



# Durham E-Theses

---

## *The pisistratid tyranny at Athens*

Worthington, Ian

---

### How to cite:

Worthington, Ian (1981). *The pisistratid tyranny at Athens*, Durham e-Theses.  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7702/>

---

### Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is a history of the Pisistratid Tyranny at Athens, with particular concentration on the years 546 to 510, which is often viewed as merely an interim stage between the reforms of Solon and the more important legislation of Cleisthenes leading (with later help from Ephialtes) to democracy. However, the tyranny - which is the first in the history of Athens - marks a much more important stage in Athenian development, as is evident from the source material in existence.

The first chapter serves as an Introduction and deals with the rise of Pisistratus to unchallengeable power in 546 after the Battle of Pallene, and following two previous attempts to seize power. An examination will also be made of the problem of chronology and the principal source material available for this period. The following chapters are then divided into the constitutional, economic, foreign, religious and cultural aspects of the tyranny, all of which received attention and state guidance. In many areas, for example drama and trade exports, great credit has to be attached to the policies of the tyrants. The final chapter (VII), which is divided into two parts, traces the overthrow of the tyrannic rule in 510 owing to Spartan intervention, and also acts as a Conclusion on the tyranny as a whole and its place in the development of Athens.

The post-Aristotelian sense of the word tyranny cannot be applied to the reign of the Pisistratids (at least not until 514 following the murder of Hipparchus), which was one of general enlightenment. Although the tyrants' position in the state was unconstitutional, resting on force as opposed to legality, political advancement was not halted, and the loyalty of the people to the city was won not by coercion but by policies designed for the general well-being and the provision of a period of peace from civil disorder.

THE PISISTRATID TYRANNY

AT ATHENS

A Thesis

submitted for the Degree

of

Master of Arts

at the University of Durham,

Department of Classics

by

Ian Worthington

- 1981 -

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.



22 MAY 1984

CONTENTS

Declaration and Copyright	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Special Notes	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Chapters	
I: Introduction	1
II: The Constitution Under the Tyranny	23
III: Trade and the Economy	44
IV: Foreign Affairs	80
V: The Religious Policy	105
VI: Literature	130
VII: Conclusion	154
Bibliography	169

Declaration:

None of the material in this thesis has ever been submitted for a degree in the University of Durham or any other University. No part of it is the result of joint research; all of the work is my own.

Copyright:

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

To My Mother  
for her constant help and support

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my Supervisor, Dr. P. J. Rhodes, for his invaluable guidance, comments and willingness to offer help whenever sought throughout the writing of this thesis, and for dealing with various drafts of work promptly and meticulously. I am also indebted to him for allowing me to see various extracts from his yet unpublished commentary on the Athenaion Politeia of Ps-Aristotle, and for his great patience in enduring my literary style.

I would also like to thank the staff of the Department of Classics who gave me much-appreciated encouragement, especially Professor M. C. Stokes for thought-provoking suggestions made whenever our conversation centred on Pisistratid Athens.

My grateful thanks must also go to all my friends who gave me support and for their convivial company, making my stay in Durham such an enjoyable one.

Finally, I owe a special debt of gratitude to Mrs. J. Whitehead, not only for devoting so much of her time and attention to typing this thesis, but also for all her kindness and willingness to help.

University of Durham

Ian Worthington

February, 1981.

SPECIAL NOTESTexts:

When referring to the ancient authorities I have used the Oxford texts, except for the following where the Teubner editions have been used: the Athenaion Politeia (attributed to Aristotle), Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch; *other editions cited in text.*

Greek Names:

The problem of transliterating Greek names is an eternal one and I have tried to be as consistent as possible in giving their Latinized forms - thus Pisistratus as opposed to Peisistratos. However, certain words have not been Latinized, for example, Kanephoros, and these will be evident when they appear.

Dates:

All dates are B.C. unless otherwise indicated.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<u>ABV</u>	J.D. Beazley, <u>Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters</u>
<u>AP</u>	<u>Athenaion Politeia</u> (attributed to Aristotle)
Arist.	Aristotle
Aristoph.	Aristophanes
<u>Belo</u> ch, <u>G.G.</u> <sup>2</sup>	K.J. Beloch, <u>Griechische Geschichte</u> <sup>2</sup>
<u>Busolt</u> , <u>G.G.</u> <sup>2</sup>	G. Busolt, <u>Griechische Geschichte</u> <sup>2</sup>
<u>CAH</u>	<u>Cambridge Ancient History</u>
Diog. Laert.	Diogenes Laertius
<u>F.G.H.</u>	F. Jacoby, <u>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</u>
Glotz and Cohen	Glotz and Cohen, <u>Histoire Générale: Histoire Grecque</u>
Hdt.	Herodotus
<u>I.G.</u>	<u>Inscriptiones Graecae</u>
Marm. Par.	Marmor Parium
Plut.	Plutarch
<u>(Sol.</u>	<u>Life of Solon</u> )
<u>Pol.</u>	<u>Politics</u>
Ps-Arist.	Pseudo-Aristotle
Schol.	Scholiast
Thuc.	Thucydides
Travlos	J. Travlos, <u>A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens</u>
Ure	P.N. Ure, <u>The Origin of Tyranny</u>

Journals have the standard abbreviations, thus JHS = Journal of Hellenic Studies, REG = Revue des Études Grecques. Of special note is ASNP = Annali Della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa.

## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION

In this Introduction I wish briefly to examine the history of Athens from the end of the Dark Ages to 546, thus setting the scene for the Pisistratid Tyranny to be studied in the following chapters (though mention will be made of events in this period where relevant). This will also involve a brief survey of the three parties which were involved in the power struggles, the source material available, and the chronological problem of the tyranny.

Attica, a peninsula of some one thousand square miles containing a population with numerous social differences and loyal to the local landowners of each area, had emerged from the Dark Ages under the hegemony of Athens: the two names are virtually synonymous. Aristocratic government prevailed, and although at first Athens did not suffer those economic problems which afflicted other states and led to colonisation, in time this situation changed. Debts grew increasingly common as the poor, in order to survive, pledged first their land and then their actual bodies to the nobility as security in return for help; a situation arising from, among other things, the growing infertility of the soil which proved unable to support the population<sup>1</sup>. Exploitation grew as the rich increased their land-holdings at the expense of the poor farmers, who could be sold into slavery in order to settle debts incurred.

A sign of this growing discontent perhaps was Cylon's coup<sup>2</sup> in the 630s or 620s, which failed owing to mistiming, and perhaps also

1. See Chapter III, pp.44-5.

2. Thuc. I.126,iii-xii.



Athenian pride had been wounded by the support for Cylon of his father-in-law Theagenes of Megara. Some good, however, did come out of the affair: in 621/0 Dracon established a law code<sup>3</sup>. Although "written in blood rather than in ink"<sup>4</sup> (which implies its severity), at least it now gave the ordinary people some protection against the hitherto arbitrary jurisdiction of the nobility.

This was still far from enough, and as grievances grew the Athenians foresaw a situation resulting in civil war and the downfall of the oligarchic régime, as in the case of Corinth where the unpopular and repressive Bacchiad clan was overthrown by Cypselus<sup>5</sup>. In an attempt to prevent such an occurrence and alleviate the situation, Solon was elected archon in 594 with extraordinary powers<sup>6</sup>. His great political innovation was the replacement of birth by wealth as the qualification for office<sup>7</sup>, along with the creation of the Heliaeae, or people's court, and the ability of anyone to prosecute on behalf of another<sup>8</sup>. In the economic field the Solonian σεισάχθεια<sup>9</sup> cancelled outstanding debts and prohibited all future loans on the security of a person. Imposing an oath on the magistrates<sup>10</sup> to maintain his legislation, Solon left Athens, but unrest continued in both the political and economic fields. Solon may have given freedom to the indebted, but he had not solved the all-important question of land distribution, nor taken notice of the

3. AP IV,1; Arist. Pol. II,1274b15-18; Plut. Sol. XVII.

4. Plut. Sol. XVII,3: δέ Δημοσῆς ὕστερον εὐδοκέμησεν εὐπών, ὅτι δι' αὐτοῖς, οὐ διὰ μελανος, τοὺς νόμους ὁ Δράκων ἔγραψεν.

5. Hdt. V.92.

6. See Chapter II, p.23.

7. Thereby ending the Eupatrid monopoly of office; see H.T.Wade-Gery, CQ XXV, 1931, pp.1-11, 77-89 = Essays in Greek History, pp.86-115.

8. AP IX,1.

9. See Chapter III, pp.45-46.

10. Hdt. I.29; AP VII,1, LV,5; Plut. Sol. XXV,3.

lowest class, despite their increasing importance, as Beloch remarks<sup>11</sup>:

"Der schwerste Mangel der Solonischen Verfassung war es, dass sie nur auf den Grundbesitz Rücksicht nahm und dadurch die klasse der Gewerbtreibenden, der „Demiurgen“, von jedem Anteil an der Staatsleitung ausschloss, obgleich doch diese klasse bereits zum wichtigen Faktor im Wirtschaftsleben geworden war und von Tag zu Tage mehr wurde."

In this period there was a general increase in trade for the city encouraged by Solon, who attracted foreign craftsmen to Athens with grants of citizenship. In pottery production the city overtook Corinth, which until then had been the leading centre in the Greek world. Athens also won recognition and some influence in Central Greece from the part played in the First Sacred War<sup>12</sup>, as a result of helping free Delphi from Crisan power, c.594. The uneasy internal peace, of which we have so little information, was shattered soon afterwards when twice no archons were elected, in the so-called "years of anarchia": 590/89 and 586/5. Then in 582 Damasias was elected archon but remained in office illegally for a further one year and two months before being expelled by force<sup>13</sup>. The reason for this attempted tyranny (assuming it was that), is unknown; it is quite possible that Damasias represented the Eupatrids wishing to exclude non-aristocrats from political office<sup>14</sup>, and in that case he must have hoped to introduce some new form of legislation to end wealth as the qualification for office.

The government of Athens was now entrusted to a Board of Ten comprising of five Eupatrids, three Agroikoi, and two Demiourgoi, to rule for the last ten months of the year 580<sup>15</sup>. It is interesting to

11. K.J.Beloch, G.G.<sup>2</sup> I.1, p.367.

12. See Chapter IV, p.80-81.

13. AP XIII,2; chronology as interpreted by T.J.Cadoux, JHS LXVIII, 1948, pp.93-103.

14. Wade-Gery, op. cit. p.79= Essays, p.103.

15. AP XIII,2. See also Wade-Gery who takes the view that these were the πρόκρυτοι from whom the actual archons were appointed.

note the order of importance within the Board, perhaps shown by the number of representatives of each group and that, since the Eupatrids form the largest single group, they may have controlled whatever steps the Board took. Certainly such a move was extraordinary - ten replacing the usual nine archons - and Roebuck<sup>16</sup> suggests they suspended the Solonian constitution until order had been restored. Sealey<sup>17</sup> argues that the groups were regional parties, but this is hard to believe for the year 580. Although the temporary union of the three classes was short, it was a sign of the social development in which the ruling class was weakened.

Athens' relations with other states in this period are unknown<sup>18</sup>, though an early war with Aegina is known to have taken place, and at some stage Mytilene retook Sigeum, not to be retrieved until the Pisistratid period, when the tyrant's son Hegesistratus was established as governor there<sup>19</sup>. There was also a war with Megara for the island of Salamis, but really our sources are quiet until the attempted tyranny of Pisistratus in 561/0; an attempt based on his popularity from that war, during which (presumably as στρατηγός), he captured Nisaea, the port of Megara. In the ten years from 570 to 560, Pisistratus emerged as a leading political figure, and it is possible that he was the leading force behind the archon Hippocleides' reorganisation of the Panathenaic festival<sup>20</sup>.

Pisistratus had grown up in the Solonian circle (*Pisistratus' and*

16. C. Roebuck, Hesp. XLIII, 1974, pp. 485-94.

17. R. Sealey, Hist. X, 1961, pp. 512-14.

18. See Chapter IV, pp. 80-84.

19. Hdt. V. 94, i.

20. Pherecydes 3F 2; see Chapter V, p. 107.

mothers were cousins<sup>21</sup>), Solon's . . . . but had split from it<sup>22</sup> to emerge as leader of the "left-wing" and form his own party, named the Hyperacrioi, ranged against the parties of the Pedion and the Paralia<sup>23</sup>. He traced his ancestry back to Nestor thus claiming connections with the early Attic kings, and although Andrewes<sup>24</sup> says the family left no public record before 561, a Pisistratus was archon in 669/8 according to Pausanias<sup>25</sup>. He was perhaps supported by another great family in his town of Brauron, the Philaids<sup>26</sup>, this also being the stronghold of his party. According to Plutarch<sup>27</sup> Pisistratus' party must have been large, as it was composed mainly of poor farmers and shepherds, and AP<sup>28</sup> adds to it those ruined by the σεισάχθεια and those of impure descent: "προσεκεκόσμηντο δὲ τούτοις οἱ τε ἀφηρημένοι τὰ χρέα διὰ τὴν ἀπορίαν, καὶ οἱ τῷ γένει μὴ καθαροὶ διὰ τὸν φόβον."

Athenian politics before Pisistratus finally established his rule were a struggle between three parties according to, for example, AP<sup>29</sup>: that of the Plain led by Lycurgus desired oligarchy, the Coast led by the Alcmeonid Megacles aimed at a μεσή πολιτεία<sup>30</sup>, and the third party

21. Heraclides F147 Wehrli; J.K.Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, pp.322-23.

22. AP XIII,3: ...οἱ δὲ τῇ πολιτείᾳ δυσχεραίνοντες διὰ τὸ μεγάλην γεγονόντα μεταβολήν.

23. See below, pp.8-11.

24. A.Andrewes, The Greek Tyrants, p.105.

25. Pausanias II.24,7; Cadoux, op. cit. p.90.

26. Wade-Gery, JHS LXXI, 1951, pp.212-22, = Essays, pp.166-67; D.M.Lewis, Hist. XII, 1963, pp.22-5.

27. Plut. Sol. XXIX,1.

28. AP XIII,5.

29. AP XIII,4.

30. AP XIII,4.

was led by Pisistratus δημοτεκάτατος εἶναι δοκῶν<sup>31</sup>. All the causes for discontent and the grievances which had existed from the time of Solon, together with the growing prosperity of the traders, led to the desire for a tyranny. Only a tyrant could solve the sort of problems which Solon had believed his measures would solve. Pisistratus' personal ambitions and the claims of his followers led him to seize the Acropolis in 561/0 with the help of, allegedly, a fifty-man bodyguard<sup>32</sup> voted him by the Assembly on the proposal of Aristion<sup>33</sup>.

Perhaps soon afterwards<sup>34</sup> he was expelled by a coalition of Lycurgus and Megacles, and retired to Brauron. With the end of the coalition, Pisistratus returned to Athens in partnership with Megacles. An intriguing plan was concocted for his return<sup>35</sup>: a tall girl from Paeania named Phye was persuaded to masquerade as the city-goddess Athena and travel to Athens with Pisistratus. Thus, it appeared as though the goddess herself was bringing back the master of the city; it is therefore hardly surprising that he met with no resistance. Later, this entry to the city was symbolised by Heracles' entry to Mount Olympus led by Athena - now shown in a chariot on pottery<sup>36</sup>.

The political alliance between Pisistratus and Megacles depended upon the former marrying Megacles' daughter<sup>37</sup>, but the marriage was

31. Arist. Pol. V,1305a23-24 represents Pisistratus' party as opposed to that of the Plain: οὗτοι Ἀθηνῆσι τε Πειστράτος στασιάσας πρὸς τοὺς πεδιακούς.

32. Plut. Sol. XXX,3 but it is unknown where this figure came from, and it should not be taken as the truth.

33. Hdt. I.59,iv-vi; AP XIV,1; Plut. Sol. XXX,1-6.

34. On chronology see below, pp.16-21.

35. Hdt. I.60; cf. AP XIV,4.

36. See Chapter V, p.122.

37. Hdt. I.60,ii: ὁ Μεγακλέης ἐπεκηρυκεύετο Πειστράτῳ, εἰς βούλοιτο οἱ τὴν θυγατέρα ἔχειν γυναῖκα; AP XIV,4.

never consummated<sup>38</sup> and when Megacles found this out he ended the alliance, causing Pisistratus to flee Attica this time, into exile which lasted for ten years<sup>39</sup>. His property was bought by Callias of the Ceryces family<sup>40</sup>. Pisistratus went to Rhaecelus and Thrace, and during his exile he built up resources and made friendships with places including Thebes, Macedon and Argos, where he already had connections by marriage. According to AP<sup>41</sup> Pisistratus married Timonassa in either his first period of rule or first banishment, which raises the question of whether or not he married her bigamously. It seems highly likely that he did not divorce Timonassa or have her as wife at the same time as Megacles' daughter, since Argos sent help at Pallene and would not have done so if Pisistratus had insulted ~~Argos~~ in some way. What might have occurred was the timely (for Pisistratus) death of Timonassa.

Finally, Pisistratus went to Eretria and from there launched an attack against Attica<sup>42</sup>, where faction strife had again arisen, and was brought to battle at Pallene, where he successfully routed the opposing forces<sup>43</sup>. Pisistratus took as hostages the sons of those noble families not killed at, or fleeing after, Pallene<sup>44</sup>, and deposited them under the care of Lygdamis of Naxos.

Pisistratus was now master of Athens by conquest and established

38. Hdt. I.61,i says this was because Megacles was an Alcmeonid and subject to the family curse, and implies that Pisistratus had no wish to disinherit his sons from a previous marriage.

39. For Pisistratus' long exile, see Chapter IV, pp.84-87.

40. Hdt. VI.121,ii.

41. AP XVII,4.

42. Hdt. I.62,i.

43. Hdt. I.63,i; AP XV,3.

44. Hdt. I.64,i.

his rule by employing a mercenary bodyguard<sup>45</sup> and perhaps disarming the citizens<sup>46</sup>. By his return the city had had enough of governmental insecurity resulting from the faction struggles and, since Herodotus<sup>47</sup> says Pisistratus governed well in his first tyranny, must have looked to him for a period of settled government.

Of the three parties it should be noted that that of Pisistratus was not formed until after the time of Damasias<sup>48</sup>. Aristotle<sup>49</sup> agrees with Plutarch<sup>50</sup> that it was based on enmity to the rich. Herodotus<sup>51</sup> describes the three parties geographically, while AP<sup>52</sup> gives them a more political definition. It can be said that Lycurgus and the Plain represent the old landowning aristocracy who were against the Solonian legislation ending their monopoly of political control, and thus desiring a return to oligarchy. Megacles and the Coast were the middle party, including merchants and traders as well as some middle class farmers, interested in their own commercial development and a share in political power. Pisistratus represented the unsatisfied demos. However, the actual geographical names appear to defy such a political interpretation: the old aristocracy had local origins in all the Attic demes, and surely their estates cannot all have been centred on the Central Plain? This is true, although certainly they will have been more thickly represented

45. Hdt. I.64,i.

46. AP XV,4; but contr. Thuc. VI.56,ii and 58 – attributing the disarming to Hippias in 514. It is impossible to decide which is correct.

47. Hdt. I.59,vi.

48. Hdt. I.59,iii; contr. Plut. Sol. XIII,1-3 who is wrong on this issue.

49. Arist. Pol. V,1305a22-24.

50. Plut. Sol. XXIX,1.

51. Hdt. I.59,iii.

52. AP XIII,4.

there than elsewhere. Similarly, why should the nouveaux riches merchants prefer land nearer the coast than by the city where trading interests were centred? However, if a trader invested in a boat, he would naturally wish to choose a coastal home. Finally, the demos cannot all be "beyond the hills", i.e. on the far side of Hymettus, but all over Attica.

The frontiers of the areas often overlapped, especially in the case of the city of Athens which belonged equally to the Pedion and the Paralia, yet Pisistratus, leading the Hyperacrioī, had great support in the city. It would appear that the most natural explanation for the party name is that it signified the whereabouts of the party nucleus which, in effect, was the local estate of the leader<sup>53</sup> - in the case of Pisistratus his nucleus lay in the area of Brauron in Eastern Attica.

At this point it may be a good idea to consider the three parties individually. Firstly, that of the Plain, which corresponds to the main plain surrounding Athens. The Eupatrids formed a party named the Pedieis from the *πέδον* where their estates were based: they are called οἱ ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου in Herodotus<sup>54</sup>. They probably combined to exclude rivals from election to the archonship, thus were against the wealth factor in politics<sup>55</sup>. Unfortunately, nothing is known of Lycurgus; it is plausible to associate him with his fourth century namesake, and make him a member of the (Eteo)butadae family.

Supporting the Solonian legislation and opposing the Plain party was that of the Paralia. In AP<sup>56</sup> the Coast is cast as a "middle party" which explains Megacles' ability to ally with Lycurgus or Pisistratus,

---

53. See R.Sealey, Hist. IX, 1960, pp.155-81; R.J.Hopper, BSA LVI, 1961, pp.189-219.

54. Hdt. I.59,iii.

55. C.Hignett, A History of the Athenian Constitution, pp.108-24; Busolt-Swoboda, Griechische Staatskunde, pp.779 and 860.

56. AP XIII,4.

yet Pisistratus and Lycurgus were themselves unable to ally with each other. The Paralia was later the South-East triangle of Attica<sup>57</sup>, so it is reasonably safe to fix our area in question to the South and South-East of Athens<sup>58</sup>. The party was led by the Alcmeonid Megacles (whose grandfather had been archon at the time of the Cylonian coup), who had married Agariste, daughter of Cleisthenes of Sicyon. Eliot<sup>59</sup> fixed the Alcmeonidae in the Paralia district of Anavyssos, probably centred at ancient Aigilia, following the discovery of the "Kroisos Base" in Anavyssos, Kroisos being an Alcmeonid.

Within the ranks of the Paralia occurred a split between those for the Solonian legislation *per se*, and those seeing it as a mere step towards an ultimate goal<sup>60</sup>. The latter emerged in the form of the Hyperacrioī party led by Pisistratus; the most democratic of the three. In AP the party is named Diakrioī, and Hesychius<sup>61</sup> describes the Diacria as the "area from Parnes to Brauron." Strabo<sup>62</sup> identifies the Diacria as in the North-East. Herodotus' name of Hyperacrioī has a wider application, and as the two cannot both be the original name Herodotus is to be preferred as the oldest witness. Given the existence of a region called Diacria, it is easy to explain how the variant arose<sup>63</sup>. Thus, it is feasible to assign Pisistratus' party to the northern and central areas of Eastern Attica with Brauron the party centre.

Pisistratus' followers cannot all have been those living in this

57. Thuc. II,55,i.

58. Cornelius Nepos, 14-15; Ure, pp.312-13.

59. C.W.J.Eliot, Hist. XVI, 1967, pp.279-87.

60. AP XIII,3.

61. Hesychius, s.v. Διακρίτος.

62. Strabo 392; Schol. Aristoph. Lysistrata 58.

63. J.S.Traill, Hesp. XLVII, 1978, pp.89-109.

area; he must have appealed to a wider section of society, as French<sup>64</sup> points out that the original coup d'etat was a bloodless event and only successful owing to city support<sup>65</sup>. This could not have been obtained on purely personal and/or regional following, as the East coast was not only the most remote of the three areas, but also probably the least populated, and in the Assembly its representation can hardly have been great. It might therefore be said that Pisistratus set the precedent for Cleisthenes in adding a political following to his personal one<sup>66</sup>. It is worth noting that when he had finally established himself in power Pisistratus did not neglect his supporters as the Sicilian tyrants did<sup>67</sup>.

Thus it is wrong to say, as AP does, that the three parties were distinguished by specific political aims and ideals; for the most part they were mere factions in the internal struggle and the new society, led by individual members of the aristocracy connected with regional areas where the bulk of their supporters were to be found. Although the parties can be associated with both regional and economic factors, a political one may also be taken into account with the influence of the leader in each region.

There are three major sources for the tyranny: Herodotus, Thucydides, AP; with the Politics of Aristotle acting as an important supplement<sup>68</sup>. Thucydides and AP agree with Herodotus for the most part, although very often there is conflict: Herodotus is even cited once by

64. A. French, G&R<sup>2</sup> VI, 1959, p.51.

65. Hdt. I.62,i: οὐ τε ἐκ τοῦ ἀστεος στασιῶται ἀπέκοντο, ἄλλοι τε ἐκ τῶν δῆμων.

66. AP XX,1.

67. See further on Pisistratus: J. Holladay, G&R<sup>2</sup> XXIV, 1977, pp.40-57.

68. See F. Jacoby, Atthis pp.152-68, especially on the murder of Hipparchus as well as on the sources in general.

AP<sup>69</sup>, in connection with the Phye episode. Herodotus' material is all from oral sources which may of course be biased, and some effect is evident on his narrative where Alcmeonid (and therefore anti-tyranny) sources have been used.

One example of the Alcmeonid bias is seen in Herodotus' attempt to exculpate Megacles from the guilt of sacrilege for putting the supporters of Cylon to death after they had claimed sanctuary. He hoped to throw the blame on magistrates known as the προτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων, but he is corrected by Thucydides<sup>70</sup> who replaces them with the nine archons, and this is surely correct<sup>71</sup>. Herodotus' whole account of Cylon is based on Alcmeonid tradition, and is corrected by Thucydides and Plutarch<sup>72</sup>.

The most explicit political statement made by Herodotus is to be found in V,78, when he praises democracy for its help in promoting Athenian strength and prosperity. It is unsurprising therefore to discover he does not parallel Thucydides and AP in praising Pisistratus' personal government after he has applauded the first period of power. In the main, however, Herodotus does not deserve the judgement meted out by Plutarch who accuses him of unfairness and interference.<sup>73</sup>.

Thucydides is more sceptical, with a greater eye for detail, as in his correcting the belief that Hipparchus was tyrant after Pisistratus had died and not Hippias<sup>74</sup>, although of course on this point he agrees

69. AP XIV,4.

70. Thuc. I.126,viii.

71. See Chapter II, pp.40-41.

72. Plut. Sol. XII,1-7.

73. Plut. de Malignitate Herodoti.

74. Thuc. I.20,ii: 'Αθηναίων γοῦν τὸ πλῆθος "Ιππαρχον οὖνται ὑφ' Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογεέτονος τύραννον ὄντα ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ οὕτω σασιν ὅτι 'Ιππίας μὲν πρεσβύτατος ἦν ἡρχε τῶν Πεισιστράτου υἱέων, "Ιππαρχος δὲ καὶ θεσσαλὸς ἀδελφὸς ἡσαν αὐτοῦ.

with Herodotus. The only continuous narrative of the tyranny is the AP, which lacks internal consistency. For events before Solon, as indeed for most sixth century events, a great reliance was placed upon tradition; the reliability of which is questionable. So, what do these sources tell us about the tyranny?

From Herodotus and AP is derived the information for the three parties and the rise of Pisistratus, although AP adds a variant to the story of Phye, saying she was also alleged to be a Thracian flower-girl from Collytus<sup>75</sup>. There is some disagreement regarding the aftermath of Pallene: Herodotus<sup>76</sup> says the sons tell the people to go home on the orders of Pisistratus, but AP<sup>77</sup> says the tyrant himself called an *έξοπλαστά* in the Theseum<sup>78</sup> and disarmed the people. Thucydides has nothing to say on this period.

When in power Pisistratus usually receives favourable comments for adhering to the laws<sup>79</sup> and so forth. We learn from Herodotus that he maintained his position with the aid of a mercenary bodyguard<sup>80</sup> and the taking of hostages, who were sent to Lygdamis on Naxos, whom he helped to power as a reward for his help in the long exile<sup>81</sup>. Herodotus mentions these things briefly; the next we hear of the tyranny is in V.55 with the conspiracy plot of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, and the end of the tyranny. This is also the aspect of the tyranny to which Thucydides devoted his attention. His statement that pro-Pisistratid men

75. AP XIV,4.

76. Hdt. I.63,ii.

77. AP XV,4.

78. See Chapter V,pp.126-127.

79. Hdt. I.59,vi; Thuc. VI.54,v; AP XVI,1-3, 7-10.

80. Hdt. I.64,i.

81. Hdt. I.64,ii; AP XV,3.

always held the archonship<sup>82</sup> has been called "an inference drawn from the Athenian archon list"<sup>83</sup>, but it does appear that this was the practice under the régime.

For a somewhat fuller account of how Pisistratus conducted affairs when in power, AP XVI is very useful. However, analysis of it reveals the author had very little evidence, and it is unknown from where this was derived. AP talks of loaning money to the poor, and mentions a tax of 10%<sup>84</sup> (ἐπράττετο γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν γυγνομένων δεκάτην), but this contradicts Thucydides<sup>85</sup>, who says the tax was levied at 5% (εἰκοστή), and in connection with Pisistratus' sons. It is unknown who is right, but it is possible<sup>86</sup> that the tax was originally introduced at 10% and then lowered to 5% or even that the term δεκάτη is merely a parallel of our word tithe, and could refer to any exaction coming under the heading of tithe, not just 10%.

The tyranny is portrayed as mild, Pisistratus even obeying a summons to appear before the Areopagus at one stage on a murder charge<sup>87</sup>, in contrast to the hostile view of the Politics towards tyranny as a form of government<sup>88</sup>, with the tyrant ruling with his own interests at heart<sup>89</sup>, and maintaining power by repression<sup>90</sup>. Yet in AP Pisistratus

82. Thuc. VI.54.vi.

83. J.Day & M.Chambers, Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy, p.92.

84. AP XVI,4.

85. Thuc. VI.54,v.

86. See Chapter III, pp.53-4.

87. AP XVI,8; Arist. Pol. V,1315b21-22; Plut. Sol. XXXI,3.

88. Pol. IV,1295a1-2 (although in V,1314a30-1315b39 there is a discussion of how a "good" tyrant can preserve his rule).

89. Arist. Pol. III,1279b6-7.

90. Ibid. V,1313a40.

is not cast as ruthless but is "humane...mild...indulgent" - φιλάνθρωπος ...πρᾶος...συγγνωμονικός - and rules μᾶλλον πολιτικῶς ή τυραννικῶς.<sup>91</sup>

The statement that the laws of Solon lapsed in the tyranny<sup>92</sup> is refuted by Herodotus and Thucydides<sup>93</sup>.

The sources agree for the most part on how the tyranny ended, beginning with the conspiracy leading to the murder of Hipparchus and the harsh rule of Hippias, which was followed by Alcmeonid bribery of the Pythia<sup>94</sup> to secure Spartan aid which overthrew the tyranny. There are one or two inconsistencies between AP and Thucydides, for example the number of conspirators in the plot<sup>95</sup>, and Thucydides is not entirely self-consistent<sup>96</sup>.

Sometimes evidence is open to doubt: for example, Politics<sup>97</sup> mentions a decree passed by Solon to limit the amount of land a person might own in order to prevent large estates forming. As there is no other evidence for this measure perhaps Aristotle is wrong on this point.

Other sources for the tyranny do, of course, exist, but these are mainly scattered. Cicero<sup>98</sup> remarks about the musical contests at the Panathenaea, and Plutarch's Life of Solon is a valuable source of information, especially for the early career of Pisistratus. Inscriptions

91. AP XVI,2.

92. Ibid. XXII,1.

93. Hdt. I.59,vi; Thuc. VI.54,vi.

94. Hdt. V.63,i.

95. AP XVIII,2 says there were a number of accomplices in the plot; Thuc. VI.56,iii says there were only a few for reasons of safety, οὐαν δὲ οὐ πολλοὶ οἱ ξυνομωμοκότες ἀσφαλείας ἔνεκα.

96. The overthrow of the tyranny and the inconsistencies in the source material will be examined in further detail in Chapter VII - pp.157ff.

97. Arist. Pol. II,1266b16.

98. Cicero, de Oratore III,137.

survive, perhaps the most illuminating being the fragment of the archon list<sup>99</sup> which, among other information, places Cleisthenes as archon in Athens in 525/4<sup>100</sup> indicating that the Alcmeonidae returned from exile, though exactly when is unknown, and they were certainly exiled again - perhaps in 514 after the assassination of Hipparchus.

The chronology of the Pisistratid Tyranny is a complicated subject involving four major texts: Herodotus, Thucydides, AP and Aristotle, Politics, not always in agreement with each other<sup>101</sup>. Herodotus, our oldest authority, gives no date for Pisistratus' first seizure of power but he says he was expelled μετὰ...οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον<sup>102</sup>, with the tyranny οὐ κω κάρτα ἐρριζωμένην. The second period of tyranny should be short since it ended as a result of his refusing to have children by Megacles' daughter<sup>102a</sup>. The final seizure of power is in διὰ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτεος<sup>103</sup>, and it is implied in the "Croesus digression"<sup>104</sup> that this preceded the outbreak of Croesus' war against Persia. No mention of Pisistratus' death is made; Hipparchus was killed at the Παναθήναια<sup>105</sup>, and the tyranny continued επ' ἔτεα τέσσαρα<sup>106</sup>. Hippias and his family are

99. B.D.Meritt, Hesp. VIII, 1939, pp.59-65; R.Meiggs & D.M.Lewis, Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the Fifth Century BC, no.6(c).

100. Dionysius, Rom. Antiq. VII.3,1.

101. For a more detailed examination of the chronological problem see:  
 G.V.Summer, CQ<sup>2</sup> XI, 1961, pp.31-55.  
 J.S.Reubel, GRBS XIV, 1973, pp.125-37.  
 J.G.F.Hind, CQ<sup>2</sup> XXIV, 1974, pp.1-19.  
 P.J.Rhodes, Phoen. XXX, 1976, pp.219-34.

102. Hdt. I.60,i.

102a. Hdt. I.61,i-ii.

103. Hdt. I.62,i.

104. Hdt. I.53-57.

105. Hdt. V.56.

106. Hdt. V.55.

expelled ἀρξαντες μὲν 'Αθηναῖων ἐπ'"ετεα ἔξ τε καὶ τριήκοντα.<sup>107</sup>

AP has a narrative based on Herodotus, but a series of chronological dates which is not self-consistent, and if we make emendations to the text to achieve self-consistency a chronological scheme results which is quite different from that implied by Herodotus. Pisistratus seized power ἔτει δευτέρῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ μετὰ τὴν τῶν νόμων θέσιν, ἐπὶ Κωμέου ἀρχοντος<sup>108</sup>, but most probably Solon was archon in 594/3 and Comeas in 561/0, in which case either AP has simply miscounted, or the text is corrupt and should read, "in the thirty-fourth year" – probably the former. Pisistratus was expelled after a short time<sup>109</sup>, apparently in the sixth year after his coup, and seized power again ἔτει δὲ δωδεκάτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα<sup>110</sup>. After ruling οὐ...πόλυν χρόνον<sup>111</sup> he was expelled again in the seventh year and his third seizure of power ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει<sup>112</sup> would fall in 529/8. However, Pisistratus ruled for another nineteen of the thirty-three years from his first coup to his death<sup>113</sup>, ἐπὶ Φιλόνεω ἀρχοντος but from the items listed a total rule of only twelve years is apparent: 561/0-556/5, 546/5-539/8, 529/8-528/7. AP is therefore inconsistent within the narrative and leaves an incredibly short time for the duration of the third tyranny. The simplest way to restore consistency and lengthen the third period of tyranny is to convert δωδεκάτῳ in XIV,4 to πέμπτῳ, in which case the periods of tyranny will be 561/0-556/5, 552/1-546/5, 536/5-528/7<sup>114</sup>.

---

107. Hdt. V.65,iii.

108. AP XIV,1.

109. Ibid XIV,3.

110. Ibid. XIV,4.

111. Ibid. XV,1.

112. Ibid. XV,2.

113. Ibid. XVII,1; see also the variation in Arist. Pol. V,1315b31-34.

114. Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, I,22-3; Sumner, op. cit. p.40, Rhodes, op.cit. pp.222-23.

Thus corrected, AP still disagrees with Herodotus: the latter implies that the third seizure of power preceded Cyrus' defeat of Croesus, for which the traditional date is 546/5, and he also implies that the first two periods of tyranny were short. AP follows Herodotus in portraying the first two periods of tyranny as short, but his series of dates allows several years for each and makes the third period, beginning in 536/5, scarcely longer than the first or second.

Hipparchus is killed at the Panathenaea<sup>115</sup> and Hippias is expelled ἐτε...τετάρτῳ μάλιστα μετὰ τὸν Ἰππάρχου θάνατον<sup>116</sup>; which is 511/0 ἐπὶ Ἀρπακτέδου ἀρχοντος. Thucydides<sup>117</sup> tells us that after the murder of Hipparchus at the Great Panathenaea<sup>118</sup>, Hippias continued ruling ἐτη τρια...ετι and was expelled ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ. AP therefore has Hippias ruling for seventeen years, and Politics eighteen. Thus the total years of tyranny are given as thirty-six by Herodotus; thirty-five by the Politics: and forty-nine by AP<sup>119</sup>, which is probably corrupted from thirty-six<sup>120</sup>.

The author of AP used Herodotus mainly, along with some others, perhaps Androton, but certainly an Atthis. According to Heidbüchel<sup>121</sup>, AP's figures are based on an arbitrary process which began with Hellanicus who reckoned one generation (= thirty-three years) for the whole length of Pisistratus' career as tyrant, and seventeen years, or one half-generation, for his sons' reign. Pisistratid chronology from the

115. AP XVIII, 3.

116. AP XIX, 2.

117. Thuc. VI.59.iv.

118. Thuc. VI.56,ii.

119. AP XIX, 6.

120. Wilamowitz, op. cit. I, 23; Sumner, op. cit. p. 41; Rhodes, op. cit. pp. 223-24.

121. F. Heidbüchel, Philologus CI, 1957, pp. 70-90.

Atthidographers was based on oral tradition, and is unreliable concerning periods of time, since the emphasis is placed more on personalities. It would appear that the only data for their scheme which Herodotus did not have access to was the archon list, and so their reliability is questionable.

Hellenicus is the first Atthidographer and the first to put Athenian history in chronological order<sup>122</sup>. It has been argued, however, that Hellenicus worked out his chronological pattern with a generation of forty years and later writers transformed it into a thirty-three year one<sup>123</sup>. Miss Lang reconstructs the Atthides' chronology as follows: 561/0: rule of Pisistratus begins in the archonship of Comeas; 556/5: exile in the archonship of Hegesias; 546/5: return; 528/7: death of Pisistratus in the archonship of Philoneos. Thus, according to her, the Atthid tradition appears to know of only one exile; but this is too drastic, and probably like Herodotus and AP the Atthides had two exiles. Cleidemus<sup>124</sup> relates the story of Phye, which would indicate a knowledge of two exiles; perhaps Phye was thought of in connection with Pallene<sup>125</sup>, but if so surely Megacles would be more intent on escaping than forming an alliance with Pisistratus, who had just won total victory?

Since the narrative of Herodotus and AP agrees, Herodotus being the accepted version in Athens when the latter text was composed, the belief has arisen<sup>126</sup> that mistakes in the Atthis have led to inconsistencies, and that the times in AP XIV,3 and XV,1 are interpolations added later. Thus, it is often proposed to emend the text in favour of

122. See F. Jacoby, Atthis, pp.215ff.

123. M. Lang, AJPh LXXV, 1945, pp.59-73.

124. In Athenaeus XIII,609c.

125. Mistakenly by Polyaenus I.21,1.

126. F.E. Adcock, CQ XVIII, 1924, pp.174-82.

Herodotus, and the information given in the Politics. However, it is more likely that the chronological scheme of AP was originally consistent and that this state was lost by textual corruption, and so drastic emendation to secure agreement with Herodotus is not required<sup>127</sup>.

