THE COMMONER IN SPARTAN HISTORY FROM THE LYCURGAN REFORMS TO THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER: 776-323 B. C.

By

SHASTA HUTTON ABUALTIN

Bachelor of Arts

in Arts and Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
May, 1986

History

THE COMMONER IN SPARTAN HISTORY

FROM THE LYCURGAN REFORMS TO

THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER:

776-323 B. C.

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

John Paul Bischoff

A James Henderson

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

The ancient Greeks, their accomplishments, and their history have always facinated me. Further studies into Greek history developed an interest in the Spartans and their activities. So many of the ancient authors are if not openly, at least covertly, hostile to the Spartans. Many of the modern works are concerned only with the early or late history or are general surveys of the total history of Sparta while few works consider Sparta separate from the other Greek city-states in the classical period.

My intention is to examine the role of the commoner in ancient Sparta. It must be emphasized that the use of "commoner" in this text refers to the Spartan citizens who were not kings. The Spartan slaves and other non-citizen groups are not included in the classification of commoners. This examination considers the lifestyle of the commoner, his various roles in the government, the better-known commoners, and the various conflicts which arose between the kings and the commoners. This work will not reveal any startling new information. It is rather a different approach to viewing Spartan history based on the Spartan commoner and his position in his society.

I wish to thank my thesis adviser, Dr. Neil Hackett, for all of his patience, understanding, guidance, and assistance. I wish to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Dr. John Paul Bischoff reguarding comments on stylistic matters. The final member of the committee, Dr. James Henderson, I also thank for his help in the preparation and completion of this thesis.

I owe my husband Sa'adeh and my parents more than I can possibly describe for their understanding and support during the course of this work. I also owe a debt of thanks to Mrs. Kathleen Chambers and her daughter Anne-Marie Webster for helping me to discover that history was the field for me. I thank the rest of my relatives and friends for their encouragement and support throughout this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Spartan commoners, the Spartiates, had a major influence upon the making of Sparta; however, most studies do not dwell upon their contributions but concentrate instead upon the kings and other outstanding heroes of Spartan history. Sparta had a dual monarchy, but her governing constitution did not give sole power of rule to the kings. The constitution allowed the commoners of Sparta to be of major influence and importance in the events and history of the Spartan state. Commoners had roles as significant as those of the kings and in many instances, as will be seen throughout this paper, the Spartan commoners' role was more important. The term "commoner" refers to those persons who were male citizens of Sparta (Spartiates) but were not kings. In the classical period of Greek history wealth was not a factor in determining the role of the commoner in the Spartan system. The only importance wealth had was in making the commoner a citizen of the polis through the continued payment of his public mess dues. The Spartan commoners held high positions in the government, some of which could limit or direct the

activities of the kings. Commoners were a significant part of the military and, like Lysander, were responsible for many developments in the other Greek city-states. The great importance of the nonroyal citizens in Spartan history requires a detailed consideration of them and their activities.

A discussion of the ancient sources is necessary to reveal the validity, biases, and shortcomings of the materials available for research on ancient Sparta. The primary source materials for the period under discussion in this paper are not satisfactory on all aspects of Spartan history. In general, the writers of the ancient works were often inaccurate. They ignored, glossed over, or otherwise distorted many facts.

Except for a few fragmentary remains of the poems of Alcman and Tyrtaeus the first sources for early Spartan history are in the work of the historian Herodotus, who wrote about the events of Greece before the prejudice of the Athenians and Athenian idealization after the Peloponnesian War produced serious distortions in Greek and Spartan history.[1] Herodotus' histories covered the period of the Persian Wars, from 499 to 479 B. C.,[2] and the history of Persia and Greece before the wars. Although he distinctly prefers the Greeks over the Persians and greatly admires Athens, Herodotus is relatively free of bias for either Athens or Sparta over the other because he was born in Halicarnassus.

Herodotus' work shows that he is not greatly concerned with detailed chronology. He does use literary sources, personal accounts which are biased in themselves, and whatever other sources he found. These materials he supplemented and verified through the use of inquiry and common sense.[3] Herodotus states more than one view on a particular issue and then justifies the view he considers to be the more accurate option, but he does not insist that the more probable had to be true and the other views wrong. Later writers have questioned Herodotus' statistics, especially concerning the numbers of dead after the various battle and campaigns.[4] Even with such a fault, Herodotus is a valuable source of information on Sparta.

Thucydides' histories are the next important contemporary source for the history of Sparta. The work covers the Peloponnesian War from 431 to 411 plus a consideration of the Athenian expansion before the war. While Herodotus' work is sometimes referred to as a collection of "entertaining tales of the romantic past,"[5] Thucydides is more interested in giving an exact, accurate account of his own time. Thucydides, who was an Athenian, admires Pericles and Periclean Athens. At the same time, some of his hostility towards Athens, resulting from his banishment from the city after he lost to Brasidas at Amphipolis, is also apparent in the work.

However, for the most part Thucydides writes with great impartiality.[6] He is the source of much of the information about the Spartan commoners Brasidas, Lysander, and others who will be considered in greater detail later.[7] Although Thucydides was contemporary to the events he wrote about, his reconstruction of that history should not be taken as the total truth, but rather as a rationalization of the events. Even Thucydides could not be everywhere at once and had to rely upon witnesses who could very well have distorted the events intentionally or not.

Xenophon is the third historian of significant value for the reconstruction of Spartan history. He began his work by continuing where Thucydides had stopped his writings in 411 B. C. and from there, Xenophon provided a discourse on Greek events to 362 B. C. He details the end of the Peloponnesian War, the Spartan hegemony, and the loss of the Spartan supremacy to the Thebans. His work on the great Spartan king of that period, Agesilaus II, shows even more strongly than in his Hellenica Xenophon's partiality towards the Spartans. Xenophon was an Athenian but his sympathies were in the Spartan camp where he had spent most of his adult life. His work, Lacedaemonian Politics, is of great importance for information on Spartan political institutions and the constitution. Xenophon's works are not of the same historical quality as those of Thucydides because there

is little analysis of political development. Xenophon was contemporary to the events of his narrative which is why many historians prefer his material over that of later writers,[8] but he frequently omits material which showed Sparta's failures or damaged her character. In later historical documents of other chroniclers writing about the period 411 to 362 are discussions of many of Spartan's problems and defeats. Xenophon's organization is also difficult to traverse and to reconstruct a chronological pattern of events. He dislikes the Thebans and is impartial towards Athens, while excusing Sparta's defeats and ignoring her humiliations.

The unknown historian, most commonly designated as "P", wrote the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia which discusses the same period as Xenophon's history. P's work includes many items not found in Xenophon and seems to be the major source for the later historian Ephorus.[9] P's works exist mainly in a fragmentary state and what is extensive (covering the years 396 and 395) has not yet been translated into a modern language in its entirety. The identification of this historian has been equated with Theopompus, Cratippus, and Daimachus, but many modern scholars hold that the historian is still unknown to present researchers.[10]

The last major sources contemporary to the time period being examined are the works of the philosopher Aristotle. His works are partly scientific treatises and

partly works on philosophical subjects. Aristotle's work on the politics of many different Greek city-states is important for details of Spartan customs and government. Aristotle, who was not an historian but rather a constitutionalist, is anti-Spartan in his criticisms of Spartan institutions and Spartan aims; because of this he should not to be accepted as entirely accurate on the matters of Spartan life and law. Although Aristotle criticizes various aspects of the Spartan political system, his ideal political system contains several aspects from the Spartan device, so obviously he does not consider everything about Sparta to be ill-conceived.[11]

A writer of importance whose works have not survived the passage of time is Ephorus of Cyme in Asia Minor. His History, a leading source for Diodorus Siculus' Lives, covers the period from the Dorian invasions to the siege of Perinthus in 340.[12] Ephorus' work is an episodic history divided into geographical areas where more details are available. The work of Ephorus may be lost but it is known that he presents a tradition apart from that of Xenophon and that he is not as pro-Spartan as Xenophon.

An ancient source, but not contemporary with the Spartan hegemony is Diodorus of Sicily, who is of great importance because he relied upon the historian Ephorus for much of his information for the fourth and fifth centuries. Diodorus' work is intended to be a

compilation of history from the beginning of Greek history, which for him was in 1184 with the Trojan Wars, until the year 59. The work was to be a total world history, at least as far as the world was then recognized, and not confined just to Greece and Rome. Much of Diodorus' forty books exist only in fragments mentioned in later works, but the books which cover history from 480 to 302 are extant and are informative for the study of Spartan history. Because of his lateness (he wrote in the first century of the Roman period) many historians and writers prefer Xenophon to Diodorus when the two conflict. More recent authors such as Rice[13] and Hornblower[14] emphatically state that the account of Diodorus should not be dismissed merely because it does not agree with Xenophon and that the former offers an anti-Spartan tradition, but should be used carefully to correct and supplement Xenophon. Diodorus' account is merely a summary of historical events which others had already written about in greater detail.[15] Diodorus moralizes on various activities of the people involved but does not analyze, as does Thucydides, the political reasons behind the events.

The last primary sources of importance for ancient Spartan history are the works of Plutarch, who lived in the second century A. D. The most vital works of Plutarch are his biographies of major Greek and Roman figures. Like Diodorus, Plutarch's writings are only as

valuable as the sources upon which the author relies. He also represents a tradition different from Xenophon and a rather anti-Spartan point of view.

The other ancient materials, generally have pro-Athenian, anti-Spartan tendencies and are not as informative as the sources already discussed. After the Thebans defeated Sparta at Leuctra in 371 and destroyed Sparta's hegemony, ancient writers had very little more to say about the Spartans until the middle of the third century. Most of the histories contemporary with the period 362 to 323 have not survived in their entirety. Only fragments of the writings by Ephorus, Theopompus, and others survive in the quotations of writers of the Roman period.

The time period which this thesis covers is limited to the span of time between the Lycurgan reforms and the death of Alexander. The reasons for this are several. The main reason for examining the period after the Lycurgan reforms rather than before, is the availability and trustworthyness of sources. The Lycurgan reforms were governmental reforms made sometime between the ninth and sixth centuries. The use of the date 776 is based upon Aristotle,[16] who dated the reforms with the occurrence of the first Olympiad. Another reason for the date is because of the fact that a reform of the Spartan government in the ninth century seems to be extremely early considering the limited amount of political

development in other Greek city-states while the sixth too late. The reforms probably took place between the eighth and seventh centuries after the turmoil of the first and second Messenian Wars.[17] The Spartan state embarked upon these wars mainly to obtain and consolidate more nearby territory.[18] The Spartan reforms were named for Lycurgus, a figure who seems to be half legendary and half real. Most modern historians accept that there was indeed a man named Lycurgus but doubt that Lycurgus could be responsible for all of the reforms credited to him.[19] Most writers believe that the Lycurgan reforms evolved over a long span of time[20] and that it was not until the fifth century that ancient Spartans credited Lycurgus with their manufacture.[21] The individual arguments about Lycurgus and the reforms go beyond the scope of this paper but the way of life dictated by the Lycurgan reforms in the Spartan Rhetra (constitution) will be considered later.

The decision to end the discussion of the Spartan commoner in 323 results from the change in polity in Greece after Alexander's death[24] and the continued decline of Sparta and her role in Greek affairs, a decline which began with the defeat at Leuctra. There are sources which consider Sparta in the middle of the third century and in the second,[25] but Sparta was unable to break out of her decline and became just another minor city in the vast Roman empire.

The consideration of the commoner and his importance to Sparta will center around his lifestyle, the types of governmental role he could hold, and conflicts (both real and assumed) with the Spartan kings. Those commoners which the ancient writers consider to be more outstanding than the majority will also be examined. Discussions will be made on the classification of the Lacedaemonians and on the decline in the number of the Spartan citizens. Throughout it will be shown that Spartan commoners held extremely important positions in the Spartan government and its history because of which the Spartan commoners deserve special examination.

ENDNOTES

[1] C. G. Starr. "The Credibility of Early Spartan History," Historia 14 (1965): 263.

[2] All dates in the text are B. C. unless otherwise noted.

[3] Herodotus, The Histories, de Selincourt edition, pp. 26, 32, 34.

[4] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[5] Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, Crawley edition, p. xxiii.

[6] Ibid., p. xxii.

[7] See Chapter 5.

[8] More recent writers argue that because of the finds of the works by the historian of the Hellenica Oxyrhynica and their agreement with Diodorus of Sicily and Plutarch, Xenophon should not be accepted as the total truth.

[9] I. A. F. Bruce, An Historical Commentary on the 'Hellenica Oxyrhynchia' (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 2.

[10] Truesdell S. Brown, The Greek Historians (Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1973), p. 115.

[11] Arist. Pol. 34 b 40 for an example.

[12] David G. Rice, "Agesilaos, Agesipolis, and Spartan Politics, 386-379 B. C.," Historia 23 (1974): 164.

[13] Brown, Greek Historians, p. 108.

[14] Simon Hornblower, The Greek World, 479-323 B. C. (London: Methuen and Co., 1983), p. 6.

[15] Diodorus, Loeb Classical Library, vol. 1, p. xvii.

16 Arist. Pol. 1271 b 24-26; G. L. Huxley, Early Sparta (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1970), p. 42

17 Huxley, Early Sparta, p. 38; N. G. L. Hammond, A History of Greece to 322 B. C. (Oxford: Claredon Press, 1959), p. 106.

