

SPARTAN AUSTERITY

Excavations at Sparta early in this century seemed at the time to have provided a fairly clear-cut and decisive answer to questions about the character of Spartan life in the archaic and classical periods. In the seventh century B.C. and the beginning of the sixth century, it was thought, life was comfortable and even luxurious but thereafter comforts and luxuries disappeared from among the offerings at the temple of Artemis Orthia and so, it was held, from Spartan life. On this evidence G. Dickins¹ based his reconstruction of Spartan development, claiming that a great reform must have been carried out before the middle of the sixth century, possibly by the ephor Chilon, as a result of which austerity was enforced at Sparta.

Subsequent excavations and further analysis of the material produced a more complicated pattern in the evidence. In 1935 A. Blakeway summarized the state of the evidence as it then was.² He indicated that Dickins's solution was no longer adequate and that something more complex (and probably economic) was needed to explain a process of decline in commerce and arts which stretched over a considerable period of time, so that gold and ivory and imported pottery disappear from the offerings at a quite early date, whereas the local school of painted pottery persists till c. 525 and good quality bronzework continues down into the fifth century.

There have not been any fundamental changes in the archaeological evidence since Blakeway wrote, although there has been a slight adjustment in the dating of early Laconian pottery styles.³ Several attempts have been made to provide an explanation of this evidence along the lines indicated by Blakeway. (He himself threw out one suggestion in his review.) Other scholars have taken a different line, suggesting that there is nothing very peculiar at all about the life of Sparta which requires a special explanation. Spartan austerity, in their view, in so far as it existed at all, was merely due to poverty, and for the rest was a myth built up for propaganda purposes. It is the purpose of this paper first to examine the various explanations which have been proposed by those who think an explanation necessary and then to consider the view of those who deny the existence of a problem.

Blakeway's suggestion was that an economic cause would be more likely than a political one to explain the uneven and protracted changes in the archaeological and artistic material. He pointed out that Sparta's retention of iron currency at a time when other Greek cities had adopted silver coins might have had a discouraging effect on traders who would cease to visit Spartan ports and markets. This, in turn, might come to affect local arts and crafts adversely.

This suggestion was made at a time when it was generally thought that the earliest Lydian coins belonged to the second half of the eighth century, and that Greek silver coins preceded 700 B.C. This picture was changed fairly abruptly by

¹ *JHS* 32 (1912), 1–42.

² Review of Ollier, *Le Mirage spartiate*, in *CR* 49 (1935), 184 f.

³ J. Boardman in *BSA* 58 (1963), 1–4,

downdates the end of Laconian II to 580 B.C., and hints at downdating of other objects from c. 700 to c. 650 B.C.

the articles of Robinson and Jacobsthal in 1951,⁴ but there had always been a basic weakness in the explanation which Blakeway himself recognized. If the failure to have silver coins produced these effects and if these effects were regarded as undesirable why did the Spartans not take action to remedy the situation? If it is said that they regarded such effects as desirable then a return has been made to an explanation in terms of a Spartan renunciation of comfort and it is only the means whereby austerity was achieved that is in question.

C. Seltman⁵ attempted to resolve this dilemma by suggesting that the Spartans only retained iron currency because they lacked sources of silver within Laconia and Messenia, while there was an abundance of iron. These geological facts are correct but the consequence required by Seltman does not follow from them.

In the first place, Sparta was by no means unique among Greek states in lacking her own supplies of silver. Our literary sources only record a few areas in the Greek world where silver-mines were exploited in antiquity and Athens was the only major city which possessed one within its territory at Laurion. Even so the earliest Athenian coins were made of silver not from Laurion but probably from outside Attica. Aegina, which was the first Greek city to issue silver coins, apparently got its silver initially from Siphnos, while the other great commercial city of mainland Greece, Corinth, derived its silver at different periods from at least three different sources.⁶ Obviously the lack of silver in her own territory is not an adequate explanation in itself for a city's failure to issue silver coins. Seltman himself seemed uneasy about this and he therefore threw in conservatism and a desire to symbolize iron discipline as contributory causes. But this is to revert to a socio-political explanation rather than an objective economic one, such as Blakeway desired. But Seltman's hypothesis, like Blakeway's, is open to more fundamental criticism. Not all Greek cities issued their own coins, yet they were not thereby debarred from trade. In the first hundred years or so after the introduction of silver coins to Greece—i.e. c. 620–520 B.C.—these coins were of high value and not therefore used in common day-to-day transactions. States which were much involved in trade, like Carthage, Phoenicia, and Etruria, were slow to adopt coinage and it was only towards the end of the sixth century or the beginning of the fifth century B.C. that the coinage of any state came to find any degree of acceptance as international currency. Until that time, and even to a large extent after it, international trade must have been conducted largely on a basis of barter.⁷ Sparta, therefore, cannot have been excluded from participation in international trade by her lack of coinage. If an economic cause for Spartan austerity is still sought it must be looked for in Sparta's inability to produce goods which were attractive or inability to reach markets which found them attractive. It is theories of this type that should be considered next.

A popular explanation in this category is based on Sparta's relationship with markets in the East. It is suggested that Spartan concern with the affairs of Lydia and Ionia during the sixth century B.C. is best explained by commercial involvement. Sparta, it is held, needed markets in Asia in order to sell her exports and

⁴ *JHS* 71 (1951), 85 ff. (Jacobsthal) and 156 ff. (Robinson).

⁵ *Greek Coins*² (1955), pp. 33 f.

⁶ C. M. Kraay, *The Composition of Greek Silver Coins* (1962), p. 33.

⁷ Some of these points were foreshadowed by R. M. Cook, *Historia* 7 (1958),

257 ff., but argued at greater length by C. M. Kraay *JHS* 84 (1964), 76 f. Corinth and Athens themselves did not follow Aegina's lead for half a century and even in fourth-century Athens exchange of goods could be talked of as the most natural form of international trade: Xen. *Poroi* 3.2.

thereby enable herself to import luxuries, most of which in any case would come from the East. The period in which Spartan trade seems to have flourished is explained by the existence of a stable and friendly hinterland power in Lydia. But when Persia conquered Sparta's ally, the Lydian king Croesus, it is held that Sparta's trade connections with both Lydia and the Ionian Greeks were ruptured and these former trade-partners were also impoverished by Persian tribute demands. Hence Spartan trade suffered a fatal blow with consequent austerity and other political and social consequences.⁸

In order to make this hypothesis convincing it would be necessary to show, first, that Sparta was particularly dependent on the Eastern markets and, second, that the effect of the conquest of these regions by Persia was to cut off imports from Greece.

