. 213 is isolated and unparalleled in the current state of our evidence, it must be admitted that the rich mainstream account on the Athenian ostracism, headed by the Aristotelian *Atheniaion Politeia* 43.5 (henceforward *A.P.*) and the famous fragment 30 of Philochorus (in F. Jacoby's *FGrHist*), may also represent a single line of tradition.<sup>11</sup>

Another way to validate the authority of the excerptum's account would be to find some corroborative pieces of historical information in it. But here again we find ourselves in the realm of inconclusiveness. Two possible elements stand out, it is true, as being likely to be reliable. First, the idea of fencing off some spot in the Athenian Agora in the process, the *periphragma* of our excerptum, is paralleled (without the mention of the Bouleuterion involved, though) in other accounts of the *ostrakophoria*, or the vote using ostraca.<sup>12</sup> Second, the phrase τὰ ἐκείνου (or ἑαυτοῦ) καρπούμενον, recurring in several sources,<sup>13</sup> that most probably belonged to the original text of the law of ostracism.<sup>14</sup> Both elements, however, can only prove some relationship between the Byzantine account and the aforementioned "mainstream tradition" of ostracism and do not bespeak of any degree of originality, let alone independent authority, of this account.

What is left to the supporters of the "buleutic ostracism" are general historical considerations based on the alleged coherence of the excerptum.<sup>15</sup> One detail is particularly important here, namely the very idea of ostracizing a citizen by the Boule combined with the fact that the "mainstream tradition" mentions the role of the Boule (and that of the archonts) in supervising the vote of *ostrakophoria*.<sup>16</sup> As such, this piece of information may suggest that the fifth-century practice was based on an earlier, and "buleutic", procedure of ostracism. However, it is fair to observe with many scholars that the *bouleutai* were the only possible choice for the supervision of the vote since the voters, we are told, approached the area using ten entrances, one for each *phylē*.<sup>17</sup> Only the elected representatives of the Athenian tribes could be used to check the identity of their fellow-citizens and thus to prevent potential impostors from voting. Beside that, nothing suggests any historical link between the Boule and ostracism as it is attested for the fifth century. Quite the contrary, the automatically conducted preliminary vote in the

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. next footnote.

<sup>11</sup> See esp. Raubitschek (1958) (cf. already Bloch (1940), 355-376), for Theophrastus as the ultimate source of this tradition. Develin (1977), 11, would prefer to see the Atthidographer Androtion in this role.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. in particular Philochoros, *FGrHist* 328 F 30, with Costa (2007), 227-228, for parallel accounts.

<sup>13</sup> See also below, 17 with n. 39.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Longo (1980), 263.

<sup>15</sup> Thus e.g. J. J. Keaney, in Keaney & Raubitschek (1972), 90.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. esp. Philochoros, *FGrHist* 328 F 30.

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Raubitschek (1956).

Assembly whether to hold an ostracism (*A.P.* 43.5), with no probuleumatic procedures involved, is not suggestive of possible “buleutic” precedents of ostracism.<sup>18</sup>

Next comes the problem of the alleged logic or coherence of the excerptum. In 1985, Robert Develin withdrew from his earlier attempts at defending not so much the authority of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 (or that of its source), but of some pieces of information included in it. In his second paper on the issue, in the face the chaotic nature of the excerptum itself, Develin made a strong methodological point when he asked how its writer really worked, ‘Was he here copying directly from a source? Or was he working from notes? Or was he relying on memory?’. And, since the text as we have it is obviously in need of emending, ‘are these emendations made in order to reconstruct the writer’s source or to correct his grammar? Consideration of this may provide a clue as to the writer’s dependability’.<sup>19</sup>

Develin pointed out several cases of the writer’s “sloppiness” such as the necessity of emending *σκεψαμένων* into Sternbach’s *σκεψαμένην*, the unmentioned subject of the Boule’s “examination”, but also the strange *genetivus temporis* *τινῶν ἡμερῶν*, which can either mean ‘after some days [of examination]’, as scholars usually translate it, or literally ‘during certain days [of examination]’. The latter would indicate a specific time of the year, but in all this the writer of the excerptum is extremely careless and vague. Next, he argued, the phrase *ὑστερον δὲ τὸν δῆμον ἔδοξε νομοθετῆσαι* of the manuscript actually resists emendation and it is not necessary to change it with Sternberg into more meaningful *τῷ δῆμῳ* or into *τοῦ δῆμου* (with Develin 1977) *ἔδοξε*. Be as it may, a good constitutional source could not have omitted the crucial fact that the vote of ostracism would be executed by the *demos* itself since the introduction of the requirement of six thousand ostraca. As it stands now, the excerptum only says that the *demos* decided to change the number of the ostraca required to expel a citizen from Athens. At best, the writer is drastically abbreviating his source, but, as Develin concludes,

we seem at least to be in the presence of an inattentive mind. My impression is that that the writer was working from memory or at the most from notes on a matter that had already been distorted by Byzantine times. The point is that if he has been so slack in his expression, we can hardly have confidence in the content. It can be argued that this does not necessarily follow, but this is just one more consideration in the case against a text which has very little chance of inserting another stage into the history of ostracism.<sup>20</sup>

I for one could not agree more.

