

**A.L. Pierris**

**ON THE TIMES OF UNREST  
IN ARCHAIC ATHENS**

Surely the chief, and certainly the only known to us, sanctuary of the Erinyes 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 Propylaea, mentions as lying just below a fountain (to be identified with the well-known Κῆψύδρα) 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): πῆσόν δὲ ἱερὸν θεῶν ἐστὶν ὃς καθοῦσιν Ἀθηναῖοι Σεμνάς, Ἡσίοδος δὲ Ἐρινύς ἐν Θεογονίᾳ. Ulpianus, in his already quoted scholion on Demosthenes, *Contra Meidiam* p. 81 Dobson: ὧν (sc. Εὐμενίδων) καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν πῆσόν ἵδρυτο τῆς βουλής (sc. τῆς Ἀρεοπαγιτικῆς). Καὶ οἱ μὲν φασὶν ὅτι διὰ τὸν Ὀρέστην ἐκεῖ καθιδρύθη (cf. Aeschylus' *Eumenides ad.fin.*; this will be discussed *infra*)· βέλτιον δὲ ἡγεῖν ὅτι διὰ τὰ φονικά. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν Ἀρείῳ Πάγῳ τὰ τῶν φονέων ἐδικάζοντο ἐκεῖ καθιδρύθησαν, ἵν' εἴ τι καὶ ἠανθάνειν μέλλοι τὴν βουλήν, αὗται συναγωνίζονται πρὸς τὸν ἔηγχον ἐγγύς ἐξεστῶσαι. (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' ἄλλοι (the conspirators except Cylon and his brother who had already escaped) ὥς ἐπιέζοντο καὶ τινες καὶ ἀπέθνησκον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡμοῦ, καθίζουσι ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἱκέται τὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀκροπόλει (the great altar of Athena. Herodotus says that Cylon with his followers supplicated being attached to the very statue of Athena: - οὐ δυνάμενος δὲ ἐπικρατῆσαι ἱκέτης ἵζετο πρὸς τὸ ἄγαλμα). Ἀναστήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς οἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακὴν 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 *πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων*, something that has created unnecessary lamentation and consternation among the throngs of modern

commentators and investigators. *Ναυκραπίαι*, *constituting the political and financial organization of γένν*, 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 φυλή. 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 *ναυκραπικοὶ 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 πολλὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ἔπρασσον, and Herodotus’ statement: οἷον (sc. οἱ πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράων) ἔνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας. 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 (archontic 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 αὐτοὺς αἰτὴν ἔχει Ἀλκμεωνίδας. 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 ἔχοντες τὰς ἀρχάς; laudable and pragmatic inspecification.

Thucydides continues in the above quoted passage: ἀναστήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς οἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακὴν, ὥς ἐώρων ἀποθνήσκοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐφ’ ᾧ μηδὲν κακὸν ποιήσουσιν, ἀπαγαγόντες ἀπέκτειναν· καθεζομένους δὲ τινὰς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Σεμῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς βωμοῖς

ἐν τῇ παρόδῳ διεκρήσαντο. On which last sentence the Scholiast has: τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν· τῶν Ἑριννύων, κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν. Ἄς μετὰ τὸν Ὀρέστην οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πῆλυσον τοῦ Ἀρείου Πάγου ἰδρύσαντο, ἵνα ποῖται τιμῆς τύχῃσι (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 Κυθώνειον ἄγος ἤδη μὲν ἐκ πολεοῦ διετάραττε τὴν πόλιν, ἐξ οὗ τοὺς συνωμότας τοῦ Κύλωνος ἰκετεύοντας τὴν θεὰν Μεγακλῆς ὁ ἄρχων (sc. ἐπώνυμος, the chief magistrate with considerable civil power at the time) ἐπὶ δίκῃ κατεῖθεῖν ἔπεισεν· ἐξάψαντας δὲ τοῦ ἔδους etc. (i.e. Athena's statue; which coheres with Herodotus' statement that the ἱεσία took place at Athena's *statue* rather than the *altar*, as with Thucydides). As the ἔδος in question must be the ancient, διοικητής statue of Athena, and as this was reposing in the religious complex comprising the Ἑρέχθειον, 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 πύλῳ νῶϊ (*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*: πύλῳ ἀντὶ τοῦ πηλοσύῳ καὶ εὐδαίμονι); we do find, in the *Sch. B* on the corresponding passage *Iliad* E, 512 πύλον ἀδύτοιο, the literal interpretation presupposing sacrificial burnings of flesh: πύλον· τοῦ κεκνισμένου καὶ ῥηϊπασμένου. *Sch. T* also have *ad loc.*: πύλον· κεκνισμένου.

The Plutarchean passage continues: ἐξάψαντας δὲ τοῦ ἔδους κρόκην κήωσθην καὶ ταύτης ἐχομένους, 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 ραγίσσης, ὥρμησε συληθῆναι ὁ Μεγακλῆς καὶ οἱ Συνάρχοντες, ὡς τῆς θεοῦ τὴν ἰκεσίαν ἀποθιγομένης. 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 Goddesses' 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 κατέηυσαν, οἱ δὲ τοῖς βωμοῖς προσφυγόντες ἀπὸ σφάγης· μόνοι δ' ἀφείθησαν οἱ τὰς γυναικῶν αὐτῶν ἰκετεύσαντες – a monstrous token of sacrilegious disregard and contempt of Divinity's zealous majesty, sure to be implacably 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. Καθεζομένους δέ τινες καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς βωμοῖς ἐν τῇ παρόδῳ διεχρήσαντο, signifies: and some they slaughtered who placed themselves in supplication on the altars in the byway, in the very presence of the August Goddesses – 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 *ἱερόν θεῶν* – a *sanctuary*. This was surrounded τέμενος-like by a sacred

precinct, a περίβοηος, as he informs us in I, 28, 7: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόηου μνῆμα Οἰδίποδος, which precisely fits in with the Thucidedean 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 multiform appearings. 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 necessities.

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: ἐπελήθων τῇ ἀκροπόλει (sc. ὁ Κύλων) ἐλήστυε καὶ ἀήσκειται. ἐλήφθη δὲ συλῶν τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. Καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ὁ Κύλων φεύγει etc. And again: Κύλων τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κατέλαβεν ἐπὶ τυραννίδι, καὶ ἐλήφθη πότε συλῶν τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐκλείσθη 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 Κυλώνειον ἄγος μᾶλλον τοῦ Ἡροδότου καὶ Εὐφορίωνος (sic restituo pro ms. Εὐφρονος; κατ' Εὐφρόνιον frustra tentat Valckenaer ad *Herodotum* V, 71 qui etiam adverbium substituendum suspicat, "quod sensui conveniat" dicens. Male; μᾶλλον ἐξείργασται apte valet *magis elaboratum*

*est*) ἐξείργασται Θουκυδίδῃ [1]. 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

Sch. on *Aristophanes Equites*, 445

τὸ δὲ *Κυθωνεῖον* ἄγος ἦδη μὲν ἐκ ποθῆοῦ  
διετάραττε τὴν πόλιν, ἐξ οὗ τοὺς  
συνωμότας τοῦ Κύθωνος

ἐκ τῶν ἀλιτηρίων: τῶν μετεχόντων τοῦ  
*Κυθωνείου* ἄγους,

*ἰκετεύοντος τὴν θεὸν*

ὅπερ εἰς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν δοκεῖ γενέσθαι

*ἀσέβημα,*

Μεγακλῆς ὁ ἄρχων

ἐπειδὴπερ οἱ συγκατακλευσθέντες τῷ

Κύθωνι ἐν τῇ Ἀκροπόλει

*ἐπὶ δίκη κατελήθειν ἔπεισεν*

*εἰς τὴν κρίσιν κατέβησαν ἐν Ἀρείῳ Πάγῳ,*

*ἐξάψαντες δὲ τοῦ ἔδους κρόκην κλωστήν*  
καὶ ταύτης

*ἐκ τοῦ ἔδους τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξάψαντες τὴν*

*ἰκετηρίαν.*

ἐχομένους, ὡς ἐγένοντο περὶ τὰς Σεμνάς

θεὰς καταβαίνοντες

αὐτομάτως τῆς κρόκης *ραγείσης*,

ἥς *διαρρυσείσης*

ὥρμησε συληθῆναι ὁ Μεγακλῆς καὶ οἱ

συνάρχοντες

ὡς τῆς θεοῦ τὴν ἰκεσίαν ἀποθιγεμένης

*καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἔξω κατέκλυσαν,*

*λίθοις αὐτοὺς ἔβαλλον 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 (*ἰκετηρία*), upon whose *disassemblage* (*διαρρυσείσης* 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 Ariadnian 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 κῆωστή). 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 δίκῃ; 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 ἀθιτηρίων σέ φημι γεγονέναι τῶν τῆς Θεοῦ) 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: ἐπὶ τούτου (sc. τοῦ Περικλέους) ἤρξατο ὁ Πελοποννησιακός πόλεμος. ἐπὶ τούτου τὸ Κυθώνειον ἄγος ἠθαύνετο παρὰ Ἀθηναίων, ὃ ἐνείχετο Περικλῆς· Κύθωνα γὰρ ἄνδρα Ἀθηναῖον Ὀδύμπια

νενικηκότα, γαμβρὸν Θεαγένους τοῦ Μεγαρέων τυράννου, ἐπιθέμενον τυραννίδι τῶν Ἀθηναίων, παραχρῆμα φυγόντα, καταφυγόντα δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς Σεμνὰς θεάς, ἀποσπάσαντες οἱ περὶ Περικλῆα ἀπέκτειναν. (The latter part of this account is also repeated s.v. Κυθήναιον ἄγος). We should of course dispense with the extravagance of making the Cylonian affair taking place some time before the Peloponnesian war and Pericles being directly implicated in the unholy transactions. The *blunderous error* arose from a failure to perceive that the Lacedaemonian demand at the preludial “premath” of the War for an expiatory purgation of the Cylonian pollution by the banishment of its bearers (the descendants of the original offenders belonging to the Alcmaeonid clan) on the one hand and the perpetration of the sacrilegious crime on the other, were not temporally co-terminous events – the connection religiously consisting in the pestiferous blood-transmission of the guilt to the descendants of the immediate culprits rather than physically residing in direct causal agency. Another *confusion* we must assume in the notion that Cylon himself took refuge by the Awful Goddesses; but it is right that *their* involvement into the affair should be brought more to the foreground.

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 Κυθήναιον ἄγος ἤδη μὲν ἐκ πόλεως διετάραττε τὴν πόλιν, ἐξ οὗ etc.; he refers to the time immediately preceding the Solonian constitutional and legislative Reforms, when intense civil strife was permanently disturbing Athens. And so much is confirmed by Aristotle’s *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*. The papyrus begins with the relation of events which Plutarch ascribes to that very time. So:

Aristotle *Αθ. Πολ.* I

*Μύρωνος* καθ' ἱερῶν ὁμόσαντες *ἀριστίνδην*. *Καταγνωσθέντος* δὲ τοῦ ἄγους, αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐκ τῶν τάφων ἐξεβλήθησαν, τὸ δὲ γένος αὐτῶν ἔφυγεν ἀειφυγίαν. Ἐπιμενίδης δ' ὁ Κρής ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐκάθηρε τὴν πόλιν.

