

THE EXILE OF THEMISTOKLES AND DEMOCRACY IN THE PELOPONNESE

The period after the repulse of Xerxes' invasion is one of the more obscure in Greek history, and this is particularly true of the eclipse of Themistokles and the history of the Peloponnese in the seventies and sixties. On the period of Themistokles' ostracism before the flight which led him to Persia Thucydides says only that he was ostracized and lived at Argos while also travelling to the rest of the Peloponnese.¹ Other writers add a few details to Thucydides' account on other aspects of the ostracism, but tell us even less on the sojourn in Argos. Diodoros and Plutarch merely tell us that he lived there in exile² while Nepos informs us that Themistokles' virtuous and dignified life in Argos aroused resentment.³

Now Themistokles did not remain inactive in exile. The Spartans had some good reason to wish to remove him from Argos. The activities which aroused the Spartans' distrust are probably referred to by Thucydides' remark that Themistokles journeyed to the rest of the Peloponnese. It is usually concluded that Themistokles was involved in the creation of an anti-Spartan coalition and that a major part of this policy may have been the establishment of democratic governments in and the synoecism of the cities of Elis and Mantinea.⁴

But we lack any clear evidence on Themistokles' actions in this period⁵ and the hypothesis rests principally on deductions from two brief passages. The first is from Herodotos and records that in 479 B.C. the Mantineian and Eleian contingents arrived too late to take part in the battle of Plataia and on their return both cities banished their commanders.⁶ This is a clear sign of disaffection in the two cities⁷ but it is proof of disaffection in 479. The banishment of the generals need not have ended disloyalty in the two cities but we should bear in mind that it may well have done so.

The second passage underlying the hypothesis is one of Strabo which mentions the synoecism of Elis and that of Mantinea in the one paragraph.⁸ But Strabo does not actually say that they occurred at the same time and it is unwise to assume that he meant to imply that they did. His list also includes Tegea, Heraia, Aigion, Patrai and Dyme.⁹ In the case of Heraia, Strabo tells us that the synoecism was due to Kleombrotos or Kleonymos – therefore it happened between 380 and 371 B.C.¹⁰ and

¹ Thucydides 1. 135. 3.

² Diodorus Siculus 11. 55. 3. Plutarch, *Themistokles* 23. 1.

³ Nepos 2. 8. 1.

⁴ G. Fougères, *Mantinee et l'Arcadie orientale* (Paris, 1898), pp. 376 f.; A. Andrewes, 'Sparta and Arcadia in the Fifth Century', *Phoenix* 6 (1952), 2; W. G. Forrest, 'Themistocles and Argos', *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 226; A. J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* (Montreal, 1975), p. 37.

⁵ R. J. Lenardon, *The Saga of Themistocles* (London, 1978), p. 118. R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (London, 1972), pp. 104 ff., agrees that Themistokles was involved in some anti-Spartan activity but doubts whether we can determine what it was.

⁶ Herodotos 9. 77.

⁷ Andrewes, *Phoenix* 6 (1952), 2.

⁸ Strabo 8. 3. 2.

⁹ W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 226 and 229 n. 8, mentions the synoecism of Tegea as perhaps contemporary with that of Mantinea, while A. Andrewes, op. cit., p. 3 n. 11 says 'there seems to be no evidence for dating the *συνοικισμός* of Tegea'. The other synoecisms are not discussed.

¹⁰ C. Callmer, *Studien zur Geschichte Arkadiens bis zur Gründung des Arkadischen Bundes* (Lund, 1943), p. 104.

must have been in the interest of the Spartans, not of a coalition against them. Strabo is giving a list of Peloponnesian cities synoecized from a number of villages, not a group of cities involved in a common political movement.¹¹

As two of the major pieces of evidence advanced to demonstrate the existence of a major democratic movement in the Peloponnese at the time of Themistokles' ostracism need not bear the implications drawn from them, it is worth examining the surviving evidence on the history of the individual cities to test the plausibility of the hypothesis.

At first sight the evidence on Mantinea fits well with the theory. When Mantinea was split into four villages in 385 her government became aristocratic and more loyal to the Spartans.¹² The reunion of Mantinea in 370 had the opposite effect – the democracy was restored and an anti-Spartan policy adopted.¹³ As Strabo says that Mantinea's original synoecism was accomplished by the Argives¹⁴ it is clear Mantinea was on bad terms with Sparta at the time. It is then easy to suggest that synoecism, democracy and hostility to Sparta went hand in hand at Mantinea.¹⁵

But there is a serious problem created by this assumption. Mantinea, like Argos, was a democracy when the two made their alliance in 421 B.C.¹⁶ As Argos had then been at peace with Sparta for thirty years, Argive assistance for the Mantineian synoecism cannot have been a recent event. But the one piece of evidence on the establishment of democracy at Mantinea which actually survives indicates that it took place not long before 421.

