

THE CAREER OF PEISISTRATOS SON OF HIPPIAS

THE RESULTS of archaeological exploration, the study of Attic epigraphy, and the exegesis of events by the historians of the 5th century B.C. converge on one point so infrequently that it behooves us to pay particular attention when they do.¹ The discovery in 1877 of a Peisistratid Altar of Apollo Pythios² in Athens, the text of which Thucydides records *verbatim*, has led many students of Archaic Athenian history to promulgate their views on the strands of epigraphy, history, and archaeology interwoven at this point and has also sparked considerable controversy since the publication of a particular fragment of an archon list over fifty years ago.³ Succinctly, the archon list, Thucydides, and the altar seem to state unequivocally that Peisistratos the younger, the son of Hippias and namesake of his grandfather the Athenian tyrant, dedicated an altar to Apollo Pythios during his archonship in 522/1. The controversy stems from epigraphic analyses of the text, which have repeatedly concluded that the letter forms and style of the inscription belong instead to the early 5th century and so create a historical and epigraphic anomaly.⁴ I suggest that a reexamination of the archaeological, epigraphic, and historical evidence can reveal when and, more precisely, why the altar was dedicated. I propose that the evidence overwhelmingly supports placing Peisistratos' archonship in 522/1 and that in the course of his career Peisistratos returned to Athens after the exile of his father in 511/10, allied with his nephew Hipparchos son of Charmos, the archon of 496/5 (Dionysios of Halikarnassos 5.77.6), in an effort to support the Persian empire and the return of Hippias, and during a period of Persian appeasement in Athens in the mid-490's, dedicated the altar to Pythian Apollo. The dedication served as a response to the influence of the ruling Alkmaionid family, both to rival their connection with Apollo and to identify with elements of the new democracy. Peisistratos' career did not terminate with this offering, for he became a candidate for ostracism in the 480's, probably left the city by about 485, and may have returned with Xerxes in 481.

THE ARCHONSHIP OF PEISISTRATOS, 522/1 B.C.

τὰ δὲ ἄλλα αὐτῇ ἡ πόλις τοῖς πρὶν κεῖμένοις νόμοις ἐχρῆτο, πλὴν καθ' ὅσον αἰεὶ τινα ἐπεμέλοντο σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς εἶναι. καὶ ἄλλοι τε αὐτῶν ἤρξαν τὴν ἐνιαύσιον

¹ I wish to thank Judith Binder, A. John Graham, Mabel Lang, Leslie Mechem, and the anonymous readers for *Hesperia* for their helpful suggestions and valuable contributions to this paper and the Faculty Development Committee of Skidmore College for a grant that enabled me to work on this problem. I presented an earlier version of this article, "Behind the Scenes: Peisistratid Activity in Athens After 510 B.C.," at the 1992 Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association in New Orleans, Louisiana.

² *IG I²* 761.

³ Meritt 1939.

⁴ See particularly Löwy 1937; Meritt 1939; Dinsmoor 1942.

Ἀθηναῖοις ἀρχὴν καὶ Πεισίστρατος ὁ Ἰππίου τοῦ τυραννεύσαντος υἱός, τοῦ πάππου ἔχων τοῦνομα, ὃς τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν βωμὸν τὸν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀρχὼν ἀνέθηκε. . . .⁵

Thucydides observed that the Peisistratids⁶ always looked to having one of their own, σφῶν αὐτῶν, in the ἀρχαί, or nine archonships.⁷ Presumably, this included members of the immediate family and then close relations. We were forced to alter this view in 1939 when Meritt published a fragment of an Athenian archon list produced in the 430's to 420's⁸ and preserving portions of six names from the 520's. This fragment and the circumstances surrounding the magistracies of some of the most prominent individuals named⁹ have already been much discussed elsewhere.¹⁰ Their presence on this list, which lies outside this discussion, "must be taken to go beyond relatives and to include those prominent men who had been persuaded to co-operate with the régime, political friends and even former enemies who had been conciliated and were willing to accept office."¹¹ The sixth and last name on the list, [. . .⁵ . . .]στρατ[ος], has usually been restored as [Πεισί]στρατ[ος], and since the fourth archon, [Μ]ιλτιάδης, can be dated independently to 524/3 (Dionysios of Halikarnassos 7.3.1),¹² the archonship of [Πεισί]στρατ[ος] falls in 522/1. Meritt attempted to divorce the identification of [. . .⁵ . . .]στρατ[ος] from the son of Hippias mentioned by Thucydides and on the altar, largely because he believed the letter forms of *IG I² 761* belonged in the early 5th century, not the late 6th.¹³ Meritt's reaction was to marshal the evidence for dating Peisistratos' *archonship* to the early 5th century and to select the then-unassigned year of 497/6, an issue to which I shall return.

⁵ Thucydides 6.54.6.

⁶ See the discussion by Wade-Gery (1958b, p. 164, note 1): the subjects of ἐπεμέλοντο are Peisistratos and Hippias.

⁷ So Dover in Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, pp. 330–331; Badian 1971, p. 8, note 20; White 1974, pp. 82–83. As White pointed out, the result of this policy was an Areiopagos heavily stacked in favor of the Peisistratids, even after their expulsion in 511/10.

⁸ Cadoux 1948, p. 77. See also *SEG X 352*. Stroud (1978, p. 33 and note 57) commented that the date of the inscription depends on Meritt's assessment (1939, p. 60) that the letter forms "suggest a date *ca.* 425." Erring on the side of caution, Stroud broadened the date to *at least* (his emphasis) 435–415. I concur that when the sole piece of evidence is the form of the letters, we can be no more accurate than within approximately twenty years, or plus or minus ten years on either side. Jeffery (1990, p. 60) suggested *ca.* 425–400 for the archon-list fragment and that inscriptions can be dated by letter forms with no greater precision than within a quarter century. I agree with Woodhead's expression of caution with regard to the dating of inscriptions from any period. I feel, however, that he may have been too conservative when he criticized Jeffery's categorization of inscriptions to quarter centuries and proposed half centuries instead (1962, pp. 351–352). T. F. Winters (1992) suggested "a leeway of approximately thirty years."

⁹ [H]ippias, [K]leisthen[es], and [M]iltiades, as well as [On]eto[rides] and [K]alliades.

¹⁰ *SEG X 352*. See Cadoux 1948 for a discussion of the history of Athenian archon lists and this fragment in particular; more recently, White 1974; Meiggs and Lewis 1975, no. 6, pp. 9–12. See also Alexander 1958/1959 for a novel proposal (which I cannot support) that the fragment published by Meritt lists names of individuals involved in Athenian politics at the end of the Peloponnesian War and not the names of 6th-century archons. Alexander did not, however, explain the presence of [. . .⁵ . . .]στρατ[-----] in this list. For spirited defenses of Meritt's study, *contra* Alexander, see Thompson 1959/1960; also Eliot and McGregor 1960.

¹¹ White 1974, p. 82. Badian (1971, p. 21) suggested that the political caliber of individuals elected in this period indicates precisely the Peisistratid policy outlined by Thucydides.

¹² See Cadoux 1948, p. 110, note 216; White 1974, pp. 83–84.

¹³ Meritt 1939, pp. 62–63; so Löwy (1937), who believed so strongly that the letter forms belonged after 510 that he suggested an incidence of recutting in the late 5th century.

Meritt¹⁴ saw a fragment of what might be an oblique hasta below the iota of [Κα]λλιᾶδες, therefore requiring a reading of [. . .]στράτος for the last name on the list. Crosby¹⁵ dismissed this reading, noting that the traces of the hasta constitute a break and that enough of the surface of the stone survives to preclude such a restoration. The prosopographical evidence for names ending in -στράτος suggests that any restoration other than [Πεισί]στράτος is most unlikely. A survey of Kirchner (1948) produced only twelve names that could meet the epigraphic limitations of the stone, and of these only [Ναυσί]στράτος and [Πεισί]στράτος are names otherwise attested for late Archaic Athens.¹⁶ Accordingly, a reading of [Πεισί]στράτος seems certain.¹⁷

Further support for Peisistratos' archonship comes from his dedication of the Altar of the Twelve Gods. In the same passage in which he commented on the Peisistratid control of the Athenian archonships, Thucydides indicated that Peisistratos, the son of the tyrant Hippias,¹⁸ dedicated an Altar of the Twelve Gods in the Agora when he was archon. Literary and archaeological testimonia affix the dedication of this altar securely in or before 519: in that year¹⁹ the Plataians sought an alliance with the Athenians and came to the altar as suppliants (Herodotos 6.108.4).²⁰ The architectural remains support a date for the Altar of the Twelve Gods in the last quarter of the 6th century, perhaps more precisely between 523 and 512.²¹ I think it certain that Peisistratos, the son of Hippias, held the eponymous archonship in Athens in 522/1.

¹⁴ In Cadoux 1948, p. 111, note 224.

¹⁵ 1949, p. 100, note 52.

¹⁶ Eliot and McGregor 1960, p. 28, note 7.

¹⁷ The name of Nausistratos appears once on a καλός black-figured vase, dated to the second half of the 6th century: *PA*, no. 10587, p. 114. No other testimonium suggests that we should disregard the evidence from the Pythian Apollo altar (and Thucydides) that Peisistratos held the archonship in favor of this otherwise unattested Nausistratos.

¹⁸ I accept the explanation in Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, p. 333, that the aorist τοῦ τυρᾶννεύσαντος only identifies Hippias and does not indicate temporality.

¹⁹ For the calculation of this date, see Thucydides 3.68.5.

²⁰ On the date, see Frost 1985, pp. 69, 78, note 61; White 1974, p. 94, note 18. Amit (1970) argued for a date shortly after the exile of Hippias and family, *ca.* 509, as did Grote (1868, p. 167, note 1); Busolt (II, 1893–1904, p. 399, note 4) placed the alliance in 510/9.

²¹ Raubitschek 1939, p. 164 and notes 1 and 2; Thompson 1947, p. 199; Crosby 1949, pp. 93–97. According to Crosby's exhaustive study, although the pottery record is scant (p. 97: "The few scraps of pottery that can be associated with the construction of the first period are consistent with a date in the second half of the sixth century"), the architectural details of the cuttings on the sill course of the poros altar are consistent with this date. The hawksbeak molding on the altar fragment, for which Crosby admitted there are no very close parallels, also dates to the second half of the century, "and probably to the latter part of that period" (*ibid.*). Shoe, in correspondence with Crosby, asserted that she felt "quite safe in agreeing to a 523–512 date for the hawksbeak" (*ibid.*, note 43). Gadbery's 1988 doctoral thesis on the Leagros base (recently republished: Gadbery 1992) abutting the temenos of the Altar does not modify the date proposed by Crosby, although it demonstrates how weak the archaeological evidence is. None of the pottery lots associated with the earliest strata are uncontaminated, although some contain a sherd or two from the second half of the 6th century. The poros-altar fragments found beneath the later paving of the altar seem to belong to the original, Peisistratid altar, although as Gadbery noted (p. 461, note 32), "their material and form are strikingly different from the marble molding" of the Apollo Pythios altar. Five or six other fragments of poros orthostates which derive either from the Altar of the Twelve Gods or the Eschara to the south *may* provide additional evidence for the *terminus post quem* for the altar of Pythian Apollo; see note 80 below.

The certainty of Peisistratos' service as chief magistrate in 522/1 warrants an estimation of the year of his birth. The evidence from the Classical period indicates that candidates for the highest magistracies had to have passed their thirtieth birthday,²² and although our evidence for the eligibility for officeholding in the Archaic period is negligible, nothing suggests that the prerequisites in the 5th and 4th centuries did not hold in the 6th century as well. Peisistratos would have turned thirty no earlier than 523/2, thus providing a *terminus ante quem* of 553/2 for his birth to Hippias son of Peisistratos the tyrant and Myrrhine daughter of Charmos the polemarch (Thucydides 6.55.1). As White has already suggested, if the formal Peisistratid policy was to ensure that individuals σφῶν αὐτῶν held the archonships, then the tyrant Hippias will have sought the "election" of his son Peisistratos to the eponymous archonship, probably as soon as he was eligible.²³ Thus, after Hippias held the archonship in 526/5, three years ensued in which members of other powerful noble Athenian families held the magistracy until the son of the tyrant came of age. If we assume that Hippias was roughly twenty-five to thirty years of age at the time of his son's birth in 553/2, then we can place his own birth about 583–577.²⁴

EXILE OF THE TYRANT HIPPIAS AND THE ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΕΙΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΙΔΕΩΝ

The circumstances under which Hippias yielded his power in 511/10 are surprisingly dispassionate. When the Spartan Kleomenes, together with the Alkmaionids, forced him to capitulate, the terms of surrender were relatively mild. He and his family were given five days to get out of town, together with their movable property (Herodotos 5.64.2–65.2). The tradition that includes the setting up of a stele on the Akropolis²⁵ listing the names

²² Rhodes 1981, pp. 116, 389–390, 510; Badian 1971, p. 18, note 48.

²³ White 1974, p. 89 and note 19.

