

## CLASS DIVISIONS IN FIFTH CENTURY ATHENS \*

A recent study of «Classes and Society in Classical Greece» begins with the comment, «A fuller understanding of antiquity has been hampered by the failure of ancient historians to perceive clearly the nature of its basic class structures»<sup>1</sup>. So let there be an end to discussions of ancient history which speak as if ancient society were that of 18th or 19th century Europe with a proletariat, a bourgeoisie and an (often threatened but legally entrenched) nobility<sup>2</sup>. The article goes on, however, to suggest that the correct «model» for understanding ancient society is Marx's pre-capitalist «ancient mode» in which the classless, equalitarian «commune» is first dissolved by the formation of classes (e.g., an aristocracy) and then reestablished (on the principle of equality) as the «democratic polis»<sup>3</sup>. Athens, moreover, «has been taken as a paradigm capable of explaining the general direction of development in which in one form or another the entire Greek world ultimately moved»<sup>4</sup>. This seems to me a definite step backward. At least the three French estates are historical and offer a potential historical parallel, but Marx's «commune» belongs entirely to the 'age of Kronos'. And Athens ought not to be considered typical just because we have more information on it than on any other city. Judging from Athenian accomplishments Athens is more likely to have been atypical. Although de Ste. Croix is certainly right in insisting that the ancient historian needs to examine his «concepts and categories»<sup>5</sup>, it is not necessary to import a foreign model in order to make sure that no unexamined ideology creeps in. The ancient evidence cannot support the weight of a model such as Padgug (or Marx) proposes — it is smothered beneath it — and in Padgug's article we hear much about the model and very little about antiquity. I propose to consider some class divisions of the fifth century Athenian citizen body in «the British and American empirical tradition»<sup>6</sup> by letting the ancient evidence speak for itself as much as possible.

---

\* This paper developed out of work which began during a graduate seminar the author attended at the University of Cincinnati under the direction of the late Professor Donald W. Bradeen in 1959–60. The author also wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the esteemed assistance recently given him in the final preparation of this paper by Professor Frank W. Walbank, Cambridge (England), whose comments, criticism and encouragement have been of great value.

1. Padgug, «Classes and Society in Classical Greece», *Arethusa* v. 8 (1975), p. 85.

2. I consider Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B. C.*, Oxford 1952, one of the worst offenders (in English) in this regard. For all his scepticism about early Athenian tradition, he is totally credulous as to the applicability of the terms proletariat, middle classes or bourgeoisie and nobility to Athenian society.

3. Padgug, *op. cit.*, pp. 86–91.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

5. «Karl Marx and the History of Classical Antiquity», *Arethusa* v. 8 (1975), p. 11f. It should be noted that de Ste. Croix does not argue for the adoption of Padgug's model, but rather for the more traditional «class struggle».

6. de Ste. Croix, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

First, however, a few words are necessary on the terms class, status, and order (or estate). The trouble with the word class is that while its basic meaning is «admirably vague»<sup>1</sup> it usually brings to mind the Marxist economic classes based on relation to the means of production<sup>2</sup>. Finley prefers to avoid the word class (except in the vague sense of 'upper-class' and 'lower class') and to speak instead of order and status, an order being «a juridically defined group within a population, possessing formalized privileges and disabilities in one or more fields of activity, governmental, military, legal, economic, religious, marital, and *standing in a hierarchical relation to other orders*»<sup>3</sup>, and a status an unofficial (non - juridically defined) group sharing common economic, social or political position. I accept the importance of this distinction and will follow Finley's usage in so far as the terms are used. I would also like to reintroduce 'class' — not in order to speak of de Ste. Croix's struggle between the «propertied and non-propertied» classes<sup>4</sup> but to denote social groups which are not hierarchical or vertical but rather horizontal. Status, as Finley says<sup>5</sup>, is a vague word but class (if the Marxist sense is avoided) is even more so. Finally, we should note that the most important class, status, and order of Athenian society was the 'Ἀθηναῖοι themselves»<sup>6</sup>; and despite the emphasis in the pages to follow on the divisions within the Athenian citizen body, the solidarity of οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι is itself an important piece of the background of Pericles' citizenship law of 451/0 B. C.

For purposes of distributing offices (ἀρχαί) the Athenians were divided into what can be called four orders the πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι, ἱππεῖς, ζευγῖται and θῆτες. These orders were called τέλη (or τιμήματα) and were based on a type of property rating, the exact nature of which is unfortunately unclear. According to Aristotle<sup>7</sup> membership of a τέλος (in the time of Solon) was determined by quantity of agricultural yield; the πεντακοσιομέδιμνος produced 500 medimnoi (or liquid measures) per year, the ἱππεὺς 300, the ζευγίτης 200 and the θῆς less than 200. This leaves many questions unanswered, most prominently :

1. This is Finley's description of the word status, *The Ancient Economy*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973, p. 51.

2. A good translation is von Fritz and Kapp's translation of *Ath. Pol.* 5.3: ἦν δ' ὁ Σόλων... τῇ δ' οὐσίᾳ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τῶν μέσων, as «Solon... by wealth and occupation... belonged to the middle class». This seems innocent enough but suggests the unjustified notion of «Solon the merchant».

3. *Op. cit.* p. 45.

4. One problem with de Ste Croix's argument is that he does not make clear just who should be considered «propertied». Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, 600—300 B. C., Oxford 1971, clearly thinks of the «propertied» as his «liturgical class», viz. those with estates worth four talents or more (xxiv). Whether or not de Ste. Croix accepts that definition, I do not see that «Greek democracy was essentially the political means by which the non-propertied protected themselves against oppression and exploitation by the richer landowners», (*op. cit.*, p. 29), is a universally true statement.

5. See note 1.

6. Cf. Finley, *op. cit.*, pp. 47—48. In Plato's *Laws* the groups or orders which receive different treatment under the law are the ἄστοί, ξένοι, μέτοικοι and δοῦλοι (see, e.g., the laws on homicide, 865—873).

7. *Ath. Pol.* 7.3.

What is the significance of the names? Are medimnoi of wheat and barley, measures of wine and oil, all considered as equal in value? And what of non-agricultural income?

Aristotle thought that the *τέλη* existed before Solon<sup>1</sup>, Plutarch attributed them to Solon<sup>2</sup>, while Plato simply links them with the *παλαιὰ πολιτεία*<sup>3</sup>. Perhaps it is possible to reconcile Aristotle and Plutarch by supposing that Solon set definite minimal qualifications and added the 500-bushel-men<sup>4</sup> to what were before three traditional orders, the horse owners<sup>5</sup>, the owners of a team of oxen<sup>6</sup> and those who owned neither (and who might hire themselves out as laborers either because they did not own land or because they did not own enough land to support their families). Further, Aristotle's account is most certainly a summary, and we might suppose that even from the time of Solon the system could take account both of the different values of wheat and barley, oil and wine, and of non-agricultural income. In the early sixth century, grain, oil and wine were 'common currency'; they were what most Athenians counted their wealth by and so formed the natural basis of Solon's system. It is usually assumed, however, that by the middle of the fifth century at the latest<sup>7</sup> the Solonian system

---

1. Ath. Pol. 7. 3.

2. Solon, 18. 1.

3. Laws 689 b.

4. Bushel is not an exact translation of medimnos: a medimnos was somewhat larger than a bushel, c. 50 as opposed to c. 35 litres. See Lang, *The Athenian Agora*, v. 10, p. 46.

5. Horses were a luxury and were used for racing, hunting, warfare or just pleasure. A man who owned a horse probably also owned oxen.

6. It has been maintained that the *ζευγῖται* were so called from their place in the ranks (*ζυγῶν*) of the hoplite phalanx (Adcock, *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957, p. 5) and that the *ἵππεῖς* were simply the cavalry. I think that the former is not a very likely explanation; one thing is that the word is *ζευγῖται*, not *ζυγῖται*; and it is the word *ζυγῶν*, not a word taken from the *ζευγ-* form that means 'rank'. On the other hand, the *τέλη* had their main purpose in determining eligibility for offices (cf. Ath. Pol. 7. 4, Plato, *Laws* 698 b, Isaeus 7. 39). As will be seen, the *θῆτες* were generally thought of in the latter part of the fifth century as the non-hoplite class, and *ἵππεῖς* is the word used for 'cavalry'. But no complete equation of *τέλη* with military classes seems to have been made. *Ζευγίτης* and *θής* are not military terms, and it is not clear whether or not all those who qualified for the *τέλος* of *ἵππευός* were also eligible for service in the cavalry. Unfortunately, Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 49) does not say specifically what size *οὐσία* qualified a man for the cavalry. The knights of Aristophanes' Knights are clearly members of the cavalry (see, e. g., 595 ff.), but are they also members of the *τέλος* of *ἵππεῖς*?

