

WHO WERE THE FIVE THOUSAND?*

By Miriam Valdés Guía

Summary: This paper focuses on who the “Five Thousand” might have been in the oligarchic revolution of the Four Hundred in 411 BC and in the political regime of the Five Thousand four months later. In both cases, the “Five Thousand” were nominal groups. During the despotic rule of the Four Hundred, it seems that they never existed at all and that the figure corresponded to those “most able to serve the state in person and in purse” ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.5; Thuc. 8.65.3). Namely, those paying the *eisphora* who, during the first part of the Peloponnesian War, might have numbered c. 5000. During the Archidamian War, this internal tax was first exacted in 428 BC, as was perhaps also the case of the Sicilian Expedition. In the *politeia* of the Five Thousand, this figure referred to those who “*ta hopla parechomenoi*” (in [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 33 and Thuc. 8.97.1), whose composition and number can be surmised, to some extent, from the spurious “Draconian constitution” emanating from the reflection on the *patrios politeia* at the time (which included the revision of the laws of Cleisthenes: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.3).

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to address two main questions in relation to the Five Thousand. On the one hand, an attempt is made to understand why this number was chosen in the oligarchic revolution of 411 BC, which began in the spring with the establishment of the rule of the Four Hundred. On the other, there is the issue of who formed part of the government of the Five Thousand from September 411 to the restoration of democracy in 410, especially when viewed in the light of the spurious “Draconian constitution.” The intention is not to deal systematically with all the aspects and interpretations of the oligarchic coup of 411, but simply to offer a few brief insights into this group of the “Five Thousand” from the perspective of their social classification. Judging by the available sources, the group of the Five Thousand seems to have been a nominal group

* This research has been aided by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, Project PID2020-112790GB-I00.

never formally constituted as such, neither in the coup of the Four Hundred in the spring of 411 nor in the subsequent “government of the Five Thousand,” established in September of the same year.

Accordingly, it is contended here that this specific number was chosen in Athens during the oligarchic coup because of its emblematic connotations in that it was equivalent to the number of those who habitually paid the *eisphora* in the early stages of the Peloponnesian War (the Archidamian War) and, perhaps, during the Sicilian Expedition. These original Five Thousand (an approximate and variable number, in any case) were, therefore, those who contributed to the *polis* not only with their military service (as hoplites or horsemen) but also with their own money in the *eisphora* levy, as established during the Archidamian War (431-421 BC). In order to support this hypothesis, it is necessary to focus on similar extraordinary levies in times of war, first documented in Athens in 428.

In the second section, it is held that this emblematic number was used to designate the “government of the Five Thousand.” An attempt is also made to inquire, on the basis of a contextualised re-reading of the spurious Draconian constitution, into the social composition of the citizenry at these moments (at least at the beginning of this period) when there was a pressing need for troops and when the fleet of Samos, mostly manned by *thetes*, was away from Athens. There are indications that allow the assumption of a rather broad social base (even open to the *thetes* or, at least, to the well-off among them) in this brief and poorly documented period of the rule of “the Five Thousand.”

1. The “Five Thousand” in the regime of the Four Hundred

According to Thucydides, in the spring of 411¹ the oligarchic rule of the Four Hundred was established at the instigation of Peisandros, who had

1 All dates are BC unless otherwise stated. According to the *Athenaion Politeia*, the effective government of the Four Hundred, after the preliminaries, started on the 22nd of the month of Targelion: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 32.1. Thucydides states that the Four Hundred were elected at an assembly in Colonus: Thuc. 8.67. For the oligarchic coup of

previously pointed out to the assembly the possibility of obtaining financing from the king, provided that the regime was transformed into an oligarchy and that Alcibiades was brought back from exile (Thuc. 8.53.3). On returning from Samos, Peisandros and his companions discovered that their associates (Melobios, Pythodoros and Kleitophon, according to Aristotle)² had already laid the groundwork for the establishment of the oligarchy in the city (Thuc. 8.65.1-2). At that time (spring 411), it was decided to withhold public pay, except for those participating in military campaigns (Thuc. 8.65.3), including the salaries of the archons and *prytaneis* ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.5), and, in the words of Thucydides (8.65.3), “[...] and that not more than five thousand should share in the government, and those such as were most able to serve the state in person and *in purse*” (οὔτε μεθεκτέον τῶν πραγμάτων πλέοσιν ἢ πεντακισχιλίοις, καὶ τούτοις οἱ ἄν μάλιστα τοῖς τε χρήμασι καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ὠφελεῖν οἰοί τε ὤσιν). Aristotle has much the same to say about the Five Thousand ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.5): “[...] and that all the rest of the functions of government should be entrusted to those Athenians who in person and *property* were most capable of serving the state, not less than five thousand” (τὴν δ’ ἄλλην πολιτείαν ἐπιτρέψαι πᾶσαν Ἀθηναίων τοῖς

411, see Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 165-256 (with other sources and a discussion on that date); Kagan 2012 [1987]: 131-86 (with bibliography); David 1996; Heftner 2001: 1-108; Taylor 2002 (who argues that there were many more people in favour of the conspirators and change than Thucydides leads us to believe); Sancho 2004; Hornblower 2008: 938-64; Shear 2011: 19-69 (with chronological tables of the events described by Thucydides and Aristotle, which underscore the contradictions between the two narratives); Tuci 2013 who analyses the manipulation of the will of the people (as well as discussing Taylor’s thesis on p. 87); David 2014 (also criticising Taylor’s thesis on pp. 18 and 22). See also Bearzot 2013; Sancho 2016; Nývlt 2017; Battistin Sebastiani 2018a (who draws parallels between Thucydides and Xenophon and the coups of 411 and 404, respectively); Wolpert 2017: 183-87 (who also highlights the discrepancies between Aristotle’s and Thucydides’ accounts). All these authors include a previous discussion and bibliography.

- 2 [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.1-3. In addition to Peisandros, Thucydides mentions the leading roles of Antiphon, Phrynichos and Theramenes: Thuc. 8.68 (see also [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 32.2). With respect to the seizure of power by the Four Hundred, see also Thuc. 8.69-70 (see the commentary of Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 178-82, plus that of Hornblower 2008: 953-64); [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 32.3. For a comprehensive study of the preliminaries of the coup: Tuci 2013: 13-111.

δυνατωτάτοις καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν καὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν λητουργεῖν, μὴ ἔλαττον ἢ πεντακισχίλιος).³ According to this author, 10 men aged over 40 (the *katalogeis*) were to be chosen from each tribe to draw up the list of the Five Thousand ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.5).⁴ One of their number was Polystratos (in *Lys.* 20), who expressed his intention of enrolling 9,000, instead of 5,000 (*Lys.* 20.31), which shows that the drawing up of this list posed difficulties and would not be successfully completed.⁵ In an earlier passage, in relation to the intentions of Peisandros and his companions on Samos, Thucydides (8.63.4) insists on this same idea of a contribution in cash and in kind: “Meanwhile to sustain the war, and to contribute without stint money and all else that might be required from their own private estates, as they would henceforth labour for themselves alone” (καὶ τὰ τοῦ πολέμου ἅμα ἀντέχειν καὶ ἐσφέρειν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων οἴκων προθύμως χρήματα καὶ ἦν

- 3 For all the translations of Thucydides: J. M. Dent. For all the translations of the *Athenaion Politeia*: H. Rackham. Emphases added.
- 4 For 10 *syngrapheis* in *Thuc.* 8.67.1; 30 in [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.2-3 and 30 (*syngrapheis* for making proposals and legislating); Rhodes 1981: 372-74; Hornblower 2008: 948-49; Bearzot 2013: 80-81, 89-90. See the detailed analysis of Tuci 2013: 27-28, 115-26, 130-38, with a discussion and different theories. See also Sancho 2016: 19-20; Fantasia 2018 (who lends more credibility to Aristotle than to Thucydides in this regard); Wolpert 2017: 184. But there is a contradiction in the *Athenaion Politeia* itself, which in 30.1 mentions 100 *anagrapheis* already chosen by the Five Thousand to draft a pair of constitutions, one for the future and one for the present, the latter being that of the Four Hundred (*Ath. Pol.* 31); Rhodes 1981: 386-87. As regards this contradiction: Sancho 2004: 84. On the contradictions between Thucydides’ and Aristotle’s versions (see the table in Rhodes 1981: 364-65; Shear 2011: 25, 32, tables 1 and 2), lending greater credibility to Thucydides’ account: Sancho 2004: 84 (the Five Thousand never met [see *infra* notes 36 and 37] and the list was never completed); Shear 2011: 19-69; Tuci 2013: 127-138. But see Nývlt 2017.
- 5 Rhodes 1981: 384-85; Sancho 2004: 84. This information from Lysias implies that it is necessary to consider not only the “nominal” character of the Five Thousand but also the existence of possible disputes and differences of opinion on who should form part of the *politeia* in the oligarchic constitution at the time, either a more restricted group (only the wealthiest, namely, the usual *eisphora*-payers) or a broader one of hoplites, such as those who would usually be recruited *ek katalogou* (see notes 69 and 71). These disagreements among oligarchs as to the constitution of the *politeia* are clearly seen later on between Theramenes and Kritias in relation to the number of citizens (*Xen. Hell.* 2.3.15). For the number according to oligarchic propaganda: Brock 1989.

τι ἄλλο δέη, ὡς οὐκέτι ἄλλοις ἢ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ταλαιπωροῦντας).⁶ Undoubtedly, in the eyes of the members of the oligarchy self-benefit was tantamount to refusing to subsidise democracy (the *demos*) any longer. There is a probable reference to the bankrolling of the *polis* by the wealthy in a passage from Aristophanes in which Cleon (Paphlagon) notes that he has extorted and pressured people (the rich of Athens and Allies?) to fill the treasury of the *polis* and so please the *demos*:

καὶ πῶς ἂν ἐμοῦ μᾶλλον σε φιλῶν ὦ Δῆμε γένοιτο πολίτης;
ὅς πρῶτα μὲν ἠνίκ' ἐβούλευον σοὶ χρήματα πλεῖστ' ἀπέδειξα
ἐν τῷ κοινῷ, τοὺς μὲν στρεβλῶν τοὺς δ' ἄγχων τοὺς δὲ μεταιτῶν,
οὐ φροντίζων τῶν ἰδιωτῶν οὐδενός, εἰ σοὶ χαριοίμην.

Is it possible, Demos, to love you more than I do? And firstly, as long as you have governed with my consent, *have I not filled your treasury*, putting pressure on some, torturing others or begging of them, indifferent to the opinion of *private individuals*, and solely anxious to please you?⁷

All these testimonies emphasising the cash contributions (τοῖς χρήμασιν) of the Five Thousand destined to be chosen give reason to believe that this group had made some such contribution to the *polis*.⁸ The number 5000⁹ is too high to correspond to the liturgical class,¹⁰ but not so to those

6 Also, in Thuc. 48.1. See Raaflaub 2006: 215; Simonton 2017: 45-46.

7 Ar. Eq. 773-76. Tr. E. O'Neill Jr. Emphasis added.

8 The reference to their 'serving in person' (τοῖς σώμασιν), in addition to their riches, may refer to the fact that these 'Five Thousand' would have also been included on the hoplite and/or knight muster rolls. This does not mean that they were *the only ones* who were recruited from the rolls (*pace van Wees* 2006, 2018; see Valdés & Gallego 2010; Valdés 2022a), but that they were the only ones who, besides 'serving in person', also made a cash contribution, as will be seen below, to the city out of their own pocket during the war (through the *eisphorai*).