²⁴ Eliot and McGregor (1960, p. 32) placed Hippias' birth *ca.* 575, while Lang (1954, pp. 66–67) had him born *ca.* 573–568, making him a very unlikely 16–19 at the birth of his eldest son (if that son held the archonship in 522/1 in his thirtieth year) and an elderly man in his late 70's or early to mid 80's at Marathon. Davies (1971, no. 11793 III.A, p. 446) assigned his birth to no later than 570. The year of Hippias' birth is linked with the testimonia identifying his spouse(s). White (1974, p. 89 and note 19) attempted to reconcile the contradictory statements by Kleidemos (*FGrHist* 323 F 15) and Thucydides (6.55.1) as to the identity of Hippias' spouse by having him married twice, first to the daughter of Charmos the polemarch and then to Myrrhine daughter of Kallias, the mother of Peisistratos the younger. At issue is the date of *ca.* 557/6 provided by Kleidemos for the marriage to Charmos' daughter: the customary age for men at marriage was 30, which must not have applied here, for then Hippias would have been an unlikely 97 at Marathon. By modifying White's proposal slightly, the following scenario works: Hippias married his first wife, the daughter of Charmos, when he was no more than 26, and she died soon after the nuptials; Hippias would have then remarried, this time to Myrrhine, and their first son, Peisistratos, would have been born in 553/2 when Hippias was approximately thirty years old; Hippias then succeeded his father Peisistratos the elder when he was in his early fifties, held the archonship at about age 56 in 526, presided over his son's magistracy four years later, went into "early retirement" in 511/10 in his late sixties or early seventies, and returned to his homeland between the ages of 87 and 93 (Herodotos 6.107–108). See also Cadoux 1948, p. 111; Wade-Gery 1958b, p. 168, note 1.

²⁵ Dinsmoor (1942, p. 196, note 14) rejected associating this stele with that of *ca.* 507, which named Isagoras' supporters (Schol. Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 273; cf. Herodotos 5.72; Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 20, 28), or with the stele

of Peisistratos, his sons, their descendants, and their ἀδελφός (Thucydides 6.55.1–2), which Lavelle equated with προδοσία,²⁶ does not seem to allow for such mild punishment as that meted out in 511/10. Two years later, when the failed policy of Isagoras and Kleomenes resulted in the arrest and execution of all Athenians involved in the plot to seize the city (Herodotos 5.72.4), these likely προδότες received a punishment worthy of their crime. The clemency accorded Hippias and his family, carried out by the Spartans,²⁷ the returned exiles, and the Athenian δῆμος, implies a sympathetic attitude reflective of the extent to which Peisistratid patronage had staffed the critical centers of power in Athenian government.²⁸ If Lavelle correctly surmised that the stele described by Thucydides in Book 6 does not mirror the events of 511/10 but instead the period of reprisal after Marathon, and that in 511/10 a more temperate climate prevailed which allowed the presence of Hipparchos son of Charmos, the likely grandson of Hippias, as well as other φίλοι τῶν τυράννων (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 22.4),²⁹ then it falls within the realm of possibility that other members of the family might have survived this moderate purge.³⁰

Dover argued that in 511/10 the Athenians exiled forever “the surviving Peisistratids and their issue and everyone who might be found to be a descendant (even an illegitimate descendant) of those members of the family who were already dead.”³¹ The archonship of Hipparchos son of Charmos in 496/5 undermines this argument. Holladay admitted the difficulty of “how a son of Hippias’ daughter could escape so wide a definition”³² and sought an explanation in the youthfulness of a Hipparchos born ca. 530.³³ If a stele was erected on the Akropolis in or shortly after 511/10, as Holladay believed, naming names, then surely Hipparchos could not have remained in the city. Even if he was only twenty years old, he was the tyrant’s grandson! Instead, we must turn to Lavelle’s thesis that the stele was not yet erected, that the “charges” against the Peisistratid family were not yet severe, and that only Hippias and his children were forced out.³⁴ If Hipparchos could remain, then surely other, less politically active family members could have stayed, or returned soon after.

Herodotos used the term παῖδες τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν to describe the descendants of Hippias ransomed by the besiegers (5.65.1),³⁵ and although Thucydides saw only the names of Hippias and Myrrhine’s children on the Akropolis stele, he did acknowledge that two of Hippias’ brothers, Hipparchos and Thessalos, had progeny as well who were listed (6.55.1).

fabricated from the remains of the melted statue of Hipparchos son of Charmos (either in 487 or 479), which named among others Hipparchos himself (Lykourgos, *Leokr.* 117–119).

²⁶ Lavelle 1983, pp. 105–106, 116–117.

²⁷ Recall the ties of ξεινή between the Spartans and the Peisistratids; see Herodotos 5.63.2, 90.1, 91.2.

²⁸ Lavelle 1983, p. 111 and notes 129 and 130; see note 7 above.

²⁹ Lavelle 1983, pp. 111–112. I return to this issue below (pp. 154–155).

³⁰ Hart 1982, p. 57. Dover (Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, pp. 324–325) dated the stele between 511/10 and a time immediately after Marathon.

³¹ Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, p. 324.

³² Holladay 1978, p. 191, note 12.

³³ So Davies 1971, p. 451.

³⁴ Dover (Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, pp. 324–325) suggested that this stele was set up sometime between 511/10 and the immediate aftermath of Marathon. Lavelle (1983, pp. 81–120) limited it to the years immediately following the battle of Marathon.

³⁵ Also τὰ τέκνα, at 5.65.2.

The ransomed παῖδες probably included them as well as the children of Hippias.³⁶ Was Peisistratos one of those seized? His age, now roughly forty, would not preclude his inclusion among the παῖδες.³⁷ As a member of the Areiopagos and the only son of the tyrant, he would have been a notable hostage held at spearpoint until the capitulation of his father. Hipparchos son of Charmos and grandson of Hippias,³⁸ styled as the ἡγεμὼν καὶ προστάτης of the φίλοι τῶν τυράννων, remained in Athens after the coup d'état along with these supporters of the Peisistratids (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 22.4); I suggest that it is unlikely that Peisistratos the ex-archon survived the initial purge³⁹ but that he instead accompanied Hippias and the rest of his family when they fled to Sigeion-on-the-Skamandros (Herodotos 5.65.3).

During the next twenty years the Athenians attempted to appease the Persian empire on a number of occasions, and Ducat wondered whether Peisistratos returned to Athens during this period.⁴⁰ The scholarly debate on the relationships between the noble families of Athens in this period has flourished in the last twenty years, and no consensus has emerged on the influence of the aristocracy, the existence of political factions or ἐταίρῃαι, and the extent of partisan *vs.* individual politics between 510 and 490 (or 480).⁴¹ In this period I place Peisistratos and his dedication to Apollo Pythios in Athens, and analogously it is worth noting that our understanding of the issues for the earliest years of Hippias' reign, issues of aristocratic, partisan, and individual politics, was altered drastically only with the discovery and interpretation of the fragmentary archon list by Meritt in 1939. The notice of Kleisthenes the Alkmaionid as archon in 525/4 on this list demanded a reconsideration of the relationship between his family and the ruling Peisistratids and led to the conviction that the Alkmaionids had returned to Athens before 525⁴² and went into exile only as late as the assassination of Hipparchos in 514.⁴³ Although I envision Peisistratos in Athens after the coup and before Marathon, I do not intend to propose that he survived the initial purge.

³⁶ According to Davies (1971, no. 11793 and table 1), Hippias and Myrrhine's five children were their only son Peisistratos, a daughter married to Anaxileos who produced Hippokrates, another married to Charmos who produced Hipparchos, a third married to Miltiades who produced Kimon, and the last, Archedike, who married Aiantides of Lampsakos.

³⁷ LSJ, s.v. παῖς I.1, understands the term to describe progeny, not necessarily in relation to age (for which, see II.1).

³⁸ Rhodes 1981, pp. 271–272; Davies 1971, p. 451.

³⁹ Grote (1868, p. 125) doubted that many individuals were exiled or punished by being deprived of their civic rights and thought that in fact any residents of the city after 508/7, even the Peisistratids, must have received the full benefits of the new democracy. Even this modest interpretation could not tolerate the presence of Hippias' successor, who was perceptibly the most immediate threat to post-tyrannical Athens in the city *just* after the tyrant's exile.

⁴⁰ Ducat 1971, p. 255. Ducat's interest was in refuting Meritt's contention that Peisistratos held his archonship in the 490's, and so he did not consider the presence of Peisistratos separate from his magistracy.

⁴¹ E.g., Stanton 1970; Galli 1971; Bicknell 1972; White 1974; Holladay 1978; Kelly 1978; Cromeey 1979; Williams 1980; Develin 1985; Horsley 1986. Much of the discussion can be traced to the positions outlined by McGregor (1940) and Robinson (1945).

⁴² Williams (1973, p. 81) suggested *ca.* 530.

⁴³ Meritt 1939, pp. 61–62. Ever since the successful defense of Meritt's interpretation of this fragmentary piece of an archon list by Eliot and McGregor (1960), the reconciliation between the two families in this period has become part of the canonical study of Athenian partisan politics.

The following evidence seems in favor instead of a return by Peisistratos to the city in the first decade of the 5th century, retaining residency only until shortly after Marathon.

PEISISTRATIDS IN EXILE AND IN ATHENS, 510–490 B.C.

Neither Herodotos nor Thucydides was particularly interested in the affairs of Hippias or his descendants after 511/10, and so little more than a quick biographical sketch of the ex-tyrant seems possible. Just prior to his exile, he married off his daughter Archedike to the son of Hippokles, tyrant of Lampsakos (Thucydides 6.59.3).⁴⁴ Thucydides placed the exiled Hippias first in Sigeion-on-the-Skamandros (where his half-brother Hegesistratos had ruled), then in quick succession in Lampsakos and then Susa and the court of Dareios (6.59.4). We can date his appearance in the Persian court to *ca.* 510 if we can believe the statement of Thucydides, usually so circumspect when it comes to chronology, that twenty years after his arrival he departed with the Persians for Marathon.

After the recall of Kleisthenes and the 700 families expelled by Kleomenes in 508/7, the Athenians sought an alliance with the Persians to counter the Spartan threat (Herodotos 5.73.1–3). Artaphernes, anticipating the reaction of Dareios in his first encounter with the Athenians after the conflagration at Sardis in 498 (5.105.1),⁴⁵ asked who and whence were the Athenians. His demand of the standard terms of submission, that the Athenians *διδούσι . . . γῆν τε καὶ ὕδωρ* (5.73.2), was accepted by the envoys, who were then severely rebuked for their indiscretion.⁴⁶ Kleisthenes may well have been the instigator of this surprising Athenian policy and may have drawn his motivation from the Spartan threat, the desire to consolidate his influence among the noble γένη sympathetic to Isagoras and Kleomenes, and the potential threat of an agreement between Hippias and the Persians to restore the former to Athens (an agreement which could have been mediated by Hippias' in-law by marriage, Hippokles of Lampsakos).⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Thucydides regarded this arrangement as a medizing attempt by Hippias because Hippokles had the Persian king's ear; Jacoby 1949, pp. 164 and 342, note 40. Holladay (1978, pp. 177–178) suggested that Hippias was simply seeking a place of refuge if ever he had to flee Athens, which proved prophetic. He envisioned Hippias' first act of medizing to have occurred after the Spartans attempted to restore Hippias to Athens about 506, for they would have opposed placing a medizer in a city which they had once liberated and which now they hoped would cooperate with them. Thucydides' source for the connection between the Peisistratids and the tyrants of Lampsakos was most likely Charon's *Ἱστορίαι Λαμψακηνῶν* (Jacoby 1949, pp. 164 and 342, note 70).

⁴⁵ [Δαρείον] εἰρέσθαι οἷτινες εἶεν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

⁴⁶ Horsley (1986, pp. 102–105) argued that Kleisthenes both proposed the motion before the ἐκκλησία and accompanied the embassy to Sardis. Since the embassy did not have (or take) the time to seek guidance from the δῆμος, they offered the appropriate symbols of submission. Horsley further argued that Herodotos euphemistically alluded (73.3: αἰτίας μεγάλας εἶχον) to the reaction that met them at home, while in fact the punishment as they expected was severe, and that Kleisthenes, anticipating such a response, secured his family's safety by depositing financial securities on Samos (using Cicero, *de legibus* 2.41, which need not refer to post-Peisistratid Athens). *Contra*: Eliot (1986, p. 34), who wrote an obituary for a Kleisthenes dead shortly after 508/7 and before this embassy, and Cromeley (1979), who prodded Kleisthenes into retirement in a home outside of Attica.

⁴⁷ Thucydides 6.59.1; see Williams 1973, pp. 174–175.

Herodotos alone provided the elements of the next set of events involving the exiled tyrant (5.91–94). According to his account, fearful of the growing might of the Athenians, the Lakedaimonians attempted to restore Hippias to power *ca.* 506 at a meeting in Sparta, an attempt which ultimately failed at the hands of the Corinthian Sosikles, upholder of τὸ δίκαιον (5.92η.5).⁴⁸ Although Herodotos situated Hippias in Sigeion (5.94.1), not Susa as in Thucydides' account, before and after the Peloponnesian conference, Hippias' presence in the Persian kingdom indicates more than an expatriate seeking refuge; the account describes efforts by the former tyrant to arrange for his return to Athens.

