

## THE DATE AND PURPOSE OF THE PSEUDO-XENOPHON CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS\*

This short political pamphlet has survived to our day through the lucky chance of being included in the minor works of Xenophon, and for over 150 years it has been the subject of lively scholarly debate. The unknown author was a confirmed oligarch, but with an insider's insight into Athenian democracy. Though he cannot approve of this form of government, he is astute enough to see that the system works well on its own terms and that it is therefore popular; it will prove very hard to overthrow. The work has proved difficult to tie down to an historical context. Dates proposed range from 443 to c. 410–6 B.C.; the consensus now seems to favour the Archidamian War.<sup>2</sup> Despite the wide range of dates chosen, even within the 420s, I believe that a fairly precise date can still be reached by following certain indications in the text.

The first good pointer is the allusion to *normal* quadrennial assessments of tribute in ch. 3.5, which implies that the author had observed at least one abnormal review. The norm was clearly assessment at the Great Panathenaia. The *ATL* editors, following Nesselhauf, postulated abnormal assessments in 443/2 and 428/7 B.C. The first assumption partly led Bowersock to his unusually early date for the pamphlet. It can, however, be shown to be highly suspect. In that year five geographical districts were first introduced in the Quota Lists and an assistant secretary to the Hellenotamiai was appointed, who continued in office the following year. But these were simply administrative matters and indeed the district grouping went back at least to 446/5.<sup>3</sup> Only a significant number of changes in tribute should be considered proof of a new assessment. Meritt had to admit that the case for 443/2 rested on only five such changes and one—Neapolis—was quite uncertain. The evidence for Phokaia is also poor, since the crucial name and tribute have both been restored in List 12 of 443/2. We are left with just three reductions—and changes can admittedly occur between assessments.<sup>4</sup> The tribute record of Abydos suggests that the normal 442/1 was in fact the assessment year. In 445/4 Abydos' quota *HHHHITIC* was most

\* Earlier versions of this paper were presented to seminars in Leeds 1993 and the University of South Africa, Pretoria, in February 1995, where I was a Visiting Fellow. I thank the audiences on both occasions for positive and vigorous discussion, which helped me considerably in finalizing my work.

<sup>1</sup> W. Roscher effectively opened the debate in *Leben, Werke und Zeitalter des Thukydides* (*Klio* 1 [1842], 409–529). For the anonymous author's character see ch. 1.10–13, 17f. with 2.18 and 3.1–9 (inside view): 1.1 and 3.1 with 1.2–9 (attitude to democracy): 3.12f. (its strength).

<sup>2</sup> On 443 see G. W. Bowersock, *HarvStud* 71 (1966), 33–46. For c. 410–6 see Maria Jose Fontana, *L'Athenaion Politeia del V secolo a.c.* (Palermo, 1968), pp. 32f. and 55–84. For the full range of datings see H. Frisch, *The Constitution of the Athenians* (Copenhagen, 1942), pp. 49f., 55–62, 79–86; G. Serra, *RendAcadLin* 17 (1962), 285–90; Fontana, pp. 6f., n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> H. Nesselhauf, *Klio Beiheft* 30 (1930), 44–7 and 71–5; B. D. Meritt, *AJA* 29 (1925), 246–50 and 252–7 with *Athenian Financial Documents* (Michigan, 1934), pp. 16–20 and *ATL* 3, 68 and 70; Bowersock, op. cit. (n. 2), 38. Nesselhauf anticipated my view on the administrative details.

<sup>4</sup> See *AJA* 29 (1925), 252: Athenai Diades, Tenedos, Galepsos, Phokaia, and Neapolis (Hellespontine). Meritt was unhappy about Neapolis and in *ATL* 1 (1949), 352 and 354 (Register), the crucial evidence was transferred to Neapolis (Kavalla) in Thrace. For Phokaia see *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 266.I.11 (irregular), 269.I.14 (name and 2 talent tribute restored), 270.I.12 (2 T in 442/1). For changes within periods see *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 61.5–7 (Methone): Nesselhauf, op. cit. (n. 3), p. 68f.: *ATL* 3, 64f. and 67.