9 For another theory on this number, derived from an ancient law of 487 on the *klerosis ek prokriton*, see Marcaccini 2013.

10 Approximately 1,200, plus 300, of the wealthiest citizens in the 4th century and between 1,500 and 1,600 at the end of the century: see Gallego 2016: 61, fig. 3. For the group of 1,200, see also Poll. 8.100; Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 45 (Harp. s.v. χίλιοι διακόσιοι). Regarding the group of 300: Dem. 42.25; 18.103; Aeschin. 3.222; Isae. 6.60;

who contributed to the war effort with the *eisphora*, the extraordinary wartime tax, first levied (πρῶτον: Thuc. 3.19.1) in Athens in 428, no doubt at the behest of radical democrats such as Cleon.¹¹ During the Archidamian War, this demagogue apparently proposed its introduction to the assembly in 428, when the population had already fallen considerably due to plague.¹² The *eisphora* would have been exacted from individuals with

Hyp. fr. 160; Dem. 18.171; 42.5; 50.9; schol. Dem. 2.192. See Davies 1981: 15–24, 26–28. For further information on the liturgical class, see Davies (1971: xx–xxiv), who established the threshold at 3 talents (also Hansen 1991: 113). For other scholars, however, the minimum requirement would have been between 1 and 2 talents: Gabrielsen 1994: 45–47, 52–53; Rhodes 1982; Kron 2011: 129–31. The minimum net worth for belonging to the liturgical class in the 5th century possibly differed from that in the 4th century (due to price rises). This liturgical class represented c. 5 per cent of an estimated population of 30,000 (Hansen 1991: 91–93; Gallego 2016) in the 4th century (Hansen 1985; 1988a; 1988b; 1991. 92–93; 2006; Kron 2011: 130). It is possible that in the Pentecontaetia the percentage would have been similar, but, given the population growth during that period (c. 60,000: Hansen 1985; 1988a: 14–28; Akrigg 2019: 143), the number of wealthy citizens was higher than in the 4th century. In any case, at the time (411) the population of Athens must have been around 30,000 citizens, according to Hansen’s calculations (1988a: 27, with table; c. 25,000 citizens according to Akrigg 2019: 142), a figure very similar to that estimated for the 4th century, before Antipater: see Gallego 2016: 61, fig. 3 (sectors 1, 2 and 3 amount to about 3,000). For the population during the Archidamian War, after the outbreak of the plague, see note 13.

11 The possibility of an earlier *eisphora* outside Athens among the cleruchs of Histiaia (*IG I² 42*, 21–24) and in the “decree of Callias” (*IG I³ 52 B*; *GHI 144B*: c. 433), which Mattingly (1968: 452) and others establishes in 422 (see note 31). For other interpretations of the term ‘πρῶτον’: Blamire 2001: 110 with n. 75. See Fawcett 2016: 155–57 (with further bibliography). On the levying of the *eisphora* at the time: Thomsen 1964: 14–15; Meritt 1982; Kallet–Marx 1989. Christ 2007: 54 believes that before 378 all *eisphora*-payers contributed the same amount of money and, therefore, not according to their wealth (*timema*), but if the text of Pollux 8.130 – see note 43 – is referring to the levying of the *eisphorai* before 378, as seems likely, the contribution was apparently made differently according to the rank of wealth. After 378, those liable to the *eisphora* paid a percentage (usually 1% but not excluding higher or lower rates) of their net worth: Ste. Croix 1953: 34–36, 47–53; Brun 1983: 61–62; Poddighe 2010: 108; Migeotte 2014: 521. Valdés 2014; 2018.

12 The responsibility of Cleon as a member of Council: Ar. *Eq.* 773–75; 923–26. Mattingly 1968: 452. See previous note.

assets exceeding an established threshold, a burden that might well have fallen at the time on some 5,000 individuals.’

Based on Hansen’s estimates of the population during the war, following the outbreak of plague, there would have been about 45,000 inhabitants, before falling (after the second outbreak) to about 39,500 in 426,¹³ which means that the wealthiest 5,000 citizens would have accounted for around 10 or, at best, 15 per cent of the total. All of which implies that this group was larger than the first two census classes – which would not have represented more than 5 per cent of the citizenry.¹⁴ In fact, it was a somewhat broader group than the liturgical census class that seems to have been liable to the *eisphora* in the 4th century.¹⁵ During the Archidamian War that number (5,000) would have been smaller than the hoplite

13 Establishing the population of Athens at c. 45,815 in 428, a figure that dropped to around 40,000 after the second outbreak of plague (426): Hansen 1988a: 27. For considerations on the population of Athens in the 5th century, without discarding Hansen’s numbers for the period: Akrigg 2019: esp. 143 and 160-68.

14 See note 10.

15 The number of *eisphora*-payers is a mystery, as is whether or not there were any variations in this number at any time (e.g. since 378); nor is it known with certainty the threshold above which citizens were liable to the tax. Thomsen (1964: 163) postulates a very high number of *eisphora*-payers, about 22,000 in 428. According to Ste. Croix (1953: 32), however, there was a large number of citizens who were exempt from payment of the tax, while assuming that the minimum net worth for being liable to taxation would have been, at least as of 378, 2,500 drachmae. See also Jones 1957: 23-38, esp. 29; Brun 1983: 19-21 who posits 2,500 drachmae in 428, around 2,000 drachmae after 378, and between 6,000 and 9,000 taxpayers. A minimum of 2,500 drachmae would have resulted in a total of 6,000 taxpayers (60 for every 100 symmories) in 378. However, Hansen 1991: 112-14 identifies the trierarchic symmories with the *eisphora* symmories (following Ruschenbush 1978; Mossé 1979; MacDowell 1986), assuming the same number of taxpayers (1,200) in both cases. These taxpayers would have therefore corresponded to the liturgical class. In this line, see also Poddighe 2002: 129. But making the case for two different systems of the symmories, one for the *eisphora* (100, according to Cleidemus *FGrHist* 323 F 8) and other for the triarchies (20): Jones 1957: 28; Rhodes 1982; Gabrielsen 1994: 183-94. It is likely that between 428 and 378 the *eisphora*-payers accounted for no more than between 10 and 15 per cent of the population (a percentage that may have increased since 378: Valdés 2018). They were the *plousioi* and *georgoi* in Aristophanes: *Ar. Eccl.* 197-98. In the Oxyrhynchus papyri: οἱ μὲν ἐπικτεῖς καὶ τὰς οὐσίας ἔχοντες in *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*: P.Oxy. 842, A 6.2 (A Col. I, lin. 19 Grenfell & Hunt 1908: 145).

class as a whole, which was usually identified with the *zeugitai* during the 5th century, a theory that has since been debunked by van Wees on the basis of Aristotelian measurements, although counter-arguments continue to fuel the debate.¹⁶ If the Five Thousand had all belonged to the *zeugitai* census class or higher, before the end of the 5th century, as van Wees seems to suggest (the “leisure class hoplites,” in his view),¹⁷ then it is likely that the sources (either Thucydides or Aristotle) would have pointed this out (i.e. that the Five Thousand were composed of the first three census classes), for during the Archidamian War the census classes still seem to have played an active role in military life.¹⁸ Nothing is known about which estates were subject to the *eisphora* as of 428, but if the suggestion that the Five Thousand correlated to the number of citizens paying this tax during the Archidamian War is accepted, they must have been among the wealthiest *zeugitai*¹⁹ (plus the first two classes), not

16 In the traditional view (Hansen 1991: 30; Ste. Croix 2004: 48-49), in the 5th century the *zeugitai* census class would have correspond to that of the hoplites, to wit, those with assets with a value equivalent to more than approximately 4 hectares. H. van Wees questions the generally accepted views on the *zeugitai* and a landholding requirement as high as 8.7 hectares, subsequently increased to a minimum of 13.8 hectares, by applying the measures stipulated in the *Athenaion Politeia* ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.3-4): van Wees 2001; 2006; 2018: 27 (13.8 hectares or 7,590 drachmae, including fallow). But see a different opinion: Rhodes 2006: 253; Valdés & Gallego 2010; Mavrogordatos 2011: 12-15; Valdés 2022a. Concerning the census classes, see also Rosivach 2002.

17 Around 10-15% of the population: see van Wees in previous note.

18 In the emergency of 428, metics and citizens of all census classes, except for the first two, were drafted into the navy: Thuc. 3.16.1. *Thetes* as *epibatai* in Sicily (415): Thuc. 6.43.1. See Valdés 2022a and 2022b.

19 See note 15. For the socio-economic status of those fighting as hoplites in classical times, including those owning between 4 and 5 hectares (or more) or their equivalent in movable assets: Valdés 2022a: 62. With respect to the large number of middling farmers (with landholdings of between 40 and 60 *plethra* – 3.6 and 5.4 ha) in classical times: Andreyev 1974: 14-16; Burford 1993: 67-72; Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 78-79; Jameson 1994: 59; van Wees 2001: 51, with n. 41; Halstead 2014: 61; Gallego 2016.

exceeding 10-15% of the population²⁰ corresponding to a group somewhat larger than the small liturgical class.²¹

It cannot be ruled out that the number of those liable to the *eisphora* was established at 5,000 (perhaps in 428) for a time, albeit with the possibility of revising this figure,²² nor that ad hoc lists were drawn up each time the tax was levied (establishing a threshold) using the lists of the demes (as in the case of conscription) during the Archidamian War.²³ Be that as it may, this figure, which might have been higher or lower depending on the vicissitudes of war or the death rate, would vary only slightly during this period (Archidamian War), being more or less stable between 428 and 422.²⁴

The sources for this period point to the possibility that there might have been more than one *eisphora* (to be approved by the assembly) before the Peace of Nicias. Firstly, the one introduced in 428/7 “for the first time” (πρῶτον), as Thucydides notes (Thuc. 3.19.1), which is the only one

20 See note 13.

21 As regards the liturgical class, see note 10. A few years ago, together with J. Gallego (Valdés & Gallego 2010), I briefly pointed out that the number of the Five Thousand derived from those paying the *eisphora*. This theory is also taken up by Simonton 2017: 46. For the number of hoplites (*zeugitai*) in the 5th century: Valdés 2022a. For a table of land wealth distribution of the citizen population at the end of the 4th century: Gallego 2016 (with further bibliography).

22 Namely, the group of the 300 was established for a time, susceptible to being revised, in the 4th century, evidenced by the fact that Demosthenes was *hegemon* for 10 years (Dem. 21.157). In a fragment of Hyperides (Hyp. fr. 154 Blass, in Suda, s.v. Ἀνασυντάξας and Harp. s.v. Διάγραμμα), the *diagrapheus* (for this figure: Mossé 1979: 40) is attributed a re-evaluation of the *timemata* recorded in the symmories, which could be carried out every three or four years: Wallace 1989: 489-90. Something similar might have happened with the designation of these Five Thousand liable to the *eisphora*.

23 In the 4th century there was a magistrate, the *epigraphicus*, in charge of the *eisphora*, who established (based on the information provided by the demes) the amount due: Isoc. 17.41. Harp. s.v. Ἐπιγραφέας (who are also mentioned in a lost speech of Lysias ‘Περὶ τῆς εἰσφορᾶς’). Hyp. fr. 152 Blass; Suda, s.v. Διάγραμμα, s.v. Ἐπιγραφεῖς; Lexica Segueriana s.v., Διάγραμμα, Διαγραφεὺς τί ἐστὶ. See Thomsen 1964: 187. For the role of the demarch in determining the value of landholdings, together with the *epigraphicus* or *diagraphicus*: Poddighe 2010: 108. For the *eisphora*, see note 11.

