



Pnyx: Journal of Classical Studies

Τόμ. 1, Αρ. 1 (2022)

Pnyx: Journal of Classical Studies (Inaugural Issue)





ISEGORIA

Making it Fair for Scholars Everywhere

www.isegoriapublishing.co.uk

16 Commerce Square, Lace Market, NG1 1HS, Nottingham, UK

ISSN: 2754-5725



PNYX: Journal of Classical Studies

Volume 1 1 | 2022

eISSN: 2754-5725

<https://pnyx.co.uk>

PNYX is a double-blind peer-reviewed journal for Classical Studies (broadly defined). It publishes research papers and reviews of books on any topic relating to the ancient Mediterranean world and its periphery, from the 8th century BCE to the 7th century CE.

Copyright © Isegoria Publishing LTD | 2022

Layout: DM Design | Myrto David & ePage Imaging Services | Viswanath Prasanna

Typesetting: ePage Imaging Services | Viswanath Prasanna

Proofreading: Maria Lymperopoulou & Derrick Davis



ISEGORIA


Making it Fair for Scholars Everywhere

16 Commerce Square, Lace Market, Nottingham,
NG1 1HS, Nottinghamshire, United Kingdom

Registered in England No. 13517102

Registered Office: 22 Wollaton Vale, Wollaton, Nottingham, NG8 2NR, England

<https://isegoriapublishing.co.uk/>



Articles copyright held by the author(s) and made available under the

Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Cover image: Adapted version by M. David; Statue of Demosthenes, Vatican Museum. Photograph by Robert Macpherson (1811-1872). Digital image courtesy of Getty's Open Content Program.

Editors-in-Chief

Stefanos Apostolou (University of Nottingham)

Manolis Pagkalos (University of Groningen)

Advisory Board

Bartosz Awianowicz (Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń)

Sandra Boehringer (University of Strasbourg)

Camila Condilo (University of Brasília)

Christy Constantakopoulou (Birkbeck University of London | National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens)

Madalina-Claudia Dana (Université Jean Moulin Lyon 3)

Stefania De Vido (Ca' Foscari University, Venice)

Julián Gallego (University of Buenos Aires)

Sven Günther (Institute for the History of Ancient Civilizations, Northeast Normal University, Changchun)

Matthias Haake (Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University of Bonn)

Etienne Helmer (University of Puerto Rico, San Juan)

Panagiotis Iossif (Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands | Museum of Cycladic Art, Athens)

Yukiko Kawamoto (Nagoya University)

Lynn Kozak (McGill University, Montreal)

Jack Lennon (University of Leicester)

David Lewis (University of Edinburgh)

Jinyu Liu (DePauw University, Greencastle, IN)

Egidia Occhipinti (University of Palermo)

Katarina Petrovićová (Masaryk University, Brno)

Selene Psoma (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens)

Milena Raycheva (National Institute of Archaeology and Museum – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia)

Yannis Stoyas (KIKPE Social and Cultural Affairs Welfare Foundation, Athens)

Ivo Topalilov (Institute of Balkan Studies – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia)

Miriam Valdes Guía (Complutense University of Madrid)

Christina Williamson (University of Groningen)

External Reviewers (Current Issue)

Alba Patricia Cardona Zuluaga (EAFIT University, Medellín)

Alberto Esu (University of Mannheim)

Francisco García-Jurado (Complutense University of Madrid)

Juan Felipe Gonzalez-Calderon (Carlos III University of Madrid)

Zilong Guo (Institute for the History of Ancient Civilizations, Northeast Normal University, Changchun)

Laura Sancho Rocher (University of Zaragoza)

Breno Battistin Sebastiani (University of São Paulo)

Table of Contents

Preface: Introducing <i>PNYX</i>	vii
---	------------

Alexandra Bartzoka

The Vocabulary and Moments of Change: Thucydides and Isocrates on the Rise and Fall of Athens and Sparta	1
---	----------

Gemma Bernadó Ferrer

Miguel Antonio Caro and the (Trans)Formations of Classical Tradition in Colombia.....	27
--	-----------

Miriam Valdés Guía

<i>Zeugitai</i> in Fifth-Century Athens: Social and Economic Qualification from Cleisthenes to the End of the Peloponnesian War.....	45
---	-----------

Preface: Introducing *PNYX*

PNYX is a digital-only, double-blind peer-reviewed, free-for-all, Open Access journal for Classical Studies, Archaeology, and their Receptions that publishes research papers in English and offers full editorial services to authors. We understand that every term used in the previous sentence invites debate and in what follows we address each one separately. Before we proceed, we must say that we are proud of our Advisory Board, which spans three continents and a dozen countries, whose numbers are tilted in favour of female, non-Anglophone members. It is indicative of our vision of Classical Studies and the slightly different way we do things. We thank them for their support, insight, and confidence, and we look forward to the wonderful journey ahead.

Why Digital-only?

No crisis is an opportunity, yet the pandemic has removed us from libraries and brought us closer to electronic resources. Many more colleagues are happy to read PDFs and libraries across the world continue to invest heavily in electronic copies, following the trend that had developed a few years before Covid. Besides the apparent positive effect on the environment, digital print makes the material available worldwide with the click of a button. Thanks to specialised software, digital texts become easily accessible to readers with impediments. Portability is another factor, as not everyone has enough space to store publications or pack copies in suitcases. In less noble aspects, digital print is cheaper and facilitates faster production.

Why Two Rounds of Peer Review?

Colleagues active on social media may be aware of a growing discussion over the unpredictability of reviewers. As publishers, we choose to orient reviewers' work towards the positive changes they bring to the table: constructive criticism and meaningful suggestions. Of course, their views continue to weigh in significantly, but the decision to publish a paper is, and should be, editorial. For this, a broad Advisory Board and editors' commitment are absolute necessities. The publishing house and the journal are scholarly-led endeavours, and the editors-in-chief work full-time to ensure that authors receive the best service possible, inclusive, fair, high-quality, and free. During the internal review, editors and Advisory Board members read papers, make suggestions to authors, and decide on publication. External reviewers are then asked to pinpoint errors and/or slips, but mostly to suggest improvements and different viewpoints to authors in a genuinely collaborative manner that many colleagues are happy to experience and be part of.

Why Free?

Let us be clear: there are no hidden fees anywhere, at any point of the production and service. Our authors receive a CC-BY 4.0 license and editorial services for free. We believe that no one should pay to publish their work. Open Access should make things more inclusive and accessible hence we opted for a different model that relies on donations and sponsorship from third parties. We reach out to the public for donations and go directly to funders and donors to receive support and ensure that we continue to provide our services for free. Access to institutional or private funding should not be the litmus test for publishing one's work: rigour, value, and substance should.

Why Open Access?

Over the last few years, the direction of scientific publishing has become clear, as an increasing number of funding bodies require funded research to be freely available to the public. It is the way of the foreseeable future, and publishers have a duty to facilitate the free and fair dissemination of research. We are committed to our principles and vision¹ for our field, and we firmly believe that Open Access must be a facilitator available to all. We hope that innovative business models will alleviate the financial burden and other barriers from the shoulders of scholars, students, readers, and libraries worldwide.

Why All Those Disciplines?

As scholars, we believe in a holistic approach that embraces as many aspects of the ancient world as possible. The examination of different kinds of evidence from different perspectives only benefits research in a scholarly environment that has long been subjected to the demand for cross-disciplinarity; addressing the full spectrum of Classical Studies feels like the logical step in that direction. No genre, discipline, or field operates in a vacuum.

Why English Only?

There may not be enough cyberspace to address this issue fully. For Anglophone colleagues and readers, this choice is expected, given the base of operations of the journal and the publishing house. More widely, despite polyglotism in our field, English is the language of convenience and, arguably, main language of research. Authoring research in English ensures wider dissemination of one's work, and the demand to publish in English is increasing rapidly. Whereas as editors we are happy to work in several languages between us, we decided to tailor our editorial services to non-Anglophone authors who publish in their native language but look to publish in English. Often, they face substantial costs to meet the requirements of English academic style (for whatever that means in the age of International English), as they hire the services of professional editors with unpredictable outcomes. A substantial investment of time and money does not guarantee success. We decided to break this vicious circle and offer language editing services to our authors for free. Upon acceptance for publication after the internal review, papers undergo language editing before forwarding them to external reviewers. In our view, Global Scholars who author their research in English already make a giant step in exiting their comfort zone; therefore, they should not be the ones that have to bear all costs to tailor their manuscript to requirements of language and style.

At *Pnyx*, no author will be sent away, and no submission will be rejected on the grounds of language or style. Instead, we work with authors constructively to improve their work and bring it closer to Anglophone academic standards, always respecting the author's voice and affinity to other research traditions and environments. Our decision to publish manuscripts depends on merit, originality, and value alone. If the idea is there, we work with authors on style. In our vision for Classical Studies, colleagues can focus on what they do best: researching, thinking, and writing.

¹ Available here: <https://isegoriapublishing.co.uk/our-purpose>.

Why (Do we Need) Another Journal?

It may be clear that this is not just another journal, but an innovative model, a service provided by scholars to scholars, an initiative that addresses the most critical aspects of our profession: fairness and inclusivity, beyond costs and style. *PNYX* offers free language editing, a free Open Access Licence, and the opportunity for authors, Advisory Board Members, editors, and reviewers to work collaboratively. We are interested in finding reasons to publish a paper, not to reject it; we focus on the idea and help with style and presentation; we welcome contributions from members of groups currently under-represented in our field and enjoy pulling down barriers. The current issue is indicative of our vision for Classics: fair, free, global, inclusive. We are proud that all three articles are authored by female, non-Anglophone colleagues and reviewed by non-Anglophone colleagues.

The title of the journal speaks volumes of our mission to create a platform where researchers can publish their work in English without much stress, able to enjoy the process of authoring and receive services we would all like to see. *PNYX* promotes a multitude of voices and perspectives, each with the right of expressing one's views freely and equally (*Isegoria*). More importantly, it moves away from the Ancient Athenian reality to include all scholars, especially those belonging to groups currently under-represented in our field. In the words of the Athenian herald, 'Who wishes to speak?', we are happy to receive your manuscripts, but please also get in touch to share your views and suggestions; this is how our projects develop. You are warmly invited to visit our websites to learn more about our story, vision, and work *ethos*.²

Stay safe, and enjoy reading our inaugural issue,
Manolis E. Pagkalos and Stefanos Apostolou
Nottingham, February 2022

² *PNYX: Journal of Classical Studies*: www.pnyx.co.uk; *Isegoria Publishing*: www.isegoriapublishing.co.uk.

We would like to dedicate our inaugural issue to the loving memory of Anna Ramou-Hapsiades (2021+), a teacher of teachers and a prolific Professor of Ancient History at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. We start with Demosthenes on the cover of the issue, with three papers authored by female historians, and two papers on ancient Athens. Mrs Anna would have liked that.

The Vocabulary and Moments of Change: Thucydides and Isocrates on the Rise and Fall of Athens and Sparta

Alexandra Bartzoka

Department of History and Archaeology, University of Patras

abartzoka@upatras.gr

Submitted	15/11/2021
Accepted (Internal Review)	03/12/2021
Revised (External Review)	22/01/2022
Published	24/03/2022

Abstract

This paper presents the events classical authors deemed as key moments in the rise and fall of Athens and Sparta, and examines the vocabulary they used to describe change: its extent (momentary or long-lasting), nature (evolution, transition, reversal, destruction, or renewal), and effects (positive or negative). It relies mainly on Thucydides and Isocrates and uses supporting evidence where appropriate. The Persian Wars, the end of the Peloponnesian War, and the battles of Knidos, Naxos, and Leuktra were frequently thought of as the causes of Athens' and Sparta's growth or collapse, prosperity or misfortune. These events were not only key moments in the balance of power in interstate relations, but also part of a particular argumentation which exploited and presented the phenomenon of change in several ways and through varying narratives. The study of the vocabulary pertaining to the rise and fall of the two cities reveals, on the one hand, the different ways one can treat change and, on the other hand, that the relevant words can convey neutral, positive, or negative connotations, depending especially on an author's intentions when emphasising a particular event.

Keywords

Change; Classical period; Athens; Sparta; interstate relations; Thucydides; Isocrates

Acknowledgements

This article is part of my research project about the phenomenon of change in the Greek poleis of the archaic and classical period, financed by the funding programme MEDICUS of the University of Patras. I would like to thank the audience at the University of Exeter for their remarks on the paper from which this article originates. In addition, I would like to thank the editors and the anonymous reviewers of the journal for their helpful comments. Any remaining mistakes are my own.

Introduction

Herodotus acknowledges in the proem of his *Histories* that ‘human prosperity never remains constant’ (τὴν ἀνθρωπικήν... ἐπιστάμενος εὐδαιμονίην οὐδαμὰ ἐν τῷ τῷ μένουσαν), that ‘many cities that were great long ago have become inferior’ (τὰ γὰρ τὸ πάλαι μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν σμικρὰ γέγονε), whereas ‘some that are great in *his* own time were inferior before’ (τὰ δὲ ἐπ’ ἐμέο ἦν μεγάλα, πρότερον ἦν σμικρὰ).¹ Herodotus’ interpretive framework of historical change that political communities may experience² reflects a common perception in Greek discourse, the changeability of human fortune.³ Along the same lines, Isocrates clearly states in his *Panegyricus* that ‘changes often occur, and power never stays in the same hands’ (πολλὰς τὰς μεταβολὰς γίγνεσθαι, τὰς γὰρ δυναστείας οὐδέποτε τοῖς αὐτοῖς παραμένειν).⁴ The adjective πολὺς, followed by the term μεταβολή, is used to show how frequently a change in the concentration of power can take place. Isocrates then juxtaposes to these two words the verb παραμένω, which, combined with the adverb οὐδέποτε, repeats and emphasises how easily a major power may rise and fall. This general observation may well apply to Athens and Sparta of the classical period, two Greek cities which, according to the ancient authors of the era, were the foremost examples of great powers undergoing such a reversal of fortune regarding their public affairs standing.⁵

The notion of historical change (μεταβολή) is a major aspect of ancient Greek history. Modern scholars have turned their attention to the subject of constitutional change (μεταβολή πολιτειῶν),⁶ and in recent years there is renewed interest in studying its various aspects through the organisation of seminars and colloquiums around this notion.⁷ Among these aspects, the change in possession of power regarding Athens and Sparta is a topic thoroughly examined in most works about the political history of the two cities. However, these studies concentrate on the implications of this phenomenon (political, social, economic) and not on reading the vocabulary pertaining to their growth and collapse.

To this end, this paper examines the different opinions expressed by the authors of the classical period about the rise and fall of Athens and Sparta, emphasising the vocabulary these authors used

¹ Hdt. 1.5; cf. Pl. *Leg.* 676c: καὶ τότε μὲν ἐξ ἐλαττόνων μείζους, τότε δ’ ἐκ μείζονων ἐλάττους, καὶ χείρους ἐκ βελτιόνων γεγόνασιν καὶ βελτίους ἐκ χειρόνων. For the translations of Demosthenes’ and Isocrates’ works I used the Loeb Classical Library (LCL) collection as well as the relevant volumes of M. Gagarin’s series *The Oratory of Classical Greece* (for Demosthenes, Harris, 2008; Trevett, 2011; for Isocrates, Too and Mirhady, 2000; Papillon, 2004). For Thucydides, Herodotus, and Xenophon’s *Hellenika*, I used Strassler, 2008; 2009; 2010 respectively.

² Cartledge and Greenwood, 2002: 357; Rösler, 2002: 92; van Wees, 2002: 328; Asheri, Loyd and Corcella, 2007: 78.

³ See e.g., Antiph. 1.4.9 (*Tetralogy I*; Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀτυχούσιν νεωτερίζειν συμφέρεται. ἐκ γὰρ τῶν μεταβολῶν ἐπίδοξος ἢ δυσπραγία μεταβάλλειν αὐτῶν ἐστὶ. τοῖς δ’ εὐτυχούσιν ἀτρεμίζειν καὶ φυλάσσειν τὴν παρούσαν εὐπραγίαν. μεθισταμένων γὰρ τῶν πραγμάτων δυστυχεῖς ἐξ εὐτυχούντων καθίστανται.); Thuc. 2.53.1 (ἀγχίστροφον τὴν μεταβολήν), 4.17.5 (πλείστα μεταβολαὶ ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρω ξυμβεβήκασι); Dem. 20.49 (*Against Leptines*; οὐ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτε τὰ πράγματα ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρω).

⁴ Isoc. 4.22 (*Panegyricus*).

⁵ Cf. Aeschin. 2.131 (*On the Embassy*), on the rise and fall of the power of the Phocian tyrants.

⁶ Ryffel, 1949; Bertelli, 1989: 275-326; Ingravalle, 1989: 327-352; Liddel, 2010: 15-29; Poddighe, 2014; Loddo, 2016: 175-206; Poddighe, 2019: 271-300. See also the HDR of P. Hamon, *Metabolai politeiōn*, conducted in EPHE, under the supervision of D. Rousset.

⁷ Seminars: *Le vocabulaire politique grec: le vocabulaire du changement politique*, ENS, Paris, France, 2018; *Change and Resilience in Classical Antiquity*, Exeter, United Kingdom, 2021. Colloquia: *Le changement: conceptions et représentations dans l’Antiquité gréco-romaine*, Paris, 14-15 October 2016; the acts have been published in *Camenuiae* 18: <https://lettres.sorbonne-universite.fr/camenuiae-18-novembre-2017>; *Historical Change in the Ancient Aegean: A conference in honour of John K. Davies*, Rethymno, Greece, 16-18 October 2020; *Metabolé: Crisis and Transformation in Antiquity*, Madrid, Spain, 25-27 November 2021.

to reflect on the succession of hegemonies, and by taking into account their usually Athenocentric narratives.⁸ Due to the available evidence, it relies mainly on Thucydides and Isocrates, two authors who were particularly interested in discussing the constant changes of power, and uses Herodotus, Xenophon, Ephorus, and Demosthenes when possible. More precisely, this paper determines, on the one hand, which particular events were regarded as critical moments in the rise and fall of Athens and Sparta: the Persian Wars, the Peloponnesian War, and the battles of Knidos, Naxos, and Leuktra. On the other hand, it examines the vocabulary used to describe the transformation of the two *poleis* and underlines the different ways one can depict change, in terms of its extent and frequency (momentary or long-lasting change), nature (evolution, transition, reversal, rupture, destruction, renewal), and impact on those who experienced change (positive or negative). The first part of the paper focuses on the growth and collapse of Athenian power, the second on Spartan supremacy and its downfall.

Growth and Collapse of the Athenian Power

1. The Persian Wars

In Book 6, Thucydides presents the Athenian ambassador Euphemos speaking before the people of Kamarina in an attempt to persuade them to remain allied with the Athenians instead of offering their support to Syracuse.⁹ Euphemos did not convince the Kamarinians, who decided to stay neutral in the conflict between Syracuse and Athens. Regardless, his speech is of great value to historians. It offers important information on the Athenians' perception of their empire and their difficulty in gaining the support of the Sicilian cities.¹⁰ To this end, Euphemos explains how the Athenians acquired their empire and how circumstances forced them to expand it;¹¹ it was, in fact, the perennial hostility between Ionians and Dorians that contributed to Athenian growth. Concerned about the size of the Dorian population in the Peloponnese and their proximity to Athens, the Athenians sought the best means to avoid becoming subjects of the Peloponnesians.¹²

Καὶ μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ ναῦς κτησάμενοι τῆς μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀρχῆς καὶ ἡγεμονίας¹³
ἀπηλλάγημεν, οὐδὲν προσήκον μᾶλλον τι ἐκείνους ἢ μὴν ἢ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκείνοις ἐπιτάσσειν,
πλὴν καθ' ὅσον ἐν τῷ παρόντι μείζον ἴσχυον, αὐτοὶ δὲ τῶν ὑπὸ βασιλεῖ πρότερον ὄντων
ἡγεμόνες καταστάντες οἰκοῦμεν.¹⁴

⁸ On the Athenocentric models of change that modern research applies to the study of the classical period and the Athenian perceptions of Greek interstate relations, Low, 2007: 213-215. On the succession of hegemonies in the Greek and Roman worlds, Bearzot, 2010: 11-24; Landucci, 2018: 7-28.

⁹ Thuc. 6.81-87.

¹⁰ On the function of the speeches in Thucydides that failed to convince but at the same time remain important for the economy of the work, Tsakmakis, 2017: 270.

¹¹ Euphemos' speech is a good example of the pressure to pursue the power one has acquired and the constant vigilance it demanded; cf. Saxonhouse, 2017: 347-349.

¹² On the argument involving kinship and the justification provided for the consolidation of Athenian domination, Kagan, 1981: 246; Connor, 1984: 182-184 (who emphasises the difference between Euphemos' argumentation and the Athenian version of the facts before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War; see below). On Athens' kinship connections across the empire, Fragoulaki, 2013: 210-227.

¹³ On the meanings of the words ἡγεμονία and ἀρχή, Low, 2007: 201-202 n. 67; Boëldieu-Trevet, 2016: 68-72.

¹⁴ Thuc. 6.82.3.

And after the Persian war we acquired a fleet, and so got rid of the empire and the supremacy of the Spartans, who had no right to give order to us more than we to them, except that of being the strongest at that moment; and having ourselves become leaders of the King's former subjects, we are continuing to be so.

(Trans. by R. Crawley, with adjustments)

According to Euphemos, the critical moment came after the Persian Wars,¹⁵ when the Athenians were delivered (ἀπηλλάγημεν) from the rule of the Lakedaimonians with the help of their newly acquired navy and, thus, assumed the leadership of the Persian King's former subjects. The construction of their fleet made the Athenians the dominant force at that time,¹⁶ because, Euphemos points out, the Spartans had no more right to give orders to the Athenians than the Athenians to the Spartans, except being the strongest in that instance.

To describe change in the Greeks' leadership, Euphemos uses the verb ἀπαλλάσσω, 'to deliver', 'to liberate'. The choice is not accidental and serves two purposes that are directly linked to its particular meaning. The term is part of the medical vocabulary and usually denotes the complete cure of an illness. For example, Isocrates uses this verb where he compares the treatment necessary for the cure of bodily illnesses (ἀπαλλαγώμεν) with the remedies necessary for minds that are ignorant and full of evil desires.¹⁷ Except for its medical use, the term is also attested in other passages in Thucydides, Herodotus, and Xenophon's works, as well as in Greek oratory,¹⁸ where, in political terms, it denotes the definite end of a previous situation. In our case, it describes the end of Spartan leadership.¹⁹ Indeed, it is used to criticise the power Sparta was exercising and at the same time to imply the sentiment of relief²⁰ that the Athenians expressed for having been delivered from the Spartan rule.

Euphemos' wording on the opposition between Ionians and Dorians, the Athenian fleet, and its role in the development of the Athenian hegemony and empire, presents different versions we must consider when assessing change in the Greeks' leadership after the Persian Wars (478/7).

¹⁵ On the prestige that the Athenians gained after the Persian Wars, Bonnin, 2015: 87-89.

¹⁶ Cf. Thuc. 6.83.1 on the right of the Athenians to rule (ἄξιοι τε ὄντες ἅμα ἄρχομεν), because of the largest fleet they possessed and their services towards the Greeks. Also, Thuc. 2.41.3 (ὥς οὐχ ὑπ' ἄξιων ἄρχεται) and 5.89.1 (ὥς ἡ δικαίως τὸν Μῆδον καταλύσαντες ἄρχομεν).

¹⁷ Isoc. 8.39-40 (*On the Peace*): τὰς μὲν καύσεις καὶ τὰς τομὰς τῶν ἱατρῶν ὑπομένειν ἵνα πλείονων ἀλγηδόνων ἀπαλλαγώμεν. The verb ἀπαλλάσσω is frequently attested in Galen's treatises. On the medical references found in Thucydides' Book 6 – in Nicias' and Alcibiades' speeches – and their political significance, Jouanna, 2012: 21-38. On the use of medical metaphors as a model for politics by ancient historians, Jouanna, 2005: 17-20. On the interaction of Thucydides with the medical writers of his era, Thomas, 2006: 92-108; 2017: 569-576.

¹⁸ Different uses of the term in Thuc. 1.95.7, 7.42.3, 8.86.6, 89.1; Hdt. 1.170, 5.65-66; Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.7; *Poroi* 6.1; and in Attic orators, e.g., Dem. 1.8 (*Olynthiac I*); 4.13 (*Philippic I*); 6.25 (*Philippic II*); 9.17 (*Philippic III*); 10.64 (*Philippic IV*); 18.324 (*On the Crown*); 19.314 (*On the False Embassy*); 22.37 (*Against Androtion*); Isoc. 3.6, 3.23 (*Nicocles*); 4.39 (*Panegyricus*); 5.49 (*To Philip*); 7.16 (*Areopagiticus*); 8.20, 8.25 (*On the Peace*); 12.77, 12.164 (*Panathenaicus*); 14.18 (*Plataicus*); Epistle 9.19 (*To Archidamus*); Lyc. 1.114 (*Against Leocrates*); Lys. 1.45 (*Against Eratosthenes*); 6.35 (*Against Andocides*); 7.35 (*Areopagiticus*).

¹⁹ Exceptions in Aeschin. 2.13 (*On the Embassy*): βούλεσθαι δὲ καὶ νῦν ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοῦ πολέμου, where the author refers to Ctesiphon's embassy to Philip II of Macedon and to the king's desire to be rid of the war. Placing the adverb νῦν (at that moment) next to the term ἀπαλλάσσω limits the extent of the change and suggests that Philip wanted to stop the war only temporarily. Cf. the verb ἀναβάλλω ('to postpone') which is used to denote the temporary character of a change and contrasts with the ἀπαλλάσσω. Also, Isoc. 4.172 (*Panegyricus*); 8.25 (*On the Peace*).

²⁰ Cf. Sanders, 2012: 151-152, about the emotions implied in Thuc. 1.70. On historiography as a source of information for the part played by emotions in various domains of communication, Sanders, 2012: 153, 159, 162-165.

First, the version presented by the Athenians in Sparta before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, when they claimed that they had acquired their leadership ‘by no violent means’ and at the request of the allies, since Sparta was no longer willing to continue the war against the Persians.²¹ A few chapters after (1.95.7-96.1), in his account of the foundation of the Delian League, Thucydides himself offers a different version from the Athenian ambassadors’ one. He suggests that the Athenians succeeded the Spartans ‘by the voluntary act of the allies’, not only because Sparta wanted to end the war, but also because of the hatred (μῖσος)²² of the allies for the Spartan king Pausanias. In other words, Thucydides specifies that the allies asked the Athenians to take over the leadership of the Greeks since Sparta appeared preoccupied with problems of internal and external politics.²³ On the contrary, Herodotus does not stress any initiative of the allies but suggests it was the Athenians who seized leadership (ἀπείλοντο), because they took advantage of the problems Sparta was facing at the time (Pausanias’ *hubris*).²⁴

All these versions reveal how a particular change could be exploited and presented in multiple ways and through varying narratives. That is, Herodotus and Thucydides insist on Pausanias’ behaviour that proved decisive in changing the Greeks’ leadership, but they write from a different perspective. Herodotus explains this change regarding the Athenian attitude: two years before, the Athenians were willing to cede naval command to the Spartans to confront the Persians, because they put the survival of Greece first,²⁵ but now Pausanias’ *hubris* came at the right moment for them to take over the leadership. Thucydides, in turn, puts emphasis on the connection between Pausanias’ behaviour and the allies’ attitude, by underlying that the latter would not have petitioned to the Athenians to become their leaders had it not been for Pausanias. Again, the Athenians of 432/1, who needed to legitimise their rule before the Peloponnesians, give no details about the exact historical conditions that made their allies request Athenian command. In fact, it is worth noting that in the Athenian ambassadors’ version of the events, the justification of Athens’ dominant position is not just an Athenian construct but became an argument accepted and used by their allies:²⁶ the Athenians claim that it was their allies who attached themselves to Athens and requested to take over command due to the default of Sparta from continuing the war. This need for legitimacy becomes even more apparent in Euphemos’ speech of 415, where the envoy needs to defend Athenian hegemony to avoid losing the support of the Kamarinians: by using the argument of kinship and the justification it provided for the consolidation of Athenian domination, he explains how the fear of the growing power of others compelled the Athenians to pursue power themselves.

²¹ Thuc. 1.75.2.

²² On the emotion of hatred, Konstan, 2006: 185-200. Also, Fragoulaki, 2016: 121, on the emotion of hatred in Thucydides’ Plataian debate.

²³ On the difference between the ambassadors’ version and the one presented by Thucydides, Kallet, 2017: 65-66. Cf. Philochoros *FGrHist* 328 F 117: ὁ δὲ Φιλόχορος φησι καὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους λαβεῖν διὰ τὰς κατασχούσας τὴν Λακεδαιμόνα συμφορὰς. For a discussion of this fragment and Philochoros’ attitude to Athenian imperialism, Harding, 2008: 108-109.

²⁴ Hdt. 8.3. On the difference between Herodotus and Thucydides, Hornblower, 1991: 141, 142-143; Bouchet, 2014: 47-48; Kallet, 2017: 65-67.

²⁵ On this Athenian attitude praised by Herodotus, van Wees, 2002: 341-342.

²⁶ On how the Athenians exploited the circumstances to legitimise their hegemony and empire, Bartzoka, 2020: 60-61.

2. The Peloponnesian War

As far as Thucydides and the epigraphic evidence allow us to tell, the transformation of the Athenians from leaders to rulers of the Greek world was a gradual process.²⁷ But the Peloponnesian War itself was a dramatic change and is assessed by Thucydides as the ‘greatest movement (κίνησις μεγίστη) yet known in history not only of the Greeks, but of a large part of the barbarian world.’²⁸ If one puts aside the questions raised by the precise translation of the word κίνησις (whether as ‘upheaval’ or as ‘preparation’),²⁹ this term reflects exactly, I think, the way the Peloponnesian War set in motion the struggles for a significant number of Greek cities,³⁰ the effect it had on them, and the revolution it provoked in terms of possession of power.³¹ Regarding this last point, Thucydides uses the verb καταπαύω to denote precisely the collapse and destruction of the Athenian power at the end of the war.³²

Although Xenophon narrates the last years of the Peloponnesian War,³³ he makes no use of specific words to describe the Athenian fall. Instead, he only mentions the reaction of the exiles who returned to Athens and, thus, benefited from the terms of the peace of 404. ‘They believed,’ he says, ‘that that day would be the beginning of freedom (ἄρχην τῆς ἐλευθερίας) for all of Greece.’³⁴ That is why the next interesting set of words that describe the Athenian decline are found in Isocrates’ works, where the orator draws the readers’ attention to the major historical ruptures and constant changes of power that concern the greater cities of the Greek world exclusively,³⁵ leaving aside other, smaller powers that were, however, capable of changing the state of affairs.³⁶ Due to his views on a broad

²⁷ On the much less dramatic nature of this transition, Low, 2007: 234-237. On a summary of the difficulties in reconstructing the administration and mechanisms of the League with great detail, due to Thucydides’ particular narrative, its omissions, and the limitations of the epigraphic evidence, Kallet, 2017: 74-76; Low, 2017: 99-100. For a summary of the different dates proposed for these inscriptions, Rhodes, 2008: 500-506; Pébarthe, 2011: 59-73. On the history of the Delian League, Meiggs, 1972 (the dating of certain decrees has now been reconsidered); Scheilbelreiter, 2013. On the pragmatism of the Athenian policy towards its allies, Brock, 2009: 149-166. For a summary of the finances of the League, Migeotte, 2014: 438-443. On its judicial aspects, de Ste. Croix, 1961: 94-112; Gauthier, 1972; Bartzoka, 2018: 113-118, 131-149 (with references to earlier bibliography).

²⁸ Thuc. 1.1.2: κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐγένετο καὶ μέρει τινὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, ὥς δὲ εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀνθρώπων.

²⁹ On the different translations and interpretations of this term, Rusten (2015: 27-40), who translates it as ‘the largest mobilisation’ of manpower, money, and materials. Among the most recent views that adopt the traditional translation of the term as ‘upheaval/convulsion’, Munson, 2015: 41-43.

³⁰ See also the use of the term in Thuc. 3.82.1 (τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκινήθη), regarding the effects of *stasis* that broke out in the Greek cities. On this term, its allusion to the physical and moral disruptions of the war, and its connection with Thuc. 1.1.2, Connor, 1984: 103-104; Hornblower, 1991: 478-479. On the fact that a city in *stasis* is not only shaken by the forces of motion, but also entrapped in a paralysed condition, Loraux, 1997: 102-106; Joho, 2021: 34-35. On the verbs κινέω and μετακινέω conveying the meaning of change occurred in a political context, Ar. *Ran.* 759; Arist. *Pol.* 1306b 22-26, 1307a 40-1307b 19; [Ath. Pol.] 29.1, 31.2; Dem. 2.21 (*Olynthiac II*); 9.24 (*Philippic III*); 11.14 (*Response to the Letter of Philip*); 23.205 (*Against Aristocrates*); Hdt. 3.80; Isoc. 2.17 (*To Nicocles*); 7.30 (*Areopagiticus*); 8.95 (*On the Peace*); 9.63 (*Evagoras*); 16.5 (*On the Team of Horses*); Pl. *Resp.* 426b-c, 545d; Xen. *Ages.* 1.37; [Ath. Pol.] 3.8.

³¹ For an overview of the effects of the Peloponnesian War, Hornblower, 2011: 190-216.

³² Thuc. 5.26.1: τὴν τε ἀρχὴν κατέπαυσαν τῶν Ἀθηναίων Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι, καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τεῖχη καὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ κατέλαβον.

³³ On Xenophon’s narrative about the ‘coup techniques’ that led to the overthrow of Athenian democracy in 404, Bearzot, 2013: 88-103, 109-170 (with analysis of the other sources as well); Sebastiani, 2018: 498-501, 504-507, 509-515.

³⁴ Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.23.

³⁵ On Isocrates’ preference to focus on the greater cities instead of the small ones, Gauthier, 1987-1989: 187-202; Daverio Rocchi, 1991: 54-55.

³⁶ On the role that smaller regional powers may play in the interstate relations, Buckler and Beck, 2008: 7-8.

range of political issues and to the length of his life (he is reported to have died at the age of 98), Isocrates' works offer a great variety of vocabulary about the changes of power at the end of the fifth and fourth century.

Let me first examine *Areopagiticus*, a speech probably written before the so-called Social War (357-355),³⁷ where Isocrates directly connects the transformation of the Athenian power and its decline with the reforms of 462/1 that deprived the Areopagus Court of its authority to ensure the preservation of the laws and to supervise the behaviour of the citizens, and that resulted in the moral decadence and injustice of the Athenians.³⁸ He explicitly shows how great powers, such as Athens and Sparta, can be quickly destroyed, and, as in the *Panegyricus* before, he uses the noun μεταβολή,³⁹ that is preceded by the adjective τοσούτος, to show how frequent these changes could be. He additionally employs the verb ἀναιρῶ, which has the same effect as καταπαύω mentioned above, and the adverb ταχέως, to refer to a particular kind of change, that of a power's destruction, and to how quickly it may occur. He states, more precisely, that the Athenians 'were nearly enslaved', when they thought they had 'invincible power' (ἀνυπέρβλητον).⁴⁰ The Athenian defeat at the end of the Peloponnesian War was, for him, the result of an extended policy of arrogance demonstrated towards its allies.⁴¹

His explanation for the Athenian collapse was not, of course, a new one. Isocrates had expressed the same idea almost twenty years earlier, when in his *Plataicus* the Plataean representative to the Athenian Assembly reminded the Athenians of their destruction (κατέλυσαν) by the Spartans, when the former appeared 'invincible' (ἀνυπόστατον).⁴² In order to show the extent of change and the emotions the Athenians experienced when they realised that they had lost all their empire, Isocrates uses in his *Evagoras* the expression μεγάλη μεταβολή and the adverbs λυπηρῶς and βαρέως that all together indicate the fundamental change that fell upon the city, which was 'painful and hard to bear'.⁴³ These emotions contrast directly with the feelings of relief and hope expressed by the exiles in Xenophon's narration.

³⁷ For a recent summary of the debate about the date of the speech, Bouchet, 2015: 423-430.

³⁸ Cf. 7.15: ὅπως ἐπανορθώσομεν αὐτήν; 16: καὶ τῶν μελλόντων κινδύνων ἀποτροπὴν καὶ τῶν παρόντων κακῶν ἀπαλλαγὴν, ἣν ἐθελήσωμεν ἐκείνην τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀναλαβεῖν, ἣν Σόλων μὲν ὁ δημοτικώτατος γενόμενος ἐνομοθέτησε; 77: ὑμᾶς παύσασθαι τοιαῦτ' ἐξαμαρτάνοντας; 78: ἣν δὲ μεταβάλωμεν τὴν πολιτείαν. On the necessity to restore the privileges of the Areopagus Court and return to the ancestral habits, Demont, 2003; Bouchet, 2014: 68-70; Bartzoka, 2015: 178-183. On the nature of Isocrates' proposals, Bearzot, 2020: 23-39.

