THE ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF SOCIAL PROCESSES DURING THE FORMATION OF THE STATE OF THE ANCIENT GREECE

JIŘÍ BÍLÝ[1] – ZUZANA HORVÁTHOVÁ[2]

**Ekonomické zázemie sociálnej politiky starovekého Grécka
v procese formovania štátu**

Abstract: *Ancient history and the history of the middle ages are as necessary to present people as the most recent history. Historical science must provide a profound scientific picture of the entire historical development of humanity in all its aspects, a picture based on established facts. The topical character of subjects for historical investigation is not limited by a chronological frame, but by the significance of how great and important are the theoretical problems which it poses, on how much it leads to the enriching of science of society. This is the scientific and practical meaning of historical research and not its superficial analogies to the present which can and often lead to the modernisation and distortion of historical reality and events. The early Greek tyranny is therefore a significant landmark on the path of the rise of the state in those communities with highly developed economies, those particularly advanced in handicraft production. At the same time, however, the early tyranny is only a transitory phenomenon in the process of the rise of the state and usually after a given period of time comes into conflict with those social forces to which it gave birth. In the following text, we attempt to show the importance of the transformations of ancient economy in the context of civilizational clashes. The main method of processing text is the comparative method in the context of indicators of cultural, economical and political development in the greece area and, subsequently, the analytical, which is to draw attention to the growing trends state's forming between economic trends in and outside Greece.*

Keywords: *tyranny, constitution, cult, slavery, class*

JEL Classification: B 11, N 01.

[1] doc. JUDr., PhDr. Jiří Bílý, CSc., Metropolitan University Prague, Czech Republic, e-mail: jiri.bily@mup.cz

[2] PaedDr. Zuzana Horváthová, Ph.D., Metropolitan University Prague, Czech Republic, e-mail: zuzana.horvathova@mup.cz

1 Introduction

1.1 Objectives

The task of a historian examining phases of human history far removed in time consists primarily in determining the basic features of the historic epochs or phenomena under review, in determining the evolutionary law-governing process of the period being investigated. The discovery of the law-governing process is a necessary precondition for a really objective, scientific analysis of all periods of the history of human society.

One of the most important tasks which face a historian engaged in the study, of ancient history is, on the basis of these brilliant analyses, to follow the rise and development of the state under concrete, historical conditions in certain regions of the ancient world. In the Greek communities (poleis) we find unusually advanced forms of state and intensity of political life, however, not all questions concerning Greek political development have been explained in scientific literature. For example, the questions of the role of the tyranny still remain insufficiently clear, to what extent the tyranny aided or hindered the development of the slave society, or its significance in the later period of the history of antiquity. It is undeniable that historiography overestimates the value of the tyranny, not recognising the basic differences between the tyrants of the VIth century (Thrasyboulos of Miletos, Polykrates of Samos and Peisistratos of Athens) and the tyrants of the IVth century (Dionysios of Sicily, Klearchos of Pontus Heraklea and others). „Whereas in the case of the former we can speak of the rise of the state power, in the case of the latter we are in the period of its crisis and the beginning of its decline" (Meyer, [9, p. 212]).

Such are the tasks which face a historian examining the period of the ancient system and such is the significance of the study of the functions of the tyranny in the process of the rise and development of Greece of antiquity. To elucidate these great tasks is, of course, not easy and demands the cooperation and mutual assistance of many historians. Therefore it is obvious that this work on the early Greek tyranny can by no means solve all the questions which arise in the course of the study of this problem. This article then is limited to the so-called early Greek tyranny only, the tyranny which appeared in a number of Greek communities in the archaic period of Greek history, in the VIIth and VIth centuries B. G. but it attempts on the basis of an analysis of concrete historical material, to determine at least the basic characteristic features of the early tyranny and to define its role in the history of the rise of the state system and Greece of antiquity.

I leave untouched the entire question of the later Greek tyranny which arose under completely different historical conditions. „Class support for all the later Greek tyrants was the army and the new bureaucratic aristocracy

whose ranks were filled by hired soldiers (mercenaries) rewarded with land, slaves, agricultural implements and livestock" (Hyde, [6, p. 123]). The later tyranny was a characteristic phenomenon' of Greece in the IVth century B. C. „when there were already clear sign of crisis in the social system of the Greek world" (Sergeev, [24, p. 344]).

Besides the later tyranny at the end of the classical period of Greek history, this article likewise avoids the question of the tyranny which had already arisen in archaic times in Sicily, particularly in Leontini and Akragas. The Sicilian tyranny was created under quite different historical conditions than those of the communities of Greece proper, the Asia Minor coast and the islands in the Aegean Sea. The Sicilian communities were, from the middle of the VIIIth century B. C., colonies of the first Greek settlers. These settlements arose at a time when social relations of production began to develop, at a time when the old gentile ties were to a considerable degree affected by the growing slave society. For this reason the process of the rise of the ancient state cannot be traced in the same way as in the communities of the „mother country". The Sicilian tyranny, therefore, necessarily has a different character than the early tyranny which was formed in the course of sharpening political struggle during the process of the rise of the state in a number of communities in the Greek world.

„If the role of the early Greek tyranny in the whole historical evolution is to be determined, then it is impossible to remain confined only to the rise and development of the tyranny in individual communities, but it is essential to examine the economic and social development of the community in which the tyranny was established" [11, p. 89]. This work tries to denote at every stage of development the progressive forces and at the same time, in so far as possible, to point out also the growth of slave relations of community.

1.2 Source materials, literature and methodology

The archaic period of Greek history demands the thorough use of archeological material. „A particularly important part of archeological material in this phase of Greek history is played by pottery" (Smith, [25, p. 121]). On the basis of the extent of ceramic production the development of the forces of production can best be traced not only in handicraft production but, to a certain degree, also in agriculture where earthenware vessels were used for storing and transporting agricultural products, namely wine and olive oil (Salin, [16, pp. 333 – 361]). It is also possible on the basis of pottery to determine the contribution of different communities to the development of Greek trade with its neighbours in the far away regions of the Mediterranean Sea.

An important component of source materials is numismatics (Seltman, 1933). In the archaic period of Greek history, for the first time in all history up to that moment, metallic money, minted coins, appear, offering marked proof of a highly developed system of exchange.[3]

We first note those which come directly from the archaic period of Greek history, primarily lyric poems. In an analysis of these written, narrative sources, mention is made of the opinions of outstanding Greek authors on the role of the early Greek tyranny.

In the historiography on the early Greek tyranny it is possible to trace very easily the development of historical science from the middle of the last century and at the same time to clearly document the inability of former methodology to solve the basic problems of the historical development. For several historians, the tyranny is a „timeless manifestation" which appears at all times and in all countries. Those who went farthest in this direction were the American historians C. A. Robinson Jr. [18, pp. 68 – 71]. and H. L. Russel [21, pp. 128 – 130]. who, during the last war, did not hesitate to compare the early Greek tyranny of the VIIth and VIth centuries B. C. with German and Italian fascism.