Chronological references in Herodotus are vague, though he does suggest two tyrannies separated by a brief exile and followed by a longer one. Jacoby<sup>128</sup> limits the first two tyranny periods and brief exile to five years between 561/0 and 556/5 to comply with Herodotus' figure of thirty-six years of continuous rule<sup>129</sup>. This probably refers to the thirty-sixth year after Pallene, counting inclusively. Herodotus therefore sets Pisistratus' reign from Pallene at 546, agreeing with his synchronisation of Croesus' last campaign, whose reign ended in Sardis in 546.

Pisistratus' death can be fixed at 528/7 by back-counting seventeen years from 511/0 (since AP XIX,6 says his sons ruled for seventeen years, and Politics V,1315b33 says for eighteen; thus an inclusive count gives 528/7 and an exclusive count gives 529/8). That Hipparchus was killed in 514/3 is fixed by the Great Panathenaea, and 511/0 is a certain date for Hippias' expulsion. The following chronological table may be quoted<sup>130</sup>:

561/0.....	first coup
561/0 or 560/59....	first expulsion
557/6 or 556/5....	second coup
556/5.....	second expulsion
546/5.....	third coup
528/7.....	death of Pisistratus
514/3.....	murder of Hipparchus
511/0.....	expulsion of Hipparchus from Athens
	end of the tyranny

---

127. Rhodes, op. cit. pp.222-25.

128. Jacoby, op. cit. pp.188ff..

129. Hdt. V.65,iii.

130. Rhodes, op. cit. p.231.

A final point to be noted linguistically is the use of  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$  to qualify certain numbers, normally used to indicate a degree of imprecision or uncertainty regarding figures<sup>131</sup>. Three of the numerals in AP are qualified by  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$ , viz,  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\acute{\epsilon}\beta\delta\delta\mu\omega$ <sup>132</sup>.  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$ <sup>133</sup>, and  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ <sup>134</sup>; the former two being ordinal numbers and the last a cardinal. Ordinals are always used with an inclusive count, and since ordinals are less ambiguous than cardinals it is odd for AP to have used  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$  here with these two ordinals in his Pisistratid account. The reason is unknown, but Rubincam<sup>135</sup> concludes that AP shows a general lack of confidence about the precision and correctness of all the ordinal numbers.

In this period a tyrant was a person illegally usurping a monarchy: an unconstitutional ruler in effect. The word  $\tau\acute{\mu}\rho\alpha\omega\omega\sigma$  is first used by Archilochus<sup>136</sup> referring to Gyges, and is probably a word of Lydian origin. The "despotic and repressive" sense of the word came later in post-Aristotelian times.

Throughout his reign Pisistratus endeavoured to preserve the Solonian forms of government with only a few modifications and irregular measures<sup>137</sup>. He strove to unite Attica under the leadership of Athens, and to subordinate local interests to the national, for example by using religion<sup>138</sup>: the Panathenaea promoted national loyalty to the city,

131. See N.G.L. Hammond, Hist. IV 1955, pp.371-411; C.Reid Rubincam, Phoen. XXXIII, 1979, pp.293-307.

132. AP XV,1.

133. Ibid. XIX,2.

134. Ibid. XIX,6.

135. Rubincam, op. cit. pp.305-06.

136. Archilochus, fr. 22 D.

137. See Chapter II, pp.26ff.

138. See Chapter V, pp.105ff.

while the City Dionysia served a propaganda value in the Greek world.

The tyranny fostered the political development of the lower classes on whose well-being and support the position of the Pisistratids depended.

The economic ills of Attica received necessary attention, and olive oil, a valuable export commodity, was produced in greater quantities<sup>139</sup>, which in turn stimulated pottery production. The physical appearance of the city was altered with the building policy also alleviating the unemployment problem. As Glotz and Cohen point out<sup>140</sup>:

"C'était la préoccupation constante des tyrans d'augmenter le bien-être et de flatter l'amour-propre de leurs sujets en attachant leur nom à des travaux d'utilité publique. Athènes était un grand village; Pisistrate en fit une grande ville."

These policies were financed by taxation and revenue from mining property at Pangaeum.

Abroad, Pisistratus pursued a peaceful policy helped by the stability of the Greek world in this period, allowing him to maintain friendly relations with most Greek states without too much difficulty<sup>141</sup>, Megara being a notorious exception. Megara caused Pisistratus much trouble when two of its citizens accused him of making deliberate insertions in an official edition of the Homeric poems which he had assembled<sup>142</sup>.

Although the general policies of Pisistratus were adhered to by Hippias who succeeded him, changing circumstances in the Greek world made this course difficult. The rule proved moderate until Hipparchus was assassinated and then grew repressive, before the tyranny was eventually overthrown in 510<sup>143</sup>.

139. See Chapter III, p.52.

140. Glotz and Cohen, p.450.

141. See Chapter IV, pp.90-92.

142. See Chapter VI, pp.133-35.

143. See Chapter VII.

## Chapter II

### THE CONSTITUTION UNDER THE TYRANNY

Solon, beginning his extraordinary archonship in 594<sup>1</sup>, created a constitution which, despite its failures and shortcomings, averted for the moment the danger of revolution causing his appointment in the first place. He established a somewhat Utopian constitution, whereby every member of society had what he considered to be his rightful position according to his circumstances. Anything regarded as wrong was either remedied by further legislation or removed. Although Solon may be credited with laying the foundations of the future democracy, both sides of society were still dissatisfied with their way of life and exploitation of the poor continued along with internal dissension. Within half a century tyranny was established.

Solon's measures may be divided into two spheres: the economic<sup>2</sup>, where the most important step taken was the *σευσαχθεῖα*<sup>3</sup> resulting in the poor farmer now regaining his freedom and being placed on a more equal footing with his fellows, and the political, such as the creation of the *Heliaeae* or people's court which was the ancestor of the people's courts of the fully-developed Athenian democracy, and the replacement of birth by wealth as the qualification for political office, thus ending the Eupatrid monopoly of power<sup>4</sup>. It was the opinion of writers such as the author of AP<sup>5</sup> that the three

1. AP V,2; Plut. Sol. XIV,3.

2. See Chapter III, pp.45-7.

3. AP VI,1; Plut. Sol. XV,2.

4. See Chapter I, pp.2-3.

5. AP IX,1.

most democratic elements of the Solonian constitution were the prohibition of loans secured upon the actual person (under the terms of the *σευσάχθεια*), the ability of anyone to prosecute on behalf of another, and the right of appeal to the jury-court or *Dikasterion*.

The nobility had filled the high offices of state as a matter of course, and Solon's reforms still left them in control of much of the state administration (the *Areopagus*, for example, was retained with the same functions<sup>6</sup>), but their influence was steadily declining, for example, the power of the archon was curtailed with the right of appeal. The Solonian codification of the laws which amended<sup>7</sup> those already laid down by Dracon<sup>8</sup> was important for protecting the common people from oppression at the hands of the nobility, but the Athenians were still far from a common political outlook despite the steps taken towards social justice between class and class.

By the abolition of the divine right to rule, Solon based the right to office on wealth as opposed to birth; such a step being necessary for the future democracy. Within a short space of time, however, faction struggle again broke out, this time ending in tyranny. Between 594 and 561, the unrest is revealed in two periods of anarchia and the attempted tyranny of Damasias, 582-80<sup>9</sup>. In this period three parties account for a large part of the strife<sup>10</sup>, each having a political and a local basis<sup>11</sup>.

6. AP VIII,4; Plut. Sol. XIX,2.

7. AP VII,1.

8. AP IV,1; Arist. Pol. II,1274b15-18; Plut. Sol. XVII.

9. See Chapter I, p.3.

10. AP XIII,4; Plut. Sol. XXIX,1.

11. See Chapter I, pp.4-6; 8-11.

As we have seen<sup>12</sup>, Herodotus gives only the geographical nature of the three parties<sup>13</sup>; a more political definition is derived from AP<sup>14</sup>: that of the Plain led by Lycurgus desired oligarchy, the Coast was the party under the leadership of the Alcmeonid Megacles seeking a μέση πολιτεία, while Pisistratus formed the party of the Hillmen, δημοτικώτατος εἶναι δοκῶν (to champion the poor against the men of the Plain<sup>15</sup>). Pisistratus may be originally associated with the Solonian circle<sup>16</sup>, himself a landowner and noble in his home of Brauron, but had split from the Coast party owing to dissatisfaction with the constitution which he saw as only a temporary measure<sup>17</sup>. Herodotus<sup>18</sup> states that the third party came into being with the other two already in existence, and this is preferred to Plutarch<sup>19</sup> who makes the three parties contemporary in origin before Solon's archonship. Too little information survives on this period of strife, unfortunately, and so we are reduced to speculation.

The party of Pisistratus was the most democratic of the three, wanting more radical changes than those Solon had been prepared to make. It was therefore natural for the lower and middle classes to be in favour of tyranny – on the one hand, for protection against exploitation by the rich, and on the other hand as a means of improving their

12. See Chapter I, p.8.

13. Hdt. I.59,iii.

14. AP XIII,4.

15. Arist. Pol. V,1305a23-24; cf. Plut. Sol. XXIX,1: ἐν οἷς ήν ὁ θητικὸς ὄχλος καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς πλουσίοις ἀχθόμενος.

16. See J.K.Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, pp.322-3, 445.

17. AP XIII,3: οἱ δὲ τῇ πολιτείᾳ δυσχεραίνοντες διὰ τὸ μεγάλην γεγονέναι μεταβολήν.

18. Hdt. I.59,iii.

19. Plut. Sol. XIII,1-3.

lot. It is worthwhile to note that by 561 only those aged above fifty years could remember life before Solon. Pisistratus attained victory at Pallene<sup>20</sup> with the support of the people, whose allegiance he must have enjoyed since 561/0 when the Assembly voted him a bodyguard<sup>21</sup>.

It is unknown how the Solonian constitution survived under the troubles and uncertainties of the period, but survive it did as good use was made of it by Pisistratus, as can be seen from his conduct when in power. Herodotus' statement<sup>22</sup>, which admittedly refers to the first tenure of power, bears witness to this<sup>23</sup>.

Did the existence of a tyrant impede Athenian advancement towards democracy after Solon had ended the oligarchical element in the constitution? As will be seen below, the tyranny hastened and facilitated the movement to democracy. Did Pisistratus wish to establish a new constitution? Obviously not; he chose to rule πολιτευώς and not to rule τυραννικῶς<sup>24</sup>. His rule brought the peace and prosperity by suppressing aristocratic faction which enabled Cleisthenes to establish his system as successfully and swiftly as he did.

Pisistratus was fortunate in being preceded by Solon, who had already modified the original form of aristocratic government. Thus, Pisistratus was able to let the existing constitution and laws remain in force; he merely adapted them for his own purpose. The statement

20. Hdt. I.63,i; AP XV,3.

21. Hdt. I.59,v; AP XIV,1; Plut. Sol. XXX,1-6.

22. Hdt. I.59,vi.

23. cf. Thuc. VI.54,v; Plut. Sol. XXXI,1-4.

24. AP XVI,2.

of AP<sup>25</sup> that the laws of Solon lapsed in the tyranny is refuted by Herodotus<sup>26</sup> and Thucydides<sup>27</sup>. Ultimately, Pisistratus held complete power, ensuring that at least some of his own men held the high offices of state<sup>28</sup>, as well as controlling state finances, having a mercenary bodyguard<sup>29</sup>, and holding as hostages sons of those noble families who remained in Attica after Pallene<sup>30</sup>. It was a necessity for him to control all the internal means to power in order to maintain his position, since he was without constitutional power. His rule was based on force and not legality, and absolute power coupled with popular support (as a result of his desire to rule according to the laws and the favouring of the poor) secured the existence of the regime.

The key to Pisistratus' continued ascendancy was the control of archon elections, which served a twofold purpose: firstly, the archonship was the chief state magistracy (owing to the power of the archon<sup>31</sup> this office was always fought for in any struggle for power), and thus very necessary for Pisistratus to control. Secondly, an ex-archon automatically became a member of the Areopagus<sup>32</sup>, which served as a murder court under the tyranny<sup>33</sup>. Also falling within

25. AP XXII,1.

26. Hdt. I.59,vi.

27. Thuc. VI.54,v.

28. Ibid. VI.54,vi.

29. Hdt. I.64,i.

30. Ibid. I.64.i.

31. AP XIII,2.

32. For its powers see: AP III,6, IV,4, VII,4.

33. AP XVI,8; Arist. Pol. V,1315b21-22; Plut. Sol. XXXI,3 relate how Pisistratus was once called before the Areopagus on a murder charge, but his accuser failed to appear.

its jurisdiction were those cases dealing with plots to overthrow the state under the νόμος εἰσαγγελίας<sup>34</sup>, and it is possible that the εὑθυνοι who conducted the εὑθυναι were subject to the Areopagus' control before the εὑθυναι were transferred to the board of εὑθυνοι and the courts by Ephialtes<sup>35</sup>. This is, of course, conjecture, but as will be seen later<sup>36</sup>, the εὑθυναι may have been instituted by Pisistratus (evidence is lacking for a specific date), in which case a connection with the Areopagus is possible. The Areopagus' guardianship of the laws, νομοφυλακεῖν, appears to be age-old, and it may also have had the right to initiate business in the Ecclesia.

On account of its political importance, the Areopagus was the most likely centre of resistance to the tyranny because of its contingent of nobles. Thus, even if only half of the nine archons were Pisistratid men, in time the régime would be able to count on a large body of support in the Council - especially as some of the Areopagites who were opposed to Pisistratus would have sons whom he held hostage. Obviously some nobles were willing to be in office under Pisistratus, therefore they accepted his leadership, but not all - and it was these that Pisistratus needed to keep in control.

Calhoun suggests that Pisistratus strengthened the magistrates as a counter to the opposition of the Areopagus<sup>37</sup>, and this may be interpreted as being a necessity. The tyrant needed his own men in power to guarantee no defiance on the part of the Council, and perhaps he ensured that the right men were appointed to office by helping new

34. AP VIII,4.

35. See P.J.Rhodes, The Athenian Boule, p.204.

36. See below, pp.32-3.

37. M.Calhoun, Criminal Law, p.96.

men qualify for office with "monetary aid", in return for such support. This would suggest control of the archon elections, perhaps by letting it be known whom the tyrant was favouring for the office?

Although he followed the established constitution as closely as he could, certain changes had to be made with regard to the method of appointing archons. After Solon the archons were appointed by *πληρωσις ἐκ προκρίτων*<sup>38</sup>, and Pisistratus must have reverted to direct election. For one thing, AP says<sup>39</sup> that in the archonship of Telesinus the nine archons were elected by lot, which was the first election along such lines since the tyranny, when the archons were elected by vote. Also, the significance of Isagoras' archonship in 508/7 with the defeat of Cleisthenes<sup>39a</sup> suggests direct election.

Despite there being no record of Pisistratus ever holding the archonship, the silence is not particularly significant since we know of very few archons in the sixth century. Thus, it is more than possible that Pisistratus was archon and no record of this survives – after all, he was a noble and had held the position of a *στρατηγός*, during the Megarian war for Salamis<sup>40</sup> therefore he probably held the archonship before his first tyranny. Hippias was archon in 527/6<sup>41</sup>, no doubt following the precedent set by his father, in which case they were both legal members of the Areopagus. It is unknown if Pisistratus attended meetings of the Areopagus. His desire to have his own people in office could indicate he realised the need for keeping a watch on

38. AP VIII,1, XXII,5, which is preferred to the claim of Arist. Pol. II,1273b35-1274a3, 1274a16-17, III,1281b25-34, that Solon retained the "aristocratic" principle of election.

39. AP XXII,5.

39a. Hdt. V.66; AP XX,1.

40. See Chapter IV, pp.83-4.

41. See below, p.34 n.63 and p.35.

events when absent from Council meetings himself, and also that he needed the support of his own people in that body for any measures he might have proposed.

Apart from the archon elections and, of course, control in the hands of one man, Pisistratus made no other changes in the constitutional machinery. He kept in operation the Solonian Council of 400<sup>42</sup>, whose membership must have included the zeugitai class, and which still existed in 508/7 when it resisted Cleomenes' attempt to set up Isagoras and the 300 co-rulers in Athens<sup>42a</sup>. Cleisthenes increased the number to 500 in 508/7<sup>43</sup> although the first meeting may not have taken place until 501/0 when the first oath was sworn<sup>44</sup>.

The tyrants did everything in their power to subordinate local interests to the national and enforce governmental control over the local dynasts - to combat the strong influence of the old nobility policies were used such as the building programme<sup>45</sup>, creation of the δικασταὶ κατὰ δῆμους<sup>46</sup>, and the use of religion and festivals<sup>47</sup>. Pisistratus saw the necessity of a strong government as being more important than new constitutional machinery to enforce law and order, and his increased centralisation of government led to the growth in importance of the central institutions. The patronage of the tyrants strengthened the country people in their resistance to the nobility, and the development of the Athenian political conscience grew under the

42. AP VIII,4; Plut. Sol. XIX,1.

42a. Hdt. V.72,i; AP XX,3.

43. AP XXI,3.

44. AP XXII,2; see Rhodes, op. cit. p.210.

45. See Chapter III, pp.73-7.

46. See below, pp.36-8.

47. See Chapter V.

régime with the idea of the overall superiority of the Athenian citizenship. Solon began the process of getting the people more involved in affairs of state<sup>48</sup>, but it is interesting to note that the people only really become actively involved in the running of the state at the end of the sixth century after the fall of the tyranny, since work on the Pnyx (the regular meeting place of the Assembly) has been dated to this time<sup>49</sup>.

The Assembly and the Council meetings continued as before. It may appear odd that in such a régime an Assembly would still be left free to express an opinion and to discuss any matter the Council invited it to, but a parallel may be drawn with the principate of Augustus and the meetings of the Senate under his rule. As in Rome, so in sixth century Athens, provided the dictator had the necessary popular support, and does not appear to be flouting the laws, a "free" Assembly is possible. Pisistratus could allow this to happen because ultimately he laid down the law and held real control from his command of all internal means to power and, more significantly, (as in the case of Augustus), control of the armed forces. The extent to which Pisistratus influenced deliberations of the Ecclesia (and the Boule for that matter) is unknown.

Despite the prosperity brought to the city by the Pisistratids, one cannot escape from the fact that all were bought at the expense of individual liberty; for all his good intentions Pisistratus was the unconstitutional ruler not bound to any law other than his own. A significant change in the already existing custom was the control of the armed forces; state finances were also in the hands of the tyrants,

---

48. AP VIII,5; Plut. Sol. XX,1.

49. see Travlos, pp.191-2.

and though the introduction of the produce-tax<sup>50</sup> certainly helped the Treasury, again this sort of power was outside the Solonian constitution.

Hignett states<sup>51</sup> that if the Solonian code was retained then it must have been supplemented by fresh statutes, such as <sup>that</sup> providing support for war invalids which <sup>was</sup> said to have been introduced by either Solon or Pisistratus<sup>52</sup>. The regular system of δημοσία τροφή was not created until Periclean – or possibly later – times, and any instances of maintenance will have been paid in kind and not in money<sup>53</sup>. Heraclides attributes the invalid support to Pisistratus and Theophrastus the νόμος ἀργύρας<sup>54</sup> – not to Solon. It may be possible that Pisistratus introduced the εὔθυνα, the investigation of an archon's conduct in his year in office, which could lead to prosecution, in order that he might keep an eye on any archon not ranked amongst his own supporters, and therefore open to suspicion.

Although a number of men entering the Areopagus would be for Pisistratus, either in the capacity of friendly Eupatrids or members of his party, thereby helping to reduce the danger of defiance to the policies of the tyrant, Pisistratus could not have controlled every archon in and out of office, nor could Hippias. A fragment of an archon list<sup>55</sup> shows that certain nobles did hold office who had been against

50. See Chapter III, pp.53-4.

51. C.Hignett, History of the Athenian Constitution, p.19.

52. Plut. Sol. XXXI,3; Schol. Tim. 103.

53. Rhodes, op. cit. pp.175-6.

54. Hdt. II.177,ii assigns the law to Solon; Plut. Sol. XXXI,5: ὡς δὲ ὁ Θεόφραστος ἵστορηκε, κατ τὸν τῆς ἀργύρας νόμον οὐ Σόλων ἔθηκεν, ἀλλὰ Πεισάστρατος. See also Busolt-Swoboda, Griechische Staatskunde, p.815,n.1 claiming that Theophrastus' attribution is mere guesswork.

55. See below, pp.34-5.

Pisistratus previously – as the events of 561–46 have shown. How could Pisistratus control those archons and ex-archons whose behaviour could be open to doubt?

If the outgoing magistrate was found to be corrupt or had not performed his duties sufficiently well in his tenure of office, entry to the Areopagus could be denied him. In other words, Pisistratus may have introduced the εὔθυνται as an indirect means of controlling the archons: a pro-Pisistratid archon could enter the Areopagus without doubt, but one who could possibly prove a danger to the security of the rule could now be stopped lawfully. Again, the power of Pisistratus was absolute, nor did it appear to be an outright flouting of the laws.

The conciliatory style of the régime reconciled most of the people<sup>56</sup>, but nevertheless we find in the σκόλιον to Harmodius and Aristogeiton<sup>57</sup> reference made to the lack of "equality before the law" and the generally arbitrary rule. This cannot be absolutely true: a fair legal innovation had been made in the case of the δικαιστὰς κατὰ δῆμον and all previously existing laws were kept in existence – even the one referring to tyranny. Here some action must have been taken by the tyrants to prohibit its enforcement, though it may not have been deleted from the ἀξονες. The earliest datable law is attributed to Solon<sup>58</sup>, though legislation against tyranny does come earlier<sup>59</sup>. It is

56. AP XVI,7–10.

57. See Chapter VI, p.149.

58. AP VIII,4: ...Σόλωνος θέντος νόμον εἰσαγγελίας περὶ αὐτῶν.

59. See M.Ostwald, TAPA LXXXVI, 1955, pp.103–29 who suggests that the ancient law of AP XVI,10 is Draconian. Plut. Sol. XIX,3–5 could refer to Cylon, whose attempt would have alerted the Athenians to this danger, and maybe Dracon saw the taking of a would-be tyrant's life as justifiable homicide. Swoboda, Beiträge zur griechischen Rechtsgeschichte p.163 n.1, argues that the law must have been preceded by tyranny itself, and places the law after the first or second expulsion of Pisistratus, but this is far too late.

unknown when the original law was enacted. The first enactment may be Draconian laying down as punishment for attempted tyranny death. This could have been amended by Solon in his law code, and trial before the Areopagus substituted for immediate death without trial although still with death the penalty. Now, we are told that Pisistratus himself was once called before the Areopagus to answer a murder charge, but his accuser failed to appear<sup>60</sup>: ὁ δὲ προσκαλεσάμενος φοβηθεὶς ἔλεπεν. Is it possible that the charge of murder was a sham and the real issue involved was the tyranny itself?<sup>61</sup> If things went well with this charge, then perhaps it was hoped to invoke the law against tyranny. The failure of the accuser to appear could stem from a number of reasons: "persuasion" by the Pisistratid party not to press charges, or simply fear at what the outcome might be. This is, of course, hypothesis, but could contain some element of truth: a direct and open charge under the tyranny law could not have been successful; perhaps in this way an attempt could be made on an unsuspecting Pisistratus. After the fall of the tyranny the descendants of the Pisistratids were declared outlaws by the people<sup>62</sup>.

For all the anti-aristocratic bias of the tyranny, Pisistratus needed the aristocracy for their skill and experience in making the government work, and the tyrants set out to create good relations with the noble families as the fragment of the archon list proves<sup>63</sup>. The policies of Pisistratus did break up aristocratic influence and control,

60. AP XVI,8.

61. "Façade charges" hiding more political motivations are frequently found in history, witness the trial of Socrates for one.

62. Thuc. VI.55,i.

63. See B.D.Meritt, Hesp. VIII, 1939, pp.59-65; R.Meiggs & D.M.Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions To The End Of The Fifth Century BC, 6(c).

but to do this without some modicum of power for them to retain would have been political suicide, hence the use of the archonship as a placatory measure.

The fragment of the archon list is important for showing the collaboration of the tyrants with the noble families to make the government work. It bears the names of six archons for the years 527/6-522/1 inclusive: Onetorides, Hippias, Cleisthenes, Miltiades, Calliades, and Pisistratus (son of Hippias). Cleisthenes, archon of 525/4, was the head of the Alcmeonid clan, bitter opponents of the tyrants who engineered their downfall in 510, with Spartan aid. The dating of the archons is dependent on Miltiades' archonship, which is fixed to the year 524/3 by Dionysius of Halicarnassus<sup>64</sup>. Thus, the archons for the years 526/5-524/3 were: Hippias the Pisistratid, Cleisthenes the Alcmeonid, and Miltiades the Philaid. Movement against the tyranny only began to increase significantly during the final, despotic years of Hippias' rule, following the murder of Hipparchus<sup>65</sup>. Such evidence shows the success and diplomacy of Pisistratus in conciliating ambitious men and in keeping the ordinary people too busy and therefore free from political mischief, according to AP<sup>66</sup>: μῆτ, ἐπεθυμῶσι μῆτε σχολάζωσιν ἐπειμελεῖσθαι τῶν κοινῶν. Here, τὰ κοινά (public affairs) includes the administration of justice.

For the ordinary administration of criminal law, magistrates such as the Thesmothetae and the Eleven were available and Pisistratus probably used his position as head of the state to enforce the law. In the cases where the tyranny was threatened with overthrow, the tyrants may have taken a more direct and personal rôle. For example, Hippias

---

64. Dionysius, Rom. Antiq. VII,3.1.

65. Hdt. V.56ff, VI.123; Thuc. VI.59,i-iii.

66. AP XVI,3.

slew Aristogeiton<sup>67</sup> when the latter should have been brought under the jurisdiction of the Areopagus as laid down by Solon. However, it appears that the accused may already have been in custody<sup>68</sup>, which would indicate Hippias over-rode its authority. It appears he did this on numerous occasions in the future too: following the murder of Hipparchus the rule of Hippias was characterised by numerous exiles and executions<sup>69</sup>. No mention is made of the Areopagus' support here; since this body had the authority to order executions it appears Hippias had no need of its approval but issued orders by virtue of his own position. However, it is unknown how far these orders were sanctioned by compliant courts or magistrates.

Pisistratus was also τοῖς ἀμαρτάνουσι συγγνωμονεύσ<sup>70</sup> which could mean he used his autocratic position to rescind an unjust verdict. This implies he held some sort of power of clemency, as did the Roman Emperors. Doubtless the magistrates, knowing of Pisistratus' contacts with their affairs, would be less inclined to fall into venal practices, but this cannot always have been the case. The government of Pisistratus was the first with sufficient authority to enforce respect for the laws on all, and to enforce justice<sup>71</sup>.

In the establishment of the δικαισταὶ κατὰ δῆμος a major institutional step was taken. Dracon's laws were already a move in the direction of uniformity, but Pisistratus made justice more accessible to all, saving the countryman having to journey to Athens to have his

67. AP XVIII,6.

68. Ibid. XVIII,4.

69. Ibid. XIX,1.

70. Ibid. XVI,2.

71. See R.J.Bonner and G.Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle, Vol. I, pp.181-87.

small, private suit heard. The deme judges deprived the local aristocracy of their right to jurisdiction in their own localities. Pisistratus' interest in the administration of justice for curbing the arbitrary local jurisdiction and protecting the people against exploitation stemmed from the need for constant vigilance on his part, despite his victory at Pallene. His tours of the demes<sup>72</sup> reflect this policy of showing himself to the people in order to keep an eye on events, and the words διαλύων τοὺς διαφερομένους suggest some sort of arbitration.

The case of the "tax-free" farmer<sup>73</sup> shows the extent to which Pisistratus did control taxation - he could abolish all forms of taxation just as he could introduce it. Perhaps on such a tour he thought of the idea of itinerant judges, officially independent magistrates (like the archons) but, in practice, no doubt subject to his authority, to judge those cases worth not more than ten drachmae. Like Pisistratus, these judges attempted to effect a compromise before passing judgement<sup>74</sup>. Apart from being part of the tyrant's concern for the well-being of the people, AP points out that it was also a measure to keep the people on their farms to help promote agriculture, but also to prevent them coming to Athens where their accumulation could be politically dangerous to the régime<sup>75</sup>.

The cases before the δικασταὶ κατὰ δήμους were all private cases involving small claims; most of the public cases were dealt with by the Areopagus and individual archons. Cornelius believed the 'Demenrichter' replaced some kind of local court previously in the

---

72. AP XVI,5.

73. Ibid. XVI,6.

74. R.J.Bonner, CPh. XI,1916, pp.191-96.

75. AP XVI,3.

hands of the nobility by the tyrant<sup>76</sup>. This is quite possible and if so, as in the case of the Solonian constitution, an existing procedure will have been adapted. The rural judges were abolished on the fall of the tyranny, and it was not until 453/2 that they were re-introduced, this time to number thirty<sup>77</sup>. In the fourth century they numbered forty and ceased to be itinerant<sup>78</sup>. The answer to why they were abolished is unknown, but it seems a likely enough action to get rid of the innovation of a hated régime. In creating the δικαστικὰ δήμους Pisistratus was influenced more by political considerations than judicial which caused the restoration of the judges: they reported their finds to him from tours, so he knew how things lay in the demes. At the same time he took the first step of what was later to be one of the most admirable features of the fourth century legal system: public arbitration, and credit is due for this<sup>79</sup>.

A question arising in connection with the tyrants' view of citizenship is, how many new citizens owed their position to the tyrants, and was the privilege of granting citizenship abused by the tyrants? Solon, with the σεισάχθεια, began the process by which all men would be theoretically equal but apart from strengthening the plebeian element in society, Pisistratus did very little else, since the thetes were already eligible to attend the Assembly. Following the overthrow of the tyranny, AP<sup>80</sup> says the Athenians voted to deny those

76. F.Cornelius, Die Tyrannis in Athen, p.53: "Die Demenrichter müssen vielmehr andere ländliche Gerichte abgelöst haben, und die wird man vor der Peisistratidenzeit nur...in den Händen der Adelsgeschlechter suchen dürfen."

77. AP XXVI,3.

78. Ibid. LIII,1.

79. See R.J.Bonner, CPh. XIX,1924, pp.359-61 for the powers of the judges.

80. AP XIII,5.

new citizens their privileges, with the διαφοράς, considering they had received them illegally under the tyranny. Obviously, some new citizens were created, amongst them Pisistratus' Thracian henchmen, and the increase in number can be credibly attached to the tyranny period, but the scale of enfranchisement was not great.

A number of people must have owed their new status to the tyrants and would not wish for it to be removed in any way – another reason for supporting their rule. It is unlikely that Pisistratus, with his pro-Athenian policies, would think he was abusing the growing importance of Athenian citizenship, for one thing he would not wish to have any of his Thracian support in office at Athens, but others may have thought this. Solon's awarding of citizenship to those craftsmen coming to live and work in Athens<sup>81</sup> cannot, surely, be ranked as an abuse. Naturally, the nobility would oppose any such measure which was both untraditional and attacked the ancient phratry system.

Finally, it remains to consider the ναυκαρία, a subject so complicated that, with the lack of evidence too, one can only really say that Pisistratus may have remodelled an already existing system for a new purpose.

The ναυκαρία were the forty-eight administrative districts<sup>82</sup> into which Attica was divided for taxation purposes, each one to provide one battle-ship and levy money and contingents for the army, and each headed by a ναύκαρος. Since the expense of providing a ship would fall on the wealthier elements of society, it would be natural to choose a ναύκαρος from them, and Pollux<sup>83</sup> says each naucracy

81. Plut. Sol. XXIV, 4.

82. The suggestion of the naucraries being local divisions is supported by Photius and I. Bekker, Anecdota Graeca I.275, 20 concerning Κωλύας (a strip of coast near Phalerum), as a "region of Attica ... also a ναυκαρία."

83. Pollux VIII, 108.

supplied one ship and two horsemen, implying the wealthy were responsible for a large part of the contribution<sup>84</sup>. In Bekker<sup>85</sup> the ναῦκραποι are defined as "those who provide ships and act as trierarchs, being subordinate to the polemarch".

Under the Solonian legislation, their chief function was the collection and disbursement of public funds for various purposes. In earlier times a large part of these funds were used essentially for naval support, and later in non-naval activities. No evidence exists as to whether they had any other judicial and administrative functions, apart from controlling the naucratic treasury and the εἰσφορα, which in this context probably means nothing more specific than "revenue". AP<sup>86</sup> says of the ναῦκραποι that they were responsible for the income and expenditure of their ναυκραρία.

Opinion is divided as to whether or not the ναυκραρία existed before Solon. The evidence does seem to suggest a pre-Solonian existence: AP uses the pluperfect νενεμημέναι to show that the divisions are datable to before Solon, and Herodotus<sup>87</sup> introduces the ναῦκραποι in connection with the Cylonian conspiracy and says at that time their presidents (πρυτάνεις) held an important position in the Athenian government: οἱ πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων οὕπερ ἐνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας. Thus, it appears that the πρυτάνεις must have been instituted well before Solon. Yet, Thucydides<sup>88</sup> contradicts Herodotus by replacing the πρυτάνεις with the nine archons: τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολιτειῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἀρχοντες ἐπρασσον, which must be correct. Herodotus, showing his

84. See also: R.J.Bonner, CPh. XXIII, 1928, pp.19-25.

85. Bekker, op. cit. I.283.

86. AP VIII,3.

87. Hdt. V.71,ii.

88. Thuc. I.126,viii.

Alcmeonid bias here, was anxious to exculpate the archon Megacles from the guilt of his action in having the Cylonian supporters put to death despite their having claimed sanctuary. He hoped to throw the blame of sacrilege on another board of magistrates, hence the belief of the πρυτάνεις' important position<sup>89</sup>.

Photius<sup>90</sup> mistakenly quotes AP as his authority in attributing the origin of the ναυκραπος to Solon: Σόλωνος οὗτως ὄνομάσαντος, ὡς οὐλ 'Αριστοτέλης φησί. Hommel<sup>91</sup> dates the financial functions before Solon, but does recognise that the body underwent some evolutionary change, possibly owing to Pisistratus. Beloch<sup>92</sup> dates it to the time of Pisistratus:

"Die Gesetze, durch die das alles geregelt wurde und die Aristoteles für solonisch gehalten hat (AP 8,3) müssen in Wahrheit von Peisistratos herrühren, wenigstens zum grössten Teil, wenn auch immerhin Solon die Grundzüge der Organisation geschaffen haben mag."

Again, if it is right, this is a case of Pisistratus making use of an already existing system and adapting this to his own purpose, perhaps giving the ναυκραποια other administrative functions to help the needs of the Treasury and to increase governmental centralisation.

Hommel<sup>93</sup> believes in the extension of the function of the ναυκραποια to cover the whole of Attica as opposed to the coastal regions only, or alternatively, all of the wealthier citizens becoming liable to taxation. The former appears to be the more likely and may be attributed to Pisistratus.

89. See Hignett, op. cit. p.69.

90. Photius, s.v. ναυκραποια.

91. Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, XVI, pp.1938-51.

92. Beloch, G.G.<sup>2</sup> I.2, p.327.

93. See also Hignett, op. cit. pp.70-71.

In the seventh century the unity of Attica was not an important issue since only the nobility, chasing the high political offices, were concerned with such matters; the ordinary person looked to his local master for protection. The work of Solon began the change to democracy with measures including the right of appeal, the codification of the laws, and the making of wealth as opposed to birth the qualification for public office, to break the Eupatrid monopoly of office. His constitution failed with the demand for more far-reaching economic and political reforms, which only a tyrant could supply.

The most creditable action on the part of Pisistratus was the enforcement of the Solonian constitution, and the measures taken to create a united Attica subservient to a Central Executive. Yet he wisely worked to maintain a working relationship with the noble families, and his skill in reconciling the opposition impressed many. Although the local power bases of the nobility were not destroyed, their previous power was drastically curtailed, and the villages of Attica began to lose local prejudices and turn increasingly to the city in a common pride and allegiance.

"... the idea of citizenship, fully but to some extent only theoretically defined by Solon, acquired another element of real meaning. The man from Marathon was still very much a Marathonian, but increasingly acquiring non-Marathonian interests and as he did so he became slowly aware that he belonged to a much wider body, the Athenian demos."<sup>94</sup>

In his dealings with the people Pisistratus went further than Solon but not as far as Cleisthenes in enhancing their political development. The demos grew increasingly self-confident as a result of this, so that in

---

94. W.G.Forrest, The Emergence of Greek Democracy, p.189.

in the fifth century it can be said that:

"The demos ... was conscious of itself being the ultimate arbiter of policy ... now becomes its own defender and patron of its successive leaders. The corporate feeling which made this possible was in large part the creation of the Peisistratidae."

Pisistratus nevertheless was an unconstitutional ruler who exercised autocratic power to maintain his position by controlling state policy and tolerating no other party except his own. Although Plate and Aristotle viewed tyranny as the worst form of government, one cannot describe the rule of Pisistratus in the post-Aristotelian sense of tyranny. Indeed, his rule had been referred to as a "Golden Age"<sup>96</sup>, and can be summed up in the words of De Sanctis as, "La Fine dell'anarchia"<sup>97</sup>. The fact that a tyrant existed did not, in this case, render the existing constitution null as Pisistratus worked through it to put it into practice: Athenian advancement towards democracy was not halted, and aristocratic faction was replaced by a stable and less biased government.

---

95. A. Andrewes, The Greek Tyrants, p.115.

96. AP XVI,7: ὁ επὶ Κρόνου βασ.

97. G. De Sanctis, Atthis<sup>3</sup>, p.331.

### Chapter III

#### TRADE AND THE ECONOMY

Athens, the centre of a brilliant civilisation, was one of the most advanced states at the end of the Dark Ages, but was surpassed by others: for example Attic Late Geometric II ware was overtaken by that of Corinth. Although the Attic peninsula is some one thousand square miles, the soil, excluding that of the fertile plain of Athens, is generally poor and unable to support a large population. This, plus the lack of raw materials and the widespread exploitation of the poor farmers<sup>1</sup> or *ēxtr̄mopol* bound to the local landowners, was causing serious discontent.

We may assume that the soil was growing increasingly less productive with no fertilisation or crop-rotation system in operation. Although no population statistics exist for early Greece, it is clear that increasing population would pose a serious problem. This would lead to a division of family land between too many sons and lead to the exploitation of the soil for more grain. It is unsurprising therefore to find so much importance attached to fertility rites in Greek religion, especially the cult of Dionysus, as the farmers turned to magic in order to bring relief. As the cereal surpluses diminished so grain prices rose (ruining the small farmer with no surplus to sell), but grain prices in general decreased with the importation of foreign grain - a factor which aggravated the agricultural crisis. The end product was the poor turning for help to the local lord and in return continuing to work the land but bound to him in a state of virtual enslavement: citizens in theory only.

---

1. AP II,2, IX,1; Plut. Sol. XV,2.

Some measures were thought of to try to alleviate the situation, for example the surplus population could be exported (but this option was not attempted – Athens did not join in the colonising movement until quite late on, by which time all of the choice sites had been taken by other states), food could be imported, or there could be a general increase of grain production at home. The last sounds the most obvious solution, but was impracticable owing to Attica's thin top soil<sup>2</sup> which could not take increased production. The fall in grain prices probably played a part in the move to olive and vine cultivation, an export product of great value in the Athenian economy, and a crop which had the advantage of being able to grow on poor land unfit for grain growing. The drawback here lay in the fact that olive trees take a generation to mature, and consequently during this period the farmer would experience further hardship – a reason for Pisistratus' later produce tax<sup>3</sup>?

Since the aristocracy in charge of the running of the state were unable to meet these problems satisfactorily, the social and economic conditions were inviting tyranny. However, in 594 Solon was elected archon with extraordinary powers to relieve the situation<sup>4</sup>.