\*\*\*

<sup>18</sup> As emphasised by Develin (1985), 13. In the light of *A.P.* 43.5, where the preliminary vote of ostracism is depicted as still valid in the author’s life-time, the majority opinion is that ostracism ‘was not formally abolished, and the assembly voted each year not to hold an ostracism’ (thus Rhodes (1992), 526). For a recent attempt at reconstructing some elements of the law of ostracism based on a scholion to Aristophanes’ *Knights* (sch vet Ar. Eq. 855B) see Scheibelreiter (2008).

<sup>19</sup> All quotations from Develin (1985), 14.

<sup>20</sup> Develin (1985), 15.

Let me stress that the reason why the negative arguments against the idea of the “buleutic ostracism” have failed to persuade many scholars is that one would need to explain the provenance of the extravagant Byzantine version, even if it was abbreviated and distorted by the writer of the excerptum, to put this account to rest with clear conscience. Unless proven otherwise, we do read of the vote of ostracism in the Boule in the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 no. 213 after all.

At this juncture, it may prove instructive to take a look at two more Byzantine accounts of ostracism, one roughly contemporary with our manuscript and one predating it by several generations. Let me begin with the second one.

In the fourteenth-century *Miscellanea* (p. 608-609 ed. Müller-Kießling) by Theodoros Metochites († 1332), an interesting collection of excerpts and variegated material stemming from classical sources in political and constitutional issues (essays nos. 94-109), we read the story of the ostracism of Aristides as an example of the perversity of the Athenian *demos*. In general, the author rather faithfully follows Plutarch’s account from the *Life of Aristides*,<sup>21</sup> except for one curious mistake: for the *ostrakophoria*, the Athenians gather from all quarters in the... Buleuterion (p. 609 Müller-Kießling: ὡς ἤθροιστο μὲν ὁ δῆμος παντόθεν εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον). This unparalleled and topographically absurd idea is, however, naturally integrated in an account that otherwise follows the “mainstream tradition” on ostracism. The author, no doubt relying on his memory, misconstrued the procedure and confused ostracism with another piece of information regarding an issue similar enough to the *ostrakophoria* to be imperceptibly blended into his account about ostracism.

Another late Byzantine account of ostracism is even more confusing. We owe it to John Tzetzes († ca 1180) and his poetic *Chiliades* in accentual verse (XIII 441-486 Kiessling, story no. 489). Once again, the narrative follows Plutarch’s *Life of Aristides*, including the famous anecdote about the illiterate Athenian willing to expel Aristides, but this time we are facing a maddening stream of associations and pieces of quasi-erudite information. Among other things, we learn that the Athenians did not exile anyone right away, but waited for a specific day (l. 445: ἡμέραν ὠρισμένην), when they listened to a thousand accusers against the one they were about to banish and then they wrote down his name on ostraca and threw them in... the gymnasium of Kynosarges (l. 449).<sup>22</sup>

Thus, if the specified day a thousand shells were found, / Without any sympathy the person was exiled. / If the shells were less than that, though, / He could stay in his homeland, achieving forgiveness. / Because of the shells ostracism stands for banishment, / The same as to which Aristides the Just was submitted.

(ll. 452-457; tr. N. Giallousis)

This account provides us with several unparalleled nonsenses about ostracism (such as the mention of Kynosarges), but contains some elements matching both the version found in Metochites and especially that of the Vatican excerptum: (1) the idea of

<sup>21</sup> On this writer and his “personal encyclopaedism”, but also on Plutarch’s role in his work, see recently Featherstone (2011). Raubitschek (1958), 101-102, quotes Metochites’s account, but abstains from commenting on the idiosyncrasies of this version.

<sup>22</sup> On this strange idea, see below, 17 n. 40.

throwing ostraca into some specific enclosure (not the Buleuterion, though); (2) the notion of a specific day to do it; (3) the idea of a time-lag between some preliminary indication of the guilty one and the actual day of voting, (4) a time-lag devoted to some form of deliberation on the guilt (although this is very unclear in the Vat. Gr. 1144); (5) a precise number of ostraca required to exile the suspect, but very different from that of the “mainstream tradition” (not six thousand, but two hundred, as in the Vatican excerptum, or one thousand, as in the *Chiliades*).

In Tzetzes it all gets utterly confused, but he may have been following, recalling it from his memory, a source underlying the account of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 no. 213 as well, since the correspondences between the two are striking indeed. In the remaining part of the story no. 489 in the *Chiliades*, we may find a key to identify not the source itself, but at least the class of evidence Tzetzes may have followed.

The anecdote about the illiterate Athenian keen on exiling Aristides ends with the line stating that ‘thus exile (*exoria*) was named ostracising’ (l. 476). Immediately afterwards, we read ‘but we also call it *ekphyllophorēsis*’, i.e. the sentence passed by leaves (l. 477).<sup>23</sup> However,

In places where potsherds were hard to find / They used leaves in the place of potsherds / And did everything else just as I said, / But they dropped them not in Kynosarges, / But in a place where the leaves could be hidden and kept dry. / So, either we use the word ostracism or *ekphyllophorēsis* for exile (*exoria*) / We mean the very same thing. / But there were people that were banished in autumn time / Because of the trees leaves and the blowing of the winds.

