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THE LOCAL HISTORY OF HIPPIAS OF ERYTHRAI

Politics, Place, Memory, and Monumentality

ABSTRACT

Recent studies of local historiography in ancient Greece have overlooked the importance of Hippias of Erythrai, whose lone surviving fragment reveals complex processes of memory making and the politics of place. This article argues that Hippias should be understood as a participant in Early Hellenistic struggles between democracy and oligarchy, concluding with an exploration of how the historian’s language interacts with the text and iconography of a Late Classical Athenian monument.

INTRODUCTION

Time has not been kind to Hippias of Erythrai.¹ The local historian, the author of a work entitled Inquiries Concerning His Fatherland (Ἱστορίαι περὶ τῆς πατρίδος), is known to us from a single quotation preserved in the work of Athenaios. Otherwise, he is passed over by the extant sources.² The Suda and other ancient lexicographers are silent on him, and modern scholars have not paid him much attention, either. One will not find Hippias in the Oxford Classical Dictionary. He has no entry in Brill’s New Pauly alongside the homonymous tyrant of Athens and sophist of Elis.³ The Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (LGPN) has managed to take note of him, as the lone Hippias known from his Ionia hometown; yet even there his identity is mysterious, a cryptic “[hell.?]” placed next to his name.⁴ Hippias of Erythrai has nearly been forgotten—but not completely.

¹ An early version of this paper was given at the 2014 meeting of the American Philological Association; I thank my fellow panelists and audience members, who provided helpful feedback. A Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activities Grant from Arizona State University allowed me to visit the site of Erythrai and to inspect the Euphran stele in person in 2015. James Kierstead and Nino Luraghi read the entire manuscript and gave me much useful advice. I also thank the two anonymous Hesperia readers. Any mistakes that remain are my own.
² Eust. Od. 2.80, lines 23–24, quotes his work without attribution.
³ In the RE (1907), he is covered by Jacoby, one of whose other “H” historian entries, for Herodotos, was pathbreaking. Hippias is now covered by Eran Almagor in Brill’s new edition of Jacoby’s fragments, Brill’s New Jacoby (henceforth BNJ). I thank Ian Worthington for sharing with me an advanced copy of the entry, which I was able to see only after I had completed the present article.
⁴ LGPN VA, s.v. Ἰππίας.
Hippias has earned a permanent reference number in modern scholarship, and it is no insignificant marker at that. He is number 421 in Felix Jacoby’s monumental *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (FGrH)*, arguably “the greatest philological work of [the twentieth] century and the greatest work on Greek history for all time.” He has thus acquired the distinction of being “FGrH 421,” by which he will always (and, presumably, exclusively) be differentiated. As to the fragments (“FF”) of this fragmentary historian, there is only one, the single lengthy passage quoted by Athenaios. That status, which puts Hippias in the company of roughly 183 other historians with only a single surviving fragment (or a little more than 21% out of a total of 856 in Jacoby’s original *Fragmente*), may sound dismal, but it represents a veritable treasure trove compared with the 145 historians (or 16.9%) for whom there are no extant fragments at all, only testimonies (“TT”).

In line with Jacoby’s conceptual schema for understanding the development of historiography, first laid out in detail in an article of 1909, Hippias is not classed by his own date or by the period covered by his work. Instead, he is grouped according to the genre of historical writing in which he was supposedly engaged, which Jacoby called *Horographie*, or “local history” (*Lokalgeschichte*). In Jacoby’s conceptualization, which despite being massively learned has not gained general acceptance, local history writing is necessarily posterior to monumental historiography of the kind perfected early on by Herodotos. Although one might think local history came first, and even provided the individual tributaries for the central, massive stream of general history, Jacoby insisted that the reverse was true: local historians did not emerge until prompted by the example of Herodotos and others to consider the place of their own cities’ histories in the wider Greek world. The horographers, then, authors of histories of cities (*Geschichte von Städten*), chronologically and conceptually follow and depend upon Herodotos and, following him, the writers of political and military history (*Zeitgeschichte*). What Luraghi has called “the severe logic of this evolutionary scheme,” which led Jacoby to unnecessarily redate certain early historians in order to fit his theory, will not be my main concern here. Important, however, is Hippias’s status as a local historian, a category that remains crucial for understanding ancient historiography.

In fact, local history has increasingly become the focus of recent scholarship, much of it concerned with the legacy of Jacoby. Puzzlingly, Hippias has featured only briefly or, more commonly, not at all in these studies. This omission becomes even more surprising when we consider

6. Jacoby 1909 (reprinted in Jacoby 1956 and in English in Jacoby 2015), with the “schematic overview” on p. 123. Hippias is one of 311 historians (vol. IIIB, nos. 297–607) grouped under the heading “authors concerned with single cities.” The term “horography” is known from ancient sources (*Diod. Sic.* 1.26.5; *Hsch.*, s.v. ὤρογράφοι; *Etym. Magn.*, s.v. ὤρος) and signifies annalistic chronicles.
7. *Genealogie, Ethnographie, and Mythographie* developed earlier still.
10. An exception is De Luna (2010), who uses the fragment to question Aristotle’s picture of Erythraian
that Hippias’s fragment is one of the longest in volume IIIB of the FGrH (excluding the Atthidographers), at 42 lines of ipsissima verba. As we will see, when scholars have turned to Hippias in the past, it has typically been to mine his words for whatever genuine nuggets of truth they can provide about Erythrai in the Archaic period. Moreover, since Hippias purports to describe the takeover of his polis by tyrants, historians of tyranny have attempted to fit the fragment into what we know about the development and practice of one-man rule. Hippias’s history has rarely been analyzed on its own terms to assess whatever aim(s) and function(s) its author may have intended it to perform in its local and Panhellenic contexts.

In this article, I attempt to make up for this scholarly deficit. Rather than sift through the fragment for Archaic Erythraian history as it really happened, I will treat Hippias as an active participant in the politics of his own time, an interested party concerned with shaping processes of local collective memory. The benefits of such an approach are at least three in number. First, it will become clear that Hippias was an exemplary practitioner of what has been labeled “intentional history,” or the “projection in time of the elements of subjective, self-conscious self categorization which construct the identity of a group as a group.” Hippias was engaged not so much in collecting, adjudicating between, and presenting the historical data about Erythrai as he found them, as he was in crafting a vision of the past that conformed to his polis’s ideological self-understanding. Moreover, Hippias’s history writing complicates the notion of intentional history by revealing the essentially contested nature of the community’s past: there was no single, agreed-upon “intention” but rather a series of conflicting accounts, each vying to achieve hegemonic status. In this sense, Hippias’s ancient history mirrored the recent history of Erythrai: just as contemporary political actors had struggled to control the spaces and symbols of his polis, so too would Hippias’s historical figures fight over the city, and so too would his history fight other narratives for recognition.

11. The long fragment of Hesychios of Miletos preserved in a 10th-century manuscript (FGrH 390 F1) is by far the most substantial instance of direct quotation, but barring that, Hippias is surpassed only by Nymphodoros of Syracuse (FGrH 574 F4) at 55 lines. The next closest are Ion (FGrH 392 F6) at 39 lines and Ergias (FGrH 513 F1) at 30 lines. Hereafter, FGrH 421 will be referred to by line number alone for the sake of convenience. Note that Jacoby’s word spacing, and therefore line numbering, in FGrH differs slightly from the numbering used in this article. Internal references in this article always refer to the version quoted and translated here, not to Jacoby’s numbering.


13. This does not mean that Hippias was doing something other than so-called real history; it may just be that what the Greeks considered typical history was different from our contemporary conception of it. Ancient Greek history writing may have been more open-ended and polymorphous than we typically acknowledge. As Gabba has pointed out (1981, p. 50), we consider Thucydides and Polybius paradigmatic historians because their methods look like our own; in fact, they were “untypical and exceptional.”

14. For this point about collective memory being an object of contestation, see the suggestion of Ma (2009, p. 256): “The construction of memory may have been the means or the prize in power struggles or personal agendas.”
Second, reading Hippias’s fragment with an eye to its historical context reveals its engagement with contemporary Panhellenic political debates (as will be argued in detail, those of the Early Hellenistic period). Hippias is evidence for an increased hardening in the distinction between democracy and oligarchy and for an attempt by the former to link the latter inextricably with tyranny as an illegitimate regime type. Further attestations of this trend can be found in the public discourse of the period, whether in oratory, decrees, or historical accounts.

Finally, I explore the striking similarity between the text of Hippias and a material object—a late-4th-century Athenian inscription and the sculpted relief that crowned it—and argue that if Hippias’s fragment was not in fact directly influenced by the stele, then they both at least belong to the same Late Classical and Early Hellenistic ideological milieu. The connection has important consequences for our understanding of the relationship between historical texts and material culture.

THE FRAGMENT AS AN EXAMPLE OF LOCAL HISTORY

Before the analysis can proceed, it is necessary to introduce and contextualize the fragment, especially since as an author Hippias is quite obscure. The fragment also provides an opportunity, so far largely neglected by historians, for exploring broader issues in local historiography. I reproduce here the “cover-text,” Athenaios 6.258f–259f, along with Olson’s translation from the Loeb edition.\footnote{Trans. S. D. Olson, Cambridge, Mass., 2008, with slight modification. For the notion of a “cover-text” when dealing with fragmentary Greek historians, see Schepens 1997. The term refers to the ancient text from which a quotation or paraphrase of a lost Greek historian derives.}

The quotation of Hippias comes during a discussion of flatterers (κόλακες). The speaker Demokritos of Nikomedeia has just quoted some lines from the comic poet Alexis’s play \textit{The Liar} spoken by a \textit{kolax}, and he goes on to cite Theopompos of Chios concerning a flatterer of Philip of Macedon. In between, however, we are fortunate to get the long quotation from Hippias (\textit{FrGH} 421):

\begin{quote}
Ὑπίππας δ’ ὁ Ἐρυθραῖος
ἐν τῇ δεύτερᾳ τῶν Περὶ τῆς πατρίδος ιστοριῶν, διηγοῦμένος ὡς ἴν ὁ Κνωπὸς βασιλεύει ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκείνου κολάκων κατελύθη, φησι καὶ τά τιτά· “Κνωπῷ μεντευμένῳ
περὶ σωτηρίας ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησε θυεῖν Ἑρμῇ δολίῳ. Καὶ μετά ταῦτα, ἀρμήσαντος αὐτοῦ εἰς Δελφοὺς, οἱ τὴν
βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ καταλύσαι βουλόμενοι, ἵν’ ὀλιγαρχίαν
καταστήσανται (ἤσαν δ’ οὗτοι Ὀρτύγης καὶ ἤρος καὶ
Ἐξαρός, οἱ ἐκαλοῦντο διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς θεραπείας εἶναι
τῶν ἐπιφανῶν πρόκυπτες καὶ κόλακες), συμπλέοντες
οὗν τῷ Κνωπῷ, ὡς ἢ ἴν’ άρησαν, δήσαντες
tὸν Κνωπὸν ἔρριψαν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, καὶ καταχθέντες
eἰς Χίον, καὶ δύναμιν παρὰ τῶν ἐκεί τυράννων λαβόντες
Ἀμφίκλου καὶ Πολυτέκνου, νυκτὸς κατέπλευσαν εἰς
τάς Ἐρυθράς. Κατὰ τὰ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Κνωποῦ σῶμα
ἐξεβράσθη ταῖς Ἐρυθραῖς κατὰ τὴν ἀκθίνην, ἤ νῦν Λεό-
ποδον καλεῖται. Τῆς δὲ γυναίκος τοῦ Κνωποῦ Κλεονί-
κῆς περὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος κηδείαν γινομένης (ὥν
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
15. Trans. S. D. Olson, Cambridge, Mass., 2008, with slight modification. For the notion of a “cover-text” when dealing with fragmentary Greek historians, see Schepens 1997. The term refers to the ancient text from which a quotation or paraphrase of a lost Greek historian derives.
\end{flushright}
Hippias of Erythrai, in Book II of his Inquiries Concerning His Fatherland, describes how Knopos's flatterers cost him his kingship, saying the following: “When Knopos consulted an oracle concerning safety, the god prophesied that he should sacrifice to Hermes Dolios. Afterward he set off for Delphi, and the people who wanted to put an end to his kingship in order to establish an oligarchy (the individuals in question were Ortyges, Iros, and Echaros, who were referred to as lap-dogs and flatterers, because they fawned on the powerful) and who were on the same ship as Knopos, tied him up once they were far from land and threw him into the sea. They put in at Chios and got troops from Amphiklos and Polyteknos, who were the tyrants there, and then sailed by night for Erythrai. Simultaneously, Knopos’s body washed ashore on the Erythraian headland known today as Leopodon. As his wife Kleonike was preparing the body for
burial (it was a holiday and a festival was being celebrated in honor of Artemis Strophaia), suddenly the sound of a trumpet was heard. Ortyges’ men captured the city, and many of Knopos’s friends were killed, although Kleonike fled to Kolophon once she learned what was happening. Ortyges and his fellow tyrants used their Chian troops to eliminate anyone who opposed their policies; and after abolishing the laws, they ran the city’s affairs themselves and refused to allow any of the common people inside the walls. They set up a lawcourt outside, in front of the gates, and held trials there, wrapped in purple robes and dressed in tunics with purple fringe. In the summer, they wore elaborate sandals, while in the winter, they routinely went around in women’s shoes; they grew their hair long and made it a practice to keep it in braids; they differentiated their heads from other people’s by adopting yellow and purple diadems; and they and their wives wore solid gold jewelry. They forced some of the citizens to carry them in litters, others to serve as lictors, and still others to clear the streets; summoned some people’s sons to appear at the parties they held and ordered others to bring their wives and daughters; and severely punished anyone who disobeyed. If a member of their group died, they herded the citizens together along with their wives and children and forced them to lament the dead and to beat their breasts violently and cry out shrill and loud, while a man armed with a whip stood over them and forced them to behave this way. This state of affairs continued until Knopos’s brother Hippotes attacked Erythrai with troops while a festival was going on; when the people of the city sided with him, he directed his attack against the tyrants. He tortured many of their supporters; stabbed Ortyges to death as he was trying to escape, along with the men accompanying him; tortured their wives and children in horrible ways; and liberated his native land.”

The first issue to address is the reliability of the quotation. Robert and Vanessa Gorman have recently highlighted the problems involved with taking Athenaios’s numerous acts of name-dropping as straightforward instances of direct quotation. In several cases, particularly when he is talking about τρυφή, or luxury, Athenaios paraphrases earlier authors in order to make them conform to his own concerns; what we have in these cases is more distortion than scholarly citation. There is little danger that this is the case with the fragment of Hippias, however. First, Athenaios explicitly writes, “he says these things [ταῦτα],” followed by oratio recta, rather than summarizing the author in indirect discourse. Second, Hippias’s text comes into play in the first place not because its main theme, a tyrannical-oligarchic coup, fits the subject at hand, but because it contains a tangential, one-word mention of flatterers. Thus, the wider text is unlikely to have been altered by Athenaios to fit the context. Jacoby was therefore justified in printing the text in expanded spacing (Sperrdruck) to signify direct quotation.

Given that we are dealing with the actual words of a local historian, taken from his second book, we can begin to situate Hippias within the broader aspects of the genre. The title attributed to the work by Athenaios, Inquiries Concerning His Fatherland, is common among the local historians

16. See Gorman and Gorman (2007, 2010, 2014), discussing the theme of “corrupting luxury.” The authors do not deal at length with the case of Hippias. They suggest that the language ascribed to Hippias by Athenaios “may occur in the cited author,” i.e., be a direct quotation (Gorman and Gorman 2014, p. 225, with n. 144). For more on Athenaios’s quotation of historians, see Pelling 2000; Lenfant 2007.
of the Hellenistic period and later. The work might also have been known as *Peri Erythron*, since sometimes Athenaios substitutes the word “*patris*” in the place where other sources give the actual name of the polis, if the writer was a citizen of the city that serves as the subject of his history. Alternative possibilities for the title of a work of local history include *Horoi* (“Annals”—thus Jacoby’s *Horographie*) and substantive adjectives based on the name of the polis in the neuter plural (in this case it would be “Erythraïka”), but these are less likely to be the title by which Hippias’s work was formally known.

As is clear from the content of the fragment, the historian was interested in narrative political history. If, as I will argue, the fragment of Book 2 deals with events during the 11th century B.C., we may wonder how far back Hippias’s research went. What might have been treated in Book 1 of the *Historiai peri tes patridos*? Furthermore, under what chronological schema might Hippias have organized his work? Harding characterizes the beginning portions of a polis’s local history as “concerned with origins and foundations . . . of the specific people themselves, where they came from, how they reached their present territory . . .; of their culture; origins of leading families and of names of places and topographical phenomena; foundations of cults and religious practices and festivals, of sacred sites, of legal, administrative, and political institutions.”

