

ARISTOTLE
AND XENOPHON ON
DEMOCRACY AND
OLIGARCHY

ARISTOTLE'S
THE CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ATHENIANS
Ascribed to XENOPHON THE ORATOR

XENOPHON'S
THE POLITEIA OF THE SPARTANS

THE BOEOTIAN CONSTITUTION
From the OXYRHYNCHUS HISTORIAN

TRANSLATIONS WITH INTRODUCTIONS
AND COMMENTARY BY

J. M. MOORE
RADLEY COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES
1983

The Constitution of Athens

GLOSSARY

The following Greek words and technical terms are used in the text; references after the brief definition are to passages of the Commentary where the words are more fully discussed. Plurals are given in brackets.

Archon One of nine magistrates at Athens; the Archon, sometimes called the Archon *Eponimos* ('who gave his name' to the year in which he held office) was at one stage the chief magistrate of the city; LV-LVI.

Boule (-ai) The council which prepared material for consideration by the *Ekklesia* and supervised day-to-day administration; XLIIIF.

choregos (-oi) The provider of a chorus; XXI.

deme A subdivision of Attica; XXI.

dikasterion (-a) The jury-courts, in which a juror was called *dikastes* (-ai).

dokimasia The investigation of the credentials of a magistrate before he took up office; LV.

eisphora (-ai) Extraordinary capital levy.

Ekklesia The assembly of adult male citizens; XLIII.

Ephete A young Athenian aged 18-20 undergoing military training; XLII.

Ephetai (plural) Jurors in an archaic homicide court; LVII.

Epikleros (-oi) A girl without brothers whose Father was dead; XLII.

eupatridai (plural) The collective name for the old aristocracy of Attica.

euthuna (-ai) usually plural in the Classical period) The investigation of an office-holder's conduct at the end of his term of office; LIV.

hektemoroi (plural) Citizens under a form of bondage; II.

Helisia The Athenian *Ekklesia* sitting as a court; LXVIII.

Hellenotamiai 'Treasurers of the Greeks'; in effect, chief treasurers of the Delian League; XXX.

- Hieromonon* A recorder whose functions are not fully known.
- hippeus* (-*ai*) 'Cavalryman'; the name used for the second social class at Athens.
- hoplite A heavily-armed infantryman; they formed the backbone of Greek armies from the late seventh century onwards.
- King Archon A modern name for one of the three senior Archons; LVII.
- kolakretai* (plural) Financial officials at an early date in Athens; VII.
- kurbeis* (plural) Wooden plaques on which laws were inscribed; VII.
- Liturgy An item of public expenditure undertaken by an individual at Athens; xxxvii.
- metic A resident alien; LVIII.
- mina / mna A measure of weight, also used for a sum of money.
- naukratia* (-*ai*) An early division within the Athenian state whose chief officers were called *naukratois*; VIII.
- pelatai* (plural) Men in a situation analogous to that of the *hektemeroi*; II.
- pentakosiomedimnos* (-*oi*) A member of the highest property class established by Solon; VII.
- Polemarch One of the three senior Archons; LVIII.
- polelai* (plural) Financial officers; VII and XLVII.
- proxenos* (-*oi*) The word for two different positions: (a) XLIII; (b) LIV and LVIII.
- Prytany A member of the committee of the *Boule*, or that committee; XLIII; prytany (small p) is used for their term of office.
- sisachtheia* 'Shedding of burdens'; Solon's cancellation of debts; VI.
- strategos* (-*oi*) Literally 'general', but from the early fifth century the office at Athens had also much wider functions, and the ten *strategoi* were the nearest equivalent there was to a board of chief magistrates, symmory A group who jointly undertook a financial burden; LXI.
- Thesmothetes* (-*ai*) One of the junior six of the nine Archons; LX.
- thetes* (plural) The lowest class at Athens.
- trierarch The commander of a trireme, the normal Greek warship.
- trittus* (-*ues*) (a) An early division of the Athenian state; VIII.
(b) A unit created by Cleisthenes; XXI.
- zeugites* (-*ai*) A member of the third of the four classes at Athens.
- A few other technical terms have been used in the Commentary and defined on the spot.

INTRODUCTION

Aristotle was born in Stagirus in the Chalcidice in 384, but came to Athens while still a youth, and spent twenty years in Plato's Academy, first as a pupil and later working to a greater or lesser degree on his own. After the death of Plato and the election of Speusippus to head the Academy, Aristotle left Athens for a period, in the course of which he spent some time as the tutor of Alexander the Great; he returned to Athens in 335, and set up his own philosophical school in a grove sacred to Lycæan Apollo and the Muses—hence the name Lyceum.* Here he stayed until 323, when he left under threat of prosecution because of a wave of anti-Macedonian feeling at the time of the death of Alexander the Great. He retired to Chalcis where he died the next year.

His writings are divided into three groups: popular works, many in dialogue form, which were published early in his career; collections of information and records; philosophical and scientific works. Of these categories, only the third was known (except through fragmentary quotations) until the *Constitution of Athens* was rediscovered at the end of the nineteenth century; the first group and the rest of the second remain lost.

The *Constitution of Athens* was one (perhaps the first) of a collection of memoranda on the constitutions of 158 states, most of which were Greek. The papyrus from which our text is drawn was acquired by the British Museum from an unknown site in Egypt; it consists of four rolls totalling eighteen feet eight inches in length. The Aristotle text is copied on the back of a set of accounts written in the first century A.D. and was itself copied at least by the first quarter of the second century, and probably towards the end of the first. There are also two fragments of a papyrus codex in Berlin which contain parts of four chapters; they were copied in the fourth century A.D. The opening of the work is missing, and was missing from the copy from which our papyrus was transcribed, for the copyist left a column blank at the beginning. The text appears to end very abruptly, but there is every indication that the copyist had reproduced all the text in front of him, and thought that he had reached the end of the work; see below on LXX.

The collection of information on constitutions was probably made during Aristotle's second period in Athens, for he must have had the

* The philosophical school was referred to as the Peripatetic school from Aristotle's habit of walking up and down in a covered court while teaching.

assistance of a group of pupils in the compilation of so massive a body of information, particularly at a time when he was also writing other works as well as teaching. Some have denied that Aristotle himself wrote the surviving document, both on stylistic grounds and because there are significant differences of view between the present treatise and Aristotle's *Politics*. Granted the style is different, there are similarities as well, and the work is of a different type from anything else of his which survives. Further, the fact that others will have had a hand in compiling what we have may have some bearing on differences of view as well as those of style. The work was known in the ancient world and accepted as genuine then, and this conclusion seems correct; such differences as exist are attributable to the type of work and its intended audience.