The *communis opinio* is also against Adcock's view. See Hignett, *op. cit.* p. 101, and the references given there.

7. Different dates have been proposed for the change from a criterion of annual yield to one of total property value. Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, München 1926, v. 2, p. 837, voted for the time of Cleisthenes, Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, v. II<sup>2</sup>, p. 89, for the era of the Persian wars and Hignett, *op. cit.* 143, for the mid-fifth century — and Pericles. As noted below, the whole discussion may be unnecessary.

(as reported by Aristotle) of determining membership by annual yield had been changed to one based on total property value (now definitely including non-landed property). This seems possible although there is actually no direct evidence for it<sup>1</sup>. The word *τίμημα*, which Plato uses for the 'ancestral' divisions of the citizen body<sup>2</sup>, does mean in the fourth century an assessment based on the total value of the estate<sup>3</sup>. But again, it is possible that agricultural yield was retained as the common denominator for comparing different sorts of property or income. The *τέλος* of the owner of a pottery workshop, for example, might have been determined by calculating how many bushels (or measures) an equivalently valued farm would produce or perhaps how many pots corresponded in value to a bushel of wheat.

Referring to a time when the *τέλη* were determined by total property, Jones has argued that 200 medimnoi were valued at 200 drachmas and then multiplied by 10 to get a value for the total *ξενγίται* census of 2,000 drachmas of 2 minae<sup>4</sup>. This value (if not the method by which it was produced) is generally accepted and may be correct, but it should be noted that the evidence behind it is minimal. The figure of 2 minae «is an inference from Diod. XVIII. 18. 4—5, on the assumption that Antipater set up a hoplite franchise»<sup>5</sup>. And that is about all. Thucydides<sup>6</sup> does say that each *κλήρος* on Lesbos brought the Athenian cleruch two minae annual rent, but this is a matter of annual income, not total property<sup>7</sup>. (On Jones' reckoning 200, not 2,000, drachmae per year would be the minimum income of *ξενγίται*). Should we suppose that the Lesbian cleruchs were instant *ξενγίται* (or *όπλίται*) from one year's income?

Whether or not Jones' argument is valid, we still need to ask: «How rich was a *πεντακοσιομέδιμνος*, how poor was a *θής* in terms of land?». No precise answers are possible; we have no official reports nor any reliable figures for the price of land in classical Athens<sup>8</sup>. All I will do here is say a few words on the

1. Isaeus 7.39, cited by Jones, *Athenian Democracy*, Oxford 1969, p. 142 n. 50, as evidence on this point is not — when read as de Ste. Croix thinks it should be, «Demosthenes' *τίμημα* and the Athenian *εισφορά* in the Fourth Century», C & M, v. 14 (1953), p. 44. Then *τίμημα* is referring to assessment for liturgy or *εισφορά* while *τελών* *επιπάδα* means enrollment in the Solonian class of *ίππεῖς*.

2. Laws 698 b.

3. See Demosthenes' speeches against his guardians (27—29) and de Ste. Croix, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 30.

4. Op. cit., p. 142, n. 50. Presumably the value of the property of *ίππεῖς* and *πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι* would be calculated in the same manner. Since Jones believes in fifth century inflation (e.g., p. 166) it is a little odd that he thinks the «Solonian scale of values» (p. 142, n. 50) was used in figuring the total property values.

5. Jones, op. cit., p. 142, n. 50. See below, pp. 232—234, for the equation of *όπλίται* and *ξενγίται*.

6. 3. 50. 2.

7. On the cleruchy of Lesbos see Vartsov, 'Αθηναϊκά Κληρουχία, 'Αθήναι 1972, pp. 128—37.

8. I follow de Ste. Croix in his scepticism on the value of land prices used by Jones, Jarde and others (see de Ste. Croix, «The Estate of Phaenippus», *Ancient Society and Institutions, Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg*, Oxford 1966, p. 114). Using one fourth century price, Jones calculates that 2 minae (his *τίμημα* for a *ξενγίτης*) would buy «perhaps a holding of 5 acres with house and stock», op. cit., p. 79. But that seems too small. Is it not likely that the price given by Lysias (19. 29. 42) is 'rhetorically' inflated?



scale of land-holding implied by the Solonian system<sup>1</sup>. First, it can be noted that the range between 200 and 500 bushels is not extreme, and we need not assume that the majority of *θῆτες* were at the lower end of the 199—000 bushel range<sup>2</sup>. The system was — to modern eyes — one of small gradations. Second, 200 medimnoi of grain is a considerable amount. At a maximum yield of 10 medimnoi per acre<sup>3</sup> this would mean a minimum plot of 20 acres (or to calculate in a different way, a subsistence diet for a family of five would have been about 30 medimnoi per year)<sup>4</sup>. On this same method of reckoning the *πενταχοσιομέδιμνος* would need about 50 acres planted with grain (each year — no fallow is counted in here). This at least seems to be the right order of magnitude since two of the largest Athenian estates we know of are each 300 plethra or about 70 acres (those of Alcibiades as reported by [Plato] Alcibiades 1. 123c and of Aristophanes as reported by Lysias 19.19). Alcibiades and Aristophanes probably had other sources of income in addition to their land, but the fact still stands that in classical Athens a farm of 70 acres was considered very large<sup>5</sup>.

1. Any attempt to calculate exact equivalencies in land for the Solonian *τέλη* is so riddled with problems and questions as to make the undertaking almost not worth the effort. Apart from ignorance about such crucial matters as fallowing customs or ratio of seed to yield, or whether the seed was included in the Solonian assessment, the apparent equating in value of dry and liquid measures (Ath. Pol. 7.3) suggests that not size but what was planted could have determined the status of an estate. Olive trees need more land to produce a measure of oil than wheat needs to produce a bushel of grain, while vines need less. The most usual situation may have been a mixture of agricultural products.

2. In 403 there were apparently some 5,000 landless Athenians (Dionysius, hypothesis to Lysias 34). As has been noted (e.g., by Jones, p. 80) these 5,000 are not necessarily co-terminous with the *θῆτες*. In fact, Lysias says they included «many» hoplites and knights (34.4).

3. This figure is given by French, «Solon's Hoplite Assessment», *Historia* v. 10 (1961) p. 511. De Sanctis, 'Αρχαία, Storia della Repubblica Ateniese delle Origini alla Eta di Pericle, Roma 1964, p. 299, gave a figure of c. 23 medimnoi per hectare or just under 10 medimnoi per acre. Similarly, Beloch, op. cit., p. 303, n. 2, put the Attic yield «in einem unfruchtbaren Lande... bei primitiven Wirtschaftsmethoden», at 12—14 hectoliters per hectare or again about 23 medimnoi per hectare.

4. Cf. Jones, op. cit., p. 78.

5. Despite the specific statements on circumference and yield, the size and value of Phaenippus' estate remains obscure; see de Ste. Croix, op. cit. (p. 229, n. 8), p. 109 ff. The speaker of [Demosthenes] 42 claims that the estate produces 1,000 medimnoi of wheat and 800 metretai of wine, but Phaenippus has sworn that the yield was not *τὸ δέκατον μέρος* of those figures (29.5). And while the speaker says that the estate measures forty stades in circumference, the actual area would depend on the contour (as de Ste. Croix points out, the speaker is trying to make the estate seem as large as possible). De Ste. Croix sets 100 acres as the minimum size of a piece of land enclosed by 40 stades; this is still «the largest single Athenian estate of which we have any details», (op. cit., p. 112), but it all need not have been suitable for agriculture. No doubt Phaenippus was one of the wealthier Athenians — he served in the cavalry (24) and might have had additional sources of income, such as his wood-carrying donkeys (30) — but the information given about his estate by [Demosthenes] 42 is of little help in estimating average Attic yield per acre.

The previous comments may seem an 'exercise in futility' but they at least suggest that a *θῆς* was not necessarily destitute nor landless, or even many times poorer than a *πεντακοσιομέδιμνος*<sup>1</sup>. (This is not to deny that great extremes in wealth may have existed — as between the poorest *θῆς* and the richest *πεντακοσιομέδιμνος*). The system did not address itself to extremes of wealth, but set three minimum yield requirements all suggesting moderate sized property holding.

We ought, therefore, to be wary of accepting Athenian talk of *πλούσιοι* and *πένητες* at face value<sup>2</sup> and especially of equating the *πένητες* with any one or two of the *τέλη*.

