

The Tradition of Hippias' Expulsion from Athens

W. G. Forrest

THE PURPOSE of this essay is to clarify the tradition about, only incidentally the facts of, the expulsion of Hippias from Athens in 510 B.C. The main points of the story (Hdt. 5.62–65) are firm enough. In 514 Hippias' brother, Hipparchos, was assassinated by Harmodios and Aristogeiton. Then, if not earlier, the Alkmeonid family went into exile, and after an unsuccessful attempt to establish or maintain a foothold in Attika at Leipsydriion they managed, through the good offices of Delphi, to win the support of Sparta. One Spartan expedition failed but a second succeeded, this in 510, and Hippias left Attika. But how did the Alkmeonids win Delphic and thence Spartan support?

After Herodotos it is nearly a hundred years before another voice is heard—two voices but they speak as one, and the reference book which both had pulled down from their shelves is readily identified. It can hardly be coincidence that Demosthenes in the *Meidias* (21.144), written shortly after 350, and Isokrates in the *Antidosis* of 353 tell precisely the same new story; it must be the story put out a year or so before by Kleidemos in his *Atthis*.¹ The story was that the Alkmeonids had borrowed money from Delphi with which to raise a Spartan mercenary army for the liberation.

Some twenty-five years later Aristotle had a different tale (*Ath. Pol.* 19). After the failure at Leipsydriion the Alkmeonids took up the contract for the rebuilding of Apollo's temple at Delphi, burnt down some years before (in 548 according to the chronographers). By doing so they were able to collect an advance payment, which they misappropriated—*ὄθεν εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων πρὸς τὴν τῶν Λακῶνων βοήθειαν*.

Where did this story come from? The bulk of the narrative in

¹ Jacoby's *terminus post quem* for Kleidemos' publication (354) is less firm than he believed (cf. L. Pearson, *CP* 51 [1956] 258), but a *terminus ante ca.* 350 is solid enough.

Aristotle is Herodotean. But there are marks of other sources too, with Androtion, whose *Atthis* had appeared in the 340's, as the favoured candidate for much, Hellanikos and/or Kleidemos somewhere in the background behind the vague *δημοτικοί*, who are credited with a variant view of the courage of Aristogeiton at 18.5.² Now Herodotos had also described the taking up of the contract, but continued (5.62) with the words *οἱα δὴ χρημάτων εὖ ἤκοντες* 'being wealthy' (not *ὄθεν εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων*, 'having thus acquired wealth') and had then launched into the complicated rigmarole of temple-building to which we must return, not into the simple *πρὸς τὴν τῶν Λακῶνων βοήθειαν*. Aristotle or Androtion (not here Kleidemos) has surely misunderstood Herodotos, has confused established wealth with an immediately acquired bonus, and it might be thought that *πρὸς τὴν τῶν Λακῶνων βοήθειαν* was no more than shorthand for Herodotean detail. But its form points far more readily to Kleidemos' version, to the purchase of Spartan aid than to the Herodotean persuasion of the Spartans by the Pythia. Rather, the story is a composite one—Herodotos (misunderstood) for the first part, Kleidemos for the second.

Finally there is another Atthidographer, Philochoros (*FGrHist* 328 F 115), who, through the scholiast on Pindar who quotes him, seems to have had Aristotle's (Androtion's?) misappropriation of the money but to have followed it with an account of Alkmeonid gratitude, of the repayment of the money by rebuilding the *τέμενος* with *εὐχαριστήρια πλείονα*.

Philochoros is final so far as traceable tradition goes. But there is one more document, the scholiast on Demosthenes 21.144, who gives briefly what is in all essentials the Aristotle (Androtion)-Philochoros story but stops short at the liberation while adding one or two extra details: the Alkmeonids received ten talents all told, of which they spent three on the temple and the other seven on their mercenaries.³

So far, then, the *Atthis*. Basically two stories; common to both, the

² On Androtion as a source for the *Ath. Pol.* see e.g. F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 207–08. On his date, *FGrHist* 234 Komm. Jacoby (p.75) may be right in arguing that Kleidemos alone was Aristotle's *δημοτικοί*, but the favourable view of Aristogeiton at 18.5 would fit well with Hellanikos' view of the tyrannicides (not that it necessarily conflicts with that of Kleidemos); cf. *infra* pp.279 and 281.