(ll. 478-486; tr. N. Giallousis, adapted)

For Tzetzes, then, ostracism and the *ekphyllophorēsis* is one and the same thing, a type of banishment in Athens, and the difference between them is most probably that of the availability of the “instruments” of the vote in a given place and at a given time of the year. This last idea looks rather ingenious and may well have been a novel concept of the writer. Original or not, he combined here, relying again solely on his memory, ostracism and the Athenian institution of *ekphyllophoria* or *ekphyllophorēsis*, the “leafing-out” of the Boule.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> For institutions where voting procedures involved tree-leaves, see e.g. *IG XII.5 595 A*, l. 11-15 (Ceos, 3<sup>rd</sup> cent. BCE-early 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. BCE) and the famous case of the *petalismos* in Syracuse (see esp. Diod. 11.86.4-87.6 and Hesychius, *Lex.* 2044 ed. Hansen, s.v. *pet[ta]lismos* and 2041, s.v. *petal[la]*; cf. recently Schirripa, Lentini, Cordano (2012), 148-149). Some connection between the *petalismos* in Syracuse and ostracism was postulated already by Wilamowitz (as quoted by the editor of *IG XII.5 595 A*, F. Hiller von Gaertringen).

<sup>24</sup> To eliminate one of its members as guilty of some wrongdoings (see below, 20-21), the Council of Five Hundred first voted using tree-leaves. In the second and final vote, more regular voting-pebbles were used (sch Aeschin. 1 (*In Tim.*) 111 = 242a-b Dilts). We hear of this institution from Aeschin. 1 (*In Tim.*) 110-112, from references to a lost speech by Deinarchos (*Against Polyeuktos*, the testimonia collected as no. II in N. Conomis’ Teubner edition of this orator, p. 74-76); from Antiphon, *Choreg.* 49, and from a series of lexicographical entries: Harpocration, s.v. *ekphyllophorēsai* (109.1 Dindorf); *Suda*, s.v. *ekphyllophorēsai kai ekphyllophoria* (E 722 Adler) (the preceding entry *ekphyllophorein* [E

As regards the excerptum of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144, scholars have long envisioned the possibility that this excerptum confused ostracism with the *ekphyllophoria*, but discounted it as a ‘desperate’<sup>25</sup> or at least ‘not very convincing’<sup>26</sup> hypothesis. If anything, students of ostracism allowed for the idea of some historical link between the *ekphyllophoria* and the “buleutic ostracism” in Athens.<sup>27</sup>

Indeed, there is a strong analogy between one of the strange passages of the Vatican excerptum (l. 3: τὴν βουλήν τινων ἡμερῶν σκευαμένην), on the one hand, and a passage of the entry *ekphyllophorēsis* (or *ekphyllophorēsai kai ekphyllophoria*) in the Byzantine lexicographic tradition: ‘the Boule used to look into his [i.e. of the potential wrongdoer from among its members — M.W.] case’ (ἐσκόπει ἡ βουλή περὶ αὐτοῦ). This is what we find in the *Suda* (E 722 Adler), in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (325.9 Gaisdorf), and in the *Lexica Segueriana* (ed. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* I, 248.7).<sup>28</sup> In his reassessment of the historical value of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 pp. 213, R. Develin observed that ‘in the *Suda* (E 722 Adler) reasons given and terminology used are such that a mistake or two along the way could have led to a wrong ascription to ostracism’ in the Vatican excerptum.<sup>29</sup>

Actually, there is more to be said about the Byzantine lexicographic tradition of the *ekphyllophoria* (and *ekphyllophorēsis*). In the *Suda* entry (s.v. *ekphyllophorēsai kai ekphyllophoria*, E 722 Adler), we read that

If ever any of the citizens appeared to be a wrongdoer and [thus] unworthy of belonging to the Council of the 500, the council used to look into his case, [*sc.* to determine] whether he ought to be a councillor no longer but expelled from the synod altogether.

(tr. D. Whitehead for the *Suda* On Line: <http://www.stoa.org/sol/>)

In other representatives of the same tradition (*Lexica Segueriana*, s.v. *ekphyllophorēsai*, ed. Bekker I, 248.7 and *Etymologicum Magnum*, s.v. *ekphyllophorēsai kai ekphyllophoriai*, 325.9 ed. Gaisdorf) we find the same curious mistake, as they mention ‘any of the citizens’ (τις τῶν πολιτῶν) instead of ‘any of the members of the Boule’ as the subject of the Council’s scrutiny. In his edition of the *Etymologicum Magnum*, Thomas Gaisdorf naturally suggests the necessary correction into τις τῶν βουλευτῶν in his apparatus (*quod praeferendum videtur*), following the authority of the much shorter

---

721 Adler] is a corrupted version of the tradition, on which see below); *Lex. Segueriana* (ed. Bekker I.248.7), s.v. *ekphyllophorēsai*; *E.M.* (325.9 Gaisdorf), s.v. *ekphyllophorēsai kai ekphyllophoriai*. See also Pollux, *Onom.* 8.19-20 (see below, 16-17). Cf. Busolt-Swoboda (1926), 1023-1024 and Rhodes (1972), 144-146.

<sup>25</sup> Thus Keaney & Raubitschek (1972), 90. Cf. also Longo (1980), 259 n. 6.

<sup>26</sup> Develin (1977), 12-13. Develin (1985), 12, is not so sure any more that the *ekphyllophoria* can be eliminated as a possible source of confusion.

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. Hall (1989), 96-99.

<sup>28</sup> This is the most extensive lexicographical entry on the issue, preserved in an eleventh-century codex (now called Parisinus Coislinianus 345 and 347) combining several short treatises on Greek syntax and five anonymous works dubbed *Lexica Segueriana*, from the original owner of the codex (Pierre Ségurier, 1588-1672) or *Lexica Bekkeriana*, from their editor Imanuel Bekker. Our entry belongs to *Lexeis rhetorikai*, most probably stemming from a lexicon to Attic orators. Cf. Sandys (1921), 416.

