



THE ANCIENT GREEKS A CRITICAL HISTORY



John V. A. Fine

The Belknap Press of
Harvard University Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
and London, England

proceeded as far as Eleusis, where dissatisfaction among the allies and friction between Cleomenes and the other Spartan king, Demaratus, caused the whole undertaking to be abandoned. Interesting evidence, based on a decree, is provided for this abortive campaign by the scholar's comment on line 273 of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, which also proves that Herodotus' statement about the execution of all those besieged on the Acropolis except Cleomenes and the Spartans was misinformed. The passage reads in part: "Of those [Isagoras and his partisans] who had seized Eleusis with Cleomenes, the Athenians razed their houses, confiscated their property, and voted sentence of death upon them [*in absentia*]. And having inscribed this on a bronze *stèle* they set it up in the Acropolis beside the ancient temple."

There has been a great deal of controversy concerning the identity of the council which resisted when Cleomenes tried to abolish it and establish Isagoras in power with 300 of his partisans. Of the three possibilities advocated, one can surely be ruled out. Since this episode occurred so soon after the enactment of Cleisthenes' program, the council could hardly refer to his proposed Council of Five Hundred, for there would have been insufficient time for the establishment of this new body. The Council of the Areopagus is a possibility, but more probable is the Council of Four Hundred, which may have been the body that brought Cleisthenes' proposals before the assembly. Certainty is obviously impossible when the evidence is so scanty and ambiguous that there are only three possible references to this Council of Four Hundred—first, when Solon is supposed to have established it; second, the passage under discussion; and third, Aristotle's statement (*Ath. Const.*, 21.3) that Cleisthenes made the council consist of 500 instead of 400 members.

Immediately after Cleomenes and his followers, both Spartan and Athenian, had been expelled from Athens, the Athenians, presumably the assembly, recalled Cleisthenes and the 700 families who had recently been driven into exile. It was then, apparently, that the necessary steps were taken so that the reforms of Cleisthenes, which already had been voted, could be put into effect.

TO UNDERSTAND the purpose and significance of Cleisthenes' measures, which revolutionized the structure of the Athenian state to its very foundation, one must keep clearly in mind the framework of the previous Athenian state. The Athenians were grouped in the four Ionian tribes, each tribe consisting of a certain number of phratries, which in turn were composed of one or more *genē* and also the non-*gennētai* or commoners. These institutions were based on the kinship principle, whether real or fictitious, and the members were further united by the

cults in which they participated. Since the *gennētai* and commoners belonging to a particular phratry were probably more or less neighbors, and since the several phratries which were the components of each tribe presumably were located in the same general area, it would seem to follow that the tribes also had territorial or regional characteristics. These four tribes, therefore, based on both the kinship and regional principles, were particularly susceptible to the domination of powerful and wealthy families. It is important also to remember that citizenship depended on membership in a phratry, an institution which, with its kinship and religious traditions, was not suited to the admission of new members beyond the children of the current members.

Although Solon at the beginning of the sixth century introduced many reforms and weakened the monopoly of the nobles (Eupatrids), the government as he left it was still based on the four Ionian tribes. The little that is known of the history of Athens in the first half of the sixth century reveals clearly that the "constitution" gave free play to the disruptive rivalries and combinations of the great families. This situation was accentuated by the emergence, apparently distinct from the four tribes, of the three factions of the plain, the coast, and the hill (Hyperakrois), each having its nucleus in a particular region. It was largely by capitalizing on the feuds between these factions that Pisistratus had been able to establish himself as tyrant. The Pisistratids during their fifty years (with intermissions) as tyrants were able to suppress the centrifugal tendencies in Attica and to make the land a united whole as it never had been before. Under them, despite the tyranny, Athens was revealing its tremendous promise. No sooner were the Pisistratids expelled, however, than the struggles between the powerful families, with the old disruptive effects, began again. To curb these long-standing evils and the current chaos, Cleisthenes, after his return to Athens following the expulsion of Cleomenes, began to carry out his proposals which the assembly had ratified shortly before.