The next incident related in the Herodotean narrative finds Hippias slandering the good name of his former compatriots in an attempt to set Artaphernes against them. His efforts to subjugate Athens to himself and to Dareios (ὅπως αἱ Ἀθηναί γενοίατο ὑπ' ἐωυτῷ τε καὶ Δαρείῳ [5.96.1]) about 501/0 aroused the attention of the Athenians, who worked assiduously to convince Artaphernes to ignore τοῖσι φυγάσι (5.96.2).⁴⁹ Artaphernes' demand that the Athenians must again embrace Hippias and their refusal to do so serve as dramatic elements in Herodotos' framing of the hostility that now arose between Athens and Persia (5.96.2).⁵⁰ I am inclined to accept the general sense of this account, that Hippias was actively engaged in persuading the Persians to support his return to his homeland.⁵¹ Herodotos' use of the plural in φυγάσι suggests that Hippias was not the only individual in exile, and although this might refer to one or more of his surviving brothers or other partisans, his eldest child and heir, Peisistratos, is the likeliest candidate for inclusion among these fugitives.

The thread that runs through all three of these episodes (an abortive Athenian-Persian alliance, Hippias' presence in Susa [and briefly in the Peloponnese], and a blatant attempt by him to line up the support of Artaphernes in an enterprise aimed at regaining his power) is the Athenian perception of "medizing" in the last decade of the 6th century, the first decade of democracy.⁵² Shortly after their liberation from the bitterness of tyranny, Athenian envoys, perhaps including the great Kleisthenes himself, submit to a greater power in order to effect a strategic balance with a domestic enemy. Even the reaction of the δῆμος does not mitigate the willingness of Athenian representatives to subjugate their fellow citizens to

⁴⁸ Lavelle (1983, p. 114) dismissed this entire episode in Sparta as part of a literary convention employed for dramatic and ironic purposes.

⁴⁹ Williams (1973, pp. 176–177), who suggested that this incident occurred instead *ca.* 504/3, contextualized this embassy to Persia in terms of rising anti-Persian sentiment among the citizenry and an attempt by the Philaids to destroy Kleisthenes' influence over the δῆμος. The lack of evidence for the positions taken by the Athenian citizenry from 511/1 to 490 or even later reduces this to mere speculation.

⁵⁰ So Lavelle 1983, p. 113. Lavelle rejected the historical veracity of this portion of the narrative in part because he questioned Artaphernes' authority to effect any policy initiatives. Yet if Hippias resided in Sigeion and saw Artaphernes in Sardis but had not yet journeyed to Susa, he may not have gained the trust and attention of the King. Accordingly, an approach to the regional authority, the satrap in Sardis, might have made perfect sense.

⁵¹ Horsley (1986, p. 101, note 10) pictured this encounter as no more than an effort (1) by Hippias to see to his own reinstatement and (2) by the Athenians, who clearly had representatives in Sardis, to prevent such an arrangement. Some have argued that this followed on the heels of an alliance accepted in 507/6, which I address below (p. 155), but which I should note here was repudiated by the Athenian δῆμος (5.73).

⁵² On the 6th-century Athenian posture towards medism that did not yet carry a negative connotation, see Gomme 1944, p. 321; Holladay 1978, *passim*; Horsley 1986, p. 100, note 9.

an eastern potentate. Surely the Athenian envoys were aware that negotiations with, and the appeasement of, the Persians might result in a renewal of Peisistratid rule. The Athenians endeavored then, on at least one occasion, to ally with Persia, probably to tip the balance of power in their struggles with the Spartans. At approximately the same time, the skirmishes fought with the “eyesore of the Peiraeus”, Aigina, represented a new threat even closer to home; perhaps an Athenian-Persian alliance could countercheck the growing menace on this front as well.

As both Williams⁵³ and Badian⁵⁴ observed, attempts to reconstruct the history of Athens from 511/10 until 480 have been more optimistic, if not fanciful, than the evidence would allow.⁵⁵ The so-called “orthodox position” of Walker,⁵⁶ recounted by Williams⁵⁷ and discredited by Badian,⁵⁸ situates the embassies to Persia in a larger framework of the beginning of an Alkmaionid-Peisistratid rapprochement which was bolstered by an alliance against the Isagoras-supported Ionian cause in 498 (Herodotos 5.97.2) and by the archonship of Hipparchos the son of Charmos and grandson of Hippias in 496/5. Walker maintained that the alliance endured through and after the battle at Marathon and that together both “factions” suffered via ostracism at the hands of the political giant Themistokles.

Robinson tinkered with Walker’s interpretation, undoing the proposed Peisistratid-Alkmaionid reconciliation in the late 6th century and the anti-Ionian Alkmaionid position.⁵⁹ There followed new efforts by Gomme⁶⁰ and Robinson⁶¹ to categorize the number and types of political factions in Athens and to place Hipparchos’ archonship in 496/5 in the proper perspective,⁶² deemphasizing factionalism and partisan politics.⁶³ Badian and Williams separately held that no evidence supports the contention, often made, that the Alkmaionids opposed the plea of Aristagoras in 499 (Herodotos 5.97) because they supported the Peisistratid-Persian alliance or that they promoted Hipparchos’ election to the archonship, and concluded that because so many possibilities emerge to explain this election, speculation would be futile.⁶⁴ My proposal, to place Peisistratos’ altar in this period, does not contradict this position. Little as we can explain the motives or alliances which led to Hipparchos’ election, we must admit that the powerful Alkmaionids at least tolerated the presence of the Peisistratids in Athens if Hippias’ grandson could hold the archonship in 496/5, which

⁵³ 1973, p. 163.

⁵⁴ 1971, *passim*.

⁵⁵ Badian, for example, keenly contemplated that “[t]here are—at least in internal history—practically no facts known, and ingenuity and imagination have been limited only by what the audience has been ready to believe” (1971, p. 1).

⁵⁶ 1926, pp. 137–140, 167–172.

⁵⁷ 1973, pp. 165–166.

⁵⁸ 1971, pp. 5–6 and 9–11.

⁵⁹ 1939.

⁶⁰ 1944, pp. 327–331.

⁶¹ 1945.

⁶² So Gomme suggested that “Hipparchos stayed on in Athens and was elected archon because he was with the democrats, not because he was a relation of Hippias” (1944, p. 327).

⁶³ Robinson, for example, devalued the importance of pro- and antityrannist sympathies in the political battles of 510–486.

⁶⁴ So Williams 1973, p. 179.

mirrors what transpired in 525/4 when Kleisthenes held the magistracy under Peisistratid rule. Whether or not a formal rapprochement had occurred (and the evidence simply does not exist to flesh out the political turmoil of the period), we must acknowledge that tensions, and animosity towards the Peisistratids, had eased, if a grandson of the exiled tyrant could hold the still powerful eponymous magistracy.⁶⁵ It is in this context that I situate Peisistratos' dedication.

THE ALTAR OF APOLLO PYTHIOS

Thucydides linked the dedication of the Altar of the Twelve Gods to a second offering made by Peisistratos, the Altar of Apollo in the Pythion that as archon he also set up. Thucydides considered the letters of the Pythion altar ἀμυδροῖς, or obscure, and then provided the text of this elegiac couplet: μνήμα τόδ' ἦς ἀρχῆς Πεισιστράτος Ἰππίου υἱὸς θῆκεν Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθίου ἐν τεμένει (6.54.6–7: "Peisistratos the son of Hippias set up this commemoration of his archonship in the sacred precinct of Apollo Pythios"). The results of excavations in Athens in the late 19th century produced the following comparandum:

E.M. 6787 (*JG* I² 761).

Five fragments of Pentelic marble,⁶⁶ excavated in 1877 on the right bank of the Ilissos River. The altar contains a crowning fascia carrying the text, a Lesbian leaf on a cyma-reversa molding, and then a soffit with a hawksbeak molding.⁶⁷

H. 0.185, L. 1.82, D. 0.59 m.⁶⁸

496/5–493/2 B.C.

Μνῆμα τόδε ἡὲς ἀρχῆς Πεισιστ[ράτος] ἱππίου υἱὸς θῆκεν Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθ[ι]ο ἐν τεμένει

Elegiac couplet in one line. Πεισιστ[ράτος]: of the dotted *tau*, the lower portion of the vertical hasta and the left portion of the horizontal hasta are visible. Guarducci 1948: Πυθ[ι]ο; Cadoux 1948: Π[ΥΘ:Ο]; Guarducci 1967, Hansen 1983: Πυθ[ι]ο. Hansen 1983: τεμενει; Guarducci 1967: τεμενε[ι].⁶⁹ The vertical hasta of the iota of τεμένει is (barely) discernible, although to Guarducci it seemed worn away.

Photographs: Kern 1913, p. 12; Kirchner 1948, no. 12; Travlos 1971, p. 102, figs. 132–134; Jeffery 1990, pl. 4:37.

Pausanias (1.19.1) knew of a statue of Apollo Pythios and a sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios in this region but no sanctuary of Apollo Pythios. Excavations in the 1940's and 1960's

⁶⁵ Badian 1971, pp. 9–11. Williams' hesitation and counsel bears repeating here: "In the end we must admit that Hipparchos' position cannot be determined on the evidence at our disposal" (1973, p. 192).

⁶⁶ Welter (1939, col. 23) stated that it is of Parian marble. Two fragments comprise the left portion (A) of the inscription and attending architectural features; three fragments comprise the right portion (B).

⁶⁷ Welter (1939, cols. 31–32) proposed a restoration for the altar (fig. 7), based on comparanda, which includes corner Ionic volutes above the inscribed fascia along the long sides, a gabled superstructure along the short sides, and a corresponding Lesbian-leaf profile at the base of the body of the altar.

⁶⁸ Travlos 1971, p. 102, figs. 132–134. Welter's measurements differ slightly: (A) H. 0.17, W. 0.66, D. 0.55 m. (B) H. 0.17, W. 0.84, D. 0.55 m. Maximum restored dimensions: W. 1.86, D. 1.24 m., for a ratio of 2:1. For these measurements, and comparanda, see Welter 1939, pp. 24–31.

⁶⁹ For parallels with the phrase recording the location of the dedication, see Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948, no. 102, pp. 100–101; no. 112, pp. 108–109.

produced inconclusive results: a 6th-century date for the pottery, no Pythion temple remains (perhaps confirming Pausanias), and a late 6th-century tripartite structure that might be the Delphinion lawcourt and is usually assigned to post-Kleisthenic Athens.⁷⁰ The earliest literary evidence that associates Peisistratos the elder with the construction of a temple of Apollo Pythios is found in the 1st-century (after Christ) *Epitome* of Zenobios⁷¹ and then again in a notice by Hesychios in the 5th century.⁷² That only one passage antedates Pausanias' account, making reference to a temple which the latter did not mention, and that its proverbial nature conjures up a late *damnatio memoriae* of the age of tyrants calls the association between the elder Peisistratos and the construction of the sanctuary into question.⁷³ The archaeological record in conjunction with the literary testimonia does not prove that a sanctuary of Apollo Pythios flourished in Athens under Peisistratos the elder, only that there was activity in this region at the end of the 6th century B.C.

Architectural features of the extant superstructure of the Pentelic marble altar include a Lesbian leaf on a cyma-reversa molding and a hawksbeak soffit molding. Shoe⁷⁴ dated the cyma reversas between ca. 560 and 480. The Peisistratid altar, dated by Shoe to 527–510, belongs to the end of this group, and although Shoe noted similarities between the molding of the altar and one from the Letoön at Delos (ca. mid-6th century), she also found parallels with a molding on a statue base from the Athenian Akropolis dated “before 480” (*JG* I² 521).⁷⁵ In Shoe's catalogue of hawksbeak moldings the one from the altar resembles those on the Megarian Treasury at Olympia (ca. 520), the Alkmaionid Temple of Apollo at Delphi (513–505), and the Temple of Aphaia at Aigina (490).⁷⁶ In order for the Peisistratid altar to date to the early 490's it would have to shift positions in Shoe's list with the Alkmaionid Temple only; the very fragmentary nature of the hawksbeak molding from Delphi should allow this, especially since Shoe noted that “the undercut [of the molding of the Apollo temple] is then in *approximately* [my emphasis] correct proportion for the period.” A shift of the altar to ca. 496 should not require any substantial changes in Shoe's relative assignments of monuments in either list.

Boardman, in an article addressing Ionic architecture, included a brief discussion of the leaf-and-dart decoration on the Peisistratid altar, which he described as “very archaic” in appearance.⁷⁷ Although he acknowledged the preferred date of ca. 522, Boardman admitted that a date in the early 490's was not unreasonable for the Lesbian-leaf decoration.⁷⁸

⁷⁰ Mitsos and Vanderpool 1950, p. 26; Alexandri 1968, 1969, 1970; Boersma 1970, no. 110, p. 227, with bibliography.

⁷¹ ἐπὶ Πυθίῳ κρεῖττον ἢν ἀποπατῆσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Πυθίου ᾠκοδόμησεν ὁ Πεισίστρατος: an epitome of Tarrhaios' and Didymos' proverbs of the 1st century B.C.; Lynch 1984, p. 177.

⁷² ἐν Πυθίῳ χέσαι· Πεισίστρατος ᾠκοδόμει τὸν ἐν Πυθίῳ ναόν.