The difficulty in coming to any firm conclusions about the 'real' wealth of the members of the four *τέλη* is in large part due to the infrequency with which the *τέλη* are mentioned (in any context at all) in the literary and epigraphic sources of classical Athens<sup>3</sup>. This does not mean that the orders were obsolete throughout this period for they do seem to have been used officially, e.g., in determining who was eligible for the cleruchy at Brea<sup>4</sup> or who would be called up for service in the fleet in 427<sup>5</sup>. Although in Aristotle's day requirements that certain offices be held by members of certain *τέλη* were «on the books» but ignored<sup>6</sup>, we cannot assume that this was the case in the fifth century. As the two examples given above show, membership in one of the four *τέλη* was a matter of record; and Aristotle also notes<sup>7</sup> that in 458/7 the archonship was opened to the *ζευγῖται*, which certainly shows that the *τέλη* were important at that time<sup>8</sup>.

It is sometimes assumed<sup>9</sup> that inflation and general prosperity during the

---

1. It will seem odd, then, that all those beneath the 200 medimnoi level were called *θῆτες*, a term carrying the implication of hired labor. Possibly, since this *τέλος* was composed simply of 'all others', the name is not official in the same sense as are the names of the upper three *τέλη*. It could be a case of the lowest ranking members of a class giving the name to the whole. Or perhaps *θῆς* like *πένης* (see next note), carried the implication of actually having to work for oneself (as well as possibly for others) instead of enjoying the fruits (or bushels) of another's labor.

2. See also the comments of Finley, *op. cit.*, p. 41, on *πένης* and *πλούσιος*: «A plousios was a man who was rich enough to live properly on his income (as we should phrase it), a penēs was not. The latter need not be propertyless or even, in the full sense, poor: he could own a farm or slaves, and he could have a few hundred drachmas accumulated in a strong-box, but he was compelled to devote himself to gaining a livelihood».

3. For example, *πεντακοσιομέδιμνος* appears once in Thucydides (3.16) but not at all in Herodotus or the I. G. I<sup>2</sup> index or Aristophanes. *Ζευγίτης* appears once in the I. G. I<sup>2</sup> index (45.41–2) but not at all in Herodotus, Thucydides or Aristophanes. *Θῆς* is also rarely used, while *ἱππεύς* appears frequently — as a cavalry member.

4. I. G. I<sup>2</sup> 45, 40–42. On the settlement of Brea see Vartsos, *op. cit.*, pp. 98–104 and «The Foundation of Brea», *Ἀρχαία Μακεδονία II*, *Ἀνακοινώσεις κατὰ τὸ Δεύτερο Διεθνὲς Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη*, 19–24 Αὐγούστου 1973, *Θεσσαλονίκη* 1977, pp. 13–16.

5. Thucydides 3–16.

6. Ath. Pol. 7.4, 47.1.

7. Ath. Pol. 26.2: ... ἐκτὼ ἔτει μετὰ τὸν Ἐφιάλτου θάνατον...

8. Cf. also the Athenian dedication, Ath. Pol. 7.4, and p. 232, n. 2 below.

9. e.g., by Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 166 f.

course of the fifth century resulted in a mass movement upwards into higher *τέλη*<sup>1</sup>. If this were true the effect would perhaps have been to lessen the significance of the Solonian system. On the other hand, if more Athenians were becoming *ξενγῖται* (or *ἱππεῖς* or *πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι*) during the fifth century, we might expect to hear about it. Probably sometime during the fifth century Anthemion jumped two orders and set up a statue on the Acropolis with this inscription:

*Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίων τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς...  
θητικοῦ ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππᾶδ' ἀμειψάμενος*<sup>2</sup>.

It would be interesting to know if there were many others like him.

It seems, then, that a somewhat paradoxical situation existed in Athens; the official orders (*τέλη*), based on property, which determined the manner in which an Athenian participated in his city's government did not 'cut at the (social or political) joints' in the Athenian citizen body<sup>3</sup>. Political issues were not drawn on these lines; social status was not directly linked to *τέλος* membership. The Athenians saw other sorts of classes (or classifications) as more significant.

The military classes (or orders)<sup>4</sup> — based on type of participation in battle — were significant. A possible objection to the conclusion just drawn in the preceding paragraph is that the military classes were equated with the Solonian *τέλη*,

1. The idea that inflation caused this «upward mobility» involves some confused thinking. First, the Solonian value of one drachma per medimnos is assumed to be the standard on which the figures in produce were translated into drachmae. Then, since the prices at the end of the fifth century appear higher, inflation is assumed. And many more Athenians would have been able to qualify as *ξενγῖται*. But when did the supposed change-over to monetary values occur? If it was sometime in the fifth century it would have been odd to use a Solonian price as standard — if there had been inflation. Further, as suggested earlier, there is perhaps no reason to think that the agricultural basis for the assessment was ever eliminated. Adjustment could have been made for non-agricultural income while keeping the agricultural yield as the standard. Second, Jones claims that inflation will help explain the increase in the number of hoplites from 480 to 431. Granted that there was such an increase, can this have been due to inflation? An equation is made between hoplites and *ξενγῖται* and since membership in the *τέλος* of *ξενγῖτης* was 'cheaper' in 431 than in 480 there were more hoplites in 431 than 480. But service as a hoplite was based on *real* wealth, on the ability to provide a set of *δπλα*. If 50 medimnoi of a *θῆς* were in 430 valued at 200 drachmae, how would that enable him to own his own armor any more than in 480? Presumably the cost of armor would also have been inflated.

2. Ath. Pol. 7.4. Raubitschek, Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis, Cambridge: Archaeological Institute of America, 1949, p. 206, noted that if Aristotle saw this dedication it should be post-480 and suggested that this was Anthemion, father of Anytos, the late fifth century politician. Plato, *Meno* 90a, praises that Anthemion for the way he made his fortune through *σοφία*. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 40, says «attractive but not certain».

3. Here, I use the word 'seems' advisably, since it is clear that a marxist would have no difficulty with the notion that an institution can outlive the reality on which it was originally based. Moreover, it is possible that the division may still have *some* validity in terms of political alignment and social prestige.

4. See below, p. 234.

the *θῆτες* serving as light-armed soldiers or as rowers, the *ζευγῖται* as hoplites and the *ἵππεῖς* (and *πεντακοσιομέδιμοι*) in the cavalry. A reference to a military class, then, would essentially be a reference to a Solonian *τέλος*. This equation is in fact generally taken for granted<sup>1</sup> and is not without some ancient support. Harpocration (s. v. *θῆτες*) quotes Aristophanes and Antiphon to the effect that *θῆτες* were those who could not supply their own armor. Thucydides<sup>2</sup> on the manning of the Sicilian fleet, has been taken as support for this: ... *ὀπλίταις δὲ τοῖς ξύμπασιν ἑκατὸν καὶ πεντακισχίλοις (καὶ τούτων Ἀθηναίων μὲν αὐτῶν ἦσαν πεντακόσιοι μὲν καὶ χίλιοι ἐκ καταλόγου, ἑπτακόσιοι δὲ θῆτες ἐπιβάται τῶν νεῶν...* Aristotle<sup>3</sup> says that the *πολιτεία* of Dracon was given over to those who could bear arms. Since he speaks later<sup>4</sup> of the *πεντακοσιομέδιμοι ἵππεῖς* and *ζευγῖται* as members of the council of 400 and notes the new privileges given by Solon to the *θῆτες*<sup>5</sup>, we can assume that according to the tradition Aristotle followed the *θῆτες* were those who could not supply their own *ὄπλα*.

However, when we recognize that the «constitution of Dracon» is probably an invention of the late fifth century<sup>6</sup>, it is striking that all these statements go back to the same period — the last decades of the fifth century. Further, all references have to do with *θῆτες* as none-hoplites; the other *τέλη* are not mentioned. Thucydides<sup>7</sup> says that the Athenians manned a fleet (at the time of the Mytilenean revolt) with their own citizens, except for the *πεντακοσιομέδιμοι* and *ἵππεῖς*. As noted earlier, this shows that the *τέλη* were still 'operative' official orders; it does not show that the two upper *τέλη* were officially equated with the cavalry. It would appear that at the end of the fifth century the *θῆτες* and the non-hoplites were usually the same people and so the cavalry and hoplites were usually those of the *ζευγῖται* census and above. Nothing more than this can legitimately be concluded from the evidence available.

