

Plutarch on Cimon, Athenian Expeditions, and Ephialtes' Reform (Plut. *Cim.*14–17)

Valerij Gouščin

IN THE 460S B.C. Cimon played a key role in Athenian politics. But his predominance came to an end in 462/1, when he was ostracized. Not long before his exile he had clashed with Ephialtes over support for the Lacedaemonians. They had called on the Athenians for help against the Helots and *perioikoi*, who had revolted. Cimon argued strongly for helping the Lacedaemonians while Ephialtes opposed aiding Sparta. But Cimon's dominance was still great and he was sent, Thucydides reports, to Messenia (1.102.1, cf. Ar. *Lys.*1137–1146). While he was away Ephialtes accomplished his reform (462 B.C.), which deprived the Areopagus of its role as guardian of the laws and diminished the influence of the aristocracy. The Lacedaemonians, frightened by Ephialtes' reform (or by *neoteropoiia* in Thucydides' terminology), dismissed the Athenian contingent. Shortly after returning from Messenia Cimon was ostracized. This is the generally accepted view, which is based mainly on Thucydides' account.¹

We have in addition Plutarch's narrative in the biography of Cimon, where he presents the course of the same events differently (*Cim.* 14–17). In particular, he speaks of two Athenian expeditions to Messenia and of the reform of Ephialtes that was carried out at the time of a certain naval expedition. This version is well known, but is considered untrustworthy. I propose that

¹ E.g. P. J. Rhodes, "The Athenian Revolution," in *CAH²* V (1992) 69; S. Hornblower, *The Greek World 479–323 BC* (London/New York 2002) 23.

Plutarch deserves more confidence.

The main theme is the confrontation of Cimon, “the foremost Hellenic statesman” (*Cim.* 16.3), with the Athenian demos, headed by Ephialtes (and Pericles).² The events that Plutarch presents in these chapters should serve as a confirmation and illustration of the confrontation. The reason for it, as Plutarch hinted, was Cimon’s philolaconism, which led him to incur the hatred of the people every now and again. In the end this would lead to sad consequences for Cimon. His advice to help Sparta at the time of the Helots’ rebellion aroused “the strongest charge against him” (16.4). In the end he would be exiled through the procedure of ostracism.

Let us see how the events developed according to Plutarch. The first attack on Cimon was a prosecution in 463 B.C. Cimon, who conducted successful military operations in Thrace, the Chersonese, and Thasos, was put on trial accused of taking bribes from the Macedonian king Alexander: “He had a good opportunity, as it was thought, to invade Macedonia and cut off a great part of it, and because he would not consent to do it, he was accused of having been bribed to this position by King Alexander, and was actually prosecuted, his enemies forming a coalition against him” (14.2, δίκην ἔφυγε τῶν ἐχθρῶν συστάτων ἐπ’ αὐτόν, transl. B. Perrin).³

The charges were quite serious and could probably result in the death penalty (cf. *Per.* 10.6).⁴ Among the most significant accusations was philolaconism, if we can rely on Plutarch’s narrative. And Cimon in his defense placed emphasis on his Spartan

² On Plutarch’s ring composition and moralizing in these passages see J. R. Cole, “Cimon’s Dismissal, Ephialtes’ Revolution and the Peloponnesian Wars,” *GRBS* 15 (1974) 375–376.

³ The accusation arose when Cimon’s conduct was scrutinized under the procedure of *euthynai* (*Ath. Pol.* 27.1): E. M. Carawan, “*Eisangelia* and *Euthyna*: The Trials of Miltiades, Themistocles, and Cimon,” *GRBS* 28 (1987) 202–205; A. Blamire, *Plutarch, Life of Cimon* (London 1989) 156.

⁴ R. J. Bonner and G. Smith doubted this: *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle II* (Chicago 1938) 26–27.

proxenia.⁵ In his defense speech he praised Sparta and left aside the accusations of bribery (*Cim.* 14.3).⁶ But the fact that Plutarch does not mention a response about bribery does not mean that Cimon did not address that accusation. In the end he was acquitted for this or some other reason, in spite of the efforts of his enemies (15.1).⁷ It is in this connection that Plutarch mentions Stesimbrotus' story of Cimon's sister Elpinice who pleaded with Pericles (14.4).

Immediately after this, Plutarch inserts a narrative about the people's attempts to change the constitution, which ended with Ephialtes' reform: "During the remainder of his political career, when he [Cimon] was at home, he mastered and constrained the people in its onsets upon the nobles, and in its efforts to wrest all office and power to itself; but when he sailed away again on military service (ὡς δὲ πάλιν ἐπὶ στρατείαν ἐξέπλευσε) the populace got completely beyond control. They confounded the established political order of things and the ancestral practices which they had formerly observed" (*Cim.* 15.1–2). It is worthwhile to pay attention to the naval expedition mentioned by Plutarch, during which Ephialtes achieved his reform. We shall discuss this below.

"When Cimon came back home," Plutarch continues, "and in his indignation at the insults heaped upon the reverend council,

⁵ Blamire, *Plutarch* 156.

⁶ If so, it would be unlikely that philolaconism, as M. Zaccarini notes, was not generally perceived in this case as questionable or dangerous: "The Case of Cimon: The Evolution of the Meaning of *Philolaconism* in Athens," *Hormos* 3 (2011) 288.

