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ON THE TIMES OF UNREST
IN ARCHAIC ATHENS
Surely the chief, and certainly the only known to us, sanctuary of the Erinys in Athens was the famous one at the foot of Areopagus, located in an eastern direction towards the rock of Acropolis, the road leading down from it just passing by. Pausanias, having described Acropolis and leaving it by the Propylaeae, mentions as lying just below a fountain (to be identified with the well-known Κηφευδρα) and the renowned (cf. Euripides’ Ion) sacred place of Apollo and Pan. Then he moves to Areius Pagus, upon which he immediately continues (I, 28, 6): ηπειρεν δε ιερον θεων εστιν ας καινοσιν Αθηναιοι Σεμνας, Ἡσιόδος δε Ἐρινυς ἐν Θεσσαλονικα. Ulpianus, in his already quoted scholion on Demosthenes, *Contra Meidiam* p. 81 Dobson: ὃν (sc. Εὐμενίδων) και τὸ ιερὸν ἡπειρεν ίδρυτο τῆς βουησης (sc. τῆς Ἀρεοπαγιτικῆς). Και οἱ μὲν φασιν ὅτι διὰ τὸν ὄρεστην ἐκεῖ καθιδρύθη (cf. Aeschylus’ Eumenides ad.fin.; this will be discussed infra) βεβητον δε ἤγειν ὅτι διὰ τὰ φονικά. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν Ἀρείῳ Πάγῳ τὰ τῶν φονεῶν ἐδικάζοντο ἐκεῖ καθιδρύθησαν, ἵν’ εἰ τι καὶ ἡμιθάνειν μέλησι τὴν βουησην, αὕτη συναγωνίζωνται πρὸς τὸν ἔθελον ἐγγὺς ἔξεστώσαι. (Both reasons are, of course, operative, intertexted as they are into the same meaning-field).

Thucydides, in relating the last stages of the Cylonian affair refers to the atrocious sacrilege perpetrated by the Athenian Archons in their wonted exemplary hatred of an aristocrat-tyrant’s followers. I, 126: οἱ δ’ ἄνθροι (the conspirators except Cylon and his brother who had already escaped) ὡς ἐπεζοντο καὶ τινες καὶ ἀπέθνησαν ὕπ’ τοῦ θιμοῦ, καθίζουσι ἐπί τὸν βωμὸν ἱκέται τὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀκρόπολει (the great altar of Athena. Herodotus says that Cylon with his followers supplicated being attached to the very statue of Athena: - οὐ δυνάμενος δὲ ἐπικρατήσας ἱκέτης ἦσετο πρὸς τὸ ἄγαμμα). Ἀναστήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῦς οἱ τῶν Αθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακήν etc.

Very definitely Thucydides has specified *supra* that those in charge were the *Nine Archons*; Herodotus, V, 71 says that the matter was entrusted to the hands of πρωτάνεις τῶν ναυκράτων, something that has created unnecessary lamentation and consternation among the throngs of modern
commentators and investigators. Ναυκράται, constituting the political and financial organization of γέν, are the expressest proof of the tribal phyletic basis for even the most practical aspects of the Athenian social life at the time, those remotest from their ethno-religious roots. Their πρυτάνεις, corresponding to the later ones, expressed the clanish organization of political authority in early archaic Athens, and represented, on the higher level of political power, the smallest significant tribal units; just as the Cleisthenic ones were carefully chosen so as to originate from the various demes included in a tribe, cf. e.g. the commented inscription of the Aeantid φυνή. As every healthy aristocratic constitution emphasises the idiosyncrasy of each component natural division of the societal body in its strictly hierarchichal structure (be it a genetico-ethnical division, an occupational, or geographical one in this order of importance), it is to be assumed that those ναυκράτικοι πρυτάνεις wielded in the older, pre-Solonic, times of Athenian history considerable political power of the first order, especially as compared with their later substitutes. And this is naturally born out by the facts where known and checkable.

Now, whether the supreme nine archons (representative as they were of the State in its unitary wholeness) were appointed by the πρυτάνεις, or by the nobles under the former's direct agency, or by Areopagus with little involvement of theirs; so much is certain, that archonship and prytandom, as eupatridic institutions of a tribal-ethnic society, were both markedly prominent in pre-Solonian times, both operating in the same direction and governed by the same spirit, the one with more of a national in the grander scale, the other with more of an inter-societal jurisdiction; the former speaking with the single voice of the state as unity, the latter occupied with the harmonious, consonant coordination of the voices of the constituent parts; the one with more abstract authority in deep-lying issues and more real power in individual matters coming to its legitimate cognizance; the other with more real and universal authority over whatever affects the life
of the community in its general form and character, but with rather abstract and restricted power in cases specific and of individually great import—differentiations all wrought proportionately to their respective degree of generalizing removal from the tribal, "grass and root" structure of a natural aristocratic society.

Thus we have struck at the harmonious coordination of both Thucydides' dictum: τότε δὲ τὰ πολιτικὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ἔπρασον, and Herodotus' statement: οἵπερ (sc. οἱ πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράτων) ἔνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθηναίς. A consonance which must have surfaced more to the open if we knew more on the proto-archaic organization of political life in Athens.

By the side of the officialized institutional governing magistracies (archantic or prytanic, representing the State as an integral, or the State as a multi-ethnic structure of a deep clanish organization respectively), we note by and large the informal authority and power of a pre-eminent family in the aristocratical constitution: whatever the formal responsibility of the state-officials as such, it was the Alcmeonid gens that was considered the real causality behind the crime; they were the religious culprits and they alone suffered collectively the retributive punishment inflicted on them later on. Herodotus makes this clear in his brief notice of the affair: φονεύσαι δὲ αὐτοῦς ἀπίτιν ἔχει Ἀθηναίων. The fact that according to Plutarch, in a passage to be instantly quoted, Megacles the Alcmeonid was ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος then is natural (as members of the principal families were evidently to possess some main magistracies), but not inimical to the point made. Pausanias, VII, 25, 3, speaks generally of οἱ ἐχοντες τὰς ἄρχας; laudable and pragmatic inspecification.

Thucydides continues in the above quoted passage: ἀναστήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς οἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακήν, ὡς ἐώρων ἀποθνηκοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐφ' ὧν μὴ δὲν κακὸν ποίησον, ἀπαγαγόντες ἀπέκτειναν καθεξομένους δὲ τίνας καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς βωμοῖς
ἐν τῇ παρόδῳ διεξήγαντο. On which last sentence the Scholiast has: τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν τῶν Ἐριννῶν, κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν. Ἄς μετὰ τὸν Ὀρέστην οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πηναίον τοῦ Ἀρέιοι Πάγου ἰδρύσαντο, ἵνα πολλὴς τιμῆς τύχωσι (fully agreeing as to the connection with the Orestes adjudication and the supreme honour paid to them, with the Aeschylean Eumenides).

What Thucydides tells us is thus expounded by Plutarch, Vita Solonis, 12: Τὸ δὲ Κυνωνείον ἅγος ἦδη μὲν ἐκ πολλοῦ διετάραττε τὴν πόλιν, ἐξ οὗ τοὺς συνωμότας τοῦ Κύωνος ἱκετεύοντας τὴν θεὰν Μεγακλῆς ὁ ἄρχων (sc. ἐπώνυμος, the chief magistrate with considerable civil power at the time) ἐπὶ δίκη κατατῆκεν ἐπεισεν ἐξάψαντας δὲ τοῦ ἔδους etc. (i.e. Athena's statue; which coheres with Herodotus' statement that the ἱερεία took place at Athena's statue rather than the altar, as with Thucydides). As the ἔδους in question must be the ancient, διοπτεῖς statue of Athena, and as this was reposing in the religious complex comprising the Ἐρέχθειον, the ancient temple of Athena (if this was synchronically distinct from the former) and the Pandrosion, the distance from the Great ὑπαίθριος Altar is much reduced – some 20 m if the eastern parts of the relevant buildings were consecrated specifically to Athena, as is probablest. But since these ancient sanctuaries had many marked peculiarities as compared with pure classical Olympian temples (e.g. the existence of Heroes' tombs in their very bosom), so they sometimes engulfed altars inside themselves; as was indeed the case with the Erechtheion described by Pausanias I, 26, 5. Similarly an altar for Athena might have existed inside her Temple, in which case we could construe literally Homer's ἐνὶ πνοι ὑνῳ ὑλᾳ (Iliad, B, 549) in his relation of Athena's acceptance of Erechtheus in her Temple. And strikingly: by the side of the easy, metaphorical acceptations of the word (e.g. in Sch. D: πνοι ἄντι τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ εὐδαίμονι; we do find, in the Sch. B on the corresponding passage Iliad E, 512 πνον τοῦ κεκνισμένου καὶ ἰεραπασμένου. Sch. T also have ad loc.: πνον τοῦ κεκνισμένου.
The Plutarchean passage continues: ἔξαψαντας δὲ τοῦ ἔδους κρόκην κηρωσθέν καὶ ταύτης ἐκομένους, ὡς ἐγένοντο περὶ τὰς Σεμνὰς θεὰς καταβαίνοντες (hence the road was passing by their sanctuary – something which is obviously implicit in Thucydides’ narration) αὐτομάτως τῆς κρόκης ραγείσης, ὁρμησας συνηπαμβάνειν ὁ Μεγακήν καὶ οἱ Συνάρχοντες, ὡς τῆς θεοῦ τῆν ἱκεσίαν ἀποδειγμένης. An event like this breaking of the thread may or may not be significant of a divine dissociation from the collaboration intended by the symbolical human act. The archons interpreted the occurrence as manifesting the Godesses’ will and attitude; but they either were mistaken in their conception; or aggravated and compounded the situation by some subsequent dereliction on their part regarding divine prerogatives; as, for example, by their discriminating behaviour towards the suppliants immediately to be mentioned, which constituted an outrageous crimen majestatis. For the passage continues: καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἔξω κατέθεσαν, οἱ δὲ τοῖς βωμοῖς προσφυγόντες ἀπεσφάγυσαν· μόνοι δ’ ἀφείθησαν οἱ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν ἱκετεύσαντες – a monstrous token of sacrilegious disregard and contempt of Divinity’s zealous majesty, sure to be implaceably chastised. The archons were swayed to let live those that supplicated their wives, but sternly put to the sword the unhappy ones who fell on the sacred altars to escape death.

The altars (more than one) were inside the sacred precinct (hence the antithesis τοὺς μὲν ἔξω - οἱ δὲ τοῖς βωμοῖς προσφυγόντες), a byway (the Thucydidean πάροδος) leading to them from the main road. Καθεξουμένους δὲ τινὰς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς βωμοῖς ἐν τῇ παρόδῳ διεκρήσαντο, signifies: and some they slaughtered who placed themselves in supplication on the altars in the byway, in the very presence of the August Godesses – their statues overlooking the altars. It should be noticed that there is no mention of a temple in our sources. Pausanias, extremely sensitive, knowledgeable, careful and exact in religious matters that he is, speaks of an ἱερὸν θεῶν – a sanctuary. This was surrounded τέμενος-like by a sacred
precinct, a περίβολος, as he informs us in I, 28, 7: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου μνήμα Οἰδίποδος, which precisely fits in with the Thucididean and Plutarchean formulations. And it is only religiously proper that chthonic deities, even with their monstrous, hideous aspects carefully kept into the background through their external association with Olympic cult, should observe the dogmatic asymmetry of their nature by eschewing the Apollonian harmony of a strictly templar habitation. In general: the more terrestrial the worship the more anomalous and odd its manifestations; and contrariwise: the more celestial it is, the more orderly and even its multiformal appearances. Thus here, we assume an irregularly delineated enclosure in the open, with maybe niches or other kinds of small-scale built up or worked out receptacles of statues, holy things, implements, accessories and necessaries.

Before proceeding further, I shall mention two other relevant testimonies, pertaining to the Cylonian affair. The here congenial scholia on Aristophanes, Equites 445 give three accounts, the two latter substantially identical, conspiring in a defamatory attitude towards Cylon: ἐπεθῇ τῇ ἀκρόπολει (sc. ὁ Κύθων) ἐνῖστευε καὶ ἐθίσκεται. ἐπήφηθι δὲ συνὼν τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. Καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ὁ Κύθων φεύγει etc. And again: Κύθων τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κατέλαβεν ἐν τυραννίδι, καὶ ἐπήφηθι ποτὲ συνὼν τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐκθείσθη etc. As this is not to be met in our principal or other secondary testimonials, it must proceed from a philo-Alcmeonid source. The conjecture may be proposed that Euphorion countenanced that account. For he is (probably) mentioned by Theon the Sophist, as one of the three writers whose narrations of the Cylonian enterprise, failure and pollution Theon compares as to their artistic merits: (Progymn. p. 22) τὸ Κυθῶνειον ἄγος μᾶθην τοῦ Ἡροδότου καὶ Εὐφρόνων (sic restituo pro ms. Εὐφρόνων; κατ' Εὐφρόνων frustra tentat Valckenaer ad Herodotum V, 71 qui etiam adverbiun substituendum suspicat, "quod sensui conveniat" dicens. Male; μᾶθην ἔξειργασται apte valet magis elaboratum
est) ἔξειργασταὶ θουκυδίδην (11. Euphorion can have related the events in his ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα. In the abstract of this narration preserved in the two last entries, there is only a general reference to the conspirators running to the altars of the Gods from whose protection they were violently drawn away and then killed. The first account answers exactly to the Plutarchean one, as their parallel juxtaposition makes evident:

Plutarch, V. Sol., 12

τὸ δὲ Κυθώνειον ἄγος ἤδη μὲν ἐκ ποθῆς ἕκ τῶν ἀθρόπτητων τοῦ διετάραττε τὴν πόλιν, ἔστι οὖ τούς συνωμότας τοῦ Κύθωνος ἱκετεύοντος τὴν θεόν

Sch. on Aristophanes Equites, 445

ὁπερ εἰς τὴν Ἀθηναὺς δοκεῖ γενέσθαι ἀσέβημα,

Μεγακήθης ὁ ἄρχων ἐπειδὴ ἤπειροι οἱ συγκατακληθευσθέντες τῷ Κύθωνι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει ἔπι δίκη κατεθείνει ἔπεισεν.

ἐξάψαντες δὲ τού ἐδούς κρόκτην κλωστήν καὶ ταύτης εἰς τὴν κρίσιν κατέβησαν ἐν Ἀρείῳ Πάγῳ, ἐκ τοῦ ἐδοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξάψαντες τὴν ἱκετεύαν.

ἐχομένους, ὡς ἐγένοντο περὶ τὰς Σεμνὰς θέας καταβαίνοντες ἀυτομάτως τῆς κρόκτης ραγείσης, ζῇς διαρρύεισιν ὁ ἀρχικήθης καὶ οἱ συνάρχοντες όρμουες συνηλαμβάνειν ὡς τῇ θεοῦ τὴν ἱκετίαν ἀποθεομένης

καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἔξω κατέθεσαν, ἁθικοὶ αὐτοὺς ἐβαύηθην οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. οἱ δὲ etc.

The congruence is even verbal at places. The more striking is the difference as to how the suppliants tangibly secured the Goddess’s protection. According to the scholion they attached to the statue their symbolic rod of supplication (ἱκετηρία), upon whose disassemblage (διαρρυείςιν; meaning that the pieces of wool betufting the olive branch, or perhaps the leaves, fell away) the divine concurrence was held to be retracted. Whereas in Plutarch, we have the Ariadnean analogue, infused with potent religious meaning, of the extension of the physically immediate
nearness of the divine presence and action through a *spun out thread of wool* (κρόκη κῆωστι). Of course both accounts concur in the weight they presuppose and utilize of wool (see my separate treatment of this very important religious lanarism); and the supplicatory olive branch of the one balances significatorially the fatal clotho-like spinning of the other. I suggest that all this richness of detail comes, not uncharacteristically, from Euphorion as the ultimate collector of relevant traditions unknown or unreported by Herodotus and Thucydides. Remarkable is, in any case, the specification we get through the Plutarchean ἐνὶ δίκη; they agreed to submit themselves to the Areopagitic judgement, and were, probably, actually on their way hither, when the calamitous accident occurred. The Areopagus would have been involved by virtue of its all-powerful general cognizance and superintendence of social, political and ethical life for the Athenian citizens in those times, as well as the repository of genuinely and uncontaminatedly Eupatridic traditions. It is in this latter respect, in which it is cardinally important that the Cylonian partizans accepted in advance its absolute (or, at most, conditional on there not being open in their case the question of capital punishment [2]) jurisdiction and judgement. It is also interesting for our concerns to notice the strong concatenation of details and their conspiracy to always uphold a central meaning. The suppliants were killed in the very eyes of the Erinies while they have submitted themselves to, and perhaps were actually going to undergo, an Areopagitic trial. – Aristophanes, (Equites 445: ἐκ τῶν ἀδίπτυρων σὲ φημὶ γεγονέναι τῶν τῆς θεόυ) agrees with Thucydides in referring the sacrilegious outrage committed to Athena, as the Goddess initially supplicated. Herodotus and Plutarch leave the matter in correcter unspecified universality.

The second, and a singular one, testimony is provided by Suda, which s.v. Περικλῆς (a) writes: ἐνὶ τοῦτον (sc. τοῦ Περικλέους) ἤρξατο ὁ Πελοποννησιακὸς πόλεμος, ἐνὶ τοῦτον τὸ Κυκλώνειον ἄγος ἠλαύνετο παρὰ Ἀθηναίων, ὥ ἐνείχετο Περικλῆς: Κύκλωνα γὰρ ἄνδρα Ἀθηναίον Ὀνύμπιον
The same telling basic coherence of reports that has been noticed above is also observed in relation to one of Epimenides’ purificatory rites, when he was petitioned to undertake the religious purgatorial treatment of deeply maladious Athens and to effect the restoration of her spiritual and physical health. For long after the Cylonian affair, Athens was in a continuous state of turmoil only acutely aggravated or sullenly depressed at times alternately. Plutarch Vit. Sol. 12: τὸ δὲ Κυθώνειον ἁγός ἦδον μὲν ἐκ ποθεῖου διεστάραττε τὴν πόλιν, ἐξ οὗ ἄλλῳ etc.; he refers to the time immediately preceding the Solonian constitutional and legisational Reforms, when intense civil strife was permanently disturbing Athens. And so much is confirmed by Aristotle’s Αθηναίων Πολιτεία. The papyrus begins with the relation of events which Plutarch ascribes to that very time. So:
Aristotle 'Aθ. Πολ. I

Mýrōnocos kath' ierón ómósanteces áristín-
dn. Katagvnothntos dé toú d'gous, auto- mén ék toú tóv táboun éxevnhshas, to dé gé-
voi aútów ëfugven dêsuglyan. 'Épimenídes
s' o K'phts épi toútois ékásthe t'hn pónin.

Plutarch, Vita Sol., 12

'En dé t'w tóté chrónw (long after Cylon's attempted tyranny) téis stáseswá ókmhn
haboushs máhista kai toú dh'mou diastánt-
tos, hón dòzewn ëxhwn ó Sóhón parnhthên
éis méson áma toús áristous toú Ath-
navión kai dêzmenvos kai didáskwov épeis
toús énagnésis dégyménous dékein ápsoxein
kai kríthnai triakošwov áristínndn
dkagöntwn. Mýrōnocos dé toú phwés
katanoróntos é físasen oi ánghres, kai
metétpswan oi zántes t'w s' ápohván-
tovn toús nkrówous ánrogvántes ëxérnp
ùpew toús ð'rous ... oútow ðh métanmpotocos
aútow ëkhn ék Krhts 'Épimenídes ó
phiástos ... to dé mégyston ëlasmwv te kai
katharmwv kai idríssei katorgyásas kai
kadoiéssas t'hn pónin etc.