24 As to the population figures during the Archidamian War, see Hansen 1988a: 27; Akrigg 2019: 143.

directly documented. As a member of the Council, Cleon undoubtedly played a prominent role in this levy, as a passage from Aristophanes' *The Knights* (424) confirms.²⁵ This comedy refers to the burden on the rich (*plousioi*) posed by the *eisphora* in those years, possibly pointing to other exactions. Furthermore, Aristophanes alludes to the existence of a "list of the rich" (Eq. 923-26). In the play, Cleon (Paphlagon) states the following:

δώσεις ἔμοι καλήν δίκην
 ἰπούμενος ταῖς ἐσφοραῖς.
 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐς τοὺς πλουσίους
 σπεύσω σ' ὅπως ἂν ἐγγραφής.

I will punish your self-importance; I will crush you with imposts; I will have you inscribed on the list of the rich.

The poet Eupolis also mentions the *eisphora* (423),²⁶ whereas in *The Wasps* (422), Aristophanes compares (*Vesp.* 31-45) Cleon to a "whale swallowing everything" (φάλαινα πανδοκεύτρια), which for Xanthias signified that Cleon wished to cut up (δυστάναί) the Athenian people and despoil them of their fat. In Mattingly's view, this refers to the *eisphora* levied on the wealthy classes, for later in the play the dicasts claim that they are the only ones spared from Cleon's depredations (*Vesp.* 596).²⁷

Xenophon also seems to be referring to the *eisphora* in those years when observing, in the words of Charmides, "I was for ever being ordered by the government to undergo some expenditure or other" (καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ προσετάρτετο μὲν αἰεὶ τί μοι δαπανᾶν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως).²⁸ This idea of being required by the *polis* to make cash contributions is emphasised in another passage from the same work:

25 See notes 7 and 12 and text supra.

26 Eupolis fr. 300 K-A: ἔπειθ' ὁ κουρεύς τὰς μαχαιρίδας λαβὼν ὑπὸ τῆς ὑπῆνης κατακερεῖ τὴν εἰσφορὰν (the barber will take his *machairides* and [holding them] beneath his beard will crop short his contribution): Tr. S. Douglas Olson. Mattingly 1968: 452.

27 For φάλαινα πανδοκεύτρια, see Sommerstein 1983: 154-55: "omnivorous" or literally "a taker-in of all," generally referred to women innkeepers who had "the reputation of being evil-tempered and foul-tongued." See Mattingly 1968: 452.

28 Xen. *Symp.* 4.30. Mattingly 1968: 453.

τά τε ἄλλα ζηλῶ σε τοῦ πλούτου καὶ ὅτι οὔτε ἡ πόλις σοι ἐπιτάττουσα ὡς δούλῳ χρῆται οὔτε οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἂν μὴ δανείσης, ὀργίζονται.

Among the numerous reasons I find for congratulating you on your wealth, one is that the government does not lay its commands on you and treat you as a slave, another is that people do not feel resentful at your not making them a loan.²⁹

In the run-up to the revolution of 411, it was precisely the Athenian oligarchs at Samos, Peisandros' companions, who boasted, as already seen above, that they would stop making these contributions for the benefit of the people en masse (the *demos*) and start making them for that of the oligarchs themselves (Thuc. 8.63.4). Although it is impossible to say how many taxes were levied during this period of the Archidamian War, there might have been more than one, which would not have been incompatible with the simultaneous increase in financial pressure on the Allies.³⁰ In the decree of Callias, traditionally dated 434 – although Mattingly and others date it later to 422 – it is stated that a vote of immunity (*adeia*) was required for a citizen to propose a levy of *eisphora*.³¹ Internal taxation (*eisphora*) would be suspended with the Peace of Nicias and would not be resumed until the Sicilian Expedition.³² Although the decree of this expedition does not clarify whether or not an *eisphora* was levied, in all likelihood it was, at least in 413. By the time of the Sicilian Expedition (415), the population of Athens would have recovered considerably³³ and, therefore, before its disastrous defeat in 413, the number of taxpayers would have been similar to that during the Archidamian War. In view of the passage from *Lysistrata* (411), which states that the fund “of the

29 Xen. *Symp.* 4.45. Tr. O. J. Todd.

30 Thuc. 3.19.1. Kallet-Marx 1993: 136-37; Blamire 2001: 110-11. See *GHI* 152 (*IG* I³ 68) and 153 (*IG* I³ 71).

31 *IG* I³ 52 B lin. 17 and 19 (*GHI* 144B: see commentary on p. 257). Dated to 422: Mattingly 1968: 453; Kallet-Marx 1993: 134-36; Blamire 2001: 103-5. For a discussion on the date, see Flament 2018.

32 Thomsen 1964: 174-75; Brun 1983: 25; Blamire 2001; Mattingly 1968: 453-54. Decree: *IG* I³ 93 *GHI* 171, fragment c.

33 Hansen 1988a: 27 (around 40,000 citizens).

grandfathers” had been spent, but no extraordinary contribution (*eisphora*) had been made, it is unlikely – *pace* Brun – that there was a levy of *eisphora* in 412.³⁴ In any case, the tax would be suspended during the oligarchic coup and would not be resumed until after the restoration of democracy (410), at which point it seems that two were levied in the final years of the conflict, specifically, during the Decelean War.³⁵

Thus, the controversial Five Thousand of the oligarchic revolution would have been no more than the usual number of individuals paying the *eisphora* from the beginning of the war (during the Archidamian War and perhaps in the case of the Sicilian Expedition), maybe introduced for a fixed period, which could be revised and vary and, therefore, was approximate. From this perspective, the need to “draw up” a list of the Five Thousand makes sense, as does assuming that it was not a group per se whose members could meet immediately, but one that had to be constituted ad hoc by “drawing up a list.” Moreover, it is likely, as several authors have argued, that the group’s members did not actually meet at all during the four months that the rule of the Four Hundred lasted, as Thucydides points out: “Indeed this was why the Four Hundred neither wished the Five Thousand to exist, nor to have it known that they did not exist” (οἱ τετρακόσιοι διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἤθελον τοὺς πεντακισχιλίους οὔτε εἶναι οὔτε μὴ ὄντας δήλους εἶναι) (Thuc. 8.92.11).³⁶ Aristotle does, how-

34 Brun 1983: 25. But see Ar. *Lys.* 651-55: ‘For I (women’s chorus) make contributions to the state—I give birth to men. You miserable old farts, you contribute nothing! That pile of cash which we collected from the Persian Wars you squandered. You don’t pay any taxes (*eisphorai*)’ (τοῦράνου γάρ μοι μέτεστι: καὶ γὰρ ἄνδρας ἐσφέρω, τοῖς δὲ δυστήνοισι γέρουσιν οὐ μέτεσθ’ ὑμῖν, ἐπεὶ τὸν ἔρανον τὸν λεγόμενον παππῶν ἐκ τῶν Μηδικῶν εἶτ’ ἀναλώσαντες οὐκ ἀντεσφέρετε τὰς ἐσφοράς) (tr. I. Johnston). By this time, the reserve of 1000 talents deposited on the Acropolis at the beginning of the war had been spent: Thuc. 8.15.

35 Two or three *eisphorai*: Thomsen 1964: 175-77. Two *eisphorai*: Blamire 2001: 118 (*Lys.* 21.3).

36 See *infra* in text with note 85. Thucydides claims that the election of the Five Thousand ‘was a mere catchword (εὐπρεπές) for the multitude, as the authors of the revolution were really to govern’ (Thuc. 66.1); in 67.3 it is said that the Four Hundred could summon the Five Thousand whenever they wanted to, but not that they actually did so: ‘The way thus cleared, it was now plainly declared, that all tenure of office and receipt of pay under the existing institutions were at an end, and that five men

ever, consider such an encounter in several passages, although he contradicts himself because he also denies that they met.³⁷ So, perhaps, Thucydides should be given the benefit of the doubt in this respect.

On the other hand, it is also understandable that the *katalogeis* were given the job of drawing up the list (following a similar procedure as in the case of that of the *eisphora*),³⁸ together with other officials tasked with devising the best constitution, in accordance with the *patrios politeia*.³⁹ But, given the population decline as a result of the debacle in Sicily, the number of those who were liable to pay the *eisphora* (which

must be elected as presidents, who should in their turn elect one hundred, and each of the hundred three apiece; and that this body thus made up to four hundred should enter the council chamber with full powers and govern as they judged best, and should convene the five thousand whenever they pleased.' Thuc. 8.89.2-3: '[They] urged that the Five Thousand must be shown to exist not merely in name but in reality, and the constitution placed upon a fairer basis. But this was merely their political cry'. See also: Thuc. 8.92.11 and Thuc. 8.93.2.

37 [Aristotle] (*Ath. Pol.* 30.1; 31.2 and 32.1) apparently assumes that they met. In 32.3, however, he argues that the Five Thousand were only nominally elected, thus corroborating Thucydides' version. See Andrewes in Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 168-69, 254-56; Rhodes 1981: 364, 377-87; Munn 2000: 146 ('publication of this list, on the other hand, was repeatedly deferred, and never actually achieved'). Sancho 2004: 84; Raaflaub 2006: 215; Hornblower 2008: 949-53; Tuci 2013: 129-30, 161; Bearzot 2013. Nevertheless, Nývlt 2017 (with a previous discussion and bibliography) points out that the Five Thousand were in fact chosen after the establishment of the Four Hundred, but without any practical consequences. See note 39.

38 On the role of the *epigraphes* or *diagrapheus* in drawing up the list of contributors in the 4th century, see note 23.

39 See note 4. Much doubt has been cast on the historicity of these texts (the constitutions for the future – [*Ath. Pol.*] 30 – and for the present – [*Ath. Pol.*] 31 – alike), suspecting that they formed part of propaganda pamphlets elaborated in the milieu of the conspirators, without official approval: see Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 242-46; Sordi 1981: 3-12 (Thucydides' account is more credible, according to this author); Rhodes 1981: 386-89 (with a previous discussion); Munn 2000: 136-38; Osborne 2010: 276-77; Shear 2011, 20-21, 33-35 (tables 3 and 4), 41, 47-49; Bearzot 2013: 69-70; Tuci 2014: 174-79. Regarding the *patrios politeia*, see: Fuks 1953: 1-32; Cecchin 1969: 3-4, 26-51; Heftner 2001: 130-41; Shear 2011: 41-53. As to the interpretation of the account of the Four Hundred in the *Athenaion Politeia* as a 'significant source for documenting in detail the main strategy of revolutionary propaganda: the promotion of oligarchy as a different form of democracy': David 2014.

was never levied during the rule of the oligarchs) might have dropped.⁴⁰ It did not, however, prevent the use of this “traditional” and emblematic number (the “Five Thousand”), especially considering that it probably was not only a “nominal” figure, but also “real” (i.e. those who had made a financial contribution to the war in the recent past) and representative of a group of “rich” people (the *plousioi*). Nevertheless, it was impossible to know immediately and accurately the number and names of those who had a certain amount of wealth, without first drawing up a list. The Five Thousand were those who, as Aristotle and Thucydides observe, simultaneously made two contributions to the *polis*: in purse (the *eisphora*) and in person in war (in their status as hoplites or horsemen).⁴¹ It was precisely this reality of those liable to the *eisphora* together with the financial straits of the period, that could have led to a hypothetical modification of the monetary requirements of the third census class, the *zeugitai*, at the end of the 5th century, adjusting it to this new reality of “*eisphora*-payers” on the occasion of the revision of Solon’s laws (from 410 to 399, probably adjusted around 403). Henceforth, the *eisphora*-payers (a slightly larger group than the smaller liturgical class) would coincide with the *zeugitai* who had been redefined as those producing 200 measures (according to Aristotle).⁴² Moreover, as several authors accept,

40 See n. 10. Against this backdrop, the number of people able to contribute to the *eisphora* would have been closer to 3,000 than to 5,000, which in fact coincides with the number of eligible citizens in the oligarchy of the Thirty Tyrants. In fact, 3,000 is 10% of 30,000 and 12% of the likely 25,000 citizens at the end of the war.