The most detailed description of the measures which Cleisthenes took is presented in chapter 21 of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians*, but unfortunately many points are left unexplained. The core of the reforms was the establishment of ten tribes based on *dēmēs* (townships) as fundamental units in place of the four old Ionian kinship tribes based on *genē* and phratries. These ten new tribes were not territorial in the sense that each represented one particular section of Attica, for ten such blocks would still have left too much scope for the operation of local influences, although less than under the previous four tribes. Each of the ten new tribes was composed of territory from the three different regions into which Cleisthenes divided Attica: the city and its surroundings; the

coast, except for the area immediately south, southeast, and southwest of Athens, which was included in the city region; and the inland area. A tribe, accordingly, was composed of thirds (*trittyes*), a *trittys* from the city, a *trittys* from the coast, and a *trittys* from the inland area. In each *trittys* the basic unit was one which had developed naturally—the *deme*, the equivalent of a modern village, town, or township. Since the borders of the *trittyes*, especially in the country districts, sometimes conformed to natural phenomena, *trittyes* often varied considerably in size both of physical area and of population. Depending on the size of the *demes*, there might be one or several in each *trittys*. In the city region the *trittyes* naturally were smaller in area and larger in population. Some of the component *demes* of these ten city *trittyes* must have somewhat resembled the wards of a modern city.

The sketch just given should make clear that Cleisthenes, as Aristotle says, wished to "mix up" the population, for in each tribe there would be citizens from the city, from the coast, and from the inland area. Aristotle adds that Cleisthenes assigned the *trittyes* to the tribes, three to each, by lot. It is hard, however, to accept literally the statement that these assignments were made entirely by lot. Since the *trittyes* certainly varied in size of population, Cleisthenes, who wanted the tribes to have approximately equal numbers of citizens in view of military and political responsibilities, probably took steps to prevent any one tribe, for example, from consisting of three large or of three small *trittyes*. To secure tribes of more or less equal population, therefore, the assignment of *trittyes* to tribes could hardly have been left entirely to chance.⁴¹

The inadequacy of the source material makes it impossible to comprehend all the methods which Cleisthenes used in establishing this elaborate structure, or all the motives which influenced him, but the following observation of a scholar, although somewhat technical, will serve to illustrate his technique and purposes.⁴² The coastal *trittys*, named Tetrapoleis, of the tribe Aiantis was located in the northeastern section of Attica. From prehistoric times there had existed there a religious league of four communities (known as the Tetrapolis), Marathon, Oinoe, Trikorynthos, and Probalinthos, and this league, even after it had been included in the *synoecism* of Attica, continued to survive as an independent cult organization, performing sacrifices and sending sacred embassies to shrines such as Delphi down at least to the first century B.C. These four *demes*, which formed a compact territorial group, had been an area of strong Pisistratid influence; it was at Marathon that Pisistratus landed when he returned from exile to establish his permanent tyranny, and Hippias led the Persians to Marathon in 490. Cleisthenes, when he set up the *trittys* of Tetrapoleis, detached the *deme* of Probalinthos and at-

tached it not to the adjoining (on the south) coast *trittys* of the tribe Aigeis, for that contained Pisistratus' home town of Brauron, but to the coast *trittys* of the tribe Pandionis, which was still further to the south. Probalinthos, consequently, as far as the new tribal organization was concerned, was left as an enclave, separated from the *trittys* to which its fellow *demes* in the religious league belonged and serving as a barrier between Pisistratid influences in the neighboring coast *trittyes* of the tribes Aiantis and Aigeis. The place of Probalinthos in the coastal *trittys* of Aiantis was taken by the *deme* Rhamnous, a step that was logical from its adjacent location, but also advantageous, in Cleisthenes' eyes, because its cults were quite different from those of the Tetrapolis. In connection with this same tribe Aiantis it is significant to note that Aphidna, probably the name of the inland *trittys* bordering on the coast *trittys* with its Pisistratid influences, was the home of the *genos* Gephyraioi to which the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogiton had belonged. It seems clear, therefore, that these two *trittyes* had been established and organized with the definite purpose of trying to weaken the remnants of Pisistratid influence and also to break up old local religious cults, which always were an obstacle to the true unification of Attica. If such motives can be detected in the case of one tribe, Aiantis, it is a reasonable assumption that, if the evidence were adequate, somewhat similar motives might be found operating in the establishment of some of the other tribes.