When Aristotle goes on in §2 to say: Mtq dè tauta ouvénabh stathíasai
tow te gnwrímos kai to nphdos nohín chrónon, toú dh'mov, he refers by
tauta to the Cylonian enterprise itself and to the terrible events
accompanying its suppression, and not to the much later transactions
related at what remains of §1. In §3 Aristotle describes the ancient, purely
aristocratic, constitution holding before the Dracanian Òsewóoi (institutional)
statutes. In §4 he gives these latter arrangements, introducing them by the
following words: 'H mén ouv prwti nohtitía (the ancient one just described
in §3) tauth evèxe t'hn úpolýraifhn. Mtq dè tauta, chrónou tinoí oú
nohínó diephóntos, épi 'Aristaikh mou árkontos Dráikwn toús Òsewóou
ènkven' ð dè táxí aútí tônbe toú trónon éixe. Comparing the underlined
expressions here and in §2, and considering them in their context, it is to be
concluded that tauta in both cases refers to the Cylonian proceedings. Thus
the Draconian measures were ordained relatively shortly after that affair
(χρόνου τινος ού πολιτου διεξάγοντος); while some considerable time elapsed from Draco’s intervention to the Solonian mediation, as is implied by Aristotle’s introduction of this latter, in the beginning of §5: τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς τάξεως ούσης ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ τῶν ἱππευόντων τοῖς ὀχήγοις, ἀντέστι τοῖς γνωρίμοις ο ὁμοσ. ἱσχυρᾶς δὲ τῆς στάσεως ούσης καὶ πολλών χρόνων ἀντικαθιστών ἀναπληρώνεται, εἰ ἔν τῶν κοινῆς διαπασχάτικην καὶ ἄρχοντα Σώθωνα, καὶ τίνων πολιτείαιν ἐπέτρεπαν αὐτῷ ετ c. (Cf. also §2: μετὰ δὲ ταύτα συνέβη στασιάσαι ... πολλῶν χρόνων).

It is further possible to give more precise details on the chronology of those momentous developments in Athenian history.

(1) Cylon was an Olympic victor; Thucydidès I, 126: Κύλων ἔν ὀλυμπιονίκης ἄνηρ Ἀθηναίος, τῶν πάθαι εὐγενῆς τε καὶ δύνατός, Herodotus V, 71: Ἐν Κύλων τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἄνηρ ὀλυμπιονίκης. His victory was in δίαιθες, Pausanias I, 28, 1: (Κύλων) – εἰ δός κάπηλος καὶ τὰ ἐκ δοξαν ἐγένετο οὐκ ἄφαντι, ἀνεγόμενος διαφόρου νῖκην Ὀλυμπικὴν. And Africanus in Eusebius, Chronica p. 145 puts his victory at Olympiad 35 (640 BC): Ol. 35. Recursum Cylon Atheniensis, is qui tyrannidem affectavit.

(2) Draco’s legislation is richly attested as to its chronology with some minor variegation. Tatianus, Oratio ad Graecos p. 160 Otto: Δράκων δὲ περὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα τριακοστὴν καὶ ἐννάτην εὑρίσκεται γεγονός (two inferior mss. of Eusebius give τριακοστήν καὶ ἐκτὸς in his transcription of this Tatianian passage, Praep. Ev. X, II, 33; they are Parisinus 468 and Venetus 341; but the correct reading is firmly supported there too). Clemens Strom. I, 16, §80: Δράκων δὲ ὁ καὶ αὐτὸς νομοθέτης περὶ τὴν τριακοστὴν καὶ ἐννάτην ὀλυμπιάδα γεγονός εὑρίσκεται. Suda s.v. has: Δράκων Ἀθηναίος νομοθέτης ... γέγονε δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τοὺς ζ’ σοφούς, ἢ μάθησιν καὶ πρεσβύτερος τῇ γούν ἀθ’ ὀλυμπιάδι τοὺς νόμους ἔθετο γηραιός ὄν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις. Ἐγραφε ὑποθήκας εἰς ἔππ τρισχίδια. (By the way, Draco is not reported to have been archon or to have occupied any other magistracy when promulgating his Ordinances. He might have been, though, θεσμοθέτης ordinary or
plenipotentiary extraordinary. The archon eponymous during Draco’s legislation was Aristaechmus, Aristotle Ἀθ. Ποι. IV sub. in.). Eusebius in his Chronica posited the major event of Draco’s life between ol. 39.2 and 40.1; thus in Armen. V: Anno 1396 ol. 40.1. Draconem aiunt leges tuilisse; in Armen. M: Anno 1395, ol. 39.4; in Hieronymus, Anno 1393 (ol. 39.2). We are practically still within the 39th Olympiad, which harmonizes with the above reports, as περὶ τὴν δείνα Ὀλυμπιάδα or τῇ δείνα Ὀλυμπιάδι may mean either at about the relevant Olympic year or within the interval between it and the next one. Still there are two puzzling testimonies to be considered: Ulpius on Demosthenes, Contra Timocr. p. 765R relates: ὁ μὲν Σάδων ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων τῶν τυχάνων ἐν ταῖς Ἀθηναίοις πρὸ τῶν Περσικῶν πολέμων (extremely loose), ὁ δὲ Δράκων πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐπέτα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτεσιν, ὡς φησίν ὁ Διόδωρος. From Diodorus, of course, only the latter piece of information is drawn, as it is highly unlikely that he would have located Solon with such uncharacteristic laxity if not implicatory inexactness. (I suspect a number of years has dropped out after Ἀθηναίοις, but even so the formulation is too unscientific for Diodorus). Now, as to the precise bit of information, 47 years are too many counting them between the principal events in the respective personages’ lives. And the difficulty is aggravated by a passage in Tzetzes, Chilades, V 350-1:

μετὰ ἑπτὰ τοῦ Δράκοντος ἐπὶ δὲ νομογράφου,
γίνεται Σάδων Ἀττικός δεύτερος νομογράφος.

The wretched politic verses are metrically correct, as it were, so the ἑπτὰ is really problematic; it is also ominously present in the τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἑπτὰ of Ulpius’ testimony. This strongly suggests Diodorus as Tzetzes’ source as well, which he often is generally. Diodorus gave most probably the distance between the two legislations. Locating Draco’s at some year between 624 and 621 BC, and Solon’s at c. 594 BC, we can nicely calculate 621-594 = 27 years, and accordingly correct (with Clinton, Fasti Hellenici I p. 213) in Ulpius’ text ἑπτὰ καὶ ἔικοσι, the error having possibly arisen from a reading like: ὁ
δὲ Δράκων πρὸ αὐτοῦ κ'ζ' ἔτεσιν etc. (the second letter κ being a compendium for καί), which was simplified, misread or misunderstood (κ' + κ' = μ') to μζ. A similar mode of signalizing ordinals I have observed in Eusebius Praep.Ev. X, ii, 33 (a transcription of Tatianus, Oratio Contra Gr. p. 160 (Otto)) where one ms. (Flor. Plut. VI, 6) has μμζ for the correct μζ or τεσσαρακοστὴν καὶ ἔκτην – and another (Flor. Plut. VI.9) spells it out μκαι ζ.

- Tzetzes' blunder is however unaccountable, but for his condescending negligence in matters of mechanical exactness, esp. in historicochronological matters regarding mere politics and not the superior (for him) spheres of grammaticophilosophical speculations on literature and mythology. However his source might have counted seven Olympiads, which is correct: 4x7 = 28.

Of course, an easier solution would be to correct verse 350 in his Chilaides to run thus: μετὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ Δράκοντος ἔτη καὶ τεσσαράκοντα. This would also cancel the harshness νομογράφου... νομογράφος. (But that could be no real problem for Tzetzian poetics). In such a case, Tzetzes simply drew from an erroneous Diodorean ms.

(3) Solon's legislation is fixed chronologically even more securely by a general concurrence of authorities. Thus Diogenes Laertius I, 62: Σῴδων ἡκμαζε̂ περὶ τὴν τεσσαρακοστῆν ἔκτην Ὀλυμπιάδα, ἢς τῷ τρίτῳ ἔτει ἔρξεν Ἀθηναίων, καθά φησι Σωκράτης· ὅτε καὶ τίθετο τους νόμους. Sosicles the Rhodian (Diog. Laert. II, 84) is a reliable writer of the 2nd century BC whose Κρητικά are among the chief works utilized by Diororus (v. V, 80) and is praised by Apollodorus apud Strabonem X, 474 for his exactness of relation regarding Cretan things (ὅν φησίν ἄκριβοιν Ἀπολλόδωρος τὰ περὶ τὴν νήσουν). The information given above comes from his other mentioned work "Διαδοχαί or Διαδοχή (φιλοσόφων)". Solon was actually ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος in 594 BC. (There were lists of such archons, naturally, extending to the inauguration of annual archonship and beyond. For a literary edition cf. the Demetrius' of Phalerus one, Diog. Laert. I, 22: ὃς φησὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Φανηρεύς ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφῇ. And who can read Aristotle's Constitutional
History without noticing that a working list of archons is readily presupposed as a settled accessibility?). This is confirmed by Plutarch, Vit. Sol., XIV: Ἡρέθη (the election was not by lot then but ἄριστίνδων as Aristotle nicely puts it) δὲ ἀρχων μετὰ Φιλόμβροτον ὤμου καὶ διαθηκῆς καὶ νομοθέτης, δεξαμένων προθύμως αὐτὸν ὡς μὲν εὐπορον τῶν πνευσίων, ὥς δὲ χριστὸν τῶν πενήπων. (He apparently himself helped the issue by an ambiguous statement that he is reputed to have made before his election, as Plutarch goes on poignantly to narrate: Λέγεται δὲ καὶ φωνῇ τις αὐτῶν περιφερομένη (notice the exquisite suggestiveness of what Plutarch’s nobility will not so much as indicate) πρῶτον εἰςόντος, ὡς τὸ ἴδιον πόθεμον οὐ ποιεῖ, καὶ τοῖς κτηματικοῖς ἄρεσκειν καὶ τούς ἀκτήμοσι, τῶν μὲν ἀξία καὶ ἀρετὴ, τῶν δὲ μέτρῳ καὶ ἀριθμῷ τὸ ἴδιον ἔξειν προσδοκῶντων). Philombrotus was the archon before him; Dropides the one after, Philostratus Vit. Sophist. 1, 16 ἐς Δρωπιδόν δὲ ἀναφέρων (sc. τὸ γένος Κριτίας) δὲ μετὰ Σόσιων Ἀθηναίων ἦρξεν. – Solon’s archonship is also commemorated by Aristotle Αθ. Πολ. 5: ἱσχυρὰς δὲ τῆς στάσεως οὖσας καὶ πολλὰν χρόνον ἀντικαθημένων ἁθηναίοις, εἰπόντο κοινῆ διαθηκῆς καὶ ἀρχοντα Σόσιων, καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ etc., which answers to the triple authority mentioned by Plutarch above as exercised by Solon. Cf. also §13, 1: τῷ δὲ πέμπτῳ (sc. ἔτει) μετὰ τὴν Σόσιωνος ἀρχήν etc. (An exact list of archons is again definitively presupposed).

Solon’s attempt at pacification of the civil strife then rife ended, of course, in total failure, as is conclusively shown by the entire subsequent sociopolitical history of Athens and by various crucially significant events of the immediately following years. He himself in his poems amply testifies to a bitter feeling arising from the universal displeasure and total rejection that his reforms were met with. He naturally ascribes this multilateral dissatisfaction and the consequent inefficiency of his measures, to his resolutely, and against the advice of all those around him as well as of the contending factions themselves acting separately for their own self-
interest, following the Golden Rule of the *Middle* and *Measure*, avoiding extreme positions both in *Ends* and *Means*. And the spirit of such an explanation has been prevalent with modern interpreters of those ominous developments. But it must be emphasized that Solon's constitutional principle is decidedly *timocratic*; and that the tenour of his legislation was unmistakably *plutocratic* in its general, social configuration, notwithstanding the undoubted *democratical* tendency and bearing of much of the proposed political organization of the state. The system advocated by him may be aptly termed *graded putocracy*. By bringing mere wealth of the landowning class to the *explicit center* of the sociopolitical life he broke away most decidedly, and very immeasurably and disharmoniously, with the eupatridic traditions and the aristocratic organization of society; in whose late stages of development may the insalubrious growth in importance of wealth as such (in particular, of a specific type of wealth), and of the employments and professions that secure and increase it irrespective of their *intrinsic value* have made itself painfully felt by the healthy, creative elements of society; but only as an *unacknowledged* potency, indeed as a virtual power whose dissociation from objective, independently established *merit* is *shameful*, and whose operations in its own *naked name* are deeply *resented* and *despised*.

The aristocratically organized society was indeed in grave disease; Solon postulated her death by bringing unashamedly to the surface the morbid bacillus of her deep affliction. He thereby cut away simultaneously both the *sole* objective foundation of *natural* harmony in social life; and the only *solace* of those *unprivileged* in nature's distribution of her bounties, of those, that is, with little or no naturally approved "aristocratic" *merit*. What was, therefore, *implicit* in the previous form of society, and to various degrees *checked* and *controlled* even in later stages of its evolution, break out even more forcibly and uncompromisingly: I mean, of course, the strife between the *prosperous* and the *needy*, between those *possessed* of
wealth (in both senses of the word) and those \textit{equally possessed by it} in their very want of it, in short the class-struggle. No real problem was thus solved by the Solonian arrangements, indeed none was even squarely faced. And Solon's boastful following the \textit{Middle} path, far from providing some real common ground between the antagonizing elements of the civil disturbance, it only, with false compromise, promoted the interests of a certain class and supported the pretentious claims of a certain misbegotten social archetype to the detriment of the truly significant, creative forces operating in society's power-field.

The disturbance necessarily caused by \textit{tacit plutocracy}, always stigmatized as an \textit{aberration} from the true aristocratic principles and as a \textit{malfunction}, through erroneous focusing, within the natural, hierarchical order of society, was bound to thrive prodigiously when its secret source was proclaimed as Society's organizational Norm. To accept the derivative principle of Wealth in itself and on its own as the exclusive, fundamental structure – generating source of societal order is to open an intrinsically \textit{unlimited} scope for deadly struggle and unceasing strife between two camps, in Zoroastrian manner. For, \textit{firstly}, there is no objective reason why wealth should be concentrated more in one than in another individual – no valid reason, that is, unless we invoke some \textit{external} justification such as wisdom, skills and abilities, beauty, origin, authority etc. It is divine how the uncorrupted natural instinct of mankind is spontaneously governed by the Great Principle of the \textit{Association of Merit}: delighting when it finds excellences cohabitating in individual cases, grieving inwardly when deficiencies interposed loosen the organic cohesion of Value with Value. Only when operating as an hierarchised member of the native aristocracy of goods, wealth shows forth its natural value. Even the merest law observed in wealth transactions, such as the hereditary or testamentary transmission of wealth, presupposes extraplutocratical determinations; just as the conferment of art and knowledge in education obeys extrasophiological
coordinates. The more, thus, wealth is exclusively emphasized, the less the organic ordinances of Merit-Aristocracy and Nature-Power Field can regulate its motivations and workings. And as a more or less autonomous wealth-principle democratically leaves to every man equal rights and claims for its possession; the unremitting strife ensues in which disjunct individuality, enriched with a necessarily, under the circumstances, insatiable thirst for wealth, battles its miserable way to an unprofitable distinction, where success is ludicrously and deleteriously empty, and failure works total prostration. In no human enterprise whatever is so enormously much staked for such a low chance on so desperately little. Never has Man been so treacherously deceived to work against such monstrous odds.

But it is a case really of pure self-imposition. Wealth is not the principle of societal organization, but a criterion of success, and hence an index of some capacity. In a healthy, free and natural system, the success and the capacity underlying it are positive; and so is wealth. Wealth is then generated by the exercise of excellence, and accrues to those endowed with creative excellencies. This happens because in such a system the distribution of roles and resources is made spontaneously with a view to the maximal efficiency of the system. On the contrary, in a system paralysed and sickened by heavy restrictions in its freedom of movement, "success" and "capacity" are misnomers for results and aptitudes in the manipulation of unnatural orders according to artificial rules. Wealth thus is an index of corruption in such highly regulatory systems functioning under the heavy burden of protectionism and dirigisme.

And herein lies Solon's chief error. In a sickened society, where the principle of nobility had collapsed, he thought of introducing the criterion of wealth as a (re)ordering societal principle. In effect he devolved some power to the lower strata of the existing system, one governed according to the principle of land-owning nobility: this devolution was attempted by his
graduated plutocracy. But the system was terminally ill. To his unworking remedy, there followed Pelsistratid tyranny.

Nor is, secondly, realistic or intelligent to indulge in futile, utopian imaginings of artificial regulatory restrictions imposed and observed in that internal, intestinal, unheralded War among the members of Society divided into the camp-classes of possessing and unpossessing. Every possible controlling regulation (be it religious, moral, legal or customary) stems, if real and actually effective, from the Tree of Nature; it is an internal constraint, a self-imposed obligation, the negative aspect of the very Law of Development. In this organic cohesion and self-determination of a Natural System, wealth has its precise character, position and function. And as no objective injustice is permitted in the nature of things to the elements of a whole against their necessary co-functionaries; no violation, in other words, of the Absolute Code distributing rights and duties to the various parts according to their several natures and roles as contributive, in objectively given hierarchical coordination and co-operation, to the life and excellence of the whole; as every disturbance of the self-generated natural order is inescapably annihilated, devoured by the terrible Ministers of the Law (the Persecuting Rabid Dogs of Cosmic Justice) which feed on Anomaly; so the insolence of negative wealth is naturally chastised and subdued in a well-organized and well-working society; and wealth itself plays its positive role in weaving the societal structure, maximizing the efficiency, and optimizing the quality of its Natural Harmony. But the man-made, arbitrary transformation of what is an intrinsically subordinate (if telling and striking) criterion and means into the central principle and the overriding motive force of society, dissolves the systematic ties and mutual dependencies among the several elements upon whose existence and spontaneous adjustment the maintenance of the societal order rests. It is capital folly, and a momentous example of human unnatural arbitrariness, to imagine that internal restraints, expressive of a universal concurrence and consonance of
elements as manifested in an objectively valid Law and Order, can operate, control and constrain their multiple, aberrant malfunction in heavily deformed (i.e. constrained) systems working under the degenerating influence of a despised usurpation of sovereign authority by a single, in itself secondary, part. To be sure the system will run for a time with a tolerable regularity, and even at times, for rather a shortwhile, in an enhanced state of hectic activation resulting from that focusing of energy which every absolutization effects; but this inertial movement and feverish intensity will last only so long as the (idealized by now) deference (despite its formal abrogation) to the pure aristocratical principle, implicit in the continued observance of codes and ordinances rooted in its own structures and workings, can counteract the influence of the noxious usurper. Sooner or later the inherent contradiction between the old (i.e. natural aristocracy of excellence) and the new (i.e. positive plutocracy of possessions) will reach the point of unstable, incoherent, explosive equilibrium; which must be followed by the corrupt disintegration of the very bonds of social order, the gradual result of the predominance of Plutocracy's evil Law.

