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THE HORSEMEN OF CLASSICAL ATHENS.
SOME CONSIDERATIONS
ON THEIR RECRUITMENT AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND*

ABSTRACT. Classical Athens took into the Peloponnesian War 1000 horsemen and 200 mounted archers. Elite young citizens were legally obliged to serve in the cavalry-corps. Athenian democracy may have subsidised their military service. But it still cost them about 10 times what hoplites had to pay. In order to meet the corps’s significant time-demands horsemen also needed to be men of independent means. It is thus unsurprising that they represented only 5 percent of those in their age-band. A young horsemen who had been drafted could ask for an exemption on the grounds of poverty. In classical Athens horsemanship was viewed as proof of an individual’s elite-membership. Consequently asking for such an exemption came at a high social price; for it called into question a family’s claim to be wealthy. The state subsidised a lot more the corps-membership of the mounted archers. This confirms that they were not part of the elite from which the horsemen certainly came.

1. Introduction

In the late 430s BC the cavalry-corps consisted of 1000 horsemen and 200 mounted archers. It was a legal requirement of elite Athenians to serve as horsemen. While the state subsidised their corps-membership, it still personally cost them about 10 times what hoplites had to pay. After the Peloponnesian War, when this subsidy was reduced, a horseman had to be a man of independent means. Therefore all horsemen had to come from wealthy families, because only they could shoulder the associated costs. These 1000 members joined the corps, when they were 20 years old, and retired in their early 30s. At the beginning of the Peloponnesian War they represented 5 percent of all Athenians in this age-band. Their organisation was closely modelled on the hoplite corps. They were likewise divided into 10 tribal units. Each tribe of horsemen was commanded by a phylarch, while 2 hipparchs commanded the corps as a whole. Horsemen were also conscripted for a campaign in the same way: their phylarch put their names on a conscription-list. Yet this tribal commander, when compiling his list, could consult a central record of corps-members. What made the maintenance of this record possible was the cavalry-corps’s small size. The state subsidised much more heavily the corps-member-

* This article was written when I was, from mid-2015, on a yearlong research fellowship at l’Institut d’études avancées de l’université de Strasbourg. Sincere thanks go to E. Foster, M. Golden, A. Jacquemin, D. Lenfant, L. Pernot, P.J. Rhodes, B. Zimmermann and especially E. Pischedda for discussing with me, during this fellowship, the armed forces of classical Athens. This article is much the stronger for the excellent suggestions of «Athenaeum»’s three anonymous referees. It draws heavily on my forthcoming Athenian Democracy at War; it does so courtesy of Cambridge University Press. All the article’s translations are my own.
ship of the 200 mounted archers. Postwar Athens paid them double what it gave the horsemen. This suggests that these corps-members did not come from the same wealthy backgrounds. Athenians certainly served as mounted archers. Indeed there is no sure evidence that their ranks ever included metics. Nevertheless they did not serve beside the horsemen in the 10 tribes. Rather they served in their own unit under the command of a hipparch. We last hear of the mounted archers during the Corinthian War.

2. The History of the Cavalry-Corps

On the eve of the Peloponnesian War Pericles reassured the Athenian dēmos (people) that they had the required armed forces to win (Thuc. 2.13.6-9). The second corps of which he spoke was the cavalry (8). At the time it consisted of 1000 horsemen and 200 hippotoxotai or mounted archers (Andoc. 3.5; Diod. Sic. 13.72.1). The classical Athenians saw the horsemen as this branch’s core group (e.g. Ar. Eq. 225, 580; Dem. 14.3; Xen. Eq. Mag. 9.3)1. These 1000 hippeis (horsemen) were always Athenian (e.g. Xen. Eq. Mag. 9.3, 6; Vect. 2.5)2. Their organisation was closely modelled on Cleisthenes’s army of hoplites. Because they were phuleţai (tribemen), they were likewise divided into 10 tribal units (e.g. Lys. 15.5; Xen. Hell. 2.4.31; Eq. Mag. 2.2; 8.7). Each phule (tribe) of 100 horsemen was commanded by a phularkhos (phylarch)3. Two hipparkhoi (hipparchs) held overall command (e.g. Ar. Av. 798-800; [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 61.4; Xen. Eq. Mag. 3.11). The Athenians only deployed a part of this corps at any one time. Thucydides wrote of them sending out, for example, 250, 300, 400 or 600 of its members4. Horsemen were conscripted for a campaign in the same way as hoplites: their names were put on katalogan or conscription-lists (Lys. 16.13)5. Of the two sets of cavalry-commanders the phylarchs had the most-detailed knowledge of corps-members (6-7). They also worked out the place of each conscript in his tribe’s battle formation (15.5). Consequently it is more likely that the phylarchs compiled the conscription-lists. Yet in compiling his tribe’s katalogos a phylarch could consult a record that a taxiarth could not: a central record of hippeis ([Arist.] Ath. Pol. 49.2; Lys. 16.6)6. What made the upkeep of this record possible was the corps’s small size. Yet an Athenian’s