Plutarch, *Vita Sol.*, 12

Ἐν δὲ τῷ τότε χρόνῳ (long after Cylon's attempted tyranny) τῆς στάσεως ἀκμὴν λαβούσης μάλιστα καὶ τοῦ δήμου διαστάντος, ἥδη δόξαν ἔχων ὁ Σόλων παρῆλθεν εἰς μέσον ἅμα τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ δεόμενος καὶ διδάσκων ἔπεισε τοὺς ἐναγεῖς λεγομένους δίκειν ὑποσχεῖν καὶ κριθῆναι τριακοσίων *ἀριστίνδην* δικαζόντων. *Μύρωνος* δὲ τοῦ Φηυέως κατηγορούντος *ἐάησαν* οἱ ἄνδρες, καὶ *μετέστησαν οἱ ζῶντες*· τῶν δ' ἀποθανόντων τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀνορύξαντες ἐξέρριψαν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ὄρους ... οὕτω δὲ μετάπεμπτος αὐτοῖς ἦκεν ἐκ Κρήτης Ἐπιμενίδης ὁ Φαίστιος ... τὸ δὲ μέγιστον ἴλασμοῖς τε καὶ καθαρμοῖς καὶ ἰδρύσεσι κατοργιάσας καὶ καθοσιώσας τὴν πόλιν etc.

When Aristotle goes on in §2 to say: *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα* συνέβη στασιάσαι τοὺς τε γνωρίμους καὶ τὸ πᾶνθος *πολλὺν χρόνον*, τὸν δῆμον, he refers by *ταῦτα* 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 Draconian θεσμοί (institutional) statutes. In §4 he gives these latter arrangements, introducing them by the following words: Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη νομοθεσία (the ancient one just described in §3) ταύτην εἶχε τὴν ὑπογραφὴν. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα*, χρόνου τινὸς οὐ πολλοῦ διεθόντος, ἐπ' Ἀρισταίχμου ἄρχοντος Δράκων τὸς θεσμοὺς ἔθηκεν· ἡ δὲ τάξις αὕτη τόνδε τὸν τρόπον εἶχε. Comparing the underlined expressions here and in §2, and considering them in their context, it is to be concluded that *ταῦτα* in both cases refers to the Cylonian proceedings. Thus the *Draconian measures* were ordained relatively *shortly after that affair*

(χρόνου τινος οὐ πολλοῦ διεληθόντος); while some considerable time elapsed from Dracon'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 οὔσης ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ τῶν ἰπποκλήων δουλιεύοντων τοῖς ὀλίγοις, ἀντέστη τοῖς γνωρίμοις ὁ δῆμος. Ἰσχυρᾶς δὲ τῆς στάσεως οὔσης καὶ πολλὸν χρόνον ἀντικαθημένων ἀλλήλοισι, εἴλοντο κοινῇ διαληλεκτὴν καὶ ἄρχοντα Σόλωνα, καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ etc. (Cf. also §2: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συνέβη στασιάζειν ... πολλὸν χρόνον).

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; *Thucydides* I, 126: Κύλων ἦν ὀλυμπιονίκης ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος, τῶν πάῃσι εὐγενὴς τε καὶ δυνατός. *Herodotus* V, 71: Ἦν Κύλων τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀνὴρ ὀλυμπιονίκης. His victory was in δίαυθος, *Pausanias* I, 28, 1: (Κύλων) – εἶδος κάλλιστος καὶ τὰ ἐς δόξαν ἐγένετο οὐκ ἀφανής, ἀνεγόμενος διαύθου νίκην 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 εὐρίσκεται γεγονώς (two inferior mss. of Eusebius give τριακοστὴν καὶ ἕκτην 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 ἐνάτην ὀλυμπιάδα γεγονώς εὐρίσκεται. *Suda* s.v. has: Δράκων Ἀθηναῖος νομοθέτης ... γέγονε δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τοὺς ζ' σοφούς, ἢ μᾶλλον καὶ πρεσβύτερος τῇ γούνῃ ἢ Ὀλυμπιάδι τοὺς νόμους ἔθετο γηραιὸς ὢν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις. ἔγραφε ὑποθήκας εἰς ἔτη τρισχίλια. (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

plenipotentary extraordinary. The archon eponymous during Draco's legislation was Aristaechmus, Aristotle *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 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 tulisse; in *Armen.* M: Anno 1395, ol. 39.4; In *Hieronymus*, Anno 1393 (Ol. 39.2). We are practically still *within* the 39<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, which harmonizes with the above reports, as *περὶ τὴν δεῖνα ὀλυμπιάδα* or *τῇ δεῖνᾳ 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: Ulpianus on *Demosthenes*, *Contra Timocr.* p. 765R relates: ὁ μὲν Σόλων ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων τῶν τυράννων ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις πρὸ τῶν Περσικῶν πολέμων (extremely loose), ὁ δὲ Δράκων πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἑπτὰ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτεσιν, ὡς φησιν 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 implicative inexactness. (I suspect a number of years has dropped out after *Ἀθήναις*, 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, *Chiliades*, V 350-1:

μετὰ ἑπτὰ τοῦ Δράκοντος ἔτη δὲ νομογράφου,  
γίνεται Σόλων Ἀττικοῖς 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 Ulpianus' 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 Ulpian's text *ἑπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσιν*, the error having possibly arisen from a reading like: ὁ

δὲ Δράκων πρὸ αὐτοῦ κ'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 signaling 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  $\bar{\mu} \bar{\kappa} \bar{\zeta}$  for the correct  $\bar{\mu}\zeta$  or τεσσαρακοστὴν καὶ ἑκτὴν – and another (Flor. Plut. VI.9) spells it out  $\bar{\mu}$  καὶ  $\bar{\zeta}$ . – 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:  $4 \times 7 = 28$ . Of course, an easier solution would be to correct verse 350 in his *Chiliades* to run thus: μετὰ ἑπτὰ τοῦ Δράκοντος ἔτη καὶ τεσσαράκοντα. This would also cancel the harshness νομογράφου... νομογράφος. (But that could be no real problem for Tzetizian 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: Σόλων ἤκμαζε περὶ τὴν τεσσαρακοστὴν ἑκτὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα, ἥς τῷ τρίτῳ ἔτει ἤρξεν Ἀθηναίων, καθά φησι Σωσικράτης· ὅτε καὶ τίθησι τοὺς νόμους. Sosicrates the Rhodian (Diog. Laert. II, 84) is a reliable writer of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC whose *Κρητικά* are among the chief works utilized by Diodorus (v. V, 80) and is praised by Apollodorus apud *Strabonem* X, 474 for his exactness of relation regarding Cretan things (ὃν φησιν ἀκριβοῦν Ἀπολλόδορος τὰ περὶ τὴν νῆσον). 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: ὥς φησι Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς 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: Ἡρέθην (the election was not by lot then but ἀριστίνδην as Aristotle nicely puts it) δὲ ἄρχων μετὰ Φιλόμβροτον ὁμοῦ καὶ διαῤῃακτῆς καὶ νομοθέτης, δεξαμένων προθύμως αὐτὸν ὥς μὲν εὖπορον τῶν πηουσίων, ὥς δὲ χρυστὸν τῶν πενήτων. (He apparently himself helped the issue by an ambiguous statement that he is reputed to had made before his election, as Plutarch goes on poignantly to narrate: Λέγεται δὲ καὶ φωνή τις αὐτοῦ περιφερομένη (notice the exquisite suggestiveness of what Plutarch's nobility will not so much as indicate) πρότερον εἰπόντος, ὥς τὸ ἴσον πόημον οὐ ποιεῖ, καὶ τοῖς κτηματικοῖς ἀρέσκειν καὶ τοὺς ἀκτῆμοσι, τῶν μὲν ἀξία καὶ ἀρετῇ, τῶν δὲ μέτρῳ καὶ ἀριθμῷ τὸ ἴσον ἔξιν προσδοκόντων). Philombrotus was the archon before him; Dropides the one after, Philostratus *Vit. Sophist.* I, 16 ἐς Δρωπίδην δ' ἀναφέρων (sc. τὸ γένος Κριτίας) ὃς μετὰ Σόλωνα Ἀθηναίοις ἦρξεν. – Solon's archonship is also commemorated by Aristotle *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 5: ἰσχυρᾶς δὲ τῆς στάσεως οὔσης καὶ πολλὸν χρόνον ἀντικαθημένων ἀλλήλοισι, εἴηοντο κοινῇ διαῤῃακτὴν καὶ ἄρχοντα Σόλωνα, 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 Σόλωνος ἀρχὴν 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 plutocracy*. 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 *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 *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 *tacit plutocracy*, always stigmatized as an *aberration* from the true aristocratic principles and as a *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 *unlimited* scope for deadly struggle and unceasing strife between two camps, in Zoroastrian manner. For, *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 *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 *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

gradated plutocracy. But the system was terminally ill. To his unworking remedy, there followed Peisistratid 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 aristocracies 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 entrepreneurial activity in free and open markets, it cannot fulfil 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 ἀκμή at the 46<sup>th</sup> Olympiad. Cyrillus, *adv. Julianum*, I, 12 D (Spanheim): τεσσαρακοστῇ ἔκτῃ Ὀλυμπιάδι Σόλων νενομοθέτηκε. Tatianus, *adv. Graecos*, p. 160 (Otto): Σόλων περὶ μζ' (sc. εὐρίσκεται γεγονώς). Two mss. (Parisinus 2376 and Etonensis 1886) have περὶ μζ'. I consider this μζ' to have been an *erroneous variant* and not a *mere graphic error*. For *Suda* s.v. Σόλων has: γέγονε δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς μζ' Ὀλυμπιάδος, οἱ δὲ νζ'. Now this latter date is absurdly late; it should be corrected to μζ'; 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 μζ' (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 46<sup>th</sup> Olympiad according to *Diog. Laert.*, I, 110: Ἀθηναίοις ῥοιμῶ κατεχομένοις ἔχρησεν ἡ Πυθία καθῆραι τὴν πόλιν· οἱ δὲ πέμπουσι ναῦν τε καὶ Νικίαν τὸν Νικηράτου εἰς Κρήτην καθοῦντες τὸν Ἐπιμενίδην. Καὶ ὃς ἐλθὼν Ὀλυμπιάδι τεσσαρακοστῇ ἔκτῃ ἐκάθηρεν αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν. (*Suda* s.v. Ἐπιμενίδης gives the 44<sup>th</sup> 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' Ὀλυμπιάδος, ὡς προτερεύειν καὶ τῶν ζ' κῆθόντων σοφῶν, ἧ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν γενέσθαι· ἐκάθηρε γοῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας τοῦ Κυθωνείου ἄγους κατὰ τὴν μδ' Ὀλυμπιάδα, *γῆραιός ὢν*. An interval of 44-30 = 14 Olympiads gives, *at most*, 56 years, if they were full; while assuming μδ' an error for μς', 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 *Cirrhaean War*. The Crisaeans or Cirrhaeans (Κρίσα or Κρίσσα and Κίρρα 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):

-----Πυθῶνά τε πετρήεσσιν,  
Κρίσαν τε Ζαθέην, etc.