⁷ Blamire, *Cimon* 158; Carawan, *GRBS* 28 (1987) 202–205. It has been suggested that Demosthenes' words on a fine imposed on Cimon relate to this trial: "Because Cimon had dislocated the ancestral constitution by his personal efforts (καὶ Κίμωνα, ὅτι τὴν πάτριον μετεκίνησε πολιτείαν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ), they acquitted him by a majority of three votes only on the capital charge, and made him pay fifty talents" (23.205, transl. A. T. Murray). A. E. Raubitschek assumed that Cimon was fined rather than acquitted: "Theophrastus on Ostracism," *ClMed* 19 (1958) 91 n.7. But I think this is an echo of the fine imposed on his father Miltiades (Zaccarini, *Hormos* 3 [2011] 293).

tried to recall again its jurisdiction and to revive the aristocracy of the times of Cleisthenes (τὴν ἐπὶ Κλεισθένους ἐγείρειν ἀριστοκρατίαν), they banded together to denounce him, and tried to inflame the people against him” (*Cim.* 15.2, cf. *Per.* 9.5). His enemies united again and put forward the traditional charges of philolaconism and of having sexual ties with his sister Elpinice. Plutarch gives here another reference to the evidence of Stesimbrotus as confirmation of the story (*Cim.* 16.3).⁸

The efforts of his enemies would be successful. His opposition to the reform would not remain without consequences for him. Nevertheless the charges put forward against Cimon after his return from a certain naval expedition, according to Plutarch’s narrative, would not result in his expulsion through ostracism.

The next chapter has a long passage proving that Cimon was an admirer of Sparta and the Spartans’ life style (*Cim.* 16.1–3). Then follows the story of the earthquake in Sparta and the revolt of the Helots as its consequence. Thus, it is possible to see chronological distortion in this narrative, for the earthquake may have occurred some time earlier, probably in 464.⁹ Plutarch says that the earthquake resulted in destruction and many fatalities and brought about the uprising of the Helots, who “hurriedly gathered from all the country round about with intent to dispatch the surviving Spartans” (16.6). Here Plutarch is obviously portraying the situation shortly after the earthquake, i.e. the very beginning of the Spartan war with the rebels. The situation was so menacing that the Lacedaemonians appealed for help to their allies (including the Athenians): “The Lacedaemonians sent Pericleidas to Athens with request for aid, and Aristophanes introduces him into a comedy as ‘sitting at the

⁸ Cf. Carawan, *GRBS* 28 (1987) 204; Blamire, *Cimon* 161 ff.

⁹ E.g. N. G. L. Hammond, “Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.” *Historia* 4 (1955) 375; Cole, *GRBS* 15 (1974) 370; Blamire, *Cimon* 167–168; Rhodes, in *CAH²* V 68; see also A. French, “The Spartan Earthquake,” *G&R* 2 [1955] 108–118. R. Sealey dates the earthquake to 469: “The Great Earthquake in Lacedaemon,” *Historia* 6 (1957) 370, supported by E. Badian, “Towards a Chronology of the Pentekontaetia down to the Renewal of the Peace of Callias,” *EchCl* 32 (1988) 307 ff., 314.

altars, pale of face, in purple cloak, soliciting an army’” (16.7, cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1137 ff.); Aristophanes states that the Athenians sent 4000 hoplites (1143).

The Spartans’ appeal caused heated controversy between Cimon and Ephialtes: “But Ephialtes opposed the project, and besought the Athenians not to succour nor restore a city which was their rival, but to let haughty Sparta lie to be trodden under foot of men. Whereupon, as Critias says, Cimon made his country’s increase of less account than Sparta’s interest, and persuaded the people to go forth to her aid with many hoplites. And Ion actually mentions the phrase by which, more than by anything else, Cimon prevailed upon the Athenians, exhorting them “not to suffer Hellas to be crippled, nor their city to be robbed of its yoke-fellow” (*Cim.* 16.8).¹⁰ Plutarch, as we can see, uses here the evidence of Critias and Ion of Chios.¹¹

According to Plutarch, the Athenians fulfilled their mission successfully and Cimon returned to Athens. Plutarch gives an anecdote about the passage of the Athenians returning from Messenia through Corinth and Cimon’s dialogue with Lachartus (*Cim.* 17.1).¹²

Some time later the Lacedaemonians asked for Athenian help

¹⁰ Cf. Blamire, *Cimon* 170.

¹¹ Ion’s metaphor, according to G. Huxley, has the immediacy of an eye witness: “Ion of Chios,” *GRBS* 6 (1965) 31. F. Jacoby argued that Ion followed Cimon to the allied camp before Ithome: “Some Remarks on Ion of Chios,” *CQ* 41 (1947) 7–9. See also Rhodes, in *CAH*² V 68.