⁷³ Lynch 1984, p. 176. For the topography of this region south of the Olympieion, see Travlos 1971, pp. 100–101 and fig. 130; Wycherley 1978, pp. 167–168. For the unlikely connection between Peisistratos the tyrant and the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios, see Judeich 1931, pp. 65, 386.

⁷⁴ 1936, pp. 54–57.

⁷⁵ The text, --- ἡυιδ[ς] | [--- ἐπο]εσε, is too fragmentary to provide any additional information.

⁷⁶ Shoe 1936, pp. 104–105.

⁷⁷ Boardman 1959, pp. 206–207. Dinsmoor (1942, pp. 200–201) noted similarities between the heart-and-dart ornament of the altar and that of the Siphnian treasury (ca. 525). Cf. Weickert 1913, pp. 30, 58, pls. III:a, b.

⁷⁸ Boardman 1959, p. 207.

One other architectural feature led Dinsmoor to date the altar, but not the inscription, to 522/1: the use of double-T clamps, for which Dinsmoor observed parallels on the Peisistratid Temple of Athena on the Athenian Akropolis. As Dinsmoor himself pointed out, the Akropolis example is only the earliest, thus serving as a *terminus post quem*. Double-T clamps were common throughout Greece well past the 6th and 5th centuries.⁷⁹ In sum, the architectural features can support a date of the 490's,⁸⁰ and the altar may represent the earliest tangible evidence for Peisistratid interest in the cult of Apollo Pythios in Athens.

Attempts to assign a date to the altar on the basis of the epigraphic evidence have preoccupied studies of the inscription nearly since its discovery,⁸¹ while recent warnings may discourage further epigraphic analysis.⁸² Work done during the early part of this century unveiled an anomaly: those who believed that the architectural evidence and literary testimonia placed the altar in the 520's assigned the style of the letter forms to the early 5th century.⁸³ One solution offered was to attribute both the architectural and epigraphic features of the altar to 522/1 and resolve the anomaly by concluding that "the lettering of the dedicatory inscription on the Altar of Apollo Pythios must have been simply ahead

⁷⁹ Dinsmoor 1942, pp. 200–201, note 25.

⁸⁰ Gadbery (1992, pp. 469–470 and notes 70–75) noted a stylistic element common to the Pythian Apollo fragments and other monuments ("the lower portion [was] roughly worked, often with a gouge, and the upper portion meticulously smoothed with fine, horizontal strokes of a broad, flat chisel") which she suggested was more typical of Archaic than of Classical architecture. The evidence does not entirely support this view and may even help confirm a *terminus post quem* of ca. 500 for the Altar. Gadbery cited fragments from the Square Peristyle (end of the 4th century), the Stoa Basileios (the architecture suggests the late 6th century, the pottery a *terminus post quem* of ca. 500), the Rectangular Peribolos (between 550 and the second quarter of the 5th century), the Eschara (ca. 500), and fragments of poros orthostates found near to, and perhaps from, the Altar of the Twelve Gods. If these last blocks belong instead to the Eschara (Gadbery 1992, p. 462, note 32), then the style of dressing orthostates noted above is not "more typically . . . found on Archaic stelai" but is in use from ca. 500–300, with most of the examples ca. 500. This does not conflict with the date I am proposing for the Altar of Apollo Pythios.

⁸¹ 527–511 B.C.: Tod 1946, no. 8, p. 11. 527–510 B.C.: Hill 1953, p. 214. Ca. 525 B.C.: Hondius 1922. 522/1(?) B.C.: SEG XII 56. 522/1 B.C.: Hammond 1955, p. 393 and note 3; SEG XVII 11; Kluwe 1966, pp. 44–45; Meiggs 1966, p. 88; Kleine 1973, p. 33; White 1974, p. 94, note 18; Stroud 1978, pp. 27–28; Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, pp. 331–332; Page 1981, pp. 240–241; Hansen 1983, no. 305, pp. 163–164. Slightly after 522/1 B.C.: SEG XVIII 9; XXII 56. 522/1–512/11 B.C.: Guarducci 1967, p. 139. Ca. 521 B.C.: Meiggs and Lewis 1975, no. 11, pp. 19–20. Ca. 520–510(?) B.C.: Jeffery 1990, no. 37, p. 78. Before 514 B.C.: Cornelius 1929, p. 10, note 1. Before 512/11 B.C.: Kirchner 1948, p. 11. 512/11 B.C.: Beloch 1926, pp. 299–300; Welter 1939. 497/6 B.C.: Meritt 1939, pp. 62–65; Raubitschek 1940, p. 59; SEG X 318; Raubitschek 1949, pp. 449–450. Cut 522/1, reinscribed 497/6 B.C.: Crosby 1949, p. 100, note 52; Dinsmoor 1942, pp. 195–198. Late 5th century B.C.: Löwy 1937. Additional studies worth consulting are arranged here in order of their date of publication: 'Εφημερίς Ἀθηναίων, May 7, 1877, p. 4 (*editio princeps*); Mylonas 1877, no. 10, pp. 349–350; Kirchhoff 1877, no. 373:e; Hicks 1882, no. 9; Roberts 1887, no. 56, p. 86; Preger 1891, no. 71, pp. 58–59; Michel 1900, p. 1019; Hicks and Hill 1901, no. 10, p. 12; Roberts and Gardner 1905, p. 190; Janell 1906, no. 102, p. 89; Nachmanson 1913, no. 2, p. 7; Arbanitopoulos I, 1937–1939, p. 111; Hiller von Gaertringen 1926, no. 8, p. 6; Guarducci 1948, p. 118; Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948, no. 100, pp. 99–100; Cadoux 1948, p. 70; Pfohl 1964, no. 7, p. 11.

⁸² As Page wrote, "the date of the inscription is the subject of controversy in which none but the experienced epigraphist can participate" (1981, p. 240).

⁸³ So Dinsmoor (1942, p. 196), who commented on the "embarrassingly late lettering" of this inscription if it should date to the 520's.

of its time.”⁸⁴ Welter, invoking the notion of Peisistratid patronage of the arts, attributed the advanced lettering to an Ionian craftsman ahead of his contemporaries;⁸⁵ Dinsmoor proposed that the original text was recut in 496/5,⁸⁶ while Löwy chose a more desperate solution, proposing that the first text was painted *ca.* 522/1 and then inscribed later.⁸⁷

Many have warned against dating an inscription on the basis of letter forms more precisely than within a range of twenty-five to fifty years.⁸⁸ So, Hammond rejected Raubitschek’s analysis⁸⁹ of the letter forms on the altar and its assignation to the early 5th century because he believed that changes in styles were slow and that no inscription “can be dated to within a matter of ten or twenty years with any certainty.”⁹⁰ I do not propose to date the text on the altar on the basis of its letter forms, but I do maintain that comparanda suggest and permit a date in the first decade of the 5th century as well as, if not in preference to, a date in the 520’s.

The theta with the Greek cross, the nu with oblique and parallel outer hastae, the “Chalcidian” lambda with an oblique hasta beginning at the base of the vertical hasta, the “open” H as *spiritus asper*, the isosceles alpha with a horizontal crossbar parallel with the line of text, and the tailless epsilon with short, horizontal hastae of equal length are all idiosyncracies

⁸⁴ Meiggs 1966, p. 88; Lavelle 1983, p. 255.

⁸⁵ Welter 1939, p. 35. He noted that the alpha with a horizontal hasta and the epsilon with three horizontal hastae of equal length continue throughout the 5th century and that in the Archaic period there were “zahlreiche archaische inselionische Inschriften waagerechte Querhasten an diesen Buchstaben auf, z.B. *IG I² 487. IV 48, 50* und zahlreiche andere, auch Vaseninschriften (z.B. Kirchner, *Imagines* Nr. 8).” Of the four inscriptions cited by Welter, two are Archaic Ionian inscriptions (*IG IV 48, 50*); the third is an amphora made and painted by Exekias *ca.* 550, which contains similar alphas and epsilons but which also uses the St. Andrew’s-cross chi, which does not appear on the Altar of Apollo Pythios; while the last, *IG I² 487*, is a dedication from the Akropolis made by a Chian. Many of the letter forms of this last text are indeed similar; the alpha’s transverse hasta, however, is not horizontal but oblique, the sigma has four bars, not three, and the theta is dotted. In addition, this inscription is dated to *ca.* 500, which compares satisfactorily with Welter’s date of 512/11 for the altar, as well as my proposed 496/5–493/2. Welter did have the opportunity to see Meritt’s 1939 article in *Hesperia* prior to publication; I am surprised that, since he took issue with Meritt’s proposed date of 497/6, he did not date the archonship and altar of Peisistratos to 522/1, a natural assumption from the evidence of the archon list. Cf. Meiggs (1966, p. 88), who attributed the refined lettering to Peisistratid good taste.

⁸⁶ Dinsmoor 1942, pp. 197–198. He suggested that the original text either had been destroyed or, if only painted, had deteriorated; he attributed Thucydides’ remarks about the “obscure” lettering to mean that whatever paint had been in the engraved letters, a not uncommon practice in antiquity, had worn off. The smooth, narrow band in which the letters reside Dinsmoor saw as evidence that the stonemason either was replacing the first text or preparing a previously completed surface for a new purpose nearly thirty years later. “Only photographs taken under certain lighting conditions show this band, which is invisible on other photographs and on squeezes . . .” (1942, p. 198, note 17). I have seen no evidence for this band.

⁸⁷ Löwy 1937. I cannot accept Crosby’s solution to the apparent contradiction between the arguments for dating the altar to 522/1 and its inscription to a later period (1949, p. 100, note 52): “Therefore, it seems better to ignore this dedication and assume, as others have, either that our knowledge of Attic letter forms in the late sixth century is insufficient for precise dating or that the inscription on the Altar was recut.”

⁸⁸ Dover in Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, pp. 331–332; Woodhead 1962, pp. 351–352 (fifty years); Frost 1985, p. 66; Jeffery 1990, p. vii (twenty-five years).

⁸⁹ Raubitschek 1949, pp. 449–450.

⁹⁰ Hammond 1955, p. 393, note 3. Gomme (1944, p. 327) deemed our knowledge regarding letter forms insufficient to come to any conclusions.

which pertain to the Peisistratid altar. These specific descriptions, however, were not given for the altar but for the dedicatory inscription along the stylobate of the Athenian Stoa at Delphi traditionally dated to 479.⁹¹ As Amandry noted, only one inscription dated prior to *ca.* 485⁹² has the same characteristic letter forms: the Peisistratid altar.⁹³

Striking similarities exist between the letter forms of *IG I² 761* and some inscriptions confidently assigned to the end of the 6th century and the early years of the 5th: the dedication commemorating the victory over Boiotia and Chalkis, the Salamis Decree, the Marathon cenotaph, the Hekatompedon inscription, the dedicatory inscription on the Athenian Stoa at Delphi, and two altars from the Eleusinion.⁹⁴ Although Dover acknowledged that the affinities between the text of the altar and Attic documents of the first two decades of the 5th century were stronger than with earlier inscriptions, ultimately he backpedaled from this identification.⁹⁵ Jeffery discerned some epigraphic similarities between the letter forms of the altar and those of some texts dated to 525–500, as well as others dated to 510–500.⁹⁶ Jeffery chose to align *IG I² 761* with the earliest of these texts (which are in fact the signatures of vase painters) and so assigned it to “520–500(?)”.⁹⁷ It would not contradict her general thesis that inscriptions can be dated epigraphically to within twenty-five years (or other, more conservative estimates of fifty years) if the Apollo altar belonged to the first decade of the 5th century. Although I agree with Winters⁹⁸ that many of the documents belonging to the epigraphic “transitional period” of the early 490’s to the 480’s display an inconsistency of style and cannot be pinpointed on paleographic styles alone to less than a thirty-year span, the *independently dated* documents with which *IG I² 761* shares the greatest number of

⁹¹ Amandry 1946, p. 2.

⁹² By choosing this date I assume he was thinking about the Hekatompedon inscription (*IG I³ 4/5*), which contains some significant changes in these letter forms.

⁹³ Amandry 1946, p. 2, note 2.

⁹⁴ For each inscription I provide the number in Immerwahr 1990 (if available), the most recent publication to address the dates of almost all the following texts. Dedication for the victory over Boiotia and Chalkis, *ca.* 506: Immerwahr, no. 457; Salamis Decree, *ca.* 500: Immerwahr, no. 453; Marathon cenotaph, *ca.* 485: *IG I² 763* + Agora I 303; Hekatompedon inscription, 485/4: Immerwahr, no. 616; Athenian Stoa at Delphi, *ca.* 479: Meiggs and Lewis 1975, no. 25, pp. 53–54, but compare Walsh (1986), who downdated the previously accepted date to the 450’s (if Walsh’s interpretation is correct, then we must admit that we know even less about dating Attic inscriptions than we thought). Eleusinion altars, *ca.* 510–490: Jeffery 1948, pp. 86–106; Immerwahr, no. 458. Many of the letter forms of Jeffery’s Block II of an Eleusinian altar found in the Agora (pp. 93–101) are identical to those of the Peisistratid altar: tailless epsilon with three horizontal hastae of equal length; *h* as aspirate; crossbar theta, mu, and nu with oblique hastae; three-bar sigma; chi as upright cross. The only letter with any significantly different shape is the alpha with transverse hasta not quite horizontal. Jeffery dated the inscriptions on Block II to *ca.* 500–480, since she views these texts as slightly later than those of Block I, dated by comparison with five other Archaic Attic inscriptions to *ca.* 510–500 (p. 102). Some of these parallels were first observed by Dinsmoor over fifty years ago (1942, p. 198).