18 Guy Dickins, "The Growth of Spartan Policy," Journal of Hellenic Studies 32 (1912): 24.

19 Pavel Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, trans., Iris Urwin-Lewitova (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971), p. 65; H. Michell, Sparta (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), p. 22.

20 J. T. Hooker, The Ancient Spartans (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1980), p. 132; Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 65.

21 H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, A History of the Delphic Oracle (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1939), vol. 1, p. 91.

22 For more on the various arguments see Oliva and the individual works of Huxley, Cartledge, Chrimes, Michell, and Jones listed in the bibliography.

23 See Chapter 3.

24 M. I. Finley, "Sparta" in Jean-Pierre Vernant, Problemes de la Guerre en grece ancienne (La Haye, 1967), p. 143.

25 Plut. Agis; Plut. Cleom.

CHAPTER II

CLASSIFICATIONS OF LACEDAEMONIANS

There were several classifications in Spartan society other than that of the Spartiates to which the commoners belonged. The different groups influenced the lifestyle and activities. An examination of the Spartan estates is significant for a more concise understanding of Spartan commoners and their activities. The classifications of Lacedaemonians in addition to the citizens, the Spartiates, were those of the perioeci, helots, _hypomeiones_, _neodamodeis_, and _mothakes_.

The Spartiates claimed to be descended from the original Dorians who conquered the area which formed Sparta.[1] The Spartiates were full Spartan citizens and in order to qualify for citizenship, a person had to have a Spartan citizen father and mother. An additional requirement was the possession of a _kleros_ or a piece of land which the state allotted to him. Another condition for citizenship was the successful completion of the state regulated educational system.[2] All Spartan citizens were considered _homoioi_ or equals.[3] This meant that each Spartiate had an equal standing in the eyes of the law and an equal claim to the rights the state gave its citizens.[4]

The Spartan citizen had an equal chance of holding most offices, although capability or popularity may have been factors in the elections. Spartiates were, in general, the office holding group of Sparta.[5] The use of the term homoioi implies that since all were equal there could not have been an exclusive nobility among of Spartan citizens.[6]

The possession of land was a very important factor in being a Spartiate. The kleros supported the Spartiate and was his means of making his monthly contributions to the eating halls. The loss of property, which occurred in Sparta increasingly after the Peloponnesian War and then after the end of the Spartan hegemony, caused numerous Spartans to lose many of the rights as citizens. The ex-Spartiates then sank into the order of inferiors known as the hypomeiones.[7] The Spartan constitution, the Rhetra, prevented the sale of the kleros, but this restraint was removed sometime in the fourth century[8] and led to an aristocracy of people who were rich enough to buy up these lands or forclose on lands whose owners were unable to pay back their debts.[9] The condition which changed the kleros from an allotment to individuals by the state into a freehold property was blamed on the loss of Messenia in 370/369.[10] Entrance to the Spartiate class by non-Spartiates was rare because members jealously guarded their status. There were exceptions but these were few indeed.

The next group of people were the perioeci. They, like the Spartiates, owed military service to the state and ancient sources often lumped both groups together when using the term "Lacedaemonians".[11] The perioeci were probably the inhabitants of the area when the Dorians first arrived in Laconia.[12] The Dorians subjugated the perioeci to the degree that they had no rights of participation in the Spartan government nor any voice in the decisions of foreign policy which might affect them. The perioeci were more or less under the control of the Spartiates. However, since most of them lived in small villages surrounding Sparta, the citizens allowed the perioeci to administer their internal affairs under the guidance of a Spartiate called a harmost.[13] Thus they were not slaves but were free people without citizenship.

The perioeci do not seem to have been an oppressed section of the population. They showed few signs of being discontented with their position.[14] The towns of the perioeci were the seats of industry and trade. Because such occupations as artisan or merchant were forbidden to the Spartiates, the perioeci took over these professions and could become fairly wealthy from their profits in these jobs.[15] Yet, the majority were farmers and as such had only a modest income.

The third major division of people at Sparta were the helots. For the most part they were the conquered peoples of Messenia which Sparta subdued by the end of the fifth

century. There were probably in addition to the Messenian helots many Laconian helots.[16] The helots were slaves of the state. The state allotted these slaves to the Spartiates to work the kleroi. The Spartiates could not sell or trade the helots, only the state could do this. Thus the helots were not strictly property as were most slaves in ancient Greece.

Because they numbered far more than the Spartiates and resented their position, the helots were a constant source of trouble for the Spartan citizenry. Aristotle reports that the helots repeatedly rose up against the Spartiates.[17] Athenaeus records that the Spartiates treated the helots with great insolence[18] which could account for much of the helot's hostility. Thucydides and Herodotus mention instances which indicated the extent Spartan fear of the possibility of helot revolt. One such case was the existence of the crypteia during which the magistrates sent out Spartan youths on certain occassions to kill any helot they met.[19] This along with the disappearance and assumed murder of 2,000 helots during the Peloponnesian War[20] suggest how the Spartiate attempted to control the rebellious helots. Another method of removing the threat posed by the helots was a formal declaration of war upon the helots which the ephors issued upon entry of their office.[21] Dio Chrystom and Aristotle imply that because the helots had no prospect of ever

becoming Spartan citizens helots were constantly plotting against the Spartiates.[22] Thus a strained situation existed between helots and Spartiates until Messenia became an independent polis again.

Upon rare occasion the helots were given freedom and became members of a separate class--that of the neodamodeis. Diodorus speaks of 1,000 helots who served with Brasidas in Thrace and because of their bravery and deeds, the Spartan government subsequently granted these men their freedom in 421.[23] It is most probable that those helots freed due to military service were Laconian helots, not Messenian,[24] because of the fear on the behalf of the Spartiates that the Messenian helots would rise up and, with the help of those helots who had managed to escape from Laconia, attempt to overthrow the Spartiate control.[25] The helots made an effort in 464 after a great earthquake destroyed much of Sparta. The citizens subdued the revolt but did not put an end to fears of another uprising, nor did they totally suppress the Messenian helots.[26] In the helot rebellion only two of the many perioecic townships sided with the helots. Appart from the incident in 464, the perioeci did not show any further hostility towards the ruling class until of Cinadon's conspiracy in 398.[27]

Because the Messenian helots did not quietly submit to the Spartiates, the citizens had to organize themselves

and became a state of professional soldiers who were constantly ready for rebellion.[28] A major revolt in the seventh century had caused the implementation of a strict military disciplinary system, the agoge.[29] For the most part, fear and hatred on both sides was the relationship between Spartiates and helots.

Beneath the Spartiates were several groups of inferiors who were jealous of the Spartiate's social prestige. These inferiors were freedmen but did not possess the full rights of citizenship.[30] The aforementioned hypomeiones had once been citizens but had lost their citizenship when they lost their kleros and were no longer able to pay the dues of the syssitia, the common mess.[31] Since hypomeiones no longer owned land, they lived by occasional labor and probably engaged in the different crafts which the constitution forbidden to the Spartiates.[32] The hypomeiones were politically unhappy and ranged themselves on the side of the helots and perioeci.[33] One such person was Cinadon who attempted in 398 to overthrow the domination of the Spartiates.[34] An informer told the ephors of the plot, and the citizens who were then able to prevent Cinadon's plan from maturing. The failure of the plot resulted in the deaths of Cinadon and his associates.[35]

The neodamodeis were a classification of freed former slaves. They most often were those helots who gained their freedom from service in the army as hoplites.[36]

Hypomeiones and neodamodeis served in the army in the same fashion as Spartiates and perioeci.[37] The number of neodamodeis must have been considerable because King Agesilaus took some two thousand with him to Asia when he was fighting the Persians.[38] The neodamodeis probably never reached the status of homoioi because of the latent Spartan fear of the helots.

In addition to the neodamodeis and hypomeiones was the group, the tresantes. These were men who returned to Sparta after being defeated in a war or who showed cowardice in battle.[39] They lost their eligibility for public office and lost control over their land. Lycurgus' Rhetra required the people to choose an honorable death over a disgraceful life.[40] The rest of the Spartans treated the tresantes with contempt. In some cases the ephors and the assembly reversed the status and the tresantes became full citizens again.[41]

Mothakes were yet another classification of freedmen. They were not homoioi, did not receive a kleros, and were not eligible to be members of the Ecclesia, the Spartan assembly; but, they were subject to the hardships of the Spartan agoge.[42] Mothakes were the sons of helot women and probably had Spartiate fathers. Brought up as foster brothers to young Spartans citizens, the mothakes participated along side their foster brothers in the discipline training in order to become good soldiers.[43] Some mothakes were actually promoted to the status of

citizens, but this only occurred through very unusual circumstances.[44] Lysander was one mothake to whom the Spartan state granted citizenship in 405 in recognition of merit during the Peloponnesian War.[45] Whether Lysander was really a mothake or a Spartiate is greatly disputed in both ancient and modern works and his case may have been unusual.[46] Promotion to Spartiate was more exceptional than demotion down to hypomeion status.[47]

The emergence of the neodamodeis proved how accute was the problem of the decline in the number of Spartiates. Even as early as the Peloponnesian Wars, the use of freed helots as a regular segment of the Spartan military system revealed the shortage of man power available for fighting in major wars. With mistrust and hatred on both sides, the Spartiates must have needed large numbers of loyal fighting men for the state to go so far as to arm, train, and liberate slaves.[48] The hiring of mercenary troops apparently increased greatly during and after the reign of Agesilaus II.[49] Freed slaves and mercenaries came to constitute the majority of the armed hoplite troops. The Spartan citizens were employed in the states administration system or in army command positions.

Just what the numbers of each of the three major classifications (helots, perioeci, and Spartiates) were at the time of the formation of the Lycurgan constitution is unknown and indeterminable although Plutarch gives the number at 9,000 for the number of Spartiates.[50] One of

the earliest references to a number of helots is found in Herodotus who records that seven attended each Spartiate soldier.[51] The number of helots appears to have been enormous in relation to that of Spartiates.[52] In numbers the perioeci were probably somewhere between helots and Spartiates.[53] The number of Spartan citizens at the time of Lycurgus is not known exactly which causes problems in determing just when the Spartiates did begin to decline in numbers. If Plutarch is correct and there were 9,000 Spartiates at the time of Lycurgus then the decline must have been in process or have started soon after, because by 479 there were only some 5,000 Spartiates[54] of actual military age between twenty and fifty.[55] The number of men of combat age in 418 was 2,500 with the total number of Spartiates being between 3,000 and 4,000, according to Thucydides.[56] Xenophon gives the total number of citizens as being approximately 2,500 in 394.[57] By the Battle of Leuctra in 371 there were only 1,050 Spartiates 700 of whom were at the battle.[58] By his own time Aristotle reports that there were less than 1,000 Spartan citizens.[59] These numbers present a significant decrease in the number of citizens from the time of Lycurgus to after 369.

There are of course problems with the numbers and other figures available. In many cases where ancient sources have "Lacedaemonians" and a figure, the number can refer to only Spartiates or to a mixture of Spartiates and perioeci both. Often there is no way of differentiating

between methods used, although Herodotus and Aristotle denoted Spartiates as separate from the perioeci and helots.[60] The numbers also give no indication of the number of Spartiate women, of men over the maximum army age, or of children. However the available figures indicate that the actual number of Spartan citizens was decreasing and that very few people were being admitted to the citizen class from below.

Scholars have suggested many reasons for the decline of the Spartan citizen population.[61] One suggestion for the decrease is connected to the massive earthquake that struck Sparta in 464. Diodorus records that 20,000 Lacedaimonians died.[62] Again there was no indication as to whether Diodorus means only Spartiates or includes the perioeci in this figure of 20,000, but examination of other sources reveals that it is probably the number of citizens and perioeci together and possibly an exaggeration of the true number. The figure of 20,000 Lacedaimonians is extremely large, but even if it were accurate, some scholars argue that a population should quickly recover deficits which natural events caused.[63] Therefore, although the earthquake had an immediate effect on the citizen population, it was not a lasting influence.

Another argument advanced for the decline in Spartan male citizens is the effect of war. War casualties might have had some bearing on the decline of Spartiates, but were not sufficient to have caused such a drastic decline,

especially when it is noted how few Spartiates actually were casualties of the many battles.[64]

Other causes for the decline in the numbers of Spartiates cannot be so easily dismissed as having actually very little effect on the total citizen population. Other reasons include a growing unwillingness on the part of the Spartiates to produce children. This in turn can be blamed on the accumulation of wealth and land in the hands of increasingly fewer people.[65] Desire to amass as much accumulative wealth as possible caused Spartan commoners to have fewer children in order to limit division of the property. In Sparta sons and daughters were both entitled to share in the inheritance.[66] Therefore if there was a daughter but no son, instead of trying to produce more children in the hopes of having a son the father sought the richest man who could be found to marry the daughter and thereby increased the amount of wealth into fewer hands.[67] Such a deliberate restriction in the number of children on the part of Spartiates may have caused a decline in population.

Another cause of the decrease in the numbers of Spartiates is also linked to the accumulation of wealth in the hands of fewer and fewer Spartiates. The process of collecting property left many previous landholders without kleros to provide their contributions to the public messes. When Spartiates had sold or otherwise lost land, and were consequently unable to pay mess bills, they then

lost the rights of citizenship and joined the ranks of the inferior class, the hypomeiones. After dividing the inheritance, sons of lower class Spartiates who had numerous children discovered that their share of the inheritance was often not enough to provide for their contributions.[68] They also became inferiors. The loss of the Messenian helots because of the refounding of Messenia in 370/369 deprived many Spartiates of estates and means of living. The loss of Messenia caused many commoners to become inferiors as well.[69] The ever increasing number of hypomeiones indicated that the wealth required for retainig citizenship was harder to maintain. As their number increased, it is certain that the population of the Spartiates was declining.