As to the first point, it is an oddity that none of the scholars mentioned made use of the available archaeological evidence when considering the importance of Spartan trade with the East. The main stress was on the literary evidence of Herodotus. Herodotus clearly shows that Sparta was concerned with the affairs of Lydia and Ionia in the sixth century and it was argued that only commercial relations could explain this concern. Herodotus treats it on a political and military level but it is suggested that this must be due to his ignorance. The only hint of commerce in his story comes with King Cyrus' reference to the Spartans as men who gather together to cheat each other on oath.⁹ This reference to deals in the *agora* is said by Herodotus to have been aimed at the Greeks in general because the Persians had no *agora*. It was not a well-aimed missile in the case of the Spartans unless Cyrus was remarkably well informed about the backsliding of the previous generation of Spartiates as revealed by the evidence cited in note 43.

It would not seem that this passage provides a very solid base on which to construct an otherwise unsupported explanation of Sparta's interest in Ionia unless one takes the outmoded view that everything must be explained in terms of economic interest. And certainly there can be no justification for ignoring archaeological evidence which exists (and has existed in accessible form since 1933/4) and which must be highly relevant to the question whether Sparta's trade was heavily biased to the East. This evidence is, of course, the distribution of Spartan artefacts outside Laconia and Messenia, and especially of pottery, which is conveniently set out by E. A. Lane in *BSA* 34 (1933/4), 99 ff. and supplemented by *Perachora* ii.309 n.2.

Further finds have been reported from many more recent excavations but it is unnecessary to track down every single sherd, since a fairly clear picture emerges. In the East small quantities of Laconian pottery have been found in a number of sites, mostly Greek cities but also at Sardis and Gordion. The only places where a considerable quantity has been discovered are Samos and Naucratis. At Al Mina, the Greek trading post on the coast of Syria, no Laconian has been found.¹⁰ This would not by itself be very significant since there is a lacuna in the evidence for the period c. 600–520, but at near-by Sukas where there is no such lacuna, Laconian is also absent, although much Greek pottery

⁸ This view was touched on by K.M.T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta* (1949), p. 307, though she also entertained the Blakeway hypothesis to some extent. A more elaborate treatment followed from H.W. Stubbs, *CQ* 44 (1950), 32 f. His view seems to have

been adopted by G.L. Huxley, *Early Sparta* (1962), pp. 73 f. and something similar is to be found in J. Wolski, *Rev. Ét. Anc.* 69 (1967), 31–49.

⁹ Hdt. 1.153.1–3.

¹⁰ *JHS* 48 (1928), 20–1.

has been found there.¹¹ So the archaeological evidence which we possess would not require us to believe in a very intense trade in Spartan commodities with the East.

But it is safer to turn to the positive evidence—that of trade with areas other than the East—and this is available in abundance, from Italy and Sicily (and even Marseille) as well as from Greece itself. The biggest concentration of Laconian material is at Sparta's colony Taras, but it is widely disseminated among the Greek colonies and in Etruria and Rome. In Greece itself it has been found in most of the important sites of the Peloponnese, particularly Olympia, and at Delphi, Aegina, Athens, Delos, and Thasos. At Perachora, the port controlled by Corinth, so much Laconian pottery was found, extending over so great a period, that it was thought to be not a dedication in the temple of Hera, but an accumulation over the years of surplus from cargoes being shipped to the West.¹² It is therefore clear that Sparta had plenty of export outlets in Greece and the West and was not dependent on Eastern markets.

The second assumption on which Stubbs's theory was based, viz. that the Persian conquest would have broken Greek trade contacts with Asia, either through direct interference or through heavy economic obligations imposed by Persia, is shown by archaeological evidence to be equally false. In 1938 Sir Leonard Woolley, writing about Al Mina, commented specifically on the fact that Athens' trade with Al Mina first developed at just about the time when Persia was becoming the enemy of Greece and that this trade continued throughout the Persian Wars.¹³ Yet Al Mina stood within Persian territorial domination.

There is plenty of evidence to show that Al Mina was not an isolated case in this respect. The excavations of Old Smyrna showed a continuous importation of Attic pottery over the period 560–480 including B.F. of the highest quality and almost every known variety of Attic cup.¹⁴ Sinope shows an abundance of Attic pottery from c. 550 onwards and Akurgal reports a similar development on other Pontic sites and at Phocaea.¹⁵ At the southern end of Asia Minor, Xanthos has an extensive Attic B.F. deposit covering the period c. 540–480.¹⁶

This is perhaps enough to show that the Persian conquest did not have the effect of breaking trade contacts between Greece and Asia. Woolley, in his discussion of Al Mina, observed: 'It is a curious sidelight on ancient political conditions when we find international trade uninterrupted by international wars, and merchant-ships discharging their cargoes without let or hindrance in enemy harbours.' The Persians had no reason whatever to interfere with trade between Asia and the Greeks before the Ionian Revolt and, as we can see, did not feel any call to do so even after it. Woolley was perhaps rash to think that Athenian ships carried the pots to Al Mina actually during the Persian War. The goods could have travelled in neutral ships.

Since Sparta was not dependent on Eastern markets and the Persian conquest did not in fact cut the Eastern markets off, clearly the theory under discussion does not stand up. The decline of Laconian pottery exports is due to other causes. It also occurs in mainland Greece and in the West where no political explanation is relevant and is quite clearly due to the rapid drop in quality of Laconian vase-

¹¹ G. Ploug, *Sukas*, ii (1973).

¹² *Perachora* ii (1962), 369.

¹³ *JHS* 58 (1938), 32.

¹⁴ *BSA* 48 (1953), 29.

¹⁵ *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in*

Sinope (1956–9) and *AA* (1959), 17–18.

¹⁶ *Arch. Reports* 1959/60, p. 54. Now published in H. Metzger, *Fouilles de Xanthos*, ii (1972).

painting after c. 550, together with the rapid rise of the excellent Attic B.F. This decline in artistic quality occurred also in Corinthian vase-painting and does not require any socio-political explanation. The successful phase of the Laconian school of vase painting was brief in duration. It has been suggested that all the good-quality output of the best period of this school was the work of only three painters and their workshop followers.¹⁷

As Sparta's austerity cannot be blamed on loss of trade due to the disappearance of a special market, can it be attributed to a general collapse of her trade in all markets owing to an inability to produce goods that were in demand? If her pottery was the main item of her export trade then the loss of its quality would certainly produce a major crisis and she would no longer have the means to pay for imports by exchange of goods. So far as I am aware, this theory has not been formally advanced by any scholar but it seems worth consideration. If it could be upheld it would satisfy those who seek an objective economic cause and wish to discount deliberate Spartan choice, whilst it would confer an added bonus by accounting for her failure to import silver coins from other states or silver bullion from which to make her own coins. On this view, she would not have been able to afford them, and legislation need not enter into it.