If we try to imagine how the system worked in practice, it appears even more unlikely that membership in a Solonian *τέλος* necessarily implied a certain type of military service. Service as a hoplite depended on having *ὄπλα*, but would this always depend on annual produce or value of total property? Although wealth, of course, was a limiting factor, we could imagine a *ζευγίτης* who was experienced as a hoplite continuing to serve as a hoplite even though he lost his property and became officially a *θῆς*. Or, was it likely that the son of a rich *πεντακοσιομέδιμος* would serve as a light-armed soldier because he had not yet come into his inheritance<sup>8</sup>? Or perhaps a *θῆς*, full of zeal and *φιλοτιμία*, would acquire *ὄπλα* and enroll himself in the *κατάλογος*. Would the Athenians have objected? The *κατάλογοι* were lists of men eligible to be called upon to serve as

1. e.g., by Jones, op. cit., Appendix, p. 161 ff, and French, op. cit., p. 512 ff.

2. 6. 43.

3. Ath. Pol. 4. 2.

4. 5. 1.

5. 7. 3. 9.

6. See Hignett, op. cit., p. 5, with references.

7. 3. 16.

8. The problem of the son who was not yet *κύριος τῶν ἑαυτοῦ* is a problem in any case. To what *τέλος* did he belong? French, op. cit., p. 512, also envisages this situation. His explanation is: «Solon's assessment was minimal, i.e., each zeugite's farm was expected to supply at least one hoplite».

hoplites<sup>1</sup> or cavalry<sup>2</sup>. It seems possible (although there is no proof) that as with liturgies enrollment was in the first instance voluntary. But if the rolls were not filled or if it were brought to the attention of a *καταλογεὺς* that a man who was able to serve had failed to enroll in the proper register, the *καταλογεὺς* would have done some drafting. In this context and in view of the evidence presented above, it is likely that thetic status (during the Peloponnesian War) legally excused a man from the duty of serving as a hoplite. Similarly, falling beneath some higher level would excuse a richer Athenian from service in the cavalry. Perhaps it was a 300-bushed farm (or the equivalent), perhaps not<sup>3</sup>.

The military classes, the cavalry, the hoplites, the light-armed (including archers) and the rowers, can be considered orders based on wealth — although a *θῆς* may not have been prevented from serving as a hoplite if he so desired. They were also status groups. The chorus of knights in Aristophanes' *Knights* are rich, long-haired and proud of their and their fathers' service in the cavalry. They might well have won admiration and esteem from others besides Aristophanes. But the wealthiest Athenians also could serve «in the ranks» as hoplites (e.g., Alcibiades at Potidaea<sup>4</sup>). While the horsemen were perhaps showier, the hoplites were considered the backbone of the city and the respect paid them was not diminished as Athens 'turned toward sea power'. Rather, they may have increased in stature as Athenian sea power grew, and they came to represent the ancestral virtues of steadfastness, courage and public service<sup>5</sup>. Athenian rowers were skilled<sup>6</sup> and Athenians were proud of their *τριήρεις αἱ καλαί*<sup>7</sup>, but rowing in a trireme did not command the social respect given to a hoplite or knight.

Neither the Solonian *τέλη* nor the military classes should, however, be taken as political interest groups whose conflict will elucidate Athenian politics. They determined the nature of a man's political and military participation but not necessarily his vote. A rower would not begrudge the hoplite or *ἵππεδς* his honor, if it were deserved, nor a *θῆς* the *πεντακοσιομέδιμνος* his office, if it were not abused.

In order to consider the political interest groups of Athens in the middle of the fifth century, attention should be turned first to the Athenian 'upper-class' whence political initiative generally came. (What Athenians do we know from the 'lower-class'? Cleon or Hyperbolus will not qualify<sup>8</sup>). The Athenian «upper-class» is another «admirably vague» term which is hard to pin down. Who were they? Neither *πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι* nor cavalry seems a sufficient description.

1. Thucydides 6.43; 8.24.2.

2. Ath. Pol. 49.2. These lists are distinct from the *ληξιαρχικά γραμμάτια* which were lists of all Athenians for general purposes of civic participation.

3. It also can be noted that the property requirement for a *στρατηγός* cited by Deinarchos (In Demosthenem 71) is not that of any Solonian *τέλος* but simply *ζῆν ἐντός ὄρων κεκτῆσθαι*.

4. Plato, *Symposium* 221a.

5. When the Athenians try to restore the 'ancestral constitution' they think in terms of turning things over to the hoplites. On the ideal of the «Marathon-fighter» in Aristophanes see Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes*, London 1974, p. 299 ff.

6. Thucydides, 1.142.

7. *Birds* 108.

8. Cf. Connor, *The New Politicians*, Princeton 1971, p. 158 f.

A common modern recourse is to the term 'nobility'. This term, however, is no improvement on 'upper class'; it serves no real function and is apt to be misleading.

Wilamowitz, while commonly using *Adel* in a loose sense, declared that there never was «ein rechtlich irgendwie abgesonderter Stand der Adligen» in Athens<sup>1</sup>. Essentially he was saying that no order of nobles had ever existed in Athens. A true nobility would be a hereditary and legally defined group with special rights and duties in various spheres of Athenian life. Wade-Gery took up the challenge of Wilamowitz' claim and by a careful reading of the fragments of the *Ath. Pol.* (plus Plutarch and Thucydides) attempted to show that until 580 or the creation of the *τέλη* such a nobility, with privilege in the areas of law, religion and office holding, did exist in Athens in the form of the «caste» of *Εὐπατρίδαι*<sup>2</sup>. Apart from the fact that «caste» is not an appropriate term for a class such as Wade-Gery describes<sup>3</sup>, there is some difficulty in seeing how Wade Gery's essentially pre-historic nobility (Theseus to Solon) operated in historical (post-Solon) Athens — or in accepting his (and Aristotle's) inferences about pre-historic events<sup>4</sup>. Still, there was a class of people called *Εὐπατρίδαι* in historical Athens, and I shall be concerned here with ascertaining what sort of a class they may have been then.

The most important pieces of evidence are the sixth century inscription from Eretria, *Χαιρίδων Ἀθηναῖος Εὐπατρίδων ἐνθάδε κεῖται*[ι]<sup>5</sup>: Pollux 8.111, *οἱ δὲ φυλοβασιλεῖς, ἐξ Εὐπατρίδων ὄντες* and (to a lesser extent) Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 13.2. Chairion seems to be the same man who, as treasurer of Athena, made a dedication on the Acropolis c. 550<sup>6</sup> and whose son, calling himself Alchimachos *ἔσθλο δὲ πατρός*<sup>7</sup> erected a statue on the Acropolis c. 525. This was a proud, prominent, and wealthy family<sup>8</sup>. Pollux' entry is of help in understanding the nature of their prominence. The *φυλοβασιλεῖς* are not, for us at least, well-known

1. Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen und Römer, Berlin 1910, p. 74.

2. «Eupatridai, Archons and Areopagos», *Essays in Greek History*, Oxford 1958, p. 86 ff.

3. See Finley, *op. cit.*, p. 185, n. 20, who comments that castes (on the most accepted definition — the essential features of a caste system would be «separation in matters of marriage and contact... division of labour... and finally hierarchy») «did not exist in the ancient world... when ancient historians write caste, they mean 'order'». Wade-Gery's Eupatridai are correctly called an order, or an estate, as he sometimes terms them (e.g., *op. cit.*, p. 92). I do not know what he intends with «Eupatrid race», p. 104; this is rather an unfortunate phrase, but I think he meant «of Eupatrid stock».

4. Sealey's comment: «Wade-Gery has shown that the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* believed that once upon a time in Athens a hereditary class, called eupatrids and recognized by law, could alone serve as archons... Whether the author was right about this is quite another question», «Regionalism in Archaic Athens», *Historia* v. 9 (1960). Appendix II, p. 187, puts the problem very well.

5. I. G. XII 9.296.

6. Raubitschek, *op. cit.*, p. 364, n. 330.

7. Raubitschek, *op. cit.*, p. 10, n. 6.

8. See Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 12—15 on this family. Only *πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι* were eligible for the office of treasurer of Athena, *Ath. Pol.* 47.1.



figures, but they would be the 'kings' of the four old (pre-Cleisthenic) Attic tribes. They judged homicide cases involving inanimate objects and animals<sup>1</sup> and also have a part in the cult regulations laid down in the surviving part of the late fifth century Athenian calendar<sup>2</sup>. There may have been other responsibilities of which we have no record. If these tribe kings were chosen exclusively from the group of families known as the *Εὔπατριδαι*, we can consider that group an official religious elite in historical Athens. Calling them an order or a nobility is, however, another matter. An order, as Finley notes, stands in relation to other orders. Further, it should be a recognized division of the population as a whole. Aristotle<sup>3</sup> reports that after the archonship of Damasias ten archons were chosen, five from the *Εὔπατριδαι*, three from the *ἀγροῖκοι* and two from the *δημιουργοί*. This might be sufficient for considering the *Εὔπατριδαι* (and *ἀγροῖκοι* and *δημιουργοί*) a legal order of the Athenian state — if it can be trusted. Wade-Gery was willing to believe the story with qualification, «These are of course not farmers and artisans (in the first quarter of the sixth century!) but wealthy Hippeis (or Pentakosiomedimnoi) admitted by Solon despite their non-noble estate»<sup>4</sup>. But why call them *δημιουργοί* and *ἀγροῖκοι* if they really were not? Ath. Pol. 13.2 is puzzling; is it an authentic piece of archon list tradition or is it a piece of theory similar in nature to Ath. Pol. fragment 3<sup>5</sup>? Unfortunately, there are no historical references to such orders of farmers and craftsmen in Athens to help solve the puzzle<sup>6</sup>.