We know that the Arthidographers, the subject of Harding’s particular focus, spent their first books discussing such early phenomena as the concentration of the Athenians into the city center; the mythological origins of the names of prominent institutions and landmarks; the location of early cult sites; and the inaugural celebration of important festivals. Moreover, the local chroniclers of Attica organized their Arthides, or histories of Athens, according to the reigns of kings and, later, of eponymous magistrates. The first books would thus have dealt with the earliest Attic kings, beginning with Kekrops.

Thanks to Jacoby’s collection of the fragments, we have an idea of the content of the early books of other historians as well, some of whom (especially those from Ionia) may constitute better models for Hippias’s history. Non-Athenian local historians also describe early kings; the

---

17. E.g., Aphrodiosios-Euphemios, *FGrH* 386 F1 (date unknown); Zenis of Chios, *FGrH* 393 F1 (date unknown); Agathokles, *FGrH* 472 F4 (3rd century B.C.); Aristokritos, *FGrH* 493 F1 (date unknown); Ergias, *FGrH* 513 F1 (no earlier than mid-4th century B.C.).

18. Cf. Agathokles, *FGrH* 472 F4, with F1a (also quoted by Athenaios); Nymphis, *FGrH* 432 F1 (Hippokrates, *FGrH* 432 F1, has *Peri Herakleiai*, in Steph. Byz.), with F9 (Peri *tes patridos*, in Athenaios—but elsewhere [F10], he gives *Peri Herakleiai*).

19. I can find no instance of a *Peri [polis/patris]* title being alternatively known as either *Horoi* or [*Erythrai*-]ka. Note that Charon of Lampsakos is said by the *Suda* to have written both a *Peri Lampakou* and a *Horoi Lampakenon* (*FGrH* 262 T1), although Ceccarelli at *BNJ* 262 T1 suggests that the former is a Hellenistic epitome of the latter.


22. See Hellanikos (*FGrH* 322 F1) on the Areopagos.

23. See Kleitodemos (*FGrH* 323 F2) on the heroon of Melanippos in the deme of Melite.

24. See Hellanikos (*FGrH* 322 F2) and Androtion (*FGrH* 324 F2) on the Panathenaia.


26. See Philochoros, *FGrH* 328 F93–F98; see also *Marm. Par.*, *FGrH* 239 F1.

27. See Aristippos (*FGrH* 317 F1) in the first book of his *Arkadiaka* on Apis, king of Argos; Aristophanes of Boiotia (*FGrH* 379 F1b) from the first book of his *Boiotika* on Pompandomor, the founder of Tanagra; Akesandros (*FGrH* 469 F3) from the first book of his *On Kyrene* on the reign of Kyrene following that of Eurypylus.
etiol ogies of geological formations and other topographical features; and cultural and religious customs. In accounts of the Ionian poleis, there seems to have been a particular interest in foundation stories (ξίτες) and in the non-Greek peoples who inhabited the sites prior to the arrival of the Ionians. Establishing the precise relationship between Greeks and barbarians would have been important to later audiences’ sense of civic identity. Mimnermos’s account of the founding of Kolophon (FGrH 578 F3) and Asios’s foundation story of Samos (FGrH 545 F1) are early, poetic examples of this tendency, and both Pherekydes (FGrH 3 F155) and Ion of Chios (FGrH 392 F1) evince interest in the pre-Greek (Karian, Abantian, Lelegian) populations of the region. The pattern is maintained by the Samian local historian Menodotos, who describes the encounter between an Argive princess and the local Karian population at the site of the Heraion at Samos, and by Aristokritos, who tells of Miletos son of Areia’s flight from Crete to Karia and his founding of the city named after him. Intriguingly, Polyainos (8.43) knows a story in which Knopos, “of the stock [γένος] of the Kodridai,” allies with a Thessalian priestess of Hekate to take the site of Erythrai from the non-Greek locals. From Pausanias (7.3.7), we learn that this pre-Knopos population was made up of Cretans, Lycians, Karians, and Pamphylians. Jacoby suspected that both Polyainos

28. See Pythainetos (FGrH 299 F1) from On Aigina on the island Hippiouris; Semos (FGrH 396 F2) and Phanodikos (FGrH 397 F6), both from the first book of their Deliaka and both dealing with the island of Psammiteica; Agathokles (FGrH 472 F2) from the first book of his On Kyzikos on the founding of the island Besbikos by Perssephone; Diogenes (FGrH 474 F1, F2) from the first book of his On Kyzikos on the origins of the region called Adrasteia and on the seven traditional islands of his polis, respectively. Nymphis (FGrH 432) in the first book of his On Herakleia discussed among other things a harbor of Phrixos (F1), a Mt. Hypia (F2), and a spring called Acherousia that leads to the underworld (F3). See also Artemon Klazomenes (FGrH 443 F1) in an unknown book describing the origins of the place in Klazomenai known as the “Winged Sow.”

29. See Semos (FGrH 396 F2), explaining the name of the island Psammiteica (see above, n. 28), with reference to flat cakes called σάνις; Sosikrates (FGrH 461 F1) from the first book of the Kretika on the Phaistians’ early childhood training in jokes; Klytos (FGrH 490 F1) from the first book of his On Miletos on the guinea fowl around the temple of the Maiden Goddess on Leros. Interestingly, Hippia’s fragment contains the latter elements—the promontory known as the Leopodon, the festival of Artemis Strophia—without actually providing etiological explanations for them. They are instead incidental (without, however, being unimportant) to the story of Knopos’s murder, the oligarchic tyrants’ takeover, and the brother’s bloody revenge. Nonetheless, their presence in the passage suggests that Hippia similarly noted local features of Erythrai in his first book.

30. See Mac Sweeney 2013, pp. 36–43; Thomas 2014a. Herodoto (1.146.1–2) denigrates the Ionians for being of “mixed” heritage.

31. See further the testimony for Semonides of Amorgos’s Archaiaologia of the Samians (FGrH 534 T1a), which presumably dealt with the foundation of the city; Xenophon’s Κτίσις of Kolophon (FGrH 450 T1); and Panayssis of Halikarnassos’s Ιωνικα (FGrH 440 T1), which dealt with “matters concerning Kodros and Neleus as well as the Ionian settlements.” Dougherty (1994) argues that κτίσις poetry did not form its own autonomous genre, but that accounts of foundations made their way into other types of poetry defined primarily by context. This may be true, but Archaic poetry nonetheless betrays an intense interest in foundation narratives, no matter what the performative context in which the accounts were embedded. See further Bowie 1986, 2001, 2010; Fowler 1996, p. 65.

32. Menodotos, FGrH 541 F1; see also Aethlios of Samos (FGrH 536 F3), who describes the transformation of the cult statue (ἀγαλμα) of Hera at Samos from a wooden board (σανίς) to a proper human-shaped (ἀνθρωποειδής) statue “in the archonship of Prokles,” the Greek founder of Samos (cf. Paus. 7.4.2; Strabo 14.1.3; The mistigoras, FHG IV 152, no. 1).

Perhaps we are to understand that before the arrival of the Greeks the local population maintained a primitive statute. Miletos’s flight: Aristokritos, FGrH 493 F3, with Herodoros, FGrH 31 F45 (see also Paus. 7.2.5 = 496 F2). For Ionian κτίσις literature, see further Hellanikos, FGrH 4 F71; Charon of Lampsakos, FGrH 262 T1; Ephoros, FGrH 70 F125; Kadmos of Miletos, FGrH 489 T1b. Although their works were not called κτίσις, Kropolylos (FGrH 417 F1) describes “those founding Ephesos” in his Ηρωι, and Heropythos (FGrH 448 F1) investigates the founding of Phaselis in his Ηρωι of the Kolophonians.

33. Pausanias calls Knopos “Κλεοπος,” but the name is unknown from elsewhere and is likely a mistake.
and Pausanias drew on sources that traced back to Hippias. Given the presence of Knopos in the Polyainos episode, however, we are probably still looking at a moment from the second book of Hippias’s history. We are not much closer to knowing what was in Book 1, but the passage in Pausanias suggests that it might have been taken up with early inhabitants of the site and later Cretan settlers, perhaps headed by an eponymous Erythros. As Jacoby noted, the fact that the early Ionians appear only in Book 2 implies that in the first book he “dealt very extensively with prehistory.” As for the organization of the work, it is probably safest to assume that based on the extant fragment’s focus on Knopos, Hippias arranged his history to some degree according to founders and kings. A non-Greek focus in Book 1 would not constitute evidence against such an approach, since local historians were known to begin their works from indigenous, pre-Greek dynasts.

IDENTIFYING KNOPOS: HISTORICAL AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Turning now to the content of the fragment itself, we are faced with some difficulties in establishing the historical context. As we have just seen, Knopos was not unknown beyond Hippias’s fragment. Our earliest source for him, Hekataios, knew him as the individual who gave Erythrai its nickname “Knopoupolis.” This might imply ktistes, or founder, status. Strabo (14.1.3) says straightforwardly that Knopos, a “bastard [νόθος] son of Kodros,” founded Erythrai—the statement coming later on in the same passage that provides fragment 155 of Pherekydes, in which Androklos, the “legitimate [γνήσιος] son of Kodros,” led the settlement of Ionia and founded Ephesos. Given the similarity of the language (“bastard son”/“legitimate son”) and the fact that the Knopos story builds upon, rather than contradicts, the Androklos narrative, Jacoby’s decision to end the Pherekydes fragment with Androklos is not entirely convincing. It is quite possible that Pherekydes knew of Knopos, as well. Otherwise, we see Knopos in the previously discussed passages by Pausanias (7.3.7) and

34. Burkert (1979, p. 169, n. 11) also thought Polyainos drew on Hippias.
35. For this figure, see Diod. Sic. 5.79.1. He was the recipient of hero cult at Erythrai in the Hellenistic period (SEG XXX 1327).
36. FGrH IIIB, introduction to 421.
37. Although organization by annual “chronicles” or horoi is supposedly typical of the horographers of FGrH, vol. IIIB, note that Athenaios does not refer to Hippias’s text as Horoi Erythraion. Nor is his style anything like the “monotonous” (µουσικής) chronicling of the Arthidographers, complained of by Dionysios of Halikarnassos (Ant. Rom. 1.8.3). Hippias’s text may not have taken the form of strict year-by-year annals (this is rare in surviving Greek historical fragments anyway; see Möller 2001, pp. 249–251) but instead been loosely structured around the reigns of kings. For more on the use of regal and dynastic time for dating by local historians, see Clarke 2008, pp. 204–208 (Hippias is not discussed).
38. E.g., Antiochos of Syracuse (FGrH 555 T3) started his history of Sicily with the Sikanian king Kokalos.
39. See FGrH 1 F228. From what follows it will become clear that despite Pownall’s remarks at Bnj 1 F228, Knopos is not “otherwise unattested.”
40. For Androklos, see also Paus. 7.2.8–9. Ephoros (FGrH 70 F126) knew of him and of a quarrel between his descendants and the Ephesians. Jacoby drew attention to the similarity between stasis erupting in Ephesos during the foundational period and the civil strife described in Hippias’s fragment; see commentary on FGrH 421 F1.
41. See the commentary on FGrH 3 F155. Jacoby speculates that what follows after the mention of Androklos derives from Artemidoros of Ephesos. Luraghi (2000, pp. 364–365) also questions Jacoby’s decision to delimit the Pherekydes fragment as he did. I thank Nino Luraghi for bringing his article to my attention. For problems involving the delimitation of fragments in Jacoby, see the illuminating discussion of Baron (2011).
Polyainos (8.43), both times as a Kodrid and as the founder of Erythrai. The most parsimonious reading of the Hippias passage, then, is that he is discussing the same Knopos. Since the Classical Greeks tended to date the Ionian Migration to the 11th century, that should be the context for the fragment, even if the idea of a single “migration” is unhistorical. 42 This was indeed Jacoby’s own judgment. 43 Nevertheless, many scholars have insisted on downdating the dissolution of Knopos’s monarchy—rather drastically, in fact. Berve put the story “probably in the seventh century.” 44 He acknowledged Strabo’s labeling of Knopos as the founder of Erythrai, but he thought that the scenario of a conspiratorial group of men unrelated by birth paralleled that of Myrsilos and Pittakos at Mytilene in the late 7th century B.C. 45 Similarly, Huxley, in his history of early Ionia, treats Hippias’s fragment separately from the other Knopos material, which he dates to the “Ionian Migration” period (for him, the late 12th century). 46 In a chapter on the early wars and feuds of the Asiatic Ionians, he cites Hippias’s text in a discussion of Archaic Erythrai’s wars with its neighbors, principally Chios; in the index of the book, the Knopos from Hippias’s local history is labeled as “another Erythraean king” (as to distinguish him from the Knopos who founded Erythrai). Tellingly, Huxley dates the episode thus: “An Erythraean story about a king of that city called Cnopus comes from the time when monarchs were losing their authority to dissident nobles, and so perhaps from about 700 B.C.” 47 Here, the appearance of aristocrats overthrowing monarchies requires eo ipso a later date than the foundational period. Two Knoposes are therefore posited instead of one. 48

42. For the date of the Ionian Migration, see Marm. Par., FGrH 239 F27A (Neleus founded Miletos and the rest of Ionia 813 years before Diogenetes was archon in Athens [264/3, or in 1077/6 B.C.]); Eratosthenes, FGrH 241 F1a (1044/3 B.C.). I cannot discuss the question of Ionian ethnicity here (see Hall 1997, pp. 51–56; 2002, pp. 67–73; Crielard 2009), but I agree with Fowler (2013, pp. 572–576) that the story that the Ionian cities were apoikiai (settlements) of Athens cannot be reduced to pro-Athenian propaganda developed during the Delian League. A Kodrid foundation of Erythrai is based on my reading the least of Hippias’s pro-Athenian stances; I do not agree with Jacoby that the fragment is necessarily an example of the clash (Zusammenstoss) between local traditions and the Athenian Konstruktion of a unified Ionian Migration. Note also the recent discussion of the Ionian Migration by Mac Sweeney (2017). She does not list Hippias as a source for the Migration in her table 1, indicating that she must consider the king to belong to the 7th century rather than the 11th. Nevertheless, I am in broad agreement with her general thesis that the literary sources for the Ionian Migration tell us more about the contemporary concerns of the author than about the historical truth of the distant past. 43. Jacoby thought that Hippias had “transferred the conditions of the tyrannical period and of the degenerate aristocracy from the 7th and 6th centuries to the beginnings of the history of the Greek city” (commentary on 421 F1). A political situation known to Hippias from sources concerning the Archaic period has been projected by him back onto the foundational period. 44. Berve 1967, p. 96. 45. Berve 1967, p. 596. 46. Huxley 1966, pp. 26, 28. 47. Huxley 1966, p. 48; emphasis added. 48. Problems of dating would be ameliorated if we knew when the Chian tyrants Polyteknos and Amphiklos (FGrH 421 F1, lines 13–14) lived. A 4th-century tribe of the Polyteknidai on Chios has been known for some time (SEG XVII 380), and we now have evidence for a tribe of Amphiklidai (SEG LVI 1003). The two eponymous tribal figures are probably to be identified with the “tyrants” from Hippias’s fragment, but we are not necessarily closer to knowing when they lived (or were imagined as living). Note that an Amphiklos features in a fragment of Ion of Chios (FGrH 392 F1): he came from Histiaia on Euboia and replaced the family of Oinopion as ruler of the island. I would identify these two Amphikloses as one person (see Webster 1958, pp. 151–152), but Huxley again imagines two (1966, p. 170, n. 14): “Amphiclus [in Hippias] is perhaps a descendant of the great-grandfather of King Hector [i.e., the Amphiklos found in Ion’s fragment].” Berve (1967, pp. 106, 581) also views the Amphikloses as distinct, the one in Ion of Chios being the earlier king.
A few exceptions aside, most historians have likewise placed the events of the fragment somewhere in the 7th century.\textsuperscript{50}

The problem with this analysis is that it forces Hippias to conform to our own presuppositions about Archaic Greek political development. Rather than accept the simplest and most straightforward reading of the text—that Hippias thought the Knopos who founded Erythrai was murdered by “lap-dogs”—historians have pressed Hippias’s narrative into a “properly historical” framework in which the dissolution of a monarchy by an aristocracy or oligarchy is acceptable in the 7th century but not earlier.\textsuperscript{51} Scholars have been hesitant to take Hippias’s text on its own terms and to ask what purpose(s) he may have been trying to fulfill by exploring the early history of his polis in the manner that he does.