³⁹ Isoc. 7.8 (*Areopagiticus*): τοσαύτας μεταβολὰς γεγενημένας καὶ τηλικαύτας δυνάμεις οὕτω ταχέως ἀναιρεθείσας; 4.116 (*Panegyricus*): πυκνότης τῶν μεταβολῶν.

⁴⁰ Isoc. 7.6 (*Areopagiticus*): ἐπειδὴ δ' ἀνυπέρβλητον φήθημεν τὴν δύναμιν ἔχειν, παρὰ μικρὸν ἤλθομεν ἐξανδραποδισθῆναι. This calls to mind the proposal to destroy Athens advocated by many Greeks gathered in Sparta after the Athenian defeat of 405 and Sparta's refusal to comply: Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.19-20.

⁴¹ On the fatal ruin of the powerful who constantly seek to acquire more than necessary, Demont, 2003; Perysinakis, 2015: 396-397.

⁴² Isoc. 14.40 (*Plataicus*): τὰ δ' οὖν ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενόμενα τίς οὐκ οἶδεν, ὅτι καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀνυπόστατον δοκοῦσαν εἶναι κατέλυσαν, μικρὰς μὲν ἀφορμὰς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τὸν κατὰ θάλατταν τὸ πρῶτον ἔχοντες, διὰ δὲ τὴν δόξαν ταύτην προσαγόμενοι τοὺς Ἕλληνας. On the different opinions expressed about the function of this speech (actual delivery, exercise, political pamphlet), Papillon, 2004: 228-229 with n. 2.

⁴³ Isoc. 9.54 (*Evagoras*): Ὁρῶντες γὰρ αὐτὴν ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίοις οὖσαν καὶ μεγάλη μεταβολὴ κεχηρμένην λυπηρῶς καὶ βαρέως ἔφερον, ἀμφοτέροι προσηκόντα ποιοῦντες.

Spartan Supremacy and its Downfall

1. The End of the Peloponnesian War

What is more interesting in Isocrates' *Areopagiticus* is the assumption that maritime power was ultimately the cause for the fall of the Spartans as well. In their case, he says, although they used to live moderately,⁴⁴ they became more arrogant after the end of the Peloponnesian War, when they gained control of both land and sea, and thus encountered the same dangers as the Athenians.⁴⁵ In other words, in Isocrates' thought, the defeat of Athens had a twofold effect on Sparta's power. First, the Spartans took the chance to establish their maritime empire.⁴⁶ Second, their maritime empire proved to be short-lived.

The idea that having a naval empire was the cause of seemingly all problems is better attested in Isocrates' *On the Peace*, a treatise discussing the so-called Social War (357-355), when a group of allies revolted against the Athenian leadership of the Second Athenian League.⁴⁷ Although in his *Areopagiticus* he did not advise the Athenians yet to correct the abuses of their naval empire but their internal policy, in this speech, Isocrates urges the Athenians to 'stop' (παυσώμεθα – same use as in Thucydides before) desiring an unjust naval empire,⁴⁸ since this acquisition was what was throwing them into 'confusion' (ταραχήν)⁴⁹ and had 'destroyed' (καταλύσασα) twice the democracy of their ancestors of the fifth century.⁵⁰ Instead, he advises them to establish a long-lasting and peaceful hegemony.⁵¹

⁴⁴ On how the difference of character (Spartans: slowness and lack of daring, Athenians: dash and enterprise) is linked to the development of a maritime empire, Thuc. 8.96. On the corrupting force of sea, Pl. *Gorg.* 519a; *Leg.* 705a; Arist. *Pol.* 1303b 7-15. Cf. Daverio Rocchi, 2015: 84-88, on the image of sea as space of inequality, violence, and power struggle in fourth-century philosophical and political thought.

⁴⁵ Isoc. 7.7 (*Areopagiticus*): Λακεδαιμόνιοι τε τὸ μὲν παλαιὸν ἐκ φαύλων καὶ ταπεινῶν πόλεων ὀρμηθέντες διὰ τὸ σωφρόνως ζῆν καὶ στρατιωτικῶς κατέσχον Πελοπόννησον, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα μείζον φρονήσαντες τοῦ δέοντος καὶ λαβόντες καὶ τὴν κατὰ γῆν καὶ τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν ἀρχήν, εἰς τοὺς αὐτοὺς κινδύνους κατέστησαν ἡμῖν.

⁴⁶ Its creation was the result of a long process that did not begin only in the last decade of the Peloponnesian War; rather, it was throughout the war that Sparta pursued an active naval policy. On Spartan naval policy during the fifth century, contrary to the standard assumption regarding the conservative nature of Sparta as a land power, Millender, 2015: 299-312, with bibliography.

⁴⁷ On the events of these years, Buckler, 2003: 351-384. On the relations between Athens and its allies in the Cyclades during the war and on its consequences, Bonnin, 2014: 65-66; 2015: 274-283.

⁴⁸ Isoc. 8.64-65 (*On the Peace*): Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἡμᾶς ἄμεινον οἰκῆσιν καὶ βελτίους αὐτοὺς ἔσεσθαι καὶ πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς πράξεις ἐπιδώσιν, ἣν παυσώμεθα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς κατὰ θάλατταν ἐπιθυμοῦντες. Αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ καὶ νῦν εἰς ταραχήν ἡμᾶς καθιστάσα καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἐκείνην καταλύσασα μεθ' ἧς οἱ πρόγονοι ζῶντες εὐδαιμονέστατοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦσαν, καὶ σχεδὸν ἀπάντων αἰτία τῶν κακῶν ὧν αὐτοὶ τ' ἔχομεν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις παρέχομεν. Cf. Davidson, 1990: 21-24, 25; Masaracchia, 1995: 107-108; Bearzot, 2020: 118. On the terms Isocrates uses to refer to this change, Bartzoka, 2017: 2-4.

⁴⁹ On the term ταραχή as cause of the transformation, see Isoc. 3.31 (*Nicocles*); as its result, Isoc. 3.55 (*Nicocles*); 4.104 (*Panegyricus*); 7.9, 7.76 (*Areopagiticus*).

⁵⁰ Ceccarelli (1993: 453-455) notes that there is no exclusive link between naval empire and democratic government, but naval supremacy may have had a detrimental effect on both types of constitution, democratic and oligarchic, even in Isocrates' works.

⁵¹ Cf. Low, 2007: 155; Bouchet, 2014: 41-43. Xenophon (*Poroi* 5.2) also speaks of a new, more just, Athenian hegemony; cf. Gauthier, 1976: 199, 212-213; Farrell, 2016: 331-355; de Martinis, 2018: 149-150.

Since, according to Isocrates, the naval empire ‘by its very nature’ (πέφυκε) makes those who are part of it worse,⁵² it ‘destroyed’ (διέφθειρεν) not only the Athenians but the Spartans too,⁵³ and destruction came ‘much more quickly’ (πολὺ γὰρ θάττον) for the Spartans than for the Athenians.

Μέγιστον δὲ τεκμήριον· οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων πόλιν διέφθειρεν, ὥστε τοῖς εἰθισμένοις ἐπαινεῖν τὰς ἐκείνων ἀρετὰς οὐχ οἶόν τ’ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, ὡς ἡμεῖς μὲν διὰ τὸ δημοκρατεῖσθαι κακῶς ἐχρησάμεθα τοῖς πράγμασιν, εἰ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ταύτην τὴν δύναμιν παρέλαβον, εὐδαίμονας ἂν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους καὶ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐποίησαν. Πολὺ γὰρ θάττον ἐν ἐκείνοις ἐπεδείξατο τὴν φύσιν τὴν αὐτῆς· τὴν γὰρ πολιτείαν, ἣν ἐν ἑπτακοσίοις ἔτεσιν οὐδεὶς οἶδεν οὐθ’ ὑπὸ κινδύνων οὐθ’ ὑπὸ συμφορῶν κινήσειαν, ταύτην ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ σαλεῦσαι καὶ λυθῆναι παρὰ μικρὸν ἐποίησεν.⁵⁴

The greatest evidence of the danger of empire is that it destroyed not only us but the Spartan state too. Thus, those who always used to praise the valour of Sparta cannot make the claim that we mishandled our affairs because we were a democracy, whereas if Sparta had had that power, they would have made themselves and everyone else happy. Indeed, the empire showed its true nature much more quickly with the Spartans, for it caused their polity in a short time to shake and almost end, although no one had seen it moved by dangers or troubles for seven hundred years.

(Trans. by T.L. Papillon, with adjustments)

I would say that the verb διαφθείρω is a good example of the kind of transformation the Spartan supremacy underwent, as it does not only describe the collapse of the Spartans’ position in interstate affairs but also, in a moral sense, their ruin and corruption. Except for several passages where this word indicates the change/corruption of one’s opinion or character,⁵⁵ it is worth examining in greater detail how Demosthenes uses this term in *On the Crown*.⁵⁶ In his account of Aeschines’ disruptive role in the Peace of Philocrates and its aftermath, the orator explains how he warned about and protested against Philip II’s interference in the Greek cities in a way that the latter ‘became sick’ (ἐνόσουν) because their active politicians were ‘venal’ (δωροδοκούντων) and ‘corrupted’ (διαφθειρομένων) by money. As with Thucydides before, Demosthenes uses in a political context a verb (νοσέω) that is part of the medical vocabulary and combines it with the verb διαφθείρω to note that corruption may be regarded as a moral disease. Considering this metaphor, one may add that the naval empire itself may also be regarded as a disease that ruined the Spartans and needs to be cured.

Indeed, Isocrates asserts that although the Spartan polity ‘had not been moved’ (κινήθεισαν) ‘by dangers or troubles for seven hundred years’, ‘in a short time’ (ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ) after the Spartans assumed the leadership of the Greeks, their naval empire caused their government ‘to shake’ (σαλεῦσαι) ‘and almost end’ (λυθῆναι παρὰ μικρόν). With great artistry, Isocrates chooses specific terms to demonstrate the effect of naval power on the fall of Sparta. On the one hand, he combines

⁵² Isoc. 8.94 (*On the Peace*).

⁵³ Cf. also Isoc. 5.61 (*To Philip*): ὥστ’ εἰ τις φαίη τότε τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι τῶν παρόντων κακῶν ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς θαλάττης ἐλάβανον. Isocrates plays with the word ἀρχή, which means both beginning and power/empire, Papillon, 2004: 89 n. 42; Lévy, 2015: 250-251.

⁵⁴ Isoc. 8.95 (*On the Peace*).

⁵⁵ On this use cf. Aesch. Ag. 932 (γνώμην μὲν ἴσθι μὴ διαφθεροῦντ’ ἐμέ); Pl. Ap. 30b (διαφθείρω τοὺς νέους).

⁵⁶ Dem. 18.45 (*On the Crown*): αἱ δὲ πόλεις ἐνόσουν, τῶν μὲν ἐν τῷ πολιτεύεσθαι καὶ πράττειν δωροδοκούντων καὶ διαφθειρομένων ἐπὶ χρήμασι.

three verbs that escalate in intensity, namely κινῶ ('to move, to disturb'), σαλεύω ('to shake'), and λύω ('to destroy; to put an end'), to show the impact and lurking danger of having an empire. On the other hand, he uses the synonymous expressions πολὺ θάπτον – ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ to compare the swiftness of the change with the stability of the Spartan constitution. Isocrates follows here the established tradition about the origin, stability and duration of the Spartan *politeia*, already expressed by Thucydides and Xenophon, who point out how Spartan constitution in its entirety or some of its aspects continued uninterrupted.⁵⁷

The effect of the Peloponnesian War and the victory of Sparta on its polity are repeated in *On the Peace*.

Διὰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν κατὰ γῆν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ τὴν εὐταξίαν καὶ τὴν καρτερίαν τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ μελετωμένην ῥαδίως τῆς κατὰ θάλατταν δυνάμεως ἐπεκράτησαν, διὰ δὲ τὴν ἀκολασίαν τὴν ὑπὸ [ταύτης] τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῖς ἐγγενομένην ταχέως κάκεινης τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀπεστερήθησαν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔτι τοὺς νόμους ἐφύλαττον οὐδὲ παρὰ τῶν προγόνων παρέλαβον, οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς ἥθεσιν ἔμενον οἷς πρότερον εἶχον, ἀλλ' ὑπολαβόντες ἐξείναι ποιεῖν αὐτοῖς ὅ τι ἂν βουληθῶσιν, εἰς πολλὴν ταραχὴν κατέστησαν.⁵⁸

Through their hegemony on land and the discipline and endurance they learned from it, they easily gained control of power at sea too, but through the lack of restraint they acquired from this naval empire, they quickly lost even their former hegemony. For they were no longer observing the laws that were handed down from their ancestors, nor were they following former ways; instead, assuming they could do whatever they wanted, they fell into great turmoil.

(Trans. by T.L. Papillon)

There, Isocrates discusses Spartan hegemony and how easy (ῥαδίως) it was for the Spartans to gain control of power at sea, due to their supremacy on land and the discipline and 'endurance' (καρτερίαν) they had learned from it. The word καρτερία is an opposite term to the notion of change. It suggests durability (cf. πέφυκε and τὰ καθεστηκότα in this article)⁵⁹ and illuminates, I believe, the way Spartans reacted to their newly acquired role; it gives us the sense that, after a long time of patience, perseverance, and preparation, it was the right moment for them to regain their power and reap all its benefits.⁶⁰ However, Isocrates says that 'quickly' (ταχέως) 'they lost even their former hegemony' ('κάκεινης τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀπεστερήθησαν'), 'through the lack of restraint they acquired from their naval empire.' The two adverbs ῥαδίως and ταχέως clearly emphasise here that the second

⁵⁷ Thuc. 1.18.1, on Spartans enjoying the same form of government (τῇ αὐτῇ πολιτεία χρώνται) for more than four hundred years (ἔτη γὰρ ἔστι μάλιστα τετρακόσια καὶ ὀλίγω πλείω), a reckoning at the end of the Peloponnesian War, and their capacity to arrange the affairs of other states. For problems of chronology raised by this passage, Hornblower, 1991: 51-54. Xen. Ag. 1.4: ἄλλη μὲν οὐδεμία ἀρχὴ φανερά ἐστι διαγεγενημένη ἀδιάσπαστος οὔτε δημοκρατία οὔτε ὀλιγαρχία οὔτε τυραννὶς οὔτε βασιλεία· αὕτη δὲ μόνη διαμένει συνεχῆς βασιλεία; Lac. 15.1: μόνη γὰρ δὴ αὕτη ἀρχὴ διατελεῖ οἷα περ ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατεστάθη· τὰς δὲ ἄλλας πολιτείας εὖροι ἂν τις μετακεκινημένας καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν μετακινουμένας, on how kingship continues as it had been originally established, whereas other constitutions had undergone and were still undergoing modifications.

⁵⁸ Isoc. 8.102-103 (*On the Peace*).

⁵⁹ On the words and expressions that suggest historical continuity and reveal how the ancients expressed their reaction – positive or negative – towards the multiple transformations their societies underwent, Bartzoka, 2022.

⁶⁰ Cf. Xen. Cyr. 3.3.8, on how obedience (πειθῶ), perseverance (καρτερία), and endurance of toil (οἱ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ πόνοι καὶ κίνδυνοι) bring great pleasure and blessings.

rise of the Spartans to the leadership of the Greeks did not last long, and that it was more of an interval in the long process of power changing hands. When this loss took place is an issue that I will address later.

The orator continues by saying that the Spartans, believing they could do whatever they pleased, eventually ‘fell into great turmoil’ (εἰς πολλὴν ταραχὴν⁶¹ κατέστησαν). Indeed, their policy⁶² confronted the reactions of the Greek cities, reactions that manifested themselves, first, in the outbreak of the Corinthian War,⁶³ later, in the foundation of the Second Athenian League⁶⁴ and, finally, in the rise of Thebes.⁶⁵ For example, in Xenophon’s account of the outbreak of the Corinthian War, the Theban envoys sent to Athens in 395 to persuade the city to join them against Sparta talked about ‘the greedy rule’ (πλεονεξία) of the Spartans that would be ‘much easier to overthrow’ (πολὺ εὐκαταλυτωτέρα) than it was with the Athenian empire:⁶⁶ namely, the Athenians had a navy and ruled over those who did not, whereas the Spartans, who were few in number, were exercising their rule over men who were far more numerous and in no way inferior to them in arms. This kind of argument that aims to persuade the Athenians to take action deals once more with the lack of restraint that the most powerful demonstrate and that eventually leads to their fatal ruin.

In other words, as Isocrates states in his *Evagoras*,⁶⁷ it was in fact the Spartans themselves who ‘soon’ (ταχύν) provided ‘the opportunity’ (τὸν καιρὸν) for the change in possession of power and, more precisely, for Athens to shake off its misfortunes (ὅπως τῶν συμφορῶν αὐτὴν ἀπαλλάξουσιν). On the one hand, Isocrates describes this opportunity in moral terms,⁶⁸ when he refers to the ‘insatiable appetite’ (ἀπληστία) the Spartans acquired through their rule of the Greeks by land and sea and their effort to ‘damage’ (κακῶς ποιεῖν) Asia, and sees a direct connection between their immoral behaviour and the rise of Athens. On the other hand, in historical terms, what Isocrates describes here refers to the Spartan war that was conducted in Asia Minor (399-394) and began after the Lakedaimonians responded to the demand of the Greeks of Asia for protection against the Persians.⁶⁹ Namely, what the orator has in mind regarding the moment that marked the liberation of Athens from its misfortunes is the naval battle of Knidos.

⁶¹ Lévy, 2015: 251, on the fact that the word ταραχή is studiously vague on the kind of confusion into which the Spartans fell.

⁶² For a summary of the Spartan policy and the reactions it provoked, Cartledge, 2002: 228-251; Roberts, 2017: 324-346, 355-361; Ruzé, 2018: 326-345.

⁶³ Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.16, 4.2.1; Diod. Sic. 14.82. On the Corinthian War, that was declared by the Persian-financed alliance of Athens, Argos, Corinth, and Thebes against Sparta, Seager, 1967: 95-115; Strauss, 1986: 121-169; Seager, 1994: 97-119; Buckler, 2003: 75-128.

⁶⁴ RO 22; Diod. Sic. 15.28. On the foundation of the Second Athenian League and its evolution (with the inscriptions of this period accepting different interpretations), Accame, 1941; Cargill, 1981; Dreher, 1995; Baron, 2006: 379-395 (on the expansion of the League); Cawkwell, 2011: 192-240; Kierstead, 2016: 164-181 (on the Athenian Leagues acting as groups to secure for themselves certain public goods).

⁶⁵ On Theban hegemony from the Theban victory in Leuktra (371) to the battle of Mantinea (362), Rockwell, 2017: 110-124. On the pursuit of Theban hegemony, as presented in Xenophon’s *Hellenika*, Sterling, 2004: 453-461. On Theban hegemony and the hegemony of the Boeotian League, from 371 to 346, Mackil, 2013: 71-85.

⁶⁶ Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.15: ἡ Λακεδαιμονίων πλεονεξία πολὺ εὐκαταλυτωτέρα ἐστὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας γενομένης ἀρχῆς. On this speech, Tuci, 2019: 35, 38, 41, 43-44 (with references to earlier bibliography). On this negative description of Sparta by Xenophon whose validity should not be questioned because it is expressed by the Theban ambassadors, Tuplin, 1993: 62; on the rhetorical purpose of the speech, Gray, 1989: 107-112; Flower, 2017: 316-317 with n. 46.

⁶⁷ Isoc. 9.54 (*Evagoras*): Σκοποῦμενοι δ’ αὐτοῖς ὅπως τῶν συμφορῶν αὐτὴν ἀπαλλάξουσιν ταχύν τὸν καιρὸν Λακεδαιμόνιοι παρεσκεύασαν· ἄρχοντες γὰρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν εἰς τοῦτ’ ἀπληστίας ἦλθον ὥστε καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν κακῶς ποιεῖν ἐπεχείρησαν; Lévy, 2015: 248-249.

⁶⁸ Alexiou 2010, 146. On the emphasis on the notion of ‘greed’ in Isocrates’ works, Alexiou, 2015: 411-417.

⁶⁹ Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.3-6, 4.1.41; Diod. Sic. 14.35.6-7. On this war, Buckler, 2003: 39-74.

2. The Battle of Knidos

The authors of the classical period regarded the battle of Knidos as a key moment in the renewal of the Athenian power and the decline of Sparta. It took place in the eastern Aegean in 394 between the Spartan fleet, under the command of Peisander, and the Persian one, under the joint command of Pharnabazos and Conon.⁷⁰ This battle was a disaster for Sparta; Peisander was killed, fifty triremes were captured, and some five hundred crew members were taken prisoners.⁷¹ All available sources agree that the architect of the victory was the Athenian general Conon.⁷² For example, as noted by Demosthenes in *Against Leptines*, Conon's contemporaries believed that 'by destroying the power of the Spartans' (τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀρχὴν καταλύσαντα), 'he put an end to a great tyranny' (οὐ μικρὰν τυραννίδα πεπαυκέναι).⁷³ Likewise, Isocrates, in his *Panegyricus*, says that Conon campaigned for Asia and thus 'ruined the power of Sparta' (τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων κατέλυσεν);⁷⁴ in *Evagoras*, he praises Conon for making the Spartans 'lose their supremacy' (τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπεστερήθησαν), for freeing the Greeks and making Athens 'receive again' (πάλιν ἀνέλαβεν) part of its ancient glory and become leader of the allies;⁷⁵ finally, in his *Areopagiticus*, he talks about the Greeks who 'fell into Athens' control' after Conon's victory (ὑπὸ τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ὑποπεσοῦσης).⁷⁶

It is worth discussing here in greater detail the vocabulary used by Attic orators to present Conon's victory, namely the three verbs καταλύω, παύω, and ἀποστερῶ. These usually mean 'to deprive', 'to bring something to an end' and, thus, from an Athenian perspective, they describe the destruction of the power the Spartans used to exercise both on land and sea after the Peloponnesian War.⁷⁷ But one may add that this is not the case here, as we know that both Spartan hegemony and their arrogance towards the Greek cities continued to exist,⁷⁸ especially after the King's Peace in 386⁷⁹ and until the foundation of the Second Athenian League in 377. Therefore, these three terms reflect, I think, the retrospective thought of the Attic orators on the battle of Knidos and show the effect this encounter had on Athens in the long term, as it marked the beginning of the revival of the Athenian power and thus the gradual decline of Sparta. But, again, it may be worth noting that the importance of the battle of Knidos for the restoration of the Athenian power appears already in Isocrates' *Panegyricus*,

⁷⁰ Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.10-12, who offers no details of this naval battle. On his paucity, explained by his absence from Asia and his participation in the battle of Coronea in Boeotia, Cartledge, 2002: 240. On this account being subordinate to the description of the battle of Coronea in order to highlight what the Spartan king Agesilaus achieved there, Gray, 1989: 151.

⁷¹ Diod. Sic. 14.83.7. It is interesting to note that, according to Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.13-14 (as in Plut. *Ages.* 17.3), when Agesilaus learned of the defeat before the battle of Coronea, he decided to hide the truth from his troops and to announce a Spartan victory at sea instead. On the function of this stratagem, Gray, 1989: 149-152; Tuplin, 1993: 68.

⁷² Isoc. 4.142, 154 (*Panegyricus*); 7.12 (*Areopagiticus*); 9.56 (*Evagoras*); Dem. 20.70 (*Against Leptines*); Diod. Sic. 14.83.4-7, 84.4; Nep. *Conon*, 4.4. On the reception of Conon in Athenian oratory, Nouhaud, 1982: 333-338.

⁷³ Dem. 20.70 (*Against Leptines*).

⁷⁴ Isoc. 4.154 (*Panegyricus*).

⁷⁵ Isoc. 9.56 (*Evagoras*).

⁷⁶ Isoc. 7.12 (*Areopagiticus*). The same passage also associates Athenian control over Greece with the military successes of Timotheus, son of Conon, between 375 and 364.

⁷⁷ On this Athenian tradition, which is different from non-Athenian perceptions that regarded the battle of Leuktra as the key moment for the end of the Spartan hegemony on land, Bearzot, 2015: 90.

⁷⁸ Also Buckler and Beck, 2008: 9. On Isocrates' simplistic view of history, Bouchet, 2014: 58.

⁷⁹ Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.30-36; Diod. Sic. 14.110.

composed in the 380s and published in 380.⁸⁰ This was a time of confusion for the Greek affairs due to the Corinthian War, the conclusion of the King's Peace, and the ongoing efforts of Sparta and Athens to reaffirm their power.

After the battle, Conon sailed to Athens bearing Persian funds and assisted the Athenians in rebuilding their fortifications. His purpose was to use the Great King's money 'to maintain his fleet and to win over to the Athenian side both the islands and the cities on the mainland'.⁸¹ As expected, Xenophon says, Conon's action worried, on the one hand, the Spartans, who even offered to make peace with the Persians in 392, thereby relinquishing control of the Greek cities in Asia to the King and offering autonomy to the islands and the other Greek cities; however, peace was not achieved.⁸² On the other hand, Conon's military success was the reason for the relief felt among the Athenians. Isocrates' *To Philip* gives such an impression,⁸³ where Conon is thought to be the man responsible for the reversal of the fortune of Greece (ἀναστροφῆσθαι τὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πράγματα), the one who 'removed the Spartans from their rule' (ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς), 'freed the Greeks, rebuilt the walls of his city, and brought Athens back to the high reputation from which it had fallen' (τὴν πόλιν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν δόξαν προήγαγεν ἐξ ἧσπερ ἐξέπεσεν).⁸⁴ The victory of Conon is, thus, seen as the cause and the link for all the events that followed the battle of Knidos in a simple, linear way.⁸⁵ This complete change in the balance of power is shown through the verb ἀναστρέφω, which is a general term to signify a neutral transformation. The repercussions of change are usually denoted by the context of the phrase where this verb is cited, in our case, by the verbs ἐκβάλλω, ἐκπίπτω, and προάγω. Similarly, in Xenophon's account of the peace negotiations in 371, just before the battle of Leuktra, the Athenian Callistratos delivered a speech, in which he insisted on the fact that Athens and Sparta should make peace while they were strong and fortune was on their side, because in this way their influence in Greek affairs would grow even stronger (μείζους... ἀναστρεφοίμεθα).⁸⁶ The verb ἀναστρέφω, combined with the adjective μείζων, implies the expectations in Athens and Sparta about how the conclusion of the peace would make things better for both and bring about another change.

3. The Battle of Naxos

Delivered in 341, Demosthenes' *Third Philippic* examines, among other things, the gradual domination of Greece by Philip II and the unwillingness of the Greeks to act against him in such a way that they have given the Macedonian king more freedom to dominate Greece than they ever allowed Athens or Sparta. To this end, the orator compares the Athenians with the Spartans and points out how fast

⁸⁰ On its composition, Papillon, 2004: 24; Bouchet, 2014: 43.

⁸¹ Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.9-10, 12. On winning over the Cyclades and replacing the oligarchic governments with democratic ones, Diod. Sic. 14.84.4; Paus. 6.3.16: οὕτω μετεβάλλοντο οἱ Ἴωνες. On the same change as far as Rhodes is concerned, *Hell. Oxy.* 10: οἱ δὲ τὴν σφαγὴν ἐξεργασάμενοι καταλύσαντες τὴν παροῦσαν πολιτείαν κατέστησαν δημοκρατίαν καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τινὰς ὀλίγους φυγάδας ἐποίησαν. ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐπανάστασις ἡ περὶ τὴν Ῥόδον τοῦτο τὸ τέλος ἔλαβεν; Paus. 6.7.6: Ῥοδίων δὲ τὸν δῆμον πεισθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Κόνωνος ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων μεταβαλέσθαι σφᾶς ἐς τὴν βασιλείῳ καὶ Ἀθηναίων συμμαχία. On the importance of the battle of Knidos for the renewal of the Athenian power in the Aegean, Bonnin, 2015: 231-233.

⁸² Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.14-15.

⁸³ Isoc. 5.63-64 (*To Philip*).

⁸⁴ Here, the battle of Knidos marks the beginning of the recovery of Athens. On the contrary, in Isoc. 12.58 (*Panathenaicus*), the victory at Knidos is presented as the final step of this revival, as Isocrates states that Athens recovered from its defeat in less than ten years. Roth, 2003: 118.

⁸⁵ Nouhaud, 1982: 336.

⁸⁶ Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.17: οὕτω γὰρ ἡμεῖς τ' ἂν δι' ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑμεῖς δι' ἡμᾶς ἔτι μείζους ἢ τὸν παρελθόντα χρόνον ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀναστρεφοίμεθα.

things changed for the Spartan policy.⁸⁷ He refers to the seventy-three years the Athenians were the leaders of the Greeks, from the moment of the foundation of the Delian League in 478 to the defeat in the battle of Aigos Potamoi in 405,⁸⁸ and contrasts those years with the twenty-nine years of Spartan supremacy, counting approximately from the end of the Peloponnesian War in 404 to their defeat by the Athenians in the battle of Naxos in 376.⁸⁹ In this battle, the Spartans lost twenty-four triremes and eight more were captured with their crews, while the Athenians lost eighteen. Chabrias, the victorious Athenian general, received an enthusiastic welcome from the Athenians and subsequent honours awarded for his service.⁹⁰ As the epigraphic record indicates, the Second Athenian League grew with new members.⁹¹ Additionally, according to Diodorus, this was the first naval battle the Athenians had won since the Peloponnesian War, as the victory of Knidos had not been achieved with their own fleet but by the use of the Persian one.⁹² Therefore, the battle of Naxos was thought to have provoked a dramatic shift in the balance of power in the Aegean.⁹³

Consequently, two battles, the one at Aigos Potamoi, the other at Naxos, function in the speech of Demosthenes as the two key moments that marked the collapse of Athenian and Spartan power respectively. The reasons for this end are the same as those presented in Isocrates' works, where the notion of 'greed' appears in his narrative frequently. Demosthenes, thus, says that 'since the Athenians were thought to be treating some unfairly' (ἐπειδὴ τισιν οὐ μετρίως ἐδόκουν προσφέρεσθαι), war was declared on them. 'Again' (πάλιν), 'when the Spartans succeeded the Athenians to their position of supremacy' (Λακεδαιμονίοις ἄρξασι καὶ παρελθοῦσιν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν δυναστείαν ὑμῖν) and started 'to disturb the established order of things' (τὰ καθεστηκότ' ἐκίνουν) 'beyond what was reasonable' (πέρα τοῦ μετρίου), they made the Greeks react and declare war on them. One understands that, as Isocrates before, Demosthenes explains the rise and fall of Sparta and Athens as part of a general and frequently attested phenomenon. That is why the orator emphasises the three following words: first, the two opposing terms καθίστημι and κινῶ that represent the change between stability and development in the area of the Greek interstate politics respectively,⁹⁴ and, second, the keyword πάλιν ('again, in turn'), a word that shows how repeatedly one power succeeds another due to a policy of arrogance that may end or decline with the outbreak of war. The word πάλιν is central to the description of frequent reversals of fortune and of the succession of hegemonies. This is also made clear in Isocrates' *Plataicus*,⁹⁵ where it appears again, this time in relation to the battle of Knidos and the way the Athenians 'took away' (πάλιν... ἀφείλεσθε) Sparta's supremacy.

⁸⁷ Dem. 9.23-24 (*Philippic III*).

⁸⁸ The count is ambiguous; cf. Croiset, 1925: 98 n. 1 (477-404); Trevett, 2011: 161 n. 27 (476-404). On the different ways of counting, Roth, 2003: 117 n. 208. See also below (n. 109, 111), Isoc. 12.56 (*Panathenaicus*).

⁸⁹ Diod. Sic. 15.34.5-35.2.

⁹⁰ Aeschin. 3.243 (*Against Ctesiphon*) 243; Dem. 23.198 (*Against Aristocrates*); 24.180 (*Against Timocrates*). On his honours, Gauthier, 1985: 99-102. The same decree was unsuccessfully refuted by Leodamas of Acharnai for being unconstitutional; Hansen, 1974: 30; Bartzoka, 2018: 262-264 (on how external politics interact with public trials).

⁹¹ RO 22, l. 79-90, with 104, noting that the names of the allies inscribed in these lines could have been added after Chabrias' campaign.

⁹² Diod. Sic. 15.35.2.

⁹³ On the importance of this battle for the decline of the Spartan power and the re-establishment of Athens as the leading naval power, Cargill, 1981: 190; Buckler, 2003: 249; Bonnin, 2015: 239. Trevett (2011: 161 n. 28) notes that it was the battle of Leuktra that marked the end of Spartan hegemony.

⁹⁴ On the question of stability in the conduct of interstate relations, Low, 2007: 212-251.

⁹⁵ Isoc. 14.40 (*Plataicus*): καὶ πάλιν ὑμεῖς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφείλεσθε τὴν ἐκείνων, ἐξ ἀτειχίστου μὲν τῆς πόλεως ὀρμηθέντες καὶ κακῶς πρᾶττούσης. See also above (n. 75), Isoc. 9.56 (*Evagoras*) and below (n. 98), Isoc. 5.44 (*To Philip*).

4. The Battle of Leuktra

Isocrates' praise of Conon's achievements in his *To Philip* is part of an argument that aimed to convince Philip II to unify the Greek states in a campaign against the Great King. Isocrates cites examples of famous leaders and their deeds that were more difficult to achieve, in his view, than the one he advised Philip to undertake. That is why it is no surprise that in the same speech, he views the battle of Leuktra in 371 as another critical moment in the collapse of Spartan hegemony.⁹⁶

Isocrates mentions this battle when talking about the misfortunes of the Greeks and the usual changes in the balance of power in interstate relations (τηλικαύτας μεταβολὰς γιγνομένης). He refers to the Greek affairs after the end of the Peloponnesian War, when Sparta appeared as the leader of the Greek world and was trying to destroy the Boeotian League reunified under the leadership of Thebes.⁹⁷ As with the case of Knidos, the narrative that follows is once more simplistic and draws no distinction between the moment Sparta lost its naval power, either in the battle of Knidos or in the battle of Naxos, and the time it lost its supremacy as a whole.

καὶ πάλιν μεταπεσούσης τῆς τύχης καὶ Θηβαίων καὶ Πελοποννησίων ἀπάντων ἐπιχειρησάντων ἀνάστατον ποιῆσαι τὴν Σπάρτην, [...] εἴ τις ὁρῶν τηλικαύτας μεταβολὰς γιγνομένης [...] καὶ πρῶτον μὲν σκεψαίμεθα τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων. Οὗτοι γὰρ ἄρχοντες τῶν Ἑλλήνων, οὐ πολλὸς χρόνος ἐξ οὗ, καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν, εἰς τοσαύτην μεταβολὴν ἦλθον, ἐπειδὴ τὴν μάχην ἡττήθησαν τὴν ἐν Λεύκτροις, ὥστ' ἀπεστερήθησαν μὲν τῆς ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήσι δυναστείας, τοιούτους δ' ἄνδρας ἀπώλεσαν σφῶν αὐτῶν, οἱ προηροῦντο τεθνάναι μᾶλλον ἢ ζῆν ἡττηθέντες ὥν πρότερον ἐδέσποζον.⁹⁸

Again, when fortune changed, and the Thebans and all the Peloponnesians were trying to destroy Sparta, [...]. Therefore, anyone who sees such changes happening [...]. First, let us look at the Spartans' situation. Although they ruled over Greece not too long ago by both land and sea, they suffered such a reversal when they lost the battle at Leuktra that they were stripped of their empire over the Greeks and lost many of their men who chose to die rather than live after being defeated by those who used to be their subjects

(Trans. by T. L. Papillon)

Sparta, he says, had not ruled over Greece for too long (οὐ πολλὸς χρόνος) by both land and sea that 'fortune changed again' (πάλιν μεταπεσούσης τῆς τύχης) and this time it was the Thebans who were trying to destroy Sparta. The expression τῆς τύχης μεταπεσούσης shows the complete transformation that may concern either the collapse or the renewal of a city's power, as the verb ἀναστρέφω before. More precisely, the verb μεταπίπτω (to change) has a neutral meaning.⁹⁹ Its positive or negative connotations

⁹⁶ Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.1-20; Diod. *Sic.* 15.51-56.4. On this battle and its military significance, Buckler, 2003: 286-295; 2013: 657-670; Rockwell, 2017: 101-104.

⁹⁷ Spartan occupation of Thebes in 382 and the liberation of the Cadmea in 379: Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.25-31, 5.4.1-12; the re-establishment of the Boeotian League after 379: Buckler and Beck, 2008: 87-98; Beck and Ganter, 2015: 147-148; Thebans recovering the neighboring cities of Boeotia: Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.63; the destruction of Plataea and Thespieae: Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.1-5; and the expansionist aspirations of Thebes that paved the way to the battle of Leuktra: Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.1-20.

⁹⁸ Isoc. 5.44-47 (*To Philip*).