(the best and most mss. with Etym. M. 515.20 have Κρίσαν; 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.*: Κρίσαν· πεδίων ἐν Λοκρίδι, ἧ, ὡς οἱ πηϊόνες φασιν, ἐν Δελφοῖς (hence on the Phocesan side)· ὠνόμασται ἀπὸ Κρίσσου τοῦ Τυράννου καὶ Ἀστεροδίας τῆς Δηϊονέως. However Homer does not mention any other Locrians than those οἱ ναίουσαι πέρην ἱερῆς Εὐβοίης. 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 Ἑσπερίων Λοκρῶν Ὀμηρος οὐ

μέμνηται, ἢ οὐ ρητῶς γε, ἀλλῆλὰ μόνον τῷ δοκεῖν ἀντιδιαστέλλεσθαι τούτοις ἐκείνους, περὶ ὧν εἰρήκαμεν: Λοκρῶν - Εὐβοίης, ὡς καὶ ἐτέρων ὄντων. Dionysius Periegeta equally ignores the Ozolian Locrians; he recenses the eastern ones (426), but he passes over from Aetolia and Acheloo directly to Phoea on the south of mainland Greece (437). Definite, as usual, is Pausanias, X, 38, 1: Ἡ δὲ γῆ ἡ Λοκρῶν τῶν καλουμένων Ὀζοιῶν προσεχὴς τῇ Φωκίδι ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν Κίρραν. And consonantly Strabo (IX, 416), describing the area as part of western Phocis, remarks on Λοκρίς, which διττὴ ἐστὶ, διηρημένη ὑπὸ τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ δίχα· ἡ μὲν τοῦ ἐσπερίου μέρους παρακειμένη τῷ Παρνασσῷ καὶ μέρος αὐτοῦ νεμομένη, καθήκουσα δ' ἐπὶ τὸν Κρισαῖον κόλπον 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 ἴδρυται 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 Δελφῶν) ἐστὶ τὰ ἐσπεριώτατα μέρη τῆς Φωκίδος, a natural starting place for the description of the land (*ibid.*). The harbour [3] then laid just as the border between the Phoecean 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 Phoecean centers, *Iliad* B 519-20:

οἱ Κυπάρισσον ἔχον Πυθῶνά τε πετρήεσσαν

Κρίσάν τε ζαθέην, -----

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 οὐδ' ὅσα φασὶν

Ἴλιον ἐκτῆσθαι, εὐναιόμενον πτολίεθρον,

τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν,

οὐδ' ὅσα ῥαΐνος οὐδὸς ἀφήτορος ἐντὸς ἔργει  
 Φοίβου Ἀπόλλωνος, Πυθοῖ ἐνι πετρῆσση.

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 δὴ φρονέω τεύξιν περικαλλέα νηόν,  
 ἔμμεναι ἀνθρώποις χρηστήριον, οἳ τέ μοι αἰεὶ  
 ἐνθάδ' ἀγινήσουσι τεληέσσας ἑκατόμβας,  
 ἡμὲν ὅσοι Πελοπόννησον πείραν ἔχουσιν,  
 ἡδ' ὅσοι Εὐρώπην τε καὶ ἀμφιρύτας κατὰ νήσους,  
 χρυσόμενοι etc.

Men, cattle and rich gifts were continuously offered to the God and augmented his treasures. When the Cretan future ministrants 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 Νήπιοι ἄνθρωποι, δυστήμονες, οἳ μελεδῶνας  
 βούλησθ' ἀργαλέους τε πόνους καὶ στείνεα θυμῷ·  
 ρηΐδιον ἔπος ὕμῳ ἔρέω καὶ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θήσω.  
 δεξιτερῇ μάρ' ἕκαστος ἔχων ἐν χειρὶ μάχαιραν,  
 σφάζειν αἰεὶ μῆλα· τὰ δ' ἄφθονα πάντα παρέσται,  
 ὅσα ἐμοί κ' ἀγάγωσι περικλυτὰ φῦλ' 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 Πυθωνί κε τεκμήραιο.

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.:

Μοῦσ' ἄρ' αἰδοὺν ἀνῆκεν αἰδέμεναι κῆέα ἀνδρῶν,  
οἴμης τῆς τότε ἄρα κῆέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἴκανε,  
νεῖκος Ὀδυσσοῦ καὶ Πηλεΐδew Ἀχιλλῆος,  
ὥς ποτε δηρίσαντο θεῶν ἐν δαιτὶ θαλῆϊν  
ἐκπάγησις ἐπέεσσιν, ἄναξ δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων  
χαῖρε νόω, ὅ τ' ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν δηριόωντο.  
ᾠς γὰρ οἱ χρεῖων μυθήσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων  
Πυθοῖ ἐν ἡγαθήῃ, ὅθ' ὑπέρβη *ῥαῖνον οὐδὸν*  
χρησόμενος· τότε γάρ ῥα κυλίνδετο πῆματος ἀρχή  
Τρωσί τε καὶ Δαναοῖσι Διὸς μεγάλῃου διὰ βουλήας.

(*Τότε* γάρ refers to the time when Agamemnon visited the oracle; it was at the beginning of the glorious enterprise. Διὸς μεγάλῃου διὰ βουλήας – Zeus having resolved to destroy the impious, unjust race of men, whose abominations were a burden onto earth). The *ῥαῖνος οὐδός* 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.:

ᾠς εἰπὼν διέθηκε θεμελίδια Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων  
εὐρέα καὶ μάλα μακρὰ δινεκές· αὐτὰρ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς  
*ῥαῖνον οὐδὸν* ἔθηκε Τροφώνιος ἡδ' Ἀγαμήδης,  
υἱέες Ἐργίνου, φίλοι ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν·

ἀμφὶ δὲ νηὸν ἔνασσαν ἀθέσφατα φύῃ' ἀνθρώπων  
 ξεστοῖσιν (Ernesti pro mss. κτιστοῖσιν) ῥάεσσιν, ἀοίδιμον  
 ἔμμεναι αἰεὶ.

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 ἀφήτορος (*Ilias* I, 404) most ancient commentators accepted it as an *epitheton Apollinis*, either deriving it from ἀφιέναι (sc. τοὺς ἰοὺς, τὰ βέη), Apollo being generally so called ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν βεῆων ἀφέσεως; or connecting it with φημί and the oracular faculty of Apollo in Delphes specifically, construing ἀφήτωρ as equivalent to ὁμοφήτωρ, ὁμοίως πᾶσι προφητεύοντος καὶ μαντευομένου, τῷ τε πένντι καὶ τῷ πληυσίῳ. Thus the *Sch. D* and the *Etym. M* s.v. (where significantly a third association is mentioned, namely Apollo as ἥλιος throws down, sends, hurls his vivificatory rays – a connection again with ἀφίημι). Similarly Hesychius has two successive entries:

ἀφητορεῖα· μαντεῖα  
 ἀφήτορος· προφητεύοντος ἢ τοξότου.

*Suda* s.v. opts for the second interpretation, explaining οὐ κοινότερον (i.e. not an epitheton of Apollo in general) ἀλλὰ τοῦ Πυθίου (sc. Ἀπόλλωνος), οἷον ὁμοφήτορος, διὰ τὸ οἷον εἰς ῥήγους ἔρχεσθαι τοῖς χρησμοδουμένοις. (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: ἢ τοῦ πολυφήτορος, τούτεστι τοῦ πολλὰς φήμας ἀφιέντος· ὃ καὶ ἄμεινον – 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 acceptation mentioned here (also to be found in *Sch. A and*

Τ: οἱ μὲν ἀσαφήτορος, evidently supposedly from ἀσαφῶς φάναι. But how exactly? Unless the *a* 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 ἵππων ξανθὰ κάρηνα 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-ἔτυμον of both ἴημι and φημί is the same: from -Fn- we have Fi-Fn-μι and so ἴημι, as well as βη- (hence βάζω, βάξις, Βάκχος etc., cf. Part I of my inquiry into the Eleusinian Mysteries), and, with consonant change from μέσον to δασύ, φη-μι; speech being *send out* and *forth* from the mouth just as, and with, the air breathed out (cf. the ἔπος that φύγεν ἔρκος ὀδόντων; and even psyche does exactly the same on dying). – That ἴημι often has in metre the first syllable long is evidence of the root δίγαμμα; otherwise it would metrically be corrected whatever it naturally was, as the ἰσχνός sound of -ι- could not sustain production before a long vowel; that the ι-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 Γῆωσσογράφοι ἀφήτορα (pro ἀφητόρας, with Villosion) ἔδοξαν ἡέγεσθαι τὴν (better τὸν) στροφέα τῆς θύρας [4]. *Sch. A* add interesting information. On the one hand there was a διπλῆ attached to v. 404; and the *Sch.* explain: ἡ διπλῆ πρὸς τοὺς γῆωσσογράφους, ἀφήτορος τοῦ στροφέως ἀποδιδόντας. καὶ Ζηνόδοτος δὲ οὕτως ἐκδέδεκται τὸν γὰρ ἐξῆς μετέγραφε νηοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. (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 Iliadic Scholia).

Zenodotus adopted unwarranted high-handed treatment of the locus: in order to interpret ἀφήτορος as στροφέως, he changed the Φοίβου Ἀπόλλωνος of the next verse into νηοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. Even so, one wonders what to do with the unacceptable harshness of a construction which would necessitate ἡδίνος οὐδὸς ἀφήτορος νηοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, “what is enclosed within by the stone threshold of the hinge of the temple of Apollo”. This is indigestible. Ἀφήτωρ 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, illumining, as the case may be, in physical or mental reality.*

The First Holy War (the Crissaeon 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 (γυμνικὸς ἀγών), with prizes from the spoils of war (χρηματίτης ἀγών ἀπὸ τῶν ἡαφύρων). The *Chronicum Parium*, §38, in the entry following the one previously mentioned, gives 582 BC as the year when the στεφανίτης ἀγών (participants contesting for the crown of victory rather than for material prizes) was *restituted* or repeated: ἀφ’ οὗ ἔν Δεῖφοις ἰὸ στεφανίτης ἀγών *πάλην* ἐτέθη etc. By implication the χρηματίτης ἀγών of 591 was then an exception, caused by the circumstances of the war. (And so one understands the emphasis of καὶ δὲ

