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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines Hipparchos, the son of Peisistratos, and the years 528-514 B.C. at Athens. Modern scholarship has generally adjudged Hipparchos a powerless, dissolute aesthete on the basis of Thucydides' testimonia about Hipparchos' murder. Yet, it is clear from other sources that Hipparchos was much more, perhaps even the most important Peisistratid after Peisistratos' death, certainly the most visible. The purpose of this dissertation is to shed new light on this important period by aiming at a better understanding of Hipparchos.

Chapter I concerns Hipparchos' image and is a compilation of testimonia relevant to him. The introduction to the chapter attempts to illustrate the importance of image to Greek tyrants of the archaic period and to show that image can be useful as an indicator of tyrannical power. The remainder of the chapter is divided into the archaeological and literary records of Hipparchos. Sections are devoted to Hipparchos' herms, the wall of the Akademy and his Ptoion dedication. The literary record is divided into external affairs (Hipparchos and Ionia), internal/external affairs (the Onomakritos-affair), and internal affairs (the Panathenaia and Hipparchos). The conclusion is that Hipparchos was far more prominent than his brother Hippias and much more significant than previously believed.

Chapter II confronts the historiographical problem of succession to Peisistratos. It is divided into examination of the stele concerning the adikia of the tyrants, Thucydides' most important evidence for the succes-
sion, and the literary tradition about the succession. (An appendix examines the evidence of the sixth century archon-list.) The conclusion is that the succession-issue became controversial in the fifth century, apparently well after the end of the tyranny.

Chapter III deals with Thucydides' account of Hipparchos' murder. Sections are given to accounts before Thucydides', but later accounts are considered only as they differ from his on specific points. Thucydides' account is examined in two sections: motivation of the tyrannicides and the act itself. The conclusion is that Thucydides was quite probably influenced by his own preconceptions to read his beliefs into a substructure of earlier material. The evidence for this is inconsistency and implausibility in Thucydides' account.

An epilogue considers Hipparchos' influence over later prominent Athenians and the city itself.
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INTRODUCTION

Historically, the years 528 - 514 B.C. at Athens are vaguely known and largely unexplored. Little evidence has survived to shed light on the events from Peisistratos' death to the death of his son, Hipparchos. Modern views of the period are based for the most part on inference and reconstruction from reasonability. Much of what has been reconstructed or inferred rests upon the testimony of Thucydides, who in Book VI (54-59) recounts Hipparchos' murder. On the basis of that testimony, we assume that Hippias succeeded his father in 528 and that his brother Hipparchos contented himself with the role of aesthete and patron of poets. It is further assumed that Hippias ruled much as his father had until his fragile alliance with the great families of Athens, such as the Alkmaionidai and the Philaidai, apparently broke down. The result was Hipparchos' murder. It is generally believed that, throughout the period, Hippias remained quiet and ruled unobtrusively, desiring not to offend the Athenian aristocracy, but that Hipparochos, to the contrary, acted tyrannically and paid the price because of his behaviour. These assumptions are actually paradoxical: if Hippias was tyrant, why would Hipparchos appear to be tyrant? Again, how could Hippias conciliate the Athenian aristocracy if he allowed Hipparchos to flaunt the power of the tyranny? The reconstruction thus seems unsatisfactory.

Of the little solid evidence from our sources that pertains to the period, much concerns Hipparchos, not Hippias. Indeed, even from cursory study of what is said about Hipparchos in Herodotos and in other authors'
works and from his archaeological record, it is clear that Hipparchos was a much more substantial figure than modern scholarship has allowed. In general, Hipparchos has been dismissed as a dandy who "...had a reputation for dissolute arrogance". Again, this judgement arises from Thucydides' assessment of the tyrannicide. Yet it is clear that Thucydides has adopted a polemical approach to the importance of the tyrannicide and his views may not be untouched by that attitude.

This dissertation aims primarily at clarifying Hipparchos' status and importance in his own time away from the polemic and controversy of later authors. To achieve this aim, the dissertation is divided into two main sections: examination of Hipparchos' archaeological and literary records (Chapter I) and of the historiographical problems about him that derive from Thucydides (Chapters II and III). The first chapter is largely concerned with Hipparchos' image and acts as a preface to the following chapters. The introduction of this chapter is a study of the importance of image to Greek tyrants of the archaic period; the conclusion examines Hipparchos' designation in Herodotos as lion, an apparent allusion to power. Quite clearly, Hipparchos appears to have been a wealthy, powerful man who greatly outshone all Athenians of his day, including Hippias, in the same way as Peisistratos and other tyrants were luminous. Hippias, to the contrary, was silent and nearly invisible during the period. This very low profile is especially anomalous in view of Peisistratos' example.

With this new perspective on Hipparchos in mind, it is possible to confront the historiographical problems affecting him. The purpose of the dissertation's second section is two-fold: to determine what Thucydides wrote about Hipparchos and to discover, if possible, why Thucydides wrote what he did. Thucydides' strongest evidence for his views about the
succession, the subject of Chapter II, is the stele concerning the \textit{adikia} of
the tyrants. Yet, there are reasons to question Thucydides' conclusions,
e.g., the stele Thucydides saw was probably not set up before 480. On the
other hand, the Archedike-epigram, which derives from an early part of the
fifth century, seems to show that the Peisistratidai ranked themselves
collectively. It is quite possible that Thucydides was locked into an argu-
ment for Hippias' primacy that precluded considering the possibility of a
shared rule.

Indeed, there are clear inconsistencies in Thucydides' account of
Hipparchos' murder, the subject of Chapter III. It appears that Thucydides'
dedication to his argument about the importance of Hipparchos and the
tyannicide compelled him to force his preconceptions onto a substructure
of facts that yield only imperfectly to those preconceptions. It is a
secondary aim of this chapter to bring to light that substructure and to
explore its implications for Thucydides' account and for our own understand-
ing of the tyrannicide.
Notes
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I. THE IMAGE OF HIPPARCHOS

1. Introduction: The Appearance of Tyranny

"Good fortune is first of prizes,
good repute is second; he who attains
these two and grasps them in his hands
is given the uttermost garland."

Pindar, Pyth. 1.98-100

These words have some significance for an assessment of the image of Hipparchos: for to estimate his importance reasonably accurately, he must be viewed in his own time away from the polemics of later writers and be judged on the basis of what he appeared to be in his time. Such an examination and its resultant impression will not be devoid of worth, however, because archaic Greeks made far less distinction between appearances and realities. A man was what he appeared to be: if he was lucky, he reported it; if he was wealthy, he displayed it; if he was powerful, he lorded it. Things were real, not subtle, and men measured themselves and their accomplishments by comparisons. Thus, appearance suggested substance and substance was assuring and therefore admirable and enviable. Like tyrants and other powerful men of his day, Hipparchos displayed wealth and power. I do not mean to say by this that such appearance can be reliably used to indicate that Hipparchos was the tyrant of Athens after Peisistratos, but only that he apparently shared an attitude common among tyrants and so could easily have generated the belief that he was the tyrant for lack of more substantive evidence. The concept of appearance and its bearing on
the comportment of tyrants must, however, be kept in mind while Hipparchos' projects and endeavours are examined, chiefly because appearance was important to the tyrants of the day and because Hipparchos' appearance contrasts so sharply with the near invisibility of Hippias before 514.

Tyranny in archaic Greece was never clandestine. Tyrants wished to be recognized for what they were: men who, with a measure of divine aid, had gained preeminence among their fellows. They were eudaimones, special among men and blessed:

"The great mind of Zeus guides

the angel in the men he loves."

Such men naturally wanted others to know of their fortune and so wished to publicize the differences between themselves and common folk. Andrewes observes: "If his courtiers called him king or tyrant, it was a recognition of his power and enhanced his prestige.... The tyrant did not try to conceal the fact of his power but rather advertised it, knowing that the ordinary man would at least half admire him for it." Simonides sets out the popular conception of the motivations of tyrants in Xenophon's Hieron:

"...you (sc. tyrants) rush headlong to it (sc. tyranny) so that you are honoured, that all will obey you in all things unquestioningly, that all will look upon you, that all by words and deeds may glorify you whoever is around you." Any concealment will have detracted from the tyrant by muting the differences worthy of peculiar honour.

Power and wealth were sources for honour in archaic Greece and were confirmed by display:

"Wide is the strength of Wealth

when, mixed with stainless virtue

and granted of destiny, mortal man leads it home...."
Simonides says in the Hieron: "The ochlos forms its opinion of one man's luck (εὐσκημονία) and another's lack by seeing. Tyranny offers its precious possessions outspread for all to see." Wealth was the distinction that set the tyrant above the common folk, for it was the assurance of surfeit and security, of coveted luxuries that were denied the ordinary Greek. Kroisos' wealth caused him to consider himself the most fortunate of men (δυνατός) and earned him undying reputation through his display of it:

"The generous achievement of Kroisos fades not."

Secret wealth or undisplayed power would have earned nothing whatsoever for its possessor; memorability and respect were won by examples of wealth demonstrated for all the Greeks to see.

One of the Greeks most impressed with such display was Herodotos, whose history is replete with the report of fabulous dedications made by rich and powerful men of the archaic period. Like other Greeks of his day, Herodotos visited Hellenic shrines and sanctuaries, such as at Delphoi, where he noted the sumptuous gifts of men who controlled power and wanted repute among their fellow Greeks: Kypselos, Herodotos observed, was really responsible for the splendid treasury of the Korinthians at Delphoi. In it was housed the remarkable censer of Eleutherion, the tyrant of Cyprian Salamis. The gold statue of Alexander Philhellene of Macedon was used by Herodotos to orient his readers, implying that many would know it well. Greeks who, like Herodotos, came to Delphoi or other sanctuaries would have been impressed by such rich offerings as Herodotos was and would have taken back report of them to their own towns or villages. The reputation of the dedicator would grow and grow.

Similarly, to the shrines during festival-times would come Greeks from all parts of the Hellenic world to witness the games. It was then that a
tyrant or powerful man could hope to impress, literally, all Greece with his wealth and good fortune. For wealth enabled the tyrant or powerful man to compete in the lordliest of all competitions, the four-horse chariot-race. And if his team won for him at Olympia or at the Pythia, his name would be proclaimed victor before the assembled Greeks. Proof of *eudaimonia* was thus witnessed by the assembly, who then dispersed each to his own city with the talk:

"Great is his fame always whom your bright victory befalls."

Such were the power and prestige involved in the games that, it seems, some tyrants sought to acquire established games or to set up their own. Control of the games could help ensure confirmation of *eudaimonia*, for a tyrant might then influence the outcome of contests and competitions. This seems to have been the course of Pheidon of Argos who acquired control over the Olympic games and substituted his own *agonothetai* for the traditional Eleian judges. Kleisthenes of Sikyon, on the other hand, devised his own version of the Pythia at Sikyon and it is likely that Peisistratos influenced the competitions of the Greater Panathenaia. Control of domestic games, which were less prestigious than their panhellenic counterparts, nevertheless offered the advantage to tyrants of controlling the limelight: the entire event could be made to reflect upon the tyrant and his accomplishments.

No less important than the victory was its publication and its publicizer. The publicizer *par excellence* of the later archaic period was, of course, Pindar of Thebes. Pindar was quite conscious of his important role:

"And I, lighting a city beloved with a blaze of whirling song,
swifter than the proud horse
or winged ship on the sea,
will carry the message
everywhere...."

Pindar emulated other publicists:
"For other kings other men have given
the high sound of song, requital of their achievement."

And he was conscious of song's effect:
"The vaunt of reputation to come
alone attests the life of those who are gone,
in song and story."

The same sentiment was echoed a century later in prose by Isokrates for
Nikon, the son of Evagoras of Salamis: "If report (λόγος) well recounts
his deeds, it would make for all men never to be forgotten the arete of
Evagoras." The praise of immortality became mere flattery for the clever
court-poets such as Ibykos:
"...and you, Polykrates, shall have fame undying
in song as my fame will."

The deed that would legitimately win glory for its doer had become superfluous for the inspiration of the court-poet who now could consciously purvey
immortality to his patron without it.

Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos in the third quarter of the sixth century, retained such court-poets as Ibykos and Anakreon, the author of skolia
and other banquet-poetry. Anakreon repaid his patron with frequent mention
in his poetry. When Polykrates was murdered and Samos fell, Anakreon was
fetched to Athens from Samos on a pentekonter by Hipparchos. At court
in Athens were also Simonides of Keos and Lasos of Hermione, the reputed
inventor of the dithyramb. When the Peisistratids were expelled from Athens, Simonides proceeded first to the courts of Thessaly, to the Aleuadai and Skopadai, and then, perhaps, to the splendid realms of the tyrants of Sicily. Simonides was reputedly fond of money and the mobility of the poets of the day suggests that their services were available to the highest bidder: indeed, there is some reason to believe that tyrants like Polykrates engaged in bidding wars to secure the presence at court of eminent men. Now the mere presence at court of the renowned, who were ready to do the bidding of the tyrant and so glorify him, became an indication of power and wealth.

As I have already stated, tyrants were better able to display their distinctions at home than abroad: only the imprudent citizen would seek to compete with a tyrant for reputation at home. In fact, few at home could hope to match the vast outlay possible for the controllers of state revenues. Great temples and public works could be financed from the common fund and these edifices would become identified with their dedicators. For example, the colossal temple of Hera at Samos was Polykrates', while the temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens was, throughout antiquity, attributed to the Peisistratids. The grand scale of these monuments could not be duplicated by private individuals.

The fountain-house was a cleverly devised combination of practical benefaction and grandiose display. Less imposing certainly than the mammoth temples, fountain-houses were nevertheless useful and practical and undoubtedly prized by the native folk for their convenience. They were a place of daily congregation, especially for women, and their donors could be sure that their dedications could be daily observed. Indeed, travellers even in late antiquity were still quite sure that Peisistratos had dedicated the
Enneakrounos fountain.

Personal display was easier still for tyrants and undoubtedly more agreeable. The common view held that tyrants enjoyed the very best that life in Greece could offer: they possessed the finest houses, servants, horses, arms and clothing. The tyrant's table, it was thought, was always filled with the choicest of delicacies in never-ending supply. Daily proof of eudaimonia could best be expressed in conspicuous consumption, for the commons could best appreciate what they themselves lacked, i.e., comfortable abundance.

Displays of power and wealth would inform have-nots of the tyrant's extraordinary lot by simple contrast. To show this difference, tyrants courted attention, not an anonymity that could be interpreted as shame occasioned by lack of material wealth. Clandestine wealth and power were useless, foreign to archaic Greek tyrants, for all eyes must be upon them. Ostentation to gain repute among the Greeks was an important part of archaic tyranny.

I have made this case to introduce the examination of Hipparchos' image. Of all the persons and events that pertain to Hipparchos, there are none that can specifically pertain to Hippias for the same period (528-514). This contrast provides some circumstantial evidence for the greater importance of Hipparchos during those years and must be kept in mind during the survey of evidence concerning Hipparchos. It does not by any means prove that Hipparchos was tyrant, but it is significant that Hippias, unlike Peisistratos, Hipparchos, or even his son, Peisistratos, has left nothing by way of dedication or public work or a record of activity before 514. This silence is anomalous, even for Athens.

This examination of information pertaining to Hipparchos will proceed in
two parts, the archaeological record and the literary one, which, of course, will be further subdivided. I shall present a composite survey based on evidence at the end of the examination.
2. The Archaeological Record

A. Hipparchos' Herms

"When he had educated those citizens around the city and they marveled at him for his wisdom, he thought to educate those in the countryside and so put up herms for them by the sides of roads in between the city and each deme. Then he selected from the wisdom that he had learned and that he had discovered the things he thought best, and, turning them into elegies, wrote them as poems and as examples of wisdom. He did this first of all in order that the citizens might not admire those wise things written in Delphi, such as KNOW THYSELF and NOTHING TOO MUCH and other such things, but that they might think his sayings wiser. Second, he did it in order that those going to and fro would read and taste of his wisdom and would come in from the fields to be educated completely. There are two inscriptions of his: on the left of each herm is written Hermes saying that he stands between city and deme midway (ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ δῆμου καὶ τοῦ δήμου), on the right he says:

THIS IS A MEMORIAL OF HIPPARCHOS: WALK INTENT ON JUSTICE.

There are many other beautiful epigrams on other herms: there is even this one on the Steiria road that says:

THIS IS A MEMORIAL OF HIPPARCHOS: DECEIVE NOT A FRIEND.

[Plato] Hipparchos, 228c-229b
The author of this dialogue, which is ascribed to Plato and generally dated to the fourth century B.C., was familiar with Hipparchos' herms in some form. They were already famous, however, in Old Comedy as Harpokration (s.v. Ἐρμαῖ) shows: ὅτι δὲ ἐπιλογεὶ τινες καὶ Ἰππάρχεος Ἐρμαῖ ἀπὸ Ἰππάρχου τοῦ Πεισιστράτου ἔρπηκε ἐν τῇ ἄρχῃ κυρωδίᾳ καὶ παρὰ Πλάτωνι ἐν τῷ Ἰππάρχῳ. The herms are thus attested in literature no later than the fifth century B.C.

The existence of the herms in the sixth century B.C. has been confirmed in this century. Kirchner and Dow rediscovered a fragment of an inscription from what must have been a Hipparchan herm. The letters of the inscription had originally been transcribed by the Abbé Fourmont in the early eighteenth century but the herm had been subsequently lost from then until its rediscovery in 1935; Fourmont's transcription was published as IG I² 837:

[ἘΝ] ΜΗΣΟΙ ΚΕΦΑΛΕΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΣΤΕΟΣ, ΑΝΕΡ, [Η]Ο ΗΕΡΜΗΣ

Peek, in a preliminary study sanctioned by Kirchner and Dow, offered the following emended reading of Fourmont's transcription:

[ἘΝ] ΜΗΣΟΙ ΚΕΦΑΛΕΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΣΤΕΟΣ ΑΓΛΑΟΣ ΗΕΡΜΗΣ

Clearly, the line found on the herm and that attested in the Hipparchos are nearly identical.

The state of the stone was such that it permitted reasonable conclusions about its original proportions and even added some new information about herms. The preserved height (1.291 m.) was probably the original height of this surviving element of the herm, which was composed of parts: the top and bottom had apparently been smoothed for anathyrosis. The bottom of the preserved stone fitted onto a stone base and the head was attached separately on top, making the combined height of the separate elements, of
course, more than that of the element preserved. From the herm's later use, it was also possible to determine what was probably its original breadth: half an encircled cross survived inscribed in the stone, which allowed the herm's breadth to be calculated at .28 m. The herm's original thickness was about .17 m., although it tapered from bottom to top. Spurs .16 m. from the top of the stone indicated that brackets had existed.

The lettering of the stone does not correspond exactly to the description in the Hipparchos. In the text, the hexameter is said to have appeared on the left, while the pentameter was inscribed on the right. On the herm, it is just the opposite: the right side carries the hexameter, while the left (presumably) carried the pentameter. Peek rightly observed that this variation should cause no difficulty: "Es darf auch a priori bezweifelt werden, dass die Hermen des Hipparch wirklich alle so uniform waren, wie es nach dem Dialog der Anschein hat." Indeed, the author's personal acquaintance with the herms may not have been extensive and he perhaps generalized on the basis of his induction. It cannot be fortuitous, however, that the words on the stone so closely match the text of the verse given in the Hipparchos.

The fragment confirms the existence of herms set up by Hipparchos in the sixth century. From the agreement between text and stone, we may take it that the herms were erected midway between city and deme, that each one declared itself to be Hermes, and that the herms were μνήμεια of Hipparchos that included his moral γνώμαι, which the passer-by must have identified with Hipparchos.

It is of course important to discover if possible the primary purpose of the Ηερμαί. Were they road-signs or markers, shrines or memorials of Hipparchos? Or were they designed to combine the political, the religious
and the practical? Most of all, what did they mean to Athens, Attica and Hipparchos? Are they important?

Possibly the most significant thing about the herms is that they are the first known square herms to have appeared in Greece. Herodotos (II.51) states that the Athenians first of all the Greeks adopted the herm-form from the Pelasgians, the pre-Hellenic inhabitants of the Aegean basin. Earlier he had said (I.57.3) that the Athenians were themselves Pelasgian and he seems to be distinguishing between Pelasgians of the city and Pelasgians of the countryside. The Pelasgians had settlements in olden times around the foot of Mount Hymettos and their depredations finally caused the Athenians of the city to drive them from Attica. Obviously, the Athenians learned of the herm-form while the Pelasgians were still in Attica. What Herodotos seems to be saying is that the herm-form appeared first in the Attic countryside and Pausanias (IV.33.3) affirms that connection.

Hipparchos' herms, however, had far greater impact than any of their predecessors. Marwitz notes that herms do not appear on vase-paintings before 520 and the profusion of herms throughout Attica can be dated from that period. The novelty of the herms attracted the attention of vase-painters from the early fifth century. One painting by the Pan-painter (480-50) shows a boy running to market past a herm set up upon a stone base. Beazley's ascription of the herm in the painting as Hipparchan is very attractive because the boy running to market would naturally be expected to use a road as the quickest way to town. On the Pan-painter's name-vase, Pan chases a boy past an apparently wooden herm somewhere in the countryside. This herm was perhaps a rustic precursor of Hipparchos' stone herms. On the other hand, it may be that not all Hipparchos' herms were of stone: a cup by Epiktetos (520-490) shows a boy apparently carving a
wooden herm surrounded by the inscription ΗΙΠΑΡΧΟΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ. It is tempting to see in this painting an indication of the popularity of Hipparchos' herms.

The herms themselves seem to have originated as piles of stones (επίκοτι), heaped by roadsides, perhaps by travellers. In time, the growing cairns acquired daimon, becoming sacred as well as familiar landmarks to their passers-by. It has been suggested that the herms evolved gradually: piles of stone were surmounted by aniconic pillars or posts, perhaps more to define the daimon, and these in turn acquired their more familiar semi-human form. Miller has proposed that the traces of anathyrosis atop the surviving fragment of the Hipparchan herm do indeed indicate that its head was attached separately and that this in turn indicates almost the precise moment in the evolution of the herm-form when the aniconic slab acquired its human head.

How the herms came to be identified with Hermes is unclear. The natural assumption, that the god's name came from the word for these piles of stones, is unlikely because Hermes was known to the Mykenaians as Hermes and because Priapos was also identified with the herm-form. Others have suggested that the herms depict Hermes as the Guide, a function most notable in Homer, or as the Psychopompos, since semata of the dead are frequently found along Greek roads. Goldman believed that Hermes acquired the function of a rural Dionysos and that the herms were ritually dressed at weddings in the countryside; Farnell that Hermes was originally a pastoral god like Pan. Perhaps the best view is that the herm-form was parented by "one of those indigenous godlets who were afterwards confused or identified with Priapos" or Hermes.

Hipparchos' herms must be linked with Hermes who leads the traveller,
since, of course, the herms were erected primarily with the traveller in mind. But Herodotos' information about the origin of the herm-form surely indicates that the herms were rural to begin with. Hipparchos apparently blended the form indigenous to the countryside with Hermes' Homeric function as the Guide.

There may be something more to Hipparchos' interest in Hermes than as a rural godlet, for in Hipparchos' day Hermes was much more than a local god or a mere guide to travellers. He was also the Thief, popular in literature and art. Brown has outlined the possibility of a very special relationship between Hermes and Hipparchos that can account for the herms. There is perhaps some truth to it: interestingly, a Panathenaic prize-vase, dated c. 540, shows Athena in her traditional spear-throwing attitude, but curiously joined by Hermes. Of course, Hipparchos was a patron of the Panathenaic games. Brown also noted that the epithet used on the herm to describe Hermes, ἀγλαος, occurs also in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes. Brown argued that the Homeric Hymn, which was composed during the sixth century, was authored at Athens under the patronage of the poetically-inclined Hipparchos. His connections are, however, very tenuous.

It has also been suggested that Hipparchos' herms were introduced as part of a general improvement of Attic roads under the Peisistratidai that included the Altar of the Twelve Gods. The Altar was erected in the archonship of Peisistratos the Younger, the nephew of Hipparchos, in 522/1. By the fifth century, the Altar had become the central milestone of Athens, from which distances to outlying points were measured. Since the herms measured the distance between deme and city, the Altar of the Twelve Gods and Hipparchos' herms have been considered complementary and so jointly conceived. Some have even ventured to add that the Peisistratid road-
improvement was meant to benefit merchants who would use the roads and so improve commerce throughout Attica.

This connection is false. For, as far as I can tell, there is no proof of any Peisistratid road-improvement beyond the herms and the Altar. The herms cannot be taken as evidence of any such improvement since they were set up on existing roads and since their measurements are imprecise, unlike the measurements of the fifth century. Again, Hipparchos' herms measured the halfway point between deme and city, not deme and Altar, and so there is nothing to indicate any interdependence. The position of the Altar at the northwest corner of the Agora where the Panathenaic Way entered the Agora and where three important roads met made the Altar a logical point from which to compute distances later. What the Altar may have become in the fifth century cannot however be used to allege a relationship between it and the herms in the sixth century. Hipparchos' herms seem to have been independently conceived.

Crome, who took the testimony of the Hipparchos literally, estimated that more than one hundred herms were sprinkled throughout Attica, one for each deme. That is an extremely large number that would have required vast outlays of time and money. While it is not impossible that such numbers were actually constructed and erected, it seems likelier that the herms were set up along main roads that radiated to the major demes from Athens. Smaller demes would have been reached from these "trunklines" anyway.

It is abundantly clear that the primary intention of the herms was that they should be seen by those travelling to and from the country demes. Like the boy running to market on the Pan-painter's vase, the majority of those travelling the Attic roads were probably simple country folk who journeyed to Athens to buy and to sell at the market. The author of the
Hipparchos realized the connection between the location of the herms and the people who would notice them and reasoned that Hipparchos' intention was to educate the rustics. The herms were not meant primarily to inform the demesman of his place on the road in respect of Athens, for most demesmen had obviously made the trip to market countless times before Hipparchos' herms informed them that they were halfway from deme or city.

The herms were meant, however, to attract attention and that they undoubtedly did as the vase-paintings show. Their initial novelty combined with their solitary placement to draw the passer-by to look at the herm, perhaps to touch it for luck, and then to read the inscribed message. The herms can thus be compared with the funerary monuments set up along Attic roadsides, hailing the traveller:

Χαίρετε τοις παριέντες, ἐνώ καὶ θεεῖνην κατάκελεμεν:
δεῦρα ἵων ἄνακερμα, ἱνὴρ τίς τε ἑτέραπεται.  

Other couplets directed the onlooker to stop and ponder the message on the stone:

Ἄνθρωπε, ἄσ (σ)τειχεῖς καὶ τρίῳ ὄδον φρονοίν ἄλαμμα μενολυν,  
στηθή καὶ οἰκτερον σῆμα Θράσυνος ἱδὼν.  

These monuments reach out to the reader and communicate directly; they were undoubtedly set up by the sides of roads to attract the greatest number to view them. Indeed, great clusters of *semata* were similarly placed at crossroads and along well-travelled roads, such as the Sacred Way in the Kerameikos.

Hipparchos' message was thus the object for attention on the herm, both its *gnome* and its commemoration. The commemoration is informative: the herm declares itself to be Hermes, a *μνήμα* of Hipparchos, not a dedication to Hermes. We note too that no patronymic was inscribed: Hipparchos must
have felt that he needed no further identification beyond his name. No other dedication from members of Hipparchos' family approaches this type of personal indulgence.

Hipparchos' message was conveyed by short, easily remembered verses. The gnomai are moral directives, instructing the country folk as the author of the Hipparchos induced. Perhaps, as the author 'says, Hipparchos wished to arrogate to himself the title of sage of Athens at Delphoi's expense. The Peisistratidai were apparently not on good terms with the Delphic oracle throughout their history. But directive elegiacs were as old as Kallinos of Ephesos and Tyrtaios and Hipparchos may have taken Solon for his model. Although Solon was famous more for his longer, more instructive elegies, he could still muster the curt directive. Even in his lifetime, Solon was recognized by the Athenians as a possessor of sophia, that combination of moral and political wisdom, and was ranked among the Seven Sages. Perhaps Hipparchos, whose father, tradition tells, knew and appreciated Solon, used the moralizing verses of the herms to acquire for himself that mantle of Solon, or, at least, made the attempt. Such an identification would reap political dividends for Hipparchos and the Peisistratidai: for Hipparchos was perhaps not strongly linked with the coup of Peisistratos and the people of the country would be soothed by the image of a benign moral philosopher in the mode of Solon as leader in Athens, instead of a clear-cut tyrant like Peisistratos. The herms might thus be viewed as propagandistic symbols that the regime after Peisistratos' was more to be identified with Solon than with Peisistratos, perhaps used to conciliate the rural folk and to keep them quiet.

In sum, Hipparchos' herms appear to have been a successful combination of ancient rural religion, innovative graphic art and current moral/political
literature. As Hermes the Guide, the herm protected the traveller on his way to the city and home again in a form that had long been known in the Attic countryside. But Hipparchos refined the form and made it less austere by giving it more human features. The striking new figure identified itself as a μνήμα of Hipparchos and issued a short moral maxim that may have reminded its reader of the last great Attic moralist, Solon. In one gesture, the Attic countryside and its roads became the domain of herm, Hermes and Hipparchos. It is interesting to note that at Sparta the kings had domain over the public roads (Hdt. VI.57.4). Was Hipparchos trying to arrogate to himself the image of Commander of the Roads?

Hipparchos' herms were a coup de main of publicity that could only earn him advantage. Each time the demesman passed the herm, even without bothering to read the dedication or look closely at the herm, he would, in his mind, reinforce its identity with Hipparchos. Perhaps as never before country demes were united with Athens, their metropolis. The herms were not single dedications, but a network of publicity for Hipparchos.

Von Stern has suggested that Hipparchos' herms were nothing more than a dedication made by Hipparchos to commemorate his archonship, on the order of that made by Peisistratos the Younger. But aside from the obvious difference that Hipparchos did not mention anything about office are other differences: the herms were many in number and ubiquitous, they were unique and, above all, gnomic, not dedicatory. The herms were much more than memorial or dedications, they were far more alive with instruction. We shall perhaps never know the precise meaning of the herms or their intent, but they are important as the first public documents of Athens and the first tangible symbols of Attic unity: all roads led to Athens and all roads were guarded by Hermes, assisted by Hipparchos. We know that the herms evolved in the
fifth century into a symbol of the Athenian democracy. It is tempting to see in the unifying herms of Hipparchos the beginning of that evolution.

B. The Wall of Hipparchos

The district of the Akademy, six stades outside the Dipylon Gate to the northwest of the city, was dedicated to the hero, Hekademos. Hekademos, who apparently came to Attica with the Tyndaridai, was deemed the first settler of the Akademy. A small apsidal house of the Geometric period has been unearthed in the area and named appropriately the "House of Hekademos." A larger building of unbaked brick of the same period stands nearby dubbed the "Sacred House" because its rooms house plentiful evidence of cult. We may take it that the Akademy was a place of cult at least from that time.

Remains of the wall enclosing the precinct are scanty, but a section of wall that has been assigned by some scholars to the Archaic period has been found a short distance to the southeast of the Geometric buildings. Parts of a later wall have been discovered near the Church of St. Tryphon and these may trace the circuit of Hipparchos' wall. At the southeast corner of
Aimonos Street and Tripoleos Street, a boundary stone has come to light with an inscription dated c. 500 B.C. reading: ἡδρος τῆς ἡκαδεμείας. That stone fixes the northeast corner of the precinct of the Akademy and supports the existence of the wall of Hipparchos, which is otherwise undiscovered.

In Pausanias' time, several altars stood at the entrance to the Akademy. From the altar of Prometheus outside the precinct, torches were lit and carried in races down the Akademy road toward the city. Outside the precinct were other altars dedicated to Hermes, Herakles and the Muses. Another altar had been dedicated to Eros by Charmos, the father of Hipparchos, the first man ostracized. In fact, Charmos was the first Athenian to dedicate an altar to Eros and on it was inscribed:

Παυκλομηχανή Ερως, σοι τόνδ' ἱδρύσατο βωμὸν
Χάρμος ἐπὶ σκιεροὺς τέρμας γυμνασίων.

Charmos is very closely identified with the Peisistratidai. Of course, his son bore the same name as Peisistratos' son and seems to have suffered for his family ties with the Peisistratidai. Charmos himself was described by Kleidemos as an erastes of Hippias, but by Plutarch as an erastes of Peisistratos. In spite of the confusion, the reputed connection with the tyrant-family is plain and it is no surprise to find Charmos associated with the Akademy, especially in light of Hipparchos' special interest in it.

Three words in Charmos' epigram may help in understanding Hipparchos' interest. Eros, to whom Charmos' altar was dedicated, was the symbol of sexual love, but he may also be joined with Orphism at Athens. For the first great god of the Orphics was Eros, also called Phanes. To the Orphics, Eros embodied the principle of generation by which all is created. In that light, it was perhaps not by chance that the altars of Eros and Prometheus
were close together outside the precinct. Peisistratid interest in
Orphism is indicated by their patronage of Onomakritos, the reputed editor
of Musaios' oracles. Musaios was a myth-hero of Orphism. Onomakritos
himself is most closely associated with Hipparchos of all the Peisistratidai
and it may well be that he cultivated most an interest in Orphism and current
Orphic theology. (I say more about Hipparchos and Onomakritos in section
3,B.) If that connection is valid, Charmos' altar to Eros might be linked to
Orphism and perhaps be considered a symbol of respect for Hipparchos' inter­
est in it.

But the epithet used in the epigram to describe Eros, ποικίλομήχαν',
belies such a connection, for it indicates a far less serious conception of
Eros than as the Primal Mover. Significantly, compounds of ποικίλο-
 occur
in the love-verse of Sappho and of Anakreon, the latter of whom was in the
company of Hipparchos at Athens after 522. The epithet ποικίλομήχανε,
a hapax legomenon and so perhaps a conceit, summons that very Eros of
Anakreon who is invoked for love-intrigues and passion, a topic apparently
much in vogue among Hipparchos' set. Hipparchos' reputation was for eros
and poetry, a reputation he must have earned through the very poets he employed:
for Polykrates of Samos before him and Kimon after were described biograph­
ically by their poet-retainers, the one as the lover of boys and the other as
the lover of women. Charmos with his dedication may thus be participating
in the court-vogue: certainly his own reputation as lover of Peisistratos
and Hippias suggests some erotic connection with the Peisistratidai.

The last important word, γυμνασίου, shows that already by the time
of Charmos' dedication the Akademy had become an official place for young men
to practise and drill. The Athenians themselves thought of their gymnasia
as as old as Solon and Charmos' inscription makes their belief at least
Military practice we may imagine was as old as the introduction of the hoplite and the city's young men regularly travelled to the open spaces around the city to game and to practise, but it may be that Hipparchos with his wall was the first to designate the Akademy as a place officially devoted to such pursuits. The connection between the hero, Hekademos, and the wall marking the area for gymnic practice is clear: Hekademos came from Arkadia with the Dioskouroi to fetch Helen back to Sparta after she had been abducted by Theseus and sequestered at Aphidna. Hekademos, in response to the directive of an oracle, was sacrificed before the whole army of the Tyndaridai at the Akademy. This mythic connection with the patrons of boxing and sport for young men, Kastor and Polydeuces, made the Akademy an appropriate place to assign to the exercise of Athens' youth. Again, it may be that Hipparchos, who was interested in festivals and competitions (see below, section C), decided to set aside the land at the Akademy once and for all as a permanent training ground for Athenian competitors, perhaps in the same way a patron of sports would do today.

We see from the testimony of the Souda that the Akademy wall was synonymous with lavish expenditure, and it surely would have been expensive to wall the Akademy. The wall must have earned Hipparchos the reputation for wealth, envy for which perhaps impelled Kimon later to embellish the Akademy grounds. But the walling shows very clearly that Hipparchos was indeed a man of substance, very great substance if he could afford it, the herms and other luxuries (see below, section 3,A,2). If one were to judge from these two projects alone, Hipparchos must have been one of the richest men of his day: he had the means to expend on an order rivalling Kimon's. Kimon of course drew his wealth from the Persian spoils and as Miltiades' heir; Hipparchos' source of such wealth would be worth knowing.
C. The Ptoion Dedication

In 1920, L. Bizard published the details of a small marble base found at
the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoios near Akraiphia in Boiotia. It bore the
following inscription:

HIPPAP\RTOΣ \N\E\S|\[\N\H\O\ \N\E\I\S]|\RATO

The ascription of the dedication to Hipparchos, the son of Peisistratos, can
scarcely be questioned. The well-engraved letters of the inscription bear
close affinity to the inscription of the surviving fragment of the altar of
Apollo Pythios at Athens and it is possible that one hand engraved both.
In fact, the letter-forms of both inscriptions seem so advanced for the sixth
century that some have argued that they could not possibly antedate the be-
ginning of the fifth century. But letter-forms that became common later
can have appeared earlier in isolated cases if they were cut by an advanced
mason: an approximate date for the inscriptions in the late 520s seems best
for both inscriptions.

The dedication shows that Hipparchos wished to propitiate Apollo Ptoios
at his shrine in Boiotia. The oracle was controlled by the Thebans and
it is possible that Hipparchos was making a political as well as religious
gesture toward the Thebans, who had been allies of his father, for their con-
tinued goodwill toward the Peisistratidai. If that is true, the dedica-
tion was probably made before 519 when the Athenians snubbed the Thebans and
allied themselves with the Plataians, their inveterate enemies.

On a less tangible level, it is interesting to view Hipparchos' dedica-
tion to Apollo Ptoios in light of what [Plato] says about his competition
with Delphian Apollo in the Hipparchos. There it is claimed that Hipparchos
vied with Delphoi for the moral leadership of the Athenians. That pro-
announcement would attract no attention except for the fact that relations between the Peisistratidai and Delphoi were never very good. Although it could be that [Plato] based his deduction that Hipparchos contested the moral leadership of the Athenians solely upon the maxims of the herms, it might also be that he drew on more substantial information that defined Hipparchos' antipathy toward Delphoi. In that case, the dedication made by Hipparchos to Ptoion Apollo might have been something of a slight directed against the Pythia.
3. The Literary Tradition

A. External Affairs: Hipparchos and Ionia

1.) Background: Peisistratos and Delos

Both Peisistratos and Hipparchos had interests that overlapped those of the great tyrant of Samos, Polykrates. Peisistratos' attentions were focussed on the island of Delos, the hub of the Cyclades and a religious center of Ionia and the islands. The significance of that attention is shown really only by Polykrates' actions in regard to the island after Peisistratos' death.