The more one thinks about the *trittyes*, the clearer it becomes that these seemingly very artificial institutions were Cleisthenes' chief device in "mixing up" the people and in making citizens from the different regions of Attica—the city, the coast, and the inland area—cooperate in the various duties which as members of the tribes they owed, such as providing the personnel for the tribal regiment in the army and for the tribal representatives in the new Council of Five Hundred.

The *trittyes* were able to perform this essential function only because each *trittys* was composed of a certain number of *demes*, the fundamental units of the Cleisthenic system. Certainly one of the chief reasons why his reorganization of the citizen body in the new tribal arrangement endured for centuries was that at its foundation it was based on natural units, the *demes*. In the country districts—the coast and inland regions—Cleisthenes found *demes* already in existence, although it is possible, of course, that in a few cases he may have created one *deme* by consolidating several straggling settlements, or two *demes* by subdividing a settlement which might have seemed too large in area and population for his purposes. Only in the city did he have to establish *demes* arbitrarily by dividing the populous area into a sufficient number of units so that, by

means of the *trittyes*, the population of the city could be distributed equally in the ten tribes.

Since people had their homes in their respective *demes*, Cleisthenes decided to use the criterion of residence rather than that of membership in a phratry for determining citizenship. All citizens who at the time of his reforms had their permanent residence in a particular *deme* became members and citizens of that *deme*, and their names were inscribed on the *deme* registers which, presumably, then began to be kept. Thereafter, sons of members, on becoming eighteen, were presented to the assembly of demesmen for inclusion, as adult citizens, on the rolls of the *deme*. Membership in a *deme* was made hereditary. Even if a man moved and took up permanent residence elsewhere in Attica, he still remained a member of the *deme* in which he or his forefather had originally been registered. The purpose of this hereditary regulation probably lay in the need to ensure as far as possible that, despite possible population shifts, the ten tribes should continue to have roughly equal numbers of citizens, for a man's tribal affiliation was dependent on the *deme* in which he was registered. Another motive may have been to keep a man, even though he migrated, legally tied to the district in which his family tombs were located.

The *demes* became centers of local government. Most of the available evidence comes from the fourth century, but local organs of government must have existed at least since Cleisthenes designated the *demes* as the foundation of the reorganized state. Each *deme* had an assembly (*agora*) of adult male citizens; an annual *demarch* (mayor), whether elected or appointed by lot is uncertain; other officials, including treasurers; shrines at which various festivals were held; public lands which were leased to produce revenues for the *deme*, and the like. In fact, each *deme* was, in a way, a microcosm of Athens, and it had a rather active municipal life in which its members could and did acquire experience for participating in the political life of Athens. Beyond their role in local affairs, the *demes* were essential for the functioning of the central administration of Athens, for it was from the data provided by the *deme* registers that the necessary provisions could be made for levying soldiers and for obtaining candidates for the various boards of magistrates, the Council of Five Hundred, and, from the middle of the fifth century on, for the law courts.

Although it is certain that Cleisthenes made enrollment in a *deme* the criterion for citizenship, there is an interesting problem concerning whether the implementation of this measure was accompanied by an increase in the size of the citizen body. Aristotle, in his discussion of

Cleisthenes' reforms, makes the following statement (*Ath. Const.*, 21.4): "And he made all the inhabitants in each of the *demes* fellow demesmen of one another, in order that they might not call attention to the newly enfranchised citizens by addressing people by their fathers' names, but designate people by their *demes*; whence it happens that Athenians address themselves according to their *demes*." This passage explicitly states two things: first, that new citizens were enrolled when the reforms were carried out, and second, that calling a man by his demotic (Thucydides of the *deme* Halimos) rather than by his patronymic (Thucydides, son of Olorus) would conceal that he was a new citizen, a fact which would be evident to all from the use of the father's name, if that name was strange to Athens. The inference which Aristotle drew about the purpose of the demotics was wrong, as is proved by numerous fifth-century inscriptions and *ostraka* which reveal no standard usage in the system of names; sometimes the personal name alone was used, sometimes the personal name combined with either the patronymic or the demotic, or both.