<sup>29</sup> Develin (1985), 12.



entry *ekphyllophorēsai* in Harpocration (109.1 Dindorf).<sup>30</sup> The emendation looks no doubt indispensable to suit the *ekphyllophoria* procedure, but the Byzantine tradition is consistent in keeping the nonsensical phrase ‘any of the citizens’ instead of ‘members of the Council’.

It is true that Byzantine lexicographers never directly and literally confuse ostracism with the *ekphyllophoria* and they only connect the two because both institutions used other “instruments” of vote than the regular *psēphoi* (see below, 17 and 20-21).<sup>31</sup> However, I think there is no other solution but to assume that the lexicographic entries studied above stemmed from an earlier confusion between the procedure of ostracism, regarding all the citizens of Athens, and that of the *ekphyllophoria*, concerning only the members of the Council of Five Hundred. Indeed, if we compare the lexicographic version (εἴ ποτέ τις τῶν πολιτῶν ἀδικεῖν ἐδόκει καὶ ἀνάξιος εἶναι τοῦ συνεδρίου τῶν φ’, ἐσκόπει ἢ βουλή περὶ αὐτοῦ, εἰ χρὴ αὐτὸν μηκέτι βουλευεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐλαθῆναι καὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου) with the text of our Vatican excerptum (τὴν βουλήν τινῶν ἡμερῶν σκεψαμένην ... ὄντινα δέοι τῶν πολιτῶν φυγαδευθῆναι κτλ.) it looks rather obvious, first, that the latter version is based, however confusingly, on Byzantine traditions about the *ekphyllophoria* and/or, second, that the lexicographers and the writer of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 no. 312 fell victim to an earlier conflation of the information about ostracism with that about the *ekphyllophoria*.

Now, the tenth-century *Suda*, the eleventh-century manuscript of the *Lexica Segueriana*, and the twelfth-century *Etymologicum Magnum* share the same meaningful mistake, but the “cross-fertilization”, so to say, between the material regarding the *ekphyllophoria* and that on the Athenian ostracism is also attested in the fourteenth-century *Miscellanea* by Theodoros Metochites (the enclosure of the Bouleuterion as the voting booth) and, in a massive and imaginative combination of the two, in the *Chiliades* by John Tzetzes in the second half of the twelfth-century. I think there can be no doubt at this point that we are entitled to add to this list the account about ostracism in the fifteenth- or fourteenth-century *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144, roughly contemporary with Metochites’ work or slightly postdating it. Thus, our sole witness to the existence of the phase of the “buleutic ostracism” in Athens proves worthless.

In the penultimate part of this paper, I would like to speculate on possible mechanisms of the appearance of this peculiar vision of the history of ostracism in the Vatican excerptum.

\*\*\*

As already mentioned, Harpocration’s lexicon in the later second century still offers an “uncontaminated” entry on *ekphyllophorēsai* (109.1 Dindorf):<sup>32</sup>

εἰ ἐδόκει τις τῶν βουλευτῶν ἀδικεῖν, διεψηφίζετο ἢ βουλή περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰ χρὴ αὐτὸν μηκέτι βουλευεῖν. ἀντὶ δὲ ψήφων φύλλοις ἐχρῶντο, δι’ ὧν ἕκαστος ἐπεσημαίνετο τὴν αὐτοῦ γνώμην κτλ.

<sup>30</sup> As observed by W. Dindorf (Oxford, 1853, ad loc.), *Hanc gl.[ossam] omisit Suidas, alia substituta copiosiore.*

<sup>31</sup> *Suda*, E 722 Adler; *Lex. Segueriana* ed. Bekker I, 248.11-14; *E.M.* 325.15 Gaisdorf.

<sup>32</sup> On some problems of using Harpocration, cf. e.g. Kinzl (1991).

If any of the *bouleutai* appeared to be a wrongdoer, the Council voted on his case, whether he ought to cease to perform the function of a councillor. Instead of voting-pebbles they used leaves, on which each councillor would indicate his own opinion ...

In this entry, there is still no trace of comparing the *ekphyllophoria* with ostracism based on their original voting “instruments”, just a brief mention of voting-pebbles. Accordingly, those subject to the Council’s scrutiny are logically the members of the Boule and not the Athenian citizens at large.

Now, based on the (now epitomised) *Onomasticon* by Pollux of Naucratis, a contemporary of Harpocration in the latter part of the second century, we may perhaps tentatively suggest the hypothetical ultimate source of the Byzantine “cross-fertilization” of the material about ostracism and the *ekphyllophoria*.