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 ἀγών 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 Cirfis six years after Crissa's fall. And so the *scholion d* maintains, with the characterization of this festivity as a στεφανίτης ἀγών. (*Scholion b* can be construed in a way that leaves the question open whether the 582 Games could not be meant: μετὰ δὲ χρόνον ἑξαετῇ καταγωνισαμένων τῶν μετὰ τοῦ Ἰννίδα (the Thessalian General left in charge of the operations against the Crissaeans that survived) τοὺς ὑποῆλειμμένους τῶν Κιρραίων, ..., ὕστερον καὶ στεφανίτην ἔθεντο κατορθώσαντες. Vol. II p. 3.15.8). Pausanias, however, explains that the Pythian agons were prize-winning contests (X, 7, 2: ἄθῃα ἔθεσαν). In 586 BC (= on the third year of the 48<sup>th</sup> Olympiad), the *Amphictyons* held a χρηματίτης ἀγών (ἄθῃα ἔθεσαν) with additional musical and, for the first time, athletic contests (§§4-5). They instituted the στεφανίτης ἀγών in the next Pythiad (582 BC), §5: δευτέρᾳ δὲ Πυθιάδι οὐκ ἐπὶ ἄθῃοις ἐκάθυσαν ἔτι ἀγωνίζεσθαι, στεφανίτην δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἀπὸ τούτου κατεστήσαντο. 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: ᾄσαι ὕμνον (παιᾶνα) εἰς τὸν θεόν, this being the ἀρχαιότατον ἀγώνισμα (Pausanias), ὁ ἀρχαῖος ἀγών (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 Δεῖφοις κιθαρωδῶν ἐγενήθη, παιᾶνα ῥδόντων εἰς τὸν θεόν· ἔθηκαν δὲ Δεῖφοι· μετὰ δὲ τὸν Κρισαῖον πόλεμον οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες ἵππικὸν καὶ γυμνικὸν ἐπ' Εὐρυλόχου διέταξαν στεφανίτην καὶ Πύθια ἐκάλεσαν. προσέθεσαν δὲ τοῖς κιθαρωδοῖς αὐλητάς τε καὶ κιθαριστὰς χωρὶς ᾠδῆς 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 ἀγῶνα· χρήμασι γὰρ μόνοις τοὺς νικήσαντας ἐτίμων (the general practice), οὕτω 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 phrase without the definite article ὁ: ἀφ' οὗ ἰὲν Δεῖφοις Ἰστυφανίτης ἀγών πύθιν ἐτέθη etc. But this is again a little less unnatural to interpret as he wants: ex quo rursum Pythium certamen aliquod 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 phrase 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. Aboriginally, the citharoedic contest was ἐννεατηρικός ἀγών, 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 coluntur, *Delphis quoque ludī, qui vocantur Pythia, post annum octavum olim conficiebantur*. 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): ἐτεῖνετο δὲ ὁ ἀγών καταρχὰς μὲν διὰ ἐννεατηρίδος, <ὅτ'> ἔκτισαν δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες Εὐρυπλόχου τοῦ Θεσσαλοῦ θέντος αὐτὸν μετέστη ἰδὲ εἰς πεντατηρίδα <...>. Drachmann secludes "ἔκτισαν ... θέντος αὐτὸν", 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 πεντατηρίδα something like: <ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν θέρει> διὰ τὸ τὰς Παρνασίδας νύμφας Ἀπόλλωνι κτείναντι τὸ θηρίον τὰς ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὀπώρας 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 *Scholia* 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, *Ἀθηναίων 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 equence 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 octaeric 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 Cirfis goes on. Besides the octacteric rule is still valid.

586 B.C. Six (inclusive) years after the capture of Crissa, the Crissaeans on Mount Cirfis succumb. A Pythiad is celebrated by the Amphictyons, again *extra ordinem*. Prize-winning contests include athletic games. The Amphictyons resolve on a pentateric Pythic 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 Crissaeen 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 Phocian 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 facie* 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. LIII Meineke = Scholion b, p. 3.19 sqq. Drachmann:

ὀπιότερου τ' Ἀχιλλῆος ἀκούομεν Εὐρυλόχοιο,  
 Δελφίδες ᾧ ὑπο κατὸν Ἰήϊον ἀντεβόησαν  
 <Κρίσαν> πορθήσαντι, Λυκωρέος οἰκία Φοίβου.

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 participated in the war; its leader was Alcmaeon according to the Delphic Records. The Alcmaeonids were ἐναγείς, i.e. implicated in the Κυθώνειον ἄγος, by virtue of the role played in it by Megacles, Alcmaeon's father. Sometime in the very beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> 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 Κυθώνειον ἄγος 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 Callisthenean 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' *Πρεσβευτικός* ([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: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τῶν Μεγαρέων ἐπιμενόντων (after their initial set back) πολλὰ καὶ δρῶντες ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ 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 ἀπιοτοὶ ἄνδρες, indicates a period of Argive preeminence in Peloponnesus, which would nicely fit with the second half of the 7<sup>th</sup> 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 μακρόν τινα καὶ δυσχερῆ πόληον οἱ ἐν ἄστει περὶ τῆς Σαλαμινίων νήσου Μεγαρεῦσι πολημοῦντες ἐξέκαμον καὶ νόμον ἔθεντο μήτε γράψαι τινὰ μήτ' εἰπεῖν αὐθις, ὥς χρὴ τὴν πόλιν ἀντιποιεῖσθαι τῆς Σαλαμίνος ἢ 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, *Ἀθ. Πολ.* XIII, 4: ἦσαν δ' αἱ στάσεις (= parties) τρεῖς· μία μὲν τῶν παραλίων, ὧν προειστίκει Μεγακλῆς ὁ Ἀἰκμέωνος, οἵπερ ἐδόκουν μάλιστα διώκειν τὴν μέσων 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 aristocratical traditionalist in his views and habits of life. Peisistratus 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 Amphietyonic Council to declare the First Sacred War (Plutarch, *ibid.*, XI; Aristotle confirmed as much in his *Πυθιονικῶν Ἀναγραφὴ*, 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 (ἑταῖροι), 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 ἀριστίνδην δικάζόντων). 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 Crissaeans 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



phyletic 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 Oitaeans, 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 Cierion. 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 Amphyctyony). The other two northern members are the Magnesians in the eastern sea-coast and peninsula and the Perrhaebioi 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 road 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, Ἴόνες, might have been supposed to refer to the aboriginal Ἀῶνες 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 Ἀχιλλεύς (*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 legitimized the ThessaloAthenian 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, *Crissaeen*) 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 valey, the lower Spercheios valley and Thessaly. To the east, the famous οχιστὴ ὁδός 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 lied just opposite the Crissaeen 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 Κηισθένειος, as having been built from the spoils of the Crissaeen war that he waged together (side by side) with the Amphictyons: ὠκοδόμησε δὲ ἀπὸ ἡαφύρων ὁ Κηισθένης αὐτὴν τὸν πρὸς Κίρραν πόηεμον συμπολεμήσας Ἀμφικτυόσι. That Eurylochos was commander in chief of the Amphictyonic army is beyond reasonable doubt (Euphorion Fr. 80 Powell; Scholia in Pindar *Hypothesis Pythiorum*; *Epistola 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; *Política* 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: ...Κῆισθένης μιν (sc. the house of Alcmaeon) ὁ Σικυώνιος τύραννος ἐξῆρε, ὥστε πολλῶν ὀνομαστοτέραν γενέσθαι ἐν τοῖσι Ἑλλήσιν ἢ πρότερον ἦν. And 131: ἀμφὶ μὲν κρίσι τῶν μνηστήρων τοσαῦτα ἐγένετο, καὶ οὕτω Ἀλκμεωνίδαι ἐβώσθησαν ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα. 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 chief 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 Adrastus from the city

(67, 1-5). He substituted the hero-worship of a Theban in his place, of Melanippus an arch enemy of Adrastus (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 Adrastus. He changed the names of the three traditional Doric tribes, imposing instead derogatory appellations: the Sow-tribe, the Donkey-tribe, the Pig-tribe (Ὑᾶται, Ὀνεᾶται, Χοιρεᾶται). His own clan he baptized "Leaders of the People" (Ἀρχέηαιοι). 68, 1. It is curious that Aristotle seems to include Cleisthenes' tyranny in a positive characterisation of the entire Orthagorid leadership in Sicyon; 1215b12 sqq.: πηϊστόν γὰρ ἐγένετο χρόνον ἡ περὶ Σικυῶνα τυραννίς, ἡ τῶν Ὀρθαγόρου παίδων καὶ αὐτοῦ Ὀρθαγόρου ἔτη δ' αὕτη διέμεινεν ἑκατόν. τούτου δ' αἴτιον ὅτι τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἐχρῶντο μετρίως καὶ πολλὰ τοῖς νόμοις ἐδούληον, καὶ διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς γενέσθαι κλεισθένης οὐκ ἦν εὐκαταφρόνητος, καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ταῖς ἐπιμελείαις ἐδημαγώγουν etc. *It would seem that Cleisthenes' policies reflected the people's tendencies.*

In his Delphic strategy, however, Cleisthenes suffered severe setback. Asking the Oracle for confirmation of his anti-Dorian, anti-Argive, anti-Adrastus policies, he received the harsh and contemptuous answer that Adrastus is a real king of the Sicyonians, whereas he is a mere stone-thrower, a mere light soldier; 67, 2: ἐνθὼν δὲ ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐχρηστηριάζετο εἰ ἐκβάηοι τὸν Ἄδρηστον ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρᾶ φᾶσα Ἄδρηστον μὲν εἶναι Σικυωνίων βασιλέα, ἐκείνον δὲ ἡευστήρα. The Delphic priesthood naturally did not struggle to get independent of Crissa in order to place the sanctuary under the controlling influence of any particular power, especially of any neighbouring state, like Sicyon or, later, Phocis. The point of the Amphictyonic arrangement was that it suited best the permanent interests of the Apollonian priesthood, while serving also the temporal interests of willing strong players at the moment of its institution as an umbrella for the Delphic phenomenon. The Amphictyony was an unwieldy, loose and distant

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. Thessaly 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 foreign policy towards the turn of the centuries strikes one the Sigeion 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 Sigeion, 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 43<sup>rd</sup> 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 AeginetoAthenean 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 Ἐλευσινίοις μάχης πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἀπέθανε μὲν Ἐρεχθεὺς Ἀθηναίων βασιλεὺς, ἀπέθανε δὲ Ἰμμάραδος Εὐμόλῃου· καταλύονται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖσδε τὸν πόλεμον, ὥς Ἐλευσινίους ἐς τὰ ἄλλα Ἀθηναίων κατηκούς ὄντας ἰδίᾳ τελεῖν τὴν τελετήν. 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 adduce 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 Ἀθηναίοισι μάχης πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας ἐν Ἐλευσίνι βοηθήσας καὶ τροπὴν ποιήσας τῶν πολεμίων ἀπέθανε κάλλιστα. The ἀστυγείτονας 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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 Pheidonean-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 Euboic stater (divided into thirds, sixth etc.) weighted 17.2 gr., leading to an assumed [1 dr] = 5.7 gr. The Euboic 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. Seltman'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,  $70 \times 6,1 = 427$  gr. in silver. And this is what Aristotle tells us in *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, X, 2: καὶ ἡ μὲν πρότερον ἔχλουσα ἰσिताθμὸν ἑβδομήκοντα δραχμάς, ἀνεπληρώθη ταῖς ἑκατόν, so that it was made  $70+30 = 100$  new δραχμαί. (No need really to correct with Blass to τριάκοντα in place of ἑκατόν. A well known fact was and is readily understood by the phrase). The same is testified by Plutarch, *Solon*, XV, 4: ἑκατὸν γὰρ ἐποίησε δραχμῶν τὴν μὲν πρότερον ἑβδομήκοντ' ἄγουσαν. (Adopting, that is, the brilliant correction of T. Reinach in place of the transmitted text ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ τριῶν οὔσαν. The ἄγουσαν is moreover a stylistic improvement on οὔσαν, esp. in Plutarch. The occasion of the error is furthermore readily understood: ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑΓΟΥΣΑΝ became ἑβδομήκοντα (καὶ) γ' οὔσαν. 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 10<sup>th</sup> chapter to contradict Androtion's account, as related by Plutarch, *Solon*, XV, 3-4 = Androtion 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 CorinthoEuboeian 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. Settleman, *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 (αὔξειν) of measures, weights and currency in Solon's reforms. He first then states that measures became μείζω τῶν Φειδωνίων. He goes on to explain the monetary amendment. Finally he comes to the weight system: ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ σταθμὰ πρὸς τὸ νόμισμα, τριπλεῖς καὶ ἑξήκοντα μνᾶς τὸ τάλαντον ἀγούσας (vel ἄγον with Herwerden and Papabasilou), καὶ ἐπιδιενεμήθησαν ἰαὶ τριπλεῖς μναὶ τῷ στατήρι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις 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  $60 \times 60 \times 6.1 = 21.960$  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 6<sup>th</sup> century Athens there indeed prevailed a weight standard of 378-397.5 gr. (Cf. P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, 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 6<sup>th</sup> 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 gainsaing 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 σεῖσάχεια 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 ἀποκοπήν χρεῶν, 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! (ὠφεηῖσθαι μὲν τοὺς ἐκτίνοντας μεγάλα, μηδὲν δὲ βλάπτεσθαι τοὺς κομιζομένους). 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.~~ <sup>productive</sup>