irregular and it remained so in 443/2, where only the ending  $\Delta\Lambda\Phi\Phi\text{IIC}$  remains. Such irregularity should end in an assessment year and indeed the quota duly appears as  $HHHH$  in 442/1 and subsequent years.<sup>5</sup> There is equally strong evidence against the abnormal assessment assumed in 428/7 by Nesselhauf and the *ATL* editors. It has been urged independently by M. Piérart and myself, with reasons for regarding 426/5 as a normal assessment year. No convincing answer has been offered.<sup>6</sup> The first certain abnormal assessment then will be that ordered by Thoudippos' decree for the autumn of 425/4. When he carefully re-established the Great Panathenaia as the regular time for future assessments, he had his own innovation in mind—not any other aberration in recent years.<sup>7</sup> So far the argument suggests 425/4 as the *terminus post quem* for our pamphlet.

Ever since Roscher, autumn 424 has been taken by many as a firm *terminus ante*. In ch. 2.5 our author insists that land powers are incapable of sending expeditionary forces a long way from home. Roscher argued that this could not have been written after Brasidas' amazing forced march through Thessaly to Macedon and Chalkidike. Some scholars have dissented, arguing that Brasidas' exploit was quite exceptional and that memory of it would have faded with time. All that we should assume is that our writer did not compose his piece soon after those events.<sup>8</sup> Brasidas was indeed the exception, breaking and proving the rule of ch. 2.5. He was able to pass rapidly through Thessaly because his force was fairly small and he had every incentive to deny Athens's friends the chance of preventing his passage. Perdikkas' friends provided guides through Thessaly and perhaps supplies also: certainly, when he reached his destination, Brasidas had all his supplies met by Perdikkas and the Chalkidians.<sup>9</sup>

Roscher's *terminus* looks rather uncertain. Other pointers suggest that the pamphlet was composed well after 424. In ch. 3.4 the author alludes to *choregoi* being needed each year for the Dionysia, Thargelia, Panathenaia, Prometheia, and Hephaistia. The festivals and their *choregoi* recur—and in the same order—in *IG* 11<sup>2</sup> 1138 of 403/2 and later; only the Panathenaia is missing.<sup>10</sup> Now *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 82 of 421/0 either instituted the Hephaistia or made major changes in its organization and scope, and the phrase in line 14 confirms our other evidence for *choregoi* in the late fifth century.<sup>11</sup> The text of *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 82 is tantalizingly incomplete. But lines 31–3 may be reasonably restored as follows, with the *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> stoichedon line of 61 letters: ποιόντο[ν δ]ὲ [h]οι *ἱεροποιοὶ* *hoútos hóste*[τε]ν *λανπαδ[εδρομίαν καὶ] τὸν ἄλλον ἀγὼνα γίγνεσθαι καθά[περ τέι πεντετερι]δι τε[ν] θέαν [οἱ γυμνασίαρχ]οι ποιῶσι.*

<sup>5</sup> For Abydos' tribute record see *ATL* 1, 216; *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 267.II.3 and 269.II.12 with 270.II.8 (442/1), 271.II.29 and 272.I.31.

<sup>6</sup> See H. B. Mattingly, *BSA* 65 (1970), 133–6 and M. Piérart, *BCH* 108 (1984), 172–6.

<sup>7</sup> See *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 71.26–33; M. Piérart, op. cit. (n. 6), p. 176. R. Meiggs, however, thought that this provision implied a failure to have an assessment in 426 (*Athenian Empire* [Oxford, 1972], pp. 322f. and 533).

<sup>8</sup> See Roscher, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 529. He was countered by H. Helbig, *RhMus* 16 (1861), 522; H. Müller-Strubing, *Philologos* Suppl. 4(1880), 36f.; A. W. Gomme, *HarvStud* Suppl. 1 (1940), 224f.

<sup>9</sup> See Thuc. 4.78–79.2, 80, and 83.4–6 with Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 3, p. 551 and 85.3–5 (Brasidas at Akanthos). Later Spartans, lacking Brasidas' advantages, could not get through with their troops to Macedon: see Thuc. 4.132 and 5.12–13.

<sup>10</sup> Lysias 21.2 (409/8) and *IG* 11<sup>2</sup> 3025 (fourth century) confirm *choregoi* for the Lesser Panathenaia. Perhaps these contests were not tribal and so irrelevant to *IG* 11<sup>2</sup> 1138 (a record of Pandionis).