Very briefly, Solon's economic legislation involved the placing of a ban on δανείζειν επὶ τοῖς σώμασιν for the future, and the σεισάχθεια which abolished all rural debts. It is difficult to ascertain precisely what the debts incurred would be – money may be ruled out since Athens was not coining then<sup>5</sup>. Solon claims to have

2. Thuc. I.2,v.

3. See below, pp. 52–3.

4. AP V,2; Plut. Sol. XIV,1–4.

5. See below, pp. 60–61.

uprooted the *σροι* and thus to have liberated the earth<sup>6</sup>, which suggests the *σευσάχθεια* cancelled the principal obligations of the *ἐκτήμοροι*, namely, the one-sixth of produce payable to the lord. Perhaps also there were some with additional debts, payable to either the state or a local temple, which would also be cancelled.

Excluding olive oil, Solon banned the export of all natural produce to keep what little grain there was at home to help feed the people. This measure and the encouragement given to olive cultivation did much to encourage the economic prosperity of Attica. By this time there was a growing interest in the commercial development of the city, and Solon issued a decree ordering each father to have his sons taught a trade<sup>7</sup> and encouraging foreign craftsmen to live and work in Athens with grants of citizenship<sup>8</sup>. The Solonian reforms secured the freedom of the peasantry, and the impetus given to commercial expansion, along with the political legislation<sup>9</sup>, opened the way to a growth of trade and the economy.

The lack of source material concerning the causes of rural discontent which still continued and indeed grew worse, has led to the rise of much conjecture. Despite the *σευσάχθεια* the people still hungered: Solon may have given the peasant farmers their freedom, but a redistribution of land was needed. The commercial growth and agricultural discontent must be linked with the rise of Pisistratus: the people looked to him for a land distribution, and he is made the champion of the poor against the rich men of the plain by Aristotle<sup>10</sup>.

6. M.L.West, Iambi et Elegi Graeci II, fr.36,3-7.

7. Plut. Sol. XXII, 1.

8. Plut. ibid. XXIV, 4.

9. See Chapter II, pp.23-4.

10. Arist. Pol. V, 1305a23-24: οὗτοι 'Αθήνησι τε Πεισώστρατος στασιάσας πρὸς τοὺς πεδιλακούς.

It appears though that the chief complaint of the masses lay along more political lines: their enslavement whilst still Athenian citizens. The serfs could be sold into slavery if they defaulted, and the ὅρος was seen as a symbol of this serfdom. The only hope of salvation lay in a cancellation of debts, which came about with the σεισάχθεια.

A major question arising is, what happened to the land after the σεισάχθεια? Was it restored completely to the ἔκτημοροι since it had traditionally been their own property before they had pledged themselves to the lord? It appears from Plutarch<sup>11</sup> that Solon had no intention of redistributing land, and therefore it remained in the hands of the landlords. But, if this was the case, how did Attica later become a state of prosperous small farmers? This, surely, indicates the ἔκτημοροι were owners of the land which they continued to occupy. No positive evidence can be found in the sources and their silence concerning such a striking action has led French to believe no such thing took place<sup>12</sup>.

However, a passage in AP<sup>13</sup> implies that the people received some property but wanted more. It is likely that the σεισάχθεια made the peasants unburdened owners of the land of which they had previously been burdened occupants, as in the sense that while they paid their share the land was their own, but if they defaulted, the landlord was free both to enslave the debtor and to take over the land.

11. Plut. Sol. XV,7: ὅτι γῆν μὲν οὐ μέλλει κινεῖν.

12. A.French, CQ<sup>2</sup> VI, 1956, pp.20-25; see also J.Day and M.Chambers, Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy, pp.168-9.

13. AP XI,2.

The period 600-550 saw the Solonian reforms having fruitful effects and Athenian goods can be detected throughout the area of the Mediterranean in increasing quantities. This is especially seen in the case of pottery, where archaeological evidence indicates an increase in the number of Attic exports to the North-West and West, thus showing a growing volume of trade, and Attic pots appear in greater quantities at home too<sup>14</sup>.

Ure<sup>14a</sup> suggested that the rise of Pisistratus, which he bases on commercial factors and the exploitation of the mines of Laurium, may be linked with this boom. This view is untrue - for one thing effective exploitation of these mines only began in about 525<sup>15</sup>. No specific grievances are known in the period between Solon and Pisistratus; perhaps everything revolved around Solon's having given the poor less than some of them hoped, and more than the rich had wanted. The most important known event of this period was the war against Megara and the capture of Salamis<sup>16</sup> which found its origin in commercial considerations. "The war for Salamis was most probably fought to make possible the free use to Athenian ships of the ports of Southern Attica, as well as to open the route to the isthmus of Corinth."<sup>17</sup>

Salamis improved trading facilities with the Western Greeks by allowing trade to pass through the harbours nearest Athens without hindrance from enemy boats based on Salamis. Before Athens controlled Salamis, the natural way for goods into Attica was by the ports of

14. See B.L.Bailey, JHS LX, 1940, pp.60-71.

14a. Ure, pp.36-8.

15. C.M.Kraay, The Composition of Greek Silver Coins, p.33. It was only then that Attic coins were made of Attic silver.

16. See Chapter IV, pp.83-4.

17. A.French, JHS LXXVII, 1957, p.238.

East Attica, notably Prasiae<sup>18</sup>. The most important early Athenian trade route was that running from East Attica north-west along the coast of Euboea, then north to Thessaly and Macedonia. Grain importation was vital for the needs of the city, but there was also a need for timber (used for fuel and in the ship-building trade). Perhaps some Athenian ships, or ships trading with Athens, used the Southern Attic ports, but a dangerous run with Salamis in anti-Athenian hands prevented a great volume of trade passing this way.

The rapid rise in city population<sup>19</sup> with the general westward shift from the east coast<sup>20</sup> resulted in the need for more grain which could be obtained in larger quantities (and perhaps more cheaply) from the Pontus area. This was, however, a bulky cargo and it was necessary to land it as close to the city as possible, rather than transport it by land from the east coast. However, the former meant the dangerous run from the Black Sea to Phaleron, which ended with patrols from a hostile Salamis. Before Attic trade could be developed on any scale in the North-East a friendly base was needed in that area (and therefore Sigeum was secured), and the possession or neutralisation of Salamis. The city went to war over that island, as the physical wants of Attica could never remain static nor could the peninsula ever be self-sufficient in grain production<sup>21</sup>.

The development of trade had a profound effect upon economic life, and consequently the population distribution of Attica. If one assumes this distribution to be according to the carrying capacity of

18. The early importance of this port is attested by Pausanias I.31,2

19. Plut. Sol. XXII,1: τὸ ἄστυ πιεμπλάμενον.

20. See below, p.50.

21. Indeed Plato Republic II,370E admits that no Greek state was ever really self-sufficient: ...κατοίκουσαι γε αὐτὴν τὴν πόλιν εἰς τοιοῦτον τόπον, οὐ ἐπεισαγωγέμων μὴ δεήσεται, σχεδόν τι ἀδύνατον.

the land, grain being the staple food, the densest areas of population should be in the grain producing regions. Thus, those living in the poor areas on the east coast depended upon being able to exchange their wool, wine, oil and honey for grain. French<sup>22</sup> puts forward the theory that this coast declined in usefulness as Phaleron overtook Prasiae in importance. If this was the case, those depending on Prasiae would be forced to move in order to survive, hence a westward shift to Athens where imported corn was available and some employment. This aggravated conditions for those already in the city, since what little grain or jobs did exist were insufficient to meet the demands of the increased population. With the switch in production from grain to olives resulting in less labour being required for harvesting, a revolutionary situation was created which only a tyrant could solve - hence the emergence of Pisistratus.

Pisistratus' first problem lay in the agricultural sphere. In effect the poor were reduced to the same position as before their hectemorage - i.e. as crops failed again so there would be further need of help, only this time, owing to the *σεισάχθεια*, they had no security to put up. The only solution appeared to be a basic redistribution of the land, which Solon, believing his own measures to be enough of a solution, had thought fit not to do. Aristotle<sup>23</sup> mentions a decree passed by Solon to limit the amount of land a person could own, to prevent large estates forming, which indicates a loss of land was envisaged.

The logical step for Pisistratus to have taken was to settle

22. A.French, G&R<sup>2</sup>VI, 1959, pp.46-58.

23. Arist. Pol. II,1266b16-18: οἶον καὶ Σόλων ἐνομοθέτησεν, καὶ παρ' ἄλλους ἔστι νόμος ὃς κωλύει κτᾶσθαι γῆν ὀπόσην ἀν βουληταί τις, but as no other evidence for this exists, perhaps Aristotle is mistaken on this point.

the poor on land taken from those nobles leaving Attica after Pallene. However, on this point a great deal of controversy has arisen, since the ancient authorities nowhere tell us what Pisistratus did. Too little is known on the agricultural issue, but perhaps the silence of the sources is indicative. The number of large enough estates cannot have been great, therefore if there was a resettlement policy using these abandoned lands the acreage available would ensure that only a limited number of the distressed would be satisfied. In the long term a resettlement policy such as this would be fruitful, but in the short term it was unlikely to increase the food production of Attica on which the city depended - and this was the immediate problem. Also, confiscation of land could result in whetting the opposition which would be politically disadvantageous, and when the Alcmeonidae did return there is no mention of them having to buy back land.

It is more than likely that the farmers, now in possession of their own lands again, kept them and received help in the form of loans from the tyrant when needed. For those in the city, loans could be advanced to set them up in olive farming, for example. Apart from the economic aspect of Pisistratus' back to the land policy to increase rural production, it is also possible to detect a political side<sup>24</sup>:

"τοῦτο δ' ἔποιει δυοῖν χάριν, ὅνα μῆτε ἐν τῷ ἀστεῖ διατρέβωσιν, ἀλλὰ διεπαρμένοις κατὰ τὴν χώραν, καὶ ὅπως εὐποροῦντες τῶν μετρίων καὶ πρὸς τοῖς Ἰδίοις δύντες, μητ' ἐπιθυμῶσι μῆτε σχολάζωσιν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν κοινῶν."

which is also found expressed by Aristotle referring to tyranny in general<sup>25</sup>. By dispersing the people the threat of political activity

24. AP XVI,3.

25. Arist. Pol. V,1311a13-14, VI,1320b7.

on their part was reduced, since the concentration of the people in the city could be politically dangerous.

The basic agricultural problem of what the land was best suited for was solved by the development of olive cultivation, leading to the export of olive oil which enabled Athens to pay for the much-needed grain imports. This stimulated pottery manufacture, since pots were required as container vessels for the oil. The olive growth also showed this to be a peaceful period: olive trees take some eighteen years to mature and are very easily destroyed. Loans by the state would help alleviate hardships incurred in the change-over period from grain to olive cultivation.

Concerning the loans, a view recently put forward<sup>26</sup> links them with this olive cultivation. As well as helping farmers on already cultivated land, the loans could have been made to establish olive farms on land not previously cultivated, as only small, intensive settlements would be needed. This deliberate policy by the tyrants appears to have a sound economic basis: apart from the increase in production, there would be no disruption in grain production from resettlement on cultivated land, i.e. not swopping land able to grow grain for olives. It should be pointed out, that in the beginning the vast majority of the loans came from Pisistratus himself: he deserves much credit for this. His advancement of money to those in need may also be found in a passage of AP<sup>27</sup>: "...καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῖς ἀπόροις προεδάνεις χρήματα πρὸς τὰς ἐργασίας, ὅστε διατρέφεσθαι γεωργοῦντας."

Controversy has also arisen over the introduction of a tax (see below, pp.53-54), but whatever the actual amount, what was the point

---

26. J. Holladay, G&R<sup>2</sup> XXIV, 1977, pp.40-57.

27. AP XVI,2.

of it? It seems unlikely to have been a life-time subsidy for the poor farmers, and therefore probably the tax was introduced to advance money for the period while olive trees matured. Pisistratus' solution would be more acceptable than a wholesale confiscation of land, and at the same time provided another source of revenue. By 510 the agrarian crisis appeared to be resolved and Solon's economic work completed. Attica was to remain a country of prosperous small-holders, and in helping the middle class Pisistratus contributed to the development of the hoplite class which was the solid basis of the Athenian democracy.

It is interesting to note that in such economic situations tyranny as an institution emerges: in the case of Pisistratus who derived much of his wealth from Rhaecelus, the person with his wealth in liquid capital as opposed to the nobility having their money in land is usually in a much better political position. Liquid capital was a powerful political lever in Athens as in Megara<sup>28</sup> and where wealth accumulated tyranny usually coincided<sup>29</sup>.

The major source of Pisistratus' revenue lay in the produce tax which Thucydides states was levied at 5%: εἰκοστή in connection with Pisistratus' sons<sup>30</sup>, and which AP states was levied at 10%<sup>31</sup>: ἐπράττετο γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν γιγνομένων δεκάτην . Again, very little is known about the financial basis of the tyranny. Dover<sup>32</sup> interprets the δεκάτη as being a generic name, parallel to our word tithe, whereby an

28. See Theognis 53f.

29. As Thucydides notes in I.13.i: Δυνατωτέρας δὲ γιγνομένης τῆς Ἐλλάδος καὶ τῶν χρημάτων τὴν κτῆσιν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ποιουμένης τὰ πολλὰ τυραννύδες ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι καθίσταντο.

30. Thuc. VI.54.v.

31. AP XVI,4.

32. K.J.Dover, Historical Commentary on Thucydides IV, pp.329-30.

exaction, not necessarily at 10%, could be termed a tithe. However, it is likely that the tax was introduced at a rate of 10% by Pisistratus, but as the demand for loans decreased over the years as a result of economic prosperity, it could safely be lowered to 5% perhaps by Hippias, since some taxation was necessary for internal revenue<sup>33</sup>.

Pisistratus' own possessions, such as those on the Strymon, and revenues from state lands (which later included the Laurium mines) also contributed as direct sources of revenue. Indirect taxation probably took the form of customs dues etc. which was the normal practice in the ancient world. In the reign of Hippias a new tax on births and deaths was introduced which, despite its apparently non-extortionate rate of one ear of barley, one of corn, and one obol, proved unpopular<sup>34</sup>. There was also a tax introduced for protruding higher stories of buildings<sup>35</sup>, all of which provided extra revenue for the Treasury. Hippias has been credited with calling in and reissuing the coinage<sup>36</sup> at less value, for self-enrichment (see below, p.60); whether this issue was the new Owl coinage is open to doubt, as will be seen below.

Against the revenues, the greatest outlays will have been the maintenance of cults, especially sacrifices, and the public works programme. Cavaignac<sup>37</sup> lists the cult expenditure among the few things burdening the Athenian budget before the Persian Wars, and Andreades says<sup>38</sup> quite rightly: "But admittedly the religious cults from the

33. See also J.E.Sandys, Constitution of Athens<sup>2</sup>, p.63.

34. Ps-Arist. Oeconomica II,1347a15-18; Glotz and Cohen, p.462.

35. Ps-Arist. ibid. II,1347a4-8.

36. Ps-Arist. ibid. II,1347a8-11.

37. E.Cavaignac, L'économie grecque, pp.81-82.

38. A.Andreades, History of Greek Public Finance p.230.

point of view of finance survived rather as an element of expenditure rather than as a source of revenue." According to one source<sup>39</sup> Athens spent as much money on festivals as all the other Greeks (but this can hardly be true), while another<sup>40</sup> says the Athenians celebrated more festivals than any other Greeks. One sixth of the year was apparently devoted to religious festivals<sup>41</sup>. The actual expenditure on buildings was comparatively small; cash outlays would only be made for paying foreign sculptors and architects, and for the purchase of roof-tiles etc.; the men employed were paid for their work in kind: food and/or shelter. The latter expenditure would not run to the amount needed for the former.

The upkeep of a private army<sup>42</sup> rather than the cheaper (but more politically dangerous) citizen militia must have been a heavy drain on resources, although we are told that Pisistratus paid for it out of his own funds. This brings us to the problem: to what extent was this Pisistratus' own money as opposed to that of the state, but it seems reasonable to suppose that in the beginning of his third tyranny the state produced only as many coins as it thought it was going to need. In this case, no reserve stock was built up and therefore the upkeep of this bodyguard did stem from personal funds. The costs of external defence were negligible: Attica was not invaded until 511 by which time the Treasury was strong enough to deal with the situation. Loans to farmers by the state may appear to be a heavy source of public revenue; in Classical and Hellenistic times loans could be secured at a rate of 33½%, but it is unknown what the interest

39. Ps-Plato Alcibiades II,148E.

40. Ps-Xenophon Ath. Pol. III,2.

41. Schol. Aristoph. Wasps 663.

42. Hdt. I.64,i.

rate was in the sixth century, or even if, for example, individuals owning ships relied on borrowed capital<sup>43</sup>.

The Athenians had realised that a possible source of wealth lay in the lead and silver mines of SE Attica, but had done little to exploit them effectively in the early days. Some mining is known in Attica in the earlier period<sup>44</sup>, and Xenophon asserts the antiquity of the Laurium mines<sup>45</sup>. It is plausible that most of the Aegean must have used silver from Thrace and Macedonia before full-scale exploitation of the Attic mines began. Perhaps the lead and silver used in Mycenaean times came from there, but this is only conjecture. That the mining industry is seen as a means of ending Athens' grave financial problems in the fourth century is shown by Xenophon in the Poroi, thus stressing its importance.

It has been assumed that Pisistratus had some connection with the Laurium mines<sup>46</sup>, owning property in that region: from the richness of the fifth century yield it appears that a higher and poorer level must have first been worked, perhaps in the time of the Pisistratids. It is known that he had interests in the mining industry<sup>47</sup>, but it is wrong to accept the theory of Ure<sup>48</sup> that Pisistratus led a mob of militant silver miners. For one thing this does not explain his success in the Assembly vote of 561/0<sup>49</sup>, and also the mines only became

43. See H. Bolkestein, Economic Life in Greece's Golden Age, p. 112f; M. Calhoun, Business Life in Athens.

44. See R. J. Hopper, Trade and Industry in Classical Greece, pp. 170-71.

45. Xenophon, Poroi IV, 2.

46. Ure, pp. 36-7.

47. For example, his Thracian connections and Rhaecelus in the second exile.

48. Ure, pp. 38ff.

49. See Chapter II, p. 26.

important in the reign of Hippias<sup>50</sup>. Capitalisation of the mining industry was a consequence of the tyranny. In levying the produce tax, though, Pisistratus may have intended some of the loans for the mining prospectors; mining requires a large capital investment and in sixth century Athens there could be few men able to risk losing money in mining speculations<sup>51</sup>. It is not until 483 that a decree is known making the first relatively clear statement about the Laurium mines when Themistocles persuaded the Assembly to divert some money into the building of a fleet<sup>52</sup>.

Glotz and Cohen state<sup>53</sup>: "L'État athénien n'avait jamais eu de finances", but this is too cynical a view for the Pisistratid period. Pisistratus himself controlled all state finances and access to the Treasury, and under his control this organ was put on a working basis. Whether or not the tyrants distinguished between their personal funds and the state treasury is a matter unknown, but it does seem unlikely for Pisistratus (in Roman terms) to have observed any distinction between the aerarium and his patrimonium. For one thing he did not need to account to anyone for withdrawals made for personal or public expenditure.

Controversy exists concerning the date of introduction for Athenian coinage and Solon's alleged influence on it. Before turning to this, a brief summary may be made of early currency.

There is evidence<sup>54</sup> that the Greeks were using some sort of

50. See above, p.48.

51. R.J.Hopper, G&R<sup>2</sup> VIII, 1961, pp.138-52.

52. AP XXII,7 gives the date of 483/2 (Νεκομήδου ἄρχοντος), but the earliest evidence is found in Hdt. VII,144.

53. Glotz and Cohen, p.451.

54. W.L.Brown, NC<sup>6</sup> <sup>X</sup> 1950, pp.177-98.

iron spit currency before coins of precious metal were introduced, and iron spits continued to be used into the sixth century when we hear of Rhodopis at Delphi dedicating a tithe of her earnings in that form<sup>55</sup>.

Herodotus tells us<sup>56</sup> that the Lydians under Croesus were the first κάπηλοι, and he is probably following the earliest authority on the subject, Xenophanes<sup>57</sup>. The earliest Greek silver coinage was that of Aegina, with the famous turtle design<sup>58</sup>. Corinth began soon after with a Pegasus stamp and a "Koppa", the archaic Greek first letter of the word "Corinthians".

Little evidence exists for the original purpose of coinage, leading to speculation yet again. Seltman<sup>59</sup> says the original purpose was to pay for mercenaries<sup>60</sup> which is plausible as the smallest electrum coinage (the "ninety-sixth") was worth one-third of a sheep - far too large for any small <sup>κ</sup>ommercial transactions. In Solonian times, not far from the introduction of coined money, we are told that a drachma was worth one sheep<sup>61</sup>. Kraay<sup>62</sup> suggests that as life was growing more complex and the functions of the government more complicated with the number of official payments and receipts, less cumbersome pieces of metal were required than were in use then. These

55. Hdt. II.135,iv.

56. Hdt. I.94,i: ... πρῶτοι δὲ ἀνθρώπων τῶν ήμεῖς ὕδμεν νόμισμα χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου κοφάμενοι ἔχρισαντο, πρῶτοι δὲ καὶ κάπηλοι ἐγένοντο.

57. Pollux Onom. IX,83.

58. Dated c.565/60 by C.M.Kraay, NC<sup>7</sup> XVII, 1977, p.198, c.550 by M. Price & N.Waggoner, The Asyut Hoard, p.76.

59. C.T.Seltman, Greek Coins: a history of metallic currency and coinage down to the fall of the Hellenistic Kingdoms<sup>2</sup>, XI.

60. A view supported by R.M.Cook, Hist. VII, 1958, pp.257-63.

61. Plut. Sol. XXIII,3.

62. Kraay, JHS LXXXIV, 1964, p.90.

pieces were eventually transformed into specific amounts of currency by the governments, and thus coinage was created.

The first issues of Athenian coins preceding the owl and helmeted head of Athena are known as the Wappenmünzen, and mostly consist of didrachms weighing 8.6g and bearing a number of different types - for example, a horse, owl, amphora, or bull's head. These were struck at one central mint: Athens. Seltman had a theory that Athens struck with a variety of heraldic badges of the nobility, but this has been proved wrong<sup>63</sup>. The Wappenmünzen appear to date from the Pisistratid era, with the owl coins succeeding them probably in the reign of Hippias<sup>64</sup>. Although the Athenian coinage was so influential and voluminous, its very uniformity makes dating so difficult - at least in the time prior to the Persian Wars. Consequently, the terminal date of the Wappenmünzen and the introduction of the Owls cannot be fixed with any great certainty.

Levy<sup>65</sup> fixes the Wappenmünzen to the time of Solon, but it is most unlikely that Athens was coining at this time, and therefore the passage of AP<sup>66</sup> referring to Solon cannot be taken as true. The Wappenmünzen may possibly be ascribed to Pisistratus: his government was in a strong enough position to enforce the introduction of an officially-sponsored coinage, demanded by the incomes from revenues and the increase in goods and so forth unable to be paid for in kind, for example mercenaries.

63. See R.J.Hopper, CQ<sup>2</sup> X, 1960, pp.242-48.

64. See Kraay, op. cit. pp.188-98 and for his earlier arguments: NC<sup>6</sup> XVI, 1956, pp.43-69.

65. E.Levy, La Parola del Passato XXVII, 1973, pp.88-92.

66. AP X,2: ἐπ' ἐκείνου γὰρ ἐγένετο καὶ τὰ μέτρα μείζω τῶν Φειδωνείων, καὶ ἡ μνᾶ πρότερον ἔχουσα σταθμὸν ἐβδομήκοντα δραχμάς, ἀνεπληρώθη ταῖς ἐκατόντα.

The contents of the Taranto Hoard (six hundred coins of which nearly all were minted in Italy and Sicily), make the Owls contemporary with the change at Corinth of the reverse head of Athena which the Asyut Hoard (nine hundred silver coins discovered in 1969) places about 500 BC. Wallace<sup>67</sup> pointed out that a date of 510 was quite likely with the end of the tyranny and the establishment of democracy. But the two did not take place in the same year, and it seems unlikely in the chaos following the overthrow of the tyranny and renewed faction strife that a new and powerful piece of Athenian propaganda would be launched. Williams<sup>68</sup> dates the Owls to the reign of Hippias, basing his theory on the text of Pseudo-Aristotle, Oeconomica, II, 1347a8 which mentions Hippias declaring the existing coinage ἀδόκτονος and recalling it. Price and Waggoner<sup>69</sup> put a date before 510 as unlikely, while Gabrici<sup>70</sup> and Hill<sup>71</sup> state the last quarter of the sixth century as a date.

Thus, numismatists tend towards a lower starting date than those implied in the literary sources, and currently Price and Waggoner offer the most extreme view, placing the Wappenmünzen in c.545 or later, and the Owls between 510 and 506. Kraay<sup>72</sup> in reviewing Price and Waggoner suggests c.527-20 for the Owls. It is wrong to follow Hammond<sup>73</sup> and Weidauer<sup>74</sup> who believe in even higher dates. The low

67. W.P.Wallace, NC<sup>7</sup> II, 1962, pp.23-43.

68. R.T.Williams, NC<sup>7</sup> VI, 1966, pp.9-14.

69. Price and Waggoner, op. cit. pp.64-8.

70. E.Gabrici, Tecnica e cronologia delle monete Greche, p.54.

71. G.F.Hill, Historical Greek Coins, p.9 and no.5.

72. Kraay, NC<sup>7</sup> XVII, 1977, pp.188-89.

73. N.G.L.Hammond, History of Greece<sup>2</sup>, p.661.

74. L.Weidauer, Probleme der Frühen Elektronprägung.

dating of Price and Waggoner leaves rather a short time in which to fit in the coins known to be earlier than 480, and so Kraay's dating seems the most acceptable, involving the attribution of the Wappenmünzen to Pisistratus and of the Owls to his sons. This rules out any dating of the first coins of the Wappenmünzen series to the time of Solon's archonship.

The Owl coinage of Athens has two main phases: the unwreathed head of Athena wearing a helmet wreathed with olive, (and a small waning moon above the head of the owl on the reverse, *which was also added in the fifth century*). One of the most striking features of the coinage is its official nature: the design is a badge of political authority, thus the adding of the ethnic ΑΘΕ and the unchanging, explicitly national type of Athena and the Owl suggests a deliberate attempt to popularise Athenian coinage in foreign markets and declare its origin. The changing status of Athens in the Greek world owing to the policies of the tyrants, and the abandonment of the didrachm for the tetradrachm, suggest a coinage was required for use in foreign markets. This view is supported by the extent to which the Owl tetradrachms flowed abroad as opposed to the Wappenmünzen<sup>75</sup>. This is a secondary development though, as coinage was not primarily devised to meet the needs of foreign trade (since most coinages that were exported were not amongst the earliest in existence).

Athens was lucky in having its own deposits of silver. The coinage could be destined for foreign trade once any internal needs had been satisfied. It is not possible, of course, to speak of a monetary economy in Greece at this time since coins made of precious metal took time to develop from local currency into that of international payments.

---

75. See Kraay, JHS LXXXIV, 1964, p.81 for a table of the Owl finds in the West and East.

With the overseas expansion (see below, pp. 63ff.), a number of merchant ships was required for transporting goods, for in the sixth century Athens abandoned the attempt to be self-sufficient and settled for importing corn and paying for it by exporting olive oil and silver in the form of coinage; hence the need for ships. Shipping was a lucrative business, and states such as Aegina and Corinth grew very wealthy from it; originally Attic ware was carried in Corinthian vessels, but as her own production increased and relations between the two states grew worse, there was a need for her own ships.

The Athenian vessels were owned by wealthy individuals (who, we should expect, probably lived near the sea and joined in the trading business themselves), as opposed to state-ownership. Despite the alleged "Thirty Years' Boom", Athenian commerce was still not strong enough to oust all other competition, and just as this was developing so was the need for a merchant fleet. For the present, the individual was free to operate ships with the consent of the government.

Herodotus<sup>76</sup> says by the beginning of the fifth century Athens had some fifty warships, with sail-powered merchant vessels (as distinct from warships) first appearing in the late sixth century<sup>77</sup>.

Is there any evidence for the existence of Athenian warships in the Pisistratid period? According to French,

"... one piece of evidence which suggests that Athenian naval power and interests were already considerable in this period is the struggle against Mytilene for Sigeum."<sup>78</sup>

To face Megara, a powerful state, it must surely be that Athens would need a fleet of some striking power as opposed to mere fishing ships or other merchant vessels. Since we know of the existence of the

76. Hdt. VI. 89.

77. See S.C. Humphreys, Anthropology and the Greeks, pp. 166-69.

78. A. French, JHS LXXVII, 1957, p. 238.

naucrarias<sup>79</sup> (which collected money for, in the first instance, ships), we may assume Athens had access to warships at this time. It is plausible that the fleet was formed by those merchant vessels which grouped together for protection, as loaded ships were a tempting target for pirates, and the corn convoys might well have been escorted. When not in use (or even perhaps hired by the state?), these vessels were available for defensive and offensive purposes. Thus, in effect, the merchant fleet would be doubling as the navy.

During the period 800-500 BC, Greece's economic expansion had begun with the flowering of manufacture both at home and abroad<sup>80</sup>. The colonies and the trading posts of the Near East required agricultural and manufactured goods, thereby creating an extensive market for the products of either the mother-country or one able to supply them. The foreign policy of Athens, linked with trading opportunities, began under the leadership of Pisistratus, and led on to Empire. Perhaps the tyrants had imperialistic aims with the securing of the Thracian Chersonese, Rhaecelus on the Thermaic Gulf, Sigeum, and Lemnos in the reign of Hippias<sup>81</sup> to name a few, but they were also concerned with the well-being of the people. Pisistratus, realising the importance of overseas economic considerations for the prosperity of Attica, allowed these considerations to influence his foreign policy; for example, the precious metals and woods of the Chalcidice and Thrace were needed for treasury and maritime needs.

We have seen that Attica suffered from a grain shortage; the importance of corn from the Black Sea area was crucial to the economic

79. See Chapter II, pp.39-41.

80. See C.G.Starr, The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800-500 BC.

81. See Chapter IV, p.102.

life of Attica, and so much importance was attached to the Black Sea trade route via the Hellespont. Corn importation was also important for other states: Herodotus says Aegina and the Peloponnese also depended on it<sup>82</sup>. Athens set out to establish control over the Hellespont area by securing Sigeum (which guarded the southern side of the Hellespont), and the Thracian Chersonese (which guarded the northern). Sigeum's position did not guarantee absolute control of the straits, but did give Athens a valuable resting and supply base. In the Thracian Chersonese, Miltiades the Elder ruled as vassal to the Athenian tyrant (and as virtual ruler in his own area there<sup>83</sup>).

The foreign policy and geographical position of Athens' allies suggest a desire to safeguard commercial routes. The widening trading area of Athens to the North-East and West resulted in a change in the economic pattern of Attic society in favour of the craftsmen who contributed to it and the entrepreneurs who conducted it.

The commodities exchanged in trade are basically unknown. Athens imported some fish, timber, and, of course, grain. The city's chief exports were pots and their contents - oil and wine - and also "luxury" pottery such as decorated ornamental vases, silver (usually in the form of coinage), and wool. The last was famous and exported throughout the Greek world; Athenaeus<sup>84</sup> tells of Polycrates of Samos importing Attic sheep: "... ἐκ πολλῶν πόλεων <sup>μηρίον</sup> κοσμηθῆναι τὴν Σάμον ὑπὸ τοῦ Πολυκράτους... πρόβατα δὲ ἐκ Μιλήτου καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς."

Aegina also enjoyed a wide trading activity, and the trading

82. Hdt. VII, 147, ii.

83. See Chapter IV, pp. 100-101.

84. Athenaeus XII, 540D.

operations of Sostratus help to indicate that in this period it is better to think of trade by individuals than of trade by states. The discovery in 1970 of an inscribed stone by the sanctuary of Hera at Gravisca, the port of Tarquinia<sup>85</sup>, and the distance from Aegina of this Apollo, is explained by Aegina's trading activity. Pottery evidence has shown that Sostratus'  $\text{Σ}$  type of mark appears on some ninety-five vases to date, and is the largest class of all mercantile marks found on Attic pottery<sup>86</sup>. Dates for the production of these vases have been fixed at <sup>535-505</sup>, by which time Athens and Aegina were at war<sup>87</sup>, and so it is logical to assume that this ended any further trading between the two states.

The vast majority of vases exported by Sostratus are amphorae and hydriai of the black-figure type; he does not seem to have concerned himself with red-figure pottery. Mention of Aeginetan trade is made by Herodotus<sup>88</sup>, and so it appears his Sostratus is the same as that of the  $\text{Σ}$  mark<sup>89</sup>. The inscription can be placed either towards the end of the sixth century or within the first quarter of the fifth: "Della fine del VI sec." "alla fine del VI sec. o, al più tardi, ai primissimi decenni del V sec"<sup>90</sup>. It is believed<sup>91</sup> that the inscription and merchant's mark provide sufficient evidence for the existence of an "international merchant class" in the sixth century Greek world.

85. Which reads: Απόλονος Ἀγινεάτα ἐμι, Σόστρατος ἐποιέστι ho...

86. See A.W.Johnston, La Parola del Passato XXVII, 1972, pp.416-24.

87. N.G.L.Hammond, Hist. IV, 1955, pp.406-11.

88. Hdt. IV.152,iii.

89. See also F.D.Harvey, La Parola del Passato XXXI, 1976, pp.206-15.

90. M.Torelli, La Parola del Passato XXVI, 1971, pp.44-68.

91. G.E.M.de Ste.Croix, The Origins of the Peloponnesian War, p.265f.

In Athens, export of Attic vases grew, implying a trade in other goods contained in them such as oil and wine. Until the Solonian period Corinth had been the leader in pottery production; painted earthenware made there between 650 and 550 has been found all over the Mediterranean area from the Black Sea to Carthage and Etruria. Pliny<sup>92</sup> tells of the Sicyonian Butades who first mixed ruddle with clay in Corinth:

"eiusdem opere terrae fingere ex argilla similituines  
Butades Sicyonius figulus primus invenit Corinthi  
filiae opera ..."

and of the Corinthian Hyperbius who invented the potter's wheel<sup>93</sup>:

"... in iis orbem Anacharsis Scythes, ut alii  
Hyperbius Corinthius."

After the mid-sixth century Attic ware is found in the export market with a widening scope and in higher numbers. For the first time it reaches Italy and Sicily in any large numbers, and pots such as comast cups are found at fresh sites including Olynthus, Olympia, Lesbos, Chios, Miletus, Egypt and Ephesus, and in the west at Bologna, Rome, Capua and Syracuse.

Naturally, much reliance has to be placed on archaeological evidence for trade development<sup>94</sup>; for example, the sixth century tombs in Italy and Sicily show a gradual decrease in Corinthian imports, as well as ~~Laconian and Ionian~~, in favour of Athens.

Sostratus' activity shows that the presence of pottery from any state at a certain site is not good evidence for the traders' activities since it may have been carried there by others, as in the case of Sostratus, who, although an Aeginetan, sold Attic ware in Etruria. Thus, the distribution and quantity of Attic pottery found there is not

92. Pliny, Naturalis Historia XXXV, 151.

93. Pliny, ibid. VII, 198.

94. See G.M.A.Richter, BSA XI, 1904/5, pp.224-43; B.L.Bailey, JHS LX, 1940, pp.60-71.

such good evidence for Athenian trade with Etruria, since perhaps much of the ware was taken there by non-Athenian traders.

However, there was an increase in the number of Attic pots produced; a period of increase which coincided with the Pisistratid Tyranny. Pisistratus appreciated the value of wide commercial connections and the need of exports to give Attica some sort of economic balance. By 575 the better wares of Corinth were in decline, and those of Athens the only ones around of sufficiently good quality to replace them. Consequently, what had once been the Corinthian market was now the Athenian. Athens was gradually becoming an active competitor in the commercial world<sup>95</sup>.

As well as utility ware serving a specific purpose, pottery also provided a luxury trade in ornamental ware, though these types would usually be specially-commissioned and not "mass-produced". Practically speaking, Attica had no need of the decorated ware since plain amphorae were used for storage, and also doubtless the ordinary person could ill afford them. The exported ware was of higher quality than the vessels for the home market, and presumably cost more than the latter. Could this indicate that as red-figure became the norm in painted ware, and was generally regarded as the finer product, black-figure ware was less expensive?

Apart from the economic aspect, there is also the artistic. Progress in vase painting is constant, from the oriental-inspired protoattic pottery to the Francois Vase of c.570 by Clitias and Ergotimus<sup>96</sup>, to the introduction of the red-figure technique, about 530. Pisistratus favoured the installation of foreign potters and

---

95. Beloch, G.G.<sup>2</sup> I.1. p.387f.

96. ABV p.76, no.1.

painters who had been attracted to Athens by Solon's decree in a new suburb of the city which became known as the Cerameicus Quarter. In terms of wealth the potters must have been fairly well-off, and the excellence of their ware proves their skill. Pottery was also an excellent vehicle for Athenian propaganda, and Pisistratus must have been aware of this as he encouraged its production by such means as the ordering of Panathenaic amphorae. It is now proposed briefly to examine the work of some of the artists of this period.

Black-figure reached its peak with such painters as Lydos, Nearchos, Exekias, and the Amasis Painter. The last is one of the first to introduce complex daily scenes on to his pots, for example the lekythos showing women at work<sup>97</sup>. Exekias paints a new suicide of Ajax<sup>98</sup>: instead of the bloody impalement we see an Ajax in brooding preparation for the deed. Another scene depicts Achilles slaying the Amazon. Penthesilea<sup>99</sup>. One of the commonest signatures on black-figure is that of Nicosthenes, and in his workshop a particular type of amphora, known as the Nicosthenic, was produced between 535-485. Nicosthenes is one of the first to use a white ground for black-figure.

The Swing Painter worked from c.540 to 520, mostly painting mythological scenes. Perhaps his most interesting scene of the period is a painting on a hydria of women in a fountain-house drawing water or chatting<sup>100</sup>. From the elaborate architecture it is possible that this scene was inspired by the Enneakrounos, the fountain-house built by Pisistratus. (see below, p.76).

97. ABV p.154, no.47.

98. ABV p.145, no.18.

99. ABV p.144, no.7.

100. ABV p.261, no.41.

One series of black-figure vases distinguished by their shape, decoration, and inscriptions is the prize Panathenaic amphorae, in which was stored the oil given to victors at the Panathenaic Games. The earliest vases are those of the Burgon Group, contemporary with the François Vase. These have the usual armed Athena, the owl on the neck, and the inscription TON AΘENEΩEN AΘΛΟΝ (with, on the very early ones, an added εἰμί). The earliest artist of whose prize vases any significant number have survived is known as the Euphiletos Painter.

Exekias was the first to add Doric columns supporting cocks by the figure of Athena. The Swing Painter's prize amphorae are without inscription, and it is possible that these inscription-less vases might simply be souvenirs from the games taken home by non-competitors. The prize amphorae were always painted in the black-figure style, even after the abandonment of that style for other purposes.

Athenian black-figure has the richest corpus of mythological scenes in Archaic Greek art. The Olympian gods, heroes (especially Heracles and Theseus) and stories from legends are all found on pottery. Excluding the Sisyphus episode, the Underworld seems to have held little interest for painters. Most of the scenes involving Heracles involve the labours given to him by King Eurystheus of Mycenae. Heracles was also exploited for a more political purpose by Pisistratus via the medium of pottery<sup>101</sup>. Theseus and the Minotaur appear to be a stock scene on vases, for example, an amphora of Lydos, in about 540 BC<sup>102</sup>.

