CROWD IN ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREECE[*]

First, it is necessary to define my field clearly. What does the word "crowd" mean? For sociologists it is "an incidental aggregation, held together by a relatively extrinsic and temporary bond", for psychologists it is "a group whose cooperation is relatively occasional and temporary, as opposed to that which is either instinctively or reflectively determined". Even more, "a crowd whose performances are particularly capricious and violent is called a mob."[1] As for social historians and classicists, the picture is quite different. They usually substitute the notion "crowd" for the notion "masses".[2] For historical study, "crowd" may be defined as "group of persons with common traditions intentionally acting together outside existing channels to achieve one or more specifically defined goals".[3]

It is very difficult to form a realistic view of the notion "crowd" concerning the reality of classical Greece, but I will try to show its place in Greek social and political history, with two important limitations. First, my analysis will cover primarily the classical period, i. e. the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Second, I will deal mostly with so-called "political crowds", i. e., people gatherings which influenced the political life of the ancient Greek cities. So, when Plato describes beautiful boys and a crowd of people following behind them (*Charm.* 154 a), this case will interest me only if it has political consequences.

When we turn to the study of ancient Greek history of the archaic and classical periods we find that the crowd (not the masses!) has been a neglected phenomenon. Even Eli Sagan in his provocative book about the

---

[1] *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, ed. by J. M. Baldwin. 1 (Gloucester, Mass. 1960) 246–247.

[2] Two examples, from very different fields: both H. J. Perkins in his well-known book, *The Structured Crowd. Essays in English Social History* (Sussex 1981), and Fergus Millar in *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic* (Ann Arbor 1998), a new and very impressive description of Roman social history, regard «crowd(s)» as a synonym to «the masses». And Fergus Millar places «the *populus Romanus* – or the crowd that represented it – in the center of our picture of the Roman system» (*ibid.* 1).

[3] D. Herder, *Crowd Action in Revolutionary Massachusetts, 1765–1780* (N. Y. 1977) 4.

Athenian democracy did not mention this particular type of public mad-
ness.[4] Only a few scholars paid any attention to crowd actions in that histo-
rical period. In the opinion of Virginia Hunter, "Thucydides evolved a com-
prehensive psychology of mass man";[5] she tried to demonstrate that the
historian took a psychological approach to the problem of the crowd.[6]
Josiah Ober in his studies aims to underline the role of the masses in histor-
ical events. He regards the Cleisthenic revolution as the result of a sponta-
neous mass uprising.[7] But these are rare examples of scholarly interest in
the crowd and crowd activities.

    How is it possible to explain such a lack of scholarly interest? In my
view, there are two reasons. First, this phenomenon was considered less
important in comparison with well organized and very effectively function-
ing city institutions. However, the study of the role of crowds in the political
life of ancient Greece may help to emphasize a high level of organization in
the political sphere in ancient Greece just as Dodds' *The Greeks and Irra-
tional* brought out the prevalence of the rational element in the Greek mind.

    There is, however, another reason for the lack of such studies, namely
the nature of our sources. The pioneers in studying crowd behavior in his-
torical contexts were the students of 18–19th century Europe, such as Gus-
tave Le Bon or George Rudé.[8] They used as their sources police archives,
newspapers etc., i. e., materials which can be called "inside sources". But
the classicists have at their disposal mostly the texts of ancient authors.
Inscriptions and papyri cannot help us, because they deal with a relatively
late period (e. g., the first mention of ὄχλος in inscriptions dates to the end
of the second century BC). So it is mostly "outside sources" that scholars
have to rely upon, and these were not very friendly to the crowd.

    There are two obvious ways to look for appearances of crowds in an-
cient texts: first, to pick out all the words that are connected with crowds,
and to study their usage. Second, to pull out of the context all the situations
which indicate any trace of crowd activity or at least crowd existence.

    My earlier studies were devoted to the terminology of the crowd, first of
all to ὄχλος, which is perhaps the 'key-word' for 'crowd studies'. Partici-

---

[4] Eli Sagan, *The Honey and the Hemlock: Democracy and Paranoia in Ancient Athens
and Modern America* (Princeton 1991).

[5] V. Hunter, "Thucydides, Gorgias, and Mass Psychology", *Hermes* 114 (1986) 428.

[6] V. Hunter, "Thucydides and the Sociology of the Crowd", *CJ* 84 (1988/9) 17–30.

[7] Josiah Ober, *The Athenian Revolution: Essays on Ancient Greek Democracy and Poli-
tical Theory* (Princeton 1996) 43 ff.

[8] Gustave Le Bon, *Psychologie des foules* (Paris 1895); George Rudé, *The Crowd in
History. A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England* (London 1981).

pation of the citizen masses in political life was obviously connected with the development of democracy, and the process lets its clear mark in the appearance of the word ὄχλος, to replace ὅμιλος. Greek society and Greek authors did need a new word to indicate a new reality.

According to a common belief, ὄχλος belonged to the concepts created by the supporters of aristocracy (oligarchy) to denote the poorest strata of the population hostile to aristocracy. However, this opinion seems to me somewhat one-sided. Ὄχλος surfaces for the first time during a period of the first half of the fifth century BC which was active in word coining and appearance of new concepts. At first it was used on a par with ὅμιλος, well-known since Homeric times, which also had the meaning of "crowd", "unorganized gathering". But ὅμιλος had the primary meaning of "connection with something, contact, affinity", whereas ὄχλος belongs to a completely different semantic group ("anxiety, difficulty, inconvenience"). The difference came to light gradually: Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Thucydides used the two words interchangeably, and Herodotus preferred the word ὅμιλος.

Of course, the appearance of the word ὄχλος reflects (in some way) realities of social life in fifth century Athens. But used frequently by the Greek authors in the meaning of "crowd", it can also mean (and did in fact very often mean) the mob, the low strata of citizens, or non-citizens (women, μέτοικοι, slaves), i. e., it assumed social or situational characteristics. And πλῆθος, οἱ πολλοί and even δῆμος may acquire the same meanings.

If there is no word in ancient Greek to designate the crowd *separately* from the mob, maybe there is a word to describe crowd action? Indeed, there is such a word, the verb ἀθροίζω (Attic ἀθροίζω) and the corresponding adjective, ἀθρόος (Attic ἀθρόος) and other derivatives. So, first of all I will examine the usage of these words (not terms!), and then discuss some situations in which unorganized mass gatherings were involved.

TERMINOLOGY

I begin with Pindar. He glorifies king Arcesilaus of Cyrene who "went anon and stood where all the crowd was thronging in the market-place" (ἐν ἀγορᾷ πλήθοντος ὄχλου, *Pyth.* 4. 83 sqq., transl. by Sir John Sandys). And the crowd problem stood more seriously in this period of wider and wider citizen participation in public affairs.

Tragedy

The Athenian theater was not only a place of regular public gatherings, it was a place where people gatherings were spoken about. Aeschylus had

some interest in politically important gatherings. For him "crowd" is usual-
ly a crowd of warriors (*Suppl.* 182; *Pers.* 42, 53, etc.), enemies (*Sept.* 35),
Scythians (*Prometh.* 417). Sophocles mentions "the wild crowd" (ἀγρώ-
στης ὄχλος) in a fragment of the *Alexander* (fr. 91 Nauck = fr. 94 Pearson)
and in the *Trachinians* a great crowd (πολύς... ὄχλος) of the Trachinians
gathered ἐν μέσῃ Τραχινίων ἀγορᾷ (423 sq.), which, of course, alludes to
the Assembly.