The main line of development of Greece in the archaic period of Greek history is indicated and the most important problems on the question of the rise of the state in Greece of antiquity, especially on the history of the early tyranny, are dealt with. „Mention is made of the character of the Greek gentile constitution in particularregions of Greece and attention is also given to their economic development, the development of agriculture and handicraft production" (Heichelheim, [5, p. 98]).

The essence of this article is the explanation of the course of the early tyranny in certain Greek communities, which is divided into three comprehensive parts. For the first relates the history of the early tyranny in the Asia Minor regions and islands of the Aegean Sea. For the second is devoted to the tyranny in the communities of the Isthmus of Corinth and the next follows the history of the early tyranny of Athens, This division into three parts comes naturally of itself. I'm not merely concerned here with a geographical division. The decisive factor is that in Asia Minor and the adjoining islands, the rise of early tyranny took place under different concrete, historical conditions and for different reasons than in the regions of the Isthmus of Corinth. In the archaic period the basis was laid for Athens to become, in the Vth century B. C., at the time of the very height of Greece of antiquity, the most important economic, political and cultural centre of the whole Greek world. Information on the tyranny of the Asia Minor region - with the exception of the tyranny

---

[3]   Her. 1, 94.

of Polykrates of the island of Samos - is very fragmentary and often very unclear. Source material on the history of the tyranny on the Isthmus of Corinth is richer, and on the basis of it a number of significant characteristics of early Greek tyranny can be determined. The history of Athens, as regards this aspect, is the logical climax to the preceding explanations. In addition to this, the history of the communities on the Corinthian Isthmus,[4] in the archaic period, particularly the history of Megara,[5] is very closely connected with the history of Athens in the VIIth and VIth centuries B. C.[6]

In this entire analysis the intent has been to bring out most clearly the economic and social development of the different communities prior to the rise of the tyranny, to point out their contribution to the economic development of the tyranny wherever it is possible to reconstruct this from the existing source materials and, at the same time, to determine their role in the creation of the slave state in their communities.

1.3 The tyranny of Asia Minor

The history of two outstanding Ionian communities lying on the west coast of Asia Minor, Miletos[7] and Ephesos,[8] and the history of two large islands closely adjoining the Asia Minor continent, Ionian Samos[9] and Aeolian Lesbos,[10] particularly its largest community Mytilene is very interesant. Even when the information contained in the source materials is unusually fragmentary it is still possible to determine the character of the early tyranny on the west coast of Asia Minor and the adjoining islands. According to this work, in the most important Greek communities of this region, as a result of the development of the forces of production and the growing slave relations of production, great social changes took place. The rule of the gentile aristocracy, supported by the remnants of the gentile constitution which it misused against the people, was swept away and the slave city state was created in which, for all practical purposes, the wealthiest citizens made all decisions. A significant role in this process was played by the early Greek tyranny. It is quite obvious that this development in individual communities had its specific character. However, the main features appeared essentially the same everywhere.

---

[4]   Pollux III. 83.
[5]   Plut. Quaest. G. 1 (Moral. 291 DE).
[6]   Theop. ap. Athen. VI 271 D.
[7]   Plut. Mul. virt 16 (Moral. 253 F, 254 A); Arist. fr. 199b, FHG II 164; Arist. fr. 556; Nic. Dam. fr. 54b, FGr. Hist. 90 F 52; μίαν μὲν ὀκτάδα προβούλων ἐποίησεν, ἐκ δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν βουλὴν κατέλε_εν ἀνδρῶν ϑ’;Ephor. ap. Strab. XIV 634 n. μίαν μὲν ὀκτάδα προβούλων ἐποίησεν, ἐκ δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν βουλὴν κατέλεξεν ἀνδρῶν ϑ’.
[8]   Paus. VII 2, 6-9; Strab. XIV 640, 632.
[9]   Her. I 142, Thuc. I 15.
[10]   Her. V 95; Arist. Pol. 1311 b 26.

Whereas the representatives of the early tyranny, Thrasyboulos of Miletos, Pythagoras of Ephesos, Polykrates of Samos and the ruler of Mytilene, Pittakos, expressed the interest of the rising class of slave owners and fought against the position of the gentile aristocracy, the exact opposite was the case of the tyrants who had been established in the middle of the VIth century B. C. in the Greek Asia Minor communities of Persia. Histiaios of Miletos, Komas and Athenagoras of Ephesos, Koes of Mytilene and Syloson and his son Aiakes of Samos have only the name in common with the representatives of the early tyranny. These tyrants did not find their support and no longer fought against the gentile aristocracy. They remained at the head of the community by the grace of the Persian king as the executors of Persian power.

The nature of the source materials, however, do not permit an evaluation of their exact course and significance.

1.4   The tyranny on the Corinthian Isthmus

The tyranny on the Corinthian Isthmus falls into three large groupings, each of which is devoted to the history of one of three communities situated in this region. The history of Sikyon sets up an early tyranny, probably the earliest in all of Greece, and which lasted the longest - a whole one hundred years. Conditions the tyranny of the Orthagoridai was established in this community, discusses the problem of the genealogy of the Sikyon tyrants and devotes the greatest attention to the rule of Kleisthenes the most outstanding of them.[11] The tyranny of the Orthagoridai discharged their task of unseating the rule of the Dorian aristocracy in Sikyon and cleared the path for the further development of slave production. The Dorian phylae, Hylleis, Dymanes, and Pamphyloi, in the course of the tyranny, lost their gentile character and became merely organs for the territorial division of the inhabitants, like the Aigialeis phyle, which united the pre-Dorian population of Sikyon.[12]

Corinth, one of the economic centres of Greece in the archaic period, made a significant contribution to the Greek handicraft industry, to colonizing activities and to trade, particularly between Italy and Sicily. In Corinth, as in Sikyon, the tyranny was already established before the middle of the VIth century B. G.[13] The founder of the Corinthian tyranny, Kypselos, drew his support from the prospering handicraftsmen and merchants of the pre-Dorian inhabitants.[14] During the second half of that century the power of the Corinthian merchants and handicraft workshop owners grew so strong that they no longer needed the protection of the tyrants against their willful

---

[11]   Arist. Pol. 5, 1315b 12-14.
[12]   Her. 5, 67.
[13]   Her. 5, 92; Diod. 7, 9; Paus. 2, 4, 4.
[14]   Her. I 18, 20, 22; Arist. Pol. 5, 1310b 29-31, idem Pol. 5, 1315b 24-6; Diog. Laer. 1, 99.

aristocracy. The tyranny at the beginning of the VIth century B. C. in Corinth became a hindrance to further development. Kypselos' successor, Periandros, feared the growing strength of the wealthy Corinthians and therefore attempted to halt the further increase of their power by measures which were meant to prevent the influx of slaves into Corinth. This merely served to increase the resistance of the Corinthians to the tyranny and within three years following Periandros' death, the tyranny of the Kypselidai of Corinth was overthrown. After the fall of the tyranny a constitution was created which climaxed the development of the Corinthian city slave state. In place of three Dorian phylae, eight local phylae were formed in which a difference was no longer made between the Dorian population and other Corinthian citizens.