But were new citizens admitted to the state when enrollment in *demes* became the criterion for citizenship? Some scholars answer this question with a flat negative, arguing that this is another example of an erroneous inference on Aristotle's part;⁴³ they claim that, since in Aristotle's political theory an increase in the citizen body was always accompanied by an increase in democracy, it would have seemed obvious to him that Cleisthenes, who apparently furthered democracy, achieved this aim by increasing the number of citizens. Many other scholars take the position that, although some new citizens probably were registered at this time, the numbers were too few to be of any real significance. As is true with so many matters in early Greek history, it is unlikely that a definitive answer will ever be given to this question, but since it is intimately connected with the whole problem of what constituted Athenian citizenship in the sixth century, the student of Greek history should at least be familiar with the nature of the evidence. Two other passages in Aristotle's writings are relevant to this discussion.

In an attempt to characterize the nature of citizenship, Aristotle (*Politics*, 3.1.10) remarks, "We may take as an example the action of Cleisthenes at Athens, when after the expulsion of the tyrants he enrolled in the tribes many foreigners and slave metics" (these last two words probably mean metics—that is, resident aliens—who formerly had been slaves). This statement should be studied in connection with a passage in the *Constitution of the Athenians* (13.5) where Aristotle, mentioning the motives of some of Pisistratus' adherents, writes, ". . . and, from the motive of fear, those who are not of pure descent; and this is proved by the fact that after the putting down of the tyrants the Athenians enacted

a revision of the citizen lists (*diapsēphismos*) because many people shared the citizenship who had no right to it." This revision of the citizen lists is mentioned nowhere else in the ancient sources, but that is not sufficient reason for rejecting it, as some scholars advocate. If there was such an investigation into citizen status, it must have occurred shortly after the expulsion of Hippias when the Athenian oligarchs under Isagoras and Cleisthenes, backed by Cleomenes of Sparta, were in control. Who, then, were these men who, out of fear because of "their impure descent," had been supporters of Pisistratus and whose sons presumably had been supporters of Hippias?

In trying to find an answer, one must remember that down to the enactment of Cleisthenes' reforms citizenship had been based on membership in a phratry. As was pointed out earlier in this chapter, from the time of Draco (ca. 621), at least, phratries included in addition to the *gennētai* a certain, but unknown, number of "commoners." A generation later Solon was supposed to have attracted foreign artisans to Athens and to have granted citizenship to those who took up permanent residence in Attica. This tradition may be true, but one can only wonder how Solon managed to have these newcomers enrolled in the phratries, considering the "kinship" principle on which those institutions were based and their exclusive religious cults. In the following two generations the Pisistratids, using their power as tyrants, could have forced the phratries to admit new members, or they could have recognized various commoners who were potential supporters as citizens whether they were members of phratries or not. One can only confess ignorance and admit that in the sixth century there were probably many men in Attica, and particularly in Athens, whose citizen status was ambiguous. These men must have been primarily laborers and poor artisans—landless *thetes*—for the tradition probably still prevailed that ownership of land and citizenship went together. It would have been a natural reaction for the oligarchic forces, once the Pisistratids had been overthrown, to oust from their precarious citizenship and from any participation in the state these lowly men, who undoubtedly had been supporters of the tyranny.

Final answers in matters such as these, when the source material is so slight and vague, obviously are impossible, but it does seem probable that in 510 or 509 a revision of whatever citizen lists existed caused a considerable number of men to lose their citizen status, which at the best had been dubious. The new citizens whom Cleisthenes was said to have created were presumably those same men who were able to regain their citizenship because of Cleisthenes' reforms, and to have their citizen status guaranteed for the future through enrollment on the *deme* citizen rolls. Cleisthenes' reforms may also have been the occasion when official

recognition was given to the fact that ownership of land was no longer essential for the enjoyment of citizenship.⁴⁴ Once again certainty is unattainable, but it is reasonable to assume that from this time on, whatever had been the case in preceding generations, landless *thetes*, as well as those *thetes* whose lands could not produce 200 measures of produce annually, had the right to participate in meetings of the assembly. These landless *thetes*—artisans and laborers—were probably chiefly inhabitants of the city and hence were enrolled in the city *demes*. As residents of the city they could easily attend meetings of the assembly and—although by means of the *trittys* system they were distributed among the ten tribes—could furnish support to Cleisthenes; it is important to remember that in the Athenian assembly questions at issue were decided by a majority of the voters present, not, as in Rome, by a majority of the tribes.