⁹⁹ See Dem. 20.49 (*Against Leptines*): οὐ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτε τὰ πράγματα ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρω ('things would not change for better or worse').

depend on the context of the phrase where it is cited.¹⁰⁰ Here, the change of fortune is detrimental to the Spartans but beneficial to the Thebans. The noun τύχη¹⁰¹ itself may acquire in Isocrates' works the meanings of chance, destiny, fortune, but it may also be synonymous with good or ill fortune, depending again on the author's description.¹⁰²

In Isocrates' view, the crucial moment for the change came with the battle of Leuktra, where the Spartans were defeated and 'suffered such a reversal' (τοσαύτην μεταβολὴν ἦλθον) that 'they were stripped of their power over the Greeks' (ὥστ' ἀπεστερήθησαν μὲν τῆς ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήσι δυναστείας) and lost many of their men.¹⁰³ Isocrates repeats the vocabulary attested in his other works and in Demosthenes: one may find the similar words about the oscillation of fate and frequency of change (πάλιν, τηλικαύτας μεταβολάς), about the short time the Spartans dominated the Greeks (οὐ πολὺς χρόνος) compared to the Athenians, and, finally, about the consequences the Spartans suffered after their defeat (ἀπεστερήθησαν).

These consequences are also pointed out by the non-Athenian historian Ephorus. In fragment 118 from Book 23 of his *Histories*, he refers to the Spartans of old who, after the conquest of Lakonia turned over their state to Lycurgus and, thus, surpassed the Greeks to such a degree that they alone ruled both by land and sea. They continued to do so until the Thebans 'deprived' (ἀφείλοντο) them of their hegemony.¹⁰⁴ Although in his previous books Ephorus discusses important turning points regarding the renewal of the Athenian power and the decline of Sparta, such as the battles of Knidos and Naxos,¹⁰⁵ here he omits the rise of Athens, either in the fifth or in the fourth century.¹⁰⁶ He stresses, instead, the continuity of Spartan hegemony (διετέλεσαν) until Leuktra. The claim of Ephorus is thus problematic in terms of interpretation. Different solutions can be proposed to explain his omission. Perhaps this continuity must be understood if we think that Ephorus presents here his views on the succession of terrestrial hegemonies in Greece,¹⁰⁷ or that he has in mind the territorial unity of Lakonia that was preserved as long as the Spartans held their dominant position in this area.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁰ On its positive meaning, see, e.g., Aeschin. 3.75 (*Against Ctesiphon*; οὐ συμμεταπίπτει), on the usefulness of preserving the texts of public documents; Din. 1.65 (*Against Demosthenes*; μεταπεσοῦσης τῆς τύχης), 'on the hope that the situation of Athens would improve' (ἐλπίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἂν τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματ' ἔλθῃν) if a suitable penalty was imposed on Demosthenes during his trial about the Harpalus affair; Lyc. 1.60 (*Against Leocrates*; μεταπεσεῖν), on the hope of any man who is alive to improve his fortune. On its negative meaning, see, e.g., Isoc. *Epistle* 7.12 (*To Timotheus*; μεταπεσεῖν), on how seizing power may change an individual's behaviour; Lyc. 1.50 (*Against Leocrates*; μετέπεσεν), regarding the battle of Chaeronea and its consequences.

¹⁰¹ On the different notions of τύχη and its significance for the Greeks, Eidinow, 2011: 45, 150-154.

¹⁰² Chance: 3.47 (*Nicocles*); 4.91, 134 (*Panegyricus*); 6.92 (*Archidamus*); 7.23 (*Areopagiticus*); 10.40 (*Encomium of Helen*); 19.35 (*Aegineticus*). Destiny: 1.29 (*To Demonius*). Fortune: 5.44 (*To Philip*); 6.47 (*Archidamus*); 9.59 (*Evagoras*); 12.32 (*Panathenaicus*); 15.292 (*Antidosis*); 20.8 (*Against Lochites*). Good fortune: 1.3, 1.49 (*To Demonius*); 2.30 (*To Nicocles*); 4.26, 4.132 (*Panegyricus*); 5.15, 5.152 (*To Philip*); 7.11 (*Areopagiticus*); 9.36, 9.45 (*Evagoras*); 15.36, 15.128 (*Antidosis*); 18.68 (*Against Callimachos*). Ill fortune: 12.9 (*Panathenaicus*).

¹⁰³ Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4.4.15.

¹⁰⁴ Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 118: Οἱ δὲ κατασχόντες τὴν Λακωνικὴν καὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν ἐσωφρόνουν, ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν Λυκούργῳ τὴν πολιτείαν ἐπέτρεψαν, τοσοῦτον ὑπερεβάλοντο τοὺς ἄλλους, ὥστε μόνοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάττης ἐπῆρξαν, διετέλεσάν τε ἄρχοντες τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἕως ἀφείλοντο αὐτοὺς τὴν ἡγεμονίαν Θηβαῖοι καὶ μετ' ἐκείνους εὐθὺς Μακεδόνες.

¹⁰⁵ Parmegianni, 2011: 537-539, with n. 10, 546. For a summary of Ephorus' historical thought on the succession of hegemonies and the different modern interpretations and approaches on Ephorus, Luraghi, 2014: 147-148.

¹⁰⁶ Christesen, 2010: 247-248, n. 14; Landucci, 2018: 11.

¹⁰⁷ On this solution, Christesen, 2010: 247-248 n. 14.

¹⁰⁸ On this interpretation, Parmegianni, 2011: 559.

Finally, Isocrates discusses the battle of Leuktra in his *Panathenaicus*.¹⁰⁹ In a speech that celebrates the superiority of the Athenians over the Spartans, Isocrates discusses the leading role of Athens among the Greeks.¹¹⁰ His city, he states, held its empire for sixty-five years ‘continuously’ (συνεχῶς), from 478 to the disaster of the Sicilian expedition in 413, whereas the Spartans held to the rule for ‘barely’ (μόλις) ten years, counting from 404 to the battle of Knidos in 394.¹¹¹ Contrary to his *To Philip*, Isocrates here draws a distinction between the collapse of Sparta’s maritime power in Knidos and the continuation of its supremacy at land. However, he proceeds with this distinction in a way that underplays the fact that Sparta maintained its dominant position on land until the battle of Leuktra and, thus, he gives no exact number of the years its supremacy lasted.¹¹² He says, instead, that ‘both cities were hated’ during their rule ‘and ended up in war and turmoil’ (ἀμφοτέραι μισηθεῖσαι κατέστησαν εἰς πόλεμον καὶ ταραχήν), but Athens was able to hold out for ten years after its defeat in Sicily, whereas the Spartans, though still the leading power by land, could not resist the Thebans and were defeated in a single battle, that of Leuktra. The defeat, he says, had such a great impact on Sparta that it ‘lost all its possessions’ (ἀπάντων ἀποστερηθέντας) and was not able after its loss to regain the position from which it ‘fell’ (ἐξέπεσον).

I wish to add two remarks here about the verb ἀποστερῶ (deprive). First, we have already seen this term being used by Isocrates in his *Evagoras* to depict the negative results of the battle of Knidos for the Lakedaimonians (τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπεστερήθησαν) and in *To Philip* to emphasise the outcome of the battle of Leuktra (ἀπεστερήθησαν μὲν τῆς ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήσι δυναστείας). It appears again in Isocrates’ argumentation in *Panathenaicus*. But there is a difference in the way it is employed in these three passages, which can be seen most clearly in the use of the terms ἀρχῆς, δυναστείας, and ἀπάντων that are associated with this verb respectively: in the first two cases, the Spartans lost their supremacy, in the third case, they lost everything they had. The word ἅπαν does not only add dramatic intensity to the consequences the Spartans suffered in the aftermath of Leuktra, but is also used in a passage whose main purpose is to compare Athens and Sparta and celebrate Athenian history and culture. Even more so, it reflects the historical reality of how Sparta could no longer play a significant role in Greece at the time of the speech’s composition (342-339) due to Philip’s political ascendancy – however, Isocrates remains silent about Macedonian hegemony in this speech.

Conclusions

Pivotal events in the balance of power in interstate Greek relations are part of a particular argumentation that exploits the phenomenon of change according to historical context and the rhetorical purposes of the speakers or authors who refer to these moments. These events are presented in different ways not only by different authors (historians, orators, or other kinds of speakers — ambassadors, allies) but also within their own work, as the case of Isocrates amply illustrates. Inevitably, we rely on these narratives to reconstruct the history of the period, but this reconstruction considers the context in which these episodes are invoked. During this process, the study of the vocabulary that the ancients used may help us to understand the multiple ways through which they perceived and presented every change.

More precisely, the words that describe change in the rise and fall of Athens and Sparta, its extent, nature, and impact may appear either with a neutral meaning or with a positive or negative connotation.

¹⁰⁹ Isoc. 12.56-58 (*Panathenaicus*).

¹¹⁰ On how Isocrates uses Sparta to show Athenian pre-eminence, Atack, 2018: 157-184.

¹¹¹ Roth, 2003: 117, with n. 208.

¹¹² On this negative description of the Spartan power by Isocrates, Roth, 2003: 117-118.

For example, in the works of Isocrates, where particular attention is paid to the successive changes of power, the word μεταβολή is used five times, as a general term to signify change neutrally. The frequency, impact, and repercussions of these changes are denoted by the adjectives πολὺς, τοσοῦτος (repeated twice), μέγας, and τηλικούτος in connection with μεταβολή, or by the use of the adverb πάλιν ('again') – also attested in Demosthenes' speech. This demonstrates how inevitable and repetitive the phenomenon of the succession of hegemonies may be. The complete transformation may be shown as well through the verb ἀναστρέφω (reverse) or by the expression τῆς τύχης μεταπεσούσης meaning the reversal of fortune.

The rest of the vocabulary is invested with a particular meaning that describes mostly the fall of a power and, consequently, the rise of another. Although the succession of hegemonies is a common topic in the aforementioned authors, the range of evidence and disparities therein are indicative, on the one hand, of the different ways through which one can depict change, in linguistic terms, and, on the other hand, of an author's intentions when emphasising on the event he refers, with certain verbs creating a particularly strong effect. To this end, there are verbs that show the misfortune or the beginning of the decline, such as κινῶ (move; disturb) and σαλεύω (shake); verbs that depict the actual downfall, such as ἀφαιρῶ (take away; remove), ἐκβάλλω (remove), ἐκπίπτω (fall), λύω (put an end), and παύω (to put an end); finally, other verbs emphasise how complete this downfall was, such as ἀναιρῶ (destroy), ἀποστερῶ (deprive), διαφθείρω (destroy), καταλύω (ruin), καταπαύω (destroy). Of course, these verbs are colored by adverbs or adverbial phrases that convey the swiftness of a change (ταχέως, ταχύν, ῥαδίως, πολὺ θάττον, ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ, οὐ πολὺς χρόνος) or indicate the duration of the situation preceding the forthcoming change (συνεχῶς and μόλις). In the texts discussed above, change is often viewed either as a result of a war, a misfortune, a state of confusion, or as the cause for all these. Finally, in the face of a new situation, reactions may differ, varying from feelings of joy and relief, if the individuals in question benefited from the change, to expressions of sadness and despair about their future, if they belonged to the defeated party.

Bibliography

- Accame, S. 1941. *La lega ateniese del secolo IV a.C.* Rome: A. Signorelli.
- Alexiou, E. 2010. *Der Euagoras des Isokrates. Ein Kommentar.* Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Alexiou, E. 2015. ἀρχὴ τῆς θαλάττης – ἀρχὴ τῶν κακῶν? Kompetitive Motivationen bei Thukydides, Ps.-Xenophon und Isokrates. *Historika*, 5, 405-421.
- Asheri, D., Lloyd, A. B. and Corcella, A. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV.* Edited by O. Murray and A. Moreno. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Atack, C. 2018. Imagined Superpowers: Isocrates' Opposition of Athens and Sparta. In: Cartledge, P. and Powell, A. (eds.) *The Greek Superpower: Sparta in the Self-Definitions of Athenians*, Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 157-184.
- Baron, C. A. 2006. The Aristoteles Decree and the Expansion of the Second Athenian League. *Hesperia*, 75, 379-395.
- Bartzoka, A. 2015. L'Aréopage et le *dēmos* dans la vision politique et morale d'Isocrate. In: Bouchet, C. and Giovannelli-Jouanna, P. G. (eds.) *Isocrate: entre jeu rhétorique et enjeux politiques*, Collection du Centre d'Études et de Recherches sur l'Occident Romain. Nouvelle série, 47, Paris: De Boccard, 175-183.
- Bartzoka, A. 2017. La guerre des Alliés. Un point de rupture vu sous le prisme des textes du milieu du IV^e siècle. *Camenulae*, 18, 1-12.
- Bartzoka, A. 2018. *Le tribunal de l'Héliée. Justice et Politique dans l'Athènes du VI^e au IV^e siècles avant J.-C.* Bruxelles: Peter Lang.
- Bartzoka, A. 2020. Construire et déconstruire la légitimité. De l'hégémonie à l'archè athénienne (V^e siècle avant J.-C.). In: Cormier, P., Gilly, X. and Girardin, M. (eds.) *Construire la légitimité politique de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, Paris: Classiques Garnier, 59-69.
- Bartzoka, A. 2022. Penser le changement à l'envers: le passé, la tradition et les ancêtres vus par les différentes générations de l'époque classique. *Klio*, 104(1).
- Bearzot, C. 2010. Le potenze egemoniche greche nel quadro della storia universale. In: Roberto, U. and Mecella, L. (eds.) *Dalla storiografia ellenistica alla storiografia tardoantica: aspetti, problemi, prospettive. Atti del Convegno, Roma 23-25 ottobre 2008*, Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino, 11-24.
- Bearzot, C. 2013. *Come si abbatte una democrazia. Tecniche di colpo di Stato nell'Atene antica.* Bari: Laterza.
- Bearzot, C. 2015. L'impero del mare come egemonia subalterna nel IV secolo (Diodoro, Libri XIV-XV). *Aevum*, 89, 83-91.
- Bearzot, C. 2020. *Studi su Isocrate (1980-2020).* Milano: LED Edizioni Universitarie.
- Beck, H. and Ganter, A. 2015. Boiotia and the Boiotian Leagues. In: Beck, H. and Funke, P. (eds.) *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 132-157.
- Bertelli, L. 1989. Metabole politeion. *Filosofia Politica*, 3, 275-326.
- Boëldieu-Trevet, J. 2016. Les commandements alliés dans le monde grec de la deuxième guerre médique à la bataille de Chéronée. In: Couvenhes, J.-C. (ed.) *La symmachia comme pratique du droit international dans le monde grec*, Dialogue d'histoire ancienne, Supplément 16, Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 67-95.
- Bonnin, G. 2014. Les Cyclades face à l'impérialisme d'Athènes: entre coercition et acceptation. In: Bonnin, G. and Le Quéré, E. (eds.) *Pouvoirs, îles et mer. Formes et modalités de l'hégémonie dans les Cyclades antiques (VII^e s. a.C.-III^e s. p.C.)*, Bordeaux: Ausonius, 57-68.
- Bonnin, G. 2015. *De Naxos à Amorgos. L'impérialisme athénien vu des Cyclades à l'époque classique*, Scripta Antiqua 75. Bordeaux: Ausonius.

- Bouchet, C. 2014. *Isocrate l'Athénien, ou la belle hégémonie. Étude des relations internationales au IV^e siècle a.C.*, Scripta Antiqua 60. Bordeaux: Ausonius.
- Bouchet, C. 2015. Isocrate, la seconde Confédération maritime et l'Aréopagitique. *Historika*, 5, 423-431.
- Brock, R. 2009. Did the Athenian Empire Promote Democracy? In: Ma, J., Papazarkadas, N. and Parker, R. (eds.) *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, London: Duckworth, 149-166.
- Buckler, J. 2003. *Aegean Greece in the Fourth Century BC*. Leiden: Brill.
- Buckler, J. 2013. Epaminondas at Leuctra, 371 B.C. In: Campbell, B. and Tritle, L. A. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 657-670.
- Buckler, J. and Beck, H. 2008. *Central Greece and the Politics of Power in the Fourth Century BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cargill, J. L. 1981. *The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance?* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cartledge, P. 2002. *Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History 1300-362 BC*, 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Cartledge, P. and Greenwood, E. 2002. Herodotus as a Critic: Truth, Fiction, Polarity. In: Bakker, E. J., de Jong, I. J. F. and van Wees, H. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden: Brill, 351-371.
- Cawkwell, G. 2011. *Cyrene to Chaeronea: Selected Essays on Ancient Greek History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ceccarelli, P. 1993. Sans thalassocratie, pas de démocratie? Le rapport entre thalassocratie et démocratie à Athènes dans la discussion du Ve et IV^e siècle av. J.-C. *Historia*, 42, 444-470.
- Christesen, P. 2010. Spartans and Scythians, A Meeting of Mirages: The Portrayal of the Lycurgan *Politeia* in Ephorus' *Histories*. In: Powell, A. and Hodkinson, S. (eds.) *Sparta: The Body Politic*, Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 211-263.
- Connor, W. R. 1984. *Thucydides*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Croiset, M. 1925. *Démosthène, Harangues II*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Daverio Rocchi, G. 1991. Le poleis *megalai* e *mikrai* come tema letterario, motivo politico e rapporto giuridico. *Acme*, 44, 53-73.
- Daverio Rocchi, G. 2015. Immaginario del mare e *homonoia*. Luoghi reali e virtuali dell' armonia e dell' amicizia nella retorica politica e nella prassi (IV sec. a.C.). *Historika*, 5, 83-96.
- Davidson, J. 1990. Isocrates Against Imperialism: An Analysis of the *De Pace*. *Historia*, 39, 20-36.
- de Martinis, L. 2018. *Eubulo e i Poroi di Senofonte. L'Atene del IV secolo tra riflessione teorica e pratica politica*. Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste.
- de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 1961. Notes on Jurisdiction in the Athenian Empire. I. *Classical Quarterly*, 11, 94-112.
- Demont, P. 2003. La réflexion d'Isocrate sur le pouvoir dans les années 360-350. In: Fromentin, V., Roddaz, J.-M., Gotteland, S. and Franchet d'Espèrey, S. (eds.) *Fondements et crises du pouvoir, Études 9*. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 35-46.
- Dreher, M. 1995. *Hegemon und Symmachoi. Untersuchungen zum zweiten athenischen Seebund*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 46. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Eidinow, E. 2011. *Luck, Fate and Fortune: Antiquity and its Legacy*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Farrell, C. A. 2016. Xenophon *Poroi* 5: Securing a 'More Just' Athenian Hegemony. *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought*, 33, 331-355.
- Flower, M. A. 2017. Xenophon as a Historian. In: Flower, M. A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 301-322.
- Fragoulaki, M. 2013. *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Fragoulaki, M. 2016. Emotion, Persuasion and Kinship in Thucydides: The Plataian Debate (3.52-68) and the Melian Dialogue (5.83-113). In: Sanders, E. and Johncock, M. (eds.) *Emotion and Persuasion in Classical Antiquity*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 113-132.
- Gauthier, P. 1972. *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*. Nancy: Université de Nancy II.
- Gauthier, P. 1976. *Un commentaire historique des Poroi de Xénophon*. Genève: Librairie Droz.
- Gauthier, P. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs. Contribution à l'histoire des institutions*, Suppléments au Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique 12. Paris: École Française d'Athènes.
- Gauthier, P. 1987-1989. Grandes et petites cités: hégémonie et autarcie. *Opus*, 7-8, 187-202.
- Gray, V. 1989. *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins' University Press.
- Hansen, M. H. 1974. *The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C. and The Public Action against Unconstitutional Proposals*. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Harding, P. 2008. *The Story of Athens: The Fragments of the Local Chronicles of Attika*. London: Routledge.
- Harris, E. M. 2008. *Demosthenes: Speeches 20-22, The Oratory of Classical Greece 12*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. I, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hornblower, S. 2011. *The Greek World 479-323 BC*, 4th edition. London: Routledge.
- Ingravalle, F. 1989. Conflitti e trasformazioni costituzionali nella "Costituzione degli Ateniesi". *Filosofia Politica*, 3, 327-352.
- Joho, T. 2021. The Peloponnesian War and the State of Nature in Thucydides: The Coincidence of Motion and Rest. In: Bruzzone, R. (ed.) *Polemos and his Children: War, its Repercussions, and Narrative in Ancient Greek Literature*, Histos Supplements 12, Histos, 17-45.
- Jouanna, J. 2005. Cause and Crisis in Historians and Medical Writers of the Classical Period. In: van der Eijk, J. P. J. (ed.) *Hippocrates in Context: Papers Read at the XIth International Hippocrates Colloquium University of Newcastle upon Tyne 27-31 August 2002*, Leiden: Brill, 3-27.
- Jouanna, J. 2012. *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers*, Studies in Ancient Medicine 40. Leiden: Brill.
- Kagan, D. 1981. *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kallet, L. 2017. The Pentecontaetia. In: Forsdyke, S., Foster, E. and Balot, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 63-80.
- Kierstead, J. 2016. The Delian and Second Athenian Leagues: The Perspective of Collective Action. In: Armstrong, J. (ed.) *Circum Mare: Themes in Ancient Warfare*, Mnemosyne Supplements 388, Leiden: Brill, 164-181.
- Konstan, D. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Landucci, F. 2018. La translatio imperii dal mondo greco al mondo romano. *Erga-Logoi*, 6, 7-28.
- Lévy, E. 2015. La Sparte d'Isocrate. In: Bouchet, C. and Giovannelli-Jouanna, P. G. (eds.) *Isocrate: entre jeu rhétorique et enjeux politiques*, Collection du Centre d'Études et de Recherches sur l'Occident Romain. Nouvelle série, 47, Paris: De Boccard, 245-271.
- Liddel, P. 2010. *Metabole Politeion* as Universal Historiography. In: Liddel, P. and Fear, A. (eds.) *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, London: Bloomsbury, 15-29.
- Loddo, L. 2016. Cambiamenti costituzionali nei *Philippika* di Teopompo di Chio. *Incidenza dell'Antico*, 14, 175-206.
- Loraux, N. 1997. *La cité divisée. L'oubli dans la mémoire d'Athènes*. Paris: Payot et Rivages.
- Low, P. 2007. *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece: Morality and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Low, P. 2017. Thucydides on the Athenian Empire and Interstate Relations (431-404). In: Forsdyke, S., Foster, E. and Balot, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 99-114.
- Luraghi, N. 2014. Ephorus in Context. In: Parmegianni, G. (ed.) *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography*, Hellenic Studies Series 64, Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 133-151.
- Masaracchia, A. 1995. *Isocrate. Retorica e politica*, Filologia e Critica 73, Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale.
- Mackil, E. 2013. *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon*, Hellenistic Culture and Society 55, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Migeotte, L. 2014. *Les finances des cités grecques aux périodes classique et hellénistique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Millender, E. 2015. The Spartans "at Sea". *Historika*, 5, 299-312.
- Munson, R. V. 2015. Natural Upheavals in Thucydides (and Herodotus). In: Clark, C. A., Foster, E. and Hallett, J. P. (eds.) *Kinesis: The Ancient Depiction of Gesture, Motion, and Emotion*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 41-59.
- Nouhaud, M. 1982. *L'utilisation de l'histoire par les orateurs attiques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Papillon, T. L. 2004. *Isocrates II, The Oratory of Classical Greece* 7, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Parmegianni, G. 2011. *Eforo di Cuma. Studi di storiografica greca*, Studi di storia 14, Bologna: Patròn.
- Pébarthe, C. 2011. L'empire athénien est-il toujours un empire comme les autres? *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, Supplément 5, 57-88.
- Persynakis, I. 2015. «Μέγα τὸ τῆς θαλάσσης κράτος» (Θουκ. I 143, 5): αρχαιολογία της ιδέας. *Historika*, 5, 387-404.
- Poddighe, E. 2014. *Aristotele, Atene e le metamorfosi dell'idea democratica: da Solone a Pericle (594-451 a.C.)*. Rome: Carocci.
- Poddighe, E. 2019. *Politeia nella storiografia e nel pensiero storico greco tra V e IV secolo a.C.: la questione della continuità e del mutamento*. *Gerión*, 37, 271-300.
- Rhodes, P. J. 2008. After the Three-Bar Sigma Controversy: The History of Athenian Imperialism Reassessed. *Classical Quarterly*, 58, 501-506.
- Roberts, J. T. 2017. *The Plague of War: Athens, Sparta, and the Struggle for Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rockwell, N. 2017. *Thebes: A History*. London: Routledge.
- Rösler, W. 2002. The Histories and Writing. In: Bakker, E. J., de Jong, I. J. F. and van Wees, H. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden: Brill, 79-94.
- Roth, P. 2003. *Der Panathenaios des Isokrates*. Übersetzung und Kommentar, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 196. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Rusten, J. S. 2015. Kinesis in the Preface to Thucydides. In: Clark, C. A., Foster, E. and Hallett, J. P. (eds.) *Kinesis: the Ancient Depiction of Gesture, Motion, and Emotion*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 27-40.
- Ruzé, F. 2018. The Empire of the Spartans (404-371). In: Powell, A. (ed.) *A Companion to Sparta*, vol. I, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 320-353.
- Ryffel, H. 1949. *Metabole Politeion: Der Wandel der Staatsverfassungen*. Bern: Arno Press.
- Sanders, E. 2012. Beyond the Usual Suspects: Literary Sources and the Historian of Emotions. In: Chaniotis, A. (ed.) *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World*, Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge Und Epigraphische Studien 52, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 151-173.
- Saxonhouse, A. W. 2017. Kinesis, Navies, and the Power Trap in Thucydides. In: Forsdyke, S., Foster, E. and Balot, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 339-353.
- Scheibelreiter, P. 2013. *Untersuchungen zur vertragsrechtlichen Struktur des delisch-attischen Seebundes*, Akten der Gesellschaft für griechische und hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte 22. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Seager, R. 1967. Thrasybulus, Conon and Athenian Imperialism, 396-386 B.C. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 87, 95-115.
- Seager, R. 1994. The Corinthian War. In: Lewis, D. M., Boardman, J., Hornblower, S. and Ostwald, M. (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History (CAH). Volume VI: The Fourth Century B.C.*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 97-119.
- Sebastiani, B. B. 2018. The Coups of 411 and 404 in Athens: Thucydides and Xenophon on Conservative Turns. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 58, 490-515.
- Sterling, N. 2004. Xenophon's Hellenica and the Theban Hegemony. In: Tuplin, C. (ed.) *Xenophon and his World: Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999*, Historia Einzelschriften 172, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 453-462.
- Strassler, R. B. (ed.) 2008. *Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War*, Translated by R. Crawley. New York: The Free Press.
- Strassler, R. B. (ed.) 2009. *The Landmark Herodotus: The Histories*, Translated by A. Purvis. New York: Anchor Books.
- Strassler, R. B. (ed.) 2010. *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika*, Translated by J. Marincola. New York: Anchor Books.
- Strauss, B. S. 1986. *Athens after the Peloponnesian War: Class, Faction, and Policy 403-386*. London: Croom Helm.
- Thomas, R. 2006. Thucydides' Intellectual Milieu and the Plague. In: Rengakos, A. and Tsakmakis, A. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden: Brill, 87-108.
- Thomas, R. 2017. Thucydides and His Intellectual Milieu. In: Forsdyke, S., Foster, E. and Balot, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 567-586.
- Too, Y. L. and Mirhady, D., *Isocrates I, The Oratory of Classical Greece 4*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Trevett, J. 2011. *Demosthenes: Speeches 1-17, The Oratory of Classical Greece 14*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Tsakmakis, A. 2017. Speeches. In: Forsdyke, S., Foster, E. and Balot, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 267-281.
- Tuci, P. A. 2019. The Speeches of Theban Ambassadors in Greek Literature (404-362 B.C.). *Ktema*, 44, 33-52.
- Tuplin, C. 1993. *The Failings of the Empire: A Reading of Xenophon Hellenica 2.3.11-7.5.27*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- van Wees, H. 2002. Herodotus and the Past. In: Bakker, E. J., de Jong, I.J.F. and van Wees, H. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden: Brill, 321-349.

Abstract (Greek) | Περίληψη

Ο όρος αλλαγή-μεταβολή αποτελεί βασικό σημείο αναφοράς ενός ερευνητή των κλασικών σπουδών στο πλαίσιο της μελέτης και έρευνας του παρελθόντος. Ιδιαίτερα δε τα τελευταία χρόνια, έχει ανανεωθεί το ενδιαφέρον των ερευνητών γύρω από τη διερεύνηση του όρου τόσο ως προς το εννοιολογικό του φορτίο όσο και ως προς τις ποικίλες εκφάνσεις του. Μεταξύ αυτών των εκφάνσεων, η σύγχρονη έρευνα έχει εξετάσει διεξοδικά τον ανταγωνισμό Αθήνας-Σπάρτης και την εναλλαγή της αθηναϊκής και σπαρτιατικής ηγεμονίας στον ελληνικό κόσμο της κλασικής εποχής. Ωστόσο, οι μελέτες αυτές επικεντρώνονται στις επιπτώσεις (πολιτικές, κοινωνικές, οικονομικές) του φαινομένου και όχι στην εξέταση του λεξιλογίου που αποτυπώνει την άνοδο και παρακμή της δύναμης των δύο πόλεων.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, το παρόν άρθρο παρουσιάζει τις απόψεις ιστορικών και ρητόρων της κλασικής εποχής γύρω από την ακμή και πτώση των ηγεμονιών της Αθήνας και της Σπάρτης, μέσα από την αναζήτηση και εξέταση των όρων εκείνων που χρησιμοποιούσαν οι Αρχαίοι για να εκφράσουν την εν λόγω αλλαγή, λαμβάνοντας ταυτόχρονα υπόψη τον αθηνοκεντρικό χαρακτήρα των πηγών. Λόγω των διαθέσιμων μαρτυριών, οι περισσότερες πληροφορίες προέρχονται από τον Θουκυδίδη και, κυρίως, από τον Ισοκράτη, δύο συγγραφείς οι οποίοι ενδιαφέρθηκαν ιδιαίτερα για τις συνεχείς μεταβολές που σημειώνονταν στην άσκηση ηγεμονικής πολιτικής στον ελληνικό χώρο. Επιπροσθέτως, οι γνώσεις μας συμπληρώνονται από τις μαρτυρίες του Ηροδότου, του Ξενοφώντα, του Έφορου και του Δημοσθένη. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, το άρθρο εντοπίζει, αφενός, τα γεγονότα εκείνα τα οποία θεωρήθηκαν από τους προαναφερθέντες συγγραφείς σημεία τομής για την άνοδο και πτώση της Αθήνας και της Σπάρτης· σε αυτά συγκαταλέγονται οι Μηδικοί πόλεμοι και ο Πελοποννησιακός πόλεμος, καθώς και οι ναυμαχίες της Κνίδου, της Νάξου και η μάχη των Λεύκτρων του 4ου αιώνα. Αφετέρου, η εργασία εξετάζει το λεξιλόγιο που χρησιμοποιείται για να περιγραφεί ο άνωθεν μετασχηματισμός των δύο πόλεων και υπογραμμίζει τους διαφορετικούς τρόπους αναπαράστασης αυτής της αλλαγής στις αρχαίες πηγές. Η εύρεση των σχετικών όρων αποτελεί τη βάση για να εξεταστεί το εύρος (στιγμιαία αλλαγή ή με διάρκεια) και η συχνότητα της αλλαγής, το είδος της (εξέλιξη, μετάβαση από μια παλαιότερη κατάσταση σε μία νέα, ανατροπή ή εξαφάνιση της καθεστηκυίας τάξης, ανανέωση), καθώς και ο τρόπος αντιμετώπισής της από τους Αρχαίους (θετική ή αρνητική).

Από τη μελέτη διαφαίνεται, πρώτον, ότι το φαινόμενο της διαδοχής διαφορετικών ηγεμονιών στον ελληνικό κόσμο της κλασικής εποχής είναι ένα κοινός τόπος, ο οποίος απαντάται άλλοτε σε μεγαλύτερο και άλλοτε σε μικρότερο βαθμό στους παραπάνω συγγραφείς. Δεύτερον, φαίνεται ότι τα παραπάνω γεγονότα αποτελούν κομβικούς σταθμούς τόσο στην πορεία εξέλιξης των δύο πόλεων όσο και στον συσχετισμό δυνάμεων στον ελληνικό κόσμο. Ωστόσο, τα εν λόγω γεγονότα αποτελούν ταυτόχρονα και μέρος της επιχειρηματολογίας που αναπτύσσουν οι ομιλητές/συγγραφείς που αναφέρονται σε αυτά. Η επιχειρηματολογία αυτή εντάσσεται κάθε φορά μέσα σε ένα διαφορετικό ιστορικό πλαίσιο και εξυπηρετεί συγκεκριμένους ρητορικούς στόχους. Μάλιστα, είναι χαρακτηριστικό ότι οι ιστορικές αυτές στιγμές παρουσιάζονται με διαφορετικό τρόπο όχι μόνο από διαφορετικούς μεταξύ τους συγγραφείς, αλλά και από τον ίδιο έναν συγγραφέα, όπως ξεκάθαρα φαίνεται μέσα από τα έργα του Ισοκράτη. Αναπόφευκτα, βασιζόμαστε σε αυτές τις αφηγήσεις για να ανασυνθέσουμε την ιστορία της περιόδου, αλλά αυτή η ανασύνθεση λαμβάνει υπόψη της το αντίστοιχο ιστορικό/ρητορικό πλαίσιο μέσα στο οποίο προβάλλονται τα γεγονότα. Για τον λόγο αυτόν, η μελέτη του λεξιλογίου που περιγράφει την άνοδο και την παρακμή των ηγεμονιών της Αθήνας και της Σπάρτης είναι σημαντική, καθώς επιτρέπει να αντιληφθούμε και να κατανοήσουμε τους πολλαπλούς τρόπους με τους οποίους οι Αρχαίοι παρουσίαζαν κάθε αλλαγή.


Συγκεκριμένα, οι όροι που περιγράφουν τη μεταβολή στην ισορροπία δυνάμεων στον ελληνικό χώρο είτε έχουν ουδέτερη σημασία (βλ. π.χ. τους όρους μεταβολή, το ρήμα «ἀναστρέφω» ή την έκφραση «τῆς τύχης μεταπεσούσης») είτε εμφανίζονται με θετική ή αρνητική χροιά. Στην τελευταία αυτή περίπτωση, περιγράφουν κυρίως την παρακμή μιας δύναμης και τη συνακόλουθη άνοδο της αντιπάλου της· ο πόλεμος, μια ατυχία ή μια κατάσταση αναταραχής θεωρούνται συχνά είτε η αιτία είτε το αποτέλεσμα της εκάστοτε μεταβολής. Η παρουσίαση της ίδιας αλλαγής με διαφορετικό τρόπο, από τη μία μεριά, εξηγείται γλωσσικά –λόγω των ποικίλων λειτουργικών εκφάνσεων της γλώσσας– και, από την άλλη, εξαρτάται από τις προθέσεις του συγγραφέα όταν επιδιώκει να δώσει έμφαση σε ένα συγκεκριμένο γεγονός. Για τον σκοπό αυτό, χρησιμοποιούνται όροι που άλλοτε δείχνουν την αρχή της παρακμής, άλλοτε απεικονίζουν την πτώση και άλλοτε τονίζουν τον αντίκτυπό της. Επίσης, τον ίδιο σκοπό εξυπηρετούν και λέξεις ή εκφράσεις που αποτυπώνουν χρονικά την ταχύτητα με την οποία διενεργείται η αλλαγή ή τη διάρκεια της προηγούμενης της μεταβολής κατάστασης. Και, τέλος, σε αυτό συμβάλλουν και τα λεκτικά σύνολα που εκφράζουν τις αντιδράσεις των Αρχαίων απέναντι στη νέα διαμορφωθείσα κατάσταση και οι οποίες ήταν είτε συναισθήματα χαράς και ανακούφισης, εάν τα υποκείμενα επωφελήθηκαν από την αλλαγή, είτε εκφράσεις λύπης και απόγνωσης για το μέλλον τους, εάν ανήκαν στους ηττημένους.

Miguel Antonio Caro and the (Trans)Formations of Classical Tradition in Colombia

Gemma Bernadó Ferrer

Department of Humanities and Literature, University of Los Andes

g.bernado@uniandes.edu.co

 0003-3322-8047

Submitted	23/11/2021
Accepted (Internal Review)	30/11/2021
Revised (External Review)	31/01/2022
Published	24/03/2022

Abstract

This paper highlights a unique phenomenon in Colombia, the entanglement between Latin and power, epitomised by the pivotal role of President and Latinist Miguel Antonio Caro. The study of Classics arrived in the territory with the first conquerors from Spain at the end of the sixteenth century and Caro stands on the shoulders of a long Classical tradition in New Granada. A member of the Conservative Party and a humanist, he was widely known for his work and contribution in the Political Constitution of the Republic of Colombia of 1886 and his central role in the formation of the modern state of Colombia. Besides politics, Caro co-authored a Latin Grammar, wrote many articles on translation and Latin Literature, composed poetry in Spanish and Latin, and produced the first translation of the complete works of Vergil in Colombia. Caro's works and days aptly demonstrate the association between grammar, Classics, and state power throughout the history of Colombia. The paper contextualises the role of Classics in Colombia from the colonial period until the end of the nineteenth century and sketches Caro as an individual and a politician. It outlines his scholarly activity, which involved grammar, translation, and scholarly publishing, and underlines his influence on other scholars and his idiosyncratic interest, as a decisive political figure, in re-invigorating interest in Latin language and literature.