¹² “Lachartus upbraided him for having introduced his army before he had conferred with the citizens. ‘People who knock at doors’, said he, ‘do not go in before the owner bids them’; to which Cimon replied, ‘And yet you Corinthians, O Lachartus, did not so much as knock at the gates of Cleonae and Megara, but hewed them down and forced your way in under arms, demanding that everything be opened up to the stronger.’ Blamire, *Cimon* 171, supposes that Plutarch derived this anecdote from the *Epidemiai* of Ion, who may have participated in this expedition. See also D. M. Lewis, *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History* (Cambridge 1997) 13. By contrast, A. W. Gomme held that this took place on the way to Messenia (*HCT* I [Oxford 1945] 411 n.1).

again.¹³ According to Plutarch, the repeated appeal was due to the need to besiege those who were holding out at Ithome: “Once more the Lacedaemonians summoned the Athenians to come to their aid against the Messenians and Helots in Ithome, and the Athenians went, but their dashing boldness awakened fear, and they were singled out from all the allies and sent off as dangerous conspirators” (ἐλθόντων δὲ τὴν τόλμαν καὶ τὴν λαμπρότητα δείσαντες ἀπεπέμψαντο μόνους τῶν συμμάχων ὡς νεωτεριστάς, *Cim.* 17.2).¹⁴ The Athenians then turned their anger against Cimon (and against the Laconizers, according to Plutarch) and exiled him through ostracism, but using a trifling (and unstated) pretext (μικρῶς ἐπιλαβόμενοι προφάσεως, 17.3).

This is the story in Plutarch’s *Cimon*. First of all we may note that the reported naval expedition could have taken place between the first and the second Athenian expeditions to Sparta. As for the expeditions themselves, they are connected with different episodes of the Helots’ uprising. The first request of the Lacedaemonians should be attributed to the initial phase of the rebellion, the second was due to the protracted siege of the Helots who fortified Ithome.

Let us see what Thucydides says about these events. His short account makes it clear that the Lacedaemonians waged war with the Messenians for some time, without seeking help. But the military actions dragged on because the rebels fortified Ithome, and they appealed to their allies, including the Athenians. The Athenians responded to their request and sent a large contingent led by Cimon (οἱ δ’ ἦλθον Κίμωνος στρατηγοῦντος πλήθει οὐκ ὀλίγῳ). Thucydides’ explanation of the motive for the request: “The reason for this pressing summons lay in their reputed skill in siege operations; a long siege had taught the Lacedaemonians their own deficiency in this art, else they would have taken the

¹³ Blamire, *Cimon* 172, notes that there is no suggestion apart from Plutarch that more than one expedition was sent.

¹⁴ C. Hignett thought these words indicated that Ephialtes’ reform can be supposed to have prompted the dismissal: *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford 1952) 197; *contra*, Blamire, *Cimon* 172–173.

place by assault” (1.102.1–2, transl. R. Crawley).

This expedition was to cause the subsequent conflict: “The first open quarrel between the Lacedaemonians and Athenians arose out of this expedition. The Lacedaemonians, when assault failed to take the place, apprehensive of the enterprising and revolutionary character of the Athenians, and further looking upon them as of alien extraction, began to fear that if they remained (δείσαντες τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸ τολμηρὸν καὶ τὴν νεωτεροποιίαν, καὶ ἀλλοφύλους ἅμα ἡγησάμενοι), they might be tempted by the besieged in Ithome to attempt some political changes. They accordingly dismissed them alone of the allies, without declaring their suspicions, but merely saying that they had now no need of them” (102.2–3).¹⁵

We know from Plutarch that the expulsion of the Athenians resulted in attacks on Cimon and his subsequent ostracism. But Thucydides does not mention this.¹⁶ He does not say anything concerning the situation that arose as a result of the earthquake and the beginning of the Helots’ revolt. We do not hear of the circumstances of the Lacedaemonians’ address to the Athenians and the acute debates between Cimon and Ephialtes in the assembly. What Thucydides says, if we trust Plutarch’s narrative, can hardly be related to the beginning of the Third Messenian War, but to the time of the second Athenian expedition (in the treatment of Plutarch), which ended in their dismissal.¹⁷ Nor does he mention the reform of Ephialtes, which supposedly occurred in Athens in the absence of Cimon.

Thucydides’ narrative reflects his own logic, which perhaps

¹⁵ R. Sealey suspects that Thucydides did not know why the Athenians were dismissed: *A History of the Greek City States* (Berkeley 1976) 258. But see Pausanias: “When the Athenians arrived, they seem to have regarded them with suspicion that they were likely to promote revolution (ὡς τάχα νεωτερίσοντας), and as a result of this suspicion to have soon dismissed them from Ithome” (Paus. 4.24.5, transl. W. H. S. Jones).

¹⁶ He did not mention Cimon’s ostracism even in his account of the battle of Tanagra in 457 B.C. (1.107–108).

¹⁷ See French, *G&R* 2 (1955) 113–114.

did not allow him to augment the story with needless details. The context is the relationship between the Lacedaemonians and the Athenians, which deteriorated as a result of the events described (“The first open quarrel” etc.). The story of the appeal to the Athenians is preceded by the account of their siege of Thasos. The Lacedaemonians, Thucydides informs us, promised the Thasians to help by invading Attica, but they were prevented by the earthquake (1.101.1–2).¹⁸ That is why, because of their secret negotiations with the Thasians, they could well be afraid of the same actions from the Athenians.¹⁹ The suspicion may well seem justifiable if we take into account that the Helots were settled by the Athenians in Naupactus a few years later (1.103.3, Diod. 11.84.7–8).²⁰ Given that Thucydides does not say anything about Ephialtes’ reform, we can assume that, following Thucydides’ logic, the fear of the Lacedaemonians was caused not so much by the reform, but by the possibility of secret diplomacy by the Athenians in Messenia.²¹

Thus we have two versions of the same events. Plutarch informs us of two Athenian expeditions to Messenia and the reform of Ephialtes in the time of a certain naval expedition which fit into the logic of his narrative. At its center is the confrontation of Cimon and the Athenian demos. Thucydides’ main theme is the deterioration of the relations of Athens and Sparta that will lead to the Peloponnesian War.

