

(1) On gaining control of affairs Solon liberated the people, both immediately and for the future, by forbidding loans on the security of the person; and he enacted laws; and he made a cancellation of debts, both private and public, which the Athenians call the Shaking-off of Burdens, since by means of it they shook off the weight lying on them. (2) Some people try to slander Solon in this matter. When Solon was about to bring in the Shaking-off of Burdens, he mentioned it in advance to some of the notables; then, according to the democrats, he was outmanoeuvred by his friends, or, according to hostile sources, he joined in the scheme himself. The men he had spoken to raised loans and bought up large tracts of land, and not long afterwards the cancellation of debts took place and made them rich. This is said to be how men who were later reputed to be of ancient wealth had come by their riches. (3) However, the democratic version of the story is more credible. Solon was so moderate and impartial in other respects that, when he could have got the rest of the people into his power and made himself tyrant over the city, he instead accepted the hatred of both sides and set a higher value on honour and the safety of the city than on his own advantage; so it is not plausible that he should have defiled himself in so petty and easily detected a matter. (4) That he had the opportunity to become tyrant is evident from the diseased state of affairs: he frequently mentions it in his poetry, and everyone else agrees. The accusation that he joined in the scheme must therefore be judged false.

(1) Solon established a constitution and enacted other laws, and the Athenians ceased to use the ordinances of Draco apart from those concerning homicide. The laws were inscribed on the *kyrbeis* and set up in the Portico of the Basileus, and everyone swore to observe them. The nine archons, when swearing their oath at the stone, solemnly undertook to dedicate a golden statue if they should transgress any of the laws, and so even today they continue to swear this. (2) Solon secured the laws against alteration for a hundred years, and he organized the constitution as follows. (3) He divided the citizens into four classes by an assessment of wealth, as they had been divided before: the five-hundred-bushel class, the cavalry, the rankers and the labourers. He distributed among the five-hundred-bushel class, the cavalry and the rankers the major offices, such as the nine archons, the treasurers, the sellers, the Eleven and the *colacretae*, assigning offices to the members of each class according to the level of their assessment. To those registered in the labourers' class he gave only membership of the assembly and jury-courts. (4) A man was registered in the five-hundred-bushel class if the produce of his own estate amounted to five hundred measures of dry

and liquid goods taken together; in the cavalry class if it amounted to three hundred. (Some people say that the cavalry were defined as those capable of maintaining a horse. They cite both the name of the class, as a reflection of that criterion, and also ancient dedications; for there stands on the Acropolis a statue of Diphilus bearing this inscription:

Anthemion son of Diphilus made this dedication to the gods,
Having exchanged the labourers' for the cavalry class.

There is a horse standing beside him, as an indication that this is what the cavalry class signifies. Even so, it is more reasonable that the cavalry should have been defined by measures of produce like the five-hundred-bushel class.) The rankers' class comprised those whose produce amounted to two hundred measures in both kinds; the remainder belonged to the labourers' class, and had no share in office-holding. For this reason, even today, when a candidate for allotment to any office is asked which class he belongs to, no one will reply that he belongs to the labourers' class.

(1) Solon had the officials appointed by allotment from a short list of men elected by each of the tribes. For the nine archons each tribe elected ten candidates, and lots were drawn among these: because of this it is still the practice for each of the tribes to pick ten men by lot, and then for an allotment to be made among them. That Solon stipulated appointment by lot from the property-classes is confirmed by the law on the treasurers, which remains in use even today: it orders the appointment of the treasurers by lot from the five-hundred-bushel class. (2) That is the law which Solon enacted concerning the nine archons. Originally the council of the Areopagus on its own called men up, judged them and made its disposition, appointing the most suitable man to each of the offices for the year. (3) In Solon's constitution there were four tribes, as before, and four tribal heads. Each of the tribes was divided into three thirds and into twelve *naucrariae*. There were officials called *naucrari* in charge of the *naucrariae*, with responsibility for income and expenditure: for that reason in the laws of Solon which are no longer in use we often find written 'the *naucrari* shall exact' and 'disburse from the naucratic silver'. (4) Solon instituted a council of four hundred, one hundred from each tribe, and appointed the council of the Areopagus to guard the laws, just as previously it had been overseer of the constitution. In general it watched over most and the greatest of the city's affairs; it corrected wrongdoers, having full power to punish and chastise, and depositing its penalties on the Acropolis without recording the reason for the penalty; and in particular it tried those charged with conspiring to dissolve the democracy, under the law of denunciation which Solon enacted to deal with them.