Useful here in understanding Hippias’s historiographical project is Gehrke’s concept of “intentional history” (intentionale Geschichte). Drawing upon the ethnosophy of Mühlmann, as well as research into mémoire collective by Halbwachs, Gehrke means by “intentional” the “elements of subjective and conscious self-categorization as belonging to a particular group, ethnic or of other sort.”\textsuperscript{52} Intentionality in this sense becomes “historical” when it is projected back into the past, creating “history in a group’s own understanding, especially in so far as it is significant for the make-up and identity of the group.”\textsuperscript{53} The notion of “intentional history” takes us...
beyond the traditional questions of what individual historians wrote about the past and whether their representations were accurate. It affords us a productive tool for exploring the social and political function(s) of history making (particularly as they relate to the formation of group identity), as well as the media and performative contexts through which accounts of the past were articulated and propagated to the wider community. As Gehrke points out, accounts of the past came as often in the form of poems as in “proper” written historiography; moreover, these poetic works were delivered publicly, at civic festivals, often by choruses of citizens. This picture of open, performative history making provides a useful corrective to modernizing notions of individuals receiving their history through solitary reading. At the same time, we should not forget that figures conventionally understood as historians (the sorts of individuals who feature in Jacoby’s *Fragmente*) were also part of this milieu. They recited their works at festivals and during embassies, competed for public honors, and had their accomplishments recorded on official inscribed monuments. Local historians in particular were central protagonists in this public, performative process of “intentional history”:—formation, since their works addressed the origins and characteristic institutions of individual poleis and the citizen bodies thereof.

If we cease trying to stretch Hippias’s fragment to fit the Procrustean bed of normal Greek constitutional history, his text immediately begins to make sense as an instance of intentional history. The passage describes, using partisan ideological language, the takeover of the early polis by “oligarchic tyrants.” Here, these “lap-dogs and flatterers” luxuriate in splendor while subjecting the citizens to slavish, humiliating treatment, reshaping the civic landscape for their own purposes. The legitimate king’s brother finally returns and—with the support of the community—mercilessly false in order to strengthen communal solidarity. Instead, a subtler process is at work: intentional history frequently confirms a group’s existing ideological assumptions or offers them a convenient way out of cognitive dissonance or ideological contradiction. The version of the past on which social actors converge is then taken to be the best (meaning, among other things, the “most accurate”) account of the community’s history—and not a willful falsehood (such as the “Noble Lie,” which Plato’s Guardians propagate in the *Republic*). For example, the delicate balance between truth and self-promotion in local historiography, see the decree for Syriskos of Chersonesos (FGrH 807 T1, discussed in Clarke 2008, pp. 344–346), which praises him for recording deeds “truthfully” (ἀληθινῶς) but at the same time “fittingly” (ἐνδοξά) for the city.”

54. Gehrke 2010, pp. 300–303; 2014, pp. 9–36; see also Kowalzig 2007; Grethelein 2010, pp. 17–146. The early poetic foundation-stories (ktiseis), which served as accounts of the past for local communities, were almost certainly performed at public festivals rather than in symposia (Bowie 1986). For social memory in democratic Athens as formulated through festivals, monuments, and public rhetoric, see Steinbock 2013. The contributions to Marincola, Llewellyn-Jones, and Maciver 2012 discuss “history without historians” in the Archaic and Classical periods, with most of the material coming from public, performative contexts.

55. For writers of local history (whether homegrown or foreign) as participants in the public life of poleis and as agents in the formation of civic identity, see esp. Clarke 2008, pp. 338–354 (although she does not utilize the language of “intentional history”); see also Chaniotis 1988, 2009 (mentioning intentional history and proposing the term “mnemopoetics,” the making of memory); Schepens 2001, 2006; Dillery 2005 (positing the existing of a genre of historiography called “sacred history” and drawing upon Gehrike’s work); Harding 2007a, p. 183; Priestley 2014, pp. 22–24; Thomas 2014a; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2014. As a historical example, see the recent re-edition of an inscribed decree, probably issued by Paros, honoring a Thasian historian, “A[lex?2]andros,” who spent time with the “ephebes and young men,” probably in the gymnasium, delivering lectures on the “famous deeds [κόης] of the polis”; see Hamon 2008a (= SEG LVIII 952), bringing together two previously known fragments (for the first of which, see BullEp 1959, no. 330; Chaniotis 1988, p. 312, no. E20; for historians in the Hellenistic gymnasion, see Scholz 2004). An early precedent was set by the sophist Hippias of Elis, who gave performances in Sparta on the families of heroes and mortal men, as well as on the ancient foundations of cities (Pl. *Hp. mai.* 285d = FGrH 6 T3).
slaughters the usurpers and their families, extirpating them root and branch. The brief oligarchic-tyrannical interlude reads as a kind of negative ideal of the city, a reverse mirror image of how it was supposed to function (i.e., as a legitimate monarchy and, by extension, as a democracy in Hippias’s own day). The text is not merely descriptive but normative: oligarchic tyranny not only failed historically in the earliest days of the polis, but it will continue to fail (and must, in fact, fail) going forward. Hippias’s history attempts to make opposition to oligarchic tyranny literally foundational to the identity of his polis. In this respect, it is fitting that our one fragment of the *Inquiries Concerning His Fatherland* ends with the liberation of that fatherland (patris) from tyranny ([Hippotes] τὴν πατρίδα ἠλευθέρωσεν).

Perhaps the theme recurred throughout the work. Schepens, discussing local historiography, has noted that “the earliest period [of a polis’s history] was not only important as the starting point of the historical development of the polis; since many city-states situated their origins in a dark, legendary time, the discussion of this period offered numerous possibilities to project patriotic themes and aspirations through the adaption and manipulation of the material.” Fifty Hippias’s history illustrates these tendencies perfectly.

It is not enough, however, to claim that Hippias is engaged in intentional history and rest content with that. We must also identify what specific concerns Hippias and his society might have been facing, as well as how the text serves as a response to that context. Here, the dating of the fragment is crucial. Jacoby placed Hippias in the Hellenistic period. He noted that the style of the fragment and its lack of dialect warned against an early text, and he thought that the construction of Erythrai’s city wall around 300 B.C. (Fig. 1) suggested a terminus post quem, since Hippias

---

mentions the wall. A terminus ante quem is less forthcoming, but it seems likely that the Imperial authors, especially Polyainos, knew Hippias’s work. A period any time after 300 b.c. works just as well for the present argument, but the first quarter of the 3rd century would be especially appropriate for Hippias’s content and outlook. To show this, I reconstruct the Classical and Early Hellenistic history of Erythrai, largely through inscriptions.

ERYTHRAIAN HISTORY, 480–280 B.C.

In 280 B.C., Erythrai could look back on a turbulent past 200 years. The city had been a powerful regional player upon its entrance into the Delian League, to judge from its substantial tribute and numerous subject territories. It was also perhaps democratic already in the mid-5th century. An Erythraian inscription dated to before 453/2 B.C., when Erythrai supposedly revolted from the Athenian empire, has been interpreted as showing a democratic or at least moderate constitutional regime at work. In the event of an unspecified infraction, prosecution (δίωξις) is open to “whoever wishes” (ὁ βουλόμενος), and the jury is to be composed of nine men from each of the tribes possessing no less than 30 staters each. A council (βουλή) and presiding officers (πρύτανεις) are also mentioned, but no demos, although this could simply be a matter of the stone’s state of preservation.

57. Thomas (2014a) notes that “the great mass of activity” as regards Ionian local historiography comes from the 4th and 3rd centuries. She adds (p. 262): “In the Ionian cities, the conflicts and struggles are in the remote past, part of the story of how they came to be as they were now. This could be vitally important in an era of violence, stasis, external interference from greater powers, successor wars—and the need to impress a powerful overlord.” The point about stasis seems to me to be particularly apt in the case of Hippias.

58. In his excellent study of Timaeos, Baron (2013, p. 4) has noted that one basic feature shared by all fragmentary historians is a “lack of context.” I hope to supply a bit of that missing context for our single surviving fragment of Hippias.

59. Political histories of Erythrai include Lamprecht 1871; Gaehler 1892; Bürchner, RE 6, 1907, cols. 575–590; Hornblower 1982, pp. 107–110; Gehrke 1985, pp. 66–69; Hansen and Nielsen 2004, pp. 1073–1076, no. 845 (Rubenstein); Teegarden 2014, pp. 153–172. I omit extensive discussion of Erythrai in the Archaic period, when the polis frequently saw war with nearby Chios (Hdt. 1.18.3; Plut. Mor. 244e–45a; Polyainos, Strat. 8.66) and Miletos (Andriskos, FGrH 500 F1; Plut. Mor. 254b–f). More cooperatively, the Erythraians joined Miletos and Paros for the founding of Parion in 709 (Strabo 13.1.14; Euseb. Chron. 91b; see also Paus. 9.27.1). At some point in the Archaic period, the polis was ruled by an elite clan known as the Basilidai, who were overthrown by the demos (Arist. Pol. 1305b18–22). Some scholars have attributed the so-called Constitutional Law of Chios (ML 8, early 6th century) to Erythrai (Forrest at ML 8; Hansen 1985) on unconvincing grounds.

60. Erythrai’s median payment out of the attested tribute payments we possess (11 different years spanning 450/49 to 428/7) is 7 talents; the average is 8 talents. Payments doubled between 448/7 (6 talents) and 428/7 (12 talents, the maximum number recorded). To judge from the contributions of other poleis, Erythrai was very wealthy indeed: Nixon and Price (1990, pp. 142–143), basing their figures on the tribute list of 442/1 (IG I’ 270), show that a minority of contributors to the Delian League (29%) paid more than 1 talent, with only 12 cities out of 205 (less than 6%) paying more than 7 talents, as Erythrai did that year. For Erythrai’s five dependent territories, probably dependent poleis, which formed a synteleia, or payment group, with it, see Jensen 2012. Hansen and Nielsen (2004) put Erythrai’s territory at a “5,” the highest ranking in their study, signifying an area of over 500 km².

61. Erythrai 2; see also Nomina 1, pp. 374–380, no. 106. For a translation, see Arnaoutoglou 1998, pp. 77–78. The inscription also mentions the “bean” (κύαμος), suggesting the assignment of
there were homegrown (and not simply Athenian-imposed) democratic or quasi-democratic traditions at Erythrai.

Probably in 453/2, Erythrai revolted from the Athenians but was brought back into the fold. The famous “Erythrai decree” (IG I 14 = ML 40) shows an Athenian settlement for the Erythraians following the polis’s reincorporation into the ἄρχη (empire). Erythrai is to have a boule made up of 120 men over 30 years of age, selected by lot (ἐκ τῶν κυρίων [from the bean], lines 8–9). The members of the council are to swear an oath to “counsel as best and as just as I am able for the mass [πλῆθος] of the Erythraians and of the Athenians” (lines 21–22). They also swear neither to banish any of those who have remained nor to banish any of those who have gone into exile “to the Medes” (line 27) without the approval of Athens. Later, in a lacunose section (line 33), “tyrants” (τυράννοι) are mentioned. Given the language of sortition and “mass,” it is highly likely that Athens mandated a democratic regime at Erythrai in the aftermath of a coup led by men labeled as tyrants (probably Persian-backed members of the local elite). A complex of ideas is beginning to form in Erythrai—not necessarily shared by all of the citizens—in which the rule of the demos is potentially threatened by foreign-backed opportunists who wish to install themselves as tyrants. This is, of course, the official Athenian reading of

magistracies by lot. For the constitutional implications of this decree, see Rhodes and Lewis 1997, p. 530; Hansen and Nielsen 2004, p. 1074, no. 845; Robinson 2011, p. 175. Rubinstein (2003, p. 110) argues it would be wrong to think that Erythrai utilized volunteer prosecutors solely on the basis of the Athenian democratic model.

62. For the dating of the inscription (and other issues of interpretation), see Highby 1936, p. 35; ATL, vol. 2, pp. 54–55 (D10); Meiggs 1972, p. 422; Koch 1991, pp. 61–63; Dössel 2003, pp. 41–53; Liddel 2010, pp. 116–120. The original inscription was copied by the traveler Fauvel in the 19th century, and it is now lost. A second facsimile has surfaced; see Malouchou 2014. There are no archon names with which to date the decree, but the authors of ATL supplied “Lysikrates” at line 2 (453/2 B.C.). Considered strong evidence for a date in the 450s is the fact that Bouthrea, a dependent territory of Erythrai, is listed separately in the tribute lists of 454/3 (IG I 259) and 453/2 (IG I 260), where it pays a large sum of three talents. Erythrai itself does not appear to have featured in these lists, but it surfaces in 450/49 (IG I 263), where the Bouthecieis are listed beneath it. Historians have interpreted this to mean that pro-Athenian Erythraian exiles, ejected by the stasis documented by IG I 14, lived at Bouthrea before 453/2 and contributed to what would normally have been Erythrai’s tribute payment. Mattingly, notwithstanding his arguments for downgrading many inscriptions (arguments generally accepted today), ultimately decided that the decree belonged to the 450s (1999, p. 367, n. 23). Papazarkadas (2009, p. 78), however, has reopened the question of whether it dates from a later period, since many important imperial decrees are now accepted as coming late (cf. Moroo 2014). The dating of the inscription is ultimately unimportant for my argument, so long as we see L.Erythrai 2 (discussed above) as predating Athenian intervention at Erythrai. Liddel (2010, p. 118) says that it is impossible to know if L.Erythrai 2 predates IG I 14, which is strictly speaking correct, but Engelmann and Merkelbach in L.Erythrai provide strong arguments for thinking that it does. If, per Papazarkadas 2009, IG I 14 is perhaps late, in the 420s or even the Ionian War, then it definitely postdates the Erythraian decree.

63. Cf. the language of RO 17, lines 7–11.

64. Malouchou, commenting on a recently discovered second facsimile of this decree (2014, pp. 93–94), says that the relevant passage seems to have read “if anyone should contrive [τεχνάζει] to [some verb in the infinitive] the tyrants [reading τυράννοις in the accusative rather than several previous scholars’ τυράννοις, dative].” The verb is likely to have been “introduce” or “aid” the tyrants (cf. I.Ilion 25, lines 114–115). Anyone who does this may be killed with impunity. This looks like antityranny legislation, and would in fact constitute the earliest known example (according to the historical account of Teegarden 2014).

65. See de Ste. Croix 1954, pp. 39–40; Meiggs 1972, pp. 113–114; Robinson 2011, p. 175. The Athenian empire may not have had a general, uniform policy of imposing democracy (see Brock 2009), but it would be excessive to deny that what we see at Erythrai in 453/2 is a democratic constitution. The quasi-democratic character of L.Erythrai 2 means that democratic governance in 453/2 would not have been totally unfamiliar or a completely alien imposition.
the situation, and the voices of the Erythraians themselves are largely silent (except insofar as the councilors mouth the words the Athenians have scripted for them). It is striking, however, that this is the narrative Hippias wishes to perpetuate: that tyrannical-oligarchic usurpers will ally with foreign forces to put down the rightful constitution. The episode in 453/2 was not the last time something like this would happen, and so it is not the last example Hippias would have known.

For the remainder of the 5th century, Erythrai presumably retained its Athenian-promoted democratic regime. We possess two decrees of indeterminate date that might stem from this period, both setting limits to office-holding. The first (I.Erythrai 17) forbids the same man from serving as joint-supervisor of the marshlands (συνέλεορεῖν) for the subdivision known as the Peproioi twice within 10 years. As in I.Erythrai 2, prosecution is open to "ὁ βουλόμενος." In the second decree (I.Erythrai 1), a certain Apellias carries a motion forbidding men who served as secretary (γραμματεύς) from the time of Chalkideus (another official) from serving as secretary again for any other office. Moreover, in the future, no one is to serve as secretary more than once for the same office. Since Greek laws are often ad hoc responses to concrete infractions, it is likely that someone in the time of Chalkideus had attempted to serve as secretary twice for the same office or had succeeded in doing so, perhaps for subversive or corrupt reasons. Such a concern over regulating the power of magistrates is just as characteristic of oligarchies as it is of democracies, but it is unusual for oligarchic decrees to name proposers, and most commentators have considered the decree the product of a democracy.

The democracy of the 5th century probably came to an end with the second revolt of Erythrai from the Athenian empire, this time in 412 B.C., in the midst of the Ionian War (Thuc. 8.5.4–5, 14.2). We read nothing explicit about the Erythraian constitution between this point and 394, but it was one of those cities addressed by Konon and Pharabazos that had been controlled by Lakedaimonian harmosts (governors) before the Battle of Knidos, and so probably also had a Spartan-imposed oligarchy. The duo promises the cities that they will not "fortify their acropoleis," as the Spartans had presumably done (this detail looks forward to a later episode at Erythrai, to be discussed shortly). The restored Erythraian democracy of 394 responded with effusive civic honors for Konon, granting him—in addition to representative (πρόξενος) status, front row seating in the theater, and exemption from taxation—a bronze statue (εἰκών χαλκῆ) to be set up wherever he wished. The democratic nature of the regime bestowing the honor comes through in the enactment formula of the decree, "decided by the council and the people [δῆμος, convincingly restored]." As Ma points out, this is the first epigraphically attested honorary statue in the Greek world; as we will see, it also initiates a series of politically motivated statue offerings (and statue manipulations) within Erythrai itself.