Another possible cause of the decrease of citizens is the limited population base. Most recent scholars have overlooked this possibility.[70] The major requirement to be a Spartiate was to have a Spartiate mother and a Spartiate father. There were few other ways to become a citizen which thereby limited the number of Spartans who could intermarry and produce offspring. Without the influx of "new" blood the gene pool stagnated, births decreased, and defects could possibly increase.[71] Spartan women tended to marry later in life than most Greeks.[72] This limited the number of children women could bear and further restricted the number of Spartans.[73]

The last three arguments working together were most likely directly responsible for the decline of the Spartiates. Yet in the end the Spartiates themselves were the only ones to blame for their diminishing numbers. Directly responsible for the limitations on citizenship and on child production, the commoners could have changed the situation.

ENDNOTES

[1] Michell, Sparta, p. 42.

[2] Hooker, Ancient Spartans, p. 116; Gustave Gilbert, The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, trans., E. J. Brooks and T. Nicklin (Chicago, Illinois: Argonaut, Inc., 1968), p. 39.

[3] Hooker, Ancient Spartans, p. 117; Xen. Res. Lac. x. 7.

[4] W. G. Forrest, A History of Sparta; 950-192 B. C. (London: Hutchinson and Co. Ltd., 1968), p. 51.

[5] K. M. T. Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, A Re-examination of the Evidence (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952), p. 354.

[6] Michell, Sparta, p. 43.

[7] Ibid., p. 89.

[8] John A. Fine, The Ancient Greeks: A Critical History (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 158.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Michell, Sparta, p. 64; Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 62.

[12] Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, pp. 55, 59; Michell (p. 70) agrues that they were Dorians and thus allies to the Spartans.

[13] N. G. L. Hammond, p. 103.

[14] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 36 disagrees.

[15] Ibid.; Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 30; Michell, Sparta, p. 73.

16 G. E. M. de Ste Croix, The Origins of the Peloponnesian War (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1972), p. 92.

17 Arist. Pol. 1269 a 34-35.

18 Ath. Deip. xiv 657 d.

19 Plut. Lyc. xxviii. 1-3.

20 Thuc. IV. 80.

21 Plut. Lyc. xxviii. 4.

22 Dio Chrys. Or. 36. 38.; Arist. Pol. 1269 a 39.

23 Diod. XII. 76.1.

24 de Ste Croix, Origins of the Peloponnesian War, p. 91.

25 Thuc. V. 14.

26 Plut. Lyc. xxviii. 5; Diod. XI. 63. 4.

27 A. H. J. Greenidge, A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History (London: Mcmillan and Co., Ltd., 1928), p. 81.

28 de Ste Croix, Origins of the Peloponnesian War, p. 92.

29 Hornblower, Greek World, p. 99.

30 Michell, Sparta, p. 42.

31 Ibid., p. 89; Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 177.

32 Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 178.

33 Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, p. 228.

34 Xen. Hell. III. iii. 4.

35 Ibid., III. iii. 4-11.

36 Thuc. VII. 19; Michell, Sparta, p. 251.

37 Michell, Sparta, p. 248.

[38] Ibid., p. 90.

[39] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 77.

[40] Xen. Resp. Lac. IX. 1.

[41] Michell, Sparta, p. 44.

[42] Ibid., p. 41.

[43] Ibid., p. 40; Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 177.

[44] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 34.

[45] Hooker, Ancient Spartans, p. 119; Ath. Deip. VI 271 e-f.

[46] Chrimes does not accept this, Ancient Sparta, p. 221.

[47] Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 136.

[48] Ibid., p. 134; Oliva Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 169.

[49] G. T. Griffith, The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935; reprint , Chicage, Illinois: Ares Publishers, Inc., 1979), p. 4.

[50] Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, p. 350.

[51] Hdt. IX. 29.

[52] Hornblower, Greek World, p. 99.

[53] Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 55.

[54] Hdt. IX. 10, 11, 28, 29.

[55] Michell, Sparta, pp. 247-248. If the Spartan state desperately needed more warriors then the groups from eighteen to twenty and in their fifties would be required to join in the fighting.

[56] Thuc. V. 68.

[57] Xen. Hell. IV. ii. 16.

58 Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 134: Xen. Hell. VI. i. 1 says about 1,500.

59 Of the 700 Spartiates some 400 of them were killed in the battle.

60 Arist. Pol. 1270 a 29-32.

61 Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, p. 350.

62 Diod. XI. 63. 1.

63 Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 135.

64 A. H. M. Jones, Sparta (Oxford: Basil Blackwell and Mott, Ltd., 1967), p. 135.

65 Xen. Lac. Pol. 14. 3; Plut. Lyc. 30. 1.

66 Paul Cartledge, Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History 1300-362 B. C. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), p. 307.

67 Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 137.

68 Jones, Sparta, p. 136.

69 Ibid., p. 137; Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens., p. 23.

70 Cartledge, Sparta and Lakonia, p. 315.

71 Ibid. Such as what happened in the royal families of Europe.

72 See Chapter 3; Jones, Sparta, p. 35.

73 A tendency well illustrated in the American colonial experience. Lois G. Carr and Lorens S. Walsh, "The Planter's Wife: The Experience of White Women in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," in Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development, eds., Stanley N. Katz and John M. Murrin, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983), p. 104.

CHAPTER III

THE SPARTAN COMMONER'S LIFESTYLE

After examing the various orders of Sparta's society, one must consider the commoner's way of life. The ancients credited the shadowy figure of Lycurgus with the development of the system of Spartan education.[1] Aristotle says that the educational system was based on fighting, because the Spartans were, for the most part, warriors.[2] As discussed in the previous chapter, the major reason for the militarization of the Spartan citizens was the need to keep the helot population under control. The Spartans devised an educational system that enhanced and promoted military training among the citizens, enabling them to cope with helot uprisings as well as fighting foreign enemies. Spartans only counted those trained for war among their noblity, not anyone connected with manual labor.[3] The system of education directed the Spartan commoner into a pattern that resulted in a military career. His education influenced the way in which the Spartiate reacted towards other commoners, other classes, his leaders, and foreigners.

Participation in the formal educational and training system, the agoge, was required for the Spartan commoner,

because in order to qualify for citizenship the state demanded that the Spartiate successfully complete the discipline. The commoner who refused to submit to the agoge was in disgrace before the rest; he became adokimos, that is "of no repute."[4] Those who refused to partake in the agoge or who failed to complete it sucessfully most likely fell into the class of inferiors, the hypomeiones, because they could not be chosen as ephors nor as senators of the Gerousia.[5] The king's heir seems to have been exempt from participation in the agoge, but any other sons of the king, like Agesilaus II who was a younger son, had to undergo the discipline or else could not qualify for full citizenship.[6]

From the moment of birth until the age of thirty, the state controlled male Spartan children's lives, at which time they were able to direct themselves a little more. Upon birth, Spartan officials examined commoner children, and if found to be sound in body children lived; however, any physically defective children officials left exposed in the countryside to die.[7] Male children spent the first six years of their lives with their mothers, but at the age of seven were enrolled into the agoge.[8] Thus at seven Spartiate boys began the trials and tribulations which developed them into a part of the Spartan military framework.

Boys were in the charge of adult Spartiates who the

government authorized to punish any youth's misconduct as severely as the adult found to be necessary.[9] Boys who excelled in the discipline system became captains of their companies and the rest had to obey them and submit to their punishments.[10] The disciplinary system grouped boys according to age. They did not wear shoes, were allowed only one garment to wear for a whole year, slept together in groups in the public barracks.[11] They seldom bathed or used ointments.[12] The Spartan state allotted Spartiate youths only a moderate amount of food each day, but allowed the boys to steal whatever food they could in order to decrease their hunger.[13] Xenophon reports that the state implemented the stealing of food in order to make boys more resourceful at obtaining supplies which in the future increased their worth as fighting men.[14] However, if caught in the act of stealing, the boy's supervisor punished the offender.[15] The system thus permitted the stealing of food but not gettingcaught doing so, the latter resulting in punishment and ridicule.

Every Spartan citizen could demand of the boys any task considered necessary to develop the youths. Each Spartiate could punish the boys for any wrongdoings in order to instil in the youths more respectfulness toward elders and leaders.[16] All Spartan men watched over these children as if each were his own son.[17] The Spartiates employed the custom to make the boys obey their leaders and encouraged active participation of adults with youths.

The boys were not idle; they were given endless tasks to keep them occupied.[18] They had little formal education and learned to read and write only at the most elementary level.[19] They spent long hours at exercise and sport designed to develop and harden their bodies physically. All Spartiate training was intended to make the boys accept commands willingly, prevail against hardships, and to be militarily victorious.

The disciplinary training of the Spartiates lasted beyond maturity until the age of sixty. The agoge allowed no citizen to live only as he pleased but required citizens follow a set regimen and join in public service.[20] The Spartan law forbade the citizens to participate in any money-making activities because "wealth brought no honor"[21] to the Spartiate. When not at war, dances, feasts and festivals, hunts, and exercise occupied the commoner fulltime.[22] The Spartans were not to be seen loitering in the market places, but instead, were to be seen at places of exercise and of discussion of important political matters which trained them to speak concisely and improve their minds.[23] Because Spartans were unable to participate in mercantile or artistic occupations, they devoted their lives to serving the state and becoming professional soldiers which was to guarantee the continued safety and existence of Sparta.

Upon the completion of their thirtieth year Spartan commoners were no longer required to live in the barracks

and were able to establish their own residences with wife and family. At this time they acquired full citizenship and could take places at the assembly, the Ecclesia.[24] Spartiates were then able to have some privacy in their own home but still had to participate in the disciplinary system and eat at the public messes.

Spartan men from the age of seven to their sixieth year ate at public messes called syssitia,--sometimes referred to as phiditia. Xenophon records that Lycurgus established the common eating places because he believed that they would "reduce disregard of orders to a minimum."[25] The individual syssitia consisted of fifteen members. Each member of the group had to approve new candidates when vacancies occurred which was most likely to happen in those groups of military age. Only one negative vote was necessary to prevent addition of a hopeful applicant.[26] Participation in the syssitia promoted camaraderie which was of value in high pressure situations such as war when mess mates were able to depend upon fellows.

The food served in the messes for the adult Spartiates was neither excessive nor minimal. Each Spartiate provided his portion of the food from his kleros, that piece of land which the state gave to each male citizen. Lot sizes varied so that each was theoretically able to provide yearly seventy bushels of

barley for Spartiates plus twelve for his wife along with a "proportionate amount of wine and [olive] oil."[27] From this the citizen was required to contribute to his mess each month "a bushel of barley-meal, eight gallons of wine, five pounds of cheese, and two and a half pounds of figs and a small sum of money for things like flesh and fish."[28] Hunting and the richer men provided the extras.[29] The Spartiate sent to his mess portions of sacrifices and game acquired from hunting.[30] The food found at the syssitia was not scanty, but eating at the public messes prevented the commoners from gorging themselves, which they might at home, and thus become unfit for military and public services to the state. A commoner's continued failure to pay his mess bill resulted in his loss of Spartan citizenship and relegation to the inferior order of hypomeiones.[31]

Plutarch wrote that the custom of eating in the syssitia was rigidly observed. Even the kings had to eat in the common mess.[32] The only occasion upon which a person was allowed to dine at home was when he was late due to performing a sacrifice or because of hunting.[33] The syssitia provided the Spartan state with another method to control the activities of all its citizens, and even its kings.

Spartan women exercised their bodies so that they would have healthy babies. Exercise also reduced the

amount of suffering which occurred in the birthing process.[34] Motherhood was a woman's most important role in the Spartan state. Women and girls participated in such sports as wrestling, running, and the throwing of javelin and discus.[35] Through physical activity the women intended to make sure that their children had the standard of fitness the Spartan state demanded.

The state gave incentives to Spartan men to marry and produce children. Men without children deprived themselves of much of the honor that went with having children. In the assembly childless men had no rights to good seating and younger men could refuse to give them their seats because the elder had no offspring. Fines were even imposed on those men who did not marry and beget children.[36] To benefit those men who had three sons or more, the state exempted such fathers from night watches.[37] The family was subservient to the state, because the Spartan's duty was first to the state with the family far behind in second place. The family enabled the commoner to "fulfill his responsibilities towards the state,"[38] which was the production of children, especially males, who would enhance the military capabilities of the state.

Marriage was the course to fulfilling the requirement of begetting children. The Spartan groom "stole" his wife from her parents' home and dressed her in the guise of a

male, with her hair cut short to cheat evil spirits which might otherwise do their marriage harm.[39] Spartan marriages were at a later age, for the most part, than those among the other ancient Greeks.[40] If a man married before his thirtieth year, he was unable to live with his wife because the agoge training required him to reside with his fellow males in the barracks. He was able to see his wife only occasionally after sneaking out of the barracks at night. Xenophon reports that Lycurgus had put restrictions on intercourse, because infrequent meetings of the husband and wife would result in their being more eager and would surely result in the reproduction of better and healthier children.[41] After his thirtieth year the husband resided with his wife and family of girls and those boys under seven.