(5) Seeing that the city was often in a state of strife, and that some of the citizens through apathy accepted whatever might happen, he enacted a special law to deal with them, that if when the city was torn by strife anyone should refuse to place his arms at the disposal of either side he should be outlawed and have no share in the city.

9

(1) That is how the officials were dealt with. The following seem to be the three most democratic features of Solon's constitution: first and most important, the ban on loans on the security of the person; next, permission for anyone who wished to seek retribution for those who were wronged; and third, the one which is said particularly to have contributed to the power of the masses, the right of appeal to the jury-court – for when the people are masters of the vote they are masters of the state. (2) In addition, because his laws were not written simply and clearly, but were like the law on inheritance and heiresses, it was inevitable that many disputes should arise and that the jury-court should decide all things both public and private. Some people think that he made his laws unclear deliberately, in order that the power of decision should rest with the people. However, it is not likely that he was unclear for that reason, but rather because it is impossible to define what is best in general terms. It is not right to estimate his intentions from present-day practice: one should judge from the rest of his political programme.

11

(1) Solon organized the constitution in the manner stated. Since men persisted in coming up to him and complaining about his laws, criticizing some and questioning others, and he did not want either to change them or to stay in Athens and incur hostility, he went on his travels, going to Egypt to trade and to see the sights, and saying that he would not return for ten years: he did not think it right that he should stay and expound his laws, but everyone should simply do what he had written. (2) Moreover, it turned out that many of the notables had become disenchanted with him because of the cancellation of debts, and that both parties regretted his appointment because his settlement was contrary to their expectations. The people had thought that he would carry out a complete redistribution of property, while the notables had thought that he would restore them to the same position as before, or make only small changes. But Solon was opposed to both; and, while he could have combined with whichever party he chose and become tyrant, he preferred to incur the hatred of both by saving his country and legislating for the best.

12

(1) Everyone agrees that that is how he acted, and he has mentioned it himself in his poetry, as follows:

I gave to the people as much esteem as is sufficient for them,
Not detracting from their honour or reaching out to take it;
And to those who had power and were admired for their wealth
I declared that they should have nothing unseemly.
I stood holding my mighty shield against both,
And did not allow either to win an unjust victory.

(2) Here is another passage in which he shows how the masses should be treated:

This is how the people will best follow their leaders:
If they are neither unleashed nor restrained too much.
For excess breeds insolence, when great prosperity comes
To men who are not sound of mind.

(3) Again, in another passage he speaks of those who wanted a redistribution of land:

They came for plunder, full of rich hopes,
Each of them expecting to find great prosperity,
And expecting me to reveal an iron will behind my velvet speech.
Their talk then was vain; but now they are angry with me,
And all look askance at me as if I were their enemy.
It should not be. What I said, I have done with the help of the gods:
I did nothing in vain, nor was it my pleasure
To act through the violence of tyranny, or that the bad
Should have equal shares with the good in our country's rich land.

(4) Again, on the cancellation of debts, and on those who were previously slaves and were freed by the Shaking-off of Burdens, he says:

Of the things for which I summoned the people to assemble,
Did I finish before I had achieved all?
I might call to witness in the justice which time brings
The greatest and best mother of the Olympian deities,
Black Earth, from which I removed
The markers that were fixed in many places,
The Earth which once was enslaved but now is free.
To Athens, to their home of divine origin,
I brought back many who had been sold,
Some unjustly, some justly,
And some who had fled out of dire necessity,
Who no longer spoke the Athenian tongue
After wandering in many places.
Others, who were subjected here to shameful slavery,

Fearing the whims of their masters, I set free.
 These things I achieved by my power,
 Harnessing together force and justice;
 And I persevered in my promises.
 I wrote down ordinances for bad and good alike,
 Providing straight justice for each man.
 If another man had taken up the goad as I did,
 A man of malicious counsel and greed,
 He would not have restrained the people. If I had been willing
 To do what the people's opponents then desired,
 Or again to do what the other party threatened to them,
 This city would have been bereft of many men.
 For that reason, setting up a defence on all sides,
 I turned about like a wolf among many dogs.