At a point around 530 the technique known as red-figure was invented, and the first artist to use it regularly was the Andocides

101. See Chapter V, pp.122-23.

102. ABV p.109, no.25.

Painter, working between 530 and 515. Painters such as Paseas and Psiax are, however, regarded as the true red-figure "pioneers". Red-figure is the complete reversal of black-figure: the figures (drawn in outline and left in the pale colour of the clay, while the background is painted all black), appear more real and defined. The colour difference denoting the sexes (black for male, white for female) is abolished, and there is a tendency to depict gods and heroes as being much younger. With the introduction of red-figure, the lekythos acquires its cylindrical shape, while the neck amphora becomes the commonest shape of pot. Some painters were able to work in both styles, and are referred to as "bilingualists" - the Andocides Painter is one.

Black-figure did, of course, remain, with the Antimenes Painter and the Leagros Group, but by the end of the century any painter of quality was committed to red-figure; Euphronius and Euthymides are perhaps the best known of this period. The latter, by his use of thinned paints for anatomical detail, makes his figures more definable.

We are told<sup>103</sup> that Pisistratus had a mercenary bodyguard, and Glotz and Cohen<sup>104</sup> talk of him 's'entourant par surcroît de gardes (les épicouroi), lanciers et archers recrutés en Attique et en Thrace.' The Scythian archer must have been a fairly common sight, hence his increased portrayal on Athenian ware, as Plassart notes<sup>105</sup>. The bulk of pictures involving barbarian archers belong to the period 530-490, though some are found on earlier ware, for example the François Vase where three <sup>archers</sup> take part in the Calydonian boar hunt. In order to

103. Hdt. I.64,i.

104. Glotz and Cohen, p.449.

105. A.Plassart, REG XXVI, 1913, pp.151-214: L'archer en costume scythe est fréquemment représenté sur les vases attiques à figures noires.

portray their alien character, Clitias has embroidered their chitons, while those of the Greeks in the same picture are left plain.

In the middle sixth century archers begin to appear with hoplites in battle scenes. A kylix cup, now in the British Museum, has Scythians, hoplites and cavalry stationed on both sides of a chariot in the interior<sup>106</sup>. Helbig<sup>107</sup> interpreted the scene as an army inspection by either Pisistratus or Hippias. Tempting though this is, it is, unfortunately, incapable of proof. Seltman<sup>108</sup> believed the scene portrayed the Alcmeonid invasion of Attica, but this is chronologically impossible.

By the beginning of the fifth century <sup>or soon after</sup> there are no Scythians left at Athens, a disappearance noted by, for example, Schoppa<sup>109</sup>: "verschwinden bald nach den Perserkriegen die Bogenschützen aus der attischen kunst." Helbig<sup>110</sup> connected their departure with the fall of the tyranny, but this is doubtful - for one thing some Scythians are still to be found on Athenian vases after 510, so it is better not to connect the two incidents.

The Scythian arrival in Athens has been dated to 530 by a fragment of an amphora by Exekias<sup>111</sup>. On one side a Scythian is grazing a horse alone, and again he is dressed in gaily-coloured clothes which include a chequered cap. As the Scythians are believed to be part of

106. ABV p.256, no.20; M.F.Vos, Scythian Archers in Archaic Attic Vase Painting, Plate III.

107. W.Helbig, Eine Heerschau des Peisistrates oder Hippias auf einer Schwarz figurigen Schale, p.262.

108. C.T.Seltman, Athens: Its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion, p.84.

109. H. Schoppa, Darstellung der Perser, p.27.

110. Helbig, op. cit. p.307.

111. ABV p.145, no.16.

Pisistratus' bodyguard<sup>112</sup>, 530 seems to be rather a late date - a date of 546 would be better. Any date before then must, I believe, be ruled out: in 561 Pisistratus' bodyguard was a citizen one voted to him by the Assembly<sup>113</sup> and not a privately-owned body which Pisistratus' later one was. But, of course, the Scythians might already have been in the city for a number of years before 530 - the painters need not depict them on vases immediately on their arrival in Athens.

It should be remembered that there were other potteries in Attica apart from Athens, just as there were other sources of clay apart from the main clay beds of Amarousion, close to the city. At Eleusis some vases of distinctive shape have been found appropriate to the worship of Demeter, for example, the neck amphoræ by the Painter of Eleusis<sup>114</sup>. At Brauron footed craters depicting naked dancing girls have also been unearthed, part of the ritual involved in the worship of Artemis<sup>115</sup>. Quite often the painters moved location, as in the case of the nomadic ~~potters~~ of Siphnos.

The economic importance of the pottery trade must be kept in perspective. Pottery was not the most valuable of export products and did not employ a large number of people<sup>116</sup>. Cook<sup>117</sup> states that half

112. See, for example, F.E. Adcock, CAH IV, p.65; H. Berve, Bericht über den VI International Kongress für Archäologie, 1942, p.432; Busolt, G.G2 I, p.326; Helbig, op. cit. p.289.

113. Hdt. I.59,v; AP XIV,1; Plut. Sol. XXX, 1-6.

114. ABV p.21, no.1.

115. See Chapter V, pp.114-15.

116. Although the number was small, the output was surprisingly large, showing the skill of the painter and potter in being able to execute production both skilfully and swiftly.

117. Cook, Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 1959, pp.14-23.

of the signed black-figure vases are the product of but six workshops, and he estimates a maximum of five hundred <sup>persons</sup> in the whole Athenian pottery industry when at its most flourishing; Webster<sup>118</sup> suggests a maximum of two hundred painters and fifty potters doing fine work.

It was the constant preoccupation of the tyrants to enhance the image of their cities, and increase the well-being of the people living there with public works. Pisistratus' building policy aligned with his overall religious one in evoking a common pride and allegiance to the city, as well as to give employment to many<sup>119</sup>. Indeed, Aristotle<sup>120</sup> believed the scheme was inaugurated in order to keep the people too busy for any political activity against the régime: *καὶ πρὸς τῷ καθ' ήμέραν ὅντες ἀσχολούσσονται ἐπιβουλεύειν*, and compares this with Polycrates of Samos who also kept his subjects preoccupied with the *έργα Πολυκράτεια*<sup>121</sup>.

Aristotle's judgement may be closer to the truth than has been realised. As land was only available in limited lots, and not enough for a large part of the surplus city population to leave the city, those having to stay would require work. The public works scheme had a twofold purpose: to embellish the city and to provide employment, thereby averting civil strife. The cost of the great building programme could not be met by taxation alone, despite the increased revenue under the tyranny, and Pisistratus deserves credit for devoting much of his own wealth towards it. "Athènes était un grand village; Pisistrate en fit une grande ville."<sup>122</sup>

118. T.B.L.Webster, Potter and Patron in Classical Athens, p.3.

119. Compare the building policies of Pericles and Julius Caesar.

120. Pol. V, 1313b20-26.

121. See Chapter IV, pp.93-4.

122. Glotz and Cohen, p.450.

The Pisistratids may not have left the city as one of marble, but the improvements were many. The greatest monuments of the tyranny were the temples to Athena on the Acropolis, and the unfinished temple to Zeus by the Ilissos. On the Acropolis, the Pisistratids reworked the old temple of Athena (to the south of the Erechtheum with foundations dating back to a much earlier period<sup>123</sup>) by adding marble sculpture and other work, in the period 529-20. There is no reason to suppose that any addition to the second temple to Athena called the Hecatomedon (perhaps constructed on the site of the later Parthenon<sup>124</sup>) was undertaken by them.

In the town below Pisistratus began the construction of a huge Olympieion on the banks of the river Ilissos. The cella alone measured 35 by 15m and the stone columns some 2.28m in diameter; the height of the columns has been estimated at 10m. Thucydides<sup>126</sup> mentions the antiquity of the shrine of Olympian Zeus, and Pausanias<sup>127</sup> says Deucalion built the first temple; the earlier one has been revealed by excavations within the Pisistratid temple<sup>128</sup>, but Pisistratus' is about twice as long. Vitruvius<sup>129</sup> has given the names of the four architects involved as Antistates, Porinos, Antimachides, and Callaischros. The temple construction was halted on the death of Pisistratus, and only finally completed in the reign of Hadrian.

123. Travlos, p.143.

124. Ibid. p.53.

No note 125.

126. Thuc. II.15,v.

127. Pausanias I.18,8.

128. Travlos, p.402.

129. Vitruvius VII,15.

It is about this time that stone becomes the normal material in temple construction. Snodgrass<sup>130</sup> dates the first monumental temples to the late eighth century, while Dinsmoor<sup>131</sup> states that the first temple of Apollo at Thermum in Aetolia was one of the earliest peripteral temples on the Greek mainland. Also at this time roof-tiles are introduced.

South-East of the Acropolis a precinct to Dionysus Eleuthereus was built, although it seems improbable that a theatre was constructed along with it<sup>132</sup>. With the discovery of six stones set in a curved line fourteen feet long, speculation has arisen connecting them with part of an orchestral circle, which has been dated to Pisistratid times by the combination of materials used and masonry of the temple remains. The main building is of poros, the foundations are of Kara limestone, and a comparison with the buildings at Eleusis built by the tyrant suggests a similar Pisistratid construction<sup>133</sup>. Also, the polygonal masonry indicates a sixth century date, but since the stones lack the regularity of a segment of a circle, and drama was originally performed in the Agora<sup>134</sup>, the theatre cannot be dated to Pisistratid times. Also, any building would not necessarily have to be permanent. In this area the Panathenaic festival<sup>135</sup> was celebrated; the procession crossing through the Agora by the principal route starting at the Dipylon

130. A.M.Snodgrass, Archaic Greece, pp.24-34.

131. W.B.Dinsmoor, The Architecture of Ancient Greece, pp.63-64, Plate XV, opp.p.68.

132. See: A.W.Pickard-Cambridge, The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens, pp.3-10.

133. See Chapter V, pp.112-13.

134. Though there were some performances at the Sanctuary; see Travlos, p.537.

135. See Chapter V, pp.105-11.

gate and ending at the Acropolis.

The most beneficial public scheme was the regularisation of the water supply. Before, the people collected water from outside the city, but now a new source of water was obtained from the Ilissos, which was brought into the city centre at the fountain-house known as the Enneakrounos. Pausanias<sup>136</sup> implies this is close to, or in, the Agora, but Thucydides<sup>137</sup> is most probably correct in placing it south of the Acropolis. A specific place has not yet been located. Some sort of drainage system was also established<sup>138</sup>. This concern for the public water supply is a policy typical of tyrants<sup>139</sup>, since the aristocracy with their own wells had neglected it.

A shrine to Artemis Brauronia on the Acropolis, South-East of the Propylaea, is known, and may be attributed to the tyranny, but it seems the goddess never had a temple on the Acropolis<sup>140</sup>. Considering the connection between Pisistratus and his home town of Brauron, it seems plausible to assume he would do something for the worship of that goddess in the city.

On the main roads and street corners Hipparchus set up the Herms<sup>141</sup>, quadrangular pillars on which the heads of gods and heroes were mounted with moral sentences inscribed on the bases. Again, a political element can be detected in this<sup>142</sup>.

136. Pausanias I.14,1.

137. Thuc. II.15,v; Travlos p.204; <sup>contr.</sup> H.A. Thompson & R.E. Wycherley, The Athenian Agora XIV, pp.198-200.

138. Glotz and Cohen, p.450.

139. Compare the aqueducts built for Theagenes and Polycrates.

140. Travlos p.124.

141. Ps-Plato Hipparchus 228d-229b.

142. Ps-Plato ibid. 228e1-7.

The two brothers surrounded the gardens of the Academy with a wall, and built an altar to Eros which served as the departure point for torch-lit races<sup>143</sup>. The shrine of Apollo Pythios was also built to the south side of the Olympieion<sup>144</sup>. In the Agora Pisistratus the Younger, son of Hippias, built the altar of the Twelve Gods<sup>145</sup> and many principal routes and roads appeared to converge on it<sup>146</sup>. An improved road system could only help internal trade and communications too.

It is possible that the city-walls of Athens, built before the time of Themistocles<sup>147</sup>, could be Pisistratid, but this attribution is guesswork<sup>148</sup>. Such a construction would not be out of place or unusual, though, and we know that fortifications were constructed in this period - the case of the Alcmeonidae and Leipsydrion is one example. As has already been seen<sup>149</sup>, work on the Pnyx has been fixed to the end of the sixth century, after the fall of the tyranny<sup>150</sup>.

Sculptors began to work on new styles on a much larger scale, experimenting with kouroi and korai. This period sees the beginnings of the seated Athena<sup>151</sup>: a group of terracotta figures dating from the last half of the sixth century and discovered on the Acropolis represents female figures in Ionic dress, *the bulk are* characterised as Athena, *a few as other goddesses.*

143. Plut. Sol. I,7; Clitodorus, fr.24: Suidas, s.v. 'Ιππάρχου τεχνῶν.

144. Thuc. II.15,iv; Travlos, p.100.

145. Thuc. VI,54.vi; I.G. i<sup>2</sup> 761.

146. Hdt. II.7,i; I.G. ii<sup>2</sup> 1078.

147. Hdt. IV,13,ii; Thuc. I.89,iii, 93,i, VI.57,i; Glotz and Cohen, p.451 attribute the first fortified city wall to Hippias.

148. Travlos, p.162; R.E.Wycherley, The Stones of Athens, pp.9-11.

149. See Chapter II, p.31.

150. Travlos, pp.191-92.

151. H.L.Lorimer, Homer and the Monuments, pp.446-47.

This Ionian influence was now manifesting itself in Athens, and characterised the latter half of the century. Perhaps the <sup>votive</sup> statues of Athena were erected to celebrate Pisistratus' triumphant usurpation of power with the help of Athena, and carried out along with his re-organisation of the *παναθηναῖα*.

In conclusion, the economic developments made by Athens in this period are not merely material developments in a prosperous state but came about through policies fostered by the tyrants. Pisistratus' economic measures remedied the troubles which had first led to Solon's appointment and to his own rise. Olive production stimulated the economy, producing much profit, and thereby helped to pay for grain importation<sup>152</sup>. The incentive given to those growing olives by means of loans and taxes from produce is deliberate policy, perhaps involving the planting of olives on land previously uncultivated, designed to secure production and ultimately to give Attica some sort of economic balance with regard to imports. Rural productivity was an important achievement of the régime: the struggle against poverty was not yet over but it was being overcome.

Since the tyranny was based on force as opposed to legality the expenses were heavy and the tyrants did not refrain from using any form of taxation they could<sup>153</sup>, hence the deliberate control of state finances which gained strength under the rule. The extent of overseas trading begun by Solon was greatly increased, and the increased volume of trade per se boosted pottery production which the tyrants encouraged with measures such as a regular order of prize Panathenaic amphorae. Another, and more powerful instrument of propaganda was coinage. The

---

152. According to Demosthenes XVIII, de Corona, 87 and XX, contra Leptinem, 31, Athens required more grain than all other cities.

153. Andreades, op. cit. p.124.

official nature of the Owl coinage with the ΑΘΕ symbol and national emblem of Athena made this easily recognisable in the foreign markets, at the same time increasing the commercial prestige of the city.

This was the age of the developing economies<sup>154</sup> and the growing merchant class, so how much political insight did Pisistratus reveal? He realised the need to put the finances on a secure footing and for a stable agricultural policy to put Attica on its feet again: the other policies followed on. A conscious economic plan was followed, and the tyrant displayed a shrewd nature by spending income from taxes on and in the city where it would do most good. By the end of the sixth century Athenian commercial influence had grown in the Greek world, a position resulting from the policies of the Pisistratids.

---

154. It must be remembered that goods were not produced on the same scale as today or even of the late Classical period. As J. Hasebroek (Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece, p.66) says, "The prevailing descriptions of Greek industry in the seventh and sixth centuries seriously exaggerate its volume and importance."

Chapter IVFOREIGN AFFAIRS

It must be pointed out that, as in so many events of this period, the source material available is very little, and consequently it is hard to determine exactly the overseas policy of the Pisistratids together with their motives. Much speculation has therefore to be used which, as in the case of the *argumentum e silentio*, is a dangerous practice.

Before Pisistratus Athens had very little foreign policy and the evidence for events involving her in the Greek world is little. Dunbabin<sup>1</sup> states the case for an early war between Athens and Aegina following Pheidon's encouragement to the Aeginetans to revolt from Epidaurus and place themselves under Argive protection. The events from the revolt of Aegina to the Athenian defeat are not likely to have covered a long time; Pheidon's assertion of hegemony over Epidaurus can be dated to the first quarter of the seventh century and this date is backed to a large extent by the artistic and commercial weakness of Athens in this period. Such a defeat was serious enough to be remembered two centuries later, and, in the words of Dunbabin, "we may reasonably associate it, as cause or effect, with this decline."<sup>14</sup>

In about 590 Athens was involved in the First Sacred War, sending men to help free Delphi from the power of Crisa. For her part in the liberation Athens received one of the two votes reserved for the Ionians in the Amphictyonic League, thereby gaining considerable

---

1. T.J.Dunbabin, BSA XXXVII, 1936-37, pp.83-92, though Pheidon and the war are dated earlier by J.N.Coldstream, Geometric Greece, pp. 135, 154-56.

influence and recognition in Central Greece. In this particular war<sup>2</sup> Solon was influential both in sending Athenian help and in the Amphictyonic decree regarding the fate of Crisa<sup>3</sup>. Despite the Athenian gains, faction strife led to weakness as revealed in the recovery of Salamis by Megara and the losing of Sigeum. Herodotus<sup>4</sup> has Pisistratus involved in war against Mytilene for Sigeum, and some doubt has arisen over his chronology; he has been thought to have confused events of an earlier period with a later one<sup>5</sup>, but this is not the case: there was a second war in Pisistratid times.

Three sources exist for the Sigeum war<sup>6</sup>, perhaps all deriving information from the poems of Alcaeus. The causes and aims of the venture are speculative, but in view of Sigeum's position with regard to the flow of trade from the Pontus<sup>7</sup>, it is reasonable to connect the venture with commercial interests. Few of the details are known: Diogenes refers the events to a time before Pittacus who led the Mytileneans in the territorial dispute and who, having defeated the Athenian commander Phrynon in single-handed combat, established Mytilene's claim to the land. Strabo says much the same, adding that as Pittacus was campaigning for control of much of the Troad the Athenians despatched Phrynon, and in one battle the poet Alcaeus dropped his arms and fled. Herodotus appears to place Alcaeus' flight and Periander's mediation (the latter being the Corinthian tyrant, who settled this conflict by ruling in favour of Athens' possession of

2. Disbelieved by N. Robertson, CQ<sup>2</sup> XXVII, 1978, pp.38-74; see also G.A. Lehmann, Hist. XXIX, 1980, pp.242-46.

3. Aeschines III, in Ctesiphon 108; Plut. Sol. XI,1.

4. Hdt. V.94,i.

5. G. Busolt, G.G.<sup>2</sup> II, p.249f.

6. Hdt. V.94-5; Diog. Laert. I,74; Strabo 599f.

7. See Chapter III, pp.63-4.

Sigeum) in a war between Athens and Mytilene in Pisistratid times, some seventy years later.

It is impossible to estimate the reliability of the three sources. For one thing Aristotle<sup>8</sup> says the Mytileneans gave Pittacus supreme power in the city not as a reward for his conduct in the war, as Diogenes would have us believe, but "to deal with the exiles led by Antiménidas and Alcaeus the poet". Previously, Pittacus had worked with Alcaeus and his *ētātēpol* for the tyrant Myrsilus' overthrow, but had then quarrelled and the alliance had ended. Is Diogenes' description of how Pittacus achieved power to be believed? The answer is unknown.

There has been a belief<sup>9</sup> that Herodotus is responsible for a chronological miscount of some fifty years or so, but this does not appear likely; the dates are consistent: Phrynon won an Olympic victory in 636/5 according to Eusebius and is said to have been killed by Pittacus in 607/6. There must then have been two wars, with Athens losing Sigeum some time after Periander's mediation, and recapturing it after a further war in Pisistratid times. What Herodotus is giving us<sup>10</sup> when relating the campaign of Hegesistratus is just one in a long series of campaigns as part of the island's history. In describing that of Pittacus and Alcaeus a preparation is made for the later campaigns which end in the establishment of Hegesistratus (Pisistratus' son by Timonassa) as governor of Sigeum. At this time Athens was suffering economic distress, which adds weight to the theory that the Sigeum venture was to help secure the Hellespontine corn route.

8. Arist. Pol. III, 1285a35-37.

9. K.J.Beloch, G.G.<sup>2</sup> I.2, p.314f; A.R.Burn, JHS LV, 1935, pp.130-47.

10. For Herodotus' chronology see D.L.Page, Sappho and Alcaeus, pp.152-61.

The details of the war against Megara are equally unknown. French<sup>11</sup> gives the reason as being, "to make possible the free use to Athenian ships of the ports of Southern Attica as well as to open the route to the isthmus of Corinth." It is logical to assume the motives for the war again stemmed from commercial reasons. As has been seen<sup>12</sup>, grain was the most important import product; Attica relied heavily on it since the peninsula was unable to be self-sufficient in grain production. Possession of Salamis was essential to secure the route from the Black Sea to Phaleron, which was closer to the city than Prasiae and the east coast and therefore a better place for the bulky grain cargo to be landed.

The war itself was a long one, perhaps ranging from the close of the seventh century, as Plutarch says that Solon defeated the Megarians<sup>13</sup> and Megara was able to recover Nisaea and Salamis when the Alcmeonids were exiled for the Cylonian affair<sup>14</sup> (which would fit, as the trial and banishment took place when Solon was an important figure - ... ἥδη δοξαν ἔχων ὁ Σόλων<sup>15</sup>), until the campaign of Pisistratus, c.565<sup>16</sup>. After the capture of Nisaea, the port of Megara, and Spartan arbitration in favour of Athens, the island was returned to that city in exchange for Nisaea. Thus, it is possible to conclude that at some point after Solon Salamis was again lost<sup>17</sup>, to be retaken by Pisistratus.

11. A. French, JHS LXXVII, 1957, p.238, R.J. Hopper, BSA LVI, 1961, pp. 208-17.

12. Chapter III, p.49.

13. Plut. Sol. IX,1-6.

14. Plut. ibid. XII,4.

15. Plut. ibid. XII,3.

16. Hdt. I.59,iv; AP XIV,1, cf. XVII,2.

17. Accepted by Hopper op. cit., but disbelieved by L. Picirilli, ASNP<sup>3</sup> VII, 1978, pp.1-13.

On that island land was divided into lots for Athenian settlers there<sup>18</sup>.

From what is known of the wealth and power of Megara, it would appear the final capture of Salamis was achieved by a power of some naval strength - is this true of Athens? Taking into account the war against Mytilene and the evidence concerning the naucrarias<sup>19</sup>, one can assume the existence of a fleet of sorts<sup>20</sup>.

The Athenian claim to Salamis was supported by a passage from Homer<sup>21</sup>, where Ajax the hero of Salamis is found fighting with the Athenians. Likewise, the claim to Sigeum was supported by Homer<sup>22</sup>, and the poet played an important rôle in the tyrant's Ionian policy. It is interesting to note that Megara, angered by the loss of Salamis, but unable to take any direct retaliatory action, resorted to the indirect means of slander and misrepresentation, in accusing Pisistratus of tampering with the Homeric texts in the Athenian interest<sup>23</sup>.

The Megarian defeat and capture of Salamis earned Pisistratus the popularity on which to base his first attempt at tyranny, c.561/60. Expelled probably a few months later, he returned to Athens in 556/5 before a second expulsion caused him to remain in exile for ten years<sup>24</sup>. He went firstly to Rhaeculus and then to Eretria - misunderstanding of the word *πάλιν* in AP XV,2 has led to the belief that Pisistratus originally went to Eretria, then Rhaeculus, before going to

18. See H.T.Wade-Gery, CQ XL, 1946, pp.101-5.

19. See Chapter II, pp.39-41.

20. See Chapter III, pp.62-3.

21. Homer, Iliad II, 557/8.

22. Hdt. V.94,ii.

23. See Chapter VI, pp.130-31; 133-34.

24. For the chronology of Pisistratus' early career, see Chapter I, pp. 16-17.

Eretria again. Settling at Rhaecelus in the North-West of the Chalcidic peninsula Pisistratus established some sort of πόλις (see below), before leaving for the Mount Pangaeus region near the mouth of the river Strymon. The immediate attraction of this region for him was its mineral wealth, which would enable him to return to Athens and to give his rule a secure foundation<sup>25</sup>. AP gives a somewhat fuller account of Pisistratus' movements in the second exile as opposed to Herodotus, who mentions only Eretria as a place of retirement.

The long exile involved the making of alliances and friendships which were later to be of benefit to the tyrants and to Athens. He secured the friendship of the Naxian exile, Lygdamis, later to become tyrant of that island with Pisistratus' help<sup>26</sup>, and of Thebes, Thessaly, and Argos, the last pact being cemented by the marriage of Pisistratus to the Argive Timonassa<sup>27</sup>, formerly wife to Archinus the Cypselid. Argos was later to despatch one thousand men to aid Pisistratus at the battle of Pallene, 546/5. Some contact must have been made between Athens and Macedon, perhaps in this period of exile, for when Hippias was overthrown in 510 he is later found with the Macedonian king<sup>27a</sup>.

AP believed Pisistratus established a settlement at a specific place known as Rhaecelus, which he located on the Thermaic Gulf. The Scholiast to Lycophron<sup>28</sup> connected Rhaecelus and Mount Cissus with the name Αἴγος in Macedonia, (to be identified with the Aeneia mentioned in

25. Hdt. I.64,i; AP XV,2 tells us that he enriched himself from that region (ὅθεν χρηματισάμενος) during his second exile.

26. Hdt. I.64,ii, AP XV,3.

27. AP XVII,4.

27a. Hdt. V.94,i.

28. Schol. Lycophron, Alexandra 1236-38.

Herodotus<sup>29</sup>, situated at the extreme west of the Chalcidic peninsula<sup>30</sup>), a connection argued against by Edson<sup>31</sup>. Probably Rhaecelus was close to Aeneia but distinct from it in terms of settlement, and Hammond<sup>32</sup> places Rhaecelus in the last part of a stretch of land running north-west towards Aeneia. Cole<sup>33</sup>, believing Rhaecelus to be a specific place, has raised a number of points in connection with it: what was its status? how enduring was it? how large a group of followers did Pisistratus take with him (since there is no indication in the sources that Pisistratus left in fear of his life), and finally, how significant is the συν- prefix in συνφύκεσε?

Rhaecelus is referred to as a πόλις only by the above Scholiast and by Stephanus of Byzantium, which casts doubt as to whether or not it was ever envisaged as a permanent city-state or simply as a temporary, glorified base of operations; for one thing Pisistratus' following would not have been considerable. Rhaecelus does not appear to be a long-lasting settlement: it is mentioned only once more, by Stephanus. Perhaps the town, assuming the existence of one, was either simply renamed or coalesced with a neighbouring one.

Doubtless Lycurgus and Megacles, simply wanting Pisistratus out of the way, hoped he would remain in exile having founded his little state abroad: the sources imply he left by arrangement with them. Cole suggests συνφύκεσε could indicate a joint venture with people from another state, and names Eretria as the strongest candidate, with its Chalcidic knowledge and connections. Thus the argument put forward is

29. Hdt. VII.123.ii-iii.

30. J.E.Sandys, Constitution of Athens<sup>2</sup>, p.61.

31. C.F.Edson, CPh XLII, 1947, pp.88-106.

32. N.G.L.Hammond, History of Macedonia I, pp.186-88.

33. J.W.Cole, G&R<sup>2</sup> XXII, 1975, pp.42-5.

that the settlement was a combined Pisistratid-Eretrian one, as opposed to an accidental landing, and so was a deliberately pre-planned enterprise. This does not appear to be very likely, and no doubt συν- was not used with any great emphasis in mind.

The hostility of the Thracian and Paeonian tribes in the fifth century suggests Pisistratus resorted to diplomatic means in order to work the mines of Pangaeus by maintaining amicable relations. Again, evidence is lacking; perhaps to overcome any aggression on their part the Athenians agreed to cede a percentage of what was mined to the tribes in return for mining rights. Cole suggests that we should see a link with the worship of the god Dionysus<sup>34</sup>, since an important part of the god's mythical life was rooted in Thrace, and that in return for their cooperation Pisistratus would expand the worship of Dionysus in Athens. Again this is open to doubt: the Edones are not likely to have cared whether or not Dionysus was worshipped by the Athenians in distant Athens.

Ure suggests<sup>35</sup> that when Herodotus talks of Phye<sup>36</sup> from the deme Paeania, he may have written Paeonia which has become corrupted over the years. AP<sup>37</sup>, as well as agreeing with Herodotus, mentions the alternative identification of "a Thracian flower-girl from Collytus", to suggest a Pisistratid-Thracian connection before the long exile. This theory of corruption does not hold: Herodotus specifically says ἐν τῷ δῆμῳ τῷ Παιανίᾳ and this is confirmed by AP who even cites Herodotus as source material.

34. Cole, op. cit. p.44.

35. Ure, pp.55-8.

36. Hdt. I.60,iv.

37. AP XIV,4.

From his base at Eretria Pisistratus launched an attack to seize power and won victory at the battle of Pallene<sup>38</sup>. Having returned to Athens as undisputed master of the city, Pisistratus embarked on an active though cautious foreign policy, and showed diplomatic skills in maintaining amicable relations with foreign powers. In the words of Glotz and Cohen<sup>39</sup>, "la politique extérieure qu'avait inaugurée Solon, reçut de Pisistrate une impulsion puissante."

Economic considerations and desires to safeguard commercial routes characterise Pisistratus' foreign policy. Much attention was given to the area of the Hellespont, since it was vital to secure this grain route and the Solonian restrictions on grain exportation<sup>40</sup> suggest that Athens could not afford to export the little corn she had. Guarding the southern side of the Hellespont was Sigeum, which was recaptured from Mytilene and placed under the governorship of Hegesistratus. The northern side of the Hellespont was guarded by the Thracian Chersonese, under the rule of Miltiades the Philaid, who had gone out there at the request of the Dolonci tribe for protection against the attacks of the Apsinthii<sup>41</sup>. Miltiades went on to occupy the whole peninsula and to colonise Crithote, Cardia, and Pactye<sup>42</sup>. Perhaps it is unwise to attach too much importance to the strategic position of the Chersonese, as Miltiades' followers were volunteers: the settlement served equally as an outlet for Attic surplus population<sup>43</sup>.

The extent of overseas trading begun by Solon was continued by

38. Hdt. I.62,ii; AP XV,3.

39. Glotz and Cohen, p.458.

40. Plut. Sol. XXIV,1.

41. Hdt. VI.34-7.

42. Hdt. VI.36,ii; Ephorus, 70 F 40.

43. For the deeds of the *Cimonids* in the Chersonese, see below, pp.99-102.

Pisistratus with even greater zeal. "The increase in overseas trade, especially food and timber, made possible an increased specialisation in production, particularly of wine and oil ... and an accumulation of capital for investment not only in shipping and defence, but in projects designed to increase future production, e.g. in mining and communications."<sup>44</sup> Increasing production of oil and wine led to a greater demand for pottery production, the pots being used as containers for these products, and Athenian pottery developed to such an extent that by 545 it had ousted Corinth from the leading position in the pottery market. Imports were paid for by exports, which also included silver in the form of coinage. This new coinage<sup>45</sup> not only helped the commercial prestige of Athens, but also it was an important element from a propaganda point of view in foreign affairs. From the 520s the Owls, bearing the AΩE symbol which identified their origin as Athens, were of greater propaganda value than the Wappenmünzen, which were less distinctively Athenian. The silver deposits of Thrace and of Macedonia were used by Pisistratus (along with most of Greece) for the minting of coinage; the Attic Laurium mines only being properly used from 525 onwards<sup>46</sup>.

Other tyrants also allowed economic motives to influence foreign policy. For example, the Cypselids of Corinth placed colonies on the North-West coast of Greece at places such as Ambracia and Leucas to secure raw materials and to safeguard routes to the west from interference by a hostile Corcyra. Megarian colonies were established in the Bosphorus area, for example at Chalcedon and Byzantium, to play a rôle in the wool trade, an important source of wealth.

44. A. French, G&R<sup>2</sup> VI, 1959, p.54.

45. See Chapter III, pp.60-61.

46. C.M.Kraay, The Composition of Greek Silver Coins, p.33.

A policy of friendship to all was realised by Pisistratus, who kept the contacts made during the long exile. His motivation in this may have been to prevent any nobles in exile after Pallene, for example the Alcmeonidae, from finding a base of support from which to launch an offensive against Attica - precisely how he himself had obtained power by using Eretria as a base. Thus it was necessary to surround Attica with a circle of friendly states. Yet the rivalries which existed between each state appeared to make such a task impossible. Thebes, although tied to Athens in a friendship pact, was now building up a Boeotian confederacy under her hegemony and this growth of power could prove dangerous to Athens, but to a very large extent it was offset by a close friendship with Thessaly, the great power of the north. In the Thessalian alliance Glotz and Cohen talk of a virtual family pact with the Aleuadae of Larissa<sup>47</sup>, "... en concluant avec les Aleuades de Larissa un véritable pacte de famille: son fils Hégesistratos reçut le surnom de Thessalos; une monnaie d'alliance fut frappée, qui représentait au droit la tête d'Athèna et au revers la tête de la nymphe Larissa!"

Both the coinage mentioned here and the renaming are incorrect. As references Babelon and Herodotus are quoted<sup>48</sup>, but they refer to the coinage and times of Hippias, thus placing the Thessalian alliance far too late. In the case of Hegesistratus, we are told that he was abroad at Sigeum throughout the tyranny, yet in AP<sup>49</sup> Thessalus apparently is the one who fell in love with Harmodius. How can Hegesistratus and Thessalus be one and the same person when the former is placed in Sigeum and the latter in Athens? Thucydides<sup>50</sup> records three legitimate sons of

47. Glotz and Cohen, pp.458-59.

48. E.Babelon, Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines II,i,756; Hdt. V.63, 94.

49. AP XVIII,2.

50. Thuc. VI.55,i.

Pisistratus: Hippias, Hipparchus, and their γυνήτος ἀδελφός, Thessalus, while Herodotus<sup>51</sup> refers to Hegesistratus as the illegitimate son of Timonassa<sup>52</sup>. It is therefore hard to see why certain authorities<sup>53</sup> maintain Thessalus to be a byname for Hegesistratus. We should reject the suggestion that Thessalus was an alternative name of Hegesistratus and accept that Pisistratus had five sons: Hippias, Hipparchus, Hegesistratus, Thessalus, and the somewhat enigmatic Iophon.

Peaceful relations were established and adhered to with Thebes, Thessaly, Argos, Eretria, Macedon, . . . Corinth, and Sparta, although in the case of the last the Athenian status of proxenia was no doubt a piece of opportunist policy on the part of Athens<sup>53a</sup>. Considering the very real enmity which existed between some of the states, notably Argos and Sparta, Pisistratus' circle of alliances speaks for itself when one assesses his diplomatic skill. Holladay<sup>54</sup> suggests that the most likely reason for the friendship of Corinth down to the Persian Wars was that Corinthian ships carried Attic ware to Italy and Sicily, thereby making good profits.

During the reign of Pisistratus a confederation of Greek states was created which has sometimes been referred to as the Peloponnesian League, although it is better not to apply this name until the organisation of about 505. This was a combination of various states, each being autonomous, but under the military hegemony of Sparta in a permanent alliance. At the instigation of Sparta, whose actions are

51. Hdt. V.94,i.

52. Possibly referring to Pericles' bastard law, and so being incorrect about Hegesistratus.

53. AP XVII,3; Plut. Cato Major XXIV,8; Schol. Aristoph. Wasps, 502.

53a. Although W.G.Forrest, GRBS X, 1969, p.281 n.7 argues against this friendship.

54. J.Holladay, G&R<sup>2</sup> XXIV, 1977, p.48.

more certain than those of her allies, the League was responsible for the overthrow of several tyrannies, including those of Naxos and Athens. It is unknown whether or not Athens was forced to join this combination as payment for her liberation in 510; but if she did join she did not remain a member for long.

Closer contact was made between the Aegean islands and Athens. As a means of repayment for his help during the second exile, Pisistratus gave Lygdamis support in seizing control of Naxos<sup>55</sup>, potentially the most powerful of the Cyclades. On Naxos Pisistratus deposited the sons taken from those noble families remaining in Attica after Pallene<sup>56</sup>. In about 533, Lygdamis, perhaps with Pisistratus' help but at least with his knowledge and therefore consent, helped Polycrates to become tyrant at Samos<sup>57</sup>, though there is a belief that Polycrates inherited the tyranny with his brother, Syloson from his father Aiaces<sup>58</sup>. Perhaps Polycrates and Syloson were expelled on their father's death, and Polycrates later rewon his position.

Thucydides<sup>59</sup> dates Polycrates to the time of Cambyses, 530-22: *καὶ Πολυκράτης Σάμου τυραννῶν ἐπὶ Καμβύσου*, but Mitchell<sup>60</sup> argues for lengthening the dates of the reign to associate the tyrant with the *Ἐργα Πολυκράτεια*. However, relevant doubts are expressed by Barron and White<sup>61</sup>, as to whether or not all of the works can be attributed to

55. Hdt. I.64,ii; AP XV,3.

56. Hdt. I.64,i.

57. Polyaenus I.23,2.

58. See M.White, JHS LXXIV, 1954, pp.36-44; J.P.Barron, CQ<sup>2</sup> XIV, 1964, pp.210-30 (though his theory of there being two Polycrates is unorthodox); M.L.West, CQ<sup>2</sup> XX, 1970, pp.205-16.

59. Thuc. I.13,vi.

60. B.M.Mitchell, JHS XCV, 1975, p.81f.

61. Barron, op. cit. p.214; White, op. cit. pp.40-1.

Polycrates because of the time factor.

Despite being the most famous of all the Aegean tyrannies, the only account of Polycrates is to be found in Herodotus' account of Cambyses' invasion of Egypt <sup>in</sup> 525<sup>62</sup>. Herodotus' Samian material is largely derived from visits to the island, as revealed in his knowledge of the names of some Samians<sup>63</sup>, offerings in the Heraion<sup>64</sup>, and the account of Samian internal politics, for example. His informants are presumably aristocratic<sup>65</sup> (as in the case of Athens, where the information is derived from the Alcmeonids), since there is an aristocratic bias in his Samian narrative - especially seen in the account of Maeandrius, Polycrates' secretary and heir to power<sup>66</sup>. The story of Polycrates' tragedy may have been suggested by the lyric poets Anacreon<sup>67</sup> and Ibycus<sup>68</sup>, both having been present at the Samian court.

On Samos were the three greatest public works of Greece<sup>69</sup>: the temple of Hera (two much smaller-scale Heraia preceded that built c.570<sup>70</sup> a generation before Polycrates<sup>70</sup>, which was then destroyed by fire. Subsequently, Polycrates ordered the construction of a new temple and he may have had Rhoecus, who designed the temple of c.570<sup>71</sup>, supervising the rebuilding); the water tunnel

62. Hdt. III.39-50, 54-61, 120-26.

63. See, for example, Hdt. IV.43,vii, VII,85,ii.

64. Hdt. II.182.

65. Mitchell, op. cit. pp.85-6.

66. Hdt. III.142-45.

67. Hdt. II.121,i and Strabo 638 mentions Anacreon at Samos, and the latter could have been hired by Aiaces as Polycrates' tutor: Himerius Or. 29,22.