The theater of Euripides was, to paraphrase the famous *Gettysburg Ad-
dress* of President Lincoln, for the people and of the people, and, naturally,
"the people" here means "the Athenian citizens". It is not surprising that his
plays contain many mentions of people gatherings. Euripides often uses
ὄχλος, ἀθροίζω and its derivatives, sometimes ὅμιλος, πλῆθος, and other
words for their designation. Surely, these words do not primarily and neces-
sarily designate non-organized crowds. Ὄχλος sometimes describes a
throng of servants (*Hippol.* 842; *Heracl.* 976), warriors (*Hecub.* 521; *Rhes.*
312 sq.), ὅμιλος one of sailors (ναύταν... ὅμιλον – *Hec.* 921), ἀθροίζω
one of suppliants near Zeus' altar (*Heraclid.* 122). The cyclops, watching
Odysseus and his friends, exclaims:

> Hullo! what's this here rabble (ὄχλος) at my door?
> Have thieves or pirates run their ship ashore?
> 　　　　　　　　　　(*Cycl.* 222 sq., transl. by A. S. Way)

Any crowd, any gathering is a specific place of danger for women.
Iolaus warns:

> ... for we think shame to let young girls
> Stand, a crowd's gazing-stock, on altar-steps.
> 　　　　　　　　　　　　(*Heraclid.* 43 sq.)

Helen is sure that "to pass mid throngs baseemeth maidens not (εἰς
ὄχλον ἔρπειν παρθένοισιν οὐ καλόν)" (*Orest.* 108). Antigone is even
more decisive: "I shrink from throngs! (αἰδούμεθ' ὄχλον)" (*Phoin.* 1276).[9]
And, of course, we should remember the role which the throng of Argives
played in Iphigenia's fate.[10]

But it is not a specific women's problem. Even Agamemnon is afraid of
a crowd, and Hippolytus is very proud that he cannot παρ' ὄχλῳ μουσικώ-
τερος λέγειν (*Hippol.* 988 sq.). This crowd is, of course, quite organized.
Tyndareus is in a hurry εἰς ἔκκλητον Ἀργεῖον ὄχλον to learn about Ores-

---

[9] Cf. *Iph. Aul.* 1338; *Hippol.* 213 sq., etc.
[10] Εὐθὺς Ἀργείων ὄχλος ἠθροίζεθ' (*Iph. Aul.* 1546 sq.). It means here all the Greek forces
on their way to Troy.

tes' fate (*Orest.* 612; cp. 119, 1280, etc.). The Argives gathered on the hill are expected to make a decision about Orestes' fate (*Orest.* 871 sqq.; 884 sqq.). It is a clear allusion to the Ecclesia.

So for Euripides "a crowd" means first of all the δῆμος, the citizen body; only occasionally, when dealing with a non-polis context, it means unorganized gathering which can be dangerous for a concrete person, but absolutely not important in the political life.

Comedy

Can Aristophanes, a real "insider" in everyday life of rank-and-file Athenian citizens, help us? His complaints about noisy urban life are well-known: that of Dicaeopolis comments in the *Acharnians* on the crowding around at the Pnyx and the noise in the market place, typical signs of the city – ἄστυ (33 sqq.). The crowd (the throng of warriors) to the poet is comparable to locusts (*Ach.* 150). But everyone who expects to see descriptions of crowds in Aristophanes' plays will be greatly surprised. Where are they? Let us take a closer look.

First of all, official gatherings: in the *Frogs* Aristophanes uses twice the expression "crowded people" (λαῶν ὄχλος) to designate people celebrating a religious festival (676 sq., 219). And even more: when Dicaeopolis arranges his private Dionysia, where only he and his family participate, he is afraid of this ὄχλος (*Ach.* 257 sq.).[11] Of course, this is a comic exaggeration, but obviously the Dionysia were very crowded.

In the *Ecclesiazusae* Chremes describes the crowd of Athenian women gathered in the Pnyx, which he regards as a crowd of shoemakers:

> ... There gathered such a crowd
> About the Pnyx, you never saw the like...
> ...πλεῖστος ἀνθρώπων ὄχλος,
> ὅσος οὐδεπώποτ᾽, ἦλθ᾽ ἀθρόος ἐς τὴν Πύκνα.
> (383 sq., transl. by B. B. Rogers)

Later Blepyrus again mentions the ὄχλος gathered in the Ecclesia (393).

In the *Knights* the Sausage-seller describes to Demos the gathering of sellers in the Athenian agora (850 sqq.). But this concerns everyday market activity and has no political importance.

---

[11] The commentator of the beginning of the 20th century explained *ad loc.*: "The humour lies in the speaking of three or four persons as if they were the crowd usual at this festival, during which pickpockets seem to have driven a roaring trade" (Aristophanes, *The Acharnians*. With introd., transl. and comm. by J. M. Starkie [London 1909, ²1962]). The same situation (and attitude) is repeated in the *Peace*: the crowd is the best place for pickpockets (731).

There are two mentions of crowd activities out of public places. In the *Wasps* (1334) the Guest (Sympotes) threatens Phylocleon to come with all the throng of those aggrieved by him. The Guest means, that Philocleon's private house would become the place of probable crowd gathering, but, of course, his threats were virtual enough. In the latest Aristophanes' comedy, *Plutus*, we in fact can see crowd in an "unofficial" place. Cario describes Plutus coming to Chremylus' house with a great crowd (ὄχλος), consisting of just men (οἱ δίκαιοι), but poor before (*Plut*. 749 sq.).

To sum up, in Aristophanes' comedies the description of people's gatherings occurs very rarely. Aristophanes (and his characters) could have imagined a crowd, but only in the Pnyx,[12] or agora, i. e. in the "official" places. In his latest play, however, the poet is able to imagine mass gatherings in a non-official area. It is difficult to decide whether it was reaction to some social and ideological changes or something else. Aristophanes' crowd is primarily an official gathering of citizens.

Historiography

The *Histories* of Herodotus are full of mass actions: his purpose was to describe "the great and the wonderful actions of the Greeks and the barbarians" (1. 1), and these ἔργα definitely demanded the masses to participate. But this does not really mean that Herodotus was in any way interested in spontaneous gatherings of inhabitants of the Greek cities. He describes a great throng (πολλὸς ὅμιλος) of the Persian warriors plundering Sardis (1. 88. 3); he notes that during the siege of Babylon Cyrus managed to divide the Gindes river into many trenches because he had a great throng of warriors at his disposal (1. 189. 4). However, it is very difficult to find in the *Histories* any mention of crowd acting in a Greek polis. Only extraordinary situation, such as Xerxes' invasion, results in appearing of such a crowd (e.g. ὅμιλος of the Phocians ascending the heights of Parnassus in order to escape the Persians – 8. 32. 1). But usually crowding is more usual for the barbarians: e.g. the crowd of men surrounding the maidens during the ritual of "selling the brides" in Illyria (1. 196. 1).

Herodotus' terminology differs from those of posterior authors. He uses ὄχλος only once, but in the meaning of "a trouble" (1. 86. 5), he uses ἀθροίζω and its derivatives only four times, and his favorite word to designate any multitude is ὅμιλος (21 times), e.g. all the multitude of Persian

---

[12] The poet emphasized the fact that the masses of Athenian citizen started to gather at the Pnyx after introducing and increasing payments for visiting the Ecclesia (*Eccl*. 183 sqq.; 289 sqq.; 380 sqq.; *Plut*. 329 sqq., etc.).

allies (τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων ὁ πᾶς ὅμιλος) fleeing away after the battle of Plataeae (9. 67; *cf.* 9. 70. 1). But ὅμιλος for Herodotus was primarily a mob, not a crowd, and it becomes clear from his famous "dispute of the three Persians" where Megabyzus condemns the multitude (πλῆθος): "Nothing is more foolish and violent than a useless mob (ὅμιλος)" (3. 81. 1, transl. by A. D. Godley).