These questions can be asked in addressing the problem:

- (a) the reality of the naval expedition mentioned by Plutarch;
- (b) the circumstances of Ephialtes’ reform;
- (c) were one or two Athenian expeditions sent to Messenia?

¹⁸ Gomme, *HCTI* 298. Hammond, *Historia* 4 (1955) 376, translated “were about to help Thasos” (not “were intending”); *contra*, Sealey, *Historia* 6 (1957) 368–369.

¹⁹ Blamire, *Cimon* 166–167; G. A. Papantoniou, “Once or Twice,” *AJP* 72 (1951) 179–180.

²⁰ French, *G&R* 2 (1955) 116.

²¹ Papantoniou, *AJP* 72 (1951) 179.

(a) The naval expedition has often been considered to be a doublet of that to Messenia.²² But Cimon did not go to Ithome by sea.²³ If this is correct we are justified in considering the possibility of such a naval expedition. And we may assume that the naval expedition that Plutarch mentioned was the first Cyprus expedition of Cimon.²⁴ In spite of the Athenian victories (e.g. Eurymedon), Cyprus had not yet been fully released from the Persians.²⁵ Indirect confirmation of the reality of this expedition is Plutarch's reference (*Cim.* 18.1) to another expedition to Cyprus (ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον καὶ Κύπρον ἀΐθις) after the return of Cimon from exile ca. 450.²⁶

During this expedition, as Barns supposed, were the attacks on Citium and Marium which Diodorus dates to 450/49.²⁷ After this Cimon returned home, but the squadron was redirected to Egypt. This took place, according to Barns, soon after the abortive Ithome campaign. Blamire (supported by Hornblower) rightly notes that "it is difficult to believe that Kimon, if he had returned in humiliation from Ithome, would have been appointed to command a naval enterprise at the beginning of the next campaigning season."²⁸ We shall discuss this below.

²² E.g. Rhodes, in *CAH²* V 69. Hammond, *Historia* 4 (1955) 399–400, supposed that it was the *second* Cimon's expedition to aid Sparta against Ithome (see point *c* below).

²³ E.g. J. Barns, "Cimon and the First Athenian Expedition to Cyprus," *Historia* 2 (1953) 167; Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* 196; cf. S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* I (Oxford 1991) 164. Rhodes assumes that Cimon will not have taken his hoplites to Messenia by sea. Nevertheless, he thinks, Plutarch in *Cim.* 15.2 is referring to that expedition (*CAH²* V 69), cf. Hornblower.

²⁴ Thucydides, as Hornblower notes, totally omitted a Cyprus campaign in 462 supposedly alluded to by Plutarch: *A Commentary* I 164.

²⁵ Hornblower, *A Commentary* I 163.

²⁶ Barns, *Historia* 2 (1953) 167.

²⁷ Barns, *Historia* 2 (1953) 170. Cf. J. H. Schreiner, *Hellankos, Thucydides and the Era of Kimon* (Aarus 1997) 50–59; *contra*, P. Green, *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11–12.37.1* (Austin 2006) 179 n.9.

²⁸ Blamire, *Cimon* 158; Hornblower, *A Commentary* I 169.

Plutarch hints at this in the biography of Themistocles: “But when Egypt revolted with Athenian aid, and Hellenic triremes sailed up as far as Cyprus and Cilicia, and Cimon’s mastery of the sea forced the King to resist the efforts of the Hellenes and to hinder their hostile growth’ (*Them.* 31.3).

Thucydides speaks of the same sequence of events. The Athenians were engaged in an expedition against Cyprus with 200 ships of their own and their allies, when the Egyptians revolted. Raising the rebellion, Inaros turned to the Athenians, and “abandoning a Cyprian expedition <...> they arrived in Egypt” (1.104.2).²⁹

It is believed that Inaros’ rebellion began in 460/59, and lasted six years (Thuc. 1.110.1).³⁰ This view is based mainly on Thucydides’ Pentekontaetia, where he narrates the events in strict chronological order. But some scholars suppose that the revolt began soon after Xerxes’ death and date it to 464–454.³¹ A. B. Lloyd admits that Inaros took up arms in 463/2, but the Athenian intervention in Egypt he dates to 459/8, lasting to

²⁹ Hornblower, *A Commentary* I 164. A. E. Raubitschek held that this happened simultaneously with the second expedition to Messenia, which, therefore, should not have been headed by Cimon: “The Peace Policy of Pericles,” *AJA* 70 (1966) 38. He believed also that Plut. *Cim.* 15.2 refers to this campaign, which took place in summer 462; cf. D. Kahn, “Inaros’ Rebellion against Artaxerxes I and the Athenian Disaster in Egypt,” *CQ* 58 (2008) 431.

³⁰ E.g. E. Bresciani, “The Persian Occupation of Egypt,” in *The Cambridge History of Iran II* (London/New York 1985) 510–511; J. D. Ray, “Egypt 525–404 B.C.,” *CAH²* V 266, 276–277; P. J. Rhodes, “Thucydidean Chronology,” *AAntHung* 49 (2009) 353–358; S. Ruzicka, *Trouble in the West. Egypt and the Persian Empire* (Oxford 2012) 31.