2 Whitehead 1977, p. 82.
3 E.g. Ar. Lys. 561-562; [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 61.5; Xen. Eq. Mag. 1.21, 25; 3.4-7; IG I.1190.179.
4 For the references see e.g. Bugh 1988, pp. 79-107.
5 For the use of such lists in the conscription of hoplites see e.g. Christ 2001, pp. 398-403.
6 Bugh 1988, pp. 55, 141 s. The much greater size of the hoplite corps made the upkeep of a central list of its members impossible (e.g. Hansen 1986, pp. 83-89; Christ 2001, pp. 400 s.; Crowley 2012, pp. 29 s.).
membership in this wing still needed to be recorded in his deme (IG I².138.1-6). This ensured that his demarch would not accidentally include him among possible conscripts for hoplite service.

In 392/1 Andocides negotiated a peace-treaty for ending the Corinthian War (Andoc. 3.33-5) ⁷. On his return from Sparta he spoke in favour of it. In a genuine speech he told assemblygoers that the cavalry-corps had been created in two stages (3.5) ⁸. The treaty that had ended the Peloponnesian War led to the overthrow of Athenian democracy (e.g. Lys. 2.61-4; Xen. Hell. 2.2-4). Andocides had to convince the assemblygoers that it would not happen again (3.1). Consequently he claimed that there had been three earlier treaties with Sparta and that each had strengthened Athens’s armed forces (2.4,6,10). The first, for example, saw the establishment, «for the first time (próton)», of a corps of 300 hippeis (5). After the second they expanded this corps to 1200 (7). Andocides argued that his peace-treaty would similarly make their military stronger (39-40). His account of fifth-century history contains «remarkable historical and chronological errors» ⁹. His first two treaties look to be a double counting of the thirty-year peace of 446/5. To them Andocides linked military reforms that had been introduced decades earlier ¹¹. In view of such egregious errors M.A. Martin famously dismissed Andocides’s speech as unreliable evidence ¹². Martin proposed instead that a corps of 1200 horsemen had been created in one go during the 440s ¹³. Yet the discovery of IG I³.511 on the Acropolis unexpectedly corroborated Andocides’s two stages ¹⁴. This inscription states that the dedication of which it was once part was set up by «the horsemen» (1). It gives the names of 3 hipparchs (1-3). We have seen that the 1200-strong corps had only 2 hipparchs. But each of its phylarchs commanded a unit of 100. Therefore it has been plausibly suggested that the inscription’s 3 hipparchs were the unit-commanders of the first 300-strong corps ¹⁵.