68. Ibycus was first at Samos in the reign of Aiaces, see West, op. cit. pp.207-08.

69. Hdt. III.60; Arist. Pol. V,1313b24.

70. Reuther, Der Heratempel von Samos, pp.63-5.

through Mount Ampelus of seven stades in length which took some ten years to build<sup>71</sup>; and the harbour fortifications.

Polycrates is also credited with the largest fleet in the Aegean. Herodotus states that Polycrates had one hundred penteconters<sup>72</sup> which were later replaced with triremes. Davison suggests<sup>73</sup> Polycrates was the first Greek ruler to adopt triremes as the battleship for his navy, thus helping to explain the important rôle he played in the period's international affairs. The penteconter was the main warship in the sixth century, although Thucydides says Corinth was building triremes by 700<sup>74</sup>. Triremes, along with penteconters, are to be found in the Phocaean and Samian navies<sup>75</sup>, and so, following Herodotus<sup>76</sup>, it appears Polycrates' navy was a mixed one, as opposed to being purely penteconters and then purely triremes<sup>77</sup>. Perhaps a reason for Pisistratus' friendship with Polycrates lies in the fact that if affairs in the more distant regions were to go wrong, the strength of the fleet would be needed.

It is unknown whether or not the three tyrants preserved any formal ties between each other, although there would appear to be indications of a lack of cooperation, as revealed in the lack of

71. See T.R.Bichowsky, Compressed Air Magazine, XLVII, 1943, pp.7086-90.

72. Hdt. III.39,iii.

73. J.A.Davison, CQ XLI, 1947, pp.18-25; see also L.Basch, JHS XCVII, 1977, pp.1-11.

74. Thuc. I.13,i-iii.

75. Thuc. I.13,vi-14,ii.

76. Hdt. III.39,iii: πεντηκοντέρους τε ἐκατὸν; 44,ii: τεσσεράκοντα τριηρεσι.

77. In connection with Thucydides' date for triremes, see: A.B.Lloyd, JEA LVIII, 1972, pp.276-9, JHS XCV, 1975, pp.52-5 (who says the triremes are Cypselid); J.S.Morrison & R.T.Williams, Greek Oared Ships, pp.128-31, 157-59 (before the tyranny at Corinth, triremes placed in the seventh century).

Athenian help to Lygdamis in 525/4 when a combined Spartan-Corinthian expedition successfully overthrew him. Naxos then fell under the rule of a pro-Spartan oligarchy<sup>78</sup>. Previously, the same force had met with failure against Polycrates; again there is no evidence of Athenian help. Since Lygdamis was in charge of the Athenian hostages, it is plausible to assume that Athens had some superiority in the dealings with the Aegean tyrants since any premature release of the hostages would be dangerous to the security of the régime, as would an alliance of Polycrates and Lygdamis against Pisistratus. Also we are told<sup>79</sup> that Polycrates hoped to become master of Ionia and the islands.

Athens, Naxos, and Samos were Ionian settlements, and because Athens asserted herself as the mother-city of all the Ionians<sup>80</sup> Pisistratus felt it his duty to purify the precinct of the temple of Apollo on the island of Delos, the religious and topographical centre of the Cyclades<sup>81</sup>. Pisistratus used the island as a foundation stone on which to build Athenian leadership over the islands, strategic considerations thus playing their part, and in so doing he created a precedent for the Confederacy of Delos in the fifth century. It is more than likely that an element of rivalry existed between Pisistratus and Polycrates over this island, since the latter was responsible for establishing a festival on it, and for dedicating the island of Rheneia

78. Hdt. V.30,i mentions some of the oligarchic party, ἄνδρες τῶν πάχεων, being exiled.

79. Hdt. III.122,ii: ἐλπίδας πολλὰς ἔχων Ἰωνίης τε καὶ νήσων ἅρξειν.

80. AP V,2; see: M.L.West, Iambi et Lyrici Graeci II, fr.4a.

γιγνώσκω, καὶ μοι φρενὸς ἔνδοθεν ἄλγεα κεῖται  
πρεσβυτάτην ἐσορῶν γαῖαν Ἰαονίης  
κλινομένην.

81. Polyaenus I,23; Thuc. III.104,i: ἐκάθηρε μὲν γὰρ καὶ Πεισόστρατος ὁ τύραννος πρότερον αὐτίν, οὐχ ἄπασαν, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔροῦ ἐφεωρᾶτο τῆς νήσου.

to Apollo and binding it to Delos with a chain<sup>82</sup>.

The Athenian festivals also played their part in foreign policy. Athens controlled the Great Mysteries, giving the city enormous prestige and reverence in the Greek world. The City Dionysia was celebrated when Athens was being visited by foreign merchants and visitors<sup>83</sup>. Consequently, the propaganda value was great: Pisistratus was out to impress on the Greek world the grandeur of his city, and the festivals were a powerful vehicle with which to achieve this.

In his foreign policy Pisistratus was very lucky because of the relative stability of the Greek world at this time, which enabled him to maintain the sort of amicable relations that he did. The foreign policy which had been inaugurated by Solon was an ambitious one, and it is to Pisistratus' credit that the future areas of expansion for the Athenian Empire were indicated a century before Pericles. The changing circumstances in the Greek world did not allow Hippias, succeeding his father in 528/7, to enjoy the same luck.

Hippias found it increasingly difficult to adhere to his father's policy of peace with all. The power of Thessaly was now in decline as that of Thebes arose and Thebes was perhaps by now realising that in the Southern Boeotian states Athens would be seen as a means of support against Theban influence. Megara, as always, was out for revenge and Aegina also was hostile and jealous of Athenian prosperity. Matters came to a head with the affair of Plataea.

Plataea lay at the Boeotian side of the western passes from Attica to Boeotia and, under Theban pressure to join the Boeotian League, appealed for help to Sparta. Cleomenes, the Spartan king,

82. Thuc. I.13,vi, III.104,ii; H.W.Parke, CQ XL, 1946, pp.105-9.

83. Aeschines III, in Ctes. 43.

realised that if this help were to be granted, Thebes might ally with Thessaly and Athens, thus forming an effective counter to his league. Consequently, Sparta declined help, but urged Plataea to seek assistance from Athens, which was duly given. As Sparta hoped, Athens and Thebes now became enemies, Sparta's league remaining secure. When Thebes moved against Plataea, an Athenian force was able to defeat the Boeotian one, and Athens followed up this victory by advancing the boundaries of Plataea and her neighbour Hysiae<sup>84</sup>. The lasting hostility of Thebes was gained, and it allowed the Alcmeonidae to use the land as a base of operations against Athens – precisely what Pisistratus had striven to avoid.

The chronology of the Plataean alliance has been much discussed. Thucydides<sup>85</sup> dates it to 519, in the ninety-third year before the capture of Plataea in 427<sup>86</sup>, but a number of modern scholars argue for a date of 509. A statement of Gomme<sup>87</sup> appears to sum up the argument: "there is no good evidence against 519, and nothing particularly in favour of ... 509".<sup>88</sup> Yet there is ground for believing in a date of 519<sup>89</sup>.

The controversy revolves around two passages in Herodotus: in VI,108, he represents the alliance as part of Cleomenes' plan to create enmity between Athens and Thebes, while in V.63,i, Herodotus tells us that the Pisistratids were friends of Sparta. Surely Herodotus is

84. Hdt. VI.108,vi; Thuc. III.55,i-iv.

85. Thuc. III.68,v.

86. See J.Wells, JHS XXV, 1905, pp.193-204.

87. A.W.Gomme, Historical Commentary on Thucydides II, p.358.

88. Those arguing for a date of 509 include: A.French, JHS LXXX, 1960, p.191; M.Amit, L'Ant. Class. XXXIX, 1970, pp.414-27.

89. See N.G.L.Hammond, Hist. IV, 1955, p.393; J.Wells, Studies in Herodotus, pp.81-8.

correct on both counts? Sparta and Athens were friendly, there is the implication in Herodotus<sup>90</sup> that Hippias was the friend of Sparta, and that Athens enjoyed Spartan proxenia<sup>91</sup>. Herodotus goes on to say<sup>92</sup> that the reason why the Spartans decided to restore Hippias about 503 was that by then they knew that the Alcmeonidae, and not Apollo, had been behind the Delphic pleas for the overthrow of the Athenian tyranny, (though that this was their reason is quite implausible). But the Pisistratids were allied to states such as Argos, Eretria and Thessaly<sup>93</sup>, an alliance dangerous to Cleomenes' policy of expansion in the Peloponnese; indeed it is stated<sup>94</sup> that the Spartans moved against Athens because of the friendship of that city with Argos.

What would be more natural than for the Spartans to resort to diplomatic warfare in order to undermine the power of the tyrants? The Spartan diplomacy of 519 was a preparation of the way for the direct attack which was to come in 510. By then of course Sparta had the added justification of Hippias' alliance with Persia<sup>95</sup>, and the Delphic pressure must have had considerable influence too. Thus when the Spartans overthrew the tyranny in 510, both political and religious reasons played their rôle in the justification for the attack.

The statement of Herodotus<sup>96</sup>, in connection with Cleomenes'

90. Hdt. V.90,i: ὅτι τε ἄνδρας ξείνους σφέσι τέλοντας ἐξεληλάκεσαν ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνων: the plural could indicate the Pisistratids.

91. See above, p.91, n.53a.

92. Hdt. V.90.

93. See W.W.How and J.Wells, Commentary on Herodotus, II, pp.344-45.

94. AP XIX,4: συνβάλλετο δὲ οὐκ ἐλάττω μοῖραν τῆς ὁρμῆς τοῖς Λάκωνιν ἢ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀργείους τοῖς Πεισιστρατίδαις ὑπάρχουσα φιλία.

95. See below, p.103.

96. Hdt. V.74,ii.

invasion of Attica in c.506, that the Boeotians ... ἀπὸ συνθήματος Οἰνόην αἱρέουσι. καὶ Υσίας, δῆμος τοὺς ἐσχάτους τῆς Ἀττικῆς . . . . ., could point equally to 519 or 509, both coming before 506. This can be linked with the extension of the frontiers made following the defeat of the Boeotian force at the hands of the Athenians, although doubt has correctly arisen concerning Hysiae. Oenoe was on the Boeotian border, but on the Athenian side of Mount Cithaeron; Hysiae was near the road from Plataea to Athens but never an Attic deme – it was only Athenian in the sense that it was connected with Plataea<sup>97</sup>, and therefore in alliance with Athens. Herodotus is mistaken in describing Hysiae as an Attic deme.

The network of alliances which Pisistratus had created on mainland Greece was fast deteriorating; the same can be said of Athenian influence in the Chersonese, where war again between Lampsacus and the Athenian people there had prompted the sending of Miltiades the Younger to re-establish Athenian hold. Here, it may be worthwhile to examine the role of the ~~Cimonides~~<sup>98</sup> in the Chersonese and in Athens during the tyranny period<sup>99</sup>.

It is known that a Miltiades was archon in Athens in 524/3<sup>99</sup>, and that he was a member of the Philaid family, but was he the elder Miltiades who had founded the Chersonese settlement<sup>100</sup>, sometime before 556/4? In 524/3 he would probably be in his sixties, having left Athens probably in his thirties, and as Herodotus does not say he returned to Athens, he does not appear to be the archon in question. The only other

97. Hdt. VI.108,vi.

98. See Beloch, G.G.<sup>2</sup> I.2. pp.280-81; H. Berve, Hermes Einzelschrift, II. 1937, pp.1-6.

99. See Chapter II, pp.34-5.

100. Hdt. VI.36.

known Miltiades is the famous son of Cimon, who died in 489, and who had probably been born in about 554<sup>101</sup>. It has been argued that a third Miltiades existed<sup>102</sup>, placed between the Elder and the Younger, but this is highly unlikely<sup>103</sup>.

The burial of Cimon (murdered by the sons of Pisistratus for political reasons<sup>104</sup>) and his mares was probably conducted by Miltiades the Younger<sup>105</sup>, and since this is about the time when Miltiades was archon in Athens and his brother Stesagoras was ruler in the Chersonese, it is safe to assume Miltiades the Younger was the archon of 524/3. This is backed by Marcellinus<sup>106</sup> who says he had sons by an Athenian wife, while Herodotus<sup>107</sup> names the eldest as Metiochus. This Metiochus commanded a ship in 495/4 and was born not later than 520, which would place Miltiades' marriage in Athens in c.522.

Thus Miltiades the Elder was sent out with volunteers to establish control of the Chersonese and to guard the grain route<sup>108</sup>. He ruled there almost as a prince, though perhaps his power was not autocratic and if he showed signs of breaking off relations with Athens Pisistratus doubtless could override his authority. Having established

101. H.T.Wade-Gery, JHS LXXI, 1951, pp.219-20, = Essays in Greek History, p.168.

102. N.G.L. Hammond, CQ<sup>2</sup> VI, 1956, pp.113-30.

103. See D.W.Braden, Hesp. XXXII, 1963, pp.206-09.

104. Hdt. VI.103,iii.

105. Hdt. VI.103,iv.

106. Marcellinus V.Th. II.

107. Hdt. VI.41,iii: τῆς δὲ νεὸς ταῦτης ἔτυχε τῶν Μελτιάδεω παῖδων ὁ πρεσβύτατος ἀρχῶν Μητίοχος.

108. The story of his rescue by Croesus (Hdt. V.37) suggests that he went before the final establishment of the tyranny.

control there and refounded Cardia, he founded Crithote and Pactye<sup>109</sup> and built a wall across the isthmus of the Chersonese (about 4½ miles) from Cardia to Pactye. Cardia is placed on the north coast of the Chersonese, and Pactye on the south. The wall acted as a barrier against the invading Apsinthii tribe<sup>110</sup>; what Miltiades had effectively done of course was to colonise the whole peninsula, and Pisistratus must have realised how useful a vassal of the ruler in Athens Miltiades would make. Pericles<sup>111</sup> and Dercyllidas<sup>112</sup> were later to rebuild the wall<sup>113</sup>. On Miltiades' death he was honoured with funeral games<sup>114</sup> and control passed to Stesagoras. A period of peace was maintained until warfare again broke out, placing the Athenian hold in danger.

At this point Miltiades the Younger was sent out with a force of mercenaries to re-establish control. This must have been envisaged as a military operation since Herodotus<sup>115</sup> says he was sent out in a trireme, obviously a prime Athenian warship as Thucydides<sup>116</sup> makes the point that most of the Athenian fleet was composed of penteconters<sup>117</sup>. When he arrived in the Chersonese Miltiades seized the local dynasts

109. For Cardia: Strabo fr. 52; Schol. Dem. 63.16.  
For Crithote and Pactye: Ephorus 70 F 40.

110. Hdt. VI.36,ii-37,ii.

111. Plut. Pericles XIX,1.

112. Xenophon, Hellenica III.2,8f.

113. See How and Wells, op. cit. II, p.76 for the actual measurements.

114. Hdt. VI.38,i.

115. Hdt. VI.39,i.

116. Thuc. I.14,iii.

117. Here though Herodotus could be making a careless mistake: in his time warships were triremes but this does not mean that Miltiades' ship was a trireme - Herodotus may simply be using the wrong name.



and re-established Athenian control there, and married Hegesipyle, the daughter of the Thracian king Olearus<sup>118</sup>, before capturing Lemnos (see below). All of which falls neatly before Darius invaded Scythia in 513, and therefore can be placed in Miltiades' first tenure of power, 516-11<sup>119</sup>.

Nepos<sup>120</sup> says Miltiades won Lemnos from the Carians who left the island, "Cares qui tum Lemnum incolebant", and then went on to win the rest of the Cyclades for Athens. Here Nepos is clearly wrong, and seems to be mistaking a passage from Herodotus<sup>121</sup>: *ὡς αἱ ἐπὶ Λήμνῳ ἐπικείμεναι νῆσοι ἀφανιζούσατο κατὰ τῆς θαλάσσης*. Hammond<sup>122</sup> takes the view that the capture of Lemnos must precede Lycaretus' destruction of the Pelasgians<sup>123</sup>, therefore the capture must fall during Miltiades' first tenure of power. Since Nepos puts the seizure of the island before Darius invaded Scythia, and Zenobius<sup>124</sup> places it in the period when Darius is in Thrace, a date of 514 may be suggested.

Pisistratid influence in the Aegean was seriously weakened with the overthrow of the tyrannies there, as a result of the expedition of 524 and the extension of Persian influence. As Naxos had formed a safe buffer-state between Samos and the rest of Greece, Polycrates, now this was gone, was forced to safeguard himself against further attacks from the west. Consequently he embarked on a policy of self-protection by

118. Hdt. VI.39,ii.

119. The chronology is, however, controversial: for an alternative see A.R.Burn, Persia and the Greeks, pp.218-20.

120. Cornelius Nepos, Life of Miltiades, I-III.

121. Hdt. VII.6,iii.

122. Hammond, op. cit. pp.122-26.

123. Hdt. V.27,ii.

124. Zenobius III,85.

intervening actively in the Aegean with the taking of Amorgos, Myconos, Rheneia, Scyros, and Tenos. There is no evidence for any interest shown in Naxos. For all of his carefully laid plans Polycrates was murdered by the satrap of Sardis, Oroetes, in about 520<sup>125</sup>.

An interesting question is raised when the Spartans overthrew Lygdamis: what happened to the Athenian hostages left on the island he ruled? Parke<sup>126</sup> suggests that as Cleisthenes the Alcmeonid was allowed to hold office in 525/4, perhaps the hostages had already been freed before the overthrow of Lygdamis as part of a reconciliatory policy by the tyrants. This is a distinct possibility: by this time the tyranny had been established for more than twenty years, and was sufficiently strong to withstand their release. The lack of evidence is, however, frustrating. Curious is the lack of Athenian help to the Aegean tyrants.

Following an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the Athenian tyranny in 514 Hippias ruled all the more harshly and in so doing created much discontent. He then made an alliance with Persia by means of marrying his daughter Archedice to Aeantides, son of the Lampsacene tyrant Hippocles, who was influential at the Persian court<sup>127</sup>. This alliance with Persia showed Hippias' political insight in aligning with a growing power in the Greek world. After an abortive attempt at a return ending in defeat at Leipsydrium, the Alcmeonidae enlisted Spartan help, and though a Spartan force under Anchimolus was defeated by the Athenians the tyranny was overthrown by Cleomenes in 511/10<sup>128</sup>.

125. Hdt. III.120-26.

126. Parke, op. cit. p.108.

127. Thuc. VI.59,iii.

128. Hdt. V.65,i-iii, Thuc. VI.59,iv; AP XIX.

French<sup>129</sup> says that the Pisistratids pursued a generally pacific policy precisely because they could not entrust a citizen army with weapons. But the cautious policy of the tyrants is understandable, since, having disarmed the citizens<sup>130</sup> and by using a mercenary force for security reasons<sup>131</sup>, they could not afford to take part in an overseas policy involving their security troops abroad because in the last resort their rule was based on the control of the army - in its absence the régime would be endangered. Cleisthenes later renewed the citizen force.

Pisistratus employed a policy of careful neutrality among his allies which greatly strengthened Attica through the peace it brought. Further away from home his policy was more imperialistic, marking the guidelines for the future Athenian empire with positive activity in the Aegean and Hellespont regions. Perhaps his foreign policy was influenced to an extent by the fact that he was the only Greek mainland tyrant to win power with outside help - hence his careful cultivation of friendship with all.

It is going too far to say that everthing was done for economic reasons, although these must have played a fundamental part in his policy. Attic ceramics benefitted in this period from the Corinthian decline, and pottery was favoured in production to an extent by the government<sup>132</sup>, though perhaps not in the same direct way as in other matters, for example, loans to struggling farmers. The prosperity of the farmers was promoted by his peaceful foreign policy.

129. A. French, JHS LXXX, 1960, p.191.

130. AP XV,4.

131. Hdt. I.64,i; but AP XV,3 is not consistent with Thuc. VI.56,ii, though Thuc. VI.58,ii says the mercenaries took the arms from the people.

132. See Chapter III, pp.67-8.

## Chapter V

### THE RELIGIOUS POLICY

In this chapter the manner in which Pisistratus used religion for political purposes will be examined, for instance as a means of subordinating local interests to the national. Since the celebration of festivals was an integral part of Greek life, it is important not only to consider the festivals themselves and any developments, but also to examine to what extent they were manipulated by the tyrant in order to fit in with general policies. This will also involve considering the relationship between Pisistratus and Heracles, and whether or not the tyranny was responsible for any growth of the cult of Theseus under the democracy.

As Pisistratus hoped to establish a centralised government, his religious policy fitted in with such a concern. Religion symbolised national unity and was used by him as a weapon against those hostile to the régime and to combat the multitude of local cults. Other tyrants had also employed religion in this way, for example, Cleisthenes<sup>1</sup> and Periander<sup>2</sup>. In every aspect of society some religious element could be found: Solon had even decreed that those magistrates guilty of corruption were to dedicate a gold statue at Delphi as punishment<sup>3</sup>.

The close relationship Pisistratus shared with the city goddess Athena is demonstrated in the great augmentation of her festival, the Panathenaea, celebrated at the end of Hecatombaeon, the first month of

1. Hdt. V.67-68.

2. Hdt. V.92.

3. AP VII,1, LV,5: ...ομνύμουσιν δικαιώς ἀρξειν καὶ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, καὶ δῶρα μὴ λήψεσθαι τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔνεκα, καν τι λάβωσι ἀνδριάντα ἀναθήσειν χρυσὸῦν.

the Attic year. This festival completely overshadowed the others held in that month, the Kronia to Zeus (held on the 12), and the Synoikia (held on the 16), which celebrated the unification of Attica by Theseus<sup>4</sup>. According to the Scholiasts of Aelius Aristides' Panathenaicus, the Panathenaea was the second oldest festival in Greece behind the Eleusinia, and it is believed<sup>5</sup> that the festival was originally held in honour of Erechtheus, who was displaced in post-Homeric times by Erichthonius. This belief has arisen from the similarity between this festival and the Spartan Hyacinthia, dedicated to Hyacinthus and Apollo: for one thing the peplos of Athena may be compared with the chiton of Apollo.

That Erechtheus was originally honoured receives further support from the fact that the peplos, the important offering of the Panathenaea, was always carried to the Erechtheum on the Acropolis where Athena had placed Erechtheus as a baby. The great difference between these two festivals was the time factor: the Hyacinthia was an annual festival only, while the Panathenaea was celebrated annually and quadrennially (as the Great Panathenaea), but this difference can be explained by the reforms of Pisistratus in the case of the latter.

Harpocration<sup>6</sup> says the original name of the festival was 'Αθηναῖα before Παναθηναῖα, and he takes great care to distinguish between the two types - καθ' ἔκαστον ἐνταυτόν and διὰ πενταετηρίδος" which they also called μεγάλα". The epithet μεγάλα referring to the annual festival may be found in other literature, for example, Lysias<sup>7</sup>:

"καὶ ἐπὶ Διοκλέους Παναθηναῖοις τοῖς μεγροῖς κυκλίψ χορῷ τριακοσίας (drachmae)."

4. Plut. Theseus XXIV, 4.

5. J.D.Mikalson, AJPh XCVII, 1976, pp.141-54.

6. s.v. Παναθηναῖα.

7. Lysias XXI, 2.

The oldest reference to a festival in honour of Athena in Athens is found in a passage of Homer<sup>8</sup>:

"καδ' δ' ἐν Ἀθήνης εἶσεν, ἐῷ ἐν πέονις νηῷ  
ἔνθα δέ μιν ταῦροισι καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἵλαντας  
κοῦροι, Ἀθηναῖων περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν."

From its simple beginnings there evolved an elaborate event involving the whole population, united in worshipping the city goddess on her birthday. In the archonship of Hippocleides<sup>9</sup>, 566/5, the festival underwent reorganisation with the introduction of athletic contests<sup>10</sup>. The date of 566/5 is known from Eusebius<sup>11</sup> who places the reorganisation in either 01. 53,3 (566/5), or 01. 53,4 (565/4); as the Great Panathenaea was held in the third year of the Olympiad, the former is correct<sup>12</sup>.

A problem encountered here is the extent to which Hippocleides acted as a free agent, since some have supposed that he acted at the initiative of Pisistratus<sup>13</sup>. It seems likely that Pisistratus made use of Hippocleides' archonship to begin a series of reforms designed to increase the prestige of the festival<sup>14</sup>.

Certainly, developments were made: probably the most notable was the establishment of rhapsodic contests for Homeric recitations, together

8. Homer, Iliad II, 549-51.

9. The same as he who lost the hand of Agariste, daughter of the Sicyonian tyrant Cleisthenes, Hdt. VI.129; see also J.W.Alexander, CJ LV, 1959, pp.129-34.

10. Marcellinus, V.Th. II,4.

11. Eusebius, Chron. ab Abr. 1451.

12. See also J.K.Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, p.295; T.J.Cadoux, JHS LXVIII, 1948, p.104.

13. See E.Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums ii<sup>2</sup> pp.665-66, 785; C.Hignett, History of the Athenian Constitution, pp.330-31.

14. See J.A.Davison, JHS LXXVIII, 1958, pp.23-42, LXXXII, 1962, pp.141-42, (= From Archilochus to Pindar, pp.28-70).

with the establishment of a single Homeric text<sup>15</sup>. Athena was not just a goddess favouring the nobility, but the Protectress of the whole city, and an attempt to create a unity of the people by the centralised worship of the city's goddess may be seen.

The dates and lengths of the events are unknown; the festival lasted perhaps one week. The prizes in the athletic and musical contests must have been good: in the fourth century a victorious harp singer won a crown worth one thousand drachmae and five hundred in cash, while the winner of the foot-race in the "beardless youth" category won sixty jars of olive oil<sup>16</sup>. This awarding of prizes of real value distinguished the Panathenaea from other festivals where the prizes were still garlands of leaves. The olive oil was obtained from the olive trees supposedly descended from that planted by Athena in her battle with Poseidon, and therefore sacred, and was presented in the vases known as Panathenaic Amphorae, which were first produced in the 560s<sup>17</sup>. This type of vase would have an armoured Athena on the front brandishing a spear and the inscription TON AΘENEΘEN AΘΛΟΝ, and on the reverse a picture of the particular event. The earliest of these, the Burgon Amphora, has a picture of a two-horse chariot race on it.

The route of the procession lay from the Dipylon Gate, through the Agora (diagonally NW-SE), and thence up the west slope of the Acropolis, a distance of about one kilometre<sup>18</sup>. Gymnastic events were held in the Agora, especially on the straight stretch of the Panathenaic Way, before the construction of the Panathenaic Stadium in the time of Lycurgus, c.330. The oldest and most characteristic event

15. See Chapter VI, pp.130-31; 133; 138.

16. I.G. ii<sup>2</sup> 2311; H.W.Parke, Festivals of the Athenians, pp.35-7.

17. See Chapter III, p.69.

18. H.Thompson, AA LXI, 1960, pp.24-31.

of the festival programme was the Apobates race, in which a fully armed passenger mounted and dismounted from a chariot at speed, a reminder of Homeric days.

The evidence concerning the introduction of musical contests in the tyranny period is more shaky, but sufficient exists to assign them to the Pisistratids rather than the Periclean era. Plutarch<sup>19</sup> describes the building of the Odeion and that Pericles decreed τότε πρῶτον that a musical contest was to be held as part of the festival<sup>20</sup>, but it may be that Plutarch is mistaken and Pericles re-instituted an old contest. This gives grounds for a dating of the musical contests to the tyranny. Also, a work mistakenly attributed to Plato<sup>21</sup> has Socrates saying of Hipparchus:

"καὶ τὰ ὄμηρου ἐπη πρῶτος ἐκόμισεν εὖς τὴν γῆν ταυτηνέ  
καὶ ἡνάγκασε τοὺς ῥαψῳδούς Παναθηναῖοις ἐξ υπολήφεως  
ἔφεξῆς αὐτὰ διενεγαντα."

Now, it seems strange that only rhapsodic contests would be instituted considering the reputation of Hipparchus in the artistic sphere. Therefore, both rhapsodic and musical contests were instituted in the tyranny, and Pericles was later to re-institute (or perhaps inject new elements in them) presumably to coincide with the erection of the Theatre.

The games were merely the secondary part of the festival; the sacrifice and the procession (taking the peplos for Athena to the Acropolis) held the primary religious significance. The peplos was begun nine months earlier on the last day of Pyanopsion at the festival of the Chalkeia, and woven by a team of ergastinae - aristocratic maidens - in the traditional material of wool. The size of the peplos

19. Plut. Pericles XIII,9.

20. Plut. ibid. XIII,11.

21. Ps-Plato, Hipparchus 228b.

grew over the years to such large proportions that it was unable to be carried aloft by the people<sup>22</sup>. The emphasis was on decoration rather than the actual weaving, the pattern depicting Athena's exploit in the battle of the gods and giants; the same motif as on the Panathenaic frieze of the Parthenon<sup>23</sup>. The procession ended with a great sacrifice of bulls and oxen on the Acropolis.

Although the sacrifice was religiously important since it represented the offerings to the goddess for her benevolence and future protection, the question is raised why so many animals were sacrificed. Was this a deliberate act by Pisistratus when revitalising the festival? The population of the city was given the chance to eat meat at the expense of the state; since the average Athenian was unable to purchase meat from his own pocket, he would naturally take part in such an affair. More importantly, such a person would be more likely to accept a régime which provided fun and games, appeased his religious conscience, and kept his stomach full<sup>24</sup>. A parallel case is that of the Roman Emperors and their *panem et circenses*.

The name of Pisistratus is associated with the torch race or *λαμπαδηφορία*, bringing fire from the altar of Eros in the Academy to that on the Acropolis, on which the great sacrifice was performed<sup>25</sup>. The object of the race was for the torch to remain lit; the winner's flame would be used to light the altar to Athena. Probably, Pisistratus took as a model for this race the older torch race from the

22. Pollux VII,50; Harpocration, s.v. *πέπλος*.

23. See R. Stillwell, *Hesp.* XXXVIII, 1969, pp.231-41.

24. For a reference to food and its after-effects at the Panathenaea, see Aristoph. *Clouds* 386.

25. The <sup>to Eros</sup> altar, incidentally, was built by Hippias and Hipparchus: Chapter III, p.77.

altar of Prometheus<sup>26</sup>.

Under Pisistratus the festival of the Panathenaea became the climax of civic life and through it the tyrant hoped the people would be encouraged in their pride and loyalty to attach themselves to the city as the centre of a united Attica. Athena's position as Protectress was enhanced – an aspect of her often referred to in literature, for example, the case of the Superstitious Man in Theophrastus<sup>27</sup>:

"καν γλαῦκες βαδίζοντος αὐτοῦ (ἀνακράγωσι) ταράττεσθαι καὶ εὖπας "Ἀθηνᾶ κρείττων" παρελθεῖν οὔτω."

Chronologically, the next festival of any importance fell in the third month of the Attic year, Boedromion, and was called the Mysteries, τὰ Μυστήρια<sup>28</sup>, a profoundly sober religious rite involving a belief in life after death. Athenian control of the cult at Eleusis via the medium of Heracles will be examined later<sup>29</sup>. The Eleusinian Mysteries should not, however, be confused with the festival of the Eleusinia, which took place in the second month, Metageitnion<sup>30</sup>. This was a harvest festival modified at some point between 600 and 468 (perhaps in the Pisistratid era, since this would fit in with the general policy of re-organisation), of which little is known. There was a procession of some kind with games, the prizes for which were a certain amount of grain from the Rarian Field<sup>31</sup>.

The Great Mysteries began on 15 Boedromion. A preliminary initiation before full initiation was held in the Lesser Mysteries

26. For a more humorous side to this race, see Aristoph. Frogs 1089f.

27. Theophrastus, Characters XVI,8.

28. See C.H.Moore, Religious Thought of the Greeks, pp.68-9; G.E.Mylonas, Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, pp.224-87, for an account of the proceedings of the festival, and those beliefs which are known.

29. See below, pp.124-25.

30. I.G. ii<sup>2</sup> 1946.

31. For more information on this festival: P.M.Simms, GRBS XVI, 1975, pp. 269-81.

conducted in the Athenian suburb of Agrae, in the month of Anthesterion. That, and the building of the Eleusinion in Athens to house the Hiera, are positive indications of an Athenian desire to control the cult of Demeter, which was secured with help from the priestly clan of the Eumolpidae. Much power and prestige obviously lay in controlling the Lesser Mysteries, the "matriculation requirement" for full initiation at Eleusis.

Why was there such a strong desire for Athenian control? Probably this stems from strategic reasons, as much as from Athens' "image", i.e. it would hardly do for the city if a major festival was connected with one city independent of Athenian control. After Athens, Eleusis was the next most important town of Attica, situated some fourteen miles North-West of the city: clearly it would not be in the best interests of Athens to be faced with a hostile Eleusis at any time. Thus, the most important mysteries in Greece were brought under Athenian control.

The Pisistratid period saw the building of many works at Eleusis. As its reputation as a Panhellenic centre increased along with the number of initiates, the early Telesterion was soon unable to cope and an extensive building programme was inaugurated by Pisistratus<sup>32</sup>. The early Telesterion was pulled down and a much larger one built, the remains of which make a reconstruction possible. The new temple was virtually square in shape and built of poros blocks with a foundation of Kara limestone, the characteristic material of Pisistratid construction<sup>33</sup>. The prostoion was two columns deep with a Doric entablature, and the Naos, measuring 25.3 by 27.1m was supported by twenty-two Ionic columns. This Ionic element in a Doric temple agrees with what is known of Pisistratid

---

32. See Mylonas, op. cit. pp.77-106 for fuller details.

33. See Chapter III, p.75.

practices. The Anaktoron, or Holy of Holies, where the cult Hiera were stored, was situated in the South-West corner of the Hall.

One of the earliest examples of a double gateway in Greek architecture can be traced to the tyranny period, being found close to the "Asty Gate". Here, an opening 4m wide is fronting an enclosed court 7m by 5.4m with a door on the South-East side 3m in width. The object was, of course, to serve as a cul-de-sac for an invading army. A strong peribolos wall enclosed both the sanctuary and the city.

Owing to Roman upheavals little in the north and west of the sanctuary can be reliably dated to the time of Pisistratus, but he may have been responsible for various administrative blocks, and the long, narrow building which has been identified as a *στρόφις* for the *ἀπαρχή*. Finally, in the northern area a temple to Plouton was built in the cave which henceforth became known as the Ploutonion. The temple today is of a later period, but the foundations date back to Pisistratid times, where a small shrine was composed of a naos 2.9m by 2.5m and perhaps fronted by an open portico.

In Athens Demeter was established in the Eleusinion below the North-West corner of the Acropolis. This establishment had nothing to do with the Mysteries, but a parallel may be drawn with Dionysus, two deities both coming to Athens from afar and being received as guests in the city, while the *εὐσαγωγή* of Dionysus is similar to the bringing of the Eleusinian Hiera to Athens.

Pisistratus, realising the importance to be attached to Eleusis, transformed it into a satellite of Athens. The increase in the size and facilities of the Telesterion enabled it to play a greater rôle in the religious life of the Greeks, while ties between the two cities were made stronger with Pisistratus connecting the cult with Athens as part of his policy of increasing the affluence of his city.

Too little is known of any part played by Pisistratus in fostering

the cult of Artemis Brauronia in Athens. Since he originated from Brauron (modern Vraona), it seems likely he would favour the establishment of his home goddess in the city, perhaps for those supporters from his home area who had been unable to worship her there for a while<sup>34</sup>. A shrine of the goddess is known on the South-West corner of the Acropolis<sup>35</sup>, but again, any connection with the work of the tyrant is conjecture. It is likely that Artemis was introduced in this period since this was a time when there was a tendency to introduce prominent local cults in the city. Brauron was originally one of the twelve townships united in tradition by Theseus, but then declined in importance until the archaic age when it regained its importance owing to the influence of Artemis, whose cult was allegedly founded there by Iphigeneia<sup>36</sup>.

A number of legends have arisen concerning the cult of Artemis, most notably that of a she-bear living in the goddess' sanctuary at Eleusis, which tore out one of a little girl's eyes after provocation, but was then killed as punishment by the girl's brothers. In anger, the goddess sent a plague, and to rid themselves of it the people had to make their young daughters "act the she-bear": *ἀρκτεύεται*, presumably meaning to imitate a bear walking on hind legs. The Athenians voted that their maidens could not marry until they had been *ἀρκτοί*.

The young girls acting the part are thought to have been between the ages of five and ten<sup>37</sup>, but a problem arises here in connection with Aristophanes' Lysistrata 641-7 which makes the "bears"

34. See I.Kontis, AD XXII, 1967, pp.156-206.

35. Travlos, p.124.

36. A.Brelich, Paides e Parthenoi, pp.242-46.

37. Schol. Aristoph. Lysistrata 645.

more than the age of ten, contrary to any other evidence.  $\kappa\lambda\tau' \epsilon\chiou\sigma\alpha$ <sup>38</sup> implies the girl was an arktos having been an aletris at the age of ten, but a definite age can be fixed if an emendation of the accepted text of Aristophanes is made<sup>39</sup> to read for lines 643-5:

"εξτ' ἀλετρὸς ή δεκέτις οὖσα τάρχηγέτις  
καὶ χέουσα τὸν ἡρόκωτὸν ἄρκτος ή Βραυρωνίους."

The implication of the latter is that the "bear" was now finishing office at the age of ten, and thus a specific age is known.

There is a parallel case of a rite in the cult of Artemis Pagasitis at Pagasae-Demetrias, and of Artemis Throsia at Larissa, where young girls are conscripted to "play the fawn" ( $\nuεβεύεται$ ) in periods consecrated to Artemis<sup>40</sup>. During this time, the girls were referred to as "fawns" ( $\nuεβροί$ ).

Finally, the last of the major festivals was known as the City Dionysia ( $\Deltaιονύσια τὰ ἐν ἀστεῖ$ <sup>41</sup>,  $\Deltaιονύσια τὰ ἀστικά$ <sup>42</sup>, or  $\Deltaιονύσια τὰ μεγάλα$ <sup>43</sup>), founded in honour of Dionysus of Eleutherae, a rural god whose wooden image was brought to Athens from Eleutherae by Pegasus of Eleutherae. The transfer date is uncertain, but there is no need to connect it, as Pausanias does<sup>44</sup>, with the Eleutherians transferring themselves from Boeotian to Athenian protection. This incident is just one in the spread of Dionysiac worship in Greece. Dionysus was a nature divinity; his death symbolised the dead vegetation of winter and his rebirth the spring revival. He was also a god of wine, and in the

38. Aristoph. Lysistrata 645.

39. T.C.W.Stinton, CQ<sup>2</sup> XXVI, 1976, pp.11-14; C.Sourvinou-Inwood, CQ<sup>2</sup> XXI, 1971, pp.339-43.

40. See P.Clément, L'Ant. Class. III, 1934, pp.393-409.

41. Aeschines III, in Ctes. 68; I.G. ii<sup>2</sup> 851.

42. Thuc. V.20,i.

43. I.G. ii<sup>2</sup> 654.

44. Pausanias I.38,8.

procession a Kanephoros carried a golden basket of first-fruits - presumably grapes.

The straightforward account of the transfer of Dionysus underwent elaboration in order to become "acceptable" in Greek eyes. In this case, the male Athenians were stricken with disease for not receiving the god with due honour, and to appease him and have the disease cured the people were to hold processions bearing aloft a phallus in his honour. This phallic procession no doubt was originally connected with the Rural Dionysia<sup>45</sup> where they were used to encourage the fertility of the land.

In the sixth century, Pisistratus' establishment of the festival demonstrated his preoccupation with controlling local cults and centres, although local cults were allowed to remain in existence. Dionysus was the type of deity whose appeal was universal, and who fitted in best with the movement away from aristocratic rites and privileges.