The years immediately after 394 B.C. probably also saw the inauguration of a new civic cult at Erythrai, that of Aphrodite Pandemos (Aphrodite of "all the people"). A decree dated to the first half of the 4th century (SEG XXXVI 1039) relates that two sets of religious officials, the [. . .] and the θεοπρόσωποι (those sent to inquire of an oracle), announced that a temple

66. Based on a later inscription (I.Erythrai 81, from around 100 B.C.), in which a χιλιαστύς (a thousand, a type of civic subdivision) of the Peproioi features, Engelmann and Merkelbach assume the Peproioi mentioned in inscription 17 represent a chiliastys, as well. For the practice of supervising marshlands, see Bresson 2016, p. 179.

67. This inscription is treated also in Koerner 1993, no. 74; van Effenteerre and Ruzé 1994, p. 84; Arnaoutoglou 1998, p. 84, no. 76.


69. For these decrees as democratic, see Rhodes and Lewis 1997, p. 530; Robinson 2011, p. 175.

70. Xen. Hell. 4.8.1; see also Diod. Sic. 14.84.3–4. An Erythraian is probably to be restored in the text of Pausanias (10.9.9) among the generals who aided Lysandros at Aigospotamoi; see also ML 95.


72. See Ma (2006), who also proposes that Konon had his statue erected in the sanctuary of Aphrodite Pontia. Ma questions the restoration ἐπίχρυσον (gilded) from line 15.
and a statue of Aphrodite Pandemos ought to be constructed "for the safety [ὡρμτίζε] of the demos" (lines 2–6). The community then chose five men to oversee the establishment of the cult. While Pandemos, despite its "demos" root, is not necessarily a politically marked epithet, the especially fraught constitutional history of Erythrai at the turn of the 4th century suggests that this cult was connected to some degree to the desire of the new democratic regime to survive and flourish. It is striking, too, that Hippias's fragment describes an episode in which king Knopos inquires specifically about soteria and is told to sacrifice to Hermes Dolios (lines 4–5). Translators have traditionally taken the soteria in question to be Knopos's own since he is treacherously killed just a few lines later. Much more common, though, is for a prominent political figure to ask after the salvation of the community, with the institution of a new religious cult as the result. Indeed, the "safety" of Erythrai as a whole turned out to be in danger, since the tyrannical usurpers not only murder the king but subject the citizenry to degrading treatment. Both Hippias and the Aphrodite Pandemos decree thus attest to the practice at Erythrai of seeking out cultic means of preserving the political community against internal enemies.

The post-394 democracy did not go uncontested. Within a decade, probably sometime between the years 390 and 386, an oligarchic faction attempted to seize control of the city. An Athenian decree for Erythrai, a copy of which was discovered at the site of Erythrai itself, forbids the Athenian generals from "reconciling [a group whose identity is obscured

73. The editio princeps dated this decree to ca. 400 B.C., but see SEG XXXIX 1238 for arguments that it belongs to a later period in the century; if so, it would have to be post-332, since the decree is almost certainly democratic.

74. A seemingly pre-political attestation of the cult of Aphrodite Pandemos comes from the site of Naukratis in Egypt, which was not a polis until the 4th century B.C. (SEG LII 1793). The cult could have a political function, however; see Paus. 1.22.3, with Petre 1992–1994, Rosenzweig 2004, pp. 25–28; Parker 2005, pp. 407–408; Larson 2007, pp. 118–119. Ancient accounts that connected the Archaic cult of Aphrodite Pandemos with Solon's establishment of a public brothel (e.g., Nikandros and Nikandros, FGrH 271–272 F9a–b) are incorrect; see Frost 2002. Merkelbach, editor of the editio princeps of SEG XXXVI 1039, speculated that the theopropoi had been sent to ask how the citizens could obtain homonoia, or likemindedness, after civic strife. Gauthier, in BullÉp 1988, no. 396, is more circumspect, saying there is nothing in the text to confirm this hypothesis. Given the likely historical context, however, a politically integrative function is probable; see also Bfr. di Cos, no. EV 2, a dedication ca. 200 B.C. to Aphrodite and Homonoia.

75. See Kearns 1990. It could be that the injunction to Knopos to sacrifice to Hermes Dolios is at first ironic (he is "deceitfully" killed by his pro-koins, or "lap-dogs") but ultimately redemptive for the city, in that the oligarchic tyrants are eventually killed and their families wiped out by Knopos's brother Hippotes. Robertson (1996, p. 300, n. 256) thinks that the ritual background to the story of Knopos is "a festival of Hermes with unruly conduct by inferiors," such as that found at Samos (Plut. Mor. 303d). But Plutarch says nothing about inferiors, only ritual theft. Hermes Dolios is attested in curse tablets aimed at enemies (e.g., Jordan 1985, p. 158, no. 18; IG III, app. 90), and this may be in part the subtext of Hippias's mention of Hermes Dolios. Interestingly, Knopos's father, Kodros, also died for the "deliverance" of his patris: the Athenians were told that the invading Peloponnesians would take Athens so long as the latter did not kill king Kodros. Kodros voluntarily snuck into the enemy's camp, donning beggar's rags, and provoked a fight that resulted in his murder. The Athenians thus won the conflict. The story is as old as Pherekydes (FGrH 3 F154) and Hellenikos (FGrH 4 F125), but the orator Lykourgos (1.86) includes the explicit statement that Kodros died "for the soteria of his subjects."

76. Note also that Erythrai's fellow Ionians in nearby Priene established a cult to personified Soteria in the early 3rd century, following the end of what Robert (1944, pp. 7–8), among others, has argued was a tyrannical regime, likely that of Hieron (I.Priene 6). The festival day is to occur on the anniversary of the liberation of the city, in order that there be a "memorial" (ὑπόμνημα, convincingly restored, line 19) of the "struggle for autonomy and freedom" that took place (ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτοκρατορίας καὶ ἐλευθερίας ἀγώνος; lines 16–17). For the importance of political anniversaries and the language of "struggle," see below, n. 168.
by a lacuna] with those in the polis [ἐν τῇ πόλει] without the demos of the Athenians” (RO 17, lines 3–7). Furthermore, “no one is to be allowed to restore to Erythrai any of the exiles whom the Erythraians should drive out without the demos of the Erythraians” (lines 7–11). The inscription clearly describes some sort of internal conflict at Erythrai, with one faction, “those in the city,” at odds with another group. If the past and future political history of Erythrai is any indication, the besieged men are oligarchs. There is some ambiguity as to the meaning of “in the polis” at lines 5–6. Rhodes and Osborne provide the translation “on the Acropolis” and note that “this decree uses the old term polis: in decrees ordering publication on the Athenian Acropolis, en akropolei replaced en polei ca. 386.” There are problems with this interpretation, however. The Athenians, already in the 5th century, sometimes take care to specify when they mean “the Acropolis,” and not merely “the city”; one of those times is precisely a decree for Erythrai, probably from around 450 (IG I 15). In fact, that decree seems to differentiate (in an all-but-certain restoration) between the “polis” at Athens (i.e., the Acropolis) and the “acropolis” explicitly at Erythrai (lines 43–44). By the same token, the later decree for Erythrai from 390–386 is unlikely to have left the meaning of “polis” ambiguous for its Erythraian audience: those en tei polei have probably seized the central city itself, encompassing the acropolis but also the area that corresponds to the theater and (presumed site of) the agora at the archaeological site today (see Fig. 1). Not only is the insurrectionary technique of seizing control of the city-center, or ἄστυ, well attested in the sources, but it is precisely the tactic the oligarchic tyrants employ in Hippias’s text (καταληφθέντος τοῦ ἄστεος, lines 20–21).

The 4th-century Athenian decree for Erythrai develops some features apparent in the 5th-century decree and adds others. The final portion of the surviving inscription reads: “Concerning not giving up [ἐκδεδομέναι τοῖς βαρβάροις] the Erythraians to the barbarians, provide an answer to the Erythraians that it has been decided by the demos of the Athenians” (RO 17, lines 11–16). As in 453/2, so in the early 4th century, a chief concern of the Erythraian democrats was that an antidemocratic faction (recall the so-called tyrants of IG I 14) would be willing to betray the city to the Persians in exchange for some form of local dominance. But whereas the oligarchs of the 5th century all seem to have gone into exile (“fled to the Medes”), in the 4th century the polis itself is an object of contestation between opposing factions. The citizenry has been divided into two mutually exclusive camps, one of which, the oligarchs, has physically laid claim to the space of the city, which it currently holds as its private possession. A struggle over political space in this manner finds a counterpart in Hippias’s history of his patris (lines 26–27), in which the oligarchs seize the astu, “[run] the city’s affairs themselves, and refus[e] to allow any of the common people inside the walls.” The local historian’s reconstruction of the distant past thus reflects this Classical-era record of competition over the inner city of Erythrai as a locus of strategic importance. And as we will see, this was not the last time the central space of the polis was up for grabs.

Despite the Athenian intervention attested by the decree, the Erythraian democracy fell in 386 B.C. as a result of the transfer of the polis...
to Persian control. Presumably the faction that had attempted to seize the city and hand it over to the “barbarians” now came into power. As Teegarden notes, the year 387/6 inaugurated 54 consecutive years of oligarchic dominance, ending only in 332 with Alexander the Great’s championing of democracy in Ionia.83 The oligarchic nature of the pro-Persian regime in power comes through in inscriptional evidence, in which the boule alone replaces the “council and people” attested in earlier enactment formulas.84 The first decree of this kind (I.Erythrai 8 = RO 56) comes from the mid-350s and honors Maussollos the son of Hekatomnos, satrap of Karia. The council, acting on the motion of the generals or the prytaneis, grants Maussollos euergetes (benefactor), proxenos (representative), and citizen status, in addition to other privileges. He is described as having been a good man toward “the polis” and a benefactor of “the demos.”85 Maussollos also receives a bronze statue in the agora (to be the rival, as it were, of the one granted Konon in 394), while his wife Artemisia receives a stone likeness set up in the sanctuary of Athena (for these sites, see Fig. 1:3, A, respectively).86 Maussollos was further honored by another Erythraian, the shadowy Naukrates, with a funeral oration (ἐπιτάφιος λόγος) delivered on the occasion of the dynast’s death. Other intellectuals delivered epitaphioi in competition for a prize, including Theodectes of Phaselis, Isokrates of Apollonia, and Theopompos the historian of Chios, who won.87 It is impossible to know for certain what an anti-authoritarian such as Hippias would have thought of Naukrates’ performance at Maussollos’s funeral, but the fragment of his history gives some indication: in his telling, citizens lamented over dead members of the tyrants’ companions (ἑταιρία) only under extreme duress, at the instigation of a whip-bearer (lines 41–46); how much worse it must have appeared for an Erythraian to have voluntarily celebrated a “barbarian” who had cooperated with an oligarchic regime.88

83. Teegarden 2014, p. 142. In 366/5, the Athenians passed a decree (IG II1 108) concerning Erythrai and the general Timotheos, but the context is unclear; it is not necessary to believe that Erythrai was a democracy at the time simply because the Athenians were talking about it.

84. This is one of our surest ways of determining the constitutional nature of the regime issuing a decree, but it is not an absolute rule. In this case, however, the evidence of RO 17 suggests that a constitutional change did occur post-386 and that use of boule alone signals an oligarchy. For a similar instance, see ML 82, an Erythraian decree issued by the council alone; based on internal evidence from the decree, we can date this inscription to the period after 411, when Athenian oligarchs introduced an oligarchy at Eretria (Thuc. 8.64.2–65.1).

85. See also I.Erythrai 21, line 5, and the discussion at RO 56; Teegarden 2014, p. 142, n. 1. Similar language features in a separate Erythraian decree for Idrieus, the brother of Maussollos, who took over the satrapy of Karia following the deaths of Maussollos and Artemisia (SEG XXXI 969, again enacted by the boule alone). The officials known as εξετασταί, normal in democratic decrees of Erythrai (best example: I.Erythrai 21), are here replaced by ἐπιμήνιοι (monthly officers).

86. See further Ma 2013a, p. 170, on this as an example of “additive history,” legible through honorific statues in the statuescapes of local communities.”

87. Suda, s.v. Ισιδώρας; θ 138, s.v. Θεοδέκτης; Gell. NA 10.18.6. For Naukrates, see also Theopompos., FGrH 115 F25; Dion. Hal. De Isaeo 19; Cic. De or. 2.94. According to Theopompos, Naukrates was “sufficient in his holdings,” i.e., of the leisurely wealthy.

88. For ill will toward Maussollos in other cities of Ionia and Karia, see I.Mylasa 1–3 = RO 54; I.Iasos 1. A recently discovered statue base from Iasos seems to show an act of erasure of the name “Hekatomnos”; see Nafissi 2015. Nevertheless, other cities voted Maussollos and his family statues and other honors: I.Kaunos 46–48, SEG LI 1504 (Herakleia under Latmos); and see the recently discovered decree honoring Olympichos (SEG LVIII 1220), which mentions an altar to Maussollos from the unnamed issuing city (probably Mylasa).
A final piece of evidence from the oligarchic period (386–332 B.C.) comes in the form of a treaty between Erythrai and Hermeias, tyrant of Atarneus. Hermeias, supposedly a eunuch, was the inheritor of Euboulos of Bithynia’s tyranny in Atarneus, starting around 350 B.C. He had been a pupil of Plato and befriended Aristotle, to whom he gave his daughter (or adoptive daughter if he was truly a eunuch) in marriage. He handed the polis of Assos over to several philosopher friends, including Xenokrates, Koriskos, Erastos, and Aristotle himself, to use as a philosophical school. He was also a major political player in the eastern Aegean, working initially with the Persians. He later made friendly overtures to Philip II of Macedon before being arrested by Mentor of Rhodes and killed at the Persian court, probably in 342/1.

The treaty between Hermeias and Erythrai contains some interesting features. First, the demos is mentioned nowhere, and “the generals” (στρατηγοί) are to oversee the swearing of an oath to Hermeias, an arrangement that Rhodes and Osborne note is compatible with the supposition that Erythrai was oligarchic at this time. Second, the alliance is not simply between the Erythraians and Hermeias, with the latter acting as tyrant and thus as the representative of the territories under his control, but between the Erythraians and “Hermeias and his companions [ἑταῖροι]” (I. Erythrai 9, lines 1–2, 10–11, 13, 14–15, 20–21, 24). The identity of these hetairoi has been a recurring topic of debate. Some have seen in them the philosophers just mentioned, and therefore a kind of utopian “philosopher-king” regime put into actual practice. Much more likely, however, is that the hetairoi are simply political or military subordinates employed by Hermeias to manage his extensive holdings. Either way, it is striking that the treaty partner of the Erythraians is represented in the decree not as the sole ruler Hermeias but as a ruling collectivity with Hermeias at its head. Engels, in his New Pauly Online entry for Hermeias, is thus prompted to speak of “the unusual

89. I. Erythrai 9; see also RO 68 (translations in RO; Harding 1985, pp. 103–104, no. 79). On this decree, see the discussions at Syll. 229; Berve 1967, pp. 332–335, 688–689; Trampedach 1994, pp. 75–79.
90. Dem. 10.32, with schol.; Theopomp., FGrH 115 F250, F291; Kallisthenes, FGrH 124 F2; Hermippus, FGrH 1026 F30; Arist. [Occ.] 1351 a 35; Pl. Ep. 322d6–7; Diod. Sic. 16.52.5–6; Strabo 13.1.57; Phld. Index Academicorum, col. 5.1–13; Dion. Hal. ad Ammaeum 5; Polyaeus, Strat. 6.48; Diog. Laert. 5.3–4; Suda, s.v. Hermias. Several of these sources derive from Didymos’s commentaries on the speeches of Demosthenes, a portion of which survives on papyrus. Didymos himself tells us that “those who have handed down accounts about Hermias greatly disagree” (translation in Gibson 2002, p. 85; see generally pp. 85–88.) For modern treatments of Hermeias, see Wormell 1935; Jaeger 1948, pp. 111–121, 288–290; Trampedach 1994, pp. 66–79; Green 2003; Harding 2006, pp. 124–161; Ford 2011, pp. 9–26; Natali 2013, pp. 32–42 (where at p. 39, for “Eretria,” read “Erythrai”).
91. Strangely, Nawotka (2003, p. 19, n. 42) thinks that the treaty was enacted by a democracy; not only is the communis opinio against this, but he cites as supposedly democratic com- paranda I. Erythrai 8 (for Maussollos) and SEG XXXI 969 (for Idrieus), both oligarchic.
92. Hermeias is named alone at lines 32–33, where it is his responsibility to set up the stone stele recording the alliance in the “shrine of Atarneus,” the eponymous founder-hero of Atarneus. This may be because he alone was responsible for the site of Atarneus, while his various hetairoi oversaw the rest of his territory.
93. Jaeger 1948, p. 112; Pavese 1961, p. 116; Gaiser 1985, p. 20. Contributing to this identification is the language of Kallisthenes (FGrH 124 F2), who speaks of Hermeias sending word to his “friends [συμμάχοι] and companions [ἑταῖροι]” that he had done nothing during his interrogation and death “unworthy of philosophy.” A portion of Didymos’s text, which may derive from Theopompus, also refers to Hermeias changing his tyranny to a “milder” (πραοτέραν, col. 5.58) form of rule, which some commentators have interpreted as meaning he moderated his behavior under the salutary influence of philosopher companions.
94. See RO 68, p. 345.
regime of a *betairia* or a collective tyrannis." This is exactly the political arrangement described by Hippias, whose “oligarchic tyrants” are headed by Ortyges and referred to by the term *betairia* (line 41). It is all but guaranteed that Hippias knew about his polis’s alliance with Hermeias, which had taken place during a period of oligarchy. As an educated Ionian Greek, he would have been aware of the controversy surrounding the figure of Hermeias and the conflicting accounts given about his character, rule, philosophical inclinations, and death. It is therefore possible that Hippias drew upon these traditions about Hermeias in his depiction of the oligarchic tyrants of his polis, with the purpose of discrediting them both. In any case, informed readers of Hippias’s local history would have been reminded of the recent experiences of the polis with oligarchs and *betairoi* as they read about the ancient past.