This inscription may corroborate Andocides’s claim that the Athenians created

---

⁷ Asmonti 2015, p. 175.
⁸ E.M. Harris (2000) argues that Andoc. 3 is not a genuine speech but a later rhetorical exercise. As proof he points to the fact that the speech’s ambassadors do not follow norms of classical-Greek diplomacy (pp. 487-495). But Magnetto 2013 shows to the contrary that the speech is consistent with such norms. P.J. Rhodes (2016, pp. 83-86) questions the other reasons that Harris gives for its inauthenticity. On balance Aeschin. 2.172-175 and Philochorus 328F.149a FGrH support the case for genuineness.
¹⁰ On this peace see e.g. Rhodes 2010, pp. 56-58.
¹¹ Plassart 1913, pp. 152-154; Thomas 1989, pp. 119-123.
¹² Martin 1886, pp. 367 s.
¹³ Martin 1886, pp. 121-134.
¹⁴ On it see e.g. Bugh 1988, pp. 45-50; Spence 1993, pp. 14-15; 2010, p. 119.
¹⁵ E.g. Bugh 1988, pp. 49 s.; Spence 1993, pp. 14 s.
their cavalry-corps in two stages. But neither source sheds light on when exactly these stages occurred: \(IG I^3.511\) cannot be dated more precisely than to the mid-fifth century, while Andocides’s chronology is manifestly error ridden. The Parthenon provides a firm date by which the second stage had been completed. The horsemen participated in the pompē (procession) of the Great Panathenaeae (e.g. Xen. \(Eq.\ Mag.\ 3.1-2\))\(^{16}\). Their participation was the focus of this temple’s frieze. It depicts 10 distinct units of horsemen\(^7\). Slight variations in the dress further distinguish the units from each other. This seems to be a depiction of the 10 phulai (tribes) of the 1200-strong corps. Most of the Parthenon, including its frieze, was completed by 438/7, when the temple’s builders were transferred to the Propylaea (Paus. 1.24.5-7; Plut. \(Per.\) 13.7; \(IG I^3.462-6\))\(^8\).

G.B. Bugh plausibly links the corps’s development to two setbacks that Athens suffered before 438/7. The first was the battle of Tanagra in 458/7 (Thuc. 1.106-7). During this battle the Thessalians, who were providing the cavalry for Athens (102.4), deserted to the Spartan side (Diod. Sic. 11.80.1-6). The resultant defeat made plain that Athens really needed to create its own corps of horsemen\(^9\). The second setback was the Peloponnesian League’s unopposed invasion of Attica in 447/6 (Thuc. 1.114.2; 2.21). This showed the de\(m\)os that a 300-strong corps was not enough, if they wanted successfully to counter such invasions\(^{10}\). Pollux suggested that the 48 naukrariai of sixth-century Athens each supplied 1 warship and 2 horsemen (8.108)\(^{21}\). But what this Roman-period author wrote about these archaic units is directly contradicted by classical-period authors (e.g. [Arist.] \(Ath.\ Pol.\ 8.3; 21.5; Hdt.\ 5.71.2\))\(^{22}\). Consequently there is no reason to doubt Andocides’s depiction of the 300-strong corps as Athens’s first publicly controlled cavalry force (3.5; cf. Hdt. 6.112)\(^{23}\).

3. The Recruitment of the Horsemen

In the 360s Xenophon wrote a how-to guide for Athenian hipparchs. His treatise noted that the state required its hippeis to be ready to fight as soon as a war broke out (Xen. \(Eq.\ Mag.\ 1.2,9-10; 9.3\)). Xenophon emphasised that serving well

---

\(^{16}\) Shear 2000, pp. 128-130; Stevenson 2003, pp. 248-251.
\(^{17}\) Boardman 1977, p. 40; Spence 1993, pp. 267-271; Stevenson 2003, pp. 242-252.
\(^{18}\) Camp 2001, pp. 74-82.
\(^{19}\) Bugh 1988, pp. 41-44.
\(^{21}\) Rhodes 1981, pp. 151 s.
\(^{23}\) Pace Bugh 1988, pp. 1-38; Spence 1993, pp. 8-12.
required constant training (e.g. 1.5-6,18,21; 4.4; 8.1-8) \textsuperscript{24}. The cavalry-corps, he noted, gave regular public displays of its horsemanship (1.26; 3.1-7,9-14). In its entirety it participated in the processions and the agônes (contests) of several festivals (2.8-3.4) \textsuperscript{25}. Therefore service as a hippeus (horseman) was physically demanding and, it seems, time-consuming. This made it suitable really only for young men (e.g. Ar. Eq. 731; Eup. fr. 293 Kassel and Austin; Xen. Eq. Mag. 1.2,11) \textsuperscript{26}. Yet the hippocarchs were allowed to recruit only those who had turned 20 years of age, because the state preferred to keep hoi neôtatoi (the youngest) away from active-military service (e.g. Thuc. 2.13.7) \textsuperscript{27}. Recruits had to pass the council’s annual dokimasia (scrutiny) of corps-members before they could join \textsuperscript{28}. During this scrutiny councillors voted on whether individuals were capable of being hippeis or should be allowed to retire from the corps \textsuperscript{29}. Those who passed it were supposed to serve only in the cavalry-corps until they retired (Lys. 15.7-8).