So, for Herodotus crowd, unlike mob, was neither a political problem nor a sphere of his particular interest.

Thucydides was the historian of a war, and the cases of mass gatherings in his work are first of all those of military men, soldiers, or military ships. Ὄχλος for the historian usually means disordered military men (as ὅμιλος was);[13] wherever he uses the verb ἀθροίζω and its derivatives he deals with the military events.[14]

The historian used ὄχλος and ὅμιλος interchangeably to designate the crowd at religious processions (6. 57. 2) and ceremonies (2. 36. 4; 6. 30. 2 and 32. 2). He used the same words (ὄχλος, ὅμιλος) to designate the mob. Both words could denote the whole δῆμος, but only when it manifested the worst features specific for a mob or when reference was made to an excited mass of people or the worst part of the Athenian δῆμος (ναυτικὸς ὄχλος) (6. 20. 4; 7. 62. 2; 8. 72. 2). Thucydides often used both ὄχλος and ὅμιλος as derogatory synonyms for δῆμος. The real situation may be distorted to please ὄχλος *(= δῆμος)*. This is what Nicias feared (7. 8. 2). Ὄχλος (= δῆμος) headed by demagogues may do wicked things. This is what Alcibiades said to the Spartans (6. 89. 5).

Δῆμος may turn into ὄχλος by falling into disarray in the course of hostilities or by losing common sense in the time of peace and acting like a mob. Δῆμος is a regular population of a polis, and if "the cities in Sicily are peopled by motley rabbles (ὄχλοις τε γὰρ ξυμμείκτοις πολυανδροῦσιν)" (6. 17. 2), and this mob has no political culture (6. 17. 4), it is the sign of their weakness, which makes them somewhat similar to the barbarians. For Thucydides δῆμος and ὄχλος were two sides of the activity of a civic com-

---

[13] E.g. 4. 56. 1; 126. 1; 8. 25. 4. In his speech Brasidas asked his warriors to maintain combat order (τάξις); on the contrary, enemy barbaric troops were characterized by him as a rabble (ὄχλοι) (4. 126. 6). Disordered battle ships are ὄχλος too (1. 49. 3; 2. 88. 2; 7. 62. 1). The mass of disorganized Athenian troops at Sicily became the crowd and was characterized as ὄχλος by the historian (7. 75. 5). For ὅμιλος in military context see: 2. 31. 2; 98. 4; 100. 6; 3. 1; 4. 112. 3; 124. 1; 125. 2; 7. 58. 4.

[14] Thucydides often used ἀθρόοι to characterize military forces (1. 11. 2; 2. 31. 2; 39. 3; 3. 107. 1; 107. 4; 4. 76. 4 sq.; 7. 33. 6, etc.).

munity – normative and not specific for citizens. That is why ὄχλος for the historian was mostly the mob. His expression "as the mob (ὄχλος, ὅμιλος) likes to do (φιλεῖ ποιεῖν)" (2. 65. 4; 6. 28. 3; 63. 2) shows his attitude to the lower strata of Athenian citizenry and does not characterize, either positively or negatively, his attitude to mass gatherings.[15]

All mass civil gatherings described by Thucydides were the organized ones: the religious festivals, the audiences of political speeches (e.g. 4. 106. 1). They have their appropriate place in the city (agora, Kerameikos, Panathenaic way, etc.); maybe only farewell ceremony to the Sicilian expedition took place not in appropriate place, but simply near Piraeus' harbor (6. 30. 1 – 31. 1; 32. 1–2).

To compare with that of Thucydides, there are some differences in Xenophon's attitude to crowd. Thucydides' related terminology differs from Xenophon's one, but that is not very important. Like Thucydides before him, Xenophon often uses ἀθροίζω and ἀθρόος to designate a compact mass or mass formation of infantry warriors (*Hell.* 5. 1. 7; 1. 12; 2. 23; 2. 24; 2. 38, etc.), chariots (*Hell.* 4. 1. 19), or combat ships (*Hell.* 1. 1. 13; 3. 17; 6. 3; 6. 33; 2. 1. 28; 1. 31; 4. 8. 6; 7. 1. 4). Unlike Thucydides, Xenophon did not use the word ὅμιλος at all. In the *Anabasis* he uses ὄχλος mostly to designate an army or part of it. For Xenophon ὄχλος often is no more than *terminus technicus* which designates the non-combatants, the camp-followers (*Anab.* 3. 3. 6; 3. 4. 26; 4. 3. 15, 26 sq.; 5. 4. 34; cf. *Hell.* 6. 2. 23; *Peri Hippikes* 2. 5). But he clearly distinguishes captive slaves from this mass (*Anab.* 6. 5. 3). Ὄχλος means the entire barbaric (not Greek!) army too (*Anab.* 2. 5. 9; 4. 1. 20); in the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon uses this word to designate the armies of Cyrus' enemies (*Cyr.* 5. 2. 35; 4. 48; 5. 4). Like for Thucydides, for Xenophon ὄχλος means an unorganized or disorganized army (*Cyr.* 4. 2. 6; 5. 2. 35; 6. 1. 26; *Anab.* 2. 5. 9; 7. 1. 18; *Cyneget.* 17. 5).

There is only one exception, but a very specific one. The retreating Argive army was transformed into ὄχλος (*Hell.* 4. 4. 11: 392 BC), but the Spartan army retreated in the battle of Leuctra, as Xenophon notes, under the pressure of the ὄχλος of the Thebans (*Hell.* 6. 4. 14)! And this is the only place in Xenophon's works when ὄχλος in a military context loses its technical meaning and becomes a very emotionally colored word. Surely,

[15] It's just like A. W. Gomme who notes (ad 1. 80. 2) that ὄχλος "has not necessarily a derogatory sense, as often asserted. It depends on the context, as with our word 'crowd'" (A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* I [Oxford 1945] 247.)

for Xenophon, who was a Laconophile, the Spartan army could not be an ὄχλος in any case.

Throng in the battle-field, "crowd-in-arms" was quite a usual thing. But what about non-military contexts, more interesting for us? And the *Hellenica* gives us some interesting examples.

Callicratidas, a Spartan commander, gathered the assembly of the Milesians (*Hell.* 1. 6. 8): it is an example of an organized gathering in special, not ordinary circumstances. Xenophon also mentions everyday people gatherings (ὄχλος) in Piraeus (*Hell.* 1. 3. 22), and some special public events. The crowd (mob?) (ὄχλος) gathered to meet Alcibiades (*Hell.* 1. 4. 13) or Theramenes and his embassy (*Hell.* 2. 2. 21). During the discussion on the case of generals, the victors at Arginusae, the mob (ὄχλος, i. e. the majority of the Assembly) demanded to convict the generals immediately (*Hell.* 1. 7. 13).

Is it really possible to speak about any special social importance of crowds in Xenophon's works? Maybe not, because for Xenohon the mob, not the crowd, was the important participant of the Athenian political life. Of course, there is a clear opposition in the *Memorabilia* of being in crowds (ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις) and being in private companies (ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις ὁμιλίαις) (3. 7. 5).[16] But Socrates' ὄχλοι are surely regular ones, and Socrates calls their representatives: "It is the fullers among them or the shoemakers or the carpenters or the smiths or the farmers or the merchants or those who barter in the agora and worry about what they can buy for less and sell for more whom you feel shame before? For it is from all of these that the assembly is composed" (3. 7. 6, transl. by Amy L. Bonnette). The mob (ὄχλος, δῆμος) demanded equality, not meritocracy (*Cyr.* 2. 2. 21), and Xenophon surely opposed such a demand. For the historian ὄχλος in non-military contexts was usually not more than a synonym for δῆμος, sometimes with a negative coloring.