In Megara the development moved along slightly different lines than in Sikyon and Corinth. The position of the Dorian landowners, the possessors of flocks of sheep needed for the production of woolen goods, the main branch of Megarian handicraft production, was stronger than in other communities of the Corinthian Isthmus. The short-lived rule of the tyranny of Theagenes did not destroy the power of the Dorians and after he was overthrown a period ensued in which the Dorian landowners drew closer to the wealthy handicraftsmen and merchants.[15] The reaction to this is to be found in the poems of the Megarian aristocrat, Theognis, who speaks with contempt of the nouveaux riches who assume the same rights as the aristocrat, and with the same rancour he condemns the high-born Megarians for forming friendships with the wealthy merchants.[16] The development of slave production and trade was hard hit by the failure of Megara in the Black Sea and especially in its struggles with Athens for access to the Aegean Sea.[17] The difficulties were used to advantage by the common Megarian people who came to power for a short time.[18] Shortly thereafter, however, the oligarchical government in which the wealthy Megarians, landowners and merchants, were the most influential returned to power. The Megarian tyranny did not play the same outstanding role here in the evolution towards the classical slave state as did the tyranny in other communities. Despite this fact, however, the tyranny of Theagenes had the same character and only the specific economic and social development in Megara caused its short existence and led to a somewhat different development in the later period (Melišek, [8]).

---

[15] Arist. Pol. 5, 1305a 24.
[16] Arist. Rhetor. 1, 1357h 33.
[17] Paus. 1, 40, 1; 1, 41, 2.
[18] Plut. Moralia 295 CD.

1.5 Tyranny of Athens

The greatest number of source materials are available on the history of the tyranny of Athens. In order to understand the significance of the tyranny in the process of the rise of the Athenian state, it is necessary to examine in detail the history of Athens from the second half of the VIIth century B. G., the time of the first unsuccessful attempt to establish a tyranny there and to pay particular attention to the historical development in the VIth century B. C., from the time of the appearance of Solon until after the Kleisthenes constitution. „Only during the VIth century did a decisive struggle take place in Athens between the old world represented by the gentile constitution and the newborn world of the slave society. The result of this struggle was the democratic type of slave state" (Ehrenberg, [4, p. 56]).

The Athenian tyranny of the Peisistratidai was only one link in the chain of development of the slave state in Athens. Peisistratos brought about no constitutional changes which would have strengthened the state organs in the process of formation, as did his predecessor Solon and successor Kleisthenes.[19] Nevertheless, the period of the Athenian tyranny brought about a great expansion of Athenian economy, the development of the slave economy and the ripening of the new ideology of the rising slaveowning class in Athens.[20]

1.6 The role played by the tyranny

We note, first of all, several specific characteristics which appear in the history of the early tyranny in different regions and then takes up the question of the most important general features which characterize the function of the early tyranny in the process of the rise of the state in Greece of antiquity.

The rise of the tyrannies in all localities came about as a result of the particular development in the communities where they were established. Since different specific conditions influenced the development it is natural that the course of the tyranny was not the same everywhere.

Thus, for example, the specific feature of the tyranny on the Isthmus of Corinth was its anti-Dorian character which was most conspicuous in Sikyon. The anti-Dorian character of the tyranny of these communities however, was not caused by the ethnic characteristics of the native Dorians or pre-Dorian inhabitants but came about from the historical conditions created on the Corinthian Isthmus. In Sikyon, in Corinth, and in all probability in Megara, the Dorians up to the time of the rise of the tyranny, were the only inhabitants who enjoyed full rights; they were the owners of the basic means

---

[19] Her. 1, 59; Arist. Ath. pol. 14, 3; 16, 2; Plut. Sol. 30.
[20] Arist. Ath. pol. 16, 3-5.

of production, the land. The Dorian gentile phylae only guaranteed rights to the Dorians whereas towards the mass of pre-Dorian inhabitants they probably performed the same function as the Dorian phylae in Sparta toward the Helots and Perioeci.[21] In Athens and in other Ionian communities which passed through periods of the tyranny, the struggle against the gentile aristocracy was that of the people, who previously had been equal members of the gentile organs, against the aristocrats who abused their important functions in the gentile organs, controlling for the most part the wealth of the collective and misusing the gentile organs against their own people. „In the communities on the Corinthian Isthmus however, the struggle against the gentile aristocracy was that of the pre-Dorian population against the privileged class of the Dorian inhabitants" (Will, [27, p. 75]). The pre-Dorian inhabitants of these communities had never been members of the Dorian gentile organs. Their own gentile constitution in all likelihood had been destroyed by the invasion of the Dorians and the Dorian phylae were exclusively organs of the Dorian landowners. For this very reason the struggle against the gentile constitution in the communities on the Corinthian Isthmus had such a sharp, anti-Dorian character.

The tyranny in all the communities of the Corinthian Isthmus did not occur in the same manner. Whereas in Sikyon and Corinth the tyranny lasted a long time and abolished the rule of the Dorians, the tyranny of Theagenes in Megara lasted only a short while.[22] The short-lived tyranny of Theagenes therefore was unable to leave behind such significant results to the further development of Megara as did the tyranny of the Orthagoridai in Sikyon and the tyranny of the Kypselidai in Corinth. The Dorian rule in Megara was not abolished and the Dorian phylae continued to exist there.

Other specific characteristics can be noted in the history of the Athenian tyranny. The tyranny of Peisistratos did not have such a decisive influence on the process of the rise of the slave state as the tyranny in other advanced Greek communities. The struggle of the progressive, social forces against the gentile aristocracy in Athens was unusually long and difficult. The author is of the opinion that this peculiarity of the Athenian development can be explained in part, at least, by the fact that Athens had far greater agricultural hinterland than other communities which passed through the phase of tyranny. The position of the Athenian gentile aristocrats, the Eupatridai, for this reason was much stronger than that of the aristocrats in the communities where agriculture played a less important role. For this reason, too, in Athens the tyranny was not established immediately but at first the Solon, constitution was created which on the one hand solved the most burning

---

[21]   Xen. Laked. pol. 15, 3; Paus. 3, 20, 6; Strab. 8, 365; Pollux 3, 83.
[22]   Plut. Moralia 295 CD.

problem of freeing the slave from slavery and forbidding enslavement for debts incurred, but which, on the other hand, moved" very cautiously against the landowning aristocracy. The rights and duties of citizens of this rising state were based on a census of income and land which left the key position in the hands of the Eupatridai. The importance of the peasant question in Athens can also explain why Peisistratos, on the path to tyranny, relied mainly on the impoverished peasants and landless persons who demanded the division of the land.[23] The Solon constitution protected the peasants against slavery and gave them personal freedom. The tyranny of Peisistratos went even further in this direction. It gave at least a portion of the land confiscated from the Eupatridai landowners to the landless and guaranteed the peasants subsistence and basic civil rights. During the whole process of sharpening class struggle in Athens in the VIth century B. C. the agricultural question comes more to the forefront than in other advanced communities in which, in archaic times, the advanced slave state was created. Whereas, for example, in Sikyon the tyrant Kleisthenes acted in a decisive manner against the Dorian gentile phylae, in Athens, the tyranny did not strike against the gentile constitution until the time of the Kleisthenes constitution which brought to a climax the whole development of Athenian society from the gentile constitution to the state.