It was as a member of one of the ten tribes that an Athenian participated in the public life of the state. He was automatically a member of the tribe to which his *deme* belonged. The tribes were named after ancient, more or less legendary, Athenian heroes. Apollo of Delphi gave his blessing to these new tribes by selecting through his priestess ten names from a list of one hundred that had been presented to him (Aristotle, *Ath. Const.*, 21.6). Statues of these eponymous heroes were erected on the south side of the agora in Athens.⁴⁵ These tribes, although each one by means of the *trittys* system was composed of *demes* from the three regions of Attica, were organized like corporations. Each tribe had a shrine at which a priest officiated over the honors offered to the eponymous hero, and owned property which was leased to provide money for the tribal treasury. Tribal assemblies, presided over by annually elected officers, were held on occasion in Athens to transact tribal business. Each tribe was responsible for providing its quota of men for the army, for the Council of Five Hundred and various boards of magistrates, and later for the law courts. The tribes were also responsible for performing various public services (liturgies), especially in connection with the conduct of festivals, on both the state and tribal levels. In fact, there were few aspects of Athenian public life which were not linked in some way to these Cleisthenic tribes.

In his reorganization of the state, Cleisthenes erected a new framework without destroying the old. Understanding the hold that ancient institutions, consecrated by kinship and religious traditions, had on the Athenian people, he limited himself, by means of the new ten tribes based on *demes*, to strengthening the secular structure of the state at the expense of the religious. The *genē* remained influential, and for many years political and social leadership was provided primarily by men

coming from the great families. Even the four old Ionian tribes were not officially abolished, although they faded away from desuetude until the only vestige left was an archaic homicide court composed of the king archon and the four "tribal kings." The phratries, in particular, retained an important place in social and religious life—and in political life also, at least to the extent that citizens were usually, if not always, enrolled in them. Inscriptions reveal that as late as the third century a foreigner granted Athenian citizenship was enrolled in a *deme*, tribe, and phratry. Membership in a phratry, however, although almost universal, was not obligatory for the citizen, as is proved by the fact that a newly appointed archon was not allowed to assume office unless he could answer in the affirmative the question of whether he belonged to a phratry (Aristotle, *Ath. Const.*, 55.3). Certainly the question would not have been asked unless there was the possibility of a negative answer.

The fact that it was customary for an Athenian citizen to belong to a phratry is one of the reasons why many scholars deny that Cleisthenes' reforms were accompanied by the creation of many new citizens, for they emphasize the difficulties Cleisthenes would have had in securing admission to the phratries for them. It is hard to believe that additional phratries were established at this time, for their members would have been immediately branded as new citizens. There is no satisfactory answer to the objections raised to the hypothesis that Cleisthenes' legislation involving the *demes* led to an increase in the number of citizens except the obvious one that, if the recognition as citizens of the landless *thetes*—the laborers and artisans—is denied to Cleisthenes, then it must be referred to the Pisistratids or to Solon, a suggestion which hardly solves the dilemma. If one employs the argument from probability, certainly it seems reasonable to attribute the increase in numbers of citizens to Cleisthenes, for his action in removing from the phratries their vital political role may well have had the effect of making them less exclusive. From this time on the activities of the phratries were largely social and religious, and only indirectly political. Beyond these roles they made an important contribution to Athenian life because the phratry records provided the only "official" lists of the numbers of women and children in the population. Since only citizens—that is, adult males from eighteen years on—were registered in the *demes*, the *deme* lists have been compared to modern voting lists, while the phratry rolls, containing men, women, and children, can be likened to the lists kept by departments of vital statistics or to the baptismal records maintained by some churches.