As with many of the Ionian nondemocratic regimes of the mid-4th century, the Erythraian oligarchy came to an end with the campaigns of Alexander in Asia Minor. Arrian tells us that Alexander made it his policy to put down oligarchies and establish democracies in the cities (Anab. 1.18.2), and this presumably happened at Erythrai. One decree that has been dated to the period (L.Erythrai 10), moved by Aparchaios and amended by Hermon, forbids citizens from prosecuting returning exiles. Perhaps democrats in exile are being allowed to return, or else, following the Chian example, triumphant democrats are deliberating on how to deal with temporarily expelled oligarchs.

---

95. Our best evidence here is Theopompos, who wrote about Hermeias on at least two different occasions (*FGrH* 115 F250, F291), in one case complaining that the Aryanion tyrant had “insulted [σπειραμάτως] the majority of the Ionians,” which would have included Erythrai (F291). Hermeias’s death, and Aristotle’s (on this reading, excessive) reaction to it, was also known to the sophist Theokritos of Chios, who composed a mocking epigram against Aristotle (Diog. Laert. 5.11; Didymos, *On Demosthenes*, col. 6.43–49; Euseb. *Praep. evang*. 15.2.12; Plut. *Mor*. 603c).

96. A few further facts about Hermeias’s biography suggest him as a possible model for Hippias. First, like Hippias’s Ortyges, he is (in Theopompos’s account, anyway: *FGrH* 115 F291) horribly tortured, as befitting a tyrant, before being killed (on this motif of tyrant-killing, see Luraghi 2013, pp. 55–57 [citing Hippias at p. 56], 60–62.) Second, just as we noted the excessive and inappropriate mourning practices of Naukrates of Erythrai for Maussollos, so might we observe the tradition that Aristotle was put on trial in 323 B.C. by the politician Demophilos for composing what his opponents said was a paean for the dead mortal Hermeias (Ath. 15.696α–f = Hermippos, *FGrH* 1026 F30; Diog. Laert. 5.4–8; see also Ath. 15.697α = Arist., fr. 645 Rose, supposedly from Aristotle’s defense speech, in which he admits to granting Hermeias burial honors but denies they were godlike honors). The philosopher also supposedly mourned his wife (Hermeias’s relation) excessively, treating her like the goddess Demeter (Euseb. *Praep. evang*. 15.2.8 = Lykon, *FGrH* 1110 F1; Diog. Laert. 5.4). For Aristotle’s impiety trial, see O’Sullivan 2008, pp. 205–209; Ford 2011, pp. 60–67; Natali 2013, pp. 60–64. Hippias’s detail about the rulers forcing their subjects to mourn for dead members of the *betairia*, in a fashion similar to the heroized kings of Sparta (Hdt. 6.58, with Xen. *Lac.* 15.9), recalls the politics of mourning surrounding Aristotle’s trial. Finally, we may note Hippias’s description of the oligarchic tyrants as “routinely going around in women’s shoes” (ἀν γυναικείοις ὑποδήμασι διετέλουν περιπατοῦντες, line 30). Already in the 4th century, critics were attacking Aristotle and his followers (Demetrius of Phaleron, Alexander the Great) with verbal plays on *peripatein* and *Peripatos*; e.g., Dikaiarchos, fr. 29 Wehrli, (Plut. *Mor*. 796d); Karystios of Pergamon (Ath. 12.542e) on Demetrius of Phaleron (probably relying on Demochares; see Dürring 1957, p. 151). Comic sources referring to philosophers *peripatetous* include Men., fr. 114.1, 722 Kassel-Austin; Alex. fr. 151.2 Kassel-Austin; Aristophon, fr. 10.8 Kassel-Austin. It may seem over-subtle to think the use of the verb *peripatein* by Hippias is a reference to Hermeias and his philosophical companions, but note that according to Philodemos (*Index Academicorum*, col. 5.1–13), Hermeias gave his philosopher friends at Assos a *perίπατος* (covered walk) as a gift.

97. For Chios, see RO 84; see also RO 85 (Mytilene); RO 101 (Tegea); *IG XII*. 7 3 (Arkesine); *SEG* LVII 576, lines 28–52 (Dikaia).
We also possess a fascinating decree, *I.Erythrai* 21, which probably describes the end of the nondemocratic period in Erythrai. It serves as additional evidence for the struggle over civic space in the polis, attested in the earlier 4th century and of concern to Hippias. Enacted by the council and the people, and thus almost certainly a product of democracy, the decree praises Phanes the son of Mnesitheos for being a “good man and well-minded toward the demos of the Erythraians” (lines 4–5). It goes on to describe (lines 7–10) how he “contributed money at no interest both for the dismissal of the mercenary troops and for the razing of the acropolis” (χρήματά τε ἐσήνει γενεθλίων των στρατιωτῶν καὶ τῆς ἁρπαγμένης τῆς κατασκήνης φόνον). Phanes’ actions imply a situation in which a nondemocratic regime, a tyranny, or more probably an oligarchy, held power in Erythrai through the use of garrison troops stationed on the fortified acropolis. When the demos returned to power, the wealthy *euergetes* Phanes paid the mercenary troops what they were owed and sent them on their way. He also paid for the destruction of the acropolis defenses (not, it should be noted, the entire acropolis itself, which remains to this day; see Fig. 1:1). As in the situation described by the Athenian decree for Erythrai from 390–386, antidemocratic forces seized control of the commanding heights of the central city in order to secure their own rule. Likewise, as with both Athenian decrees for Erythrai from the 5th and 4th centuries (ML 40 and RO 17, respectively), the usurpers appear to have looked to outside forces, probably the Persians, for support. These experiences left a stamp on Erythraian collective memory, which Hippias, writing for a local audience, draws upon in his reconstruction of the distant past. The oligarchic tyrants led by Ortyges acquire a mercenary force (δύναμις) from Chios, using which they kill their opponents and keep the common people (δημόται) outside the walls. Were he to recite his histories for the citizenry—for example, in the theater during a festival—heir audience might have cast a glance at the acropolis during the relevant part of the Knopos story, recalling the more recent history of their polis and the struggles that took place over civic space. Had they been in a good location as any for an Erythraian local historian to give readings of his research (see Fig. 1:2). The Dionysia festival was where Phanes and others were announced as civic benefactors (*I.Erythrai* 21, lines 13–14), and it seems to have taken place in the theater (*I.Erythrai* 24, lines 31–32, 115, line 11); see also Teegarden 2014, p. 157, n. 38. For an itinerant performer giving exhibitions in the theater, see the example of Ariston, the son of Akrisios of Phokaia, who delivered encomia and celebrated Apollo in a hymn at Delos in the mid-2nd century, in both the *ekkleistieron* and theater (*I.Délos* 1506). Unfortunately, we lack evidence for performance contexts for native historians giving the history of their own poleis.
the Athenaion or Herakleion, the two Standorte specified by the Phanes decree for the erection of the stele, they could read the decree directly and be reminded of the city’s liberation from antidemocratic control and from an occupying power. Hippias’s history would fit with that pattern: despite the occasional attempt by opportunists to gain power over their fellow citizens, the Erythraians could be assured that eventually legitimate rule would triumph over illegitimate.102

As might by now be expected, Erythrai’s democracy was still not secure. The regime did probably succeed in initiating a wall-building program during this time, since the city repulsed an attack by Seleukos in 315.103 Internal subversion, however, seems to have toppled the democracy in the aftermath of the battle of Ipsos in 301.104 Our evidence for this comes from another inscription (I.Erythrai 503), which has received extensive scholarly treatment in the recent past.105 The decree, enacted by a democracy, tells us that “those in the oligarchy removed the sword from the statue of Philites the tyrant-killer, considering its stance to be directed entirely at them” (lines 2–6). A resurgent democratic regime, however, now repairs the statue and orders its cleaning and crowning in perpetuity during civic festivals.106 Teegarden places the restoration of democracy at Erythrai around 281, after the battle of Koroupedion.107 All of our evidence for the subsequent period points to stable democratic government—a decree of the 270s or 260s (I.Erythrai 29) even explicitly states that during a time of crisis the generals guarded over the δημοκρατία and handed over the city in a state of freedom (ἐλευθέρα) to the magistrates who followed them.108

This period seems an ideal context in which to place Hippias. The early 3rd century b.C. offered democratic Erythraians the opportunity to breathe a collective sigh of relief, to hope for a future of unbroken and stable popular government. Not that it was guaranteed: the seeming precariousness of democracy ca. 280, the suspicion—informed by decades, even centuries of reversals—that it could be suddenly and violently dissolved, no doubt tempered enthusiasm in Erythrai at this time, and it may explain the bloodthirsty and slightly desperate tone that animates Hippias’s fragment.

102. The reality of the situation was, of course, more complicated than that, and it would have been disturbingly apparent to Hippias’s audience if reminders of previous oligarchic regimes, such as the statue of Maussollos in the agora and the decree ordering its erection, were still standing in Erythrai. In this respect, the monumental topography of the city would have contained layers of history and meaning, permitting certain kinds of interpretation (like that offered by Hippias) but never being fully under any one person’s interpretative control.

103. For wall construction, see I.Erythrai 22, 23, with Maier 1959–1961, no. 61; Migeotte 1992, pp. 211–213, no. 68; Teegarden 2014, pp. 157–158. For the attack by Seleukos, see Diod. Sic. 19.60.4. Recall that Jacoby made this the terminus post quem for Hippias, since his fragment mentions the city walls (F421, line 27). For the excavated remains of the walls, see Fig. 1:T. But strictly speaking, even in the absence of walls, Hippias could have imagined the Archaic polis as having possessed them.

104. Here, I follow the chronology proposed by Teegarden (2014, pp. 159–164).

105. Teegarden (2014 pp. 142–172) presents the fullest treatment of this inscription and provides a convincing explanation as to what the different political factions enumerated in the decree were trying to accomplish. See further Heisserer 1979; Gauthier 1982, pp. 215–221; Ober 2003, pp. 227–228; Ma 2013b, p. 306; Gray 2015, p. 285.

106. The appearance of the agoranomos, or market official, in the decree makes clear that the statue of Philites was located in the agora, probably the area labeled as no. 3 in Fig. 1. Philites’s story is unknown. The name appears as an eponymous magistrate on Erythraian bronze coins of the mid– to late-4th century b.C.; see Heesserer 1979, pp. 286–287.


108. See now also SEG LIX 1407, lines 13–14: generals of 3rd-century Kyme must hand over a “free and democratic city” at the end of their term.
Hippias’s history is an antityrannical and anti-oligarchic account, but one that protests too much. It insists that oligarchic tyranny will fail—but not before the “lap-dogs” first have their fun at the citizenry’s expense. The atmosphere, nonetheless, is quite triumphant, much as it was when the democracy restored the sword to the statue of Philites. It is not difficult to believe that Hippias had the tyrannicidal example of Philites in mind when he narrated the return of Knopos’s brother Hippotes to his patris. As the fragment makes clear in gruesome detail, Hippotes’ sword-bearing “stance” was certainly “directed entirely at” Ortyges and company, as well as their families (lines 48–52). Hippias’s Hippotes would thus paradoxically be based upon, but at the same time serve as a historical paradigm for, the bronze figure of Philites standing in the Erythraian agora, which was of much more recent vintage. The point was to craft a vision of the polis as fundamentally and seamlessly opposed to tyranny. Various models in various media (e.g., statues in three-dimensional space, figures in historical texts) would embody this vision. It was not necessarily a vision shared by all citizens of the polis of Erythrai—history had shown time and time again that some Erythraians wanted a very different political arrangement from democracy—but it was the version of events that Hippias and those like him hoped to see predominate.

PANHELLENIC POLITICAL TRENDS IN HIPPIAS’S HISTORY

As much as Hippias’s local history is just that—local—it would be a mistake to ignore the Panhellenic elements of which it partakes. In this penultimate section, three aspects of Hippias’s text in particular come under review: his depiction of Knopos’s murder by the “lap-dogs”; the manner in which the oligarchic tyrants seize control of the polis; and the pairing itself of “oligarchy” and “tyranny” as related, even equivalent, forms. All three features belong to a broader Late Classical and Early Hellenistic democratic discourse that was gaining significant ideological ground at the time. Hippias’s text is both informed by and a contributor to this discourse.

The murder of Knopos looks at first glance like an act of καταποντισμός, the sinking of one’s opponent into the sea. There is no reason to assume that the Hippotes of Athenaios is a corruption of Philites, but perhaps Hippias’s Hippotes is a variant of the inscription’s Philites, if the statue of Philites was considered by the Erythraians to depict the brother of Knopos. This must remain unknown.

109. The use of the verb συν-εκέντησε strongly suggests a sword, less realistically a spear; Herodotos’s two instances of the word involve swords or daggers (3.77, 6.29); see also Polyb. 4.22.11.

110. It is interesting that the names Hippotes and Philites are both seven letters in length and have the same ending. They are both rare (six and four known instances, respectively) and largely confined to the area of coastal Asia Minor (see LGPN, vols. IIIB, VA).

111. Ellis-Evans (2012) sees comparable processes at work in the Tyrants Dossier from Eresos (RO 83), which he analyzes in terms similar to those employed here; see esp. p. 200: “the past was pressed into service in an attempt to stifle the views of a significant minority of Eresian citizens . . . this is memory-making as a discourse of power, coercive in its intent.”

112. For the rise and fall of Classical Greek oligarchy in the political and ideological realms, see Simonton 2017.

113. On the connection between this act and tyranny, see Versnel 1977, pp. 39–40; Azoulay 2009, pp. 324–327; Luraghi 2013, p. 60.
employed against tyrants and other unpopular leaders. Both Polybios (2.59–60) and Plutarch (Arat. 44.6) bear witness to the Argive tyrant Aristomachos having met this end. When the Lokrians got the wife and children of Dionysios II of Syracuse into their power, they too were subjected to horrific sexual violence before being dismembered and their remains cast into the sea.\textsuperscript{114} Similarly, the Kyrenaïans, following a democratic revolution, killed the last of the Battiad kings and sank his head into the ocean.\textsuperscript{115} One purpose of \textit{katapontismos} was to submerge an unwanted object into what was perceived as a limitless depth of no return, the sea. It was thus a technique for erasing the object or person so treated from public memory.\textsuperscript{116} In this respect, the miraculous discovery of Knopos’s corpse on the Erythraïan seashore reveals the ritual infelicity of the conspirators’ act of murder: they could not keep the body of the rightful king hidden forever.\textsuperscript{117}

But the entire act of killing is not in fact a conventional version of \textit{katapontismos}, insofar as the latter was intended to be a highly publicized event. Knopos’s murder is instead a clandestine affair, orchestrated so that the king’s (presumably numerous) supporters will have no opportunity to resist the actions of the assassins. As Hippias emphasizes, the killing takes place when Knopos is isolated and alone, on a boat with those he thought he could trust. When they are “far from land,” they “throw him into the sea” (ἐρρίψαν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, line 12). Knopos’s death belongs to a long tradition of acts in which a small, unpopular group must eliminate their more popular opponent without thereby galvanizing his or her followers. This tactic is on display already in the \textit{Odyssey} (16.383–384), when the suitors contemplate murdering Telemachos “in a field far from the polis, or on the road” (ἐπ᾽ ἀγροῦ νόσφι πόληος ἢ ἐν ὁδῷ). They are afraid the young prince will gather the people in the assembly and turn them against the suitors, driving them from the land.\textsuperscript{118}

Such secretive assassination efforts only increase in the Archaic and especially Classical periods, when they are adopted by oligarchs. Oligarchic violence, because it is aimed at populist figures with large followings, has to take place off-stage, as it were, in out-of-the-way locales where there is no danger of it sparking collective action.\textsuperscript{119} Thus, the traditions about