For Xenophon's ὄχλος there was only one "prohibited field": the citizens of Sparta, the ὅμοιοι could not be named "the crowd" or "the mob" in any sense and in any case.[17] The Spartan state for Xenophon, like the ideal state for Plato, did not and should not have any social and political disorder. But the role of these "disorder-making elements" (and they may be designated as ὄχλος, or πλῆθος, or δῆμος) was obvious for Athens, in any case, from Xenophon's point of view. But he did not distinguish the crowd activities from that of the mob and had the same attitude to both of them.

---

[16] There are some other related quotations, e.g. Hiero was afraid of the crowd when he became a tyrant (*Hier.* 6. 4). Cf. *Symp.* 2. 18; *Mem.* 1. 1. 14.

[17] In *Hell.* 3. 3. 7 ὄχλος should mean the lowest strata of non-citizen population.

In any case Xenophon was the first Greek historian who paid attention to the civil unorganized mass gatherings. Of course, they were not very important for him, it was just a new detail of the Athenian political landscape. It is interesting that Piraeus was a place for such a type of gatherings. But Piraeus was not the center of the Athenian political life, and that is why it attracted ancient author's attention very rarely, only in the extraordinary cases.

Let us check the usage of the word ὄχλος, on the one hand, and the notion crowd, on the other, in the treatise *How to survive under siege* of Aeneas Tacticus, an author from Arcadia (a rare example of a non-Athenian author!) of the mid-fourth century BC. For Aeneas ὄχλος is an unorganized (31. 27) or not the best part of the army (1, 9). In non-military contexts ὄχλος in Aeneas' work usually means population in general (22. 23), πλῆθος designates the mass of citizens (14. 1).

Aeneas Tacticus uses ὄχλος to designate people's gatherings too, and it is important that he mentions organized gatherings: sport contests (torch-races, horse-races, etc.), mass religious ceremonies (17. 1, 6). One may expect that Aeneas would be afraid of crowd activities. But being a general he was not afraid of any disturbances in the city. The only occasion when he describes spontaneous crowd activities is the defense of Sparta against the Thebans by self-organized groups of the Spartans (2. 2).

Orators

Isocrates who founded in 392 BC his school of rhetoric in Athens was not a public orator himself. The reason for that he gives in the *Philippus*: "I was not given a strong enough voice nor sufficient assurance to deal with the mob (ὄχλος)" (Isocr. 5. 81, transl. by G. Norlin). And in another speech Isocrates claims to be a very artificial orator who has no courage to speak to the crowd (ὄχλος) (Isocr. 15. 192). For Isocrates the lowest strata of the city population is the crowd (mob), and he uses ὄχλος, πλῆθος, οἱ πολλοί interchangeably (2. 16, 48–49; cf. 6. 78; 18. 9). He advises Nicocles «not to allow the multitude (ὄχλος) either to do or to suffer outrage» (Isocr. 2. 16, transl. by G. Norlin). Isocrates contrasts the monarch to the demagogue in the terms of their audience, and ὄχλος is the audience of the latter (3. 21). In his early speech *Busiris* he writes about the necessity of taming of crowd (ὄχλος) to obey to any direction of the authorities (11. 26).

So for Isocrates condemnation of ὄχλος became an important ideological topos. In his vocabulary this word meant usually the mob, but Isocrates never spoke at the Assembly. Speaking at the Assembly (or composing speeches for appearances in court) orators, regardless of their

political convictions, could not freely display their arrogant attitude towards their audiences. Both Demosthenes (19. 206) and Aeschines (1. 126 and 2. 99) accused each other that their political opponent perceived the Athenian citizens as ὄχλος, i. e. 'mob' in this context. It is natural that speakers, sensitive to the mood of the Ecclesia and dicasts, while criticizing actions and moods of the δῆμος, could not overstep the line and lose the support of their audience. But what did they say about gatherings? Usual gathering for the orators is a theater performance (Dem. 21. 59). Isocrates even condemns masses, sleeping during the performances (Isocr. 12. 263). But there are no unofficial *political gatherings* in their works. So, there should be no mob, and there was really no crowd in the Attic orators' speeches. But what was instead? And there are some traces of this imperceptible feature.

Demosthenes accuses Meidias that "he could affront a whole tribe or the Council or some class of citizens (ἔθνος) and harass vast multitudes of you (the audience – πολλοὺς ἀθρόους ὑμῶν) at once" (*In Meid.* 131, transl. by J. H. Vince). In another speech Demosthenes enumerates the actions of Philip, and let his audience realize the result: "But, little by little... the foundation is sapped and the integrity of public life collapses (...ὑπορ-ρέουσα ἀθρόος τῇ πόλει βλάβη γίγνεται) (*De falsa legat.* 228). Maybe this integrity, this polis collectivism made crowd activities difficult, if not impossible.

Philosophy

It is interesting that there is no mention of crowd(s) and crowd activities in Pseudo-Xenophon's *Athenaion politeia*, and only one mention of ὄχλος there (2. 10). But here ὄχλος obviously means δῆμος. Even the author of this anti-democratic pamphlet could not find any sign of crowd activities in the Athenian political life. But the situation changed after the Peloponnesian war.

Since the beginning of the fourth century BC ὄχλος became an important word in the vocabulary of the philosophers. Plato often uses ὄχλος in his works, moreover, its meaning is often very close to that of πλῆθος and δῆμος;[18] but ὄχλος is usually more emotionally colored. Surely, Plato uses ὄχλος simply to designate people gatherings, e.g. a crowd of people, fol-

---

[18] Plato used πλῆθος and δῆμος as synonyms: as an example one may refer to the speech of Alcibiades in *Symposium* (215 a – 222 b). See S. Salkever, *Finding the Mean: Theory and Practice in Aristotelian Political Philosophy* (Princeton 1990) p. 222. Πλῆθος and ὄχλος are used interchangeably in the *Politicus* (304 c–d).

lowing beautiful boys (*Charm.* 154 a), the multitude of Egyptian children (*Leg.* 819 a–b), etc. It is necessary to avoid people's gatherings as Apollodorus explains that he had not visited a symposium the day before, φοβη-θεὶς τὸν ὄχλον, and came this day (*Symp.* 174 a). And that was the typical position.

But in Plato's works ὄχλος acquired philosophical meaning too. In the *Timaeus* ὄχλος (opposite to λόγος) designates disorder, and the World-Artificer (Demiurge) speaks about the purpose of creation of the souls "as dominating by force of reason (λόγος) that burdensome mass (ἄλογος ὄχ-λος) which afterwards adhered to him of fire and water and earth and air, a mass tumultuous and irrational, returns again to the semblance of his first and best state" (*Tim.* 42 c–d). Ὄχλος means not only the absence of order in the world, but also disorder in the state.

For Plato ὄχλος is not only the crowd or even the mob, hated by and hostile to the philosopher, but the great strong beast, whose desires the sophists try to please (*Resp.* 493 a–c). Plato hated the power of "the mob-like beast" (ὀχλῶδες θηρίον) (*Resp.* 590 b). But most of all Plato hated the jury courts: the worst features of the Athenians become clear "in the law-courts and in any public gatherings" (ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ὄχλοις) (*Gorg.* 454 b, e, 455 a). The philosopher feels no more respect to the members of the Assembly; they are charmed by the orators just like a sorcerer charms snakes, tarantulas and scorpions (*Euthyd.* 290 a). And again Plato uses the word ὄχλος τo designate the courts and the Assembly meetings. For Plato there is no difference between organized and unorganized gatherings. Every crowd – both legitimated or not – is plain evil for him.