<sup>11</sup> For the institution of the Hephaistia in 421/1 see A. Kirchoff in *IG* 1 Suppl. p. 64; Stengel, *GriechKulturAltertum*<sup>3</sup> (1920), 224 and 250f. and *RE* 8, col. 290; L. Ziehen, *Leges Sacrae* (1906), p. 53 n. 27. For major reordering see Hiller in *IG* 1<sup>2</sup> 84; E. Kalinka, *Die PseudoXenophontische Äθηναιών Πολίτεια* (Berlin, 1913), pp. 278f.

The torch-race at the Hephaistia was apparently to be modelled on the procedure devised by the gymnasiarchs for the Great Panathenaia.<sup>12</sup> The text continues after my quotation with *καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐὰν δοκῇ[ι]*. This seems to imply that more definite arrangements for the future would replace the provisions for this year. That would support the view that a new festival is being created, like that for Bendis in 413/2.<sup>13</sup> Hyperbolos, then at the height of his power, apparently proposed the decree. Such men would not have wasted their time on Council on secondary matters.<sup>14</sup> Thus Kleon probably proposed *eisphora* in 428/7, as well as the first savage decree on conquered Mytilene. His son-in-law Thoudippos was entrusted with introducing the great reassessment out of turn in 425/4.<sup>15</sup> Aristophanes' butt Kleonymos proposed an important decree for Methone in 426/5 and a major decree on tribute in the next prytany. We now know that he proposed another piece of business that year. Since it was found on Delos, it is possible that it concerned the founding of the Delian festival, which Thucydides records under that year. That would prove a very close parallel to Hyperbolos' intervention in the Hephaistos cult in 421/0, as I see it.<sup>16</sup> Now, if the Hephaistia were first instituted that year, ch. 3.4, as Ziehen acutely saw long ago, would put the pamphlet firmly after that date.<sup>17</sup>

One more pointer implies an even later dating. In ch. 3.5 we hear of 'other sudden offences' which the Council might have to judge: *καὶ ἐάν τι ἄλλο ἐξαπιναῖον ἀδίκημα γίγνηται, ἐάν τε ὑβρίζωσί τινες ἄηθες ὕβρισμα ἐάν τε ἀσεβήσωσι*. L. Bieler suggested in 1952 that this might refer to the scandal of the Hermokopidai and the Mysteries in summer 415, and quite independently I came to the same conclusion a decade later.<sup>18</sup> Neither of us was aware that Helbig and Bergk had had the same idea much earlier. But after Kalinka's vigorous 'refutation' their heresy was evidently buried.<sup>19</sup> Kalinka's counter, however, was weak. He saw that the passage implied major events that had made a deep impression at Athens. So he had to postulate offences similar to those of 415, by more than one group, of which there was not a word anywhere in our literary tradition. It seems unlikely. Kalinka ended with a dangerously

<sup>12</sup> I keep Kirchhoff's supplement in line 32f. against *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 82, which prefers Ziehen's *καθὰ[περ τοῖς Προμεθίοις]*. The *penteteris* will be the Great Panathenaia. I reject Kirchhoff's [*οἱ λαμπάδαρχοι*] in line 33, which *IG* retains. As Oehler and Schwoboda showed (*RE* 7, col. 1987f. and 9, col. 256), the *lampas* in the fourth century was still organized by gymnasiarchs. The introduction of *οἱ δὲ γυμνασίαρχοι οἱ χειρεμένοι ἐς τὰ Προμέθια* in line 35 as something new seems a further argument against *καθὰ[περ τοῖς Προμεθίοις]* in line 32f.

<sup>13</sup> For *καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν* compare *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 32.18f., 52.24f., 78.23f. Bendis's festival was certainly instituted in 413/2: see Plato, *Republic* I.327–8A. Unluckily *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 136 (Bendis) is more fragmentary than 82, so that nothing can be won by close comparison of the two texts.

<sup>14</sup> Only *ἡνπε* survives of the name in *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 82.5, but such Attic names are extremely rare. Hyperbolos—marginally the least uncommon in M. J. Osborne, S. G. Byrne, *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names II, Attica* (Oxford, 1994)—has just five certain Athenian entries. For Hyperbolos as Councillor probably in 421/0 see Plato fr. 166f. in J. D. Edmonds, *Frag. Gr. Com.* I, p. 559f.; *RE* 9, col. 256.