³ The scholiast names the Alkmeonid responsible as Megakles, not Kleisthenes, but this I suspect may be simple confusion at some point in the tradition with the hero of Pind. *Pyth.* 7 (who might well from the poem earn false credit as a temple-builder), rather than a deliberate, still less a respectable claim that Kleisthenes' father was involved.

hiring of Spartan help; one a hiring with money legitimately borrowed, the other with money that should have been spent on the temple. Implicit in the second is that the temple was built after the liberation; but it is important to note that there is no sign that the building as a fact of history in its own right ever entered the authors' heads. Most are silent; Philochoros mentions only the *τέμενος* and *εὐχαριστήρια πλείονα*, the scholiast on Demosthenes might even be taken to suggest that the temple, or part of it, was built before the liberation (the Alkmeonids spent three talents on the temple and seven on the mercenaries).

To Herodotos then. After their failure at Leipsydrion the Alkmeonids took up the contract and completed it more generously than was demanded of them. But although they took up the contract as part of their scheming against the Peisistratids, *πάν ἐπὶ τοῖσι Πεισιστρατίδῃσι μηχανώμενοι*, Herodotos does not choose to tell us how it helped them. Instead, he branches off into a different story (5.63): *ὡς ὦν δὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσιν*, the Alkmeonids bribed the Pythia to win Spartan aid. How then did their lavish provision of Parian marble instead of the prescribed limestone help them? Only, so far as I can see, if the fact of building won the Pythia's gratitude and so prompted her to stir up the Spartans in the same way as the bribery was supposed to have done. That is to say, Herodotos gives two versions: in one generosity, in the other bribery produce the same result, Delphic support.

But there is a linguistic point. *ὡς ὦν δὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσιν*, bribery. *ὦν δὴ* is normally 'resumptive after a digression' (cf. Powell, *Lexicon* s.v.); but if the story of temple-building was a digression, what was the point of it, introduced as it is as a deliberate and important move against the Peisistratids, the last and by implication successful move? Is it possible, then, to read some adversative force into *ὦν δὴ*? At 7.142 the Athenians debate the meaning of the oracle about the 'Wooden Wall'. *οἱ μὲν* argue that the Wooden Wall is the defences of the Akropolis, *οἱ δέ* that it is the ships. *οἱ ὦν δὴ τὰς νέας λέγοντες* had trouble explaining the final couplet. Here *ὦν δὴ* is again in part resumptive, but it surely has some adversative force as well—"Some said this . . ., others said that . . ., however the latter . . ." I should hope to read something similar into 5.63.1.⁴

⁴ Seven talents would provide a reasonable mercenary force, but three would not go far on a temple. Cf. Powell, *Lexicon*, on 7.142.

If so, two stories. But the second, the story told by οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, that the Alkmeonids ἀνέπειθον τὴν Πυθίην χρήμασιν, is not so simple as it looks. Athenians, and for that matter Herodotos, knew yet another version of the whole affair, that the Alkmeonids and the Spartans had nothing to do with the liberation whatsoever, that it was the work of Harmodios and Aristogeiton. This was, in a sense, the 'official version' throughout the fifth century and, most importantly for us, was given the blessing of Hellanikos in his *Atthis* at the end of the century,⁵ though it earned the censure of Thucydides at the same time.

Unfortunately it is not easy to see precisely what Hellanikos blessed. It would be typical of Greek historiography for him to have accepted the facts of 510 but to have discredited them by giving the Alkmeonids unworthy motives or disreputable methods—bribery, peculation or the like. But this would not have served his purpose. However dirty he might make Alkmeonid methods, the result would still have been the same, that the Spartans were stirred to liberate Athens; and Hellanikos was as anxious to be rid of the embarrassing Spartans as he was to minimise the rôle of the Alkmeonids, as Thucydides' petulant insistence on the importance of Sparta clearly shows (6.53.3).

There is only one clue. The *Marmor Parium* (*FGrHist* 239 A 45) dates both the murder of Hipparchos and the expulsion of Hippias to the same year, naming the expellers only as οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. Now the *Marmor* did use Hellanikos;⁶ secondly, rather trivially, it does show here a marked lack of chronological ἀκρίβεια, a fault of which Hellanikos has been accused elsewhere (Thuc. 1.97.2); more important, its story does exactly what Hellanikos wanted to do. It is a reasonable guess, then, that this was his account, that he simply allowed 514 and 510 to coalesce, that he named no Alkmeonids, no Spartans, only οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

What follows? Certainly that the simplicity of Herodotos' second story has taken a nasty knock. For who now are his Ἀθηναῖοι who thought that the Alkmeonids had bribed the Pythia? Not the Alkmeonids themselves; not the mass of Athenians, who accepted Hellanikos. We need men who disliked Alkmeonids, disliked the

⁵ For details see the full account by A. J. Podlecki, *Historia* 15 (1966) 129–41; Thuc. 1.20.2 and 6.53.3–59.