Xenophon recognised that this recruitment had to follow an established law (Eq. Mag. 1.9-10). This nomos required a hippocarch to recruit only from «those who were most able in terms of money and physical capacity». Under it he could use a law-court to force those who met these criteria to join up. But Xenophon’s advice was that it should be used as little as possible (10-11). Instead a hippocarch should try to persuade neoi (young men) to volunteer by talking about the brilliancy of horsemanship (11; cf. Ar. Av. 1441-1443). With their fathers an economic argument should be used (Xen. Eq. Mag. 11-12). A hippocarch, Xenophon writes, can remind fathers «how they will be compelled to keep horses (hippotrophein), if not by you, then, by reason of their money, by someone else». A hippocarch can assure them that if their «boys» join up, he will put a stop to «their expensive and frenzied horse-buying» (12). Two aspects of this recruitment stand out. The first is that the hippocarchs only rarely had to compel those who were liable for cavalry service to serve. For Xenophon most recruits could be persuaded voluntarily to do so. The second is that Solon’s income-classes played no role \textsuperscript{30}. This explains why hippeis in classical-Athenian sources are members of either Solon’s second highest income-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Spence 1993, pp.76-79; 2010, p.117. Pace van Wees 2004, p. 212.
\item \textsuperscript{25} For its competing at the Great Panathenaea see e.g. Kyle 1987, pp.189 s.; Pritchard 2015, p. 36; Shear 2001, pp. 340-345.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Bugh 1988, pp.64-66; Spence 1993, pp.198-202.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Pischedda 2013, p.80. The neôtatoi were the precursors of the fourth century’s ephes (Winkler 1990, p. 29), who were aged 18 and 19 years of age (e.g. [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 42.1-5).
\item \textsuperscript{28} This dokimasia was well established by the 390s (Lys. 14.8,10,15-17,22; 15.6-7; 16.13). The council’s conducting of this scrutiny is first attested only in the 320s ([Arist.] Ath. Pol. 49.2). But, as it had a big role in the corps’s management well before this (e.g. Xen. Eq. Mag. 1.8,13; 3.9,12,14), it is likely that it had always scrutinised the cavalry-corps’s recruits.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Rhodes 1981, pp. 564-568; Bugh 1988, pp. 53-55.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Bugh 1988, pp. 20-34; Spence 1993, p. 182; de Sainte Croix 2004, pp. 25 s.; Pritchard 2010, p. 25.
\end{itemize}
class or the cavalry-corps \textsuperscript{31}. The term was never simultaneously used to describe both groups. Xenophon provides the earliest evidence for how Athenian \textit{hippeis} were recruited. Much else of what he saw in the cavalry-corps of the 360s is first attested before the Peloponnesian War’s end. It is likely that the recruitment-method of his day dated back just as far.

4. \textit{The State Subsidisation of Corps-Membership}

By the 360s the state had long helped its young citizens to participate in the cavalry-corps. This came in the form of two subsidies \textsuperscript{32}. A close look at how each subsidy reduced the personal cost of corps-membership allows us to work out which stratum of Athenian citizens could afford to be \textit{hippeis}. This makes it possible to identify «those who were most able in terms of money» on whom a hipparch focused his recruitment-efforts. The first subsidy that each recruit received was a \textit{katastasis} (establishment loan) of up to 1200 drachmas (dr.) for his warhorse (e.g. Lys. 16.6-7) \textsuperscript{33}. We first hear of this loan in the 420s (e.g. Eup. fr. 293) \textsuperscript{34}. But both subsidies, presumably, were introduced as part of the corps’s expansion in the later 440s. Certainly they would make it easier to find the three times more recruits that were now required. A horseman had to pay back his \textit{katastasis} only at his retirement. Consequently it might have been possible to reduce what he owed the state by selling his warhorse. The most-reliable evidence for the cost of such horses comes from the lead tablets of the cavalry-headquarters that were discovered in the wells of the \textit{agora} (civic centre) and the Ceramicus \textsuperscript{35}. They recorded the market value of each corps-member’s horse \textsuperscript{36}. The prices of the 19 fourth-century tables that are legible average 408 dr \textsuperscript{37}.