<sup>15</sup> For Kleon see Aristophanes, *Knights* 923–6 and 773–6 with Thuc. 3.19.1 and 36.2–6; for Thoudippos see *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 71.4 and 55. Thoudippos is an exceptionally rare Attic name (only three entries in *LGPV* 2): Kleon Thoudippou Araphenios, *tamias* in 337/6 (PA 8669), was evidently named after his maternal grandfather.

<sup>16</sup> See *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 61.34 and 68.5 and 27f.; D. N. Lewis, *ZPE* 60 (1984), 108, with my comments in *EMG* 32 (1988), 321. S. Hornblower, *Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford, 1991), p. 517f., on Thuc. 3.104, gave my idea a cautious welcome.

<sup>17</sup> L. Ziehen, *Leges Sacrae* (1906), p. 53 n. 27.

<sup>18</sup> *AJPh* 72 (1951), 182 n. 2; *Hist* 10 (1961), 179.

<sup>19</sup> See Helbig, op. cit. (n. 8), p. 519 n.; T. Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* 4 (1887), 238f. n. 3.; Kalinka, op. cit. (n. 11), pp. 286–8.

circular argument!<sup>20</sup> There is really nothing against so late a date, and Gomme and Serra have both favoured putting the pamphlet between 421 and 415.<sup>21</sup>

Bergk indeed wanted to associate ch. 3.12f. on the *atimoi* also with the Hermokopidai scandal. But those exiled as a result of the purge were not *atimoi*. That our author knew what *atimia* meant at Athens is clear from ch. 1.14, where it is opposed to both exile and death. It meant whole or partial loss of civic rights, with or without loss of property, and the *atimos* remained in Athens. I shall return to ch. 3.12f. later.<sup>22</sup>

If summer 415 is a *terminus post quem* for the pamphlet, what is the bottom line? In ch. 2.14–16 the author deals with Athens's policy of evacuating the countryside in face of invasion. It is their means of survival and their only fear is that malcontents within might open the gates to the enemy. This fear was alive as late as summer 415, when enemy forces mobilized at the Isthmos and on the Boiotian frontier, and there was near panic in the city—the Hermokopidai affair being still at its height.<sup>23</sup> Just then Alkibiades was in Sparta, trying to persuade them to fortify Dekeleia. They were slow to act on his advice. First they waited until an Athenian raid on Lakonia left them free to breach the Peace of Nikias. This was in summer 414, and even so it was not until spring 413 that the planned *epiteichismos* was established. The pamphlet must certainly have been published before that point.<sup>24</sup> Chapters 3.5, 2.1, and 1.15 provide a similar *terminus*. Tribute is still being assessed and collected from the allies. About the time of Dekeleia it was replaced by the 5% harbour-tax throughout the Empire. Tribute may have been assessed as normal in autumn 414 and collected the next spring. But its replacement must fall at the latest in the following autumn.<sup>25</sup> These two criteria leave 414 as a possible year for the pamphlet's composition.

The author, despite his inside knowledge, is surely not a native Athenian. He too often adopts the outsider's view of events. He is more likely to have been some allied oligarch, accustomed to visiting Athens from time to time, and with useful contacts there. At some point he may well have become an exile from his city, whether voluntarily or under Athenian pressure. We could imagine him among the Ionian exiles with Alkidas in 427, the Thasian group in the Peloponnese in 411, or the mixed body who found their way to Thourioi and helped to engineer its passage from the Athenian camp to the enemy.<sup>26</sup>

He interestingly illustrates some aspects of the oligarchic mind, whilst justifying Athens on its own terms. No good government would tolerate ill-educated, boorish, 'crazy' men addressing the Assembly—or even being present there. The Athenians

<sup>20</sup> Frisch, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 317, thought that Kalinka's 'sensazionale Monstreprozesse' made far too much of the context, which in his view dealt with routine religious misdemeanours. He erred the other way. On p. 287 n. 3 Kalinka claimed that 'Eine Anspielung auf die Hermokopiden des Jahres 415... ist durch die Entstehungszeit der *Ἀθην. Πολ.* ausgeschlossen'.