⁹⁵ “The script of the altar is no more obviously at home among Attic dedications of 500–495 than among those of 525–520” (in Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, pp. 331–332).

⁹⁶ Jeffery 1990, nos. 36 (*ca.* 525?), 39 (*ca.* 525–500?), 40 (*ca.* 525–500), 41 and 52 (*ca.* 510), and 43 (*ca.* 506), p. 75.

⁹⁷ Jeffery 1990, no. 37, p. 78. “In conclusion, therefore, we can only infer that this Peisistratid mason modelled his lettering on the symmetrical script of the vase-painters” (p. 75). Yet Jeffery also advised caution in this regard: “A painted inscription, then, cannot be judged by the same standards as one cut by a mason” (p. 64).

⁹⁸ See note 8 above.

idiosyncracies cluster around the period 506–485, not *ca.* 522/1. This seems to outweigh the notion that, since a document's date is "movable" within a thirty-year period, a suggested date for the altar of the mid-490's might well drift upwards to the 520's.

A dedication by Hipparchos son of Peisistratos, probably Peisistratos the younger's uncle, at the Ptoön in Boiotia prior to his death in 514 has been assigned to the same stonemason as the cutter of the Apollo altar.⁹⁹ Recently, Immerwahr attempted to separate the two texts epigraphically, suggesting that the finer lettering and more even spacing of the text on the altar indicated that the two need not be contemporary.¹⁰⁰ These discrepancies can be attributed to the differences in shape (irregular, largely concave *vs.* flat) and material (coarse-grained blue-gray marble *vs.* fine-grained Pentelic marble) between the dedications of Hipparchos and Peisistratos and do not prevent assigning both inscriptions to the same stonemason. We are left then with two inscriptions containing similar letter forms dating to *ca.* 514 and *ca.* 496, respectively, both of which were most likely carved by the same craftsman. This span of roughly twenty years falls within all proposed parameters for a minimum period by which to date texts paleographically and for the period proposed for a stonemason's career.¹⁰¹

If the evidence, both architectural and epigraphic, does not preclude a date for the Altar of Apollo Pythios in the 490's, and if the historical circumstances seem appropriate for Peisistratos' presence in Athens *ca.* 496/5, how do we reconcile these assumptions with Thucydides' statement that Peisistratos as archon dedicated the altar when his archonship belongs in 522/1? He mentioned the inscription on the altar both to call his reader's attention to monuments which highlight his narrative and to demonstrate that the Peisistratids habitually placed in the archonships one of their own: family members and supporters. According to Jacoby, Thucydides determined the year of Peisistratos' magistracy from an archon list which contained no historical annotations and determined the association between his archonship and the two dedications "from his knowledge of the monuments, their inscriptions, and the history of these."¹⁰² I suggest that when Thucydides commented at 6.54.6 that Peisistratos set up the altar *as archon*, he misunderstood not who was responsible for the dedication, only when it was made. The obliteration of the inscription on the Altar of the Twelve Gods (Thucydides 6.54.7), executed perhaps as a *damnatio memoriae* of Peisistratos,¹⁰³ and the disrepair of the Altar of Apollo Pythios as suggested by the ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασι surely complicated Thucydides' researches. Since the tradition associated both dedications

⁹⁹ Bizard 1920, pp. 237–241 and figs. 4, 5 (*editio princeps*). The identification of the same hand was made by Raubitschek in Meritt 1939, p. 65, note 1; see also Meiggs 1966, p. 88.

¹⁰⁰ Immerwahr 1990, no. 455, p. 76 and note 62.

¹⁰¹ Tracy (1990, pp. 228–229) noted that the careers of Athenian masons from the late 3rd to the early 1st centuries B.C. sometimes extended more than forty years. Of the thirty-eight craftsmen whose work Tracy studied, roughly one-third remained active for over twenty years.

¹⁰² Jacoby 1949, p. 176.

¹⁰³ Gadbery (1992, pp. 471–472) hesitated to assign any political motivation for the damage inflicted during the lengthening of the Altar in the last third of the 5th century. As she noted, however, Thucydides used the same verb, ἀφανίζειν, at 5.11.1 to describe the obliteration of any μνημόσυλον of Hagnon's settlement at Amphilopolis (p. 472, note 86).

with Peisistratos and the Altar of Twelve Gods with his archonship, Thucydides might have mistakenly correlated the Apollo altar with Peisistratos' magistracy as well.¹⁰⁴

Peisistratos called his dedication a *μνημα* of this magistracy, a commemoration. This word usually appears in a funerary context, synonymous with *σῆμα*, suggesting a memorial, probably set up shortly after someone's death.¹⁰⁵ There are rare occasions when a dedication so labeled is made to commemorate an earlier event. In the example of the Anavysos kouros, the statue of Kroisos dates to *ca.* 520,¹⁰⁶ while his death seems to have occurred at the battle of Pallene in 546.¹⁰⁷ What we have then is an example of a monument erected more than twenty-five years after the event commemorated.¹⁰⁸ This memorial is labeled a *σῆμα*, a tomb, not a *μνημα*, but this may be what Peisistratos had in mind: a commemoration of his earlier archonship, perhaps as a reminder of his previous service to the state.¹⁰⁹

I make no claims to demonstrate conclusively Peisistratos' ultimate motivation for such a dedication because the evidence is thin, but many factors may have played a role. Was it a continuation of a family affinity for the god first expressed by Peisistratos the elder and indicative of a private, religious act? Or was it perhaps an attempt to counter Alkmaionid influence at Delphi? Or did Peisistratos desire to associate the remnant of the family in Athens with the ruling powers championing the democratic cause by "recalling" (*μνημα*) his service to the state in a magistracy now representative of the new democracy? I propose that Peisistratos' commemoration of his archonship, an event not typically celebrated epigraphically, was at least directly related to one of the responsibilities of the eponymous archon in the new democracy and was linked to the worship of Apollo Pythios.

¹⁰⁴ Dover (Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, p. 323), in considering the subsequent statement by Thucydides that he had more accurate information than others through what he had heard (*εἰδὼς μὲν καὶ ἀκοῇ ἀκριβέστερον ἄλλων ἰσχυρίζομαι*, 6.55.1), limited Thucydides' special knowledge to the seniority of Hippias gleaned from a "peculiarly reliable" source. As Dover pointed out, any other elements of the narrative, and this would include even the previous section on the Apollo altar and the archonship of Peisistratos, need be no more than Thucydides' own conclusions "(justified or not) from other data."

¹⁰⁵ For parallels with the *μνημα* formula, see Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948, nos. 97–99, pp. 97–98.

¹⁰⁶ Karouzos 1961, A 18, p. 63. See *contra*, Bicknell (1971, p. 393), who would have Kroisos belong to the previous generation.

¹⁰⁷ Eliot 1967.

¹⁰⁸ See Clairmont 1970, no. 2, pp. 16–17. The text reads as follows: *Στέθι καὶ οἴκτιρον : Κρόισο | παρὰ σῆμα θανόντος : ἡδὼν | πότ' ἐνὶ προμάχοις · ὄλεσε | θόρος : Ἄρες*. "Stand and weep by the tomb of Croesus dead, whom rushing Ares destroyed one day as he fought in the forefront" (trans. Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948, no. 82).

¹⁰⁹ An analogous point was made by Badian regarding a notice in Herodotos. In 494 Miletos was captured; Badian has rejected the traditional date of 493 for the production of Phrynichos' play *The Sack of Miletos* in favor of a date during the first years of the Delian League (1971, pp. 15–16, note 44). Badian's argument depended largely on the basis of his interpretation of Herodotos' comment at 6.21 that Phrynichos "reminded" (*ἀναμνήσαντα*) the Athenians of an event, now presumably forgotten, which occurred some fifteen years earlier. Although I accept the notion that *ἀναμνήσχω* can have this meaning, it seems unnecessary to remove Phrynichos' play from the context of 493 clearly suggested by Herodotos.

Jeffery (1990, p. 75) suggested as well that Peisistratos might have dedicated the altar as a "memorial of his office" sometime after he held the archonship, although she held to a *terminus ante quem* of 511/10 for such a commemoration.

THE THARGELIA

What was the importance of the cult and sanctuary of Pythian Apollo to the Athenians? It served as the seat of the ἐξηγηταί, the place where auspices were observed, the point of departure for the θεωροί to Delphi after the lightning over Harma was observed from the altar of Zeus Astrapaioi, near the Pythion precinct (Strabo 9.2.11),¹¹⁰ and most important, the Pythion served as the focal point of the Thargelian festival. The cult of Pythian Apollo reached its culmination in Athens at the Thargelia on the 7th of Thargelion, Apollo's birthday. Originally a harvest festival, it eventually was linked to the purification of Athens by the selection of two scapegoats who would bear the burden of the citizens' transgressions.¹¹¹ The first day of the festival, 6 Thargelion, was devoted to the ritual purification of the city.¹¹² "On the second day of the Thargelia the procession with the stew of first fruits went from newly purified Athens to Apollo's [Pythian] sanctuary. There were also contests of dithyrambic choruses of boys and men. These contests must have been a later addition to the old festival because the eponymous archon—not the archon basileus—was responsible for them, and the singers came from the ten Kleisthenic tribes The victorious tribe set up a tripod in the Pythion near the Ilissos."¹¹³ A number of such dedicatory tripods were found just west of the Apollo altar during the initial excavations, as well as a statue base recording a dedication to Apollo.¹¹⁴

Some form of competition associated with this festival may date as early as Late Geometric Athens,¹¹⁵ but the contest as described by Aristotle involving dithyrambic choruses drawn from the Athenian tribes must have been added after 507/6. This addition to the festival can be dated so precisely because our sources indicate the choruses were recruited from the ten Kleisthenic tribes, which were established in the year after the implementation of Kleisthenes' reforms.¹¹⁶ Aristotle added that the eponymous archon had the responsibility for overseeing this competition (*Ath. Pol.* 56.3).¹¹⁷ What emerges,

¹¹⁰ See Wycherley 1959, pp. 69–70 and Vanderpool's remarks (following on p. 71) that Harma and all of the Parnes range are visible from the Pythion southeast of the Akropolis. But cf. Broneer 1960.

¹¹¹ Colin 1905, p. 12; Harpocraton, s.v. Φαρμακός.

¹¹² Simon 1983, p. 76.

¹¹³ Simon 1983, p. 77, note 34. "In the fifth century the archon, who was responsible for organizing the dramatic and choral performances at the City Dionysia, also was required in a similar way to provide for choirs of men and boys to compete as two classes in singing hymns at the Thargelia. The choirs were recruited from the different tribes, but as ten units would have been too many for the competition, the tribes were grouped in pairs to form five choirs of men and five of boys, each containing fifty singers" (Parke 1977, p. 148). *Suda*, s.v. Πύθιον.

¹¹⁴ Tripods: *IG* II² 3065–3067; statue base: *IG* II² 2789; Travlos 1971, pp. 100, 101, fig. 130 and 103, figs. 135, 136. Only the altar identifies the region conclusively as a sanctuary of Apollo Pythios.

¹¹⁵ Simon 1983, p. 79. Parke (1977, pp. 146–149) suggested Asian origins for this Apollo cult and placed its arrival in Athens in the 8th century.

¹¹⁶ Pollux, ὀνομαστικόν 8.110 (during Alkmaion's archonship); Cadoux 1948, p. 114; Pickard-Cambridge 1962, p. 37; Badian 1971, pp. 10–11. The *Marmor Parium* (*FGrHist* 239 F 26) associated the archonship of Lysagoras (probably 509/8) with the first competition of choruses of men in Athens (Cadoux 1948, p. 113).

¹¹⁷ The eponymous archon was also responsible for the Great Dionysia and the Diisoteria (*Ath. Pol.* 56.4–5); Rhodes 1981, pp. 622–629. Cf. Antiphon 6.11. See also Wade-Gery 1958a, p. 171.

then, is a distinct relationship between the eponymous archon, the contests of dithyrambic choruses at the Thargelia, and the cult of Apollo Pythios, which can be dated definitively. The choruses were chosen by Kleisthenic tribe, and the eponymous archon was responsible for the competition, and since Peisistratos made his dedication as a commemoration of *his* archonship, then it seems logical to associate the dedication with an Athens which had experienced the Kleisthenic reforms, for a *terminus post quem* of 507/6 for the altar. Peisistratos' dedication emphasized the connection between the eponymous archonship and the worship of Apollo Pythios through the medium of the Thargelia contests.