A horseman also had his own slave \textit{hippokomos} (groom), who cared for his horse, and carried his equipment and supplies on campaign (Thuc. 7.75.5; Xen. \textit{Eq. Mag.} 4.4; 5.6) \textsuperscript{38}. Such personal servants never fought alongside their masters in battle (e.g. Xen. \textit{Eq. Mag.} 2.6) \textsuperscript{39}. A safe estimate for how much a horseman spent

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{31} For the first usage see e.g. [Arist.] \textit{Ath. Pol.} 7.4; Thuc. 3.16.1. For the second see e.g. Ar. \textit{Eq.} 225, 550; Xen. \textit{Eq. Mag.} 1.2,3.  
\textsuperscript{32} Migeotte 2014, pp. 559-563.  
\textsuperscript{33} Bugh 1988, pp. 56 s.; Spence 1993, pp. 183, 279; Pritchard 2010, pp. 48 s.; Spence 2010, pp. 113 s.; Pishedda 2013, pp. 81 s.  
\textsuperscript{34} With Spence 2010, pp. 121 s.  
\textsuperscript{36} Kroll 1977, pp. 97-100.  
\textsuperscript{37} Spence 1993, pp. 274-277.  
\textsuperscript{38} Pishedda 2013, p. 79.  
\textsuperscript{39} Welwei 1974, I, p. 88; Hunt 1998, pp. 1-101; Crowley 2012, p. 199 nt. 283.}
on his slave’s horse is probably 100 dr. This is the lowest recorded price for a horse in the cavalry-archive and literary sources (Ar. Nub. 21-3; Isae. 5.43; Lys. 7.10; Xen. An. 7.8.6).

Horsemen probably retired after 10 to 15 years. By their early 30s they would have found increasingly difficult the physical demands of training and campaigning ([Arist.] Ath. Pol. 49.2; Xen. Eq. Mag. 1.2,9). Many now had new social responsibilities as the kurioi (masters) of households, while some, no doubt, had started political careers. Significantly the average depreciation of a warhorse was 100 dr. per year. This meant that a corps-member could have used the sale of his horse to reduce his katastasis only if he retired within 3 to 4 years. It is most likely that the council would not have let a horsemen retire so far short of a regular service-period. Therefore hippeis ultimately had to pay for their horses and those of their slave grooms out of their own pockets.

Xenophon wrote that the Athenian state spent «nearly 40 talents (t.)» to have a cavalry-corps that was always ready for battle (Eq. Mag. 1.19). This sum provided year-round pay for 1000 horsemen at the rate of 4 obols (ob.) per day. This misthos (pay) was the second subsidy that the state gave corps-members. What survives of Against Theozotides by Lysias confirms that this daily rate of 4 ob. went back to the last years of the fifth century. This speech attacked Theozotides for two proposals that he had put to the assembly in, most probably, 403/2. A fragment shows that one of them was about the misthos of horsemen (fr. 6.73-9 Gernet and Bizos): «On war this Theozotides put forward the motion that the hippeis would receive as pay (misthophorein) 4 ob. instead of 1 dr. and the mounted archers 8 ob. instead of 2 dr.».

In 403/2 the Athenians faced a significant shortfall in their state budget (Lys. 30.22). At the same time they simply loathed their cavalry-corps (e.g. Lys. 16.6-7; Xen. Hell. 3.1.4), because its members had committed violent crimes as part of the oligarchy of 404/3. Consequently it is not so surprising that assemblygoers accepted the proposal of Theozotides to target this corps for spending-cuts (Lys. fr. 6.79-81).