114. Klearchos, fr. 47 Wehrli; Strabo 6.1.8; Plut. \textit{Mor.} 821d; Tim. 13.10; Ael. \textit{VII} 6.12.
115. Arist., fr. 611.16 Rose; see also Robinson 2011, p. 130. In other cases, anti-tyrannical actors sank possessions or other characteristic objects of the tyrant into the sea \textit{faute de mieux}, when they could not sink the tyrants themselves, as with the Akrangantes and the famous bull of Phaleris (Timaios, \textit{FG 556 F}28c) and the Athenians and the statues of Demetrios of Phaleron (Diog. Laert. 5.77).
116. Less deadly examples include Polykrates’ famous casting of his ring into the ocean (Hdt. 3.40–43); the lumps of iron sunk into the sea at the formation of the Delian League (Arist. \textit{Ath. Pol.} 23.5); and Alkibiades’ submersion in the sea of the stelai recording penalties against him following his triumphant return to Athens in 407 (Diod. Sic. 13.69.2; Nep. \textit{Alkibiades} 6.5). See further Lindenlauf 2003, pp. 419–423.
117. See also the opening of Eur. \textit{Hec.}, in which the corpse of the Trojan prince Polydoros, betrayed by Polymestor and cast into the sea, is discovered on the shore by his mother Hekabe. For a nonlethal failed act of \textit{katapontismos}, see the attempted murder of Arion of Methymna, who famously escaped on a dolphin (Hdt. 1.24).
118. Note also the story of Prokles, tyrant of Epidaurus, related by Plutarch (\textit{Mor.} 403c–e): he had an Athenian, Timarchos, secretly killed and his body thrown into the sea. Later, Timarchos’s friends caught Prokles trying to flee Epidaurus, killed him, and cast the corpse into the ocean (this death having been foretold by the Delphic oracle). The tyrant uses the surreptitious form of \textit{katapontismos}, whereas the assassins employ the open and publicized form.
119. See Pl. \textit{Resp.} 8.566b. For treatments of political murder in Classical Greece, see Riess 2006; Bearzot 2007. Neither treats oligarchic assassination techniques as a separate category, but see now Simonton 2017, pp. 112–118.
the Athenian democratic reformer Ephialtes’ murder stress its treacherous and clandestine nature, emphasizing in several cases its nocturnal setting.\(^1\) Oligarchs attempt to assassinate popular leaders and demagogues in a similar fashion in Elis, Mantinea, and Syracuse.\(^2\) Nowhere is this propensity for secretive assassination more apparent than in the oligarchic takeover of Athens in 411 B.C.\(^3\) Thucydides (8.65.2) notes that members of the *bētairei* or drinking clubs killed the demagogue Androkles “in secret” (κρύφα) and eliminated many others opposed to their faction “in the same manner, in secret” (τὸ ἀυτῷ τρόπῳ κρύφα). The really suggestive act, however, is the murder of the demagogue Hyperbolos. He had been ostracized from Athens in the notorious final ostracism of ca. 417 B.C., when Nikias, Alkibiades, and Phaiaks coordinated their followers against him.\(^4\) He was living in Samos in 411, waiting out his ostracism, when the so-called Four Hundred came to power. Samian oligarchs formed a pact with Charminos, one of the Athenian generals, as well as with several other prominent Athenians, and they killed Hyperbolos in an act of pledge-giving and mutual implication. This is Thucydides’ version of the story (8.73.3), but we learn more from fragments of Theopompos. According to a scholiast on Aristophanes’ *Wasps* (FGrH 115 F96b), the Chian historian wrote that Hyperbolos died at the hands of assassins at Samos, who stuffed his body into a sack (or perhaps a wineskin, or ἀσκός) and threw it into the sea (εἰς τὸ πέλαγος κατεπόντισαν). Other accounts, likewise preserved by scholars, render this as “he was thrown into the sea” (ἔρριψαν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος [F96a]; έρριψαν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος [F96c]). This is precisely the language used by Hippias to describe Knopos’s murder (ἔρριψαν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, line 12).

The similarity is at first confusing: what does the “low,” “vile” demagogue have to do with the (favorably depicted) Erythraian king?\(^5\) It is true that both were subjected by their enemies to a form of katapontismos ritual, perhaps in an attempt to associate them with the figure of the φαρμακός, or scapegoat. Yet this fact should make us wonder why two such different figures were considered appropriate for the same treatment.\(^6\) The foregoing analysis points to one part of the answer: isolating one’s opponent and murdering him in secret was an effective strategy for minority-based, unpopular factions. On the other hand, the identical nature of the deaths of Knopos and Hyperbolos suggests another, rather counterintuitive observation: monarchy and democracy (and in particular the figure of the good king and the figure of the protector [προστάτης] of the demos) are not necessarily mutually exclusive, inveterately hostile constitutions. Knopos

---

120. Antiph. 5.68; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 25.4 (δολοφονηθείς); Plut. *Per.* 10.7 = Idomeneos, FGrH 338 F8, 10.8 (κρυφαίως); Diod. Sic. 11.77.6 (τὴς νυκτὸς ἀναιρεθεῖς). See further Sommerstein (2010, p. 158), who connects Ephialtes’ murder with deadly night imagery in the *Oresteia*.

121. Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.27 (oligarchs murder a man they think is the champion of the demos under the cover of early-morning darkness), 7.4.3 (Lycomedes the Mantinean democrat ambushed by oligarchs far from home; see Beck 1997); Plut. *Dion* 53.3 (the Syracusan demagogue Herakleides is murdered in his home by agents of Dion).

122. See Bearzot 2006; Shear 2011, pp. 19–31; Teegarden 2014, pp. 17–25 (stressing the secretive nature of the killing of Androkles and others at pp. 19–20).

123. For the date and other interpretive problems involved with this episode, see Rhodes 1994 (citing the relevant sources).

124. For the “vulgar” (πονηρός) character of Hyperbolos, see Thuc. 8.73.3; Androtion, FGrH 324 F42; Philochoros, FGrH 328 F30; Andoc., fr. 5 Blass; Plato Com., fr. 203 Kassel–Austin.

125. For Hyperbolos as pharmakos, see Rosenbloom 2004b, pp. 338–339, discussing the katapontismos aspect of Hyperbolos’s death.
in fact belongs to a long tradition of kindly kings who shield the common people from the excesses of the elite. Odysseus is a well-known example, but the pattern also emerges in the case of Polydoros, an early Spartan king who supposedly favored the demos in legal trials, in Thucydides’ picture of Atreus (1.9.2), and in the origin story Herodotos (1.96) tells about the Median king Deioikes. This last individual was elevated to the status of monarch thanks to his favorable decisions toward the people in what had been corrupt, elite-led local courts. These figures closely resemble Kypselos of Corinth and Peisistratos of Athens, and therefore reveal (uncomfortably for Hippias) the thin line between king and tyrant. Nonetheless, the connection between kingship and the people during the Archaic and Classical periods is a strong one, stronger certainly than scholars have typically recognized, as Mitchell has recently shown. Hippias’s fragment attests to the persistence and in fact the growing relevance of the connection in the Early Hellenistic period. Thomas, in a study of Ionian local history in the 4th and 3rd centuries, alerts us to the usefulness of polis history as

127. Paus. 3.3.2: Πολύδωρον εὐδοκιμοῦντα ἐν Σπάρτῃ καὶ κατὰ γούμην λαχθαμομίαν μᾶλλα ὡς τῇ δήμῳ —οὔτε γὰρ ἄρχον βίαιον οὔτε ὕβρισσεν λόγον παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδέ

127. Paus. 3.3.2: Πολύδωρον εὐδοκιμοῦντα ἐν Σπάρτῃ καὶ κατὰ γούμην λαχθαμομίαν μᾶλλα ὡς τῇ δήμῳ —οὔτε γὰρ ἄρχον βίαιον οὔτε ὕβρισσεν λόγον παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδένα, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κρήσεις τὰ δίκαια ἔφυλασσεν οὐκ ἄνευ λόγου παρείχετο ἐς οὐδέ

129. Nic. Dam. 90 F57.4–5 (Kypselos treats the demos kindly and aids them in court); Arist. Ath. Pol. 16.5 (Peisistratos institutes the δικασταὶ κατὰ δῆμος, or judges throughout the demos; as Rhodes [1993, p. 216] notes in his commentary, this would have had the effect of undermining local elite authority in favor of Peisistratos’s centralized power). There were attempts already in the 5th-century Athenian democracy to distinguish between the “good king,” personified by Theseus, and the “bad tyrant”; see Mitchell 2008, pp. 10–16, and Rhodes 2014, both drawing upon Walker 1995 and Mills
a tool for interstate diplomacy, including relations with the Hellenistic monarchs; she notes the opportunities afforded by local history in an era when there was often a “need to impress a powerful overlord.” Hippias’s fragment adroitly threads the needle between opposing antidemocratic regimes and valorizing good kings. It leaves open the possibility that the city would not be averse to receiving the help of a single ruler, so long as that help is directed against “tyrants” and “oligarchs” and does not disturb the fundamentals of the democratic constitution. The text signals to a potential royal audience that the Erythraians are not categorically opposed to all nondemocratic forms of regime, and that they are willing to play along, so to speak, in the subtle exchange, increasingly common during the Hellenistic period, between patron king and client community.

The second noteworthy aspect of Hippias’s history is the tactic whereby the oligarchic tyrants carry out their coup d’état. As the historian describes it (line 20), after obtaining troops from the tyrants of Chios, Ortyges and company wait until the population of Erythrai is celebrating a “festival and holiday” (ἕορτη καὶ πανήγυρις) to Artemis Strophaia. As becomes clear, the festival is extramural, with the citizenry gathered far outside the city walls. When the oligarchs give the signal, therefore, no one is present to resist the takeover of the polis. Taking advantage when a population is physically removed from its city is a longstanding ruse in the history of the Greek polis. It is, for example, the means by which Kolophonian exiles seize control of Smyrna. The Smyrnaeans are celebrating a festival to Dionysos outside of the city walls, and the Kolophonians “shut the gates [πύλαι] and hold the polis” (Hdt. 1.150.1). In terms of stasis, however, extramural festivals were particularly suited to (and therefore exploited by) tyrants and oligarchs. The extramural factor is crucial to note, since otherwise we might be tempted to believe, based on Hippotes’ later invasion during a festival (ἕορτης οὔσης, line 47), that both sides take advantage of festivals indiscriminately. In fact, Hippias’s fragment illustrates perfectly the different ways in which different kinds of political factions in ancient Greece utilized festivals for revolutionary ends. Oligarchs and tyrants found extramural festivals useful because they left the central spaces of the polis unguarded, which could then be unilaterally seized and monopolized by a minority faction. Gaining power

133. On this exchange, see Ma 2002; Paschalis 2008, pp. 459–505; Dreyer and Mittag 2011; Strootman 2011.
134. It was specifically near the site called the Leopodon, near the seashore. This area remains unidentified.
135. Graf, who has one of the most sustained discussions of the Hippias fragment (1985, pp. 243–247), sees in the story not a historical event but rather a cult etiology (Kultaition), the “historicizing of a ritual complex” meant to explain the worship of Artemis Strophaia at Erythrai. Graf speculates that the cult involved ritual acts of transvestism, which are explained in the Hippias fragment through the “womanly” dress of the decadent tyrants. The entire story is thus not a “historically faithful transmission” of the story of the foundational period at Erythrai but the mythological explanation for a later “rite of reversal” (Ausnahmeritual). There is no evidence that the cult of Artemis Strophaia involved these kinds of rituals, however, nor is it clear why that cult should be the center of the story and not Hermes Dolios, named earlier in the fragment. As we have seen, a political/intentional interpretation of the fragment makes much better sense of it than a ritual etiology, since Hippias places so little emphasis on the cult titles and proper names (e.g., the area known as “Leopodon”) mentioned in the fragment. The story seems rather straightforwardly antityrannical and oligarchic.
136. See also Hdt. 6.23.1–3 (the Samians seize Zankle while the inhabitants are away fighting the Sikels). During the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians attempt to surprise the Mytileneans when the latter are celebrating en masse (πανδημεί) an extramural festival to Apollo Maloeis, but the plot fails (Thuc. 3.3.3).
over entry and exit through the city’s walls granted oligarchs and tyrants an enormous advantage that compensated for their smaller numbers (and thus more vulnerable position). If through careful planning and deception they could make themselves the literal gatekeepers of the polis, they could neutralize the power in numbers enjoyed by the opposition. Seizing the polis during an extramural festival presented a fait accompli to the members of the demos meant to discourage them and convince them to disperse.\textsuperscript{137}

The tactical writer Aineias provides a textbook example of such a scheme (\textit{Aen. Tact.} 17.2–4). Argive oligarchs waited for an extramural festival to take place in which there was a parade of the citizenry under arms. When the rest of the Argives had deposited their weapons, the conspirators used daggers to kill several magistrates. They then seized the weapons and fled within the city walls.\textsuperscript{138} The fundamentally antidemocratic nature of a plot of this type is confirmed by the Eretrian law against tyranny and oligarchy, restored and commented on in the magisterial edition of Knoepfler.\textsuperscript{139} One section of the law (\textit{SEG} LI 1105, B, line 26) dictates to the demos what steps to take should it find itself “shut out of the city walls” (\παρακλεισθεί ὁ δῆμος τῶν τειχῶν). Knoepfler adduces numerous parallels for such an act in his commentary but does not cite the Erythraian episode.\textsuperscript{140} Interestingly, however, he points out that the Eretrian democracy might have been particularly vulnerable to an oligarchic attack along these lines because it was known to celebrate an extramural festival precisely to Artemis (in this case Artemis Amarysia, at the nearby village of Amarynthos: Strabo 10.1.10; \textit{RO} 73; \textit{SEG} LI 1105, B, line 9). It is as if Hippias was attempting to do with his history what was more straightforwardly achieved by strategic handbooks and antityranny legislation: warn his readers about the characteristic tactics of antidemocratic conspirators and put his fellow citizens on guard against them.\textsuperscript{141}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{137} On oligarchic control of public space, see Simonton 2017, pp. 160–167.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Whitehead (2001, p. 146) rightly connects this episode to the oligarchic coup described by Thuc. 5.81.2.
\item \textsuperscript{139} Knoepfler 2001 = \textit{SEG} LI 1105; see also Teegarden 2014, pp. 57–84.
\item \textsuperscript{140} See, esp., \textit{RO} 83i, lines 2–3; 83ii, lines 7–8, the Tyrants Dossier from Eresos, cited by Knoepfler 2002, p. 176, n. 45. Since the publication of the Eretrian law by Knoepfler, another interesting decree has come to light, this time from 3rd-century B.C. Aiolian Kyme (\textit{editio princeps} Manganaro 2004; re-edited by Hamon 2008b = \textit{SEG} LIX 1407). The decree concerns the duties of the city’s generals and requires that they hand over the city “free and democratic” at the conclusion of an unnamed crisis (see also \textit{I.Erythrai} 29). It specifies that the generals are not to “surrender the keys [of the city] to those attempting to put down the democracy” (\παρακλεισθεί ὁ δῆμος τῶν τειχῶν), lines 14–15, nor to “allow anyone to say that it is necessary to turn over the acropolis to anyone or to receive a gar- rison or to surrender the keys” (\ἐπειτρέπη τῶν πόλεων [τινὶ καὶ φρο[υ̣ρὰν παραδέχεσθαι ἢ τῶν κλα[δίων παραμε[ρίσεις]), lines 18–19; cf. Xen. \textit{Hell.} 5.2.29). Clearly a major concern of democratic regimes was preventing disloyal citizens from handing over control of the central spaces of the city to antidemocratic forces.
\item \textsuperscript{141} For remarks on how the spread of antityrannical legislation during the Classical period stabilized democracy over time, see Teegarden 2014, pp. 215–220. In addition to oligarchs, tyrants are also known to have taken advantage of extramural festivals: see Polyaeus, \textit{Strat.} 1.23.2 (Polykrates of Samos), 5.1.2 (Phalaris of Akragas). The “dikasterion outside the walls” mentioned by Hippias finds parallels in the \textit{dikastai kata demous} of Peisistratos’s Athens (Arist. \textit{Ath. Pol.} 16.5) and the council εἰς ἐσχάτων of Corinth (Arist., fr. 611.20 Rose); see also Jones 2004, pp. 3–4. The point of these institutions seems to have been to keep the common people away from the city center. Decentralized, local dispute resolution also occurred under elite-led regimes, if the point of Peisistratos’s deme judges was to replace elite judges in the periphery of Attica. Classical-era oligarchs are well known for driving the demos from the city center; the Thirty are an especially clear case (Xen. \textit{Hell.} 2.4.1; Lys. 12.95, 25.22; Isoc. 7.67; Diod. Sic. 14.32.4), but the practice was not limited to Athenian oligarchs (Thuc. 5.4.3; Arist. \textit{Pol.} 1311a13–14; perhaps RO 17).
\end{itemize}
As for Hippotes’ brutal return to Erythrai, “during a festival, with the Erythraians rallying to his support” (ἔορτῆς ὦν̄, τῶν Ἐρυθραίων προσβηθοῦντοι, lines 47–48), this is not simply the mirror image of the oligarchs’ insurrectionary technique. The latter had waited for a moment when the polis would be empty of citizens; Hippotes clearly picks a more typical festival in or near the city, when the oligarchic tyrants would be vulnerable to attack and he could involve as many bystanders as possible. The potential inherent in festivals for triggering an insurrectionary wave of collective action always made them dangerous to tyrannical and oligarchic regimes, as numerous examples make clear. Hippias’s oligarchic tyrants come to power by one festival strategy, but they are overthrown by another.