At some time during his reign as tyrant, perhaps c. 546 (see below text), Peisistratos undertook to purify Delos (Hdt. I.64.2): πρὸς τε ἐκ τούτων τὴν νήσον Δήλου καθήκας ἐκ τῶν λογίων, καθήκας δὲ ὢς ἐπὶ ὅσον ἐποιήσα τοῦ ἐρεύν ἐπιε ἐκ τούτων τοῦ χώρου παντὸς ἐξορύζασ τοὺς νεκροὺς μετεφόρεε ἐς ἅλλον χώρον τῆς Δήλου. κτλ. 140

To Herodotos, the purification was an outstanding act of Peisistratos' reign and will surely have earned for Peisistratos good repute among the islanders and perhaps the prestige of being considered a leader of the island community.

Athens had a claim to this leadership that dated to the remote past: 142 all Ionians were apoikoi from Athens. Solon had recently recalled that leadership in his poetry, signifying at the very least a consciousness on his part that Athens was the mother-city of the Ionians. Some have viewed 144 Solon's words as propaganda for the leadership of Athens.

Peisistratos, however, actively pursued an eastern policy, designed, we
may imagine, to increase his visibility among the Ionians. His interest began with the purification, but apparently did not end with it: according both to Herodotos and Thucydides, Peisistratos purified only as much "as could be seen from the temple (sc. of Apollo)".  Thus, Peisistratos purified Delos only in relation to the temple, a fact that has been shown to be important because of the archaeology of the temple area. Excavation has revealed the remains of an archaic temple of Apollo dating c. 550 B.C. The connection between this temple and Athens is clear: parts of the structure were made of yellow poros from Piraeus and Eleusinian limestone, somewhat surprisingly since the quarries of fine Parian and Naxian marble are so close at hand. It is thus very tempting to associate Peisistratos' partial purification of the island with construction of this temple. At any rate, it seems that stones were brought from Attica in order that actual parts of the "oldest land of Ionia" would be physically among the islanders. The temple could then have been constructed very shortly after Peisistratos' return to power at Athens in 546, perhaps built as a thank-offering for a successful enterprise. If Peisistratos did not build the temple, it may be that his purification of the land around was meant to cut into the popularity of the builder of the new temple (whoever that might have been). Naturally, his action will have made him enviable to the throngs who flocked to the quadrennial Delia.

An even more tangible proof of Peisistratos' eastern policy is his alliance with the tyrant of Naxos, Lygdamis. Herodotos (I.64.2) states that Peisistratos conquered the island for Lygdamis and turned it over to him before the battle of Pallene; for when Peisistratos had routed the Athenians, he took hostages and deposited them with Lygdamis on Naxos. In the Ath. Pol. (15.3), however, it appears that Lygdamis was not in possession of Naxos at
the time of Pallene, but acquired it later. What is clear is that Lygdamis
acquired Naxos through Peisistratos' aid and undoubtedly repaid the kindness
with cooperation. Peisistratos thus established a friend in a dominant
position in the Cyclades, very near to Delos.

Sometime later, between 529 and 522, Polykrates turned his attention
toward Delos (Thuc. III.104.2): ...Πολυκράτης δὲ Σαμών τύραννος
ισχύσας τινὰ χρόνον ὑπετικὼ καὶ τῶν τε ἄλλων νήσων ἄρξας καὶ τὴν
Ῥήνελαιν ἑλὼν ἀνεθηκε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δήλῳ ἐλέσει δῆσιν πρὸς τὸν Δήλον.
In addition to the dedication of Rheneia, a theatrical gesture, Polykrates
was also of a mind to establish games on the island. Death, however,
prevented him from accomplishing his purpose.

Polykrates' activity has been considered both commercially and strate-
gically inspired. But the nature of his interest in Delos was obviously
more for show than for substance: the chain was as unnecessary as it was
memorable. Polykrates' actions show that he was making a display for the
islanders and Ionians. Delos, as the crossroads of the Aegean, was the
place to make such a gesture. In that he was trying to impress, Polykrates'
actions are emulative of Peisistratos'. Peisistratos' act was pious;
Polykrates' gaudy, such that it would outshine that of the Athenian.
Polykrates seems to have acted consciously to eclipse others with his
brilliance and Delos was, after all, on his doorstep.

2.) Hipparchos and Anakreon

About 522, we are told, Hipparchos, the son of Peisistratos, dispatched
a pentekoner to carry the poet, Anakreon of Teos, to Athens. The poet
had been retained by Polykrates at his court until the year of the tyrant's
death and Anakreon had repaid the kindness of patronage by mentioning his employer frequently in his poems. There can be no doubt that Hipparchos fetched Anakreon to Athens in order that the poet would do for him what he had done for Polykrates at Samos: to delight and perhaps to immortalize his patron.

Anakreon was, above all, the poet of love, especially the love of boys, and Polykrates was notorious for his self-indulgence in this respect. Naturally, the tyrant would want a singer to delight with amorous songs and Anakreon's poems were undoubtedly replete with references to Polykrates' affairs. It is therefore no surprise that Hipparchos, described in the Ath. Pol. as an *erotikos*, would want to procure Anakreon's services for himself.

But Anakreon was something more than an erotic poet. He was very, very good at what he did. His technique was unmatched: his varied use of metre indicates a thorough acquaintance with the Lesbian poets and he was himself an innovator in the use of metre; his wording was clear and uncomplicated, his dialect, the elegant Ionian. His short poems are jewel-like, sparkling and complete. Anakreon's poetry was not simple love poetry, it was the last word in Greek love poetry of the late sixth century.

Hipparchos wanted to obtain the brilliance of Anakreon to add to his own growing court-circle. His assembly of poets rivalled Polykrates', if not outstripped it, for brilliance: for, in addition to Anakreon, Hipparchos also retained at court Simonides, an elegist, dithyrambist and epinikian poet. Simonides was a victor many times in competitions and prided himself on his memory; his knowledge of poetic technique matched, in its way, Anakreon's. It should be noted that Simonides' services did not come cheaply to Hipparchos: earned or not, Simonides' reputation was for avarice
and it was certainly a sign of wealth for Hipparchos to retain him. Joining these at court and no less an innovator was Lasos of Hermione, renowned as a dithyrambist (he competed with Simonides). Lasos was reputed to have been the author of a book on music, implying that he too was an expert in his field. Hipparchos thus surrounded himself with poets who could also have been teachers. With this circle came his reputation for poetic interests and with them too Hipparchos may have fashioned a poetic patrimony for the Athenians that bore fruit in the fifth century.

Perhaps the most significant thing about Hipparchos' effort to fetch Anakreon to Athens is the way in which the Teian was brought to Athens. Instead of making a quiet journey as the other poets seem to have, Anakreon arrived at Athens in a warship. This gesture, which may have been recorded in Anakreon's verse, was perhaps unnecessary, but certainly theatrical. It was obviously done to show to the world how highly Anakreon was regarded by Hipparchos. Such a gesture naturally required spectators.

The dispatch of the pentekonter is reminiscent of Polykrates' theatrics at Delos. In both cases, the spectators were primarily the Ionians and the object was to demonstrate a certain power. Perhaps Hipparchos acted in a very limited way to indicate to the Cyclades again Athens' claim to leadership of Ionia: for the thalassocrat, Polykrates, had died and the seaways were open. There were no obvious contenders and in this vacuum even a very weak gesture will have created some impression. In that light, the dispatch of the pentekonter might be viewed as a limited reassertion of Peisistratos' policy in the wake of Polykrates' dramatic fall.

Hipparchos may have been acting on his own initiative in following the lead of Polykrates, for he seems to have emulated the Samian by acquiring a circle of court-poets, thus displaying his wealth and magnificence by retain-
ing them at court at Athens. The power to hold such a luminous group together was a proof of Hipparchos' good fortune and it surely helped to promote his image at Athens as it had done for Polykrates at Samos. The ostentation of the court was daily apparent to the Athenians and, by means of analogy with Polykrates' court at Samos, would later give evidence to the Athenians that Hipparchos, not Hippias, had succeeded Peisistratos as the tyrant of Athens.

It would be interesting to know on whose authority Hipparchos sent the warship to fetch Anakreon.

B. Internal/External Affairs: Hipparchos and Onomakritos

When Xerxes was hesitating to invade Greece, certain of the Greek expatriates at Susa urged him on, among whom were the Peisistratidai and Onomakritos. A short while before, Onomakritos and the Peisistratidai had been enemies: ἔξηλάθη γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἰππαρχοῦ τοῦ Πεισιστράτου ὁ Ὀνομάκριτος ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν. Onomakritos, a χρησμολόγος concerned chiefly with editing the oracles of the Orphic Musaios, was caught in the act of trying to insert a forged oracle among them, to wit, that the islands near Lemnos would sink into the sea. It was Lasos of Hermione who caught Onomakritos and, although Hipparchos had employed Onomakritos before, he nevertheless banished him from Athens for his act.

The Peisistratidai were associated with oracles and oracle-mongering. Peisistratos himself was called Bakis and, at Pallene, he was accompanied by the Acarnanian seer, Amphilytos, who foretold his victory over the
Athenians. It is possible that the store of oracles housed on the Akropolis, later raided by Kleomenes, was Peisistratos' creation. Hippias, it seems, was well-acquainted with these oracles: at Korinth, after he had been expelled from Athens and recalled to the congress of Peloponnesian allies, Hippias predicted future trouble for Korinth from Athens on the basis of the oracles. According to Herodotos, no man knew the oracles better than Hippias. It is somewhat surprising, in view of Hippias' reputed acquaintance with and implied interest in the oracles, that not he but Hipparchos acted to expel Onomakritos.

K.J. Beloch has argued on this basis that Onomakritos' banishment provides adequate reason to believe that Hipparchos succeeded Peisistratos. For Beloch believed that banishment was a prerogative exercised by a ruler, not a subordinate. E. von Stern, however, objected to Beloch's reasoning, calling it "ein sonderbare Schlussfolgerung". According to Stern, proceedings against Onomakritos would have to have been legal and systematic, especially since the Peisistratidai had a reputation for abiding by the law. The appropriate legal body handled the banishment: Hipparchos merely recommended to them that Onomakritos be banished, fittingly, since he was most responsible for the conduct of poets at Athens. Others have suggested that Hipparchos simply made it plain to Onomakritos that he was no longer welcome at Athens after the crime and that no legal proceedings were involved.

The significant thing about Herodotos' testimony concerning the incident is that it names Hipparchos at all: for, regardless of the legal aspects of the case, it is remarkable that Hippias, "who knew the oracles better than any living man", had no hand in the affair. The testimony is the only real link between Hipparchos and oracles and, as such, it constitutes something of a lectio difficilior that is all the more significant in view of the
importance of oracles for the Peisistratidai. For Onomakritos cannot be understood as just another poet belonging to Hipparchos' literary circle.

My statements are explained by the importance attached to oracles by the Spartan kings. Herodotos (VI.57) states that, at Sparta, the kings controlled the oracles, although they shared knowledge of them with the Pythians, special officers chosen by the kings. Control of the oracles was apparently exercised solely by the kings as a royal prerogative, perhaps in their capacity as mediators between gods and men. The Pythians evolved as a check on the royal domain over oracles. Obviously, great abuse could arise if the kings alone knew the oracles. In fact, the kings may have altered or forged oracles to suit their own purposes and could easily have done so before the creation of the Pythians without any fear of being gainsaid. The Pythians prevented such abuse.

Unlike the Spartan kings, the Peisistratidai had no such checks. Consequently, their power over the Athenians through the oracles could have been enormous, since they could have manipulated the Athenians with their own orders in the guise of divine will. Naturally, the Athenians would have been far more pliant if they had thought they were obeying the injunctions of the god. When Onomakritos invaded their preserve and altered the oracles, it was not harmless tampering he accomplished, but treason aimed at the Peisistratidai and it will have earned him a fall from grace and the enmity of the tyrant-family.

The nature of Onomakritos' insertion is intriguing, for it concerns Lemnos, a strategic island in the northeast Aegean, highly prized by the Athenians and close to Peisistratid interests in Sigeion. Diodoros (10.19.6) says that the Tyrrenoi left Lemnos because of fear of the Persians but also that they departed because of some oracles. Ostensibly, they handed
Lemnos to Miltiades in accordance with an oracle. Now it may be that these anecdotes were later constructed to explain how Miltiades was able to acquire Lemnos from the Tyrrenoi, but there may also be more to it than that. For it is possible that the Peisistratidai tried to "soften up" the Tyrrenoi by pelting them with doom-saying oracles about the fate of Lemnos like Onomakritos' about the fate of the islands nearby. Perhaps Onomakritos was eager to please his patrons and thus decided to slip a (marginally?) helpful oracle into the pile to be used somehow against the Lemnians. At any rate, Onomakritos' insertion concerned a very sensitive, active area of Peisistratid interest.

It is significant that Hipparchos acted on Onomakritos' treason and that he acted alone. Hipparchos exiled Onomakritos and, so doing, performed what was necessary for the leader of the family. It may thus have been his prerogative to control and dispense the oracles accumulated on the Akropolis as he saw fit. What is definite from Herodotos' testimony is that Hippias, who we expect should have taken a hand in the matter, is entirely out of the picture.

C. Internal Affairs: Hipparchos and The Panathenaia

1.) Introduction: Peisistratos

The games of the Greater Panathenaia were established at Athens during the archonship of Hippokleides (566/5 B.C.). The archon was apparently the same Hippokleides who lost the competition in Sikyon for the hand of
Agariste, the daughter of Kleisthenes of Sikyon. While it cannot be concluded from the evidence available to us that Hippokleides actually had a hand in the establishment of the games, it appears likely that he did, from the importance that we know was attached to the games elsewhere by other aristocratic families. The scholiast on Aristeides' Panathenaikos says that the lesser Panathenaia was begun by Erichthonios but that the greater Panathenaia was begun by Peisistratos. That ascription should be rejected because it is imprecise in comparison with the information that puts the festival at the time of Hippokleides' archonship: the record of a victor-

But the link that the scholiast makes between Peisistratos and the Panathenaia should not be rejected out of hand. A later author looking backward to Athens in the sixth century could easily have been tempted to associate the games with Peisistratos, clearly the most famous Athenian of his time. Moreover, Peisistratos was especially associated with the goddess Athena in the minds of the Athenians and the growth of her cult in the city can perhaps be estimated in Peisistratos' time by the construction of the temple of Athena Polias on the Akropolis (c. 560). The advent of tyrant, growth of cult of Athena and the beginning of the games might have led the writer to join Peisistratos with the origin of the Panathenaic games.

It was surely not by coincidence that the games, which included musical, athletic and equestrian competitions, originated in the period of confusion at Athens immediately before Peisistratos' first attempt to gain power.

Kleisthenes of Sikyon, who had figured prominently in the lives of Hippokleides and Megakles the Alkmaionid, two Athenian notables of the 560s, had done much in the way of example to promote games, at last establishing his own at Sikyon. Such proud and powerful Athenians as Megakles,
Kleisthenes' son-in-law, will surely have realized the value of the games and the chance they afforded for glamour and prestige. Little wonder then that Peisistratos, who became the most powerful Athenian, also became the "founder" of the Greater Panathenaia.

It was also not by coincidence that the Panathenaia blossomed at the same time into something more than a local festival. The "Burgon" amphora, dated c. 560, is the oldest known Panathenaic prize-vase. Its importance is two-fold: first, it depicts Athena in her later canonical attitude, brandishing her spear, poised to thrust. Second, more importantly, the lettering on the vase proudly proclaims the vase as a prize "from the games at Athens". Thus, by the time the "Burgon" vase was awarded, the games of the Panathenaia had grown to include non-residents of Attica. For the people of Athens and Attica, Athena symbolized the contests and the city, but on the "Burgon" vase the lettering names the occasion and the city for foreigners who might not know the symbols. The lettering was surely designed to promote the games overseas or around Greece outside Attica.

It is tempting to link the flowering of the Panathenaia with Peisistratos' interests in the east: for, above all, a festival honouring Athena at Athens will have appealed, after the Athenians, to the Ionians, who thought themselves descendants of the Athenians. I have already outlined Peisistratos' interests in the Cyclades and Ionia (above, section 3,A,1) and his efforts to impress the islanders and Ionians. Promotion of the Panathenaia outside of Attica might be viewed as another phase of Athens' growing interests abroad and her need to be recognized in Greece and the Aegean.

This expansionistic nationalism, already alluded to by Solon, offered a sense of purpose to the Athenians and undoubtedly served to strengthen the
sense of unity at home. Expressions of this nationalism - Solon's, Peisistratos', Hipparchos' - constitute the first efforts of the Athenians to assert their leadership over Ionia and the Aegean and cultivated the seeds of leadership that were to flower after the Persian Wars among the Cyclades and Ionia. Thus, the establishment and growth of the Panathenaia may not be a sign that Attica was engaged in unifying herself, but rather that she was already unified, confident and looking outwardly, perhaps already sure of herself as rightful hegemon of the Ionians.

2.) Hipparchos

Hipparchos' connection with the Panathenaia is much more substantial and specific ([Plato] Hipp. 228b): τὰ Ὀμηροὺς ἐπὶ πρῶτος ἐκάμενον εἰς τὴν γῆν τωτήν, καὶ ἴσανασε τοὺς ἄρχοντας Παναθηναίους ἐς ὑπολήψεις ἐφεξῆς αὐτὰ διελέγαν κτλ. The evidence of the dialogue, written by all accounts in the fourth century, has been considered plausible by Davison. Given Hipparchos' interest in poetry and poets, it is certainly no surprise to find him involved in the recitation of Homer.

Recitation of the Iliad was apparently already a regular thing at Brauron in east Attica. Brauron is very close to the Peisistratid deme of Philaidai and strengthens a connection between Hipparchos and the "Panathenaic rule" at Athens: it is possible that Hipparchos or Peisistratos transferred the practice of rhapsodic recitals to Athens from Brauron. Brauron, on the eastern coast of Attica, may have copied the practice of rhapsodic recitals from the great maritime city of Chalkis where such recitals had been long established.

At any rate, according to [Plato], the son of Peisistratos adjusted the
competition so that the rhapsodes would recite consecutively, the implication being that they had recited haphazardly before. This innovation implies the existence of a standardized text of Homer from which variation could be measured, and this in turn brings one face to face with the very vexed question of the "Peisistratid recension". Cicero (De Or. 3.34.137) states: 
"qui (sc. Pisistratus) primus Homeri libros confusos antea sic disposuisse dicitur ut nunc habemus". There are other testimonia, but they do not differ substantially from Cicero's account. Unfortunately, there are only later testimonia to use and these appear to derive from a common source.

It was almost certainly the hindsight of later authors that attributed the recension to Peisistratos, since no author from the fourth century B.C. or before ascribed a recension to anybody in the sixth century. The question then becomes, why was Peisistratos' name attached to the recension? A simple solution to the problem might be that victors in the recitation-competitions were known from Peisistratos' time, perhaps from a victor-list or tradition. If the recitation-competitions began in 566, it would be as natural to ascribe the recension to Peisistratos as it was to ascribe the beginning of the games to him.

Another author, Ps.-Plato, attributed what must be the same thing to Hipparchos, but for different reasons. The element most suspect in the Hipparchos is the motive given to Hipparchos for starting the competition, i.e., that he wished to educate the people in order that he could rule the best. The entire theme of the excursus in the Hipparchos about him is his role as educator of the people. It was an excellent, kingly thing to do and so was a desirable accomplishment to ascribe to Hipparchos. The connection could be made because of a) his renowned poetical interests, and b) the lack of definite ascription to anybody else. Hipparchos' poetical in-
clinations presuppose an interest in the competitions involving song and
would naturally link him with the recitals of Homer. We can imagine him
taking a great deal of interest in contests as he did in lyric poetry. On
the face of it, Hipparchos was a likely candidate for institution of the
recitals and patron of the Panathenaia. It may have been no accident that
he was killed while dispatching the Panathenaic procession.

D. Conclusions: Hipparchos, The Lion Enduring

Τλήθει λέων ἀνήλτα παθὼν τετεληστε θυμῷ
οὐδές ἀνθρώπων ἀδελφῶν τίσιν οὐκ ἀποτίσει.

These "riddling" hexameters were spoken to Hipparchos while he slept by
a beautiful apparition on the night before his death. When Hipparchos
awoke, he told the dream-interpreters of his vision, but then dismissed its
meaning and went to his death anyway.

The lines have aroused scant interest. Some have considered the lines
obscure, others argue that Hipparchos is addressed with some respect as a
lion and that the epithet might imply honour for him. Dyson finds it
possible to associate the lines with Orphism. As far as I can tell, the
lines have not been considered for their relevance to Hipparchos' status or
in regard to the approximate time of their composition. My examination takes
up these points.

Two significant facts can be gleaned from the verses affecting
Hipparchos: Hipparchos is addressed as leon and inevitable retribution is
promised to the perpetrators of his death. Obviously, the prophecy must
pertain to the tyrannicide, since it immediately precedes Hipparchos' death and since Hipparchos' casual disregard of its meaning provided a certain poignance to the story. It is very surprising in view of the glorification of the tyrannicides that this story does not make their act heroic or even justified, but the act of unjust men who will suffer justice because of it. The verses are favourable to Hipparchos.

The epithet leon has been thought ambiguous in Herodotos, chiefly because it seems to occur in contexts that are both complimentary and uncomplimentary. The word can be ambivalent, it has been urged, signifying either strength and power or danger and malevolence. Strassburger's pronouncement is representative: "Aus Herodot selbst lässt es sich nicht umgehen, gerade die zwei auf Tyrannen bezüglichen Stellen zur Deutung heranzuziehen: 5,56,1 wo Hipparchos der Sohn des Peisistratos, in Traum als Löwe angeredet wird (hier vielleicht mehrerbietig gemeint), anderseits das Orakel: αἰετός τέξει λέοντα κυρτερὸν ὤμησιν, welcher auf den blutgierigen Tyrannen (Kypselos) hindeutet."

The distinction fails because it disregards what is shared in Herodotos' usage. A far better way to determine Herodotos' meaning when he applied the word to humans is to examine more closely the passages where the word occurs and to note what those passages have in common. Use of the word outside of Herodotos must inevitably have limited application to his usage.

The first use of leon occurs in Herodotos' account of the siege of Sardis (I.84). A concubine had born a lion cub to King Meles, Kroisos' ancestor. The Telmessian seers declared that, if Meles carried the lion cub around the walls of Sardis' citadel, the fortress would be impregnable. Meles did so, but scorned to carry the cub past what seemed already impregnable. It was from that quarter that the Persians later attacked and forced
entry into the Lydian city.

The only human being named in the story is Meles, and it is to him that the Lydians attributed the earlier impregnability of the citadel of Sardis. The lion cub, the product of Meles and a nameless concubine - obviously, the rightful queen produced human heirs - was a symbol of the strength and durability of the walls of Sardis' citadel, a product of King Meles too. We note that the lion was the symbol of the Lydian royal house.

At V.92, Herodotos reports the oracle given to Aetion concerning the birth of his son, later named Kypselos:

\[\text{αἰετὸς ἐν πέτρῃ κύλη, τέξει δὲ λέοντα καρπερὸν ἑκμησθῆν, πολλὰν ὅπο γούνας λύσει.}\]

The lion, which the eagle (= Aetion) bore, was the future tyrant of Korinth and the oracle portends Kypselos' acquisition of power. He was a ravening lion because, when he acquired the tyranny, he killed and exiled many and took away their possessions. But Herodotos can still call Kypselos "blessed" (ὁλίβρος) because he finished his life after twenty years of power and handed it intact over to his successor, Periander.

The term leonta is used to describe Kypselos as a ruler, for it was only after he had acquired the tyranny that he "loosed the limbs of many". Kypselos' power was history and the oracle helped enhance the story of Kypselos' rise to power. Herodotos could disapprove of Kypselos and the way he used his tyranny, but he could also admire him for having it at all. Leonta here must mean "man of singular power" or tyrant.

Most of the controversy concerning Herodotos' use of leon involves VI.131, where he describes the birth of Perikles to Agariste. She, pregnant with Perikles, dreamed that she gave birth to a lion a few days before parturition. Some have seen in this dream a compliment to Perikles, others con-
sider it at least ambivalent because of Herodotos' use of the term *leon* elsewhere.

So far Herodotos has used the word to designate royal or singular power and it would be no surprise to find it here used in the same way. Perikles was sometimes called "the new Peisistratos" and was regarded as exercising a singular influence over the Athenians. In fact, Perikles enjoyed a primacy at Athens from the 440s such that even Thucydides characterized his influence as "rule by the first man of the state". Such primacy could be considered either good or bad, but was still enviable and there were no other examples of singular power as familiar to the Greeks as their own tyrants. Perikles was, by all accounts, the first man of Athens and Herodotos, like Thucydides, was undoubtedly admiring him for it.

There is one more link in Herodotos between *leon* and kingly power, although not specifically applied by Herodotos. At VII.225, the Spartans at Thermopylai perceived that Ephialtes had betrayed them and was leading the Persians to encircle them. They withdrew to a little hillock in the pass and made their last stand: οδε κολωνος ἐστι ἐν τῇ ἐσόδῳ, ὅκου νῦν ὁ λίθινος λέων ἐστηκε ἐπὶ Λεωνίδη. We note that, unlike the later dedication of the lion over the bodies of the fallen Sacred Band at Chaironeia, the lion of Thermopylai was dedicated to Leonidas, the fallen king of Sparta; a *sema* was made separately for the rest of the dead. The lion was meant to signify the courage, strength and kingliness of Leonidas.

Throughout the *History*, Herodotos uses the word *leon* to denote royalty or royal characteristics. In every case, it was applied to some type of ruler. Later, writers used it to describe such singular and royal personages as Alkibiades and Alexander. Although in poetry the image of the lion may have been ambivalent, its implication in Herodotos is apparently consis-
As applied to Hipparchos, the word **leon** suggests a perception of him as royal or kingly or as a ruler of some sort. It is a complimentary epithet and favourable to Hipparchos. The words **τετληστι θυμοί** are also favourable to Hipparchos because they constitute a formula found frequently in the *Odyssey* indicating courage and the endurance of a sympathetic character in a difficult situation: **τετλησμενοι θυμοί** was an admirable thing for a Homeric warrior.

More favourable to Hipparchos is the second hexameter. Far from making Hipparchos the deserving victim of the tyrannicides or even casting their act in an approving light, the tone of the second hexameter suggests reproof of the tyrannicides. Hipparchos' murder is indirectly deplored and justice is promised for the perpetrators (unnamed) of the crime. There is a tragic overtone in the way that the author of the hexameters perceived the murder.

But this is remarkable: it seems to offer proof that some at least at Athens did not look approvingly on the tyrannicides, one of whom was the author of these hexameters. Such a disapproving attitude would be entirely out of place after the cult of the tyrannicides was established firmly at Athens, no later than 480 B.C. After that, Harmodios and Aristogeiton were the very embodiment of Athenian democracy and their cult was apparently well-woven into the fabric of the state.

Thus these hexameters must have been composed before the tyrannicides were apotheosized, i.e., before 480. The likeliest time for the story should be before 490 because the Athenian attitude toward the Péisistratidai soured totally only after the battle of Marathon. The period before Marathon, one in which an ambiguous attitude toward the Péisistratidai is apparent, would allow for such a favourable view of Hipparchos and an anonymity for the
That is again significant because, if true, it means that the composer of the hexameters designated Hipparchos a leon, a complimentary term indicating official and, in some cases, tyrannical power within two decades after his death. In view of the archaeological record of Hipparchos and the literary tradition concerning him, it is not really surprising that he should be so designated. The hexameter appears to affirm what Hipparchos' record implies - that he was a very important (perhaps the most important?) Peisistratid at Athens before his death.

At any rate, the favourable tone of the hexameters is clear: the word λέων and the adjectival phrase τετληστὶ θυμοῦ are complimentary to Hipparchos; leon indicates some sort of official status. The second line portrays the murder as unjust and the tyrannicides as murderers who will atone for their crime.
4. Conclusions

The image of Hipparchos that emerges from this survey of the archaeological and literary record is that of a very wealthy, important Peisistratid who seems to have held centre stage during his lifetime. Hipparchos' activity included the primary role in the affair involving Onomakritos and was not confined to cultural pursuits. His high profile will account for the persistent notion that Hipparchos was considered the successor of Peisistratos.

Two major projects depict Hipparchos' considerable substance and vision. The herms and the Akademy wall, the latter of which became proverbial for expensiveness, were certainly costly, but they also demonstrated Hipparchos' interest in the community of Athens and Attica. The herms were a constant reminder to the demesmen of their relationship to their metropolis, while the Akademy wall enclosed a permanent place for Athenians to congregate for athletic practice.

Perhaps equally as costly was Hipparchos' circle of court-poets. Like the great Polykrates before him, Hipparchos surrounded himself with eminent artists of the day, such as Anakreon and Simonides. These poets were undoubtedly employed by Hipparchos at least in part to flatter him with their skills and their presence as they had done for Polykrates. But these men were also skilled enough to be teachers and it may have been part of Hipparchos' plan for them to school the Athenians in appreciation of the newest trends in literature and music: obviously, Hipparchos' poets will have influenced the flowering of Athenian letters in the fifth century. At any rate, Hipparchos' circle of poets shows the same sort of megaloprepeia as Polykrates'. Like that tyrant, Hipparchos may have had other men who were
eminent in other fields around him.

The most significant conclusion from this examination of Hipparchos is that, by contrast, Hippias had no profile at all. Hipparchos, as the more visible Peisistratid, would have been thought the true successor of his father. For it was he who apparently sought reputation among the islanders as Peisistratos had (albeit in a less grandiose way), it was he who actively promoted the concept of Attic unity by means of the herms and, perhaps, the Panathenaia, and it was he, not Hippias, who protected the important family-interests of the oracles when Onomakritos tried to interpolate his forged oracle. Little wonder, then, that Hipparchos was called leon and considered tyrant so soon after his death. How he seemed will have represented Peisistratid tyranny to the Athenians because it resembled perceptions of Peisistratos and of other tyrants throughout Greece.

In contrast to his brother, Hippias was relatively invisible before 514, the year of Hipparchos' death. In fact, Hippias was apparently remembered for little more than his "reign of terror" following Hipparchos' death. In view of the examples of other highly visible tyrants like Polykrates and of Hippias' father, brother, and even his son, Hippias' conspicuous inactivity is plainly anomalous. Whatever "image" Hippias might have had while Hipparchos lived must surely have paled before the relative magnificence of Hipparchos, his works and his manner of living. Hipparchos' herms were abroad throughout Attica, his poets ever-present at the festivals and in the city, his profile high and resplendent in Attica and the rest of Greece. But Hippias was very much in the background.

The reason generally given to reconcile the problem of Hippias' invisibility is that his rule was cloaked in order to dull its sharp edge. This would conciliate otherwise discomfitted Athenian aristocrats. Perhaps it
suited Hippias to allow his brother the higher profile in order to control
the city from "the wings". Hipparchos thus acted as something of a befuddled, dissolute pawn to confound or dissipate animosity.

This explanation should be rejected. Its main defect is that it makes
much too sophisticated a distinction between appearances and realities. I
have tried to show in the introduction that archaic tyranny involved honour
and honour demanded visibility. There was no honour in remaining invisible
and Peisistratos, Hipparchos and even Peisistratos the Younger knew it.
The fact of the tyranny was daily driven home to the Athenians by Hippias'
relatives who acted as tyrants, but also by the doryphoroi who enforced it
and the exactions charged upon the Athenians to keep it functioning. The
concept of a cloaked tyranny is modern and inappropriate: some other reason
must be found to explain Hippias' silence and "invisibility".

In sum, Hipparchos was the most prominent Peisistratid of his time and
so could easily have been taken for tyrant when he was murdered. On the face
of things - a consideration not to be disdained when contemplating archaic
tyrranny - Hipparchos was also the most important Peisistratid until his
death. It was only after his death that Hippias clearly became ruler of
Athens.
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47 The fact that the herm-head was apparently attached separately caused Kirchner and Dow some disquiet. E. Harrison, Athenian Agora, XI: Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture (Princeton, 1965) 143, however, noted that a herm-head (Cat. No. 156), dated around 480-70, was attached separately to its shaft by means of a dowel. Harrison observed that marble could thus be conserved - an important consideration if many herm-heads were manufactured at once. For representations of herms on stone-bases see J.D. Beazley, The Pan-Painter (Mainz, 1974) pls. 4.1, 23.2, 30.1; see also J. Boardman, Athenian Red-Figure Vases: The Archaic Period (London, 1975) ills. 278, 330, 364.

48 Kirchner and Dow (above, n. 43) 3 and Tafel 1.3.

49 Kirchner and Dow (above, n. 43) 2.

50 Cf. Beazley and Boardman (above, n. 47).

51 Peek (above, n. 44) 463 thought that the herm from Koropi possessed only the hexameter verse, not the pentameter. That does not follow (see
Pritchett (above, n. 44) 162.

Peek (above, n. 44) 463.

Harrison (above, n. 47) 112; little faith should be put in the so-called "Solonian" law regulating Hermai quoted by Cicero (De Leg. 2.64-5), since Hermai became profuse in Attica apparently only after Hipparchos' day. It may be that the "Solonian" law was invented by Demetrius of Phaleron as a precedent for his own law concerning the adornment of tombs (Cic. De Leg. 2.66). We note that Hermai were not used in burials of the earlier Classical period (see D. Kurtz and J. Boardman, Greek Burial Customs [New York, 1971] 90 and 241). Cf. also H. Goldman, "The Origin of the Herm", AJA 46 (1942) 58-68 and C. Trypanis, "The Epigrams of Anacreon on Hermae", CO 45 (1951) 31.

Herodotos (II.51.7) does, however, say that the Pelasgians of Attica first lived in Samothrace before coming to Attica, indicating that the Athenians made themselves distinct from that group of Pelasgians.

Hdt. VI.137.


H. Marwitz, Der Kleine Pauly (Stuttgart, 1967) 1065 s.v. €ρμαι; cf. also Trypanis (above, n. 53) and Page (above, n. 16) 140, 144-5, 255-9.
Painting: Beazley (above, n. 47) pl. 23.2; Date: Beazley, 8.

Beazley (above, n. 47) 4, n. 21.

Beazley (above, n. 47) pls. 1.2, 4.1.

Beazley (above, n. 47) 2.

J.D. Beazley, *Athenian Red-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford, 1963) 75, 59; Boardman (above, n. 47) pl. 74. Several cups by Epiktetos are so inscribed: Beazley, 72, 21; 73, 25, 29; 74, 37; 75, 60, 64; 76, 72 and possibly 72, 17 and 74, 40. Of course, the Hipparchos of the inscription might be other than the son of Peisistratos: see Beazley, 1584.


Guthrie (above, n. 63).

H. Goldman (above, n. 53) linked the word ἐρμα with "prop" or "support" instead of "heap". Her views have not found much support.


68 Nillson (above, n. 64); Chittenden (above, n. 63) 90ff.; Harrison (above, n. 47).

69 Chittenden (above, n. 63) 89, n. 2.

70 Goldman (above, n. 53) 67-8.

71 Farnell (above, n. 64) 9; Chittenden (above, n. 63) 90ff. and 102 suggested that Hermes was both the guardian of flock and of wayfarers and, therefore, the master of animals; S. Eitrem, R-E 8, 696 s.v. ἐρμα suggested that herms were simply guards.

72 Beazley (above, n. 47) 2, n. The herm must be linked with Priapos (Paton [above, n. 63] IV.7.8 and 9; esp. 8.3) and perhaps with Pan (IV.10.11). It could be that Hermes' name most closely matched what had been, under the Pelasgians, nameless heaps of stone with daimon.

73 Cf. N.O. Brown, Hermes the Thief (New York, 1947) 106-37; also Marwitz (above, n. 57).

74 Brown (above, n. 73).
J. Boardman, Athenian Black-Figure Vases (London, 1974) pl. 145, 1; Date: Boardman, 63. It is interesting to note that Pausanias (I.27.1) observes a wooden statue of Hermes could be found in the temple of Athena Polias, where the goddess' oldest image resided (Paus. I.16.6). Pausanias further states that the statue of Hermes was dedicated by Kekrops.

See below, section 3,C,2.

At 1. 394; see Brown (above, n. 73) 120, n. 18; also Peek (above, n. 44) 461.


Cf. Crome (above, n. 45) 306; Harrison (above, n. 47); also M. Crosby, "The Altar of the Twelve Gods", Hesperia Suppl. 8 (1949) 100.

Thuc. VI.54.6; see Appendix.

Hdt. II.7; IG II² 2640.

Cf. Harrison (above, n. 47) 113: "These road-marking herms, like the Altar of the Twelve Gods in the Agora which served as the zero milestone for measuring distances out of Athens, must have been part of the Attic road system set up by the tyrants as well as being dedications of object and cult."

Brown (above, n. 73).
This view appears to derive from H. Curtius, "Zur Geschichte des Wegebaus bei den Griechen", Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin aus dem Jahre 1854 (1855) 247ff. and has been followed ever since (see above, n. 82). The herms and the Altar by themselves do not constitute proof of a new road system: Brown (above, n. 73) 119-20, to his credit, realized that no relationship existed between the herms and the Altar that would have implied that they were jointly conceived.

See above, n. 45.

Crome (above, n. 45) 306; cf. Pindar, Fr. 63.3: "...navel of Athens, fragrant with incense...."

Crome (above, n. 45) 307.

See above, n. 47 (Harrison's observation); Hipparchos was not, however, adverse to huge outlay: see below, section B.

Steiria and Kephale were larger demes (see J.S. Traill, "The Political Organization of Attica", Hesperia Suppl. 14 [1975] 67).

Contra Crome (above, n. 45) 306.

See above, n. 18; cf. also Curtius (above, n. 84) 250ff. for a romantic view of the relation of demesman to city.

Cf. Friedländer (above, n. 41) 125-6.
Ivan Margary, *Roman Roads in Britain* (London, 1967) 502-3 notes that, where inscriptions appear on Roman milestones, the laudatory titles of the reigning emperor were more important than information about mileage, destination or point of origin. Of course, Roman milestones were far more numerous and much more precise than Hipparchos' herms. Distances in Attica, smaller and more well-known to its inhabitants, were probably measured then as today in time rather than precisely in stades, a later development.

Cf. Farnell (above, n. 64) 23.


Cf. Paton (above, n. 63) II. 2b, 17, 26, 28, 198, 246, 316, 320, 337 etc.