Speaking of Plutocracy's evil Law, I am referring to the pure plutocracy of amassed, inactive possessions, to the plutocracy of dead, and deadening, wealth as such (an unwealth really; cf. my Value and Knowledge). For we should keep conceptually distinct with great care what is very different in objective reality, despite confusing lexicographical categorization. Thus between natural aristocracy of excellence on the one hand, and pure plutocracy of possession on the other; i.e. between an organizational principle of general societal order which rests on individual accomplishments of human nature (on skills, dexterities, arts, knowledge and wisdom), and another such principle emphasising accumulated wealth as inert magnitude; between these two polar extremes, there lie the actual aristocracies of nobility in descent on the one side, and actual plutocracies of working wealth on the other. And
while the aristocracy of nobility represents a retrogression in societal
developments; the plutocracy of active wealth constitutes a progressive
evolution. For this (kind of) plutocracy reintroduces de facto the
principle of excellence (abilities etc.): since possessions are accumulated
and used actively and not as dead matter (become, that is, real wealth)
only by means of their efficient employment in the course of human
activity; and such efficient employment must needs proceed directly or
ultimately from pragmatic knowledge.

When aristocratical systems of merit (the natural condition of human
society) degenerate into aristocratics of mere nobility, turmoil becomes
endemic in society. For man accepts at bottom no other superiority than the
superiority of excellence in human nature and work, i.e. the superiority of
real ability (and coordinate success). And there is of course a very material
reason for such singular and exclusive acknowledgment: society’s existence
and well-being depends on that spontaneous submission to the rule of
excellence, esp. in times of crisis and heightened danger.

Societal disorder then means that the natural cohesive bond of
society, namely the principle of excellence, is malfunctioning because of an
increasing institutional fossilization of structures which, while initially
generated as a result of the operations of the cohesive principle and with a
view to promoting its workings, become with the passage of time so many
constraints on its functionality. A new ordering criterion is thus needed to
realign institutional structures with the sense of the principle. And wealth
proximately emerges as such a realistic criterion. But before it can be
embedded into a dynamic framework of enterpreunerial activity in free and
open markets, it cannot fulfill its purpose: it simply substitutes (in idealized
theory) one dead body (inactive possessions as accumulated wealth of a
rentier) to another (nobility of descent). This lies at the bottom of Solon’s
failure to solve the riddle of social unrest in his times.
When the principle of wealth becomes dominant in a societal system (wealth in its static aspect as sheer weight, indeed burden, of possession – and not as a dynamic factor, i.e. wealth as materialized creativity, result and cause of progress through human inventiveness, skill and knowledge), then a *homogeneization* sets in, which eliminates one of the principal causes of development: the antagonism inherent in diversity.

*Finally*, a state of affairs will of necessity prevail, in which in place of the multiple and multifarious classifications of individuals according to *natural* features and relationships – religious, phyletic, sanguine, occupational, co-habitative, geographical, civil, cultural – a single division is monstrously magnified tending gradually to supplant all other interlaced differentiations: the monopoly of the unitary class-distinction into *rich* and *poor* is being established. Its very uniqueness and exclusiveness, accompanied by the absence of well-founded, nature-rooted stable constraints in the working of the principle it stems from, generates the barbarous society of ferocious class-struggle. The *dynamic harmony* of the natural co-existence of men in a variegated and highly antagonistic field (the fertile ground of human creativity) is dissolved, and in its place reigns tyrannically the centrifugal force of *compulsive social dissonance*. And as the previous order, artificially prolonged, follows more and more into the subconscious of the Universal Man-Soul the natural system from which it sprang, its faculties become less and less potent, its operations ineffective, its effects negligible. Thus of necessity we end with the shameless and iniquitous work of pure Plutocracy: the division of society into two groups, the *oppressors* and the *oppressed*, the *exploitators* and the *exploited*, the worthless, degenerate, castrated *dominant* class and the systematically demoralized, dis-orientated un-humanized *proletariat*. Herein lies the root of communist ideology. Communism is the polar opposite of pure plutocracy: but they both share an oversimplified, homogenized picture of society divided Manichaistically between two mutually exclusive camps, the classes
of the wealthy and of the poor. (For a revealing example of how "modernized" versions of such simplistic views will lead astray, cf. de St. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*). On the other hand one should notice how close to such artificial states of affairs come actual societies in moments of intense crisis, when the real principles of societal cohesion are no more fully operational within the diseased body of the commonwealth.

In such critical stages, to try to remedy this self-defeating situation by simply resting substantive power (albeit of a restraining rather than of a directive character) with the multitude as a means of checking the transgressivity of the superior class, is to aggravate the essential antinomianism of the State, and to make it insolvable by recognizing and authorizing it as such. Attempting to separate the administrative, magisterial, governing political power of the wealthy, from the controlling, checking, approving or censuring potency of the plebeian mass (something that Solon, indeed, intentionally endeavoured to achieve as a way of reducing the contential contradictoriness of the system), is at most a transitional arrangement, as experience and reason both represent; the reality and significance of the distinction is soon emasculated to a true question of formalities, as the Athenian Constitutional History amply and clearly manifests. For you cannot correct the false structure of a bifurcated society (no more one, but two really societal integrals, as Aristotle puts it), by essentially upholding the principle of division, while merely trying to contain it within its framework.

We can follow with considerable details the Athenian exemplification of the general law of inadequacy of "democratic plutocracy" (as one may rightfully call Solon's system) Democracy as a correction of an ailing societal order in its process of dissolution. And I shall investigate the courses and causes of these developments that led to the genesis of democracy proper, and to the momentous transformation of the body politic which ushered
the era of high Hellenism. But we are here interested in incidents and dates preceding Solon's miscarried attempt in the Athenian case.

For the fixation of the date for the Solonian archonship and legislation cf. also: Clemens Strom. I, 65, 3 (p. 354P), who gives Solon's ἄκμη at the 46th Olympiad. Cyrillus, adv. Julianum, I, 12 D (Spanheim): τεσσαρακοστὴ ἐκτη 'Ολυμπιάδι Σόην νενομοθέτηκε. Tatianus, adv. Graecos, p. 160 (Otto): Σόην περὶ μυ' (sc. εὑρίσκεται γεγονός). Two mss. (Parisinus 2376 and Etonensis 1886) have περὶ μς. I consider this μς to have been an erroneous variant and not a mere graphic error. For Suda s.v. Σόην has: γέγονε δὲ ἐν τῇ μς 'Ολυμπιάδος, οἱ δὲ νς. Now this latter date is absurdly late; it should be corrected to μς; and taken to mean either a divergent opinion of some chronologists or a variant reading of some manuscripts. We shall find in a moment that in all probability Eusebius, in his Chronica, countenanced the later date; however in his Praep. Evang. X, 11, 33 he quotes at length Tatian giving for Solon his μς (v. also supra). Eusebius in his Chronica gives Ol. 46.2 as the time of the legislation; according to the Armenian V copy it is: Anno 1426, Ol. 47.3 Solon leges ferebat (it locates Epimenides visit at 46.4, and makes of it an aggressive onslaught). Hieronymus' translation maintains the following sequence: Anno 1422, Epimenides Athenas emundavit, Anno 1425, Solon - sua jura constituit. That is 594 BC and 591 BC respectively, or Ol. 46.2 and 47.1. We deduce an interval of 2 or 3 years between the two events. Locating, firstly, the later at 46, 3 according to the overwhelming weight of the testimonies and the general fitness of relevant events and dates. And postulating, secondly, the occurrence of the former within the 46th Olympiad according to Diog. Laert., I, 110: Αθηναίοις θοιμᾶτε κατεχομένως ἕχρησεν ἢ Πυθία καθῆρα τὴν πόλιν· οἱ δὲ πέμπουσι ναῦν τε καὶ Νικίαν τὸν Νικηράτου εἰς Κράτιν καθούντες τὸν Ἐπιμενίδην. Καὶ ὃς ἑπθὼν Ὀλυμπιάδι τεσσαρακοστῆ ἐκτη ἐκάθηρεν αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν. (Suda s.v. Ἐπιμενίδης gives the 44th Olympiad as the date for the purification of Athens. But if we carefully study the passage, we shall conceive the plausibility of correcting
to 46th. For it is said: γέγονε δὲ (sc. ὁ Ἐπιμενίδης) ἐπὶ τῆς Ἡ ὁμομπιάδος, ώς προτερεύειν καὶ τῶν ζ' κηρηθέντων σοφῶν, ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν γενέσθαι ἐκάθερε γοῦν τὰς Ἀθηνᾶς τοιῷ Κυλωνείου ἁγίους κατὰ τὴν μᾶ' ὁμομπιάδο, γυραιοίς ὄν. An interval of 44-30 = 14 Olympiads gives, at most, 56 years, if they were full; while assuming μὲ an error for μη', we reckon 16 Olympiads or, at most, 64 years, more characteristically of old age; because the γέγονε here cannot stand for the age of ἀκμή (= 40 years old), since in such case, we would have extreme longevity even on the shorter reckoning, 40+56 = 106). We conclude from the foregoing two premises to 46.1 = 596 BC, as the year of the Epimenidean visitation.

The next, partially overlapping, important event to be considered as shedding light both on the chronology and the law of development in the portion of Athenian History that we are now delineating, is the Cirrhæan War. The Crisaeans or Cirrhæans (Κρίσσα or Κρίσσα and Kíppa being anagrammatic forms on the frequent mutation – ρρ - ↔ - ρσ - ) was a people occupying the homonymous region by the seaside at the foot of Delphi. Homer, in the Catalogue speaks of (B, 519-20):

-------------Πυθώνα τε πετρήσασαν,
Κρίσσαν τε ζαθένα, etc.

(the best and most mss. with Etym. M. 515.20 have Κρίσσαν; a number of mss. and Sch. Sophocles, Oed.R. 733 give Κρίσσαν) as belonging to the Phoceans, but the area was really at the very boundary with Locrian territory, and hence becomes explicable, e.g. the vacillation in Sch.D.: Κρίσσαν, πεδίον ἐν Λοκρίδι, ἢ, ὡς οἱ πελαίας ἁφαίν, ἐν Δεξιφοῖς (hence on the Phocaean side): οὐνόμασται ἀπὸ Κρίσσου τοῦ Τυράννου καὶ Άστεροδίας τῆς Δεξιφοίς. However Homer does not mention any other Locrians than those οἱ ναίουσαι πέρνν ἱερῆς Εὔβοιας. So has Strabo remarked, with the qualification that Homer may be implicitly recognising their existence by the very formula he uses just quoted: IX p. 426: τῶν γε μὴν Ἐσπερίων Λοκρῶν Ὁμηρος οὐ
μέμνυται, ἣ ὦ ρητῶς γε, ἀδηλά μόνον τῷ δοκεῖν ἀντιδιαστήμησθαι τούτοις ἑκείνους, περὶ ὧν εἰρήκαμεν: Λοκρῶν - Εὔβοιάς, ὡς καὶ ἐτέρων οὖν. Dionysius Periegeta equally ignores the Ozolian Locrians; he recenses the eastern ones (426), but he passes over from Aetolia and Acheloos directly to Phocaea on the south of mainland Greece (437). Definite, as usual, is Pausanias, X, 38, 1: Ἡ δὲ γη ἡ Λοκρῶν τῶν καθομένων Ὀζωιῶν προσεχὴς τῇ Φωκίδι ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν Κύρραν. And consonantly Strabo (IX, 416), describing the area as part of western Phocis, remarks on Λοκρίς, which διττῆ ἐστι, διηρημένη ὑπὸ τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ δίχα· ἢ μὲν τοῦ ἔσπερίου μέρους παρακειμένη τῷ Παρνασσῷ καὶ μέρος αὐτοῦ νεμομένη, καθήκουσα δ’ ἐπὶ τὸν Κρισαίον κόσμον etc., which Crisaean bay must here be understood strictly, although Strabo uses it in a very wide sense. Amphissa, the nearby Locrian city, ἐπὶ τῆς ἄκροις ἱδρυται τοῦ Κρισαίου πεδίου, IX p. 427. Delphi is located on the westernmost side of Phocis, Strabo IX p. 418: ταῦτα γάρ (sc. τὰ χωρία τῶν Δεθφῶν) ἐστι τὰ ἐσπεριώτατα μέρη τῆς Φωκίδος, a natural starting place for the description of the land (ibid.). The harbour [31] then laid just as the border between the Phocean mountainous area and inner vales and plateaus on the one hand and the Locrian grand sea-side plain on the other.

When we first meet the region in extant literature, we find two spots preeminent in it, rocky Pytho, the sacred place, and god-blessed Crissa, the population focus. They occur side by side in the Homeric catalogue as Phocean centers, Iliad B 519-20:

οἱ Κυνάρισσαν ἢν Πυθῶνας τν πετρῆσαν
Κρισάω τν Ζαθένην. -------------------

The Temple possesses already enormous wealth, since it is mentioned together with Troy's riches as preeminent examples and extreme cases of affluence, Iliad, I, 401 sqq.:

οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ψυχῆς ἀντάξιον οὐδὲ ὅσα φασίν
"Ἰησοῦν ἐκτήσθαι, εὐναίόμενον πτοχίζετον,
τὸ πρὶν ἐπὶ εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἐγέθειν υἱὰς Ἀχαιῶν,
What Apollo is made to prophesize as the accomplishment of his will in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* Pythius 69-75 (*Hymn to Apollo*, 247-252) and again 109-115 (*Hymn to Apollo*, 287-292), has obviously actually taken place (in the words of the latter passage):

*ἐνθάδε ὃ δὲ φρονέω τεύξειν περικαθήνεα νῦν,*
*ἐμμεναι ἀνθρώποις χρηστήριον, οἰ τέ μοι αἰεὶ*
*ἐνθάδ’ ἀγινύουσι τεθνέσσας ἐκατόμβας,*
*ημὲν δοὺς Πεινοπόννησον πέιραν ἔχουσιν,*
*ὁδ’ δοὺς Ἐυρώπην τε καὶ ἀμφίρυτας κατὰ νῆσους,*
*χρησόμενοι etc.*

Men, cattle and rich gifts were continuously offered to the God and augmented his treasures. When the Cretan future ministers express apprehension as to their sustainance in that unproductive region (*ibid*. 350-2), Apollo haughtily and peremptorily dismisses their improper anxiety, lack of faith and want of intelligence:

354 Νῦπιοι ἀνθρώποι, δυστηθήσοντες, οἱ μηθεδόνας
*βούλεσθ’ ἀργαθέους τε πόνους καὶ στείνεα θυμῷ*
*ρπίδιον ἐπος ὑμμ’ ἐρέο καὶ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆσω.*
*δεξιτερῇ μάρ’ ἕκαστος ἔχων ἐν χειρὶ μάχαιραν,*
*οφάζειν αἰεὶ μὴνα τὰ δ’ ἀφθονα πάντα παρέσται,*
*όσα ἐμοὶ κ’ ἀγάγωσι περικηπτὰ φυτ’ ἀνθρώπων.*

Verses 404-5 of the Iliadic passage above are used as evidence for the splendour and affluence of the oracle at olden times by Strabo IX p. 420C (= 644A); by Aelianus *Var. Hist.* VI, 9 (cf. also *Hist. Anim.* VI, 13); by the *Scholiast* on Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*, 34-5:

---------- πολύχρυσος γὰρ Ἀπόλλων,
καὶ τε πολυκτέανος Πυθώνι κε τεκμήριο.
This primeval treasure was not really found, as Strabo, *loc. cit.*, relates. Thus some were led to postulate an ancient sacrilegious plunder, distinct from that by Onomarchus and Phayllus in the Sacred War, and much earlier.

Agamemnon himself has sought divine instruction from the Pythian Oracle as to the End of the Trojan War. *Odyssey* θ, 73 sqq.:

Μούσ’ ἄρ’ ἀοιδῶν ἀνήκεν ἀειδόμεναι κλέα ἄνδρῶν,
οἴμης τῆς τότ’ ἄρα κλέος οὐρανόν εὐρὺν ἵκανε,
νείκος ὦδυσσόνσα καὶ Πηθείδεῳ Αχιλῆος,
ὡς ποτε Ἰππίαντο θεῶν ἐν δαίμον ταξιεῖ
ἐκπάγης ἐπέεσσιν, ὡμαί τ’ ἄνδρῶν Ἀγαμήμων
χαίρε νόῳ, ὁ τ’ ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν ἰππίαντο.
Τότε γάρ οἱ κρείων μυθήσατο Φοῖβος Απόλλων
Πυθεὶ ἐν ἰαγαθέ, δῆθ’ ὑπέρβη ἡλίων οὐδὸν
κρησόμενος, τότε γάρ ῥα κυθίνδετο πήματος ἀρχή
Τρωεί τε καὶ Δαναοίς Διὸς μεγάθου διὰ βουνάς.

(Τότε γάρ refers to the time when Agamemnon visited the oracle; it was at the beginning of the glorious enterprise. Διὸς μεγάθου διὰ βουνάς – Zeus having resolved to destroy the impious, unjust race of men, whose abominations were a burden onto earth). The ἡλίων οὐδὸς here and in the Iliadic passage above, is significant. When Apollo set his mind on establishing his oracle in Pytho (the name under which Homer refers to Delphes), he himself dug the foundations of the Temple; then Trophonios and Agamedes formed the *marmarean threshold*, and the people inhabiting the area erected the Temple. The three stages of the construction, corresponding to the three orders of being (divine, heroic and human) are clearly set out in the Homeric Hymn to *Apollo Pythios*, 116 sqq.:

"Ως εἴπὼν διέθηκε θεμεῖθα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
ἐὐρέα καὶ μάρτα μακρὰ δινεκές’ αὐτὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς
ἡλίων οὐδόν ἐθηκε Τροφώνιος ἡδ’ Ἀγαμήνης,
υίες Ἐργίνου, φίλοι αἰθανάτοις θεοῖσιν’
The threshold of a building, its point where it opens to the World without, the passage of Entrance and Exit with its Janusian identity in complementarity, is the second most crucial part of it after the divinely wrought foundation.

On ἀφήτωρος (Ilissi I, 404) most ancient commentators accepted it as an epitheton Apollinis, either deriving it from ἀφιέναι (sc. τοὺς ἱός, τὰ βέν), Apollon being generally so called ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν βενῶν ἀφέσεως; or connecting it with φημὶ and the oracular faculty of Apollo in Delphes specifically, construing ἀφήτωρ as equivalent to ὁμοφήτωρ, ὁμοίως πάσι προφητεύοντος καὶ μαντευομένου, τῷ τε πέντε καὶ τῷ πενθοσίῳ. Thus the Sch. D and the Etym. M s.v. (where significantly a third association is mentioned, namely Apollo as ἰήσος throws down, sends, hurls his vivificatory rays – a connection again with ἀφίμη). Similarly Hesychius has two successive entries:

ἀφητορεία; μαντεία
ἀφήτωρος προφητεύοντος; ἡ τοξότου.