Pisistratus saw in him a powerful weapon against this local element. Apart from the dramatic and lyric importance of the festival<sup>46</sup> with the work of Thespis within the festival's framework, it was also perhaps the ultimate propaganda advertisement in the Greek world, of Athenian power, artistic achievement, and general splendour. Aeschines later remarks<sup>47</sup> that the Dionysiac processions took place "ἐν αντίστοιχοι ἀπάντων τῶν Ἐλλήνων", as the festival was held in the ninth month of the year, Elaphebolion (our March), a commercially good time with the seas again navigable and the city visited by traders and foreign merchants after the winter. Again the idea of a *panem et circenses* motivation to the festival is seen: a great sacrifice and dramatic events would add an

45. See below, p.118.

46. See Chapter VI, pp.132-33; 139-42.

47. III, in Ctes. 43.

entertainment value as well as increasing pride towards the city; all within the framework of a religious festival.

The central rite of the City Dionysia was the main procession or πομπή, usually held on 10 Elaphebolion following the εἰσαγωγή. The latter re-enacts the original arrival of the god in the city in a procession bearing a wooden image, on the night of 8 Elaphebolion. The πομπή consisted of leading in the sacrificial bulls into the Sanctuary of Dionysus and the carrying of the phallic symbols. The highlight of the πομπή was the sacrifice at the altar resulting in another roast beef dinner; in 333 some 240 bulls were sacrificed<sup>48</sup>. Bloodless offerings were also made, for example, obeliae, long thin rods of bread, something very similar to the modern French loaves. The day ended with the κῶμος an ultra-informal "revel"<sup>49</sup>.

As the connection between the festival and drama grew, certain administrative and legal additions were made<sup>50</sup>, for instance the holding of a προαγών after the εἰσαγωγή and before the πομπή to advertise the forthcoming plays, and after the festival the Ecclesia would meet on 14 Elaphebolion to discuss the conduct of the archon in charge and to hear any individual complaints -προβολαί, such as the προβολή of Demosthenes against Meidias in 348, although as a compromise was reached the speech was never delivered in court.

The transfer of the rural cult to the city revealed the growing importance of that place as a cultural centre, and of its urban populace. It is worthwhile to note that the official in charge of the organisation was not the βασιλεύς, the old religious official of the community, but the ἄρχων - the political leader increasing in

---

48. See W.S.Ferguson, Hesp. XVII, 1948, p.134.

49. For a fuller account of the events, Parke, op. cit. pp.127-30.

50. See G.M.Sifakis, CQ<sup>2</sup> XV, 1965, pp.206-15.

importance as overall authority in the sixth century.

On a much smaller scale, incidentally, than the City Dionysia was the Rural Dionysia, taking place in Poseideon; the most important celebrations being held at Myrrhinous and Peiraeus<sup>51</sup>. Certain similarities do exist, for example the carrying of  $\varphi\alpha\lambda\lambdao\acute{u}$  in procession and some tragic contests, but the  $\kappa\tilde{\omega}\muo\acute{s}$  as attested by the Law of Euegoros in Athens is not found in the rural festival.

The final festival to be instituted by Pisistratus was on a much smaller scale and held on 19 Munychion in honour of Olympian Zeus and thus called the Olympieia. It was most probably instituted when work began on the great temple to Olympian Zeus<sup>52</sup>, and although this project was suspended on the overthrow of the tyranny, the festival continued to be celebrated. It must have been organised to an extent under the democracy because by the Hellenistic period it had evolved into a cavalry occasion, and the military tattoo known as "Riding Opposite", or  $\alpha\nu\theta\pi\alpha\sigma'ca$ <sup>53</sup>, was performed in the Hippodrome<sup>54</sup>.

In the sixth century Attica was not a centralised state entirely dominated by Athens: Pisistratus endeavoured to end this regionalism by the city festivals and by using religion against local influences. Although specific evidence is lacking, it is likely that the tyrant deliberately played down the aristocratic cult of Codrus, Neleus and Basile, in existence at this time. *Despite the impetus this cult*

51. See L. Deubner, Attische Feste, p. 137.

52. See Chapter III, p. 74.

53. I.G. ii<sup>2</sup> 1291.

54. For more details on the festivals, A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, The Dramatic Festival of Athens<sup>2</sup>, relevant sections.

would have given the Athenian claim to leadership over the Ionians, Pisistratus may have used the cults of Artemis Brauronia and perhaps that of Theseus to supersede that of the trio.

A ring of mystery surrounds the trio: for one thing their shrine has never been discovered with any degree of certainty – the site is apparently in South-East Athens<sup>55</sup>. Socrates enters the palaestra of Taureas opposite the shrine of Basile<sup>56</sup>, but it is more than likely that Basile had more than one shrine in the city. Codrus is believed to be a later addition and buried somewhere near the Acropolis<sup>57</sup>, although Lycurgus<sup>58</sup> says he was killed outside the city near the gate, in the disguise of a beggar.

Despite the multitude of cults and the celebration of numerous festivals, dissatisfaction could still be found regarding the reward of spiritual salvation after death, and in the Pisistratid era a new cult was acquired: Orphism. This belief was closer to Pythagoreanism than the Great Mysteries; for example the Orphics met in cult societies united by strange beliefs. Little is known of their organisation or number, but their beliefs again stressed the unimportance of this world and the desire for salvation which could only be achieved through initiation.

Herodotus says the Orphic movement originated from Egypt and laid down its doctrines in texts. These early poems have been lost, and so reliance has to be placed on later sources for information. By the sixth century Orphism was well-established at Croton, Southern Italy, and then came to Athens. It is unknown if the tyrants were

55. Travlos, pp.332-34, 291 fig.379.

56. Ps-Plato, Charmides, 153a.

57. I.G. ii<sup>2</sup> 4258.

58. Lycurgus, in Leocratem 86.

directly responsible for its importation or merely gave it encouragement; both sons displayed a greater taste for Orphism than their father. At the Athenian court were Zopyrus of Heraclea, Orpheus of Croton, and Onomacritus, who himself wrote Orphic poetry<sup>59</sup>.

The island of Delos may be brought in here<sup>60</sup>. As well as being the topographical centre of the Cyclades, Delos was also the religious centre: the temple of Apollo had been used by the Ionians from its first associations with Apollo and Artemis. This was also the first place where the two deities were associated.

Pisistratus used the island to build up Athenian leadership over the Ionians, although there was no overt racial discrimination, as in the policy of Cleisthenes of Sicyon, for example. Pisistratus set about "purifying" Delos by digging up the bones of the dead buried within sight of the temple<sup>62</sup>, and re-interring them on the far side of the island. The tyrant was generally cool to any institution favouring the nobility, especially Delphi, owing to aristocratic (and perhaps especially Alcmeonid) influence there. This is probably the reason why so much interest was shown in Delos as a competitor for the worship of Apollo. That religion was used as an excuse for more military action is seen in the policy of Polycrates of Samos, who also recognised the strategic importance of the island. Probably in 523 he dedicated the island of Rheneia to Delos and established some sort of festival on the island, which was never repeated owing to his death the following year<sup>63</sup>. Athenian mastery over Delos was never endangered, however.

59. Glotz and Cohen, pp.457-58.

60. See also Chapter IV, pp.95-6.

No note 61

62. Hdt. I.64,ii.

63. See Chapter IV, p.92.

It now remains to consider Pisistratus' relationship with Heracles and Theseus. Of deliberate identification with Heracles there can be no doubt<sup>64</sup>, at least in the beginning of the rule, but can one detect any evidence that the cult of Theseus was encouraged under the tyranny to emerge into the limelight under Cleisthenes? Specific evidence is lacking, but there are some grounds for doubt, and it may be that Cleisthenes did follow some precedent in enhancing worship of Theseus.

Politicians and rulers took the importance of myths and hero-status seriously<sup>65</sup>, and therefore welcomed their portrayal in vase painting. As Theseus' life and acts become as frequent, and then surpass those of Heracles, from only 510 onwards (the ratio of Theseus vases to those of Heracles before 510 is 1:8), it is concluded that Theseus' emergence cannot derive from Pisistratid times. This may be wrong. For one thing, Theseus' victory dance is portrayed by Cleitias on the François Vase<sup>66</sup> of c.570. As this was the "age" of Heracles, so to speak, it is unsurprising Theseus takes a secondary rôle. What is surprising is the interest taken in a Dorian hero as opposed to an Ionian, but Pisistratus' identification with Heracles was a matter of political expediency. It is not possible to pursue with certainty political symbolism in Greek Art, but for evidence of Heracles and Theseus in the sixth century it is necessary to look at the art of this period, since this is the period in which the development of Theseus as an Athenian hero seems to have begun.

The most explicit political symbolism is Pisistratus' return to

64. See J. Boardman, RA 1972, pp.57-72.

65. The ultimate example being Cleisthenes of Sicyon, who stopped epic recitals because they celebrated the deeds of his enemies, the Argives.

66. ABV p.76, no.1.

Athens helped by the false Athena<sup>67</sup>, which can be associated with Heracles' introduction to Olympus by Athena herself. This may have been part of the Heracles story already, but only from the middle of the sixth century does it become important for artists.

Heracles' Introduction was soon modified by the introduction of a chariot in the procession having Athena either already stationed in it or mounting or dismounting, and from that time onwards she becomes associated with chariots. Why the change? Pisistratus rode to Athens in a chariot with the false Athena, so this change of Heracles' apotheosis would emphasise the similarity between the two events. The only drawback to this is the important one that Heracles was already dead and on his way to "heaven" as an immortal; Pisistratus was still very much alive with a future not so certain. If we read deeply into the matter, we may draw a parallel between Pisistratus' club-bearing bodyguard<sup>68</sup> and Heracles, the club-bearer extraordinaire; or perhaps even connect the name of Thessalus with the fact that Heracles also had a son named Thessalus<sup>69</sup>:

"θεσσαλοῦ υἱε δύω 'Ηρακλεῖδαο ἄνακτος."

If Pisistratus did favour such a deliberate identification with a hero, he was not the only statesman to do so: Pericles, for example, impersonated Theseus on the Parthenos shield. What reasons would Pisistratus need to align himself with Heracles in such an explicit manner? Heracles was the favourite of the city goddess Athena, and the tyrant displayed a close relationship with her, and there is also the fact that Heracles was a <sup>Athenian</sup> ~~hero~~ popular in <sup>Athenian</sup> there was every cause for an aspiring political leader to link himself with such a personage. It

67. Hdt. I.60,iv.

68. Hdt. I.59,v; AP XIV,1; Plut. Sol. XXX,1-6.

69. Homer, Iliad II, 679.

is worth pointing out that despite all the religious and symbolic rig-marole attached to Pisistratus' first return, he was nevertheless expelled from the city within a short time<sup>70</sup> – an indication of the power still wielded by the nobility.

So the tyrant aimed for support from among the mass of people, more susceptible to religious practices and their significance. There could not be a better medium than religion, especially when the predominant position of a national hero could be exploited in his favour. Perhaps as time continued the new interpretation of the apotheosis of Heracles was taken up more readily than first anticipated by artists seeking new material and scenes. In time, these scenes which carried the political significance as portrayed on the early pottery would become part of a general corpus as mass production increased.

Scenes involving both Heracles and Theseus are lacking from the art of our period, for example, Heracles' rescue of Theseus from Hades. Is this significant? Athena, the patroness of Heracles, displayed no similar signs of affection for Theseus, and he ~~often~~ appears without her help. This coolness to Theseus may have influenced Pisistratus to favour Heracles as he did: the tyrant was in power by right of conquest rather than legality, and his position was precarious; it would not be in his best interests to align with a virtual enemy of the city goddess. In the case of the Battle of Pallene, there could be a deliberate ambiguity by Pisistratus, since this battle can be associated either with Theseus' victory over the Pallantidae there, or even with the other Pallene where Heracles won immortality in the fight with the gods against the giants<sup>71</sup>.

---

70. See Chapter I, pp.6; 16-17.

71. Diodorus Siculus IV.15,i.

In the case of the Eleusinian Mysteries, Heracles is put to use for the good of Athens rather than for any personal reasons<sup>72</sup>. A fragment of an amphora of c.540<sup>73</sup> places Heracles in Eleusis: Demeter is seen mounting a chariot, Hermes, Triptolemos and Plouton are also present, as are Heracles and Athena (Heracles is also found on the neck with Cerberus). Apollodorus places that labour after Heracles' initiation, while Euripides says his success in the Underworld was owing to this initiation. The question is, to what extent did Pisistratus exploit such a connection in securing Athenian control over the Mysteries?

Since the earliest times control of the Mysteries was in the hands of the Eleusinian officials<sup>74</sup> tracing their descent back to Eumolpus, allegedly the first to learn about and then to celebrate them. The Homeric Hymn to Demeter is purely Eleusinian in composition with no Athenian intervention at all; a situation which had changed radically by the fifth century. The Hiera were carried in great procession from Eleusis to Athens, and in the sixth century an Eleusinion was built in Athens, remains of which have been found under the fifth century erection<sup>75</sup>, while Andocides<sup>76</sup> records that Solon had decreed that the Basileus was to report to the Boule in the Eleusinion after the Mysteries<sup>77</sup>. However, this is more likely to be a conventional ascription of an Athenian law to Solon, rather than an actual law passed by him. It is plausible that the Athenian building policy there<sup>78</sup> was

72. See J. Boardman, JHS XCV, 1975, pp.1-13.

73. ABV p.147, no.16.

74. See K. Clinton, Trans. Am. Philos. Soc. LXIV, 3, 1974.

75. Travlos, p.198.

76. Andocides I.111-12.

77. See also I.G. ii<sup>2</sup> 848 line 30, 1072.

78. See above, pp.112-13.

followed by an Athenian take-over of the cult.

Apollodorus states that after the slaying of the Centaurs Heracles was unable to be initiated owing to his impurity from such an act and his foreign birth. He was therefore adopted by Pylios and naturalised<sup>79</sup>, after initiation by Eumolpus following the preliminary rite at the Lesser Mysteries. Heracles was therefore used to help smooth the transfer of control, though doubtless some Athenian doctoring of his position was carried out to increase his political and religious esteem<sup>80</sup>. New and relevant iconography was established by the Lysippides Painter, for example, with the new-style Heracles and Cerberus scenes<sup>81</sup> or Heracles playing the lyre<sup>82</sup>.

In the last quarter of the sixth century Theseus takes on a new and important rôle as the champion of the new democracy coupled with the writing of a new Theseid which increased his stature. This was added to all his other stories, such as Theseus and the Minotaur, Theseus and Ariadne, and his journey to Athens. Controversy has arisen over the authorship of the Theseid: Deubner<sup>83</sup> attributes it to the Pisistratids<sup>84</sup>, while Jacoby<sup>85</sup> attributes it to the opposition and the

79. Plut. Theseus XXXIII,2.

80. Diodorus Siculus IV.39,i states that the Athenians were the first to tell the Greeks of Heracles' apotheosis: 'Αθηναῖοι πρῶτοι τῶν ἄλλων ὡς θεόν ἐτύμησαν θυσίας τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ανθρώποις παράδειγμα τὴν ἐαυτῶν εἰς τὸν θεὸν εύσεβειαν ἀποδείξαντες προετρέφαντο τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἀπαντας "Ελληνας, μετὰ δὲ ταυτὰ καὶ τοὺς κατὰ τὴν οὐκουμένην ἀνθρώπους ἀπαντας ὡς θεὸν τιμᾶν τὸν Ἡρακλέα.

81. ABV p.254, no.1.

82. ABV p.520, no.20.

83. L.Deubner, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1944, p.15.

84. It is doubtful if they were able to create such a story, but they were able to assemble one from a literary viewpoint, witness the edition of the Homeric text, Chapter VI, pp.133-38.

85. F.Jacoby, Atthis, pp.394-95, n.23.

influence of the Alcmeonids, then in exile at Delphi. This view is supported by Sourvinou-Inwood<sup>86</sup> who suggests an anti-tyranny influence. The influence of the Alcmeonids in the Theseid is strong, but evidence leading to a specific date is lacking. It is a possibility that the cult was augmented in the time of the tyranny and amplified under the democracy.

An amphora by the Würzburg Painter<sup>87</sup> has been dated to the middle of the sixth century, and portrays Theseus and the Bull. This could link up with the later red-figure Euergides Painter<sup>88</sup> as the merging of the old and new: the end of Heracles and the growth of Theseus. Definite proof is again lacking, and only conjecture may be advanced at the moment. The abduction of the Amazon Antiope myth begins to occur on early red-figure vases about 515, with those of the Oltos Group, and a brief survey of Theseus and the Minotaur scenes reveals some 10 in early black-figure; 48 in middle black-figure; 37 in late black-figure; and 11 in early red-figure<sup>89</sup>.

It is worth noting the account of the action of Pisistratus in AP upon arriving in Athens after Pallene<sup>90</sup>:

"παρεῖλε δὲ τοῦ δῆμου τὰ ὄπλα τόνδε τὸν τρόπον. ἐξοπλασίαν ἐν τῷ θησεύῳ ποιησάμενος ἐκκλησιάζειν ἐπεχείρει."

Could such a reference to a Theseum indicate that one was already in existence before the (supposedly) new one was built along with the Stoa Poikile in the 460s? An account of the Theseum situated close to the

86. C.Sourvinou-Inwood, B.I.C.S. Supp. XL, 1979.

87. ABV p.315, no.2.

88. Who paints Theseus and the Minotaur and Prokrustes, and Heracles and the Lion on the same cup, which is most unusual: it was usual for one hero with two or three acts to be portrayed on the same cup.

89. See also C.Sourvinou-Inwood, JHS XCI, 1971, pp.94-110.

90. AP XV,4.

Gymnasium of Ptolemy, is given by Pausanias<sup>91</sup>, who attributes the foundation to the occasion when the bones of Theseus were brought back to Athens by Cimon from Scyrus<sup>92</sup>. Polyaenus, however, places the ἑξοπλασία or armed muster not in the Theseum but in the Anaceum<sup>93</sup>, an enclosure large enough to hold either a meeting<sup>94</sup> or even a cavalry parade<sup>95</sup>. However, apart from the reference in AP, there is no other evidence for the Theseum or the Anaceum being on these sites before the fifth century, so it is possible that AP is mistaken.

Considering the aim of Pisistratus in asserting Athenian hegemony over the Ionians, it is plausible to assume that he would do something about Theseus, and the fact that Pisistratus did effect a more lasting unity of Attica immediately brings to mind the alleged unification of Attica by Theseus, which is emphasised in the re-organisation of the Panathenaea. Apart from being a festival in honour of Athena, it was also in commemoration of the original act of unification by Theseus.

It is perhaps wrong to try to detect political symbols from art, since some of the works may be specially commissioned mythical scenes, reflecting the taste of the purchaser, without having any political leanings. But we can see that Pisistratus did take advantage of Heracles' position for purely political reasons, rather than a conscious desire to emulate that particular hero. Also, although it is true that Theseus does only fully emerge under the democracy it can be seen that the Ionian Theseus began his development as a national hero against the

91. Pausanias, I.17,2-6.

92. Plut. Theseus XXXVI,2-4.

93. Polyaenus I.31,2.

94. See, for example, Thuc. VIII,93,i.

95. Andocides, I, Mysteries, 45.

Dorian Heracles in the tyranny<sup>96</sup>.

Religion fitted in well with Pisistratus' statesmanship, since it could be made applicable to any and all classes. Although the priesthoods remained in the hands of the aristocracy (for example, the families of the Eumolpidae and the Kerukes held control of the cult of Demeter), the tyrant had seen to it that they now enjoyed only a limited independence, and were working for the good of the state (and thus under his own control), as opposed to themselves.

Pisistratus realised how politically useful a state religion could be in ensuring his position as tyrant. The unity of Attica ensured the strengthening of the régime, and so a personal element underlines his policy. Perhaps his reason for promoting such a zealous religious policy stemmed from a desire to appease the city goddess, since he was master of her city by conquest and not birth - the element of *ubius* entering here? Actions which were opposed to justice were seen as *ubius* in the eyes of the gods and punishable by them. Pisistratus' position was not gained according to tradition, and this may have influenced his religious beliefs and morality to an extent.

In increasing the prestige of the Panathenaea and in bringing the rustic deity Dionysus into the city Pisistratus played on the religious conscience of the people in binding them to the city as the centre of a united Attica. The general moral effect, although the evidence from the poets about the morality and religion of the sixth century is often scattered and biased, also increased the affluence of the city as trading and commercial opportunities grew as a result of visits by foreigners attracted by the festival show-pieces, as well as

---

96. The evidence for the interest displayed in the two heroes is collected in: T.B.L. Webster, Potter and Patron in Classical Athens, pp.82-90, 252-53; F. Brommer, Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldenage,<sup>3</sup> pp.1-209, 210-58; Denkmälerlisten zur griechischen Heldenage I, & II, pp.1-28.

the stability of the rule. Pisistratus aimed to be a second Theseus in achieving a more lasting unity of Attica, and religion was an important medium with which to effect this aim, pervading every aspect of society and being exploited by the tyrants for their own security and to combat the local, powerful families.

Chapter VILITERATURE

The aim of this chapter is to examine the literature of Pisistratid Athens and any rôle played in its development by the tyrants. Did they so encourage the growth of tragic drama (from which comedy was later to grow) that without their help it would not have developed as speedily as it did, or was it simply a product of an artistic age in a developing state? To what extent is it possible to discover political tones to the tyrants' cultural policy or is it unfair not to recognise the extent to which they were lovers of the arts for their own sake? This appears to be the case with Philip II of Macedon and his "real motives" for his courtship of Athens, for example. This chapter falls into three main sections: the alleged Pisistratid recension of the Homeric epics, the rise of drama and the work of Thespis, and the general literature of the period, such as the *σκόλια Ἀττικά* and writers receiving patronage – Anacreon and Simonides.

There has been a general belief in Pisistratid involvement with an edition of the Homeric epics<sup>1</sup>, that Pisistratus collected the poems and established a text<sup>2</sup>. Although the Homeric manuscripts do not appear until the third century BC it is possible to retrace the Homeric story from textual analysis and early stories.

Exactly when the Homeric poems were written down is unknown, perhaps even in the time of Homer himself, and various unofficial texts may have gone into circulation after that, but indications exist pointing

---

1. See M.V.Bérard, Revue de Philologie XLV, 1921, pp.194-234.

2. See, for example, Cicero de Oratore III,137: *qui* (i.e. Pisistratus *primus Homeri libros confusos antea sic disposuisse dicitur ut nunc habemus.*

to some official text to be dated between the middle and the end of the sixth century. Obviously, the tyrants must have been involved in this and Pisistratus is accused of inserting various lines in the Athenian interest. Thus, the tyrant is responsible for creating the first definitive edition of the Homeric poems, and later charged with interpolating. It is therefore important to distinguish between what he did, and what he is unjustly accused of doing. But before this, it is perhaps worthwhile to see why the Homeric epics reached their level of prominence in the Greek world, assuming the existence of other epic poems.

According to Callinus of Ephesus and Antigonus of Carystus, Homer was also responsible for writing the Thebaid<sup>3</sup> and the Cypria, which he apparently gave as dowry for his daughter<sup>4</sup>, and in referring to his tragedies as "slices from the great banquets of Homer", Aeschylus cannot be referring to the Iliad and Odyssey alone. A large body of early Greek heroic poetry, roughly contemporary with the great epics, was in existence and was known as the Epic Cycle. A more precise dating is impossible: Severyns<sup>5</sup> dates the Aethiopis by Arctinus of Miletus to the early eighth century, while Wilamowitz<sup>6</sup> argues a later date for the Cypria because of forms such as  $\alpha\delta\omega\zeta$  and  $\prime\lambda\lambda\omega\zeta\omega$ . Lesky<sup>7</sup> is probably correct in setting a general date of composition *in* the seventh century.

The difference between the Cyclic Epics and Homer is great: superficially there appears to be a similar style but attitudes differ - the romantic and miraculous elements are dealt with less austerely in

3. Pausanias IX.9,5 tells us Callinus ascribed the Thebaid to Homer.

4. Pindar, fr. 189.

5. A. Severyns, Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque, p.313.

6. Wilamowitz, Homerische Untersuchungen, p.367.

7. A. Lesky, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur<sup>3</sup>, p.104.

the Cycle than in the Iliad<sup>8</sup>. Important concepts are much different, for example invulnerability: Iliad XXIII,69f has the rule of Patroclus' ghost that the dead do not return to life, even Heracles cannot evade death<sup>9</sup>, but it can be evaded in the Cycle. The most notable instance of this perhaps regards the Dioscuri, since Homer writes of them as dead and buried in Iliad III,243, yet in the Cypria Zeus gives them immortality on alternate days. The *inferiority* of the Cyclic epics in comparison with the Homeric is displayed in <sup>their</sup> un-heroic attitudes, a tendency towards myth and romance, and a less dramatic style on the whole<sup>10</sup>.

The public recitations at the Panathenaea set aside any other epic poetry in favour of the Iliad and Odyssey, which henceforth occupied an exclusive position. Neither of them were the first poems to be composed on their subjects (the phrase εἰπε καὶ ἡμῖν<sup>11</sup> suggests predecessors), but as time continued the Homeric epics became the definitive epics, owing to their portrayal of national endeavour (for example the great war of the Iliad), as well as their general popularity, and were taken under state control - as shown by the Panathenaic Rule.

Plutarch<sup>12</sup> states that Pericles instituted the Homeric recitations in 442, but the word πρῶτον may here be wrong, since it could refer either to the first decree establishing musical contests at the Panathenaea or the first of a series of decrees extending their content or re-establishing them after a lapse of time<sup>13</sup>. The latter appears more likely, since further evidence exists suggesting Hipparchus

8. See D.B.Monro, JHS V, 1884, pp.1-42.

9. Iliad XVIII,117.

10. See also J.Griffin, JHS XCVII, 1977, pp.39-54.

11. Odyssey I,10.

12. Plut. Pericles XIII, 11.

13. See also Chapter V, p.109.

(perhaps with Pisistratus) established the rule<sup>14</sup>. It specified that the rhapsodes at the contests had to follow a specific text of Homer in the correct order without any deviations. In other words, the rhapsode had to follow with the next consecutive book, ἐξ ὑποβολῆς<sup>15</sup> or ἐξ ὑπολήψεως ἐφεξῆς<sup>16</sup>.

This rule helps to prove the existence of a written text in Pisistratid times. There is no evidence to suggest the text was not written down before it arrived in Athens, having been brought either by wandering bards or at the instigation of Hipparchus and later changed or "Atticised" on arrival, rather than having been written from scratch<sup>17</sup>. The Panathenaic Rule would seem to suggest that a logical order of recitation had previously been lacking, and that Pisistratus was responsible for a definitive text. This should not imply insertions in it by such people as Onomacritus<sup>18</sup>, although forgers did exist at this time.

The accusations arose from the Megarians Dieuchidas and Hereas, since Megara had recently lost Salamis to Athens<sup>19</sup> and was determined on revenge, but revenge was impossible on any other basis than slander and misrepresentation. The Athenians had used Homer to strengthen their claim to Salamis: how natural for Dieuchidas and Hereas to discredit the

14. Ps-Plato, Hipparchus 228b; the festival but not the author is named in Lycurgus, in Leocratem 102; Isocrates, Panegyricus 159; Plato, Ion 530 b-c.

15. Diog. Laert. I,57.

16. Ps-Plato, op. cit. 228b.

17. See T. Allen, Homer: Origin and Transmission, pp.225-49.

18. Onomacritus, in his collection of the oracles of Musaeus, was charged by Lasus of Hermione with forging an oracle to predict the disappearance of Lemnos and banished. Thus he could have made pro-Athenian insertions in the Homeric poems. See Hdt. VII.6,iii.

19. See Chapter IV, pp.83-4.

text associating Ajax with the Athenians<sup>20</sup> and thereby cast doubt on Athens' control of the island. Hereas<sup>20a</sup> accused Pisistratus of inserting a line into the Odyssey: "Θησέα Περίθοόν τε, θεῶν ἐρικυδέα τέκνα"<sup>21</sup>, and also of the removal of a line from Hesiod<sup>22</sup>. Theseus' feat in killing the Megarian Sciron was also reduced by the Μεγαρόθεν συγγραφεῖς.

Really, the historical evidence for Pisistratus' tampering with the text is so weak that Wilamowitz rightly says of Dieuchidas<sup>23</sup>, "Wir sind vollkommen in der Lage die Richtigkeit seiner Conjectur zu prüfen", and it is worthwhile pointing out that before Dieuchidas there is nothing heard of Pisistratean (or even Solonian<sup>24</sup>) interference with Homer. To what extent may we rely on Dieuchidas and Hereas as being correct in accusing the tyrant? Obviously, none; the accusations are merely the conjectures of a political enemy intent on furthering the Megarian cause at the expense of Athens. Indeed, the passage of Diogenes connecting either Solon or Pisistratus with Iliad II, 557/8 and portraying Dieuchidas as the accuser is incomplete<sup>25</sup>, and Dieuchidas cannot be viewed as authoritative when dealing with the alleged interference. Despite this, some have used Diogenes' text to base arguments for the alleged recension<sup>26</sup>.

20. Iliad II, 557/8; Arist. Rhetoric I, 1375b29-30: οἶνον Ἀθηναῖον Ὀμῆρῳ μάρτυρι ἔχοντα περὶ Σαλαμῖνος.

20a. F.G.H. 486 F 1.

21. XI, 631.

22. See below, pp. 138-39.

23. Wilamowitz, op. cit. p. 243.

24. Diog. Laert. I, 57.

25. See J.A. Davison, CQ<sup>2</sup> IX, 1959, p. 216.

26. For example, R. Merkelbach, Rh. Mus. XCV, 1952, pp. 23-47, referring to Dieuchidas as, "der älteste Zeuge".

There are problems as to when Dieuchidas' work, the Megarica, which dealt with various aspects of Megara, for example, its history and cult, was written. Wilamowitz<sup>27</sup> suggests Dieuchidas lived in the fourth century and was perhaps born in the late fifth, "schon ein menschenalter vor Aristoteles las Dieuchidas einen attischen Homer", but doubt has been cast on this by Bourguet<sup>28</sup>, who connects this Dieuchidas with a Dieuchidas, son of Praxion, whose name was listed among the ranks of the valonotocat Delphi in the 330s and 320s.

If the Megarian accusation is valid, then surely the poems would be full of insertions in the Athenian favour portraying Athenian affluence? But this is not the case<sup>29</sup>; in comparison with the evidence against the accusation, that for it is scanty indeed. Eustathius<sup>30</sup> tells us that Book X of Iliad was originally not part of the poems but inserted by the Pisistratids.

Athens was an important centre in Mycenaean times: her citadel on the Acropolis was on a level with that of Thebes, both second in position to Mycenae. But it is plain that the Athenian position as described by Homer is not flattering: the expedition to Troy sets out from Aulis as opposed to Phaleron or Peiraeus, and one of the Athenian leaders, Menestheus, who plays a more important rôle, repeatedly falls short of the heroic standard of an Achilles or an Agamemnon. Athens is mentioned once only in Iliad<sup>31</sup>, and there is a reference to 'Αθηναῖοι in Iliad IV, 328, and in Odyssey it is mentioned at II,278; VII,80;

27. Wilamowitz, op. cit. p.239f.

28. E.Bourguet, B.C.H. XX, 1896, pp.221-41.

29. See also J.A.Scott, CPh VI,1911, pp.419-28 & IX, 1914, pp.395-409.

30. Who ascribes it to "the ancients".

31. Iliad II,546.

XI,323 – the "Catalogue of Women". The reference to Theseus at Odyssey XI,631 is so vague that one would not expect it to flatter the Athenian sense of vanity. If there had been deliberate interpolations, surely Athens would have enjoyed a more heroic and favourable position?

Menestheus at one point<sup>32</sup> is reprimanded by Agamemnon:

"Διὸς νύν Πετεῶδος διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος,  
καὶ σύ, κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένε, κερδαλεόφρον,  
τέπτε καταπτώσσοντες αφέστατε, μέμνετε δ' ἄλλους."

and when he next appears<sup>33</sup> the Lycian leaders who have terrified him at their approach cause him to send for help, resulting in his rescue by Ajax. Now the Athenians had laid claim to Salamis through their relations with Ajax, the leader of the island. This particular episode of the Athenian leader's rescue by Ajax would, surely, only lead to discredit and harm to the Athenian claim of hegemony?

In the Iliad Athens is represented by three generals: Stichius, who appears at XIII,195, Iasus, and Menestheus. In XV,329-332 there appears to be the ultimate in valourless behaviour as Menestheus fails to save his fellow-generals from death: Stichius at the hands of Hector, and Iasus <sup>at those of</sup> Aeneas. Again<sup>34</sup>, the failure of the Greeks is portrayed, especially the Athenians, in keeping Hector from the ships.

The alleged insertion in the Catalogue of Ships has caused the greatest controversy, the verses in question being:

"Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆσος  
στήσε δ' ἄγων τούτον Αθηναίων ὑσταντο φάλαγγες."

Ajax and the Athenians are elsewhere found fighting together, for example, Iliad XIII,685f and XII,339. The passage of IV,489-92 helps to

32. Iliad IV,338-40.

33. Iliad XII,331f.

34. Ibid. XIII, 685-93.

prove that II,557/8 is not an Athenian interpolation:

"...τοῦ δ' Ἀντιφος αἰολοθώρηξ  
Πριαμέδης καθ' ὅμιλον ἀκόντισεν οξέῖ δουρέ.  
τοῦ μεν ἄμαρθ' ο δε Λεῦκον, Ὁδυσσεός ἐσθλον ἔταῖρον  
βεβλήκει βουβῶνα, νέκυν ἐτέρωσ' ἐρύοντα."

Ajax, having just killed Simoeisius, himself narrowly misses death when Priam's son Antiphus casts a spear at him but misses, and kills Leucus, Odysseus' companion. Since Ajax and Odysseus were both fighting close to the Athenians when the spear was cast this shows Ajax could not have been fighting as close to the Megarians as alleged, and helps to show that II,557/8 is not an Athenian interpolation but part of the original structure.

Certainly, some Athenians were responsible for re-arranging Homer, for example, Euripides<sup>35</sup>, who increases the number of Athenian ships from the Homeric fifty to sixty, and decreases the Argive contingent from eighty to fifty, and also substitutes a new leader for Menestheus<sup>36</sup>. A high level of artistic ability was required to insert passages into the poems conforming to the rules, more than was needed for a collection of the poems into one official text. Athens was artistically weak in this period – not one of the Homeric myths is Attic in origin and Solon is the only elegiac poet of actual Attic birth living in Athens before 480, so if insertions were to be made, someone in Athens must have been capable of writing Homeric verse – perhaps one of the imported poets?

The Greek world regarded Homer as its teacher and Xenophanes of Colophon<sup>37</sup> considered him a fundamental part of education: "έξ ἀρχῆς καθ'

35. Euripides, Iphigeneia in Aulis.

36. Euripides, ibid. 247.

37. fr. 18, Hillier Crusius.

"Ομηρον ἐπεὶ μεμαθήκασι πάντες", and Homer and Hesiod were credited with the formation of a hierarchy of the gods<sup>38</sup>. Thus, the influence of Homer was paramount. It would appear that the only connection between Pisistratus and Homer concerns the Panathenaea and the text established there<sup>39</sup>. We can see that the text passed through several evolutionary stages, a process begun by Pisistratus, but in creating a definitive text out of previous disorder the process was halted for only a short time before additions by later poets<sup>40</sup>. Politically, concerning Pisistratus' policy of establishing Athenian hegemony over the Ionians, as revealed in the measures taken towards Delos<sup>41</sup> and perhaps Theseus<sup>42</sup> it follows that Pisistratus should attach great importance to Homer. Homer, after all, was the chief exponent of Ionian culture and the city enjoyed a great coup in being associated with an edition of the Homeric poems.

We may turn now to the accusation of Hereas<sup>43</sup> who charged Pisistratus with removing a line from Hesiod:

"δεινὸς γάρ μεν ἔτειρεν ἔρως Πανοπηύδος Αὔγλης"

because it harmed the position of Theseus<sup>44</sup>.

The charge cannot be found elsewhere, so one is led to believe

38. Hdt. II.53,ii: 'Ησέοδον γὰρ καὶ "Ομηρον ἡλικίην τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μεν πρεσβυτέρους γενέσθαι καὶ οὐ πλέοσι. οὗτοι δέ εἰσι οἱ ποιεῖσαντες θεογονίην "Ελληνος καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες καὶ τιμάς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες καὶ εἴδεα αὐτῶν σημήναντες.

39. See also J.A.Davison, TAPA LXXXVI, 1955, pp.1-22.

40. The Alexandrians apparently used seven MSS: Αἴολική, Ἀργολική, Σιιωπική, Κρητική, Κυπρία, Μασσαλιωτική and Χία, but an Athenian MS is never mentioned.

41. See Chapter IV, p.95; Chapter V, p.120.

42. See Chapter V, pp.125-27.

43. See H.G.Evelyn-White, CQ XVIII, 1924, pp.142-51.

44. Presumably because Pisistratus may have favoured Theseus; see n.42.

in Megarian fabrication again. Indeed, since there was no official Athenian text of the Hesiodic poems, unlike those of Homer, Pisistratus could not have made a deletion. The Hesiodic poems dealt with social and political issues, and would perhaps have been useful vehicles in advancing Pisistratus' domestic policies of agricultural promotion<sup>45</sup> and general peace. One might compare ὁ ἐπὶ Κρόνου βόος<sup>46</sup> with a passage from *Erga*<sup>47</sup>. Since one continuous text of Hesiod did not exist then, although many divergent versions probably did, the line in question may have been absent from one version regarded as having an Athenian origin, and in time a belief grew that the tyrant had edited the Hesiodic poems.

The conditions of literary production in its early stages are derived from late and often unreliable sources<sup>48</sup>. Aristotle<sup>49</sup> says tragedy grew out of the dithyramb and comedy from the Satyric Drama. Herodotus<sup>50</sup> informs us that Arion of Corinth composed the first dithyramb, which probably originated in Phrygia and came to Greece with the cult of Dionysus. In Athens dithyrambic contests were introduced by Lasus of Hermione, who apparently composed a Hymn to Demeter without using the letter Sigma, the noise of which he disliked<sup>51</sup>. Of Lasus, Suidas says, "διθύραμψον εἰς ἀγῶνα εἰσήγαγε" and that he wrote about music during the tyranny, presumably with the tyrants' patronage.

45. See Chapter III, pp.50-53.

46. AP XVI,7.

47. Hesiod, Erga 170-73.

48. See N.G.L.Hammond, GRBS XIII, 1972, pp.387-451.

49. Arist. Poetics IV, 1449a9-13.

50. Hdt. I.23; cf. Schol. Pindar Ol. XIII,26b.

51. Athenaeus X,455c.

Plutarch<sup>52</sup> talks of the greater use made of the flute and of adapting rhythms to the dithyrambic style.

The date of the first dithyrambic contests at Athens is fixed in 509/8<sup>53</sup> in the archonship of Lysagoras, indicating that Lasus was at work in the tyranny<sup>54</sup>. The prize, incidentally, went to Hypodicus of Chalcis.

Simonides was the most famous of dithyrambic writers, claiming an alleged fifty-six victories<sup>55</sup>, and a passage of Aristophanes<sup>56</sup> suggests that despite the importance of Lasus his compositions may not have been very professional. Aristotle's account of tragedy and its development from the dithyramb is confused and often lacks internal consistency, so that it cannot always be used with absolute certainty<sup>57</sup>:

"Aber ich bin nicht überzeugt, dass Aristoteles seine Theorie über die Tragödie ganz auf bewahrte Urkunden und Texte baut, Περὶ Ποιητικῆς 4.1449a11f- ἡ μὲν (τραγῳδία) ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξαρχοντων τὸν διεθεραμβόν."