Friedländer (above, n. 95) 130.

Friedländer (above, n. 95) 87.

Cf. Friedländer (above, n. 98); cf. also the monuments along the Via Appia (G. Hindley, *A History of Roads* [London, 1931] pl. 2).


W.R. Lamb, trans. *Plato* *Hipparchus* (London, 1927) 291 translates \( \nu\nu \nu\) as "memorial"; cf. Pritchett (above, n. 44) 161 who translates the word
(after Shorey) as "rede"; cf. Pausanias' dedication (Thuc. I.132.2).

102 Cf. the dedication of Peisistratos the Younger (Thuc. VI.54.6); cf. also Hipparchos' dedication in the Ptoleon (see below, section C).

103 Cf. Schol. Pind. Pyth. 7.9b (the Peisistratidai are charged with the burning of Apollo's temple at Delphoi); see also How and Wells, II, 29-30.


105 West (above, n. 104) II.137-38 (Fr. 30).

106 Absolute proof of contemporary recognition of Solon's wisdom is provided by the extraordinary commission bestowed on him by the Athenians to rewrite the laws (Plut. Sol. 14).

107 Plut. Sol. 31; according to Herakleides of Pontikos (Plut. Sol. 1), Peisistratos and Solon were related.


109 Diog. Laert. III.7; see also W. Judeich, Topographie von Athen (Munich, 1905) 364.
110
Plut. Thes. 32.3-4.

111

112

113
Paus. I.30.1.

114
Kleidemos, FrGrHist 323, Fr. 15; see also n. 113, above.

115
Pausanias (above, n. 113) states that the epigram showed that Charmos was the first to dedicate an altar to Eros. This must mean that the lines quoted by Kleidemos (above, n. 114) were only part of the inscription. On the epigram see Friedländer and Hoffleit (above, n. 95) 108-9 and Page (above, n. 16) 400-1.

116
Ath.Pol. 22.4; see Chapter II, section 2,D.

117
See above, n. 114; Plut. Sol. 2.1; on Charmos see Davies, APF, 451-2; cf. also Page (above, n. 16) 401.

118
Guthrie (above, n. 63) 319.

119
Paus. I.30.2.

120
Hdt. VII.6; see F. Stoessl R-E 18, 1, 491-3 s.v. Ονομάκριτος.
See T. Rzach, R-E 16, 1, 758-67, especially 765-6, s.v. Μυσαίος.

See above, n. 115; cf. Sappho Fr. 1 (LGS); Anakreon Fr. 358 (PMG 13); on ποικλό- see D.E. Gerber, Euterpe (Amsterdam, 1970) 162; on the date of Polykrates' death and, so, the terminus post quem for Anakreon's arrival in Athens see M.E. White, "The Duration of the Samian Tyranny", JHS 74 (1954) 36.

On Polykrates cf. Strabo 14.368; Athen. 540e; Apul. Flor. 1.15.54; Stob. Eel. 4.21; Ael. V.H. 9.4; on Kimon Plut. Kim. 4.6-9.

It is interesting that Eros is described in Anakreon Fr. 358 (PMG 13) as "throwing a purple ball", since throwing the sphaira was part of the exercise regimen; also Eros is described by Anakreon Fr. 396 as a boxer; but cf. Odys. VIII.372-3 for what may have been the model for Anakreon Fr. 358, l. 1.

Dem. 24.114; cf. Page (above, n. 16) 400.

Plut. Thes. 32ff.

Cf. Wycherley (above, n. 100) 224; πολλα ἄναγκασας ἄναλώσαι... conflicts with Thucydides' assessment that the tyranny's exactions were mild, not harsh or overburdensome.

Plutarch (above, n. 128) links Kimon's embellishment of the Akademy with the Persian spoils.


Bizard (above, n. 130) 238-9.


Jeffery (above, n. 133) 75; see also Appendix; Ducat (above, n. 130) 66 dates the Hipparchos-dedication to 515, but see R. Buck, *A History of Boeotia* (Edmonton, 1979) 118, n. 12.


Cf. Hdt. I.61. The shrine may have, however, belonged to Akraiphia from 550 to 480 and not to Thebes (see P. Stillwell, ed. *The Princeton Encyclopaedia of Classical Sites* [Princeton, 1976] 742, but see Buck [above, n. 134] 100 and 118, n. 12).

See Appendix; also Buck (above, n. 134).
138 [Plato] Hipp. 228d-e.

139 See above, n. 103.

140 See also Thuc. III.104 (below, n. 145).

141 Herodotos (I.64.1-2) links the purification of Delos with 1) rooting the tyranny firmly in Athens after Pallene by means of revenue and epikouroi, and 2) retention of hostages on Naxos, as if the purification strengthened Peisistratos' tyranny.

142 Thuc. I.2.6; 12.4.

143 West (above, n. 104) II, Fr. 4a:

γενώσω, καὶ μοι φρενὸς ἐνάθεν ἄλλην κεῖται
προσβαταὶ τὴν ἐσορῶν γὰρ καὶ τὴν Ἱλιανής
κλιμακάνθιν.

144 Cf. B. Keil, Die Solonische Verfassung in Aristoteles Verfassungsgeschichte (Berlin, 1892) 39, n. 1.

145 Cf. Thuc. III.104.1: οὐχ ἀπάσων, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔρου ἐφεσπράτε τῆς νῆσος

146 See J.S. Boersma, Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.
147
See above, n. 146.

148
For the date of Peisistratos' final return see P.J. Rhodes, "Peisistratid

149
Cf. Thuc. III.104.

150
That is implied by Peisistratos' alleged deposit of hostages on Naxos.

151
See W.A. Laidlaw, A History of Delos (Oxford, 1933) 57-8; H.W. Parke,
"Polycrates and Delos", CQ 40 (1946) 105-8.

152
Cf. Souda s.v. Πυθιά και Δηλίκα.

153
On the date of Polykrates' death see above, n. 122; Parke (above, n. 151)
puts Polykrates' activity at Delos in 523.

154
Commercially: P.N. Ure, The Origin of Tyranny (Cambridge, 1922) 70-1.
Strategically: Parke (above, n. 151).

155
Cf. Hdt. III.125.

156
[Plato] Hipp. 228b; Ael. V.H. 8.2.

157
Strabo 14.638.

158
Cf. Ibykos (LGS 263, 47-8).
159
Cf. Him. 29.22 col.; Max. Tyre 37.5; Athen. 12.540d. Cf. also Paton (above, n. 63) II. 24, 25, 29, 30.

160
Cf. above, n. 157; Hdt. III.121 is suspicious as apocryphal, since the renowned associates, Anakreon and Polykrates, are together at the fatal entrance of the messenger. On Ibykos and love cf. Cic. Tus. Disp. 4.33.71.

161
Ath. Pol. 18.1.

162

163
Cf. Anakreon Fr. 358 (PMG 13).

164
Ath. Pol. 18.1.

165
Cf. Campbell (above, n. 162) 379; Gerber (above, n. 122) 310-1.

166
Cf. [Plato] 228c; see above, n. 33.

167
Hdt. VII.6; Dithyrambist: Souda s.v. Διός; and Simonides: Ar. Wasps 1410-1; cf. also Schol. Pind. Olym. 13.26b; Plut. Mor. 530f; Athen. 8.338b-c; 9.455c.

168
Mart. Cap. 9.936; Souda s.v. Διός.

There is the possibility that Anakreon influenced Aeschylos (see Podlecki [above, n. 169] 381, n. 27): see Epilogue.

Cf. Thuc. I.14.3.

See above, n. 123.

Parke (above, n. 151) 108 considers that, when Polykrates died and no other power asserted itself, Athens "was otherwise occupied". Actually, Athens had neither the power nor the inclination to become involved in the maelstrom of the eastern Aegean after Polykrates' death. The pentekonter was only a gesture and the successors of Peisistratos may have ceded any real pretensions to influence in the Cyclades at his death; cf. above, n. 171; cf. also Bruneau and Ducat (above, n. 146) 17.

Cf. Plato 228c; also cf. Plut. Kim. 10.5 on the proverbial wealth of the Skopadai, the patrons of Simonides after Hipparchos' death (see Podlecki [above, n. 169] 384); on the retention of renowned poets see Plut. Them. 5.2 (see Epilogue).

Hdt. VII.6.3.
On the incident cf. also Paus. I.22.7; in general see M.P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece* (New York, 1951) 130-1; also J. Kirchberg, *Die Funktion der Orakel im Werke Herodots* (Hypomnemata II, Göttingen, 1965) 89.

Bakis: Schol. Ar. Peace 1071; Souda s.v. Βακίς; on Bakis see O. Kern, *R-E* 2.2 2802 s.v. Βακίς. It is important that Herodotos (VIII.96) links Bakis with Musaios, since the link gives some substance to this testimony: Musaios transcribed the oracles of Bakis (Hdt. IX.43) and it is likely they were included in the store on the Akropolis (see below, n. 178). Herodotos had great respect and reverence for them (cf. VIII.20, 77). His reverence is an important factor in light of how the Peisistratidai might have manipulated the oracles. On Amphilytos see Hdt. I.62-3.

Cf. Hdt. V.72.3, 90.2; on the library of Peisistratos see Athen. 1.3.

Hdt. V.93; see Chapter II, section 2,D.

Beloch (above, n. 108) I.2, 294.

Von Stern (above, n. 108) 362-3.

This was suggested to me by Prof. A.J. Podlecki.


Athens' entertainment of the Pelasgians of Lemnos (Hdt. VI.139) is partially indicative of her desire to obtain Lemnos.

Miltiades reminded the Pelasgians of Lemnos of the vow they had made him before the Pythia (Hdt. VI.140), namely, that if Athens sent ships on a voyage from Attic territory in one day by means of a north wind to Lemnos, the Pelasgians would gladly hand Lemnos over to Athens. Miltiades started from Elaious in the Thracian Chersonese, an Athenian foundation. Cf. J. Hart, Herodotos and Greek History (London, 1982) 42.

What part Onomakritos' oracle played in this process is hard to say but its connection with Lemnos must bear upon Peisistratid interest in the island.

Or perhaps Onomakritos had been continuously forging oracles for the Peisistratidai and his mistake was to be discovered by Lasos. In that case, to save the credibility of the remaining oracles, Hipparchos had to exile Onomakritos.

It is also possible that Onomakritos was genuinely bent on treason against Athens, although it is difficult to infer from this oracle.

Markel., Vit. Thuc. 2-4; Euseb. Chron. 01.53.3; see Cadoux, 104.

Hdt. VI.127.4-129; cf. McGregor (above, n. 21) 266-87.


Contra C. Hignett, The History of the Athenian Constitution (Oxford, 1951) 326-31: it does not follow that the Philaidai and the Peisistratidai cooperated because they inhabited the same area in Attica (see Davison [above, n. 191] 29).

194 Identification: Hdt. I.60.3-5; see How and Wells I.83. On the date of the Athena Polias temple see J.S. Boersma (above, n. 146) 113.

195 See above, n. 21.

196 Cf. Hdt. VI.125.5.

197 See J. Boardman (above, n. 75) 36, 168; pl. 296, 1 and 2; see also Davison (above, n. 191) 27 and P.E. Corbett, "The Burgon and Blacas Tombs", JHS 80 (1960) 56-8. The "Burgon" vase was apparently awarded for victory in the chariot-competition (see Corbett, pl. 2).

198 Cf. Boardman (above, n. 75) 108, pls. 207, 301.2 and 304.1. The "Burgon" amphora seems to indicate that the statue of Athena Polias, from which it may have been copied, was flat-footed, as were the korai of the period.

199 Contra J.S. Davison, "Peisistratus and Homer", TAPA 86 (1955) 12: al-
though the Panathenaia may never have developed into a truly panhellenic festival even in Athens' heyday, it was undoubtedly not because the Athenians were attempting to confine it.

Davison (above, n. 199) 10-13.

Hesychios s.v. Βραυρωνίλφες: τὴν Ἰλιδάκη γίδου ῥακυμοί ἐν Βραυρ(ω)νι τῆς Ἀττικῆς.


Cf. Hesiod Erga 653-60.

This is the sense of ἐς υπολήψεως ἑσπερίς (see Davison [above, n. 199] 11).

Cf. Davison (above, n. 199) 19; cf. also Page (above, n. 16) 339.

Cf. Davison (above, n. 199).

Isok. Pan. 159 and Lyk. In Leok. 102 and Diog. Laert. 1.57 show that there was confusion about who instituted the Panathenaiac competitions. Plut. Per. 13.6 attributes the introduction of μουσικῆς ἱγῆνα to Perikles. This attribution is undermined by other ascriptions.

[Plato] Hipp. 228b.
Hdt. V.56; Thuc. I.20.3; Ath. Pol. 18.3.

Hdt. V.56; cf. How and Wells, II.25 who term the hexameters "riddling"; contra Macan I.196: the lines constitute an oracle, not an epigram.

Cf. Macan (above, n. 210) and How and Wells (above, n. 210).


Dyson (above, n. 212) 188, n. 3; this connection is particularly appealing in view of Hipparchos' association with Onomakritos (see above, section 3,B), the chresmologos' connection with Orphism and the stress on justice in the second line of the hexameter (cf. Plato, Laws 715e; Dem. 25.11).

See above, n. 211.


Strassburger (above, n. 215).

How and Wells, I.74.

How and Wells, II.52.
Hdt. V.92e; cf. Immerwahr (above, n. 11) 155, n. 17.

Cf. the oracle spoken to Hippokrates, the father of Peisistratos, by Chilon (Hdt. I.59.2).

Cf. Herodotos' treatment of Kroisos (I.26-34). It seems to me that Fornara (above, n. 215) fails to realize that Greeks like Herodotos could feel strong opposing feelings: Greeks who feared Athens and Perikles in the fifth century could nevertheless admire her for her leading position and Perikles' leadership.


How and Wells (above, n. 222).

Lion of Chaironeia: Paus. 10.40.10; on the sema: Hdt. VII.228; cf.
How and Wells, II.230-1.

228  
Cf. How and Wells, II.230; cf. also W.R. Paton (above, n. 63) II. 344a, 344b and 426; D. Page (above, n. 16) 298-9.

229  
Cf. Ar. Knights 1037; Plut. Alk. 2.2. Plut. Alex. 2.3.

230  

231  
Cf. Odys. IV.447, 459; IX.435; XI.181( XVI.37); XVIII.135; XXIV.163; there is one instance where it is used in a bad sense XIX.100( 163).

232  
Xerxes removed the statues of the tyrannicides in 480: Plin. Nat. Hist. 34.17.

233  
See Chapter II, section 3,F.

234  
See Chapter II, section 2,D.
II. THE SUCCESSION

1. Introduction

The tyrant Peisistratos died an old man in 528/7 B.C. during the archonship of Philoneos. He was succeeded by one or perhaps by both of his eldest sons and Peisistratid rule of Athens continued without interruption until Hippias was expelled in 511. The transition of power from father to son or sons was apparently smooth and the government bequeathed by Peisistratos sound enough to endure for another seventeen years only to fall in the end to foreign intervention.

Our best sources - those nearest in time to the event - dispute who held power after Peisistratos and seem to disregard the possibility of a joint rule. The popular tradition, older than the date of composition of Herodotos' history and likely derived from the Harmodios-skolia, held that Hipparchos succeeded Peisistratos, possibly because of the popular conception of the tyrannicide. Obviously, Hipparchos must have been tyrant, if Harmodios and Aristogeiton murdered "the tyrant". Thucydides argued against the view that Hipparchos succeeded Peisistratos by citing the relative positions of the names of Peisistratos, Hippias, and Hipparchos on the stele that concerned the crimes of the tyrants. He reasoned that Hippias was the eldest of brothers and succeeded Peisistratos because his name appeared on the stele right after his father's. Like Herodotos, Thucydides emphasized that the rule of tyranny at Athens was not stopped by the death of Hipparchos, but continued under Hippias for some four years. It was the Spartans and the Alkmaionidai, not the Athenians, who put an end to Peisistratid rule. Not-
withstanding these arguments, Athenians continued to believe that Hipparchos was tyrant when he was murdered and the pressure of these popular beliefs may have resulted in efforts to reconcile the controversy by combining the brothers in a joint power. An example of this may be the account of the Ath.Pol. The polemic of our earliest sources, however, can have shifted attention away from the possibility of joint rule in fact.

Most modern scholars adhere to Thucydides' view on the subject of succession because the author is a reliable source and because the evidence that he cites seems solid enough. The Achtungsstele, which is described in Thucydides, appears to be primary evidence from the period immediately following the expulsion of Hippias and it seems to show that Hippias did indeed succeed his father because it lists his name first after Peisistratos'. To that evidence, some add the more recently discovered fragment of the Athenian archon-list, which seems to corroborate Thucydides. For the archon-list, which represents a period in the 520s, shows that Hippias held his eponymous archonship shortly after the death of his father, a fact that is taken to indicate that Hippias wanted to legitimize his rule by holding the office as soon as he could after Peisistratos' death. Fewer scholars have accepted joint rule; very few believe that Hipparchos succeeded Peisistratos.

This chapter will examine the major elements of the orthodox view of the succession to determine, if possible, reasons for the variant versions. It may thus be possible to arrive at a better understanding of the succession, especially if the facts of the matter can be viewed away from any controversy or polemic. It should be stated provisionally that much of this examination may seem negative in tone because of the paucity of information for the period. Unfortunately, there is very little to substitute for questionable information without indulging in speculation and overly creative histori-
The archon-list is treated separately in an appendix.
2. The Stele concerning The Crime of The Tyrants

A. Introduction

"Ὅτε δὲ πρεσβύτευτος ἦν Ἰππίας ἤρεν, εἰδὼς μὲν καὶ ἂκοι ἀκριβεστέροις ἅπασι Συμμόμακι, γρατι, οὖν τὸν καὶ αὐτῷ τούτῳ πρώτοις μόνως φαίνονται τῶν γνησίων ἀ δελφῶν γενόμενοι, ὡς ὅ τε Βαμύς σημαίνει καὶ ἡ στήλη περὶ τῆς τῶν τυράννων ἀδίκιας ἂ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων ἀκροπόλει σταθείσα, ἐν τῇ Θεσσαλίᾳ μὲν οὐδ' Ἰππάρχου οὐδεὶς παῖς ἀφροτελὴς, Ἰππίαν δὲ πέντε, οἷον ἐκ Μυρσίνης τῆς Καλλίου τοῦ Ἐπεροχίδου Θυμήτρος ἐγένοτο εἰκὸς μέν ἂν τὸν πρεσβύτατον πρῶτον γῆμαλ. καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ στήλῃ πρῶτος ἀφροτελὴς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα, οὗτοι τούτο ἀπεικότως διὰ τὸ πρεσβεύειν τε ἄπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τυραννέων.

Θουκίδης VI.55.1-2

The stele concerning the crime (adikia) of the tyrants is the strongest evidence adduced by Thucydides in support of his assertion that Hippias succeeded Peisistratos as the tyrant of Athens: for it seems to show that Hippias was the eldest and most politically significant of Peisistratos' sons because it lists him first after his father. Thucydides must have thought that the stele preserved solid, primary evidence about the succession that should have been enough to undercut thoroughly popular Athenian notions about the succession. In fact, the stele is the firm foundation of Thucydides' argument for the succession and it is ours for believing that argument.

The stele endorses our belief in the validity of Thucydides' methodology.
Modern scholars generally accept Thucydides' conclusions, believing that he accurately records and interprets the stele's information. The decree on the stele is thought to have provided for outlawry (atimia) of the Peisistratidai and to have been set up on the Akropolis immediately after Hippias' expulsion from Athens in 511. Many have thus assumed that the stele provides first-hand information about the succession.

In fact, our faith in Thucydides is so strong that his conclusions have really never been seriously doubted. Few studies have explored the evidence of the stele; most of these have been cursory and any that might have cast a doubt upon Thucydides' assertions have been brushed aside. It seems remarkable that such an important document, the evidence for which is almost entirely in Thucydides' history, should have escaped closer scrutiny, if only to determine more precisely the exact contents of the stele.

Actually, some studies have raised questions about the way Thucydides interprets the stele. For instance, some scholars have noted that the structures on the Akropolis, where the stele stood, were destroyed by the Persians in 480. Some of the Peisistratidai had accompanied the Persians to Athens as allies and it seems most unlikely that they would have suffered such a prominent, offensive document as the stele concerning the crimes of their forebears to survive. Again, it has been noticed that Hippias' children were named on the stele, a fact that appears to contradict the charge of tyranny implied by Thucydides: for if Hippias was the tyrant, as Thucydides would have us believe, his sons, who obviously never became tyrants at Athens, cannot have shared the crime. The crime listed on the stele may not have been tyranny. If, on the other hand, all of Hippias' sons were considered tyrants by the Athenians, then there is no reason not to think that Peisistratos' were as well, and thus Thucydides' plea for who was and was not
tyrant fails.

Thucydides' use of the document is cause for some disquiet. Thucydides' primary inference was that Hipparchos cannot have been tyrant because the stele showed that he had no sons. That is a very weak inference primarily because several tyrants and powerful men of archaic Greece had no direct heirs, but passed on their power to brothers or nephews. Thucydides deals with the most important evidence, that Hippias was named first after his father, only secondarily, as if he were less impressed by its merits.

Clearly, the stele made no direct statement about the succession. Thucydides was unable to cite the stele as the source of irrefutable proof, but was compelled to interpret the evidence offered by it from likelihood. Yet, Thucydides' tone in the digression concerning the murder of Hipparchos, which forms the context of his revelation of the stele, is polemical. This tone shows that Thucydides had set himself squarely against popular opinion about the succession, which held that Hipparchos succeeded Peisistratos, and, because of that, Thucydides may have been disposed to construe the not unambiguous information from the stele in accordance with what he strongly believed about the succession. In short, Thucydides may have taken the evidence from the stele for what it seemed rather than for what it was.

Are there any grounds for believing that Thucydides prejudiced the evidence from the stele? First, it must be remembered that the stele on the Akropolis was equally accessible to all the Athenians, not just Thucydides, and that the majority of them did not draw from it the same conclusions as he did. Obviously, if the stele singled Hippias out as the tyrant of Athens, the deeply-rooted popular tradition about Hipparchos' status will have been decisively refuted and prominently so. Again, we would be compelled to question why Thucydides did not cite such information. If the stele recorded
convictions for the crime of tyranny, but did not specify the tyrant after Peisistratos, Thucydides' argument concerning the succession is inconclusive: to any impartial reader of the stele, all named upon it will have shared the power for which they were, before the viewer's eyes, sharing the blame and Hipparchos, whom the popular tradition made "tyrant", could have been tyrant as well as Hippias. But if the crime on the stele was other than tyranny, Thucydides was wrong to insist on the order of names as proof for his assertions about the succession, since the offenders may have been ranked from most guilty to least guilty under the specific charge. The clearest conclusion from all of this is that the stele could in fact have allowed various interpretations about the succession; it offered definite proof for no interpretation. Thus, it seems that Thucydides may have prejudiced the evidence from the stele.

It is of primary importance to determine the content of the stele; equally important is the time when the stele was first erected. For if, as some have believed, the stele was originally set up after 480 and the devastation of the Akropolis, it need not have preserved an accurate record of Peisistratid succession, for that was, by this time, inconsequential. More current animosity directed against the Peisistratidai who had accompanied the Persians in 480 can have influenced the stele's content, both crime and punishment. For the same reason, a stele set up before 480 but destroyed and replaced afterwards may not have been a faithful copy of an earlier document. Perhaps Thucydides glossed over these considerations and misunderstood the stele.

There seem to be ample grounds to justify re-examination of the stele and reassessment of its testimony. Above all, it will be necessary to fix the contents of the stele without regard to Thucydides' interpretations, then
to compare the content with what Thucydides says about it. If a substantial difference exists between what the stele recorded and what Thucydides inferred from it, its citation cannot settle the issue of Peisistratos' successor. This examination will consist of four parts: reconstruction of the stele's content, examination of the charge to be read on the stele, examination of the historical background affecting the stele, and examination of Thucydides' inferences in light of the previous three sections.

B. Reconstruction

To determine the content of the stele, we must first begin with what Thucydides supplies:

- The stele concerned the adikia of the tyrants.
- The stele contained the names of Peisistratos, Hippias, Hipparchos and Thessalos.
- Hippias' name came first after his father's.
- Five children of Hippias were named, including at least two males.
- The stele stood upon the Akropolis.

Such are the "bare bones" offered by Thucydides.

Our first consideration involves the word adikias: could Thucydides have actually read that upon the stele or is he paraphrasing for something else that he read? Many modern scholars have rejected the word adikias found in Thucydides' text in favour of atimias on the ground that the subject of the inscription cannot have been adikia, which was neither a charge nor a
penalty. That is true, but there is no support from the manuscripts to emend the reading, and there is good reason to believe that Thucydides actually read the word *adikias* on the stele.

One piece of evidence is the inscription on an ostrakon cast as a vote against Xanthippos, who was ostracized in 485/4. It reads:

\[ Χοκάν \Theta[ππον τόδε] φεσίν ἀλεττερὸν προτάνελον \]
\[ τόστερα κ[ον Ἀπρρ]φρονος παίδα μᾶ[λ]ιστα ἀδικεῖν \]

Without mentioning the specific charge, the voter/author of the distich has simply pronounced Xanthippos guilty of wrongdoing. He has had done with charges and simply states his judgement.

The case of Miltiades may shed a bit more light upon this type of pronouncement. According to Herodotos (VI.136), Miltiades was found guilty of *ἀνάτη* after he had failed to capture Paros as he had promised the Athenians. He would have been executed had not the people relented and fined him fifty talents κατὰ τὴν ἀδικίαν.

The original charge against Miltiades was not fixed indisputably in antiquity: Ephoros (Nep. Milt. 7.5) reported the charge as treason. Both Herodotos and Ephoros agree on the amount of the fine. It seems likely then that part of the decree of conviction came down to the writers, perhaps to wit: "...in accordance with the crime, let Miltiades, the son of Kimon, pay fifty talents."

Perhaps the best evidence for believing that Thucydides read *adikias* on the stele also supports (at least partial) survival of a decree of conviction against Miltiades. Hipparchos, the son of Charmos, was ostracized in 488/7 and at some later date (probably before 480) was convicted of *prodosia*. Since the Athenians could not procure him to execute, they voted to take down his statue from the Akropolis, melt it and make of it a bronze stele on which
to inscribe the names of other ἀληθήριον and προδότας. Lykourgos, who records this information (1.117), appears to be quoting from a document:

Θανάτῳ ζημιώσαντες ἐπείδη τῆς ἀδικίας αὐξ ἐλαθον το σώμα ὀμηρον τὴν ἐκάκω αὐτοῦ ἐκ ἐκρωτόλεως καὶ θελόντες καὶ συμμαχοῦσας καὶ πολησαντες σώμα την ἐψηφίσαντο...This example shows that adikia was not a crime per se, but that it denoted a crime, which in Hipparchos' case was prodosia.

The crime of adikia evolved later at Athens: the decree of Kannonos (Xen. Hell. 2.7) made death the penalty for anyone "wronging" the Athenian demos. The charge appears to have been applied mostly from the 420s and seems to be a legal development of the later fifth century. Perikles, it is true, was charged with adikia, but this charge denoted alleged fiscal malversation. We have no record of anyone possibly charged before Perikles except Miltiades.

It is reasonable to conclude that Thucydides read adikias on the stele denoting the pronouncement of guilt, not the charge. The crime itself must either have been tyranny, as Thucydides implies, or stated vaguely enough to allow its interpretation as tyranny. This subject will be explored fully in the following section.

Before the examination proceeds, it will be necessary to consider the uneconomical prospect of multiple stelai affecting the Peisistratidai. Thucydides stated that the location of the stele was upon the Akropolis, a place of great concourse at Athens where the most serious offenders were proscribed upon stelai. To anticipate for a moment, the stele concerning the Peisistratidai undoubtedly provided for the gravest of punishments, which, although unnecessary in the case of the dead, need not have been duplicated on other stelai representing the results of further proceedings.
against the family. Once condemned, the Peisistratidai were "eternally"
dammed, so that the stele described by Thucydides was probably the sole major
document preserving the results of legal action against the tyrants. For
Thucydides, it was assuredly the most informative concerning the family of
Peisistratos.

If the singularity of the document is accepted, much more can be in­
ferred about the stele's content, both from the evidence directly related to
it and by analogy. The stele apparently indicted Peisistratos and his family
and Hippias and his family, facts that support the belief that the
Peisistratidai so listed were punished with atimia. It is, however, un­
usual for individual members of the family of men convicted to be named. In
the Erythrai Decree, for example, the children are described as πατέρων οἱ
ἐξ τοῦ κόσμου. In the Milesian Decree against subversives, the offspring
of those convicted are called ἐκγενέστεροι. Both decrees date approximately
to the mid-fifth century. Another decree noteworthy because it is Athenian
and extremely severe in punishment dates from the end of the fifth century:
"...and Archeptolemos and Antiphon are to be atimoi and their gene from them,
both illegitimate (νόθων) and legitimate (γνήσιων)." Since it had
already been decreed that the offenders be handed over to the Eleven for
execution, making them atimoi can only have been pro forma. Families of
men made atimoi were probably not named specifically because their guilt was
only indirect, as a result of their affinity with the offenders; that the
Peisistratidai were named argues that all listed were involved with the crime
charged on the stele.

The punishment inflicted on Antiphon and Archeptolemos was both severe
and unnecessary: with the provision for atimia, it seems likely that the
Athenians were "throwing the book" at them and using earlier models of severe
punishment to help guide them. Antiphon was charged with prodosia, one of the two most heinous crimes at Athens; Antiphon had committed his crime when the enemy were at the very gates of the city. But Antiphon was also the guiding hand of the Four Hundred, the subverters of democracy in 411. The greatest enemies of public security and the democracy throughout the fifth century had been and remained the (ghosts of the) Peisistratidai and there can be no doubt that the Four Hundred were equally regarded in the aftermath: for the fall of the oligarchs had occasioned passage of the Demophantos Decree, which contained both the "archaic" law concerning tyranny and a provision for the murderers of would-be tyrants to be treated "just like Harmodios and Aristogeiton and their descendants". For like service to the state, similar reward; for like crime against the state, similar punishment? As the worst enemies of the state, the Peisistratidai will undoubtedly have merited the harshest punishment, and, as time passed, that punishment will have become the benchmark for harshness simply because it was associated with them. The unnecessary outlawry of Antiphon and his heirs will have been modelled upon the provisions against the Peisistratidai.

The punishment of Antiphon's illegitimate heirs bears upon the stele concerning the Peisistratidai. For Peisistratos too had illegitimate sons and his were active in the affairs of Athens: Hegesistratos actually led a body of Argives to fight against the Athenians at Pallene. As ruler of Sigeion, he harboured the fugitive Peisistratidai when they were expelled from Athens and provided them with a base for further intrigues against the new democracy. It is easy to see why such a dangerous individual as Hegesistratos would not have escaped the indictment brought against the Peisistratidai at Athens.

It would thus appear likely that both the genesioi and the nothoi of
Peisistratos were listed by analogy with the punishment meted to Antiphon. If that is the case, we should expect that a distinction was made between legitimate and illegitimate. Perhaps the most economical solution is that the distinction was made by wife. If women were listed upon the stele, it would help to explain how Thucydides knew so much about Myrrhine's lineage. The stele may have named Peisistratos' sons by his first wife and then his sons by the Argive woman, Timonassa.

There is some controversy about whether the stele named only male children of Peisistratos and Hippias or both male and female. Some have urged that the decree on the stele need only have been concerned with those who were thought to constitute a threat to Athens, i.e., the sons and potential successors of Peisistratos and Hippias. But that type of reasoning is too logical: the stele was not completely functional, for Peisistratos and other dead men were made atimoi. If Myrrhine's name was on the stele, the names of other females may have been also.

The names of the nothoi (and perhaps of the female Peisistratidai) show that the stele was designed to encompass many. How far the names extended, i.e., to what degree the punishment was effective, is difficult to say. The naming of Myrrhine's grandfather suggests that no less than two generations above Hippias' were named, provided, of course, Myrrhine herself was listed.

Exactly how the names were listed on the stele depends very much upon our interpretation of Thucydides: "...on it, no child of Thessalos or of Hipparchos is listed, but there are five named of Hippias, born to him by Myrrhine, the daughter of Kallias, son of Hyperochides...." and "...his name (sc. Hippias') comes first on the stele after his father's...." If we take Thucydides literally, Peisistratos was followed on the list by Hippias, who
was in turn followed by his five paides; then came Hipparchos and Thessalos and finally the children of Peisistratos by Timonassa. That is an unattractive arrangement, not only because it leaves no room for the names of wives, but more because it disrupts Peisistratos' genos by interposing the genos of Hippias.

The original manuscript reading of the text concerning the position of Hippias' name after his father's begins ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ στήλῃ (see above, p. 81). Most scholars accept Poppo's emendation without further comment on the ground that πρώτῃ is nonsensical: Thucydides had been speaking about only one stele until that point. It has been suggested that Thucydides really meant to describe two stelai here, one that listed the names of the tyrants, and another that listed their crimes. That suggestion has drawn no support and to its criticism can be added that the word adikias is collective and shows that all named on the stele were involved with one charge. There seems to be no other alternative than to accept Valla's transcription of ipso (i.e., αὕτη).

It could be that a division was made on the stele between the genos of Peisistratos (i.e., the older generation) and the genos of Hippias (the younger generation). If that is so, then, contrary to what Thucydides imputes, the arrangement of names seems to show only that Hippias' children were involved in the crime charged, not necessarily that his brothers were childless.

Indeed, there may be some reason to believe that the stele was designed more to indict the Peisistratidai still living and still threatening Athens than to punish the dead. The best evidence for this comes from Aristophanes' Birds, 1074-75: ὥστε τῶν τυράννων τίς τινα τῶν τεθνηκότων ἀποκτεῖναι, τάλαντον λαμβάνειν. The "joke" about killing tyrants that are "already dead" fol-
lows upon mention of Diagoras the Melian, who had been proscribed with a bounty to procure his apprehension for having revealed the Mysteries to the uninitiated. According to Melanthios the Atthisographer (FrGrHist 326 Fr. 3), Diagoras' name was written upon a bronze stele with the following:

εἴν δὲ τις ἀποκτεῖνη Διαγόρας τὸν Μῆλιον, λαμβάνειν ἄργορον ταλαντον, εἴν δὲ τις ζώντα ἄγαξην, λαμβάνειν δύο. Aristophanes probably saw both stelai in the same area on the Akropolis. The bounty that he mentions must also have been on the stele known to Thucydides; of course, the words τῶν τεθυκότων were his additions.

There is other evidence to indicate that the Peisistratidai were proscribed. The Patrokleides Decree (Andok. 1.77-79) provided amnesty from the demos for most offenders convicted before 405. It was modelled by its author after an earlier decree issued before the Persian War that provided for the recall of exiles. Patrokleides moved that all the names of those convicted be expunged, with some important exceptions: ... ηλὴν ὀπὸσα εἰν στήλαις γέγραπται τῶν μη ἔθες μειλίνους, ἣ ἤ Αρειοὺ πάγου ἣ τῶν ἔφες ἢ ἐκ πρυγαγείων ἡ Δελφικὴ καταδίκα θεία [ἡ] ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων [ἡ] ἐπὶ φῶν ἢς ἔστι φωλὴ ἡ θάνατος κατερνήσθη ἡ σφάγεως ἡ ἀράννοις.

There were no specific convictions that we know of before 405 on charges of tyranny and so this provision seems to be pro forma a restatement of an earlier decree excepting those convicted as tyrants. There is no good reason to doubt that the Patrokleides Decree is in part derived from the amnesty of 480. That amnesty forbade the return of "tyrants who had been condemned to death", - i.e., the Peisistratidai inscribed upon the stele. Of course, this information has much wider significance for the type of crime charged and that will be taken up in the following section.

Stahl contended that the stele Thucydides saw also recorded a sentence
of perpetual exile for the Peisistratidai and that opinion has been shared by many. Stahl based his belief on the text of Markellinos (Vit. Thuc. 32) where it is stated that the Athenians recalled their exiles after the Sicilian debacle in 413:
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Stahl was right to cite this passage as evidence for exile being imposed on the Peisistratidai, but perhaps wrong to infer that the Athenians had developed the formal sentence of perpetual exile for secular crime and that it had been applied to the Peisistratidai. Surely, by 413, the formulaic exclusion of the Peisistratidai from amnesty bills will have become routine: continued execration of the Peisistratidai was de rigueur, in so far as they symbolized the enemies of the democracy as much as the tyrant-slayers symbolized the democracy. We should remember in conjunction with this that Markellinos derived his information from a motion made in 413, not before.

Other evidence offers a better parallel for the type of exile imposed upon the Peisistratidai, principally because it is nearer in time to their exile and because it is linked with a bounty. The Milesian Law stipulated flight for Alkimos and Kresphontes:
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would have been "forever" (or as long as their opponents remained in power at Miletos) since, if they returned, they would be subject to arrest and execution.

The same decree offers more evidence about what might have been on the stele described by Thucydides. In the Milesian Decree, Nympharetos' property is confiscated and the proceeds from its sale are used to pay for the bounty on the heads of Alkimos and Kresphontes. Herodotos (VI.121) claimed that Kallias, the son of Phainippos, alone of all the Athenians, had enough courage to purchase the property of Peisistratos when it was made public. Whatever the merits of the individual story, Herodotos preserves the memory of property-confiscation affecting the Peisistratidai, the likeliest time for which was when they had been proscribed upon the stele. In fact, since public sale of property occurred in most cases for a capital crime, it would have been surprising if the Peisistratid property was not seized.

So much can be concluded about the content of the stele with any reasonable amount of certainty. It will be useful, before proceeding to consider the crime charged to the Peisistratidai, to recapitulate the stele's content:

- The most important stele concerning the Peisistratidai was situated on the Akropolis.
- It recorded a judgement that included the word adikia.
- The names of the sons of Peisistratos and the sons of Hippias were listed; the implication is that all listed by name were subject to the charge.
- The names of legitimate and illegitimate sons were listed.
- The names of women may have been listed.
- Those charged were made atimoi; they were exiled.
- They were condemned to death specifically and a price was put upon their heads.
- Their family property was confiscated.
- The provisions affected both the living and the dead.