Suda s.v. opts for the second interpretation, explaining οὐ κοινότερον (i.e. not an epitheton of Apollo in general) ἰήσος τοῦ Πυθίου (sc. Ἀπόλλωνος), οἷον ὁμοφήτωρ, διὰ τὸ οἶον εἰς ἠγοῦς ἔρχεσθαι τοῖς χρησμοφοβομένως. (This is taken verbatim from part of Sch. A ad loc.). The Sch. B refer to the two explanations and add one that is considered better: ἦ τοῦ πολυφήτωρος, τούτεστι τοῦ πολιῆς φήμας ἀφιέντος; ὁ καὶ ἀμείνον – giving many oracular responses is fit enough; α- is taken as epitatic and multiplicatory of the force of meaning of the main word. The φήμας ἀφιέντος is an unconscious recognition of the truth of my view as explained just below; clearly the scholiast wants both words to have a bearing on ἀφήτωρ. It barely deserves notice another acceptance mentioned here (also to be found in Sch. A and
οἱ μὲν ἀσαφήτωρος, evidently supposedly from ἀσαφῶς φάναι. But how exactly? Unless the α taken privationally is made to serve not privation of oracular response, but its obscurity). – The two last sentences of the Sch. B ad v. 404 are misplaced. The latter is correctly located by means of Sch. T to ἵνων ξανθᾶ καρῆνα in v. 407. The former pertains to the entire tenour of Achilles’ speech, cf. esp. 417 sqq.; it is also misplaced by Sch. T.

Much discussion has taken place among the moderns as to the meaning of this word (ἀφήτωρ), with regard esp. to the better choice between those two chief acceptations. In vain. For the root-ἐτυμον of both ἵνι and φημί is the same: from -Fn- we have Ἰ-Fn-μι and so ἵνι, as well as βη-(hence βάζω, βάζει, Βάκκος etc., cf. Part I of my inquiry into the Eleusinian Mysteries), and, with consonant change from μέσον to ὀδοὺ, φης-μι; speech being send out and forth from the mouth just as, and with, the air breathed out (cf. the ἐσος that φύγει ἔρκος ὀδόντων; and even psyche does exactly the same on dying). – That ἵνι often has in metre the first syllable long is evidence of the root δίγμμα; otherwise it would metrically be corrected whatever it naturally was, as the ἱσχνος sound of -ι- could not sustain production before a long vowel; that the i-short predominates in Homer is a mark of the disappearance of F.

But Apollonius in his Lexicon and Sch. A and T offer a third interpretation of the word which was supported by (the majority of) the glossographers characteristically. So in Apollonius, s.v. οἱ δὲ Γίωσσογράφοι ἀφήτορα (pro ἀφητόρας, with Villoison) ἐδοξαν ἤγεσθαι τὸν (better τὸν) στροφέα τῆς θύρας (L). Sch. A add interesting information. On the one hand there was a διηνὴ attached to v. 404; and the Sch. explain: ἡ διηνὴ πρὸς τοὺς γῆσσογράφους, ἀφήτορος τοῦ στροφέως ἄποδιόντας. καὶ Ζυνόδοτος δὲ οὕτως ἐκδέδεκται τὸν γὰρ ἔξος μετέγραφε νποῦ Ἀπώλησονος. (This, but not what follows, comes from Aristonicus’ Περὶ Σημείων Ἰλιάδος; the rest is to be expunged then from Friendländer’s edition of Aristonicus’ remains as well as from Erbse’s edition of the Iliad Scholia).
Zenodotus adopted unwarranted high-handed treatment of the locus: In order to interpret ἄφτωρος as ὀστροφέως, he changed the φοίβου Ἀπόλλιωνος of the next verse into νηοῦ Ἀπόλλιωνος. Even so, one wonders what to do with the unacceptable harshness of a construction which would necessitate Ἡλίνος οὐδός ἄφτωρος ναοῦ Ἀπόλλιωνος, "what is enclosed within by the stone threshold of the hinge of the temple of Apollo". This is indigestible. Αφτωρ must be an Apollonian divine epitheton. In Delphes, it must combine in meaning the two basic functions of Pythian Apollo: the Darter of Rays killing, burning, nourishing, illuminating, as the case may be, in physical or mental reality.

The First Holy War (the Crissaean War) about the control of the Delphic sanctuary, ended in 591/0 B.C. (Marmor Parium §37). There is mention of protracted hostilities, after the fall of the city which till then in effect superintended the Holy Place and administered it in practical matters as its own. The Crissaeans that have survived the destruction of their city, withdrew to a nearby mountain called Κίρφις, and there offered desperate resistance to the Amphictyonic forces entrusted with their final and total subjection (Scholia in Pindarum, Hypothesis Pythiorum, b and d vol. ii p. 3.5 sqq.; p. 4.19 sqq. Drachmann). This guerilla war lasted, we are told, six years (ibid. p. 3.15; p. 5.2). Its conclusion therefore happened in 586/5. Upon the capture of Crissa in 591/0 B.C. the Pythian Games were celebrated by the victorious army including athletic contests (γυμνικός ἄγων), with prizes from the spoils of war (χρηματίτης ἄγων ἀπὸ τῶν ἱππόρων). The Chronicum Parium, §38, in the entry following the one previously mentioned, gives 582 BC as the year when the στεφανίτης ἄγων (participants contesting for the crown of victory rather than for material prizes) was restituted or repeated: ἄφ' οὖ lεν Δεξιφοίς ἱδ στεφανίτης ἄγων νάδιν ἐτέθη etc. By implication the χρηματίτης ἄγων of 591 was then an exception, caused by the circumstances of the war. (And so one understands the emphasis of καὶ ἰδ
τοῦτον χρηματίτην μόνον ἔθεντο, said by Scholion b (p. 3.14-5) of the agon of 591/0 BC. Unless, on the other hand, there were Games taking place in 586 BC, held as a στεφανίτης ἄγων as well, to which the Parium Chronicum may be indirectly referring). Such a Pythiad could happen then on the occasion of the final subjugation of the Crissaeans on mountain Cliris six years after Crissa's fall. And so the scholion d maintains, with the characterization of this festivity as a στεφανίτης ἄγων. (Scholion b can be construed in a way that leaves the question open whether the 582 Games could not be meant: μετὰ δὲ χρόνον ἔξαετῇ καταγωγισμένων τῶν μετὰ τοῦ Ἰννία (the Thessalian General left in charge of the operations against the Crissaeans that survived) τοὺς ὑποθεκευμένους τῶν Κιρραίων, ..., ὀστερον καὶ στεφανίτην ἔθεντο κατακατόρθωσατες. Vol. II p. 3.15.8). Pausanias, however, explains that the Pythian agon were prize-winning contests (X, 7, 2: ἄθηα ἔθεσαν). In 586 BC (= on the third year of the 48th Olympiad), the Amphictyons held a χρηματίτης ἄγων (ἄθηα ἔθεσαν) with additional musical and, for the first time, athletic contests (§§4-5). They instituted the στεφανίτης ἄγων in the next Pythiad (582 BC). §5: δευτέρα δὲ Πυθιάδι ὄνκ ἐπὶ ἄθηας ἐκάθεσαν ἐτί ἄγωνίζεσθαι, στεφανίτην δὲ τὸν ἄγων ἀπὸ τοῦτο καταστήσαντο. They for the first time included the quadriga contest, which was won on the occasion by Cleisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon (§6). This Pythiad of 582 BC is the first one in the Official lists henceforth. (Cf. Scholia in Pindarum, Olymp. 12.1; Pyth. 3.1; 4.1).

Pausanias' definite statement that up to the Amphictyonic undertaking the pythian contests were prize-winning, deserves credence (pace F. Jacoby, Das Marmor Parium, p. 103). The contest was a single citharoedic one, playing and singing to the cithara: ἄσοι ὑμιν (.phiλα) εἰς τὸν θεόν, this being the ἀρχαιότατον ἄγωνίσμα (Pausanias), ὁ ἀρχαῖος ἄγων (Strabo). Under the Amphictyonic reorganization of the festival, additional musical contests were instituted and athletic games. So we hear of flute playing and (once, according to Pausanian X, 7, 5-6) singing to the flute as
well as playing to the cithare; Strabo, IX, 421: Ἀγών δὲ ὁ μὲν ἀρχαῖος ἐν Δεήφωις κιθαρῳδῶν ἐγενήθη, παίαινα ἄδοντων εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἔθηκαν δὲ Δεήφωι μετὰ δὲ τὸν Κρισαίον πόλεμον οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες Ἰππικὸν καὶ γυμνικὸν ἐπὶ Εὐρυνόχου διέταξαν στεφανίτιν καὶ Πύθια ἐκάθεσαν. προσέθεσαν δὲ τοῖς κιθαρῳδοῖς αὐθηντὰς τε καὶ κιθαριστὰς χωρίς χώδης etc. Strabo clearly implies (thus corroborating Pausanias) that before the Amphictionic Pythia, the context was not στεφανίτης, hence it was held for a prize. The Scholion d suggests as much: at the first instance Eurylochus (the Thessalian general of the Amphictyonic forces) held a prize-winning agon: καὶ νικήσας ἔθετο χρηματικὸν ἀγώνα: χρήματι γὰρ μόνοις τούς νικήσαντας ἐτίμων (the general practice), οὖν στεφάνου ὄντος (p. 4.22-4 Drachmann). The difficulty with the formulation in the Parium Marmor remains: the natural meaning of the word sequence as it stands is that the στεφανίτης ἀγών was then restituted. The difficulty made Böckh to edit the phræze without the definite article ὁ: ὃς οὖν ἐν Δεήφωις ἰστεφανίτης ἀγών πάιν ἐτέθη etc. But this is again a little less unnatural to interpret as he wants: ex quo rursum Pythium certamen allquod Institutum sit, idque iam coronarium. Jacobi’s suggestion (op.cit. p. 105) is to suppose an error on the part of the Parium Marmor’s author: his sources would have that now the Pythian games were formally inaugurated (that was the first official Pythiad) as prize-less games. It is worth noticing that the phræze occurs in rasura: it is written over an erased text in the stone inscription. (And so is the corresponding sentence in the preceding §37).

So what is really at stake is whether we have two Amphictyonic Pythia in 586 and 582 BC respectively (Pausanias); or rather three with one in 591/0 as well (Scholia in Pindarum and perhaps, by implication, Marmor Parium): the Scholia speak of the former two, but the one in 582 is certain, as it started the official enumeration of the Pythic games. The possibility exists that there were two, but in 591/0 and 582 instead (according to the more probable interpretation of Marmor Parium’s testimony).
Consideration of another open question gives further body to the present query. Aboriginaly, the citharoedic contest was ἐνυετηρικός ἁγὼν, taking place every 8 years. This has to do with the chronological significance of an eight years period in bringing into congruence the lunar and solar year. So Censorinus, de die natali, XVIII, 2-6; esp. §6: ob hoc in Graecia multae religiones hoc intervallo temporis summa caerimonia colluntur, Delphis quoque ludi, qui vocantur Pythia, post annum octavum olim conficiabantur. Demetrius Phalereus reports a legendary celebration of this octaeteric contest (Fr. 144 Fortenbaugh – Schütrumpf = Eustathius, In Homeri Odysseam ad γ 267). Scholion c in Hypothesis Pythiorum seems to associate the change of period from 8 to 4 years with the institution of the full Pythia by the Amphictyonic intervention. So (p. 4.14 sqq. Drachmann, my reading): ἐτεθέετο δὲ ὁ ἁγὼν καταρχὰς μὲν διὰ ἐνυετηρίδος, <ὁτ> ἔκτισαν δὲ τὸν ἁγώνα οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες Εὐρύδοκου τοῦ Θεσσαλοῦ θέντος αὐτῶν μετέστη [δὲ] εἰς πενταετηρίδα <...>. Drachmann concludes "ἔκτισαν ... θέντος αὐτῶν ", simply because of the problem it presents as it stands. But we need an indication of the occasion and the time of the change in the period. Just as in the immediate sequel the reputed reason is given for the time of its celebration within the year. We should therefore supply in the lacuna after πενταετηρίδα something like: <ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν θέρει> διὰ τὸ τὰς Παρναίδας νύμφας Απόλλωνι κτείναντι τὸ ϑηρίον τὰς ἐν ταῖς κεραίν ὅπωρας προσενεγκεῖν δῶρα.

This determination does not help us directly in choosing among the possibilities as to the sequence of Games in the times of the Sacred War. But from 591 to 582 are 9 full years, and why should be disregarded just then even the 8-year period? Ang. Mommsen (Chronologie, pp. 189-90; v. p. 187 sqq.) had indeed suggested that the fall of Crissa might have happened at the end of the Athenian year 591/0 while the festivities of the Pythiad of victory might have been celebrated at the beginning of 590/589 (the Athenian year beginning at about the summer solstices). This interpretation
of the testimony §37 in *Marmor Parium* is artificial, not to say contradictory to the express meaning of the statement in the inscription. The point of course is that under such an assumption we could have a perfect ἐνναετηρίς between 590 and 582.

The best harmonizing hypothesis seems to be the following. The facts given by the *Scholēa* on Pindar appear well documented with references to synchronizing lists of Athenian and Delphic eponymous archons. (These are further confirmed by the independent evidence supplied by Aristotle, *Aθηναίων Πολιτεία*, XIII; Damasias was eponymous archon in Athens in 582/1, given Solon’s archonship in 594/3 B.C.). Combining these reports with the epochs of the *Marmor Parium*, we get this sequence of events.

591 B.C. Early, perhaps, in summer Crissa falls to the Amphictyonic forces. About midsummer, say in August, the Pythian Games are celebrated, with athletic contests as well, as befits the end of the war and is required by the honour due to the dead. Prizes set from the spoils of war. The contests are held *extra ordinem*: the octaerics period falls on the next year 590 BC. There is naturally no agon then.

587 B.C. No contests held. The guerille war against the refugees to Ciris goes on. Besides the octaerics rule is still valid.

586 B.C. Six (inclusive) years after the capture of Crissa, the Crissaeans on Mount Ciris succumb. A Pythiad is celebrated by the Amphictyons, again *extra ordinem*. Prize-winning contests include athletic games. The Amphictyons resolve on a pentateric Pythiac period, 4 full years between successive Pythiads.

582 B.C. The starting of the new official penteteric series. The victors are crowned – no prizes.

One may suppose that Pausanias does not mention the games of the 591 B.C. because they were not mentioned in any list of Pythiads, either the new, official, or the older, traditional one. Those were games celebrated on a particular occasion, the end of the Crissaeans War.
Having secured in all probability the end-point of the War, an important question for the history internal and external of Athens is when did it begin. Callisthenes of Olynthus gives the story of a ten-year war, originated by the abduction of a noble Phocean princess and some Argive women returning from their pilgrimage to the Delphic shrine. (FrGrH 124F1 Jacoby = Athenaeus, XIII, 560b-c). This account would give us 601 B.C. (rather than 596 B.C.) for the beginning of hostilities; but it is prima facia suspect, being obviously modelled on the Trojan War. That became a stereotype: even the Peloponnesian War was claimed to have been occasioned by the abduction of some women of loose morality. In the first Sacred War there was even the new Achilles, Eurylochus. So Euphorio Fr. 80 Powell = Fr. Lill Meineke = Scholion b, p. 3.19 sqq. Drachmann:

\[ \text{δησιστερου } τ' \ Αχιλληνος \ \alphaκουμεν \ Ευρυπόλυοιο,} \\
\text{Δεσφιδες} \ \phi \ \upsilon \ \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \ \iota \iota \iota \ \alpha \nu \ \alpha \iota \beta \iota \pi \iota \sigma\nu \alpha \nu
\\<\text{Крион>} \ \pi \circ \theta \omicron \varsigma \nu \iota \iota \iota \ \lambda \iota \kappa \omicron \rho \epsilon \omicron \epsilon \omicron \sigma \varsigma \ \omega \iota \kappa \iota \iota \varsigma \ \omicron \iota \varsigma \iota \iota \varsigma \ \omicron \omicron \iota \beta \omicron \nu.

Given the eminence, power and wealth of Crisa, we may suppose, however, a long war. And this is confirmed by the following consideration. An Athenian expeditionary force seems to have prrticipated in the war; its leader was Alcmaeon according to the Delphic Records. The Alcmaeonids were ἐναγείς, i.e. implicated in the Κυθηνώνειον ἁγος, by virtue of the role played in it by Megacles, Alcmaeon’s father. Sometime in the very beginning of the 6th century, and before 596 B.C., the Alcmaeonids were dishonoured and exiled from Athens because of that affair. The sacred war in which the Athenian general was Alcmaeon must therefore precede that expulsion. Unless of course Alcmaeon and his clan acted on their own in their pro-Delphic policies, as this family did for instance half a century later, when again they were exiles. But Plutarch in his relation of these events (Solon, XI) seems to imply that the Sacred War preceded (or at least, started before) the crisis in the Κυθηνώνειον ἁγος affair (XII). The condemnation of the Alcmaeonids must have happened a few years before 596 B.C., the year of
Epimenides' visit to, and purification of, Athens. Let us put it at 599 B.C. (At about that time the Megaric – Athenian war took place which ended with the loss of Salamis and Nisaea on the part of Athens; Plutarch op.cit. XII, 5). But then, since the Sacred War had probably started before this event, the year of 601 B.C. (= the Callisthenic epoch for the beginning of the war) is compatible with the evidence and naturally expected upon it. The war was pretty long. As much is suggested by the account in the so-called Thessalus' ἑρωβευτικός ([Hippocrates], Epistulae, XXVII, 6-23).

The complications and hostilities relating to the Salaminian affair again preceded the Sacred War (Plutarch, op.cit. XI). This MegaroAthenian war probably lasted for a few years (ibid. X: οὔ μὴν ἄκηλα τῶν Μεγαρέων ἐπιμενόντων (after their initial set back) πονηλα κακό καὶ δρόντες ἐν τῷ πονέμῳ καὶ πάσχοντες etc.). Allowing for some, say, 4-5 years before the eruption of the Sacred War for the consolidation of Solon's panhellenic fame, we may put the start of the Megaric War at c. 610 B.C. (Solon Fr. 2 Diehl; Pausanias I, 40, 5; Plutarch, Solon, VIII, 8; Diogenes Laertius I, 46). During the ensuing war (or in the war of the twenties) the story of Tellos may be located (v. infra). As well as the derogatory, indeed contemptuous, response issued by the Delphic Oracle to the Megarians (other sources speak of the Aegeans) on the occasion of some victory of theirs they considered precious; Q 26 Fontenrose = 1 Parke-Wormell = 1 Andersen (Studies in Oracular Verses: Concordance to Delphic Responses in Hexameter, 1987). The fact that in this oracular response Argos is on the contrary praised as the land of ἄριστοι ἄνδρες, indicates a period of Argive preeminence in Peloponnesus, which would nicely fit with the second half of the 7th century. (Notice that when Cleisthenes of Sicyon moved to create a center of power totally independent of, and indeed antagonistic to, Argos, Delphi strongly castigated the move (v. infra)). Before the beginning of the MegaroAthenian war at c. 610 B.C., there was the uneasy peace enforced internally in Athens by the "Draconian" law which prohibited deliberative debate on the
conquest of Salamis on pains of the death penalty. This period of unstable external quiet may well correlate to a corresponding phase of relative détente in the inner social strife of the Athenian body politic, which will have followed the Draconian regime (621 B.C.). And so, moving backwards one more step, we can come to the previous decade (between Cylon's coup at, say, 632 B.C., and Draco's decrees) as the period of the First Megaric War; Plutarch, op.cit. VIII: Ἐπεὶ δὲ μακρὸν τινα καὶ δυσχερὴ πόλεον οἱ ἐν ἄστει περὶ τῆς Σαλαμίνιων νῆσου Μεγαρέωι πολεμοῦντες ἔξεκαμον καὶ νόμον ἐθεντο μήτε γράψαι τινα μῆτ' εἰπεῖν αὕθις, ὡς ἐρή τὴν πόλιν ἀντιποιεῖσθαι τῆς Σαλαμίνος ἦ θανάτῳ ζημιοῦσθαι etc.