Perhaps the main obstacle to considering the *Εὔπατριδαι* an order is the chance that they may have been a *γένος* or possibly a group of *γένη*. Davies<sup>7</sup> notes that the Athenian *Εὔπατριδαι* in Hellenistic times «tend to behave as a *genos* in the Delphic sources» and that they are «described as a *genos* consistently from

1. Ath. Pol. 57.4; cf. Plato, Laws, 873e.

2. Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées des Citées Grecques*, Supplément, Paris 1962, 10.38—39, 40, 45.46, 53.

3. 13.2.

4. Wade-Gery, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

5. This fragment describes the Athenian state as being composed of 30 *γένη*, 12 phratries and 4 tribes. Only the 4 tribes are historical; the others numbers are based on the model of the days of the month and months of the year. Similarly, in Ath. Pol. 13.2 only the *Εὔπατριδαι* are known to be historical.

6. Aristotle's *ἀγροῖκοι*, Plutarch's *γεωμόροι* (Theseus, 25.2) and various mentions of *γεωργοί* (e.g., Schol. Plat. Ax., p. 465 Bk., see Wade-Gery, *op. cit.*, p. 88) are all usually taken to refer to the same group of people. The later references are of no help in resolving the puzzle of this «order». Wüst, «Gedanken über die attischen Stände», *Historia* v. 8 (1959), pp. 1—11, has attempted to give these orders a place in historical Athens by suggesting that before Solon there were only two «Stände» with political rights, the Eupatridai (the Adel) and the *geomoroi* (the freie Bauern). The *δημιουργοί* (or craftsmen) were without political rights as were the *ἐκτήμοροι*. Then, when the *ἐκτήμοροι* were «freed», they, along with the craftsmen, were admitted to the tribes, given certain political rights and became the third «Stand». But in the accounts of Solon's reforms there is no mention of these orders. Were craftsmen so numerous in 6th century Athens as to give their name to the third order? The fact that the *τέλη* probably existed before Solon as traditional orders also makes Wüst's theory unlikely; the *τέλη* have a much greater claim to historicity.

7. *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

c. 180 B. C. . . . through the Roman period. . . till A. D. 200», but believes that this is a late development. [Plutarch] is speaking anachronistically when he terms Andocides *γένους εὐπατριδῶν*<sup>1</sup> and when Isocrates says that Alcibiades *πρὸς μὲν ἀνδρῶν ἦν Εὐπατριδῶν, ὧν τὴν εὐγένειαν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπωνυμίας ὀάδιον γινῶναι, πρὸς γυναικῶν δ' Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν*<sup>2</sup> he is referring to a «caste» not a *γένος*<sup>3</sup>. I am not convinced that this distinction is justified. There is not enough solid information on the *Εὐπατρίδαι* in archaic and classical times to show that they could not have been considered a *γένος*, an elite group of families with traditional responsibilities (particularly in relation to cult) in the four old Attic tribes. For purposes of fifth century Athenian politics I think they can be considered as the same sort of group as the *γένος* to which I now turn.

Wade-Gery's interpretation of the word *γένος* seems to be a contributing cause of his conclusions as to his Eudatrid «caste». In a foot-note<sup>4</sup> he comments «I am a little embarrassed by the fact that the Greek word *γένος* means both «caste» (e. g., Hdt. 2.164) and 'Body of Gennetai'». He ought to have been also a little embarrassed by the fact that *γένος* can mean much more than this. 'Body of gennetai' is a very restricted usage and 'caste' probably a non-existent one<sup>5</sup>. Instead of saying (as Wade-Gery does<sup>6</sup>) that «*γένος* is the natural Greek word for 'caste'» we should say that *γένος* is the natural Greek word for a natural—as opposed to artificial—group or kind of almost any sort. The most basic meaning is that of origin, descent, family or offspring<sup>7</sup>. But the Greek notion of natural and 'familial' relationship was not limited by strict ideas of «blood» or heredity. The Athenians as a whole could be called a *γένος*<sup>8</sup> as could the Chalcidians<sup>9</sup> or the Ionians<sup>10</sup> or Dorians<sup>11</sup>. The barbarians were a *γένος*<sup>12</sup> but could also be divided into *γένη* of Persians, Lydians, Medes or Thracians<sup>13</sup>. And within these there could be further *γένη*<sup>14</sup>. Then, *ἄνθρωποι* as a whole are a *γένος*<sup>15</sup> as were the gods<sup>16</sup>. Finally, some other possible *γένη* were women<sup>17</sup>, old

1. Lives of the Ten Orators, 834.

2. 16.25.

3. Davies, op. cit., p. 12.

4. Op. cit., p. 108, n. 1.

5. Herodotus 2.164 (the passage Wade-Gery relies on for the meaning of *γένος* as «caste») speaks of the seven *γένη* of Egypt—which turn out to be seven occupational groups such as priests, warriors or interpreters. The fact that these Egyptian groups might be similar to true castes does not mean that *γένος* had such a meaning for Greeks in general or for Herodotus (as his use of the word in other contexts shows).

6. Op. cit., p. 109, n. 1.

7. e.g., Aristophanes, Frogs 946, Birds, 1451 or Thucydides 2.80.1.

8. Aristophanes, Wasps, 1077, Birds, 1867, 1696.

9. Thucydides 4.61.

10. Herodotus 1.56.

11. Thucydides 1.24.

12. Birds, 1600.

13. e.g., Herodotus 1.6., Birds, 833, Thucydides 7.27.

14. Herodotus 1.101, 125 on the divisions within the Medes and Persians.

15. Plato, Rep. 5.473c, Symp. 189d; Aristoph. Birds, 699, 1239.

16. e.g., Aristophanes, Birds, 700, 702, Thesmophoriazousai, 312, 960.

17. Plato, Rep. 10.620a, Aristophanes, Lysistrata, 137.

men<sup>1</sup>, birds<sup>2</sup> and frogs<sup>3</sup>. All this citation is simply to show the flexibility of the word *γένος* and of the Greek notion of «natural» relationship which it implied.

In addition to these 'natural kinds' *γένος* in Athens could refer, as Wade-Gery claimed, to a 'body of gennetai', a group of families claiming a common (mythical) ancestor and sharing in the superintendence of a common cult<sup>4</sup>. One of the more famous, for example, was the *Εὐμολπίδαι* who claimed decent from Eumolpos and who provided the Eleusinian cult with its *ιεροφάντης*. It has been claimed that the members of the Athenian *γένη* as a whole formed the true ('rechtlich') Athenian nobility (or, in addition, that *Εὐπατρίδαι* and *γεννήται* are in fact equivalent)<sup>5</sup>. This idea depends to a large extent on what I consider a mistaken interpretation of Philochoros fragment 35a<sup>6</sup>. However, even without Philochoros 35a, it is clear that the *γεννήται* (like the *Εὐπατρίδαι*) were a privileged elite with special responsibilities in the area of cult. The one group, perhaps we could say, operated within the phratry, the other within the (old Attic) tribe. It is less clear that the *γεννήται* can with justification or profit be called an order or the Athenian nobility. The *γένη* were local groups with local cults, and while many of these cults were important for the city as a whole (e.g., the cults of Athena Polias and the Eleusinian goddesses) there is no evidence to suggest that *γεννήται* as a whole were considered a unified order. Membership in a particular *γένος* brought particular privilege, but it did not bring privilege in another *γένος* or in the institutions of the city as a whole. The last is, I think, a minimum condition for considering *γεννήται* the Athenian nobility. Nor does calling the Athenian *γεννήται* (or *Εὐπατρίδαι*) a 'nobility' serve any purpose in discussing historical and, especially, middle fifth century Athenian politics. For a

1. Aristophanes, Wasps, 223.

2. Aristophanes, Birds, 699, 1227.

3. Aristophanes, Frogs, 240.

4. See Wade-Gery, op. cit., pp. 86—87.

5. Nilsson, Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics, Lund 1951, Appendix II, considers the *γεννήται* as 'nobles' as does Hignett, op. cit., esp. pp. 61.67. Hignett follows Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums<sup>2</sup>, v. 3, Stuttgart 1937, p. 278ff., in identifying (contra Wade-Gery) *γεννήται* and *Εὐπατρίδαι*. Although he never specifically states a view, Connor, op. cit., seems to be of this persuasion. See his comments about Harmodius and Nicias on p. 161.