<sup>21</sup> See Gomme, *op. cit.* (n. 8), pp. 226–8 and 240–5; Serra, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 299–307.

<sup>22</sup> Bergk, *op. cit.* (n. 190, p. 238f.). On *atimia* see Andokides 1.73–6 and *RE* 2, coll. 2101–4.

<sup>23</sup> For the scare see Thuc. 6.93.1 and Andok. 1.43. For the evacuation policy compare Thuc. 2.13.2, 14.1 and 20–2.

<sup>24</sup> See Thuc. 6.93.1 and 105.1–2 with 7.18–19.

<sup>25</sup> See Thuc. 7.28.4 with K. J. Dover, *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 4, p. 402. The change was a response to the tough financial situation created by the permanent enemy presence at Dekeleia. As Dover saw, this must have taken some time before it really came home.

<sup>26</sup> Thuc. 3.31.1 (Alkidas); Thuc. 8.64.3–4; Thuc. 8.35.1 with 3.8.1 and Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.2, and 5.19 (Dorieus at Rhodes and Thourioi) with Andok. 4.12 (exiles at Thourioi). For Thourioi see also Thuc. 6.104.2 with 7.33.5–6 and 57.11 (still pro-Athenian); 'Plutarch' *Moralia* 835.d–e (pro-Athenians expelled in 413/2).

readily put up with this. This is precisely how their democracy works, allowing everyone a feeling of participation in government. They could be better administered, but that is not the point. They want to be free. Athens's whole position rests on sea-power and it is the ordinary people who man the fleet and thus prove vital.<sup>27</sup> Nor is that all. Not only do all citizens enjoy political rights. In Athens you cannot even strike a metic or slave, or make him give way to you in the street—as you could in any decently ordered oligarchic state. The author's sarcasm here does not stop him seeing that there was good reason behind Athens's practice. It made economic sense in their society to give metics and slaves protection, since it depended on trades and services for survival.<sup>28</sup>

The author can forgive the common people their devotion to democracy. What he finds intolerable is that men of aristocratic stamp should opt to live and pursue politics in a democratic state. The only reason he can imagine is that under democracy they can get away with malpractice and corruption. Some have suspected here a specific attack on Alkibiades. But the reference is probably more general. Other natural oligarchs, such as Peisander and Charikles, had been working the democratic system for years no less than Alkibiades. With the revolution of 411 they would throw off the mask, while Alkibiades typically waited on events.<sup>29</sup>

In ch. 2.18 the author deals with the licence of the comic stage. He asserts that the poets are not allowed to satirize the *demos* itself, but are free to attack any individual by name. These butts will normally be the rich, the well-born, and the powerful. Very few of the people themselves are attacked, and these only for trying to rise above their fellows. Most of Aristophanes' targets will fall within the author's three categories. Despite this, scholars have criticized sharply the implied view of comedy.<sup>30</sup> Certainly in his earlier plays Aristophanes comes uncomfortably near attacking the *demos* and the workings of democracy. Kleon attacked him for *Babylonians*, but despite his protestations he was not much more restrained in *Acharnians*. He readily lampooned the workings of democracy.<sup>31</sup> In *Knights* Demos himself is a main character and he is treated with little respect because of his ignorance, gullibility, and weakness. Kleon appears to have attacked the poet again. Aristophanes does not appear to have given in. *Clouds* 575–94 is a bitter assault on Kleon's power and misbehaviour, and *Wasps* exposes the democratic courts to sharp criticism, with Kleon, their patron, being explicitly included.<sup>32</sup> After Aristophanes' *Peace*, however, his comedy seems to have become less savagely political and the same appears true of the other poets, as far as we can judge from the scattered fragments that we possess. The picture of comedy in

<sup>27</sup> See ch. 1.2–9.

<sup>28</sup> Ch. 1.10f. He first quipped that Athenians were so ugly and badly dressed that you might hit one by mistake, thinking him foreign or a slave.