There were two other methods of acquiring children which did not directly involve marriage. Xenophon speaks of a tradition where an elderly man with a young wife and no children had to bring into a family a young man whose qualities the older man admired. This young man then begat the children of the wife. The resulting children were considered to be the older man's not the younger's.[42] The other way of producing children Plutarch describes. In this way a man, without children and perhaps not himself married, could have children by another man's wife. If the man admired the children of a certain Spartan woman, he could approach the woman's husband. Then with the

husband's approval, the man without children could then mate with the woman to produce a child.[43] This enabled the childless man to achieve the state's requirement of children. With the practice of these two methods and marriage the Spartan commoner fulfilled his obligation to the state to reproduce.

Another aspect of Spartan life was the prohibition of the possession of large amounts of silver and gold. Iron money was the trading medium of the Spartans. Tradition gave the formulation of these regulations to Lycurgus;[44] however, this was most unlikely because coins did not exist in great quantities until the fifth century and Sparta herself did not mint coins until after this date.[45] The rejection of gold and silver must have been added later to the constitution in the hopes of preventing an economic division among the homoioi. As seen in the last chapter, the state was unable to prevent the acquisition of wealth and land into the possession of a few commoners. Foreign coins were in circulation in Sparta as early as the time of the Persian Wars.[46] The Spartan government most likely paid their mercenaries (who increased in number after the Peloponnesian Wars) in gold or silver coin because the iron coins were too bulky. In addition the Spartans did not reward the mercenary fighters with citizenship or Spartan land so a coinage system was necessary. Xenophon recorded that the state fined those citizens who had gold or silver in their homes.[47] The

state feared gold and silver as corruptive elements but in the end was unable to prevent their prevalence.

The Spartan state and its constitution intended everything in the commoner's way of life to increase the practices of obedience and conformity among the Spartiates. The individual was to be subservient to the state. He was to concentrate on those aspects of life which promoted the state such as being a professional soldier and producing strong healthy children to continue the tradition.

ENDNOTES

[1] Plut. Lyc. III. 3; Dickins, "Growth of Spartan Policy," p. 24, credits the ephor Chilon with the development while Fine, Ancient Greeks, p. 162, says that the evolution of the agoge took place over a long period of time.

[2] Arist. Pol. VII. II. 5.

[3] Hdt. II. 167.

[4] Michell, Sparta, p. 41.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Plut. Ages. I. 2-3.

[7] Plut. Lyc. XVI. 1.

[8] Ibid., XVI. 4.

[9] Xen. Resp. Lac. II. 2.

[10] Plut. Lyc. XVII. 5.

[11] Xen. Resp. Lac., II. 3.

[12] Plut. Lyc. XVI. 6.

[13] Ibid., XVII. 3; Xen. Resp. Lac. XVII. 3.

[14] Xen. Resp. Lac. II. 7.

[15] Ibid., II. 8; Plut. Lyc. XVII. 4.

[16] Xen. Resp. Lac. II. 10.

[17] Plut. Lyc. XVII. 1; Xen. Resp. Lac. VI. 1.

[18] Xen. Resp. Lac. III. 3.

[19] Plut. Lyc. XVI. 6.

[20] Ibid., XXIV. 1.

[21] Ibid., XXIV. 2.

[22] Ibid., XXIV. 4.

[23] Ibid., XXV. 1.

[24] Michell, Sparta, pp. 172-173.

[25] Xen. Resp. Lac. V. 2.

[26] Plut. Lyc. XII. 5.

[27] Ibid., VIII. 4.

[28] Ibid., XII. 2.

[29] Xen. Resp. Lac. V. 2.

[30] Plut. Lyc. XII. 2.

[31] Jones, Sparta, p. 37, and as mentioned in Chapter 3.

[32] Plut. Lyc. XII. 3. An example of the strictness of the custom is when King Agis wanted to havehis rations sent to his home, he was refused.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., XIV. 2.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid., XV. 1-2.

[37] Arist. Pol. 1270 b 5.

[38] Hooker, Ancient Sparta, p. 136.

[39] Plut. Lyc. XV. 3-4; Xen. Resp. Lac. I; Michell, Sparta, p. 53.

[40] Jones, Sparta, p. 35.

[41] Xen. Resp. Lac. I. 7.

[42] Ibid., I. 7.

[43] Plut. Lyc. XV. 1; Xen. Resp. Lac. I. 8.

[44] Plut. Lyc. IX. 1.

[45] Jones, Sparta, pp. 38-39; Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 78.

[46] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 78.

[47] Xen. Resp. Lac. VII. 2.

CHAPTER IV

SPARTIATE ROLES IN THE SPARTAN STATE

The Spartan commoners were eligible for all governmental offices in Sparta with the exception of the hereditary kingships. In order to qualify for a state position, Spartiates had to have completed the training of the agoge, the disciplinary system. In addition, commoners had to be in good standing with regards to the syssitia or mess bills.[1] The prominent government roles available to to Spartiates were three in number: the Ecclesia or general assembly, the ephorate or chief magistrates, and the gerousia or senate. In addition to these three offices there were several less important state and military posts which commoners could possess. In any of these offices Spartiates could advance both politically within the state and popularly among the Spartan people.

Ancient sources again credit the Lycurgan constitution, the Rhetra, with the establishment of many of the government seats.[2] The Rhetra is said to have established within the Spartan government all aspects necessary for proper rule of the state. The dual kingships represented the monarchical type of government;

the gerousia, the oligarichical and the assembly the democratic.[3] The ephorate was seen as either democratic or tyrannical; democratic because any commoner could hold the office, tyrannical because of the amount of power that the ephors had.[4] By having all of these governing elements in one state Lycurgus hoped to avoid the problems which one type of government alone would create.

The Ecclesia was the democratic section of the Spartan government because all adult male Spartiates who qualified and were over the age of thirty[5] attended the meetings of the general assembly. In the early days of the assembly the kings presided over the meetings of the Ecclesia, but the ephors gradually assumed the role of leading the meetings.[6] The meeting place of the Ecclesia was outside of the city of Sparta, somewhere between the two tributaries of the Eurotas River, Babyca and Cnacion. The meeting place was not inside of a building but rather in the open.[7] Possible reasons for meeting outside of the city resulted from the need for space for the assembly (Sparta was small and did not possess a building large enough to hold thee the entire assembly) and the need of the assembly to concentrate on the matters put before it away from the distractions of the polis. Ancient sources are vague as to exactly where the assembly's meeting place was located. Space was a primary issue because the total number of Spartiates making up the Ecclesia was near 5,000 at the height of the Spartiate population.[8] As the

members of Spartiates dwindled so, too, did the number of members of the Ecclesia. The decreasing numbers seems to have made the assembly less democratic and more aristocratic in nature.

Scholars have long debated the actual role of the common assembly in the decision making process. Many scholars both modern and ancient argue that the Rhetra permitted the Ecclesia the right to vote only for or against measures put before it by the kings, gerousia, and ephors.[9] Other historians contend that the assembly did have the right of debating the issues.[10] The major problem in providing the solution here lies in the limited and scanty information available in the ancient sources and in the surviving fragment of the Rhetra contained in Plutarch's Lycurgus.[11] The Lycurgus is a source whose major disadvantage in reliability results from the lateness of its actual writing. Plutarch states that Lycurgus prohibited the actual written record of the Rhetras, a fact which provides the explanation of why the document is not found in very many extant forms, complete or fragmentary.[12] The Rhetra, as Plutarch quotes it, reads:

> Having established a cult of Syllianian Zeus and Athena, having done the 'tribing and obing', and having established a Gerousia of thirty members including the kings, season in season out they are to hold Apellai between Babyka and Knadion; the Gerousia is both to introduce proposals and to stand aloof; the damos [sic] is to have power to.'give a decisive verdict'.13

The Rhetra itself is not clear whether the Ecclesia could debate the issues, but the addition of a rider, or amendment to the Rhetra indicates that Ecclesia did debate the proposals put before it. The Rider reads "if the damos [sic] speaks crookedly, the Gerousia and the kings are to be removers."[14]

The Kings Polydorus and Theopompus, Plutarch indicates, inserted the Rider because members of the assembly had overstepped their political limits concerning the making of laws for the Spartan state and these two kings wanted to prevent the corruptions.[15] Plutarch believes that the Ecclesia could only accept or reject motions which the kings and gerousia put to the assembly. He does not say how the assembly members were able to corrupt their authority the occurance of which resulted in the addition of the Rider to the Rhetra.[16]

Aristotle considers the assembly to be of no great importance in Sparta;[17] it merely afirmed or denied according to what the gerousia and ephorate had already decided.[18] Such an image of the assembly reduced its importance to a mere trivality, "a more or less empty form".[19] The Spartan Ecclesia appears to have been an organ of the state's government which heard the proposals advanced by the gerousia, kings, or ephors[20] and then voted, without discussion on its part, for or against the issues after the Rider was attached to the Rhetra. Before the addition of the Rider it was likely that the assembly

did debate measures, but made some decisions which did not please those who put the issues before the assembly. These inappropriate decisions resulted in the abolition of the Ecclesia's right to discuss matters through the establishment of the amendment to the constitution. After the introduction of the Rider, commoners "in all probability lost also the right of raising opposition in the Apella [the Ecclesia] to proposals introduced by the gerontes".[21] Thus the addition to the Spartan constitution greatly restricted the activities of the Ecclesia in making decisions.

In addition to voting on issues the assembly did have several other duties. The Ecclesia voted in general on all aspects of foreign policy and specifically on the questions of peace and war, on campaigns, and on treaties. The assembly was responsible for appointing Spartan generals and admirals for those campaigns that the kings did not lead themselves. The members of the assembly elected the gerontes and ephors and appointed other officials. If any dispute over succession to the crown arose, the Ecclesia decided in the matter. The Spartan Ecclesia emancipated helots, rescinded citizenships, and voted on proposed laws.[22] There is no evidence that the assembly conducted any sort of trials; this procedure was limited to the ephorate and gerousia.[23]

Another problem regarding the Spartan general assembly arises over the exact meeting times of the

assembly. Here the problem is the phrase "ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας ἀπέλλαζειν" found in the Rhetra. This phrase indicates when the assembly was to meet and the phrase can be interpreted in many ways. Possible translations include "to assemble in the Ecclesia," "month after month," "season after season," or "year after year". Michell accepts "season after season" to be the interpretation and meaning meetings being held each month, possibly at the full moon.[24] Oliva, Gilbert, and Fine believe that the awkward passage means for the assembly to meet in regular Monthly meetings.[25] However, Chrimes takes "season after season" to mean that there was just one meeting each season of winter, spring, and summer or perhaps only in winter and summer. To account Thucydides' saying that the assembly meetings were at the full moon, Chrimes interprets Thucydides as meaning at the full moon in the one month of the season not at each full moon.[26] Wade-Gery accepts the translation of "year after year". His acceptance of this phrase is based on the other term used to refer to the Spartan Ecclesia, the Apella, which would seem to be derived from a meeting in the month Apellaios at the beginning of the year.[27] The term "Apella" could also be accepted because of Plutarch's use of "ἀπελλάζειν" in Lycurgus. Other authorities such as Hooker and Forrest refer to the infrequent assembly meetings.[28] The acceptance of one system over the others seems totally

arbitary and when considered with the right of the ephors to call up the assembly whenever they required it, almost any of the various arguments seems feasible. It would be necessary for the assembly to meet at least once a year to elect the ephors and any other annual officials. However, one meeting a year would not enable the Ecclesia to examine all foreign policy matters and for that reason alone the assembly must have met more than once a year. Monthly meetings appear to be more appropriate because of the decisions which needed to be made concerning war, peace, and other foreign policies which especially in time of war could not be delayed for any long length of time without decisions.

The ephorate can also be referred to as a democratic element in the Spartan government because any Spartan commoner was eligible for the office.[29] The ephorate consisted of five ephors elected annually by popular vote.[30] The office was a one term only position which began in the autumn.[31] The ephors were accountable for their actions on leaving office.[32] One ephor was chosen as the chief or eponymous ephor and gave his name to the year. The eponymous ephor was able to use considerable influence.[33] The ephors decided all their questions by a vote of the majority of their number.[34] Since popular vote secured their election, the ephors were in theory answerable to the will of the Spartan citizens.[35] The

ephors were responsible for the daily government of the Spartan state.[36] Their offices were located in the Spartan market place.[37]

Herodotus credits the foundation of the ephorate to Lycurgus.[38] Aristotle and other ancient sources consider King Theopompus, who was king during the First Messenian War, the creator of the ephorate about one hundred years after Lycurgus' reforms.[39] The exact duties of the office in the beginning are unclear but it is fairly certain that its powers were not as extensive as in the fourth and fifth centuries. The fact that the ephors are not mentioned in the Rhetra has given rise much debate on the part of scholars as to whether they actually existed at the time of the consistution's founding. Some scholars argue that the ephorate did not exist until later,[40] while others say that the position of the ephors was rather weak at the time.[41] It is most probable that the first ephors were mainly advisors to the kings when the office was first begun. The kings appointed the ephors to govern the state while the kings were absent from Sparta for long periods of time during the Messenian Wars.[42] The ephors were not able to exercise any considerable influence on Spartan policies while the kings nominated the ephors. The ability to influence Spartan governmental procedures occurred as time passed. Later ephors like Asteropos and Chilon increased the power of the ephorate. Asteropos

caused the ephorate to become a popularly elected office rather than one which the kings appointed.[43] Chilon made his office as important as the kings' authority in guiding the Spartan state.[44] The ephors slowly gained more power and influence, to the detriment of the kingship, until the ephors were too powerful according to Aristotle, who equates the ephorate to a tyranny.[45] From the end of the seventh century the ephorate became a more important element of the Spartan government[46] until somewhere between 500 and 467 when the ephorate acquired its supreme power in the state.[47]

The duties of the ephorate acquired were many and most of their duties were extremely important for the continuation of the Spartan government. The Ecclesia declared war, but the ephors were the ones who set the age limits for the troops who would serve in the war and they issued the order to form the army.[48] At first the kings went into battle together but after conflicts between the kings during Cleomones I's reign, the kings were sent to separate battle areas. When on campaign two ephors accompanied the kings. The ephors were not there to interfere in the king's decisions but were there only to view the proceedings unless the king asked for the ephor's help or advice.[49] The kings were the military commanders.[50] Aristotle says that the ephors divided the kings and then accompanied the kings on their campaigns,

because the ephors "thought that the safety of the state depended on division between the kings".[51] The ephorate gave the generals their order in times of war and would recall any general who failed in battle because of his own neglect.[52] The ephorate was responsible for the major procedures in warfare and were able to dispatch envoys in the name of the Spartan state. They received the foreign envoys and decided what foreign policy matters or treaties would be sent to the Ecclesia.[53] The assembly had the final vote in the matters of foreign policy, but the ephorate had the monopoly on foreign affairs.