This fragment confirms that Athenian horsemen had earned 50 percent more before this speech. Misthos for the corps’s core group of 1000 was probably halved as it was for the other military wings in 412/11. Therefore, before this last date,

---

40 Bugh 1988, pp. 62-75, 158; Pischedda 2013, p. 80.  
42 Spence 1993, p. 183.  
45 With Loomis 1995.  
46 Stroud 1971, p. 298.  
48 For this general pay-cut see Loomis 1998, pp. 45 s. The normal term for all military pay was misthos.
the corps’s core group of 1000 could have been paid 3 times what they would earn during the Corinthian War (cf. Thuc. 5.47.6). At this higher rate their misthos probably accounted for 10 percent of the state’s annual income. Certainly pay for them was introduced before 434/3 (IG I.138.7-9).

5. The Social Background of the Horsemen

The cavalry-corps demanded a lot of time from its members. Even in peacetime they constantly trained and engaged in public activities. In times of war they often had to drop everything for an immediate deployment. These time-demands would have made it difficult for them to run farms or businesses. Importantly pay of 4 ob. was not enough to cover a horseman’s day-to-day expenses. I.G. Spence has carefully calculated how a member of the fourth-century corps had to spend between 3 ob. and 1 dr. per day (and considerably more during shortages) on grain for his horse and that of his hippokomos. He did not receive any extra pay on campaign either. There is simply no evidence for the old view that hippeis earned 1 dr. per day in the field. In an assembly-speech of 352/1 Demosthenes proposed that the horsemen of the year-round amphibious forces that he was proposing should receive 1 dr. But his whole proposal was rejected by the deños. In a treatise from around the same time Xenophon implied that the cavalry-corps’s pay-rate had long remained unchanged. After 403/2 what Athens paid corps-members usually only paid for their horses. Consequently it was the citizens who did not have to earn a living that were the most able to be hippeis.

The classical Athenians believed that such skholē (leisure) was the preserve of the wealthy (e.g. Ar. Plut. 281; Vesp. 552-7; Men. Dys. 293-5). Wealthy Athenians usually had family homes not only in their ancestral demes but also in the city or the Piraeus (e.g. Aeschin. 1.97; Isae. 11.40-3; Lys. 20.11-12). The cavalry-corps’s peacetime activities took place in or near the astu (urban centre). The wealthy’s ability to live close to them was another reason why they were

(Cook 1990, pp. 78 s.; Loomis 1998, pp. 33-36, 49). A reduction of a horseman’s misthos from 2 to 1 dr. meant that it would cover not much more than the cost of his horse’s grain (see below). Consequently it is telling that in the accounts of Athena’s treasury for 410/9 the payments to the cavalry-corps are called, not misthos, but sitos or grain (IG I.3.375.4,8-9,11-12,24).

49 In 432/1 this income was 1000 t. (Xen. An. 7.1.27; Pritchard 2015, p. 92).
51 E.g. Robbins 1918, p. 378.
53 Pritchard 2013, p. 4; Roubineau 2015, pp. 88 s.
54 Osborne 1985, pp. 47-50, 69; Pritchard 2015, p. 58.
55 E.g. Ar. Eq. 119-120; Xen. Eq. Mag. 1.18; 2.2-3.14.
more able than the poor to be horsemen. Certainly a much smaller percentage of Athenians served as *hippeis* than as hoplites. The former were aged between 20 and 32.5 years. We simply lack the evidence to reconstruct the age-structure of the ancient Greeks. This means that we can only estimate the percentage of citizens in this age-band on the basis of a model-life table and the assumption of a stable population. The most used tables of this kind were formulated by A. Coale and P. Demeny in the 1960s. M.H. Hansen has pioneered their use for ancient Greek demography. Of the Coale Demeny tables Hansen shows that the model-west table with mortality-level 4 best suits the conditions of antiquity. On this model-life table those who are aged between 20 and 32.5 years account for 37.2 percent. At the time that Xenophon wrote his guide for hipparchs the number of adult citizens living in was approaching 30,000. Of this last figure 37.2 percent is 11,160. Therefore in the mid-fourth century the 1000 horsemen represented 9.0 percent of those in their age-band.