(5) Again, he reproaches both parties for the complaints which they afterwards levelled against him:

If I am to reproach the people openly, I say
 That what they now have their eyes would not have seen
 Even in their dreams.
 And those who are greater and superior in strength
 Should praise me and make me their friend.

If some other man, he says, had obtained this position,

He would not have restrained the people, nor have stopped
 Until he had stirred up the milk and taken away its cream.
 But I stood in the middle ground between them
 Like a marker.

13

(1) For these reasons Solon went on his travels. In his absence the city continued in a state of turmoil. For four years the peace was kept, but in the fifth [590/89] the strife prevented the appointment of an archon; and again in the fifth year from that [586/5] there was no archon for the same reason. (2) Then, after the same lapse of time again, Damasias was appointed archon [582/1]: he remained in office for two years and two months, until he was removed from his office by force. Then on account of their strife the Athenians resolved to appoint ten archons, five from the Well-born, three from the rustics and two from the Workers for the People, and these held office for the year after Damasias. This makes it clear that it was the archon who wielded the greatest power: we see that that was the office over which strife always arose. (3) In general the Athenians remained in an unhealthy state in their relations with one another: some had the cancellation of debts as the origin and explanation of their discontent, since they had been impoverished by it; others were discontented with the constitution, because of

the great change that had been made; others were motivated by personal rivalry. (4) There were three factions: one the men of the coast, led by Megacles son of Alcmeon, whose particular objective seemed to be the middle form of constitution; another the men of the plain, whose aim was oligarchy, and who were led by Lycurgus; and the third, the men of the Diacria, whose leader was Pisistratus, a man who seemed most inclined to democracy. (5) Ranked with this last faction were the men deprived of debts due to them, discontented because of the hardship resulting from this, and those who were not of pure Athenian descent, because of their fear: this is confirmed by the fact that after the overthrow of the tyrants the Athenians held a review of the citizen body, because many men were taking a share in political rights though not entitled to do so. The members of each faction took their name from the region in which they farmed.

Documents from Dillon & Garland, *Ancient Greece*

3.5 Social Disorder in Attica

Solon 4, lines 1-10, 17-39

In addition to his poems urging the Athenians to action over Salamis (doc. 3.8), Solon produced many verses about the state of affairs in Attica, attempting to point out the various problems of his time. It was presumably because of his prominence as a critic that he was appointed as mediator and archon (*Ath. Pol.* 5.1; doc. 3.9). Adkins (1972) 46-51 discusses eunomia in Solon's poetry; for Solon as poet, see Knox (1978) 44-46; doc. 13.66.

Our city will never perish in accordance with the decree of Zeus
 And the will of the blessed immortal gods;
 For such a great-hearted guardian, daughter of a mighty father,
 Pallas Athena holds her hands over us;
 5 But to destroy a great city by their thoughtlessness
 Is the wish of the citizens, won over by money,
 And unrighteous is the mind of the people's leaders, who are about
 To suffer many pains from their great presumption (hybris);
 For they know not how to restrain excess or
 10 Arrange in peace the present good cheer of the feast
 This is an inescapable wound which comes to every city,
 And swiftly brings it to wretched slavery,
 Arousing civil discord and sleeping war,
 20 Which has destroyed the lovely prime of many;
 For by men of ill-will a much-loved city is swiftly
 Consumed in the gatherings of those who harm their friends.
 These evils are at large amongst the people; and of the poor
 Many arrive at a foreign land
 25 Sold for export and bound in unseemly chains [...]
 Thus the public evil comes to each at home,
 And house doors can no longer keep it out,
 It has leapt over high fences, found people in all ways,

- Even one who runs and hides in his chamber's recess.
 30 This my spirit bids me tell the Athenians,
 That most evils are brought to a city by bad order (dysnomia);
 But good order (eunomia) makes all things well-run and perfect,
 And frequently puts fetters on the unrighteous;
 She smooths the rough, stons excess, obscures presumption (hybris).
 35 Withers the growing flowers of ruin,
 Straightens crooked judgements, proud deeds
 She softens; she stops the works of sedition,
 Ends the wrath of painful strife, and by her
 All is made perfect and prudent amongst mankind.