A more tenuous link which might reveal some of Peisistratos' motivation for a dedication to Apollo Pythios arises from the connection between the worship of Apollo and the cult of Theseus. The celebration of Theseus on the 8th of Pyanepsion at the Theseia coincides with two events which occurred on the previous day: the monthly celebration of Apollo and the Pyanepsia. Like the Thargelia, the Pyanepsia was a festival devoted to the fecundity of the earth, and Parke established an intimate connection between these two festivals.¹¹⁸ Pausanias' account (1.19.1) of Theseus' demonstration of masculine prowess in the Delphinion again establishes a connection between this Attic hero and the worship of Apollo, specifically the Apollo worshipped near the Olympieion. One last connection emerges in the depiction of the rape of Antiope the Amazon, the wife of Theseus,¹¹⁹ which appears on the pediment of the Temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria.¹²⁰

The Peisistratids had established a relationship with Apollo long before the early 5th century: Peisistratos the tyrant founded the Temple of Apollo Patroos, the worship of whom was central to the home of every Athenian (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 55.3).¹²¹ A dedication by his grandson to Apollo, therefore, should not be considered novel. Not coincidentally, the bitterest rivals of the Peisistratids, the Alkmaionids, had forged a powerful connection with Delphic Apollo in the last years before the coup of 511/10, and they had bolstered the position and importance of the cult hero Theseus as well, most likely after 510.¹²²

The pieces fall neatly into place. Some time after 507/6 Peisistratos the younger chose a dedication to Apollo Pythios (1) to remind the citizenry of his service as eponymous archon, (2) to forge a link between his service in that magistracy and the democratic responsibility of overseeing the Thargelia, (3) to connect that service with the Alkmaionid-sponsored veneration of the Attic hero Theseus, who had supplanted the Peisistratid-sponsored worship of Herakles, and (4) to attempt to reestablish an association between the Peisistratids and Apollo in an effort to rival the Alkmaionids' claim to the god's special attention. I propose that this took place *ca.* 496/5 in the archonship of Hipparchos, the nephew of Peisistratos the younger. What better way for a Peisistratid, in a period when Peisistratids are "tolerated" in Athens once again, albeit briefly, to try to regain credibility than to (re)associate the family with Delphic Apollo (Delphinios and Pythios) and, topographically, with Theseus, who replaced Herakles as the new deity-of-the-day and who represented the growth and spirit of δημοκρατία? The Alkmaionids had secured their relationship with the Pythian

¹¹⁸ Parke 1977, pp. 75, 77–81, 147.

¹¹⁹ *ARV*², p. 238, no. 1.

¹²⁰ Webster 1972, pp. 74–75.

¹²¹ Rhodes 1981, pp. 617–618; Simon 1983, p. 74.

¹²² Webster 1972, pp. 74–75, 82, 250–253; Boardman 1972; Rhodes 1981, p. 211.

priestess and Apollo for all of Delphi, Athens, and for that matter Hellas to see by the early 490's. The dedication of an altar in honor of Apollo Pythios not only would have reminded Peisistratos' fellow citizens, and the Delphians, of his family's previous largesse towards the god but also would have indicated to the Alkmaionids that he and his family were similarly well connected in Phokis.¹²³

Williams viewed the dedication of the altar to Pythian Apollo in terms of the Peisistratid-Alkmaionid reconciliation documented by the archonship of Kleisthenes in 525/4,¹²⁴ bolstered by Alkmaionid influence at Delphi. Yet this conflicts with his testimony that the Alkmaionid presence at Delphi, most vividly expressed by their contributions to the reconstruction of the Temple of Apollo, took place "only when their political fortunes were in decline"¹²⁵ in a period when the Peisistratids "consolidated their power and retained firm control of the executive,"¹²⁶ in other words, *ca.* 514 and after. Williams understood the complexity of the problem when he doubted whether we are "to believe that the Pisistratidai allowed [the Alkmaionids] to continue with their propaganda" at Delphi from 530 to 514 and "that the Peisistratids considered [such activity at Delphi] politically harmless."¹²⁷ If the Alkmaionids did not exercise considerable influence at Delphi *ca.* 522/1, then the political motivation for an altar dedicated to Apollo in Athens dissolves.¹²⁸

If 496/5, the year of Hipparchos' archonship, marked the first opportunity when it was politically viable for Peisistratos to make a dedication in Athens, when did this period of Alkmaionid altruism terminate? In 493/2 two securely dated incidents occurred which bear directly on the Athenian posture towards the Peisistratids: the archonship of Themistokles and the prosecution of Miltiades by Megakles and his *adfines*, the Alkmaionids, viewed by Williams as a trial of strength between the Alkmaionids, the Philaids, and the Lykomids.¹²⁹ The contest may have been for the hearts and minds, and leadership, of the many who opposed the Persians (and the exiled Hippias) and would have represented the end to the tolerance shown towards the Peisistratids begun in 496/5.

¹²³ The Alkmaionids may have countered with a monument of their own, and at Delphi instead of Athens, in the Athenian Treasury. Proposed dates for this structure have ranged from 510 to the 480's; see recently Francis and Vickers 1988; Cook 1989; Shear, Jr. 1993. The precise date is not critical here, just the fact that *after* the expulsion of the tyrants the Alkmaionids were still making gestures towards Apollo and Delphi. This time, it was conducted when the family was in power in Athens, and it may well have prompted, or responded to, Peisistratos' dedication in the Athenian Python.

¹²⁴ Williams 1973, p. 82: "In view of the Alkmaionids' Delphic connections it seems reasonable to suppose that such a dedication would not have been made without the cooperation of the Alkmaionidai." And further: "... it seems likely that the Alkmaionidai, along with their growing faction of political allies, agreed to participate in the Peisistratids' reconciliation programme."

¹²⁵ Williams 1973, p. 94.

¹²⁶ Williams 1973, p. 92; see Thucydides 6.54.6–7, Herodotos 7.6.3.

¹²⁷ Williams 1973, p. 94.

¹²⁸ Williams' solution places Alkmaionid investment in Delphi, and Apollo, in the years after their exile in 514 and does not contravene the archaeological evidence. According to his scenario, the chronology which emerges from Herodotos and Aristotle implies "that the Alkmaionids' interest in the Delphic contract [for the reconstruction of the Temple] materialized as a direct response to their failure at Leipsydion" in 513 and that, although work on the Temple may have begun before this year, the Alkmaionid contribution began only after the failed coup at Leipsydion (Williams 1973, pp. 89, 95).

¹²⁹ Williams 1973, pp. 192–193.

I propose, then, that during this period in the mid-490's, Peisistratos the younger found a positive climate in which he could make a public display of his affiliation with his father and attempted to link himself and his family with aspects of the ruling faction. A dedication to Apollo Pythios would have been politically correct for someone trying to establish a link with the ruling Alkmaionids and have been done in honor of what was now a magistracy of the new democracy. But could Peisistratos, now roughly sixty years of age, have resided in Athens at this time?

The presence of his nephew Hipparchos certainly suggests that possibility. The only obstacle that might prevent this is the notice in Thucydides of a stele on the Akropolis which listed the ἄδελφοί of the Peisistratids and which named all of Hippias' descendants. Yet Lavelle and Dover have suggested that this could date after Marathon, in part because of the discrepancy between the mild punishment of the family in 511/10 and the public notice on a stele that must have singled out the Peisistratids as enemies of the state, and in part because of the continuing presence of Hipparchos in the city until after Marathon.¹³⁰

One direct result of the arrival of the Persian armed forces at Marathon was the likely temporary alliance against the common foe between all members of Athenian political society, including even the remaining members of Hippias' family in Athens. It is safe and logical to assume that the ostracism of Hipparchos in 488/7 proves his presence in Athens, and hence at Marathon, two years earlier. We must imagine that a grandson (and son, if Peisistratos the younger was in Athens at this time) fought against the Persians and hence against the backers of the elderly *paterfamilias*.¹³¹ Does this mean that Hipparchos and Peisistratos had turned against their family in 490, or perhaps as early as 496/5? I am disinclined to portray either Hipparchos or his uncle as the family black sheep, as the pro-democratic offspring of the exiled tyrant. Hipparchos surely must have held pro-tyrannical sympathies if we are to understand his ostracism.¹³² Aristotle, I think, was perfectly clear on this point: Hipparchos was ostracized because he was the ἡγεμὼν καὶ προστάτης of the φίλοι τῶν τυράννων (*Ath. Pol.* 22.4) and because he had grown too powerful.¹³³ The next two individuals ostracized were similarly disposed towards the Peisistratids (*Ath. Pol.* 22.5–6),¹³⁴ and only beginning in 485/4 were the targets of ostracism “the less

¹³⁰ Lavelle 1983, pp. 111–112; Dover, in Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, pp. 324–325.

¹³¹ So Badian (1971, p. 11): “Presumably he duly fought at Marathon; else retribution would have been firmer and swifter than the delayed ostracism.”

¹³² Although Badian (1971, p. 11) tempered this stance with the observation that he may have been a harmless, though prominent, politician whose name and connections alone proved his undoing, I am uncomfortable with Williams' suggestion (1973, pp. 196–197, 207, note 87) that Themistokles held responsibility for Hipparchos' ostracism, “cashing in on the popular mood to remove (potential?) enemies.” My discomfort lies with the interval of two years between Marathon and the public condemnation of Hipparchos, a long time to wait before such “postwar recrimination” took hold.

¹³³ *Pol.* 3.1284 A 17–22, B 15–22; 5.1302 B 15–21, 1308 B 16–19. Cf. Thucydides 8.73.3. Rhodes (1981, pp. 269–270) stopped short of attributing the introduction of ostracism to an attack on Hipparchos or any of the other Peisistratids or to a means by which potential tyrants might be removed from the city, a position which is sound.

¹³⁴ The second victim was Megakles the son of Hippokrates, a powerful Alkmaionid; the third, not named by Aristotle, might have been Kallias the son of Kratias. See Rhodes 1981, pp. 275–276 for the relevant

popular of rival political leaders.”¹³⁵ The most likely explanation for the contribution of the Peisistratids to the Greek cause at Marathon has all Athenians, regardless of their affiliations, uniting to counter the Persian threat.¹³⁶ Hippias’ presence at Marathon may have deterred his relations’ enthusiasm on the battlefield, although the fact that the ostracism of Hipparchos took place a full two years later suggests his innocence of any charge of προδοσία, at least for the time being.

Aristotle’s observations that the δῆμος allowed those friends of the tyrants who had not participated in the παραχάλ of 511/10 to remain in the city and that Hipparchos served as their ἡγεμὼν καὶ προστάτης suggest who lay behind the efforts to effect an Athenian-Persian-Peisistratid entente (*Ath. Pol.* 22.4). I cannot agree with Badian’s sentiment that “we certainly have no reason to assume that he was prominent when elected” and that “his election rest[ed] entirely on his name, which he could not help, and which in the end may have driven him out of his country.”¹³⁷ The easing of anti-Peisistratid sentiment that must have accompanied Hipparchos’ election to the archonship, occurring on the heels of Athenian efforts to appease the Persians¹³⁸ and their participation in the sack of Sardis and subsequent defeat suffered at the hands of the Persians at Ephesos in 498 (Herodotos 5.100–102; Pausanias 1.29.5), seems more than coincidental. The orthodox position of Walker, that the Alkmaionids abetted the election of Hipparchos, is extreme, but I do support the notion that in the mid-490’s efforts arose in Athens to demonstrate goodwill towards the Persian Empire.¹³⁹ In this context Meritt placed the archonships of Hipparchos and Peisistratos the younger.¹⁴⁰ The magistracy of the latter in any period other than the 520’s is now discredited, but his political activity or simple presence in Athens in the 490’s can be understood in the context of an easing of tensions between the Alkmaionids and Peisistratids.

The conclusion to Peisistratid activity in Athens coincides with the end of the wars with Persia. In 488/7, two years after Marathon and hence unlikely as a reaction to any commission of προδοσία, Hipparchos is the first to be ostracized, and the first of three φίλοι of the tyrants to suffer this fate (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 22.3–4; Harpokration, *s.v.* Ἱππάρχος, citing Lykourgos, *Leokr.* and Androtion).¹⁴¹ The primacy of the ὁστραχοφορία that led to the ostracism of Peisistratos’ nephew, coupled with the identity of the next two victims, Megakles and possibly Kallias, has prompted considerable speculation as to the origins and motivations for ostracism in its earliest stages.¹⁴² My goal here is not to reexamine

bibliography and the doubts thrown on this identification. See also Vanderpool 1970, pp. 21–22; Badian 1971, p. 15, note 40; Bicknell 1972, pp. 64–76.

¹³⁵ Rhodes 1981, p. 277.

¹³⁶ The alleged betrayal by the Alkmaionids at Marathon has drawn the interest of many scholars; for a recent discussion with bibliography, see Develin 1985.

¹³⁷ Badian 1971, p. 11.

¹³⁸ A view which Herodotos assumed at 5.96.

¹³⁹ See recently Hart (1982, pp. 12–15) and Develin (1985, pp. 130–133) for positions on the mercurial Peisistratid-Alkmaionid relationship from the 560’s to the 480’s.

¹⁴⁰ Meritt 1939, pp. 62–65; see also Cornelius 1929, p. 99.

¹⁴¹ See p. 154 above and note 134.

¹⁴² Some of the fundamental studies which address specifically the ostracism of Hipparchos son of Charmos and its significance include Gomme 1944; Hammond 1956; Stanton 1970; Vanderpool 1970; Badian 1971; Bicknell 1972; Rhodes 1976; Karavites 1977; Holladay 1978; Williams 1980.

these issues but to situate the peculiar evidence provided by one sherd in its appropriate context.