Before 412/11 Athenian horsemen were probably paid treble. Daily *misthos* of 2 dr. per day could have also covered their own living-expenses. It would have removed a barrier to non-elite participation in the cavalry-corps. Nevertheless belonging to this branch was still a lot more expensive than participating in the hoplite corps. Admittedly some of the participation-costs were comparable. A horseman was also responsible for his own arms and armour (e.g. Xen. *Eq. Mag.* 1.23). He was also expected to bring a slave with him on campaign. But a *hippeus* had to buy his horse and another for his groom. Together they cost around 500 dr. This was the equivalent of 2 years of wages for a skilled labourer. The need for horses made being a horseman roughly 10 times more expensive than being a hoplite. Of course the state could lend him the money to buy his warhorse. But he was required to pay it all back at his retirement. This must have been daunting to everyone except those who knew that they would inherit enough to cover a *katastasis*. From the corps’s creation in the 450s the cost of horses was clearly another reason why the wealthy were most able to join up.

---

56 In the late 430s 30 percent of Athenians in the age-band for active military service were hoplites (Pritchard 2010, pp. 21-23). By the 320s this had risen to 50 percent (pp. 54 s.).
57 Hansen 1986, pp. 9-11.
58 Coale-Demeny 1966.
60 Hansen 1986, pp. 11-12.
61 The age-bands of the Coale-Demeny tables each span 5 years. With Hansen’s chosen table we must therefore divide into two the population-percentage that 30-34 year-olds account for. In doing so I use the relevant Beers multiplier in order to preserve the uneven spread of population within this age-band.
63 Spence 1993, pp. 49-65; Hunt 2007, p. 118; Pishedda 2013, p. 79.
64 For the cost of a hoplite’s kit see e.g. van Wees 2004, pp. 52, 267 nt. 14; Hunt 2007, p. 116; Crowley 2012, p. 31.
There is no doubt that the fifth century’s *hippeis* were more prosperous as a group than the hoplites. The first indication of this is the poll tax that Athens imposed on its land forces in order to pay for the Lyceum’s maintenance. Soldiers used this athletics field for musters before going on a campaign (Ar. *Pax* 354-355)\(^{65}\). This tax, which was introduced before 434/3, was levied at 2 dr. per year for horsemen, 1 dr. for hoplites and 3 ob. for archers (*IG* I.138.1-4)\(^{66}\). These different rates, presumably, were based on what the members of each corps could pay. The second indication comes from Aristophanes. His *Knights* of 425/4 characterised the core group of 1000 *hippeis* as wealthy (e.g. 225, 266, 579-580, 842, 1369-1372; cf. Xen. *Eq. Mag.* 9.5-6)\(^{67}\). At the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war there were 60,000 adult Athenians living in Attica\(^{68}\). This suggests that in 432/1 these 1000 horsemen represented only 4.5 percent of those in their age-band.

Clearly «those who were most able in terms of money» were the wealthy. Therefore a hipparch would have focussed his recruitment-efforts on this social class. Simply belonging to it made a physically fit young Athenian liable for service as a horseman. The *demos*, no doubt, introduced this liability at the same time as they expanded the cavalry-corps. It served as another means for them to find the extra recruits that were now required. Yet the Athenian state never set an income or property qualification for elite-membership\(^{69}\). It simply lacked the means of independently assessing the personal wealth of its citizens\(^{70}\). Instead being identified as wealthy was a matter of perception: a citizen belonged to this stratum if he and his family did what the wealthy normally did. Elite Athenians set themselves apart by paying the *eisphora* and performing expensive liturgies\(^{71}\). The *eisphora* was an intermittent tax on property to pay for war. The wealthy also pursued pastimes that were too expensive and time-consuming for the poor\(^{72}\). One such pastime was *hippotrophia* (horse-keeping)\(^{73}\). The hipparchs usually drew recruits from families that already engaged in it (e.g. Eup. fr. 293; Lys. 19.63; Xen. *Eq. Mag.* 9.6). Classical-period writers saw *hippotrophia* as a sign of wealth\(^{74}\). Aristotle wrote that it was «not easy to do for those who were not wealthy» (Pol. 1289b.33-36).