Those officials which the kings did not appoint or the Ecclesia did not elect, the ephors appointed.[54] The ephorate could discipline and even fine all other magistrates of the Spartan state. The ephors could remove officials from their offices and even imprison or press capital charges against officials.[55] At the end of their terms of office, lesser Spartan officials had to issue an account of their activities to the ephorate.[56] The ephors then judged the activities of the Spartan administrators. If any wrongdoings on the part of an official were found the ephors could fine the person.[57]

The ephors fined and punished any Spartiate for any illegal act.[58] They annually declared a war on the helots with the crypteia.[59] Without a prior trial to determine guilt, the ephorate was able to execute any helot.[60] The

ephorate expelled any foreigner whose presence they did not want.[61] Ephors could summon before them the king who could refuse the summons twice but upon the third occasion had to appear before the council of the ephors. The ephors could fine and even arrest a king. Upon the entrance of the kings to the various meeting places, the ephors alone remained seated.[62] The ephorate had a wide spread disciplinary authority.

The ephors called the meetings of the Ecclesia and presided over all meetings of the general assembly which they could summon at occasions other than the regularly established meeting times. The ephors also presided over the meetings of the gerousia.[63] Along with the gerousia the ephorate formed a court for all criminal cases except for those criminal matters which the gerousia judged alone.[64] The jurisdiction in all lawsuits of upmost importance rested with the ephorate.[65] They heard the majority of the civil cases.[66] Aristotle reports that the ephors judged the cases involving homicide and breach of contract.[67] The responsibility for enforcing and implementing the sentences issued in court cases belonged to the ephors.

The ephors held a wide variety of miscellaneous duties. They had general supervision over the education of the Spartan youth.[68] The ephors supervised both the perioeci and the helots. They received war booty, managed

taxation, regulated the calendar, and offered some of the minor public sacrifices.[69] Every month the ephors exchanged an oath with the kings in which the kings agreed to govern according to the Spartan laws and the ephors would preserve the royal authority.[70] There were few areas in which the ephors did not exercise some sort of authority.

Aristotle reports that because the ephors were chosen from the whole Spartiate population many poorer men became ephors and once in office were susceptible to the taking of bribes.[71] The ephors, like many other government officials, had to account for their actions, but there is no indication in the ancient texts of major reprisals being directed against an ex-ephor.[72] The possibility of bribery among the ephors does appear possible given the later property acquiring habits of the Spartiates, but there is little information to substantiate such an event.

The third major government body in which the Spartan commoners participated was the gerousia, or the senate. This body met in its own offices in the market place.[73] There were twenty-eight commoners in the senate along with the two kings. Each member held his position for life and for this reason was not responsible for his actions to any other public official. The qualifications needed to become a geronte were to be sixty or more years of age and to be elected successfully through the popular vote of the

Spartan people in the assembly. The election process was accomplished in the following manner.[74] The commoners up for election to the gerousia went before the Ecclesia one by one in no certain order. The assembly then applauded for each candidate. The judges of the applause were in a separate area where they could hear the amount of approval but yet could not see the person receiving the vote. The judges then indicated which candidate had received the most approval from the assembly. The ones who received the greatest amount of applause became members of the gerousia to fill the empty seats, while the rejects went home to try again the next time a vacancy ocurred in the senate.[75] The election to the gerousia was a highly honorable position considered to be a reward for virtue and excellence in the Spartan system. Some scholars indicate that membership in the gerousia was limited to certain groups of aristocratic families.[76] Because it was a much desired office and popularly elected, the possibility existed that only those with wealth (which was supposedly illegal in Sparta) or prestige had a chance at election to the gerousia. There is no information in the ancient sources which records the qualifications reguarding property or birth.[77] Aristotle implies that election to the gerousia was limited to the nobles, the aristocracy, alone,[78] but he might mean that instead of wealthy persons those men best qualified through past achievements were to rule through the senate.[79]

The Rhetra indicates that the constitution provides for the establishment of the gerousia,[80] but it is likely that even before the Rhetra the kings had some sort of council of elders to advise and help them.[81] The Rhetra defines the number of gerontes and along with the Rider places the control of Sparta into the hands of the gerousia.[82] In reality, however, the gerousia did not have the supreme authority because the ephorate had acquired many powerful duties, particularly by the rule of Cleomenes I in the late fifth century.

The major functions of the gerousia were twofold: as a court and as a decider of the issues to go before the assembly. The gerousia judged all Spartan criminal cases involving murder and treason.[83] The gerontes along with the ephors judged cases strictly involving activities of the kings. The sentences which the senate imposed could be monetary fines, loss of civil rights, banishment from Sparta, or even death. The ephors then carried out the decisions.[84] The other function of the gerousia was the process of deciding just what items involving Spartan government or foreign policy would be put to the Ecclesia for its vote.[85] The senate introduced the matters brought before the assembly and could veto any decisions of the Ecclesia which the gerousia considered ill-judged.[86]

Xenophon reasons that the election process through which the older Spartan men went to gain admittance to the

gerousia would prevent the neglect of high principles and values among the Spartiates even in old age.[87] In this way the agoge continued to influence the older men just as it did the boys and younger Spartan commoners. The gerousia was thus the rule of the best and wisest of Spartan men who, though over sixty, were still a functioning part of Sparta's society and government.

The office of king was the one position to which commoners of Sparta could not aspire. The kingships were hereditary in the Agiad and Eurypontid families. The role of the kings in Sparta became greatly reduced with the establishment of both the ephorate and the gerousia. The judicial functions of the kings were very limited and existed only in the form of the king's participation in the gerousia. Matters of religion were the king's responsibilities and the kings performed the majority of the sacrifices.[88] The king, when capable, led the troops into battle and was the leader in all matters relating to war.[89] As the ephorate and gerousia acquired more of the originally royla prerogatives, the kings became more and more figureheads of the Spartan state. Such was the the case by the fifth century. However, Aristotle sees the establishment of the ephorate and the gerousia as guaranteeing the continued existence of the system of kingship that was gradually replaced in most other Greek city-states.[90]

Other positions of authority which gave Spartan

commoners a position from which to influence activities were in government and military institutions. Three of the more important positions were proxenia, harmost, and navarch (also found as nauarch). The proxenia was an appointed civil official who was to look after the merchants of other cities, a type of public relations job which was a common hospitality to foreigners practiced in ancient Greece.[91] Harmosts were governors whom the Spartan state sent out to administer the many islands and city-states in Greece during the Spartan supremacy after the Peloponnesian War and the defeat of Athens until the Thebans defeated the Spartans at Leuctra.[92] The conduct and attitude of the harmost aroused hatred against Sparta in these governed cities. Many harmosts acted as petty tyrants or actively sought to benefit themselves and their friends.[93] The navarch or admiral was a military appointment for one year and could not be held twice by the same person. Since the king could not control activities on both land and sea at the same time during a war, the office of navarch was established.[94] The navarch had control of the Spartan fleet and had almost the same amount of power as the king when it came to decisions affecting the navy.[95]

The types of offices the Spartan commoners held and the duties of these offices permitted the commoners to have a large share of the government of Sparta.

Opportunity existed in which commoners could become more influential than even the kings. This condition lead to conflicts between individual commoners and the kings or the ephorate and the kings. Some of the conflicts will be discussed in a later chapter.

ENDNOTES

[1] Arist. Pol. 1272 a 14-15.

[2] Plut. Lyc. XXVI. 1.

[3] Arist. Pol. 1270 b 35-39.

[4] Ibid., 1265 b 40; 1270 b 16.

[5] Jones, Sparta, p. 20 says 20 years.

[6] Thuc. I. 87.

[7] Plut. Lyc. VI. 3.

[8] Jones, Sparta, p. 20.

[9] Plut. Lyc. VI. 1; Arist. Pol. 1272 a 10; B. E. Hammond, Political Institution of the Ancient Greeks (NP: NPP, 1894), p. 46; Jones, Sparta, p. 24.

[10] Thuc. I. 79; Michell, p. 144.

[11] Plut. Lyc. VI. 1.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Translation of Plut. Lyc. VI. 1 from Cartledge, Sparta and Laconia, pp. 134-135.

[14] Translation of Plut. Lyc. VI. 4 from Cartledge, Sparta and Laconia, p. 135.

[15] Plut. Lyc. VI. 4.

[16] Jones, Sparta, p. 25 says that the ephors could initiate a debate in the assembly without the consent of the gerousia and that voting from this sort of assembly could explain how the demos made crooked decisions.

[17] Arist. Pol. 1270 b 18.

[18] Andrewes, "Government of Classical Sparta," Ancient Society and Institutions (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 3.

[19] Michell, Sparta, p. 144.

[20] Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, pp. 410-411 says all three propose items to the assembly while Jones, Sparta, p. 22 says only the ehpors.

[21] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 51. Jones, Sparta, p. 22 says possiblity that the assembly members might speak if the ephors invited them.

[22] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 52.

[23] de Ste Croix, Origins of the Peloponnesian War, p. 132.

[24] Michell, Sparta, p. 22.

[25] Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 92; Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 50; Fine, Ancient Greeks, p. 152.

[26] Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, pp. 423, 486.

[27] H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Spartan Rhetra in Plutarch Lycurgus VI. A. Plutarch's Text", Classical Quarterly 37 (1943): 67.

[28] Ibid.; Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 18; Hooker, Early Sparta, p. 122.

[29] Arist. Pol. 1270 b 29-30.

[30] Michell, Sparta, p. 139.

[31] Thuc. I. 87; Xen. Hell. IV. 6.

[32] Michell, Sparta, p. 145.

[33] Ibid., p. 130.

[34] Greenidge, Handbook of Greek Constitutional History, p. 31.

[35] David G. Rice, "Why Sparta Failed: A Study in Politics and Policy from the Peace of Antalcidas to the Battle of Leuctra," Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1977, p. 8.

[36] Hooker, Ancient Spartans, p. 122.

[37] Paus. XI. 2.

[38] Hdt. I. 65.

[39] Plut. Lyc. VII. 1; Arist. Pol. 1313 a 26; Oliva, Sparta and Her Social Problems, p. 125.

[40] Dickins, "Growth of Spartan Policy," p. 8; Huxley, Early Sparta, p. 38; Jones, Sparta, p. 32; Hooker, Ancient Sparta, p. 122.

[41] Michell, Sparta, p. 123; N. G. L. Hammond, History of Greece, p. 106; Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, p. 422.

[42] Huxley, Early Sparta p. 38.

[43] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 41.

[44] Huxley, Early Sparta, p. 51.

[45] Arist. Pol. 1265 b 39; 1270 b 15.

[46] Fine, Ancient Greeks, p. 148.

[47] B. E. Hammond, Political Institutions of the Ancient Greeks, pp. 49-50.

[48] Xen. Resp. Lac. XI. 2.

[49] Ibid. XIII. 5.

[50] C. G. Thomas, "On the Role of the Spartan Kings," Historia 23 (1974): p. 259.

[51] Arist. Pol. 1271 a 25-26.

[52] Michell, Sparta, p. 127.

[53] Jones, Sparta, p. 27.

[54] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 59.

[55] Xen. Resp. Lac. VIII. 4.

[56] Arist. Pol. 1271 a 5-10.

[57] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 57.

[58] Xen.Resp. Lac. VIII. 4.

[59] Hdt. IV. 146.

[60] Jones, Sparta, p. 26; Cartledge, Sparta and Lakonia, p. 164.

[61] Michell, Sparta, p. 152.

[62] Xen. Resp. Lac. XV. 6.

[63] Michell, Sparta, p. 128.

[64] Fine, Ancient Greeks, p. 149.

[65] Arist. Pol. 1270 b 29.

[66] Fine, Ancient Greeks, p. 149.

[67] Arist. Pol. 1275 b 10-12.

[68] Fine, Ancient Greeks, p. 149.

[69] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, pp, 58-59.

[70] Ibid., p. 58; Jones, Sparta, p. 27.

[71] Xen. Resp. Lac. XV. 7.

[72] Arist. Pol. 1270 b 12-14.

[73] Michell, Sparta, p. 145; Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, p. 210 says they were accountable for their activities.

[74] Paus. XI. 2.

[75] Plut. Lyc. XXVI. 2.