Finally, there is Hippias’s interchangeable use of “oligarchy” and “tyranny” to describe the regime established by Ortyges and company. The conspirators are introduced as “those who wished to dissolve [Knopos’s] kingship, so that they could establish an oligarchy [ὀλιγαρχίαν]” (lines 6–8), but a few lines later they have become “Ortyges and his fellow-tyrants [τύραννοι]” (lines 23–24; see also lines 48–49). The conflation of oligarchs and tyrants had begun already in the later 5th century in Athens, even before the experience of the oligarchic regime of the Four Hundred, to judge from Thucydides’s mention of the fear of an “oligarchic and tyrannical conspiracy” in the aftermath of the Herms and the Mysteries in 415 (6.60.1). This pairing of the two forms of regime as equally unacceptable and illegitimate alternatives to democracy recurs in an Athenian treaty with Phleious, Arkadia, Achaia, and Elis from 362/1, in which it is specified that no one is to “dissolve the democracy [at Athens] and set up either a tyrant against an unpopular regime. This happens in the case of the uprising at Corinth in 393 B.C., which took place during the festival of Artemis Eukleia (Xen. Hell. 4.4.2). See further Simonton 2017, pp. 227–237; for a nonfestival context (that of the open space of the agora), see Simonton 2015.

143. Note the interesting similarity to an episode known from an Eretrian inscription of the late 4th century (copied by the Renaissance traveler Cyriacus of Ancona and since lost): "since during the procession [ταύτη] of Dionysos the garrison left and the demos was freed [ἡλευθερωθήν] and recovered the ancestral laws [πάτριοι νόμοι] and democracy" (IG XII.9 192, lines 3–5). The exact details of this democratic “liberation” are vague and impossible to reconstruct precisely. Did the garrison leave of its own accord? Was there an uprising during the festival against the garrison? Whatever the circumstances, the Eretrian democracy commemorated the occasion by decreeing that in future years there was to be a στεφανηφορία, or collective wearing of garlands, during the procession of Dionysos (lines 5–8; the act is made to ensure that there will be a “memorial [υἱό-μυσία] of this day”). For more on the inscription, see Knoepfler 2014. The episode recalls the actions of the Erythraian citizen Phanes in “dismissing the soldiers and razing the acropolis” (I. Erythrai 21, lines 7–10); the crowning of the Philites statue at Erythraean festivals is also relevant (I. Erythrai 503, lines 15–17). See also the Ephephon stele, discussed below, pp. 530–535; L. Priene 6, with Robert 1944, pp. 7–8. For political anniversary festivals, see Chaniotis 1995. A new example is found in SEG LVIII 1220, lines 11–14 (honors for Olympichos, 2nd century B.C.).

144. Recall, too, the Erythrai decree’s mention of “tyrants” (IG I 14, line 33); most scholars have assumed this refers to an oligarchic clique.

142. Uprisings at festivals against tyrants are common: Hdt. 6.55–62; Arist. Ath. Pol. 18.2–6; Thuc. 6.56.2–3 (Harmodios and Aristogeiton against the Peisistratidai at the Panathenaia); Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.11.3–4 (the tyrant Aristodemos of Kyme); Memnon, FGrH 434 F1 (Klearchos of Herakleia Pontike); RO 54, lines 33–36. Xenophon’s Hiero tells Simonides it is not safe for tyrants to go where they could be overwhelmed by the crowd (Hier. 1.12), while Plutarch (Mor. 781e) says the tyrant Aristodemos of Argos feared the thought of the theater and assembly. Luraghi (2013, pp. 53–55) discusses the sacrilegious aspects of the murder of tyrants during festivals, noting that the stories imply not that tyrants are unprotected by the usual religious sanctions but rather that assassins are willing to incur the wrath of the gods to kill tyrannical enemies. There are also strategic considerations at work, however: a festival context afforded conspirators an ideal opportunity for activating a large uprising against an unpopular regime. This happens in the case of the uprising at Corinth in 393 B.C., which took place during the festival of Artemis Eukleia (Xen. Hell. 4.4.2). See further Simonton 2017, pp. 227–237; for a nonfestival context (that of the open space of the agora), see Simonton 2015.

143. Note the interesting similarity to an episode known from an Eretrian inscription of the late 4th century (copied by the Renaissance traveler Cyriacus of Ancona and since lost): "since during the procession [ταύτη] of Dionysos the garrison left and the demos was freed [ἡλευθερωθήν] and recovered the ancestral laws [πάτριοι νόμοι] and democracy" (IG XII.9 192, lines 3–5). The exact details of this democratic “liberation” are vague and impossible to reconstruct precisely. Did the garrison leave of its own accord? Was there an uprising during the festival against the garrison? Whatever the circumstances, the Eretrian democracy commemorated the occasion by decreeing that in future years there was to be a στεφανηφορία, or collective wearing of garlands, during the procession of Dionysos (lines 5–8; the act is made to ensure that there will be a “memorial [υἱό-μυσία] of this day”). For more on the inscription, see Knoepfler 2014. The episode recalls the actions of the Erythraian citizen Phanes in “dismiss-
or an oligarchy” (RO 41, lines 25–27). Outside of Athens, we see similar attempts to tar oligarchs with the brush of tyranny, as in Rhodes in 395 b.c., when a group of conspirators rallied the citizens in the agora to attack “the tyrants” (really, a ruling oligarchy: Hell. Oxy. 18.2 [Chambers]). Oligarchs are paired with tyrants in the Eretrian antisubversive law of the 340s just discussed (SEG LI 1105 B, lines 20–21), in a similar law from early-3rd-century Ilion (I.Ilion 25), and in a homopoliteia agreement between Kos and Kalymna (Tit. Cal. test. xii, line 21). In addition to Athenian democratic oratory of the period, these texts reveal a gradual consolidation of the distinction between “democracy” and “the rest” when it came to political constitutions.145 Democrats successfully associated oligarchy with tyranny to a degree that was never matched by their oligarchic opponents, who attempted on occasion to do the same to democracy.146

As we have already seen, the Erythraian oligarchic regime of the early 3rd century had removed the sword from the statue of the tyrant-slayer Philites on the grounds (attributed to them by victorious democrats) that its “stance” was pointed at them (I.Erythrai 503, lines 2–6). The legitimacy of oligarchy, as well as its relation to tyranny, was clearly still a live issue in the first half of the 3rd century, when Hippias very likely wrote. His history writing would have served not only to relate the events of the distant past but also to intervene in the political debate of his day on the side of democracy: he would depict a rogues’ gallery of indistinguishable oligarchs and tyrants as a perennial threat to the safety of Erythraian citizens, starting from the earliest times. Erythraian oligarchs may have attempted to deny or otherwise downplay their connection with tyranny—the oligarchic council, after all, had in the course of bestowing honors upon Maussollos acted on behalf of the polis as a whole—but the words of the democrats contained in the Philites stele suggest that Hippias’s conflation of oligarchs and tyrants would have found a receptive audience in the Erythrai of the 3rd century. Erythraian civic identity seems at that time to have been coalescing around a solidly democratic orientation. Teegarden has demonstrated that democracy remained the form of government in Erythrai following the restoration of the Philites statue circa 280 b.c. all the way down to Roman times.147 In this respect, then, Hippias may have been a man of his times, although there was, of course, no way for him to be certain when he wrote his history that democracy would survive. His historiographical cri de coeur attests to the continued vitality of politics in the cities of the Hellenistic period, traditionally downplayed but increasingly recognized in recent studies.148

145. Hippias’s oligarchic tyrants also share with other tyrants and oligarchs of the same period the propensity to abuse citizen women and children; see RO 83i, line 5–6; 83ii, lines 8–10; Theopomp., FGrH 115 F121; Douris, FGrH 76 F10. See, too, the case of Karystios of Pergamon (Ath. 12.542c).

146. For oligarchy and tyranny as a pair in the Attic orators, see, e.g., Aeschin. 1.5; Dem. 20.15–17, 24.149.


If this picture of Hippias’s career and political orientation is roughly accurate, then he closely resembles another historien engagé of the period, Demochares of Leukonoe. The nephew of Demosthenes and a fiercely outspoken proponent of democracy (his nickname was Παρρησιαστής, “Frank-talker”), Demochares found time between battling antidemocratic enemies to write a history of his times, which, according to Cicero (Brut. 286), was done more in the style of an orator than a historian. He was a critic of the philosophical schools in Athens (which he viewed as breeding grounds for tyrants), of the oligarchy Demetrios of Phaleron, and of the post-Phalerean regime under Demetrios Poliorketes. This put him in the company of Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Athenian politicians like Demophilos and Hagnonides son of Nikoxenos of Pergase, men who considered themselves antiphilosophical, anti-Macedonian, and anti-oligarchic. Demochares’ opposition to Poliorketes got him exiled, but he returned in 286/5 (the archonship of Diokles) and seems to have concluded his career (and life) in peace. His son Laches moved honors for him after his death ca. 271 on the grounds that he “went into exile on behalf of democracy and took part in no form of oligarchy nor held any office when the democracy had been dissolved, and alone of the Athenians who took part in politics at that time at no point had an interest in changing the fatherland to any regime other than democracy.” He was granted a bronze statue in the Agora.


150. Demochares defended the politician Sophokles of Sounion after the latter was challenged on a law he proposed in 307/6 heavily regulating the philosophical schools in Athens. At the trial, Demochares attacked philosophers who had supposedly gone on to become tyrants, including Euaion of Lampsakos, Timolaos of Kyzikos, and Chairon of Pellene; see FGrH 75 F1. For Chairon, see also Dem. 17.10; Paus. 7.27.7; Hermippus, FGrH 1026 F39; Phainias, FGrH 1012 F6. (Note that Hermippus wrote an entire work “On Those Who Converted from Philosophy to the Exercise of Power [δυναστεία]” [F39, F40]; this was something of a trend in the early Hellenistic period.) Chairon was a pupil of Xenocrates as well as Plato, and the former was an associate of Hermeias of Atarneus. In fact, Demochares also attacked Aristotle in his defense speech for Sophokles (FGrH 75 F2), likely drawing on the accusations made by Demophilos in the year 323 concerning Aristotle’s paian for Hermeias. Demochares had also joined the democratic politician Hagnonides in accusing Theophrastos, the pupil of Aristotle, sometime before 317 (Diog. Laert. 5.37; Ael. VH 8.12 = FGrH 75 T3).

Demochares and Hagnonides were allied opponents of Phokion (Plut. Phoc. 38.1), thus completing the circle of this triumvirate (O’Sullivan 1997). Demochares also attacked Demetrios of Phaleron during his oligarchy of 317–307 (FGrH 75 F7; Demochares may also have been the source for Douris [FGrH 76 F10], and Karystios of Pergamon [Ath. 12.542e–f], both criticizing the Phaleran; see Kebric [1977, pp. 25–26], who is cited approvingly by O’Sullivan [2008, p. 307, n. 7]). For the antiphilosophical politics of late–4th-century Athens, see further Korhonen 1997; Haake 2008.

151. Plut. Mor. 851f: φυγόντι μὲν ᾑτέρ δημοκρατίας, μετεσχηκότι δὲ οὐδεμίας ἀληγράφης οὐδὲ ἄρχην οὐδεμίαν ἤρρητι καταπελεκτός τοῦ δήμου· καὶ μόνον Αθηναίων τῶν κατὰ τὴν αὐτήν ἥλιον πολειτουσμένων μὴ χειρετησκότι τὴν πατρίδα κυνεῖν ἐτέρῳ πολειτάμετι ἡ δημοκρατία.
(although it seems to have been moved later to the prytaneion), which depicted him holding a sword, much like the statues of the tyrannicides Harmodios and Aristogeiton (and, we should note, the statue of Philites at Erythrai). Other historians would, of course, have had their political leanings, including the Aththidographers of the time, but Demochares, with his rhetorical, partisan style and his open distaste for regimes other than democracy, provides a particularly apt model for Hippias.

HIPPIAS’S HISTORY AS MONUMENT

A connection with Demochares might explain a final striking feature of Hippias’s fragment, with which I conclude. In the closing sequence of the quotation (FGrH 421, lines 47–52), Hippias describes the return of Hippotes, the brother of Knopos: he “attacked [ἐπέλθὼν] Erythrai . . . and with the Erythraians rallying to his support [τῶν Ἑρυθραίων προσβοηθούντων],” killing the tyrants and destroying their families, “he liberated his fatherland [τὴν πατρίδα ἥλευθερωσεν].” Hippotes’ actions are those of a stereotypical tyrant-slayer: he carries a sword; he attacks his tyrannical opponents in the open, during a public festival, counting on the support of the onlooking crowd; and by his actions, he liberates his polis. Hippias would have had many models to draw on in his depiction of the tyrannicide Hippotes, but one in particular stands out both in terms

152. Plut. Mor. 851d: εἰκόνα γιαλκῆν ἐν ἄγορας; 847d: ἐστὶ δ’ αὐτῷ εἰκὼν ἐν τῷ πρυτανείῳ εἰς ὅλους πρὸς τὴν ἔστιαν <ἐν> δεξιᾷ ὁ πρῶτος περιεζωσμένος ἐμπέτευρον καὶ ξίφος. The awarding of a statue along with siteia and proedria represented Athens’s “highest honors” (μέγισται τιμαί); similar honors were granted to Demosthenes, Lykourgos, Demades, Euboulos, and Kallias of Sphettos, among others. On megistai timai, see Gauthier 1985, pp. 24–28, 93–103; Kralli 1999–2000; Oliver 2007, pp. 187–190. The statue of Demochares showed him clutching a sword because, as Pseudo-Plutarch explains, it was in this pose that he addressed the people (δημοσιο-ρήσαμεν) when Antipatros was demanding that the Athenians hand over their orators (Mor. 847d = FGrH 75 T1). Shear (2010, pp. 149–150) argues that further language in the honorary decree for Demochares casts him as a tyrannicide.

153. Some Aththidographers were obviously political inasmuch as they were active politicians; Androtion, Phanodemos, and Philochoros all fit this description. However, Harding has argued repeatedly (1994; 2007b, p. 5) that the individual Aththides were not politically opposed to each other in a stronger sense, along democratic-oligarchic lines, as Jacoby (1949, p. 76) had influentially claimed. Harding seems to go too far, however, in claiming further that “local historians could . . . hardly [disagree] over issues of political ideology” (2007a, p. 187). The political condition of Erythrai in the early 3rd century suggests that political ideology was still very much a contested issue, and Hippias’s loyalties are clear.

154. Demochares may have also influenced another historian of the period, Douris of Samos, particularly in his criticisms of Demetrios of Phaleron (FGrH 76 F10). See also Douris’s moralizing critiques of the decadence and femininity of Polyperchon (F12) and Demetrios Poliorketes (F14), which strongly resemble Hippias’s description of the oligarchic tyrants’ feminine appearance. A further model for Hippias might have been the Peripatetic philosopher Phainias of Eresos (floruit ca. 336), who wrote a treatise on “Tyrrants Killed out of Revenge” (FGrH 1012 F3–F6), a title that certainly recalls Hippias’s fragment. Phainias, of course, was a member of the philosophical school with which, as I have suggested, Hippias found fault, but his works could have been consulted. The description of Skopas of Thessaly, in particular (F3), held aloft while drunk by four men, resembles Hippias’s tyrants forcing the citizens to serve as their litter-bearers (line 36).

155. For the complex of actions, gestures, and attitudes characteristic of tyrant-slayers, see Taylor 1991, describing the Athenian tyrannicides; Ober 2003; Riess 2006, esp. pp. 68, 85–86; Luraghi 2013; Azoulay 2014; Teegarden 2014. For the collocation “liberate” and “patris” in situations of tyrannicide, see Polyb. 10.22.2; Diod. Sic. 11.72.2, 76.5; Diog. Laert. 5.89; Ael., fr. 86; and note that an epigram for Harmodios and Aristogeiton, which perhaps adorned their grave in the Kerameikos, might have contained a mention of eleutheria along with patris (Lebedev 1996, p. 264): [οἱ κτῖσαν] ἀνδρα τύρανναν ἐλευθερίαν τ᾽ ἑπάτωσαν] πατρίδι καὶ λαοὺς αὐτονόμους ἱδέαν].
of diction and of historical context. The example does not derive from a
literary text, however. To encounter it, one would have had to search among
stelai on the ancient Athenian Acropolis or in the Athenian Agora (there
were two copies of this monument). The stele from the Agora, we know,
was of impressive height, standing at 2.3 meters tall. Upon approaching
it, one would have noticed the carved relief at the top bordered by antae
(Fig. 2). In it, Athena stands to the left, identifiable by her helmet and
aegis. To the right of her is a bearded man in a himation, extending his
hand to a shorter, clearly mortal man to the right of him. Scholars are nearly
unanimous in identifying the bearded man as the personified Demos. The
smaller human figure is also bearded, wearing a chiton and a cloak thrown
over his shoulder. He too carries a sword, a symbol, as it will turn out, of
his heroic, quasi-tyrannicidal actions. Rounding out the figures is a small
boy or slave at the far right, tending to the bearded human man’s horse.
The ensemble descends in height as one moves from left to right: goddess,
hero, citizen man, minor.157

In the course of reading the inscription that accompanies the relief,
one would learn that the human figure depicted is Euphron of Sikyon, a
democratic and pro-Athenian politician of the later 4th century B.C.158

156. The decrees preserved on the
monument are collectively known as
IG II 378. The earlier decree listed on
the stele is now IG II 378. For the
correct Standorte of the inscriptions, see
Oliver (2003), who shows that the two
stelai designated by the decree were
meant for the Acropolis and the area
beside the altar of Zeus Soter in the
Agora (FGrH 421, lines 47–52).