Beyond the new tribal system based on *demes* and *trittyes*, surprisingly little is known about the reforms of Cleisthenes. It is natural to at-

tribute to him the various boards of ten which were so common later in Athens, but, of course, many of these may have come into existence subsequently as a consequence of his measures. Aristotle (*Ath. Const.*, 21.3) specifically states that Cleisthenes established the Council of Five Hundred in place of the Council of Four Hundred, with each tribe supplying fifty councillors. Nothing is known concerning the method of appointing these councillors at this time, and although one can be reasonably certain that men from the top three census classes were eligible for appointment, there is no direct evidence for this supposition in the early years of the council's existence. The discussion of this council, which soon became of extreme importance, therefore, will best be postponed to a later chapter dealing with the government in the fully developed democracy.

The change from a government based on four tribes and many phratries to one based on ten territorial tribes, thirty *trittyes*, and over a hundred *demes* was a revolutionary undertaking, but the ancient sources provide little or no information on how, or in what sequence, the various stages were carried out. A scholar has recently suggested that the first step was to order men to register in the villages in which they lived,⁴⁶ thus avoiding the time-consuming task of fixing boundaries for the individual *demes*. Then subsequently these groups of men were assigned to *trittyes* and tribes. Certainly haste was important to forestall oligarchic opposition. The second century A.D. lexicographer Pollux (8.110) states that the ten Athenian tribes came into being in the archonship of Alcmaeon. Since Alcmaeon, to judge from his name, was surely an Alcmaeonid, it is reasonable to assume that Cleisthenes, who had been archon in 525/4 and hence could not hold that office again—if the same prohibition against two tenures of the archonship existed in the sixth century as was the case in the fifth and later centuries—used his influence to have a kinsman elected archon. The archonship of Alcmaeon is usually assigned to 507/6, and thus this year is considered to have marked the inauguration of the new Cleisthenic system.⁴⁷ Aristotle (*Ath. Const.*, 22.2–3) states that in the archonship of Hermocreon the Athenians introduced the oath which the 500 councillors had to take, and then the Athenians began to elect the generals (*strategoi*) by tribes, one from each tribe, although the polemarch still continued as commander of the whole army. The date of Hermocreon is unknown, but, since Aristotle says in this passage that in the twelfth year after this the Athenians were victorious at Marathon (490), the archonship is usually placed in 501/0. It is puzzling that these two measures, so intimately connected with Cleisthenes' program, should not have been taken until seven years after the reforms had been voted. The delay may be evidence for the time re-

quired to work out the details of the program. Because of these chronological dilemmas, one can only say with assurance that it was sometime in the period 508/7-501/0 that the Athenian government began to operate according to Cleisthenes' reorganization.

One further law of Cleisthenes requires discussion here (although many scholars have expressed doubt about its ascription to Cleisthenes): the law of ostracism, by which an Athenian who was deemed dangerous to the public welfare either as a potential tyrant or, in later times, more generally as an obstacle to the will of the majority could be sent into "honorable" exile for a period of ten years. This institution played an important role in fifth-century Athenian political history. In the sixth prytany each year (the official Athenian year was divided into ten prytanies, running roughly from July to July), the question was placed before the assembly of whether or not an ostracism should be held (Aristotle, *Ath. Const.*, 43.5). If the decision was in the affirmative, the voting to decide who was to be ostracized apparently took place in the following prytany. In that interval one can imagine that Athens was deluged with a wave of political propaganda. Since the election of *strategoi* normally occurred in the seventh prytany (*Ath. Const.*, 44.4), it can be assumed that the matter of ostracism was decided first so as to avoid the possibility of the absurd situation that a man who had been elected as one of the ten *strategoi* should a few days later be expelled from Athens for a decade.