These are some of the specific characteristics which appear in the history of the early Greek tyranny in certain Greek communities. The task of the historian, however, is not merely to follow and -describe the individual events and phenomena, but at the same time to seek and discover the main development of the law-governing process and try in this way to understand and explain the historical process. In order to determine the historical role of the early tyranny in the development of Greek society, it is necessary to call attention to that which is common to all the tyrannies in the different Greek communities. First of all, it is necessary to ask, under what conditions did the rise of the Greek tyranny take place and then to determine what influence the tyranny had on the further development of Greece of antiquity.

2 Analysis development

The rise of the early tyranny by no means occurred in all the regions of the Greek world. As has already been mentioned, the tyranny in the archaic period appeared primarily in the communities along the west coast of Asia Minor and on several islands of the Aegean Sea, in the region of the Corinthian Isthmus and finally in Athens. How can it be explained that the tyranny arose in exactly these communities and that there is no trace of it in the other vast areas that made up Greece; in the Peloponnes, in central and northern Greece? A quick glance at the map shows that the tyranny arose

---

[23] Arist. Ath. pol. 2, 2.

primarily in communities situated on important roads joining, on the one hand, the Near East and Black Sea area with the Greek world and, on the other hand, the region of the Eastern Mediterranean with the western part of the Mediterranean Sea. It would however, be incorrect to be satisfied with this superficial discovery and explanation of the rise of the early tyranny based on geographical factors alone. The advantageous geographical factor was not the deciding one. All the communities which developed the early tyranny, contributed to a large degree to the economic development of archaic Greece. The advantageous geographical position merely supported and promoted this economic development. The decisive factor however was the development of the productive forces in agriculture and handicraft production. Handicraft production in its beginnings in archaic Greece was closely linked to agricultural production (Zimmern, [29]). The development of metallurgy,[24] in addition to arms, produced implements mainly needed for the tilling of the soil. Pottery developed and produced, primarily, the necessary vessels for the storing and transport of agricultural products. The textile industry developed which processed wool and required the attendance of flocks of sheep. „Besides the production of the necessary means, of production, arms, state supplies and luxury items began to be produced. The artistic crafts developed, providing costly and richly ornamented arms, decorations and jewels, stone and clay statues and reliefs and luxuriously ornamented pottery" (Richter, [17, p. 109]). The luxury handicrafts became the main reason for exports. Alongside this development, the most advanced Greek communities began to export their surplus agricultural produce including wine and olive oil. „Linked with the development of the forces of production in agriculture and handicraft production a great expansion of colonizing activity took place. These very communities which later developed the early tyranny were among the most outstanding economic centres of archaic Greece" (Bartoněk, [1]).

The Asia Minor communities Miletos, Mytilene and Samos to a considerable degree contributed to the production and export of luxury pottery; Mytilene exported wine, Miletos and Samos exported woollen goods. All these communities and especially Miletos made a significant contribution to the founding of settlements in the Black Sea area. Another community in the Asia Minor region, Ephesos, did not play such an important role in handicraft production and did not take part in colonizing activities. Ephesos, however, exploited its trading relations with the Empire of Lydia and through it, with the most advanced regions of the Near East and Mesopotamia. It is not pure chance that in Ephesos terminated the main artery of the Persian empire, the so-called King's Highway which led from the Elam Susa through Lydian Sardes to Ephesos on the coast of the Aegean Sea. It is necessary to point

---

[24]   Her. 1, 25.

out that in addition to the above mentioned communities other Asia Minor communities and islands in the Aegean Sea also contributed to the economic development of archaic Greece.

Just as on the west coast of Asia Minor and on the islands of the Aegean Sea, in Greece proper the most economically developed communities also established early tyrannies. All three communities on the Corinthian Isthmus to a great extent contributed particularly to the development of handicraft production and the expansion of trade in archaic Greece. This is especially true of Corinth which, next to Miletos of Asia Minor, was altogether one of the most outstanding Greek cities of archaic times. Corinth and Megara were very active in founding colonies, Corinth predominantly in the west and Megara in the region of the Black Sea narrows.[25] The third of these communities on the Corinthian Isthmus, Sikyon, had an advanced handicraft production, but was not active in colonizing and exported its products, for the most part, probably through Corinth. It is possible to assume that the lengthy duration of the Sikyon tyranny of the Orthagoridai was caused by the fact that the forces of the merchants and handicraftsmen were comparative weak, that they long needed the protection of the tyranny against the powers of the gentile aristocrats. But whereas the Corinth tyranny, at the turn of the VIIth and VIth centuries B. C. was beginning to outlive its time and its representative, Periandros, who limited slave production, came into conflict with the interests of the merchants and owners of handicraft workshops, his younger contemporary, the Sikyon tyrant Kleisthenes, took strong measures against the Dorian landowners and deprived them .of their privileged position in the community (Pleiner, [14]).

It is probably unnecessary to emphasize that Athens, which went through the same phase of early tyranny, numbered among the most advanced Greek communities of archaic times. In the VIIIth and VIIth centuries B. C. it was somewhat behind Miletos, Corinth, Megara and other communities, but in the VIth century it quickly caught up to its rivals and at the end of the VIth century it moved to the forefront as the most important economic centre of the Greek world.

It would, however, be incorrect to attempt to explain the rise of the early tyranny merely and directly through the development of the forces of production in agriculture and especially in handicraft production. The tyranny as a political institution is a part of the superstructure.