41 Those of a lower socio-economic status who fought as hoplites but did not pay the *eisphora* would not have counted in the oligarchic revolution of the Four Hundred. See note 8.

42 *Zeugitai*: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4. Also in Pollux 8.130 (see following note). Another tradition refers to 500, 300 and 150 (instead of 200) measures (Lysias, fr. 207 Sauppe = Harp. s. v. Πεντακοσιομέδιμνον; Posidippus, fr. 38 Kassel-Austin = Harp. s. v. Θῆτες καὶ θητικόν; [Dem.] 43.54. Solon’s law on *epikleroi*: Diod. Sic. 12.18.3), possibly as a consequence of having adjusted the census classes to tax needs at some point after the Peloponnesian War, but before the *eisphora* was restructured in 378: see note 43. For the Aristotelian census classes with a discussion and bibliography, see note 16. For the hypothesis of this adjustment of the census classes at the end of the 5th century with the revision of the ‘laws of Solon’: Valdés & Gallego 2010. For this revision of the laws between 410 and 399, see: Rhodes 1991; Todd 1995; Volonaki 2001; Shear 2011: chapters 3 and 8; Carawan 2013: 233-50.

the census classes might have been used from then on (403?) until the reform of 378 for levying the *eisphora* (possibly a progressive tax, depending on the census class), as a passage from Pollux seems to indicate.⁴³

During the rule of the Four Hundred, the figure of the Five Thousand was nominal not only because it was an approximate, rather than an exact, one (although it might have been accurately established by drawing up a list, as in fact was the never achieved aim),⁴⁴ but also because the alleged “Five Thousand” were never convened during that period. This figure, which originated at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War in connection with the *eisphora*, would have become a symbolic number, corresponding to those rich people eligible for citizenship in the oligarchic ideology.

The time has now come to ponder on how this concept evolved during the regime of the Five Thousand, a time when, in my opinion, it would still have been a “nominal” figure, but one that encompassed a broader collective in a less oligarchic government than that of the Four Hundred.

43 Poll. 8.129-130: Τιμήματα δ' ἦν τέτταρα, πεντακοσιομεδίμων ἰππέων ζευγῖτων θητῶν. οἱ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πεντακόσια μέτρα ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρὰ ποιεῖν κληθέντες ἀνήλισκον δ' εἰς τὸ δημόσιον τάλαντον· οἱ δὲ τὴν ἰπάδα τελοῦντες ἐκ μὲν τοῦ δύνασθαι τρέφειν ἵππους κεκληῖσθαι δοκοῦσιν, ἐποιοῦν δὲ μέτρα τριακόσια, ἀνήλισκον δὲ ἡμιτάλαντον. οἱ δὲ τὸ ζευγῖσιον τελοῦντες ἀπὸ διακοσίων μέτρων κατελέγοντο, ἀνήλισκον δὲ μνᾶς δέκα· οἱ δὲ τὸ θητικὸν οὐδεμίαν ἀρχὴν ἤρχον, οὐδὲ ἀνήλισκον 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 *hippas* 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 *zeugision* were registered starting from two hundred measures, and contributed ten minas. Those of the *thetikon* did not hold any office and did not contribute anything” (my own translation). Pollux possibly used the same source as Aristotle (an early-4th-century Attidographer): Thomsen 1964: 150. For the use of census classes for *eisphora* before 378: Thomsen 1964: 104-18; Poddighe 2002: 123-25; Valdés & Gallego 2010: 271-72; Valdés 2018; Cataudella 2021. For the reform of 378: Philoch. *FGrHist* F 41; Polyb. 2.62.6-7. Ste. Croix 1953: 56; Brun 1983: 28-33; Christ 2007: 63-67. Census classes are no longer used: Brun 1983: 28-30; Thomsen 1964: 194-249; Cataudella 2021: chapter 3.

44 See notes 36, 37 and 40.

2. The “Five Thousand” in the government of the Five Thousand

According to Aristotle, the transition to the purported rule of the Five Thousand got underway about four months after the establishment of the Four Hundred in the wake of the rebellion of Euboea ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 33.1-2):

κατέλυσαν τοὺς τετρακοσίους, καὶ τὰ πράγματα παρέδωκαν τοῖς πεντακισχιλίοις τοῖς ἐκτῶν ὄπλων, ψηφισάμενοι μηδεμίαν ἀρχὴν εἶναι μισθοφόρον. αἰτιώτατοι δ' ἐγένοντο τῆς καταλύσεως Ἀριστοκράτης καὶ Θηραμένης, οὐ συναρεσκόμενοι τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν τετρακοσίων γιγνομένοις. ἅπαντα γὰρ δι' αὐτῶν ἔπραττον, οὐδὲν ἐπαναφέροντες τοῖς πεντακισχιλίοις. δοκοῦσι δὲ καλῶς πολιτευθῆναι κατὰ τούτους τοὺς καιροὺς, πολέμου τε καθεστῶτος καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὄπλων τῆς πολιτείας οὔσης.

They dissolved the Four Hundred and handed over affairs to the Five Thousand that were on the armed roll, having passed by vote a resolution that no office should receive pay. The persons chiefly responsible for the dissolution were Aristocrates and Theramenes, who disapproved of the proceedings of the Four Hundred; for they did everything on their own responsibility and referred nothing to the Five Thousand. But Athens seems to have been well governed during this critical period, although a war was going on and *the government was confined to the armed roll*.⁴⁵

Thucydides (8.97.1),⁴⁶ on the other hand, indicates that an assembly met at the Pnyx (the first since the establishment of the rule of the Four Hundred) which dismissed the Four Hundred. The historian notes that the assembly “deposed the Four Hundred and voted to hand over the government to the Five Thousand, *of which body all who furnished a suit of armour were to be members*” (καὶ τοὺς τετρακοσίους καταπαύσαντες τοῖς

45 Own emphasis. See Rhodes 1981: 410-12. For a detailed account of the events: Kagan 2012 [1987]: esp. 201; Munn 2000: 146-49.

46 See Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 323-25; Hornblower 2008: 1032.

πεντακισχιλίους ἐψηφίσαντο τὰ πράγματα παραδοῦναι (εἶναι δὲ αὐτῶν ὅποσοι καὶ ὄπλα παρέχονται).

In this case, the common denominator in both Aristotle and Thucydides⁴⁷ is that the Five Thousand did not serve the state in purse or in person, as seen in the previous section, but were citizens of hoplite status or those who possessed “a suit of armour.” This assertion is now examined in light of the spurious Draconian constitution and the war context at the time, after first offering a brief overview of the main theories about the government of the Five Thousand.

There are several controversies surrounding the nature of this regime of the Five Thousand. While some scholars, such as Ste. Croix, contended that it was a return to democracy with restrictions,⁴⁸ others, including Rhodes, held that it was a government of the “moderate oligarchs,” in which the *thetes* did not participate.⁴⁹ Harris, for his part, recognised in the alleged constitution “for the future,” appearing in the *Athenaion Politeia* (*Ath. Pol.* 30), an image of the regime of the Five Thousand that is now being established, a theory that had been previously postulated by Ferguson and Vlastos and refuted by Hignett.⁵⁰ An additional problem is

47 Own emphasis. Perhaps also in Diodorus (*Diod. Sic.* 13.38.1), if one accepts amending ἐκ τῶν πολιτῶν by ἐκ τῶν ὀπλιτῶν as proposed by Krueger (see Kagan 2012 [1987]: 203, with n. 46).

48 Ste. Croix 1956. See also Sealey 1967: 11–32; Sealey 1975; Gallucci 1986 and 1999; this author even denies the existence of the hoplite constitutional project, positing that democracy was established immediately after the rule of the Four Hundred. However, this hypothesis overlooks the important accounts of Thucydides and Aristotle cited above (notes 45 and 46). See Sancho 2004; Marcaccini 2013: 406 and n. 4, 420–24 (with further bibliography); David 2014: 16.

49 Rhodes 1972. Criticism of Ste. Croix also in Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 323–28. See also Kagan 2012 [1987]: 203–205; Munn 2000: 148–49. For this discussion, see Hornblower 2008: 1034–36 (with further bibliography).

50 Ferguson 1926; Vlastos 1952. In this vein, more recently: Harris 1990. But see criticism in Hignett 1952: 375–78; Ste. Croix 1956: 14–20; David 1996; 2014. Osborne (2003: 259) believes that it is implausible ‘that either constitution is what it is claimed to be’, even if ‘they must surely have come in some way out of the events of 411’; this author emphasises that the constitution outlined in Chapter 30 was ‘the result of serious thought and indeed serious research’, which shows that ‘there were Athenians in 411 who were looking for a viable alternative to the existing democratic constitution’ (2003: 260–61). As regards these constitutions, see note 39.

that the sources hardly mention, except tangentially and in passing, the restoration of democracy in 410.⁵¹ Rhodes debunked Ste. Croix's theory that the *thetes* participated in the regime of the Five Thousand and were only deprived of the right to hold office, with the argument that a democracy in which the *thetes* could not hold office had been precisely the state of affairs in the democratic regime prior to the oligarchic coup. However, it is worth noting the possibility that in the 5th century a "blind eye" was already being turned to the office-holding of *thetes* as councillors, as Hansen pointed out.⁵² Another shortcoming of Rhodes' theory is the invitation of the government of the Five Thousand to Alcibiades and the fleet of Samos to participate,⁵³ bearing in mind that the rowers in the fleet were mainly *thetes* (among others non-citizens including slaves and *metoikoi*).

It is suggested here that the key to understanding the regime of the Five Thousand, again a nominal but unreal figure,⁵⁴ lies in the expression "ὄπλα παρέχονται." It also warrants noting that this state of affairs did not last long, even less than the usual timespan up until the date of the democratic "restoration" in June or July of 410.⁵⁵ With the participation of lower-ranking citizens (*thetes*), the regime would soon shift in practice towards a democracy, at least in terms of its social base, which is confirmed by Aristotle: 'So the people *speedily* took the government out of these men's hands' (τούτους μὲν οὖν ἀφείλετο τὴν πολιτείαν ὁ δῆμος διὰ τάχους) ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 34.1); and Thucydides: "The *initial period* [of this regime] was one of the periods when the affairs of Athens were conducted best, at least in my time."⁵⁶ This shift, which possibly predated

51 In Chapter 34.1 of the *Athenaion Politeia* there is a very brief allusion to the end of this regime. In this respect, see Kagan 2012 [1987]: 202; Rhodes 1981: 414-15; Munn 2000: 150. See *infra* in text.

52 Hansen 1991: 249.

53 Thuc. 8.97.3. Galluci 1999; Sancho 2004: 86. For the role of the fleet of Samos in the overthrow of the oligarchy: Sordi 2000: 104; Bearzot 2013: 192; Teegarden 2014: 34; Battistin Sebastiani 2018: 507; 2022; Gallego 2022.

54 Andrewes (Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 329) suggests a total of 10,000 citizens. See Kagan 2012 [1987]: 203. The number was probably higher: see *infra* note 71.