Because Meritt believed the letter forms of *IG I² 761* belonged in the early 5th century,¹⁴³ he collected the evidence for dating Peisistratos' archonship to this period and selected the then unassigned year of 497/6.¹⁴⁴ For Meritt, the lynchpin was the *ostrakon* (inv. no. P 3629)¹⁴⁵ discovered in the Agora in 1934 inscribed in retrograde fashion with the name Πισίς[τ]ρατο[ς].¹⁴⁶ The most spirited objections to the evidence from this sherd came from Cadoux, Guarducci, Vanderpool, and Jeffery. Cadoux contended that "a single ostrakon is not very weighty evidence."¹⁴⁷ I apply here what Eliot and McGregor said about the presence of Kleisthenes' name in the fragmentary archon list: "The fragment, indirectly, is itself the evidence; we cannot dismiss it merely by denying what it has to tell us."¹⁴⁸ Without the evidence from the archon list we would still believe that the Alkmaionids were in exile constantly from 546–510. Guarducci,¹⁴⁹ who suggested that the inscriber of the ostrakon may have intended nothing more than to refer humorously to the tyrant Peisistratos, raised two valid points: (1) why is there only one sherd preserved containing Peisistratos' name? (2) why are neither his patronymic or demotic on the ostrakon? Lang's 1990 Agora volume on ostracism provided 14 examples from the 480's of only one ostrakon extant naming a candidate for ostracism.¹⁵⁰ One ostrakon, in fact, bearing the name of Eretrieus is extremely fragmentary, preserving only the first four letters, although a trace of another letter (for the patronymic or demotic?) is found on the succeeding line.¹⁵¹ As for the absence of additional identifying data on the ostrakon, Lang noted that some ostraka are written retrograde (as is the case with P 3629), boustrophedon, or *Schlangenschrift*¹⁵² and that it was possible, though uncommon, for a nomen to appear without patronymic or demotic.¹⁵³ Perhaps, as in the case of ostraka with incomplete patronymics or demotics, the writer believed that sufficient evidence was provided just by supplying the nomen Peisistratos.¹⁵⁴

Vanderpool voiced other objections: the sherd belongs to the foot of a large Geometric vase,¹⁵⁵ and it came from a mixed fill including late Roman and Hellenistic sherds and not from an early 5th-century fill of ostraka. Yet he himself admitted that parallels exist

¹⁴³ Meritt 1939, pp. 62–63.

¹⁴⁴ Lewis (1962, p. 201) demonstrated that Archias held the archonship in this year.

¹⁴⁵ Initial reports: Shear 1935, p. 179; Shear 1938, p. 361. Vanderpool 1949, pl. 60 for a photograph and facsimile; Jeffery 1990, pl. 2:9e for the facsimile.

¹⁴⁶ Vanderpool (1949, p. 405) described the provenience and sherd in some detail.

¹⁴⁷ Cadoux 1948, p. 111, note 219.

¹⁴⁸ Eliot and McGregor 1960, p. 32.

¹⁴⁹ 1948, pp. 122–124. Although Vanderpool had not seen Guarducci's comments, he shared her concerns; see below.

¹⁵⁰ *Agora XXV*: Alexis Mega(---), Aristo. . [] Charop[], Charias Ph[---]dou, Eret[rius], Eupolis Thoraieus, Hierokl[] Herma[], Laispodias Koilethen, Onomastos Konthyleus, Panaitios Agrylethen, Phalanthos Spintharou, Phileas Derketou, Spintharos Eu[], Teisandros Isagorou, and Thrasykles (her nos. 4, 19, 97, 108, 112, 132, 627, 649, 650, 657, 658, 662, 663, and 1052).

¹⁵¹ *Agora XXV*, no. 108, p. 44.

¹⁵² *Agora XXV*, pp. 9–10.

¹⁵³ *Agora XXV*, pp. 17–18; Vanderpool 1949, p. 405, note 37.

¹⁵⁴ Lang chose to exclude the evidence from this sherd in her study, based on Vanderpool's conviction (for which, see below) that it is not an ostrakon from the 5th century (personal communication with the author).

¹⁵⁵ Lang (*Agora XXI*, D1, p. 17) dated the vase to the late 8th or early 7th century.

among the thousands of undoubted sherds in support of assigning this to an early 5th-century ὀστρακοφορία.¹⁵⁶ Ultimately Vanderpool associated the ostrakon with Peisistratos the tyrant on the basis of the curved leg of the alpha, for which he found 7th-century parallels, and proposed that it represented a vote of exile for the tyrant by a member of the Areiopagos in the mid-6th century.¹⁵⁷ Yet the curved leg of the alpha is not limited to the 7th century and appears in numerous examples from ὀστρακοφορία of the 480's.¹⁵⁸ Vanderpool's scenario for a vote against Peisistratos in the 6th century is unique, but the lack of any substantive comparanda for such a procedure seems damning. Alternatively, Jeffery proposed that the ostrakon might refer to the Peisistratos who held the archonship in 669/8,¹⁵⁹ an equally weak suggestion. The unsophisticated style of writing suggested to these scholars that the Peisistratos sherd had affinities with idle scratchings or some otherwise unknown early system of voting. Yet, a comparison between the Peisistratos sherd and many of those from ὀστρακοφορία of the 480's examined by Lang¹⁶⁰ evinces striking similarities: misspellings, half-cut letters, multiple letter forms, and a general sloppiness of style. A survey of the ostraka from the 480's suggests that the ability to write and spell was not critical to taking part in an ὀστρακοφορία.¹⁶¹ I suggest that this ostrakon does refer to Peisistratos the younger and that, like his nephew before him, he was a candidate (although in this case, an unsuccessful one) for ostracism in the 480's. As with many of the more than 6,000 sherds now identified as ostraka, the name on this pot fragment belongs to a well-known individual in Athenian history, and nothing about the physical characteristics of the sherd demands disassociating it from a vote to ostracize a Peisistratos in 488/7 or after.

How could the grandson of Hippias be ostracized but not the son? Unlike Hipparchos, Peisistratos bore the name of his grandfather but none of the political spirit. He served as archon in the 520's because it was a necessary gesture by and for the family; he followed his father into exile in 511/10 and returned within fifteen years, because unlike his father he posed no threat to the new democracy. He dedicated an altar *ca.* 496/5–493/2 because it was politically advantageous to do so, but it did not signify public political participation. He was a candidate for ostracism, and after that we know nothing. He probably followed his nephew into exile, although perhaps his insignificance in Athenian political spheres resulted in a minimum of effort expended by the δῆμος to rid itself of him. Or, even though he was a candidate for ostracism, maybe he did not live long enough to fall victim to this new instrument of democracy¹⁶² and died shortly after the first ὀστρακοφορία of 488/7, which drove from Athens his more politically engaged nephew.

¹⁵⁶ Vanderpool 1949, pp. 406–407.

¹⁵⁷ Vanderpool 1949, pp. 406–408 and notes 40–42.

¹⁵⁸ *Agora* XXV, nos. 487, 542 (Kallixenos Aristonymous Xypetaion); 630 (Megakles Hippokratous Alopekethen); 762, 885 (Themistokles Neokleous Phrearrios); 1060 (Xanthippos Aripheon [Cholargeus]).

¹⁵⁹ Jeffery 1990, p. 70.

¹⁶⁰ For example, *Agora* XXV, nos. 49 (Aristeides Lysimachou Alopekethen), 89 (Boutalion Ep[] Marathonios), 315, 464, 542 (Kallixenos Aristonymous Xypetaion), 650 (Melanthios Phalanthous).

¹⁶¹ The best example, of course, is the anecdote recounted by Plutarch (*Aristeides* 7), strikingly similar to the scenario suggested by Lang for the ostrakon inscribed Ἀριστείδης | [Λυσι] | [Ἀλοπεκεει] | Λυσιμάχο (*Agora* XXV, no. 34, p. 36, fig. 2).

¹⁶² See Eliot's similar proposal for the sudden disappearance of Kleisthenes from the political scene (1986, p. 34).

It is also conceivable that Peisistratos left Athens voluntarily in the wake of the anti-Peisistratid sentiment following Marathon and joined the remnants of his family in the Persian court. An aside by Herodotos may allude to his presence among the advisors to Xerxes. Long after the family has been forgotten in the series of events outlined in Book 7 and the first third of Book 8, along come Xerxes and his troops to Athens, where they decamp at the Areiopagos and hurl flaming arrows at the "wooden walls". The Athenians are *in extremis* (Herodotos 8.52)¹⁶³ and in their most desperate hour (the high point of Herodotean melodrama for the history of the survival of Athens), and just before they begin to hurl pieces of the Akropolis itself at the besiegers, they reject λόγους τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν προσφερόντων περὶ ὁμολογίας. Who are these enigmatic Πεισιστράτιδαι who accompanied Xerxes to Athens in 480 B.C.? Are they the male descendants of Hippias' brothers, who probably had been in exile since 511/10 and whose knowledge of the city and its defenses would be more than thirty years obsolete? Might Hipparchos have joined Xerxes to avenge the treatment he suffered at the hands of the newly empowered δῆμος?¹⁶⁴ Or might Peisistratos have returned to his homeland one last time, reminiscent of his father's scheming in 490, to share with Xerxes the intimate knowledge he had of Athenian topography and politics, a knowledge which had terminated some time after the inception of ostracism in 488/7? Unfortunately, Herodotos's description of these repatriated Athenians fails to complete our understanding of the career of the younger Peisistratos, but now we have a better sense of his movements after his thirtieth year. Shortly after this episode, the Athenian attitude towards the Peisistratids hardened. Never again would they be tolerated in Athens: the new tyrannicide statue group was erected in the Agora, the family was condemned and exiled for perpetuity, and their property was confiscated.¹⁶⁵ More than thirty years after the exile of Hippias, Athens finally rid itself of his progeny.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agora XXI* = M. Lang, *Graffiti and Dipinti (The Athenian Agora XXI)*, Princeton 1976
Agora XXV = M. Lang, *Ostraka (The Athenian Agora XXV)*, Princeton 1990
 Alexander, J. W. 1958/1959. "Was Cleisthenes an Athenian Archon?" *CJ* 54, pp. 307–314
 Alexandri, O. 1968. «'Ὁδὸς Ἰωσὴφ τῶν Ρωγῶν», *Δελτ* 21, B' 1 1966 [1968], pp. 65–68
 ———. 1969. «'Ὁδὸς Ἰωσὴφ τῶν Ρωγῶν 15», *Δελτ* 23, B' 1 1968 [1969], pp. 61–63
 ———. 1970. «'Ὁδὸς Ἰωσὴφ τῶν Ρωγῶν 17», *Δελτ* 24, B' 1 1969 [1970], p. 50
 Amandry, P. 1946. "Le portique des Athéniens à Delphes," *BCH* 70, pp. 1–8
 Amit, M. 1970. "La date de l'alliance entre Athènes et Platées," *AntCl* 39, pp. 414–426
 Arbanitopoulos, A. S. 1937–1939. *Ἐπιγραφικὴ*, [Athens]
 Badian, E. 1971. "Archons and Strategoi," *Antichthon* 5, pp. 1–34
 Beloch, K. J. 1926. *Griechische Geschichte* I, ii, Berlin/Leipzig
 Bicknell, P. J. 1971. "Peisianax of IG I² 1022," *Mnemosyne* 24, pp. 392–395
 ———. 1972. *Studies in Athenian Politics and Genealogy (Historia Einzl. 19)*, Wiesbaden

¹⁶³ ... ἐς τὸ ἑσχατον κακοῦ.

¹⁶⁴ According to Lykourgos, *Leokr.* 117 and Harpokration, s.v. Ἱππαρχος, Hipparchos was sentenced to death *in absentia* for failing to answer a charge of προδοσία leveled against him ca. 481–480. Rhodes (1981, pp. 281–282, with bibliography) implied that his failure to return with the other exiles recalled by Themistokles before Salamis resulted in the charge. If he did not return (*contra* Holladay 1978, pp. 189–190), then he most likely lent his services to a Persian king as his grandfather did before him.

¹⁶⁵ See Dover in Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover 1970, p. 323.