There is perhaps a hint of some such idea to be found in W.G. Forrest's *A History of Sparta* (1968), p. 72, where he says 'Lakonian potters . . . began . . . to produce [an] increasingly . . . attractive style which found some favour even outside Lakonia. In return came luxuries from Africa, the East and Asia Minor'. This seems to suggest a simple one-one relationship so that the importation of luxuries is dependent on the ability to export pots and the failure of the pottery would put an end to luxuries. In order to make such a theory plausible it would be necessary to show that there was some approximate chronological correspondence between the beginning of pottery exports and the beginning of luxury imports and similarly between the ending of these two processes. But this is not in fact the case. Gold and ivory and Corinthian pottery appear at Orthia well before 600 B.C. but pottery exports only get going after 600.¹⁸ Even at Taras, where the contact was particularly strong, Laconian pottery only begins to appear after that date. Similarly, exports of Laconian ware continue down to c. 520, but many of the luxuries cease to appear in the Orthia deposit as much as fifty or more years earlier. If it is suggested that the taste for certain luxuries (e.g. amber, gold, ivory) might have changed it should be noted that no alternative luxuries replaced them and, more seriously, a similar cessation of imports occurs in the field of poetry and music, where the Spartan taste undoubtedly persisted. This break had also occurred by c. 550, when Spartan pottery exports had another thirty years or so to run.

But, quite apart from the failure of synchronism between exports and imports there are serious objections to the idea that the Spartan ability to import might be totally dependent on their pottery industry. Fine painted pottery was the product of highly skilled men and cannot reasonably be thought of as a big-scale industry. It is rather a craft industry based on small workshops and however valuable the best products might be the total turnover value cannot have been comparable with that of the major export commodities. Even Athens, which produced pottery on a much bigger scale than Sparta, must have earned an enormously larger amount from her export of olive oil. The Laconian pottery output was on

¹⁷ B. Shefton *BSA* 49 (1954), 299. ¹⁸ Lane, *op. cit.* 178.

a much smaller scale than that of Corinth or Athens or East Greece.¹⁹ It is difficult to believe that it was central to Sparta's export business, quite apart from the point already noted, that Sparta was importing luxuries before she began to export pottery.

How had Sparta managed to pay for imports before she began to export pottery? She obviously had something to offer. There were various natural resources which she could have exploited for this purpose.²⁰ After the annexation of Messenia Sparta was well endowed agriculturally and it would no doubt have been possible for her to export some of her produce. She also had timber and skins unlike many Greek states which had suffered from deforestation and depletion of wild life. More importantly, she had iron and lead. Iron in workable quantities was a rare commodity in the Greek world in spite of a recent attempt to deny this.²¹ The search for it had driven Greek traders on voyages to remote Elba and the Caucasus region early in the ninth century B.C. But Taygetus possessed it in some quantity and Daimachus in his treatise on siegecraft described its peculiar qualities in comparison with iron from the Eastern Pontus.²² Sparta's metal exports must have been much more valuable than her pottery and it therefore seems impossible to attribute changes in her way of life to poverty. R.M. Cook's suggestion²³ that Sparta should be compared with other poor agricultural states of the Peloponnese rather than with Athens, although it has some force, is not wholly valid since Sparta possessed resources which Tegea or Elis lacked.

If it is agreed that the purely economic theories of Spartan austerity which have been put forward (together with one that has only been implied indirectly) are unsatisfactory, it might seem necessary to revert to the view that it was the outcome of a political decision, though clearly Dickinson's particular type will not do. But R.M. Cook has sought to find a way out of this dilemma by putting forward the suggestion that the austerity is largely mythical, that the Spartans lived a pretty normal life by ordinary Greek standards and if it was less glamorous than in some cities this was due to her relative poverty. The latter point has already been dealt with; it fails because Sparta had been able to import luxuries in the past and the relevant comparison should be between Spartan life in the fifth century and Spartan life in the seventh century.

As Cook himself goes on to adduce evidence for normality and even above-normal enjoyment of life at Sparta in order to support his main theme, in so far as he is successful he undermines his subsidiary point. But it is now time to consider his main theme. Is there really adequate evidence for Spartan austerity, or should we think it a myth built up in order to frighten Sparta's enemies, so that when the ominous letter Lambda was described on advancing shields they would tremble to meet such dedicated men?

One argument used by Cook can be accepted at once. He points out that the decline in the artistic quality of Laconian pottery is solely responsible for its disappearance in the export markets and that nothing can be deduced from this about social change in Sparta, any more than in the case of the similar failure of Corinthian pottery. But Cook has failed to note a very important point which

¹⁹ Cf. Shefton, *op. cit.* in n.17, and R.M. Cook *Jahrb. des Deutschen Arch. Inst.* (1959), 114 ff.

²⁰ Cf. K.M.T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta*

(1949), pp. 72 ff.

²¹ A.J. Graham *JHS* 91 (1971), 43–5.

²² *FGrHist* 65 F 4.

²³ *CQ* 12 (1962), 156 ff.

marks Sparta out as exceptional. When other cities, like Corinth, found that their own pottery was declining in quality, they started to import the best pottery which could be found elsewhere—mostly Attic from the middle of the sixth century onwards. But at Sparta this was not the case. J.P. Droop in the *Artemis Orthia* excavation report comments specifically on the remarkable absence of imported pottery after the early Proto-Corinthian specimens.²⁴ 'It was towards the close of the Geometric period that the Laconian potters met with competition at home for the first and practically the only time in their history.' In other words, during the whole period of the flowering of the Attic Black Figure and Red Figure styles, when these wares were penetrating the entire Mediterranean and Black Sea areas, Sparta seems not to have made any importation of them.²⁵ This does seem to need explanation as it is unique. It can hardly be attributed to artistic insensibility since the Spartans had imported Proto-Corinthian and then patronized the fine Laconian ware in its heyday. Nor can it be explained by an accidental lacuna in the excavation since there are continuous series of other types of artefact covering the whole period. So it is the failure to import pots rather than the failure to produce them which is significant.