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 ὁρῶν γηίσχρως τοῖς γεωργοῦσι διαρκοῦσαν... §1: ...τὰ δὲ πλεῖστα τῆς χώρας ἀγεννῆ καὶ φαῦλα... To stir economic activity Solon therefore promoted artisanship, (§1) πρὸς τὰς τέχνας ἔτρεψε τοὺς πολῖτας, (§3) ταῖς τέχναις ἀξιώματα 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 πολῖτας, καὶ νόμον ἔγραψεν, υἱῷ τρέφειν πατέρα μὴ διδασκόμενον τέχνην ἐπ'ἀνάγκης 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 ἀξιώματα περιέθηκεν, καὶ τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλήν ἔταξεν ἐπισκοπεῖν ὅθεν ἕκαστος ἔχει τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, καὶ τοὺς ἀργοὺς κοινάζειν). 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: ὁρῶν δὲ τὸ μὲν ἄστὺ πημπλήμενον ἀνθρώπων ἀεὶ συρρεόντων πανταχόθεν ἐπ' 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: ...ὁ τῶν δημοποιήτων νόμος, ὅτι γενέσθαι πολίτας οὐ δίδωσι πῆλιν τοῖς φεύγουσιν ἀειφυγία τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἢ πανεστίοις Ἀθήναζε μετοικιζομένοις ἐπὶ τέχνῃ. τοῦτο δὲ ποιῆσαι φασιν αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν Σόλωνα) οὐχ οὕτως ἀπεληύοντα τοὺς ἄλλους, ὥς κατακαλοῦμενον Ἀθήναζε τούτους ἐπὶ βεβαίῳ τῷ μεθέξειν τῆς πολιτείας, καὶ ἅμα πιστοὺς νομίζοντα τοὺς μὲν ἀποβεβηκότας τὴν ἑαυτῶν διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην, τοὺς δ' ἀποηληιοπότας διὰ τὴν γνώμην.

This is a set of measures meant to stimulate enterprize, competition and productivity in manufacture and trade. Clearly we have to do with the policy of the Party of Enterprize (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 enterpreunerial 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

fre

LA

vases during the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> 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, *Ἀθηναίων 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 Σόλωνατος τὸν ὄγδοον ἔχει τῶν νόμων οὕτως αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασι γεγραμμένον: "ἀτίμων ὅσοι ἄτιμοι ἦσαν πρὶν ἢ Σόλωνα ἄρξαι, ἐπιτίμους εἶναι, πᾶν ὅσοι ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου ἢ ὅσοι ἐκ τῶν Ἐφετῶν ἢ ἐκ Πρυτανείου καταδικασθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ φόνῳ ἢ σφαγαῖσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ἔφευγον ὅτε ὁ θεσμός ἐφάνη ὁδε". 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): Σόλων δὲ τοῖς πράγμασι τοὺς νόμους μᾶλλον 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 (*Ἀθηναίων 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 Eupatrids (i.e. the aristocracy of landowners), three farmers and two artisans; (*loc. cit.*, 2): εἴτ' ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ στασιάζειν, ἄρχοντας ἐθέσθαι δέκα, πέντε μὲν εὐπατριδῶν, τρεῖς δὲ ἀγροίκων, δύο δὲ δημιουργῶν, καὶ οὗτοι τὸν μετὰ Δαμασίαν ἦρξαν ἐνιαυτόν.

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 particulare 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 7<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> 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 διήγημα τὸ κατὰ τὸν Κύβωνα θαυμάζει σφόδρα ὁ τεχνογράφος καὶ συμβουλεύει ἐπιμελέστατα αὐτὸ ἐκμαθεῖν τοὺς νέους, ἵνα μιμήσωνται. And secondly: ὅτι τοῦ διηγήματος τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Κύβωνα τὴν σαφήνειαν τινες θαυμάσαντες, εἶπον ὅτι κλέων ἐγέλασεν ἐνταῦθα, λέγοντες 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 conciseness – just as if the terrible king of animals were once to smile. (So, correctly, Valckenaer on *Herodotus* V, 71). The φοβερόν is aptly associated with Thucydides by Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Epist. ad Pomp.* p. 210.3: Καὶ αἱ μὲν αἱ ποιήσεις ἀμφοτέραι - διαφέρουσι δὲ κατὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα ἀληθῶς, ὅτι τὸ μὲν Ἡροδότου κἀκὸς ἱθαρόν ἐστι, φοβερόν δὲ τὸ Θουκυδίδου. – As to the former entry, ὁ τεχνογράφος is the *theoretician of the rhetoric art par excellence*. Maybe Theon was considered such, as Stephanus surmised (Sch. on *Scholia Thucydeia ad loc.*) referring to his *Progymnasmata*: χρὴ τὸν διδάσκαλον ἐκάστου γυμνάσματος εὖ ἔχοντα, παραδείγματα ἐκ τῶν παιδιῶν συγγραμμάτων ἀναληγόμενον προστάττειν τοῖς νέοις ἐκμανθάνειν – 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 Thucydean notion that the safeguard included assurance as to absolute exemption from all harm and maltreatment (ἀναστήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς οἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι τὴν φυλακὴν, ὡς ἐώρων ἀποθνήσκοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐφ' ᾧ μηδὲν κακὸν ποιήσουσι, 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-aristophanoscholiast testimony as to the prescription of a δίκη (before the plenipotentary Lord-council, the Areopagus) rather than with the Herodotean account of an ὑπεγγυότατα νῆην θανάτου. – 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' ἐώρων αὐτοὺς οἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτετραμμένοι ἀποθνήσκοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἀναστήσαντες, ἐφ' ᾧ μηδὲν κακὸν ποιήσουσι, 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* coerces us Thucydeanwisely. – In I, 103, Thucydides employs ξυνέβησαν ... ἐφ' ᾧ etc. in the same sense (on condition that, hoc pacto, hac lege, cf. also I, 113 ἐφ' ᾧ τοὺς ἄνδρας κομιοῦνται). 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 reliant 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 Κρίσα and the later Κίρρα; so Pausanias X, 37, 5: Λέγεται δὲ ἐς τὴν Κίρραν <...> καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Κίρρας (the name of a heroine apparently or some historic woman) τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν τεθῆναι τῷ χωρίῳ φασιν. Ὅμηρος μέντοι Κρίσαν ἐν τε Ἰλιάδι ὁμοίως καὶ Ὕμνῳ τῷ ἐν Ἀπόλλωνι ὀνόματι τῷ ἐξ ἀρχῆς καλεῖ τὴν πόλιν. (v. Hom. Hymn. In *Apoll.* 282, 431, 438, 445). A distinction between χωρίον and πόλις must not be assumed regarding nomenclature: Κρισαῖον πεδῖον is commonest appellation. Strabo (IX p. 418) speaks of *two towns*, Κίρρα and further to the east, still within the Crissaeen gulf, Κρίσα. He was singular in this as Eustathius (ad *Iliad* B, p. 273) indicates: ὁ δὲ γεωγράφος (sc. par excellence, i.e. Strabo) λέγει: ...ὥστε κατ' αὐτὸν ἑτέρα ἡ Κρίσσα καὶ ἑτέρα ἡ Κίρρα. This opinion on the duality of the towns is recognized by Stephanus Byz. s.v. Κρίσα: τινὲς τὴν αὐτὴν τῇ Κίρρα φασιν. Its negation

is peremptorily affirmed by the *Etym.M.* s.v. Κῖρρα - ἡ αὐτὴ Κῖρρα καὶ Κίρρα. But Plinius concurs with Strabo. In his delineation of the Locrian and Phocian territory, besides vividly portraying the boundary line passing just to the west limit of *Cirrhaei Phocidis campi* (IV, 3(4), §7), he details: ultra Cirrhaei Phocidis campi, oppidum *Cirrha*, portus Chalaëon (exaggeratedly called by *Stephanus Byz.* s.v., πόλις Λοκρῶν, by virtue of the proximity and maybe the tribal origination of the inhabitants; it must have been to the west of Cirrha, being her port-area strictly meant. Its place is probably occupied by modern Itea, appropriately located as to the modern Cirrha, too), a quo VII p. introrsus liberum oppidum Delphi sub monte Parnaso, clarissimi in terris oraculi Apollinis. Fons Castallius, amnis Cephissus praefluens Delphos, ortus in Lilaëa urbe (v. Homer, *Ilias* B, 523; Strabo, IX p. 407. But it is *Pleistos*, not Cephissus, that passes between Delphi and Cirphis, 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: Ἦκουσα δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τοιόνδε, τὸ ὕδωρ τῇ *Κασταλῖᾳ* ποταμοῦ δῶρον εἶναι τοῦ Κηφισοῦ. Τοῦτο ἐποίησε καὶ Ἀῆκας, ἐν προοίμῳ τῷ ἐς Ἀπόλλωνα. βεβαιοῦνται δὲ οὐκ ἥκιστα οἱ *Λιθαίει*, οἱ ἐς τοῦ Κηφισοῦ τὴν πηγὴν πέμματα ἐπιχώρια καὶ ἄλλα ὅποσα νομίζουσιν ἀφ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐν τισιν εἰρημέναις ἡμέραις, καὶ αὖθις ἐν τῇ *Κασταλῖᾳ* φασὶν αὐτὰ ἀναφαίνεσθαι. quondam praeterea oppidum *Crise*, et etc.