Plato is interested in such problems as to what extent should the crowd (mob) be obedient, is it possible to give it any knowledge, and what kind of knowledge should it receive. In the *Philebus* Socrates asks: "Shall I, like a doorkeeper who is pushed and hustled by a mob (ὑπ' ὄχλου), give up, open the door, and let all the kinds of knowledge stream in, the impure mingling with the pure?" (62 c, transl. by H. N. Fowler). For Plato, even if the crowd (mob) imagines that it understands harmony and rhetoric, it is not really so (*Leg.* 670 b). The multitude (πλῆθος) in any case cannot think in a philosophical manner (*Resp.* 493 e; cf. *Politic.* 292 e, 297 e, 300 e), ὄχλος is something opposed to the philosophers (*Euthyd.* 304 d). And in the *Gorgias* Socrates asks Gorgias to agree that 'to the crowd' (ὄχλος) means 'to the ignorant' (*Gorg.* 459 a).

But to make the state function properly, the crowd (more precisely, the mob) should be taught, and imagination is the only way to do it. Plato was

sure that it was rhetoric which gave the opportunity to convince the crowd (mob) through imagination. It is important, because the crowd cannot understand abstract ideas of justice and injustice, one can force the crowd to believe (*Gorg.* 454 e – 455 a) with the help of discipline (*Leg.* 700 c).

The crowd shouldn't be influenced by "a tyrannical person", tragic poets, orators in courts and assemblies. The law-giver should use both force and persuasion for the crowd. To sum up everything, for Plato any crowd was the mob.

Aristotle uses the word ὄχλος rather often (eleven times – in the *Politics*, three – in the *Rhetoric*). Absence of this word in the *Athenaion politeia* is quite reasonable: the purpose of the *Athenaion politeia* was to describe the realities of Athenian political history and state order, and its audience should be wide enough. That's why Aristotle prefers to use more neutral words – πλῆθος, οἱ πολλοί.

In the *Rhetoric* the philosopher uses the word ὄχλος quite in Platonic sense: Aristotle notes that an illiterate ὄχλος can comprehend rather simple methods of influence better than educated one does, using the citation of Euripides (παρ᾽ ὄχλῳ μουσικώτερος λέγειν: *Hippol.* 989): "It is this that makes the ignorant more persuasive than the educated in the presence of crowds; as the poets say, «the ignorant are more skilled in speaking before a mob»" (*Rhet.* 1395 b 28).

In the *Politics* Aristotle often uses ὄχλος as a social term, e.g. to designate a crowd of women and servants (1265 a 17), citizens of non-aristocratic origin in the aristocratic state (1303 b 28 sqq.), the "worst" citizens who intended to take a share in the property of convicts (1230 a 10). Aristotle warns against predomination of the "market crowd" (ἀγοραῖος ὄχλος) over the majority of citizens (πλῆθος) who live far from the political center of the community (1319 a 37). According to his opinion, the ναυτικὸς ὄχλος should not get the right of citizenship (1327 b 37).

But sometimes Aristotle uses both ὄχλος and πλῆθος το designate the entire population (*Pol.* 1278 a 32), or the entire citizen body (*Pol.* 1286 a 31, 1311 a 13). Such usage is typical for Plato too, but, unlike Plato, Aristotle's expressions have no negative connotations. On the contrary, Aristotle noted that "for this reason (to give judgments) in many cases a crowd (ὄχλος) judges better than any single person" (*Pol.* 1286 a 31 sq., transl. by H. Rackham). And even more, he designates not only his contemporaries, but also the citizens of the πάτριος πολιτεία as ὄχλος (*Pol.* 1286 a).

Aristotle regards ὄχλος (crowd) as a social reality of both contemporary epoch and even of the past. In the works of Aristotle ὄχλος is not so emotionally coloured and does not have such a negative connotation as it

does in Plato and Isocrates. For Aristotle the citizens of pre-Solonic Athens (πάτριος πολιτεία) are also ὄχλος. So ὄχλος became a neutral 'scientific' term denoting mostly the mob: ἀγοραῖος ὄχλος (*Pol.* 1319 a 37), ναυτικὸς ὄχλος (*Pol.* 1327 b 37). Aristotle and after him all the Peripatetics used the word ὄχλος as a neutral term designating the lower strata of the citizens as well as whole civic community. So, in their writings ὄχλος lost ideological coloring and acquired social characteristics. But Aristotle regarded it as the term for the part of city population. Unorganized gatherings were of no interest for Aristotle, were not discussed in his sociology, and we can imagine the only reason for it: crowd activities were very rare and had no importance for the Greek political life in that period and before it.

CROWD CASES

So, we cannot regard ὄχλος as a clear sign of crowd. In most cases ὄχλος designates either the mob, or even the people.

I will try to analyze the alleged cases of crowd activities in pre-Hellenistic Greece. My selection may not be comprehensive, but nevertheless the small number of the cases in which the crowd is mentioned in our sources speaks for itself.

It is necessary to note that an unorganized mass gathering was an extremely rare phenomenon for archaic Greece, and thus it would be reasonable to turn to the examination of assemblies.[19] The assemblies were quite usual social phenomenon in Homeric time. They could have been summoned by the king or by the nobles and did not meet regularly (as in Ithaca – *Od.* 2. 26–27). Agora (town-square or meeting place) already existed in that period.[20]

The assemblies consisted of citizens-warriors, but were not over-organized.[21] The nobility dominated there as we can see in the case of Thersites. Homeric Thersites insults Agamemnon at the assembly of warriors. An episode with Thersites in the "Iliad" (2, 211–277) is known enough. Thersites is a representative of the mass of warriors (πληθύς – 2. 143, 278,

---

[19] See about early Greek assemblies: Chester Starr, *The Birth of Athenian Democracy. The Assembly in the Fifth Century BC* (New York – Oxford 1990) 6.

[20] Hans van Wees, *State Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam 1992) 29, with all the mentions of agora in the Iliad.

[21] J. V. Luce, The Polis in Homer and Hesiod, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 78 C, No. 1 (Dublin 1978) 10.

δῆμος 2. 198).[22] But there is no trace of any type of crowd action in this case as well. Nobody supports Thersites, and his protest is only a verbal act, nothing more.

As for the archaic period, it's a pity that we have (as usual!) only Athenian material at our disposal. The earliest case available is about the Cylon's plot, in suppression of which the Athenian δῆμος took part. Indeed, as Thucydides reports (1. 126. 7), "all together" (πανδημεί) they besieged Cylon and his accomplices on the Acropolis. But the usage of this term doesn't necessarily mean spontaneous and non-arranged activity of the δῆμος. For example, Thucidides uses the same very term πανδημεί while reporting about departing of all the Spartan troops, which can hardly be described as badly arranged, or about mass participation of the Athenians in the construction of the so-called Long Walls (1. 90. 3), etc. When Cylon occupied the Acropolis in 636 or 632 BC, there was nothing like general rising, and the δῆμος supported Megacles, the archon (Hdt 5. 71; Thuc. 1. 126–127).[23] It is not by chance that we have such a strong tradition about Alcmaeonids' filth. The Alcmaeonids were the leaders, but not the leaders of a revolt, the leaders of a protest of the Athenians against an attempt to seize the tyrannical power. Here we can see the mobilization of those Athenians who don't support the tyranny rather than spontaneous activity of the people. The crowd as it was has not yet emerged.[24]

Athenian revolt in 508/7 BC

The Athenian democracy began with resistance of the Athenians to Cleomenes and Isagoras in 508/7 BC. Revolt of the Athenians against Cleomenes and Isagoras in 508/7 BC could be regarded as a crowd action with more reasons. This event has brought to life a lot of interpretations and comments,[25] but our interest lies in a very narrow field, i. e. in the level of

---

[22] Even his name (from θέρσος 'rashness') is a meaning one. See G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary* I (Cambridge 1985) 138.