It certainly owed something to the choral dithyramb, but drama existed before 534 and Thespis' first public performance in Athens<sup>58</sup>. In that

52. Plut. de Musica XXIX, 1141c: Λᾶσος δ' ὁ Ἐρμολονεὺς εὗς τὴν διεθεραμβικὴν ἀγωγὴν μεταστήσας τοὺς ρύθμοις, καὶ τῇ τῶν αὐλῶν πολυφωνίᾳ κατακολουθήσας, πλεόστη τε φθόγγοις καὶ διερριμμένοις χρησάμενος, εὗς μετάθεσιν τὴν προϋπάρχουσαν ἥγαγε μουσικὴν.

53. Marm. Par. A 46.

54. D.L. Page, Poetae Melici Graeci, 702-06 for the surviving fragments of Lasus.

55. Fr. 145 Bergk (= 79 Diehl). For further information on Lasus and the dithyramb: A.W. Pickard-Cambridge, Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy, pp. 23ff.

56. Aristoph. Wasps 1409-411:

μαὶ Δέ τ' ἀλλ' ἄκουσον, ἦν τέ σοι δόξω λέγειν.  
Λᾶσός ποτ' ἀντεδέδασκε καὶ Σεμεωδῆς.  
Ἐπειθ' ὁ Λᾶσος εἶπεν, "όλεγον μοι μέλει".

57. G. Rudberg, Thespis und die Tragödie, Eranos XLV, 1947, pp. 13-21.

58. Marm. Par. A 43 (exact year-number is not preserved; archon — ναῖον τοῦ προτέρου); T.J. Cadoux, JHS LXVIII, 1948, pp. 109 & 113. Suidas says Thespis first acted in the sixty-first Olympiad — ἐδέδαξε δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πρῶτης καὶ ξ ὀλυμπιάδος. The year 533/2 is occupied by Thericles' archonship, so the actual year could either be 536/5 or 535/4 or 534/3.

year Pisistratus created the festival of Dionysus, which gave the new drama a home and actively encouraged it<sup>59</sup>, giving tragedy the impetus it needed to develop as an art form.

Much controversy exists over the word *τραγῳδία*, and it is beyond the scope of this chapter to examine it<sup>60</sup>. It is plausible to suggest the word means "song for a goat prize" since the evidence<sup>61</sup> points to the original tragic prize as being a goat. There is a belief that as drama was closely connected with Dionysus and the dithyramb then in origin tragedy must be Dionysiac<sup>62</sup>, but there is no real evidence that it developed from the cyclic choruses of the dithyramb. Connections with the cult rituals, especially those of Dionysus, were secondary, although the performances were in honour of the god and some element of religion was contained in the drama, but the regular source of tragedy was the heroic epic and myth<sup>63</sup>. The connection with Dionysus stems from the fact that tragedy was first performed at the City Dionysia. It is true that the satyr play or *πατέζουσα τραγῳδία* contained a Dionysiac element, but this form was not tragic. The satyric play grew to importance owing to the work of Pratinus of Phlius and in Athens Choerilus, who apparently wrote 160 plays and worked in the time of the Pisistratids. The title of only one of his plays is known: Alope.

Tragic drama in Athens was confined to the City Dionysia,

59. See Chapter V, pp.115-16; also Rudberg, op. cit., p.14: "Die erste Tragödie, die nach antiker Tradition (Suidas) im Jahre 535/4 aufgeführt wurde, war ja ein moment der politisch-religiösen Reform des Peisistratos."

60. See, for example, H.Jeanmaire, REG LXVI, 1953, pp.501-11; G.F.Else, The Origin and early Form of Greek Tragedy; W.Ridgeway, The Origin of Tragedy.

61. Marm. Par. A 43: ἀφ'οῦ θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς [ὑπεκρίνει]. τοῦ πρῶτος, ὃς ἐδέδαξε δρᾶμα ἐν ἀστει [καὶ ἀθλον ἐτέθη ὁ [τραγός, = F.G.H. 239.

62. C.Sleeman, Religions XXVII, 1939, pp.35-47.

63. See C.M. Smertenko, Studies in Greek Religion, 1935, pp.13-25.

founded by Pisistratus in 534. The early tragic performances were held in the Agora, which at this time was about the only place where a large crowd could gather. The character and number of plays submitted is unknown, as are the regulations for the performances<sup>64</sup>, but perhaps some parallel may be drawn with those of the fifth century. No doubt some provision in the Agora was made for spectators, perhaps the building of temporary *θύραι* and the use of a back wall behind the actor to boost audibility. The actual precinct and theatre of Dionysus were built later, although a start could have been made in the later years of the tyranny<sup>65</sup>. Other festivals such as the Rural Dionysia held in the various Attic demes, the Lenaean (for comedy) and the Anthesteria involved dramatic performances, but the City Dionysia and the Lenaean were the premier festivals in the evolution of drama.

The first spoken verse in tragedy was delivered by Thespis, although it must be pointed out that no new genre erupted spontaneously: the "goat song" existed before Thespis, though he must have been working on the literary form for a while - perhaps in his native Icaria. For introducing the first actor he is credited with the title of "father of tragedy"<sup>66</sup> and his performances, as shown by Plutarch<sup>67</sup>, are totally new in character. The earliest mention of Thespis (and, as it happens, the only evidence not controversial) is in *Wasps*, where<sup>68</sup> Xanthias says:

".... ὁρχούμενος τῆς νυκτὸς οὐδὲν παύεται  
τάρχατ' ἐκεῖν' οἵς θέσπις ἡγωνίζετο."

64. Athenaeus I,22a; Diog. Laert. III,56; Themistius Orat. XXVI,316d.

65. See Chapter III, p.75.

66. See E.Tieche, Thespis, pp.1-4 for two poems from the collection of Dioscurides of Alexandria concerning Thespis and his work.

67. Plut. Sol. XXIX,6.

68. Aristoph. Wasps 1478-9.

What important step did Thespis actually take? We are told<sup>69</sup> that he created the single actor, although a statement in Pollux<sup>70</sup> indicates that the actor was already in existence. Either Pollux is simply wrong, or Thespis by some novel extension of the actor's rôle was considered important enough to be credited with the creation; in view of what he actually did (see below) one wonders exactly what the pre-Thespian "actor" could have done, and therefore it appears Pollux is wrong.

Despite the fairly full amount of evidence available for Thespis, much is open to doubt<sup>71</sup>. For example, there is disagreement regarding his name: was it an assumed one taken later in life or a real one? Athenaeus<sup>71a</sup> associates Thespis with the district of Icaria; obviously Thespis was an Athenian citizen. It is unfortunate that later authors<sup>72</sup> cannot be relied upon. Thespis is thought to have been a soloist in the Icarian village performances and was most probably at work from c.570, since he and Solon are referred to in argument, c.558<sup>73</sup>.

Thespis used the Homeric poems and their content, along with the style and metre of Solon's iambic verses and choral songs, to constitute the first tragic play<sup>74</sup>. The epic characters were given direct speech

69. Diog. Laert. III,56.

70. Pollux IV,123.

71. Pickard-Cambridge, op. cit. pp.97-121.

71a. Athenaeus II,40a.

72. For example, Dioscorides Anth. Pal. VII,411; Horace, de Arte Poet. 275f.

73. Plut. Sol. XXIX,7. This is disbelieved by Tièche, op. cit., p.9: "Ich setze den Fall, dass die Anekdote erfunden ist. Auf keinen Fall dürfen wir sie für bare Münzen nehmen". It is unknown why the anecdote was invented, but Tièche goes on to say it is because of Solon's reputation and to show that tragedy had origins in Attica and not the Peloponnese.

74. See D.F.Sutton, Arethusa VII, 1974, pp.161-95.

themselves as opposed to rhapsodic acting of them<sup>75</sup>. In the beginning tragedy contained no Attic mythological material, nor was the cult drama able to draw purely on the legends of Dionysus; the heroic epics appeared the obvious quarry. Thespis turned the Homeric hero from being partly acted/recited to being actually impersonated. The date of 534 when rhapsodic contests were in full swing adds to the suggestion of a connection between the Homeric recitals and Greek tragic drama; the latter being inspired by the former. Aristotle<sup>76</sup> tells of the dramatic awareness of Homer: therefore tragedy had already half-appeared in Iliad and Odyssey.

Aristotle ascribes the invention of the prologue to Thespis. Earlier tragedy perhaps required an explanatory monologue to prepare the spectator for the oncoming spectacle, and Thespis probably obtained the idea of a prologue from the bardic prelude or  $\pi\mu\omega\mu\lambda\omega$ , a brief address to the god at the start of his festival.

As well as the dramatic prologue, Thespis was able to put direct speech into the mouths of the participants by his introduction of the  $\rho\mu\sigma\zeta$  or spoken part. Early Aeschylean  $\hat{\rho}\mu\sigma\zeta$  display the same features as the earlier ones, for example, a tripartite structure or the effect of a  $\rho\mu\sigma\zeta$  on the following scene. But this spoken part could not be used unless there was someone to deliver it, and in all probability that someone was Thespis himself<sup>77</sup>. Thus, Thespis converted the  $\epsilon\xi\alpha\rho\chi\omega\nu$ <sup>78</sup> into the actor by the process of separation and gave him

75. G.F. Else, Hermes LXXXV, 1957, pp.17-47 links  $\tau\mu\alpha\gamma\mu\delta\zeta\alpha$  with the rhapsodic contests of the Panathenaea.

76. Arist. Poetics XXIV, 1460a5-11.

77. Athenaeus I,22a says Thespis was one of the first dancers.

78. Arist. op. cit., IV, 1449a11.

set lines (or *ρήσεις*)<sup>79</sup>.

The language of Attic tragedy is often referred to as a "Kunstsprache", created merely for dramatic and not conversational purpose. With regard to the metre, Thespis substituted iambic trimeters or trochaic tetrameters for elegiac couplets in the *rhêseis*<sup>80</sup>, which was only natural since these were the only rhythms normal to speech and dialogue. Two varieties of lyric, the hymn and the lamentation (*θρῆνος*), can be ascribed to Thespis; the *θρῆνος* of Aeschylus were seen as survivals of an older form – the form of the *θρῆνος* goes back far beyond Homeric times as part of a ritual rather than a literary form. Thespis transplanted the *θρῆνος* from its original ritual setting and element into a non-ritual setting for a new purpose: to lament the dead forming the subject of his plays.

Finally, Thespis is credited with the introduction of the mask, which Suidas says was of painted white linen, to help further define the actor. Horace<sup>81</sup>, though, credits Aeschylus with the mask, but Horace may be wrong; he is open to doubt on many issues, for example confusing the *έξ ἀμάξης σκώμματα* with tragedy, and Thespis and actors as a kind of travelling show.

Very little is known of what Thespis actually composed. Suidas preserves the titles of his plays as *Ἄθλα Πελίου*, *Ιερεῖς. ἡ Φόρβας*, *Ἡρεού* and *Πενθεύς*<sup>82</sup>. Suidas' source for the titles is unknown, and doubt has been cast on their authorship, as Aristoxenus<sup>83</sup> relates how Heraclides Ponticus wrote tragedies and assigned them to Thespis. The

79. See also Wilamowitz, Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie, p.87<sup>2</sup>.

80. Arist. op. cit. IV,1449a21–25.

81. Horace, de Arte Poet. 265–80.

82. For the fragments see: Nauck, Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta,<sup>2</sup> 832f.

83. Aristoxenus V.92.

latter's plays were probably shorter than those of the later tragedians, and began with a prologue. The central feature was the self-presentation of the hero and his sufferings, followed by a θρῆνος on his death. The titles suggest Thespis was not confined to Dionysiaca subjects, although one could call Πενθεύς in a sense Dionysiaca. This play must have been musical in the main with some spoken dialogue from the actor representing Dionysus and Pentheus, and, since mute actors - κωφὰ πρόσωπα - were employed in earlier days, a mute actor may have played the part of Cadmus.

To digress for a moment, comedy grew from the same sources as tragedy, but no parallel may be drawn owing to the difference in historical circumstances. Again, little is known of its development, apart from a passage in the Poetics<sup>84</sup>. One reason for its apparent lateness in emerging was the existence of a tyranny at this time, and Pisistratus' dictatorial position: to make jokes under a régime such as this was dangerous, and consequently comic development, although not halted, was limited. True, jokes do not have to be against the régime (but cf. the ὄνομαστὴ κωμῳδεῖν under the democracy), but nevertheless comedy had to wait until the democracy before obtaining state recognition and support. In sixth century Attica, the demos had the satyric drama for entertainment, and it was only in 486 with the victory of Chionides at the Dionysia that comedy emerged into the literary limelight.

To what extent was Thespis influenced by the times and the power of Pisistratus, and how important a rôle did the tyrant play in promoting the new art form? Rudberg says<sup>85</sup>: "Ob die Vorstufe (bzw. -en) die einer oder andere war, ist für die spezielle Thespis-Frage kaum

84. IV,1449a38-40: ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία διὰ τὸ μὴ σπουδάζεσθαι ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἔλαθεν.

85. Rudberg, op. cit. p.16.

entscheinend, wohl aber die Rolle des Pisistratos." The new tragedy took advantage of the changing conditions created by Pisistratus and through the innovative work of Thespis, perhaps in collaboration with Pisistratus, became aligned to Athenian politics. There are political and religious undertones to Pisistratus' favouring of it, for example, the city's position as the cultural centre is emphasised and loyalty thereby attracted to it. The Pisistratids were noted for their patronage, and Thespis may have worked in accordance with their wishes. However, too much emphasis placed on a collaboration is dangerous: drama was thriving of its own accord and would have continued to do so irrespective of any governmental interest; the patronage of the tyrants helped to advance its development. Thespis, however, should not be denied his credit for the art form: "Der ernste Ton, „das Tragische", scheint in der einen oder anderen Form durch Thespis eingeführt zu sein; die Zeit und die Macht verlangten es, und er ergriff die Gelegenheit zu einer Neuschöpfung."<sup>86</sup> Also, Pisistratus' motive in supporting tragedy must have stemmed from artistic appreciation as well as from any political motivation and this must not be disregarded.

Despite the advancement in other artistic forms, for instance painting and sculpture, Athens was surprisingly quiet in literary development following the elegiacs of Solon, until foreign poets were attracted to the Athenian court by state patronage. It appears that in this period the only literary product of true Attic birth was the *σκόλια* 'Αττικά, a new type of lyrical song which survived into the democratic age, and was later to owe much to the influence of Anacreon and Simonides. The Attic *σκόλιον* was normally sung after dinner-parties or symposia and was aristocratic in character and content. A choral song would first be sung by those present, followed by a song individually

---

86. Rudberg, op. cit. p.19.

sung, and then the σκόλιον.

Athenaeus preserves twenty-five σκόλια in a collection known to Dio Chrysostom<sup>87</sup> and others. Some raise doubts as to dating, whilst others can be dated with a reasonable amount of certainty. For example, the fourteenth begins:

"Αδμήτου λόγον, ὃ ἔταῖρε, μαθῶν τὸν ἀγαθὸν φέλει,  
τῶν δειλῶν δ' ἀπέχου γνοὺς ὅτι δειλοῖς ὀλίγη χάρις."

Here, mention is made of Admetus, King of Pherae in Thessaly and the husband of Alcestis and we know of connections between the tyrants and Thessaly: for instance Thessalian cavalry helped repulse the invading Spartan army led by Anchimolus<sup>88</sup>. Can we assume this σκόλιον was the product of the late tyranny? Bowra<sup>89</sup> connects the song with the Pisistratids, but there is a distinct possibility that it was composed by Praxilla of Sicyon<sup>90</sup> in the fifth century. The answer, simply, is unknown, but a Pisistratid authorship of the σκόλιον is open to doubt.

By the time of Aristophanes, some of the more popular σκόλια were thought to have originated in the tyranny; for example, in teaching his father to sing σκόλια Bdelycleon says:

"τούτοις ξυνῶν τὰ σκόλ' ὅπως δέξει καλῶς."

and meets with the reply,

"ἀληθές; ὡς οὐδείς γε διακρίων ἐγώ."<sup>91</sup>

It is possible that διακρίων here refers to the party of Pisistratus<sup>92</sup>,

87. Dio Chrysostom VI,23. See also Schol. Plato, Gorgias 451e; Aristoph. Wasps 1239.

88. Hdt. V.63,iii: Θεσσαλοι δέ σφι δεομένοισι ἀπέπεμφαν κοινῇ γυνῶμη χρεώμενοι χιλίην τε ὕππον καὶ τὸν βασιλεά τὸν σφέτερον Κινέην ἄνδρα Κονδαῖον.

89. C.M.Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry<sup>2</sup>, pp.376-79.

90. See D.M.MacDowell, Aristoph. Wasps on 1238-39.

91. Aristoph. Wasps 1222-23 (text from MacDowell, Aristoph. Wasps).

92. See Introduction, pp.4-5; 10-11.

though probably we should accept 'Υπεράκριοι from Herodotus as the original name of the party<sup>93</sup>.

Number 24 is a quatrain in honour of those who fell at Leipsydrium<sup>94</sup>, and a connection with the Alcmeonids may be assumed. This is the only σκόλιον in Athenaeus' collection which can be attributed to them:

"αἰαῖ, Λειψύδριον προδωσέταιρον,  
οἵους ἄνδρας ἀπώλεσας, μάχεσθαι  
ἀγαθούς τε καὶ εὔπατρέδας,  
οἵ τότ' ἔδειξαν οὖν πατέρων ἔσαν."

Numbers 10 to 13 celebrate Hipparchus' murder by Harmodius and Aristogeiton: a fuller account is more appropriate later when the fall of the tyranny is examined<sup>95</sup>; here a brief outline may suffice. In antiquity a 'Αρμοδίου μέλος was attributed to Callistratus<sup>96</sup>, perhaps having some connection with that composed in the final years of the tyranny. A precise date cannot be fixed, but some time between 514 and 510 may be hazarded as the cult begins shortly afterwards<sup>97</sup>.

With literary figures including Anacreon of Teos, Simonides of Ceos, Pratinus of Phlius and Onomacritus attracted to the Athenian court, it must have exuded a distinct literary and intellectual flavour and at the same time must have been extremely lively. Glotz and Cohen<sup>98</sup> say that Hipparchus "surtout mérita l'épithète d' "amant des Muses" – φιλόδμουσος."<sup>99</sup> As well as artistic motivations, a political one is

93. See also, AP XIII,4.

94. Hdt. V.62,ii; AP XIX,3.

95. See Chapter VII, pp.160-62.

96. Hesychius, s.v. 'Αρμοδίου μέλος.

97. W. G. Forrest, CQ<sup>2</sup> X, 1960, p.237, n.4 mentions the puzzle of the tyrannicide story; see also Bowra, op. cit. p.516, F. Jacoby, Atthis, p.159f.

98. p.454.

99. AP XVIII,1: ὁ δε "Ιππαρχος παιδισώδης καὶ ἔρωτικὸς καὶ φιλόδμουσος ήν (καὶ τοὺς περὶ Ἀνακρέοντα καὶ Σιμωνέδην καὶ τοὺς ὄλλους ποιητὰς οὗτος ήν ὁ μεταπεμπόμενος).

evident in that the cultural position of the city is augmented, eliminating any serious competition from any other state. It now remains to consider briefly the work of two of the more famous poets at the court: Anacreon and Simonides.

Anacreon was an Ionian from Teos who fled to Abdera in Thrace owing to the Persian advance, thence to the court of Polycrates of Samos<sup>100</sup> before arriving in Athens about 522 where most of his love poetry was written. His poetry is generally erotic and although much is addressed to women, there is also some written to, and about, boys, for example, Cleobulus<sup>101</sup>:

"Κλεοβούλου μὲν ἔγωγ' ἔρεω,  
Κλεοβούλῳ δ' ἐπιμανοματ  
Κλεόβουλον δὲ διοσκέω."

The epithets in his poetry are carefully thought out and the imagery often subtle, for example Eros working on his victim as a smith forges a hammer<sup>102</sup> which is quenched in a flood of water:

"μεγάλῳ δηῦτε μ'"Ερως ἔκοψεν, ὥστε χαλκεύς  
πελέκει, χειμερύῃ δ' ἔλουσεν ἐν χαράδρῃ."

but tenderness and warmth is expressed equally subtly, for example the comparison of youthful shyness with an abandoned fawn<sup>103</sup>:

"ἀγανῶς, οἴδα τε νεβρὸν νεοθηλέα  
γαλαθηνόν, ὃς τ' ἐν ὕλῃ κεροέσσης  
ἀπολειφθεὶς ἀπὸ μητρὸς ἐπτοήθη."

Here, νέβρον is masculine and thus refers to the youth: without his mother he is lost and alone - hence the comparison with the fawn illustrating shyness.

Although very much an aristocratic poet and full of joie de

100. See Chapter IV, pp.92-4.

101. Fr. 3 D.

102. Fr. 45 D.

103. Fr. 39 D.

vivre, Anacreon can display bitterness in verse, as revealed in an invective against Artemon<sup>104</sup>, contrasting his dishonourable past with his present affluence, for instance the use of a *σετίνη* (cushioned carriage for women) in which to ride. Critias, friend of Socrates and member of the Thirty, wrote a brief poem in praise of Anacreon<sup>105</sup>, knowing that Critias, his grandfather, had received the poet's attention<sup>106</sup>. The poem portrays the popularity of Anacreon which was so great that <sup>the</sup> painter <sup>α</sup> Oltos depicted him on <sup>a</sup> red-figure vase.<sup>107</sup>. He was later honoured with a statue on the Acropolis<sup>108</sup>.

Simonides was born in Ceos in 556<sup>109</sup>, but little is known of his youth. He came to Athens at the invitation of Hipparchus, attracted by expensive gifts<sup>110</sup>, but again little regarding his time in Athens is known, although the writing of his dithyrambs must have taken place then. Only one title is known, the *Μέμνων*; although a poem entitled *Εὐρώπη* may have been a dithyramb. Suidas<sup>111</sup> states that Simonides wrote tragedies, but what is meant perhaps is not "formal" tragedies but dramatic dithyrambs, such as Bacchylides' Ode XVII. Despite his sufferings with the fall of the tyranny Simonides is found later writing a couplet for the replacement statues of 477<sup>112</sup> praising the tyrannicides:

"ἡ μέγ' Ἀθηναῖσσαν φέως γένεθ', ἡνίκ' Ἀριστογείτων "Ιππαρχον κτεῖνε καὶ Ἀρμόδιος."

104. Fr. 54 D.

105. Fr. 3 D.

106. Ps-Plato Charmides 157e.

107. J.D. Beazley, Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters<sup>2</sup> p.63, no.71.

108. Pausanias I.25,1.

109. Fr. 77.6 D.

110. AP XVIII,1; Aelian V.H. VIII,2; Ps-Plato, Hipparchus 228c: μεγάλοις μεσθίοις καὶ δώροις πελθων.

111. s.v. Σεμωνίδης.

112. Fr. 76 D.

Simonides' reputation was established with connecting choral lyric to sport as an art form: the Epinician Ode. This became a dignified art form used for instructive stories. Although Pindar's Epinician Odes outclass those of Simonides, the latter was responsible for their introduction. One of the more famous was composed c.520 for the winner of the boys' wrestling bout at Olympia, Glaucus of Carystus<sup>113</sup>:

"οὐδὲ Πολυδεύκεος βία.  
χεῖρας ἀντεύνατι' ἀν ἐναντίον αὔτῳ  
οὐδὲ σιδάρεον 'Αλκμήνας τέκος."

Simonides saw death and catastrophe as unavoidable, believing that men should be prepared for them<sup>114</sup>:

"ἄνθρωπος ἐών μὴ ποτε φάσης τύ γενήσεται αὔριον  
μηδ' ἄνδρα ἴδων ὅλβιον, ὅσσον χρόνον ἔσσεται.  
ἀκεῖα γὰρ οὐδὲ τανυπτερύγου μυίας  
οὔτως ἀ μετάστασις."

and thereby conveyed how unpredictable human life is. On the death of Hippias' daughter, Archedice<sup>115</sup>, Simonides was commissioned to compose her epitaph<sup>116</sup>.

The most impressive of Simonides' compositions is the Danae Fragment<sup>117</sup>, which portrays human feelings with immense pathetic force, and in this respect Simonides was the leading exponent of his art. In time he was regarded as a *σοφὸς ἀνήρ*, and this may explain Plato's apology for his writing for the tyrants<sup>118</sup>, as owing to compulsion.

113. Fr. 23 D.

114. Fr. 6 D.

115. See Chapter VII, p.163.

116. Fr. 85 D; Arist. Rhet. I,1367b20-21.

117. for commentary, see Page, op. cit. no.543.

118. Plato Protagoras 346b5-8: πολλάκις δὲ, οἷματ, καὶ Σιμωνίδης ἤγήσατο καὶ αὐτὸς ἢ τύραννον ἢ ἄλλον τινὰ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπαινέσαι καὶ ἐγκαμιάσσαι οὐχ ἐκῶν, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαζόμενος. This cannot be surprising: Simonides was patronised and as such would have no monetary problems; if he did not praise the tyrants then his patronage would doubtless be ended, and thus his work would suffer to an extent. The words οὐχ ἐκῶν ἀλλ' ἀναγκαζόμενος perhaps suggest that though he was not entirely happy with the situation he wrote as he did in order to

In conclusion, it has been seen that Pisistratus had a text of Homer created as one definitive edition by collecting various ones already in existence and then having someone create a single text, and that the Megarian accusation is unfair since what Pisistratus probably wanted was not a pro-Athenian text but a standard text. Also, drama was receiving a more formalised form owing to the work of Thespis and the interest displayed by the tyrants, and numerous poets and artists were now at work in Athens under state patronage to enhance the reputation of the court.

Was this literary development a product of the times? To a very large extent, yes. Artistic creativity can never be halted, so as part of its general evolution the tyrants actively encouraged it, seeing in it also a useful political weapon. The "novelty" element must also have been there: interest derived purely for that reason from the new form. Perhaps literature would not have developed as it did without state patronage; thus the debt to the rulers is great. Pisistratus, with the creation of the City Dionysia, gave tragedy the necessary home allowing it to develop within the framework of that festival.

By means of the help given to Thespis, it would appear that the literary form of tragedy was developed under the auspices of Athens and the tyrants: an important propaganda weapon in effect, promoting the prestige of the city as a cultural centre. An equally good propaganda weapon lay in the political usage of Homer: to help assert Athenian hegemony over the Ionians. The court which the tyrants collected about them was full of intellectual merit and promise portraying the tyrants' own love of culture which must have influenced them, and their reign was a period of consciously encouraged artistic advancement.

---

survive. There must have been the opportunity to move but by now Athens was becoming established in the literary world and Simonides probably wanted to remain for this reason.

Chapter VIICONCLUSION

The Conclusion is divided into two parts: the first deals with the fall of the tyranny and the subsequent rise to power of Cleisthenes, the second part will take the form of a general conclusion on the Pisistratid Tyranny as a whole, and an assessment will be made of its importance and place in the development of Athens.

On the death of Pisistratus in 528/7<sup>1</sup>, control of affairs passed to his sons, although controversy has arisen over whether they ruled jointly or one held supreme power<sup>2</sup>. A point to remember, however, is that when what is at stake is not a defined office (since tyrant is not a formal, constitutional office), it is harder to say that a younger brother did or did not have a share in power.

The sources contradict each other on the point of a divided rule, and in some places where the plural Pisistratids is used an ambiguity arises as this could refer either to the whole family (including Pisistratus himself), rather than his sons alone<sup>3</sup>. However, it is likely that Hippias and Hipparchus were in fact co-rulers, with the former exercising overall authority in governmental affairs. Thucydides<sup>4</sup> contradicts the belief that Hipparchus was sole ruler on Pisistratus' death, stating that Hippias was the ruler, but other writers, however, make Hipparchus the eldest son of Pisistratus and sole ruler or joint

1. AP XVII,1; see also Chapter I, pp.17 and 20.

2. See D. Loenen, Mnemosyne<sup>4</sup> I, 1948, pp.81-9 who argues for the former.

3. For example, see Hdt. V.70 & 90.

4. Thuc. I.20,ii, VI.54,ii.

ruler with Hippias<sup>5</sup>, and Ephorus made the two joint rulers<sup>6</sup>. Hellanicus also thought of Hipparchus as the eldest son<sup>7</sup>, but as Thucydides<sup>8</sup> and AP<sup>9</sup> show, this is wrong.

In Herodotus Hipparchus is cast as a son of Pisistratus and the brother of Hippias the despot<sup>10</sup>; no other status is mentioned, for example co-ruler; yet in VII,6 it appears that Hipparchus banished Onomacritus<sup>11</sup>, and so must have held some power, and Thucydides<sup>12</sup> seems to say that Hipparchus οὐδὲ... τὴν ἄλλην ἀρχὴν ἐπαχθῆς ήν ἐς τοὺς πολλούς, ἀλλ' ἀνεπιφθόνως κατεστήσατο. The remainder of VI.54 then refers to "Pisistratid" measures, for example the 5% produce tax<sup>13</sup>, which could imply a government of Hippias and Hipparchus but more likely refers to the successive reigns of Pisistratus and Hippias. AP<sup>14</sup> gives another opinion by saying that affairs were under the control of Hippias and Hipparchus but that Hippias controlled the government owing to his age and more statesmanlike quality; Hipparchus was more of an artistic figurehead. It seems unlikely that Diodorus Siculus<sup>15</sup> is correct in

5. Ps-Plato, Hipparchus 228b4-229b7; Aelian, V.H. VIII,2.

6. Cf. Diodorus Siculus X.17,i.

7. See K.J.Beloch, G.G.<sup>2</sup> I.2, pp.293-97; Hermes LV, 1920, pp.311-18.

8. Thuc. VI.55,i-iii.

9. AP XVIII,1: πρεσβύτερος δὲ ὁν ὁ 'Ιππεας...

10. Hdt. V.55.

11. See Chapter VI, p.133.

12. Thuc. VI.54,v. However, the text here is probably corrupt and should read ἐπαχθεῖς ήσαν...κατεστήσαντο, thus referring to Pisistratus and Hippias: see K.J.Dover, Historical Commentary on Thucydides IV, pp.318-19.

13. See Chapter III, pp.53-4.

14. AP XVIII,1.

15. Diod. X.17.

stating that Thessalus was tyrant<sup>16</sup>; this perhaps is a way of explaining the silence regarding both Iophon and Thessalus. Surely, if they had wielded power as part of a ruling body some mention would have been made in the principal sources? It is quite possible<sup>17</sup> that after Pisistratus' first overthrow Iophon went to Argos, the home of his mother, and simply stayed there - there is no other mention of him. After Hipparchus' murder, the sources refer to the harsh rule of Hippias<sup>18</sup>, and it is likely therefore that until 514 the two brothers did hold power together, but that Hippias had the upper hand being responsible for the actual running of the state and probably supported by his brother in an advisory capacity.

Perhaps at the beginning of the new reign the Alcmeonidae were allowed to return to Athens from exile as part of a general reconciliatory policy which may also have included the release of the hostages from Naxos<sup>19</sup>. A fragment of the archon list<sup>20</sup> helps to identify the first six archons for the reign: Onetorides held the post in 527/6 (perhaps nominated by Pisistratus before his death); followed by Hippias (526/5); then Cleisthenes, the head of the Alcmeonidae, in 525/4 (thereby proving the family must have returned by then); Miltiades the Philaid (524/3), thus showing political collaboration between the two families; Calliades (523/2); and finally Pisistratus, the son of Hippias, in 522/1. During his year of office this Pisistratus was responsible for the altar of the Twelve Gods<sup>21</sup>.

16. See also Plut. de Malignate Herodoti XXI, 859 D.

17. F. Cornelius, Die Tyrannis in Athen, p.79.

18. Hdt. V.62,ii; Thuc. VI.59,ii; Ps-Plato, Hipparchus 229b4-7.

19. See Chapter IV, p.92.

20. R.Meiggs and D.M.Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC, No.6(c).

21. See Chapter III, p.77.

The general policy of Pisistratus, both at home and abroad, was adhered to as has been seen, although changing conditions in the Greek world made this difficult, and an alliance with Plataea<sup>22</sup> in 519 led to Theban enmity. As a result of state patronage attracting many foreign, gifted poets<sup>23</sup> literature at the Court developed to a larger extent than under Pisistratus, and it appeared that the reign was going to parallel that of Pisistratus in its freedom from repression and general enlightenment. The murder of Hipparchus in 514<sup>24</sup> brought about a dramatic change which altered the hitherto mild rule of the sons.

The sources agree for the most part on how the tyranny ended, beginning with the conspiracy leading to the murder of Hipparchus which resulted in the harsher rule of Hippias, and the eventual overthrow four years later with Spartan aid secured by Alcmeonid pressure on the Pythia<sup>25</sup>.

It appears that Hipparchus (or perhaps even Thessalus, see below), attempted unsuccessfully to seduce an Athenian youth named Harmodius who had as his lover Aristogeiton, both members of the Gephyraean clan<sup>26</sup>. In order to exact revenge in some way Hipparchus insulted Harmodius by appointing the latter's sister a Kanephoros in the Panathenaic procession<sup>27</sup>, a position of some honour, and then dismissing her as being unworthy to hold the post. Both Harmodius and Aristogeiton felt slighted at this and plotted with others to overthrow the tyranny. On the day of the Great Panathenaic procession Harmodius

22. See Chapter IV, pp.96-8.

23. See Chapter VI, pp.149ff.

24. Hdt. V.56; Thuc. VI.54, 56-58; AP XVIII.

25. Hdt. V.63,i.

26. Hdt. V.57-62.

27. Thuc. VI.56,i; AP XVIII,2.

and Aristogeiton, believing one of their number was informing Hippias, struck prematurely and succeeded in murdering Hipparchus only. Harmodius was killed immediately; Aristogeiton was later captured and tortured<sup>28</sup> before Hippias killed him in anger.

There are several discrepancies in the sources: for example, according to AP<sup>29</sup> there are a number of accomplices in the plot, while Thucydides<sup>30</sup> says there were only a few for reasons of safety: "ἢσαν δε οὐ πολλοὶ οἱ ξυνομωμοκότες ἀσφαλεύας ἔνεκα". AP<sup>31</sup> states that Thessalus was the would-be lover of Harmodius, while Thucydides says it was Hipparchus<sup>32</sup>. Perhaps AP was mistakenly agreeing with the work which portrayed Hipparchus as an innocent victim<sup>33</sup>, and thus his love for Harmodius is transferred to Thessalus<sup>34</sup>. Herodotus<sup>35</sup> implies Hipparchus' honesty, and in view of the latter's literary reputation AP probably did not wish to describe an act which would both tarnish and be irreconcilable with it. The conflicting material in AP has not been reconciled in any acceptable way: for instance previously AP has shown Hipparchus' bad and amorous qualities (thus proving Hipparchus was more than likely to have attempted to seduce Harmodius), yet these are ignored as Thessalus is set up as the agent provocateur. Thus, it is likely that Thessalus is being unjustly accused here<sup>36</sup>.

28. Thuc. VI,57,iif; AP XVIII,3f.

29. AP XVIII,2.

30. Thuc. VI.56,iii.

31. AP XVIII,2.

32. Thuc. VI.54,iii.

33. Ps-Plato, Hipparchus 229c1-d8.

34. See J.K.Davies, Athenian Propertied Families, pp.448-49.

35. Hdt. V.56.

36. See also T.R.Fitzgerald, Hist. VI, 1957, pp.275-86.

A more serious discrepancy is that in Thucydides' narrative, which is not entirely self-consistent: the deed of Harmodius and Aristogeiton was apparently undertaken δι' ἐρωτικὴν ξυντυχίαν<sup>37</sup>, which is repeated later<sup>38</sup>: δι' ἐρωτικὴν λύπην, but then Thucydides says that the conspiracy aimed at the actual overthrow of the tyranny<sup>39</sup>, and thus a more political motivation is evident<sup>40</sup>.

It is impossible to decide which of the two is correct concerning the action and motivation of Harmodius and Aristogeiton<sup>41</sup>. It is probable that in a sense both are right, that the conspiracy originally grew out of a genuine feeling of acting from love and indignation, especially directed against Hipparchus, but that this feeling took on a more political sense when it was amplified into a conspiracy against the tyranny itself. Thus, both private and political motives accounted for the act. It is interesting to note how various authors believing in one or other motivation allowed this to influence their description of the tyranny; those who thought Hipparchus was killed for personal reasons (Herodotus, Thucydides, Ps-Plato) made the tyranny mild until after his murder, while those accepting a plot against the tyranny itself<sup>42</sup> made the joint rule of his sons harsh, and AP attempts to give both versions<sup>43</sup>.

The murder of Hipparchus marked the beginning of the end of the

37. Thuc. VI.54,i.

38. Idem. VI.59,i. cf. VI.57,iii: the plot stems from hatred felt towards Hipparchus owing to the love element.

39. Idem. VI.54,iii, cf. VI.56.iii.

40. See F.Jacoby, Atthis, pp.152-59.

41. See C.W.Fornara, Hist. XVII, 1968, pp.400-24.

42. Ephorus - Diodorus Siculus X.17,i; Idomeneus 338 F3.

43. AP XVI,7, XIX,1.

tyranny, but one cannot credit the act of 514 as being responsible for that of 510. The two events have even been telescoped into the same year<sup>44</sup>, but this is totally incorrect and seems to have been influenced by the desire to give Harmodius and Aristogeiton the credit for ending the tyranny.

Two versions of the story concerning the fall of the tyranny exist: Hellanicus in his Atthis presented the "official" version which stated that Harmodius and Aristogeiton were responsible for the overthrow<sup>45</sup>, which therefore must have stemmed from anti-Alcmeonid and/or anti-Spartan sources. The second was that of the Alcmeonidae stating that their deed in 510 with Spartan help had freed Athens: it comes as no surprise to discover Herodotus in favour of the latter. The former became acceptable because the people had before them constantly the "tyrannicide" statues, and also this story made the liberation a purely Athenian affair. In some year between 511/0 and 480 statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton were erected in the Agora having been ~~cast~~ by Antenor, and after the removal of these by the Persians in 480 they were replaced by a new grouping in 477/6<sup>46</sup> with a dedication by Simonides<sup>47</sup>. The "tyrannicides" and their families were honoured by decree<sup>48</sup> and soon after 510 a cult in their honour came into being<sup>49</sup>.

So popular was the deed of Harmodius and Aristogeiton that a

44. Marm. Par. A 45, = F.G.H. 239.

45. See Jacoby, op. cit. p.163f.

46. Marm. Par. A 54, 70ff.

47. See Chapter VI, p.151.

48. I.G. i<sup>2</sup> 77.

49. A.J.Podlecki, Hist. XV, 1966, pp.129-41; C.W.Fornara, Philologus CXIV, 1970, pp.155-80.

σκόλιον was composed<sup>50</sup> in celebration<sup>50a</sup>:

"ἐν μύρτου κλαδὶ τὸ ξέφος φορήσω  
ώσπερ Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογεύτων  
ὅτε τὸν τύραννον κτανέτην  
ἰσονόμους τ' Ἀθήνας ἐποιησάτην.

φέλταθ' Ἀρμόδιος, οὐ τι πω τέθνηκας,  
νήσοις δ' ἐν μακάρων σέ φασιν εἶναι,  
ζνα περ ποδώκης Ἀχιλεύς  
Τυδεῖδην τέ φασι τὸν ἐσθλὸν Διομήδεα.

ἐν μύρτου κλαδὶ τὸ ξέφος φορήσω  
ώσπερ Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογεύτων  
ὅτ' Ἀθηναῖς ἐν θυσίαις  
ἄνδρα τύραννον Ἐππαρχον ἐκαίνετην.