The same situation arises with poetry and music. Cook rightly observes that the failure of Sparta to produce native poets and musicians after the middle of the sixth century needs no special explanation. The flowering of poetic schools is not a phenomenon that can easily be accounted for in political terms and we hear of no poets from Aegina, only Telesilla from Argos, and none from Corinth after Eumelus. Yet cities which had no poets of their own, but possessed a taste for music and poetry, would naturally tend to bring them in from abroad. Sparta herself had done this in the seventh and early sixth centuries but after Stesichorus they do so no more. Yet there were plenty of good poets in the Greek world and the famous Spartan festivals which required music and poetry were still a central part of the Spartan way of life. So the failure to invite them to Sparta is yet a further point which requires explanation. The absence of imported poets and pots seems a securer basis from which to infer austerity in Spartan life than the mere disappearance of gold and ivory and amber from the *Orthia* deposit. This might be attributable to a change in the fashion of adornment or in the fashion of temple dedications.²⁶ But it seems totally improbable that the taste for painted pottery had died in a people who had shown a taste for it whereas in the rest of the Greek world the taste persisted for about two more centuries. And the Spartan taste for music and dance is fully attested in literature over that same period.

²⁴ *Artemis Orthia* (1929), p. 113.

²⁵ In later excavations on the Spartan Acropolis a small group of Athenian pots was found which probably comes from the temple of Athena (*BSA* 28 (1927), 81). They are all of one type—Panathenaic amphorae of the sort originally given as prizes in the Panathenaic games. They depict a stylized Athena on one side and a representation of the relevant sport on the other. Some of these have been found in places where Panathenaic victors were unlikely to be found and presumably had been sold commercially so we cannot safely assume that the pots on the Acropolis were

dedications by victors, although it is tempting to think so. Cf. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (1972), p. 255 n.5. But these pots are not the normal aesthetic examples of Attic pottery, so hardly provide a significant exception to the general rule that Sparta failed to emulate the rest of the Mediterranean world in the importation and use of Attic pottery after the middle of the sixth century.

²⁶ No *kantharoi* have been found at *Orthia* and it was suggested (*Artemis Orthia*, p. 112) that, as vases of this shape appear regularly in Spartan tomb-reliefs, a religious taboo might be the reason.

Although the Spartans had to make do without painted pottery and poetry, Cook claims that their lives were less disagreeable than is sometimes suggested. He cites various pieces of evidence in support of this view and it is perhaps best to take first the least substantial of them which, indeed, is perhaps not altogether seriously offered. This is a passage in Plato, *Hippias Major* 285. Hippias is being teased by Socrates, who asks him how successful he was in peddling his usual educational stock-in-trade in Sparta. Hippias admits that the Spartans showed no interest in astronomy, geometry, logic, and rhetoric. The only matters which aroused their interest and approval were accounts of the founding of cities and genealogies of heroes, so he had had to get those up specially for the occasion. Cook suggests that this shows that the Spartans were not totally uncultured as they were interested in 'archaeology'. But it is a very narrow and specialized sort of archaeology, appropriate to a militarist élite rather than humane or liberal studies, and so only reinforces the picture of Spartan life that is found elsewhere in our literary sources.

More interesting is Cook's argument about chariot-racing. A mid-fifth-century inscription at Sparta records many victories won by the Spartan Damonon.²⁷ He argues that this is a luxury sport which denotes wealth and leisure, and therefore hardly conforms with the traditional image of Sparta. There are various points to be disentangled here. So far as leisure is concerned, there is no cause for surprise. All Spartiates were exempt from the need to work and they were meant to use their leisure to maintain their fitness and practise military exercises. The link of these with horses is shown below. So far as wealth is concerned there can be no doubt that some Spartans were very wealthy. The idea that all Spartans were equal in wealth or owned equal lots of land is a fallacy based on a misinterpretation of the Spartan system and the term *ἄμωιοι*. This is the myth that the philosophers of the fourth and third centuries began to build up until it finally began to have practical political consequences in the third century. No man could remain a Spartiate unless he could support himself from his land (worked by the helots). In this sense no Spartiate could be poor since if he were poor he would cease to be a Spartiate. But this is far from involving equality of wealth even between the Spartiates. The equality is political, i.e. that of the vote in the assembly and possibly, in theory at least, in candidature for certain offices.

Distinctions of birth and wealth clearly existed among the Spartans and were alluded to by Herodotus (8.134.2. *ἄνδρες Σπαρτιῆται φύσι τε γεγονότες εὐ καὶ χρήμασι ἀνήκοντες ἐς τὰ πρῶτα.*). We are, of course, informed elsewhere that Spartans were not allowed to own coins privately so we must take it that their wealth was mainly in land and stock,²⁸ and the ownership of horses by such men need not surprise us. Xenophon tells us that in the fourth century the Spartans remedied their absence of cavalry by calling on the horses owned by the rich,²⁹ whilst Pausanias 6.2.1–2 says that after the Persian War the Lacedaemonians became keener breeders of horses than any other Greeks. The inscription about Damonon's victories shows that the victorious horses were reared on his own estates and not purchased on an international bloodstock market. His victories

²⁷ C. D. Buck, *Greek Dialects* (1955), pp. 268–9 no. 71.

²⁸ M. I. Finley points out that the prohibition on silver and gold may only have applied to coinage and not to bullion. The chariots, or at least the metal components (if wood and craftsmen come from a

Spartan's estate) had to be bought either with natural produce, iron spits, or bullion. See *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne*, ed. J.-P. Vernant (1968), pp. 150–1.