Cylon was son in law of Theagenes, the Megarian tyrant. In his attempted coup d’ état Cylon was supported by a Megarian contingent. His failure, and the consequent events, caused the first MegaroAthenian War (c. 632-621 B.C.). Athens was emerging out of its aristocratic agrarianism and was keen to develop expansively seawards. A dynamic foreign policy supported by military muscle was required. Megara (as later Aegina) was a very early and very expansionist power. Besides, the very geography of the vicinity made the eventual antagonism between Athens and Megara inevitable: Athens could not even secure the Eleusinian plain, even her own harbours, without solving satisfactorily the Salaminian question and settling issues with Megara.

Athens was yet feeble. She couldn’t cope with Megara. She turned into itself and her external impotence aggravated the internal commotions. The Alcmaeonids were expressing the interests of the new emerging forces, dynamic and expansionist. Later, they were leaders of the party of the “Sea-coast people”, followers of the “middle” polity, the party of the enterprise; Aristotle, ΑΘ. Πολ. XIII, 4: ἦσαν δ' αἱ στάσεις (= parties) τρεῖς: μία μὲν τῶν παραθίων, ὥς προειστήκει Μεγακῆς ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, οἷς ἐδόκουν μάλιστα διώκειν τὴν μέσην πολιτείαν etc. Solon himself belonged to that “middling” party; and this is of course part of the reason why he was entrusted by
common acceptance with the function of a societal and political moderator. He was also a trader, although staunch aristocratic traditionalist in his views and habits of life. Pelsistratus also was inspired by the same policies. Middle in this connection means people who were neither big landowners nor unskilled workers, but rather men with dexterities, arts and knowledge determined to go forward and make a difference in their lives and in the world at large. What is reported of Alcmaeon (the Athenian general in the Sacred War) about his relationship with Lydia and its outcome is characteristic of the mentality and practices of this party (Herodotus, VI, 125 sqq.). A special early connection with Delphi is presupposed in these Herodotean reports; something which points to Alcmaeon's generalship in the Sacred War.

On the other side, Delphi appear to have been disposed favourably to Athens. Although they seem to have endorsed Cylon's attempt, later they supported the Athenian designs on Salamis (c. 610 B.C.; Plutarch, op.cit. IX, 10, X, 6). The final advantageous outcome of the dispute for the Athenians depended on the decision of five Spartan arbitrators (Plutarch, Ibid., X, 1; 6). The connection of Sparta with Delphi would make the Spartans predisposed to hear favourably the claims of a country in whose interests the Delphic God appears to have pronounced. Solon was instrumental in persuading the Amphictyonic Council to declare the First Sacred War (Plutarch, Ibid., XI; Aristotle confirmed as much in his Πυθιωνικῶν Ἀναγραφῆ, Fr. 615 Rose). He must have acted in close consort with Alcmaeon. Alcmaeon remained leader in the forces conducting the Sacred War even after the expulsion of the Alcmaeonids from Athens (c. 599 B.C.). Friends (έτεροι), followers and sympathizers of his would form his band.

The fortunes and policies of the Party of Enterprise suffered a heavy blow with the condemnation of the Alcmaeonids. It must have been something unexpected. In fact it was Solon who persuaded the Alcmaeonids to submit themselves to court proceedings. He persuaded all to create an ad
hoc court of justice with 300 jurors-judges selected not by lot but on their merits (τριακοσίων ἄριστιν δίκαιον). The outcome was disastrous for the political developments in Athens. The ἄριστοι, with land-owning aristocrats as their most influential members no doubt, and with individuals strongly conservative among them, did not look favourably to the freer attitudes and novel practices of the Enterprise Party and its most renowned and powerful representative, the Alcmaeonid family. The ἐναγείς were judged guilty and heavy penalties were delivered. Those in life were exiled; the bodies of the dead were taken out of their graves and thrown beyond the state boundaries. A wound was inflicted on the societal order which could not be healed eventually but by the stringent resources of a long tyranny. This was a first failure in successive tests of Solon’s prudence.

The interventionist, expansionist foreign policy of Athens (according to the Party of Enterprise) is best exhibited and illustrated in the circumstances relating to the Sacred War. There was, to start with, a real problem with the behaviour of Crissa, which clearly exploited the Delphic sanctuary with rapacity and increasing disorderliness. That could have been met in a number of ways. The powerful Sicyon, for instance, just opposite across the Corinthian Gulf on the Peloponnesian coast might have undertaken to correct Crissaean insolence and lawlessness. Solon, with the close collaboration of Alcmaeon and young Peisistratus no doubt (with the latter of whom he had already cooperated in the Salaminian affair), opted for a very different type of solution. He promoted the involvement of a loose association for religious purposes of States mostly insignificant, indeed mostly non-states (in the sense of being themselves loosely integrated on “ethnic” principles), and largely unconnected to the mainstream of Greek historical developments. This was the Amphictyony of Anthele by the Thermopylae (Herodotus VII, 200). Initially an association of people round a revered shrine of Demeter there, it grew in importance depending on whether one or more powerful States could employ supposed
phylectic affinities with the original participants to justify its inclusion in the association. To speak of real Confederation is totally beside the point: it was at most a political weapon of potential use under appropriate circumstances by powerful players.

The nature of the Amphictyony becomes evident as soon as one observes that five out of the final twelve member-nations of it are small peoples inhabiting the area of the Spercheios valley with the mountainous regions around [5].

These nations are (starting at the south east, going round the valley and ending up with the north east): (eastern) Locrians, Malians, Aenians or Oltaeans, Dolopes and Phthiotic Achaeans, the most important of them. To this initial main body of members, there were added probably on the occasion precisely of the First Sacred War (when the Amphictyony undertook its first major political and military action) three nations to the north and four to the south, beyond the chief boundary mountains of the Spercheios valley, Othrys and Oete respectively. The artificial adjunct that these new enlargements constituted at first is seen by the use of a vague name Thessalians to specify one such member-nation. Thessaly in this connection is either too broad, covering all districts of the vast area lying roughly between Olympus to the north, Oete to the south and Pindus to the west; or too narrow, referring to one single district of the Thessalian plain, the one lying to the center between Pharsalus and Cleion. What the Thessalians as members of the Amphictyonic Council signify is the already developed tetrarchic Thessaly (including the Thessaliotis strictu senso, the Hestiaeotis to the northwest, the Pelasgiotis to the east part of the great plain, and the Phthiotic Achaeans (who were among the original members of the Amphyctyon). The other two northern members are the Magnesians in the eastern sea-coast and peninsula and the Perrhaebol to the mountainous north, on and west of Olympus.
The four additional members of the Association to the south were the Boeotians, the Phocians, the Dorians and the Ionians. The Dorians were inhabiting an insignificant mountainous district between Parnassus and Giona, useful however as located by the root that led from Delphi directly to Thessaly. This land was considered however to be the proximate metropolis of the great Dorian population in Peloponnesus. The Ionians, Ἰάονες, might have been supposed to refer to the aboriginal Ἰάονες of Boeotia; but again, even so, this was employed as a pretext to connect specifically Athens (and not the other Ionians significantly), with the Amphictyony, even if theoretically Aeschines is right at his time in commenting on the equal rights of all cities great or small in the selection of the national representatives to the Council and on the equal votes of the representatives in it.

The extended Amphictyony was established on the occasion of the First Sacred War. Athens gain a foothold in the affairs of central Greece, in fact became a member of the power system of eastern mainland Greece (the western side being considered marginally Greek anyway). The agreement carried with it the active involvement of Thessaly in the developments of southern Greece. Just as later the Macedonian Philip would undertake to be the principal defender of the patrimony of God in Delphi, so now the Thessalian Eurylochos became commander-in-chief of the expanded Amphictyonic forces in the war against Crissa. He must have been a heroic figure, a young, impetuous military leader, ὁ νέος Ἀχιηθέες (v. supra).

The alliance against Crissa was built on a voluntary basis. Solon was instrumental in decreeing the war at the Amphictyonic Council [6]. His diplomacy aimed at forging an understanding with Thessaly on three issues: (a) The expansion of the Amphictyony. (b) War on Crissa. (c) Thessalian military leadership in it. The lesser members of the Association were persuaded to ratify this major transformation of a religious confederacy into a potent tool of dynamic foreign policy. Whether the members were also allies in the war is far from clear. We do not hear of any other
involvement than that of the Athenians. Probably, the Council simply legitimised the Thessalo-Athenian intervention in the omphalos of Greece. There are obvious contemporary analogies.

The geographical position of Delphi was focal in the Greek system of communications, adding geopolitical accent to its religion status. For Magna Graecia and Western Greece the Corinthian (or, initially, Crissaean) Gulf was a vital line of access to the eastern parts of the country, the Aegean and beyond. From Delphi started the Northern Way which led to the upper Cephissus valley, the lower Spercheios valley and Thessaly. To the east, the famous ὀχιστὴ ὅδος conducted on the one hand to the Boeotian plain, on the other to Megarid and Attica, to Euboea and the islands. Delphi herself was a meeting place of people from everywhere, a repository of information, knowledge and wisdom, a treasury house as well and an authoritative office of directives relating to the entire range of human concerns and interests, individual or communal, private and public.

It seems that Cleisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon, was also involved in the operations of the Sacred War. He certainly would not miss the opportunity to ingratiate himself to the Delphic priesthood and simultaneously to exercise influence in capital central Greece affairs. Sicyon liked just opposite the Crissaean plain across the Corinthian Gulf. Pausanias appears to maintain that he was in charge of the entire Amphictyonic army having Solon as advisor (X, 37, 6). But in this passage he simply reports the Sicyonian account of the matter and is rather carried away by it. In II, 9, 6 he is more careful: he saw a portico in Sicyon which went under the name Ἐλεοθένειος, as having been built from the spoils of the Crissaean war that he waged together (side by side) with the Amphictyons: ὡκοδόμησε δὲ ἀπὸ ἰαφύρων ὁ Ἐλεοθένης αὐτὴν τὸν πρὸς Κίρραν πόλιμον συμποθεμήσας Ἀμφικτυόσι. That Eurylochos was commander in chief of the Amphictyonic army is beyond reasonable doubt (Euphorion Fr. 80 Powell; Scholla in Pindar Hypothesis Pythiorum; iEpistola Hippocratis (Thessali Πρεσβευτικός) XXVII, 17;
Polyaenus VI, 13). Cleisthenes participated in the war, just as Alcmaion did leading the Athenian contingent.

Cleisthenes embarked in the sequel into extreme anti-dorian policies, external and internal. The more he wanted to implicate himself into developments outside of Peloponnesus, to enter the mainland power-system. And what better way to follow this strategy than by being involved in the Delphic affairs. Cleisthenes won the victory in the chariot race in the first official Pythiad (582 B.C.). Aristotle comments on his military prowess and ability; *Politics* V, 1315b16-7. He later pursued a policy of special relations with Athens; he married his daughter Agariste to Megacles, the son of his old comrade in arms Alcmaeon. The story in Herodotus (VI, 126-131) is anecdotal and only thinly disguises Cleisthenes’ political motivation: he would choose one or the other of the Athenian suitors for the hand of his daughter, among 13 of the best endowed young aristocrats from all over Greece (*Ibid.*). The importance of Sicyon at the time is manifest by the fact that being made son-in-law of Cleisthenes raised the Alcmaeonids to the peak of their panhellenic fame and prestige; Herodotus, VI 126: ...Κηδεσθένης μιν (sc. the house of Alcmaeon) ὁ Σικυώνιος τύραννος ἔζηκε, ὡστε πολλῷ ὄνομαστοτέρην γενέσθαι ἐν τοῖς "Εθῆσαι ὁ πρότερον ἂν. And 131: ἀμφὶ μὲν κρίσι τῶν μνηστήρων τοσαῦτα ἐγένετο, καὶ οὕτω Ἀλκμεωνίδαι ἐβοῦλθον ἀνὰ τὴν Ἐθῆδα. The progeny of that marriage was of momentous consequence for Athens: Cleisthenes and Pericles came from it. Something that Herodotus duly emphasizes at the conclusion of his long eulogy on the House of Alcmaeonidae (VI, 121-131).

Cleisthenes’ policies can be readily fathomed from the information supplied by Herodotus incidentally, when significantly relating Cleisthenes’ the Athenian reforms (V, 67-8). Cleisthenes made war on Argos, the chieft power in Northern Peloponnesus at the time (67, 1). He wanted to violently cut asunder any Dorian connection among the Sicyonians. Thus he attempted to, and succeeded in, eradicating the heroic cult of Adrastos from the city
(67, 1-5). He substituted the hero-worship of a Theban in his place, of Melanippus an arch enemy of Adrastos (67, 3-5). He discontinued the recitation of the Homeric poems in Sicyon on account of their Argive focus (67, 1). He assigned to Dionysus (a not very Dorian deity) what tragic δρώμενον was performed in honour of Adrastos. He changed the names of the three traditional Doric tribes, imposing instead derogatory appellations: the Sow-tribe, the Donkey-tribe, the Pig-tribe (Ὑάται, Ὀνεάται, Χοιρεάται). His own clan he baptized “Leaders of the People” (Ἀρχέθαι). 68, 1. It is curious that Aristotle seems to include Cleisthenes’ tyranny in a positive characterisation of the entire Orthogorid leadership in Sicyon; 1215b12 sqq.:...
association that, the priesthood no doubt thought, could be invoked at will when needed and when certain combinations of powers in the Greek system (in effect any, given the multiplicity of the members, and their national, non-state, character) gained preponderating influence that could be used in promoting God's privileged domain.

The priesthood was right. They curtailed Sicyon's ambitions. Thessay was too far and too disunited to pose a serious permanent problem. They cultivated from the end of the seventh century special relations with the kings of Lydia, from whom the God received veritable treasures as presents. Their wise policies (analysed elsewhere in this work) extended the Delphic influence wide and deep in the Greek world. Sparta was always there to rely upon in appropriate circumstances. They prudently cultivated Athens as well, establishing and maintaining a solid understanding, based on mutual interest, with the Alcmaeonids, the more progressive, powerful family among the Athenian aristocracy. The Delphic connection meant for Athens the implementation of a more open-ended, expansive, interventionist strategy, that started her on the road to the pinnacle of High Classical glory.

As a crucial manifestation of the new expansionist spirit in the Athenian foereign policy towards the turn of the centuries strikes one the Sigelon affair. Athens occupied the area immediately to the south of the Hellesponte mouth to the Aegean Sea in the Troas (for maps of the district, v. M. Stahl, Aristokraten und Tyrannen im Archaischen Athen, p. 224). At the time the Mitylenaeans laid claims on practically the entire region, based on their previous actual possession of the area. The Lesbians in fact had fortified the place, obviously because of its strategic position (Strabo, XIII, 599). As leader of the Athenian occupational expeditionary force was sent Phrynon, winner of the Olympic Games in 636 B.C., probably in pancration. A war ensued with varying fortunes. The Mitylenaeans fortified Achilleion, a little to the south of Sigelon, as basic for their operations (Strabo, p. 600). Pittacos, one of the reputed seven wise men, assumed the leadership of the
Lesbian forces. In one of the fights, Alcaeus the poet fled to safety abandoning his shield. The dissensions between the former comrades, Pittacus and Alcaeus, had not as yet erupted. Pittacus offered to resolve the war through a duel with Phrynon. The challenge was accepted, the duel happened, and Pittacos killed Phrynon by means of a stratagem. That might have demonstrated the superiority and effectiveness of wisdom over valour, but failed to end the war. In the end the matter was referred to arbitration, Periander the tyrant of Corinth was appointed arbitrator by both parties, and he adjudicated according to the well-tried principle to make peace on the basis of each party keeping what at the moment possessed.

Which decision confirmed the Athenian occupation of Sigeion (Herodotus V, 94-95; Apollodorus FrGrH 244F 27; Strabo loc.cit.; Diogenes Laertius I, 74; cf. D. Page, Sappho and Alcaeus, pp. 152-161; M. Stahl, op.cit. pp. 211-226). The matter however did not rest there as we learn from Herodotus. Enmity and hostilities continued. But later Peisistratus, following more consistently the expansionist foreign policy that was meant to make Athens to catch up with historical developments impeded by her late entrance into the Great Power scene, secured Sigeion to Athens, and increased the control of the Straits by occupying the area to the other side of the Hellespontic mouth as well. Yet this very early projection of Athenian power to a geopolitically and economically vital spot, is crucially significant. The Phrynon-Pittacus duel is located by the chronographic tradition at the third year of the 43rd Olympiad (Eusebius Chronica ad anno 1410 Abrahami), i.e. 606/5 B.C. We may assume the end of the century as the time of Periander's arbitration, which was favourable to the Athenian interests.

Perhaps we should ascribe to about the same time the hostilities and the source of the Aegineto-Athenean enmity that Herodotus relates V, 82-88.

On the other hand, Eleusis and the Eleusinian territory had been already secured to the City for quite some time then, since the traditions
respecting the strife between Athens and Eleusis all refer to legendary or at
least heroic times (Pausanias I, 31, 3; Thucydides II, 15, 1; cf. Pausanias I, 38, 1). The resolution of that ancient conflict consisted in the political subjugation of Eleusis to Athens, balanced by the religious exaltation of the Eleusinian cult; so Pausanias I, 38, 3: Γενομένης δὲ Ἐθευσινίοις μάχης πρὸς Αθηναίους ἀπέθανε μὲν Ἑρεχθέως Αθηναίων βασιλεὺς, ἀπέθανε δὲ Ἰμμαράδος Εὐμόηπου κατακόρονται δὲ ἐπὶ τοίοσος τὸν πόλεμον, ὡς Ἐθευσινίως ἐς τὰ ἄθνα Αθηναίων κατακόρους ὄντας ἰδία τεθεῖν τὴν τεθείν. So this is the first stage in the enlargement of the Athenian state from the City to the whole of Attica (which fuller unification – apart from the Marathonian tetrapolis – happened traditionally at the time of Theseus’ συνοικισμός). Solon, in his famous encounter with Croisos, is made to aduce the case of Tellos as the happiest man (Herodotus I, 30, 3-5). Tellos died for his country in a battle against a neighbouring people that was fought in Eleusis: γενομένης γὰρ Ἀθηναίοις μάχης πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγίτονας ἐν Ἐθευσινὶ βοηθῶν καὶ τροπίς πολέμων ἀπέθανε κάθειστα. The ἀστυγίτονας are almost certainly the Megarians (less aptly they could be the Aeginetans). There is no sure chronology of the incident in Herodotus. But it is not unlikely that during the repeated wars of Athens with the Megara in the last decades of the 7th century, a noble soldier died defending his fatherland against invading troops of Megara. To extrapolate from this into a historical theory about a longtime Megarian occupation of Eleusis and Solon’s instrumentality in the struggle to push these neighbours out of the sacred land resulting in a final successful outcome that for the first time properly integrated Eleusis into the Athenian state, is preposterous and absurd. (The theory is argued for in full book length in L.M. L’Homme-Wéry, La perspective éleusinienne dans la politique de Solon, 1996).