„The archaic period of Greek history is characterized by the breakdown of the primitive communal relations and the development of the slave relations of production" (Will, [27, p. 75]). The previously communal ownership

---

[25]   Strab. IX, 392.

of livestock and land disintegrated and was replaced by the rise of private ownership of the means of production. The greatest riches were steadily appropriated by the chiefs of the gentile organs, the gentile aristocracy. The mass of small peasants and shepherds were forced to resign themselves to a considerably smaller portion and the poorest land. The gentile aristocracy controlled the economic life of the great majority of the inhabitants. The process of the concentration of the land in the hands of the landowning aristocracy continued, as did the impoverishment of the peasants, most of whom lost their and, became landless and debtors. „As can best be seen from the history of Athens, matters reached such a stage that the debt-ridden peasants became the slaves of their creditors, either they themselves or their children could be sold into slavery" (Ehrenberg, [3, p. 212]). Even though other communities did not have the same amount of hinterland as did Athens, it is necessary to assume that a similar process of the impoverishment of the small peasant and shepherds was carried out. Level of agriculture, therefore, led to the worsening of the situation for the peasants. On the other hand the development of handicraft production led to the increased economic independence of the handicraftsmen from the gentile aristocracy and at the same time brought about an expansion of trade. Together with the craftsmen „it creates a class which no longer concerns itself with production, but only with the exchange of the products - the merchants" (Pečírka, [13, p. 21]). From that sector of the prospering handicraftsmen and merchants a new, strong, economic, social group is created from which gradually the class of slave owners was formed the new class of rich industrialists and merchants. A small part of the gentile aristocracy which was engaged in trade, belongs to this newly rising social group. The overwhelming majority of the gentile aristocracy, however, remained tied to the land. The Eupatridai of Attica, principally exploited the small and landless peasants and only to a slight extent used the labour of slaves, these slaves in many cases being former peasants.[26] The Dorian aristocrats on the Corinthian Isthmus exploited the work of the peasants from the pre-Dorian population which is similar to the position of the Spartan Helots or the Cretan Clarots. The landowning aristocracy, in the first place, lived off the work of the free peasants or of peasants who had the status of Helots. The case is different as regards handicraft production. The ever-developing handicraft production needed the constant influx of labour power. In addition to the labour of the free, small and landless peasants seeking means of subsistance in the developing handicraft workshops, slave labour was being used to a constantly greater degree. These slaves, however, were not recruited from the ranks of the impoverished peasants but were imported from the outside, particularly from those regions where Greek colonies were

---

[26]   Her. 6, 83.

founded. The cheap labour of slaves permitted the increase of production and facilitated the development of the productive forces particularly in handicraft production. Slaves were used in handicraft workshops, principally in pottery workshops, in shipbuilding and lastly in mines, which beginning with archaic times played an important role in Greek economy. Slaves brought in from the outside were used to a greater extent in agriculture only at the beginning of a later period.

Former historians usually underestimate the significance of slave labour in Greece of antiquity and the existence of slave production in archaic times is given almost no attention whatsoever. However, from a number of documents it can be shown that by the VIIth and VIIth centuries B. C. slave production had already developed in the advanced communities of Greece of antiquity.

„Thus, for example, the Corinthian tyrant Periandros tried to limit the growth of the number of slaves because he feared the growing economic power of the Corinthian slaveholders" (Oliva, [12, p. 88]). Of course, the tyrant's prohibition could not prevent the growth of slave relations of production in archaic Corinth. Proof of this is the fact that the Corinthian slaveholders, shortly after the death of Periandros, abolished the tyranny and that Corinth in the classical period was among those communities with the most developed slave production. Important evidence of the existence of slave production in archaic Greece is the report that the outstanding Athenian statesman, Solon, forbade enslavement of debtors and himself redeemed the peasants of Attica who because of debt had been sold abroad into slavery.[27] „This act of Solon's cannot be explained in the sense that he fought against the development of slave production" (Ruschenbusch, [20, p. 12]). This measure was taken against the Athenian landowners, the Eupatridai, who exploited and enslaved the small peasants. The prohibition of the enslavement of the peasants guaranteed this most numerous group of inhabitants of Attica at least basic civil rights and at the same time created the conditions for the unity of the people of Attica in their fight against the landowning gentile aristocracy. The leading power among the people of Attica was the prospering merchants and owners of handicraft workshops who increasingly used more and more slave labour brought in from the outside. The period following Solon in Athens saw the rise of a powerful development of handicraft production (Milne, [10]).

„Solon's prohibition against slavery therefore did not lead to the abolition of slavery in Attica but on the contrary it was a landmark in the development of the rising slave system in Attica and hastened the influx of slave labour brought in from the outside" (Lewis, [7, p. 10]). Slaves brought into Athens, most probably from Thrace and from the Black Sea regions, doubtlessly

---

[27]   Plut. Sol. 14.

worked principally in the Laurion silver mines in which from the middle of the VIth century B. C. - from the time of the tyranny of Peisistratos - the mining of precious metals began to an increased degree. In addition to this, slaves certainly worked on constructions and in handicraft workshops.

The expanse of slave labour and slave production can be shown through other documents. From Herodotus' description of Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos, it is evident that on the island of Samos in the second half the VIth century B. C., slaves recruited from the ranks of war prisoners worked on constructions.[28] The existence of slave production on Samos at the time of the tyranny is attested to by other reports of Herodotus and the interesting information contained in the works of the Byzantine grammarian, Souidas, which show that after the fall of the Samos tyranny a section of the slaves were admitted into the ranks of citizens.[29]

It is natural that the Greek authors recorded principally information dealing with the enslavement of the originally free Greek population. The enslavement of the non-Greeks, the barbarian inhabitants, for the Greeks was something quite natural and therefore it was not necessary to make special mention of it. In the words of the leading ideologist of the slave order in Greece, the philosopher Aristotle, *„ a* barbarian and a slave are one and the same thing".[30] Therefore it is not surprising that the import of slaves of non-Greek origin was given no attention by Herodotus or by other Greek writers. Despite this fact, however, certain information is available on the basis of which it can be ascertained that already in the archaic period slaves from non-Greek regions were brought into Greece. Archeologists affirm that slaves formed the most important commodities which the Greek merchants imported from the northern region of the Black Sea / Pontos Euxeinos - in exchange for the products of the Greek handicraftsmen.[31] „There is no doubt that under the concrete historical conditions of the VIIth and VIth centuries B. C. it was 'most likely the opportunity to obtain slaves which led the foreign merchants from the south to the lands of the northern Black Sea". Iessen, in this connection, introduces the report of the Greek historian Ktesias, according to whom the Persian King Darius, who ruled at the turn of the VIth and the beginning of the Vth centuries B. C., sent a great expedition in thirty, fifty-oared boats to Scythia on a hunt for slaves (Iessen, [7, p. 36]). If the Persians acquired slaves from the northern part of the Black Sea, then there can be no question that these slaves from the Black Sea were mainly transported to the advanced Greek communities, especially to Miletos which had ringed the whole Black Sea

---

[28] Her. 3, 39; Athen. 12, 540 D.
[29] Her. 3, 39, Suid. s. v. Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος.
[30] Arist. Pol. 1252b 9.
[31] Her. 4, 53.

coastline with its settlements and to a large extent economically controlled this area. Important proof on the import of slaves is to be found in a report by Athenaios which emphasizes that the inhabitants of the island Chios were the first of the Greeks to use slaves acquired by purchase from the ranks of the barbarian inhabitants.[32]

„Each of these more or less incidental and isolated reports are not proof in themselves. However when all this evidence is compiled- it leads to the certain; conclusion that already at the turn of the VIIth and especially during the VIth century B. C., in Corinth, Miletos, on Samos, on Chios, in Athens and certainly in a number of other advanced Greek communities, the development of slave production was taking place" (Roebuck, [20, p. 19]). As has already been mentioned, slave labour was used on constructions, in handicraft workshops and in mines. This means that primarily the owners of handicraft workshops profited from slave labour. With the support and for the benefit of this new and rapidly developing social class, in a number of advanced Greek communities in archaic times, there arose the early Greek tyranny which advanced against the position of the gentile landowning aristocracy, against the remnants of the gentile constitution and which substantially aided the further development of the slave relations of production in these communities.[33] The development of the forces of production in agriculture and especially in handicraft production is not directly linked to the rise of the early Greek tyranny. The early tyranny appeared only when the new slave economic foundation began to be laid in Greece.