Now Cirrha was located by the sea, Strabo, IX p. 418: ὑποπέτωκε δὲ τῇ Κίρρῃ πόλις ἀρχαία Κίρρα, ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ ἰδρυμένη, ἀφ' ἧς ἀνάβασις εἰς Δελφοὺς ὁδοῦντα που σταδίων. What is added, "ἰδρυταὶ δ' ἀπαντικρὺ Σικυῶνος" bespeak considerable error if co-meridianism is implied; but if we extend a straight line, from Sicyon in a N-NW direction we reach Cirrha over sea running tangentially parallel to the W. coast of the chersonesos between Cirrha and Anticyra. Probably there was also such a distribution of sea- and wind-currents that made the passage natural and easy. Philip, the Macedonian king, having been in Phocis, goes straight to Sicyon's harbour from Cirrha, Polybius V, 27: ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀναχθεὶς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ Κίρραν τόπων κατέπλευσε μετὰ τῶν ὑποσιπῶν εἰς τὸν τῶν Σικυωνίων λιμένα, etc. – The direction Kirrha – Sikyon is parallel to that of Anticyra – Lechaëon, another sea-road channel: v. Pausanias X, 37, 3: κεῖται δὲ ἐπὶ ὕψηλοῦ τε ἡ Βοῦθις καὶ ἐν παράπῳ περαιουμένοις ἐξ Ἀντικύρας ἐς Λέχαιον τὸ Κορινθίων (Lechaëon was Corinth's port on the side of the Corinthian gulf).

Kirrha was on the mouth of *Pleistos*, Pausanias X, 8, 8: τραπομένῳ δὲ ἐς ἀριστερὰν ἀπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίου (sc. τῶν Δελφῶν) καὶ ὑποκαταβάντι οὐ πῆχον, ἔμοι δοκεῖν, ἢ τρία στάδια, ποταμός ἐστιν ὀνομαζόμενος Πῆϊστος· οὗτος ὁ Πῆϊστος ἐπὶ Κίρραν τὸ ἐπίνειον Δελφῶν καὶ τῇ ταύτῃ κάτεισι θάλασσαν. Higher up, as Pausanias continues, is the sacred spring Castalia; whose waters flowing down really mingle with *Pleistos'* stream. Cirrha as the ἐπίνειον Δελφῶν is also clearly meant by Livius XLII, 15. Delphi's main port, at the innermost part of the bay, was Crise (earlier) or Cirrha (later), whether that involved a short transposition in its actual location or not.

- [4] *Στροφεύς* 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 cardinalis* of the Romans, *Vitruvius*, IV, 6, 4) working in a socket on the threshold); v. Aristophanes, *Danaiides* Fr. 251 D = 263 Bl. (apud *Suda* s.v. αὔθειος):

πρὸς τὸν στροφέα τῆς αὔθειας (sc. θύρας) σχίνου κεφαλὴν

κατορύττειν

(cf. Theophr. *Hist. Pl.* VII, 12: ῥέγεται δὲ καὶ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τῆς εἰσόδου φυτευθεῖσαν (sc. τὴν σκίαν vel σχίνον) ἀνεξητήριον εἶναι τῆς ἐπιφερομένης δολήσεως. Pythagoras, according to Plinius *N.H.* XX.9.39, *scillam in limine quoque januae suspensam* malorum medicamentorum introitum pellere tradit). Similarly Hermippus in *Μοῖραι* Fr. II Meineke (vol. II p. 398), in Athenaus XV p. 668a (and, partly, XI 487e)

τὴν δὲ τάλαιναν πῆλσιγγ' (part of the apparatus for κότταβος)

ἄν' ἴδοις

παρὰ τὸν στροφέα τῆς κηπαίας (sc. θύρας)

ἐν τοῖσι κορήμασιν οὔσαν.

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 *στροφεύς* clear. Thus Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 487:

Ἐγὼ δὲ καταχέασα τοῦ στροφέως ὕδωρ  
ἐξῆλθον ὡς τὸν μοιχόν. -----

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 percipiat fieri, mea Planesium.  
Mane, *suffundam aquulam*. PALINURUS. Viden' ut anus tremula  
medicimam facit?

Eapse merum condidicit bibere, foribus dat aquam quam bibant.

Noticeable it is that Plautus speaks plurarily of *cardines*, while the Greeks talk consistently of a *στροφεύς* 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. Mer.* XI (vol. III p. 314): τὴν αὐθιὸν εὖρον ἀποκεκλισμένην ἐπιμελῶς... οὐκ ἔκοψα δ' οὖν (it was dead of night) ὁρῶν' ἐπ' ἀρας ἡρέμα τὴν θύραν (ἦδη δὲ καὶ ἄρῃστε ἐπεποιήκειν αὐτό) παραγαγὼν τὸν στροφέα παρήλθον ἀψοφῆντί· he raised the door unhinging the pivot from the socket, and by this dislocation he entered noiselessly. To be remarked that though *στροφεύς* – *cardo* – hinge signify the entire elementary mechanism whereby a solid is being moved preserving immutable points of contact (constraints) with another solid, yet either 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 *παρὰθεις*; and similarly in Virgil's *Ciris* 222:

marmoreo *aeratus stridens* in limine *cardo*.

While in Sextus Empiricus *adv. Math.* X, 54 the identification *στροφεύς* = pivot is explicit and complete: ὁ κατὰ τοῦ ὀημίσκου (the small cavity, socket) βεβηκὼς *στροφεύς* – 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 ὥσπερ ἦδη τις *στροφεύς* τῆς θύρας ἐβλήσθησε, *στροφεύς* must be the wooden pivot, as the socket was formed in the threshold stone. In Polybius VII, 16, 5: οὗτοι μὲν ἔξωθεν προσπεσόντες πειρῶνται διακόπτειν τοὺς *στροφεῖς* καὶ τὸ ζύγωμα τῶν πυλῶν, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὸν μοχλὸν ἐνδοθεν καὶ τὰς βαλάνγγας, the *στροφεῖς* are the entire hinges again, and *διακόπτειν* τοὺς *στροφεῖς* is unhinge the door by dislocating the hinges.

What Polybius calls *διακόπτειν* τοὺς *στροφεῖς* is rendered, in an exactly analogous case, as *ὑποτεμεῖν* τοὺς *στροφίγγας* by Plutarch, *Romulus*, 23: Φιδήνας δὲ εἶπεν (sc. ὁ Ρωμύλιος), ἀστυγείτονα τῆς Ρώμης πόλιν, ὡς μὲν ἐνιοί φασιν ἐξαίφνης τοὺς ἱππέας πέμψας καὶ κελεύσας *ὑποτεμεῖν* τῶν πυλῶν τοὺς *στροφίγγας*, εἶτα ἐπιφανεῖς αὐτὸς ἀπροσδοκῆτως. *Στροφίγξ* is no doubt here the pivot. Cf. Galenus, *de Usu Part.* I, 15. In the same sense the σφόνδυλοι (vertebrae) are assimilated to *στροφίγγες* in Plato, *Timaeus* 74A, and in 74B *στροφίγξ* are all bone-hinges of the body (the first application is mentioned by Longinus *de Subl.* 32, 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: *στροφίγγες* οἱ τῶν θυρῶν *στροφεῖς*, identifying the two words admirably in this connection, if each σφόνδυλος 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 *nil 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 grammatic or lexicographic evidence), considers the matter more scrupulously in II, 130-2: ἐφέστηκε δὲ σφονδύλοις ἐπὶ τὸ τράχηλος (above the seven superior vertebrae), οὓς Ὅμηρος ἀστραγάλους καλεῖ καὶ σφονδυλίωνα τὸν μυελὸν τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς (referring to *Iliad*, Y, 481-3 and mistaking *σφονδυλίωνα* as attributive to *μυελός*, while it is genitive plural depending on ἔκπαλτο, and σφονδυλίωνα = σπονδυλίωνα:

-----ὁ δὲ φασγάνῳ αὐχένα θείνας  
τῇ αὐτῇ πῆληκι κάρη βάλλει· μυελὸς αὐτε  
σφονδυλίωνα ἔκπαλτο, ὁ δ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ κείτο τανυσθεῖς).

ὀνομάζονται δὲ οἱ σφόνδυλοι καὶ *στροφεῖς*, παρὰ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῆς τοῦ τραχήλου στροφὴν, καὶ *στροφίγγες* παρὰ φερεκράτει... τῶν δὲ σφονδυλίωνα, ὁ μὲν πρῶτος, ὁ σὺν τῷ τραχήλῳ στρεφόμενος *ἐπιστροφεύς* ὀνομάζεται. Ἰπποκράτης δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ὀδόντα δοκεῖ καλεῖν. Τοῖς δὲ

πῆγάσις αὐτοῦ δύο κοιήσῃτες μία ἐκατέρωθεν ἔνδρῃσι, εἰς ἃς ἐνίζουσι ὑπὸ τὴν παρεγκεφαλίδᾳ δύο προὔχουσαι προβοῖαι, κεφαλῆς κορῶναι καλοῦμεναι. τῶν δὲ σφονδύων ὁ δεύτερος, ἀκίνητος ὢν, ἄξων ὀνομάζεται. προβοῖας δὲ ἔχει δύο, μίαν ἐκατέρωθεν, τὴν μὲν τῷ πρώτῳ, τὴν δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ τῶν σφονδύων ἐνηρμοσμένην· καλοῦνται δὲ κάτοχοι. παραπῆσις δὲ ὄντων τῶν ἐπὶ τούτοις τεταγμένων, ὁ τελευταῖος, ὡς ἀχθοφορῶν, Ἀτῆας ὀνομάζεται. Now Hippocrates did not call the first vertebra *ὀδοῦς*, but either the apophysis of the second one, i.e. the odontoid prominence or outgrowth (*processus dentatus*) round which the first vertebra with the entire cranial system turns, or the second vertebra itself as possessing that apophysis; v. Hippocrates *Epid.* II, 2, 24 and Galen, *de usu Part.* 12, 7. So the sentence Ἱπποκράτης ... καθεῖν has condescendingly to be transposed after, say, ἄξων ὀνομάζεται. Pherecrates (*Fragm. Inc.* LXXI b Meineke, vol. II p. 356) called the vertebrae *στρόφιγγες*, like Plato. An ordinary appellation was *στροφεῖς* (cf. also Pollux X, 22); and so was a medicinal one in the case of the foremost: *ἐπιστροφεύς*.

Now with regard to the facts of the case, it should be observed that we have in the case of the head-cum-neck-vertebra system a reversal of the lintel-cum-door axis situation: namely, it is as if the lintel was rotating round a door-axis staying immovable. Instead, also, of the axial pivot moving in an appropriate socket hollowed in the lintel, we have an appendage to the lintel-head secured to it, *the ἐπιστροφεύς*, through which the vertebral pivot, *the ὀδοῦς*, can function as the immovable support for the head movements. It is consequently inaccurate to conceive Pollux' expression "ὀνομάζονται δὲ οἱ σφόνδυοι καὶ στροφεῖς *παρὰ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τοῦ τραχήλου στροφὴν*" as supporting an acceptation of *στροφεύς* that would appropriate the word to the female rather than to the male part of a hinge – and this irrespective of what inference Pollux intended, if any, on this matter.

Furthermore the lower vertebrae *do* in fact act as both pivotal minute axes *and* supportive bases, ingeniously distributing the function of an axe into small parts without breaking the unifying concatenation of the segments and consequent preservation of its wholistic activity.

