The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Αθηναίων Πολιτεία and the Chronology of the Years 462—445

E. M. Walker

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 03 / March 1892, pp 95 - 99

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185026, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185026

How to cite this article:

E. M. Walker (1892). The Αθηναίων Πολιτεία and the Chronology of the Years 462—445. The Classical Review, 6, pp 95-99 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185026

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ἔχων ἑναυστόλουν, | πάσας βεβώσας, ἄνδρα δ' οὐδέν' ἔντοτον, | οὐχ (ἄνδρα) ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν, οὐδ' (ἄνδρα) ὅστις νόσον | κύμνοντι σὺ λλάβοιτο, the object of ὁρῶντα is not ναῦς but ναῦς βεβώσας (the fact of their departure), and it does no violence to the thought to supply ἔχοντα governing ἄνδρα. At all events, the expression is but a short step beyond the customary.

In the first of my examples from the *Anabasis* (vid. supra) ἔχω is evidently ἔχω¹ and the sentence is to be explained like that in Isocr. *Pan.* In Romainic one would say δέ(ν) φοβοῦμαι (φοβᾶμαι) να μὴν ἔχω τίποτε να δῶσω (δώκω), an additional proof, as I believe, that the explanation of such a construction as one of purpose is in accordance with the genius of the Greek language. In my second example, although I am inclined to take ἔχω as ἔχω¹, it may be understood as ἔχω² and the dependent clause will then contain a deliberative subjunctive. In Xen. *Hellen.* I. 3. 21 and I. 4. 15 there is a like possible ambiguity.

In Soph. *Antig.* 270 sqq. : οὐ γὰρ εἴχομεν | οὐτ' ἀντιφωνεῖν οὐθ' ὅπως δρῶντες καλῶς | πράξαμεν, the infinitive in the first member seems to prove (as Professor Jebb thinks who cites as parallel *Al.* 428, cf. his note *ad loc.*) that ἔχω here is ἔχω².

Eur. *Orest.* 722 sq. : κοῦκέρ' εἰσὶν ἐλπίδες, | ὅποι τραπόμενος θάνατον Ἀργείων φύγω is another instance of the purpose-construction.

Eur. *Alc.* 120 sq. : οὐκ ἔχω ἐπὶ τίνα | μηλοθύταν πορευθῶ κτεί. seems clearly an instance of ἔχω² as shown by the interrogative pronoun.

Aesch. *Ag.* 1530 sqq. : ἀμχανῶ φροντίδος στερηθεῖς—ὅπα τράπωμαι is again an example of the indirect deliberative. Notice that here the phrase ἀμχανῶ φροντίδος στερηθεῖς is a strong οὐκ οἶδα.

A good example of the purpose-construction from a later writer is Plut. *Caes.* c. 5 : οὕτω διέθηκε τὸν δῆμον, ὥς καινὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς, καινὰς δὲ τιμὰς ζητεῖν ἕκαστον, αἷς αὐτὸν ἀμείψαιεντο, unless this be deemed a Latinism.

If the MSS. are to be trusted, we sometimes have the optative of purpose, instead of the subjunctive, after primary tenses. Cf. Eur. *Alc.* 112—117 : ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ναυκληρίαν | ἔσθ' ὅποι τις—παράλυσαι (MSS. -λύσαι, Nauck -λύσει), Aesch. *Prom.* 291 sq. οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτῳ | μείζονα μοῖραν νείμαιμι ἢ σοί (cited by Jerram, *ad Eur. Alc. loc. cit.*), Aesch. *Cho.* 172 : οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις πλὴν ἐμοῦ κείραιτό νιν (*M.* κείρετό νείν). Other examples of this construction, some emendable to the subjunctive, are given, along with instances of the optative without αἶν in direct questions, in Mr. Sidgwick's valuable Appendix I. of his edition of the *Choephoroe*.

In conclusion I add one example (there are doubtless others in Attic writers) of the relative clause of purpose after δίδωμι—Hes. *Op.* 57 sq. : τοῖς δ' ἐγὼ ἀντὶ πυρὸς δώσω κακὸν ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες—τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμὸν ἔδον κακὸν ἀμφαγαπῶντες.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Barnard College, New York.