Ailian says that the laws of Mantinea were established by one Nikodoros and that his laws, unlike Solon's at Athens, remained unchanged for a long time.¹⁷ Ailian tells us that Nikodoros was assisted by his lover, Diagoras of Melos, in the preparation of his law code.¹⁸ Nikodoros would be younger than his lover and Diagoras is reasonably securely dated. Diodoros says that Diagoras fled from Athens in 415/14 due to hostility against his atheism and the Athenians placed a price of a talent on his head.¹⁹ The contemporary evidence of Aristophanes confirms Diodoros' dating and shows that Diagoras was alive and active during the Peloponnesian War.²⁰

There are other sources which give Diagoras' floruit as 468/7 or even earlier but these should be explained as attempts to link Diagoras with Simonides, since both were lyric poets. As 468/7 was the year of Simonides' death it is the last possible date for the floruit of any poet regarded as his pupil.²¹ More convincing than these early dates is the scholiast on Aristophanes who informs us that Diagoras was outlawed for offences against the mysteries and the Athenians offered a reward of one talent to anyone who killed him and two talents for the man who captured him alive.²² This shows that Diagoras was believed to have firsthand evidence on the profanation of the mysteries²³ and so strengthens the case for a late fifth-century date for Diagoras.

¹¹ How & Wells, *ad Herodotum* 9. 35. 2 would place the synoecism of Mantinea later than that of Elis.

¹² Xenophon, *Hellenica* 5. 2. 7.

¹³ *Ibid.* 6. 5. 3–5.

¹⁴ Strabo 8. 3. 2.

¹⁵ A. Andrewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 2 f.: 'we may reasonably associate democracy with *συνοικισμός*'.

¹⁶ Thucydides 5. 29. 1.

¹⁷ Ailian, *Variae Historiae* 2. 22 f.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 23.

¹⁹ Diodorus Siculus 13. 6. 7: dated to the archonship of Chabrias (415/14).

²⁰ *Aves* 1073; *Ranae* 320. Cf. E. Wellman, art. Diagoras (2), *RE* 5 (1905), coll. 310 f.

²¹ L. Woodbury, 'The Date and Atheism of Diagoras of Melos', *Phoenix* 19 (1965), 192.

²² *Scholia ad Ar. Aves* 1073 (= *FGrHist* 326 F3).

²³ L. Woodbury, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

This indicates that Nikodoros and his law code are to be dated to the twenties or thirties of the fifth century.²⁴ Ailian's comparison of Nikodoros and Solon shows that the former was the founder of democracy at Mantinea. If we postulate a date around 470 for the foundation of that democracy, Ailian's evidence must be rejected.

While Ailian is a late and not always reliable author, we should not reject his evidence without good reason. An examination of what is known about the constitution of the Mantineian democracy shows striking differences from Athenian practice – which one would not expect to be the case if the mastermind behind it were Themistokles rather than the democracy being a purely local development.

In his treatment of those democracies based on a farming population (by far the best type in his view) Aristotle discusses the constitution of Mantinea.²⁵ Under it the people did not take part in the election of magistrates, but this was done by some chosen in turn from the whole population (*ἀλλὰ τινες αἵρετοὶ κατὰ μέρος ἐκ πάντων*)²⁶ and the people were responsible for deciding policy (*τοῦ δὲ βουλευέσθαι κύριοι ὄσιν*). These rights satisfied the common people and the constitution was to be classed as a sort of democracy (*σχήμα τι δημοκρατίας*). This is very different from both the constitution of Athens itself and the constitutions the Athenians introduced among their allies, for example at Erythrai.²⁷

Mantineian democracy seems to have differed from Athenian practice in another way. These indirectly elected magistrates seem to have been more influential and less the servants of the people than their Athenian opposite numbers. Under the democracy restored in 370, the magistrates effectively blocked conciliatory moves by Agesilaos, denying him a hearing before the people and then refusing his offer to negotiate on the grounds that the people had already decided on the issue involved before his arrival.²⁸ Such behaviour by Athenian magistrates would have been regarded as a violation of the people's sovereignty.

We cannot be sure that the restored democracy continued the practices of the original constitution²⁹ but it does seem unlikely that the position of the magistrates vis-à-vis the assembly was weaker in the original constitution than in the restored one. It was probably because of the greater role played by Mantineian magistrates that the *demiourgoi* were listed before the Mantineian council in the 420 alliance between Athens, Argos, Elis, and Mantinea, while for Athens and Argos the council was listed first.³⁰

This evidence does not favour the proposed link between Mantineian democracy and Themistokles. The Mantineian lawgiver Nikodoros seems to have lived too late

²⁴ M. Amit, *Great and Small Poleis* (Bruxelles, 1973), p. 136; M. Wörle, *Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte von Argos* (Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1964), p. 121; cf. A. W. Gomme et al. *Commentary on Thucydides*, iv (Oxford, 1970), p. 59.

²⁵ Aristotle, *Politics* 1318b 23–7.

²⁶ The word *αἵρετοί* implies that the electors themselves were elected, as is the case in the American presidential electoral college. W. L. Newman, *Commentary* (Oxford, 1887), ad loc. also suggests that the electors may have been selected on a system of rotation (cf. 1298a 15, where the words *κατὰ μέρος* are to be found but *αἵρετός* is not). In *IG* v. 2 (ad. No. 323, p. 65) a series of ceramic plaques in five shapes (perhaps representing the five tribes of Mantinea) each of which has a name inscribed on it, is associated with the *αἵρετοί κατὰ μέρος* – which would imply sortition. The first hypothesis seems to fit Aristotle's words best.

²⁷ Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI* number 40.

²⁸ Xenophon, *Hellenica* 6. 5. 4 f.

²⁹ Ailian's remark (*VH* 2. 22) that Nikodoros' laws were observed for a longer time than Solon's implies continuity between the two constitutions at Mantinea while Aristotle's words *ὥσπερ ἐν Μαντινείᾳ ποτ' ἦν* seem evidence for some significant changes.