55 See Rhodes 1981: 414-15; Kagan 2012 [1987]: 253-54.

56 Own emphasis. Thuc. 8.97.2: καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα δὴ τὸν πρῶτον χρόνον ἐπὶ γε ἐμοῦ Ἀθηναῖοι φαίνονται εὖ πολιτεύσαντες. The meaning of this phrase has been hotly

Cyzicus (in the spring of 410),⁵⁷ was consolidated following the victory of the fleet in which Theramenes played an active role, although democracy was not officially re-established (with the reintroduction of the

disputed. Andrewes in Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 330 provides a valuable discussion and translates it (following B. Jowett) as follows: “the initial period (of this regime) was one of the periods when the affairs of Athens were conducted best, at least in my time”; see Raaflaub 2006: 189. See, however, Kagan 2012 [1987]: 205, with n. 55: “For the first time, at least in my own time, the Athenians seem to have been well governed.” For a discussion, see Hornblower 2008: 1033. The best parallel is Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.15: τῷ μὲν οὖν πρώτῳ χρόνῳ ὁ Κριτίας τῷ Θηραμένει ὁμογνώμων τε καὶ φίλος ἦν. Another parallel in Thuc. 7.87.1: τοὺς δ’ ἐν ταῖς λιθοτομίαις οἱ Συρακόσιοι χαλεπῶς τοὺς πρώτους χρόνους μετεχείρισαν. In the *Athenaion Politeia*, the sentence “so the people *speedily* took the government out of these men’s hands” (*Ath. Pol.* 34.1) may support Andrewes’ translation, as it would also point to the brevity of the (moderate) oligarchic *politeia* of the Five Thousand. As for the qualification ἐπί γε ἐμοῦ (in my time), as Goodhart (1893: 155) remarked, “it is perhaps intended to make an exception of Solon’s constitution,” which is fully in keeping with reflections on the *patrios politeia* at the time (for this see note 88).

57 For this battle: Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.11–23; Diod. Sic. 13.49–51; Kagan 2012 [1987]: 247; Buck 1998: 36–39. Thucydides (8.97.3) alludes to the recall of Alcibiades and other exiles (also in Diod. Sic. 13.38.2; 13.42.2 emphasising the role of Theramenes), with messages being sent to Alcibiades and the army at Samos urging them “to engage in public affairs” (ἀνθάπτεσθαι τῶν πραγμάτων): see Hornblower 2008: 1036. Neither is it known when the exiles were recalled nor whether the fleet of Samos (which did not return to Athens but sailed to the Hellespontus) agreed to form part of the “government of the Five Thousand” from the very start. Collaboration and contacts had more than likely already begun well before the Battle of Cyzicus, as Thrasybulus sent news of the victory at Cynossema in the autumn to Athens (Thuc. 8.106.6; Diod. Sic. 13.40.6) and, after Abydos, Thrasyllus “set sail for Athens to report these events and to ask for troops and ships” (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.8; tr. C.L. Brownson). It is even possible, as Galluci (1999) assumes, that the invitation to enter “into public affairs” was made in the first moments of the government of the Five Thousand. Yet this does not mean that it was immediately acted upon, for it also meant denying some of the citizens manning the fleet (many of whom were *thetes* without hoplitic armament) citizenship. In any case, it seems that the enfranchisement of all the Athenians serving in the fleet (see note 53), which possibly occurred very early on, even in the wake of the Battle of Cynossema (a few weeks after the establishment of the “government of the Five Thousand”), might have marked the opening of the regime to an even broader social base (all the *thetes* and not only those with the hoplite panoply: see *infra* in text). In other words, the “initial period” might have been very short-lived

misthos, the Council of 500 elected by lot, etc.) until June-July 410, something which, as several authors have pointed out, went almost unnoticed in the sources.⁵⁸

It is proposed here that during the initial period of the government of the Five Thousand, that figure was also merely a nominal or conventional one established by the newly installed regime, which was not a democracy like the one before the oligarchic coup of the Four Hundred. Nor would the rule of the Five Thousand have been akin to that described as “for the future” in Aristotle, a constitution that might have been borrowed from a contemporary pamphlet on oligarchic theory.⁵⁹ As already mentioned, the key to interpreting this government is to be found in the expression “ὅπλα παρέχονται” pertaining to the hoplite qualification which was identical to the citizenship requirement of the “Draconian constitution.” It is therefore worth performing a deeper enquiry into the first part of this spurious constitution, insofar as it was also probably drafted in this period:

ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη πολιτεία ταύτην εἶχε τὴν ὑπογραφὴν. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα χρόνου τινὸς οὐ πολλοῦ διελθόντος, ἐπ’ Ἀρισταίχμου ἄρχοντος, Δράκων τοὺς θεσμοὺς ἔθηκεν: ἡ δὲ τάξις αὐτοῦ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον εἶχε. ἀπεδέδοτο μὲν ἡ πολιτεία τοῖς ὅπλα παρεχομένοις: ἡροῦντο δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἑννέα ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς ταμίας οὐσίαν κεκτημένους οὐκ ἐλάττω δέκα μνῶν ἑλευθέραν, τὰς δ’ ἄλλας ἀρχὰς τὰς ἐλάττους ἐκ τῶν ὅπλα παρεχομένων, στρατηγούς δὲ καὶ ἰπάρχους οὐσίαν ἀποφαίνοντας οὐκ ἔλαττον ἢ ἑκατὸν μνῶν ἑλευθέραν, καὶ παῖδας ἐκ γαμετῆς γυναικὸς γνησίους ὑπὲρ δέκα ἔτη γεγονότας.

and “so the people speedily took the government out of these men’s hands,” as Aristotle remarks (see previous note).

58 Sealey 1975: 290; Rhodes 1981. 414-15; Munn 2000: 150. An allusion in *And. Mys.* 96-98 to the decree of restoration of democracy of 410 (the decree of Demophantos) which insists on a council of 500 chosen ‘by lot’ (*And.* 1.96). Kagan 2012 [1987]: 254, 256-57. This decree has been traditionally dated to 410: Shear 2007: 149. However, Canevaro & Harris (2012: 124-25) refer to this decree as if it had been passed following the Thirty Tyrants. For the authenticity of the decree of Demophantos (410) in *Andocides*, see, however, Sommerstein 2014.

59 See note 39.

And after this when a certain moderate length of time had passed, in the archonship of Aristaechnus, Draco enacted his ordinances; and this system was on the following lines. Citizenship had already been bestowed on those who provided themselves with arms; and these elected as the Nine Archons and the Treasurers, who were owners of an unencumbered estate worth not less than 10 minae, and the other minor offices from those who provided themselves with arms, and as Generals and Masters of the Horse persons proving their possession of unencumbered estate worth not less than 100 minae and sons legitimately born in wedlock over ten years of age.⁶⁰

This passage seems to be related to the oligarchic revolution of 411, as several authors have claimed, despite van Wees' attempts to place it in the context of Demetrius of Phalerum.⁶¹ In addition to the coincidence of the expression “ὄπλα παρεχομένοις” with the purported government of the Five Thousand (in Aristotle and Thucydides),⁶² the low socio-economic status of archons and treasurers in the Draconian constitution, as opposed to that of *strategoï* and *hipparchs*, is striking. According to Rhodes, this might have reflected late-5th-century priorities⁶³ in a critical situation resulting from the pressures of war (the loss of Euboea). On

60 [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 4.1-2. Tr. H. Rackham.

61 Written in the context of the oligarchic revolution of 411: Rhodes 1981: 113-18; Munn 2000: 103. See also Osborne 2003: 259 (it ‘must surely have come in some way out of the events of 411’); Shear 2011: 45-47, esp. p. 45 with n. 93 and further bibliography. Van Wees (2011) breathes new life into the theory that the Draconian constitution dates from the time of Demetrius of Phalerum. Still valid objections in Fritz 1954: 76-86, with n. 16; Verlinsky 2017: esp. 144-46 (this author also disassociates the Draconian constitution from the ‘moderate’ oligarchic circles 411: Verlinsky 2021); Canavaro & Esu 2018: 121. Anyway, it cannot be ruled out that Demetrius of Phalerum used this pre-existing Draconian constitution as a model which, as contended here, resembles that of the Five Thousand, since, moreover, as van Wees points out, the amount of 10 minae in Demetrius' *politeia* seems to be a maximum, not a minimum, threshold (van Wees 2011: 97). This idea is developed by Faraguna (2018) who sees in Demetrius' government certain democratizing tendencies.

62 See *supra* in text.

63 Rhodes 1981: 113: ‘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

the other hand, if the amounts corresponded to this moment at the end of the 5th century, an unencumbered estate worth 10 minae is remarkable not only because it is a low figure for those elected as treasurers and archons, but also because *below this qualification there were still people who possessed the hoplite panoply* and who would therefore have been eligible, hypothetically, for the *politeia* (citizenship) of the Five Thousand.

The revolution of 411 prompted, significantly, a review of the laws of Cleisthenes,⁶⁴ which possibly included, as I have posited in a recent work, a minimum net worth in drachmae for belonging to one or other of the census classes. The “10 minae” of the “Constitution of Draco,” drawn up in a context in which the laws of Cleisthenes were being revised, may perhaps have been the lower threshold for the *zeugitai* census class in the late 6th century, a not very high economic position but enough to afford the hoplitic armament, as could be deduced from the cleruchs of Salamis.⁶⁵ This would have corresponded to a landed estate of at least 3.6 hectares or 40 plethra. However, in Antipater’s time at the end of the 4th

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 [...].’

64 [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 29.3: ‘[...] Cleitophon moved an amendment to the resolution of Pythodorus, that the commissioners elected should also investigate the ancestral laws laid down by Cleisthenes when he was establishing democracy [...]. Cleitophon associated with Theramenes: Hornblower 2008: 1035. For research on the laws of Draco and Solon just after the fall of the Four Hundred, with the election of a committee of *nomothetai*: Munn 2000, 148-50. See note 88 on the *patrios politeia*. See also Shear 2011: 31-36, 42, 50-51. For the laws of Cleisthenes: Camassa 2011. As to theoretical reflection on the time of the oligarchic revolution, see note 50.

65 The economic status of the Salaminian cleruchs at the end of the sixth century 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 (Connor 1988: 10; van Wees 2004: 48, 52-53, 55). The Salaminian cleruchs were obliged to fight (line 3: στρατ[εύεσθ]αι) and, thus, allegedly, to be enrolled on the hoplite *katalogos*. These cleruchs may have originally been *thetes* – as was usually the case in the fifth century cleruchs: Figueira 2008: 440-41; Pébarthe 2009 – 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 (*IG I³ 60*, line 10-11), to purchase weapons and to fight. The amount fixed in the Sala-

century, probably due to rising prices, 3.6 hectares would have been valued at about 20 minae and, accordingly, 1.8 hectares at about 10.⁶⁶

It is not known whether the economic qualification for membership of the *zeugitai* census class changed in the 5th century, but the economic prosperity deriving from the empire and the rise in prices during the Pentecontaetia might have led to some adjustment.⁶⁷ In any case, in 411 Athens was immersed in an unprecedented economic and financial crisis which led to a fall in prices.⁶⁸ Against this backdrop, the review of the laws of Cleisthenes probably included modifying the lower threshold for belonging to the *zeugitai* census class, establishing this at 10 minae. In other words, it involved lowering the financial requirement – if it had ever been increased – for belonging to that class, not only because of the economic depression, but also because of the imperative need for troops (hitherto, membership of this class might have been the criterion for being included on the hoplite muster rolls).⁶⁹ So, in view of the economic depression, on the one hand, and the demographic crisis, on the other, the minimum financial requirement for belonging to the *zeugitai* census class was presumably set at 10 minae, as would probably have been the case with Cleisthenes' military reforms at the end of the 6th century (it being likely that at some point during the Pentecontaetia this limit would have been increased due to economic growth). Moreover, this was in line with the review and restoration of his laws and the prevailing desire to return to the *patrios politeia*. However, the allusion to citizens with a net worth of below 10 minae (the financial requirement to be elected to the offices of archon and treasurer) in the Draconian constitution,

mis decree for arms was an affordable minimum for them and certainly an investment that, although expensive, was worthwhile and long-lasting. See Valdés 2022a, 60–66.