In what way does the early tyranny contribute to the strengthening and reinforcing of the slave relations of production in archaic Greece?

The tyranny was created in the struggle against the gentile aristocracy and therefore turned its full force against unlimited aristocratic rule. In the communities on the Corinthian Isthmus, the tyranny had an anti- Dorian character and tried to abolish the privileged position of the Dorian landowners. In Athens and in the Ionian communities in the Asia Minor region, the tyranny took a strong stand against its own gentile aristocracy, against the gentile chiefs and higher gentile organs which for over a long period had not been the elected representatives and spokesmen of their people.[34] At the same time the gentile organs become a hindrance to further economic and social development.[35] The development of the productive forces, particularly in handicraft production and, at the same time, the expansion of trade brings to the forefront the new social forces which engage in a struggle against

---

[32]   Athen. VI., 265 BC.
[33]   Athen. 6, 265 BC.
[34]   Thuc. II 15.
[35]   Her. V 66; Eur. Ion. 1575; Plut. Sol. 23.

the gentile aristocracy and its powerful supporters the organs of the gentile constitution. In the collision of the newly-developed social classes the old society founded on kinship groups is broken up; in its place appears a new society, with its control centred in the state, the subordinate units of which are no longer kinship associations, but local associations; a society in which the system of the family is completely dominated by the system of property. A significant step forward on the path from the gentile constitution to the state was taken by the removal of the gentile organs and the establishment of new institutions based on the local division of the inhabitants. In this direction the tyranny contributed in no small degree to the liquidation of the remainders of the gentile constitution and to the strengthening of the newly-developing slave state.

Significant proof of the struggle of the representatives of the early Greek tyranny against the gentile phyle is, first of all, Herodotus' explanation for the change of name of the phylae in Sikyon. The Sikyonian tyrant, Kleisthenes, gave the Dorian gentile phylae derisive names and deprived them of their prominent position in the Sikyon community (Hommel, 1940). Herodotus mentions the measures of the Sikyonian tyrant in relation to the activities of his grandson of the same name, the Athenian reformer, Kleisthenes, who in Attica removed the Ionian gentile phylae and divided them into ten local phylae.[36] Doubtlessly the measures of the Sikyonian tyrant had similar aims.

In contrast to Sikyon, in Corinth no actions against the Dorian phylae were taken during the tyranny but only after the abolition of the tyranny, as was the case in Athens. There is no disputing the fact, however, that the tyranny altered the position of the Dorian landowners in Corinth and created the conditions for the abolition of the Dorian gentile organs which had been an instrument of power of the landowning aristocracy. If the tyranny in Corinth did not bring to a climax the struggle against the Dorians by removing their gentile phylae, it was probably because, in its last phase, it lost its progressive role and turned against the interests of the slave owners. Therefore, only after the removal of the tyranny did the representatives of the new slave society definitively settle accounts with the Dorian aristocrats by abolishing the Dorian gentile phylae and introducing local phylae.

The tyranny in Megara did not deal with the Dorian gentile aristocracy in a decisive manner. This occurred because in these communities, following the overthrow of the tyranny of Theagenes, a compromise was reached between the Dorian landowners and merchants and handicraftsmen, and the Dorian gentile phylae therefore were maintained until a later period. This means that in Megara too, the character of the original gentile organs basically changed

---

[36] Her. V 68; Her. 5, 66; Arist. Ath. pol. 20, 1.

even though the Dorian landowners in these communities retained their leading positions.

Just as in the communities of the Corinthian Isthmus, a similar development took place, in archaic times, in the Asia Minor communities. In Ionian and Aeolian communities in this region the problem, of course, was not the struggle against the Dorians but the fight against the native gentile aristocracy. In Miletos the Ionian phylae possibly retained merely a religious significance and in the middle of the VIth century B. C. they were abolished and replaced by local phylae. In Ephesos the name of the old Ionian gentile phylae was retained only as a term for the so-called khiliasties, i. e. departments which were made up of one thousand inhabitants each, several such khiliastys forming one local phyle. In Miletos the complete dissolution of the phylae took place only in the Vth century B. G., that is in the classical period and therefore the exact date is not known when the Ionian phylae in Ephesos were transformed into mere components of the local division. In these communities, therefore, it is not possible to link the removal of the gentile phylae and the introduction of the local phylae with the early tyranny. It can be, however, justly assumed that the early tyranny in Miletos and Ephesos, just as in other places, weakened the position of the gentile aristocracy and reduced the importance of the gentile phylae.

Just as in Miletos and Ephesos, on Samos too, the old gentile Ionian phylae were abolished and replaced by local phylae. Neither fo i Ephesos nor Samos is there any record of when this change occurred. If, however, in the Samos settlements, founded at the turn of the VIIth and VIth centuries B. C., the names of Ionian gentile phylae appear and in the hellenistic period documents have been found testifying to the existence of two local phylae on Samos, this means that probably at the end of the archaic or beginning of the classical period the Ionian gentile phylae were replaced by local ones. It is possible to assume that the tyranny of Polykrates, directed against the Samos aristocrats - geomoroi - played an outstanding role in this regard.

Most of the information available concerning the decrease of influence of the gentile phylae, ruled by the aristocrats, and of the introduction of local phylae comes from Athens. This important change took place only at the very end] of the VIth century B. C., after the abolition of the tyranny of the Peisistratidai. There can be no doubt however that the Athenian tyranny contributed to a significant degree to the break up of power of the gentile aristocracy. The tyranny, however,, did not completely defeat the Eupatridai by abolishing their support, the gentile phylae. Just as in Corinth, so in Athens, during the reign of Pesistratos' sons, the tyranny halted this development,

turned against the interests of the Athenian people and was wiped out.[37] The outcome of this battle is to be found in the constitution of Kleisthenes which is based both on the principles of Solon and on the measures of the Peisistratidai. „In the new constitution Kleisthenes ignored the four old tribes founded on gentes and phratries. In their place appeared a completely new organisation on the basis of division of the citizens merely according to their place of residence..." (Prentice, [16, p. 81]). The introduction of local phylae and the lessening of the influence of the old gentile organs meant, in Athens, just as in other communities, the culmination of the process of the rise of the slave city state and the final defeat of the gentile aristocracy.

The early Greek tyranny played a significant role in the struggle against the gentile aristocracy and its supporters, the gentile phylae. In the final phase of the tyranny or shortly after the abolition of the tyranny there usually came about a decrease in the influence of the old gentile phylae and the introduction of population division by common place of residence.