In Pollux 8.18-20, a much longer treatment of the *ekphyllophoria* than that of Harpocration can be found. Actually, as John K. Davies kindly suggested to me *per litteras*, the sequence of ideas underlying the (epitomised) Pollux here ‘reflects a sophisticated selection process that has occurred at some point’. The author’s regular style is abandoned in paragraph 17 to present various modes of using *skeue dikastika* and then to offer antiquarian reasoning regarding three administrative procedures used to penalise an individual in Athens, namely the *diapsephisis*, the *ekphyllophoria*, and ostracism. In other words, three *ad hominem* public procedures must have been clearly distinguished here, which bespeaks of a solid original treatment of some important aspects of the Athenian law.<sup>33</sup> In this context, we find a detailed account on the Athenian *ekphyllophoria*, mentioning the procedure of “leafing-out” as executed both by the *dikastai kata demous*,<sup>34</sup> and in the Athenian Boule. Here, the terminology regarding the technicalities of voting yields to that of exile and to the remark that the Boule used leaves instead of voting-pebbles. Next, the writer switches to the terminology of ostracism and then to a brief account about ostracism that obviously originated in the “mainstream tradition” of ostracism, best preserved in the fragment 30 of Philochoros of Athens. Here, the *Onomasticon* tells us only about the need to build an enclosure encompassing some part of the Athenian Agora<sup>35</sup> and about the requirement of six thousand ostraca to effectively exile a citizen from Athens.<sup>36</sup>

Of course, this is a drastically abbreviated account, by the epitomator of Pollux, of the *diapsephisis*, the *ekphyllophoria*, and ostracism. The original and more detailed treatment of the three issues would be a perfect candidate, I would argue, for the ultimate source of the Byzantine conflation of the traditions regarding ostracism with those pertaining to the *ekphyllophoria*. It is worth noticing that of the five elements uniting the accounts of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144, of Theodoros Metochites, and of John Tzetzes (see above, 12-13), only two, the idea of some enclosure used as a voting booth and the number of the ostraca required, are found in Pollux. The epitomator skipped one particularly important element which was no doubt present in earlier

<sup>33</sup> Cf. also Maffi (2007), esp. 30-31.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. esp. *A.P.* 16.5; 26.3; 48.5; 53.1, as commented by Rhodes (1992), ad locc. Cf. also Dem. 24 (*In Tim.*) 122.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. above, 12-13 and 15.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Philochoros, *FGrHist* 328 F 30, with Costa (2007), 228-232, for scholarly debates surrounding the difficult issue of the “quorum” of the Athenian ostracism.

Byzantine sources,<sup>37</sup> namely the precise time of the year when the *ostrakophoria* was held in Athens,<sup>38</sup> which must have given rise to the three other elements of the Byzantine accounts, including the idea of a time-lag for deliberation before the actual vote of ostraca.<sup>39</sup>

If the pieces of information regarding the *ekphyllophoria* and ostracism closely neighboured one another in a fuller version of what we read now as Pollux's 8.18-20,<sup>40</sup> one crucial analogy would strike any reader of such a text, namely the fact that both institutions must have been described in a similar fashion in that they both were organized in a two-stage procedure involving a preliminary vote and the final vote after some period of time left for consideration. This fact might have been the ultimate source of confusion resulting in one of the "meaningful errors" studied above.<sup>41</sup> From this point of view, one can even say that a conflation of the two institutions could have been natural in the late lexicographical tradition, when Byzantine scholars realised, among other things, the fundamental similarity between the procedures and between the exotic "instruments of vote" in both cases.

Only when positing an early Byzantine erudite tradition of the kind postulated above, one can try to explain the actual form of the account about the ostracism we find in the

<sup>37</sup> Note that a passage from Pollux' account on ostracism is present in a marginal note to the sixth-century Neoplatonist commentary on Plato's *Gorgias* by Olympiodorus (33.3.2, p. 171.25 Westerink).

<sup>38</sup> In *A.P.* 43.5, we hear of the "main Assembly" of the sixth prytany when the vote whether to hold an ostracism or not in a given year took place, whereas in Philochoros, *FGrHist* 328 F 30, we are only told that this happened 'before the eighth prytany'. For a thorough discussion of this (apparent) incongruity, see F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIb Suppl. (Text), p. 316, with a tentative suggestion to emend, or rather complete, the text of Philochoros here. As I hope to argue elsewhere, both accounts are in a harmonious accord. It is enough to realise that the Athidographer was only interested in the final vote using ostraca and not so much in the whole procedure of ostracism, so he felt the need to date with some precision the *ostrakophoria* while only briefly mentioning that the preliminary vote in the Popular Assembly occurred 'before'.

<sup>39</sup> What is missing in Pollux, among other things, is also the paraphrase of the law of ostracism. As observed above, 10, one element of the text of this law is adduced by the Vatican excerptum.

<sup>40</sup> One additional argument in favour of this hypothesis may be Tzetzes' strange idea of throwing the ostraca into the Kynosarges (*Chiliades*, 8.448-459, 465, and 481). Raubitschek (1958), 87, brilliantly observed that this mistake may have resulted from confusing the *ekphyllophoria* with the procedure of separating the citizens from those illegally inscribed as citizens, or *nothoi* (cf. Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, 8.449-450 with Pollux, 8.18, where this procedure is only briefly touched upon), who were ordered to the Kynosarges (cf. *Suda*, s.v. *eis Kynosarges* [EI 290 Adler]). In a similar vein the compressed *Suda* entry *ekphyllophorein* (E 721 Adler) may have originated in the same source, too. Cf. also the technical language of sch Aeschin. 1 (*In Tim.*) 111 = 242a-b Dilts.

<sup>41</sup> εἴ ποτέ τις τῶν πολιτῶν ἀδικεῖν ἐδόκει καὶ ἀνάξιος εἶναι τοῦ συνεδρίου τῶν φ', ἐσκόπει ἢ βουλή περὶ αὐτοῦ, εἰ χρὴ αὐτὸν μηκέτι βουλευεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλαθῆναι καὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου, in the case of the lexicographical entries on *ekphyllophoria*, and τὴν βουλὴν τινῶν ἡμερῶν σκεψαμένην ... ὄντινα δεοὶ τῶν πολιτῶν φυγαδευθῆναι κτλ., in the Vatican excerptum. Cf. above, 15.