Consequently wealthy young Athenians expected that they would keep horses

---

66 On its date see Jameson 1980, p. 216; Pritchard 2015, p. 18.
67 Bugh 1988, p. 222; Pischedda 2013, p. 77.
71 For the wealthy as liturgists see e.g. Davies 1981, pp. 9-14. For their paying of the *eisphora* see e.g. Antiph. 2.3,8; Ar. *Eq.* 923-6; Dem. 4.7; 10.37; 27.66; Lys. 22.13; 27.9-10; Christ 2007, p. 54.
72 Pritchard 2013, pp. 4-6; Roubineau 2015, pp. 89-94.
74 E.g. Aesch. *PV* 465-6; Arist. *Pol.* 1321a.5-15; Pl. *Meno* 70a-b; Isae. 5.43.
(e.g. Xen. *Eq. Mag.* 1.12). Their fathers, however, who knew that they would have to pick up the bill, shared the popular concern that the *hippotrophia* of a son could ruin a family’s fortune. It is significant that the state’s subsidisation of participation in the cavalry-corps could reduce what an elite family spent on horses. If a son joined up, his father knew that he would have one less horse to feed. He could reasonably expect that it would eventually be his son who would pay for his warhorse either out of his inheritance or when he had become the *kurios* (master) of their household. He could hope that by being a horsemen his son would satisfy his expectation about *hippotrophia* and so be less inclined to ask for more horses. Wealthy families had a clear financial incentive for urging their sons to be part of the cavalry-corps.

In his recruiting-efforts, however, a hipparch did not always get his way. An individual who had been targeted as a possible recruit presumably could be let off, if he could not afford to service. This, certainly, was the case in 320s ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 49.2). But asking for such an exemption could come at a high social price: if, in spite of the state’s subsidies, an individual was still not able to be a horseman, it was clear that he and his family sat below the stratum that engaged in *hippotrophia*. Consequently refusing to serve cast into serious doubt a family’s claim of elite-membership. The state’s efforts to get elite Athenians to serve as *hippeis* thus had two sides: it subsidised the *hippotrophia* of those who joined up and ensured that those who refused to do so faced a credible risk of a loss of social standing.

6. Epilogue: The Mounted Archers

The cavalry-corps gained 200 *hippotoxotai* as part of its expansion in the later 440s (Andoc. 3.5; Thuc. 2.13.8). The horses that these mounted archers rode were owned by the state (Lys. 15.5). Consequently they were not required to pay back a *katastasis*. After 412/11 they were always paid twice as much as the 1000 horsemen (Lys. fr. 6.73-81). This heavier state subsidisation suggests that the *hippotoxotai* were considerably less able personally to bear the cost of their corps-membership. It strengthens the case that they were not part of the elite from which the horsemen came (e.g. Lys. 15.6; Pl. *Leg.* 834d). Athenians certainly served as mounted archers (e.g. [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 24.3). Indeed there is no unequivocal evidence that metics served alongside them. *Hippotoxotai* could be deployed inde-

---

75 E.g. Ar. *Nub.* 1-24, 97-99, 112-113; *Pax* 135-139; *Hyper.* 1.16; Thuc. 6.12.2; 6.15.3; Pritchard 2013, pp. 133-136.
76 With Bugh 1988, p. 135.
77 With Loomis 1995.
78 Bugh 1988, p. 223.
79 Puce Spence 2010, p. 112. The only possible evidence is *IG* I.1192.158-159 where a name, after
pendently of the rest of the corps. In 416/15 30 mounted archers served by themselves at Melos where they were used «for raiding isolated farms and hamlets perhaps» (Thuc. 5.84.1-2) 80. They, like the peripoloi (patrollers), could, it seems, be sent out as Attica's first defenders during an enemy invasion (Ar. Av. 1177-8) 81. They were also, of course, deployed as part of larger cavalry forces (e.g. Thuc. 6.94.4). In such deployments they were not spread across the 10 phulai, but formed their own unit under the command of a hipparch (Xen. Mem. 3.3.1). By the time that Xenophon wrote his guide for such commanders hippotoxotai were no longer a part of the cavalry-corps. We last hear of them during the Corinthian War (Lys. 15.5-6) 82.
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