It had been generally assumed that the collection of constitutions was made as a basis which Aristotle was to use for writing his *Politics*. However, the latest date mentioned in the *Politics* is 336, while the *Constitution of Athens* mentions the Archonship of Kephisophon (329/8); it does not note either the loss by Athens of control of Samos or Antipater's modification of the Athenian constitution, both of which occurred in 322. Thus the writing of the *Constitution of Athens* seems to have fallen in the period 328-322; consideration of the types of wars discussed suggests that XLVI, 1 at least may have been completed before 325/4; see below on XLVI, 1. It is thus extremely unlikely that the *Constitution of Athens* as we have it was a preliminary study for the *Politics*, for it appears to have been written seven to ten years later. However, it is possible that the material was collected prior to the writing of the *Politics*, and put into its present shape at a later date.

The work falls into two sections. The first (chapters I-XII) is a historical survey of the development of the constitution of Athens which is divided into eleven 'changes'; chapters XIII-LXX describe the constitution of Aristotle's own day in four sections, the franchise (XIII), legislation (XIII-XIV), administration (XIV-V-LXII), and the judiciary (LXIII-LXX). Both sections assume wide knowledge of technical terms, and some knowledge of constitutional practice in Athens. Some have doubted whether the work in its present form could have been intended for publication, but the grounds for doubt do not seem very convincing; Aristotle does not require anything like as much background knowledge of his reader as does (for example) Thucydides. More serious is the suggestion that the work contains some muddled sections and has not been properly revised—again this has led to suggestions that it was composed for private circulation and never fully revised for the public. There are difficulties however; to take two examples, the account of the tyranny of Peisistratus is not totally consistent (XIV-XVII), and the description of the selection of jurors is not a model of clarity (LXXIII-LXXV). Equally, there are surprising omissions, notably no description of the highly complicated procedure for modifying existing laws, which was set up after the fall of the Thirty and remained in force in Aristotle's own day; similarly, the list of cases brought before the *Thesmothetai* (LIX) is

not complete. However, the form of the work suggests that it was intended for a wider public than the immediate circle of his pupils and associates, and the contents and omissions could well have been dictated by what Aristotle was particularly interested in at the time of composition. There are certainly faults in the book as we have it, but they are not sufficient reason either for rejecting Aristotelian authorship (that could be a very dangerous line of argument), or for denying that it could have been published.

Aristotle's sources for his own day posed no problems; he or his pupils could attend all the functions and ceremonies which he describes, at least as spectators, and in addition he would presumably have had access to the state archives. For the historical section he was in greater difficulty. He certainly knew and used Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and a number of the local Attic historians, including Hellanicus and Androton, whose works are now almost totally lost. He used and quoted extensively Solon's poetry, and also would have had at his disposal many documents from the past either preserved in archives or collected by his school. However, for anything before Solon, and for many events in the sixth century where evidence like Solon's poems did not exist, he would have had to rely on such information as had been called by earlier writers and on tradition. How reliable such tradition was is a much debated point, and is important, for Herodotus and Thucydides probably relied on it too; it is doubtful whether they were significantly better off than Aristotle because they were writing a century or so earlier. This is not the place for a detailed discussion of this topic; suffice it to say that all information which purports to come from the period before the Persian Wars must be handled with caution, and the earlier it is, the more cautious one must be. The lack of precision of the information about the reforms of 487, and even about the earliest political activities of Pericles shows that the material preserved by tradition was not detailed or full.

A further source of confusion affected the material by the time Aristotle handled it: the political feuds of the end of the fifth century were marked by an attempt to return to the 'ancestral constitution', and there is no doubt that at least some of those who wished to abolish the radical democracy fathered some of their own political ideas on venerable names from Athenian history in the hope of making them more respectable and acceptable. Thus a flood of propaganda clouded the issue still further; cf. notes on IV and XXX below.

As a result of all these factors, the notes discussing the historical section of this work contain a fair amount of discussion of the reliability of what Aristotle tells us. Criticism must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the work is extremely valuable, and gives every appearance of having been constructed on the basis of a thoughtful analysis of the available information. It is itself a source of first-class importance, which is precisely why it is well worth while to attempt to clarify or correct points of detail where possible.

It is hoped that readers will be able to read the text in conjunction

with the notes. I have not split the notes into minute sections, but written explanatory sections on each chapter; the text itself is worth reading as a work of historical and analytical literature, and the form of the notes is intended to make it possible to read them in reasonable-sized sections; it may thus take a little longer to find the discussion of a particular point, but immediate speed of reference has been sacrificed in order to avoid the scrappiness which would have inevitably resulted if each point had been taken separately in the order in which it was discussed by Aristotle. The index and cross references should enable those who wish to do so to check everything which is said on a particular point; on the other hand, I have not hesitated to repeat information on occasions to ensure the clarity of a particular discussion and avoid the need for excessive cross-reference. Perhaps, in conclusion, it should be stressed that Aristotle did not write a history of Athens; naturally, therefore, the notes do not attempt to do so either. Their aim is to give just so much of the history as is necessary for the understanding of the text, and to examine the points made there.

THE CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS

THE HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION

1 . . . the accuser being Myron before a jury selected by birth who had taken their oath over sacrificial victims. When it had been decided that sacrilege had been committed, the bodies of the guilty were disinterred and their families exiled in perpetuity. Epimenides of Crete purified the city on these terms.

ii After this there was an extended period of discord between the upper classes and the people. The constitution was in all respects oligarchic, in particular in that the poor, together with their wives and children, were the slaves of the rich; they were described as *pelatai* and *hektemoroi*, which referred to the terms on which they worked the fields of the rich. The whole land was under the control of a few men, and if the ordinary people did not pay their dues they and their children could be seized. Further, all loans were made on the security of the person of the debtor until the time of Solon—he was the first champion of the people. The harshest and most resented aspect of the constitution for the mass of the people was this slavery, although they had other complaints, for they had virtually no share in any aspect of government.

iii The primitive constitution before the time of Draco, then, was as follows. Eligibility for office depended on birth and wealth, while tenure was at first for life and later for a period of ten years. The most powerful and earliest of the political offices were those of the King Archon, the Polemarch and the Archon. The first was that of the King, being traditional, while the office of