³⁰ Thucydides 5. 47. 9.

and his constitution differed too widely from Athenian practice for it to be likely that Themistokles was his associate.

It might still be argued that the synoecism of Mantinea, which must be earlier than the democracy, should be placed around 470 B.C. But there is no positive evidence for it and some grounds for rejecting such a view. In this period the mutual hostility of Mantinea and Tegea prevented them making common cause. If the one is hostile to Sparta at a given time, the other is not.³¹ The evidence is quite clear that shortly after 470 Tegea was hostile to Sparta, fighting alongside the Argives at the battle of Tegea and with all the other Arkadians except the Mantineians at Dipaia.³² In the sixties, then, the Mantineians were either neutral or pro-Spartan.

It is possible that their attitude had changed in a few years around 470,³³ rather than in the immediate aftermath of Plataia. But there is no evidence for Mantineian hostility to Sparta in the middle or late seventies, apart from the synoecism which is only dated there on the assumption of such hostility. For Tegea, however, there is some evidence which suggests hostility to Sparta in the seventies as well as in the sixties. It was to Tegea that Latychidas fled after his failure in Thessaly in the mid-seventies.³⁴

Forrest's suggestion that both Tegea and Mantinea were co-operating against Sparta about 470 seems implausible.³⁵ After Leuktra that combination virtually destroyed Sparta's hegemony in the Peloponnese, yet one cannot point to a single achievement of the two cities acting together in the fifth century. Their alliance must be assumed to have broken up without having been put to the test.³⁶

Now the existence of an Arkadian League in the 460s is demonstrated by its coins, of which Kraay has shown the earliest issues were modelled on Athenian types from 470/69 or later.³⁷ This league can only have been anti-Spartan in intention. But the deduction that Mantinea was one of the mints striking this coinage is based on the most tenuous evidence³⁸ and can hardly be used to disprove the explicit statement of Herodotos that Mantinea was not involved in the Arkadian revolt of the 460s.³⁹

Furthermore, Mantineian loyalty to Sparta in the late 460s is proven by Xenophon's remark that Agesilaos did not want to lead the attack on Mantinea in 385 because of the assistance the Mantineians gave to his father (Archidamos) in 'the war against Messene'.⁴⁰ Clearly the help the Mantineians gave to Archidamos in the aftermath of the earthquake of 464 and the subsequent helot revolt must have been greater than that of other Peloponnesian cities.

Fougères advanced three reasons for dating the synoecism of Mantinea to the fifth century:⁴¹ that for the first time Mantinea adopts a leading role in Greek politics at this time, that Sparta would not have undone the synoecism if it were of great

³¹ A. Andrewes, *Phoenix* 6 (1952), 3.

³² Herodotos 9. 35. 2, cf. Pausanias 8. 8. 6.

³³ As A. Andrewes thinks, *op. cit.*, pp. 2 f. But cf. How & Wells *ad loc.*

³⁴ Herodotos 6. 72. 2. 'Evidence it is not, but it is suggestive', W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 229 n. 8.

³⁵ *op. cit.*, p. 226.

³⁶ The wording of W. G. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 230, 'by 465/464 both Argos and Mantinea have deserted the alliance of 470' may imply that Mantinea, like Argos, took part in the battle of Tegea. But the wording of Herodotos 9. 35. 2, saying that all the Arkadians but the Mantineians were present at Dipaia does not mean that even they were present at Tegea. For that battle Herodotos mentions no Arkadians except the Tegeates themselves.

³⁷ C. M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London, 1976), p. 97.

³⁸ *Ibid.* p. 98.

³⁹ Herodotos 9. 35. 2, cf. Pausanias 8. 8. 6.

⁴⁰ Xenophon, *Hellenica* 5. 2. 3; cf. M. Amit, *Great and Small Poleis* (1973), p. 132.

⁴¹ Fougères, *Mantinee*, p. 375.

antiquity, nor would the new city of Mantinea have been built on the open plains in archaic times.

But the first of these arguments cannot support a date for the synoecism in the 460s, when Mantinea did not play the leading part against Sparta that Fougères believed. The other arguments do not rule out a date in the middle or late sixth century. As Callmer observes Argive support for the synoecism of Mantinea is more likely to have occurred before the battle of Sepeia.⁴² Amit points out that Polybios' remark that Mantinea was the oldest city in Arkadia also favours an early date for the synoecism.⁴³

While the evidence is fragmentary it does present a straightforward picture. The Mantinean synoecism was made in the sixth century with Argive help. In 479 the Mantineans were disaffected but the exile of her leaders after Plataia re-established loyalty to Sparta so that Mantinea helped Sparta against both the Arkadian and helot revolts in the 460s. Only around 430 B.C. did Mantinea become a democracy and once again disaffected from Sparta. Thus there is no real evidence that Themistokles' policy of opposition to Sparta gained any success at Mantinea.

But in Elis there was independent activity in that period. Under the year 471/0 Diodoros says that the Eleians, who had formerly lived in many small villages, came together to live in a single city.⁴⁴ Immediately after this he tells the story of Themistokles' ostracism and eventual flight to Persia. Diodoros himself makes no link between the two events (and says nothing whatever about Mantinea). It seems unlikely that his sources made an explicit link between the two events. But it may well be the case that Diodoros' chronological source listed Themistokles' ostracism and synoecism of Elis under the same year because they were in fact connected.⁴⁵

Even though it seems that Diodoros did not find a reference to Themistokles' involvement in the synoecism of Elis, it would fit in well with his anti-Spartan activity. The Eleian synoecism would probably strengthen the patriotic feelings of the Eleians and perhaps their ability to adopt independent policies. They may have seemed promising material to be recruited for an anti-Spartan coalition. Themistokles would probably have made one of his trips from Argos in the hope of detaching Elis from the Peloponnesian League.