THE 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία AND THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE YEARS 462—445.

OF the many novelties provided for us by Mr. Kenyon's papyrus, not the least startling is the assertion, that in the archonship of Conon, B.C. 462—1, Themistocles was still in Athens, awaiting his trial on a charge of medism. It has been pointed out, alike by Rühl (*Rhein. Mus.* 46, p. 426 ff.) and by Bauer (*Forschungen zu Aristoteles' Αθηναίων πολιτεία*), that Themistocles' presence in Athens in the year 462—1 is quite irreconcilable with the received chronology of this period of Greek history; and in Bauer's work we have an elaborate attempt to revise the dates hitherto assigned to the events of the years 462—445. I observe that Mr. Kenyon, while accepting without hesitation

the statements of ch. 25 of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία, adheres throughout his notes to the customary dates. He puts, for instance, the battle of the Eurymedon in 466, and the reduction of Thasos in 463; he has apparently not noticed that it can be proved from Thucydides that both these events followed the ostracism of Themistocles, and must therefore be placed after 462, if we are to admit the authority of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία.

That the presence of Themistocles in Athens in 462 cannot be reconciled with the usual chronology will not, I imagine, be seriously disputed. It is quite another question, and a far more interesting one,

whether it can be reconciled with the information Thucydides gives us as to the events of the so-called Pentecontaetia. In attempting an answer to this question, it will be wisest not to appeal to any evidence beyond that afforded by Thucydides himself, except in so far as it will be necessary to refer to a passage in Herodotus, and to one or two inscriptions, and to assume the correctness of the date hitherto assigned to the accession of Artaxerxes. It is a date which Bauer himself admits as beyond question. Those who accept the Aristotelian authorship of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* would naturally reject any evidence derived from secondary sources, such as Plutarch or Diodorus, if it should conflict with the testimony of the papyrus. If we have to make our choice between Thucydides on the one hand, and the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* on the other, there are few who would venture to maintain that it is the authority of the latter that must be preferred.

According to the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* Themistocles is in Athens, awaiting his trial for medism, in the year 462-1. This charge cannot be the one referred to by Thucydides in i. 136, for that was brought against him after his ostracism, while he was living at Argos. It follows therefore that his ostracism must have taken place at some time or other after Ephialtes had carried out his reform of the Areopagus. Now from ch. 43 of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* it appears that a preliminary vote was necessary before the ostracophoria could take place; this preliminary vote was taken only once a year, in the sixth prytany, and a fragment of Philochorus is generally held to prove that the ostracophoria itself was held in the eighth prytany. If therefore Themistocles was not ostracised in the eighth prytany of 462-1, say April 461, he cannot have been ostracised till April 460, at the earliest. Bauer and Mr. Kenyon assume that his ostracism did take place in 461, but I think this view can be proved untenable. If Themistocles played the part in the attack on the Areopagus which is attributed to him by the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, his ostracism within the next nine months could only be regarded as a triumph for the supporters of the old *régime*; it could only mean that the victory of Ephialtes had been followed by a reaction in favour of the conservative party—a reaction of so pronounced a character, that the opponents of the democratic party felt themselves strong enough by January 461 to propose an appeal to the ostraca. Such a reaction within less than six months is not

very probable; that as a matter of fact it did not occur can, I think, be proved from a passage in the very treatise we are discussing. It appears from ch. 26 that the assassination of Ephialtes took place within this same year 462-1, and the assassination of a political opponent is hardly the deed of men who believe that 'the flowing tide is with them.' The murder of Ephialtes has always been recognised as a counsel of despair.

The earliest possible date for the ostracism of Themistocles would therefore be the spring of 460, and even if we crowd all the incidents of Thucydides, i. 135-137 into the space of six months, we cannot bring him to Ephesus before the autumn of the same year. For his residence at Argos, his flight, first to Corcyra, then to Admetus, and thence to Pydna and Ephesus, twelve or eighteen months would undoubtedly be a more reasonable time to allow than six months.