³¹ P. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander* (Winona Lake 2002) 573 ff. Nevertheless he supposes that the Athenian involvement in Egypt lasted six years, from 460 to 454; see also L. Allen, *The Persian Empire* (London 2005) 101–105; L. Llewellyn-Jones and J. Robson, *Ctesias’ History of Persia* (London/New York 2010) 188 n.95; M. Waters, *Ctesias’ Persica and its Near Eastern Context* (Madison 2017) 96.

454/3.³² D. Kahn argues that the revolt probably began between May 463 and May 462 (cf. Diod. 11.71). One of the arguments for this date is an ostrakon from the oasis west of Thebes dated to 463/2, which calls Inaros “chief of the rebels.”³³

After the initial uprising, Inaros turned to asking the Athenians for help (Diod. 11.71.4, cf. Thuc. 1.104.1).³⁴ Kahn dated Inaros’ embassy to Athens to the same time, i.e. 463/2. The Athenian expedition can be assigned to the next archon year, 462/1.³⁵ According to Diodorus (11.71.5–6) the appeal was made in the Athenian *ekklesia*.³⁶ The Athenians decided to send their Cyprus squadron to the aid of the insurgents.³⁷ Thucydides, as we know, says that they had a flotilla of 200 triremes en route for Cyprus (1.104.2). But Diodorus mentions 300 triremes (11.71.5) and 200 triremes elsewhere (11.74.3). Ctesias puts the size of the Athenian squadron at 40 ships (*FGrHist* 688 F 14).³⁸

Since Inaros’ rebellion began earlier (in 463/2), we may well

³² A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II: Introduction* (Leiden 1975) 38 ff.

³³ Kahn, *CQ* 58 (2008) 430–431: Diodorus’ assertion is corroborated by documents from Egypt.

³⁴ Green, *Diodorus Siculus* 141–142 n.275; see G. Radet, “νεώτερον ὄντα,” *REG* 32 (1919) 431; J. M. Bigwood, “Ctesias’ Account of the Revolt of Inaros,” *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 17 n.57.

³⁵ Kahn, *CQ* 58 (2008) 431; Green, *Diodorus Siculus* 141–142 n.275. Cf. Barns, *Historia* 2 (1953) 166, 170; J. Scharf, “Die erste ägyptische Expedition der Athener,” *Historia* 3 (1955) 308 ff.; E. Luppino, “L’intervento ateniese in Egitto nelle tragedie eschilee,” *Aegyptus* 47 (1967) 201 ff. P. J. Rhodes can believe that the Egyptian revolt began soon after the death of Xerxes in 465, but has a strong predisposition to accept Diodorus’ dates of 462/1–460/59 for Athens’ involvement in the Egyptian events: *ActaAntHung* 49 (2009) 357.

³⁶ “The Athenians, therefore, with great enthusiasm set about the preparation of the expedition”; cf. Schreiner, *Hellanikos* 62.

³⁷ Scharf, *Historia* 3 (1955) 315; *contra*, P. J. Rhodes, “The Delian League to 449,” *CAH²* V 50.

³⁸ A. J. Holladay saw a difficulty in the claim that a fleet of 200 ships remained in Egypt: “The Hellenic Disaster in Egypt,” *JHS* 109 (1989) 177. See H. D. Westlake, “Thucydides and the Athenian Disaster in Egypt,” *CP* 45 (1950) 210; Bigwood, *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 12–13; *contra*, Green, *Diodorus Siculus* 141–142 n.275.

assume that Athens' involvement in Egypt also started earlier, i.e. in 462/1. It seems unlikely that these events were separated by much time.³⁹ The Erechtheid tribe casualty list dated to 459/8 (*IG I³ 1147*) might seem to contradict earlier involvement of the Athenians in Egypt. It mentions the casualties from campaigns in Cyprus, Egypt, Phoenicia, Halieis, Aegina, and Megara. The reference to Egypt, it is believed, belongs to the first year of this campaign. But we can assume that the year in which these casualties occurred is not necessarily the first or only year of the Egyptian expedition.⁴⁰

Perhaps Thucydides is not so accurate in his figure for the length of Inaros' rebellion and/or in his chronology of these years. Thucydides' usual practice, as Hammond stated, was to narrate the events in chronological sequence, but events in Egypt are an exception to this practice.⁴¹

If so, there is a reason to suppose that the Cyprus expedition probably took place in 463/2 and then was redirected to Egypt.⁴² Ctesias mentions Charitimides, who was outstanding in Egypt in the first year of Athenian involvement (F 14). Therefore it can be assumed that Cimon returned in Athens.

³⁹ From Thucydides and the ostrakon it appears, as Rhodes notes, that the move from Cyprus to Egypt was made at short notice: *CAH² V* 52). That is why he thinks that Inaros' approach may have been made not to Athens, but to the forces in Cyprus.

⁴⁰ Westlake, *CP* 45 (1950) 211; cf. Barns, *Historia* 2 (1953) 167. Kahn, *CQ* 58 (2008) 434, 439, holds that this list relates not to the first but to the last stages of the war. He dates Inaros' rebellion to 463/2–458/7.