On the day appointed for the decision by *ostraka* (potsherds), the agora was fenced in with planks, with ten entrances, one for each tribe, left in the fencing.⁴⁸ The members of the tribes passed through the appropriate entrances, and each man deposited an *ostrakon* on which he had scratched the name of the man he wished to be ostracized. When the voting was completed the archons first counted all the *ostraka*, because, according to Plutarch (*Aristides*, 7), the voting was considered invalid unless at least 6,000 *ostraka* had been cast. In this tradition, 6,000 *ostraka* formed the necessary quorum to make an ostracism legal. Another version (Philochorus; Jacoby, 328, fragment 30) states that to make the ostracism valid, 6,000 *ostraka* had to be cast against one man, but in view of the large "scatter vote," this interpretation seems unlikely. The man whose name was on a plurality of the *ostraka*, provided a quorum of 6,000 votes had been cast, had to leave Athens within ten days for an exile of ten years, but since this was an "honorable" exile his property was not confiscated.

Aristotle in the *Constitution of the Athenians* (22.1) specifically assigns the law concerning ostracism to Cleisthenes, but a little later in the same chapter he says that two years after the battle of Marathon "the people,

now being full of courage, then first put into effect the law concerning ostracism, which had been enacted from suspicion of those in power, because Pisistratus, being leader of the people and general, had established himself as tyrant. And first to be ostracized was one of his kinsmen, Hipparchus, son of Charmus of the *deme* Collytus, on account of whom especially Cleisthenes had made the law, wishing to drive him out." The date of this ostracism was 488/7, and many scholars argue that it makes no sense to have a law that was made with a view to one particular person not be invoked for some twenty years. To support their objection they quote a passage from Androtion, an Atticdographer writing about 350 B.C. to whom Aristotle was greatly indebted. In a passage preserved in the second century A.D. lexicographer Harpocration, Androtion is reported as saying that Hipparchus, a kinsman of Pisistratus, was the first to be ostracized, the law about ostracism *having been enacted then for the first time*. The text of Harpocration is uncertain, and in place of this reading which seems to suggest the beginning of a series of enactments of laws on ostracism, emendations have been suggested, one of which gives the reading: the law about ostracism *having been enacted before this time*.⁴⁹ In view of the uncertainty concerning the proper text of Harpocration it seems inappropriate to let a questionable reading of Androtion, dealing with a little-known period, jettison the definite statements of both Aristotle and the third-century Atticdographer Philochorus, who credit Cleisthenes with instituting the law on ostracism after he had put down the tyrants.

It has been suggested recently that Cleisthenes' motive in proposing the law on ostracism may actually have been directed against his opponent Isagoras, and that it was this threat which caused the latter to appeal to Cleomenes.⁵⁰ The failure of Cleomenes' intervention and the flight of Isagoras removed the need to resort to an ostracism at that time. On further consideration Cleisthenes may have perceived that an ostracism was an unpredictable venture in which the man urging recourse to ostracism might be hoist on his own petard. Actually a late tradition, almost certainly apocryphal, preserved by Aelian (*Varia Historia*, 13.24), states that Cleisthenes himself was ostracized.

It is surprising that the first recorded ostracism did not occur until 488/7, but one should realize that the Athenians may often have had recourse to ostracisms which never were mentioned in the sources, because, the quorum of 6,000 votes not having been obtained, they remained abortive.⁵¹ In this connection it is worth mentioning that some of the *ostraka* representing "scatter votes," usually attributed to the ostracisms which certainly did occur in the 480s, could, as far as the archaeological strata in which they were found are concerned, be dated

equally well to the last years of the sixth or the first decade of the fifth century. After the battle of Marathon in 490, however, the feeling of exaltation which had been aroused in the Athenians, combined with their revulsion against Hippias who had been with the Persians and their suspicions, whether true or false, that certain friends of the Pisistratids in Athens had tried to play the traitor, resulted in a series of ostracisms of which the first was that of Hipparchus in 488/7.