6. This is a law quoted by Philochorus, Jacoby, FGrHist., fr. 35a:

τοὺς δὲ φράτορας ἐπάναγκες δέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς  
ὀργεῶνας καὶ τοὺς ὁμογάλακτας, οὓς γεννήτας καλοῦμεν.

This is most commonly taken as guarantee of the right of 'commoners' (as opposed to 'nobles') to membership in the phratries (e.g., Guarducci, «L'istituzione della Fratria nella Grecia antica e nelle Colonie Greche d'Italia», Memorie della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Ser. VI, v. 6 (1937), p. 14f, Nilsson, op. cit., pp. 159—61, Hignett, op. cit., pp. 61f, 390f). Dracon's law on homicide shows that all Athenians were members of phratries in his time; the idea is that before Solon, aristocratic *γεννήται* could and did prevent 'commoners' from entering the phratry—and so from being citizens and Ἀθηναῖοι. Andrews, «Philochoros on Phratries», JHS v. 81 (1961), pp. 1—2 (on the difficulties of the usual interpretation), pp. 2—15 (on the possible new interpretation), has raised serious objections to this view; his thesis seems to be correct.

man's participation in Athenian politics and offices did not depend then on membership in a *γένος*. The whole force of Wade-Gery's argument (and to a lesser extent those about the *γένη*) is for the existence of a nobility which after 580 was politically obsolete. If there is need to speak of *γεννῆται* or *Εὐπατρίδαι* perhaps it will be best just to speak of *γεννῆται* and *Εὐπατρίδαι* — and leave 'nobility' aside.

Using 'nobility' in the sense of a status<sup>1</sup> (not an order), Ehrenberg chose to call the *καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ* (and *χρηστοί*, *πλούσιοι* etc.) the «nobles» as against the «commons», despite «the false and modern flavor in that antithesis»<sup>2</sup>. He is certainly correct to seize upon *καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ* as characteristic upper-class self-description<sup>3</sup>, but 'nobility' not only has a «false flavor» but seems generally inappropriate. If we are to speak of the nobles versus the commons, then the nobles must be a recognizable class — not only from their point of view but also from that of the non-noble. There ought to be a definition (I am not insisting on legal recognition here but simply clear social recognition as befits a status). But *καλοκαγαθία* does not provide such a definition. A large part of being *καλὸς κἀγαθός* was a matter of «life-style»<sup>4</sup>, of having the means (and desire) to spend time in the *γυμνάσια* in training horses or in 'politics'. The *καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ* were wealthy. On the other hand, there is a strong moral 'flavor' to *καλὸς κἀγαθός*; the *καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ* were the good and the worthy, not only the rich and the conspicuous. Use of the term implied approval. But whether one is a good or a bad noble ought not to affect membership in the nobility itself<sup>5</sup>; a bad *καλὸς κἀγαθός* however is not possible. Despite his wealth and, presumably, his life-style, Cleon was 'voted out' of the class by Aristophanes and Thucydides. A *καλὸς κἀγαθός*, in their opinion, was not violent, loud, and did not speak *περι-ζωσάμενος*<sup>6</sup>; similarly, the right of Alcibiades to be called *καλὸς κἀγαθός* would not have been unanimously granted by all Athenians (or by the same Athenian at different stages of Alcibiades' career) — although Alcibiades himself probably never doubted his title to the name. In sum, while those *καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ*

1. The «original» Roman nobility was a status (cf. Finley, *op. cit.*, pp. 46–47).

2. *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

3. For a good, brief discussion of this term, with references, see de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, Ithaca 1971, pp. 371–376. Also Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato*, Berkeley 1974, pp. 41–45.

4. Ehrenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 99, 107.

5. The 'Black Knights' of King Arthur's England would still have been considered part of nobility (such as it was in that society). Or, while there were senators of whom Cicero did not approve, he would not have questioned their status as nobles.

6. *Ath. Pol.* 28.3; cf. Thucydides 3.36.6. Aristophanes and Cleon had something of a running feud — the animosity is perhaps clearest in the Knights, *passim*. Connor considers Cleon's improper style only part of his rejection of the values of the *καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ* of «old politics» (*op. cit.*, pp. 87–136). More important, according to Connor, was his rejection of traditional *φιλία* relationships and espousal of *ἀδημο-φιλία*. However, Davies, *Hermes* v. 47 (1975), pp. 374–378, has pointed out that the 'old versus new politics' model is something of a simplification. The changes in fifth century Athenian politics were not so simple, not so complete, and Cleon's politics were not entirely new.

*δρομαζόμενοι*<sup>1</sup> were an important segment of the Athenian upper-class and an especially important part of the politically active upper class, it is misleading to call them the Athenian nobility. *Καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ* will do.

Perhaps the basic error or misconception behind attempts to speak of an Athenian nobility is the idea that the Athenian upper-class was a monolithic class, order and status group (to a certain extent this idea may result from the use of the word 'nobility'; terminology has a strange power; as Reverdin said in regard to 'party', «These words, which are inappropriate, turn out in effect to create that thing in the mind of those who employ them, and thus falsify their vision of historical reality»<sup>2</sup>). The Athenian upper-class is simply the wealthier or more powerful, as opposed to the poorer or less powerful, and it is not even clear just where we should draw the line between the two<sup>3</sup>. We should not suppose that the various Athenian elites considered in the preceding pages are necessarily all equivalent, i.e., that *γεννῆται* = *καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ* = *πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι* = cavalry, and = the politically active. Rather, these different segments (or classes) or different aspects of the Athenian upper-class most probably represent the stuff of which Athenian politics were made. Not every *«γεννήτης»* or *πεντακοσιομέδιμνος* or member of the cavalry would adopt the life style (or values) of the *καλὸς κἀγαθὸς* or take an active part in the running of the Athenian state<sup>4</sup>, but when an upper class Athenian did become a 'politician', his 'politics' would depend on the sort of upper class Athenian he was or on the nature of his «power base»<sup>5</sup>.

Finally, a comment on the Athenian upper class as the «liturgical class». In the introduction to his Athenian Propertied Families Davies argues that a «usable basic criterion does exist for defining membership of the Athenian upper class, and that this is the performance of public liturgies»<sup>6</sup>. With the prestige won by such services, rather than by any legal privilege, the «liturgical class» enjoyed

1. Thucydides 8.48.6. It is not entirely clear how successful these men were in getting other Athenians to recognize their special title to this name. In the fourth century Cleon's relatives would probably not have thought of him as anything but *καλὸς κἀγαθὸς* Mantitheos (Demosthenes 40.25) says that Cleon *μάλιστα πάντων ἐν τῇ πόλει εὐδοκίμησαι*.

2. «Remarques sur la Vie Politique d'Athènes au Ve siècle», *Museum Helveticum* 2 (1945), p. 201f, quoted (in the English given above) by Connor, op. cit., p. 7. Something similar, I think, has happened with the word 'race'.

3. For Davies' 'liturgical class' see below.

4. Cf. Connor, op. cit., p. 179f and n. 70 (with references) on the *ἀπράγμορες* in Athens in the later fifth century.

5. Davies, in his review of Connor's *New Politicians*, *Hermes* v. 47 (1975), pp. 374—378, speaks of late fifth century politics as «an uneasy competitive symbiosis of various power-bases, some (cult-linked *ἰθαγένεια*: athletic prowess) antique and crumbling, some (wealth: overseas clientela: military competence) well-established and taken for granted, others (display oratory) strident and ostentatious precisely because novel, tentative, and unincorporated» (p. 378). I think that similar competition of «power-bases» probably existed earlier in the century. Davies also notes (p. 376) the possibility that the role of the *γένη* was essentially passive. It should be recognized that some *γεννῆται* may have been more concerned with local than state business.

6. p.xx.

special political leverage. An estate of four talents, Davies suggests<sup>1</sup>, would definitely put an Athenian in this class<sup>2</sup>.