<sup>29</sup> Ch. 2.20. For Alkibiades see Müller-Strubing, op. cit. (n. 8), p. 74; Serra, op. cit. (n. 2), pp. 304–7. For Periander see *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 174.4 and Aristophanes, *Peace* 394f. (422/1) with *IG* 1<sup>3</sup> 472.3f. (Hephaistion statues, 421–415) and Andok. 1.27, 36, and 43 with *Birds* 1556–61(415). For Charikles see Andok. 1.36 with Thuc. 7.20.1. Andok. 1.36 seems to make him a crypto-oligarch. Most scholars therefore see him as the Charikles of the Thirty: Andok. 1.101, Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.2 and *Memor.* 1.2.31–7, and Aristotle *Politics* 1305 b 25 b.

<sup>30</sup> See Kalinka, op. cit. (n. 11), pp. 7–16; Gomme, op. cit. (n. 8), pp. 217–19.

<sup>31</sup> Kalinka, op. cit. (n. 11), pp. 9–12. See *Acharnians* 377–84, 502–19, 630–49. For attack on the handling of Assembly business see lines 16–173.

<sup>32</sup> On Kleon's reaction to the *Knights* see *Wasps* 1015–37 and Kalinka, op. cit. (n. 11), pp. 9–11. I have profited greatly from Ian Story's excellent study of these issues in *Scholia* 4 (1995), 3–23. He thinks that Kleon's second attack on Aristophanes may have been provoked by *Clouds* 575–94 rather than *Knights* and that *Wasps* was Aristophanes' rejoinder. He may well be right.

ch. 2.18 may not correspond with the Aristophanes and Eupolis of the 420s, but may reflect the comic stage in the years when the author could have come to know it.

Two points of vocabulary may confirm this suspicion—the use of the verb *συκοφαστέω* in ch. 1.14 and *ἀντιβολῶ* used for an accused appealing to a juror in 1.18. *συκοφαντέω/συκοφάντης* is found in the comic poets from the 420s on and also in Antiphon. Aristophanes featured a *sykophantes* in two lively scenes of *Acharnians*, which may have started a vogue. The Athenian *sykophantes*, who sails out to harrass the allies, is very like the man in *Birds* 1410–69 who wants wings to do his business with the islanders more expeditiously. It is possible that our author had actually visited Athens at the time of *Birds*.<sup>33</sup> *ἀντιβολῶ* is first found in Old Comedy from the 420s in the sense of ‘appeal’ and the parallel of *Wasps* 552–75 is particularly striking. But similar scenes will surely have been found in later comedies.<sup>34</sup>

The author ends his work by warning his oligarchic readers against over-optimism. Athenian democracy will be extremely hard to overthrow. It is no good pinning hopes on the *atimoi* as an enemy within. They are too few, and not many of them have just cause for grievance. Yet some were beginning to look in this direction. In spring 414 Aristophanes mocked the project of a certain son of Peisias to betray the gates to the *atimoi* and presumably let the enemy in.<sup>35</sup>

Our author may not be a great thinker and he is certainly not a stylist. But he gives us a unique view on the Athenian democracy from the period not long before it faced its crisis and was temporarily overthrown. The brief rule of the Four Hundred and the early transition from a compromise government to full democracy curiously and impressively confirms the main thesis of the anonymous work.<sup>36</sup>

Cambridge

HAROLD B. MATTINGLY

<sup>33</sup> See *Acharnians* 818–32 and 910–28; Fontana, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 95 (‘verbo forse tolto del linguaggio comico’); Antiphon 5.78 and 80 with 6.43.

<sup>34</sup> See Fontana, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 87, seeing a fourth-century usage and missing the comic parallels. For them see Müller-Strubing, op. cit. (n. 8), p. 177; Kalinka, op. cit. (n. 11), p. 166; Frisch, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 229.

<sup>35</sup> Lysias 12.21 and 20.4 with 25.24 and 27 show how *atimoi* could become supporters of an oligarchic coup. See *Birds* 766f. for 414. Some editors have wrongly taken this to be of the victims of the Hermokopidai investigation. See A. Somerstein, *Birds* (1987), p. 101, and N. Dunbar, *Birds* (1995), pp. 473f. But those were exiles, not *atimoi*. See earlier n. 22.

<sup>36</sup> Thuc. 8.67.4 stresses how formidable the task of overthrowing democracy was. And ch. 92.11 and 97 with 99.1 show the strength of the underlying attachment to democracy—leading to the early replacement of the Four Hundred by the Five Thousand. In the summer following Kyzikos the full democracy would return.