Keywords

Miguel Antonio Caro, Classical Tradition, Vergil, Latin Grammar, Spanish Translations of Latin Literature, Classics and Politics, Colombia

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful and constructive comments and the editors of the journal for their kind and thoughtful support in the whole process. A sincere thank you to Stefanos Apostolou for his diligent and patient proofreading of this paper.

The Status of Latin in New Granada and at the Beginning of the Republican Period in Colombia*

Miguel Antonio Caro's scholarly activities built on a long tradition of classics in the country, going back centuries, in the years of colonial administration and the Viceroyalty of New Granada. Hence, the paper begins with an overview of the study of classics in the land that later became the Republic of Colombia. It will first discuss Caro as a politician involved in important milestones in Colombian politics, and then examine his manifold contributions to the study of Classics in the country. The last section of the paper explores the two aspects of Miguel Antonio Caro, the president and the Latinist, outlines the entanglement between Classics and power, and sketches the central role of Miguel Antonio Caro in this phenomenon.

The first contact with Greek and Roman authors in the territory that today is known as Colombia took place at the dawn of the sixteenth century, with the arrival of Spanish conquerors, such as Alonso de Ojeda (Torrejoncillo del Rey, 1466 – Santo Domingo, 1515) and Diego de Nicuesa (Torredonjimeno, c. 1478 – Caribbean Sea, 1511).¹ In 1525, conqueror Rodrigo de Bastidas (Sevilla, 1475 – Santiago de Cuba, 1527) founded Santa Marta and other cities in the Caribbean coast; among others, Pedro de Heredia (Madrid, 1484 – off the coast of Cádiz, 1554), Nicolás de Federmán (Ulm, c. 1505 – Valladolid, 1542), Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada (Córdoba, 1509 – Mariquita, 1579), and Sebastián de Belalcázar (Belalcázar, 1480 – Cartagena de Indias, 1551) explored the land and established settlements across the whole territory. This process of first settlement lasted from the arrival of Spaniards in 1499 until 1550. During this early age of exploration and colonisation, contact with Classics was mediated by individuals belonging to the military, ecclesiastical, or civil servant orders. Usually, they were born and trained in Spain but lived and worked throughout their lives, or for a substantial amount of time, in the Americas.

Well-educated individuals featured among the group of conquerors, first settlers, and government officials. Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada had studied Law at the University of Salamanca and from his extensive historical writings after his relocation to America only his *Antijovio* (1567) has been transmitted to us.² Juan de Castellanos (Alanís, 1522 – Tunja, 1606), a 'humanist conqueror',³ composed *Elegías de Varones Ilustres de Indias* (*Elegies of Illustrious Men of the Indies*, 1589),⁴ the foundational epic poem in Colombia. The elegies comprise 113,609 hendecasyllable verses, grouped mostly in real octaves and divided into four parts. As Caro pointed out, the poem mourns the death of illustrious men or painful cases of conquest.⁵ The text incorporates elements from a variety of genres (epic, history, elegy, eulogy, oratory, ballads, and pilgrimage) and languages: it is written in Spanish but contains numerous passages in Latin and Amerindian voices, alongside several Italianisms, Gallicisms, and Arabisms, which make its classification a difficult task for researchers. A strong influence from Latin poetry, especially Vergil, Ovid, and Horace, has been detected by scholarly research in Castellanos' *Elegías* and has received

* All English translations of verses are my own.

¹ The region of New Granada initially belonged to the Viceroyalty of Perú since its creation in 1542 and was re-organised as a Viceroyalty in 1717. Also known as the Viceroyalty of the New Kingdom of Granada, it was temporally dissolved and re-established in 1739.

² Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 2.

³ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 1-40.

⁴ Caro himself, among others, took an interest in the work of Castellanos (Caro, 1921; Lida, 1946). Recent publications evidence a resurgence in the studies of Castellanos: e.g., Restrepo, 1999; 2004; Martínez Osorio, 2016, with an English translation of the exordium of *Elegía I*.

⁵ Caro, 1921: 52-53.

considerable attention.⁶ Cristóbal de Torres y Motones (Burgos, 1574 – Bogotá, 1654), appointed bishop of Santa Fé de Bogotá by Felipe IV in 1634, founded in 1653 the ‘Colegio Mayor del Rosario’, one of the first universities of New Granada. He brought to the land his private library comprising about 200 volumes,⁷ most of which were written in Latin; later, they would thicken the shelves of the Colegio Mayor del Rosario university library.

Religious institutions also played a crucial role in the dissemination and knowledge of Latin and Greco-Roman culture in New Granada⁸. Their influence was widespread not only across cities, with the foundation of schools and universities, but also in rural and less populated territories, through the work conducted in the missions and *haciendas*. The Jesuit Order, in particular, stood out for its educational role in creating several *haciendas* – a large estate for economic exploitation in the countryside, where schools were built and indigenous, rural populations were educated and converted to Catholicism.⁹

This contact with classical legacy taking root in New Granada instigated a fruitful dialogue between the Classical Tradition and the new American reality. Already in the seventeenth century, a Creole elite emerged, born and educated in New Granada. This new social class was educated in private schools and the Universities of Tunja, Bogotá, and Popayán, mainly religious centres at the hands of the Jesuits, Augustinians, and Franciscans. The study of Latin grammar and the works of classical Latin authors was part of the academic curriculum since the creation of these institutions. As in the Viceroyalty of New Spain,¹⁰ the University of Salamanca, which offered a program based on *trivium* and *quadrivium*, became the dominant model for institutions in New Granada.¹¹ Good knowledge of Latin was mandatory for the completion of studies, and it seems that students were able to communicate fluently in Latin (both orally and in writing). However, the use of this language was restricted to the academic field.¹²

Creol writer Juan Rodríguez Freyle (Bogotá, 1566-1642) authored *El Carnero*, a foundational novel of Colombian Literature, between 1636 and 1638.¹³ Its importance resides in describing the historical background of the conquest and the early years of the Spanish settlement, and in the early development of Baroque in the Spanish Indies.¹⁴ The influence of Classical Literature, especially Vergil and Horace, and the use of Latin, is clearly and firmly stated in Freyle’s work.¹⁵

⁶ Lida, 1946: 111-120; Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 16-17.

⁷ Restrepo Zapata (2015:73-70) presents a catalogue of 224 volumes. Del Rosario García (2015: 24) is more conservative and restricts the number to 175 volumes. According to the sources of the period, a standard traveller ventured to the Americas with a personal library of about 50 volumes.

⁸ Along with the library of the Colegio Mayor del Rosario, important book collections of religious orders, some expropriated from the Jesuits after their expulsion by Carlos III in 1767, some delivered by other religious communities, such as the Augustinians, the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Carmelites during the nineteenth century, are preserved in the National Library of Colombia; full discussion in López Arévalo, 2011. Palomino Urbano (1989) offers a catalog of the manuscripts of the National Library of Colombia. Printed books and *mamotreto*s (handwritten volumes) provide information on the education system and knowledge of Latin. Finally, the Library of the Pontifical Xaverian University houses an important collection of ancient books; Villegas, 2010; 2011; 2015.

⁹ Cf. Colmenares, 1969: 39-44. Most recent research focuses on specific areas of Colombia, Cúcuta Valley for instance; cf. Mantilla, 2019.

¹⁰ Ortiz Dávila (2014: 42) observes that the University of Salamanca was the model for the creation of universities in New Spain. The University of Salamanca was founded by Alfonso IX in 1218. It was the first university in Spain that based its curriculum on the study of *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and logic) and *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy). The University of Alcalá de Henares was also a reference point for the foundation of universities in the Americas.

¹¹ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 54-55.

¹² Cf. Olaya Perdomo, 2018: 11.

¹³ Romero, 1997.

¹⁴ Adorno, 2009.

¹⁵ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 213, 215, 223, 227.

At the turn of the seventeenth century, more writers of theological, legal, historical, philosophical, and literary works in Latin flourished in New Granada. The vast majority of authors were clergymen, only a few were secular: Francisco del Rincón (Toledo, 1650 – Bogotá, 1723), Pedro de Solís y Valenzuela (Bogotá, 1624-1711), Lucas Fernández Piedrahita (Bogotá, 1624 – Panamá City, 1688), José Ortiz y Morales (Mariquita, 1658-c. 1727), Juan Antonio de Oviedo (Bogotá, 1670 – Mexico City, 1757). For the purpose of this paper, it is vital to highlight the works of Pedro de Solís y Valenzuela and Juan Antonio de Oviedo. The former was the author of *El desierto prodigioso el prodigio del desierto* (c. 1650), known as the first romance in the Americas. From his primary settlement in México, the latter was the precursor of a long list of Jesuit humanists in the Americas. His literary production consisted of poetry, missiology, legal, theological, and university oratory works.¹⁶

The Royal Botanical Expedition by José Celestino Mutis (Cádiz, 1769 – Bogotá, 1859), Alexander von Humboldt (Berlin, 1769-1859), and Aimé Bonpland's (La Rochelle, 1773 – Paso de los Libres, 1853) travels in the region inspired a cultural renaissance in eighteenth and nineteenth-century New Granada, and introduced the tenets of the Enlightenment in classical education.¹⁷ Earlier, the foundation of the National Public Library of Colombia (1777) promoted an environment for dialogue and paved the way towards a new political order. It was a transitional period for the study of Latin and Classical authors withal,¹⁸ and in that moment and circumstance, the political discourse over the inclusion or exclusion of Latin in the educational curriculum began. The influence of Classics on the education system and cultural activities remained significant after Independence and the foundation of the Republic of Colombia in 1810.¹⁹ In the ensuing period of political instability, various government reforms in the educational system affected, among others, the teaching of Latin.

Unlike México or Perú, and despite the education reform enacted by district attorney Francisco Moreno Escandón (Mariquita, 1736 – Santiago de Chile, 1792) and Viceroy Antonio Caballero y Góngora (Priego de Córdoba, 1723 – Córdoba, 1796), there were no public universities during the colonial period in New Granada. In 1824, the Secretary of the Interior and historian José Manuel Restrepo (Envigado, 1781 – Bogotá, 1863) insisted on promoting a revolution in education in line with politics, which included the precedence of the Spanish language over Latin.²⁰ In 1826, it was stated and enacted in law that Spanish would be the primary language of tuition in tertiary education, whereas Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and indigenous languages were to be used only on special occasions.²¹ However, these stipulations were short-lived. After a turbulent period with several disruptions and many changes in higher education, by 1868 the foundation of the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, a public university, the knowledge and study of Latin were in dire straits. By then, knowledge of Latin was not a requirement for graduation for all students yet continued to be part of the teaching plan of Theology, Humanities, and Philosophy Faculties.

¹⁶ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 179-227.

¹⁷ Silva, 2017.

¹⁸ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 229-280.

¹⁹ For the influence of Classics during the War of Independence and in the first years after the proclamation of the Republic, del Molino García, 2007: 957-974.

²⁰ Olaya Perdomo, 2018: 11 and 15.

²¹ Olaya Perdomo, 2018: 15-16.

Miguel Antonio Caro: The Person and the Politician

Miguel Antonio Caro y Tobar, one of the most prominent individuals in politics and social evolution in the country, was born in Bogotá in 1843, in the independent Republic of New Granada.²² Raised in a traditional and well-educated family, he first studied Spanish and Latin with his maternal grandfather, the jurist Miguel Tobar. His apprenticeship continued with private tutors, such as Thomas Jones Stevens, an Oxford-trained naturalist, and education at the schools Liceo de Familia and San Bartolomé. In the latter, run by Jesuits, he made the acquaintance of Rufino José Cuervo (Bogotá, 1844 – Paris, 1911), who would arguably become the most prominent Colombian philologist, lexicographer, and linguist of the nineteenth century.²³ He befriended Cuervo very early in his life, and they would work together almost uninterruptedly until Caro's death in 1909. In addition, his acquaintance with the English poet and tutor Samuel Bond introduced the 18-year-old Caro to some new interlocutors for his disquisitions. During his youth, Caro enhanced his knowledge and studied Latin grammar and Literature intensively, but also Greek, Spanish, English, French, and Italian.²⁴ During his academic training, he also became familiar with the philosophical-political texts of Jaume Balmes (Vic, 1810-1848), Juan Donoso Cortés (Valle de la Serena, 1809 – Paris, 1853), and the rhetorical works of José Gómez Hermosilla (Madrid, 1771-1837).

After Independence, the period of general instability did not allow Caro to complete his studies with formal high education. However, he was acknowledged as a trained philologist, translator, humanist and, moreover, a politician, a man of action.²⁵ His engagement with politics culminated during the drafting of Colombia's Constitution of 1886 and his modernising economic reforms when he became president of the country.²⁶ The Constitution was the turning point for the country and remained in force, with minor changes, until 1991. Among other aspects, it vested Catholicism as the official state religion and established the division of powers (executive, legislative, and judiciary).²⁷

As a member of the conservative party that his father, poet and philosopher José Eusebio Caro (Ocaña, 1817 – Santa Marta, 1857) founded, Miguel Antonio Caro was elected vice president of the Republic of Colombia in 1892. He effectively served as president from 1892 until 1898, as the elected president, Rafael Núñez, was unable to exercise his duties due to health issues, which led to his eventual demise in 1894. As a politician, Caro was a proponent of the Regenerationism Movement, which fought for the implementation of the catholic religion and a centralist state based on the continuity of the Hispanic tradition.²⁸ The 1886 Constitution he helped draft reinforced this state model with the support of education, as it placed its system in the hands of the Catholic Church. Besides his political activity, Caro was a very active journalist. He founded and helped operate the newspaper *El Tradicionalista* (*The Traditionalist*), and frequently wrote for other newspapers. His political speeches, articles in the press about Literature, and translations made constant references to classical authors, especially Vergil.²⁹

²² For a biography and discussion on the influence of Caro, Díaz Guevara, 1984; Sierra Mejía, 2002.

²³ Cuervo's work is impressive and important for Hispanic Linguistics, so has thus attracted great scholarly interest. For a detailed discussion, Valencia (2012), who presents Cuervo as a disruptive character and linguist in a conservative political environment. The development of the relationship between Caro and Cuervo is very well illustrated in Vallejo (2012).

²⁴ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 349, 376.

²⁵ Mesa Chica, 2014: 81-104.

²⁶ For politics and currency, Mesa Chica, 2014: 105-126; and 37-58, respectively.

²⁷ The text of the Constitution of Colombia of 1886 can be accessed here: <https://www.suin-juriscol.gov.co/viewDocument.asp?id=1826862>. For an introduction and contextualisation, Olano García, 2019.

²⁸ Valderrama Andrade, 1997.

²⁹ Caro, 1990-1993.

Miguel Antonio Caro: The Classicist

Caro, ‘the prince of Spanish translators’ according to Rubió y Lluch,³⁰ approached Latin Classical authors in a quite interdisciplinary way. Indeed, he authored an important work for the study of Latin grammar and translation, mostly from Latin but also from other languages, and produced numerous articles on Latin literature, especially on Vergil, and on the art of translation, among many other literary topics.

At the age of 24, Caro co-authored, along with his friend Cuervo, *Gramática latina para el uso de los que hablan castellano* (*Latin Grammar for the Use of Speakers of Spanish*, 1867).³¹ *Gramática Latina* was the product of a collaborative work of both authors: issues of morphology (*Analogía*) were assigned to Cuervo, while Caro focused on syntax (*Sintaxis*). *Gramática Latina* went on for four editions with adjustments and additions until 1886, with an addition, from the fourth edition onwards, of a part entitled ‘Exercises in Latin Composition’, authored by Cuervo. Several more editions followed without significant modifications; in 1972, more than one century after the publication of its first edition of 1867, Instituto Caro y Cuervo endorsed the tenth edition of *Gramática Latina*, prepared by Jorge Páramo, who restored some texts from previous editions and added a complete general introduction and many indexes. According to the prologue of the first and second editions, this work was the handbook used in three higher-education institutions of Colombia: Seminario Conciliar, Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario, and Universidad Nacional.³²

Although an early work of two young scholars, *Gramática Latina* was warmly received by reviewers of the time, indeed by prominent ones, such as Menéndez y Pelayo, who deemed it an excellent publication.³³ Two of its most acclaimed features were the transposition of some Latin structures into Spanish and, occasionally, French and Greek, and the inclusion of the historic and comparatist viewpoint into morphology.³⁴ Sections on morphology were the work of Cuervo and, despite his good effort and acclamation, after more careful consideration, this aspect of *Gramática Latina* appeared less groundbreaking and mostly limited to some punctual references to Bopp.³⁵ As for the part on syntax, the starting point for Caro and Cuervo was Burnouf’s *Latin Grammar* in its Spanish translation published in Caracas in 1849 and Key’s *A Latin Grammar*.³⁶ Caro relied on Burnouf’s distinction between general and particular syntax, centralised the analysis on the proposition, and considered the complement as the decisive element. *Gramática Latina* was the first Latin grammar written in Spanish to introduce this viewpoint, which is probably its most significant accomplishment.³⁷ Besides *Gramática Latina*, his lengthy article *Tratado del participio* (*Treatise on Participle*, 1870) was pivotal for the study of the participle in Spanish, its comparison to the Latin participle, and its translation from Latin

³⁰ Reference from Rivas Sacconi, 1947: 138, note 51.

³¹ For the remainder of the paper, I will abbreviate this as *Gramática Latina*.

³² Olaya Perdomo, 2018: 19.

³³ Briceño Jáuregui, 1972: 553, 556-568; Olaya Perdomo, 2018: 20, for details on contemporary reviews.

³⁴ Olaya Perdomo (2018: 20-23) makes an effort to better understand why this *Latin Grammar* received so many good reviews considering that nowadays it has become obsolete.

³⁵ Franz Bopp (Mainz, 1791 – Berlin, 1867), was a linguist and a forerunner of comparative linguistics. With 24 citations from the French edition, he is the most cited authority in the field in *Gramática Latina*.

³⁶ Jean Louis Burnouf (Urville, 1775 – Paris, 1844) was a French philologist, Latinist, and translator. Páramo had already pointed out the influence of Burnouf, Key, and Bello in his edition of Caro’s *Gramática Latina* (1972); cf. the last print of Páramo’s edition Caro-Cuervo, 2019: viii-xii. Caro possessed a copy of an annotated Spanish exemplar of Burnouf (1849). Published in Caracas, Burnouf’s method was used in Venezuela for Latin teaching.

³⁷ Olaya Perdomo, 2018: 21-22.

into Spanish.³⁸ It comprised eight chapters complemented with three appendices, and contained several examples that illustrate the various ways to translate, some taken from Latin, but most from Spanish literature composed either in Spain or in the Americas.

In addition to these theoretical works on linguistics, Caro proved himself a faithful yet creative translator and wrote articles on and included aspects from the theory of translation in the prologues of his translations. This reflection on translation as a mirror of the transculturation that Caro tried to impose remains controversial and must be taken into consideration when evaluating Caro's political disposition.³⁹ His translations were a very influential tool in the political order he was trying to impose mostly through education. Caro attempted to reconnect the new social order with the Spanish past and its Roman roots, providing the general populace with translations of texts which supported and reinforced this idea of continuity. It was indeed a re-utilisation of the Classical tradition and a reaction against Gallicisms and Anglicisms entering Spanish. At the same time, it was a reaction against the French and English ideological influence to the detriment of the Hispanic tradition.⁴⁰

Caro translated texts from many languages, but mainly from Latin; hence, many of them reveal influences from translating into Spanish from this language. He was convinced that translations of Latin texts had been poor and widely neglected in Spanish-speaking countries. In an attempt to reverse the tide, he devoted himself to translation and reflected on the nature of the original texts.⁴¹ Caro expressed his views on translation in various essays, articles, and introductory passages of his works. In the introduction of his *Versiones Latinas (Latin Verses)*, he affirms that translations should take into consideration not only content but also, and especially, form:

Iis quod addam nihil habeo, quorum summa est: poetas, mea opinione, fideliter, ac simul, quantum fieri potest, poetice converti oportere.⁴²

The main point [of my former theory] – to which I have nothing to add – is: poets, in my opinion, ought to be converted faithfully, and at the same time, as far as possible, poetically.

As translation was an activity Caro engaged with throughout his life, translating new texts and authors but also returning to Vergil's texts time and again, he continued theorising about translation along with his essays. For example, in his *Vergilian Essays*, he states that literary translations of poetry should be in verse, not in prose:

La prosa habla; la poesía canta. La traducción en prosa es útil a los estudiosos, porque les facilita y aclara la inteligencia del original: la traducción en verso puede ser muy provechosa a la literatura (...)⁴³

³⁸ Torres Quintero, 1979: 41, 49, 86.

³⁹ Rodríguez García, 2004: 145.

⁴⁰ There is a fervent discussion over Hispanicity in nineteenth-century Colombia. Padilla Chasing (2008) provides an overview of this 'debate de la Hispanidad' in some 19th-century writers, including Caro. Cardona Zuluaga (2017) analyses the 1872 controversy over the celebration of the 'fiesta nacional' between Caro and José María Quijano.

⁴¹ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 363-364.

⁴² Caro, 1951: 11.

⁴³ Caro, 1985-1988: 147.

Prose talks; poetry sings. Translation of poems in prose is useful to scholars because it facilitates and clarifies the subtleties of the original: verse translation can be very helpful to literature (...)

Concerned and preoccupied with translation in verse, Caro delved into Spanish metrics to inform and improve his translations, and he produced important theoretical works throughout his life. He published a commentary of Bello's study on metrics and orthology entitled *Notas a la "Ortología y métrica" de Don Andrés Bello*,⁴⁴ as well as several articles on metrics.

Between 1869 and 1875, Caro produced a magnificent Spanish translation in verse of Vergil's *Bucolica*, *Georgica*, and the *Aeneid*. These were the first complete translations of Vergil published in Colombia,⁴⁵ where only partial translations were previously published (one must also bear in mind that printing arrived rather belatedly in New Granada, in 1735).⁴⁶ Caro busied himself improving, revising, restructuring, and reformulating his translations for the rest of his life. His definitive one, his revised general introduction on his translation, his commentary on the Latin text, and his Vergilian concordances were published posthumously.

Due to his constant reflection and theoretical work on versification, Caro's decision to translate Virgil's hexameters into real octaves (the *Bucolica* in various meters of poetry, the *Georgica* in 'silva', and the *Aeneid* in 'ottava rima') was met with significant criticism.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, Cuervo, Gutiérrez, and González Suárez, among other scholars, wrote enthusiastic reviews of Caro's translation and, in a private communication to Caro, Menéndez Pelayo hailed it as 'la más bella' (the most beautiful) of the works of Vergil into Spanish.⁴⁸

Tengo resueltamente la traducción virgiliana de usted (mirada en conjunto) por la más bella que poseemos en castellano, y creo que con algunos retoques en la segunda edición, quedará perfectísima.⁴⁹

I resolutely hold your overall Virgilian translation as the most beautiful that we have in Spanish, and I think that with some tweaks in the second edition, it will be irreproachable.

'Octava real', a stanza form of Italian origin composed of eight hendecasyllable verses comprising the rhyme scheme ABABABCC, was widely used in Renaissance Epic. It is also the verse employed by the sixteenth-century author Alonso de Ercilla in his *La Araucana*, an epic song of the Spanish Conquest of Chile, and was primarily used in Castellano's *Elegías de varones ilustres de Indias*. Caro's translation of the *Aeneid* spans 15,776 verses, evidently exceeding by almost 50% the number of verses in the original poem. The first 'octava real' in the Spanish translation of the *Aeneid* reveals how the expansion in length involves the addition of text which usually implies addition of content. In the preamble of the *Aeneid*, the inclusion of concepts and words that do not feature in the Latin text, such as 'conquistador' (conqueror), 'país latino' (the Latin country), 'templo' (temple), immediately

⁴⁴ Caro, 1980. Andrés Bello (Caracas, 1781 – Santiago de Chile, 1865) was an important figure for the development of Spanish Linguistics in the Americas.

⁴⁵ Olaya Perdomo, 2018: 23-24, with n. 33.

⁴⁶ Larrañaga (1787) is the first complete translation of Vergil's works published in the Americas.

⁴⁷ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 365-366.

⁴⁸ For all and full references, Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 361-363.

⁴⁹ In Rivas Sacconi, 1947: 127, n. 17.

capture the reader's attention. These first two additions might have functioned as a link between two different 'pasts', the classical and the subsequent Spanish one, and the third one could also attempt to smooth out the ubiquitous paganism from the epic:⁵⁰

Canto asunto marcial; al héroe canto	Arma uirumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
Que, de Troya lanzado, á Italia vino;	Italiam fato profugus Lauiniaque uenit
Que ora en mar, ora en tierra, sufrió tanto	litora, multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
De Juno rencorosa y del destino;	ui superum, saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram
5 Que en guerras luégo padeció quebranto,	multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
Conquistador en el país latino,	inferretque deos Latio;
Canto asunto marcial; al héroe canto	
Hasta fundar, en fin, con alto ejemplo,	
Muro á sus armas, y á sus dioses templo	

I sing of martial matters; for the hero I sing
 who, hurled from Troy, to Italy he arrived;
 Who now on sea, now on land, suffered so much
 From resentful Juno and from fate;
 5 Who in wars he suffered brokenness,
 Conqueror in the Latin country,
 Until founding, finally, with high example,
 Wall to their arms, and temple to their gods.

Caro complemented his accurate verse translation of Vergil's works with a series of articles on various aspects of Virgilian works. His *Vergilian Studies*⁵¹ comprised three volumes, included many articles mostly written before 1890, the year of his Presidency, and discussed the broadest range of topics: a study of the character of Camilla; commentaries on his own translations of Vergil that addressed various issues of translation and contextualisation; an appraisal of all Spanish translators and commentators of Vergil; a reading of the *Aeneid* that tried to offer a religious interpretation of Vergil predating that of Boissier;⁵² and many others. It is important to note that, until today, no other Hispanophone author has composed as many essays on Vergil as Caro,⁵³ and this extensive engagement is indicative of his extraordinary capacity for work and production. The following passage from Caro's *Vergilian Essays* highlights his preference for Vergil over other Latin authors, how his political ideas intertwined with his study of poetry, how classical tradition nurtured notions of continuity from Ancient Rome into the Americas through Spain, and how much Caro valued the idea of belonging to Spain despite Independence:

⁵⁰ Caro, 1873: 11 (*II.Eneida*); text of Verg. *Aen.* 1.1-6 as in Mynors, 1969.

⁵¹ Caro, 1985-1988.

⁵² Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 383, note 72. The omnipresent paganism in Vergil's works was an inconvenience and a disruption to the coherence of Caro's political and educative programs. It is important to stress at least the possibility of a reading of Vergil's works from a religious viewpoint. Boissier (1874) acknowledged the religious connotations in the *Aeneid* and developed the subject more widely than Caro, just a year after Caro's translation.

⁵³ Rivas Sacconi, 1993: 383.

Lo que sí puede afirmarse sin temeridad, porque esta es cuestión de hecho y no de derecho, es que el modo de ser de tal poeta es más conforme que el de tal otro, con las tradiciones y gustos de determinada nación o raza. Para nosotros, para los pueblos meridionales de Europa y América, para Italia lo mismo que para Francia y para la España de ambos mundos, Virgilio fue, es y será más simpático que Homero.⁵⁴

What can be affirmed without doubt, because this is a matter of fact and not of law, is that the state of being such a poet is more consistent than that of any other, with the traditions and tastes of a certain nation or race. For us, for the southern peoples of Europe and America, for Italy as well as for France and for the Spain of both worlds, Vergil was, is, and will be more likeable than Homer.

After he withdrew from politics, Caro devoted himself entirely to Latin literature and translations of Horace, Lucan, Ovid, Tibullus, Propertius, Pseudo-Gallus, and Catullus, collected in a work entitled *Flos Poetarum*. In addition, he dedicated a second volume to the Latin poets of the Renaissance.⁵⁵

Besides his translations, since early childhood and until his death, Caro also wrote poetry. He composed prose and poetry in Spanish and Latin, occasionally providing a Spanish rendition, as in the following poem, *Patria*, where Caro pays homage in, and declares his devotion to, his homeland, a country recently created, and the connection between his political ideas and his poetical compositions is clearly stated:⁵⁶

Te toto, patria, ex animo veneramur amantes; Tu nostro fixum pectore ines. Per te, multa dies quae dulcia miscet amaris, Libavi, plusquam voce referre datur.	¡Patria! te adoro en mi silencio mudo, y temo profanar tu nombre santo. Por ti he gozado y padecido tanto cuanto lengua mortal decir no pudo.
5 Non ego te clypeum dextramque rogabo potentem; Nam satis umbra sinus hospitiumque mihi est. Hoc tantum liceat, lacrimas tibi fundere ad aras, Nudum posse domi vivere, posse mori. Non vis, non splendor, non gignunt munera amorem;	No te pido el amparo de tu escudo, sino la dulce sombra de tu manto: quiero en tu seno derramar mi llanto, vivir, morir en ti pobre y desnudo. Ni poder, ni esplendor, ni lozanía, son razones de amar. Otro es el lazo
10 Ex alia noster stipite floret amor, Longe alia hi nostri formantur origine nexus, Vincula quae poterit rumpere nulla manus. Ad matrem iniussi nullaque ambages venimus; Sentio me partem sanguinis ese tui.	que nadie, nunca, desatar podría. Amo yo por instinto tu regazo, Madre eres tú de la familia mía; ¡Patria! de tus entrañas soy pedazo.

Homeland! I adore you in my bare silence
and I dread to profane your holy name;
for you I have enjoyed and suffered so much
how much, a mortal tongue could not say.
5 I do not ask for the protection of your shield,
but the sweet shadow of your mantle;

⁵⁴ Caro, 1985-1988: 23 (2).

⁵⁵ Rivas Sacconi (1993: 370-376) discusses in detail these translations and their characteristics.

⁵⁶ Latin and Spanish text in Caro, 1951: 28.

I want to pour my tears into your bosom,
 live, die in you, poor and naked
 Neither power, nor splendor, nor vigour
 10 are reasons to love. Elsewhere lies the tie
 that no one can ever undo.
 I instinctively love your lap;
 You are mother to my family;
 Homeland! Of your torso I am a part.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that Caro co-founded in 1871, along with Rufino José Cuervo, José Marroquín, and others, the Academia Colombiana de la Lengua, the oldest of all the Spanish Language Academies in America that paved the way for several similar associations in Latin American countries. Above the entrance to the cluster of the Spanish Language Academies, in line with the peninsular Real Academia Española de la Lengua, there was a declaration of intentions: to mark the continuation and connection with Spanish tradition and to create an institution for the regulation and normalisation of a living language for the first time in the Americas.

The Influence of the Latinist Miguel Antonio Caro on the Shaping of a Nation

Grammar and state power have been associated throughout the history of Colombia.⁵⁷ This idiosyncratic characteristic makes Colombia a unique case not only in Latin America, but potentially in the whole world.⁵⁸ While Plato envisioned a city ruled by philosopher-kings, Colombia during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had been governed by five grammarians, authors, and humanists with a solid background in Latin: Rafael Núñez (four terms: twice as President of the United States of Colombia from 1880 to 1882 and 1884 to 1886; twice as President of the Republic of Colombia from 1887 to 1888 and 1892 to 1894), Miguel Antonio Caro (1894-1898), José Manuel Marroquín (1900-1904), Marco Fidel Suárez (1918-1921), and Miguel Abadía Méndez (1926-1930). Bogotá, the capital and the centre of power of these grammarian-presidents, was often hailed as the 'Athens of South America', with the Argentinian writer and politician Miguel Cané being the first to compare Bogotá to Athens in *En Viaje*.⁵⁹ Thereafter, this appellation was widely employed to refer to the capital of Colombia, and it remained in use for an extended period of time.

This association of grammar and politics in Colombia has received the attention of several scholars, from Ángel Rama in the second half of the twentieth century to the work of recent scholars. In 1984, a posthumous publication in Spanish of Rama's *La ciudad letrada* was published in the United States. It was a decisive work for literary and cultural studies in Latin America. Rama (1926-1983) suggests that a cultivated elite, distanced from the mostly rural, from different cultural backgrounds, and illiterate still at the end of the nineteenth century general populace, had created and organised the cities in Latin America; even more so, he claimed that it had ruled the State as a 'lettered city'.⁶⁰ Unlike European cities in the Middle Ages that grew without an organic plan, this literate elite sought

⁵⁷ Deas, 1992; 1993.

⁵⁸ Rodríguez García, 2004: 145.

⁵⁹ *En viaje* was first published in 1893, the second edition – with suppressions and changes made by Cané – was published in 1903.

⁶⁰ Rama, 1998.

to conform urban development not only according to an ideal model, to an urban planification,⁶¹ but also to a social order ruled by a lettered elite, who drew legitimisation for itself and its ideals from the power of their discourses and of scripturality.⁶² In addition, this lettered city grew to become a symbolic space for modelling new societies in forming new communities, nations, and political order after Independence.⁶³ Rama opened pathways to broader research fields in Latin America, such as cultural studies.

After Rama's thesis, which examined the Americas in general, Malcolm Deas focused his research on Colombia and the strong connection between grammar and power. He observed that this entanglement proved particularly fruitful between 1885 and 1930, during the hegemony of the Conservative Party,⁶⁴ and identified the characteristics of the Colombian situation. First, Bogotá became the centre of power and all decision-making for the whole country.⁶⁵ Although Colombia was, and remains to this day, a vast and heterogeneous country in terms of physical landscape, biosphere, and language, Bogotá was fashioned as the standard for politics, language, and for all things Colombian. Second, Deas emphasised the strong links between the Catholic Church and power.⁶⁶ Third, this lettered elite, primarily members of the conservative party⁶⁷, fought for the purity of the Spanish language. They used it as a means to show and strengthen the country's and the group's connection with the Spanish past.⁶⁸ Not only indigenous languages and Afro-American variants were banned, but also any feature that could be perceived as a deviation from Spanish peninsular norms. In a nutshell, the Colombian lettered city was catholic, conservative with the Hispanic tradition; thus, they proposed an alternative model for the modernisation of the country, less open to changes and external influences than the neighbouring nations, also in their formative stages at the time, were. In the last part of the nineteenth century, knowledge of Latin grammar and literature allowed access to an active role in Colombian politics. Interest in language and lexicography also grew in North America together with English, but, unlike Colombia, they were not linked to an idea of a nation.⁶⁹

Besides Deas' influential theories, von der Walde moved a step further and explored the acceptance of the hegemony of the Conservative party and of the restoration of Catholicism after a period when Colombia was governed by Liberals.⁷⁰ She concluded that the Conservative Party reinforced the desire for unification of the country through Catholicism and linguistic standardisation as paradigms of Regenerationism, and that this project of a lettered elite must be understood within the context of national fragmentation. Von der Walde also explored the centrality of Bogotá, already noted by Deas, as a leading aspect of this model.⁷¹

Many scholars have highlighted the connection between grammar and politics and marked Caro as the leading proponent of this phenomenon. However, it is noteworthy to remark that Caro not only was involved in Grammatics, but also and especially in Classics. Besides his political activity, he remained active in a wide range of fields as a scholar, translator, poet, and cultural journalist. He belonged to

⁶¹ Rama, 1998: 17-30.

⁶² Rama, 1998: 31-60.

⁶³ Rama, 1998: 61-82.

⁶⁴ Deas, 1992: 49; 1993: 28.

⁶⁵ Deas, 1992: 53; 1993: 34.

⁶⁶ Deas, 1992: 49, 53, 63; 1993: 28, 33, 47.

⁶⁷ With exceptions, such as the liberal politician Rafael Uribe Uribe.

⁶⁸ Deas, 1992: 54-57; 1993: 35-39.

⁶⁹ Deas, 1992: 48-49; 1993: 27-28.

⁷⁰ von der Walde, 1997; especially, 2002.

⁷¹ von der Walde, 2002.

a Colombian tradition of politicians with a strong interest in language and literature, which started in the colonial period and reached its zenith at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. Caro, an excellent scholar of Vergil and a proponent of political reforms aiming to perpetuate this empowerment of Latin grammar, language, and literature, played a crucial role in consolidating this tradition. Several others were active in his time in similar manner, as evidenced in Cuervo's *Apuntaciones críticas sobre el lenguaje bogotano* (1867); Rafael Uribe's *Diccionario abreviado de galicismos, provincialismos y correcciones de lenguaje: con trescientas notas explicativas* (1887); José Manuel Marroquín's *Tratados de ortología y ortografía castellana* (1869); Marco Fidel Suárez *Nociones de prosodia latina* (1893). These politicians and humanists, not only the ones who became presidents, but also their colleagues and opponents, composed works that proved to be typical examples of a period of intense engagement with rules, authoritative handbooks, and also an attempt to refine the study of the language of power.