Although Davies' catalogue of liturgical families covers three centuries (600 - 300 B. C.) the overwhelming majority of them belong in the period 400—300<sup>3</sup>, and this is where the wealth and leverage of his class is best documented. The class as such is less evident in the fifth century, especially in the first three quarters of the century. This is due not so much to the admitted scarcity of information about prominent Athenians in the fifth century as compared with the fourth, as to the absence of the liturgical system as Davies describes it through much of the fifth century. The *εἰσφορά* was a product of the Peloponnesian War, and the *προεἰσφορά* only came in the fourth century. The history of the trierarchy is unclear before the era of the Peloponnesian War, when it is clearly a liturgy<sup>4</sup> and Paphlagon can threaten the Sausage Seller:

ἐγὼ σὲ ποιήσω τριηρ-  
αρχεῖν, ἀναλίσκοντα τῶν  
σαντοῦ, παλαιὰν ναῦν ἔχοντ'<sup>5</sup>, ...

But the mention of trierarchs in the «Decree of Themistocles»<sup>6</sup> suggests something quite different. There the trierarchs are actually in command of their ships as their title suggests they should be. Whether this is accepted as historical or not, it is hardly fourth century anachronism<sup>7</sup> and should urge caution in pushing the liturgy back too far into the fifth century. Perhaps it, like the *εἰσφορά*, was a product of the Peloponnesian War. The *χορηγία*, of course, goes back through the fifth century, but this alone does not seem enough to justify the term «liturgical class». Many of the public services of rich fifth-century Athenians were not formal liturgies but voluntary, one-time, gifts, such as Kimon's planting trees in the agora and Academy<sup>8</sup> or his financing of the foundations of the long walls<sup>9</sup> or (in an apparently longer-term gift) his opening up of his estate — and its produce — to his fellow demesmen<sup>10</sup>. Pericles and his sons helped finance the mid-fifth century Springhouse<sup>11</sup>, and the story was told that Pericles offered to pay for the Parthenon<sup>12</sup>.

Davies claims that «there came to be a rough equation in contemporary language between the people who performed liturgies and the people called *πλούσιοι*

1. p. xxiv.

2. This is for the fourth century. «The corresponding figures for the fifth century may well have been rather higher, but one cannot say by how much» (p. xxiv).

3. See the table on p. xxvii.

4. «Old Oligarch», 3.4.

5. Aristophanes, Knights, 912—14.

6. Meiggs and Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B. C., Oxford 1969, no. 23, lines 18—19, 27.

7. See Jameson, «The Provision for Mobilization in the Decree of Themistocles», Historia v. 12 (1963), p. 395.

8. Plutarch, Cimon 13.8.

9. Ibid. 13.7.

10. Ath. Pol. 27.3; Plutarch, Cimon 10.2.

11. I. G. I<sup>2</sup> 54. 13—16.

12. Plutarch, Pericles 25. 1—2.



or *εὐποροί*»<sup>1</sup>. The earliest of his examples is, however, again the «Old Oligarch» 1.13. It is clear that many rich Athenians of the fifth century would have taken advantage of the popularity which their wealth spent in public causes could bring them; it is less clear that they formed a class characterized by the regular performance of official liturgies. Therefore, despite its applicability to fourth century Athens, I do not think that the term «liturgical class» is an especially useful one for a discussion of Athenian politics and society in the mid-fifth century. Overall, perhaps the best course will be to use Athenian terms when possible (although as with *πλούσιος*/*πένης* or *καλοί*/*κακοί* they need not always be taken at face value) and attempt to understand the complexities of Athenian politics through the complexities of Athenian social terminology.

Just as the Athenian upper-class can be considered to have been composed of «criss crossing categories»<sup>2</sup>, so in the Athenian citizen population as a whole there were significant 'horizontal' classes and interest groups. I will conclude this section on social classes and social terms with a brief mention of two pairs of opposing 'horizontal' classes which are significant for Athens in the middle of the fifth century. Wealth was an all-pervasive factor in Athenian social and political life, but it was not always the most prominent or visible factor. Although Alcibiades wore purple robes<sup>3</sup> and the young knights wore their hair long<sup>4</sup>, Athenians in general dressed simply<sup>5</sup>. In this situation a *ζευγίτης* speaking in the assembly might not have been distinguishable from a *πεντακοσιομέδιμνος*, but a shepherd from Phyle would very likely appear (and sound) quite different from a potter from the Ceramicus, as would a 60-year-old from a 20-year-old.

The opposition (potential or actual) between the town (*ἄστυ*) of Athens and the rest of Attica is often noted in discussions of the Peloponnesian War and sometimes no doubt exaggerated (as, for example, by Larsen<sup>6</sup>, who says that the townsmen must have «carried the decree to abandon the countryside» at the outbreak of the war over the reluctance of the country people<sup>7</sup>). But Humphries goes too far in discounting the differences between town and country in Athens<sup>8</sup>. Granted that town and country in classical Athens were substantially more homogeneous than Hellenistic Alexandria and the surrounding Egyptian countryside, we still should not neglect what differences there were (a «continuum»<sup>9</sup> implies not uniformity but gradual change) between town and country in fifth century Athens. Humphries states that «there is little sign of a grouping of interests, of a conscious solidarity corresponding to the division of economic activity and manners» and further «the urban/rural boundary did not coincide with the oppo-

1. Athenian Propertied Families, 600—300 B. C., p. xx.

2. Finley, op. cit., p. 49.

3. Plutarch, Alcibiades, 16.1.

4. Aristophanes, Knights, 580, 1121.

5. Thucydides 1.6; «Old Oligarch» 1.10.

6. Representative Government in Greek and Roman History, Berkeley 1966, p. 3.

7. I doubt that the actual town-dwellers were numerous enough to do that. Thucydides does say that *οἱ πολλοί* of the Athenians were at that time still living in the country (2.14.2).

8. «Town and Country in Ancient Greece», Man, Settlement and Urbanism, Research Seminar in Archaeology and Related Subjects, London University 1972, pp. 763—768.

9. Ibid., p. 766.

sition between rich and poor . . . »<sup>1</sup>. The latter statement is, of course, true and is why I have called this a horizontal division. The point is that a class in Athens need not have been economic to have been significant. In regard to the former statement it can be said that there were no such «solidarity groups» as Humphries understands them in Athens at all—except for the citizens themselves. But while the «urban/rustic contrast» in Aristophanes is perhaps largely «cultural» rather than «political»<sup>2</sup> (e. g., the picture of the farmers, smelling of garlic, arriving for the assembly at the last moment in *Ekklesiazousai*, 290 ff.), cultural differences are important and often form the basis of political differences or differences of interest. Praxagora's comment :

*ναῦς δεῖ κατέλκειν τῷ πένητι μὲν δοκεῖ,  
τοῖς πλοσίοις δὲ καὶ γεωργοῖς οὐ δοκεῖ*<sup>3</sup>,

although fourth century and comic, is still revealing. Furthermore, the opposition town/country is not only relevant to the time of the Peloponnesian War. It must have become increasingly noticeable during the Pentecontaetia, when Athens grew into a cosmopolitan center and the Piraeus into a major port. The changes in intellectual, social and economic climate attendant on this development would have affected the town (and the Piraeus) more than the country<sup>4</sup>.

«When the rate of change is very great the grandson has to cope with an environment of which his grandfather had no experience at a comparable age, and nothing the old man can say seems relevant»<sup>5</sup>. Fifth century Athens underwent such a period of change: art, drama, education, warfare, public decision-making (and record-keeping) were all very different at the end of the century from what they were at the beginning. In the 420's (and perhaps earlier) Marathon and Salamis were already events in the «heroic» past. As Dover notes<sup>6</sup> this is the situation in which a «generation gap» is likely to be important. Indeed, the opposition old/young is prominent in Aristophanes<sup>7</sup>. The opposition is most evident in the sources and most discussed in relation to the generation of Alcibiades<sup>8</sup>, but we should not discount the possibility of its importance for the generation of Pericles. «What evidence there is suggests strongly that the 480's with young 'new politicians' moving into the vacuum left by the Alkmeonidai or the 450's with the young 'new politicians' moving into the vacuum

1. Ibid., pp. 765–766; n. 18, p. 768.

2. Ibid., n. 18, p. 768.

3. Aristophanes, *Ekklesiazousai*, 197–198.

4. Perhaps the key to understanding the charges of foreign birth made against many of the «new politicians» in the later fifth century lies not in their being «non-nobles» or «nouveaux riches» (which some at least were not), but in their living and doing business in the city where foreigners were plentiful and connections to paternal estates perhaps weakened.

5. Dover, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

6. Ibid.

7. e. g., in the *Clouds* and the *Wasp*. See also Eupolis, fr. 118, Thucydides 1.80.1., 6.13.1; Euripides, *Suppliants*, 232–237; Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, 1229–1235.

8. See, for example, Forrest, «An Athenian Generation Gap», *Yale Classical Studies*, v. 24 (1975), pp. 37–52.

left by Kimon and Ephialtes, were not essentially different [from the situation in the later part of the century]»<sup>1</sup>.