But in actual fact there is no evidence that they left the league before 420 B.C.. The strengthening of Elis was not carried out to the extent of making the city capable of withstanding a siege – the city was still unwallled at the start of the fourth century.⁴⁶ There is no evidence that the Spartans objected to the Eleian synoecism, probably because it did not appear to be a serious threat to their Peloponnesian hegemony.

This may cast doubt on the connection Andrewes and Forrest have suggested between synoecism and democracy at Elis.⁴⁷ We have seen that the surviving evidence does not favour such a connection at Mantinea. There the synoecism was older than the democracy. At Elis it seems to have been the reverse. The synoecism is dated to about 470, while inscriptions revealing a democracy at Elis have been dated to the start of the fifth century.⁴⁸

⁴² Callmer, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

⁴³ Amit, *op. cit.*, p. 126. Polybios 2. 56. 6.

⁴⁴ Diodorus Siculus 11. 54. 1.

⁴⁵ For the coverage of Diodoros' 'chronographic' source see E. Schwarz, *art. Diodoros* (38), *RE* 5 (1905), coll. 665–9.

⁴⁶ Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3. 2. 27; cf. A. Andrewes, *Phoenix* 6 (1952), 2 n. 7.

⁴⁷ A. Andrewes, *op. cit.*, p. 2; W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 226.

⁴⁸ A. Andrewes calls them 'undatable'; *op. cit.*, p. 2 (cf. n. 8). There still remain problems in the precise dating of archaic inscriptions; cf. L. H. Jeffery, *Local Scripts* (Oxford, 1961), pp. vii and 217 ff. Epigraphists' dates may not be certain but they should not be dismissed on even less secure grounds.

The alliance between Elis and Heraia imposes penalties on anyone who damages the decree, whether private individual, magistrate or the people themselves⁴⁹ and a second decree refers to judgements by the council of 500 and by the full assembly (δάμος πλεθύνοντι).⁵⁰ Both inscriptions clearly refer to an already established democracy, and to judge from their letter forms both are to be dated c. 500 B.C.⁵¹ – a generation earlier than the date of the synoecism.

The only reason for rejecting the epigraphical dates for these inscriptions is the belief that a democracy could only exist in a centralized city.⁵² But this need not be the case. We should remember that many Athenians still lived outside the city in 431,⁵³ and Elis may have had an even more scattered population and still have been able to run a democratic government.⁵⁴

Moreover the Eleian democracy, while it shows less difference from Athenian practice than the Mantineian did, still does not seem to have been a copy of it. For example, an Eleian decree orders the Hellanodikai and the damiorgia to collect penalties on behalf of Zeus and of the state of Elis and if they fail to do so they are required to pay double the amount themselves ἐν μαστράαι ('at the whipping').⁵⁵ This is obviously a procedure similar to the Athenian euthynai, but the difference in the name suggests an independent origin, rather than a borrowing.

If the order in which those swearing to the quadruple alliance of 420 is significant then the Eleian democracy may have resembled the Mantineian rather than the Athenian in having powerful magistrates and a relatively weak council. For Elis the damiorgoi and the other magistrates are both named before the sixty,⁵⁶ in contrast to Athens and Argos, where the council is named before any magistrates.⁵⁷

Again this evidence is not conclusive, but it tends to show that the Eleian democracy predated the synoecism there and the time of Themistokles' exile and that the Eleian democracy does not seem to have been modelled on Athenian practice. It is likely that the synoecism occurred when Themistokles was in the Peloponnese and he and his associates may well have tried to exploit Eleian nationalism against the Spartan hegemony. But they were unsuccessful in any such attempt.

There can be no doubt that Argos was involved in Themistokles' activities. All our sources, from Thucydides on, agree that it was his base and he probably chose it as a congenial place for his purposes.⁵⁸ But it is not easy to determine the nature of the government of Argos during Themistokles' stay there.

⁴⁹ ML 17 (no. 6 in *Local Scripts*, p. 220).

⁵⁰ DGE 412 (no. 5 in *Local Scripts*).

⁵¹ L. H. Jeffery, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

⁵² There is a similar problem on the date of Elis' first coins, which may also belong to this period. Cf. B. V. Head, *HN*², pp. 419 f.; L. H. Jeffery, *op. cit.*, p. 220, nos. 7a, b.

⁵³ Thucydides 2. 14–17.

⁵⁴ Meiggs & Lewis, *GHI*, p. 33 state without discussion 'Neither Elis nor Heraia was a city at this date', while Swoboda (art. Elis, *RE* 5 (1905), col. 2393) concludes that Elis became a democracy and underwent a tribal reform the year *before* the synoecism. Cf. A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes and K. J. Dover, *Commentary on Thucydides*, IV (Oxford, 1970), 60 who say it 'is unexpected but not impossible'.

⁵⁵ DGE 409. 6 f.

⁵⁶ Either the council of 500 had been replaced by a smaller body or only a part of the council was swearing the oaths (though sixty seems more likely to be a segment of a council of 600). In the latter case the importance of the full council would seem very much less than at Athens.