[23] A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London 1956) 84; cf. H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (München 1967) Bd. I, 41–43; Bd II, 539; M. Lang. "Kylonian Conspiracy". *CPH* 62 (1967) 243–249; K.-W. Welwei. *Athen. Vom neolitischen Siedlungsplatz zum archaischen Grosspolis* (Darmstadt 1992) 133–137.

[24] Raphael Sealey in his provocative article was able to imagine (at least as one of the possible things) "general strike" or "acts of rebellion" which Solon could have organized: R. Sealey, "Regionalism in Archaic Athens", *Historia* 9 (1960) 159. But there are no traces of such type of activities in our sources.

[25] A recent discussion between Kurt Raaflaub and Josiah Ober has also touched this case. See: K. Raaflaub, "Power in the Hands of the People: Foundations of Athenian Democracy".

organization of this action. Let us check our sources from this particular point of view, starting from Herodotus.

> ...Having come he (Cleomenes) banished seven hundred Athenian house-holds named for him by Isagoras, to take away the curse. Having so done he next essayed to dissolve the Council, entrusting the offices of governance to Isagoras' faction. But the Council resisted him and would not consent (ἀντισταθείσης δὲ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ οὐ βουλομένης πείθεσθαι); where-upon Cleomenes and Isagoras and his partisans seized the acropolis. The rest of the Athenians united (Ἀθηναίων οἱ λοιποὶ τὰ αὐτὰ φρονήσαντες) and besieged them for two days; and on the third they departed out of the country on the treaty, as many of them as were Lacedaemonians (Hdt. 5. 72, transl. by A. D. Godley).

Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* is not of great interest for our case. Chorus of the Athenian men remembers "the old golden days", when Cleomenes "de-parted surrendering his arms to me" (*Lys*. 277, transl. by H. Sommerstein).

Aristotle's account is based on that of Herodotus, but the author of the *Athenaion politeia* adds some more details:

> Cleisthenes secretly withdrew, and Cleomenes with a few troops proceeded to expel as accursed seven hundred Athenian households; and having ac-complished this he tried to put down the Council and set up Isagoras and three hundred of his friends with him in sovereign power over the state. But the Council resisted and the multitude banded together (τῆς δὲ βουλῆς ἀντιστάσης καὶ συναθροισθέντος τοῦ πλήθους), so the forces of Cleo-menes and Isagoras took refuge in the Acropolis, and the people (δῆμος) invested it and laid siege to it for two days. On the third day they let Cleo-menes and his comrades go away under a truce, and sent for Cleisthenes and the other exiles to go back (*Ath. pol.* 20. 3, transl. by H. Ruckham).

The problem is who organized Athenian citizen masses to upraise against Cleomenes' and Isagoras' rule?

J. Ober describes 'the Cleisthenic revolution' as follows: "The Athe-nian siege of the Acropolis in 508/7 is best understood as a riot – a violent and more or less spontaneous uprising by a large number of Athenian citi-

---

in: I. Morris, K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges* / Eds. I. Mor-ris and K. Raaflaub (Dubuque, Iowa 1997 – Archaeological Institute of America. Colloquia and Conference Papers, No. 2, 1997) 31–66; J. Ober, "Revolution Matters: Democracy as Demotic Action (A Response to Kurt A. Raaflaub)", *ibid.*, 67–85; K. Raaflaub, "The Thetes and Democracy (A Response to Josiah Ober)", *ibid.*, 87–103. As a result of this discussion the active part played by the mass of Athenian δῆμος in the political struggle of the end of the sixth century BC became obvious, but the fact of their spontaneous revolt has not been proved.

zens".[26] And further: "The 'constitution of Cleisthenes' channeled the energy of the demos' self-defining riot into a stable and workable form of government".[27] Ober makes a comparison, obvious for him, with the mass acting during the French revolution, "in this case, by rioting and besieging the Bastille".[28]

Ober points to usage of the passive participle of the verb συναθροίζω in the *Athenaion politeia* 20. 3. Analyzing Athenians' struggle against Cleomenes and Isagoras in 508/7, he translates "the boule resisted and the mob gathered itself together (συναθροισθέντος τοῦ πλήθους)".[29] This translation presupposes real crowd activities, even riots. Ober is obviously right asserting that passive participle συναθροισθέντος has a reflexive rather than a passive meaning, but in his translation the situation seems to be more "revolution-like" than Aristotle would like to tell us about. In H. Ruckham's translation in the *Loeb* series the situation is even more dramatized: "But the Council resisted and the multitude banded together". But Aristotle uses the participle συναθροισθείς in the *Athenaion politeia* twice more, describing assembling of the Council in the course of Ephialtes' reforms (25. 4), and gathering the force from the city in agora during the struggle against the Thirty (38. 1). In all three cases we can see public gatherings in extraordinary situations, but not riots.

One should also take into account an extremely low urbanization level in Athens of that period, which doesn't suppose large masses of citizens.[30] It would be more justified to speak about a kind of mobilization of citizens-warriors in order to protect the polis' autonomy.[31]

But, on the other hand, was the Athenian δῆμος ready enough to act independently and simultaneously? Only six years before this revolt Hipparchus was killed. Thucydides in the tyrannycide-excursus describes that after killing Hipparchus "Aristogiton escaped the guards at the moment, through the crowd running up, but was afterwards taken and executed" (*Thuc.* 6. 57. 4, transl. by R. Crowley, ed. by R. Strassler). This crowd (ὄχλος) consisted of the citizens, taking part in Panathenaic procession (6. 57. 2) on the Panathenaic way in the northern part of the Athenian agora. This gathering

---

[26] Josiah Ober, *The Athenian Revolution* (see n. 7), 43. But see Peter Rhodes' doubts of the possibility of such a spontaneous mass action in late sixth century Athens (P. J. Rhodes, "How to Study Athenian Democracy", in: *Polis* 15 [1998] 76).

[27] Ober, *The Athenian Revolution*, 51–52.

[28] *Ibid.* 48.

[29] *Ibid.* 45.

[30] Raaflaub, *Power in the Hands of the People*, 42.

[31] *Ibid.* 43.

was obviously an organized one (the religious procession); that's why it was rather easy for Hippias to take control over the situation after killing of Hipparchus (6. 58. 1–2). This case is really a unique one: the organized gathering did not become disorganized even in this extraordinary situation. So it is very difficult to believe that social psychology of the Athenian δῆμος changed so drastically during this short period of time. So the revolt against Cleomenes and Isagoras must have had its leader or leaders.

Spontaneous actions of the Athenian citizens against Cylon and Isagoras were something like self-mobilization of the citizen army. I am not sure whether the level of democratic consciousness of the Athenians of the archaic period was high enough to make the citizens rise against the people violating legal decisions, but I am sure of the level of their "hoplite" consciousness in purpose to defend their city.

Athens during the Peloponnesian war

The Peloponnesian war was a real proof test for city institutions of many Greek poleis. But I could find no sure trace of crowd activities, city riots and so on.