⁶ F. Jacoby, *Atthis* p.227 n.5.

tyrannicides, and who were at the same time rather pro-Spartan; for the story goes on to stress Sparta's virtuous obedience to the Pythia's command—*τὰ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ πρεσβύτερα ἐποιεῦντο ἢ τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν*. High praise for an Athenian to lavish on a Spartan. There may have existed some such men in Athens, but I cannot believe that they were very many, enough to be called by Herodotos *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι*. *Τινες* perhaps, *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι* hardly.

There were, however, some people who had no love after 508 for Alkmeonids, who had no interest in Harmodios and Aristogeiton and who were definitely pro-Spartan—the Spartans themselves, who in about 503 did indeed tell this very story to an assembly of their allies (Hdt. 5.90–91): “They had decided to restore Hippias to his tyranny, for Hippias had been their friend and they expelled him only because it was the God's command. Now that they knew that it was the Alkmeonids, not Apollo, who had inspired the Pythia, they must undo the wrong they had done.” The argument did not persuade the allies—little wonder. It was sheer invention to explain an astounding *volte-face*. No more, surely, can it have persuaded *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι*. We are therefore forced to Schweighäuser's emendation at 5.63.1: for *Ἀθηναῖοι* read *Λακεδαιμόνιοι*.⁷

Five Athenian accounts of the end of the tyranny have become four, and that is some gain. But how did the four arise and which, if any, is true?

Hellanikos, perhaps, may be set aside at once. On a point affecting Alkmeonid tradition neither Herodotos nor Thucydides ranks as an independent or wholly authoritative witness,⁸ and on the face of it Hellanikos is as likely to be right. But it is very striking that, although Kleidemos was, like Hellanikos, a *dēmotikos* and an Attidographer, he should choose on this point to ignore his predecessor;⁹ that although Aristotle (Androtion?) has not taken his Herodotos uncritically and has probably taken over some details from Hellanikos

⁷ The change produces a slight awkwardness in the then repeated *Λακεδαιμόνιοι* at the beginning of 63.2. But there is a similar repetition at 1.174.5–6—*ὡς αὐτοὶ Κνίδιοι λέγουσι . . . Κνίδιοι μὲν . . .* It is to be noted that with this change all evidence for friendship between the Spartans and the Athenian tyrants disappears (*Ath. Pol.* 19.4 is of course merely an echo of Hdt.), and the non-Herodotean motive added by Aristotle, the friendship between the Peisistratids and Argos, can be given its proper weight.

⁸ For Thuc. ‘Philaid’ connections see e.g. H. T. Wade-Gery, *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford 1958) 246–47; for Hdt. and Alkmeonids, Jacoby, *Atthis* 160–61; for ‘Philaid’ and Alkmeonids, Forrest, *CQ* 10 (1960) 232ff; for another agreement between Hdt. and Thuc. against the tradition, Jacoby, *Atthis* 187.

⁹ Cf. *supra*. n.2.

(or Kleidemos), on this point he prefers, without hesitation, to follow Herodotos;¹⁰ that Hellanikos in fact seems to have stood alone.

On the main issue of Alkmeonid responsibility, then, Herodotos is probably right. But did the Alkmeonids beg, borrow or steal the cash—or did they just happen to have it? And was the temple built before or after the liberation?

It is puzzling that Kleidemos should have forgotten or suppressed the contract and the temple-building, but no surprise that he should offer the version that he did of the help which Delphi was able to give to the Alkmeonids. Mercenaries and the money to hire them were common enough fourth-century preoccupations to make it very easy for him to jump to conclusions. How else could Delphi have helped? Kleidemos lived in an age when revolution by oracle was rare, but borrowing from Delphi a familiar enough idea. Indeed it may well have been at the moment he was writing that Philomelos and his Phokians were 'borrowing' Delphi's treasures precisely to furnish themselves with mercenary help (Diod.Sic. 15.25 and 27–30). Closer to Herodotos, Aristotle (Androtion?) has nevertheless, I have suggested, misunderstood him and thus provided the Alkmeonids with a fund of newly-acquired cash; the use they make of the cash, as in Kleidemos, is a fourth-century use.¹¹