⁵⁷ Thucydides 5. 47. 9.

⁵⁸ M. Wörle, *op. cit.*, p. 121 points out that Forrest overlooks the fact that Themistokles came to Argos after his ostracism. But even though he may not have been able to choose an ideal place of exile, he would presumably pick the one most favourable for his plans.

Forrest is sure that the democracy which was established after the battle of Sepeia was still in existence when Themistokles arrived and that his departure and the fall of that government were connected.⁵⁹ But the reconstruction Forrest suggests poses certain problems.⁶⁰ The most important is that the aristocratic government which replaced the first Argive democracy must have been established about 468 B.C. on this scheme while by 464 B.C. it had either fallen or adopted the policies of its democratic predecessors.⁶¹ This is hard to reconcile with the evidence of Herodotos. When the sons of those slain at Sepeia recovered control of the city they expelled the 'slaves' (δοῦλοι) who had governed Argos in the interval.⁶² These 'slaves' then took Tiryns and for a while the two groups lived at peace with one another (τέως μὲν δὴ σφι ἦν ἄρθμια ἐς ἀλλήλους).⁶³ Only later did the former 'slaves' go to war with the Argives, and this war lasted a long time (ἐπὶ χρόνον συχρόν).⁶⁴ It seems difficult to fit Herodotos' account into a mere four years or so.⁶⁵

There is a second difficulty in Forrest's scheme. We know the war between Mykenai and Argos started while Argos and Tegea were allies, for Strabo tells us that the Argives took Mykenai with the help of the Tegeates and the Kleonaians.⁶⁶ But on Forrest's reconstruction the Argive democrats were friendly towards and supported by the inhabitants of the neighbouring cities yet we have here Argive democrats – for Forrest places the alliance with Tegea under the democracy – attacking one of their supposed friends.

It is true that Forrest suggests that there was only 'a partial synoecism' of the Argive plain under the first Argive democracy.⁶⁷ But it is difficult to see how such an arrangement could be worked. If some of the inhabitants of the neighbouring cities became Argives while those cities themselves became independent of weakened Argos, how well could these former Mykenaians or Tirynthians have maintained control over their property? If they did not maintain control, how did they function as Argive citizens?

On the whole it seems that a longer period of Argive aristocratic government must be assumed in the middle of the fifth century than Forrest's scheme allows for. But it is not easy to determine the dates of its origin or of its fall. Wörrle suggests that the oracle given to the Argives in 481, which told them to look after the head and the head would preserve the body⁶⁸ shows that Argos had an aristocratic government at that time: that Delphi advised the ruling 'head' to look to its own safety first.⁶⁹ This is an attractive, but by no means conclusive, argument.

It might be argued that 481 is too soon after the disaster at Sepeia for the sons of the slain to have grown to maturity. But this only provides a very vague basis for dating: it cannot be as much as a full generation, since the sons of the slain must have

⁵⁹ W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 227.

⁶⁰ Forrest himself observes 'none of this evidence is conclusive' but claims that his reconstruction and the chronological scheme based on it have the merit of plausibility (p. 221).

⁶¹ W. G. Forrest, *op. cit.*, pp. 238, 248.

⁶² Herodotos' use of the words ἐξέβαλον, ἐξωθεύμενοι indicates that the new Argive government employed force. Cf. M. Wörrle, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

⁶³ Herodotos 6. 83. 2.

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁵ W. G. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 225 n. 5, does suggest that there may have been a period of aristocratic government before 470. (This would require two interludes of aristocratic government in fifth-century Argos.) He rejects the view on p. 226.

⁶⁶ Strabo 8. 6. 19; cf. W. G. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

⁶⁷ W. G. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

⁶⁸ Herodotos 7. 148. 3.

⁶⁹ *Untersuchungen* (Erlangen, 1964), pp. 116 ff.

been born before 494, and might have been as short as eleven years.⁷⁰ Almost certainly the aristocrats ruled Argos at the time of the capture of Mykenai. Diodoros places this in 468 B.C. but also says that the Spartans were unable to help the Mykenaians because of the troubles following the earthquake.⁷¹ The latter observation requires a date after 464, but whether one accepts Diodoros' date or his synchronism⁷² the Argive capture of Mykenai falls in the sixties.

Forrest suggests the fall of Tiryns was later than that of Mykenai, since the spoils from Tiryns were dedicated at the Heraion, which would be disputed territory while Mykenai was independent.⁷³ There is no objection to dating the capture of Tiryns in the late sixties, but it could also have occurred during the Argive alliance with Athens.⁷⁴

It has been suggested that this alliance rested on a shared democratic sentiment⁷⁵ but that need not follow. Common hostility to Sparta is an adequate explanation of it.⁷⁶ The alliance represents a change of policy at Athens,⁷⁷ reflecting an internal political change there, but this is no reason to assume that Argos, already hostile to Sparta in the sixties, underwent a similar change.

But democracy in Argos, unlike those in Mantinea and Elis, does show signs of Athenian influence. Most notably, Argos shared the institution of ostracism.⁷⁸ Also Argos resembles Athens in listing her council first in those who swear the oaths for the quadruple treaty of 420.⁷⁹ But neither is conclusive evidence for the establishment of the second Argive democracy – in the sixties Syracuse adopted petalism, a copy of ostracism, without there being any alliance with Athens.⁸⁰

Now if we could draw conclusions from the fact that Aischylos depicts Argos in the *Suppliants* as a democracy, we could date the restoration of the democracy to before 463 B.C.⁸¹ Once again the evidence is inconclusive. It seems that we must allow a longer aristocratic rule than Forrest does and place its end in the late sixties at the very earliest.