3.6 Greed and Injustice in Attica

Solon 13, lines 1–25, 71–76

Solon praises wealth, but only if gained legitimately. He appears to be criticizing 'new' wealth, gained unjustly, perhaps referring to extortionate methods of dealing with dependants. For the ethos of wanting to harm enemies, see Adkins (1972) 55–56. The simile in lines 17–25 is typically Homeric and shows Solon's debt to traditional poetry.

- Glorious children of Memory and Olympian Zeus,
 Pierian Muses, listen to my prayer;
 Give me prosperity at the hands of the blessed gods, and
 At the hands of all men let me have always good repute;
 5 Make me very dear to my friends, and bitter to my enemies,
 Reverenced by those, and to these dreadful to behold.
 I desire to possess money, but to have acquired it unjustly
 I do not choose; for justice always comes afterwards.
 Wealth which the gods give stays with a man
 10 Lastingly from the lowest foundation to the peak;
 While that which man values from presumption (hybris), comes not
 By right, but, persuaded by unjust deeds,
 Follows unwillingly, and soon is mixed with ruin;
 Which from a small beginning grows like fire,
 15 Trivial at first, but grievous in the end;
 For the presumptuous deeds done by mortals do not last,
 But Zeus watches over the end of everything, and, suddenly,
 Just as a wind has quickly scattered clouds
 In spring, and has stirred the unharvested many-waved ocean
 20 To its depths, and throughout the wheat-bearing land
 Laid waste the good lands, reaching the high seat of the gods,
 Heaven, and again has made the aether clear to view,
 And the strength of the sun shines down on land rich and
 Fair, but not a single cloud is still to be seen —
 25 Such is the vengeance of Zeus;
 For men there is no limit apparently laid down as to wealth;

3.13 A Fourth-Century View of the Seisachtheia

Androtion *FGH* 324 F34 (Plutarch *Solon* 15.2–4)

Androtion's interpretation of the seisachtheia was that it was only a partial reduction of debt. Plut. *Sol.* 15.5–6 points out that most writers took it to be a cancellation of debts and that Solon's poetry confirms this. Jacoby *FGH* 3b Suppl. 1.145 (cf. Harding (1974). (1994) 129–33) argued that Androtion's view was due to a desire to downplay the radical nature of Solon's reforms, so that he would not provide inspiration for radical reform in fourth-century Athens. The devaluation referred to at 15.4 should therefore be ignored.

15.2 For this was the first measure that Solon instituted, decreeing that existing debts should be cancelled, and that for the future no one could lend money on the security of the person. 15.3 And yet some people have written, of whom Androtion is one, that the poor were so pleased at being relieved not by a cancellation of debts, but by a reduction of interest rates, that they gave the name of 'seisachtheia' to this philanthropic act, as well as to the increase of measures and rise in value of the coinage which took place at the same time. 15.4 For he made the mina a hundred drachmas, it having previously been seventy-three, with the result that people paid back an equal amount numerically speaking, but less in value, and greatly benefited those paying off debts, while not disadvantaging those who recovered their money.

3.14 Land as the Source of Political Power

Aristotle *Politics* 1266b14–24 (II, vii)

According to Aristotle, Solon realized that equality of property was an issue of political significance; Aristotle is presumably referring to the seisachtheia and the uprooting of the hektemoroi. Solon's reforms meant that there was from that point on a freehold peasantry in Attica. For Aristotle on property in Sparta, see doc. 13.18.