[76] Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 46.

[77] Jones, Sparta, p. 17.

[78] Arist. Pol. 1270 b 25.

[79] Jones, Sparta, p. 17.

80 Plut. Lyc. VI. 1.

81 Fine, Ancient Greeks, p. 149.

82 Plut. Lyc. VI. 1.

83 Michell, Sparta, p. 138.

84 Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 80; Andrewes, "Government of Classical Sparta," p. 16.

85 Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, p. 81.

86 Plut. Lyc. VI. 4.

87 Xen. Resp.Lac. X. 1.

88 Arist. Pol. 1285 b 6; Xen. Resp. Lac. XV. 2.

89 Arist. Pol. 1285 b 5; Xen. Resp. Lac. XV. 2.

90 Arist. Pol. 1313 a 30.

91 Michell, Sparta, p. 151.

92 Jones, Sparta, p. 92.

93 Michell, Sparta, p. 149.

94 Arist. Pol. 1270 a 40.

95 Raphael Sealey, "Die Spartanishe Nauarchie," Klio 58 (1976): 358.

CHAPTER V

SOME SPARTAN COMMONERS

In respect to the population of the Spartiates the actual number of commoners named in the ancient sources is relatively few. For the most part those commoners known to modern scholars were mainly various heroes who exemplified the Spartan image of what a man should be. An examination of the recorded deeds of these men reveals some of the levels to which Spartan commoners could rise in importance to their state. The political offices of the commoners who are mentioned in the ancient sources were governmental, such as ephors, like Chilon, or in the military, like Brasidas and Lysander.

The first commoners mentioned in the ancient works are the ephors Asteropos and Chilon. Chilon was ephor around the middle of the sixth century, while Asteropos was sometime before him.[1] These two men increased the power and influence of the office of ephor. Asteropos took the control of the ephorate away from the kings who had decided who would be ephors before that time. After Asteropos and Chilon the assembly chose the ephors.[2] Through the change in election procedure, men with great public images or military repute more than likely secured

the election to the posts in the ephorate. The ephors not only became subject to greater influence from the public but were able to bring their ideas and desires before the masses and influence and guide the policies of Sparta. Chilon helped to increase the authority of the ephors so that the ephors were equal to, and in some ways superior to, the kings since the ephors could call the kings before them to account for their activities.[3] Chilon's influence on Sparta was so well known to the ancient Greeks that writers, such as Diodorus, referred to him as one of the "Seven Wise Men".[4]

One Spartiate who had all the powers of kings without ever actually having the title was Pausanias, regent for Pleistarchos. Because the Agiad king was a minor, Pausanias commanded the Spartan army during many of its encounters with the Persians during the wars with Persia. One battle at which Pausanias led and the Spartan forces won victory was that of Plataea.[5] In 478, the regent commanded the Spartan fleet and captured Cyrus and Byzantium.[6] While in Byzantium Pausanias acquired habits which the Spartan constitution prohibited. He adopted many of the Median and Persian manners of clothing and dining. The regent became arrogant and made it difficult for anyone to meet with him.[7] In short, he became greedy for wealth and power. In 470 the ephors, aware of the rumors in circulation about Pauanias' actions, recalled Pausanias to Sparta to stand trial.

Diodorus states that Pausanias secretly made a friend of the Persian king Xerxes and the satraph Artabazus who supplied Pausanias with large amounts of money with which to corrupt the Spartans.[8] Indications existed that Pausanias also attempted to incite the helots to revolt.[9] The ephors tried Pausanias and found him guilty of treason. The regent fled to a temple where the ephors had him blockaded in and starved. Just before his death, the ephors took Pausanias out of his sanctuary so that he could not die on consecrated land.[10] Pausanias represented the limits to which a commoner could reach in the Spartan govermental structure. However, the ephors did not treat him any differently than they did a king who strayed from the ways of the Spartan constitution.

Brasidas was the Spartan commoner who first received great attention in the Peloponnesian War for his valor and accomplishments. Plutarch says that war increased Brasidas' importance and gave him the opportunity for great achievements.[11] In 431, he kept the Peloponnesian city-state of Methone from becoming prey to the Athenian fleet.[12] For this action Brasidas became the first soldier of the war to be praised by the Spartans.[13] Because of his military achievements, Brasidas acquired a powerful political position. Brasidas was also ephor in 429 which speaks of his political position in Sparta. Thucydides records that the Spartan refusal to send

Brasidas reinforcements in 423 was, in part, a result of jealousy among other leading men of Sparta.[14]

Forrest describes Brasidas as an able diplomat, a good general, and an honest man.[15] "He was lucky; brave, with a brilliant tactical and strategic eye and the boldness to act on what he saw; over confident in hopes of welcome in Thrace but quick to adapt himself to what he found."[16] Brasidas was not a peaceful man and was hostile to the idea of a peace being arranged between Athens and Sparta.[17] He died fighting at Amphipolis in 421.[18] Brasidas through his governmental position was able to influence Sparta's attitude towards war with Athens.

Toward the end of the Peloponnesian War another commoner, Lysander, appeared on the political scene in Sparta. Lysander became an important military figure and was chosen navarch for the year 408/407.[19] Plutarch reports that Lysander's father was a Heracleidae but not of the royal family and that Lysander grew up in poverty.[20] Lysander was so successful as navarch that when his year ended and Callicratidas replaced him, many of the Spartan allies requested Lysander's return as commander of the fleet of the Spartans and the Peloponnesian allies.[21] Callicratidas died in the summer of 406 at a sea battle,[22] but the assembly would not break the tradition of allowing a person to hold the office of navarch more than once. The Spartans appointed Aracus as commander and made Lysander vice-admiral. However, the

real command of the ships would belong to Lysander; Aracus was only a token navarch.[23] This policy continued to be followed, but Lysander, although without the title, acted as the commander of the Spartan fleet.

Lysander's influence in Sparta was great enough to enable him to place his candidate Agesilaus upon the Spartan throne when King Agis died in 399.[24] Agesilaus was King Agis' brother, but Agis had a son Leotychidas who was next in line as king. Unfortunately for Leotychidas, his patrimony was questionable because Agis had remarked upon Leotychidas' birth that the child was not his. Lysander and Agesilaus brought this issue of Leotychidas' parentage before the assembly who heard both sides of the matter and then agreed in favor of Agesialus' becoming the next king.[25] Lysander's influence with the Spartans and their allies caused a rift to develop between him and the new king Agesilaus II.[26] Lysander had probably hoped to influence Agesilaus in all his activities since Lysander had been principally responsible for Agesilaus' kingship. Instead, Agesilaus began to do the opposite of what Lysander advised. After a time Lysander realized what was occurring and found out that Agesilaus was not going to allow another to control his movements.

Lysander was a friend of the Persian prince Cyrus.[27] Lysander was very influential in persuading the Spartan Assembly to agree to Sparta's helping Cyrus in his attempt

to overthrow his brother and become king of Persia in his place.[28] Sparta's aid to Cyrus resulted in trouble for the city-state when Cyrus revolt failed.

Lysander had great influence with the Lacedaemonian allies in that he was responsible for the establishment of decarchies in many of the Greek city-states.[29] The decarchies were composed of groups of ten men generally favorable to Lysander's politics. The decarchies were oligarchs who helped to oust the democratic elements in the various city-states to insure that polis' loyalty to Sparta rather than to Athens. Lysander also appointed many of his friends as harmosts or governors of different city-states.[30] Lysander in this way conferred many great favors on his friends and built a loyal following to himself. Because of his control of these men, Plutarch says that Lysander became arrogant and over confident in himself.[31] Lysander's decarchies and harmost friends were often unpopular and caused many of Sparta's allies to become unhappy with Sparta, a fact which in turn helped lead to the Corinthian War and the loss of Sparta's hegemony in Greece.[32]

Plutarch remarks that Lysander had obtained all of his offices with the consent and approval of his fellow Spartiates.[33] Plutarch regards Lysander as the founder of his own political and military greatness, but not a man who acquired any authority contrary to the Spartan laws.[34]

Lysander was at that time the "first of her [Sparta's] first men and best of her best".[35] Lysander did not abuse his authority and power but remained a steady and virtuous man.[36] Although Lysander did not acquire possession of great wealth for himself he, nevertheless, sent back to Sparta large amounts of gold and other rich spoils.[37] Many opposed these luxury items and saw them as being injurious to the Spartan state.[38] Lysander's opponents saw in the commoner's ownership of gold and silver, the method by which the majority of Spartiates had already fallen (or could fall) below the standards of Lysander because, as his enemies saw the matter, Lysander was teaching Sparta "to want what he himself had learned not to want".[39] Plutarch points out that Lysander was totally uncorrupted by material items because he died as poor as he had been born.[40]

Lysander did not work just to benefit the Spartan state, he was also ambitious. After his death the Spartans discovered that Lysander had formulated a plot to overthrow the traditional Spartan system of rule by the two kings. Lysander wanted instead to make the office elective where the assembly chose the king from among all of the Spartiates. The lucky person would be chosen not because of birth but because of his ability to govern and guide the state wisely.[41] Lysander hoped that after the establishment of the new system of governing that he

himself would be the first elected to the Spartan kingship.[42] He made his attempt at revolution not through open warfare, but rather, by persuasion and by trying to receive religious backing through one of the oracles at Delphi, Dodona, or Ammon.[43] Lysander was unable to get official religious sanctions for his movement. He died in 395 near Haliartos without having progressed far in his effort to become king.[44] Lysander's attempt to create a new system for appointing the king undoubtedly came from his desire to secure a position in which he could have a permanent and continuing influence upon Spartan policy. Lysander could not hold any other Spartan office for a long continuous period during which he could direct the state's activities. The position of longest tenure open to a commoner, that of gerontē, was not available to Lysander because of his youth.

Lysander's influence in Sparta lasted from the later part of the Peloponnesian War through much of the Spartan supremacy in Greece and ended with his death in the early part of the Corinthian War. Lysander was given much of the credit for the defeat of the Athenians.[45] Because of his military activities he was popular with the Spartan people and through this popularity was able to direct the people in directions he favored.

The next Spartan commoner to influence the state's policies was Antalcidas. Through Antalcidas' negotiations with the Persian king, the Lacedaemonians agreed to the

King's Peace which ended the Corinthian conflict. Antalcidas was navarch for the year 388 and ephor for that of 370. The Spartan state first authorized Antalcidas to negotiate with the Persians in 392. His attempts to secure peace failed at first because neither the Persian king Artaxerxes nor his allies were willing to agree to a peace settlement which could have primarily benefited Sparta.[46] The peace that Antalcidas finally made with Persia in 388 was more of a temporary settlement than a total solution to the problems of the Greek city-states.[46]

Plutarch reports that so long as Sparta was supreme in Greece the Persian king Artaxerxes treated Antalcidas as guest and friend; but after Sparta's loss at Leuctra the king ignored and slighted Antalcidas.[48] Antalcidas' achievements as a navarch and negotiator faded into history when he once again became a private citizen of Sparta. In Sparta, the citizens rejected and neglected Antalcidas who in response to this cavalier treatment starved himself to death after he had served as ephor.[49]

These few men previously discussed are not the only Spartan commoners to be mentioned in the ancient sources. Their lives do, however, indicate how influential certain Spartan commoners could become in Spartan politics and government. The careers of these men also show the paths that the commoners had to take in order to achieve their goals and become prominent in Sparta.

ENDNOTES

[1] Huxley, Ancient Sparta, p. 69.

[2] Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquity of Sparta and Athens., p. 20; Dickins, "Growth of Spartan Policy," p. 15.

[3] Dickins, "Growth of Spartan Policy," p. 15.

[4] Diod. IX. 9. 1.

[5] Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 98.

[6] Ibid., p. 99.

[7] Thuc. I. 130; Diod. XI. 23. 3, XI. 46. 3-4; Ath. Deip. XII. 535 e, XII. 536 b.

[8] Diod. XI. 44. 3-4.

[9] Thuc. I. 132; M. E. White, "Some Agiad Dates: Pausanias and his Sons," Journal of Hellenic History 84 (1964): 144-145.

[10] Thuc. I. 134.

[11] Plut. Nic. IX. 2.

[12] Thuc. II. 25.

[13] Ibid.; David M. Lewis, Sparta and Persia (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), p. 41.

[14] Thuc. IV. 108.

[15] Forrest, History of Sparta, p. 112.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Plut. Nic. IX. 2.

[18] Diod. XII. 71. 1.

[19] Xen. Hell. I. V. 2.

[20] Plut. Lys. II. 1. As mentioned in Chapter 2 there is some conflict among scholars as to Lysander true classification.

[21] Xen. Hell. II. I. 6; Plut. Lys. VII. 1.

[22] Plut. Lys. V. 5.

[23] Xen. Hell. II. I. 7; Plut. Lys. VII. 2; Diod. XIII. 100. 8.

[24] Xen. Hell. III. III. 3-4.

[25] Plut. Lys. XXII. 6.

[26] Ibid., III. IV. 7-8.

[27] Ibid., IV. 2.

[28] Charles D. Hamilton, Sparta's Bitter Victories: Politics and Dipolomacy in the Corinthian War (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1979), p. 104.

[29] Diod. XIV. 3. 4.

[30] Ibid., XIV. 10. 1.

[31] Plut. Lys. XIX. 1.

[32] Plut. Comparison of Lysander and Sulla, I. 1, V. 1.

[33] Ibid., I. 1.

[34] Ibid., I. 3.