There would be no problem if we could accept, as many do, that Plutarch was right to correct Herodotos on the identity of the 'slaves' who formed the government of Argos after the slaughter of the aristocrats at Sepeia. Plutarch says they were not slaves but the best of the *perioikoi*.⁸² Now Mykenai and Tiryns, presumably two of the cities of Plutarch's *perioikoi*, were independent of Argos at the time of the battle of Plataia,

⁷⁰ R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (London, 1972), p. 190. Cf. Wörrle, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

⁷¹ Diodorus Siculus 11. 65. 4.

⁷² The synchronism is usually preferred; cf. W. G. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 231, though he suggests the attack on Mykenai may have commenced before the earthquake. R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (London, 1972), p. 105 suggests that the synchronism rests on a deduction by Ephoros and is unreliable.

⁷³ *op. cit.*, p. 230. But A. Andrewes, *Phoenix* 6 (1952), 5 places the fall of Tiryns first.

⁷⁴ W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 225 says it 'can hardly be later than the mid-sixties'. However, How & Wells, *ad Herodotum* 7. 137. 2, place it in the early fifties.

⁷⁵ W. G. Forrest, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

⁷⁶ R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (London, 1972), p. 86.

⁷⁷ Thucydides 1. 102. 4.

⁷⁸ Aristotle, *Politics* 1302b 18.

⁷⁹ Thucydides 5. 47. 9. But even if the order is significant, the resemblance need not be due to influence.

⁸⁰ Diodorus Siculus 11. 87.

⁸¹ M. Wörrle, *op. cit.*, pp. 122 f.

⁸² Plutarch, *de Mul. Virt.* 245C–F (= *FGrHist* 310F 6). This view is accepted by W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 222 ff. and J. A. O. Larsen, art. *Περίοικοι*, *RE* 19 (1937), coll. 823 f. R. A. Tomlinson, *op. cit.*, p. 98, favours a compromise in which 'perioikoi' included both the inhabitants of the neighbouring cities and the unfree peasants of Argos itself. He considers both groups were non-Dorian.

as both were listed on the tripod dedicated by the victors.⁸³ If the people Herodotos called 'slaves' were actually the leading inhabitants of the neighbouring cities, as Plutarch (or his authority Sokrates of Argos) asserted,⁸⁴ then that synoecism had already broken up by 479 B.C. and the first Argive democracy must have fallen.

But Plutarch's authority, Sokrates, is not necessarily reliable. His date is uncertain⁸⁵ and his version may merely be a rationalization of Herodotos' account to give greater dignity to Argive history. The key to the problem is a passage of Aristotle which also refers to the Argives admitting some of the perioikoi (τῶν περιόικων τινάς) to citizenship after Sepeia.⁸⁶ But Aristotle normally uses the word perioikos to refer to unfree peasants, not to the inhabitants of dependent communities.⁸⁷

The passage makes better sense in its context if Aristotle used the word *περίοικος* as he usually did and not in the Spartan sense of the word, since he is illustrating the way in which the increase or decrease of the wealthy or the poor can change the constitution of a city. The Argive *περίοικοι* are clearly an example of *ἄποροι*.⁸⁸ The 'best of the perioikoi' (τῶν περιόικων . . . τοὺς ἀρίστους) in the sense Plutarch takes would not seem to suit Aristotle's purpose in referring to the incident, as such men would not differ from the deceased aristocrats in terms of wealth.⁸⁹

As the existence of unfree labourers at Argos is shown by Pollux⁹⁰ and Stephanos of Byzantion⁹¹ and perhaps confirmed by Thucydides⁹² it seems best to take both Herodotos' *δοῦλοι* (slaves) and Aristotle's *περίοικοι* (serfs?) as referring to such a group and to conclude that Sokrates of Argos or Plutarch has misunderstood Aristotle's usage and attributed the wrong social status to this class.⁹³

⁸³ *Syll*³ 31 lines 16, 19; cf. Pausanias, 5. 23. 3. Argos was pro-Persian at the time (cf. Herodotos 9. 12) so the policy of Mykenai and Tiryns was diametrically opposed to that of Argos. W. G. Forrest's 'partial synoecism' (op. cit., p. 224) seems insufficient to allow for such divergence – complete independence of the smaller cities is the only explanation.

⁸⁴ If it was Sokrates of Argos whom Plutarch quoted when correcting Herodotos. Sokrates is the only other authority named in the passage, but that is two sentences earlier. Plutarch may have been making his own interpretation of Aristotle; cf. D. Lotze, 'Zur Verfassung von Argos nach der Schlacht bei Sepeia', *Chiron* 1 (1971), 103.

⁸⁵ F. Kiechle, 'Argos und Tiryns nach der Schlacht bei Sepeia', *Philologus* 104 (1960), 181 calls him hellenistic as does R. A. Tomlinson, op. cit., p. 221. F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 111 B 15 merely says 'vor Demetrios Magnes'.

⁸⁶ *Politics* 1303a 6.