⁴¹ Hammond, *Historia* 4 (1955) 398. Westlake judged that Thucydides' account of the Athenian expedition to Egypt is defective in some points (*CP* 45 [1950] 214). See Barns, *Historia* 2 (1953) 174; Green, *Diodorus Siculus* 150 n.302; L. Kallet, "The Pentekontaetia," in R. K. Balot et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides* (Oxford 2017) 68.

⁴² Kahn assumes that Plut. *Cim.* 15.2 refers to this campaign (*CQ* 58 [2008] 431 n.42). See Green, *Diodorus Siculus* 261–262. C. Bearzot doubts that Cimon headed the expedition in Egypt: "Cimone, il disastro di Drabesco e la svolta democratica del 462/1: a proposito di Aristotele, *AP* 27.1," *Ancient Society* 25 (1994) 23.

(b) Let us turn to the question of the circumstances of Ephialtes' reform. There is reason to believe that the reform could most likely have been carried out in the absence of Cimon.⁴³ Thus we have two options for the course of events. Either Ephialtes' reform took place during the naval expedition mentioned by Plutarch (the Cyprus expedition, see above); or else during the Messenian (Ithome) campaign as is generally accepted.⁴⁴

The success of the reform, according to some scholars, was facilitated by the fact that the military detachment in Messenia consisted of hoplites, i.e. supporters of the so-called Cleisthenic democracy. The Lacedaemonians were frightened by Ephialtes' reform and expelled by the Athenians on a pretext.⁴⁵ But we should note that Thucydides does not say anything about Ephialtes. However, his vague statement about the "revolutionary spirit" (*neoteropoiia*) of the Athenians is often interpreted as referring to the reform of Ephialtes (1.102.2).⁴⁶

Blamire is surprised that Plutarch shows no sign of understanding that the Ephialtic revolution and the Ithome campaign were in any way connected; in addition, Plutarch describes Cimon's attempt to quash Ephialtes' legislation without recognizing this as the immediate antecedent to the ostracism.⁴⁷ But I

⁴³ Rhodes, *CAH*² V 69; *contra*, G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London 1972) 179. K. J. Beloch and E. M. Walker believed that Ephialtes made his reform after Cimon's ostracism: Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* II.2 (Berlin 1898) 197–198; Walker, *CAH* V (1927) 467–468; *contra*, Blamire, *Cimon* 159.

⁴⁴ Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* 196; Rhodes, *CAH*² V 69; Hornblower, *The Greek World* 23.

⁴⁵ Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* 196; Cole, *GRBS* 15 (1974) 378, Rhodes, *CAH*² V 69. But the hoplites, as B. Strauss notes, took part in naval expeditions as well: "Democracy, Kimon and the Evolution of Athenian Naval tactics," in P. Flensted-Jensen et al. (eds.), *Polis and Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History* (Copenhagen 2000) 321–322.

⁴⁶ These words, as Hornblower notes, can refer to the reforms of Solon and Cleisthenes and could be connected with the Athenian inclination to novelty (*A Commentary* I 114–116, 159; cf. Blamire, *Cimon* 159).

⁴⁷ Blamire, *Cimon* 159.

believe that there are no difficulties, if we accept (with certain reservations) the sequence of events described by Plutarch.

Thus we should assume a different course of events, taking into account what Plutarch said. In this case Ephialtes carried out his reform during the Cyprus expedition, as Plutarch wrote.⁴⁸ And an obvious stimulus for it could be the recent acquittal of Cimon in the trial (463).⁴⁹ Returning from the expedition, Cimon tried to oppose the reform of Ephialtes (“to revive the aristocracy of the times of Cleisthenes”), but his opponents “banded together to denounce him, and tried to inflame the people against him” (*Cim.* 15.2). Perhaps Demosthenes had these events in mind when he said that Cimon had “dislocated the ancestral constitution by his personal efforts” (23.205).⁵⁰ This was a rather serious accusation, if Demosthenes’ words refer to the situation after Ephialtes’ reform. In any case, opposition to this reform hardly remained without consequences for Cimon. It resulted in the new charges against Cimon that would lead to his ostracism. But before this, the accusations against him could become, as will be suggested below, the pretext for sending to Messenia (the Ithome campaign) a different *strategos* in response to a new appeal of the Lacedaemonians.

(c) Another question relates to the Messenian expeditions. Some scholars consider that it is possible to speak of one expedition only.⁵¹ Others hold that the expedition to Messenia and the dismissal of the Athenians were preceded by the Cyprus expedition.⁵² Plutarch’s narrative makes it possible to assume that there were two different situations that forced the Lacedaemonians to seek help. First, the very beginning of the Helots’

⁴⁸ Diodorus (11.77.6) connects the reform of Ephialtes with the events in Egypt; cf. Green, *Diodorus Siculus* 149 ff.; Radet, *REG* 32 (1919) 431.

⁴⁹ Commentary and bibliography Blamire, *Cimon* 158.

⁵⁰ Zaccarini, *Hormos* 3 (2011) 293 n.22; see n.7 above.

⁵¹ Cole, *GRBS* 15 (1974) 375–376; Rhodes, *CAH²* V 69.