Accordingly the equality of property has some effect on the political community, and some men of former times seem to have discerned this, such as Solon in his legislation, while other places have a law which prevents people obtaining as much land as they wish, and similarly laws prevent the sale of property, like that at Locri forbidding you to sell property unless you can show that an obvious misfortune has taken place, as well as those which preserve ancient estates (this was repealed at Leukas and made their constitution over democratic; for it was no longer possible to appoint officials from the specified property-classes).

3.22 Solon as the 'Founder of Athenian Democracy'

Aristotle *Politics* 1273b35–1274a21 (II, xiii)

Aristotle views the Solonian constitution as a mixed one, with oligarchic, aristocratic and democratic features. Similarly, he sees the Spartan constitution as mixed (doc. 6.19). Aristotle notes that Solon did not intend his constitution to become a democracy, as Solon gave 'the people just the power that was absolutely necessary', and this theme is found in Solon's poems (doc. 3.20). Aristotle's 'elective magistracies' here do not necessarily contradict *Ath. Pol.* 8.1, where the method described is that of election and sortition (see note at doc. 3.17). Ostwald (1986) 5–15 discusses the importance which Aristotle places on popular control of the *dikasteria*, law-courts (see also the *Ath. Pol.*, doc. 3.23). The power of examining the conduct of officials after their term of office, the 'euthyna' (plural: *euthynai*), meant that officials were fully accountable to the people; but this is an anachronism as the Areiopagos held these powers prior to Ephialtes' reforms. The order of the four classes given here differs from that of the *Ath. Pol.* (doc. 3.16).

1273b35 Some people think that Solon was an excellent law-giver, for he put an end to the oligarchy that was too elitist, and he stopped the people being enslaved, and he established the traditional democracy by a good constitutional mixture; for the Council of the Areiopagos is oligarchic, the elective magistracies aristocratic, and the law-courts democratic. But it seems probable that Solon merely did not abolish the first two which were already in existence, 1274a1 that is the council and the election of magistrates, but that he did establish the democracy by having the law-courts drawn from everybody. Accordingly some people blame him, in that he undid his other reforms by making the law-court, which is chosen by lot, supreme over everything. For when this became powerful, they changed the constitution into the present democracy to please the people, just as if it were a tyrant; and Ephialtes curtailed the power of Council of the Areiopagos as did Perikles, while Perikles instituted payment for the law-courts, and in this way each of the popular leaders (*demagogoi*) enlarged and promoted it into the democracy we have now. But it appears that this happened not according to a plan of Solon's, but rather by chance (for, as the people were responsible for naval supremacy in the Persian wars, they became presumptuous and chose inferior men as popular leaders when reasonable men pursued opposing policies), since Solon seems to have given the people just the power that was absolutely necessary, that of electing officials and of examining their conduct (for if the people were not supreme in this they would have had the status of slaves or enemies), and he ensured that all the magistracies would be filled by the notables and wealthy, that is the *pentakosiomedimnoi* and *zeugitai* and the third class called that of the *hippeis*; the fourth class were the *thetes* who had no share in office.

Athenaion Politeia 20–22.6, trans. Rhodes

20

(1) When the tyranny had been overthrown, strife broke out between Isagoras son of Tisander, a friend of the tyrants, and Cleisthenes of the Alcmaeonid family. As Cleisthenes was getting the worse of the party struggle, he attached the people to his following, by proposing to give political power to the masses. (2) Isagoras then fell behind in power, so he called back Cleomenes, with whom he had a tie of hospitality, and since it appeared that the Alcmaeonids were among those who were under a curse, persuaded Cleomenes to join him in driving out the accursed. (3) Cleisthenes withdrew; and Cleomenes came with a few men and solemnly expelled seven hundred Athenian households. After doing this he tried to dissolve the council and make Isagoras and three hundred of his friends masters of the city. However, the council resisted and the common people gathered in force; the supporters of Cleomenes and Isagoras fled to the Acropolis; the people settled down and besieged them for two days, but on the third made a truce to release Cleomenes and all the men with him, and recalled Cleisthenes and the other exiles. (4) Thus the people obtained control of affairs, and Cleisthenes became leader and champion of the people. The Alcmaeonids bore the greatest responsibility for the expulsion of the tyrants, and had persisted in opposition to them for most of the time. (5) Even earlier, Cylon of the Alcmaeonids had attacked the tyrants, and so he too was celebrated in drinking-songs:

Pour to Cylon also, steward, and forget him not,
If wine is to be poured to valiant men.