[35] Ibid., III. 1.

[36] Plut. Lys. II. 4; Plut. Lyc. XXX. 1.

[37] Plut. Lyc. XXX. 1; Plut. Comparison of Lysander and Sulla, III. 4-5; Ath. Deip. VI. 234 a.

[38] Plut. Comparison of Lysander and Sulla, III. 5.

[39] Plut. Lys. II. 4, XXX. 2.

[40] Ibid. XXIV. 4; Diod. XIV. 13. 3; Plut. Ages. XIII. 3-4.

[41] Plut. Lys. XXIV. 5.

[42] Ibid., XXV. 1-3; Diod. XIV. 13. 4-7.

[43] Plut. Lys. XXVI. 1.

[44] Hamilton, Sparta's Bitter Victories, p. 27.

[45] Ibid., p. 248.

[46] Plut. Ages. XXIII. 2; Plut. Artaxerxes, XXI. 5; Diod. XIV. 110. 2.

[47] Plut. Arta. XXII. 3.

[48] James G. DeVoto "Agesilaus and the Politics of Sparta 404-377 B. C.," Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1982, p. 193.

[49] Plut. Arta. XXII. 4.

CHAPTER VI

CONFLICTS BETWEEN SPARTAN KINGS AND COMMONERS

Because of the highly important state government positions which Spartan commoners held, conflicts between the kings and the commoners of Sparta were a fairly normal occurrence. Most common conflicts were between the ephors and kings with ambition, power, or stubbornness. Other problems arose between individual commoners who were influential and their kings, such as the troubled relationship between Lysander and Agesilaus. An examination of some of the individual kings and their problems follows as well as a general discussion of the specific conflicts.

One of the first Spartan kings recorded as having major conflicts with the ephors was the great king Cleomenes I. Some scholars see Cleomenes as one of the greatest, both militarily and politically, of the Spartan kings.[1] However, Cleomenes was implicated in conjunction with the helot revolt in 490.[2] At that time Cleomenes was in exile in Arcadia for having bribed the Delphic priestess to declare his fellow king Demaratus illegitimate. While in exile Cleomenes had been engaged in creating trouble for the Spartan government. Wallace

says that Cleomenes probably provoked or assisted in the helot rebellion.[3]

The ephors had earlier in his reign put Cleomenes on trial for having failed to capture Argos, one of Sparta's most bitter enemies.[4] Cleomenes was able on that occassion to convince the ephors that he was innocent of the charges leveled against him,[5] but this did not prevent his being brought before the ephors a second time.

Wallace and other historians believe that the ephors, as a result of the king's activities, brought Cleomenes back to Sparta and did away with him.[6] Herodotus relates that Cleomenes showed signs of mental instability and his family imprisoned him in order to protect him and anyone coming in contact with him. Cleomenes managed to get a knife from one of his guards and in his madness cut himself into strips and in this manner committed suicide.[7] The story seems suspect because there is little evidence which would indicate prior madness in Cleomenes' nature. For this reason it is likely that the ephors considered Cleomenes a political danger who had to be removed from public office. After removing him, the ephors then circulated the rumor of Cleomenes' madness and suicide.

Ehrenberg says that Spartan kings with strong personalities like Cleomenes I would inevitably conflict with the ephors.[8] Cleomenes was ambitious and opposed to the policy of isolationism which the ephors supported.[9] Cleomenes' attempts to pursue his own policy resulted in

problems with the ephors and in his ultimate exile, which was also a result of Cleomenes' deposing Demaratus and increasing public disgruntlement over his policy in Thessaly.[10]

The successor of the exiled Demaratus Leotychidas had his problems with the Spartan commoners. He was brought to trial for accepting bribes from the Athenians around 467. Leotychidas escaped condemnation by fleeing Sparta voluntarily for Tegea, but at home, the ephorate and the gerousia together deposed him.[11]

Leotychidas' successor Archidamus II brought grave censure down on himself when he wasted time at Oenoe before setting off to attack Athens early in the Peloponnesian War.[12] He injured himself in "the public estimation by his loitering at the Isthmus and the slowness with which the rest of the march had been conducted."[13]

In 445, the ephorate and gerousia exiled the king Pleistoanax who was the son of Pausanias (the regent to Pleistarchos). They exiled Pleistoanax, because it was popularly believed that the Athenians had bribed him to retreat from Attica.[14] Thucydides reports that Pleistoanax was later accused of having bribed the priestess of Delphi in order to get himself restored to his former position in Sparta.[15] After the death of King Archidamus, in 426, Pleistoanax returned to Sparta, but

some of the people blamed Spartan misfortunes in the Peloponnesian War on Pleistoanax's unconstitutional recall.[16]

Upon the Spartan army's return from Argos around the 418, the Lacedaemonians blamed King Agis II for not having subdued that city-state.[17] There were those commoners who wanted Agis fined and his home destroyed. Agis made a public appeal and promised to do better. The Spartiates decided to take no immediate action against the king, but did assign ten Spartan counsellors to him. He then needed their consent to lead an army from Sparta.[18]

King Pausanias was the leader of one of three Spartan political factions during the latter part of the Peloponnesian War and during the Spartan hegemony; Lysander and Agesilaus led the other two factions. In 403, upon his return from a inconclusive battle, Pausanias' enemies managed to bring him to trial.[19] He was cleared of the charges leveled against him for not taking proper opportunities in the battlefield and making something of them. In 395, after Lysander's death, Pausanias was again brought to trial and charged with deliberately being slow to join Lysander's forces. In effect, the commoners accused the king of causing Lysander's death through his (Pausanias') slowness.[20] Pausanias must have realized that popular sentiment was against him as he fled Sparta for Tegea without waiting to stand trial.[21] Rice indicates that the outbreak of the

Corinthian War caused the policies of Pausanias to be discredited and resulted in his trial and exile.[22] The trial held during Pausanias' absence resulted in his being condemned to death.[23] Yet even his exile Pausanias continued to attack the ephorate and urge a reform of the Spartan political system which would decrease the powers of the ephors.[24]

The ephors often played one king against the other. In this manner the ephors derived much of their power from animosity between two kings.[25] When the two kings agreed the ephors could not control the situation as they wanted.[26] Some kings worked within the system and appeared to go along with the requirements of the ephors and other Spartan authorities. One such king was Agesilaus. As soon as he had received a request from the government at home he obeyed it.[27] Although Agesilaus may have had his conflicts with Lysander and Antalcidas he was a well liked king because of his apparent subservience to the various parts of the Spartan government. Through his submissive attitude Agesilaus was able to increase his own influence and power without the awareness of the ephorate and <u>gerousia</u>.[28]

The conflict between Agesilaus and Lysander resulted from the exaltation of Lysander by his friends and many of the allies. People paid court to Lysander as though he were the one with all the power, the actual ruler, while Agesilaus was just a figurehead king.[29] While this might

have worked well with the navarchs who had the title while Lysander had the power, Agesilaus strongly objected to being second. The king began to do just the opposite of what Lysander wanted, and did not help those people who had put their confidence in Lysander.[30] Lysander soon realized what Agesilaus was doing and began to advise those seeking his help to turn to the king instead.[31]

Agesilaus had the ability to turn things to his own benefit. He knew just how far to push his advantage and when to appear meek. Agesilaus' image , however, became tarnished when the Theban Epaminondas gained control of Messenia and its former citizens (the majority of Sparta's helot population) flocked to the reestablished country. The Spartiates resented Agesilaus because Messenia was lost during his reign.[32] Agesilaus lost Sparta's entire empire along with its supremacy on land and sea to Thebes.[33] Plutarch says that Agesilaus lost even his great reputation when he offered to be a mercenary commander under the Egyptian Tachos.[34]

Conflicts between the kings and the ephors resulted from disagreements on policy to be followed. Most of the kings tended to yield to the ephors or else the king faced trial and possible exile. The ancient sources cite several instances of the actual removal of kings from their position as happened to Leotychidas (476) and Pausanias (395) but there are not any references to ephors being brought up on charges.[35] Many modern scholars argue

that the kings were most likely to have the greatest influence on Spartan politics, since they held their positions for life.[36] These scholars say that the ephors could not have much influence on politics as they held their offices for one year only and could not gain much of a following.[37] While it is true that the ephorate was a one year elective office, because it was a popularly elected office, the men who became ephors could not have gained the position without some amount of support from the general masses of Spartiates.[38] This popular support enabled the ephor to be certain that there was indeed some amount of agreement with his policy. Popular support also compelled the ephors to be more responsive to the public than the king was. Thus the ephors were responsible to their constituents and as such had to perform as the Spartiates commanded.

Rice states that men who controlled the ephorate controlled foreign policy in Sparta such as Agesilaus did during his siege of Philus.[39] Ehrenberg says that the only rivals to the ephors were some of the kings, more of these kings being Agiad than Eurypontid seemingly because more Agiad kings had stronger personalities than their Eurypontid counterparts.[40] The ephors knew how to turn the kings against one another and thus prevent their uniting together to control Spartan policy.[41] Hornblower asserts that the way in which Sparta conducted her wars

and her foreign policy left much to chance and personal axe-grinding.[42] These scholars imply that there were many ways of controlling the Spartan political scene and no set pattern existed.

M. I. Finley states that conflicts were not so much between kings and ephors as between men of ambition and power.[43] Andrews as well says that the struggles between ephorate and monarchy were not the formative blocks of Spartan history.[44] He believes that in the reigns of strong kings like Cleomenes I and Agesilaus II there were few conflicts involving ephors and kings. Rather, under strong kings the ephorate gave way to the king's aspirations.[45]

Dickins argues that beginning around 550 the issue of strife between the ephors and the kings dominated Sparta's political development and that these struggles continued to guide and influence political matters for the whole of Spartan history.[46] It does appear probable that conflicts between ephors and kings resulted in the victors directing the development of Spartan politics. These types of conflicts were not the sole determinants of Sparta politics or history. In addition to conflict between kings and ephorate there were the struggles between kings themselves and those between individual commoners, who were not ephors, and the kings. Dickins also states that there were boards of solid anti-monarchical ephors each

year during the reign of Cleomenes I and the regency of Pausanias for the young king Pleistarchos.[47] This assumption on the part of Dickins is also open to debate, for it is virtually impossible that a group of five men popularly elected year after year would be against the policy of the king unless the a majority of the population of commoners similarly objected to the king's activities.

The commoners, because of the high government positions they could possess, were able to take measures against many of the Spartan kings with whose policies the commoners disagreed. As popularly elected officials the ephors were unlikely to take any measures against popular kings or those whose policies found favor with the Spartan citizens as a group. To have advanced against a popular king would have resulted in the ephors being brought to trial for their actions after serving the year's term. Since the primary source materials do not record any such action against an ephor it is probable that when the ephors and gerousia deposed or exiled kings they were acting under the auspices of the people or at least were able to convince the Spartan people of the validity of the actions of the two groups against the king. In the conflicts between kings and commoners the importance and influence of commoners was important especially in regards to who actually prevailed in determining Spartan policy.

ENDNOTES

[1] Huxley, Early Sparta, p. 77; Jones, Sparta, p. 16; C. G. Thomas "On the Role of the Spartan Kings," p. 262.

[2] Paus. IV. 15. 2.

[3] W. P. Wallace, "Kleomenes, Marathon, the Helots, and Arkadia," Journal of Hellenic Studies (74), 1954: 32.

[4] Parke and Wormell, History of the Delphic Oracle, p. 194; Hooker, Sparta, p. 154.

[5] Hooker, Sparta, p. 154.

[6] Ibid., pp. 32-33; Parke and Wormell, History of the Delphic Oracle, p. 162.

[7] Hdt. VI. 75.

[8] Ehrenberg, Solon to Socrates, p. 45.

[9] Ibid.

[10] de Ste Croix, Origins of the Peloponnesian War, p. 141.

[11] Paus. VII. 7.

[12] Thuc. II. 18.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., II. 21.

[15] Ibid., V. 16.

[16] Parke and Wormell, History of the Delphic Oracle, p. 195.

[17] Thuc. V. 63.

[18] Ibid.; Diod. XII. 78. 6.

[19] Paus. V. 2.

20 Ibid., V. 6; Plut. Lys. XXIX. 1-3; Xen. Hell. III. 5. 25.

21 Paus. V. 6; Plut. Lys. XXX. 1; Xen. Hell. III. 5. 25.

22 David G. Rice, "Agesilaos, Agesipolis and Spartan Politics, 386-379 B. C.," Historia (23), 1974: 168.

23 Jones, Sparta, p. 106.

24 Hamilton, Sparta's Bitter Victories, pp. 206-207.

25 Plut. Ages. XII. 2.

26 Ibid; Michell Sparta. p. 117.

27 Plut. Ages. IV. 3, XV. 4; Xen. Ages. I. 36.

28 Plut. Ages. IV. 4.

29 Ibid., VII. 1; Plut. Lys. XXIII. 4.

30 Plut. Ages. Vii. 4; Plut. Lys. XXIII. 3, XXIII. 5.

31 Plut. Ages. VII. 5; Plut. Lys. XXIII. 6.

32 Plut. Ages. XXXIV. 1.

33 Ibid., XXXV. 3.

34 Ibid., XXXVI. 1.

35 A. Andrewes, "The Government of Classical Sparta," p. 14.

36 Thomas, "Role of Kings," p. 259.

37 Hornblower, Greek World, p. 103; de Ste. Croix, Origins of the Peleoponnesian War, p. 149.

38 Jones, Sparta, p. 30; Hamilton, Sparta's Bitter Victories, p. 75; Michell, Sparta, p. 144.

39 Rice, "Agesilaos, Agesilos and Spartan Policy," p. 175.

40 Ehrenberg, Solon to Socrates, p. 40.

41 Ibid.; de Ste. Croix, Origins of the Peloponnesian War, p. 138.

42 Hornblower, Greek World, p. 103.

43 Finley, "Sparta," p. 151.

44 Andrewes, "Government of Classical Sparta," p. 10.

45 Ibid., pp. 8-9.

46 Dickins, "Growth of Spartan Politics," p. 1.

47 Ibid., p. 34.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Sparta and her commoners became known for their austerity and militarism. Emphasis was placed on the achievements of the kings of Sparta and the efforts of the Spartan commoners dismissed. But the commoners were an important group within Sparta without whose efforts the polis could not have gained such prestige and power in the Peloponnese and eventually in all of Greece.