αἰεὶ σφῶιν κλέος ἔσσεται κατ' αἰαν,  
φέλταθ' Ἀρμόδιε καὶ Ἀριστόγειτον,  
ὅτι τὸν τύραννον κτανέτην  
ἰσονόμους τ' Ἀθήνας ἐποιησάτην."

The date of composition is hard to fix<sup>51</sup>, but obviously it cannot be earlier than 514; since the cult begins soon afterwards<sup>52</sup> a date of 510/08 may be hazarded, when the names of the "tyrannicides" were still fresh in Athenian minds. It is quite probable that the four stanzas were not composed at the same time. Ostwald<sup>53</sup> believes the first and fourth stanzas were composed not long after the establishment of Athenian democracy; the references to Ἰσονόμους Ἀθήνας suggest a date of 507 when the democratic constitution was brought into being by Cleisthenes, with the second and third of an earlier composition (perhaps in the period 514-10). For one thing there is no historical error in the third stanza, which refers to Hipparchus as a tyrant and not as the tyrant which is stated in the first and fourth stanzas, and also these particular stanzas credit Harmodius and Aristogeiton with

50. See Chapter VI, p.149.

50a. Text from D.L.Page, Poetae Melici Graeci, 893-6.

51. See C.M.Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry<sup>2</sup>, pp.391-96.

52. Pliny, Naturalis Historia XXIV, 4: *hoc actum est eodem anno quo et homae reges pulsi* (509).

53. M.Ostwald, Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy, pp.121-30.

making Athens Ἰσονόμους. The singers of the σκόλιον, considering how close to the events in question the earliest stanzas were composed, must have known that Hippias was not killed and that Cleisthenes made Athens Ἰσονόμους, although the reason why these misrepresentations of fact were accepted is really unknown<sup>54</sup>. The murder of Hipparchus soon became a subject for vase-painters, for example, the stamnos by the Copenhagen Painter<sup>55</sup> which may be dated to <sup>about</sup> 475.

In the first and fourth stanzas of the σκόλιον Harmodius and Aristogeiton are praised for making Athens Ἰσονόμους, but this is a mistake, and the word surely can only be applied after 508. Ἰσονομία may have been a party slogan used by Cleisthenes in his struggle against Isagoras to secure support and his taking the people into partnership<sup>56</sup> may have been the first application of the principle of Ἰσονομία in Athens<sup>57</sup>. The tyrants never practised Ἰσονομία, and this principle would certainly place Cleisthenes on a level far ahead of any opponent, and the people's enthusiastic reception proves this.

However, Harmodius and Aristogeiton were only factors in the fall of the tyranny, and for the actual expulsion of Hippias responsibility lies with the Alcmeonids, hence Herodotus' silence concerning the actual deed of the two. The murder of Hipparchus obviously shows there was no liberation from the tyranny as Hippias ruled despotically for the remaining four years.

Following the murder of his brother Hippias began to rule in the post-Aristotelian sense of the word tyranny and the final years of the reign were a succession of exiles and executions<sup>58</sup>; perhaps a parallel

54. See further, Ostwald, op. cit. pp.130-36.

55. J.D. Beazley, JHS LXVIII, 1948, p.27, citing Langlotz's date.

56. Hdt. V.66,ii: τὸν δῆμον προστατεύεται.

57. Ostwald, op. cit. p.157.

58. Hdt. V.62,ii; Thuc. VI.59,ii; AP XIX,1.

may be drawn with the final years of Tiberius' reign after the fall of Seianus. It is likely that the Alcmeonidae were now exiled again<sup>59</sup>. Hippias then set about fortifying Munichia, which would serve as an escape base if necessary, and which also perhaps was viewed as a new headquarters<sup>60</sup>. Thucydides<sup>61</sup> says that Hippias had his daughter Archedice marry Aeantides, the son of Hippocles, tyrant of Lampsacus and influential at the court of Darius; therefore it appeared that Hippias was leaning towards a greater contact with Persia. Simonides<sup>62</sup> was later to compose Archedice's epitaph<sup>63</sup>.

In the purge of Hippias' sole rule hatred grew and those exiled, led by the Alcmeonidae, staged an attempt to return but were defeated at Leipsydrium, north of Paeonidae on the slope of Parnes<sup>64</sup> and in Alcmeonid hands. The Alcmeonidae who had secured the contract for rebuilding the Delphic temple (see below), destroyed by fire in 548, were able to influence the Pythia to command any Spartan enquirer to set Athens free from tyranny. Herodotus gives two explanations of how the Alcmeonids persuaded the Pythia - by lavish restoration of the temple<sup>65</sup> and alleged bribery<sup>66</sup>. Here, it is worthwhile mentioning an emendation of Herodotus V.63,i: for 'Αθηναῖοι read Λακεδαιμόνιοι, to link with Herodotus V.90,i<sup>67</sup>. Controversy has arisen in connection with the Alcmeonid

59. See P.J.Bicknell, Hist. XIX, 1967, pp.129-31.

60. AP XIX,2.

61. Thuc. VI.59,iii.

62. Arist. Rhetoric I,1367b20-21.

63. Thuc. VI.59,iii.

64. Hdt. V.62 (in which Herodotus mistakenly gives the name of the deme as Paeonia); AP XIX,3.

65. Hdt. V.62,iii.

66. Hdt. V.63,i.

67. See W.G.Forrest, GRBS X, 1969, pp.280-81.

influence at Delphi. A fourth-century version says that the Alcmeonidae borrowed money from Delphi in order to pay for a Spartan liberation force<sup>68</sup>, while another version<sup>69</sup> accuses the Alcmeonidae of embezzlement from that money collected as part of the temple contract. Both these versions suppose that the Alcmeonidae obtained money from Delphi and spent it on hiring a mercenary force, but they are probably rival distortions of Herodotus' account, in which the Alcmeonidae spent their personal money at Delphi and Sparta was induced by the Pythia to send her own forces at her own expense<sup>70</sup>.

Herodotus<sup>71</sup> says that the Delphians were collecting money for rebuilding the temple as early as 526, in which case it must have been begun up to a decade before the Leipsydrium attempt. Certainly it had to be finished (or else virtually completed) by 510 in order to persuade the Pythia to coerce the Spartans into freeing Athens. It therefore appears the Alcmeonids cannot be responsible for the whole construction, unless it is thought that Herodotus V.62,ii is wrong to imply that the Alcmeonidae did not take the contract until after Leipsydrium<sup>72</sup>, in which case they would have sufficient time to prove how splendid the rebuilding was going to be.

The Alcmeonidae eventually secured Spartan support, Sparta's decision also being influenced by Athens' friendship with Argos<sup>73</sup> as well

68. Cf. Demosthenes XXI, Meidias 144 with Schol. (623.14 Dindorf); Isocrates XV, Antidosis 232. Forrest suggests that this version comes from Cleidemus.

69. Schol. Demosthenes XXI, 622.27 Dindorf, probably reflected in AP XIX,4 (ὅτεν εὐπρόησαν), but AP also follows Herodotus in the story of the oracular responses to Spartan enquiries.

70. For a further development of the story see Philochorus, 328F 115.

71. Hdt. II.180.

72. See Forrest, op. cit. pp.282-86.

73. AP XIX,4.

as Delphic persuasion. A Spartan force under Anchimolus was despatched but was defeated and Anchimolus was killed by a combined Athenian-Thessalian force; the latter sending one thousand cavalry led by King Cineas. This caused the Spartans to send another force, this time led by Cleomenes, which defeated the Thessalian cavalry and then besieged Hippias and his family on the Acropolis<sup>74</sup>. The siege appeared doomed to failure and the Spartans were preparing to withdraw when the *children* of the Pisistratids were caught whilst attempting to escape from the city. In return for their safe release Hippias agreed to leave the city within a space of five days<sup>75</sup>, and departed firstly to Sigeum, επὶ Ἀπαντέδου ἀποχοντος<sup>76</sup>. After thirty-six years of continuous rule<sup>77</sup> the Pisistratid Tyranny was over.

Following the overthrow faction strife again broke out between groups led by Isagoras and Cleisthenes<sup>78</sup>. Isagoras was eventually forced to enlist Spartan aid in an attempt to recover his waning position, and Cleomenes again arrived in the city; Cleisthenes by then having secretly withdrawn. However, both Isagoras and Cleomenes were themselves besieged on, ironically, the Acropolis, and after three days were forced to leave Athens. Cleisthenes was then summoned to return to lead Athens, and he began the series of measures furthering the way to Athenian democracy which was of such importance in leading to the future dominance of the city in the Classical period.

\*

Thus, Athens had experienced tyrannic rule for the first time and

74. Hdt. V.64; AP XIX,5.

75. Hdt. V.65; AP XIX,6.

76. AP XIX,6.

77. Hdt. V.65,iii; Thuc. VI.59,iv; Arist. Pol. V,1315b29-34.

78. Hdt. V.66; AP XX,1.

Athens,

had not emerged badly in 510. / in following the unconstitutional rule of the Pisistratids, ~~was further prepared~~ for the democracy which was established after Hippias' expulsion; ~~therefore,~~ / <sup>the democracy</sup> owed much to the peace and prosperity brought about by the tyranny. Solon probably did not perceive to what end his new constitution, involving now the right of appeal and the ending of power by birth, would lead - perhaps Pisistratus did not - but the latter certainly continued Solon's work with vigour and succeeded in binding the people under a more uniform judicial system (for example, the creation of the δικαισταὶ κατὰ δῆμους), and in attempting to make the same laws apply to each and every person. The long tenure of power had a part in the evolution of the state, and the tyranny was thus a vital antecedent of democracy.

By means of policies which overcame local particularism and by emphasizing his autocratic position Pisistratus ended aristocratic faction in his time, and attracted the ordinary person away from depending on the local lord to the city and its stable government. Pisistratus intended to create a united Attica under the rule of Athens, and his use of religion is one aspect of this policy: the encouragement of the national cults of Athena and Dionysus (the City Dionysia<sup>79</sup> served a propaganda purpose too), appealed to the whole people and bound them together in common worship and unity. The people were strengthened in their daily lives by measures including agricultural loans, the building programme (which provided employment), and state interest in trade and commerce; which won for Pisistratus the affection of his people and allowed the succession to pass unhindered to his sons. Attica flourished as a land of small-holders, an important element in the success of the new democracy.

An important aspect of the tyranny is the increase in the

---

79. See Chapter V, pp.115-18.

prestige of Athenian citizenship. The increased centralisation of government would not have profoundly affected those living in the Attic countryside where local affairs ranked as more important than those of the city, but the fact that the whole people was now ruled by one master in Athens and that they were all Athenian citizens ensured their loyalty to the city. By the time the tyranny fell in 510 a sense of some unity was evident as the demos was left to continue its political growth unhindered. The tyranny gave Athens the all-important factor of time for Solon's reforms to work.

Pisistratus' foreign policy not only completed the economic recovery of Attica and promoted the prosperity of the farmers, but also indicated the directions which the future empire took. Athens' commercial position in the Greek world grew owing to the stimulation of olive production (a valuable export product), which led to increased production of pottery and a new coinage which also served as a propaganda purpose: the  $\Delta\Theta\Gamma$  emblem on the Owls declared their Athenian origin. The security of the régime and the increased rural productivity, along with the establishment of a financial base for the state, led to somewhat easier living conditions. Life at the court grew more artistic and graceful, especially after Pisistratus' death, when state patronage attracted many poets, and drama was also actively encouraged. The cultural side of the court also served a propaganda purpose.

Irrespective of the regard for law and custom Pisistratus could not hide his position in the state, and the control of the armed forces and personal bodyguard along with the control of all means to power ensured he could never be treated as an equal. The tyranny allowed the tyrants to rule as they wished and to follow whatever policies they desired, irrespective of how their subjects felt. However, in this case the existence of a tyrant did not render the constitution a fiction, as Pisistratus employed it as the basis of his rule, adding only to it

when necessary. "It is not possible to write a real history of Pisistratus' reign, but we know of its most important features"<sup>80</sup>. These features were sufficient to have the tyranny period referred to as a "golden age"<sup>81</sup>, and it is a fact worth stressing that Athens was not liberated by Athenians themselves, but by Spartan intervention. The fact that a tyrant was in existence and the policies he pursued for a length of time show that these policies promoted a general reconciliation with economic and cultural progress.

The tyranny gave Attica the peace and prosperity which allowed the people time to develop and prepare for Cleisthenes: he could not have established the type of system he did immediately after Solon; the Pisistratids were important for forming the interim stage and dealing with the problems which had to be solved before Cleisthenes could get to work. If the Pisistratid Tyranny had never existed, the situation would have been quite different, as would Athenian history. In view of the reign of the Pisistratids it is a pity that the word tyranny, conjuring up modern connotations of a repressive and harmful rule, has to be applied, but, as has been seen, until 514 this was not the case. Even then, the last four years of the Pisistratid rule took the form that they did owing to a reaction stemming basically from emotional rather than political motivations. The Pisistratids were a major factor in the overall greatness and splendour of the Athenian state.

---

80. V.Ehrenberg, From Solon to Socrates, p.82.

81. AP XVI,7: ὁ ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος. It is unknown exactly when this expression would be applied to the tyranny, but it is possible to date it to the period of the Thirty, when, in view of the repression and harsh rule exercised then, the Pisistratid Tyranny would be looked upon as a more "golden" era in Athenian history. But this is speculation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adcock, F.E. 'The Exiles of Pisistratus', CQ XVIII, 1924, pp.174-82.

Adrados, F.R. Festival, Comedy, and Tragedy, Leiden: 1975.

Alexander, J.W. 'The Marriage of Megacles', CJ LV, 1959, pp.129-34.

Allen, T.W. Homer: The Origins and Transmission, Oxford: 1924.

Amit, M. 'La Date de l'alliance entre Athènes et Plateées', L'Ant. Class. XXXIV, 1970, pp.414-27.

Anderson, A.R. 'Heracles and his Successors', HSPH XXXIX, 1928, pp.7-58.

Andreades, A. A History of Greek Public Finance, tr. by C.N.Brown, Cambridge, Mass: 1933.

Andrewes, A. The Greek Tyrants, London: 1956 (repr.1974).

— 'Philochoros on Phratries', JHS LXXXI, 1961, pp.1-15.

Arnheim, M.T.W. Aristocracy in Greek Society, London: 1977.

Austin, M.M. & Vidal-Naquet, P. Economic and Social History of Early Greece, tr. by M.M.Austin, London: 1977.

Babelon, E. Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines, II partie, Tome I, Bologna: 1907.

Bailey, B.L. 'The Export of Attic Black-Figure Ware', JHS LX, 1940, pp.60-71.

Baldry, H.C. Ancient Greek Literature in its Living Context, London: 1968.

Barron, J.P. 'The Sixth Century Tyranny at Samos', CQ<sup>2</sup> XIV, 1964, pp. 210-30.

Basch, L. 'Trieres grecques, phéniciennes, et égyptiennes', JHS XCVII, 1977, pp.1-11.

Beazley, J.D. 'The Rosi Krater', JHS LXVII, 1947, pp.1-9.

— Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters, Oxford: 1956.

— Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters<sup>2</sup>, Oxford: 1963.

Bekker, I. Anecdota Graeca, Vol. I, Berolini: 1884.

Belknap, G.N. 'The Social Value of Dionysiac Ritual', Studies in Greek Religion, 1933, pp.44-61.

Beloch, K.J. 'Hipparchos und Themistokles', Hermes LV, 1920, pp.311-18.

— Griechische Geschichte<sup>2</sup>, Berlin: 1924.

Bérard, M.V. 'Pisistrate, Redacteur des Poèmes Homériques', Revue de Philologie XLV, 1921, pp.194-234.

Berve, H. 'Miltiades', Hermes Einzelschrift II, 1937, pp.1-6.

— 'Das Athen des Peisistratos', Bericht über den VI International Kongress für Archäologie, Berlin, 1942, pp.431-33.

— Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen, Munich: 1967.

Bichowsky, T.R. 'Eupalinos: First Civil Engineer', Compressed Air Magazine XLVII, 1943, pp.7086-90.

Bicknell, P.J. 'The Exile of the Alkmeonidai during the Pisistratid Tyranny', Hist. XIX, 1970, pp.129-31.

Billheimer, A. 'The Seisachtheia and Inflation', CJ XXXIII, 1938, pp. 471-78.

Boardman, J. 'Herakles, Peisistratos, and Sons', RA 1972, pp.57-72.

— Athenian Black Figure Vases, London: 1974.

— Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period, London: 1975.

— 'Herakles, Peisistratos, and Eleusis', JHS XCV, 1975, pp.1-12.

Bolkestein, H. Economic Life in Greece's Golden Age, Leiden: 1958.

Bonner, R.J. 'The Institution of Athenian Arbitrators', CPh XI, 1916, pp.191-96.

— 'Administration of Justice under Pisistratus', CPh XIX, 1924, pp.359-61.

— 'Administration of Justice in Rural Attica', CPh XXIII, 1928, pp.19-25.

Bonner, R.J. & Smith, G. The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle Vol. I, Chicago: 1930.

Bourguet, E. 'Inscriptions de Delphes, Deux Comptes du Conseil et des NAOMOIOT', Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique XX, 1896, pp.221-41.

Borthwick, E.K. 'Two Notes on Athena as Protectress', Hermes XCVII, 1969, pp.385-91.

Bowra, C.M. Greek Lyric Poetry<sup>2</sup>, Oxford: 1961.

Bradeen, D.W. 'The Fifth Century Archon List', Hesp. XXXII, 1963, pp. 187-208.

Brann, E. 'Protoattic Well Groups from the Athenian Agora', Hesp. XXX, 1961, pp.305-79.

Brelich, A. Paides e Parthenoi, Rome: 1969.

Brommer, F. Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldenage<sup>3</sup>, Marburg: 1973.

Brommer, F. & Peschlow-Bindokat, A. Denkmälerlisten zur griechischen Heldenage I and II, Marburg: 1971/4.

Brown, W.L. 'Pheidon's Alleged Aeginetan Coinage', NC<sup>6</sup> X, 1950, pp. 177-204.

Burn, A.R. 'Dates in Early Greek History', JHS LV, 1935, pp.130-46.

— Persia and the Greeks, London: 1962.

Bury, J.B. The Ancient Greek Historians, London: 1909.

— A History of Greece<sup>4</sup>, London: 1975.

Busolt, G. Griechische Geschichte, Gotha: 1895.

Busolt, G. & Swoboda, H. Griechische Staatskunde, Munich: 1926.

Byvanck, A.W. 'The Development of Attic Art during the transitional period from the Sixth to the Fifth Century', Mnemosyne<sup>4</sup> I, 1948, pp.161-97.

Cadoux, T.J. 'The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides', JHS LXVIII, 1948, pp.70-123.

Calhoun, G.M. The Growth of Criminal Law In Ancient Greece, Berkeley: 1927.

— Business Life in Athens, Rome: 1965.

Cambridge Ancient History Vol. IV, Cambridge: 1969.

Cavaignac, E. L'Economie grecque, Paris: 1951.

Clement, P. 'New Evidence for the origin of the Iphigeneia Legend', L'Ant. Class. III, 1934, pp.393-409.

Clinton, K. 'The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries', Trans. Am. Philos. Soc. LXIV, 3. 1974.

Coldstream, J.N. Geometric Greece, London: 1977.

Cole, J.W. 'Pisistratus on the Strymon', G&R<sup>2</sup> XXII, 1975, pp.42-5.

Cook, R.M. 'Speculations on the Origins of Coinage', Hist. VII, 1958, pp.257-63.

Cornelius, F. Die Tyrannis in Athen, Munich: 1929.

de Ste Croix, G.E.M. The Origins of the Peloponnesian War, London: 1972.

Davies, J.K. Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300BC, Oxford: 1971.

Davison, J.A. 'Peisistratus and Homer', TAPA LXXXVI, 1955, pp.1-22.

——— 'Notes on the Panathenaea', JHS LXXVIII, 1958, pp.23-42.

——— 'Addenda to "Notes on the Panathenaea"', JHS LXXXII, 1962, pp. 141-42.

——— From Archilochus to Pindar, London: 1968.

——— 'The First Greek Triremes', CQ XLI, 1947, pp.18-25.

——— 'Dieuchidas of Megara', CQ<sup>2</sup> IX, 1959, pp.216-22.

Day, J. & Chambers, M. Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy, Amsterdam: 1967.

Diehl, E. Anthologia Lyrica Graeca (3 vols.), Lipsiae: 1954-55.

Deubner, L.A. Attische Feste, Berlin: 1932 (reissued Hildesheim: 1966).

——— 'Das Attische Weinlesefest', Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, XII, 1943.

Dinsmoor, W.B. The Architecture of Ancient Greece, London: 1927.

Dörpfeld, W. & Reisch, E. 'Das griechischer Theater', Beiträge zur Geschichte des Dionysos-Theaters in Athen, und anderer griechischer Theater, XIV, 1896.

Dunbabbin, T.J. The Western Greeks, Oxford: 1948.

——— 'Ἐχθρη παλαίη', BSA XXXVII, 1936-37, pp.83-92.

Edson, C.F. 'Notes on the Thracian Phoros', CPh XLII, 1947, pp.88-106.

Ehrenberg, V. 'Origins of Democracy', Hist. I, 1950, pp.515-48.

——— From Solon to Socrates<sup>2</sup>, London: 1973 (repr. 1975).

Eliot, C.W.J. 'Where did the Alkmeonidai live?', Hist. XVI, 1967, pp. 279-87.

Else, G.F. 'The Origin of τραγῳδία', Hermes LXXXV, 1957, pp.17-47.

——— The Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy, Cambridge, Mass: 1965.

Evelyn-White, H.G. 'A Peisistratean Edition of the Hesiodic Poems', CQ XVIII, 1924, pp.142-51.

Farnell, L.R. Cults of the Greek States, Oxford: 1896-1909.

Ferguson, W.S. 'Demetrius Poliorcetes and the Hellenic League', Hesp. XVII, 1948, pp.112-36.

Fitzgerald, T.R. 'The Murder of Hipparchus: A Reply', Hist. VI, 1957, pp.275-86.

Flickinger, R.C. The Greek Theater and its Drama<sup>3</sup>, Chicago: 1926.

Fornara, C.W. 'The "Tradition" about the murder of Hipparchus', Hist. XVII, 1968, pp.400-24.

——— 'The Cult of Harmodius and Aristogeiton', Philologus CXIV, 1970, pp.155-80.

Forrest, W.G. 'Themistocles and Argos', CQ<sup>2</sup> X, 1960, pp.221-41.

——— 'The Tradition of Hippias' Expulsion from Athens', GRBS X, 1969, pp.277-86.

——— The Emergence of Greek Democracy, London: 1975.

Freeman, K. The Work and Life of Solon, London: 1926.

French, A. 'The Economic Background to Solon's Reforms', CQ<sup>2</sup> VI, 1956, pp.11-25.

——— 'Solon and the Megarian Question', JHS LXXVII, 1957, pp.238-46.

— 'The Party of Peisistratos', G&R<sup>2</sup> VI, 1959, pp.46-58.

— 'A Note on Thucydides III.68,v', JHS LXXX, 1960, p.191.

— The Growth of the Athenian Economy, London: 1964.

Frost, F.J. Greek Society, Lexington, Mass: 1971.

Gabriici, E. Tecnica e cronologia delle monete Greche dal VII al VI sec. Rome: 1951.

Glötz, G. and Cohen, R. Histoire Générale: Histoire Grecque, Paris: 1938.

Gomme, A.W. Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Vols. I-III, Oxford: 1956.

— 'Interpretations of Some Poems of Alkaios and Sappho', JHS LXXVII, 1957, pp.255-66.

Gomme, A.W. & Andrewes, A. & Dover, K.J. Historical Commentary on Thucydides Vol. IV Oxford: 1970.

Grande, C. del 'τραγῳδία: Essenza e Genesi della tragedia', Napoli Ricciardi XII, 1952.

Greenwood, L.H.G. 'The Shape of Greek Tragedy', G&R VI, 1936, pp.31-40.

Griffin, J. 'The Epic Cycle and Uniqueness of Homer', JHS XCVII, 1977, pp.39-54.

Grundy, G.B. Thucydides and the History of his Age<sup>2</sup>, Oxford : 1948.

Haigh, A.E. The Attic Theatre<sup>3</sup>, Oxford: 1907 (rev. A.W.Pickard-Cambridge).

Hammond, N.G.L. 'Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries BC', Hist. IV, 1955, pp.371-411.

— 'The Philaids and the Chersonese', CQ<sup>2</sup> VI, 1956, pp.113-29.

— History of Greece<sup>2</sup>, Oxford: 1967.

— History of Macedonia Vol. I, Oxford: 1972.

— 'Land Tenure in Athens and Solon's Seisachtheia', JHS LXXXI, 1961, pp.76-98.

— 'The Conditions of Dramatic Production to the death of Aeschylus', GRBS XIII, 1972, pp.387-451.

Harvey, F.D. 'Sostratos of Aegina', La Parola del Passato XXXI, 1976,  
pp.206-15.

— 'The Political Sympathies of Herodotus', Hist. XV, 1966, pp.  
254-55.

Hasebroek, J. Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece, tr. by L.M.Fraser  
and D.C.MacGregor, London: 1933.

Heidbüchel, F. 'Die Chronologie der Peisistratiden in der Atthis',  
Philologus CI, 1957, pp.70-90.

Helbig, W. 'Eine Heerschau des Peisistratos oder Hippias auf einer  
Schwarz-figurigen Schale', Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften,  
Munich: 1898.

Hignett, C. A History of the Athenian Constitution, Oxford: 1952.

Hill, G.F. Historical Greek Coins, London: 1906.

Hind, J.G.F. 'The "Tyrannis" and Exiles of Peisistratus', CQ<sup>2</sup> XXIV,  
1974, pp.1-19.

Holladay, J. 'The Followers of Peisistratus', G&R<sup>2</sup> XXIV, 1977, pp.40-57.

Holloway, R.F. 'An Archaic Hoard from Crete and the early Aeginetan  
Coinage', American Numismatic Soc. Museum Notes XVII, 1971, pp.1-21.

Hopper, R.J. 'A note on Aristophanes' Lysistrata 665-70', CQ<sup>2</sup> X, 1960,  
pp.242-48.

— 'The Mines and Miners of Ancient Athens', G&R<sup>2</sup> VIII, 1961, pp.  
138-52.

— 'Plain, Shore and Hill in Early Athens', BSA LVI, 1961, pp.189-  
219.

— Trade and Industry in Classical Greece, London: 1979.

How, W.W. & Wells, J. Commentary on Herodotus I and II, Oxford: 1912.

Humphreys, S.C. Anthropology and the Greeks, London: 1978.

Huxley, G.L. The Early Ionians, London: 1966.

Inscriptiones Graecae, Berolini: 1883.

Jacoby, F. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Berlin: 1925-58.

— Atthis, Oxford: 1949.

Jeanmaire, H. 'Sur les origines de la tragédie grecque', REG LXVI, 1953, pp.507-10.

Jeffery, L.H. Archaic Greece, London: 1976.

Johnston, A.W. 'The Rehabilitation of Sostratos', La Parola del Passato XXVII, 1972, pp.416-24.

Kagan, D. Problems in Ancient History Vol I, New York: 1966.

Kahrstedt, U. 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Thrakischen Chersones', Deutsche Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, VI, 1954.

Kenyon, F.G. Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, Oxford 1891.

Kirchner, J. Prosopographia Attica (2 vols.), Berlin: 1901/3.

Kontis, I. 'Artemis Brauronias', AD XXII, 1967, pp.156-206.

Kraay, C.M. 'The Archaic Owls of Athens: Classification and Chronology', NC<sup>6</sup> XVI, 1956, pp.43-68.

— 'The Early Coinages of Athens: A Reply', NC<sup>7</sup> II, 1962, pp.417-23.

— The Composition of Greek Silver Coins: Analysis by neutron activation, Oxford: 1962.

— 'Hoards, Small Change, and the Origin of Coinage', JHS LXXXIV, 1964, pp.76-91.

— Archaic and Classical Greek Coins, London: 1976.

— 'The Asyut Hoard: Some Comments on Chronology', NC<sup>7</sup> XVI, 1977, pp.189-99.

Lang, M. 'The Generation of Pisistratus', AJPh LXXV, 1954, pp.59-73.

Lehmann, G.A. 'Der „Erste Heilige Krieg“ - eine Fiktion', Hist. XXIX, 1980, pp.242-46.

Lesky, A. Geschichte der griechischen Literatur<sup>2</sup>, tr. by J.Willis and C.de Heer, London: 1966.

Levy, E. 'Réformes et date de Solon', La Parola del Passato XXVIII, 1973, pp.88-92.

Lewis, D.M. 'Cleisthenes and Attica', Hist. XII, 1963, pp.22-40.

Lloyd, A.B. 'Triremes and the Saïte Navy', JEA LVIII, 1972, pp.268-79.

— 'Were Necho's Triremes Phoenician?', JHS XCV, 1975, pp.45-61.

Loenen, D. 'The Pisistratides A Shared Rule', Mnemosyne<sup>4</sup> I, 1948, pp. 81-9.

Lorimer, H.L. Homer and the Monuments, London: 1950.

Luyster, R. 'Symbolic Elements in the Cult of Athena', History of Religions V, 1965, pp.133-63.

MacDowell, D.M. Aristophanes' Wasps, Oxford: 1971.

Marg. W. Herodot, Munich: 1962.

Meiggs R. & Lewis, D.M. A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC, Oxford: 1969.

Merkelbach, R. 'Die Pisistratische Redaktion der Homerischen Gedichte', RhM XCV, 1952, pp.23-47.

Merrit, B.D. 'Greek Inscriptions', Hesp. VIII, 1939, pp.48-82.

Meyer, E. Geschichte des Altertums, Stuttgart: 1931.

Michel, H. The Economics of Ancient Greece, Cambridge: 1940.

Mikalson, J.D. 'Erectheus and the Panathenaea', AJPh XCIV, 1976, pp. 141-54.

Mitchell, B.M. 'Herodotus and Samos', JHS XCV, 1975, pp.75-91.

Monro, D.B. 'The Poems of the Epic Cycle', JHS V, 1884, pp.1-42.

Moore, C.H. Religious Thought of the Greeks from Homer to the triumph of Christianity, Cambridge, Mass: 1916.

Moore, J.M. Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy, London: 1975.

Morrison, J.S. & Williams, R.T. Greek Oared Ships, 900-322BC, Cambridge: 1968.

Mosse, C. La Tyrannie dans la Grèce antique, Paris: 1969.

Murray, G.G.A. The Rise of the Greek Epic, Oxford: 1911.

Mylonas, G.E. Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, London: 1961.

Nauck, A. Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta<sup>2</sup>, Lipsiae: 1889.

Ostwald, M. 'The Athenian Legislation against Tyranny and Subversion', TAPA LXXXVI, 1955, pp.103-29.

— Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy, Oxford: 1969.

Oxford Classical Dictionary<sup>2</sup>, Oxford: 1970, (N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard edd.).

Pallis, S.A. Greek Religious Texts, Copenhagen: 1948.

Page, D.L. Sappho and Alcaeus, Oxford: 1955.

— Poetae Melici Graeci, Oxford: 1962.

Parke, H.W. 'Polycrates and Delos', CQ XL, 1946, pp.105-9.

— Festivals of the Athenians, London: 1977.

Pauly, A. Real-Encyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, (rev. G. Wissowa et al), Stuttgart: 1935.

Pfeiffer, R. History of Classical Scholarship, Vol I, Oxford: 1968.

Picirilli, L. 'Solone e la guerra per Salamina', ASNP<sup>3</sup> VIII, 1978, pp.1-13.

Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens, Oxford: 1946.

— Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy<sup>2</sup> (rev. T.B.L. Webster), Oxford: 1962 (repr.1966).

— The Dramatic Festivals of Athens<sup>2</sup> (rev. J.Gould and D.M.Lewis), Oxford: 1968.

Plassart, A. 'Les Archers d'Athènes', REG XXVI, 1913, pp.151-214.

Podlecki, A.J. 'The Political Significance of the Athenian "Tyrannicide"-Cult', Hist. XV, 1966, pp.129-41.

Powell, J.E. Lexicon to Herodotus, Cambridge: 1938.

Prentice, W.K. Those Ancient Dramas Called Tragedies, Princeton: 1942.

Price, M.J. & Waggoner, N.M. Ancient Greek Coinage: The Asyut Hoard, London: 1975.

Rubincam, C.R. 'The Qualification of Numerals in the Constitution of Athens', Phoen. XXXIII, 1979, pp.293-307.

Reubel, J.S. 'The Tyrannies of Peisistratos', GRBS XIV, 1973, pp.125-37.

Rhodes, P.J. The Athenian Boule, Oxford: 1972.

— 'Solon and the Numismatists', NC<sup>7</sup> XV, 1975, pp.1-11.

— 'Pisistratid Chronology Again', Phoen. XXX, 1976, pp.219-33.

— 'Solon and the Numismatists: A Postscript', NC<sup>7</sup> XVII, 1977, p.152.

Richter, G.M.A. 'The Distribution of Attic Vases', BSA XI, 1904/5, pp. 224-43.

Ridgeway, W. The Origin of Tragedy, Cambridge: 1910.

Robertson, N. 'The Myth of the First Sacred War', CQ<sup>2</sup> XXVIII, 1978, pp.38-73.

Robinson, C.A. 'Greek Tyranny', AHR XLII, 1936, pp.68-71.

Roebuck, C. 'Three Classes(?) in Early Attica', Hesp. XLIII, 1974, pp. 485-94.

Rudberg, G. 'Thespis und die Tragödie', Eranos XLV, 1947, pp.13-21.

Russel, H.L. 'Tyranny and Democracy', CW XXXVII, 1943/44, pp.128-30.

Samuel, A.E. Greek and Roman Chronology, Munich: 1972.

de Sanctis, G. Atthis, Firenza: 1975.

Sandys, J.E. Aristotle's Constitution of Athens<sup>2</sup>, London: 1912.

Schoppa, H. Die Darstellung der Perser in der griechischen Kunst bis zum Beginn des Hellenismus, Coburg: 1933.

Scott, J.A. 'Athenian Interpolations in Homer, Part I: Internal Evidence', CPh VI, 1911, pp.419-28.

— 'Athenian Interpolations in Homer, Part II: External Evidence', CPh IX, 1914, pp.395-409.

— 'Homer as the Poet of the Thebais', CPh XVI, 1921, pp.20-26.

— The Unity of Homer, Berkeley: 1921.

Sealey, R. 'Regionalism in Archaic Athens', Hist. IX, 1960, pp.155-80.

— 'Eupatridai', Hist. X, 1961, pp.512-14.

— History of the Greek City States, Berkeley: 1976.

Seltman, C.T. Athens: Its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion, Cambridge: 1924.

— Greek Coins : A History of Metallic Currency and Coinage down to the fall of the Hellenistic Kingdoms<sup>2</sup>, London: 1955.

Severyns, A. Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque, Liège: 1928.

Sifakis, G.M. 'Organisation of Festivals and Dionysiac Guilds', CQ<sup>2</sup> XV, 1965, pp.206-15.

Simms, P.M. 'The Eleusinia in the Sixth to Fourth Centuries BC', GRBS XVI, 1975, pp.269-79.

Simpson, R.H. & Lazenby, J.F. The Catalogue of Ships in Homer's Iliad, Oxford: 1970.

Sleeman, J.H. 'Religious Origin of Greek Drama', Religions XXVII, 1939, pp.35-47.

Smertenko, C.M. 'Greek Drama as a Religious Ritual', Studies in Greek Religion, 1935, pp.13-25.

Snodgrass, A. Archaic Greece, London: 1980.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 'Aristophanes' Lysistrata 641-47', CQ<sup>2</sup> XXI, 1971, pp.339-42.

— 'Theseus lifting the rock and a cup near the Pithos Painter', JHS XCI, 1971, pp.94-110.

— 'Theseus as Son and Stepson', B.I.C.S. Supp. XL, 1979.

Starr, C.G. The Origins of Greek Civilization, London: 1962.

— The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800-500 BC, New York, Oxford: 1977.

— Essays on Ancient History, Leiden: 1979.

Stillwell, R. 'The Panathenaic Frieze', Hesp. XXXVIII, 1969, pp.231-41.

Stinton, T.C.W. 'Iphigeneia and the Bears of Brauron', CQ<sup>2</sup> XXVI, 1976, pp.11-14.

Sumner, G.V. 'Notes on the Chronological Problems in the Aristotelian 'Αθηναῖων Πολιτεῖα', CQ<sup>2</sup> XI, 1961, pp.31-55.

Sutton, D.F. 'Satyr Plays and the Odyssey', Arethusa VII, 1974, pp.161-95.

Swoboda, H. Beiträge zur griechischen Rechtsgeschichte, Weimar: 1905.

Thompson, H. 'The Panathenaic Festival', AA LXI, 1961, pp.224-31.

Thompson, H.A. & Wycherley, R.E. 'The Agora of Athens', The Athenian Agora, XIV, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Princeton: 1972.

Tieche, E. 'Thespis', Antrittsvorlesung gehalten an der Universität Bern, Leipzig und Berlin: 1933.

Tod, M.N. A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions<sup>2</sup>, Oxford: 1946.

Torelli, M. 'Il Santuario di Hera a Gravisca', La Parola del Passato XXVI, 1971, pp.44-67.

Traill, J.S. 'Diakris, the inland trittys of Leontis', Hesp. XLVII, 1978, pp.89-109.

Travlos, J. A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens, London: 1971.

Treu, M. 'Eine Art von Choregie in peisistratischer Zeit', Hist. VII, 1958, pp.385-91.

Ure, P.N. 'The Origin of the Tyrannis', JHS XXVI, 1906, pp.131-42.

— The Origin of Tyranny, Cambridge: 1922.

Vos, M.F. Scythian Archers in Archaic Attic Vase-Painting, Groningen: 1963.

Wade-Gery, H.T. 'Eupatridai, Archons, Areopagus', CQ XXV, 1931, pp. 1-11; 75-89.

— 'The Sixth Century Athenian Decree about Salamis', CQ XL, 1946, pp.101-5.

— Essays in Greek History, Oxford 1948.

— 'Miltiades', JHS LXXI, 1951, pp.212-21.

Wallace, W.P. 'The Early Coinages of Athens and Euboia', NC<sup>7</sup> II, 1962, pp.23-43.

Waters, K.H. Herodotus on Tyrants and Despots, Wiesbaden: 1971.

Webster, T.B.L. Potter and Patron in Classical Athens, London: 1972.

Weidauer, L. Probleme der Frühen Elektronprägung, Fribourg: 1975.

Wells, J. 'Some Points as to the Chronology of the reign of Cleomenes I',  
JHS XXV, 1905, pp.193-203.

— Studies in Herodotus, Oxford: 1923.

— 'Herodotus and Athens', CPh XXIII, 1928, pp.317-31.

West, M.L. 'Melica', CQ<sup>2</sup> XX, 1970, pp.205-16.

— Iambi et Elegi Graeci, Oxford: 1971-72.

White, M. 'The Duration of the Samian Tyranny', JHS LXXIV, 1954, pp. 36-44.

— 'Greek Tyranny', Phoen. IX, 1955, pp.1-18.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von Aus Kydathen, Berlin 1880.

— Homerische Untersuchungen, Berlin: 1884.

— Aristoteles und Athen, Berlin: 1893 (repr.1966).

— Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie, Berlin: 1907.

Wilcken, U. 'Thettalos', Hermes XXXII, 1897, pp.478-82.

Williams, R.T. 'The "Owls" and Hippias', NC<sup>7</sup> VI, 1966, pp.9-14.

Wycherley, R.E. 'Neleion', BSA LV, 1960, pp.60-66.

— The Stones of Athens, Princeton: 1978.