²⁹ *Hell.* 6.4.11.

were mostly won in Laconia itself and belong to a much more modest milieu than the great international festivals like Delphi and Olympia where the tyrants of Sicily had flaunted their wealth and Alcibiades his debts.³⁰

This was a world at odds with the Spartan system but it is a fact that some rich and aristocratic or royal Spartiates did from time to time enter for the four-horse-chariot events there.³¹ This stretches back at least to Evagoras who won three successive victories with the same horses in the middle of the sixth century, prior to Cimon of Athens who achieved the same feat. There are seventeen or eighteen Spartan victories in this event won by thirteen or fourteen victors down to 368. Pausanias describes the splendid monuments which the victors set up at Olympia to celebrate their triumphs. Xenophon tells us that Agesilaus who practised an austere style persuaded his sister Cynisca to rear horses and enter them for Olympia, wishing to demonstrate that success in this event depended purely on wealth not virility.³² If this was in truth his intention, it misfired badly since she proceeded to celebrate her victory in the most ostentatious manner and was emulated by other women, especially from Sparta.³³

This evidence would have provided better arguments for Cook's case than the more modest Damonon but it does not tell us much about the normal routine of life within Sparta. It merely illustrates a remarkable aspect of the survival of aristocracy into the age of the 'Equals' at Sparta: there was a small number of highly privileged individuals alongside the monarchs who transcended the normal rules and had international connections. A good example is Lichas who won the chariot race at Olympia in 420, is one of the oath-takers for the Peace of Nicias, is proxenus of Argos, and acts as envoy to Argos in 420 and as one of the Spartan Commissioners in Asia in 412. He used to entertain at his private expense foreigners who came to Sparta to see the festivals.³⁴

Cook does take up as a general point the existence of men at Sparta who had international connections and suggests that this shows a freer intercourse than the conventional view of Spartan isolationism and xenophobia permits. If the 'conventional' view is taken to be a belief in an absolutely impermeable Iron Curtain then it is manifestly false. But the ability of some Spartans to transcend the barriers was limited to a very small class of royal and aristocratic people and has little bearing on the life of the ordinary Spartiate. The Athenian Cimon clearly has Spartan friends and Pericleidas, the Spartan who went as envoy to Athens to ask for help at Ithome, may well have been one of them. His son Athenaius signed the Truce of Laches³⁵ and this remarkable name may be matched by Cimon's son Lacedaimonius. King Archidamus was a friend of Pericles and this created difficulties for both men in the early years of the war. As one final example, there is the friendship of the ephor Endius for Alcibiades.³⁶ At one time connections

³⁰ Plut. *Alcib.* 11–12.

³¹ Cf. de Ste Croix, *Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (1972), pp. 137–8 and Appendix 28.

³² Xen. *Ages.* 9.6; cf. Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* 212 b. Ironically, those contests which did require manly qualities did not produce many Spartan victors after c. 560. There is no reason to think they were not competing, given their resentment when the Eleans tried to exclude them (Thuc. 5.49).

³³ Pausanias describes statues of the

horses and charioteer and of Cynisca herself by Apelles (6.1.6). A poem celebrating the victory was the only poem celebrating an achievement by a member of the royal houses of Sparta except that of Simonides on Pausanias' victory at Plataea (3.8.1–2).

³⁴ Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.61; cf. Plut. *Cimon*; 10.5.

³⁵ Thuc. 4.119.2.

³⁶ This was an ancient family connection as Thuc. 8.6.3 reveals. Alcibiades was a family name of Endius and borrowed by

across frontiers might have arisen through marriage-links as with Sicyon and the Alcmaeonids, Argos and the Peisistratids, Thrace and the family of Miltiades and Cimon. But the Athenian citizenship law of 451/0 put an end to that so far as Athens was concerned and it may never have been an important factor in Spartan social history. Proxeny was probably more important in establishing such relations as a *proxenus* was thought of as having a second city;³⁷ and in a different way Brasidas clearly established a special position for himself in Amphipolis.

But all this concerns a small handful of men who habitually acted as field commanders, ambassadors, and *proxenoi*, all men who travelled widely and had special privileges. The ordinary Spartan would have few such opportunities. Perhaps his best chance to see foreigners other than ambassadors would be during the famous festivals when numerous visitors might come to Sparta.³⁸ But these visitors, like the ambassadors, would themselves be aristocrats who would be entertained by Lichas and not mingle with ordinary Spartiates. We should not think of tourists of all classes mixing freely with the Spartan demos and influencing their way of life as tourists have done in Mediterranean countries in the last twenty years. It would be more like tourism in a totalitarian country, where it is not easy to meet ordinary people.

A further point made by Cook concerns architecture and sculpture at Sparta. No Greek city in the classical period could hope to emulate Athens in the splendour of its buildings but Cook draws attention to the fact that some important structures were erected at Sparta in the sixth century and at least one in the early fifth century. But Thucydides' observations about the contrast between the traces which Sparta and Athens would leave behind them, together with Pausanias' account of the architecture of Sparta in his day, make it most unlikely that anything much was built after the Persian Stoa. This was erected soon after 479 as a war memorial and is therefore due to an exceptional cause. In general, Sparta seems to have been active in building during much of the sixth century but inactive in the fifth century. Cook thinks that this is not surprising in view of the lack of development of a city centre but this would have applied equally during the sixth century. It should be noted that the sole construction known in the fifth century was a war memorial.

The last known Laconian sculpture of quality in stone belongs to the same period and also has a martial character—the so-called Leonidas head. The seventh-century Daedalic sculpture had possessed some distinctive strength, and it is an interesting fact that Pausanias in his description of the cult-images in the temples of Laconia of his day continually alludes to them as *ξόανα*.³⁹ It looks as if the primitive archaic statues had been retained. Although there is no cause for surprise if Sparta failed to produce good sculptors after the 470s, it is nevertheless revealing that they clung to their archaic statues as they also did to their archaic music and poetry. Other cities, even poor ones like Tegea,⁴⁰ moved on with the artistic developments of their day and acquired cult-images by the great sculptors of the fifth and fourth centuries. Good Laconian bronzes however continue further into

the Athenian family; cf. also 5.43.2. Endius was active in peace and other negotiations with Athens on many occasions (Thuc. 5.44.3; *FGH Hist* 324 F 44; Diod. 13.52.2).

³⁷ Plato, *Laws* 642 b.

³⁸ Plut. *Ages.* 29 says that Sparta was celebrating a festival and full of foreigners when the news of Leuctra arrived. Plato,

Laws 953, thought it desirable to restrict the number of tourists for festivals in his ideal state.

³⁹ As was the image of Artemis Orthia: G. Lippold, *Die Gr. Plastik in Handb. der Archäologie*⁵ (1950), p. 30.

⁴⁰ Cf. Pausanias 8.45–7 for Athena Alea.

the first half of the fifth century and often figurines are used to decorate mirrors and mixing-bowls. But whether these should be described as 'articles of luxury' (Cook) seems debatable.