66 Gallego 2016: 52–56 (with bibliography). For a landed estate of 3.6 as a minimum for hoplite (*zeugite*) status: see note 19. It is likely that prices rose from the fifth to the fourth century: Gallo 1987; Loomis 1998: 240–50.

67 '[...] There was a broad 50% rise in public wages in the 20 years of so before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War': Loomis 1998: 240.

68 With a period of deflation in about 412–403, according to Loomis 1998: 240–41, 244–45.

69 For a discussion on the requirements for being included on the hoplite muster rolls: see note 16. For the hoplite *katalogoi*: Christ 2001; Bakewell 2007: 90–93.

gives rise to two additional hypotheses for the initial period of this regime of the Five Thousand, in the hypothetical case that the draconian Constitution was really a reflection of the Five Thousand government which revised the laws of Cleisthenes (which included the “monetarisat-ion” of the census classes):

1. Given the military needs at the time, this regime of the Five Thousand would have included all those who could demonstrate that they possessed weapons and armour. Undoubtedly, some of those belonging to the *thetes* census class might have possessed the hoplite panoply (perhaps incomplete in many cases), especially those in the upper ranks.⁷⁰ Belonging to the *zeugitai* census class (readjusted, furthermore, to the Cleisthenic criterion of 10 minae) would only have been a prerequisite for archons and treasurers.⁷¹
2. It was precisely when the census classes ceased to be used for recruitment. Henceforth, all those who declared that they possessed weapons and armour were doubtless recruited as hoplites from the muster rolls.⁷² There is also the possibility that this group of hoplites was “enlarged” not only by higher-ranking *thetes* (i.e. owners of between 2.7 and 3.6 ha or their equivalent in movable assets),

70 For *thetes* as *epibatai* in Sicily (415) and therefore in possession of hoplitic weapons: Thuc. 6.43.1. See Valdés 2022b.

71 Between 30 and 40 per cent of a population of about 30,000 (30,500 in 411 in Hansen 1988a: 27) might have been hoplites (i.e. *zeugitai*, plus the first two census classes: see notes 16 and 19), thus accounting for between 9,000 and 12,000 citizens. The usual number of hoplites included on the muster rolls must have been as high as 9,000 at the time, of which the majority were *zeugitai* in the traditional view (see note 16 and Gallego 2016: 48-49). The rest (60-70%) were *thetes*, i.e., hypothetically, between 18,000 and 21,000 citizens. An important number of these *thetes* would have served in the fleet of Samos (82 ships, according to Thucydides – Thuc. 8.79.2 – plus around 35 additional ships – Thuc. 8.30: Gallego 2022), but not all the rowers were citizens, insofar as there was already a significant number of foreigners and slaves among their number; see Valdes 2022b.

72 For this system, see Pritchard 2019: 43-45 who believes that it functioned in this way throughout the 5th century, without considering the role of the census classes in recruitment. Along these lines: Rosivach, 2002; Gabrielsen 2002. In relation to a change in the recruitment system between the 5th and 4th centuries: Christ 2001: 398, 409-16 (with a transition period between the end of the 5th century and 386-66).

many of whom would have been regular *epibatai* and therefore would have had hoplite weapons,⁷³ but also by all those *thetes* who might have been armed by private citizens. The arming of *thetes* as hoplites might have occurred on the initiative of wealthy individuals, as acts of euergetism, such as Antiphon (perhaps on the occasion of the Sicilian Expedition, with all that this entails in terms of renewed dependence/clientelism),⁷⁴ Philon (in Lysias) and other citizens in relation to the events of 404.⁷⁵ But even at that time there were also perhaps *thetes* who might have been armed by the state.⁷⁶

Between 410 and 399, after the restoration of democracy, Solon's laws were revised. This revision probably included the law by virtue of which the census classes were redefined economically, in this case adapting the *zeugitai* census class to the *eisphora*-payers (a measure that might have been taken by Euclides in 403, when the war was over but there was still a pressing need for cash). This occurred at a time when recruitment seemed to no longer depend on the census classes but on self-declaration of possession of weapons. It seems that recruitment may have been linked to the census classes at least until the Sicilian Expedition and especially in the early part of the armed conflict, namely, the Archidamian War.⁷⁷

It is possible that the social base of this initial regime of the Five Thousand, which granted citizenship only to those who possessed arms, soon

73 For the number of *thetes* in the 4th century, see Gallego 2016: 61, fig. 3. For *thetes epibatai* see note 70.

74 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 Sicilian Expedition. Munn (2000: 100-1) stresses that the most likely context for this short sentence from Antiphon's *Against Philinos* are the events of 415, together with passing references in a biography of Antiphon to 'arming men of military age and ... manning sixty triremes' ([Plut.] *X orat.* 832f). Clientelism: Plácido 2008.

75 In Lysias' *Against Philon*: Lys. 31.15.

76 [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 42.2-4. Christ 2001: 405; Hansen 1985: 49.

77 For the revision of the laws, see note 42. Regarding the hypothesis on the adaptation of the *zeugitai* census class to the *eisphora*-payers, plus the role of the census classes in recruitment, see Valdés & Gallego 2010: 263-64, 271-77; Valdés 2022a.

(before the full democratic restoration) became broader, especially since it included not only the usual hoplite *zeugitai* (those owning estates of approx. 3.6 ha or more or their equivalent in movable assets and/or cash),⁷⁸ but also *thetes* with hoplite arms who, however, were hypothetically excluded from holding magistracies such as the offices of archon and treasurer. From the moment that the entry “into public affairs” (τῶν πραγμάτων) of the exiles, including the army on Samos (Thuc. 8.97.3), was accepted, their social base was automatically susceptible to being enlarged. This might have happened shortly after the overthrow of the Four Hundred, although certain “oligarchic” features, such as the absence of pay and a council perhaps elected, rather than drawn by lot, may have been maintained until the full restoration of the old democracy in June–July 410.⁷⁹

This shift towards a broader social base (with the integration of the citizens of the fleet of Samos), corroborating to some extent the idea of Ste. Croix and Sancho,⁸⁰ but with nuances inasmuch as a more restricted citizenship existed in the first phase of this regime,⁸¹ would explain the lack of attention given to the alleged “democratic restoration,” insofar as before June 410 (when wages would be reintroduced and the less democratic aspects of the regime would be abolished) the customary citizens of all socio-economic statuses had already been integrated into it. The issue of excluding the lower-ranking “landless,” however, would continue to lurk in the background (e.g. in Phormisios’ proposal after the war),⁸² thus pointing to a middle way between a more restricted oligarchy and a radical democracy at this time. The fact that the Five Thousand (i.e. those forming part of the body of citizens) of the eponymous regime included not only the *zeugitai* (with landholdings of 3.6 hectares or more), whose qualifications now seem to have been readjusted according

78 See notes 16 and 19.

79 See notes 53 and 57. For the restoration of democracy: see note 51.

80 See note 48. See also Sancho 2016: 26 who emphasises the weight of personal motivations (rather than ideological reasons) in the actions of leaders, while refusing to recognise a ‘moderate’ tendency among those leaders.

81 See Munn 2000: 150: ‘[...] the initial phase of the government of the Five Thousand was not quite democracy as usual’.

82 Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 32–33.

to Cleisthenic economic parameters and the new reality of depression/deflation,⁸³ but also anyone who could prove that they possessed weapons, suggests that the regime had a broad social base. This citizenry would have included many individuals (*thetes* and even most of the hoplites of low or medium rank, plus some of their higher-ranking peers) whose real intention was to restore democracy, even if they did not dare to say so in the reigning atmosphere of suspicion⁸⁴ resulting from the oligarchic coup of the Four Hundred. With regard to the atmosphere of mistrust, Thucydides has the following to say:

ἦν δὲ πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον ἡ παράκλησις ὡς χρή, ὅστις τοὺς πεντακισχιλίους βούλεται ἄρχειν ἀντὶ τῶν τετρακοσίων, ἰέναι ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον. ἐπεκρύπτοντο γὰρ ὅμως ἔτι τῶν πεντακισχιλίων τῷ ὀνόματι, μὴ ἀντικρυς δῆμον ὅστις βούλεται ἄρχειν ὀνομάζειν, φοβούμενοι μὴ τῷ ὄντι ὥσι καὶ πρὸς τινα εἰπὼν τίς τι ἀγνοίᾳ σφαλῆ. καὶ οἱ τετρακόσιοι διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἤθελον τοὺς πεντακισχιλίους οὔτε εἶναι οὔτε μὴ ὄντας δήλους εἶναι, τὸ μὲν καταστῆσαι μετόχους τοσοῦτους ἀντικρυς ἂν δῆμον ἡγούμενοι, τὸ δ' αὖ ἄφανές φόβον ἐς ἀλλήλους παρέξειν.

Now their cry to the multitude was that all should join in the work who wished the Five Thousand to govern instead of the Four Hundred. For instead of saying in so many words 'all who wished the commons to govern' they still disguised themselves under the name of the Five Thousand; being afraid that these might really exist, and that they might be speaking to one of their number and get into trouble through ignorance. Indeed this was why the Four Hundred neither wished the Five Thousand to exist, nor to have it known that they did not exist; being of opinion that to give themselves so many partners in empire would be downright democracy, while the mystery in question would make the people afraid of one another.⁸⁵

83 See note 68.

84 Gallego 2020: 312-14. See also Sancho 2016: 21.

85 Thuc. 8.92.11. Ste. Croix 1981: 606, n. 30 attaches great importance to this passage. See Kagan 2012 [1987]: 196; Hornblower 2008: 1033; Marcaccini 2013: 420-21; Sancho 2016: 27-28.

To sum up this second section, it can be claimed that the government of the Five Thousand was a nominal or “conventional” designation which would have included many more people, as has already been seen in the ambiguity of the previous period when Polystratos had attempted to enrol 9,000 citizens in the “Five Thousand.” As of September 411, the “Five Thousand” would include not only the former *zeugitai* (possessing at least 3.6 ha or their equivalent in movable assets), whose financial requirement (10 minae) was readjusted to that established under Cleisthenes for the *zeugitai*, but also the higher-ranking *thetes*, namely, those possessing the hoplite panoply at a time when there was an urgent need for troops.