EARLY IN THE course of adjusting itself to the governmental and social changes initiated by Cleisthenes, Athens had to face a serious external threat. It was probably in 506 that Cleomenes, resentful at his recent treatment by the Athenians and also wishing to make Athens behave as a respectable ally should, made arrangements for a threefold attack to be launched on Attica simultaneously: a Peloponnesian army was to invade Attica from the southwest while the Thebans attacked from the northwest and the Chalcidians of Euboea from the northeast. Thebes had been hostile to Athens ever since the occasion, several years earlier (519 or 509), when the little Boeotian town of Plataea on the northern slopes of Mt. Cithaeron had refused to join the Theban-dominated Boeotian League and had requested and received Athenian protection (Herodotus, 6.108). The reason for Chalcis' enmity is not known, unless it was a result of the friendship between Athens and Eretria, Chalcis' old rival in Euboea. The Peloponnesian army had advanced as far as Eleusis when the Corinthian contingent, becoming dissatisfied with the undertaking, returned home, to be followed shortly by the second Spartan king, Demaratus, and also by the other allies. Corinth may have decided that it was foolish to weaken Athens, whose hostility to Aegina could be serviceable to Corinth in its competition with a commercial rival. The quarrel between Demaratus and Cleomenes led to a new law at Sparta which stipulated that thereafter the two kings could not jointly conduct a foreign expedition. With the departure of his Peloponnesian allies, Cleomenes had to abandon his plan of restoring Isagoras to power in Athens as tyrant (Herodotus, 5.74-76).

The Athenians had marched out to meet Cleomenes at Eleusis thinking it best to face this menace before turning against the Boeotians, who had already crossed Cithaeron, and the Chalcidians, who were raiding northeast Attica. Freed from the Peloponnesian danger, the Athenians immediately hurried against the Chalcidians. Before they had joined battle with them they learned that the Boeotians were hastening to the support of their allies. To prevent the joining of the two forces, the Athenians turned against the Boeotians and won a complete victory, killing many and taking 700 prisoners. Then, according to

defeated the Chalcidians, who had returned home. They followed up this victory by taking possession of a large part of the Leontine plain into 4,000 lots (*kloroi*), they settled a corresponding number of Athenian citizens there. Herodotus calls the men who were sent to the Leontine plain *cleruchs*, a term which should imply, if used officially, hence concerning what class of Athenians was dispatched, but it is evident that these settlers retained their Athenian citizenship. There is no evidence concerning plain *cleruchs*, a term which should imply, if used officially, that the same time were able to act as an Athenian garrison to keep watch on Chalcis. The Chalcidians captured in the battle, as well as the 700 Boeotian prisoners, were kept in chains until they were ransomed at 200 drachmas apiece. The fetters were subsequently hung up in the Acropolis, where Herodotus some two generations later saw them, and with a tribe from the ransom the Athenians dedicated on the Acropolis to Athena a bronze four-horsed chariot which bore the proud inscription "The Athenians, the Athenians, realizing that they had incurred the displeasure of Cleomenes and the Spartans, sent envoys to the Persian satrap at Sardis in Lydia with the hope of concluding an alliance with Persia. The satrap repelled that only if the Athenians would signify their submission by the symbolic gift of earth and water would King Darius make an alliance with them. The envoys on their own responsibility accused in these terms, for which they were greatly blamed when they returned home. If this story is true, presumably Cleisthenes was responsible for this policy under the general word "Atheniens." Possibly Herodotus, informants in the mid-fifth century, the Alcmaeonids, in view of the stigma then attached to "medism" (treacherous cooperation with Persia), deliberately withheld from him the name of their ancestor.

One should realize, however, that the validity of this story is suspect for two main reasons: first, it is questionable whether before the Ionian revolt of 499 an appeal to Persia would have been condemned as "medism".

ism," and second, it is hard to believe that the envoys could have made an alliance without obtaining the subsequent approval of the Athenian council and assembly. Whether Cleisthenes did fall out of favor because of this supposed appeal to Persia, therefore, is unknown.

Cleisthenes remains one of the great enigmas of Greek history. The man who established the secular state at Athens and laid the framework for the future democracy so well that that framework endured for centuries turned to the people only after he had lost out in a struggle for power among the oligarchs. At the height of his powers he disappeared totally from the stage, whether from death or loss of favor cannot be said. Although he was remembered in the fifth century as the founder of a democratic constitution, in the fourth century he was more and more ignored, except by Aristotle, and in the popular mind and in political propaganda Theseus and Solon became the great democratic heroes. The measure of his genius, however, can be judged from the simple fact that Athens would not have been what it was in the fifth and fourth centuries had Cleisthenes not carried through his remarkable reorganization of the state.