These men not only rose to and exercised power, but also fortified it and embedded it with the use of Latin language, grammar, and lexicography, thus depriving of access to power to those who did not master this code. For Deas, the main characters that embody this paradigm are Miguel Antonio Caro (most prominently), José Marroquín, and Marco Fidel Suárez.⁷² It goes without saying that other disruptive figures supported this cast and introduced nuances in the configuration of the paradigm, with Rufino José Cuervo the most prominent among them. Valencia has already noticed such nuances and important aspects of this disruptive force.⁷³ The linguistic and grammatical works of Cuervo, who never engaged in politics but spent many years in Paris and is buried in Père Lachaise cemetery, do not always conform with this fixation to regulate a language. On the contrary, he often acknowledged linguistic change as the cause of the evolution of languages.⁷⁴ According to Deas, Caro's abundant references to the classics and his frequent use of Latin forced his most determined adversary, the liberal Rafael Uribe, to learn Latin in order to address him in Congress.⁷⁵

A remarkable consequence of articulating this notion of state is that many of these men were also engaged in education. Caro, for instance, founded a school after he left the Presidency, and Marroquín did so in his Hacienda Yerbabuena.⁷⁶ Education was the mechanism that provided the country with institutions for the exaltation of their values, embodying and perpetuating elite perceptions of an ideal state.

Vergil was the decisive author in Caro's perception of the nation, a concept he would introduce later during his political engagement.⁷⁷ Caro was a conservative party member, but above all, a Catholic activist. Hence, it was essential for the coherence of his political programme to reconcile Catholicism with Vergil's beliefs in pagan gods. To this end, Caro suggested a different interpretation and an alternative reading that portrayed Vergil as a prophet of Catholicism. Caro was also forming part of a tradition that began with the allegorical interpretation of the *Ecloga IV* from a Christian point of view. He devoted several articles to the interpretation of the *Ecloga IV*, reunited in his *Vergilian Essays*,⁷⁸ daring to suggest that the text prophesied the birth of Jesus Christ. Moreover, in

⁷² Deas, 1992: 47-48; 1993: 26.

⁷³ Valencia (2012: 80-81) notices such nuances and important aspects of this disruptive force.

⁷⁴ Valencia (2012: 74-79) offers several examples of Cuervo's broader perspective in the study of language.

⁷⁵ Deas, 1992: 47-48; 1993: 26.

⁷⁶ Deas, 1992: 51; 1993: 31.

⁷⁷ This use of Vergil can be read in his *Escritos Políticos*; Caro (1990-1993; 1: 168, 264; 2: 489), and in his own private volumes of Vergil reunited in the Fondo Caro in the National Library of Colombia detailed in Caro (1985-1988; Vol. 2: 326-329).

⁷⁸ Caro, 1985-1988: 13-72 (Vol. 4).

Vergilian Essays, Caro emphasised other aspects of the poet's works that appealed to his conservative ideals: purity of language, *pietas* or respect and devotion for the ancestors, preservation of order, and craving for peace.

Final Considerations

In Spanish-speaking countries, knowledge of Latin has always tended to be associated with a cultural and political elite. Latin has generally been linked to conservatism and Conservative Parties in the post-colonial Americas, after Independence and during a period of fervent constitutional transformations. As this paper argues, it is necessary to consider the influence of Classics on the presidents of the Republic of Colombia, because they constitute the turning point in the paradigm.

Colombia is no exception to this Latin American panorama. In a transitional period, the need to keep alive the knowledge of classical languages and culture, this ideal of Classics as a continuation of the so-called Western Civilisation, and of the Hispanic tradition, worked very well for the creation and (trans)formation of tradition. This tradition strove to sustain the bond with Rome through the Spanish language, history, and state, instead of building a new paradigm inclusive of all cultural substrates, especially the indigenous and Afro-American ones. Classics became an ideological tool and politicians used it for their own purposes, mainly to imbue and ensure conformity on the new nation. Therefore, the inclusion or not of Latin in education was a decisive matter for continuing this cultural and social sovereignty. The Conservative Party preferred to form a traditional educational system with subjects such as Law, Theology, Medicine, Grammar with a wide knowledge of Latin, following the colonial system, a model based on the ideal of the nation-state. The Liberal Party, on the contrary, worked towards an educational model based on practical studies in order to respond to the requirements of the modern world. Spanish was the vehicular language, but other European languages began to surpass Latin and undermined its entanglement with power. The Liberal Party envisaged a less privileged position for Latin in the educational system but took little action to precipitate change.

Latin in Colombia was not only a matter of education but also of great political significance. The lack of knowledge of Latin became a restriction to accessing politics and other spheres of the public domain, as well as an impediment for many individuals exercise their rights as full citizens. Miguel Antonio Caro aptly epitomises this convergence of grammar and power. He remains a very controversial figure in the history of Colombia and the evaluation of his humanistic work has been affected by his political affiliation and action. However, we must not lose sight of his effort to spread the study of Classics. Indeed, he wrote a *Gramática Latina* for speakers of Spanish and other articles that elaborated on difficult syntactic structures and promoted the study of metrics. He also translated Vergil into Spanish, making this author accessible for people with no knowledge of Latin, providing them with a translation that purported not only to translate a language but also to transpose a reality. Moreover, he made frequent use of references to classical authors in his political essays, most of them published in popular journals. Overall, Caro contributed to the dissemination of Classics not only in Colombia, but also across the Hispanophone Americas and had an active role in the attempt to reconstruct a classical utopia. His impact survived the passage of time in institutions such as the Academia Colombiana de la Lengua. In 1942, the Ministry of Culture founded the Instituto Caro y Cuervo as a tribute to Miguel Antonio Caro and his beloved friend and colleague, Rufino José Cuervo. It is a well-known institution for the promotion of the study of Language, Linguistics, and Literature of Spanish and of the indigenous languages in Colombia. Not coincidentally, the Main Room of its Headquarters, the colonial house of the Cuervo family, is presided by a bust of Vergil.

Bibliography

- Adorno, R. 2009. Grandeza novogranadina: *El Carnero* de Juan Rodríguez Freile. *Revista de Estudios Colombianos*, 35, 23-30.
- Boissier, G. 1874. *La religion romaine, d'Auguste aux Antonins*, 2 volumes. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie.
- Briceño Jáuregui, M. 1972. La gramática latina de Caro y Cuervo. *Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, 27(3), 553-569.
- Burnouf, J. L. 1849. *Método para estudiar la lengua Latina*, trans. by M. A. Carreño and M. Urbaneja. Caracas: Rojas Hermanos.
- Cané, M. 1968[1903]. *En viaje*, reprint of 2nd edition. Buenos Aires: Editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires.
- Cardona Zuluaga, A. P. 2017. El pasado en discordia. Miguel Antonio Caro y José María Quijano, 1872. *Araucaria*, 19, 445-466.
- Caro, M. A. 1870. Tratado del participio. *Anales de la Universidad Nacional de los Estados Unidos de Colombia*, 3(18), 419-499.
- Caro, M. A. 1873-1876. *Obras de Virgilio. traducida en versos castellanos, con una introducción y notas*, Vols. 1-3. Bogotá: Imprenta de Echeverría Hermanos.
- Caro, M. A. 1921. Joan de Castellanos. In: Caro, M. A., Caro, V. E. and Gómez Restrepo, A. *Obras completas de Don Miguel Antonio Caro*, Volume 3. Bogotá: Imprenta Nacional, 51-88.
- Caro, M. A. 1951. *Versiones latinas*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Caro, M. A. 1980. *Notas a la "Ortología y métrica" de Don Andrés Bello*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Caro, M. A. 1985-1988. *Estudios Virgilianos. Primera Serie, Segunda Serie, Tercera Serie*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Caro, M. A. 1990-1993. *Escritos políticos*, Vols. 1-4. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Caro, M. A. and Cuervo, R. J. 2019. *Gramática latina para el uso de los que hablan castellano*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Colmenares, G. 1969. *Las haciendas de los Jesuitas en el Nuevo Reino de Granada: siglo XVIII*. Bogotá: Banco de la República.
- Deas, M. 1992. Miguel Antonio Caro and Friends: Grammar and Power in Colombia. *History Workshop*, 34, 47-71.
- Deas, M. 1993. *Del poder y la gramática. Y otros ensayos sobre historia, política y literatura colombiana*. Bogotá: Tercer Mundo Editores.
- del Molino García, R. 2007. La educación clásica de los próceres de la independencia colombiana. In: Moreno Moreno, M. Á. (ed.) *Estudios de Humanismo español: Baeza en los siglos XVI-XVII*, Baeza: Ayuntamiento de Baeza, 957-974.
- del Rosario García, M. 2015. Bibliotecas de la Nueva Granada del siglo XVII: la biblioteca de Fray Cristóbal de Torres en el Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario. *Historia y Memoria*, 11, 17-55.
- Díaz Guevara, M. A. 1984. *La vida de Don Miguel Antonio Caro*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Larrañaga, J. R. (ed.) 1787. *Traducción de las obras del príncipe de los poetas latinos P. Virgilio Maron a verso castellano: dividida en quatro tomos*. México: Herederos del Lic. D. Joseph de Jauregui.
- Lida, M. R. 1946. Huella de la tradición grecolatina en el poema de Juan de Castellanos. *Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 1-2, 111-130.
- López Arévalo, R. 2016. La colección de incunables de la Biblioteca Nacional de Colombia: tras las huellas y vacíos de su formación. *Historia y Memoria*, 13, 85-120.
- Mantilla, D. Y. G. 2019. Origen de las haciendas de la Compañía de Jesús en el valle de Cúcuta, Virreinato de Nueva Granada, Colombia (1621-1730). *Procesos históricos: revista de historia, arte y ciencias sociales*, 35, 3-29.

- Martínez Osorio, E. 2016. *Authority, Piracy, and Captivity in Colonial Spanish American Writing: Juan de Castellanos's Elegies of Illustrious Men of the Indies*. Lanham, MD: Bucknell University Press.
- Mesa Chica, D. 2014. *Miguel Antonio Caro: el intelectual y el poeta*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Mynors, R. A. B. (ed.) 1969. *P. Vergili Maronos: Opera*, Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olano García, H. A. 2019. Historia de la regeneración constitucional de 1886. *Revista IUS*, 13(43), 161-178.
- Olaya Perdomo, N. 2018. Obra latina de Don Miguel Antonio Caro. *Forma y Función*, 31(1), 9-32.
- Ortiz Dávila, J. P. 2014. El humanismo conservador: letras clásicas y política a mediados del siglo XIX. *Signos Históricos*, 31, 38-87.
- Padilla Chasing, I. V. 2008. *El debate de la hispanidad en Colombia en el siglo XIX: lectura de la Historia de la literatura en Nueva Granada de José María Vergara y Vergara*. Bogotá: Facultad de Ciencias Humanas; Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Palomino Urbano, Delia. 1989. *Catálogos de la Biblioteca Nacional de Colombia: Manuscritos*, 2 volúmenes. Bogotá: Biblioteca Nacional.
- Rama, Á. 1998. *La ciudad letrada*. Montevideo: Arca.
- Restrepo, L. F. 1999. *Un nuevo reino imaginado: Las Elegías de Varones Ilustres de Indias de Juan de Castellanos*. Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Cultura Hispánica.
- Restrepo, L. F. 2004. *Antología crítica de Juan de Castellanos. Elegías de Varones ilustres de Indias*. Edición y Prólogo de Luis Fernando Restrepo. Bogotá: Editorial Pontificia Universidad Javeriana.
- Restrepo Zapata, J. 2015. *La biblioteca de Fray Cristóbal de Torres. A partir de los libros que conserva la biblioteca antigua del Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario*. Bogotá: Editorial Universidad del Rosario.
- Rivas Sacconi, J. M. 1947. Miguel Antonio Caro, humanista. *Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, 3(1-3), 117-170.
- Rivas Sacconi, J. M. 1993. *El latín en Colombia. Bosquejo histórico del humanismo colombiano*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Rodríguez García, J. M. 2004. The Regime of Translation in Miguel Antonio Caro's Colombia. *Diacritics*, 34(3/4), 143-175.
- Romero, M. G. 1997. Introducción. In: Rodríguez Freile, J. and Germán Romero, M. (eds.) *El Carnero: según el otro manuscrito de Yerbabuena*, Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, xv-lxxxix.
- Sierra Mejía, R. (ed.) 2002. *Miguel Antonio Caro y la cultura de su época*, Colección Sede 7. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Silva, R. 2017. Tiempo, arte y sociedad a finales del siglo XVIII "neogranadino". Los comienzos tardíos de la modernidad ilustrada. *Araucaria: Revista Iberoamericana de Filosofía, Política, Humanidades y Relaciones Internacionales*, 19(38), 369-391.
- Torres Quintero, R. 1979. *Caro, defensor de la integridad del idioma*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Valderrama Andrade, C. 1997. *Miguel Antonio Caro y la Regeneración: apuntes y documentos para la comprensión de una época*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Valencia, N. A. 2012. Gramática y poder en Colombia: el caso de Rufino José Cuervo. *Itinerarios*, 15, 67-82.
- Vallejo, F. 2012. *El cuervo blanco*. Bogotá: Alfaguara.
- Villegas, B. (ed.) 2010. *El libro de los libros I: Bibliotecas Pontificia Universidad Javeriana*. Bogotá: Villegas Editores y Universidad Javeriana.
- Villegas, B. (ed.) 2011. *El libro de los libros II: Bibliotecas Pontificia Universidad Javeriana*. Bogotá: Villegas Editores y Universidad Javeriana.
- Villegas, B. (ed.) 2015. *Thesaurus de Antigüedades Griegas y Romanas*. Bogotá: Villegas Editores y Universidad Javeriana.

von der Walde, E. 1997. Limpia, fi ja y da esplendor: El letrado y la letra en Colombia a fi nes del siglo XIX. *Revista Iberoamericana*, 63 (178-179), 71-83.

von der Walde, E. 2002. Lengua y poder: el proyecto de nación en Colombia a finales del siglo XIX. *Estudios de lingüística del español (EliEs)*, 16. Available at: <http://elies.rediris.es/elies16/Erna.html> [Accessed 11/02/2021].

Abstract (Spanish) | Resumen

Este artículo explora un fenómeno único en Colombia: la relación que se establece entre el poder político y los clásicos, personificada en el presidente de la República y latinista Miguel Antonio Caro (Bogotá, 1843-1909).

A modo de introducción se ofrece un panorama general de la difusión de los autores clásicos y del estudio del latín en la Nueva Granada y en los inicios de la República. En efecto, Caro se sitúa en una larga tradición de conocimiento y diálogo con los clásicos en Colombia. La transmisión e interacción con los clásicos se inició con la llegada de los primeros conquistadores de España a finales del siglo XVI y fue evolucionando hasta tiempos de Caro.

En primer lugar, se presenta brevemente la biografía de Caro -con énfasis en su formación- y su contribución a la arena política. Miembro del Partido Conservador y representante del movimiento Regeneracionista, fue elegido Vicepresidente de la República de Colombia el 1882. Fungió, no obstante, como Presidente desde poco después de su elección hasta el 1898. Como político, fue ampliamente conocido por sus reformas económicas y su aporte a la *Constitución Política de la República de Colombia de 1886*.

En segundo lugar, se examinan las múltiples contribuciones de Caro, como humanista, al estudio de la lengua y autores clásicos latinos, en Colombia. Caro fue coautor, junto con Rufino José Cuervo (Bogotá, 1844 – Paris, 1911) de *Gramática latina para el uso de los que hablan castellano* (1867). Escribió más adelante un *Tratado del participio* (1870), así como también múltiples artículos sobre traducción y literatura latina en general. Compuso poesía en español y latín a lo largo de su vida. Se dedicó también a la traducción, especialmente del latín al español, pero también de otras lenguas modernas al español. Entre 1869 y 1875, Caro produjo la primera traducción integral de Virgilio en Colombia. Siguió ocupado en el perfeccionamiento, reelaboración y reformulación de esta traducción virgiliana hasta su muerte. Caro tradujo en verso a Virgilio: *Bucólicas* en metros variados, *Geórgicas* en silva y *Eneida* en octava real. Completó su traducción con una serie de artículos sobre varios aspectos de la traducción, interpretación y contextualización que han sido reunidos en tres volúmenes de *Estudios Virgilianos*. Finalmente, cabe destacar que Caro fue uno de los fundadores de la Academia Colombiana de la Lengua el 1871.

La última sección del artículo profundiza en la interacción entre estas dos facetas de Miguel Antonio Caro, el Presidente y el latinista. Se esboza la relación entre poder político y clásicas en Colombia con base a *La ciudad letrada* (1984) de Ángel Rama, *Del poder y la gramática* (1993) de Malcolm Deas y otros ensayos. Las obras de Caro, en tanto que político e intelectual, ilustran la asociación entre gramática, clásicos y poder estatal a lo largo de la historia de Colombia. Ciertamente su actividad humanística en conjunto, que abarcó el estudio de la gramática, la traducción, la publicación académica, el periodismo y la creación poética, subraya su influencia en otros académicos y su rol político decisivo para revigorizar el interés por la lengua y la literatura latinas en Colombia.

***Zeugitai* in Fifth-Century Athens: Social and Economic Qualification from Cleisthenes to the End of the Peloponnesian War**

Miriam Valdés Guía

Department of Ancient History, Complutense University of Madrid

mavaldes@ucm.es

Submitted	23/12/2021
Accepted (Internal Review)	17/01/2022
Revised (External Review)	25/01/2022
Published	24/03/2022

Abstract

The status of the *zeugitai* as middle-class hoplites has received considerable attention in recent decades regarding property requirements for inclusion into the hoplite rank and their expected role in the Athenian army. Accordingly, this paper re-examines the idea that after the reforms of Cleisthenes and the fiscal and demographic changes throughout the fifth century, the *zeugitai* formed a census class of middling owners with an estate equivalent to at least 3.6 hectares. It argues that late-sixth century reforms converted the property holdings of *zeugitai* into a monetary equivalent (in *drachmas*) and used the census classes as an economic criterion for recruitment from the hoplite catalogue. Already in the sixth century but especially during the *Pentecontaetia*, the number of hoplites/*zeugitai* grew substantially due to economic prosperity and the foundation of colonies and cleruchies. Many citizens without landholdings but in possession of sufficient wealth were included in the *zeugitai* census class and, like the famous Anthemion ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4), could ascend even higher.

Keywords

Athenian classes; *zeugitai*; hoplites; Cleisthenes' reforms; Athenian military; Athenian demographics; monetary criteria of the census classes

Acknowledgements

This research has been aided by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, Project PID2020-112790GB-I00, and by the Complutense University (UCM), Project PR108/20-29. I would like to thank Hans van Wees, whose suggestions and detailed critique instigated reflection and revisions. I am also grateful to Julian Gallego, Thomas Figueira and Gil Davis for their kind comments. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their corrections and suggestions. Any inaccuracies herein are my sole responsibility. Finally, I would like to thank Stefanos Apostolou and Manolis Pagkalos for their great editing, corrections, and suggestions, as well as to congratulate them for this magnificent project of *Isegoria* and *PNYX*.

Introduction

More than a decade ago, scholars began to question the established views on the *zeugitai* and the landholding requirement as high as 8.7 hectares, subsequently increased to a minimum of 13.8 hectares, by applying the measures provided by the *Athenaion Politeia*.¹ Together with Julián Gallego, we have argued against the proposed elite status for the *zeugitai* and suggested that their class corresponded to those with an estate considered to be of ‘hoplite rank’, that is, in possession of land of at least between 3.6 and 5.4 hectares. Other scholars have rejected the application of measures attested in the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* (7.3-4) and Pollux’s *Onomasticon* (8.130), which seem to rely on the same tradition,² to the Solonian census classes (except for *pentakosiomedimnoi*),³ but failed to fully explain why these specific measures appear in the *Constitution of the Athenians* in the first place. This paper intends to build on our theory and revisit the criteria and property requirements for inclusion in the *zeugitai*. Hence, before I begin, the presentation of the two texts and a summary of the theory are essential.

τιμήματι διείλεν εἰς τέτταρα τέλη, καθάπερ δῆρ’ ἦτο καὶ πρότερον, εἰς πεντακοσιομέδιμνον καὶ ἱπ[πέα] καὶ ζευγίτην καὶ θῆτα. καὶ τὰς μέ[ν] ἄλλ[ας] ἀρχὰς ἀπένευμεν ἄρχειν ἐκ πεντακοσιομέδιμνων καὶ ἱππέων καὶ ζευγιτῶν, τοὺς ἑννέα ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς ταμίας καὶ τοὺς πωλητὰς καὶ τοὺς ἑνδεκα καὶ τοὺς κωλακρέτας, ἐκάστοις ἀνάλογον τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ τιμήματος ἀποδιδούς τὴν ἀρχήν· τοῖς δὲ τὸ θητικὸν τελοῦσιν ἐκκλησίας καὶ δικαστηρίων μετέδωκε μόνον. ἔδει δὲ τελεῖν πεντακοσιομέδιμνον μὲν, ὃς ἂν ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας ποιῇ πεντακόσια μέτρα τὰ συνάμφω ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρὰ, ἱππάδα δὲ τοὺς τριακόσια ποιοῦντας – ὥς δ’ ἔνιοί φασι τοὺς ἵπποτροφεῖν δυναμένους· σημείον δὲ φέρουσι τό τε ὄνομα τοῦ τέλους, ὥς ἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος κείμενον, καὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα τῶν ἀρχαίων· ἀνάκειται γὰρ ἐν ἀκροπόλει εἰκὼν Διφίλου, ἐφ’ ἣ ἐπιγράφεται τάδε· Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίων τήνδ’ ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς, θητικοῦ ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππάδ’ ἀμειψάμενος

He divided the people by assessment into four classes, as they had been divided before, Five-hundred-measure man, Horseman, Teamster and Laborer, and he distributed the other offices to be held from among the Five-hundred-measure men, Horsemen and Teamsters – the Nine Archons, the Treasurers, the Vendors of Contracts, the Eleven and the Paymasters, assigning each office to the several classes in proportion to the amount of their assessment; while those who were rated in the Laborer class he admitted to the membership of the assembly and law-courts alone. Any man had to be rated as a Five-hundred-measure man the produce from whose estate was five hundred dry and liquid measures jointly, and at the cavalry-rate those who made three hundred, – or as some say, those who were able to keep a horse, and they adduce as a proof the name of the rating as being derived from the fact, and also the votive offerings of the ancients; for there stands dedicated in the Acropolis a statue of Diphilos on which are inscribed these lines: ‘Anthemion Diphilos’s son dedicated this statue to the gods... having exchanged the Laborer rating for the Cavalry’.

[Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.3-4 (Trans. by H. Rackham)

¹ Foxhall, 1997; van Wees, 2001; 2006; 2013a (12 hectares *at a minimum* for a *zeugites*); 2018: 27 (13.8 hectares or 7,590 drachmas, including fallow).

² Also in Plut. *Sol.* 18.1-2. As Thomsen (1964: 150, 153) argues, in all likelihood, Pollux used the same source as Aristotle, an early fourth-century Attidographer.

³ Rhodes, 1981: 137-143 (*pentakosiomedimnoi* as the only new designation); Rhodes, 1997: 4; 2006: 253; Hansen, 1991: 30; Rosivach, 2002: 41; de Ste. Croix, 2004: 48-49; Mavrogordatos, 2011: 12-15.

Τιμήματα δ' ἦν τέτταρα, πεντακοσιομεδίμνων ἰππέων ζευγῖτων θητῶν. οἱ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πεντακόσια μέτρα ξηρὰ καὶ ὕγρὰ ποιεῖν κληθέντες· ἀνήλiskon δ' εἰς τὸ δημόσιον τάλαντον· οἱ δὲ τὴν ἰππάδα τελοῦντες ἐκ μὲν τοῦ δύνασθαι τρέφειν ἵππους κεκληῖσθαι δοκοῦσιν, ἐποιοῦν δὲ μέτρα τριακόσια, ἀνήλiskon δὲ ἡμιτάλαντον. οἱ δὲ τὸ ζευγῆσιον τελοῦντες ἀπὸ διακοσίων μέτρων κατελέγοντο, ἀνήλiskon δὲ μᾶς δέκα· οἱ δὲ τὸ θητικὸν οὐδεμίαν ἀρχὴν ἤρχον, οὐδὲ ἀνήλiskon οὐδέν.

There were four census classes: pentakosiomedimnoi, hippeis, *zeugitai* and thetes. Those so named for their production of five hundred dry and liquid measures contributed one talent to the public fund. Those who belonged to the hippeis appear to have been named for their ability to raise horses; they produced three hundred measures and contributed half a talent. Those who belonged to the *zeugition* were registered starting from two hundred measures, and contributed ten minas. Those of the *thētikon* did not hold any office and did not contribute anything.

Poll. 8.130 (Trans. by Valdés Guía and Gallego, 2010)

In our 2010 paper, we link the production measures (500, 300 and 200) of the different census classes, assuming that Aristotle or his school did not invent them, to the late fifth-century revision of the Athenian law code, which led to a redefinition of property sizes for census classes. The objective would have been to determine who should pay the *eisphora*. At that time, these comprised a somewhat broader group than the first two census classes but did not fully correspond to the first three census classes either. Therefore, the Athenians redefined the census classes to adapt them to the *eisphora* system. This system seems to have been in force – possibly in relation to the census classes, as may be inferred from the passage in Pollux – at least until the reforms of Callistratos in 378, when the *proeisphora* and other changes were introduced (also probably including a broader taxpayer base).⁴ According to this interpretation, when Aristotle and the members of his school produced their writings, that new system was no longer in force, so they assumed that those measures⁵ dated back to the time of Solon. Hence, the argument goes, the economic definition of the census classes in Solon's time would have been more in line with what our two main sources record in this respect.⁶ Namely, *hippeis* would have been those citizens in possession of material wealth sufficient to support horse-owning/horse-breeding, and the *zeugitai* those who owned at least a couple of oxen, which was the equivalent to landed property between at least 4 and 6 hectares, according to recent studies.⁷ *Pentakosiomedimnoi*

⁴ Valdés Guía and Gallego, 2010. For the measures of Callistratos and further bibliography, Valdés Guía, 2014; 2018. For the *eisphora*, Thomsen, 1964; Christ, 2007.

⁵ [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4 and Poll. 8.130 mention liquid and dry 'measures' (*metra*), not *medimnoi* (Hansen, 1991: 43), which could be 'a confusion or a later development (and so in need of correction)'; Gabrielsen, 2002: 97. Recently, Duploux (2014) has also argued against the existence of concrete measures for the Solonian census classes, following Raflaub (2006), who attributes the definition of the property qualification and the political rights associated with each class to Ephialtes or Pericles. Duploux defines the census classes as occupational groups. Although the review of the legal or institutional perspective for Archaic Athens is welcome, this 'informal behavioural' approach is, in my opinion, not fully convincing on its own.

⁶ Regarding *hippeis* as horse breeders, see the texts quoted above. For the *zeugitai* as those who 'raise oxen': Poll. 8.132: καὶ ζευγῆσιον τι τέλος οἱ ζευγοτροφούντες ἐτέλουν; as 'owner of a yoke of oxen', Hansen, 1991: 30, 43-46, 106-109, 329. For Rosivach (2002: 39-41, 46-47), 'the legislation defining the requirements for membership in the Solonic classes had been lost'.

⁷ Owning a yoke of oxen was a primary distinction for farmers, Valdés Guía, 2019b. The minimum amount of land for a farm with oxen has been calculated at 4 or 5 hectares (Halstead, 1987: 84; 2014: 61; Hodgkinson, 1988: 39; Burford, 1993: 67; Forbes, 2000: 63-64; Nagle, 2006: 71). For the large numbers of middling farmers (owners of land between 40 and 60 *plethra*) in classical times, Andreyev, 1974: 14-16; Burford, 1977/78: 168-72; 1993: 67-72; Boyd and Jameson, 1981; Isager and Skydsgaard, 1992: 78-79; Jameson 1977/78; 1994: 59; Hanson, 1995: 181-201; van Wees, 2001: 51, with n. 41; Halstead, 2014: 61; Gallego, 2016.

were apparently defined in terms of their production in *medimnoi*, with the legislator taking special care to ensure that the class included the richest of Athenians, since they were the only ones who could serve as *tamiai* (treasurers), perhaps to avoid the temptation of misappropriating public funds.⁸ The last census class, *thētes*,⁹ would have comprised citizens in possession of property less than 4 to 5 hectares and a pair of oxen. In Solon's time, it seems possible that an equivalence between land-based and non-land-based wealth had already been established so that people with assets equivalent to a certain amount of land (for *zeugitai*, c. 4 hectares at a minimum) would have been included in the respective census class.¹⁰ Hence, we argue, citizens would have been assigned to a census class probably based on their own declaration in the phratries (*phratērikon grammateion*) or before the *naukraroi*, at a time when the small population meant that people's possessions were common knowledge.¹¹ Although those entering the *zeugitai* census class could purchase hoplite weaponry, it is not clear whether it was a mandatory obligation under Solon's law.¹² However, it seems that Solon did indeed regulate the citizenry's involvement in civil conflicts (*staseis*): without exception, all had an obligation to take up arms. *Thētes*, who, by and large, would not have possessed a hoplite panoply, were undoubtedly also expected to become involved, each with the weapons available to him.¹³ According to this hypothesis, the *zeugitai* population at the time might have been much larger than the figure proposed by van Wees.¹⁴

This paper aims to build on this theory to gain further insight into the identification of the *zeugitai* in financial terms during the fifth century, after the time of Cleisthenes. I will argue that the census classes were defined in monetary terms at the beginning of the isonomy, when a drastic reconstruction of the army took place with the introduction of the recruitment of hoplites *ek katalogou* in Athens. At the same time, the obligation to fight and to possess hoplite weaponry would have been regulated for those belonging to the *zeugitai* census class, who thenceforth would have been registered on the newly established rolls for recruiting hoplites by tribes (as reflected in the Salamis decree: IG I3 1). This form of recruitment would have been employed for at least a century, until the end of the fifth century, a time of significant changes with the economic redefinition of the census classes, especially that of the *zeugitai* to adapt them to the *eisphora* system in force until the 370s. The redefinition of the census classes at the end of the fifth century might have been one of the factors behind the transformation of the recruitment

⁸ *Tamiai*: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 8.1; Harris, 1995: 13-14; Bubelis, 2016: 118-120.

⁹ The term acquired a new meaning in Solon's time: in addition to 'day labourer' or 'wage worker' (Hom. *Od.* 11.489-491; *Od.* 18.357-361; *Il.* 21.441-455; Hes. *Op.* 600-603), it designated those who belonged to the fourth census class (Arist. *Ath.* 7.4) (i.e., owners, in my view, of less than approx. four-hectare plots or without land). For *thētes*, Bravo, 1991-1993; recently Valdés Guía, 2019a.

¹⁰ Thus, for example, during the Damasias crisis ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 13.2; Figueira, 1984) ten exceptional archons were chosen, of whom three were *agroikoi* and two *demiourgoi* (artisans), possibly with a *timēma* equivalent, hypothetically, to at least that of the *zeugitai* census class. For wealthy and middle-class artisans in the sixth century, Section Four below; for the economy in Solon's time, Descat, 1990; Bresson, 2016: 402-404; for a broader perspective of the economy, Harris, Lewis and Woolmer, 2016.

¹¹ As to the possibility that the *naukraroi* also registered citizens at that time, see *infra* notes 42 and 116. For the *phratērikon grammateion*: Lambert, 1993: 174-175. Herodotus (2.177) thought that Solon introduced a law from Egypt, according to which everyone should 'declare his means of livelihood [...] annually'.

¹² As recently postulated by van Wees (2018: 10, n. 23), in light of the attribution to Solon of a law on *astrateia* in Dem. 24.103 (*Against Timocrates*) and Aeschin. 3.175 (*Against Ctesiphon*), but which, as the author himself acknowledges, is doubtful.

¹³ On the neutrality law: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 8.5 and Plut. *Sol.* 20.11; also Valdés Guía, 2021. For the *demos* taking arms in 508, Flaig, 2011; for the involvement of *thētes*, Ober, 1998.

¹⁴ Valdés Guía (2019b), as to the possibility that the population of *hoplitai* was larger than originally thought, to the point of being reflected in the name of one of the tribes, *Hoplethes*, with Solon. For the names of the four Athenian pre-Cleisthenic tribes: Hdt. 5.66; Eur. *Ion* 1579-1581; Poll. 8.109.

system and the fact that they were ignored systematically when appointing magistrates or council members during that century.¹⁵ Accordingly, in Section Two, I review the evidence on the *zeugitai* in the fifth century (archonship, cleruchies and census class promotion) and the scholarly discussion on the military use of the census classes at the time. In Section Three, I consider the demographics of the hoplites and *zeugitai*, as well as the sources of wealth (land and non-land properties) of the hoplitic class. Finally, in Section Four, I defend the hypothesis of establishing monetary equivalences for the *zeugitai* census class in the context of Cleisthenes' military reforms.

Evidence on *Zeugitai* in the Fifth Century and the Scholarly Debate on the Use of the Census Classes in the Military Organization

The validity and importance of the census classes in the fifth century notwithstanding, only a limited number of testimonies on their use has been preserved to us, perhaps because this was common knowledge for our mainly Athenocentric sources. Being a member of the first two census classes seems to have been a requirement for holding a magistracy (except for minor offices).¹⁶ This is no trivial matter because the archons held sway over the polis, albeit with less power than in archaic times. After completing their terms in office, they were responsible for all facets of life and were automatically enrolled as life-long members of the Areopagus, which seems to have played an important role in Athenian politics, especially after the Persian Wars up until the reforms of Ephialtes.¹⁷ The census requirement was verified in the *dokimasia*. On that occasion, the citizen in question had to declare and prove, among other aspects, that he belonged to the appropriate census class.¹⁸

The opening of the archonship to the third census class did not occur until after the reforms of Ephialtes ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 26.2) in 457. This rather drastic turn to what can be described as radical democracy contrasts, in my view, with van Wees' theory that the *zeugitai* were a leisured class of owners of at least c. 12-14 hectares, and therefore a very small and exclusive part of the population. This change makes much more sense if they actually owned the amount of land wherewithal to purchase their own weapons so that archonship would be open to a much larger number of citizens, given the new trends of radical democracy.¹⁹

An inscription from the colony of Brea records the use of census classes as a selection criterion for participating in the expedition: ἐς δὲ [B]ρέαν ἐχ θετον καὶ ζε[υ]γιτον ἰέναι τὸς ἀπο[ί]κος (IG I3 46, lin. 43-46, dated to 445).²⁰ Several authors have suggested, without clear evidence, that this class criterion

¹⁵ Regarding the possibility that the census classes were ignored when appointing council members was something that perhaps had happened before due to the lack eligible citizens (a person could only serve as a counsellor twice in his life), Hansen, 1991: 249. For the *Boule*, Rhodes (1972: 4-6), who argues that *thētes* did not participate in it.

¹⁶ [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.3; 26.2. It is likely that there would have soon been exceptions to this rule for membership of the council for demographic reasons.

¹⁷ For the importance and functions of archons in Athens, Rhodes, 1981: 612-668; for the pre-eminence of the Areopagus after the Persian Wars: Arist. *Pol.* 1304a1724; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 25, with recent skepticism over the credibility of ancient accounts of Ephialtes' reforms in Zaccarini, 2018; and Harris, 2019.

¹⁸ [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4, 55.3; Poll. 8.86.

¹⁹ Section Three discusses demographic evidence and calculations for the *zeugitai*.

²⁰ 'The colonists to go to Brea shall be from the *thētes* and *zeugitai*', translation by S. Lambert and P. J. Rhodes (AIO 298). IG II² 30 (387/6) may also indicate that *hippeis* and *pentakosiomedimnoi* were excluded from participating in the cleruchy of Lemnos in 387, but other interpretations are plausible. I follow the suggested reconstruction [-πλήν ἱππέων καὶ πεντακοσιομεδίωνων; discussion in Stroud, 1971: 164 (l. 12) and 171-162. Also de Ste. Croix, 2004: 11-12; Rosivach, 2002; contra Moreno, 2007: 106, n. 138 (see bibliography with criticism of Moreno's theory in note 98).

for selecting cleruchs might have favoured *thētes* in particular.²¹ The criterion would have probably been broader for the colonies ('whoever wishes': *ho boulomenos*). Still, in this case too, it might have sometimes been restricted to *zeugitai* and *thētes* (as in the amendment in the Brea inscription quoted above). The 'whoever wishes' clause in the case of the colonies would have also ensured the (minority) presence of wealthy individuals necessary to perform liturgies and other services.²² In any case, those *thētes* who were allotted with land in colonies and *cleruchies* would have joined, in my view, the *zeugitai* census class since it seems that they remained Athenian citizens – certainly in the case of cleruchs.²³ This might explain, in part, the increase in the size of the Athenian military during the *Pentecontaetia* (a point that will be discussed in further detail below).