The γῆώσης στροφή in the mock-invocation of Euripides in *Aristophanes, Ran.* 892 is the hinge of the tongue, that by which its "turning" activity is realized – understanding "turning" exactly in parallel to the previously quoted Aristophanic passage, as both physical movement and deceitful changefulness and tricky multifacedness; cf. *ibid.* 827; *Nubes* 792; Homer, *Iliad* V, 248; Euripides, *Bacchae* 268 (εὐτροχος γῆώσας); and so Plutarch, *Pericles*, 7. Στροφή ἀπὸ τοῦ στρέφειν αὐτὸν καὶ πανουργεῖσθαι say the scholia *ad nostrum loc.* – Στροφή is, again, being used in the ordinary, natural sense (that by means of which something is being turned) in Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1140 sqq., where the description of the ἐπίσημον on Polyneices' shield is given:

----- Ποτριάδες δ' ἐπ' ἀσπίδι  
ἐπίσημα πῶλοι δρομάδες ἐσκίρων φόβῳ,  
εὖ πως *στρόφιγγιν* ἔνδοθεν κυκλούμεναι  
πόρπαχ' ὑπ' αὐτόν, ὥστε μαινέσθαι δοκεῖν.

By means of hinges and an appropriate mechanism on the handle of the shield (πόρπαξ), the wild horses *appended* on the front of the shield were being circularly moved (εὖ πως *στρόφιγγιν κυκλούμεναι*), the impression being given of the unruly, leapish, bouncing, wild, tumultuous movement of phrenzied horses. The ancient scholia here indulge in fantastic interpretations, although the only correct explanation is also given: ἐπίσημον δὲ τῇ ἀσπίδι αὐτοῦ πῶλοι μανικαὶ καὶ ἐπιτήδριοι εἰς δρόμον ἐσκίρων ἐν κινήσει εὐστροφῶ, κατὰ τινα τρόπον στρεφόμεναι μηχαναῖς τισι ἔνδοθεν τῆς ἀσπίδος ὑπ' αὐτόν τὸν πόρπακα; a very good paraphrase indeed. Such devices would have been rare but perspicuous in heroic times; the effect peculiarly impressive, shiveringly tinged with the horror of the monstrous and praeternatural – in those days of glowing immediacy of feeling the world and of majestic simplicity and glorious capaciousness in psychic and spiritual affectedness. Thus in Aeschylus, *Sept. adv. Theb.*, in the similar recension of the seven heroic Princes ready to engage in War, the immaculate, blazing beauty of Parthenopaeos, that lad of full manhood (ἀνδρόπαις ἀνήρ), is pregnantly, provocatively accompanied by cruel intent, terrible eye – and a shield to match:

538. οὐ μὴν ἀκόμπαστος γ' ἐφίσταται πύλαις,  
τὸ γὰρ πόθῃος ὄνειδος ἐν χαλκῇ ἡμάτῳ,  
σάκει, κυκλῶ τῷ σώματος προβήματι,  
Σφίγγ' ὠμόσιτον *προσμηχανημένην*

γόμενοις ἐνώμα, ἡμπερὸν ἔκκρουστον δέμας,  
etc.

The metallic sphinx, embossed (ἔκκρουστον), was appended to the shield through a device (προσ-μεμνησμένην) by means of bolts or nails (γόμενοις); 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 Polyneices' weapon in Euripides. As indeed Eustathius conceives (*Comm. in Iliad* p. 1160.49 sq.): ἴσως δὲ καὶ μηχανῇ τινὶ ἐκινούντο, ἔκκρουστα ὄντα καὶ οὐ διόλου (= absolutely) προσηλωμένα τῷ σάκει. Καὶ οὕτω ἐφάνταζον τοῖς ὁρώσι τὸ αὐτοκίνητον, ὁποῖον δὴ τι πηάττει καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν τοῖς Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας, obviously referring to the passage in question. Cf. the Homeric Θάϊρος (*Iliad*, X, 459).

But the (principal) *στροφεύς*, 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 recompence for his services. He is made to recount his ἐπωνυμίας as testimony to his diverse divine efficacy. At last, he is admitted into the new régime as Ἐναγώνιος, his relevance to all games, musical and, especially gymnastic, 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: Τί δ' ἔστ' ἂν εἴης ὄφελος ἡμῖν ἐνθάδ' ὦν;

ΕΡΜΗΣ: Παρὰ τὴν θύραν *στροφαῖον* ἰδρύσασθέ με.

ΚΑ. *Στροφαῖον*; ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔργον ἔστ' οὐδὲν *στροφῶν*.

*Στροφαῖος* is the epitheton of the divinity presiding over *στροφεύς*, the hinge of doors. But the slave Carion cruelly mocks the needy God, by accepting the word in a roguish and wicked connotation, *στροφή* being, deterioratingly, a turn, a twist, a trick, dodge, a deceit, something devious, crooked, knavish. The Alexandrian *scholia ad loc.*, failing to observe the comic change of meaning, concentrate misleadingly, in explanation of this epitheton, on the crafty and treacherous features of the God, features amply, of course, expressed in his religious appellation Δόλιος. For Mercury's deviousness, roguish multifacedness, propensity to theft, deceitfulness particularly with regard to his words and downright knavery v. the Homeric *Hymn to Herm.* 13-4; 317-8; Hesiod, *Opera* 77 sqq. Thus ad *Στροφαῖον* ἰδρύσασθέ με the Scholia explain: ἐπὶ ἀποτροπῇ τῶν ἀλλήλων κληπτῶν (Hermes being himself archthief already gloriously celebrated as such in the Homeric Hymn in his honour). *Στροφαῖος*, παρὰ τὸ στρέφειν καὶ πανουργεῖν... Ἀλλῶς. *Στροφόν* (such metrical monstrosity *pro* *Στροφαῖον*?), ἐπεὶ *στροφός* (? an *στροφαί* ?) λέγονται οἱ συμπεπλεγμένοι λόγοι καὶ δολεροί. Ἀλλῶς. *Στροφαῖον* ἐκάθουν ἰδρυμένον παρὰ τῇ θύρᾳ τὸν δαίμονα <τὸ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ στρέφειν αὐτὴν> (something of the sort must be added to integrate the obvious meaning; it would apply to the turning of the door in general), ἅμα δὲ παρὰ τὸ *στρέφειν τὰ πράγματα*: οἱ δὲ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες πανοῦργοι λέγονται. And again: ἔστι δὲ ἐπωνυμία Ἑρμοῦ παρὰ τὸ ταῖς θύραις ἰδρύσθαι ἐπὶ φυλακῇ τῶν ἀλλήλων κληπτῶν· οὗτοι γὰρ ὁπίσω τῶν θυρῶν εἰσθᾶσι καὶ ἀναδύεσθαι καὶ ὁῶς πανουργεῦσθαι!

But the syncretic philology of the succeeding era corrected these Alexandrian jejunities. Thus, we read also, *Στροφαῖον*· Πυλωρόν, ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα στρεφόμενον -*πυλωρός*, the gate-keeper, caretaker. And, better, in the *Parisinus* 2827 (whose first scholion to this play ends with the colophon: Σχόλιον τοῦ ἡτοιμασμένου *Μαγίστρου*, no doubt meaning the renowned Byzantine philologist Thomas Magister whose recension we must thus possess in that ms.): *Στροφαῖον*· ἐπωνυμία ἐστὶ τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ· παρὰ τὸ ταῖς θύραις ἰδρύσθαι ἐπὶ φυλακῇ τῶν ἀλλήλων κληπτῶν (this in common with the Alexandrine criticism). *Στροφαῖον* οὖν περὶ τὴν θύραν ἀντὶ τοῦ φύλακα τῆς θύρας (cf. *Πυλωροῦ*) ἀπὸ τῆς *στροφίγγο*. Ὁ δὲ θεράπων (sc. Carion) τὸ *στροφαῖον* ἐπὶ τῶν δορίων καὶ συμπεπλεγμένων λόγων ἐκλαμβάνει· ἐπεὶ σημαίνει καὶ τοῦτο ἡ λέξις· *στροφαῖον* γὰρ φάμεν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν εἰδότα συμπλέκειν καὶ στρέφειν λόγους καὶ μηχανάς. And in this double entendre, Eustathius agrees; *Comm. in Iliad* p. 1353.9 παρὰ τῷ *στροφεῖ* ἰδρυμένος, ἢ ὁ *στροφίς*, sc. ὁ *στρέφων* καὶ ἐξαπατῶν.

The Lexicographers firmly uphold the correct interpretation. Thus Hesychius s.v. *Στροφαῖος*· Ἑρμῆς, ὁ πρὸς ταῖς θύραις ἰδρυμένος· διὰ τὸν τῆς θύρας *στροφέα*. And identically *Etym. Magnum* s.v. *Στροφαῖος*· ὁ παρὰ ταῖς θύραις ἰδρυμένος· Ἑρμῆς· παρὰ τὸν *στροφέα* τῆς θύρας. *Suda*, s.v. has: *Στροφαῖον*· οὕτω ἐκάθουν τὸν παρὰ τῇ θύρᾳ ἰδρυμένον δαίμονα, ἅμα δὲ

παρὰ τὸ στρέφειν τὰ πράγματα· οἱ δὲ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες πανοῦργοι λέγονται. Ἀριστοφάνης Πηλοῦτῳ (*loc.cit.*): παρὰ τὴν θύραν Στροφαῖον ἰδρύσασθαι με. ἐπωνυμία δέ ἐστιν Ἑρμοῦ παρὰ τὸ ταῖς θύραις ἰδρῦσθαι ἐπὶ φυλακῇ τῶν ἀλλήλων κληπτῶν· οὗτοι γὰρ ὀπίσω τῶν θυρῶν εἰώθασιν καὶ ἀναδύεσθαι καὶ ὁῶς πανουργεῦεσθαι. (*I quoted complete Suda's lemma to show that the Thomasian 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. Ἑρμῆς Στροφαῖος· ὁ περὶ (sic codex; παρὰ Salmasius) στρόφιγγι τῆς θύρας ἰδρυμένος. Photius s.v. ὁ Ἑρμῆς Στροφεύς ὁ παρὰ ταῖς θύραις ἰδρυμένος· ἀπὸ τοῦ στροφέως τῆς θύρας. Pollux, VIII, 72: καὶ Στροφαῖος ἐν τῷ οἰκίῳ περὶ τὸν Στροφέα ἰδρυμένος θεός· ἔστι δ' ὁ Ἑρμῆς. 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 *Anecdota Graeca* Vol. II, p. 53.14 on Theognostian evidence, poses a problem. Στρεψαῖος ὁ Ἑρμῆς παρὰ τῷ Ἀριστοφάνει, παρὰ τὸ διεστράφθαι τὰς ὄψεις. There are three possibilities: (that Στρεψαῖος is a mistake for Στροφαῖος and the explanation a mere misunderstanding, is too gross a supposition to be seriously entertained). a) Either in some lost Aristophanic work Hermes is epithetized as Στρεψαῖος and an ambiguity between *Deceitful* 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. Στρέψα· νόησις τῆς Θρόγκης. Καὶ οἱ νοήται Στρεψαῖοι. Στρεψαῖους· Ἀριστοφάνης Γεωργοῖς. Here are two lemmata, one concerning the Thracian city and its inhabitants, the other referring to an Aristophanic joke in his play *Γεωργοί*. The dexterous castigator of the Athenian people's faults and vices may have referred to them under this appellation signalling their strepsidic propensity in litigation and dicolabistic 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:

14 ----- ἡγήτορ' ὀνειρώων,  
νυκτὸς ὀπωπῆτῆρα, πυλῆδόκον, –

There was a Hermes consecrated at the court of Dionysius' the Tyrant palace; Athenaeus, X, 437b teste Timaeo: καὶ Ἰαβῶν (sc. Xenocrates) τὸν χρυσοῦν στέφανον, καὶ ἀνακλῶν (when he was leaving the Symposium), τῷ Ἑρμῇ τῷ ἰδρυμένῳ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλῆς ἐπέθηκεν etc. He must have been located by the αὐλῆσιος θύρα, as *supra*; thus Aelianus who relates the same story, has (*Varia Hist.* II, 41): καὶ τὸν στέφανον Ἰαβῶν, ὅτε ἐπανήει μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον, τῷ Ἑρμῇ τῷ *πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν* ἐστῶτι ἐπέθηκεν αὐτόν, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῶν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν (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 χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ τιμηθέντα ἐπάθη πομπησιᾶς τοῖς Χουσί παρὰ Διονυσίῳ ἐξόντα θεῖναι πρὸς τὸν ἰδρυμένον Ἑρμῆν, ἐνθαπερ τιθέναι καὶ τοὺς ἀνθινοὺς εἰώθει.