Some very interesting problems arise out of the iconography of Laconian art. Among recurrent themes in the vase-paintings are banquets and *κώμοι*.⁴¹ Are we to take these as representing Spartan life and, if so, what of the austerity and the simple life prescribed for the common mess? And how does it square with the high proportion of military themes found in the metal figurines?⁴² If all Spartan arts and crafts were in the hands of *perioeci* are we to take it that they were choosing themes to please themselves or to please export markets or their Spartiate masters?⁴³

Art-historians have often claimed to detect a close relationship between works of art and the society that produce them. In the case of Sparta scholars have written about vase-painting and sculpture as if it clearly reflected the outlook of the Spartiates. E. Langlotz⁴⁴ traces specific characteristics in Laconian stelai—flatness of relief, poverty of modelling, absence of any rounding of the body. Some scholars derived this from the style natural to wood-carving, but Langlotz claimed that the right way of putting it was that this style suited better what Laconian artists wanted to do. He also thought that the sixth-century reliefs reflect a Spartan physical type—lean body, short rump, and long legs—a physical type which in his opinion explained the Spartan preference for running to boxing. The bronze figures on mirror-handles have the same physical type, in his opinion, and the faces have a strength of expression greater than that found elsewhere in the art of the time. He thinks that these faces show the effect of hard upbringing and an austere life and he suggests that this type of face developed slowly from

⁴¹ Lane, op. cit. pp. 157–61; Shefton, *BSA* 49 (1954), 299–310; Cook, op. cit. p. 156 n.2.

⁴² There are, of course, plenty of non-military themes in the bronze, lead, and terracotta objects—particularly, as one would expect, statuettes of Artemis. But there remains a strong military element, especially after c. 580.

⁴³ It has generally been assumed that all the craftsmanship was in perioecic hands in Laconia because of the rule that no Spartiate could engage in such activities. Mr. J. Boardman, however, has drawn my attention to a group of rich sixth-century graves found in the city alongside a potter's kiln. (Intramural burials were accepted in Sparta.) *A. Delt.* 19 (1964) A 123, 283–5. If this is taken to be a rich Spartiate potter then the backsliding in Sparta must have gone very far indeed. The graves are dated by sherds and a funerary amphora to c. 610–590 B.C. Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 27.2, says that Lycurgus forbade the burying of objects with the dead. If this was an early ban, and part of the ancient system, these graves provide evidence of a double infringement—the engaging in manufacture by what is presumably a Spartiate family, and the burial of objects in its graves.

All the funeral amphorae of this type that have been found in Sparta date from 625 to 550 B.C., and it is suggested in the publication report that the ban was enforced again from the middle of the sixth century. The tightening up of the system would also put a stop to Spartiate manufactures and these would revert to *perioeci*.

The view that it was the *perioeci* who were normally the craftsmen and traders is nowhere directly attested, as was pointed out by F. Hampl (*Hermes* 72 (1937), 31–2) and more recently by R.T. Ridley (*Mnemosyne* 27 (1974), 281 ff.). But Hampl's suggestion that all *perioeci* were landowners is not very compelling. Much of the land in perioecic territory was not very fertile and there are indications that some Spartan manufactures were associated with areas in perioecic territory. No doubt there were grades of wealth and distinction amongst the *perioeci* and there is no need to seek craftsmen and traders among disfranchised or bastard Spartans. If the cooks (Hdt. 6.60) and engineers (Xen. *Lac. Pol.* 11.2) were indeed Spartiates they still need not be regarded as commercial operators.

⁴⁴ *Frühgr. Bildbauer-Schulen* (1927), p. 92.

early in the sixth century, reaching its purest form in the Boston head. V. Ehrenberg⁴⁵ drew attention to the hoplite figures in bronze and the very large number in lead which were found in the Orthia deposit. Amongst them is a remarkable bronze statuette of the late sixth century which represents Heracles as a hoplite. He has his lion-skin and bow but in all other respects resembles a Spartiate soldier. There are many lead figurines of hoplite soldiers in the Orthia deposit⁴⁶ and Ehrenberg holds that it is difficult to explain this phenomenon purely as an aesthetic quirk. 'It is the type of the Spartan soldier who is represented in these figures and also in that of Heracles. Heracles is doing his drill on the barrack square.'

Some of these judgements are clearly more subjective than others, and some of the apparent conflicts are perhaps unreal. The banquet and κῶμος vases were imitated from Corinthian ware, as Cook admits.⁴⁷ He merely points out that they could not have been offensive to the Laconian craftsmen or their clients. There is no obvious reason why perioecic craftsmen should have found them offensive and the time when they were being imported from Corinth was precisely the time when life at Sparta seems to have been relaxed, so the Spartiates would not have found them offensive either. The only problem is why such themes continue on Laconian vases later in the sixth century when austerity is alleged to have begun. The answer to this probably lies in the poverty of invention of Laconian artists. They only have a limited number of themes which they continue to repeat. If the Spartans had initiated an austerity regime, they themselves would have ceased to use fine decorated pottery and the declining products of Laconian potters would have gone to perioecic customers or to foreign markets. So these themes would not vex those to whom they might have seemed inappropriate.

It seems quite inconceivable that Laconian vase-painting was designed from the outset purely to meet the needs of foreign markets.⁴⁸ It was for a long time an inferior imitation of Corinthian and could not hope to compete with it abroad. It could only have been meant to satisfy a home demand, as was the locally produced pottery of Syracuse and Etruria. It was only quite late that Laconian pottery acquired a distinctive character and began to be successful in export markets. But even then its range of themes was small and only in an occasional painting like the Arcesilas Cup does actual life seem to be represented. It is at a fairly late stage that even Attic painters began to depict scenes from daily life.

The case with sculpture seems to be different, if the male and female physical types are thought to be specifically Laconian and if the strong emphasis on fully armed hoplites is peculiar to Sparta. The sculptors are not tied to imported models and come closer to reflecting life around them. But this life seems to be

⁴⁵ *Aspects of the Ancient World* (1946), pp. 99–100.

⁴⁶ There are also terracotta figures of warriors the vast majority of which are after 580. The popularity of lead hoplites also comes at that time (*Artemis Orthia*, pp. 167, 274).

⁴⁷ Lane (op. cit., pp. 157–61) comments that the orgiastic vases (with prostitutes) seem to be borrowed from Corinth and do not allude to Spartan life. There are plenty of hunting scenes on Laconian pots but

curiously few battle scenes, although these were popular in Corinthian vase-painting.