*Vaticanus Graecus* 1144 np. 312, or to put it otherwise, to understand the mechanism of “conflation” we encounter in the Vatican version.

When faced with the (hypothetical) corrupt, or better confused tradition that merged some elements of the material on the *ostrakophoria* with that on the *ekphyllophoria* (most probably by abbreviating accounts on both subjects), Byzantine lexicographers could of course rely on alternative sources of information, so they could easily dissociate ostracism from the *ekphyllophoria* in their own works. However, some meaningful errors were still left, as we have seen, in their lexical entries, which proves the existence of their common, and corrupt, source(s). This fact is best explained, I think, if we assume that in principle the lexicographers simply cut their source-material to come up with what they considered the corrected and reasonable version of the evidence they had at their disposal for the *ekphyllophoria*. Meanwhile, Theodoros Metochites let one element of the conflated tradition creep into his account of the *ostrakophoria*. He just relied on his memory and instinctively “enriched” his otherwise Plutarchean narrative by a memorable detail, the Bouleuterion as the venue of the vote of ostraca.

Tzetzes, using most probably the same source-material as Theodoros (i.e. Plutarch’s *Life of Aristides* combined with our hypothetical early Byzantine source stemming from Pollux) and relying on his defective memory as well, provided his readers with his own blend of earlier and already confused traditions adding his ingenious speculations and witty ideas to this mixture. The important point is that what Tzetzes did, among other things, was trying to reconcile the confused data and amusingly explain the relationship between the *ostrakophoria* and the *ekphyllophoria* by linking the difference between them with the problem of availability of ostraca and of leaves in different places and in different seasons of the year. We can think of a similar principle behind the account of ostracism as given by the excerptum of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144.

As established beyond any reasonable doubt by Robert Develin (see above, 11), the writer of the excerptum was sloppy and inattentive, so the intellectual effort I postulate here ought to be ascribed to his immediate source, which must have worked on similar data to that of the lexicographers, John Tzetzes, and Theodoros Metochites. At this juncture, it is important to bear in mind that this immediate source of our excerptum was surely not a lexicographer, but most probably a serious writer who tried to come up with a reasonable narrative of ostracism, just as Tzetzes did in a much less serious context.

Based on the already “conflated” tradition that confused ostracism with the institution of *ekphyllophoria*, the Byzantine scholar conceived a coherent and meaningful account (to be later confusingly copied by the writer of Vat. Gr. 1144). Its fundamental premise, just like in the case of John Tzetzes, was the idea that *ekphyllophoria* (or *ekphyllophorēsis*) was tantamount to ostracism as just another name for the Athenian form of exile (*exoria* in Tzetzes, *apheinai* in Pollux). When confronted with what seemed to him a corrupt view of the relationship between the two, the resolute Byzantine erudite made an ambitious decision to seamlessly integrate the two aspects of the pre-existing tradition by arranging them in diachronic order and thus conceiving a meaningful account of the historical development of ostracism. He was aware, on the one hand, of the high requirement of six thousand ostraca cast by the *demos* at large and, on the other hand, of the vote in the much narrower circle of the Council of Five Hundred. Consequently, it was only natural to him to ascribe the less known and less spectacular practice of “leafing-out” to an earlier “phase” of what he considered to be

ostracism. The only “fact” our scholar needed to invent, or better introduce, was the substitution of the rule of two hundred votes against the exiled citizen by that of six thousand votes by the decision of the *demos* made “later” (*hysteron*). This temporal adverb, only vaguely suggesting a chronological relationship between the two “stages” of ostracism, was the simplest and rather elegant solution to all the problems encountered by our Byzantine scholar.

As a result, an original but entirely baseless account of the “evolution” of ostracism was born, ripe for a number of twentieth-century students of this institution to be seduced by its unexpected novelty.

\*\*\*

It is of course impractical to go any further in this reasoning as the work of our hypothetical Byzantine erudite — impossible to date with any precision — was subsequently distorted by the careless writer of the excerptum of the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1144. Thus, for instance, we will never know if the ingenious inventor of the “buleutic ostracism” openly stated that, at the second “stage” of his postulated evolution, the *Ecclesia* took over the competence of *Boule*, or whether he ascribed both “stages” of the development to Kleisthenes. We will never know who of the two — the erudite scholar or the writer of the excerptum — replaced the leaves of *ekphyllophoria* by the ostraca at the first “stage” of this evolution. One last detail, however, still requires our attention.

The number of votes of the “buleutic ostracism” in our excerptum is two hundred and this figure understandably gave rise to the hypotheses that linked this hypothetical institution to the Solonian Council of Four Hundred (either pointing to a pre-Kleisthenic history of ostracism or dating it to an early stage of the reforms of Kleisthenes before the organization of the Council of Five Hundred). Two hundred votes (plus one additional) would form a simple majority within this archaic *Boule*. Now, the number in question is the only detail we do not otherwise encounter, as far as I can see, in our extant traditions regarding the *ekphyllophoria*. One could of course discount this piece of information altogether by the same token as that of the number of one thousand ostraca invented or just misremembered by John Tzetzes in his account of ostracism (see above, 12-13). However, it is easier to mistake six thousand votes for one thousand than for two hundred leaves/ostraca.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, I think one should seriously consider the possibility that this figure featured in non-extant accounts, or a non-extant account, of *ekphyllophoria* of the Roman imperial period.