Solon’s monetary reforms, accompanying a change in the operative system of weights, meant the abolition of the Pheldonean-Aeginetan standard in favour of the competing Corinthian – Euboic – Ionian one. The
former had as basic unit (numismatic and ponderal) the stater (a didrachm) of 12.2 gr. giving the equivalence 1 dr. = 6.1 gr. The Corinthian employed a stater (a tridrachm) of 8.6 gr, and so 1 dr = 2.9 gr. The Euboeic stater (divided into thirds, sixth etc.) weighted 17.2 gr., leading to an assumed [1 dr] = 5.7 gr. The Euboeic stater was double the weight of the Corinthian. The later Attic system, introduced by Solon, was based on a stater (tetradrachm) of 17.2 gr., resulting in 1 dr = 4.3 gr. Thus one attic drachma was equivalent to one and a half Corinthian ones. (For the facts, cf. e.g. C.M. Kraay, Archaic and Classical Greek Coins, Appendix I, Weight standards, pp. 329-30. Selitman’s book, to be referred infra, is still valuable). It follows that 1 mna = 100 new Attic drachmae, weighting 430 gr. in silver, were almost exactly equivalent to 70 old Attic drachmae, reckoned according to the Aeginetan system, 70x6.1 = 427 gr. in silver. And this is what Aristotle tells us in Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, X, 2: καὶ ἡ μνᾶ πρότερον ἔχοισα ἵνω παιμόν ἐβδομήκοντα δραχμάς, ἀνεπιρρόθην ταῖς ἡκατόν, so that it was made 70+30 = 100 new δραχμαί. (No need really to correct with Blass to τριάκοντα in place of ἡκατόν. A well known fact was and is readily understood by the phrase). The same is testified by Plutarch, Solon, XV, 4: ἡκατόν γὰρ ἐποίησε δραχμών τὸν μνᾶ πρότερον ἐβδομήκοντα ὅγουσαν. (Adopting, that is, the brilliant correction of T. Reinach in place of the transmitted text ἐβδομήκοντα καὶ τριῶν ὅγουσαν. The ὅγουσαν is moreover a stylistic improvement on ὅγουσαν, esp. in Plutarch.

The occasion of the error is furthermore readily understood: ἘΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑΓΟΥΣΑΝ became ἐβδομήκοντα (καὶ) γ’ ὅγουσαν. However, the vulgate text might be conceivably retained, on the ground that after all the ratio 100 to 73 instead of that of 100 to 70 could simply reflect slight differences in the later assumptions concerning the ancient standards of weight and value. But one would suppose reliable information about such a momentous incident of Athens’ early history to have survived. And besides Aristotle seems in the 10th chapter to contradict Andration’s account, as related by Plutarch, Solon, XV, 3-4 = Androtation Fr.Gr.H. 324F34. One is
tempted then to even consider that Aristotle indirectly explains Androtion’s error in giving the ratio as 100 to 73; it would rest on a confusion: the added three unites have to do with the Solonian raising of the weight standard of a talent by 3 mnae from 60 to 63 according to the Aristotelian explication. In this case we ought to keep the Plutarchean text as it stands: it gives exactly Androtion’s view of the matter, an erroneous one. The ratio of the new Attic version of the Corintho-Euboeian to the Aeginetan system is \( \frac{4.3}{6.1} = \frac{70}{100} \).

Solon observed the market equivalences of the two competing weight and money systems and determined the new Attic standard in accordance with those equivalences. He did not interfere monetarily in the free market; he simply changed the standard. It is remarkable that at one stroke he also achieved a substantial parity with the money of the Persian Empire. The Imperial system utilized a standard based on a golden daric of 8.35 gr. and a silver siglos of 5.35 gr., these being kept at the ratio of 1 to 20. (The means to preserve historically the set equivalence was to change from time to time the weight of the silver coins). One daric is thus equivalent to 20 siglos = 107 gr. Or 4 darics = 428 gr. = one new Attic mna = 100 new Attic drachmae. (Cf. C. Settman, Athens, Its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion, p. 124).

The last statement in Aristotle’s chapter X has caused endless consternation. Aristotle spoke of the increase (αὐξῆσιν) of measures, weights and currency in Solon’s reforms. He first then states that measures became μεῖζον τῶν Φείδωνιων. He goes on to explain the monetary amendment. Finally he comes to the weight system: ἑποίησε δὲ καὶ στάθμα πρὸς τὸ νόμισμα, τρίεις καὶ εἴηκοντα μνᾶς τὸ τάλαντον ἀγούσας (νεὶ ἄγων with Herwerden and Papabasililou), καὶ ἐπιδεινεμήθησαν οἱ τρεῖς μνᾶι τῷ στατηρὶ καὶ τοῖς ἄφθοις σταθμοῖς. The change in the weight standard was effected to make it correspond with the monetary reforms. Assuming the retention of the Pheidonian system of weights, and with a mna equivalent to 60 drachmae, the talent would amount to 60x60x6.1 = 21.960 gr. Adding
three mnae to this we reach 23.058 gr. Taking now the increased standard and distributing the excess to the lower denominations, we have a mna of 384.3 gr. Now there is evidence that (rather late) in 6th century Athens there indeed prevailed a weight standard of 378-397.5 gr. (Cf. P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaios Politai*, p. 166). Moreover, the weight talent standard approaches now the new monetary standard talent of 60 mnae and 100 drachmae) to the mna, i.e. $60 \times 100 \times 4.3 = 25,800$ gr. in silver. It is only an approximation; but we should take account of the fact that calculations are approximate themselves, with little, and defective, evidence of the coin-weights in early 6th century. (Cf. e.g. for frequency variations Table XI in Seltman, *op.cit.*, p. 127).

Solon's reform of the currency meant a reorientation of Athenian strategic interests. "It had a commercial object and was intended to facilitate trade" (Sandys) with Euboea, the Aegean and Asia Minor including Lydia, Cyrenaica (which has adopted the Euboic monetary standard), and Corinth herself, as well as with Chalcidice to the north and Sicily in the west. Four Attic tetradrachms now (the new Athenian unit of currency) contained the same amount of silver as one Euboic stater or two Corinthian staters (= 17.2 gr.).

There is no gainsaying that the monetary reform had another purpose as well, to temporarily alleviate the poorer part of the society's grievances and financial burdens. For the reform in effect constituted a devaluation of the currency by 30%. So those in debt could now discharge their obligations on favourable terms, and so much is explained by Androtion (*loc.cit.*), who however goes to the extreme of construing the entire content of the famous Solonian σεισάτοια as consisting in just this result of the devaluation, thus denying that there have occurred any real cancellation of debts. But Aristotle (clearly with such views in mind) explicitly contradicts this interpretation. He mentions that there was a sequence in the Solonian measures, first the ὀποκονὴ χρέων, then the legislation (νομοθεσία) and
finally the reform in the system of measures, weights and currency (ch. X
sub in.). Androtion's political agenda in construing the Solonian “moderation”
(or attempted harmonization) of Athenian ailing societal body in these
exclusively terms, appears also in the frivolous assertion that by Solon's
devaluation of the currency while the debtors benefited, the creditors also
suffered no harm! (ὡφθενεῖσθαι μὲν τοὺς ἐκτίνοντας μεγάλα, μηδὲν δὲ
βῆντεσθαι τοὺς κομίζομένους). Maybe, for a moment; before, that is, the
prices of goods and services have risen as a result of the devaluation. But
for a time the devaluation would also considerably augment Athens’
external trade by facilitating exports. And this monetary stimulus to the
Athenian economy was coupled by positive measures aimed at enhancing
the economic activity in its real sector.

The mainly external-trade oriented reform of currency, measures and
weights was accompanied by arrangements intended to ensure agricultural
autarchy and a vivid expansion of the manufacturing sector of the economy.
There were economic and social reasons for these policies. The Attic soil,
apart from a couple of fertile plains, was less than usually productive.
Plutarch, Solon, XXII, 3: ...καὶ τῆς χώρας τὴν φύσιν ὅρῶν γῆσχρως τοῖς
gεωργοῦσι διαρκούσαν... §1: ...τὰ δὲ πηείστα τῆς χώρας ἄγεννη καὶ φαῦλα...
To stir economic activity Solon therefore promoted artisanship, (§1) πρὸς
tὰς τέχνας ἔτρεψε τοὺς πολίτας, (§3) ταῖς τέχναις ἄξιωμα περιέθηκεν. He
raised the status of a craftsman. He decreed that a son who has not been
instructed in some art or skill is relieved even from his most sacred duty to
maintain his aged father (§1: πρὸς τὰς τέχνας ἔτρεψε τοὺς πολίτας, καὶ
νόμον ἔγραψεν, ὥσ τρέφειν πατέρα μὴ διδαξάμενον τέχνην ἐπάναγκες μὴ
εἶναι). He moreover assigned to the Areopagitic Council jurisdiction to
examine each one citizen's revenues and to impose penalties to those not
working in some line of business (§3: ταῖς τέχναις ἄξιωμα περιέθηκεν, καὶ
τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλήν ἔταξεν ἐπισκοπεῖν ὅθεν ἕκαστος ἔχει τὰ
ἐπιτήδεια, καὶ τοὺς ἄργους κοὴζειν). There seems to have obtained a
general attitude of free immigration, of open borders that permitted people from everywhere to come and settle in Attica; §1: ὁδὸν δὲ τὸ μὲν ἂστυ πιμηδάμενον ἀνθρώπων ἔτει συμπελάθειν πανταχόθεν ἐπὶ ἀδείας ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν etc. Solon proceeded one more, and very important, step, decreeing that two categories of immigrants settling in the country were entitled to the Athenian citizenship. The first were refugees exiled from their own countries, and therefore likely to develop strong bonds with the state that offered them full asylum. The second category involved artisans coming with their entire family to live in Athens. The secure connection to their new city was cemented in this case by means of their free choice of Athens (as against their own country) as the place where to live and exercise their skill and craft. The country offered to them the best opportunities to develop profitably their arts and professions, it was most advantageous to people able to do and make things – and they were voting for it by their own immigration. These were higher economic immigrants, which a state bent on expansion welcomed. XXIV, 4: ...ό τῶν ὄμοποιτῶν νόμος, ὃς γενέσθαι πολῖτας οὐ διδόσαι πλῆθος τῶν φεύγουσιν ἀδιψυχα τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἡ πανεστίους Αθηναῖς μετοικισόμενοι ἐπὶ τέχνη. τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσαι φασίν αὐτὸν (sc. τῶν Σόλωνα) οὐκ οὕτως ἀπεθαύνοντας τοὺς ἄθηνας, ὡς κατακαλοῦμενον Αθηναίς τούτοις ἐπὶ βεβαιῷ τῷ μεθέειν τῆς πολιτείας, καὶ ἀμα πιστοῖς νομίζοντα τοὺς μὲν ἀποβεβηκότας τὴν ἑαυτῶν διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην, τοὺς δʼ ἀποθεοτότας διὰ τὴν γνώμην.

This is a set of measures meant to stimulate enterprise, competition and productivity in manufacture and trade. Clearly we have to do with the policy of the Party of Enterprise (Alcmaeon, Solon, Peisistratus). They opened the country to skilled workers, artisans of any kind, traders, financiers later, from abroad. The result of such systematic encouragement of craftsmanship, trade, the entrepreneural spirit, of the creation of a business-friendly environment in a free market with open borders, we can gauge by the tremendous growth in the production and exportation of attic...
vases during the first half of the 6th century. Where others (esp. Corinthian production) held the day, one sees the rapid, gradual encroachment of the Athenian ware which from the status of a parvenu in the international markets becomes quickly a dominant economic power.

By the side of this emphasis on industry and commerce, Solon took care to regulate to best effect what little by way of competitive advantage was offered in Attica on the part of the physical environment. A lean soil was coupled with a wonderful climate. A system of agricultural regulations aimed at rationalizing the management of the earth and its resources, esp. the water supply (Plutarch, *Solon*, XXIII, 6-8). He enacted the prohibition of any exportation of agricultural produce, save that of oil (XXIV). The extensive cultivation of olive trees in the land and the quality of Attic oil made oil export trade very lucrative. That went hand in hand with the increasing production of Attic earthen-ware, esp. jars in which the oil was exported. Above all, the unburdening of land and person previously encumbered by debts, left an army of agricultural and unskilled workers strongly propelled into productive action by the very sense of their newly found freedom (Solon Fr. 24 Diehl; Aristotle, *Αθηναίων Πολιτεία*, VI; cf. X; XII, 5; Plutarch, *Solon*, XV, 2-6).

Solon’s economic program worked effectively with splendid results. But social commotions and political unrest did not cease. His legislation was strengthened into popular acceptance by a law of general amnesty with the exception of specific cases relating to persons having been condemned in special courts on charges of murder, massacre or tyranny. Plutarch, *Solon*, XIX, 4: ὁ δὲ τρισκαιδέκατος ἄξων τοῦ Σόθωνος τὸν ὁγδοον ἔχει τῶν νόμων οὕτως αὐτοῖς ὄνομασι γεγραμμένον: "ἀτίμων ὡσοι ἀτίμοι ἦσαν πρὶν ἡ Σόθωνα ἄρξαι, ἐπιτίμους εἶναι, πήν ὡσοι ἔξ Ἀρείου πάγου ἡ ὡσοι ἐκ τῶν Ἐφετῶν ἡ ἐκ Πυτανείου καταδικασθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλεῶν ἐνὶ φόνῳ ἡ σφαγίαιν ἡ ἐνὶ τυραννίδι ἐφευγον ὅτε ὁ θεσμὸς ἐφάνη ὑδέα". Nevertheless, the pressure continued. It is highly remarkable and significant that Solon’s celebrated
realism did not work successfully in the societal and political front; or rather it proved itself deficient and unrealistic, unlike his successes in the economic sphere. Plutarch, commenting on the Solonian arrangements as compared with the Lycurgean ones in Sparta, observes (Solon, XXII, 3): Σώθων δὲ τοῖς πράγμασι τούς νόμους μαθήσον ἢ τὰ πράγματα τοῖς νόμοις προσαρμόζων etc. Characteristically and revealingly, Plutarch’s commendation in this context has to do with Solon’s economic policies.

Solon’s failure in tranquilizing the body politic is devastatingly registered by Aristotle (Ἀθηναῖον Πολιτεία, XIII). Relative quiet after Solon’s archonship lasted for just four years. Intense civil strife was meanwhile raised to such a pitch, that in the fifth year (590/89 B.C.) the chief magistracy remained unoccupied, as it was not made possible for someone to be elected to that high position. The same thing happened four years afterwards again (586/5 B.C.). Four more years later, the elected Archon overstepped his annual period of rule, remained in office for two years and two months, and was only expelled violently (582-80 B.C.). Next year (580/79 B.C.), no single person again could be elected to the archonship, but the compromising arrangement was agreed upon to adopt a ten-member Council to exercise the rule of the Archon Eponymous: five members of the Council being Eupatriads (i.e. the aristocracy of landowners), three farmers and two artisans; (loc. cit., 2): ἐξεύθεσαν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ στασιάζειν, ἄρχοντας ἔθεσαι δέκα, πέντε μὲν εὐπατρίδοις, τρεῖς δὲ ἄγριοικων, δύο δὲ δημιουργῶν, καὶ οὗτοι τὸν μετὰ Δαμασίαν ἦρξαν ἐνιαυτὸν.

The inherent infirmity of Solon’s constitutional arrangements was explained above. Their very spirit and principle were incapable of harmonizing the society in the functioning of its parts, of appreciating the dynamism of the new historical phase the Greek world and Athens in particular were entering in, of coordinating economic performance, societal status and political power, something which is the ultimate test of a solid and healthy polity. The condition of the State was craving for the
strongman with the right ideas, the statesman of acute realism but with the power to exploit his understanding of new realities in order to push creatively forward, the wise man able to comprehend and enact the *mystery of freedom*, the necessary conjugation of *Force and Liberty*. The period was clamouring for Peisistratus, the Tyrant. Just as it was best served later on by Cleisthenes’ democratic reforms, and the imperial strategies of Themistocles and Pericles. Between the one man’s rule of Peisistratus and the one man’s rule of Pericles there is continuity despite outstanding difference as well.

But all this lied well ahead of the unrest that marked Athenian history towards the end of the 7th and the beginning of the 6th century B.C. The important point in that unrest is however this:

The energy that was exploding in social commotions and political upheavals as well, was also and mainly manifested in dynamism, creativity and productivity at home and abroad.
NOTES

[1] The high value recognized in Thucydides' treatment of the matter by the rhetoricians is testified by two entries in the Scholia ad loc.: Τὸ δὴ ἔχει τὸ κατὰ τὸν Κύκλωνα θυμάζει σφόδρα ὁ τεχνογράφος καὶ συμβουλεύεται ἔπιμελέστατα αὐτὸ ἐκμαθεῖν τοὺς νέους, ἵνα μιμήσωνται. And secondly: ὅτι τοῦ διήγηματος κατὰ τὸν Κύκλωνα τὴν συσφίναν τοις θυμόντας, εἶπον ὅτι Πέλαγος ἐγένετο ἄνευδο, ἑγόντως περὶ θουκυδίδου. The meaning of this latter being that Thucydides, employing always a severe, intricate, abstruse style, is here relaxing into a direct, facile, clear consciousness—just as if the terrible king of animals were once to smile. (So, correctly, Valckenaer on Herodotus V. 71.) The φοβερῶν is aptly associated with Thucydides by Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Epist. ad Pomp. p. 210.5: Καθαρὰ μὲν αἱ ποιήσεις ἀμφότεραι—diapheroun δὲ κατὰ τόσον μακάστα ἀποθητικῶν, ὅτι τὸ μὲν Ἡροδότου κάθεσις ἐστι, φοβερῶν δὲ τὸ θουκυδίδου. —As to the former entry, ὁ τεχνογράφος is the theoretician of the rhetorical art par excellence. Maybe Theon was considered such, as Stephanus surmised (Sch. on Scholia Thucydidea ad loc.) referring to his Progymnasmata: χρῆ τὸν διδάκτον ἔκδοσιν γυμνάσιομα εἰς ἔκοντα, παραδείγματα εἰς τῶν παιδιῶν συγγραμμάτων ἀναφερόμενον προστάται τοῖς νέοις ἐκμαθήσαν— a general, common proposition, but which compounded with Theon's specific selection of Thucydides' narration (in the immediately following passage in his text, above given) as an example of the said principle, generates a considerable probability for the identification.

[2] As Herodotus has it. The Thucydidean notion that the safeguard included assurance as to absolute exemption from all harm and maltreatment (ἀνασταθόντες δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ τῶν ᾿Αθηναίων ἐπιτεταγμένοι τὴν φυλάκην, ὡς ἡμών ἀποθητικῶν ἐν τῷ λεπτῷ, ἐφ᾽ ὧν μιᾶς κακῶν ποιήσεως, etc.) must be qualified to mean only safety from arbitrary, peremptory, summary administrative or personal revengeful punishment before a proper trial—thus harmonizing this piece of information with the Plutarcho-aristophanocollast testimony as to the prescription of a δίκαιον (before the plenipotentiary Lord-council, the Areopagus) rather than with the Herodotean account of an ἑπενυμόστα τὴν θανάσιτον. —The possibility of taking the clause in question to signify "in order that they should not be the cause of any evil, i.e. the suppliants, by their dying within the sacred space thus polluting it and drawing on them the wrath of Athena" is remote, despite the harshness of the disturbed clause-order (a smoother sequence would be: ὡς δ᾽ ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς οἱ τῶν ᾿Αθηναίων ἐπιτεταγμένοι ἀποθητικῶν ἐν τῷ λεπτῷ ἀνασταθόντες, ἐφ᾽ ὧν μιᾶς κακῶν ποιήσεως, καὶ ἀπαγαγόντες ἀπέκτειναν. But this evidently moves on a lower height. Notice that by omitting the καὶ ἀπαγαγόντες, the force of the statement considerably improves; but this is bought at the cost of essential information included in that participle, which would have then to be provided in a separate colon. Thus the simultaneous satisfaction of both requirements as to maximal informativeness and heightened rigour coheres us Thucydideanwisely. —In I, 103, Thucydides employs ἐμελθάνων ... ἐφ᾽ ὧν etc. in the same sense (on condition that, hoc facto, hac lege, cf. also I, 113 ἐφ᾽ ὧν τοὺς ἄνδρας κομάνουντα); that Stephanus, of the old commentators, would in the face of this parallelism maintain the unlikely meaning is due, surely, to his wise refusal to accept a sense which would require the conspirators to get safeguards of absolute immunity of punishment altogether. This is an absurdity violating the laws of natural propriety and the testimonies of historical experience. Subsequent scholars adopted the correct meaning for the wrong reason (an absolute reliance on the nonsensical rule "same structure = same meaning in same author") and with a wrong consequence (the absurdity mentioned above).