In short, whoever could prove to be in possession of arms (given the prevailing needs) could form part of this regime. Those who possessed weapons but were not *zeugitai* might have been high-ranking *thetes* (i.e. with landholdings of between 2.7 and 3.6 ha or their equivalent in movable assets)⁸⁶ who usually served as *epibatai* in the fleet, to whom should be added other *thetes* who had been armed by private individuals or even by the state at the time of the Sicilian Expedition.⁸⁷ This implies that the regime was “almost” a democracy in terms of its social base, but not completely so, since those *thetes* with little land and “the landless” would be left out. Even so, it is conceivable that the regime’s social base was gradually becoming broader, following a first brief period, recorded by Thucydides and possibly Aristotle, the duration of which is still a mystery. There might have been many reasons behind this shift towards a “quasi-democracy” (at least in terms of the social base), one of which was undoubtedly the democratising stance of a good part of the lower and middle ranks of the hoplite *demos* (i.e. modest hoplites, without excluding other more wealthy ones) and of those *thetes* possessing the hoplite panoply (or part of it), as can be conjectured from the aforementioned passage from Thucydides (Thuc. 8.92.11). However, this does not preclude the possibility that there were elements and individuals (perhaps a minority, but significant in terms of leadership, such as the followers of Theramenes) in the government of the Five Thousand who effectively

86 See Gallego 2016: fig. 3.

87 See note 75.

wanted a more moderate regime, a broad oligarchy or a restricted democracy of hoplites, or at least a regime that excluded “the landless or those without property.”⁸⁸

In this initial regime of the Five Thousand, probably only those who reached the threshold of 10 minae (in the Draconian constitution)⁸⁹ could be elected as archons and treasurers, to wit, those who, to my mind, were still *zeugitai* until the reform of the census qualification with the revision of Solon’s laws in c. 403, which readjusted the census classes⁹⁰ yet again with an eye to levying the *eisphora* at a time when recruitment (since 411) no longer depended on them. Indeed, the changes brought about by the oligarchic coup and in particular by the government of the Five Thousand modified the form of conscription which remained in place for the last part of the war: the drawing up of lists based on the declarations of citizens as to whether or not they possessed arms. In the latter part of the war, people of good social standing served as *epibatai*⁹¹ because they were already being routinely recruited for the fleet from the muster rolls, just as those who had weapons were compulsorily recruited as hoplites, whether or not they were *zeugitai*. Moreover, the socio-economic requirements of the *zeugitai* census class may have been raised with the revision of Solon’s laws at the end of the century (c. 403), its members now being identified with the highest-ranking hoplites, viz. with the “*eisphora*-payers.”

88 For theoretical reflections on the *patrios politeia* of the oligarchs in 411, see note 39. Regarding the ‘moderate party’ in the revolution: Hignett 1952: 272-80; Fuks 1953: 1-32; Ste. Croix 1956: 10; Cecchin 1969: 3-4; Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 163; Kagan 2000 [1987]: 117-20; 132-35, 148; Hornblower 2008: 945-46, 954. *Contra*: David 2014; Sancho 2004; 2016.

89 Elaborated as a ‘moderately oligarchic’ constitution at the time (see note 61), in the image of the constitution of the Five Thousand in its first phase but taking up the Cleisthenic *nomoi* on the monetary qualification of census classes. See *supra* in text.

90 And so, henceforth, *zeugitai* those whose production was equivalent to 200 to 300 *medimnoi* (see note 42) or the equivalent in movables assets.

91 Herzogenrath-Amelung 2017; Valdés 2022b.

General conclusion

The “Five Thousand” behind the Four Hundred was a nominal figure that probably was not firmly established at the time. It corresponded to those Athenian citizens of a higher socio-economic standing who paid the *eisphora* during the Archidamian War, a group including the first two census classes and the higher-ranking *zeugitai*. As of September 411, the regime of the Five Thousand included, as Aristotle and Thucydides rightly hold, those possessing the hoplite panoply (or part of it) in the *politeia*. This larger number of people encompassed not only the *zeugitai* census class as a whole, but also higher-ranking *thetes* possessing hoplite weapons and armour and those of their number who had been armed (so as to participate in the Sicilian Expedition) by private citizens or by the state.⁹² This regime probably entailed, as can be inferred from the Draconian constitution, the readjustment of the traditional census classes to new economic criteria, given the depression and the fall in prices at the time, probably returning to the standards of Cleisthenes’ reform. In any case, the criterion for participating in the *politeia* of the Five Thousand was probably lower than the 10 minae (i.e. hypothetically the minimum requirement for belonging to the *zeugitai* census class, as stipulated in the laws of Cleisthenes) required to be elected as archon or treasurer, that for holding the office of *strategos* or *hipparch* being much higher, corresponding, possibly, to the liturgical class.

From this time onwards, the census classes ceased to be used for recruitment, for in view of the pressing needs of the war, the muster rolls were open to anyone who could prove that he possessed weapons, while military service was prized as it was the only kind that was still paid. This regime of a *politeia* of those who possessed arms seems to have been short-lived, at least in terms of the social base and (democratic) intentionality of most of the *demos* participating in it (but not in the intentionality of others and, above all, of their leaders, all “moderate” oligarchs). By accepting the integration of the *thetes* serving in the fleet (including the “landless” among them), the social base of the regime would soon become broader, for which reason the democratic restoration was al-

92 See notes 74 and 75 and Munn 2000:150.

most ignored in the sources. On the other hand, the democratic restoration entailed, given the importance attached to the *patrios politeia*, the systematic revision of laws and, consequently, at the end of the 5th century (c. 403), the redefinition of the census classes so as to adapt them, at this time of setbacks and reversals during the war and financial straits, to the *eisphora*,⁹³ as can be deduced from the passage from Pollux.⁹⁴ The redefined census classes would be valid in the *eisphora* levy system until 378, when the tax was readjusted and the census classes were almost emptied of meaning and validity. But that is another story.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akrigg, B. 2019. *Population and Economy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- Andrewes, A. 1981. *A Historical commentary on Thucydides V (Book VIII)*. Oxford.
- Andreyev, V.N. 1974. 'Some Aspects of Agrarian Conditions in Attica in the Fifth to Third Centuries B.C.' *Eirene* 12, 5-46.
- Bakewell, G. 2007. 'Written Lists of Military personnel in Classical Athens' in C. Cooper (ed.) *Politics of Orality* (Mnemosyne Supplements 280). Leiden, 87-102.
- Battistin Sebastiani, B. 2018a. 'The Coups of 411 and 404 in Athens: Thucydides and Xenophon on Conservative Turns' *GRBS* 58, 490-515.
- Battistin Sebastiani, B. 2018b. 'Resistência democrática em Samos contra o golpe de 411' *Historia* 369 12, 51-72.
- Bearzot, C. 2013. *Come si abate una democrazia. Tecniche di colpo di stato nell'Atene antica*. Roma.
- Blamire, A. 2001. 'Athenian Finance, 454-404 B.C.' *Hesperia* 70(1), 99-126.
- Brock, R. 1989. 'Athenian Oligarchs: The Number Game', *JHS* 109, 162-63.
- Brun, P. 1983. *Eisphora-Syntaxis-Stratitotika. Recherches sur les finances militaires d'Athènes au IV^e siècle av. J.-C.* Besançon-Paris.

93 The figure of 3,000 in the oligarchic coup of 404 ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 36) would probably reflect, under the new conditions arising at the end of the war and owing to demographic decline, the approximate number of citizens who were able to pay the *eisphora* in the latter part of the Decelean War: see note 40.

94 Poll. 8.130. See supra note 43.

- Buck, R.J. 1998. *Thrasybulus and the Athenian Democracy: The Life of an Athenian Statesman*. Stuttgart.
- Burford, A. 1993. *Land and Labor in the Greek World*. Baltimore, MD.
- Camassa, G. 2011. 'Les (nouvelles) lois de Clisthène et leur histoire', in P. Ismard & V. Azoulay (eds.) *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes. Autour du politique dans la cité classique*. Paris, 43-55
- Canevaro, M. & E.M. Harris 2012. 'The Documents in Andocides' *On the Mysteries*' CQ 62(1), 98-129.
- Canevaro, M. & A. Esu 2018. 'Extreme Democracy and Athenian Nomothesia: The *Athenaion Politeia* and the Reasons of a Silence' in C. Bearzot, M. Canevaro, T. Gargiulo & E. Poddighe (eds.) *Athenaion Politeiai tra storia, politica e sociologia: Aristotele e Pseudo-Senofonte, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Cagliari 10-12 Maggio 2017)*. Milano, 105-45.
- Carawan, E.M. 2013. *The Athenian Amnesty and Reconstructing the Law*. Oxford.
- Cataudella, M. 2021. *Ritorno alla Flat Tax. Un itinerario di Atene antica fra VII e IV secolo?* Turnhout.
- Cecchin, S.A. 969. Πάτριος πολιτεία: un tentativo propagandistico durante la guerra del Peloponneso. Torino.
- Christ, M.R. 2001. 'Conscription of Hoplites in Classical Athens' CQ 51, 398-422.
- Christ, M.R. (2007). 'The Evolution of the Eisphora in Classical Athens' CQ 57, 53-69.
- Connor, W.R. 1988. 'Early Greek Land Warfare as Symbolic Expression' *PP* 119, 3-29.
- David, E. 1996. 'Four Councils of Four Tribes? A Note on Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia* 30' *RhM* 139, 225-33.
- David, E. 2014. 'An oligarchic democracy: manipulation of democratic ideals by Athenian oligarchs in 411 BC' *Eirene* 50, 11-38
- Davies, J.K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families*. Oxford.
- Davies, J.K. 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*. New York.
- Fantasia, H. 2018. 'Tucidide, Aristotele e i *syngrapheis* del 411 a.C.' *Eikasmos* 29, 183-210.
- Faraguna, M. 2018. 'Demetrius of Phalerum and Late Fourth-Century Athenian Society: Response to Delfim Leao' in G. Thür, U. Yiftach & R.

- Zelnick-Abramovitz (eds.) *Symposion 2017: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Tel Aviv, 20.-23. August 2017), Wien.
- Fawcett, P. 2016. 'When I Squeeze You with *Eisphorai*: Taxes and Tax Policy in Classical Athens', *Hesperia* 85(1), 153-99.
- Ferguson, W.S. 1926. 'The Constitution of Theramenes' *CPh* 21, 72-75.
- Figueira, T.J. 2008. 'Colonisation in the Classical Period' in G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.) *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas* (Mnemosyne Supplements 193). Leiden, 427-523.
- Flament, C. 2018. 'IG I3 52 A ET B: un ou deux décrets de Kallias pour éclairer les finances athéniennes au Ve siècle av. n. ère?' *LEC* 86, 153-75.
- Fuks, A. 1953. *The Ancestral Constitution: Four Studies in Athenian Party Politics at the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* London.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1994. *Financing the Athenian Fleet: Public Taxation and Social Relations*. Baltimore, MD.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2002. 'Socio-economic Classes and Ancient Greek Warfare' in K. Ascani, V. Gabrielsen, K. Kvist, & A.H. Rasmussen (eds.) *Ancient History Matters: Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydsgaard on his Seventieth Birthday*. Roma, 203-20.
- 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. 2020. 'Entre le courage et la peur: politisation et dépolitisation du peuple athénien' *Archimède: Archéologie et Histoire Ancienne* 7, 304-16.
- Gallego, J. 2022. 'Exilios y migraciones en la Atenas de finales del siglo V a.C.: las exclusiones de la ciudadanía y los golpes oligárquicos' *Sociedades Precapitalistas* 12, e068. <https://doi.org/10.24215/22505121e068>
- Gallucci, R. 1986. *Myth of the hoplite Oligarchy: Athens, 411/10 B.C.* Los Angeles.
- Gallucci, R. 1999. 'Relations between Athens and its Fleet in 411/10 BC' in R. Mellor & L. Tritle (eds.) *Text and Tradition, Studies in Greek History and Historiography in Honor of Mortimer H. Chambers*. Claremont, CA, 170-84.
- Gomme, A.W., A. Andrewes & K.J. Dover 1981. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. V. Book VIII. Oxford.
- Goodhart, H.C. 1893. *The Eighth Book of Thucydides' History*. London.
- Grenfell, B.P. & Hunt, A.S. 1908. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, part V. London.