157. For a description of this relief,
see Lawton 1995, pp. 107–108, no. 54
(citing previous epigraphic bibliogra-
phy); and for discussions of this de-
piction of a personified Demos, see
Glowacki 2003, p. 457, fig. 11; Messer-
schmidt 2003, pp. 15–16, 171–172,
no. D11, fig. 5; Blanshard 2004, p. 10,
pl. 2.a. Wallace (2014, pp. 620–621)
thinks the small figure is Euphron’s son.
158. From his patronymic, Adeas,
we can determine that this Euphron is
the grandson of the Euphron, son of
Adeas, who became a populist tyrant of
Sikyon in the 360s B.C. (Xen. Hell.
7.1.44–46; Diod. Sic. 15.70.3; Berve
The older Euphron had been murdered
by disaffected Sikyonian elites in
Thebes but had been interred in the
Sikyonian agora with heroic honors
by the people of Sikyon (Xen. Hell.
7.3.12). Presumably, the younger Eu-
phron continued in his grandfather’s
demotikos footsteps.
The first, upper decree on the stele (IG II² 378), from the archonship of Kephisodoros (323/2 B.C.), honors Euphron with Athenian citizenship for having convinced his polis to become the first Peloponnesian city to ally with Athens during the Lamian War. Continuing down the stele, however, one would experience a surprise: a second decree (IG II² 448, lines 35–87), this time from the archonship of Archippos (318/17), explains that in the interim period Euphron had died. Moreover, the Macedonian-backed oligarchy of Phokion (322–318 B.C.), presumably taking offense at Euphron’s anti-Macedonian stance, had revoked the demos’s earlier honors for the Sikyonian and torn down the original stelai on which his privileges were recorded. “Now that the demos has returned and has recovered the laws and the democracy,” however, Athens is ready to reissue the honors for the dead Euphron.

The Euphron decrees and relief represent a powerful response on the part of democratic Athenians in 318 to their recent experience of oligarchy. The period of oligarchy under Phokion had witnessed a concerted attempt by the ruling elite, familiar from the regime of the Thirty in 404/3, to remake the civic landscape of the polis by destroying signs of the old democracy. By reinscribing the old Euphron decree and including the new one, the Athenian people proclaimed its power and authority, and moreover, its ability to dictate the vision of the past that would be preserved in Athens for future collective memory. As Luraghi has written, “the demos of Athens was the key to dictating the vision of the past that would be preserved in Athens.”

159. For Sikyon’s participation, see also Diod. Sic. 18.11.2; Paus. 1.25.4; Just. Epit. 13.5.
160. Blanshard (2004, pp. 10–11) notes that this correspondence between image and text is unparalleled in Attic document reliefs. Lawton (1995, p. 108) thinks that the relief depicts the Demos offering Euphron a crown, but the latter is never awarded a crown in the inscriptions, only the Sikyonian demos (lines 24–25).
162. IG II² 448, lines 62–64: νῦν δὲ ἐπιτίθη τῷ δήμῳ [κατελήλυθε καὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀπείλησε. For the collocation “take back the laws and democracy,” see IG XII.9 192 (Eretria, late 4th century B.C.). The Athenian democracy was restored in 318 (Diod. Sic. 18.65.6) and lasted until the imposition of the regime of Demetrios of Phaleron in 317.
163. For destruction of monuments and stelai under the Thirty, see Arist. Ath. Pol. 35.2 (they took down the laws of Ephialtes and Archestratos concerning the Areopagos); schol. ad Aeschin. 1.39 (they “mistreated” the laws of Solon and Drakon); Plut. Them. 19.5 (reorientation of the Pnyx); IG I² 229; IG II² 6, 9, 52; Agora XVI, nos. 37, 39; Walbank 1978, no. 26 (reinscription of proxeny stelai destroyed by the Thirty). See the discussion by Culasso Gastaldi 2003a, pp. 244–245, n. 11; Shear 2011, pp. 176–177; Lambert 2012, pp. 257–259, with appendix; Mack 2015, p. 95. Another stele likely destroyed by the Thirty was an Athenian decree for the Samians from 405/4, republished (along with a later decree) in 403/2 (RO 2; the earlier decree is ML 94). For a recent discussion of this decree, rightly critical of the fact that the two decrees are treated separately in epigraphical and historical commentaries despite belonging to the same physical object, see Elsner 2015. Elsner also emphasizes the importance (but also the ambiguity) of the carved relief at the top of this stele (Athena and Hera clasping hands) and addsuces the Euphron stelai as a parallel case of memory sanction, reinscription, and iconographic complexity (p. 49, n. 28).
164. Luraghi 2010, p. 256. For more on the “politics of memory” involved with the reinscription of the Euphron stele, see Williams 1985, p. 165; Culasso Gastaldi 2003a, pp. 248–249; 2003b, pp. 66–68; Flower 2006, p. 26; Savalli-Lestrade 2009, p. 153, table A; Wallace 2014. Ellis-Evans (2012, p. 201) has made similar observations about the Tyrants Dossier from Eresos, which represents the republication of several earlier decrees as a single, monumental vision of the past: “The decision to reproduce these documents in this form at this point in time becomes a choice about how to represent the recent Eresian past.”
resembles the Philites stele of Erythrai, in which case a democratic regime similarly restored a monument defaced by an oligarchy.165 The Erythraians of ca. 280, like the Athenians of 40 years earlier, wish to ensure that future generations know that “the demos clearly takes great care concerning and remembers always its benefactors, both living and dead.”166 This is not the end of the similarities, however: Euphron, like Philites, is also a tyrant-killer, albeit of a more figurative sort. We have already seen that Euphron carries a sword, the typical weapon of the tyrannicide.167 He also died, as we learn from the second decree, attempting to ward off from his polis “slavery” of a kind normally associated with tyranny: he “chose to die at the hands of his opponents, struggling on behalf of democracy, so that he not look upon his own patris and the rest of Hellas enslaved.”168 Sikyon had in fact already lost its autonomy prior to Euphron’s return to his polis during the Lamian War, as is clear from the presence of the garrison that he expelled. As we know from other sources, Sikyon was under tyrannical rule during this period: the pseudo-Demosthenic speech “On the Agreement with Alexander” (17.16) tells us that the Macedonian king “restored the gymnastic trainer [παιδοτρίβης] to Sikyon [i.e., as tyrant].” The identity of this paidotribes is unknown, but he belongs to a motley crew of tyrants imposed by Macedon on the cities of the Peloponnese in the 330s, including Chairon of Pallene, “the wrestler.”169 The Athenian decree of 318, by elaborating on the accomplishments enumerated in the first decree, thus enhances Euphron’s reputation even further by depicting him in death as a tyrannicide along the lines of the city’s own Harmodios and Aristogeiton. A closer look at the language used to describe Euphron, however, reveals an even more striking parallel to Erythraian local history—this time, in fact, to Hippia’s fragmentary text itself. During the course of the

165. The similarity has been noted by commentators: see, e.g., I.Erythrai p. 490. For additional examples of non-democratic regimes defacing monuments or stelai, see above, p. 519, as well as RO 39, lines 27–33 (Iulus on Keos); RO 83ii, lines 4–5, 24–26 (Eresos); Art. Anah. 1.17.11 (Ephesos).

166. I.Erythrai 503, lines 6–9: ὅπως ἄν ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται πολλήν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιοῦμενως καὶ μνημονεύοντος ἀεὶ τῶν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ζώντων καὶ τετελευτηκότων. See IG II2 448, lines 81–84: ὅπως ἄν εἴδοσι πάντες, [ὅτι ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, ἔχας τῆς ἐν θυσίας σώ εὐεργετῶν καὶ ζώντων καὶ τετελευτηκότων].


168. IG II2 448, lines 53–56: ἤτοι ἕνεκεν τελευτήσαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων ἠγοινίζομενος ὑπὲρ τῆς δημοκρατίας ὡστε μήτε τὴν ταύτα τοῦ πατρίδα μήτε τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα ἰδεῖν δουλεύοσαν. For a similar complex of ideas, see Isoc. 16.25, a speech put into the mouth of the son of Alkibiades describing his ancestors’ actions under the tyranny of Peisistratos: “They refused to partake of his tyranny, but chose to go into exile rather than look upon their fellow citizens enslaved” (οὐκ ἠξίωσαν μετασχεῖν τῆς ἐκείνου τυραννίδος, ἀλλ’ ἐξελομένοι ἄλλοι γιγνάντας τὸν διαθεμένος ἰδεῖν δουλεύοντας); also Hyp. 2.10. For the idea of “struggle” on behalf of freedom, democracy, and/or autonomy, see, e.g., IG II2 457, lines 16–17 (posthumous honors for Lykourgos decreed by Stratokles of Diomeia in 307, the year that Athens was liberated from Demetrius of Phaleron; see Burgett 2011 on this figure and on the “war of memory” in Athens during this period); SEG XXVIII 60, lines 28–29 (decree for Kallias of Sphettos); I.Priene 6, lines 16–18 (cited above); and esp. SEG LIX 1407, lines 16–18, a decree of Alolian Kyme threatening generals if they betray the polis (cited above): ἐμπλήθη πρὸς τὸ δικαίωμα αὐτῶν ἀγωνίζομενος ὑπὲρ τῆς δημοκρατίας ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκείνου τῆς δημοκρατίας.

169. This Chairon was one of the “philosopher-tyrants” criticized by Demochares of Leukonoe.
Lamian War, says the inscription, “Euphron returned [κατελθὼν] [from exile] and expelled the garrison from the acropolis, enjoying the support of the Sikyonians [[ἐκόντων τῶν Σικυωνίων], and having freed his polis [τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθερώσας]], he made it friendly and allied to the demos of Athens.”

Euphron’s actions follow, both linguistically and grammatically, those of Hippotes the brother of Knopos almost exactly. Both men return to their poleis from exile, a move signaled by a compound of ἔρχεσθαι in aorist participle form (Euphron: κατελθὼν; Hippotes: ἐπελθὼν); both enjoy the support of the broader populace, which appears in a genitive absolute construction ([ἑκόντων τῶν Σικυωνίων]; τῶν Ἐρυθραίων προσβοηθοῦντων); and both “liberate” their homelands (τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθερώσας; τὴν πατρίδα ἠλευθέρωσεν).

Moreover, the broader contextual frame is the same, at the level both of Hippotes’ and Euphron’s actions and of Hippias’s text and the Athenian decree: a tyrannical-oligarchic regime has recently been in power, putting down the ancestral laws and doing its best to remake the polis in its own image. Just as the demos of Athens in the Euphron decree has “recovered the laws and the democracy” (τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀπείληφε), so also in Hippias’s fragment the return of Hippotes signals the reestablishment of the laws “put down” by the oligarchic tyrants (τοὺς νόμους καταλύσαντες, lines 25–26).

Finally, if I am correct about the role of Hippias’s fragment in constructing an “intentional history” for Erythrai, we see that both the Euphron decree and Hippias’s history writing attempt to shape the collective memory and identity of their respective poleis by establishing “nondemocracy,” of both the oligarchic and tyrannical varieties, as unacceptable, as well as by casting themselves as legitimate modes of memorialization.

Thus, as regards the influence of the monuments on Hippias’s historiographical method, I find it quite likely that Hippias based his depiction of Hippotes in part on the complex of words, images, and memories contained in the Euphron decree. The use of an inscription by an ancient historian, a practice that has received increased scholarly attention recently, is not unusual. To use a monument as a kind of ideological model for historiography, however, rather than as a source for substantiating a claim, is unprecedented. Under what circumstances might Hippias have encountered
the monument? We happen to know that Erythraian ambassadors visited Athens in the early 3rd century (*IG* II² 708). The language of the decree suggests that Erythrai was governed by a democracy at the time. Lines 2–3 (restored) state that the Athenian *boule* has decided to praise the demos of the Erythraians, and the latter portion of the inscription mentions ambassadors “from the demos of the Erythraians” (line 11, partially restored). The edition of the decree in *IG* restores at lines 5–6, “to announce the crown [for the Erythraian demos] at the Dionysia, during the new contest [ἐγών καινός] of tragedies,” based on similar inscriptions of the period (e.g., *IG* II² 682, 692). Peppa-Delmouzou (*SEG* XXXIV 83) has argued that this phrase indicates a new contest for tragedy instituted following the liberation of Athens from Demetrios Poliorketes during the archonship of Diokles (286/5). If correct, this would mean that the Erythraian embassy was in Athens sometime after Demochares of Leukonoe had returned from exile, and possibly before his death around 271. If Teegarden is right about the chronology of Erythraian constitutional history, we can narrow that date further to sometime between 281, when democracy was restored and the Philites statue was repaired, and 271. Were Hippias a part of the embassy, or in its entourage, he could have met Demochares, who, as we have seen, shared several of the ideological predilections contained in the fragment of Hippias’s local history. Furthermore, there is a personal reason Demochares might have pointed out the Euphron monument in particular to Hippias: the second Euphron decree, that of 318/7, was moved by none other than Hagnonides the son of Nikoxenos of Pergase (lines 39–40), the partner of Demochares in the accusation of Theophrastos and a fiercely democratic politician in Demochares’ general mold. Hagnonides had been killed late in the 4th century, probably in the early years of Demetrios of Phaleron’s oligarchy (*Plut. Phoc. 38.1*). Had Demochares shown the Euphron stele to Hippias, it would have both resonated with the latter, who had also seen a democratic monument (the Philites statue) defaced by oligarchs, and allowed the former to pay tribute to a dead ally.

This reconstruction must, of course, remain extremely speculative. At the very least, however, the Hippias fragment displays strong affinities with the ideological message conveyed by the Euphron stele, as well as with the contemporary style of historiography practiced by Demochares. This cluster of texts suggests that politicized local historiography was a more common phenomenon in the early Hellenistic period than has been recognized. Hippias is the most obvious example of such a historian from among the authors contained in Jacoby’s *Fragmente*, but it would be worthwhile to reexamine the extant fragments for further cases. Hippias’s fragment is

176. See above, n. 150. For more on Hagnonides’ activities in the later 4th century, see *IG* II² 1629 (325/4); Dion. Hal. *De Dinarcho* 10; Diog. Laert. 5.37; *Plut. Phoc* 33–38; *Nep. Phocion* 3.3; see also Habicht 1997, pp. 47–52; Bayliss 2011, pp. 95–99, 98–101; Wallace 2014, pp. 625–626.

177. Thomas (2014a, p. 262) has an excellent discussion of the politics of local polis history, but she concludes that “the *polis* being presented here [in early Hellenistic histories] is a different kind of polis from the more political animal of the mid and late fifth century.” The present study suggests that in certain cases there was as much continuity as change when it came to the political concerns addressed. Hippias’s local history is not the dry, erudite antiquarianism—for its own sake as depicted by Momigliano (1950, pp. 287–288; 1990, pp. 59–67, esp. p. 61: “local history [and other forms of antiquarianism] . . . were characterized by a lack of prominent political interests”). For criticism of Momigliano’s dismissal of the local historians, see Clarke 2008, pp. 181–183. On the other hand, Momigliano (1990, pp. 66–67) emphasized the greater interest shown by local historians in documents.
also by the same token striking, on this interpretation, for its adoption of an unabashedly Athens-friendly vision of the history of Erythrai. As we have seen, the story of Erythrai’s interaction with Athens was primarily one of subordination, or at least of very one-sided negotiations between a lesser polis and an imperial power. Recent studies have explored the ways in which the local histories of smaller poleis (e.g., Chios and Delos) might have constituted acts of subtle resistance against Athenian imperialism. In the case of Hippias, however, we see someone who perpetuated rather than corrected the Athenian version of Erythraian history. Granted, by his time the Athenian empire was long gone, and one could safely from a distance validate the Athenian experience in the service of promoting democracy on the home front. Still, somewhat ironically for an author who attacked “lap-dogs and flatterers” so vociferously, Hippias may have known a thing or two himself about “fawning on the powerful.”
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