The representatives of the early tyranny fought against the position of the gentile aristocracy in the ideological sphere as well. There are a number of reports which show that the tyrants introduced new religious cults aimed at forcing into the background the cults of the gentile aristocracy and thereby weakening their position. It is not mere chance that in the period of the early tyranny the cult of Dionysos, who was worshipped principally by the mass of people, flourished.

Thus, for example, one of the most famous Greek tyrants, Kleisthenes of Sikyon, introduced the cult of Dionysos. Herodotus relates how Kleisthenes replaced the old cults worshipped by the Dorian aristocracy, with new ones. The Sikyonian tyrant even abolished the tragic choruses that met in Sikyon in honour of Adrastos and „committed them to Dionysos". Archeological findings also testify to the spread of the cult of the god Dionysos in the region of the Corinthian Isthmus.[38]

At the time of the tyranny the cult of Dionysos was also introduced into Corinth. During the reign of Kleisthenes' contemporary, the Corinthian tyrant Periandros, in this community there lived the famous poet Arion who, as Herodotus states, composed dithyrambs, verses glorifying the god Dionysos. Just as in Sikyon, in Corinth too, archeological material confirms the spread of the cult of Dionysos.[39]

The poems composed in honour of the god Dionysos became the source of one of the most important types of literature of the ancient Greece, the

---

[37]   Arist. Ath. pol. 8, 3; idem 18, 1; Her. 5, 55; 6, 123; Thuc. 1, 20; 6, 54.
[38]   Her. V 67.
[39]   Her. I 23.

Attic tragedy. From the [region of the Isthmus of Corinth the cult of Dionysos spread to neighbouring Attica. At the time of the Athenian tyranny of Peisistratos, in the thirties of the VIth century B. C., the first real Greek tragedy was performed in Athens. During the rule of Peisistratos at great festivals to Dionysos, the so-called City Dionysia, regular dramatic performances in which all the Athenian people participated were given. Drama of antiquity was not mere entertainment for its audience. Under the guise of mythological themes Athenian dramatists grappled with the most important social problems of the day. Drama became an important medium leading to the unity of the Athenian people- against the internal and foreign enemies of democracy.

In addition to the cult of Dionysos, the Athenian tyrant Peisistratos; supported the cult of the goddess Athena. A magnificent temple to Athena . was built on the Acropolis and in her honour festivals, Panathenaia, were held regularly. The cult of Athena also was reflected in the minted coins in the period of the tyranny. The face of the coin depicted the head of Athena and the reverse side her symbols; an owl and an olive twig. Numismatic material very definitely shows that the cult of Athena was directed against the old aristocratic cults. The tetradrachma of Peisistratos with the head of the goddess Athena completely superseded the old Athenian mints on which the aristocracy had, through the use of their symbols, expressed their superior position in the Athenian community. Mints depicting Athena were also coined in Athens during the classical and Hellenistic periods. „The cult of Athena was intended to unite all the Athenian people and to raise their selfconfidence in the struggle against the gentile aristocracy" (Sealey, [23, p. 8]).

In the struggle against the old ideology which aided the gentile aristocracy in maintaining its privileged positions in certain Greek communities, not only were new, popular religious cults born but also scientific ideas of the world, about nature and human society, Greek materialist philosophy, came into being. It is not accidental that the materialist philosophy appears in one of the most outstanding economic centres of archaic Greece, in Miletos of Asia Minor at the beginning of the VIth century B. C., at the time of the Miletos tyranny. The founder of the Miletian school, the first Greek philosopher, Thales, is a typical representative of the newly developing slave society. He was not only a philosopher but at the same time a mathematician, astronomer, merchant and political figure.

The early tyrannies in the ideological struggle against the gentile aristocracy were of great significance. A number of documentary materials are available which testify to the severity of the struggle of the tyrants against the old aristocratic cults and prejudices of the gentile society. The period of the tyrannies created the conditions also for the rise of a scientific explanation of the world, the philosophy.

3 Conclusion

The early tyranny contributed to a significant extent to the liquidation of the old superstructure of the gentile society. Measures taken by the representatives of the early tyrannies against the gentile constitution, the strengthening of the element of the local division of the population and widespread activities in the ideological sphere contributed not only to undermining the position of the gentile aristocracy, but also meant an important step forward on the path to the state and to the creation of a new ideology of the society. These activities helped the early tyranny to strengthen and reinforce the developing slave relations.

The representatives of the early tyranny, however, did not limit themselves merely to making changes in the sphere of the superstructure, but carried out a series of measures which directly supported the development of slave production in archaic Greece. The tyrants attempted by every means possible to further advance the economic development of those communities which they headed. It is sufficient to recall that at the time of the tyranny in many communities many beneficial constructions were built, especially aqueducts and harbours. The period of the tyranny in many communities saw the development of agriculture and especially handicraft production. In a number of communities the period of the tyranny saw the powerful development of trade and led to naval supremacy / thalassocracy (Berve, [2]). The mining of precious and other metals developed as well as coinage which was significant proof of the highly developed system of exchange. The tyranny arose as an instrument of the newly advancing social forces in the struggle against the rule of the gentile aristocracy. Its representatives based their support primarily on the rich merchants and handicraftsmen and it is therefore natural that their activities in every way aided the development of trade.

The representatives of early tyranny however, not only assisted the development of production through their measures but concurrently weakened the economic position of the gentile aristocracy. In many communities the aristocrats fled into exile from the tyranny and their property was confiscated. On Samos the expelled aristocrats vainly tried to return, aided by Spartan troops. In Athens the land confiscated from the émigré aristocracy was probably divided amongst the small and landless peasants. Kypselos of Corinth[40] and Kleisthenes of Sikyon took strong measures against the aristocrats. In this manner the gentile aristocracy was deprived of its former power, the land, on which it had enjoyed unlimited rule and by the aid of which it had oppressed and enslaved the mass of peasants.

---

[40] Her. 5, 92; Arist. Pol. 5, 1310b 29-31.

It would, however, be incorrect to overestimate the significance of the early tyranny in the history of Greece of antiquity. The tyranny was only a phase in the development of the city state. Its characteristic feature is its short duration. Within a short time the tyranny became a hindrance to further economic and social development. Like the Corinthian tyrant Periandros, Peisistratos' sons in Athens, increasingly interferred in the developing economy. In this way, the representatives of tyranny came into conflict with the interests of those social forces which hitherto had supported them and for this reason their rule was abolished.

The rise and development of the tyranny in individual communities was caused by various specific conditions and circumstances peculiar to these communities. Nevertheless, despite all differences and specific peculiarities the early tyranny can be considered a significant stage on the path from gentile constitution to the slave state in Greece of antiquity.