⁵² Green, *Diodorus Siculus* 130 n.239; Barns, *Historia* 2 (1953) 170 ff.; *contra*, Blamire, *Cimon* 158; Hornblower, *A Commentary* I 164.

revolt, the most menacing moment for the Lacedaemonians (Pericleidas' appeal); later, when the struggle against the insurgents became a prolonged siege of Ithome. "The two appeals are different in context, aim and result," as Hammond puts it.⁵³

If so, the first expedition, perhaps, was sent shortly after the earthquake and the Helots' revolt, i.e. before the expedition to Cyprus (so 464 or 463).⁵⁴ Barns held that it was an abortive Ithome campaign which resulted in the Athenians' dismissal.⁵⁵ But Blamire thought it difficult to believe that Cimon would have been appointed to command a naval enterprise after an unsuccessful expedition to Messenia.⁵⁶ We could agree with Blamire, but only if we should admit that the first (for Barns, the only) Messenian expedition really ended with the expulsion of the Athenians. But if we assume that it ended successfully, the objection can be removed.

The purpose of the first expedition was the rescue of Sparta. That was the question before the Athenian assembly, at which Cimon confronted Ephialtes. We leave aside the details of this discussion, mentioned above (*Cim.* 16.8). But we can be sure that the debates would be completely incompatible with the situation when the Spartans requested Athenian aid against the fortification at Ithome.⁵⁷

The expedition was sent and we have reason to think it was successful. Plutarch relies here on *Lysistrata* (1137–1146):

Now unto you, O Spartans, do I speak. Do you forget how your own countryman, Pericleidas, once came hither suppliant before our altars, pale in his purple robes, praying for an army when in

⁵³ *Historia* 4 (1955) 378; cf. Papantoniou, *AJP* 72 (1951) 178; Sealey, *Historia* 6 (1957) 370.

⁵⁴ In 464, Hammond, *Historia* 4 (1955) 375; 463, Barns, *Historia* 2 (1953) 170; cf. Green, *Diodorus Siculus* 261. Sealey, *Historia* 6 (1957) 370, and Badian, *EchCl* 32 (1988) 307, 309, date the earthquake to 469 and Cimon's expedition accordingly to 468/7.

⁵⁵ Barns, *Historia* 2 (1953) 170.

⁵⁶ Blamire, *Cimon* 158; Hornblower, *A Commentary* I 169,

⁵⁷ Papantoniou, *AJP* 72 (1951) 178.

Messenia danger growled, and the sea-god made earth quaver. Then with four thousand hoplites Cimon marched and saved all Sparta. Yet base ingrates now, you are ravaging the soil of your preservers. (transl. J. Lindsay).⁵⁸

Plutarch's narrative of Cimon's return through Corinth also could be trustworthy.⁵⁹

Thus, if we assume that the first expedition was real we may suppose that joint actions of the Lacedaemonians and their allies, including the Athenians, made the rebels turn to defensive tactics and fortified Ithome. If so, we can say that Sparta was saved.⁶⁰ The same, we suspect, is implied by Xenophon: "They [the Lacedaemonians] reminded the Athenians that from all time the two peoples had stood by one another in the most important crises for good ends; for they on their side, they said, had aided in expelling the tyrants from Athens, while the Athenians, on the other hand, gave them zealous assistance at the time when they were hard pressed by the Messenians' (*Hell.* 6.5.33, transl. C. L. Brownson). We can deduce that in the situation that Xenophon mentions the Athenians were not expelled by the Lacedaemonians.

With the assumption of the rescue of Sparta by the Athenians (and the other allies) we cannot combine the report of Cimon's dismissal. On the one hand, the expulsion of a man who was philolacon and proxenos of the Lacedaemonians (Paus. 4.24.5) seems extraordinary.⁶¹ Cole even tries to explain the expulsion

⁵⁸ Aristophanes says nothing on the Athenians' dismissal, as Hammond notes (*Historia* 4 [1955] 377 n.1). J. Henderson saw in Aristophanes' words an exaggeration: *Aristophanes, Lysistrata* (Oxford 1989) 201. See Badian, *EchCl* 32 (1988) 304 ff.; D. M. Lewis, "Mainland Greece, 479–451 B.C.," *CAH²* V 109.

⁵⁹ See n.12 above.

⁶⁰ Hammond, *Historia* 4 (1955) 377.

⁶¹ V. Ehrenberg, *From Solon to Socrates* (London/New York 1973) 198; de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* 179. Badian assumes that the dismissal had not a political but a military reason: *EchCl* 32 (1988) 310.

by an enigmatic agreement of Cimon with the Lacedaemonians.⁶² On the other hand, Cimon's dismissal would mean that he was under suspicion and this in turn would negatively affect his relations with the Lacedaemonians.⁶³ But this did not happen. In 450 it was precisely through the efforts of Cimon that a truce with Sparta was concluded: "Whereupon Cimon came back from banishment and made peace between the cities. For the Lacedaemonians were as kindly disposed towards him as they were full of hatred towards Pericles and the other popular leaders" (Plut. *Per.* 10.3).