21

(1) For these reasons the people placed their trust in Cleisthenes. Then, as champion of the masses, in the fourth year after the overthrow of the tyrants, the archonship of Isagoras [508/7], (2) he first distributed all the citizens through ten tribes instead of the old four, wanting to mix them up so that more men should have a share in the running of the state. This is the origin of the saying 'Don't judge by tribes', addressed to those who want to inquire into a man's ancestry. (3) Next he made the council a body of five hundred instead

of four hundred, fifty from each tribe (previously there had been a hundred from each old tribe). He refused to divide the Athenians into twelve tribes, to avoid allocating them according to the already existing thirds: the four tribes were divided into twelve thirds, and if he had used them he would not have succeeded in mixing up the people. (4) He divided the land of Attica by demes into thirty parts – ten parts in the city region, ten in the coast and ten in the inland – and he called these parts thirds, and allotted three to each tribe in such a way that each tribe should have a share in all the regions. He made the men living in each deme fellow-demesmen of one another, so that they should not use their fathers' names and make it obvious who were the new citizens but should be named after their demes: this is why the Athenians still call themselves after their demes. (5) He instituted demarchs, with the same responsibilities as the old *naucrari*; for he made the demes take the place of the *naucrariae*. He named some of the demes after their localities, and some after their founders (not all founders of the demes were known any longer). (6) He left the clans, brotherhoods and priest-hoods each to retain their traditional privileges. He appointed ten eponymous heroes for the tribes, chosen by the Delphic priestess from a pre-selected list of a hundred founding heroes.

22

(1) When this had been accomplished, the constitution was much more democratic than that of Solon. Many of Solon's laws had been consigned to oblivion by the tyranny, through not being used, and Cleisthenes enacted other new laws in his bid for popular support, among them the law about ostracism. (2) First, in the eighth year after this settlement [501/0], the archonship of Hermocreon, the Athenians imposed on the council of five hundred the oath which it still swears today. Then they appointed the generals by tribes, one from each tribe; but the leader of the whole army was the polemarch. (3) In the twelfth year after this, the archonship of Phaenippus [490/89], they won the battle of Marathon. They waited two years after their victory, and then [488/7], now that the people were confident, they used for the first time the law about ostracism: this had been enacted through suspicion of men in a powerful position, because Pisistratus from being popular leader and general had made himself tyrant. (4) The first man to be ostracized was one of his relatives, Hipparchus son of Charmus, of Collytus: it was because of him in particular that Cleisthenes had enacted the law, since he wanted to drive Hipparchus out. The Athenians, with the tolerance normally shown by the people, had allowed those friends of the tyrants who had not joined in their crimes during the disturbances to continue living in the city, and Hipparchus was the leader and champion of these. (5) Immediately afterwards, in the next year, the archonship of Telesinus [487/6], for the first time

since the tyranny the nine archons were appointed by lot on a tribal basis, from a short list of five hundred elected by the members of the demes: all the archons before this were elected. Also Megacles son of Hippocrates, of Alopecce, was ostracized. (6) The Athenians continued for three years to ostracize the friends of the tyrants, on account of whom the law had been enacted; but after that, in the fourth year [485/4], they took to removing anyone else who seemed too powerful: the first man unconnected with the tyranny to be ostracized was Xanthippus son of Aripbron.