The preceding discussion has not been offered as a theory or model of Athenian society but simply as a description of some classes, vertical and horizontal, into which the *Ἀθηναῖοι* were divided and which are significant for a proper understanding both of politics in the mid-fifth century and, especially, of the citizenship law of 451/0. I have tended to emphasize the 'concepts and categories' which Athenians themselves employed; this seems to me one way to avoid the dangers of imposing inappropriate ideology on Athenian history.

## ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΙΣ

Ὁ συγγραφεὺς ἐξετάζει θέματα ἀναφερόμενα εἰς τὴν διαίρεσιν τῶν Ἀθηναίων πολιτῶν εἰς τάξεις, κυρίως κατὰ τὸν Ε' π. Χ. αἰῶνα, μὲ κριτήρια προερχόμενα «ἀπὸ τὴν βρετανικὴν καὶ ἀμερικανικὴν παράδοσιν ἐμπειρισμοῦ», δίδων τὸν λόγον, ὅσον αὐτὸ εἶναι δυνατόν, εἰς τὰς πηγάς.

Κατ' ἀρχάς, ἀσχολεῖται μὲ τοὺς ξενογλώσσους ὅρους class, status, order, estate, τοὺς χρησιμοποιουμένους σήμερον εἰς τὴν διεθνῇ βιβλιογραφίαν, διὰ νὰ ἀποδοθῇ τὸ νεοελληνικὸν «τάξις». Πρὸς τοῦτο, ἀναλύει τὸ περιεχόμενον ἑνὸς ἐκαστοῦ ὅρου καὶ παρατηρεῖ ὅτι εἰς τὴν ἀθηναϊκὴν κοινωνίαν ἡ σπουδαιότερας σημασίας «τάξις» ἦτο τὸ σύνολον τῶν Ἀθηναίων πολιτῶν, οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. Παρὰ τὸ γεγονὸς ὅτι μελετᾷ καὶ τονίζει, κυρίως, τὰς διαιρέσεις εἰς τάξεις τοῦ σώματος τῶν Ἀθηναίων πολιτῶν, τὸ συμπαγὲς τῆς ἐννοίας τοῦ ὅρου Ἀθηναῖοι εἶναι ἐκεῖνο τὸ ὁποῖον ἀποτελεῖ, οὕτως εἰπεῖν, τὴν ὑποδομὴν τοῦ περὶ γνησίων πολιτῶν νόμου τοῦ Περικλέους (451/0 π. Χ.).

---

1. Davies, *Hermes* v. 47 (1975), p. 378.

ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΜΟΡΦΟΙ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΕΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΝ ΜΥΘΟΛΟΓΙΑΝ  
ΚΑΙ ΣΥΓΚΡΙΣΙΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΖΩΟΜΟΡΦΟΥΣ ΑΝΑΤΟΛΙΚΩΝ ΛΑΩΝ

Ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸ πολὺ ἑνώρις προσεπάθησε νὰ ἐρμηνεύσῃ τὰ σχετικὰ μὲ τὴν δημιουργίαν τοῦ κόσμου. Εὐκόλως διὰ τῆς φαντασίας αὐτοῦ ἐπλασε τὰς κοσμογονικὰς ἐκεῖνας δυνάμεις, αἱ ὁποῖαι κατὰ τὴν πίστιν του ὑπῆρξαν οἱ δημιουργοὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος, καὶ ἀπὸ αὐτὰς ὕστερον τὰς πρώτας θεότητας. Παραλλήλως πραγματικά γεγονότα μὲ τὴν πάροδον τοῦ χρόνου ἀπέκτησαν μίαν διαφορετικὴν ὑπόστασιν διὰ τοὺς μεταγενεστέρους, οἱ ὅποιοι συμπληροῦντες καὶ ἀλλοιοῦντες ἐνέτασσον αὐτὰ εἰς ἕναν κόσμον κείμενον πέρα τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ὁρίων· εἰς τὸν χῶρον τοῦ φανταστικοῦ, μυστηριώδους καὶ γοητευτικοῦ, εἰς τὸν χῶρον τοῦ μύθου.

Κοσμογονία - θεογονία καὶ μυθολογία ἀπετέλεσαν τὸ πιστεύω, τὸ δόγμα τῶν ἀρχαίων λαῶν, τὸ ὁποῖον βαθμιαίως συνεπληροῦτο ἀπὸ τὴν παραλλήλως καὶ ἀναλογικῶς πρὸς αὐτὸ λειτουργοῦσαν λατρείαν.

Ἡ ἑκτασις καὶ τὸ πολυπρόσωπον μιᾶς τοιαύτης μυθικῆς παραδόσεως ἀποτελεῖ συνάρτησιν τῆς ψυχοσυνθέσεως, τῆς ιδιοσυγκρασίας καὶ τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ ἐκάστου λαοῦ. Εἰδικῶς περὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς μυθολογικῆς παραδόσεως δὲν χρειάζεται νὰ τονίσωμεν ἰδιαίτέρως τὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τὴν ἱστορικὴν βάσιν αὐτῆς. Εἶναι γνωστὰ καὶ ἔχουν κατ' ἐπανάληψιν τονισθῇ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐρευνητῶν<sup>1</sup>.

Ἐνταῦθα ἀπὸ τὸν μεγάλον ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐλληνικῶν μυθολογικῶν μορφῶν θὰ διαχωρίσωμεν καὶ θὰ ἀσχοληθῶμεν μὲ ὠρισμένας, αἱ ὁποῖαι λόγῳ τῆς μορφῆς, τῶν ιδιοτήτων καὶ τῆς θέσεως, τὴν ὁποῖαν κατέχουν, δὲν ἀνήκουν οὔτε εἰς τὸ πάνθεον οὔτε εἰς τὸν κόσμον τῶν ἡρώων. Ὁ Πλάτων ἤδη προβαίνει εἰς τὴν διάκρισιν, ὅτε λέγει ὅτι μῦθος εἶναι διήγησις «περὶ θεῶν . . . καὶ περὶ δαιμόνων τε καὶ ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀΐδου»<sup>2</sup>. Πρόκειται διὰ τὰς δαιμονικὰς ἐκεῖνας μορφάς, αἱ ὁποῖαι ἐμφανίζονται παραλλήλως μὲ τὰς καθαρῶς ἀνθρωπομόρφους ἑλληνικὰς θεότητας μὲ χαρακτηριστικὰ συγχρόνως καὶ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ ζωώδη. Αἱ δαιμονικαὶ αὗται μορφαὶ δὲν εἶναι θεοί, ἀλλὰ οὔτε καὶ ἄνθρωποι· ἔχουν δύναμιν θεϊκὴν, ζοῦν μακρὰν τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τόπους συνήθως ὄχι γεωγραφικῶς ὠρισμένους· εἶναι κατὰ μέγα μέρος μορφαὶ θνηταί, αἱ ὁποῖαι, κατὰ τὸν μῦθον πάντοτε, ἐφρονεῦθησαν ἀπὸ κάποιον ἥρωα.

Τέτοιου εἴδους δαιμονικαὶ μορφαὶ ἐμφανίζονται εἰς ὅλους σχεδὸν τοὺς ἀρχαίους λαούς. Τὸ δαιμονικόν, τὸ ὑπεράνθρωπον, τὸ ἀνίκητον ἀπὸ τὸν κοινὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι κάτι, τὸ ὁποῖον προσελκύει, γοητεύει, μαγεύει τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἰδίως τὸν πρωτόγονον. Ὅμως οἱ ἑλληνικοὶ δαίμονες διαφέρουν πάντων τῶν ἀντιστοίχων τῶν ἀνατολικῶν λαῶν καὶ ἰδίως τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν ἕνεκα τοῦ ἐντόνου ἀνθρωπίνου χαρακτῆρος αὐτῶν καὶ ἕνεκα τοῦ ὅτι ἐκεῖνοι μὲν εἶναι θεοί, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἶναι συνήθως θνητοί, ἀπόγονοι θεῶν.

1. M. P. Nilsson, *Greek popular religion*, N. Y. 1940 (Μετάφρ. ὑπὸ Ἰ. Θ. Κακριδῆ, Ἑλληνικὴ λαϊκὴ θρησκεία, Ἀθήνα 1953)· P. Grimal, *Dictionnaire de la Mythologie grecque et romaine*, Paris 1951· H. Hunger, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Wien 1953<sup>3</sup>· H. J. Rose, *A handbook of Greek Mythology*, London 1953<sup>5</sup>· K. Kerényi, *Die Mythologie der Griechen*, Zürich 1964<sup>3</sup>, κ. ἀ.

2. Πλάτ. Πολιτεία 392 α.