[3] The ancient name seems to have been Κρίαος and the later Κίρρα; so Pausanias X, 37, 5: Λέγεται δὲ ἐκ τῆς Κίρρας <..> καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Κίρρας (the name of a heroine apparently or some historic woman) τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν τεθηκαί τῷ κριῶν фαιν. Οὕτως μέντοι Κρίαον ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ἄλλως καὶ ὡς τῆς ἐν Ἀθηναίοις ὁνόματι τοῦ ἐκ ἀρχῆς καθηεὶς τὴν πόλιν. (V. Hom. Hymn. In Apoll. 282, 431, 438, 445). A distinction between κριῶν and πόλις must not be assumed regarding nomenclature: Κρίαοιον καὶ πόλιν is commonest appellation. Strabo (IX p. 418) speaks of two towns, Κίρρα and further to the east, still within the Crissaean gulf, Κρίαος. He was singular in this as Eustathius (ad Iliad B, p. 273) indicates: δὲ γεωγράφος (sc. per excellence, i.e. Strabo) ἔνες: ... οὔστε καὶ αὐτὸν ἑτέρας Κρίαος καὶ ἑτέρας Κίρρα καὶ ἑτέρας ἑτέρας Κίρρας. This opinion on the duality of the towns is recognized by Stephanus Byzv. s.v. Κρίαος πνέει τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς Κίρρα φαίνει. Its negation
is peremptorily affirmed by the *Etym.M.* s.v. *Κρίσα* - ἰ αὐτῇ Κρίσα καὶ Κίρρα. But Plinius concurs with Strabo. In his delineation of the Locrian and Phocean territory, besides vividly portraying the boundary line passing just to the west limit of *Cirrhœa Phocidis campi* (IV, 514, §7), he details: ultra Cirrhœcis Phocidis campi, oppidum *Cirrhœa*, portus Chalaeon (exaggeratedly called by *Stephanus Byz.* s.v. *δόπης Λοκρῶν*, by virtue of the proximity and maybe the tribal origin of the inhabitants; it must have been to the west of Cirrhœa, being her port-area strictly meant. Its place is probably occupied by modern Itea, appropriately located as to the modern Cirrhœa, too), a quo VII p. introrsus ilibemo oppidum Delphi sub monte Parnaso, clarissimi in terris oraculi Apollinis. Fons Castalii, amnis Cephsus praefluens Delphos, ursus in Lilaear urbe (v. Homer, *Ilias* B, 523; Strabo, IX p. 407. But it is *Pleistos*, not Cephsus, that passes between Delphi and Cirrhœa. Strabo, IX, p. 418; however Pleistos has the same sources with, and almost is continued by, a tributary to the Boeotian Cephissus, a remote justification, to be sure, for the Plinian error. Besides a much more important connection of Cephissus with the Delphic region was maintained, recorded by Pausanias X, 8, 10: ἧκουσα δὲ καὶ ἄλλη τοιόν πόρον τῷ Κάστρῳ τοπαμοῦ δύσων εἶναι τοῦ Κιφσοῦ. Τούτῳ ἐποίησε καὶ Ἀκτίλος, ἐν προοίμιο τὸ ἐν ἄπαθήνα, βεβαιοῦσθαι δὲ οὐχ ἱκτο ἦσαν τοιοῦτοι οἱ ἐπικται, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Κιφσοῦ τὴν πηγήν πέμπατο ἐπικρήσαντο καὶ ὑπάλλελον ὄφειον ἔξαραν ἐν τινι εἰρημένας ἡμέρας, καὶ αὐθείς ἐν τῇ Κάστρῳ ψαφον αὐτῇ ἄναφαθίσθαν. quondam praeterea oppidum *Crisa*, et etc.

Now Cirrhœa was located by the see, Strabo, IX p. 418: ὑποπέπτοκε δὲ τῇ Κίρρῃ πόλις ἀρχαία Κίρρα, ἐπὶ τῇ δαθῶσθι ἱρώμενη, ἀφ’ ἑς ἀνάβασις εἰς Δελφόν ὑγιοκοντα που σταθεῖται. What is added, ἵστοτε χ’ ὅποιντι ζυκώνος" bespeak considerable error if co-meridianship is implied; but if we extend a straight line, from Sicyon in a N-NW direction we reach Cirrhœa over sea running tangentially parallel to the W. coast of the chersonessos between Cirrhœa and Anticyra. Probably there was also such a distribution of sea- and wind-currents that made the passage natural and easy. Philip, who extended the same king, having been in Phocis, goes straight to Sicyon’s harbour from Cirrhœa, Polybius V, 27: ὅ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὄνομαχει ἐκ τῶν κατὰ Κίρραν τῶν κατέθεσε μετὰ τῶν ὑπερυφοτῶν εἰς τῶν τῶν ζυκωνίων ἡμέρας, etc. – The direction Cirrhœa - Sicyon is parallel to that of Anticyra – Lechaeon, another sea-road channel: v. Pausanias X, 37, 3: καὶ τι ήπὶ υἱοῦ τῆς Βοῆς καὶ ἐν παρανόμου παραμονομένοις ἐξ Ἀντικύρας ἐς Λέκανον τῇ Κορινθίων (Lechaeon was Corinth’s port on the side of the Corinthian gulf).

Κίρρα was on the mouth of Pleistos, Pausanias X, 8, 8: τραπεζόμενος δὲ εἰς ἄριστον ἀπὸ τοῦ γύμνου (sc. τῶν Δελφῶν) καὶ ὑποκαταβάνον ὑπὸ πήλον, ἔμοι δικέι, ἢ τρία στάδια, ποταμὸς ἐστιν ὁ νομαζόμενος Πέλετος οὗτος ὁ Πέλετος ἐπὶ Κίρραν τὸ ἐπίσταν τὸ δελφῖνων καὶ τῇ ταύτῃ κάτεσι διάθασαν. Higher up, as Pausanias continues, is the sacred spring Castalia: whose waters flowing down really mingle with Pleistos’ stream. Cirrhœa as the ἐπίσταν τὸ δελφῖνων is also clearly meant by Livius XIII, 15. Delphi’s main port, at the innermost part of the bay, was Crisa (earlier) or Cirrhœa (later), whether that involved a short transposition in its actual location or not.

(4) Στροφεῖς is the chief hinge of a door (the one at the basis, which bears the weight of the movement) in its fundamental, elementary form: the pivot of the door-axis (the *scapus cardinallis* of the Romans, *Vitræus*, IV, 6, 4) working in a socket on the threshold; v. Aristophanes, *Danaides* Fr. 251 D = 263 Bl. (apud *Suda* s.v. αὐθαίες):

πρὸς τον στροφεῖα της αὐθαίες (sc. θύρας) σχινοῦ κεφαθήν
κατορύττειν


τὴν δὲ τάδηναν νῆστιν (part of the apparatus for κόταβος)
δὴ ἰδιος

παρὰ τὸν στροφεῖα τῆς κηπαίας (sc. θύρας)
ἐν ταίτι κοριμάσαν υόνοι.

To open such a door without making any noise for some clandestine purpose, water was poured on the point of friction, thus making the sense of στροφεῖων clear. Thus Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 487:
The idea was taken over by Plautus, *Curcul. I. 3, 1 In In.*

LENA

Placide egredere, et sonitum prohibe forum, et crepitum cardinum;
ne quod hic agimus, herus percipiatur fieri, mea Planesium.

Mane, *suffundam aquam.* PALINURUS. Viden’ ut anus tremula
medicinam facit?

Eaps eurum condidicit gibere, foribus dat aquam quam bibant.

Noticeable it is that Plautus speaks plurarily of *cardines,* while the Greeks talk consistently of a *strophes* in the singular. He either must mean the two pivotal contacts of the axis with the appropriate threshold and lintel receptacles, or side-hinges (for surely modern-type hinges existed in Roman times at least, having been archaeologically found); or the bottom hinges of a two-fold door. — The sense of the word is vividly portrayed by Lucianus, *Dial. Men. XI* (vol. iii p. 314): τὴν αὐθεν ἐγροφ ἀποκεκεχειμένην ἐπιμεθόει... oὐκ ἔκοψα δ’ οὖν (it was dead of night) ἀλήθ' ἐπάρας ἡμέα τὸν θύραν (ὅτε δὲ καὶ άθλητε ἐπεσούσει κακότα) παραγαγών τὸν στρῴφαν παράθλιον ἄμφοτερ; he raised the door unlatching the pivot from the socket, and by this dislocation he entered noiselessly. To be remarked that though *strophes* — cardo — hinge signify the entire elementary mechanism whereby a solid is being moved preserving immutable points of contact (constraints) with another solid, yet neither of the two parts can be preferentially referred to; thus the base socket is more appropriately connoted in the Aristophanic fragment; while in the Lucianic passage the pivot is clearly *paraxtheic,* and similarly in Virgil’s *Ciris* 222:

*marmoreo aeratis stridens in limine cardo.*

While in Sextus Empiricus *adv. Math. X. 54* the identification *strophes = pivot* is explicit and complete: ὁ κατὰ τὸ δὴμακου (the small cavity, socket) βεβηκός *strophes* — making also manifest as well the natural restriction of the meaning to where the real center of *weight* and *significance* lies: the bottom hinge. Theophrastus, too, in *Hist. Pl. V 5, 4 sqq.* specifies the hard woods which were preferred for making such pivots; and when in V. 9 he says ὅπερ ἤ τις *strophes* τῆς θύρας, ἐβλάστασας, *strophes* must be the wooden pivot, as the socket was formed in the threshold *stone.* In *Polibius VII, 16, 5; οὐτοί μὲν ἔμφησαν προσεπόντες περιόρισαν διακόπτειν τοὺς στρῴφας καὶ τὸ ζώγμα τῶν πυθῶν, αὐτὸ δὲ τῶν μοχλῶν ἐνδοθέν καὶ τὰς βαθανάνγρας, τὰς στρῴφας ἐστιν ἀλλ’ ἔνδοτας, τὰς δὲ στρῴφας ἐστιν ἀλλ’ ἐνδοτάς*; the *strophes* are the entire hinges again, and diakopten tois strophes is unhinge the door by dislocating the hinges.

What Polybius calls διακόπτειν τοὺς στρῴφας is rendered, in an exactly analogous case, as *ὑποτευκόμενοι τῶν στρ锊phγας* by Plutarch, *Romylius, 25:* Φιδίνας δὲ εἶχε (sc. ὁ Ρωμύλος), ἀναγεννητον ἐκ τῆς Ρώμης πόλεως, ὡς μὲν ένοικο σειράν καινίς τοῦ στρῴφας τῆς θύρας, ἐβλάστασε αὐτῷ ὁ προσφόρας τῶν στρῳφῶν, δυνάμεις ἐκείνος αὐτῷ ἄριστος διακόπτως. Στρῳφίς is no doubt here the pivot. Cf. Galenus, *de Usu Part. I, 15.* In the same sense the σφενδύτεροι (vertebrae) are assimilated to στρῳφίγας in Plato, *Timaeus 74A,* and in *74B στρῳφίς* are all bone-hinges of the body (the first application is mentioned by Longinus of *Subl. 52,* 5 as part of Plato’s divine and ἐνθουσιαστική use of tropes in the description of human body). Timaeus Sophista in his *Plat.Lex. s.v.* has: στρῳφίγας οἱ τῶν θυρῶν στρῳφές, identifying the two words admirably in this connection, if each σφενδύτερος acted both as a *pivot* and as the *support on which a pivot turns.* Pollux however, whose superficial and misplaced fastidiousness is generally to be suspected and whose views on linguistic matters require more than the neutrality of *a nihil obstat* to be accepted (for they have either to be positively confirmed, or, at the very least, to cohere and square effectively with extant usage and other grammatical or lexicographic evidence), considers the matter more scrupulously in II, 130-2: ἐβέβλασε δὲ σφενδύτερος ἐπὶ τὸ τράχηλον (above the seven superior vertebrae), οὗς ὁ ὅμηρος διασφαλίζει καθεὶ καὶ σφενδύτικα τῶν μεθινῶν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς (referring to *Illad, Y, 481-3* and mistaking σφενδύτερον as attributive to μεθις, while it is genitive plural depending on ἐκ-ναότο, and σφενδύτερον = σφενδύτερον: *--------δὲ φαγαγάνων αὐέκαν αἶνας*

τῆθ’ αὐτῆ πασχάκα καρκύ βλάθ’ μενεός αὐτῆ
σφενδύτερου ἐκείθερ’, δ’ ἐπὶ χούδον κεῖτο ταυτοθείς).

 đoánются δὲ οἱ σφενδύτερο καὶ στρῳφίς, παρὰ τὴν ἐπὶ αὐτῆς τοῦ τραχῆλου στρῳφῆν, καὶ στρῳφίγγας παρὰ θερεσκείτε... τῶν δὲ σφενδύτων, ὁ μὲν πρῶτος, ὁ σῶν τῷ τραχήλῳ στρῳφήμενος ἐπιστρῳφεύς ονομάζεται. Ἱπποκράτεις δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ οὐδέντα δοκεῖ καθέν. Τότε δὲ
The theory of the head-cum-vertebra system, as described by Hippocrates, suggests that the vertebral column is a continuous system from the skull to the tail. This system is further supported by the fact that the vertebrae are connected by ligaments and muscles, which help to maintain their position and function. The vertebrae are also connected by intervertebral discs, which provide cushioning and shock absorption. The study of the vertebrae is important for understanding the mechanics of the spine and the function of the spinal cord.
γόμφωτος ἐνώμα, ἰαμπρόν ἐκκρουστόν δέμας, etc.

The metallic sphinx, embossed (ἐκκρουστόν), was appended to the shield through a device (προς-μεμπαχανομένων) by means of bolts or nails (γόμφωτος). Parthenopaeos either wielded (ἐνώμα) the monster as handling the shield on which it was attached; or, very probably, controlled it more directly in the way of Polynices’ weapon in Euripides. As indeed Eustathius conceives (Comm. in Iliad p. 1160.49 sq.): ἵσως δὲ καὶ μυχανή τινὶ ἐκκρουστό, ἐκκρουστά δὲντα καὶ οὐ διόδου (= absolutely) προσημένα τῷ ὀδείκ. Καὶ οὕτῳ δράγατόν τις ὀρόσι τῷ αὐτοκινήτων, ὡποῖον δὲ τι πλάται καὶ Ἀλεξύλης ἐν τοῖς ἔπιτὰ ἐπὶ δῆμος, obviously referring to the passage in question. Cf. the Homeric Θήβως Illas, X, 459).

But the (principal) στροφέως, like all focuses of important working, has a religious dimension, too. When in Aristophanes’ Plutus the kingdom of Plutus, restored to his sight, has been founded in Athens, the Athenians throw themselves into the exclusive worship and service of the new, just and all-seeing divine sovereign, to the neglect and detriment of all other Gods. Hermes comes then begging for some acceptance in recompense for his services. He is made to recount his ἐπιανάξεια as testimony to his diverse divine efficacy. At last, he is admitted into the new régime as Ἐναγάγων: his relevance to all games, musical and, especially gymnic, procuring for him a useful employment in the thriving splendid spectacles of an Affluent and Peaceful society more aristocratico. But in the beginning of the enumeration of his offices come these verses: Plutus 1152 sqq.,

ΚΑΡΙΩΝ: Τι δήδ’ ἄν εἴς ὅψε τοῦρός ἤλην ἐνθάδ’ ἄν;
ΕΡΗΜΗ: Παρά τὴν θύραν στροφάθον ἰδρύσατο με.
ΚΑ.
Προσφαίον: δια’ οὐκ ἔρχον ἄτι οὐδέν στροφῶν.

Στροφαῖος is the epithet of the divinity presiding over στροφέως, the hinge of doors. But the slave Carion cruelly mocks the needy God, by accepting the word in a rogulous and wicked connotation, στροφῆ being, deterioratingly, a turn, a twist, a trick, dodge, a deceit, something devious, crooked, knavish. The Alexandrian scholia ad loc., falling to observe the comic change of meaning, concentrate misleadingly, in explanation of this epithet, on the crafty and treacherous features of the God, features amply, of course, expressed in his religious appellation Δήλος. For Mercury’s deviousness, rogulous multifacetedness, propensity to theft, deceitfulness particularly with regard to his words and downright knavery v. the Homeric Hymn to Hermes. 15-4; 317-8; Hayesid, Opera 79 sqq. Thus ad Στροφαῖον ἰδρύσασθε με the Scholla explain: ἐπὶ ἀποστροφή τῶν δήλων κηπτῶν (Hermes being himself archetypical already gloriously celebrated as such in the Homeric Hymn in his honour). Στροφαῖος, παρὰ τὸ στρέφεσθαι καὶ πανουργίζον... Αὐτῆς. Στροφον (such metrical monstrosity pro Στροφαῖον?), ἐπὶ στροφάς (? or στροφῆ?) λέγονται οἱ συμπεπετυμένοι λόγοι καὶ δοχεῖοι. Αὐτῆς. Στροφαῖον ἐκάποιον ἱσχυμένον παρὰ τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ δαιμόνου ἐκ τοῦ θύρᾳ στρεφόμεθα (something of the sort must be added to integrate the obvious meaning; it would apply to the turning of the door in general), ἄμα δὲ παρὰ τὸ στρέφειν τὰ πράγματα: οἱ δὲ τοῦτο ποιοῦτες πανουργοί λέγονται. And again: ἔστι δὲ ἐπιστροφή ἔρμου παρὰ τὰς θύρας ἱσχυρά τις φυλακῇ τῶν δήλων κηπτῶν· οὕτῳ γὰρ ὅποιο τῶν θυρων εἰλίθαι καὶ ἀνάδεσθαι καὶ δήλως πανουργεύεσθαι!

But the syncretic philology of the succeeding era corrected these Alexandrian Jenilities. Thus, we read also, Στροφαῖον· Πυλώρων, ἐνθά καὶ ἐνθά στρεφομένοις -πυλώρως, the gate-keeper, caretaker. And, better, in the Parisinus 2827 (whose first schollon to this play ends with the colophon: Σχόλιον τοῦ Πυλωτικοῦ Μαγιστροῦ, no doubt meaning the renowned Byzantine philologist Thomas Magister whose recension we must possess in that ms.): Στροφαῖον· ἐπιστροφής ἐστὶ τούτῳ τοῦ θεοῦ παρά τὰς θύρας ἱσχυτά εἰπί. δυσκό λάθη τῶν δήλων κηπτῶν (this in common with the Alexandrine criticism). Στροφαῖον εὖν περὶ τὴν θύραν ἀντὶ τοῦ φύλακα τῆς θύρας (cf. Πυλώρου) ἀπό τῆς στροφίγγος. ο δὲ δεραίον (sc. Carion) τὸ στροφον ἐπὶ τῶν δήλων καὶ συμπεπετυμένων λόγων εἰκάμενον· εἰπὶ συμπεπετυμένοι καὶ τοῦτο ή λέξης στροφαῖον γὰρ φανεν ἀνέθρωπον, τὸν ένδοτα συμπεπετυμένοι καὶ στρέφεις λόγως και μυχανας. And in this double entendre, Eustathius agrees; Comm. in Iliad p. 1353.9 παρὰ τὸ στροφεῖν ἱσχυμένος, ο ὥ στρόφεις, sc. τὸ στρεφόν καὶ ἐξεπατάν.