A change in census class for individuals was not unusual, and such changes are recorded in our sources as a result of amassing a great fortune, as was the case with Anthemion, who from a *thēs* became a *hippeus* ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4). In this case, what is extraordinary was not the promotion itself, which in all likelihood was not that infrequent (at least for cleruchs), but that Anthemion had climbed two rungs rather than one.²⁴

According to several authors, the census classes could be used as a criterion for military recruitment. Thucydides records that in the emergency of 428 metics and citizens of all census classes were drafted into the navy, except for the first two.²⁵ In other words, it was the *zeugitai* and *thētes* who manned the triremes. Even though the voluntary or compulsory enrolment of *thētes* (alongside foreigners and, perhaps already at that time, slaves)²⁶ in the navy was a matter of course, it is striking, to say the least, on this occasion that *zeugitai* embarked as regular crew members. This was possibly a choice to secure the fleet's operational capacity as a response to population decline after the plague, and it may have occurred in response to other emergencies during the war,²⁷ above all after the disaster at Sicily, where *thētes* served as

²¹ According to Figueira (2008: 440-441), *thētes* were given precedence in cleruchies and *zeugitai* and *thētes* in colonies – as in Brea – possibly as volunteers; also Morris, 2005: 45. Plut. *Per.* 11.5-6 and Lib. 7.8.2 (*Hypotheses of Demosthenes' Speeches*) imply a distribution of land to citizens of the lowest social status to alleviate impoverishment (in his summary of Demosthenes' *On the Hersonese*, Libanios notes that the landless poor were sent as settlers and were handed in weapons and some money by the state treasury). Also Pébarthe, 2009; Gallego, 2022: 8-9.

²² Figueira, 2008: 441; Pébarthe, 2009: 381; Gallego, 2022: 8-9. Most of those who chose to go did so voluntarily and had to draw lots, as in the case, for instance, of *Ennea Hodoi*, Thuc. 4.102.2, with Figueira, 1991: 20-24. The epigraphic record attests to the important presence of wealthy Athenians in colonies and/or cleruchies like Lemnos or Samos in the fourth century (less well documented for the fifth century), as highlighted in Culasso Gastaldi, 2015 (with bibliography). However, this does not imply that these individuals constituted a majority of the population (not even of the Athenian population which could include larger segments of less privileged groups of lower status). As Culasso Gastaldi herself points out, these well-off families were 'una frazione ristretta, anche se non sappiamo quanto ristretta, della popolazione attiva' (Culasso Gastaldi, 2015: 618). On the other hand, as Culasso Gastaldi also emphasises, the intense mobility and social complexity of a cleruchy (involving changes and transformations of the economic level) must also be taken into account.

²³ Colonists theoretically acquired colonial citizenship (Hansen, 1988a: 19), but their situation was somewhat ambiguous at least in the literary sources, Graham, 1991 [1964]: 168-170, as it appears that they did not lose their Athenian citizenship (Jones, 1957: 167-173; Brunt, 1966: 75-77; Figueira, 2008: 448; Pébarthe, 2009) and some are known to have returned to Athens (Figueira, 2008; Brunt, 1966: 76). Cleruchs were eligible for military service in Athens and, although stationed at military garrisons in hotspots, they could be recalled to Athens (Graham, 1991 [1964]: 190; Brunt, 1966: 73; Figueira, 1991: 66-73). Morris (2005: 45) estimates that at least 15,000, and probably closer to 20,000, Athenians left Athens for the colonies and cleruchies throughout the fifth century. For estimates on the number of colonists and cleruchs in the Athenian army in 431, see note 123.

²⁴ IG I³ 831 records a similar case of promotion from *thēs* to *zeugitēs* (c. 480 or a little later); Raubitschek, 1949: 400-401, no. 372; Hansen, 1991: 45.

²⁵ Thuc. 3.16.1. For state of emergency, Rosivach, 1985: 46; Gabrielsen, 1994: 107. In 428, the Athenian fleet numbered 250 ships, the highest figure given by Thucydides for the fleet (3.17.2).

²⁶ For the use of slaves in the fleet, Hunt, 1998: 88-99.

²⁷ In 428, the 1,000 hoplite citizens dispatched to Lesbos with Paches served as rowers (Thuc. 3.18.3).

epibatai (Thuc. 6.43.1).²⁸ Scholars who are sceptical of the employment of the census classes for recruiting purposes interpret the *thētes* to mean salaried workers. However, the attestation of the census classes concerning military enlistment in Thucydides (3.16.1) makes it more plausible that in this passage, too, the term *thētes* refers to the census class.²⁹ A fragment of Aristophanes' *The Banqueters* (*Daitaleis*; 428/7),³⁰ transmits additional information on the relationship between the census classes and military service: the lexicographer notes that *thētes* do not 'fight' (*strateuonto*): ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἐστρατεύοντο εἶρηκε καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Δαιταλεῦσιν.³¹ As van Wees has pointed out, *thētes* were indeed conscripted to fight wars,³² especially in the fleet as rowers, as archers on a voluntary basis, and possibly as *epibatai*.³³ Hence, the implicit meaning in οὐκ ἐστρατεύοντο must refer to the fact that they were not obliged to serve in the infantry or listed in the hoplite muster rolls. A fragment of Antiphon cited in the same entry of Harpocration contains the phrase τούς τε θῆτας ἅπαντας ὀπλίτας ποιῆσαι, possibly in the context of the expedition to Sicily.³⁴ This excerpt indicates that *thētes* (or their vast majority) did not regularly fight (at least not en masse) as hoplites.³⁵

The fragments preserved in Harpocration and the passages of Thucydides evince that *thētes*, as a census class, were related in some way to military life in the fifth century. They testify that they were enrolled in the navy, served occasionally as *epibatai*, were not called up as hoplites *ek katalogou* (at least in Sicily),³⁶ and did not usually fight as such. They also indicate that the *zeugitai* did not usually embark on ships (except to be transported as land troops),³⁷ nor did the *pentakosiomedimnoi* or *hippeis*, except in emergencies and close to the end of the Peloponnesian war (after the Sicilian expedition)³⁸ in times of pressing demographic and economic problems.³⁹

Several scholars have postulated a relationship between the census classes and military service based on this meagre information relating to the fifth century, particularly regarding the Athenian army.⁴⁰

²⁸ For the *epibatai*, Zaccarini, 2015; for *thētes* as *epibatai*, infra note 33; contra Herzogenrath-Amelung, 2017 (with bibliography).

²⁹ Rosivach, 2012; Pritchard, 2019: 41. It is interesting to consider the possibility that with this term Thucydides was also, perhaps intentionally, evoking the census class, 'the lowest classes in need of wages', because at that time there were not that many *thētes epibatai* who could serve without remuneration (Valdés Guía, 2022).

³⁰ Ar. fr. 248 Kassel-Austin. For the content of this early work of Aristophanes, Buis, 2009.

³¹ Harp. s.v. *thētes kai thētikon*. This is understood in the sense of not fighting as hoplites *ek katalogou* by van Wees (2018: 27): 'Since no one was exempt from general levies, in context this presumably meant either that *thētes* did not serve as hoplites, or that they were not liable to selective conscription.' For *thētes* not usually fighting, in a broader sense of the word, as hoplites, Valdés Guía and Gallego, 2010: 258.

³² van Wees, 2001: 59; 2018: 27. For the use of *strateuomai* in a more general sense (not only for hoplites) in Aristophanes, Ar. *Ach.* 1052, 1080; *Nu.* 692; *Vesp.* 1117, 1124; *Av.* 1367; *Lys.* 1133.

³³ *Epibatai* are generally thought to have been recruited from among the *thētes* census class, Thuc. 6.43.1, 8.24.3; de Ste. Croix, 2004: 21; van Wees, 2006: 371; Hornblower, 2008: 815-816. This theory has been questioned by other scholars, Jordan, 1975: 195-203; Herzogenrath-Amelung, 2017; Okada, 2017; 2018; Pritchard, 2019: 40-42. On the theory of *thētes* as *epibatai* in the fifth century, at least until after the expedition to Sicily, a time fraught with serious demographic and financial problems, Valdés Guía, in preparation.

³⁴ Munn (2000: 100-101) stresses that the most likely context for this short sentence from Antiphon's *Against Philinos* are the circumstances of 415, in combination with passing references in a biography of Antiphon, 'arming men of military age and ... manning sixty triremes' ([Plut.] *X orat.* 832f).

³⁵ Valdés Guía and Gallego, 2010; Valdés Guía, 2022.

³⁶ Hansen, 1991:45.

³⁷ For *hoplitagogoi stratotides*, Gabrielsen, 1994: 106-107; Morrison *et al.*, 2000: 226-227.

³⁸ *Hippeis* in Arginusae, for example Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.24; Gabrielsen, 1994: 107.

³⁹ Other evidence pertaining to *thētes* before or after the fifth century: *Lys.* fr. 207 Sauppe (fr. 261 Carey) = Harp. s.v. *pentakosiomedimnon*; Posidippus, fr. 38 Kassel-Austin = Harp. s.v. *thētes kai thētikon*; [Dem.] 43.54 (*Against Macartatus*). Solon's law on *epikleroi*, Diod. Sic. 12.18.3. Rosivach, 2002: 43-45. For discussion, Valdés Guía and Gallego, 2010: 271-277; Valdés Guía, 2014; 2018.

⁴⁰ Following Böckh, 1817: 34-35; Hansen, 1991: 45-46, 116; de Ste. Croix, 2004; contra Gabrielsen, 2002b: 211; Pritchard 2019: 40-42.

Using the census classes for recruitment purposes does not necessarily render them ‘military classes’, as Whitehead contended.⁴¹ Instead, they were financially defined classes whose aim was to allocate political roles and privileges depending on wealth. Before the Cleisthenic isonomy, this was probably Solon’s objective, at a time when a timocracy replaced the aristocracy.⁴²

Hansen⁴³ postulated a tripartition of the Athenian army in the fifth century: first, the cavalry, composed of members of the first two census classes (*hippeis* and *pentakosiomedimnoi*); second, hoplites, roughly coinciding with the *zeugitai*; and, thirdly, light infantry composed of *thētes*, the lowest census class economically speaking (and presumably the largest), whose members served, according to Hansen, in the fleet as *epibatai* and rowers. As evidence, Hansen adduces Thucydides (3.87.3) on the fatalities of the plague between 430 and 426, which uses the phrase ‘the multitude’ (*ochlos*):

[...] τετρακοσίων γὰρ ὀπλιτῶν καὶ τετρακισχιλίων οὐκ ἐλάσσους ἀπέθανον ἐκ τῶν τάξεων καὶ τριακοσίων ἱππέων, τοῦ δὲ ἄλλου ὄχλου ἀνεξέυρετος ἀριθμός.

No less than four thousand four hundred heavy infantry in the ranks died of it and three hundred cavalry, besides a number of the multitude that was never ascertained.⁴⁴

Thuc. 3.87.3 (Trans. by J.M. Dent)

Hansen stresses that by this ‘multitude’ Thucydides referred to *thētes*, and I would add that, in addition to *thētes*, the term included foreigners and slaves employed in the fleet. Hansen further reads a similar term in Thucydides (2.31.2): ἄλλος ὄμιλος ψιλῶν (‘a multitude of light troops’), as referring to the rowers of the 100 ships who, from their base in Aegina, joined the hoplites led by Pericles in Megaris (more than 10,000 hoplites and 3,000 metics). The interpretation of these terms as references to light troops should be treated with caution for, as Thucydides observes, the Athenians did not deploy citizens as light infantry at the Battle of Delion (Thuc. 4.94.1), and *psilloi* do not feature in the list of troops at the beginning of the war (Thuc. 2.13.6-8). The absence of trained light troops conscripted among the citizenry (Thuc. 4.94.1: ψιλοί ὠπλισμένοι) can be explained by assuming that non-hoplite citizens were mostly employed in the fleet. This does not imply that Athenian rowers could not disembark and serve as light troops when needed be (e.g. Thuc. 2.31.2).⁴⁵ Hansen also interprets the *hyperesiai* (ὑπηρεσίας ταῖς ναυσίν) as *thētes* who, together with knights and hoplites, appear in Thuc. 8.1.2.⁴⁶ Thucydides does not use census-class terminology but prefers military terms because there would be men of the first

⁴¹ Whitehead, 1981.

⁴² Without ruling out the possibility that one of the objectives was to facilitate the introduction of taxes at that time (probably in kind), Descat, 1990; Harris, 1995: 9-10. For the *naukraroι* (introduced by Solon) in charge of tax collection, Faraguna, 2015: 652 (with sources).

⁴³ Hansen, 1991: 43-46, 116.

⁴⁴ Thuc. 8.37.3. Hansen reads a reference to these classes also in Thuc. 2.31.2 and 8.1.1. For cavalry, Bugh, 1988; van Wees, 2018: 29-30. Obviously not every member of the first two census classes could serve in the cavalry, neither those whose age or physical condition prevented them from doing so (Pritchard, 2021: 407-408), nor those who performed a liturgy. But, even though the cavalry group *hippeis* did not exactly coincide with the *hippeis* census class, this does not mean that the members of the cavalry were not primarily drafted from the first two census classes, as Hansen (1991: 43-46, 116) argues.

⁴⁵ I thank José Pascual for this point on the absence of Athenian light infantry. Van Wees (2002: 66) thinks that rowers could disembark to fight as light troops.

⁴⁶ Hansen, 1991: 116.

two census classes among the cavalrymen. Similarly, members of the three higher census classes would be among the hoplites. Finally, there would be *thētes* in large numbers among the rowers, but also metics and slaves.

De Ste. Croix suggested a relationship between the census classes and military categories, although he believed that the classes were never precisely defined in economic terms.⁴⁷ Pritchard notes that the group of knights (*hippeis*) in general did not strictly coincide with the *hippeis* census class because cavalry members would generally be young and in good physical condition.⁴⁸ However, this does not imply that the cavalry members were not drawn primarily from the first two census classes, as Hansen suggests. The cavalry was obviously smaller in number than the two upper classes combined. This would have also been the case with the *zeugitai*, who, together with hoplites from the first two census classes, may have coincided with those listed in the catalogues as regular hoplites *ek katalogou*.⁴⁹ It is even possible that compulsory enrolment as a hoplite in the regular infantry required belonging, at a minimum, to the *zeugitai*. At the same time, enrolment was voluntary for *thētes*, some of whom would have possessed hoplite weaponry (specifically, those who served as *epibatai*). Therefore, a significant majority of *thētes* would not have fought as regular hoplites, but as rowers in the fleet, as light troops, as *epibatai*, or as archers, usually on a voluntarily, but in case of emergencies, on a mandatory basis.⁵⁰ Moreover, van Wees posits that only the first three census classes enlisted on the hoplite muster rolls.⁵¹ Nevertheless, as he also believes that the *zeugitai* were a leisured class and owned a considerable amount of land, he subsequently suggests that a significant proportion of *thētes* (30%) regularly fought as hoplites (as *epibatai*, as volunteers and in general levies), and distinguishes between ‘leisured-class hoplites’ and ‘working-class hoplites’.⁵²

Other scholars have disassociated census classes from recruitment.⁵³ Pritchard, for example, holds that when citizens enlisted in their deme register at the age of 18, they decided whether they wanted to serve as horsemen, hoplites, or in the navy. However, he ultimately recognises that their choice depended on their financial means. This was the case with cavalrymen, who belonged to one of the first two census classes as wealthy young men. The hoplites were equipped with expensive weapons whose cost they defrayed themselves and who, in many cases, albeit not always, were accompanied by a servant. Only a cushion was required to serve as a rower (which was appropriate for the *thētes*).⁵⁴

The recruitment of hoplites *ek katalogou* relied on the ten Cleisthenic tribes from the lists of demesmen drawn up by the demarchs (*lēxiarchika grammateia*), which were then given to the *strategoi* and the *taxiarchoi*.⁵⁵ These lists included citizens who were compulsorily recruited as hoplites, were drawn up especially for each campaign and were placed under the statue of the eponymous hero of each

⁴⁷ de Ste. Croix, 2004: 48-49.

⁴⁸ ‘The most able in wealth and physical capacity’ (Xen. *Eq. mag.* 1.9-10); Pritchard, 2021: 407-408.

⁴⁹ For the hoplite *katalogoi* as *ad hoc* muster rolls for every occasion, Christ, 2001; Bakewell, 2007: 90-93.

⁵⁰ Although not much is known about the methods for recruiting rowers or archers for the fleet, it seems that, on many occasions, it might have been on a voluntary basis: Ar. *Ach.* 545-547; Jordan, 1975: 101-103; Pritchard, 2019: 98 – the enrolment of rowers only seems to have been compulsory on three occasions between 480 and 387/6. For the compulsory enrolment of *thētes* on several occasions and the possible existence of muster rolls, Gabrielsen, 2002a; 2002b: 205, 207 (in the fourth century); also Hansen, 1985: 22; Bakewell, 2008: 144-145. For archers, Pritchard, 2019: 90-92 (both citizens and foreigners).

⁵¹ van Wees, 2018.

⁵² van Wees, 2018: 17.

⁵³ Rosivach, 2002; Gabrielsen, 2002; Pritchard, 2019: 43-45.

⁵⁴ Cushion for rowers: Isoc. 8.48 (*De Pace*); Thuc. 2.93.2; Eup. fr. 54, Kassel and Austin; Pritchard, 2019: 45.

⁵⁵ Christ, 2001; Bakewell, 2007: esp. 90-93. For the *lēxiarchika grammateia*, Hansen, 1985: 14-15; Whitehead, 1986: 35-36 with n. 130, and 135. Concerning registration in classical Greece, Faraguna, 2014.

of the tribes in the agora. There would have been similar lists of demesmen for recruiting cavalrymen.⁵⁶ If required, the demarchs might have drawn up lists of citizens to be recruited as rowers, but this does not seem to have occurred very frequently in the fifth century.⁵⁷

The earliest indication that these lists were drawn up by the demarchs, on the basis of the *lēxiarchika grammateia*, is an inscription from 440 regulating the payment of a fee for training hoplites, cavalrymen, and archers in the gymnasium of the Lyceum.⁵⁸ According to Jameson, the inscription only refers to the army, so presumably, the fleet's rowers, *epibatai*, and archers would not have been trained there.⁵⁹ However, if the so-called Decree of Themistocles (*SEG* 22.274; fourth/third century) was a copy of the original from the beginning of the fifth century (a controversial issue), then the first mention of such lists goes back to the dawn of the classical period.⁶⁰

The demarchs' task of drawing up the lists and handing them over to the *strategoi* and the *taxiarchoi* would have been much simpler if the *zeugitai* census class had coincided with that of the hoplite class, namely, if the vast majority of hoplites had been *zeugitai*, except a minority who belonged to the first two census classes. Registration in a census class was mandatory when citizens enrolled in their deme register at the age of 18. This system thus avoided duplicate enrolments (in Pritchard's theory) in the deme register, such as 'hoplite and *zeugitēs*', 'hoplite and *thēs*', or 'hoplite and *hippeus*'. All *zeugitai* were, by default, hoplites, but not all hoplites were *zeugitai*,⁶¹ albeit the vast majority were. The deme register was mandatory to include the citizen's name and age or the date of enrolment of citizens aged 18, which made it easy to know their age. So, if the *zeugitai* were those whose wealth was considered to be equivalent to that of a hoplite, it would have been a simple matter for the demarchs to provide the *strategoi* and the *taxiarchoi* with lists to compile the *katalogos*. As possible candidates, they would have only had to include those belonging in a certain age group (decided on and stipulated for each campaign separately) and in one of the first three census classes, while removing those enrolled as cavalrymen (no more than perhaps seven to ten young men per deme, given the approximate number of demes and number of cavalrymen)⁶² and those who were known to be performing a liturgy, also a minority in each deme. The demarchs might have also indicated who was unable to perform a liturgy.

⁵⁶ Pritchard, 2021: 407-408.

⁵⁷ For the recruitment of naval forces from the lists of the demesmen drawn up by the demarchs, Dem. 50.6 (*Against Polycles*). For a probable recruitment of naval forces *ek katalogou* in exceptional circumstances, Thuc. 7.16.1, with Gabrielsen, 2002a: 89, 93-94; Christ, 2001: 401.

⁵⁸ *IG* I³ 138 (c. 440).

⁵⁹ Jameson, 2014: 49-51.

⁶⁰ Also *ML* 23. Jameson, 1960; 1963. Rejected as fabrication by many authors (Johansson, 2001; Blösel, 2004), but accepted by others (Hammond, 1982; 1986 and 1988: 558-563). Even if the source's authenticity is compromised the decree nevertheless offers an overview of the events in 480. As Chaniotis (2013: 746) contends it is 'a text based on a true incident and composed [...] possibly in the mid-fourth century by the local historian Kleidemos'.

⁶¹ Probably the *thētes* who could serve as *epibatai* (young citizens from the most prosperous families of that class) accounted, for economic reasons, for no more than 10-15% of the citizen population, perhaps owners of properties between 2.7 and 3.6 hectares or equivalent in movable assets. The proportion probably dropped as a result of the demographic and economic crisis during the Peloponnesian War (Valdés Guía, 2022). For a calculation of the percentage of *thētes*' households with more than 2.7 hectares in the fourth century (maximum c. 4,500 out of a population of 30,000 adult male citizens), Gallego, 2016: 61, fig. 3.

⁶² 1,000 cavalrymen by 139 demes approximately gives an average of 7.1 men per deme.

Hoplites and Zeugitai: Numbers, Wealth, and Land Ownership in Fifth-Century Athens

Scholars who dismiss the hypothesis of a close relationship between the *zeugitai* and hoplites argue that if the *zeugitai* included all citizens who owned a team of oxen to work their land,⁶³ there would not have been enough arable land in Attica to accommodate such the vast number of *zeugitai*⁶⁴ attested on the eve of the Peloponnesian War: 13,000 hoplites and over 1,000 cavalrymen, plus a reserve of 16,000 men, including 'hoplite rank' metics.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, this view does not consider that membership of the census classes in the fifth century was probably calculated based on both movable and immovable assets (this had perhaps already been the case since Solon) and in monetary terms.⁶⁶ Then, it is not a question of sufficient land in Attica to accommodate the 13,000 active hoplites – whether or not they were *zeugitai* – on the eve of the Peloponnesian War. Both hoplites and *zeugitai* (in my opinion, largely one and the same) might have had sources of income other than land, with total assets equivalent to the land requirements for hoplite status – namely, a minimum of between 3.6 and 5.4 hectares. Moreover, wealth requirements were stipulated in monetary terms (drachmas) when Antipater disenfranchised those who did not possess a *timēma* equivalent to at least 2,000 drachmas at the end of the fourth century.⁶⁷ In the fourth century, when a *plethron* of land was worth around 50 drachmas, 2,000 drachmas were equivalent to only 40 *plethra* (3.6 hectares).⁶⁸ This was not necessarily inclusive of the total estate value in drachmas of hoplites/*zeugitai* in fifth-century Athens, as the value of a *plethron* of land at the time is unknown. The possibility that the standard of living rose between the fifth and fourth centuries should also be borne in mind,⁶⁹ and, consequently, that the equivalent of 3.6 hectares (the minimum requirement, in my opinion, for the *zeugitai*) in drachmas was lower in the fifth century than in the fourth century.

The inclusion of citizens with non-monetary assets in the first three classes can be deduced from the aforementioned case of Anthemion, who became rich enough to move up two census classes.⁷⁰ He may have been the father of Anytus (Socrates' accuser), a tanner by trade who amassed considerable wealth

⁶³ Without ruling out that there was already an equivalence of immovable and movable assets at the time, but not as yet in drachmas; this merits further research and I will address this point in future publications.

⁶⁴ Okada, 2017: 27; Pritchard, 2021: 406.

⁶⁵ For these figures, Thuc. 2.13.6-7; Diod. Sic. 2.40.3. Christ, 2001: 401; Thomsen, 1964: 162-163. Rhodes (1988: 274) calculates a total of between 21,000 and 29,000 hoplites in 431; Garnsey (1988: 92) offers a number between 18,000 and 25,000. Van Wees (2001: 51) speaks of 18,000, but subsequently (2006: 374 n. 90) claims that there were 24,000. Some of them were cleruchs and/or colonists, according to Figueira (1991: Table 3; 2008: 459); also Pébarthe, 2009: 383.

⁶⁶ As will be contended below, this monetary requirement might have been in place since Cleisthenes.

⁶⁷ Antipater disenfranchised 22,000 citizens, Diod. Sic. 18.18.4-5. Poddighe (2002: 59-61) explains the different figures provided by Diodorus and Plutarch (*Phoc.* 28. 7: 12,000 excluded) by contending that those 12,000 were readmitted to the *politeia* when the requirement was reduced from 2,000 to 1,000 drachmas by Cassander in 317. For the census of Demetrios of Phaleron (between 317 and 307), Ctesicles (*FGrHist* 245 F 1 = Ath. 272b-c) reports that there were 21,000 citizens at the time, which suggests that, despite the fact that some had regained their citizen status, around 9,000-10,000 people would still have been left out (cf. Gallego, 2016: 47-48). The population was c. 30,000 at that time, according to Hansen's (1985; 1988a and 1988b; 1991: 92-93; 2006) calculations; cf. Kron, 2011: 130. Van Wees relates the measures of Demetrios with the Draconian Constitution in [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 4, but see *infra* note 127.

⁶⁸ Calculated from the *Rationes centesimarum*, it would be a guide price, rather than a real market one. Andreyev, 1974: 14-18. Burford, 1977/78: 169-171; 1993: 67-72; Isager and Skydsgaard, 1992: 78-79; Jameson, 1994: 59; Hanson, 1995: 181-201; Halstead, 2014: 61; Poddighe, 2002: 137; van Wees, 2006: 357-358 and n. 34; Gallego, 2016: 52-53.

⁶⁹ See *infra* note 126.

⁷⁰ [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4.

from activities unrelated to land use or ownership in the fifth century.⁷¹ It does not seem probable that well-known and prominent political figures in the latter part of the fifth century, such as Cleon, even elected as generals, who also obtained their wealth mainly from similar activities, were enrolled in the *thētes* census class rather than the upper two ones, as was the case with Demosthenes in the fourth century, who belonged to the liturgical class.⁷² In this sense, Iasos of Kollytos, a wealthy businessman in the tombstone trade, who would come to perform liturgies at the beginning of the fourth century, was surely not enrolled in the *thētes* census class, but in one of the two top ones.⁷³ As Harris observes in his study of artisan workshops, there were workshop owners with assets equivalent to 500, 700, 1,000, 2,000, 2,400, 4,000 drachmas and up to three talents.⁷⁴ In the fifth century, those with (movable or immovable) assets equivalent in drachmas to 3.6 hectares (or 2,000 drachmas according to the fourth-century criterion or its equivalent in the fifth century) would have probably been *zeugitai*, whether they owned land or not.

Just as there were landless *zeugitai* (and landless members of other census classes), evidence suggests that landless citizens owned hoplite weapons. This might have been the case with Socrates and his father, Sophroniskos.⁷⁵ Socrates was born around 470/69 and therefore should have enrolled in his deme register on his 18th birthday in 452/1. The sources indicate that he was a sculptor.⁷⁶ Before abandoning this profession for philosophy, he might have owned, like his father, a workshop (inherited from his father) employing several workers (hired labourers or slaves), so his estate might have amounted to more than 2,000 drachmas (or the equivalent of 3.6 hectares in drachmas in the fifth century), since sculpting was one of the best-paid crafts.⁷⁷ However, his decision to abandon the trade for philosophy – probably after gradually selling or renting out his properties – impoverished him.

⁷¹ Regarding this character, see: Pl. *Meno* 90a. Anytos inherited a successful tannery from his father, Xen. *Ap.* 29; Nails, 2002: 37-38, with further sources.

⁷² For the wealth of Demosthenes, Thomsen, 1964: 85-87; Valdés Guía, 2014.

⁷³ Iasos of Kollytos served as *choregos* in 387/386, Feyel, 2006: 415, with bibliography; IG II² 2318, l. 206; Davies, 1971: 24; Hochscheid, 2020: 218. He might have been a sculptor in the Erechtheus in 408-406. According to Davies (1971: xx-xxiv), the members of the liturgical class were expected to have a fortune comprising at least three talents, which would be the maximum price for a workshop in Attica (Harris, 2002: 81). For other scholars, however, the minimum requirement would have been from one to two talents, cf. Gabrielsen, 1994: 45-47., 52-53; Rhodes, 1982; Kron, 2011: 129-131. Perhaps the wealth required in the fifth century to be a member of the liturgical class (and the *hippeis* census class) might have been in the region of 1.6 talents, as stated in the spurious Draconian constitution, which might have been related to the oligarchic coup in 411 (100 *mnai* – equivalent to 1.6 talents – as a requirement ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 4.2). Those with more than three talents would be the richest of the rich – a minimum of three talents for *pentakosiomedimnoi* (van Wees, 2018: 27) – who served as *proeispherontes* (the 300 richest families) in the fourth century, see Valdés Guía, 2018.

⁷⁴ On the variety of values of *ergasteria* in fourth-century mortgage *horoi*, Finley, 1951: 69-70; Harris, 2002: 81. For workshops, Acton, 2014; Lewis, 2020.

⁷⁵ Sophroniskos, a sculptor (*lithourgos*), Aristoxenos fr. 51 Wehrli; Huffman, 2012: 261. Val. Max. 3.4 ext.1; Diog. Laert. 2.19 citing Douris of Samos (*FGrHist* 76 F 78); Cyril. *Adv. Iul.* 208a.

⁷⁶ Luc. *Somn.* 12. Sch. Ar. *Nu.* 773: as Sophroniskos' son 'he learned to carve marble and made marble sculptures, among which are the three Graces'; Douris of Samos *FGrHist* 76 F 78; Timon of Phleious, fr. 25 d. Diog. Laert. 2.19. As a descendant of Daedalus, the patron of sculptors: Pl. *Eutyphr.* 11b, 15b; Alc. 1.121a; *Hp. mai.* 282a.

⁷⁷ Feyel, 2006: 415. Socrates probably provided for his mother's dowry at a time when the family would have been comfortably off, since she married, after Sophroniskos death, Chairedemos of Alopekia, who had a good socioeconomic position, Nails, 2002: 218. Several sources suggest that Socrates sculpted the three Graces and the Hermes at the entrance of the Acropolis, Paus. 1.22.8. Diog. Laert. 2.19; Paus. 9.35.7; sch. Ar. *Nu.* 773: 'Behind Athena was a relief of the Graces on the wall, said to have been carved by Socrates'; Valdés Guía, 2020, with further bibliography. For the position of the sculptors, see recently Harris, 2020: 51-54; Hochscheid, 2020.

Although he was already depicted as poor in *The Clouds* (422 BCE), this was not always the case.⁷⁸ Socrates probably did not fight as a volunteer at Potidaea, Delion, or Amphipolis, for he himself admitted that he was not enticed by public life or politics.⁷⁹ He was called up three times, perhaps four (including Samos in 440), the last time in 422.⁸⁰ On those occasions, he was recruited presumably because he had enrolled in his deme register as a *zeugitēs*, notwithstanding the gradual diminishing of his income to the point of him owing, at the end of his days (probably c. 399), an estate worth no more than 500 drachmas, appropriate for a rather poor *thētes*.⁸¹ There is no evidence to suggest demotion to the *thētes* census class in the last years of his life due to his impoverishment; as Mavrogordatos notes, this was not the case due to the Athenian system's inherent inertia.⁸²

Moreover, less well-off *zeugitai* could normally enlist as volunteers to earn a salary before being recruited from the lists. In particular, this would have been the case for single young men.⁸³ In this way, they offered their families financial support alleviating financial burdens at dire moments or when it was necessary to consider dividing the family property because there was more than one child in the *oikos*.

That there were both landless infantrymen and cavalrymen – but possessing the equivalent in movable assets – is evidenced by Lysias. When criticising Phormisios' proposal to expel the landless, the speaker offers, doubtless exaggerating the situation, as a rhetorical device, that many citizens would have to leave the city.⁸⁴ At any rate, the vast majority of the landless at the end of the fifth century would have been *thētes* without means. Nonetheless, land ownership was probably still essential and the main way of gauging wealth in Athens. However, during the *Pentecontaetia*, in the golden years of the Empire, the possibilities for diversification would have opened up new sources of income and enrichment (for all census classes). In Xenophon, Aristotle and Socrates observed that the craft trade was highly profitable,⁸⁵ while the slave trade and the renting out of slaves were also very lucrative.⁸⁶ Certain influential fifth-century individuals, such as Cleon, Cleophon, Hyperbolus and the father of Isocrates, who surely did not belong to the *thētes* census class, obtained their wealth and economic position from their craft and trade.⁸⁷

Therefore, the *timēma* of both hoplites and *zeugitai* in the fifth century was measured in movable and immovable assets, in the same way as for the *eisphora*.⁸⁸ In addition, there would probably have been equivalences between the size of landholdings and/or production in *medimnoi* and drachmas.

⁷⁸ Ar. Nu. 103, 175, 362; Mavrogordatos, 2011. Socrates was probably already a *zeugites* of modest status since Potidaia. In the 430s, he trained as a philosopher and possibly gradually abandoned his work as a sculptor, a profession that he had been pursuing since 452, to dedicate himself to philosophy, probably his only occupation in the 420s. Further argumentation in Valdés Guía, 2020.

⁷⁹ Pl. Ap. 31d.

⁸⁰ He visited Samos in his youth, Diog. Laert. 2.23; Graham, 2008 with bibliography and discussion. Amphipolis, Potidaea and Delion, Pl. Ap. 28e; Pl. Symp. 219e-221b; Pl. Lach. 181b. Cf. Mavrogordatos, 2011.

⁸¹ Xen. Oec. 2.3; Valdés Guía, 2020 with further sources and bibliography.

⁸² Mavrogordatos, 2011; Valdés Guía, 2020.

⁸³ Ar. Av. 1364-1369; Christ, 2001: 399; van Wees, 2018: 25.

⁸⁴ Lys. 34.4 (*Against The Subversion of the Ancestral Constitution*); Phormisios' proposal, Dion. Hal. Lys. 32-33.

⁸⁵ Arist. Pol. 1278a20; Xen. Mem. 2.7.6; Feyel, 2006: 434.

⁸⁶ As regards the fortunes amassed by Nikias and Hipponikos (undoubtedly acquired in slave markets) from hiring slaves in mines, Xen. Vect. 4.14-15; Plácido, 2002: 24. For the role of slavery in Athenian economy: Porter, 2019, esp. 37.

⁸⁷ Andoc. 1.146 (*On the Mysteries*); Ar. Eq. 1302-1315; Plut. Isoc. 1; Harris, 2002: 273. For the diversity of skilled workers in Athens: Lewis, 2020.

⁸⁸ The *eisphora* in the fourth century, before and after 378, was based on *timēma* or capital, not on income, and all kinds of properties were taken into account, Thomsen, 1964: 181-183. The Solonian census classes were based, according to Aristotle, on income or production ([Arist.] Ath. Pol. 7.1), but Plato (*Leg.* 955d-e) explores the possibility of a tax system based on both, viz. *timēma* (capital) and income.

All *zeugitai* would have been hoplites, but not *vice versa* because the hoplite ranks would have also included a minority formed by members of the first two census classes and a very small proportion of *thētes*. Although they had no obligation to serve as such, the latter possessed the necessary weaponry and could serve voluntarily as *epibatai* in the fleet.⁸⁹

Regarding the number of hoplites, most scholars estimate that at the beginning of the fifth century and during the Persian Wars, there would have been c. 30,000 adult male citizens (over 18), of which around 9,000 or 10,000 would have possessed hoplite weaponry, which means that approximately 30% of the population would have been hoplites.⁹⁰ Before Antipater's disenfranchisements in the fourth century, the population would have been roughly the same.⁹¹ It seems that Antipater disenfranchised around 21,000 people with assets amounting to less than 2,000 drachmas. This should have left 9,000 citizens who still met the requirements – 3.6 hectares or 2,000 drachmas during that period – for the 'hoplite class',⁹² which is similar to the number of hoplites at the beginning of the fifth century. The rest of the population (around 70%) would have belonged to the *thētes* census class both at the beginning of the fifth century and at the end of the following one.

However, the population of Athens likely doubled during the *Pentecontaetia*; on the eve of the Peloponnesian War, the number of Athenian citizens exceeded 60,000.⁹³ If the proportion of citizens of hoplite rank was the same as that at the beginning of the fifth or the end of the fourth century (around 30%), it stands to reason that there must have been 18,000 citizens of hoplite rank in 431. However, it appears that the proportion of hoplites increased possibly to 40% due to cleruchies and colonies. Scholars who base their calculations on the figures for hoplites and knights provided by Thucydides and Diodorus before the Peloponnesian War prefer a number between 18,000 and 24,000 (40% of 60,000), including the young, the elderly, the disabled, but not counting the metics, for citizens of hoplite rank in Athens at the time. As I have argued earlier, these (a number equivalent to 40% of a total citizen population of 60,000) would have all belonged to the first three census classes. If we assume that the richest citizens – the first two classes – did not account for more than 5% of the total citizen population, that is around 3,000 during that period (when the economic position of many of them would have derived from movable assets), then the number of *zeugitai* would have been c. 21,000. This means that the number of wealthy citizens or those belonging to the first two census classes had doubled since the Persian Wars and that the number of *zeugitai* had possibly

⁸⁹ It cannot be ruled out that those *thētes* who possessed hoplitic weaponry might have volunteered as hoplites on land. Be that as it may, their number would have been very small, since the proportion of *thētes* with weapons was not very high. In addition, in the *oikoi* of well-off *thētes*, weapons would have passed, perhaps, from parents to sons (between 20 and 30 years old, the usual age of the *epibatai*, SEG 22.274, ll. 23-25) who would have served as marines, while their parents or older brothers would have served as volunteers in the fleet – as rowers, especially as *thranitai*, and as officers – than on land.