Polemarch was the first added to this because of the incompetence of some of the kings in war; it was in this way that they sent for Ion in a crisis. The last of the three was that of the Archon. Most people say that it was established in the time of Medon, though some say it was under Acastus, arguing from the fact that the nine Archons swear to observe their oaths as was done under Acastus that it was at this time that the sons of Codrus surrendered the kingship in return for the powers granted to the Archon. Whichever of these alternatives is true, the difference of date is not great; that the Archonship was the last of the three offices is shown by the fact that the Archon does not control any of the traditional ceremonies as the King Archon and the Polemarch do, but only ceremonies which are later additions; hence the importance of the office is of recent origin, arising from these later additions. The *Thesmothetai* were instituted at a much later date when offices were already annual; their function is to inscribe the laws and preserve them for the decision of disputes. Because of its late date, the office of the *Thesmothetai* is the only archonship which was never anything but annual. Such, then was the chronological sequence of these offices. All nine Archons did not have the same official residences; the King Archon lived in the building now called the Boukoleion near the Prutaneion, evidence for which is the fact that the union and marriage of the wife of the King Archon with Dionysus even now takes place there. The Archon had the Prutaneion, while the Polemarch had the Epilukeion, a building formerly called the Polemarcheion, but renamed the Epilukeion when it was rebuilt and furnished by Epilukos as Polemarch; the *Thesmothetai* had the Thesmotheteion. Under Solon all the archons were brought together in the Thesmotheteion. The Archons had full power to decide cases themselves, not only to hold preliminary hearings as now. Such then was the position of the Archons.

6 The Council of the Areopagus had the duty of watching over the laws, and had wide-ranging and important

powers in the city since it punished and fined all offenders without appeal. Archons were chosen on the basis of birth and wealth qualifications, and they made up the Areopagus; this is the reason why this is the only office which is still held for life today.

iv The above is an outline of the first constitution. A short time after this, in the Archonship of Aristaimnos, Draco introduced his legislation; this constitution was as follows. Political power had been handed over to those who provided their own armour. They chose the nine Archons and the Treasurers from those men who had an unencumbered property qualification of not less than ten minae; the lesser magistrates were chosen from those who armed themselves, while the *strategoï* and cavalry commanders had to show unencumbered property to the value of at least a hundred minae and legitimate children, by citizen wives, not less than ten years old. The Prytanies had to receive sureties for them, as also for the *strategoï* and cavalry commanders of the previous year until after their *euthuna*, the sureties being four citizens from the same class as the *strategoï* and cavalry commanders. There was a *Boule* of 401 members, selected by lot from the citizen body. All those over thirty years old cast lots for this and the other offices, and nobody could hold the same office twice until all those eligible had held it; then the allotment started again from the beginning. If a member of the *Boule* failed to attend a sitting of the *Boule* or *Ekklesia*, he was fined three drachmae if he was a *pentakostomedimos*, two if he was a *hippeus* and one if he was a *zeugites*. The Council of the Areopagos was the guardian of the laws and supervised the magistrates to ensure that they acted legally. If a man were wronged, he could lay information before the Areopagus specifying the law he relied on. Loans were made on the security of the person of the borrower, as noted above, and the land was under the control of a few men.

SOLON

v In this political situation, when the majority were the slaves of the few, the people opposed the leaders of the state. When the strife was severe, and the opposition of long standing, both sides agreed to give power to Solon as mediator, and entrusted the state to him; at that time he had written the poem which begins:

Griefs deep in my heart when I see the oldest
of the Ionian states being murdered....

In this poem he champions both sides against the other, and argues their position, and then recommends an end to the prevailing rivalry.

3 Solon was one of the leading men by birth and reputation, but 'middle class' in wealth and position; this is agreed from other evidence, and Solon himself makes it clear in the following poem, where he advises the rich not to be greedy:

Restrain in your breasts your mighty hearts; you
have taken too much of the good things of life;
satisfy your pride with what is moderate, for we
shall not tolerate excess, nor will everything turn
out as you wish.

He always attaches the over-all blame for the strife to the rich; this is why he says at the opening of the poem that he is afraid of their 'avarice and overbearing pride', since this was the cause of the conflict.

v1 When he had taken power, Solon freed the people both then and for the future by making loans on the security of a person's freedom illegal; he passed laws, and instituted a cancellation of debts both private and public which men call the *seisachtheia*, for they shook off their burdens. Some try to attack him in this context; it happened that when Solon was about to introduce his *seisachtheia* he told some of the leading citizens, and then (according to the democratic version of the story) he was outmanoeuvred by his friends, while those who wish to blacken his reputation say that he was a party to

fraud. These men borrowed money and bought large areas of land; shortly afterwards, when debts were cancelled, they were rich. This is alleged to be the origin of those who later appeared to have been wealthy for generations. However, the democratic account is more convincing. It is unlikely that Solon would have been so moderate and impartial in other respects, that, when he had it in his power to subject the other group and become tyrant of the city, he chose to incur the hostility of both sides, and preferred what was right and the salvation of the city to his own advantage, but yet would have sullied himself with such a trivial and manifest fraud. That he had power to become tyrant is demonstrated by the perilous state of the city's affairs at the time; he himself mentions it frequently in his poems, and all other sources agree. One must therefore conclude that this charge is false.

vii Solon established a constitution and enacted other laws; the Athenians ceased to use Draco's code except for his homicide laws. Solon's laws were inscribed on *kurbeis* set up in the portico of the King Archon, and all swore to observe them. The nine Archons used to take their oath on the Stone, and undertook to set up a golden statue if they broke one of the laws; hence the oath which they still take now. Solon made his laws binding for a hundred years and arranged the constitution in the following way. He divided the people into four property classes according to wealth, as had been done before; the four classes were: *pentakosomedimnoi*, *hippeis*, *zeugitai* and *thetes*. He distributed the major magistracies to be held by the *pentakosomedimnoi*, *hippeis* and *zeugitai*, allotting the nine Archons, the Treasurers, the *poletai*, the Eleven and the *kalatretai* to various classes in accordance with their property qualification. The *Thetes* received only the right to sit in the *Ekklesia* and the *dikasteria*. The property qualification for a *pentakosomedimos* was a minimum yearly return from his own property of 500 measures, dry or liquid. The *hippeis* had a minimum of 300, and some say that the class was also

restricted to those able to maintain a horse; they deduce this from early dedications, for there is a statue of Diphilos on the Acropolis with the following inscription:

Anthemion, the son of Diphilos, made this dedication to the gods, having risen from the *thetes* to the class of the *hippeis*.