- Halstead, P. 2014. *Two Oxen Ahead: Pre-Mechanised Farming in the Mediterranean*. Chichester.
- Hansen, M.H. 1985. *Demography and Democracy: The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.* Herning.
- Hansen, M.H. 1988a. *Three Studies in Athenian Demography*. Copenhagen.
- Hansen, M.H. 1988b. 'Demography and Democracy Once Again' *ZPE* 75, 189-93.
- Hansen, M.H. 1991. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology*. Oxford.
- Hansen, M.H. 2006. *Studies in the Population of Aigina, Athens and Eretria*. Copenhagen.
- Harris, E.M. 1990. 'The Constitution of the Five Thousand' *HSCPh* 93, 243-280.
- Heftner, H. 2001. *Der oligarchische Umsturz des Jahres 411 v. Chr. und die Herrschaft der Vierhundert im Athen: Quellenkritische und historische Untersuchungen*. Frankfurt a.M.
- Herzogenrath-Amelung, T. 2017. 'Social Status and Combat Reality of Classical Greek epibatai' *Historia* 66, 45-64.
- Hignett, C. 1952. *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. 2008. *A Commentary on Thucydides: Volume III: Books 5.25-8.109*. Oxford.
- Isager, S. & J.E. Skydsgaard 1992. *Ancient Greek Agriculture: An Introduction*. London.
- Jameson, M.H. 1994. 'Class in the Ancient Greek Countryside' in P. Doukellis & L. Mendoni (eds.) *Structures rurales et sociétés antiques*. Paris, 55-63
- Jones, A.H.M. 1957. *Athenian Democracy*. Oxford.
- Kagan, D. 2012 [1969-1987]. *A New History of the Peloponnesian War*. Ithaca, NY.
- Kallet-Marx, L. 1989. 'The Kallias Decree, Thucydides, and the Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War' *CQ* 39(1), 94-113.
- Kallet-Marx, L. 1993. *Money, Expense, and Naval Power in Thucydides' History 1-5.24*. Berkeley.
- Kron, G. 2011. 'The Distribution of Wealth at Athens in Comparative Perspective' *ZPE* 179, 129-38.

- Loomis, W.T. 1998. *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- MacDowell, D.M. 1986. 'The law of Periandros about Symmories' *CQ* 36, 438-49.
- Marcaccini, C. 2013. 'Rivoluzione oligarchica o restaurazione della democrazia? I Cinquemilla, la πρόκρισις e la patrios politeia' *Klio* 95, 405-28.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1968. 'Athenian Finance in the Peloponnesian War' *BCH* 92, 450-85.
- Mavrogordatos, G.T. 2011. 'Two Puzzles Involving Socrates' *CW* 105 (1), 3-23.
- Meritt, B.D. 1982. 'Thucydides and the Decrees of Kallias' in *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography. Presented to Eugene Vanderpool (Hesperia Supplements 19)*. Princeton, NY, 112-21.
- Migeotte, L. 2014. *Les finances des cités grecques aux périodes classique et hellénistique*. Paris.
- Mossé, C. 1979. 'Les symmories athéniennes' in H. van Effenterre (ed.) *Points de vue sur la fiscalité antique*. Paris, 31-42.
- Munn, M.H. 2000. *The school of history: Athens in the age of Socrates*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Nývlt, P. 2017. 'Two Misunderstood Statements in [Arist.] *Ath.* 32.3 and Their Bearing on the History of the Four Hundred' *Athenaeum* 105(2), 717-23.
- Osborne, R. 2003. 'Changing the Discourse', in K.A. Morgan (ed.) *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece*. Austin, 251-72.
- Osborne, R. 2010. *Athens and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.
- Plácido, D. 2008. 'Las relaciones clientelares en la evolución de la democracia ateniense' *Circe* 12, 225-42.
- Pébarthe, C. 2009. 'Émigrer d'Athènes. Clérouques et colons aux temps de la domination athénienne sur l'Égée au Ve siècle a.C.' in C. Moatti, W. Kaiser, & C. Pébarthe (eds.) *Le monde de l'itinérance en Méditerranée de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne. Procédures de contrôle et d'identification*. Bordeaux, 367-90.
- Poddighe, E. 2002. *Nel segno di Antipatro. L'eclissi Della democrazia ateniese dal 323/2 al 319/8 a.C.* Roma.

- Poddighe, E. 2010. 'Riflessioni sul fondamento etico-legale e sul carattere finanziario dell'eisphora ateniese tra V e IV sec. a.C.' in M.R. Cataudella, A. Greco & G. Mariotta (eds.) *Strumenti e tecniche Della riscossione dei tributi nel mondo antico: tai del convegno nazionale, Firenze, 6-7 dicembre 2007*. Padova, 97-117.
- Pritchard, D.M. 2019. *Athenian Democracy at War*. Cambridge.
- Raaflaub, K. 2006. 'Thucydides on Democracy and Oligarchy' in A. Tsakmakis & A. Rengakos (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden, Boston, 189-222.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1972. 'The Five Thousand in the Athenian Revolutions of 411 B. C.' *JHS* 92, 115-27.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1982. 'Problems in Athenian *Eisphora* and Liturgies' *AJAH* 7, 1-19.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1991. 'The Athenian Code of Laws, 410-399 B.C.' *JHS* 111, 87-100.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2006. 'The Reforms and Laws of Solon: An Optimistic View', in: J. Blok & A.P.M.H. Lardinois (eds.) *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches* (Mnemosyne Supplements 272). Leiden, 248-60.
- Rosivach, V.J. 2002. 'The Requirements for the Solonic Classes in Aristotle, AP 7.4' *Hermes* 130, 36-47.
- Ruschenbusch, E. 1978. 'Die athenischen symmorien des 4. Jh. V. Chr.' *ZPE* 31, 275-84.
- Sancho, L. 2004. 'Los "moderados" atenienses y la implantación de la oligarquía. Corrientes políticas en Atenas entre 411 y 403 a.C.' *Veleia* 21, 73-98.
- Sancho, L. 2016. 'Sociología de la stásis. I. El dêmos y los oligarcas en 411 a.C.' *Athenaeum* 104(1), 5-30.
- Sealey, R. 1967. *Essays in Greek Politics*. New York.
- Sealey, R. 1975. 'Constitutional Changes in Athens in 410 B.C.' *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 8, 271-95.
- Shear, J.L. 2007. 'The Oath of Demophantos and the Politics of Athenian Identity', in A. H. Sommerstein & J. Fletcher (eds.) *Horkos: The Oath in Greek Society*. Exeter, 148-60.

- Shear J. L. 2011. *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- Simonton, M. 2017. 'Stability and Violence in Classical Greek Democracies and Oligarchies' *ClAnt* 36 (1), 52-103.
- Sommerstein, A.H. 1983. *The Comedies of Aristophanes, vol. 4: Wasps*. Warminster.
- Sommerstein, A.H. 2014. 'The Authenticity of the Demophantus Decree' *CQ* 64, 49-57.
- Sordi, M. 1981. 'Uno scritto di propaganda oligarchica del 411 e l'avvento dei Quattrocento' *Giornale Filologico Ferrarese* 4, 3-12.
- Sordi, M. 2000. 'Trasibulo e la controrivoluzione di Samo: l'assemblea del popolo in armi come forma di opposizione' in M. Sordi (ed.) *L'opposizione nel mondo antico*. Milano, 103-10.
- Ste. Croix, G.E.M. de 1953. 'Demosthenes' τίμημα and the Athenian εἰσφορά in the Fourth Century B.C.' *C&M* 14(1-2), 30-70.
- Ste. Croix, G.E.M. de 1956. 'The Constitution of the Five Thousand' *Historia* 5, 1-21.
- Ste. Croix, G.E.M. de 1981. *Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World: From the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*. Ithaca, New York.
- Ste. Croix, G.E.M. de 2004. *Athenian Democratic Origins and Other Essays*. Edited by D. Harvey and R. Parker. Oxford.
- Taylor, M. 2002. 'Implicating the Demos: A Reading of Thucydides on the Rise of the Four Hundred' *JHS* 122, 91-108.
- Teegarden, D. 2014. *Death to tyrants! Ancient Greek democracy and the struggle against tyranny*. Princeton, Oxford.
- Thomsen, R. 1964. *Eisphora: A Study of Direct Taxation in Ancient Athens*. Copenhagen.
- Todd, S.C. 1996. 'Lysias Against Nikomachos: The Fate of the Expert in Athenian Law' in L. Foxhall & A.D.E. Lewis (eds.) *Greek Law in its Political Setting*. Oxford, 101-31.
- Tuci, P. 2013. *La fragilità della democrazia. Manipolazione istituzionale ed eversione nel colpo di stato oligarchico del 411 a.C. ad Atene*. Milano.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2014. 'Patrimonio de Demóstenes como hegemon de su "sinmoría": eisphorá y proeisphorá tras el 378' *Emerita* 82(2), 249-71.
- 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 J. Pascual et al. (eds.) *El mundo griego en el siglo IV a.C. Pervivencias, cambios y transformaciones*. Madrid, 89-107.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2022a. 'Zeugitai in Fifth-Century Athens: Social and Economic Qualification from Cleisthenes to the End of the Peloponnesian War' *Pnyx* 1, 45-78.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2022b. 'Thētes epibatai in Fifth-Century Athens' *REA* 124(2), 351-77.
- Valdés Guía, M. & J. Gallego 2010. 'Athenian zeugitai and the solonian census classes: new reflections and perspectives' *Historia* 59 (3), 257-81.
- van Wees, H. 2001. 'The Myth of the Middle-Class Army: Military and Social Status in Ancient Athens' in T. Bekker-Nielsen & L. Hannestad (eds.) *War as a Cultural and Social Force: Essays on Warfare in Antiquity*. Copenhagen, 45-71.
- van Wees, H. 2004. *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London.
- van Wees, H. 2006. 'Mass and Elite in Solon's Athens: The Property Classes Revisited' in J. Blok & A.P.M.H. Lardinois (eds.) *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches* (Mnemosyne Supplements 272). Leiden, 351-89.
- van Wees, H. 2011. 'Demetrius and Draco: Athens' Property Classes and Population in and Before 317 BC.' *JHS* 131, 95-114.
- van Wees, H. 2018. 'Citizens and Soldiers in Archaic Athens' in A. Duplouy & R.W. Brock (eds.) *Defining Citizenship in Archaic Greece*. Oxford, 103-14.
- Verlinsky, A. 2017. 'Draco's Constitution in the *Athenaion Politeia* 4: Is It an Interpolation or an Author's Later Addition?' *Hyperboreus* 23 (1), 142-73.
- Verlinsky, A. 2021. 'Draco's Constitution and Political Ideas of Athenian Oligarchs' *PhilClass* 16(2), 186-206.
- Vlastos, G. 1952. 'The Constitution of the Five Thousand' *AJPh* 73(2), 189-98.
- Volonaki, E. 2001. 'The Re-Publication of the Athenian Laws in the Last Decade of the Fifth Century B.C.' *Dike* 4, 137-67.
- Von Fritz, K. 1954. 'The Composition of Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* and the So-Called Draconian Constitution' *CPh* 49, 73-93.
- Wallace, R.W. 1989. 'The Athenian Proeispherontes' *Hesperia* 58, 473-90.

Wolpert, A. 2017. 'Thucydides on the Four Hundred and the Fall of Athens' in R.K. Balot, S. Forsdyke & E. Foster (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*. Oxford, 179-91.