- Bizard, L. 1920. "Fouilles du Ptoion (1903). II. Inscriptions," *BCH* 44, pp. 227–262
- Boardman, J. 1959. "Chian and Early Ionic Architecture," *AntJ* 39, pp. 170–218
- . 1972. "Herakles, Peisistratos and Sons," *RA*, pp. 57–72
- . 1975. "Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis," *JHS* 95, pp. 1–12
- Boersma, J. S. 1970. *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C. (Scripta archaeologica groningen 4)*, Groningen
- Bradeen, D. W. 1963. "The Fifth-Century Archon List," *Hesperia* 32, pp. 187–208
- Broneer, O. 1960. "Notes on Three Athenian Cult Places," *ApXEp*, pp. 54–62
- Busolt, G. 1893–1904. *Griechische Geschichte*, 2nd ed., Gotha
- Cadoux, T. J. 1948. "The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides," *JHS* 68, pp. 70–123
- Clairmont, C. W. 1970. *Grave Stone and Epigram: Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period*, Mainz
- Colin, G. 1905. *Le Culte d'Apollon Pythien à Athènes*, Paris
- Cook, R. M. 1989. "The Francis-Vickers Chronology," *JHS* 109, pp. 164–170
- Cornelius, F. 1929. *Die Tyrannis in Athen*, Munich
- Cromey, R. D. 1979. "Kleisthenes' Fate," *Historia* 28, pp. 129–147
- Crosby, M. 1949. "The Altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens," in *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear (Hesperia Supplement 8)*, pp. 82–103
- Curtius, E. 1894. "Das Pythion in Athen," in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen I*, Berlin
- Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford
- Develin, R. 1985. "Herodotos and the Alkmeonids," in *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*, J. W. Eadie and J. Ober, eds., Lanham, Maryland, pp. 125–139
- Dinsmoor, W. B. 1942. "The Correlation of Greek Archaeology with History," in *Studies in the History of Culture: The Disciplines of the Humanities. Essays in Honour of Waldo Leland*, Menasha, Wisconsin, pp. 185–216
- Ducat, J. 1971. *Les kouroi du Ptoion. Le sanctuaire d'Apollon Ptoieus à l'époque archaïque*, Paris
- Eliot, C. W. J. 1967. "Where Did the Alkmaionidai Live?" *Historia* 16, pp. 279–286
- . 1986. "Kleisthenes of Athens and the Disputed Case of the Paternity of Democracy," in *The Crake Lectures, 1984*, M. Farcy and I. Cohen, eds., New Brunswick, pp. 27–37
- Eliot, C. W. J., and M. F. McGregor. 1960. "Kleisthenes: Eponymous Archon 525/4 B.C.," *Phoenix* 14, pp. 27–35
- Forrest, W. G. 1969. "The Tradition of Hippias' Expulsion from Athens," *GRBS* 10, pp. 277–286
- Francis, E. D., and M. Vickers. 1988. "The Agora Revisited. Athenian Chronology c. 500–450 B.C.," *BSA* 83, pp. 143–167
- Friedländer, P., and H. B. Hoffleit. 1948. *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars*, Berkeley/Los Angeles
- Frost, F. J. 1985. "Toward a History of Peisistratid Athens," in *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*, J. W. Eadie and J. Ober, eds., Lanham, Maryland, pp. 57–75
- Gadbery, L. M. 1988. "Three Fifth Century B.C. Statue Bases from the Athenian Agora" (diss. New York University 1988)
- . 1992. "The Sanctuary of the Twelve Gods in the Athenian Agora: A Revised View," *Hesperia* 61, pp. 447–489
- Galli, F. 1971. "Aspetti della politica interna ed estera degli Alcmeonidi," *QUCC* 11, pp. 65–76
- Gomme, A. W. 1944. "Athenian Notes: 1. Athenian Politics 510–483," *AJP* 65, pp. 321–339
- Gomme, A. W., A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover. 1970. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides IV*, repr. Oxford 1978
- Grote, G. 1868. *A History of Greece IV*, New York
- Guarducci, M. 1948. "Nota di Epigrafia Attica Arcaica," *ASAtene*, n.s. 3–5 (1942 impr.), pp. 115–134
- . 1967. *Epigrafia greca I*, Rome
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1955. "Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.," *Historia* 4, pp. 371–411
- . 1956. "The Philaids and the Chersonese," *CQ* n.s. 6, pp. 113–129
- Hansen 1983 = *Carmina epigraphica Graeca saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.*, P. A. Hansen, ed., Berlin/New York
- Hart, J. 1982. *Herodotus and Greek History*, London/New York

- Hicks, E. L. 1882. *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford
- Hicks, E. L., and G. F. Hill. 1901. *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 2nd ed., Oxford
- Hignett, C. 1952. *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford
- Hill, I. T. 1953. *The Ancient City of Athens: Its Topography and Monuments*, London
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1926. *Historische griechische Epigramme*, Bonn
- Holladay, J. 1978. "Medism in Athens 508–480 B.C.," *GaR* 25, pp. 174–191
- Hondius, J. J. E. 1922. "Hippias oder Hipparchos?" *Hermes* 57, pp. 475–477
- Horsley, G. H. R. 1986. "Kleisthenes and the Abortive Athenian Embassy to Sardis," *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 7, pp. 99–107
- Immerwahr, H. R. 1990. *Attic Script: A Survey*, Oxford
- Jacoby, F. 1949. *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford, repr. New York 1973
- Janell, W. 1906. *Ausgewählte Inschriften Griechen und Deutschen*, Berlin
- Jeffery, L. J. 1948. "The Boustrophedon Sacral Inscriptions from the Agora," *Hesperia* 17, pp. 86–111
- . 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, rev. with supplement by A. W. Johnston, Oxford
- Judeich, W. 1931. *Topographie von Athen*, 2nd ed., Munich
- Karavites, P. 1977. "Realities and Appearances, 490–480 B.C.," *Historia* 26, pp. 129–147
- Karouzos, C. I. 1961. *Aristodikos. Zur Geschichte der spätarchaisch-attischen Plastik und der Grabstatue*, Stuttgart
- Kelly, D. H. 1978. "The Athenian Archonship 508/7–487/6 B.C.," *Antichthon* 12, pp. 1–17
- Kern, O. 1913. *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Bonn
- Kirchhoff 1877 = *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*, suppl. vol. I, A. Kirchhoff, ed., Berlin
- Kirchner, J. 1948. *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum*, 2nd ed., G. Klaffenbach, ed., Berlin
- Kleine, J. 1973. *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der attischen Kunst von Peisistratos bis Themistokles*, Tübingen
- Kluwe, E. 1966. "Die Tyrannis der Peisistratiden und ihr Niederschlag in der Kunst (Studien zur Kulturpolitik der Peisistratiden)" (diss. Friedrich-Schiller-Universität 1966)
- Knight, D. W. 1970. "Some Studies in Athenian Politics in the Fifth Century B.C." (*Historia Einzl.* 13), Wiesbaden
- Kolb, F. 1977. "Die Bau-, Religions- und Kulturpolitik der Peisistratiden," *JdI* 92, pp. 99–138
- Lang, M. 1954. "The Generation of Peisistratus," *AJP* 75, pp. 59–73
- . See also *Agora XXI* and *Agora XXV*
- Lavelle, B. M. 1983. "Hipparchos. Studies in Peisistratid History, 528–514 B.C." (diss. University of British Columbia 1983)
- Lewis, D. M. 1962. "The Archon of 497–496 B.C.," *CR* 12, p. 201
- Löwy, E. 1937. "Zur Datierung attischer Inschriften," *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie* 216, Abh. 4, pp. 12–14
- Lynch, J. P. 1984. "Hipparchos' Wall in the Academy at Athens: A Closer Look at the Tradition," in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday (GRBM 10)*, Durham, North Carolina, pp. 173–179
- McGregor, M. F. 1940. "The Pro-Persian Party at Athens from 510 to 480 B.C.," in *Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Supplementary vol. I)*, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 71–95
- Meiggs, R. 1966. "The Dating of Fifth-Century Attic Inscriptions," *JHS* 86, pp. 86–98
- Meiggs and Lewis 1975 = *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 2nd ed., R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, eds., Oxford
- Meritt, B. D. 1939. "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 8, pp. 59–65
- Michel, C. 1900. *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, Paris
- Mitsos, M. T., and E. Vanderpool. 1950. "Inscriptions from Attica," *Hesperia* 19, pp. 25–30
- Mylonas, K. D. 1877. «Νέα προσκτήματα τοῦ ἐν τῷ βαρβακελῷ μουσεῖου», *BCH* 1, pp. 349–350
- Nachmanson 1913 = *Historische attische Inschriften*, E. Nachmanson, ed., Bonn
- PA = *Prosopographia Attica*, J. Kirchner, ed., Berlin 1901–1903
- Page 1981 = *Further Greek Epigrams*, D. L. Page, ed., Cambridge
- Parke, H. W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*, Ithaca
- Peck, W. 1954. *Attische Grabschriften I*, Berlin

- Peek 1955 = *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I: Grab-Epigramme*, W. Peek, ed., Berlin
- Pfohl, G. 1964. *Geschichte und Epigramm*, Stuttgart
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1962. *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*, 2nd ed., rev. T. B. L. Webster, Oxford
- Plommer, W. H. 1969. "The Tyranny of the Archon List," *CR* 19, pp. 126–129
- Preger 1891 = *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae ex scriptoribus praeter Anthologiam collectae*, T. Preger, ed., Leipzig
- Raubitschek, A. E. 1939. "Leagros," *Hesperia* 8, pp. 155–164
- . 1940. "Two Monuments Erected after the Victory of Marathon," *AJA* 44, pp. 53–59
- . 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1976. "Pisistratid Chronology Again," *Phoenix* 30, pp. 219–233
- . 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford
- Roberts 1887 = *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy. Part I: The Archaic Inscriptions and the Greek Alphabet*, E. S. Roberts, ed., Cambridge
- Roberts and Gardner 1905 = *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy. Part II: The Inscriptions of Attica*, E. S. Roberts and E. A. Gardner, eds., Cambridge
- Robinson, C. A., Jr. 1939. "The Struggle for Power at Athens in the Early Fifth Century," *AJP* 60, pp. 232–237
- . 1945. "Athenian Politics, 510–486 B.C.," *AJP* 66, pp. 243–254
- Schachermeyr, F. *RE* XIX, 1937, cols. 150–155 (Peisistratiden), and cols. 156–191 (Peisistratos [3])
- Shear, T. L. 1935. "Archaeological Notes," *AJA* 39, pp. 173–181
- . 1938. "The Campaign of 1937," *Hesperia* 7, p. 361
- Shear, T. L. Jr. 1993. "The Persian Destruction of Athens," *Hesperia* 62, pp. 383–482
- Shoe, L. T. 1936. *Profiles of Greek Mouldings*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Simon, E. 1983. *Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary*, Madison, Wisconsin
- Stanton, G. R. 1970. "The Introduction of Ostracism and Alcmeonid Propaganda," *JHS* 90, pp. 180–183
- Stroud, R. S. 1978. "State Documents in Archaic Athens," in *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis. Papers of a Symposium Sponsored by the Archaeological Institute of America, Princeton Society and The Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University*, Princeton, pp. 20–42
- Thompson, H. A. 1947. "The Excavation of the Athenian Agora, 1940–46," *Hesperia* 16, pp. 193–213
- Thompson, W. E. 1959/1960. "The Archonship of Cleisthenes," *CJ* 55, pp. 217–222
- Tod, M. N. 1946. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* I, 2nd ed., repr. Oxford 1933
- Tracy, S. V. 1990. *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, Berkeley
- Travlos, J. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, repr. New York 1980
- Vanderpool, E. 1949. "Ostraka from the Athenian Agora," in *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear (Hesperia Supplement 8)*, pp. 394–412
- . 1962. "News Letter from Greece," *AJA* 66, pp. 389–391
- . 1970. *Ostracism at Athens*, Cincinnati
- Wade-Gery, H. T. 1958a. "Themistokles' Archonship," *BSA* 37, 1936/1937, pp. 263–270, reprinted with revisions in *Essays in Greek History*, Oxford 1958, pp. 171–179
- . 1958b. "Miltiades," *JHS* 71, 1951, pp. 211–222, reprinted with revisions in *Essays in Greek History*, Oxford 1958, pp. 155–170
- Walker, E. M. 1926. "Athens: The Reform of Cleisthenes," in *The Cambridge Ancient History* IV, Cambridge, pp. 137–172
- Walsh, J. 1986. "The Date of the Athenian Stoa at Delphi," *AJA* 90, pp. 319–336
- Waters, K. H. 1972. *Herodotos on Tyrants and Despots: A Study in Objectivity (Historia Einz. 15)*, Wiesbaden
- Webster, T. B. L. 1972. *Potter and Patron in Classical Athens*, London
- Weickert, C. 1913. *Das lesbische Kymation: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Ornamentik*, Leipzig
- Welter, G. 1939. "Datierete Altäre in Athen," *AA [JdI 54]*, cols. 23–35
- White, M. E. 1974. "Hippias and the Athenian Archon List," in *Polis and Imperium. Studies in Honour of Edward Togo Salmon*, J. A. S. Evans, ed., Toronto, pp. 81–95

- Williams, G. M. E. 1973. "Aristocratic Politics in Athens c. 630 to 470 B.C." (diss. Pennsylvania State University 1973)
- . 1980. "The Image of the Alkmeonidai between 490 B.C. and 487/6 B.C.," *Historia* 29, pp. 106–110
- Winters, T. F. 1992. "The Dates of the Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis," in *APA Abstracts*, 124th Meeting (New Orleans), p. 8
- Woodhead, A. G. 1962. Rev. of L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, in *The Archaeological Journal* 119, pp. 351–353
- Wycherley, R. E. 1959. "Two Athenian Shrines," *AJA* 63, pp. 67–72
- . 1963. "Pausanias at Athens, II: A Commentary on Book I, Chapters 18–19," *GRBS* 4, pp. 157–175
- . 1978. *The Stones of Athens*, Princeton
- Young, P. H. 1980. "Building Projects and Archaic Greek Tyrants" (diss. University of Pennsylvania 1980)

MICHAEL F. ARNUSH

SKIDMORE COLLEGE
Department of Classics
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866-1632