One may suggest that crowd took part in some political events and processes that were described by Thucydides. Corcyrean strife is the best possible example. But even in this case we can see only the activities of quite organized political groups of the oligarchs and democrats which successfully but not very spontaneously eliminated one another (3. 70–81; 4. 46–48). It means that Thucydides could not even imagine any crowd activities in the peak of civil strife, as we can see in his description of events in Corcyra (3. 70–81). *Stasis*, civil discord, did not presuppose any participation of unorganized mass gatherings. On the contrary, *stasis* was an unwanted, but quite logical result of escalation of the regular political struggle in the city.[32] Crowd as a political phenomenon did not exist for Thucydides, and crowd activities, in his opinion, did not influence the political life of Greek cities.

Meanwhile it is necessary to study the cases of Thucydides' mention of crowd gatherings and crowd activities in non-military context.[33] An inte-

---

[32] See about *stasis*: C. Orwin, *The Humanity of Thucydides* (Princeton 1994) 175–182.

[33] It is necessary to note that this concept usually lies out of the scholar's interests. See, e.g.. June W. Allison, *Word and Concept in Thucydides* (Atlanta 1997. American Philological Association. American Classsical Studies, N 41). Analyzing «words on words» (p. 186–206), she doesn't mention either ὄχλος or ὅμιλος. It is understandable, because it is really difficult to feel the importance of this concept.

resting example is the Pericles' speech who "advanced from the sepulcher to an elevated platform in order to be heard by as many of the crowd as possible" (2. 34. 8). This crowd (ὅμιλος) consisted of citizens, but not of citizens alone. Pericles addressed to "the whole assemblage, whether citizens or foreigners" (τὸν πάντα ὅμιλον ἀστῶν καὶ ξένων ξύμφορον – 2. 36. 4). The purpose was state funeral procession, and the Kerameikos was its location.[34] It was obviously an organized gathering too (elevated platform is the sign of special preparations), but maybe not over-organized: not only citizens and their families, but μέτοικοι and foreigners were allowed to participate in this procession.

Almost in the same words we can characterize the departure of the Sicilian expedition, when the whole population of the city came to Piraeus to say farewell to the sailors and warriors (6, 30–32). The crowd consisted of the Athenians, foreigners and the εὖνοι of the Athenians (6. 32. 2). The shores of the harbor of Piraeus was the place of this gathering. The ceremony was a religious one and obviously was organized by the state (6. 32. 1), but the crowd was rather self-organized, because it was the initiative of people to come.

The events of the oligarchic coup d'état of 411 are also of interest for examination of the political activities of the crowd. After Phrynichus had been killed, and the power of oligarchs had become unstable, there gathered crowds of hoplites in Piraeus in order to act against the oligarchs (8. 92. 5–6). Crowd activities began in Athens too (8. 92. 7–8). But it is very characteristic that these crowd activities were quickly transformed into an official people gathering – assembly in the theatre of Dionysus in Piraeus (8. 93. 1 and 3).

The same, as a matter of principle, phenomenon we can see in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*: the women's activity is transformed into a kind of a self-organized assembly.

Xenophon's *Hellenica* gives us some more interesting cases. A Theban Coiratadas, the prisoner-of-war, while disembarking at Piraeus, "slipped away in the crowd (ὄχλος) and made his escape to Decelea" (*Hell.* 1. 3. 22, transl. by C. L. Brownson). It is a very rare mention of often, if not everyday, Piraeus crowds. Piraeus was a great port, and, of course, there was a permanent circulation of port workers, ships' crews and so on. In the same year (408/7) the mob of Piraeus and the city (ὅ τε ἐκ τοῦ Πειραιῶς καὶ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ

---

[34] "The public funeral was more of a religious event than would be guessed from Thucydides' narrative: the dead were in fact given heroic cult" (S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* I [Oxford 1991] 292). Cf. also *Hyperid.* Epitaph., col. 7, l. 31 sq.

ἄστεως ὄχλος) gathered to meet Alcibiades (*Hell*. 1. 4. 13). This was, of course, a real mass gathering. The question is, whether it was organized or not. Alcibiades through his friends prepared public opinion and arrived to Piraeus just on the day of Plyntheria, a popular Athenian religious festival (*Hell*. 1. 4. 12). It was an organized gathering, but organized in favor of one person, the politician, who could transfer official people gathering (religious ceremony) to that of aimed to support his plans.[35]

The next example is the Arginusae trial. The enemies of the *strategoi*, of whom Theramenes was the first, used the religious festival Apaturia for their propaganda (here we may draw a parallel with Alcibiades arrival to Athens). But due to the specific features of this festival (the remembering of the dead relatives) there could have been only small gatherings of the relatives. "Theramenes used this time to hire people to attend the next crucial Assembly meeting posing as the relatives of those lost in the battle".[36]

It would be wrong to imagine the people's Assembly just like an exalted crowd. The Assembly had its reasons to be furious: the number of the Athenian citizens lost in the battle was too substantial even compared with the casualties of the Sicilian catastrophe. Of course, there is no precise data concerning the casualties, although both Xenophon and Diodorus report about 25 ships lost by the Athenians (Xen. *Hell*. 1. 6. 34; Diod. 13. 100. 3–4). As to the opinion of Barry Strauss, total Athenian casualties in this battle were about 3300 men.[37] Robert Buck suggests that up to 5000 Athenian lives were lost.[38] Anyway, the Assembly had serious reasons to blame the generals. Thus the trial of the *strategoi* shouldn't be regarded as an example of the crowd's influence over the Athenian political life.

A civil crowd appears in the *Hellenica* when Xenophon describes the return of Theramenes' embassy to Athens in 405 BC: "And as they were entering the city, a great crowd gathered around them" (ὄχλος περιεχεῖτο πολύς – 2. 2. 21). The situation was critical in Athens, and people were dying of famine: that was the reason, why did the crowd meet the ambassadors near the gates or in the agora. But it is very important, that there is no

---

[35] But B. Nagy suggests, that Alcibiades didn't know the exact date of Plyntheria which were an unimportant festival (B. Nagy "Alcibiades' Second 'Profanation'", *Historia* 43 [1994] 283–285).

[36] Vivienne Gray, *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica* (London, 1989) 84–85.

[37] In comparison with about 7000 in Sicily. See: Barry S. Strauss, *Athens after the Peloponnesian War. Class, Faction and Policy 403–386 BC* (London – Sydney 1986) 181.

[38] R. J. Buck, *Thrasybulus and the Athenian Democracy. The Life of an Athenian Statesman.* (Stuttgart 1998 – Historia-Einzelschriften, Ht 120) 58. "The number of Athenians lost at Syracuse was little larger" (*ibid*. 60).

mention of any crowd action. On the contrary, only "on the next day the ambassadors reported to the Assembly the terms on which the Lacedaemonians offered to make peace" (2. 2. 22). The Assembly should and did dominate over any possible unorganized political gathering in Athens.

It is interesting to compare Thucydides' and Xenophon's attitudes to the crowd with that of his contemporary, Andocides. The orator did not use ὄχλος at all, did not describe any crowd activity, and I could find the only place in Andocides' *corpus* concerning this problem, but an interesting one.

The trial of Andocides on impiety took place in 400 BC, but in his successful speech *On the Mysteries* Andocides described the events of 415 BC, when he had been imprisoned because of his real or alleged involvement in the mutilation of herms and the profanation of the mysteries. Surely, Andocides tried to retell these events in his own favor,[39] but his audience knew the real conditions of public Athenian life; that's why Andocides' picture should be realistic in this particular field.

Andocides wrote that Diocleides had brought an impeachment before the Council after he had seen "a large number of men going down from the Odeum into the orchestra" by the gateway to the theater of Dionysus. "He saw in total about three hundred men, but standing in groups of fifteen or twenty" (Andoc. 1. 38, transl. by M. Edwards).