⁴⁸ Dedications at Orthia would presumably have been made by Spartiates not *perioeci* as the latter had their own temples in perioecic territory. So the material found in the Orthia deposit will have been purchased by Spartiates. Of course it is true that most of the best specimens of Laconian pottery have been found in foreign sites, but the same is true of Corinthian and Attic.

the life of the Spartiates and not of the *perioeci* themselves.⁴⁹ This again strongly suggests that the most important part of their market was initially, at least, domestic and Spartiate, though the athletic Spartan youths and girls in bronze no doubt had some appeal for *perioeci* and foreigners, and even the hoplite figurines must have had a curiosity value to those outside the system.

At first sight, therefore, it would seem that we learn little from Laconian art about the lives of the *perioeci*. They must have lived in a curious world, having freedom to trade and handle money in a vacuum isolated from their masters who could do neither. As some trade continued into the fifth century at least, what did they take in exchange for their exports (which were presumably mostly metal-work)? No perioecic town or village in Laconia itself has been excavated, so we cannot be sure how comfortably they lived. Perhaps they imported Attic pottery and sculpture. Excavations on the island of Cythera have yielded fragmentary pottery of the late fifth century including some Attic Red Figure and some Corinthian, together with Laconian and Attic black glaze.⁵⁰ This may give some hint of what an excavation of a perioecic town on the mainland might disclose, but one must be wary of jumping to conclusions. Cythera was in a rather unique situation, being an island on a main trade-route⁵¹ and therefore more open to foreign influences and less subject to the Spartiate presence than any other part of Spartan territory.⁵²

But it seems to me doubtful that excavaton will ever reveal a perioecic Sybaris coexisting with the barracks of Sparta. There are reasons for thinking that the *perioeci*, although not subject to the discipline of the Spartan ἀγωγή, were far from being immune to its influence. Many foreigners were hypnotized by Sparta as Greek literature clearly shows, and the *perioeci* were more exposed to her influence than anyone else. It might be thought that their position of political subjection and social inferiority would have made them hostile to Spartan culture and values but this does not seem to have been the case. Subjected groups have often tended to accept and emulate the values and life-style of dominating groups, as with the Untouchables in India who created an imitative caste-system among themselves and many colonized peoples in Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean (or slaves in the U.S.A.) who at one time aspired to follow the standards of their masters.

The most important evidence that this actually occurred lies in the fact that the *perioeci* must have constituted the bulk of the Spartan army after the Persian Wars, and that as time went on Spartan armies came to consist almost entirely of *perioeci* and enfranchised helots (who make an even more striking example of the rule that the dominated ape the dominators). Yet in spite of this the morale and discipline of the Spartan armies remained high, and their reputation and capabilities formidable. Whereas at the battle of Plataea in 479 the Spartiates and *perioeci* were numbered separately and provided 5,000 men each, at the battle of Mantinea in 418 we hear of the Skiritai and the army of Brasidas and the enfranchised helots separately, and then of 'the Lacedaemonians' without distinction of

⁴⁹ This need occasion no surprise. Mr. Boardman points out to me that a very high proportion of the pot painters at Athens were non-citizens but their work is pure 'Attic'.

⁵⁰ *Arch. Reports* 1963/4, pp. 25–6, 1965/6, p. 21.

⁵¹ Thuc. 4.53.3 ὁλλκάδων προσβολή.

⁵² Thuc. 4.54.3 shows that some of the inhabitants of Cythera were in contact with Nicias before the attack in 424, and some of them went with the Athenian expedition to Sicily nine years later (7.57.6). They were not, therefore, wholly loyal to Sparta.

Spartiates from *perioeci*.⁵³ It seems certain that they were now integrated into the same units.⁵⁴ It is about this army that Thucydides writes a detailed and admiring account of the high degree of training and discipline which permitted Spartan armies to dominate their enemies, especially through the system which enabled them to pass orders swiftly down through a chain of command and consequently to change formation in the middle of a battle. This would have needed much practice and integration, so the *perioeci* could not have lived easy-going lives or failed to share much of the Spartiate way of life.

In the fourth century and especially after the battle of Leuctra there can have been few Spartiates in the average Spartan army. The defence of Sparta itself against Epaminondas and his vast and revengeful forces must have fallen mainly on the shoulders of the *perioeci*. They had a golden chance to revolt but few took the opportunity.⁵⁵ Most of them must clearly have identified themselves with the Spartan cause in spite of their political deprivation.⁵⁶ Thucydides tells us of a *perioecus* who commanded a naval force⁵⁷ and Xenophon has some extremely significant expressions when describing the army of King Agesipolis at Olynthus in 381 B.C.⁵⁸ This had thirty Spartiates with it but consisted mainly of perioecic volunteers, foreigners who had chosen to be reared in the Spartan system (like Xenophon's own sons), and illegitimate sons of Spartiates. Xenophon refers to the *perioeci* as *καλοὶ κάγαθοί*, and says of the whole force that they were a fine-looking body of men *καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει καλῶν οὐκ ἄπειροι*. The social system had become complex through the existence of the various semi-privileged categories like the foreign *τρόφιοι*, the Spartiate *νόθοι*, the *ὑπομειόνες*, the *Brasidaeioi*, and the *νεοδαμώδεις*. They were bound together by the extraordinary force of the Spartan image and by the *ἀγωγή* which alone ensured Spartan survival after Leuctra and was clearly of great political importance however much backsliding might occur in its actual practice, particularly after the defeat of Athens.⁵⁹

It is in the crucial importance of the *ἀγωγή* that it may be possible to find a solution to the problem posed by the archaeological evidence. Dickins's suggestion of a drastic and instantaneous redirection of Spartan life is not acceptable, but if the method used was not sumptuary legislation but a reversion to the strict educational system which was primitive⁶⁰ but had fallen into decline after the conquest of Messenia, then the mystery may be solved. Children were again to be separated at an early age from their parents and the father was to attend his meals at the common mess. There was little scope for fine pottery and the adornment of life; the desire for such things was treated as anti-social and un-Spartan. The failure to import fine pots and poets is due not to poverty but to the fear of losing the strict discipline through sensuous and corrupting external influences. More recent parallels to the conception of decadent art as the enemy of the state are not hard to find. The Persian Stoa and the Warrior's head (the so-called 'Leonidas') were acceptable but an *Antigone* or *Troades* would not have been. Obviously the system was never totally effective but contemporary writers of the fifth and fourth centuries show by passing references that it had much power (as does Sparta's survival

⁵³ Thuc. 5.67.1.

⁵⁴ A.H.M. Jones *Sparta* (1967), Chap. XIV.

⁵⁵ Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.25 mentions the possibility, but the promise misfired.