A horse stands by, showing the connection between the *hippeis* and being able to maintain a horse. None the less, it is more plausible that this class should have been defined by measures of produce like the *pentakosi-medimnoi*. The minimum qualification for the *zeugitai* was 200 measures, wet and dry combined, while the remainder of the population formed the *thetes* and were not entitled to hold office. This is why even now, when they are about to cast lots for a magistracy and a man is asked what his class is, nobody would say that he was one of the *thetes*.

viii Magistracies were selected by lot from a group previously elected by each tribe. For the nine Archons, each tribe made a preliminary selection of ten men, and they cast lots among them; this is the origin of the practice which survives today by which each tribe picks ten men by lot, and then lots are cast again among them. * Evidence that Solon instituted selection by lot in accordance with property classes is the law about the Treasurers which is still in force; this lays down that the Treasurers shall be

2 selected by lot from the *pentakosi-medimnoi*. These were Solon's provisions about the nine Archons. In early times, the Areopagus had summoned the candidates and selected the man it judged suitable for each office itself and installed him for the year. Solon retained the four tribes which already existed and the four tribal Kings; within each tribe there were three *tribes* and twelve *naukrariai*. The officers in charge of the *naukrariai* were called *naukraroi*, and they controlled contributions and expenditure; this is why many of the laws of Solon which

* Although in Aristotle's day there were then ten tribes (as instituted by Cleisthenes) in place of the four of Solon's time.

are no longer in force contain the phrases 'the *naukraroi* shall collect' and 'shall be spent from the funds of the *naukrariai*'. Solon instituted a *Boule* of 400 members, 100 from each tribe, and he gave the Areopagus the duty of watching over the laws, analogous to its earlier position of guardian of the constitution. It had extensive supervisory powers over the important aspects of political life, and punished wrongdoers with full powers to inflict fines or other penalties; fines were deposited in the treasury, and there was no obligation to state the reason for the fine. The Areopagus tried those who conspired to overthrow the constitution under a law of impeachment which Solon introduced.

5 Solon realised that the city was often split by factional disputes but some citizens were content because of idleness to accept whatever the outcome might be; he therefore produced a specific law against them, laying down that anyone who did not choose one side or the other in such a dispute should lose his citizen rights.

ix The magistracies were reformed in this way. The following seem to be the three most popular features of Solon's constitution: first and most important, that nobody might borrow money on the security of anyone's freedom; secondly, that anyone might seek redress on behalf of those who were wronged; thirdly, the feature which is said to have contributed most to the strength of the democracy, the right of appeal to the *dikasterion*, for when the people have the right to vote in the courts they

2 control the constitution. The fact that the laws have not been drafted simply or clearly, but are like the provisions controlling inheritances and heirs, inevitably leads to disputes; hence the courts have to decide everything, public and private. Some think that Solon made his laws obscure deliberately to give the people the power of decision. This is not likely; the obscurity arises rather from the impossibility of including the best solution for every instance in a general provision. It is not right to judge his intentions from what happens now but by analogy with the rest of his provisions.

x Those were the democratic aspects of his legislation; before introducing his laws, he carried out the cancellation of debts, and after that the increase of the measures, weights and coinage. For it was under Solon that the measures were made larger than the Pheidonian standard, and the mina, which formerly had a weight of seventy drachmae was increased to the hundred it now contains. The old coin was the two-drachma piece. He established weights for coinage purposes in which the talent was divided into sixty-three minae, and the three added minae were divided proportionately for the stater and the other weights.

xi After the reform of the constitution which has been described above, Solon was annoyed by people approaching him criticising some parts of his legislation and questioning others. He did not wish to make alterations or to incur unpopularity while in Athens, and so went abroad to Egypt for trading purposes and also to see the country, saying he would not return for ten years; he said it was not right for him to stay to interpret the laws but that everyone should follow them as they were drafted. He had incurred the hostility of many of the leading men because of the cancellation of debts, and both sides had changed their attitude to him because his legislation had been different from what they had expected. The common people had expected him to redivide all property, while the wealthy had expected him to restore them to their traditional position, or at most only to make minor alterations to it. Solon had resisted them both, and, when he could have made himself tyrant by joining whichever side he chose, had preferred to be hated by both while saving his country and giving it the best constitution possible.

xii That this was Solon's attitude is agreed by all authorities, and he himself comments on it in his poems in the following terms:

To the people I gave as much privilege* as was

* Plutarch, in quoting this poem (Solon 18), gives 'power' not 'privilege'.

sufficient for them, neither reducing nor exceeding what was their due. Those who had power and were envious for their wealth I took good care not to injure. I stood casting my strong shield around both parties, and allowed neither to triumph unjustly.

2 In another passage he describes how the ordinary people should be handled:

The people will follow their leaders best if they are neither too free nor too much restrained, for excess produces insolent behaviour when great wealth falls to men who lack sound judgement.

3 In another passage he discusses those who wish for a redistribution of land:

They came to plunder with hopes of riches, and each of them expected to find great wealth; they thought that although I spoke soothingly I would reveal stern determination. Their expectation was vain, and now they are angry and look askance at me like an enemy. This is wrong, for with the gods I carried out what I said, and did nothing else foolishly; it does not please me to act with the violence of a tyrant nor to give equal shares of our rich country to worthless and noble alike.

4 He discusses the cancellation of debts and those who had previously been enslaved but were freed through the *seisachtheia* in the following passage:

Which of my aims did I abandon unattained, the aims for which I had assembled the people? My witness to this before the judgement of the future will be the great mother of the Olympian gods, dark Earth; I took up the markers fixed in many places—previously she was enslaved, but now is free. Many I brought back to Athens, their divinely founded city, who had been sold abroad, one unjustly, another justly, and others who had fled under compulsion of debt; * men who no longer spoke the Attic tongue, so wide had their wanderings been. Those at home, suffering here the outrages of slavery and trembling

* The word translated 'debt' is doubtful; see Commentary on this passage.

at the whims of their masters, I freed. This I achieved by the might of law, combining force and justice; I carried it out as I promised. I drafted ordinances equally for bad and good, with upright justice for each. Another man holding the spur that I held, a man of evil counsel and greed, would not have restrained the people. Had I been willing to indulge the enemies of the people or do to them what the people wished to do, the city would have lost many men. That is why I set up a strong defence all round, turning like a wolf at bay among the hounds.