The Lexicographers firmly uphold the correct interpretation. Thus Haschius κ. v. Στροφαῖος: ἃρμος, ο πρός τὰς θύρας ἱσχυμένος διὰ τῆς τῆς θύρας στροφῆ. And identically Etym. Magnum κ. v. Στροφαῖος: ο παρὰ τὰς θύρας ἱσχυμένος ἃρμος παρὰ τὸν στροφᾶ τῆς θύρας. Suda, κ. v. has: Στροφαῖον· οὕτῳ ἐκάπου τὸ παρὰ τῇ θύρᾳ ἱσχυμένον δαιμόνα, άμα δὲ
parά τό στρέφεν τό πράγματα οι δε τούτο ποιοῦντες πανούργοι λέγονται. Άριστοφάνης
Πηλότου (loc.cit.): παρά τόν θύραν Στροφώλιον ἱδρύσασθε με. Ἐπωνυμία δέ ἐστιν Ἐρμοῦ παρά τό
τας θύρας ἱδρύσασθαι ἐπί φυλακιν τόνν ἁπάντων κληστών οὔτε γάρ ὁπίσω τόν θυραν εἰλώθαι καὶ ἀναδέουσθαι καὶ ὄνος πανορυγεύσαται. I quoted complete Suda's lemma to show that the
Thomian scholion ad loc. stems from post-alexandrine philology as preserved in the Suda: the
Identity is obvious and practically verbal. This is standardly the case with Byzantine
commentation: hence its great utility in restoring the sounder syncretic criticism and
antiquarianism of the later and post-Alexandrine era. Hesychius s.v. Ἐρμῆς Στροφώλιος ὁ περί
(gic codex; παρά Saimasius) στρόφιγγη τής θύρας ἱδρύμενος. Photius s.v. ὁ Ἐρμῆς Στροφώλιος ὁ
παρά τας θύρας ἱδρύμενος ἀπό τον στρόφιγγη της θύρας. Poilix, VIII, 72: καὶ Στροφώλιος ἐν τῷ
οἴκισμα περί τόν Στροφώλιον ἱδρύμενον Θέος ἔστι δ' ὁ Ἐρμῆς. Thus some symbol of Hermes was
consecrated at the entrance of the Jail, by the fundamental hinge of the door.

What is to be found in Cramer's Anecdotata Graeca Vol. II, p. 53.14 on Theognostian
evidence, poses a problem. Στρεφώσατο ὁ Ἐρμῆς παρά το Ἀριστοφάνης παρά το διεστρέφεται τας
cmp; όψεις. There are three possibilities: (that Στρεφώσατο is a mistake for Στροφώσας and the
explanation a mere misunderstanding, is too gross a supposition to be seriously entertained).
(a) Either in some lost Aristophanic work Hermes is epitheized as Στρεφώσας and an ambiguity
between Deceteful and Defective In, or rather with Distorted, sight, squinting maybe, looking
askance, is played upon, an ambiguity additionally strengthened by the mediation of the factor
of unfathomedness and unreliability included in both meaning-directions; (b) or the information
is to be related to Photius s.v. Στρέφωσα: πόθης τῆς Θάρκης. Καὶ οἳ πολείται Στρεφώσας. Στρεφάλιος,
Ἀριστοφάνης Γεώργιος. Here are two lemmata, one concerning the Thracian city and its
inhabitants, the other referring to an Aristophanic joke in his play Γεώργιος. The dexterous
castigator of the Athenian people's faults and vices may have referred to them under this
appellation signalling their stridulous propensity in litigation and dicablistic practice; an
appellation particularly apposite jokingly as there was also a people of that name. Or Thracian
ambivalences and unreliabilities as to their true attitudes towards Athens might have been the
object of a pun. In either case the deceitful god may have been nicely brought in, esp. playfully
as the God crooked In eyesight as well as in mind and deed.

In the Homeric Hymn to Hermes, Mercury is the leader and sender of Dreams, the wakeful,
watchful Eye of Night, Sleepless Guardian at Doors and Gates:

There was a Hermes consecrated at the court of Dionysus the Tyrant palace; Athenaeus,
X, 437b teste Timaeo: καὶ ἁμβοῦς (sc. Xenocrates) τὸν χρυσοῦν στέφανον, καὶ ἀναθίμων (when he
was leaving the Symposium), τῷ Ἐρμῷ τῷ ἱδρυμένῳ ἐπὶ τῆς οὐδές ἐπέθεκεν etc. He must
have been located by the aúthios θύρα, as supra; thus Aelianus who relates the same story, has
(Varia Hist. II, 41): καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἁμβοῦς, ὅτε ἔσογε μετὰ τοῦ διδύμου, τῷ Ἐρμῷ τῷ πάρ τῶν
θυρών ἐστώ τε ἐπέθικεν αὐτῶν, κατὰ τὸ θόος τῶν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν (he was in the habit of
dedicating his flowery crowns worn in the Symposia on the previous days to the self-same
Hermes). Diogenes Laertius, IV, 8 (in his brief account of the same memorable event) simply has:
καὶ χρυσοῦ στέφανος τιμήθηναι ἐπάνω πολυποίσας τῆς Χοιλῆς παρὰ Διονυσώῳ ἔβολτα θείαι
πρὸς τὸν ἱδρυμένον Ἐρμῆν, ἔθανεν τέθειναι καὶ τοὺς ἀνθίνους ἐξέθειο.

Hermes Πρόναος (together with Athena Πρόναος) was consecrated at the gate of the
temple of Apollo Istenios in Thebes, Pausanias IX, 10, 2. At the very entrance to the Acropolis
was an Hermes Προφύλακας, Pausanias, I, 22, 8. The type of this Mercury was the τετράγωνος
one, with the bearded, broad face of a senior man (more than mature, not yet quite old).
Alicarnes standardized the form, as must be judged from the numerous copies still extant.
The best preserved comes from Pergamus bearing the following inscription:

Προφύλακας Ἐρμῆν τὸν πρὸς πυθῆν· (i.e. the Προφύλακας in Acropolis)
ἔσωσαν Ἁλκιμύρειος

Below which appears the Delphic injunction: Ἑνάκει οὐκοῦν, and underneath the erect pudenda
testify to the implicit potency of the consecrated symbol. To this Προφύλακας Ἐρμῆς is
Demosthenes referring adv. Evergetum et Mnesibulum p. 1146: ὕστερον αὐτῷ περιπτυχὸν περὶ
tῶν Ἐρμῆν τῶν πρὸς τῇ Πυθῇ, i.e. by some little portem gate at the Grand Propylaea.

Harpocrates gives interesting information concerning this famous Herma; s.v. πρὸς τῇ Πυθῇ
'Ερμής Δημοκριτής ἐν τῇ κατ’ Εὐέργου. Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ Ἐλευσίνην καὶ Αθήναις ὁ Παππαίς ἐδόθη ἔναυξις τοῖς Παππαῖοι ἕκκλημα τοῦτον ἀναθέτοντες ἐπεράγοντο: ἄρα οὔτε μὲν πρότερον τῇ δημοκριτικῇ Ἐλευσίνῃ πάντως ἀμφότερον τί ἐπὶ τῶν δόξων συνέχεια ἐπὶ τοῖς Ἕρμαις, καὶ παρὰ τούτῳ μεμαθηκόν τινι δήλου ἦν. Παυσανίας δὲ ἔρισεν τὴν ἑπτάδα καὶ τῆς Ἀκαδίας ἐπιμελήθη αὐτοῖς. Παυσανίας δὲ ἔρισεν τὴν ἑπτάδα καὶ τῆς Ἀκαδίας ἐπιμελήθη αὐτοῖς. τῷ ἑπτάδα καὶ τῆς Ἀκαδίας ἐπιμελήθη αὐτοῖς. τῷ ἑπτάδα καὶ τῆς Ἀκαδίας ἐπιμελήθη αὐτοῖς. τῷ ἑπτάδα καὶ τῆς Ἀκαδίας ἐπιμελήθη αὐτοῖς. τῷ ἑπτάδα καὶ τῆς Ἀκαδίας ἐπιμελήθη αὐτοῖς.

It was the general practice, especially in Athens, to consecrate Hermes in the form of an Ερμάδι by doors and gates; thus the Sch. ad Aristophanes, Pax, 923: ἐδόθη ἔναυξις Ερμᾶς ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν. Both the fact of their widespread occurrence and the epithelial nativity of the form are confirmed by Thucydides VI, 27: ἐν δὲ τούτῳ δόσει Ἕρμας ἦσαν πλεῖον ἐν τῇ πόλει τῆς Αθηναίων, ἐγὼ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπίκομον τοῦ Ερμᾶσ τοῦ αὐτοῖς, πολλοὶ καὶ ἐν οὗτοι προμέχρισι καὶ ἐν ἐρήμοις, μὴ νυκτί οἱ περιπέπεσαν τὰ πρόσωπα, ἓν τῷ παρεξήλευσιν διὰ τῆς ἁλοτροπίας ἡμῶν. Thus the general meaning is sure despite the obvious lacuna and the uncertainty of its supplementation. Ἀκολούθως Ἕρμας (signalling them by their most conspicuous feature, the absence of extremal limbs, hands and feet protruding out of the trunk) refers clearly to the same thing with οὐκ ἔστω τετράγωνον ἐπὶ τοῖς Ἕρμαις.

The pyloric function of Hermes, as an Ερμάδι, is connected with his terminal activity. Thus e.g. he, in that square form, served to mark and safeguard the boundary between the Megalopolitan and Messenian territories, Pausanias VIII, 34, 6: καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτος (sc. Ἡμυῖδις, a place) στάδια εἶκος ἔστιν ἐπὶ τὸ Ἕρμαν, ἐξ Ἡμίκρινος καὶ Μεγαθυγατίταις εἰσώριν ἀναφερομένοις δεὸς αὐτοῖς καὶ Ἕρμην ἐπὶ στήθη — no doubt an Ἕρμας.

This close association of Hermes with Gates, in particular the specificity of his connection with that implement of a door by which it opens and closes, this nucwyria τύφωμα which controls the access to an enclosure, to a μύχω, a cavity natural or constructed; this is clearly an office identical in general function with the Mercurial guardianship of the Gates of Hades. And so according to the Pythagorean doctrines (in Diogenes Laertius VIII, 31; the account is part of the important relation by Alexander (the Polyhistor) in his Περί ιεροτροπίας, of what he saw in Πυθαγορικοῖς ὑπομνήμασι (VIII, 23): τὸν Ἕρμην Ἐλευσίμων ἐν τοῖς φυσών καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Πομπάδος ἡγέονται καὶ Κέλαδον καὶ Χάλοντας, ἐπιδήθην φύτος ἐκκέμπει (πρὸς ἐπιστήμην) ἐν τῶν σωμάτων τῶν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τες γῆς καὶ ἐκ θαλάσσης. Cf. Virgilius. Eneias IV, 242 sqq.; Horatius Carm. I, 10, 17 sqq.; (cf. Carm. I, 24, 16); Statius, Thebais, I, 306 sqq. Chief of the chorus is Homer, in Iliad 2; cf. Petronius §140; Πομπάδος Ἐλευσίμων Sophocles, Ajax 819. Thus Hermes has the magical wand (virgam potentem, Ovid, Fasti 5, 447; the Greek ραβδός, the κρούκειον specifically appropriated by Hermes) through which he exercises his power over human souls. The supreme sceptre of death belongs naturally to Hades himself, Pindar, Olym. 9, 53; Hermes, as ψυχαγωγός or ψυχονομός effects the decrees of the superior power.

It is Hermes, not Apollo, who is connected to doors and gates as keeper of enclosures and watch of exits. Hermes is connected to στροφές, the pivotal point of openings and closures, the hinge and that on which the door hinges. Apollo and ἄφθωρ are part of a different story. To interpret ἄφθωρ as στροφές in nonsense.

[5] There were in the fully constituted association twelve members: Aeschines, De Falsa Legatione, §116; Strabo, IX p. 420; Scholla in Pindar, Pyth. IV, 116.
The list in Aeschines loc.cit. is complete but for the omission of the Dolopians, who cannot be absent. They inhabited Phthiotis, Ilias, I 480; v. Strabo IX p. 431; 452, 454. Cf. Demosthenes, De Corona, 63. They were extinct by the time of August (Pausanias, X, 8, 2); at any rate their votes in the Council were then given to Nicopolis. The Dolopians are expressly mentioned in the lists of Harpocratio, Pausanias and Diodorus. Their name must have dropped from Aeschines’ mss. And similarly with the two nations missing from Pausanias’ list: one should read <περαιοι> after or before θεσσαλιων, and <βοιωτων> after υπο τω ηραι τη κυριμεδι. The intervening explanatory clause after λοκρων (namely “τη φωκιδι ομορους υπο τω όραι τη κυριμεδι”) may perhaps account for the omission of the Boeotians, as they were separated from the series of consecutive names of the member-nations. Perrhebians and Boeotians are in all other lists. Nor could the latter be absent from a religious association including Phocians and Eastern Locrians and the Dorians of Central Greece; or the former from what in effect was a political system of Eastern mainland Greece, from Olympus southward. The Boeotians are mentioned in the Amphiictionic list of his own days by Pausanias (X, 8, 4). On the other hand, it is true that the Perrhebeans are not mentioned either there, or on the occasion of the reorganization of the Amphiictiony by Augustus (X, 8, 3), where they should have been referred to either as subjoined under the Thessalians (as the Mallians, the Aenianes = Oetaeans and the Phthiotic Achaeans) or as extinct (like the Dolopians). Probably the Perrhebeans have one way or another disappeared from the Amphiictiony during the times of the Aetolian control (Polybius, IV, 25, 8), when the Thessalians and Macedonians did not attend the meetings of the Council (cf. Walbank, Commentary ad loc.). After the Great (and Third) Sacred War, the Macedonians took the votes of the Phocceans in the Amphiictionic Council. But after the destruction and expulsion of the Gauls, they were reinstated, because of the role they played in averting the barbarian danger (Pausanias X, 8, 3). In order not to change the symbolic number of member-nations (12), the weak and mountainous Perrhebeans (if there still remained as a reality more than as a past dream) might have made to cede their place to the Macedonians.

From Pausanias (X, 8, 2) we learn that initially only the Eastern Locrians were members of the Amphiictiony. Which coheres with an association of members inhabiting places around Anthela by Thermopylae rather than around Delphi (contra Anaximenes Fr.Gr.H. 72F2; and Androton 324F58). The Marmor Parium (epoch 5) is basically right, although it propagates the legend of Amphiictiony’s Athenian kingship: δι’ ου Αμφικτυων <δικαιοδοκον> διοικηθησον έν τη Θερμοπολίαι και συνήνθε Ιθαος περι το Ιερόν οκουντας και άληθησον Αμφικτυων και Πιλαταν, ούτε ή νέον θουσυν Αμφικτυων έπειτα Χληροποιησοντος Αθηνών Αμφικτυων. (Jacoby held the incredible notion that the Athenian Amphiictiony was not the king of Thermopylae in this account! V. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker IIib Supplement Vol. II p. 124, Fr. 58 n. 4. But it was Deucalion of the Cataclysm that went to Athens when Craoanros was king (§64). Deucalion’s son Amphiiction was king of the entire eastern mainland Greece afterwards, till his brother Heilen was made king of Phthiotis (§6).

Diodorus, relating the Sacred War against the Phocceans, gives the following account (XVI, 29, 1): ...τω μέν ιερῷ βοσκεῖν έγνώσαι Βοωτοι και Λοκροι και θεσσαλιοι και Περαιαιοι, προσ το του και δωραιας και Δυσηνες, έτη δη Αθαιας και Άθαοι ικαι θεϊται (corrected by Wesseling) and <Μαναες και> <κεδαες> Μαγνητας, έτη δή Άλναικες και τινες έτεροι, τοις δε δεκεσιδι υμνύμχοι Αθηναιοι και ταιαδειμοι και τινες έτερες των Πειθοπονιωνων. The Aenianes are the same with the Oetaeans of the other lists. The Athamanes were a rude, mountainous people on the western side of Pindus, more Epeliotic (Strabo, IX p. 427) than Thessalian, although Strabo reckons them in the latter greater area, wondering whether they are Greek at all (IX, p. 434; X, p. 449). They, and the Aetolians, extended gradually their influence to the east by means of a series of well calculated interventions and successes, and in particular gained control of Mount Oete (IX pp. 427-8). The Athamanes reached the acme of their power late (ibid.), so that they could not be in the mouth of Spercheios as early as the 4th century. So Diodorus mentions them simply as helping the Amphiictiony cause against the Phocceans, and, also, by historical prolepsis, for it was by means of such expansionist policies that they eventually increased their power and extended their influence. Once they got involved together with the leading Aetolians in the Delphic and Amphiictiony affairs, they would in one way or another participate in the decision-making mechanisms of the Association. The Ionians are indirectly included in Diodorus’ recension through the Athenians; Athens being in alliance with the Phocceans, no other Ionian state would explicitly side with the
Amphictyonic forces. There is then just one nation missing, the Malians in the district of Lamia. Their name must have been omitted accidentally e.g. from the place indicated in the text above.

There remains the list of Harpocratio s.v. Ἀμφικτύόνες (identical with one given by Libanius). It stands thus: ταύτα (sc. τὰ ἔθνη) δ’ ἐν Ἰλίνοις, Δωριεῖς, Περραιβοί, Βοιωτοί, Ἐφεσούσσαι, Ἀκαθόρωται, Μηθεῖς, Δόροπος, Αἴνινος, Δέθαιοι, Φωκεῖς. The Ἀκαθόρωται must be read without intervening comma. The Thessallians dropped after the Boeotians. The Δέθαιοι probably stands for the missing Λακρών. At the time of Pausanias, Delphi did possess two votes in a thoroughly reorganized Amphictyonic Council (Pausanias X, 8, 4). Perhaps this arrangement originated with the Augustan reforms.

[6] Cf. supra. Plutarch, Solon, XI. Aristotle, Fragmenta, 615 Rose. Aeschines, Adv. Ctesiph., 108. Pausanias X, 37, 6. Euanthes from Samos maintained, erroneously (v. Plutarch loc.cit.), that Solon led the Athenian forces in the war (FHG III, 2). Some ascribed to him the stratagems that led to the fall of Crissa (Pausanias, X, 37, 6-7). Polyænus (III, 5) gives the idea of how to satisfy the oracle promising victory over the Crisseans to Cleisthenes the tyrant of Sicyon. The other stratagem (diverting and poisoning of Crissa’s water supply) belongs to Eurylochus according to Polyænus VI, 13; to Cleisthenes according to Frontinus, Strategematicon, III, 7, 6; to Nebrus, an Asclepiad from Cos and no less than an ancestor of Hippocrates according to the Epistle (the so-called Προῃβευτικὸς) in the Hippocratic Corpus that is supposed to be written by Hippocrates’ son Thessalus to the Council and People of Athens (Epistola XXVII, 17-18, p. 314 Herscher).