⁵⁶ This point was noted by Pavel Oliva, *Sparta and her Social Problems* (1971),

p. 62.

⁵⁷ 8.22.1.

⁵⁸ *Hell.* 5.3.9.

⁵⁹ Xen. *Lac. Pol.* 14 and Plato and Aristotle *passim*, especially Arist. *Pol.* 1270b.

⁶⁰ Nilsson, *Klio* 12 (1912), 308–40.

after Leuctra). Herodotus refers to the common mess (6.57.3) and a Spartan meal is set beside a Persian one after Plataea (9.82.2). Diphilus (fr. 96 Kock) talks of *λακωνικῶς δειπνεῖν* and Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 79–82, delineates the muscular development of the Spartan girl Lampito. Thucydides (1.64) describes the simple clothing first adopted by the Spartans whereby the rich did their best to assimilate their way of life to the common people ('Equals'). He also praises Brasidas as a man who could speak quite well 'for a Lacedaemonian' (4.84.2). But most important is the Funeral Oration where in certain passages a contrast is clearly drawn between life in Athens and life in Sparta. The references to 'keeping close watch on each other' and 'resentment of a neighbour doing what he wants' are relevant to the Spartan system of supervision but not to other Greek cities. The references to the 'elegance of private establishments' and the 'produce of the world in our harbour' would not provide a striking comparison with Corinth and many other cities but clearly would with Sparta. Only Sparta could be meant here, as also in the allusion to the harsh discipline from the cradle aimed at producing manliness and, later on in the speech, to the courage produced by training and artifice, and the undergoing of hardships as a preparation and training for war⁶¹ (2.37.1–39.4).

All this seems to take for granted a knowledge of the Spartan system among Pericles' audience and an awareness that it was in fact working as it was meant to work. Because the discipline was imposed from without many Spartan leaders when released from its bonds failed to exercise self-control and behaved so badly that it became legendary. Brasidas was an exception and Thucydides comments on this: *πρῶτος γὰρ ἐξελθὼν καὶ δόξας εἶναι κατὰ πάντα ἀγαθὸς ἐλπίδα ἐγκατέλιπε βέβαιον ὥς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι τοιοῦτοί εἰσω* (Thuc. 4.81.3). Most Spartan leaders unfortunately disappointed this hope as they had done in the past. The Athenian envoys at Sparta before the war began observed to the Spartans that their life at home is regulated by rules incompatible with those of other peoples, and that their citizens abroad act neither on those rules nor on those which are recognized by the rest of Hellas (Thuc. 1.77.6).

If it seems clear that Sparta attempted, and to a remarkable extent succeeded, in reimposing an archaic way of life on herself in the sixth century, what was the cause? Her conquest of Messenia had solved her economic problems. Cook claims that no military crisis existed in the middle of the sixth century since the Messenian Revolt had been put down and there was no cause for alarm. But in fact there was a military crisis at a date somewhere around 580–570, when Sparta set out to conquer Tegea and met with a shattering military catastrophe.⁶² She struggled for years before she reached a solution to the problem, round about 560. She clearly was desperately worried in this period about the security of Messenia, for in the treaty of alliance that terminated the struggle a clause stipulates that the Tegeates

⁶¹ Arist. *Pol.* 1338^b also severely criticizes the principles of this system.

⁶² Hdt. 1.65. Herodotus puts the defeat in the reigns of King Leon and Agasicles. Their dates are usually given as c. 590–560 and 573–550. By 556 Anaxandridas is king, if we can trust the Rylands papyrus to that extent. It was in Anaxandridas' and Ariston's reigns that Tegea was finally dealt with, but Herodotus implies that there had

been some years in which Sparta has struggled unsuccessfully with Tegea. It seems probable that the settlement with Tegea preceded the intervention in Sicily in 556 so the original defeat may date before c. 570. If a Spartan campaign with Elis against the Pisatan control of Olympia is credited and put between Ol.50 and Ol.51 (580–575) then the defeat by Tegea probably comes after this. (Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.545).

should not give sanctuary to Messenian refugees.⁶³ It need not surprise us that Sparta was frightened since her man-power was limited and it was fully committed to the struggle with Tegea. Surely this crisis provides the context in which a strict enforcement of the *ἀγωγή* makes sense. If she wished to control large areas of the Peloponnese with a small citizen-body, her army must be the best trained and toughest in Greece. Thucydides' account of the Spartan army at Mantinea shows how she achieved this. The reassertion of the *ἀγωγή* would not produce effects overnight but as the young grew up their influence would produce the changes that we find. It is because the change would be gradual and no new laws or institutions were created that it could have left so little trace in historical tradition. Cook suggested that the silence of the fifth-century Greek historians rules out the possibility of anything so important having happened in Sparta at the proposed time. But this seems to me to overestimate grossly the knowledge possessed by fifth-century historians about the sixth century, and especially about sixth-century Sparta, since Sparta was always secretive.⁶⁴ Even our knowledge of sixth-century Athens is very patchy and centres largely on the traditions of the great families such as the Alcmaeonids and the family of Miltiades. So far as sixth-century Sparta is concerned we hear from Herodotus about the war with Tegea (probably from Delphic sources), the alliance with Croesus and the Spartan envoy to Cyrus (Ionian sources), and the Polycrates saga (Samian sources and a Spartan family source). Continuous history only begins with Cleomenes I, about whom the Spartans were not eager to talk and what they said was often false (if we assume that Herodotus got from Sparta the story that Cleomenes only ruled a short time). Our knowledge of Cleomenes is clearly due largely to Athenian sources because he had many dealings with them (the expulsion of Hippas, the intervention for Isagoras, the Aeginetan hostages).

So in a matter which only concerned Sparta's internal affairs and whose efficacy would only make itself felt gradually it is clear that the outside world would be in the dark. They only learned from the ultimate result—a more formidable military machine.⁶⁵

Trinity College, Oxford

A. J. HOLLADAY

⁶³ F. Jacoby, *CQ* 38 (1944), 15.

⁶⁴ Cf. Thuc. 2.39.1, 4.80.4, 5.68.2.

Even Sparta's foreign friends would not be able to observe in intermittent visits the subtle tightening of an existing set of rules, and if they asked about them, they would be told, as Thucydides was, that the

Eunomia was 400 years old (1.18.1).

⁶⁵ I am grateful to Professor A. Andrewes and Mr. J. Boardman for helpful suggestions and criticisms though neither of them should, of course, be thought to endorse everything in this paper.