5 Again, of the later attacks of both parties he says reproachfully:

If I must express my reproach of the people in clear terms, they would never otherwise even have dreamed of what they now possess. The greater and more powerful also should praise me and make me their friend,

for, he says, if anyone else had held his position, he would not have restrained the people nor checked them before they squeezed all the cream from the milk. But I stood, as it were in no man's land, a barrier between them.

xiii For these reasons, then, Solon went abroad. When he had left, the city was still very disturbed; four years passed peacefully, but in the fifth year after his Archonship they did not appoint an Archon because of the dissension, and four years later the same thing happened again for the same reason. After the same interval, Damasias was chosen Archon, and retained the position for two years and two months until he was forcibly removed from office. Then the Athenians decided because of the civil strife to choose ten Archons, five from the *Eupatridai*, three from the men of the country and two from the artisans; they held office the year after Damasias. This demonstrates the great power of the Archon, for the strife clearly always centred round this office. In general, the Athenians lived in a state of continual turmoil in internal affairs, some finding the cause

and reason for dissent in the cancellation of debts, which had reduced them to poverty, some being angered by the great change in the constitution, and some motivated by private feuds. There were three groups. The first was that of the Shore; their leader was Megacles the son of Alcmeon, and they favoured a middle-of-the-road policy. The second group was that of the Plain; their aim was oligarchy, and their leader Lycourgus. The third group was that of the Uplands; they were led by Peisistratus, and he seemed to be the most democratic leader. This faction had been joined by those who had lost money when the debts were cancelled because they were impoverished, and those who were not of pure Athenian descent because of anxiety about their position. Evidence of this is the fact that after the abolition of the tyranny the Athenians revised the lists of citizens on the grounds that many were exercising citizen rights who were not entitled to them. Each group took its name from the area in which it farmed.

PEISISTRATUS

xiv Peisistratus had the reputation of being a strong supporter of the people and had distinguished himself in the war against Megara; he wounded himself, and persuaded the people that his political opponents had done it, with the result that they voted him a bodyguard on the proposal of Aristion. With the assistance of these 'club-bearers' he rose against the people and seized the Acropolis in the thirty-second year after the legislation of Solon, which was the Archonship of Komear. It is said that when Peisistratus asked for the bodyguard, Solon opposed him, claiming to be wiser than some and braver than others; he said he was wiser than those who did not realise that Peisistratus was aiming at tyranny, and braver than those who kept silent although they knew it. When he failed to persuade his hearers, he placed his arms in front of his door, saying that he had done all he could to help his country—he was already a very old man—and insisted that the other citizens should do the same. Solon's appeal fell on deaf ears, and Peisistratus

seized power, and ran the state more like a private citizen than a tyrant. However, when the tyranny had not yet had time to take root the groups led by Megacles and Lycurgus combined to expel him in the Archonship of Hegesias, which was the sixth year after he first took power. In the twelfth year after this Megacles was hard pressed by dissensions, and opened negotiations with Peisistratus; having agreed that Peisistratus would marry his daughter, he brought him back by a primitive and very simple trick. Having spread a rumour that Athena was bringing Peisistratus back home, he found a tall beautiful woman called Phye, whom Herodotus says came from Paiania, but others say was a Thracian flower girl from Kollytos, dressed her as Athena, and brought her into the city with Peisistratus. Peisistratus rode on a chariot with the woman beside him, and the inhabitants fell to the ground and accepted him with awe.

- xv Peisistratus returned to Athens for the first time in this way. He was expelled for a second time in about the seventh year after his return; he did not keep his position for a long time, but, being afraid of both groups because he did not wish to treat Megacles' daughter as his wife, retired abroad. First he joined in the foundation of a place called Rhacelus near the Thernatic Gulf, and then moved to the area around Mt. Pangaeus. He grew wealthy there and hired mercenaries, and so came to Eretria and made his first attempt to recover the tyranny by force in the eleventh year after his expulsion. He received wide support, and in particular that of the Thebans, Lygdamis of Naxos, and the *hippeis* who controlled affairs in Eretria. After winning the battle of Pallene, he took Athens, disarmed the people, and established his tyranny on a firm basis. He also took Naxos and established Lygdamis as tyrant. He disarmed the Athenians in the following way. During a review of the people in full armour at the Theseum, he began to address the crowd, and spoke for a short while. When they said that they could not hear him, he told them to

come up to the gate of the Acropolis where he would be more audible. While he continued his speech, a group who had been specially detailed for the purpose collected the people's weapons and locked them in the buildings of the Theseum, near by; when they had finished, they signalled to Peisistratus. When he had concluded his speech, he told the crowd not to be surprised or alarmed by what had happened to their weapons; they should go home and look after their private affairs—he would take care of the state.

- xvi That, then, was how Peisistratus' tyranny was first established, and those were the vicissitudes it passed through. As noted above, Peisistratus ran the state moderately, and constitutionally rather than as a tyrant. He was benevolent, mild and forgiving to those who did wrong, and moreover he advanced money to the bankrupt to further their work so that they could make a living as farmers. He had two motives for doing this; he did not want them in the city, but scattered in the country, and if they had enough to live on, and were busy with their own affairs, they would neither want to meddle with affairs of state nor have the time to do so. The working of the land increased his revenues, for he took a ten per cent tax on produce. He also had the same motive for establishing the magistrates of the demes and for travelling round the country frequently, inspecting and settling disputes: it made it unnecessary for the people to come into the city and neglect their work. It was on one of these circuits that there occurred the incident of the farmer on Mt. Hymettus and the land later called 'tax-exempt'. Peisistratus saw someone working an area that was all stones, and, being surprised, told his attendant to ask what the land produced. 'Aches and pains,' the farmer replied; 'Peisistratus ought to take his ten per cent of the aches and pains too.' The man made the reply not knowing that he was speaking to Peisistratus, while the latter was delighted at his frankness and industriousness, and exempted him from all taxation.