⁹⁰ At Marathon, there were between 9,000 and 10,000 men, but this figure refers to the field army as a whole and not to the total number of hoplites. It is possible that men of all ages up to 59, or at least 49, would have been mustered (91.3 or 79.4% of adult male citizen population, see table in Hansen, 1985: 12), and/or that those 9,000 or 10,000 men included light infantry as well, as postulated by van Wees, or even slaves, as Pausanias (10.20.2) suggests: 'those who were too old for active service and slaves'. Nine thousand in Nep. *Milt.* 5. 1; Paus. 10.20.2; 10,000 in Just. *Epit.* 2.9.9 and 8,000 in Plataea: Hdt. 9.28.6; Plut. *Arist.* 11.1; Jones, 1957: 8, 161.

⁹¹ This is the same proportion as in the Persian Wars. Gallego, 2016: 47-49.

⁹² Estimates for the fourth century in Gallego, 2016. For middle-class men with hoplite status.

⁹³ Hansen, 1985; 1988: 14-28. Hansen based his estimation on the casualties during the war; Hansen, 1991: 53 and 86-88; Jones, 1957: 167-173. Garnsey (1988: 89-91) postulates 250,000 citizen families (that is, around 62,500 citizens); also Rhodes, 1988: 271-277. However, Gomme (1933: 25-26) calculated a total of 47,000 citizens in 431; Morris (1987: 100) suggests 35,000 to 40,000 at that time.

almost tripled.⁹⁴ As has been argued elsewhere, this was because landholdings in colonies or cleruchies⁹⁵ and the economic prosperity resulting from the Empire allowed many citizens to ascend the social ladder. Of this large number of *zeugitai*/hoplites (c. 21,000, excluding the first two census classes) on the eve of the Peloponnesian War, possibly just over a third had landholdings in Attica. In contrast, the remainder would have owned property in colonies or cleruchies or an artisan's workshop or other movable assets in Attica.⁹⁶

Some studies on fifth-century cleruchs, especially those on Lesbos, highlight that the minimum monetary requirement for inclusion into the *zeugitai* census class was an income of 200 drachmas or two *minae* a year.⁹⁷ This could be equivalent to around a minimum of 40 *plethra* or 3.6 hectares and perhaps a production of around 50 *medimnoi* per year.⁹⁸ This does not mean that the lots distributed to the Athenian cleruchs in Lesbos were 40 *plethra*, but that the cleruchs received income equivalent to the production of c. 40 *plethra*. Possibly the lots were larger, and the Lesbian families who worked them would have had to provide a fixed income, which hypothetically might have been half of the

⁹⁴ If those of hoplite rank at the beginning of the fifth century, with a population (c. 30,000 adult male citizens at the beginning of fifth century; Hdt. 5.97.2; 8.65.1; Ar. *Eccl.* 1132; Pl. *Symp.* 175e; Jones, 1957: 8, 161) very similar to that in the late fourth century, accounted for 30% of the population (Gallego, 2016: 64-65), then there were 9,000 hoplites of whom the first two classes might have totalled between (490) c. 1,200 and 1,500 (c. 4 or 5% of 30,000). Accordingly, the rest of the citizenry of hoplite rank (to my mind, belonging to the *zeugitai*) would have accounted for c. 7,500, perhaps slightly more if the population was larger. At Marathon, there were between 9,000 and 10,000 men, but this figure refers to the field army as a whole, and not to the total number of hoplites. Given the critical situation, it seems fair to assume that those mustered included people of all ages (perhaps up to 49 or 59) and that they were supported by light infantry and slaves.

⁹⁵ Cleruchs retained Athenian citizenship, as presumably colonists did (see note 22).

⁹⁶ Although there were apparently only 5,000 landless at the time of Phormisios' proposal in 403, c. 20% of the citizen population, it is possible that in 431, when the population was c. 60,000 citizens, the proportion was higher. In any case, this piece of information (5,000 landless citizens) provided by Dionysius should be treated with caution, since it is essential to consider the rhetorical component of Lysias' speech and understand that Phormisios' intention was not to get rid of rich Athenian citizens without land (similar to Demosthenes or Iasos of Kollytos), but the landless *thētes* (the poorest members of the population), according to their 'moderate' oligarchic ideal. Still, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that although movable assets made up the bulk of the income of many, they might have also owned a small plot of land in Attica (perhaps leased out), so that technically they would not have been landless, although their income would have derived, for the most part, from workshops or other businesses.

⁹⁷ Thuc. 3.50.2. For the distribution of land on Lesbos after the rebellion, Diod. Sic. 12.55.10; Antiph. 5. 76-80 (*On the Murder of Herodes*). For Pébarthe (2009: 382-383), an annual income of two *minae* was enough for *klerouchoi*, due to the fact it was located on the boundary between the *thētes* and *zeugitai* census classes. For a contrary view of cleruchies, with a distribution of land among the Athenian elite, based on the interpretation of the Grain-Tax Law of 374, Moreno, 2007; 2009; criticism of this theory in Lytle, 2009; Migeotte, 2011; Gallego, 2022: 8 with n. 14; forthcoming (with further bibliography and discussion). For an extensive reflection on land distribution and the status of the cleruchs, Gallego, 2022.

⁹⁸ A *medimnos* of wheat cost 5-6 drachmas and that of barley 3-4 drachmas. Van Wees (2013a: 230-231; 2018: 27, n. 100) estimates that a production equivalent to 200 *medimnoi* corresponded to 13.8 hectares (including fallow) or a property worth 7,590 drachmas; along these lines, 50 *medimnoi* would have corresponded to c. 3.45 hectares (including fallow), which was fairly close to the minimum of 3.6 hectares (producing 52.32 *medimnoi*, taking into consideration fallow) that I assume was required of the poorest *zeugitai*. These measures are, however, speculative, because although the weight of wheat and barley is known from the Grain-Tax Law of 374 (33 and 27.5 per *medimnos*, respectively, Osborne and Rhodes, 2017: no. 26, ll. 21-5), the yield (800 kg/ha) is overoptimistic to say the least, taken from statistics for average yields in Attica and Boiotia from 1911 to 1950 in Gallant, 1991: 77, table 4.7). Osborne (1987: 44-46) also calculates a very optimistic yield of 900 kg/ha. However, Sallares (1991: 79; 372-89) doubts that yields would have exceeded 650 kg/ha. Moreno (2007: 27) posits a maximum yield of 600 kg/ha for Attica (cf. Sallares, 1991: 79), with comparanda and discussion among different authors, Moreno, 2007: 2-10, table 1. Based on a yield of 600 kg/ha, a production of 50 *medimnoi* of wheat would have required 2.7 + 2.7 (for fallow) = c. 5.4 hectares (60 *plethra*); and a production of 50 *medimnoi* of barley c. 4.5 hectares (50 *plethra*). It must also be borne in mind that one quarter of the crop had to be kept back as seed grain for the following year. Anyway, on small properties it is possible that less land was left fallow and other alternatives were sought, Halstead, 2014: 200-202.

harvest/production – but converted into drachmas – in a regime of dependency similar to that of the helots (Tyrtaeus fr. 6 West).⁹⁹ In the fifth century, the minimum income (and therefore the minimum requirement for inclusion into the hoplite/*zeugitai* census class) for cleruchs might have been calculated not only in drachmas (Lesbos), but also perhaps in *medimnoi*. This is evidenced by a passage from Aristophanes alluding to two different realities that he comically intermingles, namely, the grain production (of wheat) of a plot in a cleruchy and grain distribution in Athens:

ἀλλ' ὁπότεν μὲν δείσωσ' αὐτοί, τὴν Εὐβοίαν διδῶσιν ὑμῖν καὶ σῖτον ὑφίστανται κατὰ πεντήκοντα μεδίμνους ποιεῖν: ἔδοσαν δ' οὐπώποτέ σοι πλὴν πρώην πέντε μεδίμνους, καὶ ταῦτα μόλις ξενίας φεύγων ἔλαβες κατὰ χοῖνικα κριθῶν.

When they are afraid, they promise to divide Euboea among you and to give each fifty bushels of wheat [emphasis added], but what have they given you? Nothing excepting, quite recently, five bushels of barley, and even these you have only obtained with great difficulty, on proving you were not aliens, and then choenix by choenix.

Ar. *Vesp.* 715-718 (trans. E. O'Neill Jr.)¹⁰⁰

The price of a *medimnos* of wheat during that period (fifth century) is unknown, but it might have been slightly lower (c. 4 drachmas) than in the fourth century when a *medimnos* of wheat cost 5-6 drachmas and that of barley 3-4 drachmas.¹⁰¹ Thus, if membership to the hoplite/*zeugitai* census class was based on disposable income in cash, land, and production, this raises the question of when this change was

⁹⁹ The land allocation in Lesbos accounted for approximately 1,200 km², excluding Methymna (as in Thuc. 3.50.2), but arable land was much less plentiful in Attica (between 20% and 40% of the total; calculations in Gallego, 2022: 17-24). Moreover, we cannot know whether all arable land was allocated or only that of the members of the elite or *dynatoi* as postulated by Gauthier, 1966: 80, n. 38. Antiphon (5.77) recalls the *adeia* granted to the rest of the population; Gallego 2022: 11-17, for discussion and bibliography. It is possible that the Lesbians who already worked for the *dynatoi* continued to do so for the Athenians (Zelnick-Abramovitz, 2004; Gallego, 2022: 24-27).

¹⁰⁰ With sch. Ar. *Vesp.* 715-718 (Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 118-119) on the appropriation of land in Euboea and distribution of grain by Psammetichus in 445; Nenci, 1964: 179. See the commentary of Biles and Olson (2015: 311-312), who point out that these two possibilities (promises of further cleruchies and the importance of the place as a source of grain) are not mutually exclusive.

¹⁰¹ The price of a *medimnos* fluctuated in the fifth and fourth centuries and the known prices cannot be regarded as reliable guides (Stroud, 1998: 74 with n. 175). A *medimnos* of wheat cost 5-6 drachmas and that of barley, 3-4 drachmas (Pritchett, 1956: 198; Stroud, 1998: 32-33, 63; Engen, 2010: 81-83, 87-88; Rathbone and von Reden, 2015, tables A8.2 and A8.3), but there is evidence of lower prices (3 drachmas for a *medimnos* of wheat in 393 (Ar. *Eccl.* 547-548; Suda, s.v. *hekteus*) and 2 for that barley in 430 (Plut. *Mor.* 470F). Prices go higher: 9 drachmas for a *medimnos* of wheat and 5 for that barley in 340-330 (IG II² 408) and up to 32 drachmas in 330 (Arist. [*Oec.*] 1352b14-20) due to inflation; Bresson, 2000: 183-210. The oldest attestation for the price of a *medimnos* is 430 (2 drachmas for a *medimnos* of barley attested in Plutarch; see *supra*), as well as the sale of the properties of the *hermokopidai* in 415, when the price of wheat was 6 drachmas per *phormos* (IG I³ 421, lines 137-139; Pritchett, 1956: 186, 197; Markle, 1985: 293-294). As this case was an auction, the price may be unreliable, without mentioning that the fact that although for some scholars a *phormos* was equivalent to a *medimnos* (Pritchett, 1956: 195; Markle, 1985: 293-294; Figueira, 1986: 156-157; Rathbone and von Reden, 2015). Others think that it was a higher (Bissa, 2009) or lower (Crawford, 2010: 68) measure. It is likely that prices rose from the fifth to the fourth century (Gallo, 1987; in a more moderate way, Loomis, 1998), although this cannot be confirmed. Be that as it may, if a *medimnos* of wheat cost 5-6 drachmas (the 'standard' price in the fourth century), then 50 *medimnoi* cost 250-300 drachmas, and, analogously, if a *medimnos* of barley cost 3-4 drachmas, 50 *medimnoi* cost 150-200 drachmas. In both cases, the figures are close to the yearly income of 200 drachmas for a Lesbian cleruch in the fifth century. Hypothetically, if a *medimnos* of barley cost 2 drachmas in 430 (see Plutarch *supra*), it could be stressed that a *medimnos* of wheat cost double that price, as in the fourth century, that is, 4 drachmas, so that 50 *medimnoi* of wheat (such as the production of the alleged cleruchy of Euboea: see previous note) would have been equivalent to 200 drachmas, precisely the income earned by a Lesbian cleruch at a very close date (427).

introduced. In my view, this would have most likely occurred in the time of Cleisthenes, insofar as it was then that the army was reformed and recruitment by the ten Cleisthenic tribes was implemented. It also roughly coincides with the minting of the first owls (which were possibly slightly earlier), the Athenian currency that would remain in circulation throughout the democratic period.

Cleisthenes' Measures: Monetary Requirements for Inclusion into the *Zeugitai* Census Class and Military Reforms

There are several reasons to argue that the division of the census classes based on disposable income in cash occurred as part of the Cleisthenic reforms.¹⁰² First and foremost, the introduction of a stable currency, the owls. Second, the growing importance of citizens whose wealth was produced by activities unrelated to land use or ownership in the time of the Peisistratids (or perhaps since Solon or earlier), especially potters but also other trades.¹⁰³ And, third, the fact that the Cleisthenic period was a time of major military reforms to accommodate the new 10-tribe system. I argue that Cleisthenes leveraged the census classes to gain a better knowledge of the citizenry's assets (through the new local units in which the citizen body of Athens was reorganised, i.e., the demes and the *lēxiarchikon grammateion*) and, therefore, to ascertain who was eligible to be recruited, henceforth on a mandatory basis, as a hoplite in Athens. The consequences were swift: two victories in Boiotia and Chalcis and, shortly afterwards, in Marathon and Plataea.¹⁰⁴ Yet, an early interest in increasing the number of eligible hoplites through dispatches in colonies or cleruchies (Chalcis and Salamis) and, therefore, in enlarging the *zeugitai* census class, is plausible.¹⁰⁵

It seems that, albeit already structured, the Athenian army was not genuinely effective until after the Cleisthenic reforms.¹⁰⁶ A restored line from an inscription dated to the 430s seems to mention a customary *nomos* on the recruitment of hoplites from the lists, which might date back to the Cleisthenic period, as the task was conducted 'by tribes' (κατὰ φυλὰς), a system introduced by Cleisthenes himself:¹⁰⁷ ἡ[εκατ]ὸν κα[τὰ τὸν νόμον καταλεχσάσθ]ον κατὰ φυλὰς ἐχς Ἀθ[εν]αίων. Although there is no clear evidence to credit Solon with the obligation for *zeugitai* to fight, there is evidence of the responsibility for all citizens to take up arms in a *stasis*. Cleisthenes introduced the recruitment system via the ten tribes, and it is likely that the conscription lists (*katalogoi*), one for each tribe, were also introduced at the same time. The use of the census classes, fully in force by that time, might have been an essential aspect for determining, after the income requirements in drachmas had been introduced, who were eligible for inclusion into the hoplite muster rolls. These requirements would have corresponded to an

¹⁰² For Moreno (2007: 95 n. 88), the Solonian census class requirements were converted into drachmas at the beginning of the fifth century. Beloch (1885: 245-246) was the first to suggest the time of the Persian Wars, whereas Thomsen (1964: 154) suggests a date around 500. For a date in the Cleisthenic period, De Sanctis, 1912: 237-238; Thomsen, 1964: 22, with further bibliography.

¹⁰³ Regarding the enrichment of the landless Athenian middle classes from activities other than agriculture, Charalambidou, Forthcoming.

¹⁰⁴ Chalcidians and Boiotians, Hdt. 5.77.1-2; Marathon, Nep. *Milt.* 5.1; Paus. 10.20.2; 10,000 in Just. 2.9.9. Eight thousand hoplites in Plataea, Hdt. 9.28.6; Plu. *Arist.* 11.1.

¹⁰⁵ Decree on Salamis (IG I³ 1 = ML 14; 510-500): 4,000 cleruchs in Chalcis, Hdt. 5.77.1-2; 6.100.1. Figueira (2008: 433) thinks that this number must have also included part of the Chalcidian *demos*, not just Athenians.

¹⁰⁶ For Cleisthenes' military reforms, van Effenterre, 1976; Siewert, 1982; Stanton, 1984. For military organisation in sixth-century Athens, from different perspectives: van Wees, 2018; Valdés Guía, 2019b.

¹⁰⁷ IG I³ 60, line 10-11. For the *nomoi* of Cleisthenes, [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 22, 29.3; Camassa, 2011. For Cleisthenes' relationship with the people, Ober, 1989; Flaig, 2011, who does not think that the changes at that moment qualify as a revolution. For the reception of Cleisthenes, the forgotten founding father: Anderson, 2003, esp. 197-199; 2007; Flaig, 2011.

estate equivalent to that of the hoplitic class, that is a minimum of 3.6 hectares (which in the fourth century was equivalent to a *timēma* of 2,000 drachmas and, according to fifth-century criteria, perhaps a yearly income of around 200 drachmas or 50 *medimnoi* of wheat in cleruchies). These equivalences are hypothetical, but what is not speculative is the cleruchs' obligation to fight, which appears in the Salamis decree at the end of the sixth century (IG I3 1, line 3: στρατ[εύεσθ]αι) and, therefore, to be enrolled on the hoplite *katalogos*. The economic status of these cleruchs is unknown, but it would not have been very high if the weapons they required could be purchased at a minimum of 30 drachmas according to IG I3 1 (lines 9-11; although they could cost between 75 and 100).¹⁰⁸ I assume that these cleruchs were *thētes* – as was usually the case in the fifth century – who had risen to the status of *zeugitai* and who, therefore, would have had the obligation, presumably established by a *nomos* on recruitment by tribes, to purchase weapons and to fight. The amount set in the Salamis decree was an affordable minimum for them and certainly an investment that, albeit expensive (15% of an annual income of 200 drachmas), was worthwhile and durable.¹⁰⁹

At the end of the sixth century, Cleisthenes reorganised the citizen body of Athens in demes and deme registers (*lēxiarchica grammateia*); the army was organised on the basis of the ten tribes; the new Athenian currency (the owl tetradrachm) was introduced or consolidated; and political life was rationalised with isonomy. It is logical to assume that the military conscription by *katalogos*, organised by the new Cleisthenic tribes and based on information provided by the new political units, the demes, began then and that, at a time when the census classes were fully in force, these were used to determine who was wealthy enough – after converting their assets into drachmas – to serve as a hoplite from the lists. This economic capacity would have been equivalent to the 'hoplite level', which various scholars have estimated between 3.6 and 5.4 hectares and which was subsequently set, under Antipater, at a minimum *timēma* of 2,000 drachmas. This would have been equivalent to the *timēma* of the cleruchs on Salamis, who could only afford to spend 30 drachmas on weapons. This means that those landowning *zeugitai* – for there would have been other landless members of this census class, perhaps not many at the time but growing steadily in number and whose assets (and/or income) would have been measured in drachmas – did not produce 200 *medimnoi* of grain in the time of Cleisthenes (nor, for that matter, in Solon's), but perhaps around 50 *medimnoi* at a minimum. This corresponds to a minimum landholding of 3.6 hectares or 40 *plethra* (or, in late-fourth-century monetary values, 2,000 drachmas).

The *polis* was undoubtedly interested in establishing the equivalence between wealth in land and drachmas for the census classes because an increasing number of citizens derived substantial income from activities other than agriculture. For instance, we know that in the second half of the sixth century, especially after 525, artisans began to make dedications on the Acropolis, some of which were very expensive. At that moment, this group – especially potters – started to be represented on Athenian vases.¹¹⁰ Studies of these dedications indicate that metalwork, among other trades, was more

¹⁰⁸ Between 75 and 100 drachmas, Connor, 1988: 10 with n. 30; van Wees, 2004: 48, 52-53, 55. Van Wees (2002: 63-64) argues that hoplites did not need to fight in full panoply (including the pricey metal thorax) and that the minimum requirement (a shield and a spear) was relatively cheap to come by (c. 25-30 drachmas); also Hanson, 1995: 57-59. Full armor was handed down in part from fathers to sons, Raaflaub, 1997: 54.

¹⁰⁹ Thirty drachmas comprised 15% of the annual income of the Lesbian cleruchs (200 drachmas).

¹¹⁰ Guarducci, 1980: 88-89; Himmelman, 1980: 133; Lauter, 1980: 105-129; Williams, 1995: 159; Valdés Guía, 2005. Craftsmen's dedications, Beazley, 1946: 21; Raubitschek, 1949: 465, who asserts that they were craftsmen of a good socioeconomic position, esp. nos. 30, 42, 44, 48, 70, 92, 150, 178, 197, 209, 220, 224, 225, 244, 357-358; Webster, 1972: 4-8. with references to the more modest ceramic dedications – vases and *pinakes* – in addition to larger dedications with inscribed stone bases and with scenes of craftsmen at work; Thompson, 1984: 9; Williams, 1995: 147-150. Scenes of artisans at work began to appear as of 540, Beazley, 1946: 6-8; Ziomecki, 1975: 16-17; Angiolillo, 1997: 105 fig. 50-51.

important than has been previously thought in sixth-century Athens.¹¹¹ Along these lines, the study by Makres and Scafuro on inscribed bronze *aparchai* and *dekatai* dedications for the period c. 525-480 has been essential to show the economic capacity of a 'middle class' in Athens. This middle class Athenian population comprised workers and artisans (without ruling out farmers) who possessed the wherewithal to make expensive dedications on the Acropolis, but without forming part of the more exclusive elite.¹¹² No doubt many of these dedicators would have been *zeugitai*.

The Cleisthenic reforms also coincided with the introduction or consolidation of the characteristic currency of Athens, the owl tetradrachm, which remained in circulation for centuries. Its rise might have been related to democratic and centralising measures implemented by the Athenian state without ruling out economic and tax reasons.¹¹³ Undoubtedly, this 'conversion' was not across the board, and the measurement of income in *medimnoi* and wealth in land assets was still in force, together with the measurement in cash (drachmas).¹¹⁴

The new registers of the demes, the *lēxiarchika grammateia*, were introduced by Cleisthenes at the same time as the demes became an essential unit in political life for the recognition of citizenship. Undoubtedly, the figure of the *lēxiarchos* may predate the reforms of Cleisthenes, since there were six of them, equal to the number of *thesmothetai*, thus suggesting its antiquity. On the face of it, this figure does not coincide with reality in Solon's time,¹¹⁵ but possibly with conditions in the seventh century (such as the six *thesmothetai*), at a time when Athens might have had a council of state of 300 members chosen *aristindēn* (selected from the *aristoi* or 'best-born').¹¹⁶ Counting the *aristoi* made no sense in the new democracy (nor with Solon now with an established timocracy). The link between the *lēxiarchikon grammateion* and the new political and administrative unit, the demes, began with Cleisthenes. The demarchs kept a registry of citizens belonging to their demes, including their census class, age, and, probably, their property holdings. The demarchs replaced, in this role, the *naukraroi*.

¹¹¹ Keesling, 2003; Avramidou, 2015; Tarditi, 2016; Makres and Scafuro, 2019; Charalambidou, Forthcoming. I would like to thank this latter author for allowing me to read a draft version of her work, which has offered me new insight into these realities. For *pinakes* dedications, Karoglou, 2010. For skilled workers in classical times: Lewis, 2020.

¹¹² Makres and Scafuro, 2019; Charalambidou, Forthcoming.

¹¹³ For the transit from Wappenmünzen coins to the owls, Kroll, 1981; van Wees, 2013b: 107-109; Kallet and Kroll, 2020: 52-54. The owls have been associated with the government just after the expulsion of the tyrants (Wallace, 1962: 28, 35) or with the Cleisthenic reforms (Price and Wagoner, 1975: 64-65; Trevett, 2001), but Kroll (1981: 24), following Kraay (1956), is of the mind that the reasons behind their introduction were more economic than political. This is part of a much broader debate on the economic or political reasons behind currency; on this debate, Trevett, 2001; Engen, 2005. van Alfen (2012: 20) comments: 'despite the polarization that sometimes occurs between the political and economic systems of interpretation, the two are by no means exclusive'. For the development of the currency in archaic times in relation to the ideological changes in the elite's mindset (contrary to the introduction of the currency) and of a 'middling class' linked to the birth of democracy, Kurke, 1999, with criticism in Samons, 2003; Kroll, 2000; van Alfen, 2012: 29. On the subject of the introduction of the coinage at the time of Pisistratus, Davis (2012), who considers the references to drachmas in Solon's time to be anachronistic.

¹¹⁴ This reality is verifiable at different times in the subsequent history of Athens – for example, with Phormisios – or even in the distribution of cleruchies (200 drachmas or 50 *medimnoi* of income/production).

¹¹⁵ van Wees, 2018: 27.

¹¹⁶ Six *lēxiarchoi* (Poll. 8.104) of archaic origin, van Effenterre, 1976: 13-14; Lambert, 1993: 262, n. 80; Faraguna, 1997. Referring to a council of 300 members of the *aristoi* (after Cylon; Plut. *Sol.* 12.2-4) in the seventh century, perhaps the Areopagus at that date, Valdés Guía, 2002: 122; 2012: 226, 232. For *lēxiarchika* of a different association in the archaic period, Ismard, 2010: 95-96. Registers of citizens kept by the *naukraroi* in the sixth century, Faraguna, 2015: 653-654. For evidence of *naukraroi* and *naukrariai*, van Wees, 2013b: 44-53. Muster roll from the *phratērikon grammateion* in archaic times, Frost, 1984: 284-285. For the number of phratries (c. 30-40) in classical times, Lambert, 1993: 20; Hedrick, 1991: 259; Davies, 1996: 5.

The recruitment system was greatly simplified if we assume that the *zeugitai* – equated with the hoplite class and accounting for around 30% of the population at the beginning of the fifth century – were enrolled in the hoplite *katalogos*. The author of the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* rightly pointed out that ‘the multitude’ drawn from the lists perished miserably in fifth-century Athens:

πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐφθάρθαι τοὺς πολλοὺς κατὰ πόλεμον. τῆς γὰρ στρατείας γιγνομένης ἐν τοῖς τότε χρόνοις ἐκ καταλόγου, καὶ στρατηγῶν ἐφισταμένων ἀπείρων μὲν τοῦ πολεμεῖν, τιμωμένων δὲ διὰ τὰς πατρικὰς δόξας, αἰεὶ συνέβαινεν τῶν ἐξιόντων ἀνὰ δισχιλίους ἢ τρισχιλίους ἀπόλλυσθαι, ὥστε ἀναλίσκεσθαι τοὺς ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν εὐπόρων.

And in addition, that the multitude (τοὺς πολλοὺς) had suffered seriously in war, for in those days the expeditionary force was raised from a muster-roll (ἐκ καταλόγου), and was commanded by generals with no experience of war but promoted on account of their family reputations, so that it was always happening that the troops on an expedition suffered as many as two or three thousand casualties, making a drain on the numbers of the respectable members both of the people and of the wealthy (καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν εὐπόρων).¹¹⁷

[Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 26.1. Trans. H. Rackham

In the fifth century, the *zeugitai* were predominantly members of the *demos* (τοὺς πολλοὺς) usually taken to mean the lower classes,¹¹⁸ although a small part of them could be more affluent, precisely those whose assets were just below the threshold of inclusion into the *hippeis*. Hence, the *zeugitai* would have been a multitude, many of whom died after being recruited *ek katalogou*. According to the theory articulated in Valdés Guía and Gallego (2010), however, the *zeugitai* were an elite in the fourth century, as of c. 403. It was then when the census classes ceased to be operational, and, therefore, these reforms did not have serious political or military consequences (coinciding, in addition, with the reform of the army). As I discussed previously, recruitment *ek katalogou* was perhaps employed before the battle of Salamis. On this particular occasion, and exceptionally for that period, it is possible that the fleet's *epibatai* were not *thētes*, but, for the most part, *zeugitai*. The controversial Decree of Themistocles (*SEG* 22.274) records recruitment *ek katalogou* (line 23-24: καταλέξαι δὲ καὶ ἐπ[ι]βάτας [δ]έκα [ἐφ' ἐκάστη] ν ναῦν), 10 per ship, whereas Plutarch suggests 14.¹¹⁹ It seems plausible to assume that at the battle of Salamis, for which all the Athenians (except the elders) embarked on the ships,¹²⁰ *thētes* were not allowed to serve as marines (*epibatai*), although they could usually assume this role or would do so in the future. The young men (c. 33.3%)¹²¹ aged between 20 and 30 (line 24-25) of a population of c. 9,000 with hoplite rank work out at precisely 14 per ship (the number given by Plutarch). Therefore, these young men must surely have been recruited *ek katalogou*.

¹¹⁷ The fact that Aristotle (*Pol.* 1303a8-10) points out that at that time the notables (οἱ γνώριμοι) fell in land battles as a result of being hoplites drawn from the lists, does not mean that the poor did not also fall, since, in this case, he is referring specifically to the notables or members of the elite of various cities.

¹¹⁸ For the different meanings of ‘*demos*’, especially as ‘lower classes’, Finley, 1973: 12; Hansen, 2010: 502-515. See also reflections by Cammack, 2019.

¹¹⁹ Plut. *Them.* 14.2; Jordan (1975: 194-195) is of the mind that this number should be accepted. Cimon was probably among their number, Plut. *Cim.* 5.2.

¹²⁰ Hdt. 7.144.3; Thuc. 1.18.2; Plut. *Them.* 4.3.

¹²¹ Hansen, 1985: 12 (table).

One of the consequences of the Cleisthenic military reforms was the mustering of a large number of hoplites to fight and defeat the enemy at Boiotia and Chalcis, Marathon and Plataea.¹²² At that time, many of them would have been *agroikoi*, among others plying other trades, as noted above. In the *Pentecontaetia*, the number of available hoplites/*zeugitai* grew, as did the variety of their backgrounds. A significant number of them would have been cleruchs/colonists and owners of workshops in Attica with minimum assets in drachmas equivalent to 3.6 hectares or 40 *plethra*.¹²³ To these should be added those who had landholdings in Attica, a relatively stable population between the fifth and fourth centuries.¹²⁴

It remains to be clarified what the equivalent of 3.6 hectares (40 *plethra*) in drachmas, supposedly the threshold for those *thētes* who aspired to join the *zeugitai* census class in the time of Cleisthenes, was. According to fourth-century evidence, best documented by the *Rationes centesimarum* from the second half of the fourth century¹²⁵ and the available information on Antipater's and Demetrios of Phaleron's disenfranchisements, the dividing line between the former *thētes* and *zeugitai* census classes in monetary terms was set at 2,000 drachmas (20 *mnai*). However, depreciation of money, an increase in the cost of living, or a rise of prices between the fifth and the fourth centuries should be considered probable, as Gallo and Loomis have observed, although there is no solid evidence in this regard either.¹²⁶ This could lead to the assumption that the value of land wealth in drachmas might have been lower in the fifth century than in the following one. Although it is impossible to venture a figure, the spurious Draconian constitution in *The Constitution of the Athenians* ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 4.2) may be useful in this respect, for everything points to the possibility that it was drafted (or at least its core content) in the context of an oligarchic coup in 411, in which the *nomoi* of Cleisthenes were closely reviewed. This theoretical constitution specifies that the minimum requirement for forming part of the *politeia* in the time of Draco was to own hoplite weaponry (*ta hopla parechomenos*), similar to what was postulated in the Constitution of the Five Hundred *politeia*.¹²⁷

¹²² On increased military potential, Hdt. 5.77-78.

¹²³ With respect to the size and revenues of workshops, see note 74. Cleruchs and colonists as citizens and as part of the hoplite contingent, Figueira, 1991: Table 3; Figueira (2008: 459) suggests that there would have been between 929 and 1,250 cleruchs among the 13,000 hoplites, 1,000 cavalry and 200 mounted archers (14,200 in total) in 431 (in Thucydides and Diodorus of Sicily, see *supra* note 65), and between 6,500 and 7,800 colonists among the 16,000 available reserves. Pébarthe (2009: 374) calculates the number at around 8,000-9,000 colonists and cleruchs.

¹²⁴ Gallego, 2016.

¹²⁵ For the theory that *rationes centesimarum* are inscriptions indicating the collection of a 1 per cent tax on the sale of land to Athenians by corporate groups (phratries, *demes*, etc.), Lambert, 1997; also Faraguna, 1998.

¹²⁶ According to Gallo, 1987, the cost of living rose by 200% in the fourth century. For a more moderate estimate that nonetheless highlights the impact of gradual rise of prices, Loomis, 1998: 240-250, esp. 247-249. The problem is that fifth-century prices remain obscure to us (Zimmermann, 1974: 101-103). It would be useful to focus on the price of plots of land and dwellings, although it should be borne in mind that their value varied depending on size, quality, and location. It seems that house prices rose between 415 (cf. on the stelai of the *hermokopidai*, IG I³ 421) and the fourth century, but these figures are unreliable (taken from an auction in 415, let alone the enormous difference between prices attested in Attic oratory and those in the epigraphic record of the *poletai* (Pritchett, 1956: 261-275). Gallo bases his inflation case on the rise from 1 to 2 obols for the *trophe*, with which the *polis* provided orphans and invalids from the end of the fifth century to the second half of the fourth century (*SEG* 28.46, line 10; also Lys. 24.13 and 26, *On the Refusal of a Pension to an Invalid*; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 49.4; more sources in Gallo, 1987: 26-30) and on the increase in builders' wages (Loomis, 1998: 247-249; Scheidel, 2010), as well as those of other workers (criticism in Crawford, 2010: 69). The price of a *medimnos* of wheat might have, perhaps, risen from 3-4 drachmas (on average) in the fifth century, to 5-6 drachmas in the fourth, but these figures are not entirely reliable given the fluctuations, the fact that many of these prices are related to the 'public sector', and the lack of information on wheat prices during most of the fifth century.

¹²⁷ Thuc. 8.97.1; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 33.1. Rhodes, 1981: 113-115; Shear, 2011, esp. p. 45 with n. 93, with further bibliography. Van Wees (2011) revives the theory of the insertion of the Draconian constitution in the time of Demetrius of Phalerum as an image of his new constitution. Valid objections in Fritz, 1954: 76-86, with n. 16; and recently Verlinsky, 2017: esp. 144-146; Canevaro and Esu, 2018: 121.

All scholars agree that the Draconian Constitution outlined in the Aristotelian treatise is not historical but derivative of a political pamphlet. Still, it remains an integral part of the *Constitution of the Athenians*, probably elaborated with information borrowed, at convenience, from different sources. Two interesting aspects of this constitution refer to property requirement to hold office: 10 *mnae* (1,000 drachmas) for the Nine Archons and the Treasurers, 100 *mnae* or 1.6 talents (10 times more) to hold offices like the *stratēgia* or the *hipparchia*.¹²⁸ As Rhodes points out, ‘this invites suspicion first on account of the means of assessing a man’s wealth [...] and secondly because it sets a higher qualification for generals and hipparchs than for archons and treasurers, and this, at any rate in the relative standing of archons and generals, reflects the political realities of the late fifth century [...]’.¹²⁹ The last amount could correspond roughly to the assets of those who belonged to the *hippeis* (and the liturgical) census class. The first could refer to the requirements for *zeugitai* (3.6 ha or 40 *plethra*) defined in monetary terms, more or less equivalent to the 20 *mnae* in the time of Antipater. Both measures attributed to Draco’s legislation might have been consulted and borrowed by the oligarchs of 411 from the Cleisthenic *politeia*. Regardless, the text clearly shows that the hoplite census requirements were in the lower band, namely, around 3.6 hectares.¹³⁰

With such scant evidence, it would be unwise to venture a guess as to the requirement in drachmas for belonging to the *zeugitai* census class, introduced by Cleisthenes according to the theory set out above, which coincided with the introduction of new coinage (the owl tetradrachm) and the reorganisation of the army *ek katalogou*. Nor is it possible to know whether this census remained the same throughout the fifth century or varied at some point. In my view, the monetary requirements would have been between 1,000 drachmas (10 *mnae*) in the fifth century and 2,000 (20 *mnae*) in the time of Antipater.

¹²⁸ [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 4.2. More discussion in Rhodes, 1981: 84-88, 109-111.

¹²⁹ Rhodes, 1981: 113.

¹³⁰ In any case, it is also possible that around 430 the minimum requirement for inclusion into the *zeugitai* was already higher (for example, hypothetically, around 1,500 drachmas) than that set by Cleisthenes (let us hypothesise, 1,000 drachmas). Should this be the case, we do not know when the change was introduced. However, this threshold might have dropped again to 1,000 by 411 (the return to the Cleisthenic *nomos* serving as a justification), given the precarious financial situation in the wake of Sicilian expedition (which also coincided with a period of deflation in about 412-403 according to Loomis, 1998: 240-241, 244-245). The lower threshold increased the number of those who could fight at moments of serious demographic and economic crisis but excluded the poorest *thētes*, despite the reduction in the citizen body due to the disenfranchisements of the oligarchic revolution. It should be noted that *thētes* in a better financial position, between 1,000 and 2,000 drachmas, according to fourth-century criteria, and especially those with land over 2.7 hectares or its equivalent in non-land assets, might, in many cases, have possessed hoplite weaponry or at least part of the panoply since they could serve as *epibatai* (see note 33). Anyway, they were probably few in number (see note 61) due to Athens’ demographic crisis during the last years of the war (see note 93). No more than 25,000 by the end of the war, Hansen, 1988: 22-23, 26, 28. For the Five Hundred figure, in my opinion taken from the number of those paying the *eisphora* since 428 (Thuc. 8.65.3; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.5: καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν καὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν λητουργεῖν; Valdés Guía and Gallego, 2010), as a nominal figure (Thuc. 8.92; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 32.3), but with ‘capacity’ to integrate more hoplites – up to 9,000 in [Lys.] 20.13 (For Polystratus) and perhaps all those who could certify that they possessed hoplite weapons: τοῖς πεντακισχίλοις ἐψηφίσαντο τὰ πράγματα παραδοῦναι (εἶναι δὲ αὐτῶν ὅποσοι καὶ ὄπλα παρέχονται). Thuc. 8.97.1; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 33.1-2; Fritz, 1954: 92. For the Five Hundred in the coup of the oligarchs of 411, Kagan, 2013: 187-189.; Tuci, 2013: esp. pp. 76-77, 174-176, 200; Bearzot, 2013. This matter merits further study.