Hermes *Πρόναος* (together with Athena Πρόναος) was consecrated at the gate of the temple of Apollo Ismenios in Thebes, Pausanias IX, 10, 2. At the very entrance to the Acropolis was an *Hermes Προπύλαιος*, 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). Alcamenes standardized the form, as must be judged from the numerous copies still extant. The best preserved comes from Pergamus bearing the following inscription:

εἰδῶσις Ἀἰκαμένεος  
περικαλλὲς ἄγαλμα  
Ἑρμῆν τὸν πρὸ πυλῶν· (i.e. the Προπύλαιος in Acropolis)  
εἴσατο Περγάμιος.

(Below which appears the Delphic injunction: Γνώθι Σαυτόν, and underneath the erect pudenda testify to the implicit potency of the consecrated symbol). To this Προπύλαιος Ἑρμῆς is Demosthenes referring *adv. Evergum et Mnesibulum* p. 1146: ὕστερον αὐτῷ περὶ τυχῶν περὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν τὸν πρὸς τῇ Πυλίδι, i.e. by some little portern gate at the Grand Propylaea. Harpocration gives interesting information concerning this famous Herma; s.v. πρὸς τῇ πυλίδι



Ἑρμῆς Δημοσθένους ἐν τῷ κατ' Εὐέργου. Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ ε' Ἀτθίδων "Ἀθηναίων" φησὶν "ἄρξαμένων τειχίζειν τὸν Πειραιᾶ οἱ θ' ἄρχοντες τοῦτον ἀναθέντες ἐπέγραψαν: ἀρξάμενοι πρῶτοι τειχίζειν οἷο' ἀνέθηκαν Βουλῆς καὶ Δήμου δόγμασι πειθόμενοι". Did they mean to imply that this fortification of the city was as momentous as the unyielding human wall erected by Leonidas in Thermopylae in obedience to the Spartan decrees – and much more effective? Similarly Hermes as Ἑρμῆς was consecrated by the very city gates of Megalopolis on the road from Messenia to Arcadia, Pausanias IV, 33, 3: ἰόντι δὲ τὴν ἐπ' Ἀρκαδίας εἰς Μεγάλην πόλιν ἔστιν ἐν ταῖς πύλαις Ἑρμῆς τέχνης τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Ἀθηναίων γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ τετράγωνον ἔστιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑρμαῖς, καὶ παρὰ τούτων μεμαθήκασιν οἱ ἄλλοι. Pausanias repeats the latter assertion in I, 24, 3, reiterating the renowned Athenian preoccupation and care with things divine and their exemplary piety: ῥέλεκται δέ μοι καὶ πρότερον ὥς Ἀθηναίοις περισσώτερόν τι ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐς τὰ θεῖα ἔστι σπουδῆς. Πρῶτοι μὲν γὰρ Ἀθηναῖν ἐπωνόμασαν Ἑργάνην, πρῶτοι δ' ἀκώλους Ἑρμᾶς <...> ὁμοῦ δέ σφισιν ἐν τῷ ναῷ Σπουδαίων δαίμων ἔστιν. With <ἀνέθεσαν> or <ἔδρυσαν> or <ἐποίησαν> to complete the meaning of the second clause, nothing might have been further desired, but for the following ὁμοῦ; unless this is to be corrected to, or meant as, ὁμοίως, something unpersuasive and *ad hoc*: Hermaic busts with just a plank for body wanting hands and feet. Ὁ ναός must be *the* temple, Parthenon. Σπουδαίων δαίμων must be interpreted, given also the context, as the divine potency presiding over all *σπουδαῖα*, *all things high and excellent*. Thus the general meaning is sure despite the obvious lacuna and the uncertainty of its supplementation. Ἀκώλοι Ἑρμαῖ (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 *σχῆμα τετράγωνον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑρμαῖς*.

It was the *general* practice, especially in Athens, to consecrate Hermes in the form of an Ἑρμᾶ by doors and gates; thus the *Sch. ad Aristophanes, Pax*, 923: ἔθος εἶχον Ἑρμᾶς ἰδρύοντες πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν etc. Both the fact of their widespread occurrence and the epichorial nativity of the form are confirmed by Thucydides VI, 27: ἐν δὲ τούτῳ ὅσοι Ἑρμαῖ ἦσαν ἰθινοὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει τῇ Ἀθηναίων, εἰσὶ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιχώριον ἡ τετράγωνος ἐργασία, πολλοὶ καὶ ἐν ἰδίῳ προθύροις καὶ ἐν ἱεροῖς, μὲν νυκτὶ οἱ πλείστοι περιεκόπησαν τὰ πρόσωπα (in fact καὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα cf. Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 1095 and Pausanias Grammaticus ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων Συναγωγῇ apud *Sch. ad Thucydides loc.cit.* It was a primeval ἀκρωτηριασμός).

The *pyloric* function of Hermes, as an Ἑρμᾶ, 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 ἀπ' αὐτῆς (sc. ἡ Νυμφάς, a place) στάδια εἴκοσι ἔστιν ἐπὶ τὸ Ἑρμαῖον, ἐς δὲ Μεσσηνίοις καὶ Μεγαλοπολίταις εἰσὶν ὅροι πεποινῆται δὲ αὐτόθι καὶ Ἑρμῆν ἐπὶ στήλῃ – no doubt an Ἑρμᾶ.

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 πυλωρία and θυρωρία which controls the access to an enclosure, to a μυχός, 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 *Φιλοσοφικαὶ Διαδοχαὶ* of what he saw ἐν Πυθαγορικοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν (VIII, 24)): τὸν δ' Ἑρμῆν Ταμίαν εἶναι τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Πομπαῖον ῥέγεσθαι καὶ Πυθαῖον καὶ Χρόνιον, ἐπειδήπερ οὗτος ἐκπέμπει (pro εἰσπέμπει) ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ τε γῆς καὶ ἐκ θαλάττης. Cf. Virgilius, *Aeneas* 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* Ω; cf. Petronius §140; πομπαῖον Ἑρμῆν χρόνιον Sophocles, *Ajax* 819. Thus Hermes has the magical wand (virgam potentem, Ovid, *Fasti* 5, 447; the Greek ράβδος, the κηρύκειον specifically appropriated by Hermes) through which he exercises his power over human souls. The supreme sceptre of death belongs naturally to Hades himself, Pindar, *Olymp.* 9, 33; Hermes, as ψυχαγωγός or ψυχοπομπός, effects the decrees of the superior power.

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

[5] There were in the fully constituted association twelve members; Aeschines, *De Falsa Legatione*, §116; Strabo, IX p. 420; Scholia 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; 432; 434. 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 <Περραιβούς> after or before Θεσσαίους, and <Βοιωτούς> after ὑπὸ τῷ ὄρει τῇ Κνήμιδι. The intervening explanatory clause after Λοκρούς (namely "τῇ Φωκίῳ ὁμόρους ὑπὸ τῷ ὄρει τῇ Κνήμιδι") may perhaps account for the omission of the Boeotians, as they were separated from the series of consecutive names of the member-nations. Perrhebeans 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 Amphictyonic list of his own days by Pausanias (X, 8, 4). On the other hand, it is true that the Perrhaebians are not mentioned either there, or on the occasion of the reorganization of the Amphictyony by Augustus (X, 8, 3), where they should have been referred to either as subjoined under the Thessalians (as the Malians, the Aenianes = Oetaeans and the Phthiotic Achaeans) or as extinct (like the Dolopians). Probably the Perrhaebians have one way or another disappeared from the Amphictyony 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 Phocaeans in the Amphictyonic 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 Perrhaebians (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 Amphictyone. Which coheres with an association of members inhabiting places around Anthele by Thermopylae rather than around Delphi (contra Anaximenes Fr.Gr.H. 72F2; and Androtion 324F58). The *Marmor Parium* (epoch 5) is basically right, although it propagates the legend of Amphictyon's Athenian kingship: ἀλφ' οὗ Ἀμφικτύων <ὁ> Δευκαλίωνος ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις καὶ συνῆγε [τι]οὺς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν οἰκοῦντας καὶ ὠνόμασεν Ἀμφικτύονας καὶ Πύρραϊαιν, οὗ [περ] καὶ νῦν ἔτι θύουσιν Ἀμφικτύονες [ἐ]ἴτη ΧΗΗΡΠΙΙΙ, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν Ἀμφικτύονος. (Jacoby held the incredible notion that the Athenian Amphictyon 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 Cranaos was king (§4). Deucalion's son Amphictyon was king of the entire eastern mainland Greece afterwards, till his brother Hellen was made king of Phthiotis (§6).

Diodorus, relating the Great Sacred War against the Phocaeans, gives the following account (XVI, 29, 1): ...τῷ μὲν ἱερῷ βοηθεῖν ἔγνωσαν Βοιωτοὶ καὶ Λοκροὶ καὶ Θετταῖοι καὶ Περραιβοί, πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις Δωριεῖς καὶ Δόριοι, ἔτι δὲ Ἀθαμᾶνες καὶ Ἀχαιοὶ [καὶ] Φθιώται (corrected by Wesseling) καὶ <Μαθηεῖς καὶ> [αὐτοὶ] Μαγνήτες, ἔτι δὲ Αἰνιᾶνες καὶ τινες ἕτεροι, τοῖς δὲ Φωκεῦσι συνεμάχουν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ τινες ἕτεροι τῶν Πελοποννησίων. 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 Epeirotic (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 4<sup>th</sup> century. So Diodorus mentions them simply as helping the Amphictyonic cause against the Phocaeans, 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 Amphictyonic 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 Phocaeans, 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. Ἀμφικτύονες (identical with one given by Libanius). It stands thus: ταῦτα (sc. τὰ ἔθνη) δ' ἦν Ἰβῶνες, Δωριεῖς, Περραιβοί, Βοιωτοί, <Θεσσαῖοί>, Μάγνντες, Ἀχαιοὶ Φθιώται, Μνηστῆες, Δόλιοι, Αἰνιᾶνες, Δελφοί, Φωκεῖς. The Ἀχαιοὶ Φθιώται must be read without intervening comma. The Thessalians dropped after the Boeotians. The Δελφοί probably stands for the missing Λοκροί. 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). Polyaeus (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 Polyaeus 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 *Πρεσβευτικός*) 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).