7 Peisistratus did not in general impose any heavy burdens on the people during his rule, but always preserved peace abroad and at home, with the result that it was often said that his reign was a golden age—for when his sons later took over his position their rule was much more severe. The most important facet of all those discussed was that he was naturally inclined to support the common people and was benevolent. It was his aim to govern in accordance with the laws, and not to claim any superior position for himself. He was once summoned for murder before the Areopagus; he appeared in person to make his defence, but his accuser panicked and failed to put in an appearance. This is why he remained in power for a long time, and when expelled recovered his position easily. He was supported by the majority of both nobles and the common people; he attracted the former by his association with them, and the latter by the assistance he gave them in their personal affairs; he was liked by both. Athenian laws about tyranny were mild at the time, and in particular the law about the establishment of a tyrant, which ran as follows: 'This is the law and traditional practice of the Athenians; any man who attempts to establish, or aids in the establishment of, a tyranny shall lose his citizenship together with his family.'

xvii Peisistratus, then, grew old in office, and fell ill and died in the Archonship of Philoneos, having lived for thirty-three years since he first set himself up as tyrant, and having ruled for nineteen of those years; for the remainder he was in exile. From the dates it is manifestly absurd to suggest, as some do, that Peisistratus was loved by Solon, and was general in the war against Megara for possession of Salamis; their ages make it impossible if one calculates each man's life and the date of his death.

3 After Peisistratus' death, his sons ruled, and conducted affairs in the same way. He had two sons by his citizen wife, Hippias and Hipparchus, and two by his Argive wife, Iophon and Hegesistratos, who was also called Thetalos. Peisistratus had married Timonassa, the daughter

xviii

Their position and age meant that the state was run by Hipparchus and Hippias; Hippias was the older, a natural politician and a wise man, and he presided over the government. Hipparchus was fond of amusements, and interested in love affairs and the arts—he was the man who sent for Anacreon and Simonides and their associates and the other poets. Thetalos was much younger, and violent and outrageous in his behaviour, which was the cause of all their troubles. He fell in love with Harmodius, and when his love was not returned, far from restraining his anger, he gave vent to it viciously; finally, when Harmodius' sister was to carry a basket in the procession at the Panathenaia, he stopped her, and insulted Harmodius as effeminate. Hence Harmodius and Aristogiton were provoked to their plot, in which many took part. At the time of the Panathenaia, when they were watching for Hippias on the Acropolis (for it so happened that he was receiving the procession while Hipparchus despatched it), they saw one of the conspirators greet Hippias in a friendly way. They thought that they were betrayed. Wishing to achieve something before they were arrested, they went down into the city, and, not waiting for their fellow conspirators, killed Hipparchus as he was organising the procession by the Leokoreion; thus they spoiled the whole attempt. Harmodius was killed immediately by the guards, but Aristogiton was captured later, and tortured for a long time. Under torture he accused many nobles who were friends of the tyrants of complicity. At first enquiries had been unable to find any trace of the plot, for the story that Hippias had disarmed those in the procession and searched them for daggers is not true, for they did

2

not carry weapons in the procession at that time—it was
 5 a later innovation of the democracy. The democrats say
 that Aristogeiton accused the friends of the tyrants
 deliberately in order to involve them in impiety and
 weaken their faction if they killed their friends who were
 innocent; others say that he was not making it up, but
 6 did reveal those who were in the plot. Finally, when,
 despite all his efforts, death eluded him, he promised that
 he would implicate many others; having persuaded
 Hippias to give him his hand as a pledge, he reviled him
 for giving his hand to the murderer of his brother. This
 angered Hippias so much that his fury overcame him,
 and he drew his dagger and killed him.

XIX After this the tyranny became much more severe; in
 avenging his brother, Hippias had killed or exiled many
 2 people, and was distrusted and hated by all. About three
 years after the death of Hipparchus, Hippias tried to
 fortify Munichia because of his unpopularity in the city
 of Athens; he intended to move his residence there, but
 while this was going on he was expelled by Cleomenes,
 the Spartan king, because the Spartans were repeatedly
 receiving oracles instructing them to end the tyranny at
 3 Athens. The reason was this. The Athenian exiles, who
 were led by the Alcmeonids, could not bring about their
 return unaided; a number of attempts failed. One of
 these unsuccessful attempts involved the fortification of
 Leipsudrion, a point below Mt. Parnes; there they were
 joined by some supporters from the city, but the place
 was besieged and taken by the tyrants. This was the
 origin of the well-known drinking song about the disaster
 which ran:

Alas, Leipsudrion, betrayer of friends, what heroes
 you destroyed, men brave in battle and of noble
 blood; then they showed the quality of their families.
 4 Having failed, then, in all other attempts, the Alc-
 meonids contracted to rebuild the temple at Delphi, and
 in this way they obtained plenty of money to secure the
 support of the Spartans. Whenever the Spartans con-
 sulted the oracle, the priestess instructed them to free

Athens; finally she persuaded them, although they had
 ties of hospitality with the Peisistratids.* The Spartans
 were swayed no less by the friendship between the
 5 Peisistratids and the Argives. First, they sent Anchimolus
 with an army by sea. He was defeated and killed
 because Kineas the Thessalian came to the help of the
 Athenians with a thousand cavalry. The Spartans were
 angered by this, and sent their king, Cleomenes, with a
 larger force by land; he defeated an attempt by the
 Thessalian cavalry to prevent his entry into Attica, shut
 6 up Hippias inside the so-called Pelargic wall, and be-
 sieged him with Athenian help. While he was conduct-
 ing the siege, it happened that the sons of the Peisista-
 tids were captured as they attempted to slip out of the
 city secretly. After their capture, the Peisistratids agreed,
 in return for the children's safety, to hand over the
 Acropolis and leave with their own property within a
 period of five days. This was in the Archonship of
 Harpaktides when they had held the tyranny for about
 seventeen years after the death of their father; the whole
 period including their father's reign had lasted forty-nine
 years.

CLEISTHENES

XX After the fall of the tyranny, there was a struggle
 between Isagoras the son of Teisander, who was a
 supporter of the tyrants, and Cleisthenes, who was of the
 family of the Alcmeonids. When Cleisthenes lost power
 in the political clubs, he won the support of the people
 2 by promising them control of the state. The power of
 Isagoras waned in turn, and he called in Cleomenes
 again, for he had ties of friendship with him. He per-
 suaded him to 'expel the curse', for the Alcmeonids were
 3 thought to be amongst those accursed. Cleisthenes
 retired into exile, and Cleomenes arrived with a few men
 and expelled seven hundred Athenian families as being
 under the curse. Having done this, he tried to dissolve
 the *Boule* and to put Isagoras and three hundred of his

* A collective name for the sons (and descendants) of Peisistratus.

friends in control of the city. The *Boule* resisted and the people gathered; the supporters of Cleomenes and Isagoras fled to the Acropolis. The people surrounded them and besieged them for two days; on the third they let Cleomenes and all those with him go under a truce, and recalled Cleisthenes and the other exiles. The people had taken control of affairs, and Cleisthenes was their leader and champion of the people, for the Alcmeonids had been the group probably most responsible for the expulsion of the tyrants and had stirred up trouble for them for much of the time. Even before the Alcmeonids, Kedon had attacked the tyrants, and therefore his name also figures in the drinking songs:

Pour a draught also for Kedon, boy, and do not forget him, if it is right to pour wine for brave men.

xxi The people trusted Cleisthenes for these reasons. At that time, as their leader, in the fourth year after the overthrow of the tyranny which was the Archonship of Isagoras, he first divided all the citizens into ten tribes instead of the earlier four, with the aim of mixing them together so that more might share control of the state. From this arose the saying 'No investigation of tribes' as an answer to those wishing to inquire into ancestry.