Some scholars have thought that there was more to be said for the idea of financial aid and have produced numismatic argument that there was such aid. C. Seltman¹² believed that he could see in two series of late sixth-century coins a striking confirmation of the Atthidographers' tales. The first, an electrum series, carried the letter Δ on the reverse, Δ for Delphi, and on the obverse an owl, a bull or a wheel, the last being an Alkmeonid badge; the second series, a silver issue with the *triskelis*, another Alkmeonid badge, and on the reverse a Φ, for Phokis. But others no less percipient than Seltman have read the Δ for Delphi as an Α for Athens, have pointed out that three-legged wheel-borne Alkmeonids are a myth, and finally that a

¹⁰ *Supra* nn.2 and 7. His substitution of οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι (19.5) for Herodotos' slightly derogatory Ἀθηναίων τοῖσι βουλομένοισι εἶναι ἐλευθέρους (5.64) is particularly striking (and smacks of Hellanikos; cf. *infra* p.282).

¹¹ Mercenaries, of course, existed in the sixth century (cf. Hdt. 1.61.4), but they were not quite such common furniture.

¹² *Athens, its History and Coinage* (Cambridge 1924) 79ff, regrettably followed by Jacoby in his commentary on *FGrHist* 328 F 115.

series of coins, *i.e.* something minted over a period, is not the same as a once-for-all issue for a specific purpose, hiring mercenaries. They have also argued that the Φ might stand for Phleious, say, not Phokis, and that the *triskelis* is by no means an exclusively Athenian, let alone an Alkmeonid blazon.¹³

The Atthidographers, then, merit little credit unless perchance it can be shown—what they do not assert¹⁴ but certainly imply—that the temple was built after 510, an act of gratitude for services rendered by Delphi, not one of generosity to prompt future services. On this question the archaeologists do not present a very helpful, united or even welcoming look; it is an issue that has raised much bitterness and calls for some restraint.

Briefly, when the French School at Athens excavated the temple and the Athenian Treasury, they found two texts to help them, Herodotos and Pausanias (10.11.5). The latter made the Treasury a monument for Marathon, the former appeared to place the contract for the temple after Leipsydrion in 514. The two buildings were stylistically some ten to twenty years apart. The case seemed proved.¹⁵ Pausanias was soon challenged, but Herodotos has remained throughout a threat to anyone who wished to argue on stylistic grounds that the temple was earlier.¹⁶ The unanswerable question is how far those who argue for later dates have been influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by what they have believed to be Herodotos' support.

This is not a situation in which the layman can reach an opinion by counting archaeological heads. All he can do is to state the problem and record an impression.

¹³ For various criticisms of Seltman's views see E. S. G. Robinson, *NC* 4 (1924) 337–38; J. H. Jongkees, *Mnemosyne*, SER. III 12 (1945) 87–98; R. J. Hopper, *CQ* 10 (1960) 242–47. I am very grateful to Dr C. Kraay for his advice on this section.

¹⁴ *Supra* p.278. It is important to insist on this since Jacoby, seduced by Seltman, has suggested that the Atthidographers might have established the date of temple-building by research in Delphic records. It is indeed possible that they might, but to judge from the fragments they were not interested in the temple at all; there is an alternative candidate to take its place among Philochoros' *εὐχαριστήρια πλείονα*, the Treasury.

¹⁵ Apart from Jacoby (on Philochoros, *FGrHist* 328 F 115) the most important study of the literary evidence is that of Th. Homolle, *BCH* 26 (1902) 597ff. The most thorough archaeological treatment is by P. de la Coste-Messelière, *BCH* 70 (1946) 271–87. Jacoby gives essential references to discussion up till 1953. Some more appear in the following notes.

¹⁶ Gisela M. A. Richter in the first ed. of her *Kouroi* (Oxford/New York 1942) accepted the French scholars' date; in the second ed. (London 1960) pp.129–30, she argued for an earlier date. It is significant that she announces this change of heart with the reluctant words, "Herodotos may have been misled."