⁸⁷ R. F. Willetts, 'The Servile Interregnum at Argos', *Hermes* 87 (1959), 496; D. Lotze, *Μεταξύ 'Ελευθέρων και Δούλων* (Berlin, 1959), pp. 8 f.; W. L. Newman, *Commentary* ad 1303a 6. W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 223 n. 7 argues that Aristotle should not be taken here to be using the word in his usual way but in a specific Argive sense. But can we use Pausanias and Plutarch – or even Sokrates of Argos if Plutarch is quoting him – to establish the existence of an Argive usage earlier than Aristotle?

⁸⁸ *Politics* 1303a 1 ff. cf. R. F. Willetts, op. cit., p. 496. W. G. Forrest, op. cit., p. 223 n. 7 calls this 'an unjustifiable equation' but Aristotle clearly quotes the Argive case as an example of the consequences of a relative increase of the poor. M. Wörle, op. cit., p. 105, suggests that a hoplite constitution may have been established, but it is hard to see how hoplites could have been called 'slaves' or 'serfs'.

⁸⁹ Sokrates, *FGrHist* 310 F 6. 5. Cf. D. Lotze, *Chiron* 1 (1970), 100 ff.

⁹⁰ *Onomastikon* 3. 83.

⁹¹ s.v. *Χίος*.

⁹² Thucydides 5. 82. 6; cf. R. F. Willetts, op. cit., p. 497.

⁹³ D. Lotze, *Μεταξύ 'Ελευθέρων και Δούλων* (Berlin, 1959), p. 54 saw the *perioikoi* and the *gymnetes* as separate groups, but in *Chiron* 1 (1971), 102 f. argues for their identity. The presence of a fourth tribe, the Hyrnathioi, at Argos from the mid-fifth century shows that some non-Dorians were absorbed into the Argive citizen body. Unfortunately it is not certain whether the citizens of Mykenai and Tiryns were Dorians. R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (London, 1972), pp. 74 f. concludes they were not. T. Kelly, *A History of Argos to 500 B.C.* (Minneapolis, 1976), pp. 65 f. implies they were. Strabo, 8. 6. 10 says Mykenai was part of the original Dorian conquest of the Argolid. If the smaller cities were Dorian then the new element in the Argive citizen body, being non-Dorian, cannot have been perioikoi in the Spartan sense.

Therefore the independence of Mykenai and Tiryns in 479 does not mean that the first Argive democracy had fallen. Two facts suggest that the change actually occurred later. The first is the assertion that in 481 the Argives had recently lost 6,000 men at the battle of Sepeia.⁹⁴ This would be an odd statement to make if aristocratic numbers had already recovered enough for the aristocrats to have regained full control of the government.⁹⁵

Secondly there is the fact that after the expelled 'slaves' had taken Tiryns by force (μάχη ἔσχον Τίρυνθα) they were on good terms with the new regime in Argos.⁹⁶ This suggests that their capture of Tiryns was in the Argive interest and so after 478.⁹⁷ This could also explain Diodoros' odd statement that Mykenai was the only city in the Argolid which had supported Sparta at the battle of Plataia.⁹⁸ By the time the Argives attacked Mykenai the Tirynthians who had also fought at Plataia were no longer in the Argolid, having been expelled by the 'slaves'.

Unfortunately this does not give a precise date for the first capture of Tiryns. The most probable date would be in the seventies. This would be after Plataia, but would leave about twenty years for the 'sons of the slain' to have become adult⁹⁹ and regain full control of Argos, accepting the date of 494 for the battle of Sepeia.¹⁰⁰ It also leaves ten years or more to cover the period of coexistence between Argos and the 'slaves' at Tiryns and a fairly long war which must both be allowed for between the capture of Tiryns by the 'slaves' and its second capture by the Argives themselves.

So it seems probable that Argos had already become aristocratic by 470. In that case Themistokles' friends and associates in Argos during his ostracism would have been aristocrats and not the supporters of the first Argive democracy. There is no reason to doubt this result in terms of what we know of Argive history. The massacre at Sepeia would be enough to explain the hostility of Argive aristocrats for Sparta even if there were not an earlier history of hostility between the two cities.

But the democratic regime which arose as a consequence of Kleomenes' actions may not have been so strongly opposed to Sparta. Kleomenes was able to convince the ephors that his failure to attack Argos after the massacre was sound policy, and this could well mean that the new government was better disposed towards Sparta.¹⁰¹ An earlier connection between Sparta and the 'slaves' could explain why a Spartan, Aneristos, helped the exiled Tirynthians to seize Halieis in the territory of Hermione¹⁰²

⁹⁴ Herodotos 7. 148.

⁹⁵ This is not decisive evidence. Herodotos himself knew that the losses at Sepeia were not the major reason for Argive non-involvement in the Persian War; cf. J. Wells, *Studies in Herodotus*, p. 76. But would the Argives have advanced a pretext that was obviously without foundation?

⁹⁶ Herodotos 6. 83. 1–2. And if they took Tiryns by force they were not previously living there.

⁹⁷ R. F. Willetts, *Hermes* 87 (1959), 499.

⁹⁸ Diodorus Siculus 11. 65. 2. Cf. Pausanias 2. 16. 5, where there is no mention of Tiryns.

⁹⁹ This is not a precise measure of time. 'The change may have occurred at any time at which the aristocratic leaders could say "we have avenged our fathers"', in other words, at any time between 490 and 430' – W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 225. But a period of about twenty years not only fits Herodotos' words but allows us to conclude that the democracy fell once the special circumstances which led to its establishment no longer existed.