Was it a real crowd? No. We can see only a picture (real or not very real, it doesn't matter in this context) of a conspiracy preparations. But it is of great importance that both the orator and his audience could imagine the area of the theater of Dionysus as the exact place for mass gatherings. There were really no places for mass gatherings in Athens, but the areas of official city institutions. These places can be used illegally only at night, as happened in this case.

All that points to the absence of any kind of political influence of the crowd in Athens even at the very end of the Peloponnesian War – in this hardest time for the city institutions. The power of organization was stronger than the disorganizing tendencies even in this period.

Absence of real crowd activities in Athens during the Peloponnesian War is crucial for us. It means that crowd activities were not real means in the political struggle.

---

[39] See: J. Ober and B. Strauss, "Drama, Political Rhetoric, and the Discourse of Athenian Democracy", in: *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Eds. J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (Princeton 1990) 255 ff.; A. Missiou, *The Subversive Oratory of Andokides. Politics, Ideology and Decision-Making in Democratic Athens* (Cambridge 1992) 20–25.

Argos: skytalismos

Events in Argos in 370 BC represent another possible case of crowd activities in classical Greece. Indeed, one of the most striking examples of internal strife in Greek city is the so-called "Club-law" (σκυταλισμός) in Argos in 370 BC, after the fall of Spartan domination in Peloponnesus. In his "History of Greece to 322 BC" N. G. L. Hammond describes this event as following: "The Peloponnese was a scene of violent turmoil throughout the year 370. Argos weakened herself by an internal revolution, in which a democratic mob bludgeoned 1,200 opponents to death...".[40] One could immediately imagine crowds of people beating aristocrats by clubs: the picture looks like peasant rebellions in Eastern Europe or China. But our sources draw quite a different picture. Our main source, Diodorus,[41] writes: "Among the Greeks this revolutionary movement (νεωτερισμός) was called "Club-law" (σκυταλισμός), receiving the appellation in the manner of execution" (15. 57. 3). And then he describes the internal strife in Argos; but utters not a single word about any crowd activity! The demagogues inspired the masses (πλῆθος) against upper classes. "...And the democracy (δῆμος) without a thorough investigation put to death all those who were accused and confiscated their property" (15. 58. 1) (transl. by Ch. L. Sherman). Neither Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 7. 66. 5) nor Plutarch (*Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* 814 B) contradict this statement. The only contemporary author, Isocrates, describing these events, notes that the Argives "put to death (ἀπολλύουσι) the most eminent and wealthy of their citizens" (*Philip.* 5. 52, transl. by G. Norlin). Surely, it does not necessarily mean the death in disturbances.

So, it was not spontaneous disturbances or crowd activities. Σκυτάλη in the hand of Argive democrats was not the weapon, "the club of people's war"; it was only a mean of execution, quite like a guillotine.

Conclusions

May we suppose a crowd as a social phenomenon, and crowd activities to have any importance in Greek political life in pre-Hellenistic period? The

[40] N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 BC* (Oxford ³1986) 496. Cf. A. Fuks, "Patterns and Types of Social-Economic Revolution in Greece from the 4th to the 2nd century BC", *AncSoc* (Leuven) 5 (1974) 71: the events of 370 in Argos was "an outstanding example of mass movements".

[41] *Aen. Tact.* 11. 7–10 cannot be regarded as a description of this event. See E. David, "Aeneas Tacticus 11. 7–10 and the Argive revolution of 370 BC", *AJPh* 107 (1986) 343–349.

answer is clear: no. But what are the reasons for this? One may easily point out the demography or the settlement patterns of the Greeks in classical period. Surely, ancient Greek cities, *poleis*, were rather small. There were very few places in ancient Greek cities where crowd activities could take place: agora, the theater, and maybe no more.[42] Greek polis had no place for crowd activities: both agora and acropolis were the places for organized religious and civic processions (events, festivals). All these places were controlled by the city authorities, and unofficial gatherings may have occurred there only at night (as Andocides saw or imagined). There are no traces of crowd activities during the Olympic, Nemean, or Panathenaean Games in the classical period too.

The main reason, however, is that it was extremely difficult to abuse polis institutions by this way. It seems to me that the Greek democracy was the society of a slightly organized civil crowd, and the critics of democracy were rather just. The psychological necessity for crowd activities could canalize in the assembly meetings, and in extraordinary situation such meetings may have transferred (mostly in the eyes of the opponents of democracy) into something like crowd gatherings as we can see in the case of the generals, victors of Arginusae, trial.

There were some changes at the end of the fifth – beginning of the fourth centuries BC. The signs of these changes are the appearance of a few, but really unorganized public gatherings in our sources, and the attempt of Alcibiades even to organize public gathering out of official framework. But there were only signs, and they did not influence the political life of ancient Greek cities. Even ναυτικὸς ὄχλος, so strong in Athens, was no more than the part of the Athenian population, and there were no attempts to use its resources for crowd activities. The demagogues were the leaders of the δῆμος not only by name; they continued to use polis institutional framework. These framework should be destroyed or seriously damaged to allow the crowd activities to take place.

The crowd had much more importance in the sphere of ideology. Opponents of democracy in the philosophical and rhetorical schools of Plato and Isocrates began to use the notion ὄχλος widely in the meaning of unrestrained crowd of Athenian citizens after the Peloponnesian war. It is only here, in the rhetorical and philosophical schools of the fourth century that the word ὄχλος acquires a clear and unambiguous negative anti-democratic connotation, becomes one of the key words of the vocabulary of oligarchy.

---

[42] It is a great pity that there is no book on private and public space in classical Greece.

But ὄχλος, for Plato and Isocrates, was mostly the mob; they did not use any example of crowd activities (but only organized political gatherings, such as Ecclesia, courts, etc.) in their works. Moreover, the crowd was for them mainly an ideological issue, necessary for their anti-democratic arguments, but not a real danger. There is no evidence to prove any serious involvement of the crowd into the political life of the Greek cities in the archaic and classical periods.

Sergei Karpyuk
Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow

Статья посвящена исследованию феномена толпы в архаической и классической Греции. В терминологической части анализируется употребление слов ὄχλος, ἀθροίζω и других, которые использовались древними авторами для обозначения неорганизованных массовых сборищ. В исторической части рассматриваются немногочисленные случаи реального или мнимого участия толпы в политической жизни Греции, прежде всего – Афин: "революционные" действия афинского демоса в 508/7 г. до н. э., нечастые вспышки массовой активности в период Пелопоннесской войны (особое внимание обращено на переворот 411 г., встречу афинянами Алкивиада и процесс над стратегами-победителями при Аргинуссах), аргосский скитализм 370 г. и некоторые другие события. Очевидно, что активность толпы не оказала сколько-нибудь заметного влияния на политическую жизнь доэллинистической Греции. Это можно объяснить не только стабильностью полисных институтов, но также и тем, что демократия "прямого действия" предполагала непосредственное и не всегда чрезмерно организованное участие масс в общественной жизни. Демография и топография греческих полисов также препятствовали проявлениям спонтанной активности масс. Политические лидеры классического времени (за исключением, быть может, Алкивиада) даже не пытались использовать массовые сборища в своих целях.

Феномен толпы оказался гораздо более значимым в идеологической сфере. Толпа как массовое неорганизованное сборище совмещалась с "чернью", т. е. низшими слоями населения полиса, и служила своеобразным идеологическим пугалом, которое использовалась Исократом, Платоном и другими авторами в антидемократической пропаганде. Аристотель с характерным для него "научным" подходом воспринимал толпу как данность и иногда отождествлял ее со всем демосом. Потребовались радикальные изменения в социальной жизни и демографии, чтобы толпа стала заметным фактором в политической борьбе. Но это случилось уже в эллинистическое время.