C. The Charge

It has been widely assumed that the crime for which the Peisistratidai were proscribed upon the stele described by Thucydides was tyranny. That assumption is based in part on:

a) Thucydides' belief in the stele as an accurate record of the succession (and, of course, our belief in Thucydides' soundness),
b) the order of names on the stele,
c) and perhaps most compellingly, the reasonable expectation that the Athenians once freed would condemn the Peisistratidai for the despotism they had enjoyed.

There are, however, certain problems connected with each that require solving. Thucydides' belief in the stele may have been well-intentioned, but he seems to have disregarded an eventful gap in time between the end of the tyranny and the Persian War, a gap that may have had profound influence on the stele's content. Again, the order of names on the stele, particularly with regard to the younger Peisistratidai indicted, may not indicate any
order of succession after Peisistratos: indeed, the provision on the stele for bounty shows that the younger Peisistratidai were of greater consequence to the Athenians who were actively pursuing them. The bounty indicates that the younger group, with Hippias at their head, were more threatening. For a) and b), the date of the stele is all-important and will be dealt with in the following section. The last consideration, c), is perhaps most formidable, since we know that anti-tyranny laws were in effect at Athens before 510. We want to conceive that the Athenians revenged themselves on the Peisistratidai for the loss of their freedom.

But if the reconstruction of the stele's content has so far been accurate, the Peisistratidai indicted on the stele will not have been convicted of tyranny: for there is a very great discrepancy between its punishments and those punishments meted out to criminals convicted under anti-tyranny laws in effect in 510. If the Peisistratidai were not convicted of tyranny, then the order of names on the stele need reflect only a ranking in order of degree of offense, not succession, which of course is irrelevant in such a case. A comparison of the stele's punishments with those prescribed for tyrants will illustrate my point.

The oldest tyranny law of Athens is ascribed to Solon (Ath. Pol. 8.4):

καὶ τοὺς ἑπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δῆμου συντιμήσειν
ἐκρίνειν Σολώνος Θεότας νόμον εἰσαγγέλεις περὶ αὐτῶν

This "law" is disputed as regards its total validity, but, especially, for the provisions regarding eisangelia. Great suspicion attaches to the phrase καταλύσει τοῦ δῆμου, since the collective noun demos as injured party can hardly have applied politically before 510. Again, the word καταλύσει seems to have found a certain vogue, perhaps because of its use in the Demophantos Decree against tyranny and sedition. The "Solonian
law against tyrants" gives every indication of being an anachronism.

There is, however, another law regarding tyranny that was likely in effect during and after the Peisistratid tyranny. It is preserved best in Ath. Pol. 16.10:

\[\text{Θέσμος τάδε Ἄθηναιών ἐστὶ καὶ πάτρια: έὰν τινες τυραννεῖν ἐπανιστῶνται} [ἐπὶ τυραννίδα] \]
\[\text{η' συγκαθολοτῇ <τὸς> τὴν τυραννίδα,} \]
\[\text{άτιμον εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ γένος.} \]

The same law is repeated almost verbatim, but without purpose, in the Demophantos Decree. Obviously, the archaic law was a symbol of the past and was included in the new law on tyrants to instill in it a long-recognized validity. Demophantos noted no other law concerned with tyranny and it may be that the archaic law was the only law dealing with tyrants in effect before the passage of the Demophantos Decree.

The law described in Ath. Pol. 16.10 has been termed "archaic" for two reasons, the word \(\text{Θέσμος} \) and the change of the verb number from plural (ἐπανιστῶνται) to singular (συγκαθολοτῇ). It has been accepted as valid for the period when the Peisistratidai were expelled from Athens.

Ostwald demonstrated where the passage of the law should be placed: he noted that most of Drakon's laws were overturned by Solon's amnesty law (Plut. Sol. 19.4). Solon re-enfranchised those who had been \(\text{ατιμοί} \), except those who had been convicted by the Areiopagos of murder, political massacre or for tyranny (ἐπὶ τυραννίδα). Thus, Solon's amnesty law seems to show that an anti-tyranny statute existed before Solon passed his law and that the anti-tyranny law made exile punishment for those convicted of tyranny. Ostwald reasoned that the author of the Ath. Pol. must have consulted a written source because the author quotes the archaic law directly. Ostwald thought that the archaic
anti-tyranny law must be ascribed to Drakon, who was the first to write down the laws and who probably wrote the archaic law on tyranny as a result of the attempted tyranny of Kylon. Drakon's law was, for a time in the sixth century, superseded by Solon's anti-tyranny law, Ostwald believed, but was later resurrected at the time of Hippias' expulsion to be used against the Peisistratidai and, a short time later, against the followers of Isagoras.

Whatever we choose to believe about the archaic law's authenticity, it was not invoked against the Peisistratidai at the time of their expulsion or their proscription. For the punishment inflicted by the archaic anti-tyranny law was far exceeded by the punishment found upon the stele. This punishment could not have been implicit in the old law, since it would not have needed specification on the stele. When the author of the *Ath.Pol.* wrote about the archaic anti-tyranny law, he was prompted to remark about the mildness of the archaic laws on tyranny in effect during the rule of the Peisistratidai and he used the law that he cited as an example of that mildness. The word that he used to describe the laws, *νποκλ*, has most frequently been taken as an indication that the author misunderstood the meaning of the word *atimos*. He apparently thought that *atimos* meant only "loss of civil rights" as it meant in his own day, rather than "outlawry" (i.e., "kill with impunity") as earlier. But his observation shows other important things that have been overlooked: a) the author was familiar with other anti-tyranny laws (undoubtedly the Demophantos Decree and the Law of Eukrates) that were far harsher than the archaic law, and b) the archaic law, from the evidence he had before him, must have lacked conspicuously the severity of the other laws. Obviously, the author of the *Ath.Pol.* cannot have known anything to contradict his pronouncement, since that would have made it silly; the law he saw was really all there was of it: it did not stipulate anything as
harsh as death, since then the law would have been far from ἀτιμία. The archaic law, as the author records it, must only have provided for ἀτιμία, for otherwise the term ἀτιμία makes no sense. The Peisistratidai, we have seen, were subjected to far harsher penalties than mere ἀτιμία. Their punishment was specified, not implicit, which means that such punishment cannot have been in conformity with a law that prescribed ἀτιμία. Again, the stele cannot have set forth the crime as tyranny and then have included such punishment if the author of the Αθ.Πολ. did not note it, especially since it affected the Peisistratidai and since he knew about other anti-tyranny laws. The only justifiable conclusion is that the Peisistratidai were not convicted and proscribed for tyranny under the archaic anti-tyranny law.

If the charge upon the stele was not tyranny, what was it? A contemporary case involving sedition may shed some light. Kleomenes campaigned against Athens with some renegade Athenians ἐπὶ τραχύνηδα. After he had captured the Akropolis, he was besieged there with his followers and forced to come to terms with his besiegers. Kleomenes agreed to leave the Akropolis and Attica in exchange for free passage out. When he had departed, "the Athenians took down the houses (sc. of the renegade Athenians), made public their property and voted some the death penalty. And they wrote their names upon a bronze stele and placed it in the city near the old temple."

Punishment was inflicted upon those abandoned to their fate by Kleomenes and, in absentia, upon those who were fortunate enough to have accompanied him. Whatever credence we wish to give the story, the punishment of those renegade Athenians was much graver than what the law prescribed for tyranny.

In fact, the punishment inflicted upon the Isagorids is very similar to the punishment for ἁρματική. Generally, the charge of ἁρματική was incurred either for plotting or for fighting with the enemies of one's country to sub-
due one's fellow-citizens. We compare the punishment inflicted upon Antiphon and Archeptolemos, two later Athenian prodotai: "Let them be handed over to the Eleven and let their belongings be made public property and let a tenth be the goddess'; let their homes be demolished and a marker be placed in the ground on which the words are written: (Land) of the Traitors, Antiphon and Archeptolemos. Let the demarch display their property and let them not be buried in Attica or in the jurisdiction of the Athenians. And let him be atimos, both himself and his genos, both illegitimate and legitimate." It is significant that Antiphon, the ideologue of the Four Hundred, was not charged with subversion. The Four Hundred were obviously guilty of subversion and Antiphon's defense was called the charge of subversion must have been hurled at him by his accusers (see above, n. 37). The Demophantos Decree was the result of the subversion of the Four Hundred. We presume that Antiphon's accuser could obtain an easy conviction on that charge, especially in light of the fear of subversion rampant at Athens after 415. Yet, Antiphon and Archeptolemos were not charged and convicted under any anti-tyranny or anti-subversion law, but under the law concerning prodosia.

There are at least two ways to explain this: either prodosia was thought a more serious crime than subversion or subversion did not allow for a punishment commensurate with the gravity imputed to Antiphon's crime. The first possibility seems to be ruled out because Athenian fear of tyranny made the charge very serious. But the archaic law, apparently the only anti-subversion law in effect at Athens until it was superseded by the Demophantos Decree, had no teeth: it specified only atimia as punishment; the Demophantos Decree provided much more. Although there may have been some precedents that united the crime of subversion with the punishment of atimia
(e.g., the Kylonians), they were probably misunderstood because, by the end of the fifth century, *atimia* was understood only in its milder sense of disfranchisement. The Demophantos Decree was obviously deemed necessary in order to tighten up the punishment for subversion and so explicitly to set out what was to be the lot of convicted subverters. Thus, no clear-cut precedent involving drastic punishment for tyranny or subversion was available for use in Antiphon's case. That state of affairs will account for the charge of *prodosia*, rather than subversion, brought against Antiphon.

After 410, however, the picture rapidly changes: in one case, a man whose crime was clearly treason was also charged with subversion. Aristarchos, a general of the Athenians, was tried, convicted and undoubtedly executed on a combined charge of *katalysis* and *prodosia*. His conviction shows that even marginal cases could now be linked to *katalysis*, perhaps because the Athenians, with their fears increasing, were also increasingly combining the two crimes. The Demophantos Decree provided the legal means to obtain convictions for subversion and punishments that were harsh.

Events of the late fifth century support the conclusion reached by the author of the *Ath. Pol.*: anti-tyranny laws of old were mild; they lacked the harshness of the later laws. The Demophantos Decree, an *ex post facto* law, was designed to quell any further attempts at subversion by bringing the punishment for the crime up to date. The archaic anti-tyranny law was cited in the Demophantos Decree to strengthen the new law with its long-standing validity. There was no other law that could be invoked in Antiphon's case to punish him properly for the crime of subversion. After the passage of the Demophantos Decree, convictions for sedition could be obtained even though the defendant was only marginally implicated.

Before the passage of the Demophantos Decree, the archaic anti-tyranny
law was in force and the Peisistratidai would have come within its scope had they been tried for tyranny. Yet even a glancing comparison of the provisions made for the Peisistratidai upon the stele and the archaic anti-tyranny law shows conclusively that the Peisistratidai were punished under another, far harsher law. Otherwise, we are forced to posit an anti-tyranny law affecting the Peisistratidai on the stele used especially for them, but not others like Antiphon, about which neither we nor the author of the \textit{Ath.Pol.} nor apparently Demophantos know anything and which makes the pronouncement of the author of the \textit{Ath.Pol.} about the mildness of the laws in effect during the time of the Peisistratidai sheer nonsense.

On the following page (Table 1), a comparison is shown between the punishments prescribed for the Peisistratidai and those inflicted on the Isagorids and Antiphon together with those set forth in the Milesian Decree. Only those punishments that are actually independently attested for the Peisistratidai or reasonably to be inferred from the independent sources are compared. That comparison shows that the punishments for the Peisistratidai are very similar to those inflicted on Antiphon and Archeptolemos for \textit{prodosia}. The list that should offer the greatest similarity both because of the crime and the time, i.e., the list of punishments affecting the Isagorids, is again like that for Antiphon with the notable exception that the names of the Isagorids were to be inscribed upon a stele that was to be set up on the Akropolis. On the basis of this comparison, we must conclude that the Peisistratidai were charged not with tyranny, but with \textit{prodosia}.

This conclusion is not as illogical as might seem the case at first, for several factors support the belief that the Peisistratidai were indicted for treason. First, Hippias' children are named, indicating that they too were guilty of the crime. Unlike Peisistratos' children who participated in the


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Peisistratidai</th>
<th>II. Isagorids</th>
<th>III. Milesian Decree</th>
<th>IV. Antiphon/Archeptolemos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a) death penalty/bounty</td>
<td>2. a) death penalty</td>
<td>3. a) death penalty/bounty</td>
<td>4. a) death penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. b) flight</td>
<td>3. b) -</td>
<td>4. b) flight</td>
<td>5. b) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. c) property confiscated</td>
<td>4. c) property confiscated</td>
<td>5. c) property confiscated</td>
<td>6. c) property confiscated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. d) denial of burial in Attica</td>
<td>5. d) -</td>
<td>6. d) denial of burial in Attica</td>
<td>7. d) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. e) stele with names on Akropolis</td>
<td>6. e) stele with names on Akropolis</td>
<td>7. e) names written on horoi</td>
<td>8. e) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. f) progeny condemned</td>
<td>7. f) -</td>
<td>8. f) progeny condemned</td>
<td>9. f) progeny condemned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. g) -</td>
<td>8. g) houses to be demolished</td>
<td>9. g) -</td>
<td>10. g) houses to be demolished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Ar. Birds 1074-5
2 Hdt. V.96.2; Markel., Vit. Thuc. 32
3 Hdt. VI.121
4 inferred from indictment of the dead
5 inferred

inferred from indictment of the dead
establishment of their father's tyranny, the children of Hippias did not:

Hippias' tyranny derived solely from his father. Second, the Peisistratidai actually led foreign enemies to Attica to fight against their former countrymen in 490 and accompanied the Persians once more in 480. Helping the Persians against the Athenians will surely have earned them the great hatred of the Athenians. In fact, it is impossible to believe that this treason did not have real impact on the Athenians, especially in view of their renewal of the plundered tyrannicide-group in 477. That renewal surely indicates that a consciousness survived about the Peisistratidai, which expressed itself triumphantly and defiantly. It is therefore significant that the Peisistratidai actually committed treason against the Athenians and that the stele describes punishments for treason. There is good reason to believe on separate grounds that the climate of intense hostility implied by the punishments on the stele was not present at Athens until after Marathon, well after Hippias was expelled (this will be taken up in the following section). These factors combine to suggest that the stele may indeed have recorded punishments for prodosia and may have been set up first after 490.

Perhaps it will be argued that a crime more recent than tyranny cannot have affected the long-dead members of the Peisistratidai who had not been party to it. But whatever crime was charged to the family will have had to accommodate the long-dead anyway and a retroactive charge of treason can have done that. For Peisistratos, too, had introduced foreign enemies onto Attic soil to fight the Athenians at Pallene. The same crime under similar circumstances in roughly the same region of Attica was committed later by Hippias when, in 490, he brought the Persians to land at Marathon. The memory of Pallene stood long in the minds of the Athenians and the parallel
nature of the treason will not have escaped their notice. Again, the Athenians were adept at dredging up charges well after the fact of the original crime to deal with more current malefaction when it fit their needs. Thus, in sum, *prodosia* could fit the older generation of Peisistratidai; tyranny could not fit the younger.

**D. Historical Considerations**

Two periods stand forth as the likeliest ones for the Athenians to have vented their hostility on the Peisistratidai in the way indicated by the severity of the punishments on the stele: a) 510 or shortly thereafter, in the wake of Hippias' expulsion from Athens, or b) around 490 when the Persians threatened Athens. Strong presumption has heretofore been the fast ally of the first period, for we assume that the Athenians acted to rid themselves of their tyrants and that, once free, they would turn their pent-up wrath on the Peisistratidai with full force. The stele that condemned them will have resulted from the reapplication of the archaic anti-tyranny law that was allowed to lapse during the Peisistratid regime. But even aside from the fact that the punishment on the stele is too harsh to have resulted from the anti-tyranny law, events at the time of Hippias' expulsion do not provide reasons to believe that the Athenians were hostile to the deposed tyrants. For not only were the Peisistratidai allowed to evacuate the city; they were also allowed to take some of their belongings, a fact that seems to contradict the stele. Indeed, men who could be identified with the interests of the tyrants and who later suffered by the implication survived the
expulsion of the Peisistratidai and even prospered until after the battle of Marathon. Their activity, indeed their survival, would surely have been precluded by the Athenians had they been extremely hostile to the family early on. If the stele was not part of the aftermath of Hippias' expulsion from Athens, but the result of some later action by the Peisistratidai, it obviously need not have reflected an accurate record of the succession or even had anything to do with it. We have seen that the punishment on the stele was similar to that given for prodosia; the Peisistratidai actually committed that crime when Hippias led the Persians to Marathon.

This section will be divided into two parts: first, the events surrounding the expulsion of the Peisistratidai will be examined and compared with actions taken against the similar, nearly contemporary sedition of the Isagorids in order to show that special restraint was accorded the thoroughly defeated Peisistratidai. In contrast with the punishment prescribed on the stele for the Peisistratidai, this restraint must be taken as an indication that the hostility in evidence on the stele did not yet exist in 510. For the stele shows conclusively that the Athenians wanted the Peisistratidai dead, while the events of 510 show that, although the Athenians had the family completely in their power, they spared them and even allowed them to remove some of their own property. Second, some of the events of the decade following Marathon will be discussed to show that that period was far more conducive to an Athenian hatred of the Peisistratidai and for a charge of prodosia than after 510. The charge of treason was a common one during the 480s and affected Hipparchos, the son of Charmos, and perhaps other so-called "friends of the tyrants". The charge of treason at Athens during the 480s must be construed chiefly in light of Persian aggression against Athens and the threat, after 490, of renewed invasion, destruction, and possible depor-
tation of survivors into the interior of Asia. The Peisistratidai were
the agents of the Persian threat and so the 480s are far likelier to have
seen the charge levelled at the Peisistratidai than the year 510.

After Anchimolios had been defeated by the Thessalian cavalry under
Kineas, King Kleomenes of Sparta led a new, much larger force against the
Peisistratidai, but this time by land instead of by sea. We recall that
the Spartans had finally given way to the recommendations of the Pythia, who
urged them to free Athens. Kleomenes' force encountered no trouble with
the Thessalians and put them to rout with loss. Kleomenes then advanced
on Athens with those who, according to Herodotos, "wished to be free", i.e.,
the Alkmaionidai and others who had been exiled by the Peisistratidai.
We note that it is Herodotos' designation and that the record of the
Alkmaionidai contradicts that designation: Megakles, the son of Alkmaion,
had actually formed an alliance with Peisistratos that enabled him to return
to Athens from exile and take power again. Although the family may have
been opposed to the reimposition of Peisistratid rule in 546 and may have
fought against them at Pallene, certain reconciliation was achieved by the
mid-520s: Kleisthenes' eponymous archonship followed after Hipplias'.
Kleisthenes had been exiled in the wake of Hipparchos' murder and he was re-
turning with Kleomenes to settle the score. The family's record shows
that the Alkmaionidai were opportunistic and changeable rather than idealis-
tic and Herodotos' designation of them is flattering, but inaccurate. Once
again the Alkmaionidai were being opportunistic, for it was a safe bet to
return from exile to Athens in the company of a Spartan army with a Spartan
King at its head.

The Peisistratidai had anticipated Kleomenes' advance and had provi-
sioned the Akropolis for siege. Possibly, their strategy was simply to
hold out as long as possible in the belief that the besieging army would soon tire of the siege and abandon it. But the capture of the children of the Peisistratidai shows that their condition on the Akropolis was not good, for they had deemed it better to risk sending their children away from the siege than to have them remain on the Akropolis with them.

If we were to believe what Herodotos says about the siege, the resolve of the Spartans was also fading, and they were on the verge of breaking the siege off when the children of the Peisistratidai were taken. But Herodotos may have lessened the Spartan resolve here in order to detract from them as liberators of Athens.

At any rate, when the Peisistratidai heard of the capture of their children, their plan of resistance (whatever it may have been) was ruined. In order to obtain the release of their children from danger, they agreed to abandon their positions on the Akropolis and to leave Attica in five days with their moveables. Considering the fact that, once they were away from the Akropolis and its defences, the Peisistratidai were completely in the power of the Athenians, the terms they received were extremely generous.

Hippias and his followers crossed to Sigeion in the Troad, a city that was held by Hippias' half-brother, Hegesistratos. Thucydides claimed that Hippias began to look about for allies after Hipparchos was murdered because he knew that trouble was brewing at Athens. Consequently, Hippias arranged a marriage-alliance with Hippoklos, the tyrant of Lampsakos, giving his daughter in marriage to Hippoklos' son, Aiantides. But the particle that introduces the information about the marriage of Archedike shows that Thucydides inferred there was trouble at Athens (because later there was) that caused Hippias to cast about for allies.

The arrangements made with the Peisistratidai were not like those made
with other defeated parties, and events that followed the siege of the Isagorids on the Akropolis offer an important case in point. After Hippias had been expelled and Kleisthenes and Isagoras had engaged in *stasis* to determine political primacy at Athens, Isagoras summoned his ally, Kleomenes, to assist him. Kleomenes returned to Athens to help consolidate Isagoras' power after Kleisthenes had withdrawn. Kleomenes and Isagoras, however, were forced onto the Akropolis where they were besieged by the Athenians *en masse*. After two days, the parties came to an agreement whereby the Spartans, Kleomenes and Isagoras could withdraw from Attica in peace, but the other Athenians and foreigners who had joined them were to be left behind to their fate. These latter were executed and their crime must have been *prodosia*.

It seems likely that the Spartans were allowed to depart primarily because the Athenians feared reprisals. Still, the Spartan force was small, but may have seemed formidable enough not to challenge in combat. At any rate, Kleomenes retained force enough to be able to extend his shield effectively over the chief traitor, Isagoras, the logical target of the greatest Athenian wrath.

The question arises: Why, if the Athenians were so harsh with the Isagorids, were they so lenient with the Peisistratidai? For when the younger Peisistratidai were taken and the others forced from their defensive positions on the Akropolis, the Peisistratidai were effectively divested of all of their bargaining power. Then both elder and younger could have been killed, if that was what the Athenians wanted. Instead, they granted the family not only their lives, but also their possessions. Clearly, the Athenians were not desirous of killing the Peisistratidai when they came down from the Akropolis and when they were helpless.

Fear of reprisal cannot have been a factor in this case. No army stood
poised on the border to move quickly to the rescue of the family; and even later, when Thebes and Chalkis invaded Attica, they did so not in concert with the Peisistratidai with a view to reestablishing them at Athens, but obviously from self-interest. Anyway, when the Athenians ejected the Peisistratidai, they did so with the Spartans and need have feared no reprisal.

Three groups were active in the overthrow of the Peisistratidai: the Spartans, the exiles (including the Alkmaionidai), and the rest of the Athenians. Now the exiles, whom Herodotos calls "those who wanted their freedom", would want the Peisistratidai spared least of all, for they had suffered loss and exile from Hippias. In their forefront were the Alkmaionidai, who were not averse from the summary execution of their political enemies: they had actually slaughtered the followers of Kylon, who were not personal enemies, and probably sanctioned the execution of the Isagorids who were unlucky enough to be left behind by Kleomenes. But whatever the Alkmaionidai and other exiles may have held against the Peisistratidai, they either restrained themselves or were forced to yield to the others who were determined on restraint.

Perhaps Kleomenes and the Spartans comprised the restraining force. Hippias was a proxenos of the Spartans and Kleomenes may have extended his protection to Hippias and his family as he did later to Isagoras. This means that the Athenians themselves played a far less prominent role in their own liberation than we have accepted, being really no more than bystanders to what was happening around them. It remains a distinct possibility that the Athenians were actually apathetic to their own liberation, although this seems difficult to believe.

If the Athenians took a more active role in their own liberation, it
will have been by their consent that the Peisistratidai obtained such generous terms. Herodotos' designation of the Alkmaionidai and exiles as "those who wished to be free" indicates that there were some at Athens who were either passive to the whole business or opposed to the endeavours of the Spartans and exiles. There is good reason to believe that many of the Athenians of good standing in the community were not at all ill-disposed toward the Peisistratidai, for most officials owed their positions to the patronage of the family. It has even been argued that the Peisistratidai were given such generous terms because the Areiopagos, under whose jurisdiction they will have come if tried for tyranny, refused to convict them. The Athenians allowed their former "oppressors" to leave Athens without punishment.

The punishment prescribed for the Peisistratidai on the stele will not match the events of Hippias' expulsion from Athens. For the stele's provisions are stern: death is desired and a bounty is set to obtain it, the purport being that the Peisistratidai are out of the grasp of Athenian law. It is absurd to imagine that, if the Athenians held the Peisistratidai so totally in their power and so powerfully wished them dead, they would have allowed the family to depart from Attica within a generous span of five days and to take with them some of their own property. That seems flatly to contradict the evidence of the stele. Clearly, the attitude of the Athenians had not yet hardened to the point of wanting the Peisistratidai dead. They wanted them out, yes; but the Athenians spared their lives and granted them their possessions.

In fact, there is other evidence to suggest that a number of supporters of the family remained in Athens and even amounted to a political force in the city. Hipparchos, the son of Charmos, was a σύμμετέρως of Peisistratos
and was styled leader of this faction. According to the *Ath. Pol.* (22.4), the φίλοι τῶν τυράννων were allowed to stay on at Athens because they were not implicated in the political upheavals. Hipparchos became eponymous archon in 496/5 and, whether or not his status as leader of the faction was inferred from later events, his connection with the Peisistratidai may have depended on his affinity to them. Naturally, it would have been out of the question for Hipparchos, the son of Charmos, to obtain the still desirable office of archon if the Peisistratidai were in a state of execration such as is implied by the stele. Most of the ruling families of Athens after 510 will, at some time during the course of the later sixth century, have been associated with the Peisistratidai and those expelled with Hippias may have been only the immediate family. Collateral relatives were spared exile, although it is impossible to know to what degree. Hipparchos, the son of Charmos, survived with others (like Hippokrates, son of Anaxileos?) on the favourable side of the line of demarcation to become important men and leaders of the community.

We must accept that a certain ambiguity of feeling existed at Athens in regard to the Peisistratidai. On the one hand, the Athenians clearly wanted an end to tyranny and the departure of the family; but, on the other hand, the Athenians were unwilling to harm the members of that family. Some survived the expulsion who were tied to the Peisistratidai by blood and who made themselves felt politically later. This lack of ill-will toward the Peisistratidai may have been rooted in their long tenure of power and the resultant patronage they exercised, which earned for them debts of gratitude from those they promoted. Any ambiguity of feeling toward them, however, resolved itself into open animosity when it became abundantly clear to the Athenians from Hippias' involvement in the Persian campaign of 490 that he
was ready to harm them and their city to regain his rule and to obtain vengeance.

When compared with the harsh injunctions on the stele, the attitude of the Athenians immediately after the expulsion of the Peisistratidai was mild indeed. There is thus no good reason to think that any hostile action was taken against the Peisistratidai then, for it appears as if they were not tried at all. Only a continued lack of ill-will toward their relatives (and perhaps others who were designated "friends of the tyrants") can account for the success in politics of Hipparchos, the son of Charmos. Any taint on the Peisistratidai will surely have redounded, as it did later, to those identified with them and their interests at Athens.

There is no reliable record of Hippias' precise activity before 490, although every account suggests that he was promoting his return to Athens from the time of his expulsion. Thucydides (VI.59.4) seems to indicate that Hippias moved rather rapidly from Sigeion to Lampsakos, and then to Sousa without any delay; from Sousa, he came to Marathon. Herodotos describes two occasions when Hippias could have earned the charge of treason for himself and his family; both appear suspect. At Sardis, Hippias is described by Herodotos (V.96) as trying to buy favour with Artaphrenes, and, when the Athenians came to thwart Hippias' plans (whatever they were), Artaphrenes told them that if they wanted to be saved they must take Hippias back. Thucydides apparently knew of no such visit of Hippias to Sardis to Artaphrenes, nor could Hippias have hoped to accomplish anything substantial by tarrying at Sardis. The episode may have been constructed after the event to justify Athens' really unprovoked attack on Sardis in 498: we remember that Dareios took no real notice of Athens until after the burning of Sardis. The second episode involving Hippias occurred at the Isthmian
congress (Hdt. V.91), when plans were afoot to restore Hippias to power at Athens by means of the Peloponnesian League. The Spartans had summoned their allies and Hippias to the Isthmos and a debate was held in which the Korinthians opposed restoring Hippias in a speech that is reported verbatim in Herodotos. Sparta's allies were swayed by that speech and voted not to aid Hippias. When he did speak, Hippias did not petition for assistance, but prophesied that a day would come for the Korinthians (not the Peloponnesians) when they would greatly desire that the Peisistratidai had been restored. Thus, Hippias' entire function in the debate is simply to foretell a day of rueing for Korinth, no more. Hippias was reputed to know the oracles better than any living man and it is therefore not unreasonable that he should appear at the Isthmos to utter fateful words: Korinth came to hate Athens in the later fifth century, the time of Herodotos' writing, and rooting that hatred in the debate and resultant prophesy of Hippias introduces drama and irony to the situation. The episode seems doubtful because it is difficult to believe that Hippias would attend to the call of his late adversaries and because Thucydides knew of no such sojourn; it does, however, make entertaining reading.

Dareios was provided with a casus belli against the Athenians when they participated in the burning of Sardis. According to Herodotos (V.105), Dareios was so incensed by the burning that he commanded a servant to remind him three times daily of the Athenians. It was only from that point that Dareios turned toward Athens vengefully and listened to Hippias: for it was Dareios' practice to employ ex-tyrants as puppets for his ends, not they to use him. The conflict at Marathon between the Persians and the Athenians is to be traced to the Athenian action at Sardis; the Athenians had only themselves to blame for Hippias' return.
When Hippias landed at Marathon, he repeated the tactic used by his father more than fifty years in the past when Peisistratos landed at Marathon from Eretria. Hippias undoubtedly wanted to rally what support he could from the Diakria, the region of his family's greatest influence. But he had left behind him at Eretria a fearful example of what the Persians were about and his support did not materialize. With a few exceptions, the Athenians united against him and defeated the numerically superior Persians not far from their ships. Old and broken, Hippias left Marathon, never to return to Attica.

Herodotos (VI.124.2) states that a shield-signal was made to the Persians at Marathon with treasonous intent. Just what was the nature of the signal and its precise meaning have never been satisfactorily explained, but the shield must have signified some show of support for Hippias. Some still remained at Athens who were either loyal to the Peisistratidai or opportunistic in view of the large Persian army: common report held the Alkmaionidai responsible. Whoever was responsible must have reckoned the Persians a far better bet than the greatly outnumbered Athenians.

It was surely not by coincidence that the Alkmaionidai were accused of treason at Marathon and that members of the family were ostracized as "friends of the tyrants" during the 480s. Megakles, the son of Hippokrates, was the second victim of ostracism after Hipparchos, the son of Charmos. A third victim, probably an Alkmaionid, was ostracized following Megakles. Suspicion of complicity with the Persians must have played a large part in earning these men their exiles.

Later in the decade, Hipparchos, the son of Charmos, was convicted of treason. The very time of his conviction together with his family ties unite to form a very incriminating suspicion that Hipparchos medized after his
ostracism. A stele was made from his statue to commemorate his treason and that of others and it may well be that the designation "friends of the tyrants" was earned by those listed on the stele as men who had gone over to the Persians and the Peisistratidai. Possibly these "friends of the tyrants" disregarded the recall of the exiles in 480, preferring to bank upon the success of the overwhelming force that the Persians could muster.

Hipparchos' conviction for prodosia must be viewed as the very end of the process that brought about the demise of those implicated as "friends of the tyrants". The demise was predetermined by the failure of Hippias at Marathon: afterwards, the Athenians clearly equated medism with the tyrants. The faction (if that is what it was) was "cleaned out", beginning with the most visible reminder of the former tyranny and the most visible leader of the faction, Hipparchos, the son of Charmos. We note that intense hatred of the tyrants and the Mede began apparently only after 490. By that time, Hippias and his partisans - the perpetrators of the shield-signal - had revealed themselves as men ready to harm the Athenians for their own ends. It was surely too much for the Athenians, who had now experienced twenty years of freedom, to think of subjection, especially under foreign dominators. The Athenians responded to the threat (and may have exorcised their dread) by setting up a stele condemning Hippias and his children and, retrospectively, his father and brothers. For now the Athenians wanted to execrate the entire family.

Historically, it is to this period of fear and anger (i.e., after 490) that the harsh injunctions of the stele belong. Hippias' crime and the crime of his sons was treason - taking up arms to fight with a foreigner against one's countrymen. Not unreasonably, the Athenians vented their anger also by purging the city of the tyrants' friends and suspected friends. Since the
Athenians could not procure the persons of the Peisistratidai to execute, they proscribed them and placed a bounty on their heads. The Athenians now wanted all the living tyrants dead and with them the spectre of further harm.

E. Thucydides and The Stele

What effects do these arguments have upon Thucydides' interpretations of the stele? None at all, it could be argued, for, although the crime may not have been tyranny and the charge laid many years after Hippias' expulsion, it need not follow that Thucydides' inferences are invalid. Valeton remarked that, in any case, it is difficult to imagine that Hipparchos would have been named after Hippias on the stele if he had ruled before him. The stele still seems to show that Peisistratos and Hippias alone held places of importance and the presence of only Hippias' childrens' names seems to establish him and his children as the tyrant and tyrant-family of Athens after Peisistratos. Thus, regardless of the crime written upon the stele, it will still have shown Hippias as the tyrant. Perhaps, too, Thucydides was aware of the lag in time between the expulsion of Hippias and the erection of the stele, but regarded the stele as valuable anyway: his unspoken confidence in the document should cancel our doubts.

But the fact of the matter is that if the stele did not concern itself with the crime of tyranny per se but something more recent, it obviously need not have been reflective of the succession, now so many years in the past and irrelevant to the stele's purpose. The decree on the stele was concerned more with procuring the deaths of the living, still threatening members of
the family than it was with execration of the dead: incentives were provided to obtain that end. The Athenians were concerned with eliminating the agents of the Persians and, in those circumstances, it was much more important to list the prime malefactors - Hippias, Hippias' sons and Hippias' father - than it was to state an accurate record of a succession that was not an issue. Beloch puts it quite succinctly: "...ein Achtungsdekret ist doch keine Stammtafel."

Thucydides' prime inference from the stele is obviously false. The fact that the stele held the names only of Hippias' children proves only that his children were convicted of the charge on the stele, not that Hipparchos or Thessalos had no children or that, because they had no children, they could not have held power. No one, for instance, would argue that Stesagoras, the son of Kimon Koalemos, did not rule in the Chersonese because he had no children, unless, of course, the arguer had no better information about him. Thucydides' inference shows that he grasped at the superficial evidence of the stele and that he weighted it much too heavily. It seems to show that Thucydides was already convinced about the succession and was superimposing his conclusions onto evidence that was only partially accommodating to them.

The main strength of what Thucydides alleges about the succession is that Hippias' name follows first after his father's. Thucydides infers that that must mean that Hippias succeeded his father as the eldest son. But, aside from the objections I have already laid out, there are other objections to this inference. For even if, for the moment, we admit the age-difference and that Hippias was eldest, it does not guarantee that Hippias succeeded his father. The succession of Periander illustrates the point (Hdt. III.53): when Periander grew old, he wanted his younger son, Lykophron, to succeed him as tyrant of Korinth. Periander passed over his eldest son who seemed to him
unfit. There are other cases in which brothers, obviously older and younger, shared the tyrannical power equally.

Thucydides appears unable to admit the possibility of shared rule, perhaps because he argues polemically in the digression concerning the murder of Hipparchos (see Chapter III). In answer to the common view that Hipparchos was the tyrant of Athens, Thucydides publishes the opposite opinion, undoubtedly engendered in him by the knowledge that Hippias was the tyrant when Athens was liberated and that Hipparchos was killed for private, not patriotic reasons. These conceptions were then superimposed by him on some unyielding facts, resulting in implausibilities and contradictions. It is possible that Thucydides allowed the imperfections in his account to stand because he thought that the evidence of Hippias' tyranny and the failure of the tyrannicides to free Athens was totally compelling, irrefutable, and completely undermining of the popular view of Hipparchos as tyrant.

Yet the frailty of his inferences shows that Thucydides was struggling with a void of secure information about the succession. The stele does not show conclusively who was the tyrant of Athens after Peisistratos: Thucydides inferred it. He also inferred that Hippias must have been in control of the city when Hipparchos was murdered, for otherwise the transition of power could not have been so smooth - a completely intellectual deduction. This inference, which is contradicted even in Thucydides, proves that no record of precisely who controlled the city after Peisistratos existed for Thucydides to consult. Thucydides cited the stele, undoubtedly known to all Athenians who visited the Akropolis, for what it seemed to show and thus for what it seemed to support, namely that Hippias was the most significant of Peisistratos' sons. The fact of the matter is, however, that it did not say so outright.
Thucydides was not guilty of dishonesty or of manipulating evidence to suit his purposes, but he may have been guilty of grasping too readily at the apparent. He seems to have inferred too much from too little, relying on τὸ εἰκός to supplement its information. A lack of clear-cut evidence on the subject forced Thucydides to reconstruct. He introduced the stele, perhaps thinking that it was the ultimate proof for his assertions. But it is not the proof Thucydides thought it was, for it does not designate the crime listed as tyranny or Hippias as the tyrant; these facts would have flatly contradicted the popular tradition about the succession. In this light, it may be asked how, if the stele was erected in the early part of the fifth century and was in fact a record of succession that was available to all Athenians on the Akropolis from at least 480, could the popular notion that Hipparchos and not Hippias was tyrant ever have gained the wide-spread credence it had in the first place? It seems that Thucydides may have overlooked or underestimated the Athenians who set the stele up.
3. Literary Tradition

A. Introduction

There are two ascribable accounts written before Thucydides' polemical one that pertain to the problem of succession: Herodotos' and that which is generally assigned to Hellanikos of Lesbos, the Atthidographer. There is also an important third story that may have influenced the author of the Ath.Pol. when he wrote his version.

Herodotos is not concerned with the issue of succession, but with the liberation of Athens. He stresses that the tyrannicides did not liberate Athens when they murdered Hipparchos, but aggravated the tyranny. Thus, he implicitly denies that Hipparchos was tyrant. This incomplete denial - Herodotos says nothing with any firmness - has most generally been taken as an anticipation of Thucydides' complete refutation of the "popular" or "official" account. Herodotos, however, avoids the issue of succession (if it were an issue) and is seemingly unaware of the age-difference between Hippias and Hipparchos so much stressed by Thucydides. Herodotos directed his efforts against the information linking the death of Hipparchos with Athens' freedom from tyranny.