3 Then he established a *Boule* of 500 instead of 400, fifty from each tribe; previously there had been 100 from each. His purpose in not splitting the people into twelve tribes was to avoid dividing them according to the *trittus* which already existed; there were twelve *trittus* in the four old tribes, and the result would not have been a mixing. He divided Attica into thirty sections, using the demes as the basic unit; ten of the sections were in the city area, ten around the coast and ten inland. He called these sections *trittes*, and placed three into each tribe by lot, one from each geographical area. He made fellow demesmen of those living in each deme so that they would not reveal the new citizens by using a man's father's name, but would use his deme in addressing him. Hence the Athenians use their demes as part of their names. He set up demarchs with the same functions

as the previous *naukraroi*, for the demes took the place of the *naukrariai*. Some of the demes he named after their position, others after their founders, for not all were still connected with a particular locality. He left the citizens free to belong to clan groups, and phratres, and hold priesthoods in the traditional way. He gave the tribes ten eponymous heroes selected by the Delphic oracle from a preliminary list of a hundred.

xxii These changes made the constitution much more democratic than it had been under Solon. A contributory factor was that Solon's laws had fallen into disuse under the tyranny, and Cleisthenes replaced them with others with the aim of winning the people's support; these included the law about ostracism. It was in the fifth year after this constitution was established in the Archonship of Hermokreon, that they formulated the oath which the *Boule* of 500 still take today. At that time they selected the *strategoi* by tribes, one from each; the Polemarch was the overall commander of the army. Eleven years later, in the Archonship of Phainippos, the Athenians won the battle of Marathon. This made the democracy so confident that after a further two years had passed they first used the law of ostracism; it had been passed from a suspicion of those in power, because Peisistratus had started as leader of the people and *strategos*, and become tyrant. The first to be ostracised was one of his relations, Hipparchus, the son of Charmus, of Kollyros; it was the desire to expel him which was the primary motive of Cleisthenes in proposing the law. With the customary forbearance of the democracy, the people had allowed the friends of the tyrants to continue to live in Athens with the exception of those who had committed crimes in the civil disorders; their leader and champion was Hipparchus. In the year immediately following, the Archonship of Telesinos, they cast lots for the nine Archons by tribes from the five hundred previously elected by the demesmen; this first happened then after the tyranny; all their predecessors were elected. In the same year, Megacles, the son of Hippocrates, from

6 Alopeke was ostracised. For three years they ostracised the friends of the tyrants, the original purpose of ostracism, but in the fourth year they also removed anyone else who seemed to be too powerful. The first man to be ostracised who was not connected with the tyranny was Xanthippus, the son of Ariphron.

7 Two years later, in the Archonship of Nikodemus, when the mines at Maroneia were discovered and the city had a surplus of one hundred talents from their exploitation, some recommended that the money should be distributed to the people. Themistocles prevented this; he did not say for what he would use the money, but recommended that a talent should be lent to each of the hundred wealthiest Athenians. If the people approved of what it was spent on, the expenditure should be borne by the state; if not, they should recover the money from those who had borrowed it. The proposal was approved on these terms, and he had a hundred triremes built, one by each man. This was the fleet in which they fought the barbarians at Salamis. Aristides, the son of Lysimachus, was ostracised at this time.

8 Three years later, in the Archonship of Hupsichides, because of Xerxes' expedition, they recalled all those who had been ostracised; for the future they decreed that those who had been ostracised should not live nearer to Athens than Gerastus or Scyllaeum under penalty of losing their citizenship for good.

THE AREOPAGUS

xxiii Up to this point the city went on growing and developing its democracy by gradual stages, but after the Persian wars the Areopagus became strong again and ran the city, not because it was voted the position but because it had been responsible for the battle of Salamis. When the *strategoi* did not know how to handle the situation, and ordered each man to see to his own safety, the Areopagus provided each person with eight drachmae and embarked them in the ships. For this reason the Athenians respected the Areopagus, and were well governed at this time. At the time they

paid attention to military training, were respected by the Greeks, and took the hegemony at sea despite the Spartans.

3 The champions of the people at this period were Aristides the son of Lysimachus and Themistocles the son of Neocles, the latter with the reputation of being an expert in military matters, the former a clever politician and an outstandingly just man; therefore they employed the one as a general and the other as a political adviser.

4 These two men worked together over the rebuilding of the walls of Athens despite their differences, but Aristides was the instigator of the defection of the Ionians from the Spartan alliance, when he seized the opportunity offered by the disgrace of the Spartans caused by the behaviour of Pausanias. Hence he was the man who assessed the first list of contributions to be paid by the cities two years after the battle of Salamis, in the Archonship of Timosthenes. He also gave the oath to the Ionians 'to have the same enemies and friends', in the ratification of which they dropped the lumps of iron into the sea.

xxiv Athens' confidence increased and she built up a significant financial reserve; Aristides recommended them to seize the hegemony and to live in the city rather than the countryside; there would be a livelihood for all, some on expeditions, others on garrison duty, and others in government; in this way they would hold the hegemony. The people agreed, took control, and treated their allies more tyrannically except for the peoples of Chios, Lesbos and Samos; they used them as guards of the empire, and so allowed them to retain their own constitutions and such possessions as they had.

3 The result was also affluence for the masses, as Aristides had suggested. More than twenty thousand men earned their living as a result of the tribute, the taxation and the money the empire brought in. There were six thousand *dikastai*, sixteen hundred archers, and twelve hundred cavalry, and five hundred members of the

Boule. There were five hundred guards in the docks and fifty others on the Acropolis; offices in the city occupied up to seven hundred men, and up to seven hundred were employed abroad. In addition to them, when later they were at war, there were two thousand five hundred hoplites and twenty guard ships and other ships to carry the tribute employing two thousand men selected by lot. There were also those maintained by the state at the Prutaneion or as orphans, and the guards of the prison. All these people were paid from public funds.