¹⁰⁰ R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (London, 1972), p. 93 and n. 9 (on p. 268). On J. Wells' date of c. 520 B.C. (*Studies in Herodotus*, pp. 79–81) it would be even more likely that the first Argive democracy had fallen before 470.

¹⁰¹ cf. R. F. Willetts, *Hermes* 87 (1959), 505. W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 221 f., also thinks this may have been Kleomenes' motive for not attempting to capture Argos, but that the new government may have been well disposed to Kleomenes himself, rather than to Sparta.

¹⁰² Herodotos 7. 137. 2. Aneristos' father Sperthias was one of the two Spartans sent to Persia to expiate the 'curse of Talthybios' after the Persian Wars. Aneristos himself was one of the

and to explain why the 'slaves' at Tiryns took the initiative in attacking Argos – their offensive may have been designed to help Sparta.¹⁰³ The revival of Argive hostility towards Sparta may well have been accompanied by a deterioration of relations between the Argive aristocrats and their former allies, the 'slaves'.

The major objection to this interpretation is Themistokles' reputation as a staunch democrat.¹⁰⁴ But this relies very much on the later sources and has much less support from the near-contemporary authorities.¹⁰⁵ It is all too easy to produce an oversimplified picture from limited information. Moreover, as Themistokles changed his attitude towards Sparta when Sparta seemed to threaten Athens' interests, can we be sure he did not change his attitude towards democracy when the common people rejected his leadership?

If we accept that Themistokles could co-operate with Argive aristocrats after his ostracism as easily as he later played the part of a Persian courtier, we can more easily understand the Athenian attitude to him. While Forrest suggests that the Athenians could not see his wisdom in placing the interests of democrats throughout Greece before those of the anti-Persian coalition which had served its purpose,¹⁰⁶ it is more likely that they saw him associating with those who were not only Medizers but also no friends of democracy. Both the Athenian failure to support Themistokles in his new policy and the failure of that policy to achieve worthwhile results would then be due to Themistokles' departure from the bases on which his previous successes had rested.¹⁰⁷

In none of the cities examined (Mantineia, Elis and Argos) is it impossible that democrats may have been supporters of Themistokles' anti-Spartan campaign. But in all three the surviving evidence favours a different interpretation and the hypothesis of a democratic movement common to all three cities remains unsupported. Furthermore, in each city the evidence shows distinctive features in the democratic constitutions. This favours the idea of an independent development in each case rather than the hypothesis of a common origin and so counts against the association of Themistokles and Peloponnesian democracy.

At Argos Themistokles' allies would seem to have been aristocrats from the governing group who had overthrown the first democracy. At Elis he may have tried to win over nationalist democrats, but the Eleian democracy seems to have been already established and Elis remained loyal to Sparta. In Arkadia it is highly unlikely that Themistokles was allied to Mantinea democrats, for Mantinea was not to become a democracy for a generation, while around 470 it was Tegea and not Mantinea which was hostile to Sparta.

Whatever the details of Themistokles' intrigues, there was a sufficient prospect of

ambassadors betrayed to the Athenians and executed early in the Peloponnesian War (loc. cit. cf. Th. 2. 67). Aneristos' age makes it more likely that the Tirynthian exiles concerned were the second set. The incident is also recorded by Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αλιείς and Strabo 8. 6. 11 (where the text is defective) but they add no further detail.

¹⁰³ R. F. Willetts, *Hermes* 87 (1959), 500. He relies strongly on Aneristos' seizure of Halieis to show good relations between the 'slaves' and Sparta.

¹⁰⁴ e.g. Plutarch, *Aristeides* 2. 1; W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 235.

¹⁰⁵ F. J. Frost, 'Themistokles' Place in Athenian Politics', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1 (1968), 109. But one should not assume that the tradition that Themistokles was a democrat was wholly without foundation.

¹⁰⁶ op. cit., p. 238.

¹⁰⁷ Themistokles' successes had depended on his ability to win the support of the average Athenian voter (which required a democratic approach) and on Greek hostility to the barbarian (which initially required Spartan assistance for success). Until the insult at the siege of Ithome an anti-Spartan policy would lack popular support at Athens and it would appeal to a narrower brand of patriotism.

their success for the Spartans to want to see him removed from Argos. But they had not achieved enough for him to be able to defy Sparta and to hope that Argos would not return him to Athens for trial – he fled at once.¹⁰⁸ It is implausible that the democracies established in the Peloponnese later in the fifth century were a legacy of Themistokles' plans – they represent successful developments, not a failure.¹⁰⁹

The allies of Themistokles in his attempt to organize a coalition against Sparta were probably those groups who did oppose Sparta in the sixties, the Argives, Tegeates and other Arkadians. The hypothetical democratic coalition including Elis and Mantinea does not seem to be supported by the surviving evidence. Democracy in Elis, Mantinea and Argos would seem to have been the result of local developments (not now recoverable, except for Argos), to have occurred at different times and to be largely independent of Athenian influence.

University of Sydney

J. L. O'NEIL

¹⁰⁸ W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960), 227 attributes it to the fall of the Argive democracy. But why did the Argive democracy fall so easily if Themistokles and his friends were successfully organizing a democratic coalition across the Peloponnese?

¹⁰⁹ As Fougères saw (*op. cit.*, p. 377) when he suggested that Mantinea was only effectively synoecized after 464 – when it enjoyed the approval of Sparta.