Conclusion

In the period between Cleisthenes and the end of the fifth century, the *zeugitai* can be equated with those defined as belonging to the hoplite class, with an estate equivalent, either in land, movable assets, or drachmas, to 3.6 hectares at a minimum. During that period, this would probably have meant an income of 200 drachmas or between 50 and 100 *medimnoi* of grain production (at a minimum), which might have coincided with an estate amounting to a monetary equivalent of 1,000 to 2,000 drachmas (also at a minimum). In fifth-century Athens, this census class would have accounted for between 30% and 40% of the population (or somewhat less, when excluding the non-*zeugitai* hoplites, those hoplites belonging to the upper classes). I argue that the monetary requirements for belonging to this census class were probably set by Cleisthenes or shortly afterwards, given the existence of a part of the population whose income did not rely on agriculture and who could serve as hoplites in times of war. The objective was to regulate the citizenry's military life (with the introduction of the *lēxiarchika grammateia* and the *katalogoi*) with the obligation to fight as hoplites with their own weapons (as seen in the Salamis decree) for those citizens belonging to the *zeugitai* census class, that is, those meeting the minimum monetary requirements. The reforms bore immediate fruit in both Chalcis and Boiotia, and shortly afterwards, in Marathon and Plataea.

The spectacular growth in the number of hoplites – and therefore, in my view, of the *zeugitai* census class – during the *Pentecontaetia* (around 24,000 out of an approximate total of 60,000 citizens in 431), was undoubtedly due, on the one hand, to landholdings in cleruchies and colonies, and, on the other, to the economic prosperity of Athens, deriving in part from the Hegemony, thus expanding the base of those capable of fighting with hoplite weapons onto non-landowners. To this census class, both collectives (colonists/cleruchs plus artisans/merchants) joined those who owned enough land in Attica (3.6 hectares at a minimum). This system was efficient and straightforward. Nevertheless, those belonging to the hoplite/*zeugitai* census class obviously did not possess identical estates since there were certainly significant differences between those who met the minimum requirements (3.6 hectares) and those who almost met those for inclusion into the *hippeis* census class.¹³¹ These economic differences and the obligations of the richest among them to pay the *eisphora* as of 428 would lead to the restructuring of the census classes at the end of the fifth century. This occurred at a time of the revision of Solon's laws, probably resulting in the adaptation of those classes to the well-known Aristotelian measures of production, at a time when the criterion of land ownership was important (as was the case with Phormisios).

¹³¹ Perhaps a *timēma* equivalent to approximately 1.6 talents (10,000 drachmas; see note 74).

Bibliography

- Acton, P. 2014. *Poiesis: Manufacturing in Classical Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, G. 2003. *The Athenian Experiment: Building an Imagined Political Community in Ancient Attica, 508-490 B.C.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Anderson, G. 2007. Why the Athenians Forgot Cleisthenes: Literacy and the Politics of Remembrance in Ancient Athens. In: Cooper, C. (ed.), *The Politics of Orality*, Mnemosyne Supplements 280. Leiden: Brill, 103-127.
- Andreyev, V. N. 1974. Some Aspects of Agrarian Conditions in Attica in the Fifth to Third Centuries B.C. *Eirene*, 12, 5-46.
- Angiolillo, S. 1997. *Arte e Cultura nell'Atene di Pisistrato e dei Pisistratidi*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Avramidou, A. 2015. Women Dedicators on the Athenian Acropolis and their Role in Family Festivals: The Evidence for Maternal Votives between 530-450 BCE. *Cahiers "Mondes anciens"*, 6, 1-27.
- Bakewell, G. 2007. Written Lists of Military personnel in Classical Athens. In: Cooper, C. (ed.) *Politics of Orality*, Mnemosyne Supplements 280. Leiden: Brill, 87-102.
- Bearzot, C. 2013. *Come si abbatte una democrazia. Tecniche di colpo di Stato nell'Atene antica*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- Beazley, J. 1946. *Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beloch, J. 1885. Das Volksvermögen von Attika. *Hermes*, 20, 237-261.
- Biles, Z. P. and Olson, S. D. (eds.) 2015. *Aristophanes: Wasps*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bissa, E. 2009. *Governmental Intervention in Foreign Trade in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Mnemosyne Supplements 312. Leiden: Brill.
- Blok, J. and Lardinois, A. P. M. H. (eds.), *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, Mnemosyne Supplements 272. Leiden: Brill.
- Blösel, W. 2004. *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert: Studien zur Geschichte und historiographischen Konstruktion des griechischen Freiheitskampfes 480 v. Chr.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Böckh, A. 1817. *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, vol 2. Berlin: in der Realschulbuchhandlung.
- Boyd, T. and Jameson M. H. 1981. Urban and Rural Land Division in Ancient Greece. *Hesperia*, 50, 327-342.
- Bravo, B. 1991-1993. I thetes ateniesi e la storia della parola thes. *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Perugia*, 29-30(15/16), 69-97.
- Bresson, A. 2000. *La cité marchande*. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.
- Bresson, A. 2016. *The Making of the Ancient Greek Economy: Institutions, Markets, and Growth in the City-States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brunt, P. A. 1966. Athenian Settlements Abroad in the Fifth Century B.C. In: Badian, E. (ed.) *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg*, Oxford: Blackwell, 71-92.
- Bubelis, W. S. 2016. *Hallowed Stewards: Solon and the Sacred Treasurers of Ancient Athens*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Bugh, G. R. 1988. *The Horsemen of Athens*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Buis, E. 2009. Fragmentos de un discurso jurídico: la descontextualización del léxico judicial y su eficacia cómica en Comensales de Aristófanes. *Emerita*, 77(1), 79-108.
- Burford, A. 1977/78. The Family Farm in Ancient Greece. *The Classical Journal*, 73, 162-175.
- Burford, A. 1993. *Land and Labor in the Greek World*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cammack, D. 2019. The Dēmos in Dēmokratia. *Classical Quarterly*, 69, 42-61.
- Camassa, G. 2011. Les (nouvelles) lois de Clisthène et leur histoire. In: Ismard, P. and Azoulay, V., *Clisthène et Lycourgue d'Athènes. Autour du politique dans la cité classique*, Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 43-55.

- Canevaro, M. and Esu, A. 2018. Extreme Democracy and Athenian Nomothesia: The Athenaion Politeia and the Reasons of a Silence. In: Bearzot, C., Canevaro, M., Gargiulo T. and Poddighe, E. (eds.), *Athenaion Politeiai tra storia, politica e sociologia: Aristotele e Pseudo-Senofonte, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Cagliari 10-12 Maggio 2017)*, Milano: Edizioni universitarie di lettere economia diritto, 105-145.
- Chaniotis, A. 2013. Affective Epigraphy: Emotions in Public Inscriptions of the Hellenistic Age. *Mediterraneo Antico*, 16(2), 745-760.
- Charalambidou, X. Forthcoming. Material Status Markers and Social Networks in Attica: The Evidence from the Cemeteries, Residential Contexts, Cultic Sites (draft).
- Christ, M. R. 2001. Conscription of Hoplites in Classical Athens. *Classical Quarterly*, 51, 398-422.
- Christ, M. R. 2007. The Evolution of the Eisphora in Classical Athens. *Classical Quarterly*, 57, 53-69.
- Connor, W. R. 1988. Early Greek Land Warfare as Symbolic Expression. *Past & Present*, 119, 3-29.
- Crawford, M. H. 2010. From Alcibiades to Diocletian: Slavery and the Economy in the "Longue Durée". In: Roth, U. (ed.) *By the Sweat of Your Brow: Roman Slavery in its Socio-Economic Setting*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies 53, Supplement 109, London: Institute of Classical Studies, 61-73.
- Culasso Gastaldi, E. 2015. Composizione e mobilità sociale di una cleruchia: l'esempio di Lemnos e non solo. In: Matthaïou, A. P. and Papazarkadas, P. (eds.) *AXON: Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*, Volume 2, Athens: Greek Epigraphical Society, 599-638.
- Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, J. K. 1996. Strutture e subdivisioni delle "poleis" arcaiche. Le ripartizioni minori", In: Settis, S. (ed.) *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società, 2 Una storia greca, I. Formazione (fino al VI secolo a.C)*, Torino: Giulio Einaudi Editore, 599-652.
- Davis, G. 2012. Dating the Drachmas in Solon's Laws. *Historia*, 61(2), 127-158.
- De Sanctis, G. 1912. *Atthis. Storia della Repubblica ateniese dalle origini all'età di Pericle*. Roma: La Nuova Italia.
- de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 2004. *Athenian Democratic Origins and Other Essays*, edited by D. Harvey and R. Parker. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Descat, R. 1990. De l'économie tributaire à l'économie civique. Le rôle de Solon. In: Mactoux, M.-M. and Geny, E. (eds.) *Mélanges P. Lévêque*, 5, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 85-100.
- Duploux, A. 2014. Les prétendues classes censitaires soloniennes. À propos de la citoyenneté athénienne archaïque. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 69(3), 629-658.
- Engen, D. T. 2005. Athenian Owls, the Law of Nikophon, and the Greek Economy. *Historia*, 54(4), 359-381.
- Engen, D. T. 2010. *Honor and Profit: Athenian Trade Policy and the Economy and Society of Greece, 415-307 B.C.* Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.
- Faraguna, M. 1997. Registrazioni catastali nel monto Greco: il caso di Atene. *Athenaeum*, 85, 7-37.
- Faraguna, M. 1998. Un nuovo studio sulle «Rationes. Centesimarum». *Dike*, 1, 171-80.
- Faraguna, M. 2014. Citizens, Non-Citizens, and Slaves: Identification Methods in Classical Greece. In: Depaw, M. and Coussement, S. (eds.), *Identifiers and Identification Methods in the Ancient World. Legal Documents in Ancient Societies III*, Leuven: Peeters, 165-184.
- Faraguna, M. 2015. Citizen Registers in Archaic Greece: The Evidence Reconsidered. In: Matthaïou, A. P. and Papazarkadas, N. (eds.) *AXON: Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*, Athens: Greek Epigraphical Society, 649-667.
- Feyel, C. 2006. *Les artisans dans les sanctuaires grecs aux époques classique et hellénistique à travers la documentation financière en Grèce*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 318. Paris: École française d'Athènes.
- Figueira, T. J. 1984. The Ten Archontes of 579/8 at Athens. *Hesperia*, 53, 447-473.

- Figueira, T. J. 1986. "Sitopolai" and "Sitophylakes" in Lysias' "Against the Graindealers": Governmental Intervention in the Athenian Economy. *Phoenix*, 40(2), 149-171.
- Figueira, T. J. 1991. *Athens and Aigina in the Age of Imperial Colonization*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Figueira, T. J. 2008. Colonisation in the Classical Period. In: Tsatsikis, G. R. (ed.) *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, Mnemosyne Supplements 193, Leiden: Brill, 427-523.
- Finley, M. I. 1951. *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 B.C.: The Horos-Inscriptions*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Finley M. I. 1973. *Democracy Ancient and Modern*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Flaig, E. 2011. La révolution athénienne de 507. Un mythe fondateur «oublié». In: Ismard, P. and Azoulay, V. (eds.) *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes. Autour du politique dans la cité classique*, Histoire ancienne et médiévale 109, Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 59-66.
- Forbes, H. A. 2000. The Agrarian Economy of the Ermionidha around 1700: An Ethnohistorical Reconstruction. In: Buck Sutton, S. (ed.) *Contingent Countryside, Settlement, Economy and Land Use in the Southern Argolid since 1700*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 41-70.
- Foxhall, L. 1997. A View from the Top: Evaluating the Solonian Property Class. In: Mitchell, L. G. and Rhodes, P.J. (eds.) *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, London: Routledge, 113-136.
- Frost, F.J. 1984. The Athenian Military before Cleisthenes. *Historia*, 33, 283-294.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1994. *Financing the Athenian Fleet: Public Taxation and Social Relations*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2002a. The Impact of Armed Forces on Government and Politics in Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis: A Response to Hans van Wees. In: Chaniotis, A. and Ducrey, P. (eds.) *Army and Power in the Ancient World*, Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 37, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 83-98.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2002b. Socio-economic Classes and Ancient Greek Warfare. In: Ascani, K., Gabrielsen, V., Kvist, K. and Rasmussen, A. H. (eds.) *Ancient History Matters: Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydsgaard on his Seventieth Birthday*, Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 203-220.
- Gallant, T. W. 1991 *Risk and Survival in Ancient Greece: Reconstructing the Rural Domestic Economy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gallego, J. 2016. El campesinado y la distribución de la tierra en la Atenas del s.IV a.C. *Gerión*, 34, 43-75.
- Gallego, J. 2022. La cleruquía ateniense en Lesbos: Distribución de la tierra y explotación de los nativos. *Nova Tellus*, 40(1), 1-36.
- Gallego, J. Forthcoming. La Atenas democrática y la sumisión de Lesbos y Melos: mecanismos de dominación y explotación imperialista. In: Currás, Brais X. and Conceição Lopes, M. (eds.) *As faces do império: mecanismos de controlo e estratégias de resistência* (XLI Colóquio Internacional do GIREA), Coimbra.
- Gallo, L. 1987. Salari e inflazione: Atene tra V e IV sec. A. C., *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, 17(1), 19-63.
- Garnsey, P. 1988. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gauthier, P. 1966. Les clérouques de Lesbos et la colonisation athénienne au V^e siècle. *Revue des Études Grecques*, 79, 64-88.
- Gomme, A. W. 1933. *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graham, A. J. 1991[1964]. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Graham, D. W. 2008. Socrates on Samos. *Classical Quarterly*, 58(1), 308-313.
- Guarducci, M. 1980. Sull'artista nell'Antichità classica. In: Coarelli, F. (ed.) *Artisti e artigiani in Grecia. Guida storica e critica*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, 7-101.
- Halstead, P. 1987. Traditional and Ancient Rural Economy in Mediterranean Europe: Plus ça change. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 107, 77-87.
- Halstead, P. 2014. *Two Oxen Ahead: Pre-Mechanised Farming in the Mediterranean*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1982. The Narrative of Herodotus VII and the Decree of Themistocles at Troezen. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 102, 75-93.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1986. The Manning of the Fleet in the Decree of Themistokles. *Phoenix*, 40, 143-148.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1988. The Expedition of Xerxes. In: Boardman, J., Hammond, N. G. L., Lewis, D. M. and Ostwald, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume IV: Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525 to 479 B.C.*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 518-591.
- Hansen, M. H. 1985. *Demography and Democracy: The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.* Herning: Systime.
- Hansen, M. H. 1988a. *Three Studies in Athenian Demography*, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 56. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Hansen, M. H. 1988b. Demography and Democracy Once Again. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 75, 189-193.
- Hansen, M. H. 1991. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hansen, M. H. 2006. *Studies in the Population of Aigina, Athens and Eretria*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Hansen, M. H. 2010. The Concepts of Demos, Ekklesia, and Dikasterion in Classical Athens. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 50, 499-536.
- Hanson, V. D. 1995. *The Other Greeks: The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization*. New York: Free Press.
- Harris, D. 1995. *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, E. M. 2002. Workshop, Marketplace and Household: The Nature of Technical Specialisation in Classical Athens and its Influence on Economy and Society. In: Cartledge, P., Cohen, E. E. and Foxhall, L. (eds.) *Money, Labour and Land: Approaches to the Economies of Ancient Greece*, London: Routledge, 67-99.
- Harris, E. M. 2019. Aeschylus' *Eumenides*: The Role of the Areopagus and Political Discourse in Attic Tragedy. In: Markantonatos, A. and Volonaki, E. (eds.) *Poet and Orator: A Symbiotic Relationship in Democratic Athens*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 389-419.
- Harris, E. M. 2020. Many Ancient Greek Occupations, but Few Professions. In Stewart, E., Harris, E.M. and Lewis, D. (eds.), *Skilled Labour and Professionalism in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 29-67.
- Harris, E. M., Lewis, D. and Woolmer, M. (eds.). 2016. *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City-States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hedrick, G. W. Jr. 1991. Phratry Shrines of Attica and Athens. *Hesperia*, 60, 241-268.
- Herzogenrath-Amelung, T. 2017. Social Status and Combat Reality of Classical Greek *epibatai*. *Historia*, 66(1), 45-64.
- Himmelman, N. 1980. La remunerazione dell'attività artistica nelle iscrizioni edilizie d'età classica. In: Coarelli, F. (ed.), *Artisti e artigiani in Grecia. Guida storica e critica*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, 133-152.
- Hochscheid, H. 2020. Professionalism in Archaic and Classical Sculpture in Athens: The Price of *Technē*. In Stewart, E., Harris, E. M. and Lewis, D. (eds.), *Skilled Labour and Professionalism in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 205-229.

- Hodkinson, S. 1988. Animal Husbandry in the Greek Polis. In: Whittaker, C. R. (ed.), *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 35-74.
- Hornblower, S. 2008. *A Commentary on Thucydides, III: Books 5.25-8.109*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huffman, C. A. 2012. *Aristoxenus of Tarentum: Texts and Discussion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Hunt, P. 1998. *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Isager, S. and Skydsgaard, J. E. 1992. *Ancient Greek Agriculture: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Ismard, P. 2010. *La cité des réseaux. Athènes et ses associations VIe-Ier siècle av. J.-C.* Paris: Publication de la Sorbonne.
- Jameson, M. H. 1960. A Decree of Themistokles from Troizen. *Hesperia*, 29(2), 198-223.
- Jameson, M. H. 1963. The Provisions for Mobilisation in the Decree of Themistokles. *Historia*, 12(4), 385-404.
- Jameson, M. H. 1977/78. Agriculture and Slavery in Classical Athens. *The Classical Journal*, 73(2), 122-145.
- Jameson, M. H. 1994. Class in the Ancient Greek Countryside. In: Doukellis, P. and Mendoni, L. (eds.) *Structures rurales et sociétés antiques*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 55-63.
- Jameson, M. H. 2014. *Cults and Rites in Ancient Greece: Essays on Religion and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johansson, M. 2001. The Inscription from Troizen: A Decree of Themistocles? *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 137, 69-92.
- Jones, A. H. M. 1957. *Athenian Democracy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Jordan, B. 1975. *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kagan, D. 2013. *New History of the Peloponnesian War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kallet, L and Kroll, J. H. 2020. *The Athenian Empire: Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karoglou, K. 2010. *Attic Pinakes: Votive Images in Clay*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keesling, C. M. 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kraay, C. M. 1956. The Archaic Owls of Athens: Classification and Chronology. *Numismatic Chronicles*, 16, 43-68.
- Kroll, J. H. 1981. From Wappenmünzen to Gorgoneia to Owls. *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*, 26, 1-32.
- Kroll, J. H. 2000. Review of Leslie Kurke, *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. *The Classical Journal*, 96, 85-90.
- Kron, G. 2011. The Distribution of Wealth at Athens in Comparative Perspective. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 179, 129-138.
- Kurke, L. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lambert, S. 1993. *The Phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.
- Lambert, S. 1997. *Rationes Centesimarum: Sales of public land in Lykourgan Athens*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- Lauter, H. 1980. La posizione sociale dell'artista figurativo nella Grecia classica. In: Coarelli, F. (ed.) *Artisti e artigiani in Grecia. Guida storica e critica*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, 105-29.
- Lewis, D. 2020. Labour Specialization in the Athenian Economy: Occupational Hazards. In Stewart, E., Harris, E.M. and Lewis, D. (eds.), *Skilled Labour and Professionalism in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 129-174.
- Loomis, W. T. 1998. *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.
- Lytle, E. 2009. Review of Feeding the Democracy: The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC, by Alfonso Moreno. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. *Phoenix*, 63(3-4), 398-400.

- Makres, A. and Scafuro, A. 2019. The Archaic Inscribed Bronzes on the Acropolis of Athens. In: Palagia, O. and Sioumpara, E. (eds.) *From Hippias to Kallias. Greek Art in Athens and Beyond; 527-449 B.C.*, Athens: Acropolis Museum Editions, 63-77.
- Markle, M. M. 1985. Jury Pay and Assembly Pay at Athens. *History of Political Thought*, 6, 265-97.
- Mavrogordatos, G. T. 2011. Two Puzzles Involving Socrates. *Classical World*, 105(1), 3-23.
- Migeotte, L. 2011. Compte rendu: Alfonso Moreno, Feeding the Democracy: The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC, Oxford, University Press, 2007. *L'Antiquité Classique*, 80, 462-464.
- Moreno, A. 2007. *Feeding the Democracy: The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moreno, A. 2009. 'The Attic Neighbour': The Cleruchy in the Athenian Empire. In: Ma, J., Papazarkadas, N. and Parker, R. (eds.) *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, London: Duckworth, 211-221.
- Morris, I. 1987. *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, I. 2005. *The Athenian Empire (478-404)*. Princeton, NJ: Stanford Working Papers in Classics.
- Morrison, J. S., Coates, J. F. and Rankov, N. B. 2000. *The Athenian Trireme: The History and Reconstruction of an Ancient Greek Warship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munn, M. 2000. *The School of History: Athens in the Age of Socrates*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Nagle, D. B. 2006. *The Household as the Foundation of Aristotle's Polis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nails, D. 2002. *The People of Athens: A Prosopography of Plato and Other Socratic*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub.
- Nenci, G. 1964. Una ignorata revisione delle liste dei cittadini ateniesi nel 424/3 a.C. *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica*, 92, 173-180.
- Ober, J. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ober, J. 1998. Revolution Matters: Democracy as Demotic Action (a response to Kurt. A. Raaflaub). In: Morris, I. and Raaflaub, K. A. (eds.) *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges*, Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 67-85.
- Okada, T. 2017. Zeugitai and Hoplites: A Military Dimension of the Solon's Property Classes Revisited. *Japan Studies in Classical Antiquity*, 3, 17-37.
- Okada, T. 2018. Some Notes on IG I³ 1032 and the Crews of Athenian Triremes in the Fifth Century BCE. In: Amann, P., Corsten, T., Mitthof, F. and Taeuber, H. (eds.), *Sprachen – Schriftkulturen – Identitäten der Antike. Beiträge des XV. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik*, Wien: Holzhausen, 1-11.
- Osborne, R. 1987. *Classical Landscape with Figures: The Ancient Greek City and its Countryside*. London: George Philip.
- Osborne, R. and Rhodes, P. J. 2017. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 478-404 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pébarthe, C. 2009. Émigrer d'Athènes. Clérouques et colons aux temps de la domination athénienne sur l'Égée au Ve siècle a.C. In: Moatti, C., Kaiser, W. and Pébarthe, C. (eds.) *Le monde de l'itinérance en Méditerranée de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne. Procédures de contrôle et d'identification*, Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions, 367-390.
- Plácido, D. 2002. Guerre et marché d'esclaves dans la Grèce Classique. In: Garrido-Hory, M. (ed.), *Routes et marches d'esclaves. 26ème colloque du GIREA, Besançon, 27-29 septembre 2001 (Esclavage et dépendance)*, Paris: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 21-28.
- Poddighe, E. 2002. *Nel segno di Antipatro. L'eclissi Della democrazia ateniese dal 323/2 al 319/8 a.C.* Roma: Carocci.
- Porter, J. 2019. Slavery and Athens' Economic Efflorescence: Mill Slavery as a Case Study. *Mare Nostrum*, 10, 25-50.
- Pritchard, D. M. 2019. *Athenian Democracy at War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pritchard, D. M. 2021. The Armed Forces. In: Neils, J. and Rogers, D. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 405-418.

- Pritchett, W. K. 1956. Attic Stelai, II. *Hesperia*, 25(3), 178-328.
- Raaflaub, K. A. 1997. Soldiers, Citizens, and the Evolution of the Early Greek Polis. In: Mitchell, L. G. and Rhodes, P. J. (eds.) *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, London: Routledge, 49-59.
- Rathbone, D. and von Reden, S. 2015. Mediterranean Grain Prices in Classical Antiquity. In: van der Spek, R. J., van Zanden, J. L. and van Leeuwen, B. (eds.) *A History of Market Performance: From Ancient Babylonia to the Modern World*, London: Routledge, 149-235.
- Raubitschek, A. E. 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.* Cambridge, MA: Archaeological Institute of America.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1972. *The Athenian Boule*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1982. Problems in Athenian Eispheora and Liturgies. *American Journal of Ancient History*, 7, 1-19.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1988. *Thucydides: History II*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1997. Introduction. In: Mitchell, L. G. and Rhodes, P. J. (eds.) *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, London: Routledge, 1-8.
- Rhodes, P. J. 2006. The Reforms and Laws of Solon: An Optimistic View. In: Blok, J. and Lardinois, A. P. M. H. (eds.) *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, Mnemosyne Supplements 272, Leiden: Brill, 248-260.
- Rosivach, V. J. 2002. The Requirements for the Solonic Classes in Aristotle, AP 7.4. *Hermes*, 130, 36-47.
- Rosivach, V. J. 2012. Thetes in Thucydides 6.43.1. *Hermes*, 140(2), 131-139.
- Sallares, R. 1991. *The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Samons II, L. J. 2003. Review to Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece by Leslie Kurke. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 10(2), 281-286.
- Scheidel, W. 2010. Real Wages in Early Economies: Evidence for Living Standards from 1800 BCE to 1300 CE. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 53(3), 425-462.
- Shear J. L. 2011. *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siewert, P. 1982. *Die Trittyen Attikas und die Heeresform des Kleisthenes*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Stanton, G. R. 1984. The Tribal Reform of Kleisthenes the Alkmeonid. *Chiron*, 14: 1-41.
- Stroud, R. S. 1971. Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis I. *Hesperia* 40, 146-204.
- Stroud, R. S. 1998. *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B. C.*, *Hesperia* Supplement 29. Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Tarditi, C. 2016. *Bronze Vessels from the Acropolis. Style and Decoration in Athenian Production between the Sixth and Fifth Centuries BC*, Thiasos Monografie 7. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- Thompson, H. A. 1984. The Athenian Vase-Painters and Their Neighbors. In: Rice, P. M. (ed.) *Pots and Potters: Current Approaches to Ceramic Archaeology*, Monography 24, Los Angeles, CA: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, 7-19.
- Thomsen, R. 1964. *Eisphora: A Study of Direct Taxation in Ancient Athens*, Humanitas 3. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Trevett, J. 2001. Coinage and Democracy at Athens. In: Meadows, A. and Shipton, K. (eds.), *Money and Its Uses in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23-34.
- Tuci, P. A. 2013. *La fragilità della democrazia. Manipolazione istituzionale ed eversione nel colpo di Stato oligarchico del 411 a.C. ad Atene*. Milano: LED Edizioni Universitarie.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2005. La position sociale des *dèmiourgoi* et leur intégration dans la *politeia* au VI^e siècle. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, 31, 9-24.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2014. Patrimonio de Demóstenes como *hegemón* de su "sinmoría": *eisphorá* y *proeisphorá* tras el 378. *Emerita*, 82(2), 249-271.

- Valdés Guía, M. 2018. Reformas en las cargas fiscales y sociedad ateniense en la primera mitad del s.IV: entre los problemas financieros y la renovación imperialista. In: Pascual, J., Antela-Bernárdez, B. and Gómez Castro, D. (eds.) *El mundo griego en el siglo IV a.C. Pervivencias, cambios y transformaciones*, Monografía ICCA, Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 89-107.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2019a. Historiografía de los *thetes*. In: Alvar Nuño, A. (ed.) *Historiografía de la esclavitud. Groupe International de Recherche sur l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité. Volume XXXIX*, Anejos de la Revista de Historiografía 10, Madrid: Universidad Carlos III, 235-260.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2019b. The Social and Cultural Background of Hoplite Development in Archaic Athens: Peasants, Debts, Zeugitai and Hoplethes. *Historia*, 68(4), 388-412.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2020. Sócrates, pobre como un *thes*. In: Reduzzi Merola, F. Bramante, M.V. and Caravaglios, A. (eds.), *Le realtà della schiavitù: identità e biografie da Eumee a Frederick Douglass. Les réalités de l'esclavage: identités et biographies d'Eumée à Frederick Douglass. Atti del XL Convegno internazionale del GIREA (Napoli, 18-20 dicembre 2017)*, Napoli: Satura Editrice, 107-127.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2021. A New Reading on Solon's Law on Stasis: The Sovereignty of the Demos. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, 47(2), 187-219.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2022 (Forthcoming). Thetes epibatai in Fifth-Century Athens. *Revue des Études Anciennes*.
- Valdés Guía, M. and Gallego, J. 2010. Athenian Zeugitai and the Solonian Census Classes: New reflections and Perspectives. *Historia*, 59(3), 257-281.
- van Alfen, P. G. 2012. Problems in the Political Economy of Archaic Greek Coinage. *Notae Numismaticae*, 7, 13-32.
- van Effenterre, H., 1976. Clithène et les mesures de mobilisation. *Revue des Études Grecques*, 89, 1-17.
- van Wees, H. 1999. The Mafia of Early Greece: Violent Exploitation in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries BC. In: Hopwood, K. (ed.), *Organized Crime in Antiquity*, London: Duckworth, 1-51.
- van Wees, H. 2001. The Myth of the Middle-Class Army: Military and Social Status in Ancient Athens. In: Bekker-Nielsen T. and Hannestad, L. (eds.) *War as a Cultural and Social Force: Essays on Warfare in Antiquity*, Copenhagen: Det kongelige danske videnskabernes selskab, 45-71.
- van Wees, H. 2002. Tyrants, Oligarchs and Citizen Militia. In: Chaniotis, A. and Ducrey, P. (eds.) *Army and Power in the Ancient World*, Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 37, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 61-82.
- van Wees, H. 2004. *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London: Duckworth.
- van Wees, H. 2006. Mass and Elite in Solon's Athens: The Property Classes Revisited. In: Blok, J. and Lardinois, A. P. M. H. (eds.) *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, Mnemosyne Supplements 272, Leiden: Brill, 351-389.
- van Wees, H. 2011. Demetrius and Draco: Athens' Property Classes and Population in and Before 317 BC. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 131, 95-114.
- van Wees, H. 2013a. Farmers and Hoplites: Models of Historical Development. In: Kagan, D. and Viggiano, G. F. (eds.), *Men of Bronze: Hoplite Warfare in Ancient Greece*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 122-255.
- van Wees, H. 2013b. *Ships and Silver: A Fiscal History of Archaic Athens*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- van Wees, H. 2018. Citizens and Soldiers in Archaic Athens. In: Duploux, A. and Brock, R. W. (eds.) *Defining Citizenship in Archaic Greece*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 103-114.
- von Fritz, K. 1954. The Composition of Aristotle's Constitution of Athens and the So-Called Draconian Constitution. *Classical Philology*, 49, 73-93.
- Wallace, W. P. 1962. The Early Coinages of Athens and Euboia. *Numismatic Chronicle*, 2, 23-42.
- Webster, T. B. L. 1972. *Potter and Patron in Ancient Athens*. London: Methuen.
- Whitehead, D. 1981. The Archaic Athenian Zeugitai, *Classical Quarterly*, 31: 282-286.

- Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica, 508/7-ca. 250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Williams, D. 1995. Potter, Painter, and Purchaser. In: Verbanck-Piérard, A. and Viviers, D. (eds.) *Culture et Cité. L'avènement d'Athènes à l'époque archaïque*, Bruxelles: Fondation Archéologique de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles, 139-160.
- Zaccarini, M. 2015. Thucydides' Narrative on Naval Warfare: Epibatai, Military Theory, Ideology. In: Lee, G., Whittaker, H. and Wrightson, G. (eds.) *Ancient Warfare: Introducing Current Research*, vol. 1, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 210-228.
- Zaccarini, M. 2018. The Fate of the Lawgiver: The Invention of the Reforms of Ephialtes and the Patrios Politeia. *Historia*, 67(4), 495-512.
- Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. 2004. Settlers and Dispossessed in the Athenian Empire. *Mnemosyne*, 57(3), 325-345.
- Zimmermann, H. D. 1974. Freie Arbeit, Preise und Löhne. In: Welskopf, E. C. (ed.), *Hellenische Poleis I*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 92-107.
- Ziomecki, J. 1975. *Les représentations d'artisans sur les vases attiques*. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich.

Abstract (Spanish) | Resumen

El estatus de los *zeugitai* como hoplitas de clase media ha sido objeto de una considerable atención en las últimas décadas. Se ha discutido tanto lo que respecta a los requisitos de propiedad para la inclusión en esta clase censitaria como el papel de los *zeugitai* en el ejército. Hace más de una década se empezaron a cuestionar los puntos de vista establecidos sobre los *zeugitai*, señalándose a partir de las medidas proporcionadas por la *Constitución de los atenienses*, que el requisito de propiedad para pertenecer a esta clase era una cantidad de tierra muy elevada (8,7 hectáreas, luego incrementado a un mínimo de 13,8 hectáreas: van Wees, 2001; 2006; 2013a). En un trabajo sobre este tema, Valdés y Gallego (2010) argumentaron en contra de esta elevación del estatus de los *zeugitai* y sugirieron que esta clase correspondía a aquellos con un patrimonio considerado de “rango hoplita”, es decir, en posesión de tierras, como mínimo, de entre 3,6 a 5,4 hectáreas. Estos autores relacionaban las medidas de producción aristotélicas de las diferentes clases (500, 300 y 200: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4), con la revisión del código de leyes de Atenas a finales del siglo V, que llevó a una redefinición de las clases censitarias con el objetivo de adecuarlas al pago de la *eisphora*, instaurada para Atenas durante la guerra (428 a.C.).

El objetivo de este trabajo es partir de esta teoría para conocer mejor quiénes fueron los *zeugitai* en términos económicos durante el siglo V, después de las reformas clisténicas. Se argumenta que las clases censitarias se definieron en términos monetarios a principios de la isonomía, cuando se produjo una drástica reconstrucción del ejército con la introducción del reclutamiento de hoplitas *ek katalogou* en Atenas. Al mismo tiempo, se habría regulado la obligación de combatir y de poseer armamento hoplita para los pertenecientes de la clase de los *zeugitai*, que a partir de entonces se inscribieron en las nuevas listas establecidas para el reclutamiento de hoplitas por tribus. Esta forma de reclutamiento se empleó durante al menos un siglo, hasta finales del siglo V, época de importantes cambios con la redefinición económica de las clases censitarias, especialmente la de los *zeugitai*, para adaptarlas al sistema de *eisphora* vigente hasta los años 370s.

Desde esta perspectiva se revisan los escasos testimonios sobre los *zeugitai* en el siglo V (arcontes, clerucos y promoción de clase censitaria) así como la discusión académica sobre el uso militar de las clases censitarias en esa época. A continuación, se atiende a la demografía de los hoplitas y de los *zeugitai*, así como a las fuentes de riqueza (no basadas únicamente en la tierra) de la clase hoplítica, y se señala que una proporción de hoplitas/*zeugitai*, creciente en el s.V, obtendría sus recursos de propiedades no fundiarias. Por último, en la última sección, se defiende la hipótesis del establecimiento de equivalencias monetarias para las clases censitarias en el contexto de las reformas militares de Clístenes, momento en el que el mínimo requerido para ser *zeugites* se definiría tanto por la propiedad de la tierra (con un mínimo de 3,6 hectáreas), como por el equivalente en dracmas de esos valores fundiarios.

En consecuencia, este trabajo reexamina y contribuye a consolidar la idea de que, desde la época de Clístenes y a lo largo del siglo V, los *zeugitai* formaban una clase censitaria de propietarios medianos con una propiedad equivalente a un mínimo de 3,6 hectáreas. Sostiene, asimismo, que a finales del siglo VI, se estableció una equivalencia entre la propiedad de la tierra y la moneda (en dracmas), y que, finalmente, se utilizaron las clases censitarias como criterio económico para el reclutamiento del catálogo hoplita. Ya en el siglo VI, pero especialmente durante la Pentecontecia, el número de hoplitas/*zeugitai* creció sustancialmente debido tanto a la prosperidad económica

(diversidad de fuentes de riqueza para acceder a la clase de los *zeugitai*) como a la fundación de colonias y cleruquías. Muchos ciudadanos sin tierras, pero en posesión de suficiente riqueza se incluyeron en esta clase censitaria e, incluso algunos, como el famoso Anthemion ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4), pudieron ascender aún más en el escalafón socio-económico, llegando a la de los *hippeis*.