EPHIALTES d. 462/1

- xxxv The people were supported in this way. For about seventeen years after the Persian wars the constitution remained the same under the guidance of the Areopagus, although it was gradually deteriorating. Then, with the increase of the power of the masses, Ephialtes the son of Sophonides became champion of the people; he had a reputation for incorruptibility and justice in public life. He launched an attack on the
- 2 Areopagus. First, he removed many of its members on charges of administrative misconduct. Then, in the Archonship of Konon, he stripped it of all its additional powers including the guardianship of the constitution; he distributed them among the *Boule*, the *Ekklesia* and
 - 3 the *dikasteria*. He was aided in the reforms by Themistocles, who was a member of the Areopagus, but was facing a charge of treason with Persia. Because Themistocles wanted the Areopagus to be ruined, he told Ephialtes that they were intending to arrest him, and told the Areopagus that he would lay information against certain persons who were plotting to overthrow the constitution. Then he took a group selected by the Areopagus to the place where Ephialtes was, ostensibly to show them a meeting of the conspirators, and talked with them seriously. Ephialtes was so alarmed when he saw this that he took refuge at an altar dressed in a suppliant's
 - 4 single garment. Everyone was amazed at what happened, and there followed a meeting of the *Boule* at which

168

Ephialtes and Themistocles made accusations against the members of the Areopagus. They repeated these accusations before the *Ekklesia* until they succeeded in depriving them of their power. . . . * Ephialtes also died shortly afterwards, murdered by Aristodikos of Tanagra.

xxxvi

- The Areopagus lost its supervisory powers in this way. In the years which followed, the enthusiasm of the demagogues led to an increasing absence of control in political life. It happened that at this time the better citizens were without a leader, for their principal spokesman, Cimon the son of Miltiades, was rather young and had only recently entered public life, and in addition to this the majority of them had perished in war. † Military service at that period depended on the citizen rolls, and the *stratēgoi* in charge were militarily inexperienced but respected for the achievements of their ancestors; the result was that two or three thousand of the men on any expedition were killed, and the better men from both the upper classes and the mass of the people were decimated. In their administration the Athenians did not pay the same amount of attention to the laws as they had done in earlier periods; they made no innovation affecting the selection of the nine Archons, except that in the sixth year after the death of Ephialtes they decided to admit *zeugitai* to the preliminary selection of those from whom the nine Archons would be selected by lot. The first member of this class to be Archon was Mnesitheides; all previous Archons had been *hippeis* or *pentakosiomedimnoi*, while the *zeugitai* had held only the ordinary offices, unless any of the legal restrictions had been disregarded. Four years later, in the Archonship of Lusikrates, the thirty justices were re-established who were known as the magistrates of the demes. Two years

* A surprising *kai* ('and' or 'also') preserved in the papyrus suggests that a clause or sentence is missing; it may have contained an account of the death of Themistocles.

† The historical order of events is very confused here; see the Commentary.

later, in the Archonship of Antidotos, because of the large size of the citizen body, it was enacted, on the proposal of Pericles, that those whose parents were not both citizens should not themselves be citizens.

- xxvii After this, Pericles became one of the leaders of the people, first becoming famous when he was a young man and prosecuted Cimon at his *enthura* as *strategos*. With Pericles, the state became still more democratic; he deprived the Areopagus of some of its powers and turned the state particularly towards naval power, with the result that the masses had the courage to take more into their own hands in all fields of government. Forty-eight years after the battle of Salamis, in the Archonship of Puthodoros, the Peloponnesian War broke out; during this the citizens were shut up inside the city walls, and grew accustomed to earn their living by military service, and decided, partly consciously and partly through the force of circumstances, to run the state themselves.
- 3 Pericles introduced pay for those serving in the *dikasteria* as a political move to counter the effects of Cimon's wealth. Cimon possessed a kingly fortune, and not merely performed his public liturgies magnificently but also maintained many of the members of his deme, for any member of the deme of Lakiadai who wished could come to him every day and receive adequate maintenance, and all his estates were unfenced so that anyone who wished could help himself to the fruit.
- 4 Pericles' wealth was not adequate to match such liberality, and Damonides of Oia, who was thought to have suggested most of Pericles' measures, and was later ostracised for this very reason, suggested to him that since he could not match Cimon in private resources, he should give the people what was their own; Pericles accepted his advice, and arranged pay for the *dikastai*. Some say that the quality of *dikastai* declined, since it was always the ordinary people rather than the more respectable who took care to ensure that their names were included in the ballot for places on the juries. This was also the beginning of corruption of the *dikastai*, the

first instance being Anytus after he was *strategos* at Pylos; he had been accused over the loss of Pylos, but bribed the court and was acquitted.

- xxviii Throughout the period of Pericles' ascendancy the state was run reasonably well, but after his death there was a marked decline. It was then that the people first got a leader who was not approved by the respectable citizens; before this the leaders had always come from this class. The first leader of the people was Solon, and he was followed by Peisistratus, both of them aristocrats of good family. After the fall of the tyranny there was Cleisthenes, an Alcmeonid, and he had no opponent after the expulsion of Isagoras and his supporters. Then Xanthippus was the leader of the people and Miltiades leader of the aristocrats; then came Themistocles and Aristides. After them, Ephialtes led the people and Cimon the wealthier classes; then Pericles led the people while Thucydides, a relative by marriage of Cimon, led the other group. After the death of Pericles, Nicias, who died in Sicily, was the leader of the upper classes, while Cleon the son of Cleainetus led the people. The latter appears to have corrupted the people more than anyone else by his violence; he was the first to shout when addressing the people, he used abusive language, and addressed the *Ekklesia* with his garments tucked up when it was customary to speak properly dressed. After them, Theramenes the son of Hagnon was leader of the other group, while the leader of the people was Cleophon the lyre-maker who introduced the two-obol payment. This was paid for some time and then was abolished by Kallikrates of Palania; he first promised to add a third obol to the distribution. Both these last two politicians were later condemned to death, for, even if the people are deceived for a while, they tend later to hate those who have induced them to follow an unsuitable course of action. After Cleophon there was an unbroken series of demagogues whose main aim was to be outrageous and please the people with no thought for anything but the present.