Hellanikos is considered responsible for the information found on the Parian Marble (Ep. 45). It is against the equation made on the Parian Marble (or one very much like it) that Thucydides directed his attack. Both the evidence of the Parian Marble and the equation criticized obliquely by Herodotos appear to have found their common source in the Harmodios-skolia. For it is first in the skolia that the death of Hipparchos and the day of Athens' freedom are linked.
Yet another account, at least as old as Thucydides' writing (and perhaps Herodotos'), may have conceived of the tyranny as a joint one. This account obviously made far less of an issue of the distinction between Hippias and Hipparchos than either Hellanikos or Thucydides did. It could be that the author of the Ath.Pol. preserves this account, although it seems clear that he has added other information to it.

B. Herodotos

V.55

'Απελαυνόμενος δὲ ὁ Ἀρεσταχόρης ἐκ τῆς Ἑπάρτης ἤκε ἐς τὸν Ἀθήνας γενομένας τυράννων διὰ ἐλευθερίας. ἔπει Ίππαρχος τοῦ Πεισίστρατον, Ἰππίεως δὲ τοῦ τυράννου ἀδελφοῦ, ἱδόντα ὅμως ἐνυπνιόν ἐφαρμόσατον κτείνουσι 'Ἀρεσταχόρητων καὶ Ἀρμόδιος, γένος ἐόντες τὰ ἀνέκαθεν Πεισίστρατος, µετὰ ταῦτα ἐτυρακνύνοντο 'Αθηναίοι ἐπ' ἐτεκνέσει τοῦ ἡλικοῦ πολέων ἀλλὰ καὶ µᾶλλον ἦ πρὸ τοῦ.

V.62.1-2

δεὶ δὲ πρὸς τοῦτοι ἔτει ἀναλαθεῖν τὸν καὶ ἀρχῆς ἦκα λέξων λόγον, ὡς τυράννων ἐλευθερώθηκαν Ἀθηναίοι.

Ἡπίεως τυρακνύνοντο καὶ ἐμπερικακομένου Ἀθηναίοις διὰ τὸν Ἰππαρχοῦ Ἑκάτον Ἀλκμενίδας, γένος κτῆ.

VI.123.2

καὶ αὐτῶν ἡ Ἐθήνας ὄντος [ἐκ. οἱ Ἀλκμενίδες] ἦσαν οἱ ἐλευθερώσαντες πολλῷ µᾶλλον ἦ περ Ἀρµόδιος τε καὶ Ἀρεσταχόρητων ὡς ἑώρακαν, οἱ µὲν ἀρχὰς ἐξηγήσασαν...
Herodotos argues specifically against the belief that the death of Hipparchos brought an end to Peisistratid tyranny and freedom to Athens. The plain truth of the matter was that Hippias ruled for three more years after Hipparchos was killed and was finally driven out by the Spartans and the Alkmaionidai. It is interesting that Herodotos does not argue the case more strongly.

There is one instance where Herodotos might be denying that Hipparchos was tyrant (V.55.1): ἐπεὶ Ἰππαρχὸν τὸν Πεισιστράτου, Ἰππίεω δὲ τὸν τυράννον ἀδελφὸν.... Many scholars have taken this sentence to be sure proof that Herodotos knew that Hipparchos was not tyrant, but simply the brother of Hippias, the real tyrant. Indeed, Herodotos places the identification prominently, at the very beginning of his account of Athens' liberation, indicating perhaps that he is taking issue with the popular designation of Hipparchos as tyrant. (The thread of this emphasis is picked up again at V.62.2: Ἰππίεω τυράννοντας καὶ ἐμπικρασιομένου Ἀθηναίων διὰ τοῦ...Θεότοκος.)

But this "attack" on Hipparchos' status is extremely oblique and, in fact, does not constitute a denial that Hipparchos was a tyrant. Fornara observes that the word τυράννον at V.65.1 is not easily compatible with the concept of single rule for Hippias and there are other passages in Herodotos that do not support the concept of single rule. Indeed, Herodotos actually contradicts his estimation of the tyrannicide at V.55 in a speech given to Miltiades to deliver to Kallimachos on the eve of the battle of Marathon (VI.109.3): Ἐν σοὶ νῦν, Καλλίμαχε, ἐστὶ τῇ καταδουλώσει Ἀθηναίων τῇ
Here, Herodotos acknowledges that Harmodios and Aristogeiton have left behind them an undying memory for making Athens free. As the speech of Miltiades is appropriate to its context, so, too, is the label of Hipparchos as the brother of Hippias in its context: Herodotos inserts the reference at V.55 to support the claims of the Alkmaionidai that they were the true liberators of Athens.

Herodotos' point is that the tyrannicides failed to liberate Athens by failing to end the tyranny. The information that he deemed false here linked Harmodios and Aristogeiton with Athenian freedom - the same equation found in the Harmodios-skolia:

The last two lines of both skolia show what Herodotos seems to be trying to refute. Isonomia is usually taken to mean "democracy", although here it might mean simply "no longer ruled by tyrants". At any rate, in the skolia, Harmodios and Aristogeiton were responsible for bringing tyranny at Athens to an end, thereby freeing the city.

That information is wrong and Herodotos knew it, but, as has been shown, Herodotos makes the tyrannicides paragons of Athenian democracy. The weight of the tradition that Herodotos opposes at V.55 and later at VI.123.2 actually reveals itself in Herodotos' account of Athens' liberation. For
Herodotos places the murder of Hipparchos before his extensive account of the Spartan-Alkmaionid liberation, for him the true story. This positioning seems to indicate that others who made the tyrannicides Athens' liberators compelled Herodotos to set the record straight by denying the relative worth of the tyrannicide (I) as a preface to his own true story of the liberation (II).

The most interesting aspect of Herodotos' treatment of the tyrannicide is its brevity. In contrast to the very considerable and vivid story in Thucydides, Herodotos disposes of the murder in only one sentence (V.56.2):

\[ \textit{μετα \ σε λαμπάμενος την \ ὕπνων \ ἔπεμψε \ τὴν \ πομπήν, ἐν τῇ ἰστη τελευτᾷ.} \]

The author appears much more interested in the premonitive dream of Hipparchos on the night before his death and in the origin of the Gephyraioi than he was in the murder or its causes. Unlike Thucydides, Herodotos avoided any mention of the motivation of Harmodios and Aristogeiton. It is possible that Herodotos reported a minimum about the tyrannicide in order that it not detract from the true story of the liberation.

C. Hellanikos

The first spokesman for the view that Herodotos contested ineffectually was apparently Hellanikos the Atthidographer. It should not cause wonder that Hellanikos chose to ignore Herodotos' weak and unconvincing views in favour of the "popular" account, which was reinforced by the tyrannicide-statues of some age and by the yearly sacrifices and honours offered to the martyrs. But Hellanikos appears to have altered the basic information
of the Harmodios-skolia (Marmor Parium Ep. 45):

The equation is more strongly stated in favour of the Athenians as well as being chronologically in error: not only is Hipparchos labelled successor to Peisistratos, but the Athenians, not the Spartans or the Alkmaionidai, are credited with their own liberation. The emphasis is now not upon the singular act of the tyrannicides, but more on the Athenians collectively as agents of their own freedom. This altered equation appears to be what Thucydides contested (VI.53.3):

The passage is most revealing, for not only does it link the Athenians with the tyrannicides in the new way, but it also shows that the Athenians believed that the tyranny was held, whether jointly or consecutively, by the sons of Peisistratos after his death. The issue was unresolved by Herodotos, who nevertheless acknowledged it; Hellanikos, however, attempted to resolve it by calling Hipparchos the tyrant after Peisistratos, overlooking the chronological problem.

Thus, a change occurred between the time of Herodotos' writing (c. 425)
and the time of Hellanikos' writing (c. 406/5) in which the tyrannicide was perceived differently. Herodotos apparently knew only of the singular act of two men, which was erroneously linked to Athens' freedom; Hellanikos made the Athenians responsible for freeing Athens after Harmodios and Aristogeiton killed Hipparchos. We can perhaps attach the reemphasis of the events of the liberation, which involved excluding the Spartans from a share in the liberation, to political circumstances at Athens in the late fifth century. It is easy to imagine that, during the course of the Peloponnesian War, it became increasingly odious to the Athenians to apportion any share of their own liberation to their enemies, the Spartans. The attractiveness of Hellanikos' equation for chauvinistic Athenians is obvious: they and their heroes were responsible for their own liberation, not the Spartans. Perikles, an Alkmaionid himself, seems to have endorsed the tyrannicides by moving the Prytaneion Decree for the maintenance of their offspring. It is not difficult to see in this act a political move to separate himself from any slanders about cooperation with the Spartans and to reap the benefits of the popularity of such a decree.

D. Athenaiion Politeia

I. 18.1 ἥσουν δὲ κύριοι μὲν τῶν πραγμάτων διὰ τὰ ἀξιώματα καὶ διὰ τὰς ηλικίας Ἰππαρχος καὶ Ἰππίκης, πρεσβύτερος δὲ ἂν ὦ Ἰππίκης καὶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ τελείᾳ πολιτικῇ καὶ ἐμφανῶν ἐπεστάτη θε ἀρχῆς. ὦ δὲ Ἰππαρχος παῖδα ἢν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐφικτικός καὶ φιλόμουσος ἦν καὶ.
II. 19.6 ... ἀπεδωκαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐπὶ
Αρπακτίδοις ἀρχοντος, κατασχόντες τὴν τυραννίδα
μετὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς τελευτήν ἐτη μάλιστα
ἐπικαίδεικα κτλ.

The first testimonium has been considered a compromise between the 186
Thucydidean version of the tyranny and the "popular" version. Indeed, the
issue of age-difference is properly taken up and Hippias is described as the
elder of the brothers. On the other hand, we find Hipparchos described as
παιδίωδης and φιλόμουσος. There is no apparent reason to doubt that the
author of the Ath. Pol. has attempted to reconcile the divergent accounts of
the succession.

But there is evidence in Thucydides (see above, p. 126) and less defi-
nite information in Herodotos (n. 181) to indicate that the concept of joint
rule was not at all new at the time of their writing, certainly not at the
time of the composition of the Ath. Pol. It could be that the author of the
Ath. Pol. did not originate the concept of joint tyranny by compromising
accounts, but that he enhanced an older version to take into account the 187
polemics of Hellanikos and Thucydides.

The second testimonium seems to allude to a joint tyranny that included
another son of Peisistratos (Thessalos?) who was living and reigning at the
time of the siege of the Akropolis by Kleomenes. Although it could be con-
tested that the Peisistratidai were described collectively here because no
"constitutional" position about the succession was being disputed, other
evidence indicates that there is more to the appearance of the collective
(see below, section E).
E. Thucydides

I.20.2 Αθηναίων γονὶς τὸ πλῆθος Ἰππάρχον οἶονεῖλ ὕφ σ' Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστοχείτων τῷ μὲν ὄντα ἱππο-θανεῖν καὶ ὄντα ὄνταν ὅτι Ἰππίκος μὲν πρεσβύτατος ὑπὲρ τῶν Πεισίστρατον νῦν, Ἰππάρχος δὲ καὶ Θεσσαλὸς ἀδελφός ἦσον αὐτῷ.

VI.54.2 ... οὐκ Ἰππάρχος ὐσπέρ οὲ πολλοὶ οἶονεῖλ ὥλλοι Ἰππίκος πρεσβύτατος ὑπὲρ ἂν ἄρχῃν.

VI.55.1 ὅτε δὲ πρεσβύτατος ὑπὲρ Ἰππίκος ἠρξέν εἰδῶς μὲν καὶ ἀκοῇ ἀκριβεστέρον ἄλλων ἵσχυρομακαὶ κτλ.

VI.55.4 Ἰππάρχω δὲ ἤσανθη τοὺς πάσας τῆς δυνατίκης ὀνομαθέντα καὶ τὴν δόξαν τῆς τυραννίδος ἐς τὰ ἐπετεῖα προσαλβεῖν.

Thucydides intimately links his case for Hippias' primacy to his age. He had apparently deduced that, as the eldest, Hippias must have been the tyrant of Athens after Peisistratos. Thucydides cannot, however, allow for the possibility of joint rule (VI.55.3): οὐ μὴν οὐδ' ἄλλῳ νομοσχεῖν μαρ δοκεῖ ποτὲ Ἰππίκος τὸ παραχρῆμα ἔδωσ τὴν τυραννίδα, εἰ Ἰππάρχος μὲν ἐν τῇ ἄρχῃ ἢν ἀπέθανεν, οὗτος δὲ αὐθημεροῦν καθεστάτω.

(Both men cannot have been tyrant at the same time.)

But there are serious inconsistencies in what Thucydides says about Hipparcho. In explanation of Hipparcho's desire to respond to the slight of
Harmodios without using force and to obtain vengeance covertly, he says (VI. 54. 5): \( \text{οὐδὲ σὺ τὴν ἄλλην ἂρχην ἐπαχθησάς ἵνα ἐστὶς τοὺς πολλούς, ἀλλὰ ἀνεπιθέσιν κατεστήσατο· καὶ ἐπετῆδευκόν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δῆ τύμαναι καὶ.} \\

The subject of the verb \( ἵνα \) is Hipparchos; the sentence indicates that Hipparchos ruled.

Three explanations have been advanced to deal with this difficulty in Thucydides:

a) Let Hippias be the subject of the verb \( ἵνα \). But the particle \( γὰρ \) explains Thucydides' last assertive sentence, the subject of which is Hipparchos. The two sentences are logically linked; to have inserted Hippias as the subject of the second sentence (especially without notice to the reader) is wholly illogical.

b) Emend: read \( ἐπαχθησάς ἐν τῇ κατεστήσατο· καὶ ἐπετῆδευκόν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δῆ τύμαναι καὶ. \) But there is no good ground from the manuscript tradition to emend and so emendation is unjustified.

c) Understand a different sense for \( ἂρχην \) (i.e., instead of "rule", something like "influence"). But Dover points out that, in this context, Thucydides is very clear about the meaning of \( ἂρχην \) (cf. VI. 55. 3).

There is really no reasonable alternative but to accept the text and, with it, the inconsistency, taking Hipparchos as the subject. Thus, Thucydides apparently contradicts his own views on Hipparchos' power.

There is another difficulty: an allusion to joint power - the very concept that Thucydides wished to correct (see above, p. 126) - at VI. 56. 1:
Both Hipparchos and (apparently) Hippias are made responsible for the outrage perpetrated against Harmodios' sister that cost Hipparchos his life. Dover states that "the plural verbs represent a natural way of describing action taken by Hippias on the instigation of Hipparchos". But this avoids the main problem, which is the same as in the sentence where Thucydides describes Hipparchos' ἀρχή: Thucydides muddies his own case by conveying inconsistency to his reader. Plural or singular verbs denoting an exercise of power by anyone other than Hippias, but especially Hipparchos, oppose Thucydides' argument that Hippias was the ruler of Athens. (There are other inconsistencies involving the exercise of power that I shall examine in the next chapter of this thesis.)

Thucydides could not accept here the possibility either of joint rule or succession by brothers. Examples of joint rule have been given; one example of succession of brothers involving violence occurs in Herodotos (VII.154.1): Kleandros of Gela was succeeded by his brother, Hippokrates, after Kleandros was murdered. Presumably, Hippokrates had the support of the doryphoroi led by the future usurper, Gelon. Succession on the instant by sons or brothers was more common than rare, but Thucydides disregards it, apparently because he was more committed to making points in his argument than to record facts. But the polemic that excluded taking such evidence into account must be viewed in light of Thucydides' wish to combat the really glaring error about the succession typified by the equation found on the Marmor Parium.

Somehow, Thucydides has overlooked the inconsistencies in his account...
that weaken his argument. It may be that the excursus we have was borrowed in the main from the account of another and that this account, when combined with Thucydides' views, produced the inconsistencies. In that case, the excursus may be in an unfinished state, not yet "fine-tuned", or it may be that Thucydides was so thoroughly convinced about the rightness of his argument that he was unimpressed by the inconsistencies. A prime candidate for that other account is that followed and embellished by the author of the Ath. Pol., since that account accepted joint rule. If Thucydides used the "popular" account against itself to try to prove his own case about Hipparchos, it would go a long way to help explain why Thucydides overlooked the inconsistencies in his account: Thucydides may have stopped the effort when he had proven the "popular" account fundamentally wrong. Use of the account of another will also help explain Thucydides' magisterial approach to the errors he proposed to correct (see Chapter III).

F. Harmodios-Skolia

Apparently, the Harmodios-skolia parented the view about Athens' liberation that Herodotos and Thucydides wanted to refute. The skolia obviously predate Herodotos' writing, the date of which provides a terminus ante quem for their composition and impact. But what they offer is misinformation: Harmodios and Aristogeiton did not free Athens by killing Hipparchos.

How did such misinformation arise to compete with the truth in the first place? Jacoby thought that the information contained in the skolia came from forces hostile to the Alkmaionidai, the true liberators of Athens, that were
intent upon depriving the family of the credit for actually making Athens free. The misinformation about the tyrannicides won the day among the masses because the Alkmaionidai pursued an ambiguous public policy from 510 to 490. Jacoby traced authorship of the *skolia* to the "circles of reactionary nobility; such persons as Isagoras (connected by marriage to the Philaids?) and the clan of the Gephyraioi". Ehrenberg, however, contended that, when the statues of the tyrannicides were first erected (c. 510), the Alkmaionidai were still allied with the agathoi kai eupatridai. The Athenians could not accept a "liberation" by exiles and so Kleisthenes, in an effort to promote his reforms, backed away from claiming the credit for freeing Athens and instead advanced the cult of the tyrannicides. The claim that the Alkmaionidai were the true liberators of Athens was raised later "when the part played by the Alcmaeonidae throughout the years had become a matter of serious political dispute". Podlecki discarded Ehrenberg's attribution of the driving force behind the cult to Kleisthenes, arguing that the Alkmaionidai "could point proudly to their real expulsion of Hippias in 511, and so would have vehemently opposed anyone who put forward the claims of Harmodios and Aristogeiton to tyrannicide". Podlecki attributed both the cult of the tyrannicides and the popularization of the *skolia* to Themistokles and linked them both to the reestablishment of the statue-group of the tyrannicides in 477. Themistokles cunningly moulded the dubious claims of Harmodios and Aristogeiton into weapons to use against the Alkmaionidai and in so doing made the two symbols of the democracy. Ostwald, however, pointed out that this explanation fails to take proper account of the tyrant-slayers group of Antenor, which preexisted the reestablished group of Kritios and Nesiotes, and shows that from that time the claims of Harmodios and Aristogeiton were taken seriously by the
Ostwald believed that the cult was established soon after the expulsion of Hippias by men who gave credit to Harmodios and Aristogeiton as liberators because their martyrdom had sustained the exiles in their difficulties. The cult was heartily accepted at Athens because the Athenians wanted to suppress the fact that the liberation was actually due to Spartan arms. The murder of Hipparchos was the first blow struck against the tyranny; the skolia were generated shortly after Athens was liberated.

Obviously, the skolia must have been composed after the death of Hipparchos in 514, but when? Bowra placed their composition after 510, when the tyrants had been driven from the city, since the skolia describe isonomia as fact. Ostwald linked isonomia more precisely with Kleisthenes' reforms and so put the skolia after 507. Podlecki put them latest of all, in 477, using Bowra's lower limit for composition. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the poems to help to date them, but it is reasonable to consider their composition in light of the statue-groups of the tyrannicides. For the earlier we date the statue-group of Antenor, the likelier the assumption that the skolia were composed early. The statues indicate that the act of Harmodios and Aristogeiton was already perceived as a liberation. Pliny (Nat. Hist. 34.17) dates Antenor's group "eodem anno quo et Romae reges pulsi", that is, 510/09. Pliny's dating inspires no confidence because it chronologically parallels the establishment of democracy at Athens and the Republic at Rome. Nor is there any merit in attempts to confine Antenor's work to the last quarter of the sixth century: artists such as Anakreon and Simonides who were employed by the Peisistratidai before 514 were long-lived and active well into the fifth century, Simonides into the third decade. There is no good reason to preclude any date for Antenor's group from 514 to 480.
Historically, however, there is some reason to date the group after 490 and so, too, the skolía. It has already been argued that a political ambiguity in respect of the Peisistratidai existed at Athens after 510 which finally resolved to unbridled animosity after Marathon. Until 490, however, men connected to the Peisistratidai, such as Hipparchos, the son of Charmos, became prominent and even high officials. It is unlikely that the Athenians would foster a cult of tyrant-slayers and, at the same time, promote such men as Hipparchos to high office. This, of course, is not to say that the Athenians would politely refrain from publishing skolía and erecting statues of the tyrannicides in deference to Hipparchos, but rather that his selection as archon seems to preclude hostility on the part of the Athenian electorate. We remember, too, that there must have been many influential men at Athens, men who would be instrumental in sponsoring such a cult, who owed much to the departed Peisistratids. After Marathon, however, the picture changes: Hipparchos' fall from the political scene signals this change; other so-called "friends of the tyrants" were ostracized in quick order through the 480s and it seems that during that decade the Athenians were reacting against the attempt of Hippias to return to power. It is easy to see why the Athenians would turn from the truth of their "liberation" in 510 and accept the tyrannicides as their liberators after 490. Some of the Alkmaionidai, who were responsible in fact for Athens' liberation, were classed as "friends of the tyrants" and were ostracized; they had a history of self-seeking anyway: they were now not good candidates for heroes. The tyrannicides, on the other hand, were entirely Athenian and probably unknown before their act: they were the perfect candidates for heroes. The statues were created as a symbol of defiance to the Peisistratidai and the Persians and renewed in 477 as the hallmark of
Athenian democracy vaunting itself over the old order. It is reasonable to assume that Antenor's statues inspired poets in the same way as those of Kritios and Nesiotes inspired painters of pottery later. The skolia, thus inspired by the statue-group, perhaps resulted as patriotic songs that were in fact an element of the revision of the liberation.

Such a state of affairs will help to explain the falseness of the equations made in the skolia, both reckoning the tyrannicides as liberators of Athens and designating Hipparchos as the tyrant of Athens. For the skolia definitely link the murder of Hipparchos with Athens' liberation. Hipparchos had to be the tyrant for the equation to function, since Harmodios and Aristogeiton killed only one Peisistratid. Yet Hipparchos also had to have been recognized as significant enough politically for the act of the tyrannicides to matter at all and not be the result of the mere love-quarrel alleged by Thucydides. Hipparchos was in fact the most visible of the Peisistratids before his death and could easily have been reckoned "tyrant" on that basis. Thus, the skolia, composed probably about twenty-five years after the event, will not by any means settle the issue of succession, since their purpose was other than accurate recollection.

G. The Archedike-Epigram

One piece of evidence may bear upon the succession question (Thuc. VI.59.3):

\[ \text{Ἀνδρὸς ἀριστεύουσας ἐν Ἑλλᾶδι τῶν ἐφέσκυτος
Ιππίου Ἀρχέδεκτην ὡς κέκευθε κόμης,} \]
This epigram was composed for the sema of Archedike, the daughter of Hippias. Hippias had betrothed his daughter to Aiantides, the son of Hippoklos of Lampsakos, in order to strengthen his grasp on the family holding of Sigeion in the Troad and perhaps also to improve his ties with Persia. Apparently, Archedike died in Lampsakos after seeing her children succeed their father.

The date of the epigram is determined in part from its description of Hippias. The participle ἀριστευόντας and the words τῶν ἐφ' ἐκατούρου show that his era was bygone, i.e., that Hippias was no longer alive; for it would be very odd to describe Hippias in this way if he were still living. Hippias was a very old man when he returned to Marathon in 490 and there was a report that he died on the return voyage to Sigeion. At any rate, it is unlikely that he survived for very long after Marathon and so it is possible to say that the epigram for Archedike was composed after 490.

The likeliest patrons of the poet who wrote the epigram were Hippias' sons or, at least, his relatives: for Hippias' prominence in the epigram is extraordinary and glowing. The heirs of Aiantides and Archedike are excluded as patrons on that basis, especially since there is no balance in the epigram of praise for the Hippoklids. The surviving Peisistratidai on the other hand could derive a certain amount of self-enhancement from the glorification of their own forebear, Hippias.

The important thing about the epigram for the question of succession, however, is that the sons of Hippias and indeed their nephews are described collectively as "tyrants". No distinction is made in the epigram between the sons of Hippias or the sons of Archedike. This seems to be primary
evidence that Hippias' living sons conceived of themselves as a collective unit, i.e., the Peisistratidai.

It is possible that Hipparchos and Hippias conceived of themselves in the same way. For later generations looking backward, the lack of distinction between them could have enabled either of the sons of Peisistratos to be construed as the tyrant. The need to make a distinction was based on the political distortion of the tyrannicide-cult. During the period before the murder of Hipparchos and after the death of Peisistratos, no distinction was made or was necessary. If that is the case, then the search for Peisistratos' successor, even an "unconstitutional" one, is a false pursuit. There are, however, other criteria involved that bear upon how the Athenians perceived Peisistratid rule after 528: these were, of course, the appearances of tyranny already outlined.

H. Conclusions

The dispute about who succeeded Peisistratos is really the product of later reactions to the erroneous beliefs of the Athenians about it. Herodotos wanted to combat the belief that the tyrannicides liberated Athens from the Peisistratidai and that denied the obviously better claims of the Alkmaionidai; Thucydides wanted to quash the notion that Hipparchos was tyrant when he was killed. He thus argues that Hippias succeeded Peisistratos because he was older than Hipparchos and because the tyrannicides were personally, not politically, motivated to murder Hipparchos (see Chapter III). Thucydides aimed his remarks at popular opinion, the spokesman
for which was Hellanikos. Popular opinion equated the tyrannicide with Athens' liberation, but also designated the Athenians as the agents for their own freedom. Herodotos was more concerned to refute the account of single-handed liberation of Athens by the tyrannicides as described in the Harmodios-skolia. He did not attack the status of Hipparchos directly. The belief attacked by Thucydides must have been grounded ultimately in the skolia that were composed early in the fifth century for political, not historical purposes. For the tyrannicide to be politically significant, Hipparchos simply had to be tyrant; for Thucydides, however, it was equally important in combatting this belief that Hippias be tyrant. Thucydides' account possesses many inconsistencies that undermine the force of his argument: he acknowledges that Hipparchos exercised a certain power, the very thing he seeks to deny. These inconsistencies do not promote confidence in the historical accuracy of Thucydides' report.

The Athenians may actually have thought that both Peisistratos' sons succeeded Peisistratos and thus may have been of two minds about Hipparchos. Thuc. VI.53.3 seems to show that the Athenians believed that power was shared by Hippias and Hipparchos after the death of their father. The author of the Ath. Pol. (17.3) divided the rule equally between Peisistratos' sons and so, although it is clear that he embellished the concept of joint rule by neatly characterizing the brothers (18.1) to compromise earlier divergent accounts, he may preserve the tradition acknowledged both by Herodotos and by Thucydides. The evidence of the Archedike-epigram lends weight to the belief that the Peisistratidai at least conceived of themselves collectively as tyrants.
4. Conclusions

It seems clear that the question of succession to the tyrannical power of Peisistratos became controversial in the later fifth century and that Thucydides' views are part of that controversy. Thucydides' primary assertion about the succession was that Hippias as the eldest son must have succeeded Peisistratos. In support of that assertion, Thucydides adduced the evidence of the stele adikias of the tyrants, which seemed to show that Hippias followed Peisistratos because it listed his name first after his father's. The stele apparently indicated to Thucydides how the Peisistratidai ranked themselves or were ranked by the Athenians after they had been expelled from Athens. In support of Thucydides, some modern scholars have introduced a fragment of the Athenian archon-list from the mid-520s that shows that Hippias held the office of eponymous archon shortly after the death of Peisistratos. It is generally believed that Hippias used the office to mark the beginning of his reign. In contrast to Thucydides' argument (but also supportive of that argument because of their patent falsity) are the literary sources that link Hipparchos' death with Athens' liberation. The main strength of Thucydides' argument remains the stele.

The stele, however, is incapable of bearing the weight of evidence that Thucydides would accord it. The crime on the stele was apparently not tyranny, but prodosia, and the charges were laid well after the expulsion of the Peisistratidai from Athens. The evidence of the stele shows that it was conceived more to deal with the living, threatening Peisistratidai than it was with the dead tyrants. It is thus not a reliable record of succession. Thucydides may have taken the evidence at face value because it supported his own beliefs about the succession and the relative ages of Hippias and
Hipparchos. Indeed, the stele obviously did not state in any certain terms who was and was not tyrant after Peisistratos, but was ambiguous. It cannot be used to prove Thucydides' argument about the succession.

Thucydides did not use the archon-list in his argument. Although he knew the archon-list in some form, Thucydides did not see its evidence as valuable for what he was attempting to prove (see Appendix). A significant delay occurred between Peisistratos' death and Hippias' archonship, which shows that the archonship was not an important aspect in the transition of power. These facts tell against the modern inference from the list that Hippias wished to commence his reign by holding the eponymous archonship as soon as he could after his father's death.

Thucydides' argument about the succession is inconsistent for he alludes to Hipparchos' power and to a joint power held by Peisistratos' sons. He argues that Hippias must have been tyrant and exercised long-standing control over the doryphoroi because otherwise he would not have been able to master the city so quickly after Hipparchos' death. Again, Thucydides infers that Hippias was eldest because his children alone were named on the stele. These inferences indicate that Thucydides used logic and deduction where facts obviously failed. Perhaps convinced of the merits of his own argument and the absurdity of the popular view, Thucydides used the account of another who believed that Hipparchos held some power. That would help to explain some of Thucydides' inconsistencies and perhaps some of his deductions based on τὸ εἰκός.

Evidence for the belief in joint tyranny is found in Thucydides and in the Ath.Pol. where it is specifically conceded that power was held by both Hippias and Hipparchos. The characterizations of Hippias and Hipparchos found in the Ath.Pol. may have been based on earlier accounts, but it cannot
be said with certainty if the concept of joint rule was also a rational com-
promise established early and then reiterated by the author of the Ath.Pol.
or if it described an actual state of affairs before the death of Hipparchos.
Herodotos' account is, however, replete with references to collective power
among the Peisistratidai and the Archedike-epigram offers some evidence for
believing that the Peisistratidai conceived of themselves collectively.

The Harmodios-skolia (and Hellanikos' information, which seems to be
derived from them) do not explicitly deny that Hippias was conjointly tyrant.
Hipparchos must, however, have been significant politically for the skolia to
make any sense. Although the equation of the skolia makes Harmodios and
Aristogeiton both murderers of the "tyrant" and liberators of Athens and is
clearly false, it must also show that Hipparchos was significant of the
tyranny, not a mere bystander without any power.

Hipparchos' status, which made the tyrannicide politically significant,
can have been inferred from his high visibility before his death. To later
generations of Athenians, especially to those who composed the skolia cele-
brating the tyrannicide, Hipparchos will have appeared to be the tyrant be-
cause he comported himself as tyrants did: publicly, lavishly. But, in
spite of these appearances, the evidence of the Archedike-epigram could indi-
cate that no distinction was made among the Peisistratidai themselves until
Hipparchos' murder left Hippias alone of his generation to rule.

We conclude that there was a singular lack of solid evidence about the
succession, which allowed authors interested in the subject to believe what
they would. No reliable evidence specifically named the tyrant after
Peisistratos; no reliable evidence indicated what government ruled. The
popular belief made Hipparchos tyrant; Thucydides' logic made Hippias
tyrant. A joint tyranny can, in fact, have existed and appears likeliest.
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34 I infer that prodosia was, with hierosulos, one of the two worst crimes at Athens from Xen. Hell. I.7.22: (Euryptolemos suggests to the Athenian Ekklesia that the accused generals of Arginousai be tried separately:) ἐὰν τις ἤ τὴν πόλιν προδίδῃ ἢ τῇ ἕρα κλέπτῃ, κριθέναι ἐν δικαστήριῳ καταγγέσθη, μὴ ταφήναι ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ἐξ ἐχρήματι «υτοῦ δῆμου»... We note that the punishment inflicted for the crime is the index of its serious-
ness.

35 Thuc. VIII.68.

36 Andok. I.97 (see D.M. MacDowell, Andocides. On the Mysteries [Oxford, 1962] 136; Ostwald [above, n. 15] 112). The provision implies that the subverters of 411 were deemed as evil as the Peisistratidae because the punishers of future subverters would be honoured like the punishers of the tyrants (i.e., the tyrant-slayers).

37 It should be noted here that Antiphon was charged with prodosia, but that the title of his apology was peri tis metaexadew (Harp. s.v. στεκαλτης). The fragment of it that is preserved shows that Antiphon's accuser, Apolexis, tried to slander Antiphon by connecting his grandfather with the Peisistratidae, alleging that the man was a doryphoros of the tyrants. This seems to be a good indication that parallels were being drawn between Antiphon's subversion and tyranny and the tyranny of the Peisistratidae. A similar slander seems to be cast by Aristophanes in Lysis. 64 (see J.D. Bing, "Lykopodes: A Contribution to Athenian Military History from Peisistratos to Kleisthenes", CQ 72 [1977] 308-16); cf. also Ar. Knights 448-9).

38 Hdt. V.94; Ath. Pol. 17.4.

39 Hdt. V.94; Thuc. VI.59.4.

40 Hippias had no known nothoi.
Thucydides directly contradicts Kleidemos (FrGrHist 323 Fr. 15), who says that Myrrhine was the daughter of Charmos. Other sources designate Myrrhine as the daughter of Peisistratos or his wife (see Davies, APF, 450). The compelling thing about Thucydides' testimony is that he knew the name of Kallias' father; Kleidemos, on the other hand, may have linked Hippias with Charmos because the two were otherwise associated as lovers by him (see Chapter I, section 2,B).

The presence of women's names on the stele would not mean that the women were held legally accountable, but rather that they were attainted and attainting, along with their fathers and brothers: cf. Thuc. VI.59.4; cf. also the case of Lycidas' wife (Hdt. IX.5), who was stoned to death along with her children because Lycidas had proposed that the Athenians accept Mardonios' offer.

Peisistratos' first wife is generally thought to have been an Athenian woman (cf. Wilamowitz [above, n. 7] 111; Schachermeyr [above, n. 1] 151), but that is only deduced from the status of Hippias, Hipparchos and Thessalos as genesioi. On Timonassa see Ath.Pol. 17.3-4; see also Davies, APF, 449-50. On Myrrhine see Davies, APF, 450.

Kinzl (above, n. 3) 506, n. 18; Berve (above, n. 4); Siebert (above, n. 4) I.16 and II.419, n. 95; Holladay (above, n. 5) 189.

I take it that the dead were indicted so that their bones could be dug up and cast beyond the borders of Attica: cf. Thuc. I.126.12; see also below, text p. 100.
45  Cf. Schachermeyr (above, n. 1) 154; Davies, APF, 450-2.

46  Cf. Hignett (above, n. 5); Holladay (above, n. 5) 189.

47  Cf. von Stern (above, n. 6) 361; Davies, APF, 450; see also P. Bicknell, "Studies in Athenian Politics and Genealogy", Historia Einzelschriften 19 (1972) 67, n. 32.

48  Dover, HCT, 334.

49  F. Müller, ed. L. Herbst, Zu Thukydides (Leipzig, 1898-1900) 25ff.

50  Contra Friedel (above, n. 5) 40, who suggests θυκήματα.

51  Not all Peisistratos' relatives were indicted: see Ath.Pol. 22.4.

52  See W.W. Merry, Aristophanes. The Birds (Oxford, 1904) 58.

53  On Diagoras the Melian see Diod. XII.6.7; see also L. Woodbury, "The Date and Atheism of Diagoras the Melian", Phoenix 19 (1965) 178-209.

54  I.e., the area reserved for enemies of the state (see above, n. 26); we note that there is space in the agora reserved for the great friends and benefactors of the city (near the tyrannicide-group): cf. Dem. XX.70; see also IG 12 646 and Diod. XX.46.2; Dio Cass. 47.20.4.

55  It is right to construe Aristophanes' joke about the tyrants "long dead"
as a jab at the tyrant hysteria sweeping Athens in the late fifth century (cf. Woodbury [above, n. 53] 180ff.; MacDowell [above, n. 22] 175). Perhaps this jab was sharpened by the recent amnesty for exiles that excluded the Peisistratidai (Markel., Vit. Thuc. 32; see below, text p. 93). But the joke can have point only if the stele really existed and the decree on it provided rewards for the deaths of the Peisistratidai.

The provision affecting would-be tyrants is similar to the provisions excluding certain offenders in the "Solonian" amnesty law (see below, text p. 96). This may mean that Patrokleides cited the Solonian amnesty law or that the amnesty of 480 was in part pro forma a restatement of the Solonian law or, as is more likely, the amnesty law of 480 was the original (see p. 96-7). We note that the Solonian law specifies the crime (éni τυραννίςει), while the Patrokleides Decree specifies those convicted or, perhaps, those convicted under some law who were ex post facto deemed tyrants (τυράννολος). Thus, the proposer of the amnesty law of 480 may have specifically excepted the Peisistratidai, but not necessarily generally "those convicted of tyranny". Cf. D.M. MacDowell (above, n. 36) 118.

Andok. 1.77: γηράωσθων τον δήμον ταύτα άπερ οτε ἤν τε Μηδίκω.

There seems to be a good deal of flexibility in the sentence of ἔζευσιν: it was passed as a sentence upon some who were going to die anyway (Plut. Mor. 834b) and that notable genos, the Alkmaionidai, who nevertheless returned to Athens to live (cf. Thuc. I.126.12; Ath. Pol. 1). Possibly, the
formal sentence evolved after it was observed that exiles like the Peisistratidai and Themistokles lived and died outside of Attica and could not be buried there once they had died. Originally, their flight may have been like that of the outlawed Milesians - \( \varepsilon \upiota^{\alpha} \mu \upsilon \tau \varepsilon \tau \), i.e., to return was to die instantly (cf. CIG 2008; Lyk. Leok. 93). For those who were so condemned, safety lay with the enemies of one's country and return home could only be achieved by cooperating treacherously with those enemies, the exile's benefactors.

60
The importance of the tyrannicides for the Athenian state is shown by the Prytaneion Decree (IG 13 131), which was passed probably no later than 430 (see W.E. Thompson, "The Prytaneion Decree", AJP 92 [1971] 226-37); cf. also Thuc. VI.53.3; Ar. Lysis. 631-4; Ath. Pol. 58.1.