We have the evidence of sculpture, of architecture and, indirectly, of an inscription. Of the first there remain some elements of the pedimental figures, similar in style to—some have said, by the same hand as—the Akropolis *korē* no.681, which, if rightly associated with its base,¹⁷ is the work of Antenor. For the *korē* and the inscription on the base, general opinion strongly tends towards a date in or around the 520's; on the pediment there is much more hesitation, but some powerful voices have claimed that it is nearly contemporary with the *korē*.¹⁸ As for the architecture, argument seems only to have established that in some features the Delphic temple is older, in others younger than the Peisistratid temple on the Akropolis. The safe conclusion will be that they are roughly contemporary. The Peisistratid temple was not being built after 510.¹⁹

This is slender ground to build on. Nevertheless, from what has been said and in view of the fact that the Delphians were collecting money for the rebuilding of the temple at least as early as 526 (Hdt. 2.180), it seems respectable to suspect, perhaps even more likely than not, that the contract was made, the temple begun a decade or so before Leipsydriion. With that in mind we can turn at last to the real question—what did Herodotos mean?

The contract was entered into after Leipsydriion, after 514. The temple was completed, the Pythia's gratitude earned in time for her to bore the Spartans with repeated demands to liberate Athens until, in 510, they obliged. If consultation was still only once a year at this time, how long would it take to bore a Spartan? Or even if it was once a month?²⁰ And how long would it take to build the temple, or enough of the temple to make their generous intentions plain?²¹ Herodotos could not have imagined, if he stopped to think about it,

¹⁷ The association has been doubted (see H. Payne, *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis*² [New York 1951] 31 n.2), but the doubts are well answered by P. de la Coste-Messelière, *RA* 15 (1940) 5–10.

¹⁸ For the inscription, L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961) 75. For the sculpture, see Miss Richter, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.16), and most recently Chr. Karouzos, *Aristodikos* (Stuttgart 1961) 46–49.

¹⁹ See, among many, de la Coste-Messelière, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.15) and *Fouilles de Delphes* IV.4 pp.259–67; L. Shoe, *Profiles of Greek Mouldings* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1936) 34 and 104; K. Schefold, *MusHelv* 3 (1946) 59–93; H. Riemann, *MdI* 3 (1950) 7–39.

²⁰ A summary of the question: P. Amandry, *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes* (BEFAR 170, Paris 1950) ch. vii.

²¹ As Professor M. H. Jameson points out to me, a few loads of marble on the site might be enough. For the order of construction see de la Coste-Messelière, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.15) 271–87.

that the temple was begun any later than, say, 520, or completed to the point of gratitude later than, say, 515. But in that case the temple was almost finished before the contract was signed—Herodotos must be wrong.

But what kind of error was it? I would suggest that that is the real question, that *Quellenforschung* and archaeology are alike a waste of time. The answer surely is that it is a story-teller's error and a venial one at that. Crudely, one of the two Herodotean limits has to go; either the contract was signed before Leipsydriion, in which case he is wrong; or the temple was completed after 510, in which case he is wrong. There can be no doubt about the right answer. The story demands that the temple be finished in time for gratitude to work; it does not matter one whit when it was begun. Nor, I suspect, would Herodotos much care. For him the sequence building-gratitude-liberation was sacred; how that sequence was to be correlated with Leipsydriion was not worth worrying about, and it may be a sign of this that he chooses to use imperfects and a historic present for Leipsydriion and the contracting, *προεχώρει . . . προσέπταιον . . . μισθοῦνται*, thus very slightly blurring the chronological relationships, which are brought into sharp focus again by the aorists in which the temple is completed, *ἐξεργάσαντο . . . ἐξεποίησαν*. Had he been prone to the pluperfect he might have kept historians happy by writing, "The Alkmeonids *had* taken up the contract some time before but now, after Leipsydriion, they began to exploit the gratitude." But the pluperfect is not a good story-telling tense.

There may be a parallel. In 6.48 Herodotos tells how Aigina submitted to Dareios in 491. Kleomenes of Sparta intervenes, Kleomenes intrigues, there is hostage-taking and attempted hostage-returning, there is Kleomenes' death, war between Athens and Aigina and other things besides. Yet when we return to the story we are still only in the middle of 490. It is virtually impossible that so much should have happened in so short a time, and again it seems that the story may have got the better of chronology, that one of the limits must go. Modern scholarship abandons the lower, and the events are extended into the 480's. It is less easy to say here what the story demands and modern scholarship may well be right, but, with 510 in mind, it is worth considering the possibility that Dareios had begun his activities some time before 491, that once more a pluperfect has been avoided.

To return to the point. My conclusions are two. First that Herodotos dated the building of the temple before 510. Second that in doing so Herodotos was probably right.²²

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD

October, 1969

²² An earlier version of this essay was read to a seminar at Trinity College, Toronto in November, 1968. I am grateful to all those present for their company and their criticism, especially to Professors M. E. White and L. Woodbury.