If the early tyranny appeared in a number of Greek communities, it is not possible to consider this as an accidental phenomenon or an isolated one. It is impossible to consider accidental the fact that in exactly those most advanced Greek communities on the west coast of Asia Minor, in the islands of the Aegean Sea, in the region of the Corinthian Isthmus and finally in Athens, the early Greek tyranny arose (Ziebarth, [29, p. 60]). The tyranny arose on the archaic period of Greek history in exactly those communities where the antagonisms were most sharply pointed up between the gentile aristocracy and the people of those communities.

The economic development in those advanced communities took place very quickly under especially favourable conditions. The rapid development of production and the rapid growth of slave relations of production demanded an immediate solution. Therefore this led to a sharpening of the class struggle, to the acute antagonism between the aristocracy and the people and to the necessary conflict which culminated in the defeat of the gentile aristocracy and the enthronement of the tyranny. The rise of the early tyranny therefore was forced into being by the sharp antagonisms between the aristocracy and the people.

It would be incorrect to underestimate or ignore the importance of agricultural production and the role of the agrarian population in the process of the development of the system and the rise of the state in Greece of antiquity. It is necessary, however, to stress that in exactly this unusually forceful expansion of handicraft production the stormy economic and social development is contained which led to sharp conflicts and to the rapid birth of the ancient state. The magnificant products of Greek handicraftsmen and artists, metal objects, pottery, plastic art and architecture testify to the high degree of development of handicraft production in advanced Greek

communities. In this unusually large development of handicraft production and trade it is necessary, in our opinion, to discover the real reasons for the sharp encounter between the old world of the gentile constitution and that of the new, advancing world of the slave society. The stormy economic and social development forced the rapid unfettering of the chains of the gentile constitution and the creation of the slave state. In sharp opposition to the position of the gentile aristocracy, the early tyranny was born as a powerful instrument of the new, advancing, political forces. This, then, is the answer to the question why in Greece and especially in its most advanced localities the rise of tyranny took place in the process of the formation of the ancient state.

Literature

[1] BARTONĚK, A. 1964. *Zur sozialökonomischen Struktur der mykenischen Gesellschaft*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt I. Berlin, 1964.

[2] BERVE, H. 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*. München, 1967.

[3] EHRENBERG, V. 1966. *Die Rechtsidee im frühen Griechentum*. Darmstadt, p. 212.

[4] EHRENBERG, V. 1973. *From Solon to Socrates*. London, p. 56.

[5] HEICHELHEIM, F. 1938 *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums*. Leiden. p. 98.

[6] HYDE, W. W. The Greek Tyrannis. In: *CW 1943/44*. p. 123.

[7] IESSEN, A. A. 1947. *Греческая колонизация северного Причерноморья. Ленинград*, p. 36.

[8] LEWIS, N. 1941. Solon's Agrarian Legislation. In: *AJPh*. p. 10.

[9] MELIŠEK, F. 2004. O ekonomických názoroch staroveku. In: *Ekonomické rozhľady. Economic Review*. Vol. 33, Issue 1, p. 88-97. ISSN 0323-262X.

[10] MEYER, E. 1910. Die Sklaverei im Altertum. In: *Meyer, Kleine Schriften I. Halle*. p. 212.

[11] MILNE, J. G. 1945. *The Economic Policy of Solon*. Hesperia.

[12] NILSSON, M. P. 1936. *The Age of the Early Greek Tyrants*. Belfast, p. 89.

[13] OLIVA, P. 1963. Die unentwickelte Form der Sklaverei im antiken Griechenland, Acta antiqua Philippopolitana. In: *Studia historica et philological*. Sofia, p. 88.

[14] PEČÍRKA, J. 1963. *Land tenure and the Development of Athenan Polis*. Geras, Studie presented to G. Thompson. Praha, p. 21.

[15] PLEINER, R. 1968. *IronWorking in Ancient Greece*. Praha.

[16] PRENTICE, W. K. 1926. The Fall of Aristocracies and the Emancipation of Men's Minds. AJA, p. 81.

[17] SALIN, E. 1930. Staat und Handel in Hellas in archaischer und klassischer Zeit. In: *Zeitung der Gesellschaft für Staatswissenschaft*, p. 333-361.

[18] RICHTER, G. M. A. 1949. *Archaic Greek Art*. New York, p. 109.

[19] ROBINSON, C. A. 1936. Greek Tyranny. In: *American Historical Review*. p. 68-71.

[20] ROEBUCK, C. 1959. *Ionian Trade and Colonization*. New York, p. 19.

[21] RUSCHENBUSCH, E. 1966. Solonos nomoi. In: *Historia, Einzelschriften 9*. p. 12.

[22] RUSSEL, H. L. Tyranny and Democracy. In*: CW 1943/44*. p. 128-130.

[23] SEALEY, R. 1960. Regionalism in Archaic Athens. In: *Historia 9*. p. 8.

[24] SELTMAN, C. T. 1933. *Greek Coins*. London.

[25] SERGEEV, V. S. 1948. *История древней Греции. Москва*. p. 344.

[26] SMITH, C. 1928. The Pottery. In: *Excavations at Ephesus, by D. G. Hogarth*. London, p. 121.

[27] WILL, E. 1965. *La Grèce archaique. Deuxième conference international d'histoire économique (Aix - en - Provence 1962)*. Paris, p. 56.

[28] WILL, E. 1956. *Doriens et Ioniens. Essai sur la valeur du critère ethnique appliqué à l'étude de l'histoire et de la civilisation grecques*. Paris, p. 75.

[29] ZIEBARTH, E. 1929. *Beitrage zur Geschichte des Seehandels*. Hamburg, p. 60.

[30] ZIMMERN, A. 1911. *The Greek Commonwealth Politics and Economics in Fifth - Century Athens*. Oxford.

List of abbreviation

AJA - American Journal of Archaeology

AJPh - American Journal of Philology

ap. - apud.

APA - American Philological Association

Arist. - Aristoteles

Ath. pol. - Athenian constitution

Pol. - Politics

Rhet. - Rhetoric

fr. (Rose) - V. Rose, Leipzig 1886, Aristotelis fragmenta

Athen. - Athenaios

CIG - A. Boeckh, Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum, 1828 - 1877

CW - Classical Weekly

Diod. - Diodoros from Sicilly

Diog. Laert. - Diogenes Laertios

Ephor. - Eforos

Eur. Ion. - Euripides, Ion

F Gr Hist - F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Berlin - Leiden 1923-1943

fr. - fragment

Her. - Herodotos

JHS - Journal of Hellenic Studies

Nic. Dam. - Níkolaos Damascene

Paus. - Pausanias

Plut. - Plutarchos

Plut. Mul. virt 16 – De mulierum virtutibus

Sol. - Biography of Solon

(Moral.) - Moralia

Quaest. Gr. – Greek's questions

Poll. - Pollux (Polydeukes)

Sol. (Diehl) - Solon (E. Diehl, Anthologia lyrica Graeca)

Strab. - Strabon

Suid. - Suidas

Theop. - Theopompos

Thuc. - Thukydides

Xen. - Xenophon

Laked. pol. - Lakedaimonian constitution