Although this cannot be proven but only tentatively postulated, there are good reasons to believe so. It would be instructive to return one last time to the entry of the (epitomised) *Onomasticon* by Pollux I adduced before (8.18-20). It combined the material regarding the voting tokens of the Athenian courts of law with that on the *ekphyllophoria*, and on ostracism. As I mentioned, the epitomator sharply abbreviated the well-known “mainstream account” of ostracism easily identifiable with a fragment (F. Jacoby’s *FGrHist* 328 F 30) of the Atthidographic work by Philochoros of Athens (c. 340-260 BCE). In Pollux, what is left from this long and detailed treatment is just two

<sup>42</sup> But see the ingenious suggestion made by W. R. Connor, that ‘σ’ (200) could readily be confused with ,ς (6,000)’ (in Keaney & Raubitschek (1972), 88).

abrupt sentences preserving the gist of Philochoros' account, but omitting the name of the Atthidographer and several crucial details including those most probably stemming from the actual text of the law of ostracism. This account is rounded off by a sweeping generalization, originating from a different source, of the nature of this institution. Had Pollux been the only surviving testimony to the Athenian ostracism, we would have never learned of the name of the writer behind this version, of the precise moment of the year when the *ostrakophoria* was held in Athens,<sup>43</sup> of the organization of the vote including the Athenian authorities involved, of the regulations of the law of ostracism regarding those exiled (ten days for settling one's business in Athens, ten years of exile, and its geographical limitations),<sup>44</sup> nor would we have ever learned of the famous scandal surrounding the last historical case of *ostrakophoria* (the banishment of Hyperbolos in 416 or 415 BCE). Moreover, we would have never known that Philochoros ascribed the invention of ostracism to Kleisthenes.

Now, the only reason why we are aware of all these details is the fact that ostracism was alluded to by Aristophanes and by Demosthenes, i.e. two among the prominent Attic writers massively commented upon from the Hellenistic times onwards. Philochoros' fragment was only preserved by a scholion to the *Knights* of Aristophanes (sch vet 855B) and by three fragmentary accounts depending on Didymos' commentary on a passage in Demosthenes' speech *Against Aristokrates*, in particular that of the so-called *Lexicon rhetoricum Cantabrigiense* (p. 23-24 Houtsma [*LexGrMin*, p. 84-84]).<sup>45</sup>

The *ekphyllophoria*, on the other hand, was not so spectacularly present in the corpus of Attic prose writers and most probably never alluded to in an Attic poetic work. Symptomatically perhaps, in their entries on *ekphyllophoria* and *ekphyllophorēsai*, the Byzantine lexicographers mistakenly refer their readers to [Pseudo-]Demosthenes' speech *Against Neaira*, whereas as a matter of fact it is only marginally mentioned or referred to by orators who were less intensely commented upon in the Hellenistic and Roman tradition.<sup>46</sup> What is more, the *ekphyllophoria* was much less interesting, or spectacular, by itself as it did not concern great Athenian statesmen such as Aristides or Themistocles, so it did not find its way to the anecdotal and/or biographical traditions popular in later antiquity and in the Byzantine period. True, it must have been interesting to the local historians of Athens and Attica such as, say, Philochoros, but later on, as we have seen in the relevant Pollux' entry, it was only important to those who were interested in the Athenian voting procedures and hence compared the "leaves" with the regular voting-pebbles (*psēphoi*) or in particular aspects of the Athenian law.

Therefore, all things considered, we can plausibly assume that there must have been an Atthidographic (?) account of the *ekphyllophoria* since the (epitomized) entry in Pollux seems to have followed one. In its unabbreviated form, this *Onomasticon*, or another source of the kind, was probably used by some strands of the Byzantine

---

<sup>43</sup> See above, 17 n. 38.

<sup>44</sup> For a discussion of the "geography of exile" for the victims of ostracism, see Figueira (1987).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. also Claudius Casilon, p. 398 (E. Müller, *Mélanges de littérature grecque*, Paris 1868, p. 398); *Lexicon Demosthenicum, Against Aristokrates* (= P. Berol. 5008, B 27-40 Blass = Diels-Schubart, p. 82), s.v. *ostrakismou tropos*.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. above, n. 25.

lexicographic tradition as the relevant lexicographical entries on *ekphyllophoria* and *ekphyllophorēsai* seem to suggest. If the Byzantine scholar whose inventive but aberrant work underlies the Vatican excerptum on ostracism employed such substantial but already “conflated” (see above, 15-17) lexicographical traditions, this is where he could have possibly found the piece of information regarding two hundred votes required to expel a guilty councillor from the Boule.

However, if this information be of historical value, it could only concern the Council of Five Hundred, otherwise systematically adduced by the Byzantine lexicographers in their entries regarding the *ekphyllophoria*. In fact, the ultimate sources of the *ekphyllophoria* traditions could only rely on allusions and references to the current legal situation in fourth-century orators, or perhaps even in some public documents involving this procedure. Their *ekphyllophoria* and their Boule could only be that of Five Hundred.