References to the activitites occurring in Sparta after her loss at Leuctra in 371, are few in number. Few individual Spartan commoners are known and the lists of kings and their reigns are uncertain. Diodorus mentions Peloponnesian mercenaries helping to liberate Syracuse around 356.[1] The Spartans were involved in the Sacred War which began in 355[2] and participated in a revolt against Alexander the Great of Macedon in 331.[3] Little more is known of Spartan history until the coming of the Romans to Greece. The city-state which had defeated the great polis Athens in 404 was no longer of primary importance.

The Lycurgan reforms and Spartan constitution suppressed artistic endeavors which resulted in no Spartan literary achievements other than those of a

political nature. The sources for Spartan history are limited to non-Spartan writers, several of whom were not contemporary to the events of which they wrote. In these primary materials the kings figured prominently. Yet within the sources were the details which indicate the importance of the commoners to Sparta.

The Spartan commoners constituted the smallest of the three major classifications of Laconian peoples --- the Spartiates. Although few in number, and shrinking decreasing in number between 776 and 323, the Spartiates governed Sparta. The decline in the population of the Spartiates was a direct result of the actions of the citizens themselves. The accumulation of property and wealth in the hands of fewer commoners resulted in the commoners practicing a type of birth control whereby they produced few children who would share in their parents' material possessions. Land accumulation also resulted in the loss of citizenship by certain commoners who were unable to pay their mess bills or otherwise became heavily indebted. Because it was nearly impossible for a Lacedaemonian to move up into the citizen class of Spartans, a limited Spartiate population base resulted which, in turn, helped to cause a decline in the numbers of the commoners.

The pereoicoi and helots were important to Sparta for their contributions to the military system, agricultural production, trade, and artistic endeavors.

Yet, the commoner's fear of rebellion among the pereoicoi and especially the helots resulted in the ultra militarization of Sparta and her citizens. The development of the agoge and the syssitia were a direct manifestation of the increased military nature of the Spartan commoners. All Spartan commoners were in the main subjugated to the state and had little individuality.

The Spartan commoners were active in all phases of the government of the state except for the monarchy. As navarchs they controlled the command of the Spartan forces at sea. The assembly voted on the laws and elected non-appointed officials. Between the gerousia and the ephorate no phase of judical responsiblity was omitted from the control of the commoners. These two groups also directly influenced most of the political activities of the Spartan state both at home and abroad. Together the ephorate and gerousia were empowered to try and depose the kings of Sparta. The kings were mere figureheads of the government and only ruled in the field of battle, but even there they were under the watchful eyes of the ephors.

In quarrels with the kings, the commoners proved that they would not yield to their kings, but would follow a different policy especially when the majority of Spartan commoners agreed to differ with the king. Individual commoners such as Chilon, Brasidas, and

Lysander proved to what heights the commoners could reach within the Spartan governmental structure, military system, and foreign political activities.

The Spartan commoners were the "backbone" of the Spartan state. Without their energy and influence the history of Sparta is only partial. The kings and heroes were not the only elements involved in the making of Sparta and the commoner must be remembered.

ENDNOTES

[1] Diod. XVI. 173. 3-4.

[2] Ibid. XVI. 23. 2; Paus. Lac. X. 3.

[3] Diod. XVII. 48. 1-2; Paus. Lac. X. 5; Plut. Demos. XXIV. 1; Arrian. Anab. II. 13. 4-5.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primaries

Aristotle. Politics. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Arrian. History of Alexander and Indica. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by E. Robson and P. A. Brunt. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1929-1933.

Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by C. B. Guluck. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927-1941.

Dio Chrysostomus. Orations. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by J. W. Cohoon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University press, 1960-1962.

Diodorus Siculus. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1933-1967.

Herodotus. The Histories. Translated by Aubrey de Selincourt. Revised and introduction by A. R. Burn. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972.

Isocrates. 3. vols. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by George Norlin and Larue Van Hook. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1928-1945.

Minor Attic Orators. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1941-1954.

Nepos, Cornelius. The Lives of Illustrious Men. Oxen, 1684.

Pausanias. Description of Greece. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961-1965.

Plutarch. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1917-1951.

Strabo. The Geography of Strabo. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942-1949.

Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War. Translated by Crawley. Revised by T. E. Wick. New York: Random House, 1982.

Xenophon. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960-1968.

Secondaries

Books

Badian, Ernst ed. Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on His 75th Birthday. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.

Beloch, Karl Julius. Greichishe Geschichte. 2nd ed. 4 vols. in 8. Berlin, 1912-1927.

Botsford, George Willis and Charles Alexander Robinson. Hellenic History. Revised by Donald Kagan. New York: Macmillan Company, 1948.

Brown, Truesdell S. The Greek Historians. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1973.

Bruce, I. A. F. An Historical Commentary on the 'Hellenica Oxyrhynica'. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Cartledge, Paul. Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History, 1300-362 B. C. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Chrimes, K. M. T. Ancient Sparta: A Reexamination of the Evidence. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952.

de Ste Croix, G. E. M. The Origins of the Peloponnesian War. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1972.

Ehrenberg, Victor. From Solon to Socrates: Greek History and Civilization During the 6th and 5th Centuries B. C. London: Methuen, 1968.

Fine, John V. A. The Ancient Greeks: A Critical History. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1983.

Finley, M. I. The Use and Abuse of History. New York: Viking Press, 1975.

Fitzhardinge, L. F. The Spartans. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1980.

Forrest, W. G. A History of Sparta; 950-192 B. C. London: Hutchinson and Co., Ltd., 1968.

Gilbert, Gustav. The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens. Translated by E. J. Brooks and T. Nicklin. Introduction by J. E. Sandys. New York: 1895; reprint, Chicago, Illinois: Argnaut, Inc., 1968.

Glover, T. R. From Pericles to Philip. New York: Macmillan Company, 1917.

Greenidge, A. H. J. A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1928.

Griffith, G. T. The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935; reprint Chicago, Illinois: Ares Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Hamilton, Charles D. Sparta's Bitter Victories: Politics and Diplomacy in the Corinthian War. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Hammond, B. E. Political Institutions of the Ancient Greeks. NP: NPP, 1894.

Hammond, N. G. L. and H. H. Scullard, eds. The Oxford Classical Dictionary. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Hammond, N. G. L. A History of Greece to 322 B. C. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

_____. Studies in Greek History. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Hooker, J. T. The Ancient Spartans. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1980.

Hornblower, Simon. The Greek World, 479-323 B. C. London: Methuen and Co., 1983.

Huxley, G. L. Early Sparta. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1962; reprint, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970.

Jones, A. H. M. Sparta. Oxford: Basil Blackwell and Mott, Ltd., 1970.

Lewis, David M. Sparta and Persia. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1977.

Lintott, Andrew. Violence, Civil Strife and Revolution in the Classical City, 750-330 B. C. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkin University Press, 1982.

Michell, H. Sparta. Cambridge: Cambridge Unoversity Press, 1952.

Nilsson, M. P. Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1972.

Oliva, Pavel. Sparta and Her Social Problems. Translated by Iris Urwin-Lewitova. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971.

Parke, Herbert W. and D. E. W. Wormell. The Delphic Oracle. 2 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956.

Ryder, T. T. B. Koine Eirene: General Peace and Local Independence in Ancient Greece. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Sankey, Charles. The Spartan and Theban Supremacies. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898.

Savill, Agnes. Alexander the Great and His Time. New York: Citadel Press, 1966.

Shimron, Benjamin. Late Sparta: The Spartan Revolution, 243-146 B. C. Buffalo, New York: State University Press, 1972.

Vernant, Jean-Pierre. Problems de la Guerre en grece ancienne. La Haye, 1967.

Walton, Brian G. and William R. Higgins. The Greek and Roman World. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc., 1980.

Periodicals

Brunt, Peter A. "Spartan Policy and Strategy in the Archidamian War." Phoenix 19 (1965): 255-280.

Dickins, Guy. "The Growth of Spartan Policy." Journal of Hellenic Studies 32 (1912): 1-42.

Forrest, G. B. "Legislation in Sparta." Phoenix 21 (1967): 11-19.

_____. "The Date of the Lykourgan Reforms in Sparta." Phoenix 17 (1963): 157-179.

Grundy, G. B. "The Population and Policy of Sparta in the Fifth Century." Journal of Hellenic Studies 50 (1930): 37-79.

Hammond, N. G. L. "The Lycurgean Reform at Sparta." Journal of Hellenic Studies 70 (1950): 42-64.

Parke, Herbert W. "The Development of the Second Spartan Empire." Journal of Hellenic Studies 50 (1930): 37-79.

_____. "The Deposing of Spartan Kings." Classical Quarterly 39 (1945): 106-112.

Rice, David G. "Agesilaos, Agesipolis and Spartan Politics, 386-379 B. C." Historia 23 (1974): 164-182.

Seager, Robin. "The King's Peace and the Balance of Power in Greece, 386-382 B. C." Athenaeum 52 (1974): 36-63.

Sealy, Raphael. "Die Spartanische Nauarchie." Klio 58 (1976): 335-358.

Smith, R. E. "Lysander and the Spartan Empire." Classical Philiology 43 (1948): 145-156.

_____. "The Opposition to Agesilaus' Foreign Policy, 394-371." Historia 2 (1954): 274-288.

Starr, C. G. "The Credibility of Early Spartan History." Historia 14 (1965): 257-272.

Thomas, C. G. "On the Role of the Spartan Kings." Historia 23 (1974): 257-270.

Toynbee, Arnold. "Growth of Sparta." Journal of Hellenic Studies 33 (1913): 246-275.

Wade-Gery, H. T. "The Spartan Rhetra in Plutarch Lycurgus VI. A. Plutarch's Text." Classical Quarterly 37 (1943): 57-78.

Wallace, W. P. "Kleomenes, Marathon, the Helots, and Arkadia." Journal of Hellenic Studies 74 (1954): 32-35.

White, M. E. "Some Agiad Dates: Pausanias and His Sons." Journal of Hellenic Studies 84 (1964): 104-152.

Theses

DeVeto, James G. "Agesilaos II and the Politics of Sparta, 404-377 B. C." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1982.

Rahe, Paul Anthony. "Lysander and the Spartan Settlememt 401-403 B. C." Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1977.

Rice, David G. "Why Sparta Failed: A Study in Politics and Policy from the Peace of Antalcidas to the Battle of Leuctra." Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1977.

APPENDIX A

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

B. C.	
c. 776	Lycurgan reforms begin.
c. 736- 716	First Messenian War.
c. 650	Second Messenian War.
c. 550	Chilon ephor; increased powers for the ephorate.
490-448	Persian Wars.
464	Earthquake at Sparta; helot uprising.
431-404	Peloponnesian War.
403-371	Spartan hegemony.
395	Corinthian War begins.
386	Greeks accept the Peace of Antalcidas.
371	Battle of Leuctra.
370	Thebans liberate Messenia from Sparta; Messenian helots leave Sparta.
356-347	Sacred War.
331	Agis III revolts against Alexander the Great; Antipater defeats the Spartans.
323	Alexander the Great dies; Sparta continues decline as a power in Greece.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF SPARTAN KINGS

Agiad Dynasty

Cleomenes I	c. 519-487
Leonidas	c. 491-480
Cleombrotus	480
Pleistarchus	480-458
(Pausanias regent	480-467)
Pleistoanax	458-408
Pausanias	408-394
Agesipolis	394-380
Cleombrotus I	380-371
Agesipolis II	371-370
Cleomenes II	370-309
Areus I	309-264
Acratus	264-c. 259
Areus II	c. 259-251
(Leonidas (regent)	c. 259-251)
Leonidas	251-236
Cleomenes III	236-222

Eurypontid Dynasty

Demaratus	c. 510-491
Leotychidas	491-469
Archidamus II	469-427
Agis II	427-398
Agesilaus II	398-361
Archidamus III	361-338
Agis III	338-331
Eudamidas I	331-?
uncertain of kings to 245	
Agis IV	244-241

VITA

Shasta Hutton Abualtin

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: THE COMMONER IN SPARTAN HISTORY FROM THE LYCURGAN REFORMS TO THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER: 776-322 B. C.

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Richmond, Virginia, January 6, 1960, the daughter of Charles W. and Bernice E. Hutton. Married to Sa'adeh A. Abualtin on June 7, 1984.

Education: Graduated from Elk City High School, Elk City, Oklahoma, in May, 1978; received Bachelor of Arts degree in History and German from Oklahoma State University in May, 1983; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1986.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Department of History, Oklahoma State University, January, 1984 to December, 1985.