In order to consider the first expedition as real one must explain one further matter. If the siege of Thasos began in 465 it would be very unlikely, as G. Grote noted, that Cimon left Thasos for a first expedition to the Peloponnese and afterwards returned to Thasos: if Cimon commanded at the siege of Thasos, he could not have gone as commander to Laconia at the time when the first expedition is alleged to have been undertaken.⁶⁴ Grote refers to Plutarch's narrative: "When the Thasians were in revolt from Athens, he [Cimon] defeated them in a sea-fight, captured thirty-three of their ships, besieged and took their city, acquired their gold mines on the opposite mainland for Athens, and took possession of the territory which the Thasians controlled there" (*Cim.* 14.2). But this may refer, as Papantoniou notes, not so much to the beginning but to the completion of the siege, and it need not mean that Cimon was in Thasos during the whole time of the siege.⁶⁵ And for Gomme it was not so certain that Cimon was in command throughout the two-year siege of Thasos.⁶⁶

If this is correct, we can also admit that the second appeal of the Lacedaemonians can be real. As the siege dragged on, the

⁶² Cole, *GRBS* 15 (1974) 370.

⁶³ It is unlikely that he personally was suspected by the Spartans.

⁶⁴ G. Grote, *A History of Greece* V (London 1851) 430 n.1.

⁶⁵ Papantoniou, *AJP* 72 (1951) 181.

⁶⁶ Gomme, *HCTI* 296.

Lacedaemonians addressed the Athenians once again (this, I suspect, is what Thucydides narrates).⁶⁷ “Once more,” if we trust in Plutarch’s words (*Cim.* 17.2), “the Lacedaemonians summoned the Athenians to come to their aid against the Messenians and Helots in Ithome.” The Athenians sent the expedition, but now they were rejected by the Lacedaemonians. When the Athenians returned home they “took open measures of hostility against the Laconizers, and above all against Cimon.”

Hammond thought that Cimon headed the second expedition as well.⁶⁸ Certainly this is quite possible. But Raubitschek, as noted above, held that the Cyprus expedition happened simultaneously with the second expedition to Messenia, which therefore cannot have been headed by Cimon.⁶⁹ Let us consider, together with R. Develin, the fact that Plutarch does not say it was Cimon who headed the second expedition.⁷⁰ So if the Cyprus expedition was real and the Lacedaemonians’ second appeal really took place, it follows that different *strategos* was sent to Messenia. Moreover, there could be two simultaneous (or close in time) expeditions, as Raubitschek supposed; this could be the result of Cimon’s opposition to the reform of Ephialtes. And we can only guess who this *strategos* might be.⁷¹ And Cimon’s removal from (or non-participation in) the second Athenian expedition could be a further reason for the great fear of the Lacedaemonians and entail the expulsion of the Athenians.

Cimon’s exile will have happened after the dismissal of the Athenians from Sparta. Plutarch wrote of a trifling pretext for the exile: μικρῶς ἐπιλαβόμενοι προφάσεως (*Cim.* 17.2); cf. *Per.*

⁶⁷ Cf. Badian, *EchCl* 32 (1988) 304–305.

⁶⁸ This was Plutarch’s naval expedition, discussed above: Hammond *Historia* 4 (1955) 399–400.

⁶⁹ Raubitschek, *AJA* 70 (1966) 38.

⁷⁰ R. Develin, *Athenian Officials, 684–321 B.C.* (Cambridge 1989) 72.

⁷¹ We can consider, for example, the *strategoí* of the 460s and 450s of the fifth century (excluding Pericles): Leagros (465/4); Leokrates, an unknown Phrynichos, Hippodamas, and Dikaiogenes, all of 459/8 (Develin, *Athenian Officials* 71, 74).

9.5 “Cimon ... on the charge of being a lover of Sparta and a hater of the people, was ostracized,” Κίωνα δ’ ὡς φιλολάκωνα καὶ μισόδημον ἐξοστρακισθῆναι.⁷² Plutarch notes that the irritation of the Athenians was against the Lakonizers and Cimon (*Cim.* 17.2). This suggests that among the candidates for exile could be one of his supporters. Blamire supposes that this could be Menon, who would be ostracized some time later, after the battle of Tanagra in 457.⁷³

To sum up, we have some reason for placing more confidence in Plutarch. It allows us to propose the following approximate chronology of the events in question:

464 B.C. – the earthquake in Sparta, the request of the Lacedaemonians for help and the first Athenian expedition headed by Cimon;

464/3 – campaign in Thrace, Chersonese, and Thasos, return and trial of Cimon;

463/2 – Cyprus expedition and Ephialtes’ reform. Cimon’s opposition to Ephialtes;

462/1 – another appeal of the Lacedaemonians (Ithome campaign), second Messenian expedition and the Athenians’ dismissal;

461 – ostracism of Cimon.⁷⁴

November, 2018

Department of Humanities
National Research University
Higher School of Economics
Perm, Russia
vguschin@hse.ru

⁷² Blamire, *Cimon* 162; Zaccarini, *Hormos* 3 (2011) 296. Blamire (174) says early 461.

⁷³ Blamire, *Cimon* 174; A. E. Raubitschek, “Menon, son of Menekledes,” *Hesperia* 24 (1955) 288–289; S. Brenne, “Die Ostraka (487– ca.416 v. Chr.) als Testimonien,” in P. Siewert (ed.), *Ostrakismos-Testimonien I (Historia Einzelschr.* 155 [2002]) 60, 120.

⁷⁴ My sincere thanks to Prof. P. J. Rhodes (Durham, U.K.) for his help and criticism. He is in no way responsible for any errors which remain. I am grateful to the anonymous reader for very useful comments and suggestions.