If that was the case, whence the two hundred votes, one might ask. I think that this figure does make sense in the context of the Council of Five Hundred. Two hundred “leaves” required to trigger the procedure of expelling a guilty councillor (the final vote, using more regular *psēphoi*, was most probably resolved by the simple majority of votes) is a high enough threshold to prevent too much brutal political scheming in the Boule. What is more, if we were to assume some level of corporate loyalty among the members of the Council, the two hundred votes for the *ekphyllophoria* to be effectively triggered suggests the necessity to secure the support of the representatives of only four *phylai* from among ten Athenian tribes. This looks a threshold low enough to make councillors accountable for their potential wrongdoings. As such, this two-stage procedure clearly analogous to the procedure of ostracism with which it was confused by late Byzantine scholarship, bespeaks of the intent of the lawgiver to curb both the inner political fights within the Council and to control its too influential members lest they put themselves above the law.

University of Warsaw

### Bibliography

- Bicknell, P. J. (1974). [review of R. Thomsen, *The Origin of Ostracism. A Synthesis*, Copenhagen, 1972], *Gnomon* 46, 817-819.
- Bleicken, J. (1995). *Die athenische Demokratie (4., völlig überarbeitete und wesentlich erweiterte Auflage)*. (Paderborn).
- Bloch, H. (1940). ‘Studies in Historical Literature of the Fourth Century B.C.’, in: *Athenian Studies presented to William Scott Ferguson (HSCPh, Suppl. vol. 1)*. (Cambridge, MA - London), 303-376.
- Busolt, G. & Swoboda, H. (1926). *Griechische Staatskunde*, vol. II: *Darstellungen einzelner Staaten und der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen, bearbeitet von... Heinrich Swoboda*. (München).
- Costa, V. (2007). *Filocoro di Atene*, vol. I: *Testimonianze e frammenti dell’Atthis*. (Roma).

- Develin, R. (1977). 'Cleisthenes and Ostracism: Precedents and Intentions', *Antichthon* 11, 10-21.
- Develin, R. (1985). 'Bouleutic Ostracism Again', *Antichthon* 19, 7-15.
- Doenges, N. A. (1996). 'Ostracism and the "boulai" of Kleisthenes', *Historia* 45, 387-404.
- Featherstone, M.J. (2011). 'Theodore Metochites's *Semeioseis Gnomikai*: Personal Encyclopedism', in: P. van Deun & C. Macé (eds), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium? (Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta, 212)*. (Leuven), 333-344.
- Figueira, Th. J. (1987). 'Residential Restrictions on the Athenian Ostracized', *GRBS* 28, 281-305.
- Forsdyke, S. (2005), *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy. The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece* (Princeton, N.J.).
- Hall, L. G. H. (1989). 'Remarks on the Law of Ostracism', *Tyche* 4, 91-100.
- Keaney, J. J. & Raubitschek, A. E. (1972). 'A late Byzantine account of ostracism', *AJPh* 93, 87-91.
- Kinzl, K. H. (1991). 'AP 22.4: The Sole Source of Harpokration on the Ostrakismos of Hipparkhos Son of Kharmos', *Klio* 73, 28-45.
- Lehmann, G. A. (1981). 'Der Ostrakismos-Entscheid in Athen: von Kleisthenes zur Ära des Themistokles', *ZPE* 41, 85-99.
- LexGrMin = Lexica Graeca Minora, selegit K. Latte, disposuit et praefatus est H. Erbse* (Hildesheim, 1965).
- Longo, C. P. (1980). 'La bulé e la procedura dell'ostracismo: Considerazioni su *Vat. Gr. 1144*', *Historia* 29, 257-281.
- Maffi, A. (2007). 'L'*Onomasticon* di Polluce come fonte di diritto attico', in: C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, G. Zecchini (eds), *L'Onomasticon di Giulio Polluce. Tra lessicografia e antiquaria* (Milano), 29-42.
- McCargar, D. J. (1976). 'New Evidence for the Kleisthenic Boule', *CPh* 71, 248-252.
- Mossé, C. & Schnapp Gourbeillon, A. (1994). 'Quelques réflexions sur l'ostracisme athénien', in: E. Greco (ed.), *Venticinque secoli dopo l'invenzione della Democrazia* (Paestum), 39-50.
- Raubitschek, A. E. (1956). 'The Gates in the Agora', *AJA* 60, 279-282.
- Raubitschek, A. E. (1958). 'Theophrastos on Ostracism', *C&M* 19, 73-109.
- Rhodes, P. J. (1972). *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford).
- Rhodes, P. J. (1992). *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). (Oxford).
- Sandys J. E. (1921). *A History of Classical Scholarship, Vol. I: From the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). (Cambridge).
- Scheibelreiter, P. (2008). 'Der *Peri tou Ostrakismou Nomos* in einem Scholion zu Aristophanes Equites 885B? Überlegungen zum Ostrakismos-Gesetz', *Dike* 11, 111-138.
- Schirripa, P., Lentini, M. C., Cordano, F. (2012). 'Nuova geografia dell'ostracismo', *Quaderni di Acme* 129, 115-150.
- Siewert, P. (2002) (ed.). *Ostrakismos-Testimonien I. Zie Zeugnisse antiker Autoren, der Inschriften und Ostraka über das athenische Scherbengericht aus vorhellenistischer Zeit (487-322 v. Chr.)*, (*Historia Einzel. 155*). (Stuttgart).



- Stein-Hölkeskamp, E. (1989). *Adelskultur und Polisgesellschaft. Studien zum griechischen Adel in archaischer und klassischer Zeit* (Stuttgart).
- Sternbach, L. (1894a). 'Appendix Vaticana I-II', *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności. Wydział Filologiczny* 20 (Serya II, Tom V), 171-218.
- Sternbach, L. (1894b). 'Excerpta Vaticana', *WS* 16, 8-37.