61
Cf. n. 59, above.

62
Davies, APP, 255-6 terms this story an "obvious convenience for the family image". Perhaps it was devised as a way to help combat hostile stories about the acquisition of Kallias' family's wealth (Ath. Pol. 6.2; Plut. Sol. 15), since this anecdote purports to show how Kallias, the son of Phainippos, acquired his wealth at the expense of the tyrants.

63
It is possible, even likely that two other provisions were upon the stele, although there is no direct proof: the bones of the dead were to be dug up and cast beyond the borders of Attica (see above, n. 44) and the houses of the offenders were to be demolished (see below, text p. 100). It may be, too, that the material of the stele was of bronze (Friedel [above,

65
Cf. Beloch (above, n. 6) 313.

66

67
Ostwald (above, n. 15) 104; Rhodes, *Eisangelia* (above, n. 66) 104; Hansen (above, n. 66) 91.

68
See LSJ s.v. καταλφορίς. Thucydides uses the word to describe subversion (cf. I.107.6; VI.27.3 and 28.2; VII.26 and 49).

69
For a different view see M. Gagarin, "The Thesmothetai and the Earliest Athenian Tyranny Law", *TAPA* 111 (1981) 75-6, who nevertheless sidesteps the question of the law's validity; cf. also Rhodes, *Athenaion* (above, n. 66) 156.

70
71
Ostwald (above, n. 15) 109ff.; MacDowell (above, n. 22) 178.

72
Ostwald (above, n. 15) 106; Gagarin (above, n. 69) 74, n. 20 challenges
Ostwald's emphasis upon the change of number; cf. Rhodes, Athenaión
(above, n. 66) 222-3.

73
Dover, HCT, 325; MacDowell (above, n. 22) 28-9.

74
Ostwald (above, n. 15) 106ff.; Herodotos' language at V.71.2 (ορείγματος
πλην ἐκκάκτου) seems to indicate that due-process was granted the
Kylonians, which of course argues for a pre-Solonian legal mechanism for
dealing with tyranny (see How and Wells, II.38). Ostwald (above, n. 15)
105, however, thinks that what was promised to the Kylonians was makeshift
and that no law existed at Athens to be used to try subverters. Gagarin
(above, n. 69) 74ff. challenges Ostwald, arguing that, to the contrary,
legal means were available to try the Kylonians. The issue does not bear
upon this study; cf. also Rhodes, Athenaión (above, n. 66) 223.

75
Drakon enacted his laws in 621 B.C. (see R.S. Stroud, Drakon's Law on

76
See above, n. 74; Swoboda (above, n. 5) 57-60 puts the law's enactment
at c. 556/5 after Peisistratos' first attempt at tyranny, during his first
exile.

77
See M.H. Hansen, Apagoge, Endeixis and Ephegesis against Kakougoi, Atimoi
and Pheugontes (Odense, 1976) 78-9, who traces a change in meaning of
atimos and suggests that, by 490, the word had already come to be known in its milder sense. Symptomatic of that change are additional words in imprecations like πολέμιος (Dem. IX.42); see also Gagarin (above, n. 69) 76, n. 24.

78 See Raubitschek (above, n. 4) 228, n. 21; Dover, HCT, 325; MacDowell (above, n. 22) 28-9; Hansen (above, n. 77) 78; Rhodes, Athenaios (above, n. 66) 222.

79 See Friedel (above, n. 5) 25, n. 63; Hansen (above, n. 77); cf. Rhodes, Athenaios (above, n. 66) 222.


          Gagarin (above, n. 69) 75, n. 22 suggests that the author of the Ath. Pol. was perhaps citing only one of a number of provisions in an anti-tyranny law. In any case, all the laws were, by comparison, milder in his opinion.

81 Schol. ad Ar. Lysis. 273; cf. also Hdt. V.72ff.; Contra Ostwald (above, n. 15) 109: ἐν τῷ ἱεροκλείδει must refer grammatically only to Kleomenes, not the renegade Athenians. This is the same type of character-denigration of Kleomenes as the crime of hierosulos (see above, n. 34) charged in Herodotos (V.90.2; see also V.72.3).

We note that Herodotos reports no Athenians with Kleomenes when he came into Attica the second time (V.72.3) nor is there any talk of tyranny, but, the next time Kleomenes came (V.74ff.), he wanted to set
Isagoras up as tyrant of Athens; he got only as far as Eleusis, however—one of the focal points of the scholiast's story. The whole story appears to be a conflation from a later date. It is, however, outside the scope of this study to challenge and, since it is accepted as valid by many scholars (cf. How and Wells, II.40-1; Ostwald [above, n. 15] 109; Bicknell [above, n. 47] 85, n. 10), I shall deal with it as authentic.

82 Wilamowitz (above, n. 7) 115, followed by Swoboda (above, n. 5) 63, rightly puts this stele on the Akropolis: cf. Thuc. II.15.6; Paus. I.26.6.

83 Schol. ad Ar. Lysis. 273.

84 Herodotos (V.72.4-73.1) indicates that execution was summary.

85 Cf. MacDowell (above, n. 22) 178-9.

86 Plut. Mor. 834b.

87 Noted by Ostwald (above, n. 15) 111 and MacDowell (above, n. 22) 178.

88 There is a good treatment of this hysteria in J. DeRomilly, Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism (Oxford, 1963) 217ff.; see also Woodbury (above, n. 53).

89 Contra Ostwald (above, n. 15) 113: this must mean that Demophantos detailed far more than what was inherent in the archaic anti-tyranny law,
for Antiphon would surely have been charged with subversion if punishment had been harsh enough to match how serious a crime the Athenians thought it was (see above, n. 37).

90 Xen. **Hell.** I.7.28; Lyk. **Leok.** 115; see also Hansen (above, n. 20) 83, Catalogue No. 63.

91 The bronze markers affecting Antiphon and Archeptolemos could have been an innovation for them, but cf. above, text p. 99-100.

92 Hippias and Hipparchos were with their father at Pallene (Hdt. I.63), as was Hegesistratos (Ath.**Pol.** 17.4).

93 Marathon: Hdt. VI.107; the Akropolis-burning: Hdt. VIII.52.

94 The plunder of the tyrannicide-group and its transportation to Sousa (Plin. **Nat. Hlst.** 34.70; Paus. I.8.5) by Xerxes could be taken as a good indication that the King wanted to make a show for the Athenian enemies of the Peisistratidai: why go to all the trouble of shipping the statues to Sousa? And, in the same vein, why leave untouched a stele proclaiming the Peisistratidai enemies of Athens? Together with the destruction of the structures on the Akropolis where the stele stood, this seems to suggest that the stele adikias did not survive the Persians' "rough wooing" of Athens. But replacement of the plundered statue-group by the Athenians also argues that the stele, another symbol of defiance, was replaced (cf. Busolt [above, n. 4]). Whether additions were made so that the crimes of the younger Peisistratidai were emphasized is impossible to say.
Cf. Valeton (above, n. 6) 24.

Hdt. I.61.

See below, n. 142; MacDowell (above, n. 36) 212 thinks that Andok. 1.106 refers to a battle at Pallene between the Athenians and the forces of the tyrants during the expulsion effort in 511/10 (i.e., after the final defeat of the Thessalians by Kleomenes, but before the siege of the Akropolis). Needless to say that is difficult to believe: there is absolutely no evidence for such a battle and Herodotos might fairly have been expected to say something about it in order to minimize further the Spartan contribution to the liberation. (Cf. below, n. 114 and section 3,B.)

Andokides probably mistakes the battle fought in 546, which was a loss for the anti-tyrannists and therefore the democracy, with a victory for those forces, or, perhaps, the democracy had changed the defeat into a victory.

See above, n. 44.

Cf. Gagarin (above, n. 69) 77.

Cf. Ath.Pol. 22.4; Rhodes, Athenaios (above, n. 66) 271-2.

Hdt. V.65.2; Moveables: Ath.Pol. 19.6. We note that Herodotos says that the terms of surrender were laid down by the Athenians.

On the seriousness of the children being captured cf. the rather

102

On Hipparchos see above, text p. 86. Many of those ostracized in the 480s were charged on the ostraka with treason (e.g. Kallixenos, an early victim, was called προδότης [E. Vanderpool, Hesp. 19 (1950) 376-90]; Menon was ἐκκ προ[δότης] [Vanderpool, 379, n.]; Aristeides was called Ἀριστείδης τον Δρέκουδρα [M. Meiggs and J. R. Lewis, 42]; cf. Thomsen [above, n. 14] 139ff. and below, n. 151). Whether or not the charges on the ostraka were true or merely libellous, they show that suspicion of treason was in the minds of the Athenian voters and could have been exploited by a clever politician: cf. n. 151 below.

103


104

Hdt. V.63.3ff.

105

In fact, Kleomenes, according to Herodotos (VI.66), may have manoeuvered himself into the position of being able to strike at Athens with some sort of sanction: cf. R. Sealey, "The Pit and the Well: The Persian Heralds of 491 B.C.", CJ 72 (1976) 17-8.

On bribery see Hdt. V.90.

106

It is interesting to note that the Thessalian cavalry constituted Hippias' only apparent long-distance line of defense (cf. A.J. Podlecki, The Life of Themistocles [Montreal, 1975] 5; see also Berve [above, n. 4] 71 and
107
Hdt. V.64.2; contra R.W. Macan, Herodotus, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books (London, 1895) I.204: this describes those with Kleomenes, not a party already at Athens.

108
Hdt. I.60.

109
See Appendix.

110
Hdt. V.66.1.

111
This point is best dealt with by W.G. Forrest, "Themistokles and Argos", CQ 54 (1960) 233ff.

112
Hdt. V.65.1; cf. Rhodes, Athenaión (above, n. 66) 238-9.

113
Apparently, time favoured the besieged (cf. Hdt. V.65.1; Thuc. I.126.7-12; cf. also Hdt. VIII.52).

114
Cf. Macan (above, n. 107) I.204: "How Herodotos knows so well that but for an accident the Lacedaimonians would have failed, does not appear."

115
See below, n. 183.

116
See above, n. 101.
Hdt. V.65.3, 94.1; Thuc. VI.59.4; on Sigeion see J.M. Cook, The Troad (Oxford, 1973) 178-88.

Jacoby, Atthis, 335, n. 26 suggests that Thucydides could have derived this information from Charon of Lampsakos (see also Dover, HCT, 324), but it is more likely that Thucydides deduced what Hippias planned (see below, text and n. 119).


Cf. Table 1.

Cf. Thucydides VII.81.5, who describes the reluctance of the Syracusans to come to grips with the now completely vanquished Athenians (cf. W.E. Thompson, "Thucydides 2.65.11", Historia 20 [1971] 144-5).

Isagoras preserved: Hdt. V.74.1.

On the other hand, once the Athenians had ejected Kleomenes, they were very quick to seek out allies (Hdt. V.73.1).

Hippias killed many in the aftermath of Hipparchos' murder (Thuc. VI.59.2; Ath.Pol. 19.5-6).
Kylonians: Thuc. I.126.7ff.

Hippias was especially regarded by the Spartans: Hdt. V.90.1.


See above, n. 101.

Cf. R.J. Buck, "The Reforms of 487 B.C. in the Selection of Archons", CP 60 (1965) 98; cf. also Raubitschek (above, n. 4) 228, n. 4; Ostwald (above, n. 15) 109; Gagarin (above, n. 69) 77, n. 29.

Raubitschek (above, n. 4) 228, n. 4.

Ath. Pol. 22.4; cf. Davies, APF, 451; on Hippokrates, the son of Anaxileos, as a Peisistratid see H.A. Shapiro, "Hippokrates, Son of Anaxileos", Hesperia 49 (1980) 291-3; cf. also Rhodes, Athenaiion (above, n. 66) 275.

See above, n. 41; see also E. Badian, "Archons and Strategoi", Antichthon 5 (1971) 11; P. Karavites, "Realities and Appearances, 490-480 B.C.", Historia 26 (1977) 136; also Holladay (above, n. 5) 184; Rhodes, Athenaiion (above, n. 66) 271-2, after Davies, APF, 451 accepts Hipparchos as a grandson of Hippias.
Karavites (above, n. 132) 136-7; Holladay (above, n. 5) 189.

See above, text p. 90.

Hipparchos' name and the close affiliation of his father, Charmos, with the Peisistratidai were constant reminders of the past regime.

Obviously, Dareios' willingness to subdue Athens was the necessary ingredient for Hippias' return; Artaphrenes could hardly initiate anything important on his own.

Cf. How and Wells, II.50; on the date see Podlecki (above, n. 106) 6.

Cf. How and Wells, II.51.

Cf. How and Wells, II.55.

Cf. Hdt. IV.137-8; VI.9.2ff.

Cf. Sealey (above, n. 127) 179; also Holladay (above, n. 5) 175.


On the region of the Diakria see Hesychios s.v. διακριτής; the Peisistratid home was at Philaidai near Brauron (Plato Hipparchos 228b; Plut. Sol. 10.2). The supporters of Peisistratos originally came from the

144 Euphorbos and Philagros of Eretria provided the Athenians with an example of what traitors could bring about for them (Hdt. VI.102.2) and, apparently, Dareios had the same thing in mind for the Athenians (VI.102); cf. also Diod. 10.27.2.

145 Cf. Ktesias Epit. 18 (Justin 2.9.21); Cic. Ep. ad Att. 9.10.3; Souda s.v. Πηλαζς.

146 See also Hdt. VI.115; on the shield-signal see, most recently, D. Gillis, Collaboration with the Persians, Historia Einzelschriften 24 (1980) 45-58.

147 Cf. Sealey (above, n. 127) 202-3.

148 Hdt. VI.123.1; cf. Forrest (above, n. 111); Karavites (above, n. 132) 137, n. 30; Holladay (above, n. 5) 180ff.; Rhodes, Athenaion (above, n. 66) 274-5.

149 Cf. Paus. I.33.2.

150 Ath.Pol. 22.5; cf. Rhodes, Athenaion (above, n. 66) 274-5.
Probably Kallias Kratiou (see E. Vanderpool, Ostracism in Athens [Cincinnati, 1970] 21-2; cf. also Bicknell [above, n. 47] 64-71; Thomsen [above, n. 14] 97-9). On twelve sherds Kallias is associated with the Mede, being either ἐκ Μῆδων or ὁ Μῆδος. One voter has even drawn a caricature of a Mede on an ostrakon; cf., however, Rhodes, Athenaios (above, n. 66) 276.

G.M.E. Williams, "The Kerameikos Ostraka", ZPE 31 (1978) 103-113 and "The Image of the Alkmaionidai, 490-480 B.C.", Historia 29 (1980) 106-10 offers a different view. Badian (above, n. 132) rightly points out, however, that the gap between the shield-signal and the first ostracism does not undermine a connection between the ostracisms and the events at Marathon and the treason that was alleged to have occurred there. (Cf. Rhodes, Athenaios [above, n. 66] 275.)

It is possibly significant that Lykourgos, Leok. 117 says that, when the Athenians decided to make the bronze tablet from Hipparchos' statue, "they voted to write on it (the names of) the unclean (ἀλήθερίους) and the traitors". The word ἀλήθερος is associated with the Alkmaionidai for their wrongdoing to the Kylonians (cf. Thuc. I.126.12; Ar. Knights 445-6). To speculate: perhaps the first ostracised, who were mainly Alkmaionidai, went over to the Mede after their ostracisms, refused recall because of their injury, and were thus branded as "friends of the tyrants" on the stele and proscribed as ἀλήθερος.

Hdt. V.98; VI.121.1.
Karavites (above, n. 132) 145; Davies, APF, 381.

See above, n. 144; two passages in Herodotos (VI.112.3 and 120) suggest that the Greeks of 490 feared the Persians inordinately.

Valeton (above, n. 6) 24.

Cf. Jacoby, Atthis, 339, n. 52.

Beloch (above, n. 6) 313.

Cf. Hdt. III.39; Athen. 258ff.; Diod. 20.77.1.


Thuc. VI.55.3; see above, n. 119.

Jacoby, Atthis, 336, n. 36 observes that Kleidemos for one was unconvinced by Thucydides' arguments.

Fornara (above, n. 161) 423, n. 1.

Fornara (above, n. 161) 423; see also Kinzl (above, n. 3) 506, n. 16.

Jacoby, Atthis, 156; cf. C. Fornara, "The Cult of Harmodius and Aristogeiton", Philologus 114 (1970) 160, n. 27, who points out that it
matters little whether the author was Hellanikos or not; cf. also Rhodes, *Athenaion* (above, n. 66) 189.

167
Cf. Fornara (above, n. 161) 424.

168
Von Stern (above, n. 6) 363-4; Jacoby, *Atthis*, 337, n. 43; Dover, *HCT*, 320; Kinzl (above, n. 3).

169
Cf. Fornara (above, n. 161) 423, n. 2; K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (Strassburg, 1913) I.2, 294 and Beloch (above, n. 6) 313 points out that Herodotos at V.55.1 may have been viewing events from the standpoint of 510 (or after), rather than that of 514.

170
Cf. H. Friedel (above, n. 5) 33; Podlecki (above, n. 127) 140 suggests that Hdt. VI.121 was written later than VI.109 and inserted into an already completed narrative after Herodotos had learned the true story from the Alkmaionidai. But that must also mean that the entire account of Athens' liberation (V.55ff.) was revised.

171
Herodotos' account of Athens' liberation derived from the Alkmaionidai (cf. Jacoby, *Atthis*, 335, n. 27) and it is clear that Herodotos is promoting the Alkmaionidai at the expense of the Gephyraioi (cf. VI.123.1).

172

173
See Friedel (above, n. 5) 32-3; M. Ostwald, *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Demos* (Oxford, 1969) 123.
174  
Cf. above, n. 171; cf. also Rhodes, Athenaios (above, n. 66) 191.

175  
See Chapter III.

176  
Fornara (above, n. 161) 423-4.

177  
See above, n. 166.

178  

179  

180  
Dover, HCT, 318 is undisturbed by Thuc. VI.53.3: "...for it goes without saying that a tyrant's brothers, so long as they are on good terms with him, enjoy great power...." But Thucydides equates the tyranny of the children with that of the father, an indication that the Athenian public thought that Peisistratos' sons succeeded him.

181  
Hdt. VI.39.1, 123.2, although the issue is not as clear-cut as in Thuc. (cf. Hdt. V.65.1); cf. Kinzl (above, n. 3) 506.
Cf., however, Fornara (above, n. 166) 167-8, who questions the ascription of the mistake to Hellanikos.

Herodotos seems to have been first with criticism of the Spartans, although he wanted the glory of the liberation to redound to the Alkmaionidai (V.62.1-2, VI.123.2-3). Cf. Rhodes, Athenaión (above, n. 66) 190.

On the Prytaneion Decree see Thompson (above, n. 60).
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Cornelius (above, n. 11) 79; cf. also Rhodes, Athenaios (above, n. 66) 225. Dover's rebuttal (HCT, 320) seems weak: that Thucydides raised the question of succession does not mean that the question is necessarily valid.
III. THE MURDER OF HIPPARCLOS

1. Introduction: Thucydides and The Tyrannicide

The excursus of Book VI (54-59) of Thucydides' history, which recounts the murder of Hipparclos by Harmodios and Aristogeiton, has always been considered definitive. Thucydides' purpose in writing the digression was to disprove the common Athenian assumption that Hipparclos was tyrant when he was slain. His method was to show that Harmodios and Aristogeiton acted from private motives and turbulent emotions when they killed Hipparclos, that they did not act politically to free Athens from the tyranny. Thucydides was convinced of the rightness of his view and asserted at the beginning of the digression that the Athenians were ignorant of the truth of the affair.

There are, however, problems in the digression and they seem to derive from Thucydides' polemical approach to-the subject. For his statement against the Athenians indicates that Thucydides opposes what most Athenians thought about the incident and suggests that what follows the declaration of Athenian ignorance is an argument instead of history. In fact, Thucydides' polemical approach quite possibly resulted in inconsistencies in his narrative due to misinterpretation or misapplication of the evidence. The suspicion of such misuse stems from Thucydides' interpretation of the stele concerning the adikia of the tyrants: he apparently introduced the evidence of the stele because of what it seemed to him to be. Thucydides was probably led to his interpretation by a strong belief about Hipparclos that was based on other information and by misconceptions about the origin of the stele brought about by the narrowness of his strong beliefs. Similarly, it is
also possible that Thucydides was led by the same strong conviction about Hipparchos to read his views into earlier accounts of the tyrannicide - the only material available as sources, using his own inferences and deductions. Something must account for Thucydides' inconsistency: he denies that Hipparchos was tyrant and yet at one point in the digression describes him as possessing archē. It is possible to see in this inconsistency and others how Thucydides imperfectly united his own views of Hipparchos' power with the earlier accounts that obviously ascribed tyrannical power to Hipparchos. Thucydides' neglect of these inconsistencies was likely caused by the same confidence in his beliefs about Hipparchos as that which caused him to accept the stele adikias for what it seemed: quite simply, Thucydides was convinced that Hipparchos was not tyrant when he was killed.

To illustrate these points, a closer examination of Thucydides' digression is in order. It should be cautioned, however, that the best result that can be obtained from the examination is a sharper focus on the sources used by Thucydides, material that may itself be far from the truth. Thus, charting inconsistencies in Thucydides will not reveal the truth of the tyrannicide nor even provide a preferable account, but rather show that there is variation from Thucydides that might hold the truth. We may rightly expect, however, that most inferences in the digression are Thucydides', especially references founded on τὸ εἰκός. That is a helpful standard, since much of the digression rests on reasonability.

Earlier accounts whose authorship can be determined are useful for differentiating other possible Thucydidean touches; later accounts, because they illustrate particular points of dispute and because they show why Thucydides' account was not considered definitive in antiquity. They may also hold valuable detail passed over by Thucydides.
It is most important to discover that earlier, unascribed information about the tyrannicide, for it is likely that all accounts about Hipparchos' murder derive ultimately from a common source. It is also possible that this earlier information was itself reconstructed to make sense of a dramatic event. Inferences, conclusions, reconstructions and revisions were added and subtracted from that "core" account, some of which may have merged with the tradition and become solidified over time. Unfortunately, we may never obtain the truth of the tyrannicide since the Athenians seem to have been in disagreement about its significance early on, perhaps because all explanations were constructed *ex post facto*. We can, however, reach a clearer understanding of the earlier reports, upon which Thucydides drew, and, in that way, get closer to the truth.
2. Accounts before Thucydides’

A. Introduction

There is only one account of the tyrannicide written before Thucydides’ to which a definite author can be ascribed, although it is clear that others were extant. Herodotos touched upon the murder of Hipparchos in his account of how Athens won her freedom. From what he says, it is obvious that he was responding to the view so vigorously attacked by Thucydides later that Athens was freed from tyranny by the tyrannicides. That version, termed the "official" or "vulgate" version, has been generally attributed to Hellanikos the Atthidographer, but this is not possible because it must predate Herodotos and so cannot be ascribed in its earlier, more original form to any known author. Whether Hellanikos later repeated the "official" version of Hipparchos' death and not just the erroneous equation of the Harmodios-skolia, which made Hipparchos' death synonymous with Athenian freedom, is impossible to say. It should be noted that the weight of the "official" version caused Herodotos to soften his assertions about the end of the tyranny and thus to weaken his attempted refutation of that version: indeed, Herodotos was apparently confused about the importance of the tyrannicide; Hellanikos, who knew Herodotos, nevertheless adopted a version like the "official" one.

B. Herodotos
The most significant feature of Herodotos' treatment of the tyrannicide is its brevity. In stark contrast to Thucydides' lengthy and very vivid account, Herodotos disposes of the murder of Hipparchos in one sentence (V.56.2): "After he had spoken of the dream, he dispatched the procession, during which he died." Instead of explaining the motives or unravelling the action of the murder itself, Herodotos was more concerned with Hipparchos' premonitive dream on the night before his death (V.56) and Herodotos' own theory about the origin of the Gephyraioi, the genos of the murderers. These two elements are irrelevant to the subject at hand, the freeing of Athens, but discussion of the tyrannicide, the subject at hand, is absolutely minimal. It is somewhat puzzling why Herodotos should have failed to mention such interesting material.

One possible answer is that Herodotos wanted to minimize the significance of tyrannicide as much as he could in order to maximize the role of the Alkmaionidai in the liberation of Athens. By saying very little about the tyrannicides and very much about the Alkmaionidai, Herodotos could play down the significance of the murder for his reader. The beneficiaries of this reporting were the Alkmaionidai, who were cast in a much more favourable light.

Herodotos' interest in promoting the Alkmaionidai is apparent. The clearest instance occurs at VI.121ff. where Herodotos combats the charge that the Alkmaionidai were responsible for the infamous shield-signal at Marathon that implicated the family as collaborators with Hippias and the Persians. Herodotos alleges that the Alkmaionidai were misotyrannoi who fled the Peisistratid tyranny τὸν ποντικὸν χρόνον. That is, of course, false. He argues that the Alkmaionidai "much more than Harmodios and Aristogeiton" freed Athens, perhaps because he believed that the family's action then wiped
out past or future charges of treachery. Whether Herodotos believed what he was told or constructed the information himself is of no consequence: the special pleading on behalf of the Alkmaionidai is unconvincing. It nevertheless shows quite well to what extent Herodotos was well-disposed toward the Alkmaionidai.

What Herodotos says about the clan of the Gephyraioi reinforces belief in that predisposition. For the sub-digression about the clan's origin attempts to contradict their own traditions. In the digression, Herodotos stresses the foreignness of the Gephyraioi, ending the digression with the implication that the clan, with its separate temples and rites, was still foreign and unassimilated among the Athenians. Far from being Athenians, the Gephyraioi were originally not even Greek, but Phoenician, a clear disparagement given the Greek view of the Phoenicians. In contrast, the Alkmaionidai were an old Athenian family (V.62.2): ... 'Αλκμαιωνίδαι, γένος εσόντες Ἀθηναίοι ... Herodotos' tactic in the digression apparently was to suggest that the Gephyraioi should be considered less patriotic because more foreign, while the Alkmaionidai should be thought of as more patriotic because they were Athenian to the core (see below, text). We must remember that the digression concerning the origins of the Gephyraioi is completely irrelevant to the death of Hipparchos.

Herodotos' criticism of the tyrannicides is, however, weakened by a lack of conviction about their importance. At VI.109.3 Miltiades urges Kallimachos, before the battle of Marathon, to make Athens free and thus to equal the achievement of Harmodios and Aristogeiton. Herodotos thus uses the tyrannicides as the benchmark for Miltiades to give Kallimachos, as if the tyrannicides had actually freed Athens. Two different concepts of the importance of the tyrannicide present themselves in Herodotos, showing that
he was of two minds about them. His indecision may have prevented Herodotos from arguing explicitly that Harmodios and Aristogeiton did not free Athens as Thucydides did later. It perhaps also forced Herodotos to denigrate them only obliquely by omitting the story of the murder almost entirely from his writings and by suggesting that the models of Athenian freedom were not really Athenians at all. Perhaps to lessen their importance even further, Herodotos extolled the Alkmaionidai, describing their achievement effusively.

We note that the Alkmaionidai, even in their most glorious days, never became synonymous with Athenian freedom.

Two important facts do, however, emerge from Herodotos' slender treatment of the tyrannicides that will be of some importance later: Hipparchos was murdered during the Panathenaic procession, while he was dispatching it.

C. Hellanikos and Other Versions

Hellanikos was apparently the first spokesman for the view contested by Herodotos. For the information on the Parian Marble that links Hipparchos' death with the freedom of Athens is attributed to him. It was against that equation that Herodotos and Thucydides reacted.

The equation of the Marble and of the Harmodios-skolia helps partially to explain Herodotos' motive for attacking the tyrannicides by stressing their foreignness. For the equation makes the Athenians themselves entirely responsible for their own liberation and the tyrannicide was included in that nationalism. It had become important for the Athenians to ignore the participation of outsiders, particularly the Spartans, in the liberation, perhaps
because of the Peloponnesian War. Herodotos' efforts to dim the patriotism imputed to the tyrannicides were designed to take advantage of this chauvinism and to deprive the tyrannicides of some of the credit for their act. The Athenian belief in self-liberation, a concept obviously much more attractive to them than sharing credit with the Spartans, accounts, too, for the glaring chronological error that united the tyrannicide with Athens' liberation.

Athens, which became the greatest proponent of democracy in Greece in the fifth century, perhaps wished to believe that she had been ardently democratic from the beginning.

We have no evidence to ascribe any version of the actual slaying of Hipparchos to Hellanikos, but, if he did report one, it was probably similar to the "official" version. There are, however, two earlier accounts of the motivation of the tyrannicides in Thucydides that the author apparently combined (see below, text). Since both accounts depicted Hipparchos as tyrant, Hellanikos could have reported one or the other or, perhaps, even a third.
3. Thucydides

A. Introduction

The purpose of Thucydides' digression concerning the murder of Hipparchos was to demonstrate that Hipparchos was not the tyrant of Athens when he was slain. The argument is two-fold: Hipparchos was not tyrant because his brother Hippias was elder and so ruled; the tyrant-slayers were personally, not politically, motivated to act and accomplished the murder of Hipparchos only by accident.

There are not many who would argue that Thucydides presents his argument in a straightforward way or that the argument is not weakened by the nature of the evidence adduced. Indeed, the manner in which Thucydides argues his case implies that there was no conclusive proof about the succession. I have already pointed out that the evidence of the Achtungsstele, which Thucydides used to argue for Hippias' primacy, would be indisputable proof that Hippias was tyrant if the stele was what Thucydides believed it to be. But the evidence was ambiguous and allowed for different interpretations about the succession. Actually, Thucydides' account of the events leading to Hipparchos' death is almost irrelevant to the question of Hipparchos' status. Its pertinence results only from Thucydides' allegation that the tyrannicides acted from anger and passion, rather than to overthrow the tyranny (i.e., Hipparchos). Yet even this suspect line of argument is built upon the very slender foundation of the reconstructed thoughts and emotions of the principals at almost the precise moment that they were thinking and feeling them. The argument of the digression concerning Hipparchos' death is complex, circuitous and its credibility is correspondingly weakened.
Why did Thucydides not marshal stronger arguments? The answer is probably because the evidence that he could muster was itself not strongly indicative of Hipparchos' status nor were the events of the murder cleanly reported in Thucydides' sources. Quite simply, Thucydides used what was available. The result was weakness and, consequently, it is clear that Thucydides was more concerned to argue his point weakly than he was to refrain from the muddied evidence or even to acknowledge the inadequacies of the evidence for his argument. Obviously, Thucydides was strongly urged to correct the Athenian belief about Hipparchos and this motivation must have been created by stronger proofs than those he adduces in the digression. But on what basis would this motivation be founded? One foundation must have been common sense: the tyrannicides did not liberate Athens when they killed Hipparchos; the tyranny continued for four years until the Spartans and the Alkmaionidai liberated Athens. One logical extrapolation from this knowledge would be that, since Athens was not liberated when Hipparchos was killed, he was not the tyrant when he was killed. If Thucydides was committed to that line of argument, he quite probably joined it with the evidence available to him, the earlier accounts of Hipparchos' murder, and reinterpreted it. Insight into these accounts was enhanced by Thucydides' adamantine belief in the lack of political meaning in the murder; previous accounts thus showed him that the tyrannicide was erotically, not politically, inspired. But these accounts, which comprise the infrastructure of facts in Thucydides' report, only partially accommodate his insight, for they were obviously composed with Hipparchos in mind as tyrant (hence Hipparchos' arche). The result of the imperfect combination is inconsistency, reconstruction and near irrelevancy in the digression. Thucydides' mistake was to use accounts that held Hipparchos as tyrant to draw the opposite conclusion about Hipparchos'
status. We might rightly conclude that the digression is in an unfinished state as we read it.

This examination of Thucydides' digression will be in two parts: motivations of the tyrannicides and the act of murder itself. Later accounts, such as that found in the Ath. Pol., which must have been influenced by Thucydides, will be introduced only as they differ with him on particular points. I shall not try here to settle the question of the purpose of the digression in its context, a problem really concerning Athens' history in the late fifth century. Of course we must proceed believing that Thucydides was not unduly influenced by any contemporary parallels that he may have discovered later to alter his objectivity.

B. Motivation

Thucydides' main attack against the tyrannicides concerns their motivation for murdering Hipparchos (I.20; VI.54). Thucydides asserts that, contrary to the popular Athenian notion that Hipparchos was murdered because he was the tyrant, the murder was actually a τόλμημα διέρωτικήν ξυντυχίαν (VI.54.1), an ἀλόγιστος τόλμα ἐκ τοῦ παραχρήμα περίδεος (VI.59.1). Thucydides emphasizes the error of the Athenians, suggesting that he thought their explanation of the tyrannicides' motivation particularly vulnerable to disproof. But there are actually two forces influencing the motivation of the tyrannicides in Thucydides - a personal, emotional one and a more logical, political one. These forces are confused in Thucydides' explanation and contradict Thucydides' appraisal of the tyrannicide as a ξυντυχία.
Two motives are given in Thucydides' digression, both ostensibly personal in nature, but affecting the tyrannicides differently. Aristogeiton first plotted to "loose the tyranny" after Hipparchos propositioned Harmodios. Harmodios was ὥτος ἡλικίας ημμορός and Aristogeiton his ἐρωτής. When Hipparchos made advances to Harmodios and was rejected, the youth took the story to Aristogeiton, whose response was as follows: ὅ δέ ἐρωτέως περιελήνης καὶ φοβηθεὶς τὴν Ἰππάρχον δύναμιν μὴ θυεῖ προσυγγίζην αὐτῷ, ἐπιθυμεῖε εὐθὺς ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποχώρεις ἔξισθαν κατάλογον τῇ τυραννίς.

In accordance with the initial pronouncement of Thucydides, Aristogeiton's response was swift and unreflective, i.e., thoroughly emotional. Yet then Aristogeiton's behaviour diverges from Thucydides' belief in its emotional nature: Aristogeiton attributes his potential injury not to Hipparchos, but to the condition of tyranny at Athens, a very thoughtful, even intellectual extension. This reflection makes Aristogeiton's motive political and flatly contradicts Thucydides' appraisal of the murder. For although Aristogeiton seems motivated to act from fear of losing Harmodios to the δύναμις of Hipparchos, he is able to restrain himself, coolly plotting the best way to loose the tyranny by means of his existing resources. The murder of Hipparchos thus becomes something more than "accident".

The second motive concerns Harmodios almost exclusively and again contradicts Thucydides' appraisal of the tyrannicide. We note that Aristogeiton is apparently ready to act, but fails to do so until Harmodios is motivated. Twice rejected by Harmodios, Hipparchos plans "secretly" to sully his reputation. He then causes Harmodios' sister to be disqualified as a kanephoros for "a certain procession ... because of her unworthiness". The insult naturally affects Harmodios as a slur upon his honour, and he is predictably angered. Aristogeiton, according to Thucydides, "became even angrier".
Nonetheless, in spite of Harmodios' anger and Aristogeiton's increased anger, the two men plot to postpone their act until the day of the Panathenaic procession, calculating that on that day they would be free from suspicion if they were under arms. Even after the second goad by Hipparchos, neither tyrannicide's anger is unbridled.

Thucydides recognized that only one force was at work on the tyrannicides: Aristogeiton was moved to act from outright sexual love of Harmodios (ἐρωτικής), Harmodios by outrage (ὑβρισμένος) that was nevertheless produced from Hipparchos' erotically inspired score-settling. Two motives are apportioned, one to each tyrannicide it seems, with the implication that, cumulatively, they produced Hipparchos' murder.

The apportionment of motives is suspicious and entails both problems of delay in action and others that deprive the account of a measure of plausibility. For instance, the lovers, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, do not communicate: initially Aristogeiton plots alone; Harmodios is not included in the original plot. Only after his sister's insult is Harmodios sufficiently moved to act, although he has played into his lover's enemy's hands. We note that Aristogeiton is not directly affected by the slight to Harmodios' sister, but is connected only through his love of Harmodios. Yet even though Hipparchos was the agent of their grief, the tyrannicides aim first at Hippias, not Hipparchos.

There are reasons to think that the motives given in Thucydides' digression were separate before he wrote his account and to believe that both motives given may have been reconstructed to explain the tyrannicide. Proof for two motives for the tyrannicides is found in the Hipparchos and in the Ath. Pol. The Hipparchos (229b-c) is most informative: λέγεται δέ ὑπὸ τῶν χαριστέρων ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὁ θάνατος αὐτοῦ [ς Ἰππάρχου] γενέσθαι
It is unlikely that some author after Thucydides, but before [Plato], saw clear to disentangle what Thucydides purported to be one motivation and that each motive then gained partisans. We note that "most people" thought that the insult to Harmodios' sister resulted in the tyrannicide and that is the motive that appears nearest in time to Hipparchos' death in Thucydides. This passage offers evidence that two versions of the motivation were given before Thucydides and that he incorporated both into his digression.

In the Ath. Pol. (18.2), Thessalos has taken over the role of tyrannical provocateur, but even so its author has chosen to recount the version given by "the many". Thessalos became enamoured of Harmodios, was rebuffed and then prevented Harmodios' sister from carrying the basket, saying that the boy was effeminate. Both Harmodios and Aristogeiton were moved πράττειν τὴν προκλήσις. Aristogeiton functions in this version as a mere name; his motivation is unimportant.

Aelian (Var. Hist. 11.8) makes Hipparchos the lone insulter:

"Ἰππαρχος ἀνηρέθη ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος.

The issue once again is the insult to Harmodios' sister and here the lawlessness of Hipparchos' refusal is stressed. We note the similarity of language between Aelian (ὡς μὴ ἔζηκεν οὖς) and Thucydides (διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔζηκεν εἴναι). It is possible that Aelian, who does not mention Aristogeiton's motivation except as it resulted from the insult to Harmodios' sister, pre-
serves a source that, in its older form, was used at least in part by Thucydides, i.e., the account about motivation spoken by "the many".

The "love-triangle" theme with its stress on Aristogeiton's pique and anxiety over his lover was not generally accepted as the motivation for the murder of Hipparchos, as we have seen. Even in Thucydides' account of the murder, Hipparchos' assassination was the direct result of the insult. That, in any case, Aristogeiton acted out of consideration for Harmodios can have given rise to the motive alleged of Aristogeiton in Thucydides. Apparently, the oldest version of the motivation of the tyrannicide made the insult to Harmodios' sister the cause for action.