Documents from Dillon & Garland, *Ancient Greece*

5.15 Citizenship Extended to Foreigners and Slaves

Aristotle *Politics* 1275b34–38

Kleisthenes gave Athenian citizenship to many metics 'both foreigners and slaves'. The *Ath. Pol.* 13.5 (doc. 4.2) notes that after the tyranny many who were not of pure Athenian descent, and who had supported Peisistratos and his sons, were disenfranchised. Kleisthenes gained their support by granting them citizenship. The slaves referred to by Aristotle are presumably manumitted slaves or their descendants; manumitted slaves received the status of metics. The foreigners would have been metics who came to Attica of their own free will. Bicknell (1969) suggests that Kleisthenes enfranchised Peisistratos' foreign mercenaries, but see Lavelle (1992). Oliver (1960), cf. Grace (1974), questioned the traditional interpretation and argued that Kleisthenes enrolled foreigners and slaves 'in a classification as metics'; but see Kagan (1963); Whitehead (1977) 143–47.

But perhaps there is even more of a difficulty here, regarding those who have obtained a share in the citizenship because change has taken place, for example Kleisthenes' actions at Athens after the expulsion of the tyrants; for he enrolled into the tribes a large number of metics, both foreigners and slaves. The doubt in respect of them is not who became citizens, but whether they are so unjustly or justly.

5.16 Kleisthenes Strengthens the Democracy

Aristotle *Politics* 1319b 19–27

Aristotle considers as a characteristic of extreme democracy the policy of including as many new citizens as possible in the citizen body, whether illegitimate or half-citizen. and he saw as significant the breaking down of private religious rites. Kleisthenes in the case of the Marathonian tetrapolis ('four-cities'), which had its own joint religious activities, did not put an end to these (as *Ath. Pol.* 21.6 notes, he did not interfere with religious activities) but he did ensure that the tetrapolis did not function as a political unit. The Marathonian tetrapolis, made up of the four towns of Marathon, Oinoe, Trikorynthos and Probalinthos, sent religious embassies to Delphi and Delos, as distinct from those sent by the Athenian state, from the earliest times to the first century BC. It was therefore always a unit with a distinct religious organization, and Marathon certainly had Peisistratid associations. Kleisthenes broke up this unit: the deme of Probalinthos, which provided five bouleutai, and was thus reasonably populous, was detached from the other three and placed in a different coastal trittys; Rhamnous was joined to the other three to form a coastal trittys.

The four centres of the tetrapolis were therefore now split into two different tribes (Marathon, Oinoe, Trikorynthos in the tribe Aiantis (IX), and Probalinthos in the tribe Pandionis (III)). While these four demes continued their cultic activities as a unit, the important Probalinthos deme now had different political affiliations from the other three demes with regard to all the activities carried out on a tribal basis: it elected bouleutai, fought, and elected strategoi for a different tribe. Special effort was taken to detach Probalinthos, for it is an example of a deme detached from its trittys: it belongs to the coastal trittys of Pandionis, but the coastal trittys of the tribe Aigeis intervenes. Brauron, a Peisistratid centre, is in this Aigeis trittys, so Probalinthos, with its Marathonian Peisistratid connection, was deliberately not attached to this trittys, but was put with the Pandionis coastal trittys; cf. Traill (1986) 129, suggesting that Probalinthos belonged to the city rather than the coastal trittys of Pandionis (but the implications are similar). The Tetrakomoi provides a similar example: the four demes involved, Peiraieus, Phaleron, Xypete and Thymaitadai, were split into three different trittyes and hence tribes: Peiraieus and Thymaitadai to the tribe Hippothontis (VIII); Phaleron to Aiantis (IX); Xypete to Kekropis (VII). See Lewis (1963) 30–34; cf. Eliot (1968) 11; Ostwald (1969) 154; Thompson (1971) 77; Kearns (1985) 203; Rhodes (1986) 135; Whitehead (1986) 185. For religious activities in the demes, see Mikalson (1977); Whitehead 176–222; Parker (1987); docs 5.18, 20, 10.20; cf. Lewis (1963) 35–36.

And there are also further practices like these which are useful with regard to this kind of democracy, which Kleisthenes employed in Athens when he wished to strengthen the democracy, like those who established democratic rule at Cyrene. For other tribes and phratries should be created, more than before, and private religious rites should be channelled into a few public ones, and everything should be contrived so that everyone mixes in with each other and former intimacies are dissolved.