Of the two motives mentioned in Thucydides, Aristogeiton's was quite likely reconstructed: for the motive apportioned to Aristogeiton derives from his attachment to Harmodios. It seems more sophisticated than the motive assigned to Harmodios because it is abstract: it is constructed upon the threat of injury, not upon actual injury. Aristogeiton's love for Harmodios (and his subsequent death because of his devotion) was quite possibly considered noble, ideal; his response - to end the tyranny, not Hipparchos, the real threat - is removed from emotion, intellectual and quite possibly developed from philosophical speculation about the tyrannicide, which may have been voiced before Thucydides composed his digression.

Aristogeiton's motivation is particularly subject to the charge of reconstruction because, in Thucydides, it rests upon the mental and emotional processes of the tyrannicides as they were thinking and feeling. No reliable informant can have reported to Thucydides Aristogeiton's immediate thoughts and responses, yet Thucydides was confident enough to supply them for the reader: "Aristogeiton was thoroughly lovesick and feared lest the power of Hipparchos gain Harmodios forcibly.... Aristogeiton became even angrier....
They (sc. the tyrannicides) expected others to join them in freeing the state...

... they were afraid and thought they had been betrayed.... " This reconstruction should be attributed to Thucydides, since here, as throughout his history, he deduces thoughts and emotions from results and from his general estimate of human behaviour.

Both motives given in Thucydides resemble aspects of topoi involving tyrannical hybris and must have been conceived with Hipparchos in mind as tyrant. Aristogeiton's fear of Hipparchos' power could have derived from a topos akin to Otanes' portrayal of a tyrant (Hdt. III.80): νομεῖν τε κινεῖν πάτρως καὶ Βεθές γυναῖκας κείνεις τε ἁκρίτους. Chaireas, speaking to the assembled Athenians at Samos, paints a lying picture of what is transpiring at home under the Four Hundred (Thuc. VIII.74.3): πληγές τε πάντας ζημίους...καὶ...ἀντίν καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ παιδὸς ὑπερήφανον. Aristogeiton thus fears that Hipparchos will act as tyrants act to have his way with Harmodios.

Harmodios is affected much more directly by Hipparchos' tyrannical hybris. Both Hippias and Hipparchos turned the girl away from performing the honourable duty of carrying the basket because the girl was "unworthy". According to Philochoros (FrGrHist 328, Fr. 8), unmarried girls of repute carried the basket (αἱ ἐν ἄγούμεναι παραθένοι). It has been suggested that Harmodios' sister was insulted because she was of insufficient repute or because, as a Gephyraian, she was too foreign to participate. Both reasons fail: Demosthenes (59.113) shows that ἄγούμενα could be possessed by free women and Aristophanes' Lysistrata 647 seems to indicate that ordinary women could be basket-carriers; the latter reason given is implausible because who would know better than the Gephyraioi whether or not their daughters and sisters could carry the basket? For the insult to work, the girl must have
had every expectation that she would carry the basket as other girls did.
The insult was probably directed against the girl's chastity, the allegation
being that she was not a πυρενος. Such a slur would ruin the family, for
it would destroy both the girl's marriageability and Harmodios' honour. We
note that tyrannical hybris against women frequently is sexual in nature and
such a serious slander would demand retribution from a male relative.

A comparison between Thucydides' story of the insult and the story of
Megakles' daughter (Hdt. I.61) provides some interesting similarities. In
the latter story, the tyrant (Peisistratos) insults a woman sexually by hav­ing
sex with her unnaturally (οὐ κακὰ νυμοῦ). The insult reflects on her
male protector (Megakles), who avenges the insult by loosing the tyranny. It
is interesting to note that both insulators are of the same family, that both
times the insult occurred at Athens and both times the tyrant paid for his
hybris. The girl is unnamed because the honour at issue is really not her
own but of the men involved: it is her sex that is important, not her iden-
tity.

Thus, it is possible that both motives given for the tyrannicide were
reconstructed from topoi about tyrants. The actual facts of the tyrannicide
could be as simple as Herodotos makes them: Hipparchos was killed while dis-
patching the Panathenaic procession, cause unknown. Quite possibly the moti-
vations for the tyrannicide were the results of patterned guesses projected
into the past, into a relative void of sure information.

However that may be, we can say with some degree of certainty that the
older (because less sophisticated, less abstract) version of the motivation
was the insult to Harmodios' sister that caused the youth to act. The sec-
ond motive branched off from the first perhaps in order to explain
Aristogeiton's death. Perhaps Harmodios' action because of his sister had
already become less intelligible to some. At any rate, the "bare bones" of the older version were probably as follows:

a) Hipparchos made advances to Harmodios.

b) Harmodios rebuffed him; the tyrant sought retribution.

c) Hipparchos then insulted Harmodios' sister, saying that she was not a virgin.

d) Harmodios became angered, sought revenge.

e) Aristogeiton joined Harmodios.

The question now becomes: Why did Thucydides not choose between the two motives given instead of giving two? Quite possibly it was because Thucydides used both accounts, i.e., all the evidence available to him, to prove his own view. He realized that, in both cases, the motivation was rooted in eros and that the motives given did not specifically involve Hipparchos' tyranny. He combined the two motives current, the popular one and the more philosophical one, emphasizing their emotional aspects. It was plain to him that Hipparchos was murdered because of an emotionally-triggered chain of events, the haphazard nature of which was perhaps indicated to him by the fact that even in the "popular" account Hippias was the primary target (see below, text). Thucydides thus criticized the Athenians on two fronts for failing to realize what he himself saw so plainly from the reports they themselves gave. Thucydides turned both accounts back upon the Athenians.

Thucydides' use of earlier material that depicted Hipparchos as tyrant will help explain some of the inconsistencies in his account as well as the polemical attitude he adopted toward the Athenians for their erroneous views. For there are several places in Thucydides' account that contradict his assertion that Hipparchos was not tyrant when murdered. Because he was thoroughly convinced of the merits of his argument that Hipparchos was not
tyrant when murdered and of the merits of his insight into the report that the Athenians themselves spoke, Thucydides could be reproachful with the Athenians and apparently ignore the inconsistencies he may have thought minor, completely unimportant or in no need of adjustment. Or, as seems likelier, it may be that Thucydides intended to correct the problems later in his final draft.

C. The Act

After Harmodios' sister had been insulted and Harmodios was sufficiently motivated to act, the plan to kill the tyrant was finally implemented. Thucydides says that there were co-conspirators, but he does not clarify their motivation. He reports that the tyrannicides expected the Athenian bystanders to join spontaneously with them in a bid for freedom, but then we hear nothing of that bid. The information that the tyrannicides wished to obtain freedom for Athens must have reflected favourably upon them and their alleged co-conspirators; whether or not it was true.

We arrive at the controversy involving the number of co-conspirators, a point of dispute between Thucydides and the author of the Ath.Pol. Thucydides states that, for safety's sake, the number of co-conspirators was kept small. But the author of the Ath.Pol., in what appears to be a specific contradiction of Thucydides, says that there were many co-conspirators. Thucydides has been criticized for rationalizing the number of conspirators, while the estimate found in the Ath.Pol. has been defended by some as accurate.
Actually, both estimates were probably rationalized and this rationalization was made possible for both authors because of a lack of consistent, indisputable evidence about the conspiracy. Thucydides stated that few were involved probably because, in the actual commission of the crime, only one other person was involved - the man who Harmodios and Aristogeiton thought betrayed them when he was talking to Hippias. When Thucydides says that, after Hipparchos' death, Hippias "picked out those he thought were guilty and anybody carrying a dagger", he implies that Hippias acted arbitrarily about his choices using judgement and circumstantial evidence, not sure knowledge. No one had acted with Harmodios and Aristogeiton when their daggers fell, at least no one was known to, even by Hippias.

Thucydides here struck at a fiction that portrayed the Athenians as active in the conspiracy, although he probably did so without apparent malice. For Thucydides conceded that Harmodios and Aristogeiton thought that the Athenians would join them when they acted against Hipparchos. The fact that the Athenians remained quiet was not turned to criticism by Thucydides inasmuch as he implies that there was a good reason for the Athenians to stay quiet, Hippias' preparedness (VI.55.3): οὗ μὴν οὐδὲν κατασχεῖν μαλακείην ποτε Ἰππίκος τὸ παραχρῆμα ἐξέδω τὴν ταρακνίδικ, εἰ 'Ἰππαρχὸς μὲν εἰν τῇ ἀρχῇ ὤν ἀπέθανεν, ἣν τὸν ὕπομενον καθιστάτο ἀλλὰ καὶ δἰα τὸν πρῶτον Σύμνης θεὸς τὸις μὲν πολίταις φοβερόν... Thucydides apparently believed that the Athenians would have acted if given a proper chance and perhaps that the miscarriage of the tyrannicide was linked to the Athenian quietude.

The author of the Ath. Pol. may have corrected Thucydides because he joined the numbers killed in the aftermath of the murder with the conspiracy. For him, Hippias' "reign of terror" was a simple case of punishment for a crime: many were killed because many were involved. It is possible that
the author opted for an earlier, more popular, account that had many
Athenians participating in the attempted overthrow of the tyranny, perhaps as
an extension of an account that made the Athenians their own liberators.
He may have perceived error in Thucydides and tried to refute it, but it is
highly unlikely that the author had access to better information than
Thucydides, especially in light of Thucydides' definite assertion that the
conspirators were few in number.

The only other person to have entered into the affair while it was
occurring was the nameless confederate who the tyrannicides thought betrayed
them. We see that his only function in the account was to deflect the tyran-
nicides away from Hippias. The unnamed conspirator, however, emerges only
in the thoughts of the tyrannicides and then only moments before they met
their own end (VI.57.2): "And when they saw one of their co-conspirators
talking familiarly with Hippias (for he was easy of access to all), they
feared and thought they had been betrayed and were within an ace of being
taken. Thus (οὖν) they wanted to exact revenge, if they could, from the
one who had brought them to grief and on whose account they had risked all."
For the nameless conspirator to be more than a rational contrivance to ex-
plain why Hippias was not attacked, we must accept either that Aristogeiton
later divulged his thoughts to someone who took them down then and there or
that some third person existed who saw the events unfold, guessed the
thoughts of the tyrannicides and noted them. Both alternatives are weak;
quite probably the unnamed conspirator was a figment.

Another inconsistency in the digression reinforces this assessment.
According to Thucydides, Hippias was παίσιν ζυγεσθοιδος in spite of his guard
of doryphoroi. The main inconsistency, however, involves Thucydides' reason
why the Athenians did not act to overthrow the regime of Hippias (VI.55.3)
... δίκα το πρώτερον ἑυνήθες τοῖς μὲν πολίτες φοβερόν. Hippias is both fearful to the citizenry and easy of access. The phrase πάνω εὐπρόσωπος seems to have originated as an obiter dictum to explain how the unnamed conspirator could approach Hippias to betray the tyrannicides and prevent them from killing Hippias; the rationalization about the Athenian inability to drive Hippias out was Thucydides' (see below, text).

That Hippias was approached at all is an example of revision of the original account by Thucydides or, perhaps, another source. Lang noticed that, although Hipparchos provoked the anger of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, the tyrannicides set out first to murder Hippias. Hipparchos was not the primary target and was approached by the tyrannicides only after Hippias was thought unapproachable. Lang pointed out that the fact that Hippias was targeted first should have served Thucydides as proof that Hippias, not Hipparchos, was the tyrant, especially since Aristogeiton was aiming to end the tyranny. Thucydides' single-mindedness about the overriding motivation may, however, have blunted his perceptions of these possibilities. Hippias seems to have been forced into the cause-and-effect sequence leading to Hipparchos' death by an author who wished to have the tyrant-slayers attack Hippias first. The reasons for this are obvious: the tyrannicides were meant to attack Hippias as the evil tyrant-who-was-to-be.

The story of the attack on Hippias was likely interpolated into the earlier tradition and that interpolation occurred well after his expulsion from Athens. In fact, the story of the tyrannicide will probably have been revised after Marathon - when, we cannot say - after Hippias had returned to Attica with the Persians. Hippias' role on the day of Hipparchos' murder was quite likely reconstructed on the basis of the most recent memories of him as an evil tyrant who deserved to die or because, to another author, the
tyrannicides had aimed at liberating Athens and so must have designated him primary target. In retrospect, Hippias' memory was far more pernicious than Hipparchos' and so the tyrannicides, patriots who gave their utmost that Athens might be free – the intent of dead men allows for free reconstruction – were detoured from Hipparchos to Hippias. They arrived back on Hipparchos' track after they – no fault of theirs – were deflected from killing the tyrant by the imputed treachery of the unnamed conspirator. The interposition of Hippias between cause and effect explains how Hipparchos was killed, although Hippias really deserved to die.

Hippias' relative unimportance to the earlier unrevised tradition of the episode is indicated by the confusion about his position and activity on the day of the Panathenaic procession. Thucydides (VI.57.1) puts Hippias ...

\[ ... \]

Hipparchos was by the Leokoreion doing we are not told what (VI.57.3). These statements conflict with Thucydides' own earlier pronouncement about Hipparchos, that he was \[ ... \] (I.20.2); with Herodotos' statement that Hipparchos was dispatching the Panathenaic procession when he was murdered (V.56.2: \[ ... \]); and with the report in the Ath. Pol. that Hipparchos was dispatching the procession when he was murdered (18.3: \[ ... \] ). Hippias' variable position during the procession indicates that the tradition had fixed none for him:

Thucydides may have revised his statement in the digression in Book VI about who was dispatching the procession when it occurred to him that marshalling the procession signified some status for Hippias. Thucydides reasoned that Hippias belonged in the Kerameikos ordering up the contingents for
the parade. Thucydides seems to have altered his thinking about the procession between the time he had written I.20.2 and the time he wrote VI.57.1: it must have been important to identify Hippias with the dispatch of the Panathenaic procession.

The uncertainty about Hippias' position during the procession emerges once again in the *Ath.Pol.*, whose author seems aware of the problem of status for Hippias. If Hippias was to have a status equal to the author's concept of a shared tyranny, Hippias must assume a place of importance on the route equal in significance to Hipparchos'. Thus, Hippias was situated upon the Akropolis receiving the procession that was dispatched by Hipparchos. In the *Ath.Pol.*, Hippias obtained a status vis-à-vis the procession that balanced Hipparchos'.

Thucydides adjusted Hippias' position to conform to his own ideas. Hipparchos' position near the Leokoreion was unchangeable; Hippias' position could, however, vary since there was no fixed tradition. Thucydides placed Hippias behind Hipparchos marshalling the procession because, to Thucydides, he was senior to Hipparchos and must have occupied a senior position on the route. Thucydides inferred Hippias' position from what he believed about him as the tyrant. The "core" account obviously assigned no position to Hippias because it was irrelevant.

This same silence about Hippias on the day of the murder allowed Thucydides (or another) to attach *doryphoroi* to him, causing yet another contradiction. *Doryphoroi* were the hallmarks of all tyrants and Hipparchos, according both to Thucydides and to the author of the *Ath.Pol.*, had them. The attachment of *doryphoroi* to Hippias accords with Thucydides' reasoned opinion that Hippias must have commanded them for a long time to have been able to keep control of Athens after Hipparchos' death; the attachment does
not, however, accord with Hippias' reputation as πάντα εὔπροσδόσ. The same considerations about balance may have been in play: since Hipparchoi, they must also be attributed to Hippias.

One of the most controversial aspects of the plot concerns the manner in which the murder was accomplished. Thucydides (VI.57.1) states that Harmodios and Aristogeiton went forward to the deed εἵκοντες γῆν τα ἔγχειν. Later, after the murder, Hippias hoped to discover the culprits by exposing those men who were carrying encheiridia as well as the regular equipment of shield and spear. But the author of the Ath. Pol. (18.4) declared that only later, under the democracy, did those who marched in the Panathenaic procession carry shield and spear. The author specifically contradicts Thucydides.

Some scholars have seen in this disagreement the signs of debate between the "many" and the "few". For if, as the author of Ath. Pol. asserts, the Athenians had no armament, they could obviously not be held accountable for failing to rise up against the tyrant, Hippias and the story of the disarming of the demos, wholly unflattering, loses credibility.

But the real issue was probably not political at all to begin with. For the question debated may have been simply whether the Athenians were armed or not in 514. Münch pointed out that the digression of Thucydides contrasts Hippias' calm in the face of extreme danger with the confusion and ultimate miscarriage of the plan of the tyrannicides, a theme developed, but not invented, by Thucydides. The disarming incident shows both the calmness and cleverness of Hippias and Thucydides' approval of Hippias is expressed in even more solid terms when Thucydides recounts Hippias' statesmanlike foresight in arranging a withdrawal from Athens. But because Thucydides had already excused the Athenians from rising up, the Athenians in the story of...
the disarmament were meant to be played off against Thucydides' portrayal of
Hippias, not necessarily to be ridiculed.

The anecdote about the disarmament in Thucydides has been recognized as
similar to one involving Peisistratos in the Ath.Pol. (15.4). After the
battle of Pallene, Peisistratos pretended to hold an assembly near the
Theseion, to which the Athenians came and duly disarmed. Peisistratos then
softened his voice to become inaudible and drew complaints from the assembly.
By common consent, the assembly was removed to a place with better acoustics
and Peisistratos' servants gathered up the arms of the Athenians and stored
them away. Thus, the Athenians were disarmed by Peisistratos shortly after
his final return to power.

This story about Peisistratos combines two of his attributes - general
cleverness and cleverness in speaking. In the story of his self-wounding
(Hdt. I.59; Ath.Pol. 14.1) to obtain a guard and in the story of Phye-Athena
(Hdt. I.60.4; Ath.Pol. 14.4), who reintroduced Peisistratos into Athens from
exile, Peisistratos is portrayed as consummately clever, outwitting the
Athenians. He also acquired a reputation for demagogy that caused the
Athenians later to fear such speakers. But, we ask, who kept these
stories? Obviously, the Athenians, who would clearly not be inclined to per-
petuate unflattering stories about themselves, especially about their stupid-
ity. These stories of the cleverness of the Peisistratidai must have been
kept by the Athenians, who were themselves renowned for wit among the Greeks,
to explain how they could have been ruled tyrannically. Peisistratos was
the cleverest of the clever Athenians, as he would have to have been to have
ruled over the Athenians. The disarming-anecdote was designed to explain the
inactivity of the Athenians during the long period of tyranny, a fact that
must have caused the Athenians no small measure of embarrassment.
The author of the \textit{Ath.Pol.} attributed the disarming to Peisistratos, but Thucydides attributed it to Hippias. We note that the author of the \textit{Ath.Pol.} terms Peisistratos' action "the disarming of the \textit{demos}". He was apparently stating his belief that the Athenians were without weapons early on in the tyranny, since, inferentially (although not necessarily actually), the Athenians under arms would have posed a continuous threat to the Peisistratidai. Since only under the democracy were arms restored to the people, men were not allowed to march in the Panathenaic procession under arms until after the democracy supplanted the tyranny. Whether or not the statement in the \textit{Ath.Pol.} about the practice of carrying arms in the procession is correct, to be consistent, the \textit{demos} could not be allowed the use of arms by the tyrants at any time, religious or otherwise, since the Athenians would have risen up.

Thucydides was confined by a more logical consideration: how could the tyrannicides go about armed without attracting suspicion? He had the tyrannicides postpone their act until the day when they could go about armed and not draw attention. But here the ploy fails internally: \textit{encheiridia} are not shields and spears, the arms specified. If the \textit{encheiridia} were visible, the conspirators would still have been subject to suspicion; if they could be concealed, the conspirators need not have waited until the Panathenaic procession to do the deed. Hippias used the distinction between those who carried \textit{encheiridia} and those who did not to single out the suspected conspirators. Thus, Thucydides may have used the excuse of arms-carrying to explain why the tyrannicides waited until the day of the Panathenaic procession to act, but it seems only remotely likely that he was criticizing the Athenians.

If we "weed" out the accretion of inference and revision, we may arrive
at an approximation of the "core" account in its earlier form:

a) Harmodios was a beautiful boy who was desired by the tyrant, Hipparchos.

b) Hipparchos made advances to him, but was rebuffed and sought revenge.

c) He insulted Harmodios' sister when she came forward to be a kanephoros.

d) Harmodios was angered and enlisted Aristogeiton's aid.

e) The pair rushed at Hipparchos and killed him when he was involved in dispatching the Panathenaic procession.

f) Harmodios was killed on the spot by the tyrant's bodyguard; Aristogeiton died later and not easily.

g) Hippias assumed full control of the tyranny.

There are reasons to suspect that the "core" account might have been at least partially reconstructed:

a) Hipparchos was notoriously a paederast.

b) Harmodios, from the tyrannicide-group, was a comely youth.

c) Aristogeiton, from the same group, was older than Harmodios and so can have become the rival of Hipparchos.

d) The insult to Harmodios' unnamed sister was the alleged flashpoint of action, but resembles a topos that has tyrants insulting women sexually. Again, Hipparchos was killed during the Panathenaic procession, perhaps indicating that the motivation of the tyrannicides
must somehow be connected.

This is not to say that the "core" cannot be true: indeed, the insult to Harmodios' sister may have helped to ground the topos. It is, however, as close to the truth as we can come.

D. Conclusions

Very little reliable information about the murder seems to have survived until the time of Thucydides' writing. What has come down to us from Thucydides and other writers is apparently an amalgam of inference and reconstruction from inference and perhaps even desirability. The "core" account, which included the insult to Harmodios' sister as the cause of the murder and which depicted Hipparchos as tyrant, may itself have been reconstructed after the event to explain it (with the tyrannicide-group as inspiration for embellishment?). Thus, very few solid facts are available to us about the murder of Hipparchos.

In the digression, Thucydides seems susceptible to his own argument, apparently interpreting the events of the murder in line with his thesis, under no real compunction to alter contradictory testimony to achieve internal consistency. Portions of the digression, which include the report of the very thoughts of Hipparchos and the tyrannicides, must be largely Thucydides' work. His deductions about Hippias are intellectual and therefore their force is weakened in the face of the digression's inconsistencies. Thucydides seems not to have been devoted to the report of fact.

Two preexisting versions of the motivation of the tyrannicides were com-
Thucydides in an effort to show that the act was not a political one. The insult to Harmodios' sister was the motive accepted by the "many"; Aristogeiton's motive, his love for Harmodios and the fear of losing him to the tyrant, is less immediate, more abstract, and so probably created after the insult-motive. Thucydides used both motivations, which were current in his day, to demonstrate that their common denominator was *eros*, not politics. Thus, he thought to himself to prove that the Athenians were completely in error about the murder and Hipparchos.

But his combination fails because Thucydides overlooked the problems created by the combination that work against his argument. Vestiges of the older traditions emerge, showing that the stories were conceived with Hipparchos in mind as tyrant. In some places, Thucydides even failed to strip Hipparchos of that power he denied him and, in other places, it is clear that Thucydides has explained Hipparchos' power insufficiently. The older accounts indicate that Harmodios and Aristogeiton plotted against the tyranny and waited to attack: Thucydides' conclusion about the emotional nature of the tyrannicide is vitiated.
Notes


2 The literature specifically or mainly concerned with the purpose of the digression is massive. I list some of the more important discussions: E. Schwartz, *Das Geschichtswerk Des Thukydidès* (Hildesheim, 1929) 180-7; H. Münch, *Studien zu den Exkursen des Thukydidès* (Heidelberg, 1935) 66-82; L. Pearson, "Note on a Digression of Thucydidès (VI.54-59)", *AJD* 70 (1949) 186-9; H.-J. Diesner, "Peisistratidenexkurs und Peisistratidenbild bei Thukydidès", *Historia* 8 (1959) 12-22; A. Momigliano, "L'Excursus di

3 I.20.1: οἷς ἔχει ἐν Θροποι τῶν ἁκοιτῶν ὑπομενόνων, καὶ ἤν ἐπιχώρια σφόσιν ἐτοίμος ἄθροιστος παρ' ἄλληλων δέχονται Ἀθηναίων γαρ... VI.54.1: ἕχω ἐπὶ πλέον δειγματίζονας ἀποφανῷ οὕτῃ τοῖς ἀλλοις οὕτε αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναίοισι περὶ τῶν σφετέρων τυράννων οὕτῳ περὶ τοῦ γενομένου ἀκριβεῖς οὐδέν λέγοντας.

4 On Thucydides' polemical approach see Münch (above, n. 2) 72ff.; Dover, HCT, 323; Jacoby, Atthis, 158.

5 See Chapter II, section 2.

6 Cf. Lang (above, n. 1) 399.

7 VI.54.5.

8 Fornara (above, n. 1) 401 is wrong to assume that Thucydides would have been obliged to demonstrate that what he related was preferable. That is what we wish he had done. As it is, it seems that a sound inference (to Thucydides) was its own justification. Again, I think Lang (above, n. 1) 399 is wrong to assume that variants "not so logically bound in the proof of a thesis..." are more likely to have been original, for an unchallenged variant may simply be that.

9 Cf. Lang (above, n. 1) 399; see also W.E. Thompson, "Individual

10 Cf. Arist. Rhet. 1401b; Ath. Pol. 18; Diod. 9.1.4; Plut. Mor. 504e, 770c, 995b; cf. Jacoby, Atthis, 336, n. 36.

11 Fornara (above, n. 1) 406.

12 See Chapter II, section 3,B.

13 Cf. Jacoby, Atthis, 1 and 156, n. 5; Münch (above, n. 2) 67 believed that the tradition solidified only in the second half of the fifth century B.C.

14 Cf. Jacoby, Atthis, 342-3, n. 73, however: “If by the πολλος, who believed in the insult to Harmodios' sister as motive, an Atthis is meant, it can only be that of Hellanikos - if the dialogue (Hipparchos) really was composed about 400 B.C.” This does not follow.

15 See C. Fornara, "Hellanicus and an Alcmaeonid Tradition", Historia 17 (1968) 381-4.


17 Cf. How and Wells, II.25.

18 Contra K. Kinzl, "Herodotus - Interpretations", RhM 118 (1975) 193, n. 3;
this was perceived by Fornara (above, n. 1) 406 and n. 23.

19
How and Wells, II.115; rehabilitating the Alkmaionid reputation has been recently taken up again: see G.M.E. Williams, "The Image of the Alkmaionidai between 490 B.C. and 487/6 B.C.", Historia 29 (1980) 108, whose arguments are unconvincing, however. For, rightly or wrongly, the shield-signal was attributed to some (not all) of the Alkmaionidai and that connection with the subsequent ostracisms of the 480s cannot have been fortuitous. See P. Karavites, "Realities and Appearances, 490-480 B.C.", Historia 26 (1977) 129-49.

20
See Appendix.

21
In fact, contrary to what Herodotos would have the reader believe, the Athenians had, during the 480s, classed some of the Alkmaionidai as traitors and - it must follow from the allegation of medizing - "friends of the tyrants": see Williams (above, n. 19) 108, n. 16.

22

23

24
Cf. Isok. 9.47: Παραλασών γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ἐκ βεβαιωμένην καὶ διὰ τὴν Φοινίκων ἀρχὴν οὔτε τοὺς Ἐλλήνας προσδεχομένην κα. We recall
that the Phoenicians composed the bulk of the Persian fleet during the fifth century and that the fleet posed the greatest threat to Athens and her allies in the Aegean until the Ionian War. How and Wells, II.28 suggest that Herodotos emphasizes the racial difference of the Gephyraioi by emphasizing the differences in cult and worship (V.59; see below, text), but cf. Thucydides' description of Aristogeiton as an ἂνηρ τῶν ἀστεψ [VI.54.2]. For what it is worth, this "insult" was perceived by Plut. Mor. 860e; see also Jacoby, Atthis, 337, n. 40.

25
Cf. Hdt. VI.125.1: οἱ δὲ Ἀλκμαίωνίδαι διὰ τὸν καὶ τὰ ἁνεκθέν λαμπροὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ ....

26
See Chapter II, section 3,B.

27
See Fornara (above, n. 1) 422-3.

28
The scope of this paper does not permit me to dwell on the Alkmaionidai or explore in detail the problems connected with them, but I do dispute the view that the Alkmaionidai "could point with pride to their own liberation of Athens" (cf. Jacoby, Atthis, 156-68; A.J. Podlecki, "The Political Significance of the Athenian 'Tyrannicide'—Cult", Historia 15 [1966] 130-1): they were collaborators with the Peisistratidai, they were suspected of collaborating with the Persians; they introduced the Spartans onto Attic soil. They were undoubtedly perceived as opportunistic, not patriotic; naturally, family history would have it otherwise.

29
Jacoby (above, n. 13); Dover, HCT, 321.
30 See Chapter II, section 3,A, n. 166 and section 3,C.

31 See Chapter II, section 3,C.


33 Cf. above, n. 14.

34 Cf. Chapter II, section 2.

35 See above, n. 2; on the best view, Thucydides witnessed a parallel between the end of the tyranny and the situation at Athens in 416, the context of the digression: see W. Schadewaldt, Die Geschichtsschreibung des Thukydidès (Berlin, 1929) 84-95; Münch (above, n. 2); cf. W.R. Connor, "Tyrannis Polis", Ancient and Modern: Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Else (Ann Arbor, 1977) 95-109, especially 107-9.

36 Cf. Fornara (above, n. 1) 404-5.

37 I translate ἀτυχεῖν as "accident": see LSJ s.v. ἀτυχεῖν 2b.

38 Cf. Schadewaldt (above, n. 35) 89; S. Brunnsaker, The Tyrant-Slayers of Kritios and Nesiotes (Lund, 1955) 7; Fornara (above, n. 1) 405.

39 VI.54.2ff.
Cf. Lang (above, n. 1) 402; Diesner (above, n. 2) 14-5 thinks that the gap between Aristogeiton's anger and his action is a logical one.

δύναμις: according to H. Konishi, "The Composition of Thucydides", AJP 101 (1980) 38, "...after 5.20.1 δύναμις appears only when 'hegemonic power' is suggested." Thucydides' use of the word here seems to be another inconsistency in his view of Hipparchos' power. ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπερχείσης δύναμεως: cf. Dover, HCT, 329: "I.e., so far as his influence as μέσος πολίτης allowed." Aristogeiton's "middling" status contrasts with Hipparchos' δύναμις (and, for that matter, with Herodotos' treatment of the Gephyraioi as outlanders): μέσος may have philosophical overtones:

VI.54.4: ἐν τρόπῳ δὲ τῶν ἔργων: see Dover, HCT, 329. (Dover's reasons for emending are inadequate to rule out τόπως as a possibility.)

VI.56.1: ἐν πομπῇ τινὶ: perhaps Thucydides thought that the gap between the disqualification and the Panathenaic procession was too short:
cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles und Athen (Berlin, 1893) II.110; M. Valeton, "De Harmodio et Aristogiton", Mnem. 46 (1917) 38-9; Brunnsaker (above, n. 38) 12 and 15; also Fitzgerald (above, n. 1) 283.

VI.56.2.

VI.57.3.

Cf. Valeton (above, n. 43).

See J. Miller, R-E II.1.930 s.v. Aristogeiton; also "Die Erzäiwungen von den Tyrannenmörder", Philologus 6 (1893) 573-6. Hirsch (above, n. 1) 145ff. The Hipparchos was probably composed before 320 (see P. Friedländer, Plato: The Dialogues (First Period) [New York, 1964] 127-8); the dramatic date of the Symposium is 416, but the actual date of composition was probably c. 389-79 B.C. (see K. Dover, comm. Plato. Symposium [Cambridge, 1980] 11); cf. Jacoby, Atthis, 342-3, n. 73.

Fornara (above, n. 1) 411ff. seems to have difficulty grasping the fluidity of the tradition that allowed Thessalos to be introduced into the account in the Ath.Pol. as instigator: cf. Diod. 10.17 where Thessalos alone held aloof from tyranny; P.J. Rhodes, A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia (Oxford, 1981) 228; see also Dover, HCT, 320. Lang (above, n. 1) 402 rightly observes that the story was not fixed and is thus wrong to conclude that the Ath.Pol. offers better information than Thucydides.

Rhodes (above, n. 49) 231; cf. Arist. Pol. 1311a 40 - 1311b 2 (Periander's insult to his catamite). The shift of the insult from Harmodios' sister directly to Harmodios shows that writers as early as the fourth century had difficulty understanding how Harmodios could be moti-
vated through his sister (cf. *Hipparchos* 229b-c; above, text). A change in popular morality is indicated, occurring before those writers composed their works, which seems to have made the writers insensitive to the type of insult occurring in Thucydides' and Herodotos' work (see below, text). This change in popular morality suggests that the insult to Harmodios' sister was considered archaic and silly as a motive and indicates also that the insult-motive was probably older than the story of Aristogeiton's motivation.

51
Cf. Aelian *Var. Hist.* 11.8; *Iustin 2.9* (Dioskles=Hipparchos); *Max. Tyre* 24.2. Fornara (above, n. 1) 411 points out that Thucydides is the first to call Harmodios and Aristogeiton lovers: they are not lovers in Aristophanes.

52
Cf. *Plato, Sympos.* 182c; *Arist. Rhet.* 1401b; *Athen.* 562a, 602a; *Plut. Mor.* 770c; on the dramatic date of the *Symposion* see n. 48, above.

53
Cf. Valeton (above, n. 43) 37ff.; F. Cornelius, *Die Tyrannis in Athen* (Munich, 1929) 84ff.; Thompson (above, n. 9) 158-74, especially 166-7.

54

55
Cf. *Photios s.v.* ενθορόλον· παρθενόλ...οταν...των...ευθεν...παρεναχθείνειν. See below, n. 57; cf. *Rhodes* (above, n. 49) 230-1.

See also *Lysis*, 1194; on the *kanephoroi* see M.B. Walbank, "Artemis Bear-Leader", *CQ* 31 (1981) 276-81, especially 279-80.


Cf. above, n. 50; Jacoby, *Atthis*, 342-3, n. 73.

Cf. Fornara (above, n. 1) 411.

We note, however, that nowhere in his account of the murder does Thucydides adduce a shred of positive evidence that Hipparchos was not tyrant: quite the contrary, the digression alludes to Hipparchos' power (see Chapter II, section 3,E).

See Chapter II, section 3,E.

Many scholars suggest that the digression is in an imperfect state: cf. Schwartz (above, n. 2) 180-7; M. Hirsch (above, n. 1) 131; Jacoby,
We speculate that they were fighting either for their own freedom or for Harmodios' honour.

Cf. Cornelius (above, n. 53) 83.

VI.56.3.

18.2: \( \ldots \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \chi \omicron \omicron \nu t \omega v \pi o l l \omega v \); cf. Rhodes (above, n. 49) 231. G. Kaibel, Stil und Text der Athenaión Politeia (Berlin, 1893) 167 thought that the original text likely read \( \sigma u \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \chi \omicron \omicron \nu t \omega v \pi o l l \omega v \); cf. also Hirsch (above, n. 1) 142, n. 1 and 146, n. 1.

Cf. Lang (above, n. 1) 403-4.

VI.57.2.

Cf. Ath. Pol. 18.3: \( \ldots \kappa \epsilon \iota \ \pi o \rho e s \chi \omicron \alpha \nu \nu o \sigma \zeta \alpha \nu t \zeta s \ \tau \omega v \ [\pi o l l \omega v] \kappa \epsilon \iota \). See Münch (above, n. 2).

See above, n. 71.

Cf. Fornara (above, n. 1) 407.

Contra F.G. Kenyon, comm. Aristotle on the Constitution of the Athenians
(London, 1893) 48, n.: the existence of definite facts is perhaps implied in the *Ath.* *Pol.*, but the implication does not invalidate these facts.

76
Cf. Cornelius (above, n. 53) 85, although Cornelius suggests that Aristogeiton may have given real testimony about the murder/conspiracy under torture. See below, n. 98.

77
Lang (above, n. 1) 402.

78
Lang (above, n. 1) 402.

79
See Chapter II, section 2,D. Obviously, the interpolation must have occurred after the "official" version of the murder had solidified (i.e., after the Harmodios-skolia had been composed).

80
Cf. *IG II²* 334 (=SEG XVIII, 13), which concerns the lesser Panathenaia. The *hieropoioi* dispatched this procession (11.17-18); cf. also *Ath.* *Pol.* 60.1.

81
Cf. Rhodes (above, n. 49) 231; cf. Cornelius (above, n. 53) 86; also Fornara (above, n. 1) 408-9, although he overlooks the balance of Hippias and Hipparchos; Lang (above, n. 1) 404 believes that Hippias was actually on the Akropolis, but that is unlikely since it would make the author of the *Ath.* *Pol.* a better historian than Thucydides, a difficult proposition in view of the circumstances. Fitzgerald (above, n. 1) 282-3 contends that it was unusual for anybody to be on the Akropolis receiving the procession.
82 Thucydides had changed his mind about Hippias' position over time.

Observed by Lang (above, n. 1) 404; conceded by Fornara (above, n. 1)
408, n. 28.


84 On the type of weaponry used see Brunnsaker (above, n. 38) 150-1; it is
unlikely that the tyrannicides went forward to the deed "holding their
swords in myrtle boughs" as in the Harmodios-skolia (see Ostwald [above,
 n. 32] 182-5; Jongkees' suggestion [p. 184] makes the best sense); cf.
also Valeton (above, n. 43) 39.

85 Cf. Wilamowitz (above, n. 43) 109, n. 19; Hirsch (above, n. 1) 143;
Cornelius (above, n. 53) 86-7; Dover, HCT, 336; J.M. Moore, Aristotle
and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy (Berkeley, 1975) 232.

86 Cf. Rhodes (above, n. 49) 210.

87 Cf. Münch (above, n. 2) 77ff.; Jacoby, Atthis, 335, n. 25; Diesner
(above, n. 2) 14-5.

88 Diesner (above, n. 2) 20ff. suggests that Thucydides saw in Hippias a
proto-Perikles, but that is to ignore that Thucydides had general models
for good statesmanship and good political ability; Jacoby, Atthis, 335,
n. 26 seems to have overlooked the aspect of calmness vs. chaos best de-
scribed by Münch; for a view challenging Münch's see Pearson (above, n.
2) 188, n. 2.
Cf. Rhodes (above, n. 49) 210-3. Macan (above, n. 16) II.125, n. 7; Lang (above, n. 1) 404; Dover, HCT, 335; Moore (above, n. 85).

Cf. Polyainos 1.21.2; see also n. 91; Cornelius (above, n. 53) 86, n. 15.

Ath. Pol. 22.3; Arist. Pol. 1310b 14ff.

J. Day and M. Chambers, *Aristotle's History of the Athenian Democracy* (Berkeley, 1962) 21 consider the subject of Athenian cleverness a *topos*, but surely, even if true, that implies only a frequency of usage, not the truth or falsity of the *topos* or whether the Athenians *disbelieved it* about themselves.

Cf. Hdt. VI.121ff.; cf. S. Hoffman, "In the Looking Glass", Introduction to *The Sorrow and The Pity* (New York, 1972) xii on the myth of general French resistance to German occupation: "...the discomfort felt by those who lived those years without committing themselves or had come to feel sorry about their commitment, and who knew the inaccuracies of the Official Version (i.e., that the French had resisted the Germans as a nation), but feared the squalor of the truer one, ...resulted in a general unwillingness to drain the myth. ... What was said or written in texts was in conformity to the Official Version."

15.4: παρέλευσε δὲ τοῦ δῆμου τῇ ὧπλα τὸν ἄροτον τὸν τρόπον.

Cf. Wilamowitz (above, n. 43) I.169-72; Busolt (above, n. 56) II.326, n.
1 and 383, n. 1. C. Hignett, A History of the Athenian Constitution (Oxford, 1951) 125, n. 3 states that (Aristotle) wrongly attributes the disarming to Peisistratos, but see above, n. 85; cf. Rhodes (above, n. 49) 210.

96
Lang (above, n. 1) 403-4.

97
Cf. above, n. 43; see also Moore (above, n. 85).

98
Cf. K. von Fritz and E. Kapp, Aristotle's Constitution of Athens and Related Texts (New York, 1950) 160: "Obviously, there was no reliable tradition even concerning so outstanding an event of the last quarter of the 6th century."

The stories of Aristogeiton's slow end (Ath.Pol. 18.4-6; Diod. 10.16; see J.E. Sandys, Aristotele's Constitution of Athens [London, 1893] 70 for references) were probably already current in Thucydides' time (cf. VI.57.4: ὁ χρόνος διέτευξε τὴν τρίτην). Aristogeiton's implication of fellow-conspirators explained Hippias' purge, was later deemed unflattering to the hero who then was made to implicate the "friends of the tyrants" — a trick on Hippias: the story of Hippias' shaking Aristogeiton's hand (Ath.Pol. 18.6) shows the hero's fortitude, Hippias' foolishness and violence, and involves a pretty irony. It seems, however, apocryphal (cf. Athen. 652b [Phalaris]); Rhodes (above, n. 49) 232-3. The Leiaina-myth (Paus. I.23.2; Polyainos 8.45) is surely apocryphal and shows how popular the "end of Aristogeiton" had become: cf. Jacoby, Atthis, 344, n. 92.
When Hipparchos died in 514, he left behind him both an example of conduct that leading men of Athens were to follow through the fifth century and a taste for innovation in art, especially in literature, among the Athenians. The object for Athenian statesmen was to be well-known and admired in order to obtain stature and a following of voters. Consequently, public figures vied with one another in presenting innovations and comforts to an increasingly sophisticated Athenian public. Such efforts were assessed as the price of influence in the democracy. Of course, Hipparchos need not have bothered with the courting of voters, although he quite probably sought public goodwill. At any rate, it is clear that some of the means he used to acquire publicity were emulated by men like Themistokles, Kimon and Nikias. In fact, the methods established or, at least, cultivated by him at Athens seem to have become almost institutionalized and constitute a legacy to Athenian politics of the fifth century.

1 The first emulator that we know of was the great Themistokles. Although Themistokles eschewed personal acquaintance with the lyre, he certainly had a taste for poets. 2 His closest poetical associate was Simonides, once employed by Hipparchos. Among other services, Simonides celebrated Themistokles' reconstruction of the Lykomid shrine at Phlya, perhaps lending his own name and elegy to it. 3 For Themistokles also figured prominently in Simonides' "The Sea Fight at Salamis", apparently as hero and architect of
the Greek naval victory. It is perhaps possible to see in the closeness of the two some of the same closeness as between Hipparchos and Simonides or, perhaps, Anakreon.

Another poet involved with Themistokles shows why the statesman was interested: "...while he was still young and unknown, he (sc. Themistokles) invited Epikles of Hermione, a citharist much sought after by the Athenians, to practice in his house, desiring to have the honour of many people seeking him and coming to his house." Epikles, perhaps a relative or a pupil of Hipparchos' retainer, Lasos of Hermione, could bring Themistokles publicity by his very presence in Themistokles' household. This is surely an echo of how poets had affected Hipparchos' reputation, but, more important, it shows vividly how the Athenians had come to value virtuosi in their midst. Themistokles apparently contrived to tap this rich vein of public taste and use it for his own aggrandizement. His retention of Epikles seems in a direct line from Hipparchos' retention of poets.

One further tactic that Themistokles may have adopted from the Peisistratids was his use of the office of water-commissioner to bring a better supply to the city. From the fines he had exacted from those abusing the water system, he dedicated a famous bronze statue, the Water-Carrier, as a reminder of his good service to the people. The efficient delivery of water to the Athenian multitude recalls Peisistratos' construction of the Enneakrounos fountain.

Themistokles apparently transgressed the boundaries that the Athenians had made for their prominent men, for he offended the multitude by building the temple of Artemis Aristoboule: the Athenians took the dedication to be too directly reflective of Themistokles' role in preserving Athenian freedom during the Persian War. His mistake was apparently to place a portrait
statue of himself in the temple and, from that, the Athenians may have con-
12 cluded *hybris*. That must certainly have been influential in the decision
13 of the populace to ostracize him.

Possibly even more emulative of the tyrants was Kimon, the son of
Miltiades. We read that he was quite familiar with song and the lyre and was
14 a qualified judge of the tragic competitions. Kimon, too, seems to have
had his poet-retainers: we read that Melanthios "sporting (with Kimon) in an
elegy" described Kimon's conquest of Mnestra and Asteria of Salamis, a recol-
15 lection of Anakreon's sport with his patron, Polykrates. Melanthiós's free-
dom to "sport" with Kimon surely indicates a close relationship, perhaps on
the order of that between Themistokles and Simonides. Yet another friend
might have been Archelaös, the naturalist who composed a consolatory elegy
16 for Kimon on the death of his wife, Isodike.

Kimon used the wealth that he had acquired on campaign to embellish
Athens and to aid Athens' poor. Perhaps his most ambitious undertaking was
the wall of the Akropolis, clearly a forestructure for the reconstruction of
17 Athena's temple there. Yet he brought his benefaction even closer to the
people by planting shade trees in the Agora; perhaps he completed
Hipparchos' work at the Akademy by making it into a proper training ground,
18 providing it with tracks and shady walks. When walking abroad in Athens,
Kimon bestowed gifts of clothing and money on the needy and the elderly, get-
19 ting companions to exchange clothes with the poor. He opened his fields to
the poor and allowed them to pick whatever they wished. Kimon's behaviour
cauised a comparison to be made between his lifetime and the *Age of Kronos* - a
20 term used to describe the earlier rule of the Peisistratids.

More a recollection of Hipparchos was Kimon's herm. Because of his im-
important victory on the Strymon, the Athenians permitted Kimon and his two colleagues the privilege of erecting Hermai with inscriptions — less their names. That injunction suggests that Hipparchos' herms were still reminding the Athenians of the tyranny that once was and that no one should aspire to emulate Hipparchos in fact. At any rate, the Athenians were very conscious about the greatness of the honour bestowed on Kimon and his colleagues.

Perikles' designation as the "new Peisistratos" was undoubtedly contrived by the comic poets as light disparagement. The cause for the comparison was Perikles' preeminence in Athens after the ostracism of Thucydides, the son of Melesias. Yet Perikles added to his honour in the traditional way by embellishing the city. Plutarch's testimony gives good evidence that, although the buildings of the Akropolis were undertaken by the Athenians and were overseen by Pheidias, the major buildings of the Akropolis were attributed to Perikles.

Perikles was similarly undeterred from acquiring a share of the glory of the Panathenaia. We read that Perikles moved a decree establishing musical contests for the festival. He himself was elected manager (athlothetes) for the contests, prescribing how instruments were to be played and songs were to be sung. This regulation is strongly reminiscent of the Peisistratid regulation of the Homeric recitals. Indeed, the management of the contests must have been a position of honour and surely presupposes Perikles' familiarity with and appreciation of music. Hipparchos, of course, was a connoisseur of poetry (if not an expert) and was probably a manager of the games himself. If he was dispatching the Panathenaic procession when he was killed, he was performing a function later delegated to the athlothetal of.
Perikles' object in reintroducing the contests is revealed in Nikias' behaviour. Because he could not compete with Kleon, his great adversary, in winning the people to him, he tried to win them with choral and gymnic exhibitions and other such things as would delight them. Nikias reverted to expenditure to win the Athenians.

His wealth permitted him to erect dedicatory offerings and structures such as the Palladion on the Akropolis. His outlay included the island of Delos, an arena of rivalry among archaic tyrants. Indeed, Nikias created a spectacle greatly reminiscent of Polykrates' chaining of Rheneia to Delos. For he had constructed a bridge of boats between the islands over which the chorus marched. Like Polykrates, too, Nikias purchased a track of land on Delos and donated it to the Delians. Nikias' special interest in Delos seems to have been grounded in the examples of the tyrants.

Alcibiades suffered most from a comparison of his behaviour with tyrants. And yet, it was because of Alcibiades' lack of restraint that he drew such comparisons, not because he emulated tyrants. His horses were famous throughout the Greek-speaking world for their famous victory at Olympia. Like tyrants of old, Alcibiades was celebrated with an epinikian ode by a famous poet of the day: in Alcibiades' case, it was Euripides. Alcibiades turned the victory to political good, reminding the Athenians of the glory that he brought them on at least one important occasion.

Alcibiades' personal magnetism was so great, apparently, that he was able to mitigate the ill-effects of his disability in public speaking. It is all the more impressive when we consider that Kleon achieved his political
success almost wholly through his oratory. We must conclude that the Athenians retained their addiction to traditional forms of showmanship in politicians through the fifth century, so much so that poorer Athenians were apparently willing to entrust the government entirely to Alcibiades at one point.

It is interesting to note that Alcibiades' shield-device was Eros armed with a thunderbolt. The blazon recalls an earlier interest in Eros at Athens evinced by the altar dedicated to Charmos. Plutarch indicates that the Athenians saw in this device proof for Alcibiades' tyrannical bent; their closest link between Eros and tyranny were the Peisistratids. Indeed, Aristophanes termed Alcibiades "a lion nurturing in the city". It was the fear of Alcibiades' ambition that created general disapprobation of him among the Athenians and that finally drove him from the city. That fear was, in no small part, inflated by the suspicion that Alcibiades had participated in parodies of the Eleusinian Mysteries and in the mutilation of the Herms.

In this cursory study of some of the leading Athenian statesmen, we can detect a conscious effort to turn ostentation to political credit. By extension, we can conclude that the Athenians had come to expect evidences of τιμή from their leaders and that such men as Themistokles and Kimon involved themselves in self-glorification, at least partially, as means of advancement. Clearly, the Athenians had been schooled in appreciation of leadership by the very leaders they abjured politically - the Peisistratids. At least the Peisistratidai did the most to promote the type of show that seems to have become institutionalized at Athens.

Similarly, we may expect that patronage of the literary arts by the ty-
rants, notably Hipparchos, parented the splendid flowering of Athenian and Greek literature in the fifth century. Each member of Hipparchos' circle could have been a teacher as well as a virtuoso. Epikles of Hermione, possibly a pupil or successor of his countryman, Lasos, has been mentioned and it seems that Anakreon took some interest in Aeschylus' lyrics. The interest of the Peisistratids in tragic poetry is indicated by the fact that Thespis stepped forward from the choros in 534. Indeed, Athens under the Peisistratidai may have become the poetic, if not cultural, center of Greece.

The innovations in the arts brought to Athens by the Peisistratidai seem to have been accepted wholeheartedly by the Athenians. Indeed, their acquired taste for the new was not discarded along with the tyrants, but was retained and cultivated. The very epicenter of this schooling must have been Hipparchos, undoubtedly the arbiter of Athenian taste while he lived and apparently even after his death.
Notes

1 One likely earlier emulator may have been Megakles, the son of Hippokrates, the first victim of ostracism in 487/6 (Ath. Pol. 22.5): cf. Pind. Pyth. 7.


3 Cf. Plut. Them. 5.4-5; on the friendship of Simonides and Themistokles see A.J. Podlecki, The Life of Themistocles (Montreal, 1975) 49ff.

4 Plut. Them. 1.3; cf. Frost (above, n. 2) 64.

5 Plut. Them. 15.4; cf. Podlecki (above, n. 3) 50; Frost (above, n. 2) 160.


7 Plut. Them. 5.2; Frost (above, n. 2) 88 seems to miss the point of their association in Plutarch: Epikles was part of Themistokles' pursuit of fame and honour.

8 Plut. Them. 31.1; cf. Frost (above, n. 2) 224-5.


Plut. Them. 22.1-2; on the shrine see Travlos (above, n. 10) 121-3.

Themistokles' devotion to Artemis is interesting in light of the fact that the Peisistratidai brought the cult of Brauronian Artemis to Athens and fostered it (cf. Travlos above, n. 10 124; L. Kahil, "Le 'Craterisque' d'Artemis et Le Brauronian de l'Acropole", *Hesperia* 50 [1981] 261): krateriskoi found on the site of Artemis Aristoboule are similar to ones found in number at Artemis' shrine at Brauron (cf. Kahil, 253-63).

Plut. Them. 22.2; cf. Podlecki (above, n. 3) 144. This same type of hybris is repeated in the alleged portrait of Perikles on Athena's shield (Plut. Per. 31.4) and of Alcibiades in the lap of Nemea (Plut. Alk. 16.5).

Plut. Them. 22.3; see Podlecki (above, n. 3) 194 for an ostrakon cast against Themistokles with a touch of irony; cf. Frost (above, n. 2) 186ff. on Themistokles' ostracism.

15 Melanthios and Kimon: Plut. Kim. 4.8; on Anakreon and Polykrates see Chapter I, section 3,A,2.

16 Plut. Kim. 4.9.


18 Plut. Kim. 13.8; on the Akademy see Wycherley (above, n. 17) 219-25.

19 Plut. Kim. 10.2.


21 Plut. Kim. 10.6; Peisistratids: Ath.Pol. 16.7 (cf. Rhodes above, n. 9 217-8).

22 Aes. 3.183-5; Plut. Kim. 7.3-8.2; on these Hermai see E. Harrison, The Athenian Agora, XI: Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture (Princeton, 1965) 110ff.

23 On Hipparchos' herms see Chapter I, section 2,A. Contra Harrison (above, n. 22) 116: the herms are not "best explained if we imagine a precedent which involved victory", since the common dedication for a victory was a
tripod. Rather we should seek a precedent that involved very great honour or a very honourable personage (sc. Hipparchos).

24
Plut. Per. 7; cf. also 16.

25

26
Plut. Per. 7 and 13; cf. Hopper (above, n. 17) 82-9.

27
Plut. Per. 13.6; cf. Rhodes (above, n. 9) 670-1 on musical contests.

28
See Chapter I, section 3,C,2.

29
Perikles' musical tutor was either Damon of Oa or Pythokleides (Plut. Per. 4.1).

30
Ath.Pol. 60.1; cf. Rhodes (above, n. 9) 669-71.

31
Plut. Nik. 3.2-3.

32
Plut. Nik. 3.3.

33
Plut. Nik. 3.4-6; see Chapter I, section 3,A,1.

34
Plut. Nik. 3.5.

35
Plut. Nik. 3.6.
36 Thuc. VI.16.2 (cf. Dover, HCT, 246-7); Plut. Alk. 11.1.

37 Plut. Alk. 11.2.

38 Thuc. VI.16.2.

39 Plut. Alk. 10.3 and 13.2, but cf. 16.3 (see Dover, HCT, 246; contra Dover: we do not know if Alcibiades actually spoke as Thucydides has him speak [unlikely in any event] or in what measure the sophistries, etc. in Thucydides' speeches ascribed to Alcibiades are his own).


41 Plut. Alk. 34.6.

42 Plut. Alk. 16.2.

43 See Chapter I, section 2,B.

44 Could the thunderbolts indicate that Alcibiades was advocating the displacement of Zeus?

45 Ar. Frogs 1431-2; also Plut. Alk. 7.2; see Chapter I, section 3,D.

46 Schol. Aes. P.V. M.128; cf. Podlecki (above, n. 6) 381, n. 27.

Such attitudes were not limited to the wealthy: cf. F. Frost, "Politics in Early Athens", Classical Contributions: Studies in Honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor (Locust Valley, New York, 1981) 33-9, especially 38: "And an analysis of the coarse pottery from the Agora shows a demand among Athenian housewives for imported, mould-made washbasins, probably for no other reason than vogue, for such items not only could be but were produced domestically at what must have been a much lower price."
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APPENDIX: The Sixth Century Archon-List

(SEG 10, 352)

1. Hippias

The following fragment was first published by Meritt, who suggested that it had formed part of the Athenian archon-list, and was later confirmed and dated by Bradeen:

Bradeen published additional fragments of the same list, which thoroughly extinguished doubts that had been raised about Meritt's suggestion. The identification of the fragment as part of the archon-list has not been seriously questioned since.

Meritt dated the list to the 520s, using the obviously correct restorations of Hippias, Kleisthenes and Miltiades, the last identified independently as the eponymous archon for 524/3. No other known Athenian ever bore the name of Hippias after his expulsion and the identification of this Hippias as the son of the tyrant appears certain. The name Kleisthenes was rare at Athens, having been brought to the city from Sikyon after the tyrant of that city: reasonably, the name on the archon-list can only have represented the archonship of Kleisthenes the Alkmaionid.
The fragment preserves parts of two other significant names. The letters ETO in line 3 have been restored as [ON]ETO[PF] or [ON]ETO[PIADEX].

A space remains above the letter T that, by its size, could have contained an omicron, but not an alpha, gamma, delta or other such letter that would have extended low and to the right in the letter space, since some remnant would have remained on the stone that we have to see. The importance of this is that the space above the T could have accommodated O from the name Philoneos, a man who we know was archon in 528/7, the year of Peisistratos' death. A certain restoration of the name Philoneos would anchor the fragment firmly in the mid-520s, since the number of names between it and Miltiades is exactly right to confirm Miltiades' archonship in 524/3.

In line 8, Meritt was tempted to restore ΣΤΡΑΤ as [ΓΕΙΕ]ΣΤΡΑΤ[ΟΣ] representing the archonship of the grandson and namesake of Peisistratos the tyrant. But Meritt noted that several names could fit the space and that Peisistratos the Younger would have been very young as archon in 522/1. Thucydides (VI.54.6) said that, during the archonship of Peisistratos, the son of Hippias dedicated the Altars of the Twelve Gods and of Apollo Pythios at Athens and he quoted the inscription of the latter, which is extant (IG I2 761). Meritt thought that the lettering of that inscription was too sophisticated to be dated earlier than the beginning of the fifth century. He believed that the advanced style of the inscription and the evidence of an ostrakon that bore the inscription Γισισσίος[Γ]ραφε[τ] written retrograde clearly indicated that Peisistratos the Younger had survived the expulsion of the Peisistratids in 510, had remained to become eponymous archon in 497/6, and had later become a candidate for ostracism.

Cadoux, however, observed that Peisistratos the Younger must have held the eponymous archonship before 519 anyway if he had dedicated the Altar of
the Twelve Gods during his archonship. Herodotos (VI.108.4) records that, when the Plataian ambassadors came to Athens to seek an alliance with the Athenians against the Thebans, they sat down as suppliants on the Altar of the Twelve Gods. Thucydides (III.68.5) dates the resulting Plataian/Athenian alliance 92 years before the destruction of Plataia by the Spartans and the Thebans in 427 B.C., or from 519, a date accepted by most scholars. Thus, the Altar must have been dedicated by Peisistratos the Younger before that.

Peisistratos the Younger was archon at some time and we certainly cannot put his archonship before his father's. The ostrakon with the name Peisistratos might better be attached to Peisistratos the Elder or even to Peisistratos the archon of 669/8. The lettering of the dedicatory inscription on the Altar of Apollo Pythios must have been simply ahead of its time. On epigraphic and historic grounds, the best restoration for line 8 of the archon-list is \[\text{\textasciitilde PEIX\textasciitilde TPAT[O\textasciitilde]}\].

A reasonable restoration of the names on the archon-list with their corresponding dates is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[\textasciitilde ON]} & \text{E} \text{TO[\textasciitilde P... ]} & 527/6 \\
\text{[\textasciitilde H]} & \text{I} \text{R\textasciitilde IA[\textasciitilde K]} & 526/5 \\
\text{[\textasciitilde K]} & \text{L} \text{E I\textasciitilde O\textasciitilde EN[\textasciitilde E\textasciitilde]} & 525/4 \\
\text{[\textasciitilde M]} & \text{I\textasciitilde LT\textasciitilde IA\textasciitilde DE\textasciitilde E\textasciitilde} & 524/3 \\
\text{[\textasciitilde K]} & \text{A\textasciitilde L\textasciitilde IA\textasciitilde DE\textasciitilde E\textasciitilde} & 523/2 \\
\text{[\textasciitilde PEIX]} & \text{I\textasciitilde TPAT[\textasciitilde O\textasciitilde]} & 522/1
\end{align*}
\]

The archon-list is important because it helps to lighten an otherwise dim picture of Peisistratid tyranny at Athens following the death of Peisistratos. Now it is possible to know with a reasonable amount of certainty that Hippias, the son of Peisistratos, became archon in 526/5, a full
archon-year after the death of his father. It is interesting that Hippias, whose age was about fifty at the time of his archonship, waited for so long to procure what was, in all probability, his first archonship and that there was a lag in time between his father's death and his assumption of the office. Surprisingly closely associated on the list with the Peisistratid is Kleisthenes the Alkmaionid, for Herodotos (VI.123.1) claimed that the Alkmaionidai were inveterate tyrant-haters and, because of that hate, were in continuous exile from the time of the battle of Pallene in 546. The archon-list shows not only that Kleisthenes had returned, but also that a certain cordiality had been restored between the Peisistratidai and the family of Kleisthenes which enabled Kleisthenes to obtain honourable office under the tyrants. A reconciliation must have occurred some time before Kleisthenes' archonship for him to have become eponymous archon in 525/4. Miltiades' appearance in the list after Kleisthenes is also intriguing, since he held the archonship very shortly after the death of his father: Kimon Koalemos, we are told by Herodotos (VI.103), was murdered by the sons of Peisistratos. The appearance of these names on the archon-list shows that a certain harmony existed at Athens among the Peisistratidai and other important Athenian families and might even signify the beginning of the new order, an order strengthened in its early years by such harmony.

The main concern for this thesis is not that inferred cooperation, but Hippias' archonship and its significance. Does Hippias' appearance on the archon-list support the view that Hippias succeeded Peisistratos as the tyrant of Athens? It is widely held that Hippias as heir to Peisistratos wanted to hold the archonship as soon as he could after his father's death in order to legitimize his accession to power. Since no constitutional means was available to Hippias to designate himself as successor, he used
the archonship to inaugurate his rule. Hippias' name on the archon-list is generally considered to be corroboration for Thucydides' belief that Hippias as the eldest brother succeeded as tyrant when Peisistratos died.

But there are factors that weaken such conclusions. First, the archonship was not significant of any real power at Athens, nor had it been since Peisistratos returned from Eretria to take control of the city in 546. Real power was held by those who controlled the city's revenues and the epikouroi and we know that both Hippias and Hipparchos had those. Peisistratos had rooted his renewed tyranny in revenue and enforcement and the epikouroi who accompanied the brothers were a constant reminder to the Athenians of the reality of the tyranny. Hippias' archonship was surely a gesture, but, if it was a gesture denoting succession, it needed to be made immediately or not at all. Undue delay between Peisistratos' death and Hippias' archonship naturally disrupts a connection between that archonship and any gesture designed to signify the beginning of Hippias' reign. Rather than as an indicator of Hippias' monarchical power, however, his archonship might better be viewed as a gesture on behalf of the house of Peisistratos for the benefit of lesser Athenian families.

Some scholars have acknowledged the problem created by the rather late date of Hippias' archonship and have attempted to account for the delay in order to salvage a connection between the office and the succession. It is argued that Peisistratos must have died very late in the archonship of Philoneos after the archon for the following year, Onetor, had already been selected and designated archon for 527/6. Hippias, as a law-abiding ruler, could not displace Onetor, but was forced to wait until the following year to obtain his archonship.

This explanation implies that Peisistratos' death was unforeseen and
sudden, although the evidence that we have about it will not support such a view. For Thucydides (VI.54.2) says that Peisistratos died an old man (γηραιὸν τελευτήσαντος) and in the Ath.Pol. (17.1) we read that Peisistratos died of sickness. We must conclude that Peisistratos died non-violently in the fullness of his years; the evidence certainly does not indicate that he died suddenly or unexpectedly. Thus, to the year of Onetor's archonship, we must add a certain unspecified amount of time during the archonship of Philoneos when Peisistratos gave indication that he was dying. Those nearest him - surely his heirs - must have realized that his end was nearing and have made provision for it.

In fact, it is inconceivable that the transition of power from father to son or sons was not considered before Peisistratos' death. Hippias and Hipparchos had been associated with their father in important decisions from the final period of exile and it is very difficult to imagine that the old tyrant had not provided for his family. Herodotos (III.53) records a nearly contemporary parallel: "As time went on and Periander grew old, he found himself no longer equal to the oversight and management of power, ... he sent to Corcyra and recalled Lykophron to take over the tyranny. But Lykophron did not even deign to ask the bearer about the message. Periander's heart, however, was fixed on the youth so he sent again, this time utilizing his own daughter, the sister of Lykophron .... When she reached Corcyra, she spoke with her brother in the following way: 'Do you wish the tyranny to pass into strange hands and our father's wealth made prey (to others) rather than you return and enjoy it ...? Power is a slippery thing ... let not your inheritance go to another.'" Not unnaturally, Periander wished to ensure that the tyranny of Korinth was firmly in the hands of Lykophron, his son, before he died, thus
ensuring transition of power. The Peisistratids were not unconcerned about their own well-being and Peisistratos was surely as prudent a ruler as Periander. The contingencies of transition of Peisistratid power must have been worked out well before Peisistratos' death and the archonship would surely have been included if it was deemed a necessary part of the arrangement.

There is other evidence to show that Peisistratos' death occurred well before the end of Philoneos' archonship and that Hippias had more than adequate time to obtain the archonship for the year 527/6. According to Herodotos (VI.103), Kimon Koalemos, the father of Miltiades, was banished from Athens by Peisistratos. During his exile, he became a victor in the four-horse chariot race at Olympia, making him an instant panhellenic celebrity. At the next Olympiad, Kimon won again with the same horses, but this time had Peisistratos proclaimed victor in his place. Kimon's calculated flattery won him recall to Athens. Again, at the next Olympiad, Kimon won but: \[\ldots\ \text{κατέλαβε \ άποθανέν \ ύπ' \ τών \ Πεισιστράτου, μαίσων \ οὐκέτι \ περιέσχον \ γάρ \ τού: \ Πεισιστράτου.}\]

Kimon's victories had obviously increased his prestige much too greatly for the younger Peisistratidai.

Kimon's victories must have been won in succession, since the same horses triumphed every time. Four dates are available for Kimon's victories, 536/5, 532/1, 528/7 and 524/3, the middle two of which must be reckoned in on any scheme because Peisistratos was alive for the first two victories, but dead around the time of the third. Wade-Gery suggested that Kimon threatened to use his prestige to unseat the younger Peisistratidai and so provoked a "crisis of succession." Wade-Gery favoured the first three dates for Kimon's victories, believing that Kimon was
murdered very shortly after his last victory when the successors of Peisistratos were just beginning to rule. Mary White, however, argued that the last three dates were likelier for Kimon's victories because Hippias' archonship could not be explained as an element of his succession if it came nearly two years after Peisistratos' death. She reasoned that Kimon must have obtained his latest victory in 524/3, the very year that Miltiades, his son, was elected archon. That archonship was offered to Miltiades to placate him after the death of his father; Miltiades was then bundled off to the Chersonese to be killed in the same way as his older brother, Stesagoras, had been killed.

It is obviously wrong to date the murder of Kimon in accordance with Hippias' "succession": we have already observed that there was adequate time during the archonship of Philoneos for Hippias to have arranged to become eponymous archon for 527/6. But if a "crisis of succession" did occur, it more likely happened at the time of Peisistratos' death when the personal power and prestige of the old tyrant were gone, not four years later when his successors had time to consolidate their hold over Athens. Kimon, older than the sons of Peisistratos and perhaps buoyed by his phenomenal string of Olympic victories, may have felt himself at liberty after Peisistratos' death to exploit his own political possibilities and could easily have convinced himself that fortune decidedly favoured him. The time to strike was soon after Peisistratos' death, when Kimon had achieved his latest victory, but before the younger Peisistratidai could assert themselves decisively in power. At any rate, whatever crisis may have developed was quickly dissipated at the death of Kimon, for there are no further signs of disaffection at Athens until the assassination of Hipparchos in 514.
Miltiades, the son of Kimon, enjoyed the good favour of the Peisistratidai even after Kimon's death, according to Herodotos (VI.39). The Peisistratidai did not drive Miltiades from Athens as they surely would have a rebel, but dispatched him from Athens much later on a trireme to take command of the situation in the Chersonese after Stesagoras' death. Any enemy of the family will have been dealt with more quickly and surely at home; indeed, the proximity of Miltiades' new sphere of influence to important Peisistratid holdings like Elaious and the family redoubt at Sigeion in the Troad certainly indicates that a friend, not an enemy, had been dispatched. Miltiades' archonship soon after Hippias' shows that he had remained on good terms with the Peisistratidai and that he proved himself a trusted friend of the family even though his father had been killed; his mission to the vital Thraceward area confirms that Miltiades remained a friend for some time after his archonship.

Kimon's last victory will have come in the late summer of 528, his death will have followed soon after. Miltiades will then have proven himself loyal to the family by judiciously overlooking the details of his father's death. His archonship was the reward he merited for his prudence.

This sequence of Kimon's victories simply confirms what has already been established: Hippias had ample time to secure the archonship for 527/6. For Peisistratos died before Kimon's last victory and his subsequent death, perhaps during the summer of 528. His death from the vicissitudes of old age will thus have occurred at the beginning of Philoneos' archonship, not at the end. Consequently, Hippias' archonship was held almost two whole years after Peisistratos' death and so cannot
be considered an element of his succession. There was much more than sufficient time to secure the eponymous archonship were it a necessary ingredient in the transition of Peisistratid power.

In chapter I of this thesis, I attempted to show that Greek tyrants of the archaic period desired singular, recognizable power and prestige and that any concealment or masking of that power will have detracted from their images. Peisistratos himself enjoyed such singular power and it is unlikely that his sons disregarded the model of conduct that he provided. It was therefore no distinction at all for Hippias at fifty to hold an office held by his father's minions or to share the glory of accession in any way with underlings, not only because it was unnecessary, but also because reminders of real power were all around and defeated any notions of equality that the lesser families might have had. Mindful then of contemporary attitudes among tyrants of the archaic period, it is inherently unlikely that the archonship was deemed a symbol of succession.

If Hippias' archonship does not reflect the succession, what does it mean? The answer must be found in the names and their order on the archon-list. Hippias is followed by Kleisthenes, the son of Megakles, a man who had been instrumental in returning Peisistratos to Athens once before. Megakles commanded a substantial following in the city - we recall that the Peisistratidai were outsiders, not Athenians, - as did Kleisthenes: when the latter was forced to flee from Athens by King Kleomenes of Sparta, seven hundred families were ejected in his wake, families that must have been considered allied with Kleisthenes. Such a following could hardly have been ignored or its leaders shunned by the rural Peisistratidai and they may have wished to reward Kleisthenes for returning to their fold by granting him the honourable, but meaningless
Miltiades' family was also based in rural Attica, perhaps near the deme of the Peisistratidai, and their interests may have been the same earlier on. Miltiades was useful to the Peisistratidai in the Thraceward region and how highly prized his services were to the family can be assumed from the fact that he held the archonship at a relatively young age. After Kalliades comes Peisistratos the Younger, the son of Hippias, who held the archonship as a very young man. It seems that the archon-list constitutes a manifest of important subordinates of the new regime and that their archonships are rewards or incentives for services rendered or to come.

Hippias' archonship must be viewed in this context, i.e., as part of the list: for while lesser men - even the young namesake of the old tyrant - could aspire to traditional honourable office, the monarch of the Archaic age, like the monarchical Perikles later, must stand aloof to maintain distinction. For a tyrant to be included in a pack of lesser men is to be levelled unnecessarily. Hippias' archonship must be construed as a gesture contrived by the Peisistratidai to enhance the archonship and to make it attractive as an office attainable for those outside the family as a reward for good service, service that was needed for the peaceful, orderly and profitable management of the Athenian state. Hippias was actually the perfect choice to hold the archonship, since, as we have seen, his conduct belied any pretense to tyrannical power; Hipparchos, on the other hand, was openly tyrannical in the usual opulent ways. Hippias emerges as the somewhat dour executor of the family's collective will or perhaps as the "silent partner" in the power of the Peisistratidai. His inclusion among such men, however, puts him somewhat outside of the family's mainstream.
Hippias' archonship was held rather late in his life and after almost two years had elapsed from the time of Peisistratos' death: it does not by any means support Thucydides' claims for him as successor to Peisistratos. Real power was exercised by the controllers of the revenue and the epikouroi, Hipparchos and Hippias. It is true that Hippias' name tops a list of prominent, important Athenians and may reveal something about how Peisistratid political patronage worked. It does not, however, lend itself to the question of who succeeded Peisistratos.
2. Thucydides, the Archon-List and Hipparchos

Some scholars have observed that Thucydides did not make use of the archon-list to strengthen his claim that Hippias succeeded Peisistratos. They have assumed that the appearance of Hippias' name on the list shows that he held the archonship shortly after Peisistratos' death and serves to corroborate Thucydides' assertion about the Peisistratid succession in Book VI.54.2. It has been suggested that Thucydides was silent about the archon-list because he did not know it.

But the evidence that we have indicates that Thucydides knew the archon-list in some form. For Thucydides (VI.54.6) states: "In respect of other things, the city employed the laws previously passed, except that as much as possible they (sc. the Peisistratidai) always managed that one of their own be in office. Others held the yearly archonship at Athens and Peisistratos, the son of Hippias ...." In fact, the fragment of the archon-list that survives can be taken as partial proof for Thucydides' pronouncement if we take the clause \( \pi\lambda\nu\ \kappa\alpha\Theta'\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\epsilon\epsilon\iota\nu\ \eta\pi\mu\epsilon\rho\lambda\eta\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\ \sigma\phi\omicron\nu\ \alpha\omega\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\iota\varsigma\ \omega\rho\chi\nu\sigma\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\nu\varsigma \) to denote what Thucydides saw on the list: some on the list were readily identifiable as Peisistratidai (e.g., Hippias, Peisistratos the Younger) and their archonships occurred at intervals; others (Kleisthenes, Miltiades, Kalliades) were Peisistratid men by implication.

This same clause has sometimes been taken to mean that the Peisistratidai changed the Athenian law concerning the selection of archons, their only illegality. But such a change would most certainly have altered the law-abiding reputation of the family. Thucydides must mean that the Peisistratidai were legally outstanding because, from the evidence of the
archon-list, they held a conspicuous number of archonships, not that they had broken the law in this instance. Indeed, there was no need to resort to illegality to manipulate the selection of archons, since the will and favour of the family could be easily communicated by other means within the letter of the law.

There are a number of reasons why Thucydides may not have used the archon-list to help prove his case about succession. He may have been thoroughly satisfied with the evidence of the Achtungsstele, or he may have determined that the list offered nothing to help him prove his belief and that the list did not bear upon the question of succession. It is also possible that Thucydides overlooked the list or that he disregarded it because it tended to contradict his assertion.

The last suggestion requires elaboration. Thompson observed that Thucydides need have mentioned the archon-list only if Hipparchos had not held an archonship, since that would have proven that Hipparchos was politically insignificant. But we can go further along these lines: even if Hipparchos held an archonship, it would have helped Thucydides prove his thesis about the succession, provided that Hipparchos held the office after Hippias. Logically, an older brother would have come first in office, especially if that brother were also the political heir-apparent.

It is possible that Hipparchos' name came before Hippias' on the archon-list. For although Hipparchos was closely associated in governing with Hippias and deemed by some ancient authors to have held equal power with Hippias, his name cannot reasonably be placed on the list after 520/19, the year of the younger Peisistratos' archonship. Hipparchos was not very different in age from Hippias and was civically more prominent: it seems most unlikely that he deferred his archonship (if he held one) until
after that of his brother's son. Again, for Thucydides' pronouncement about the conspicuous number of archonships to be correct, some clearly identifiable Peisistratids must have held the office before Hippias. Who other than Peisistratos the Elder and Hipparchos can have fit this bill?

One further piece of evidence tends to support the suggestion that Hipparchos was named on the archon-list before Hippias. The author of the information found upon the Parian Marble (Ep. 45) describes Hipparchos as the "successor" of Peisistratos. Although the author has wrongly linked the murder of Hipparchos with the archonship of Harpaktides (511/10), possibly because he drew on the Harmodios-skolia as a source, his designation of Hipparchos must derive from another source, since the skolia call Hipparchos "tyrant". The author - probably Hellanikos - dated his work by means of the Athenian archon-list, proving that he was familiar with it. He may thus have taken the ground for his description of Hipparchos from Hipparchos' place on the archon-list. At least, it seems that he saw nothing on it that contradicted his description. Admittedly, none of this evidence is conclusive, but the idea that Hipparchos succeeded Peisistratos was deeply entrenched at Athens and must have derived from grounds more solid than the Harmodios-skolia: the view of Hipparchos as successor surely ignored what should have been the decisive evidence of the Achtungsstele.

If the name of Hipparchos did in fact occur on the archon-list before Hippias', Thucydides need not incur a charge of suppression of evidence. For Thucydides quite likely believed that the Achtungsstele proved his case: it showed the brothers in a direct relationship (or so it seemed). Thucydides probably discarded or ignored the archon-list as irrelevant to the question of succession.
3. Conclusions

The fragment of the sixth century archon-list that has survived cannot be used as proof that Hippias succeeded Peisistratos as tyrant of Athens. For its shows quite clearly that Hippias' archonship occurred two years after Peisistratos' death, thus severing the link between it and succession.

Hipparchos may have held the archonship before Hippias, a fact that might account in part for the persistent popular notions about the succession of Hipparchos. This possibility does not, however, incriminate Thucydides for acknowledging it.

The archon-list offers no proof for the succession to Peisistratos.
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