In any case then he cannot have reached Ephesus before the autumn of 460. This date I propose to submit to four tests. Can it be harmonised (i) with the date of the accession of Artaxerxes; (ii) with the date of the Athenian disaster at Drabescus; (iii) with the date of the surrender of Aegina; (iv) with the date of the thirty years' peace? If it can be shown that a chronology, which starts from the assumption that Themistocles arrived at Ephesus in the autumn of 460, cannot be harmonised with these four dates, three of which are indisputable, and the fourth as certain as almost any date in ancient history, we shall know what to think of the historical insight of the author of ch. 25 of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*.

To take first the accession of Artaxerxes. This seems fixed for midsummer 465. (See Busolt, 2. 390-391.) The autumn of 460 would therefore fall within the sixth year of his reign. Now it was at the time when Themistocles wrote to him (*i.e.* several months after the arrival at Ephesus, see Thucydides, i. 137) that he is described by Thucydides as *νεωστὶ βασιλεύων*. Is it possible that Thucydides, a writer so exact in his use of words, could speak of a king, who at the very least was near the end of the sixth year of his reign, as having recently ascended the throne? Even Bauer does not pretend that *νεωστὶ* is quite so elastic an expression; he only claims for it that it might include the third year of his reign, unluckily forgetting that by his own showing the sixth, and not the third year of Artaxerxes'

reign was already beginning when Themistocles wrote his letter to him. (Compare pp. 179-180 with p. 71.)

To turn next to the Athenian overthrow at Drabescus. In iv. 102 Thucydides tells us that between the attempt of Aristagoras to found a city on the site of Amphipolis, and the massacre of the 10,000 colonists by the Thracians at Drabescus, thirty-two years had elapsed, and that twenty-eight years more were to be reckoned from this disaster at Drabescus to the foundation of Amphipolis by Hagnon. Thus from Aristagoras to Hagnon we have an interval of sixty years, and if we can fix either the year of Aristagoras' attempt, or the year of Hagnon's foundation, we shall be able to determine the date of the disaster at Drabescus. The date of Aristagoras' attempt can be determined from Herodotus, for a comparison of the words at the beginning of v. 108 (*ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἡ ἀγγελίη τε παρὰ βασιλέα ἀνίηκε καὶ Δαρείος ... Ἰστιάϊς ἐς λόγους ἦλθε καὶ Ἰστιάϊς μεμετιμένος ὑπὸ Δαρείου ἐκομίζετο ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, ἐν τούτῳ παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐγένετο τάδε*) with the first three lines of book vi. (*Ἀρισταγόρης μὲν νῦν Ἰωνίην ἀποστήσας οὕτω τελευτᾷ. Ἰστιάϊς δὲ μεμετιμένος ὑπὸ Δαρείου παρῆν ἐς Σάρδεις*) renders it certain that Herodotus put the death of Aristagoras within the same year as his flight from Miletus, i.e. in the year 497. This would give 465 as the year of the Athenian overthrow at Drabescus, and 437 as the year of the foundation of Amphipolis. This, as a matter of fact, is the date assigned to Hagnon's colony both by Diodorus (xii. 32) and the scholiast on Aeschines, and it seems to be generally allowed that a later date than this would be improbable. The disaster at Drabescus, however, occurred during the siege of Thasos (Thuc. i. 100), so that the revolt of Thasos cannot be put later than 465, and the siege of Naxos must belong to the year 466; for between the surrender of Naxos, and the revolt of Thasos, time must be found for the battle of the Eurymedon (Thuc. i. 100). Now Themistocles, on his voyage across the Aegean, passed the Athenian fleet which was blockading Naxos (Thuc. i. 137): if then he reached Ephesus in the autumn of 460, the siege of Naxos must have been in 460 instead of 466, and the revolt of Thasos and the Athenian overthrow in Thrace could not be put earlier than 459. This date would involve us in two conclusions, each of which is quite out of the question. Firstly, we should have to put Aristagoras' attempted colonization of Ennea Hodoi in 491, six years after his flight from Ionia;

and secondly, we should have to suppose that Amphipolis was founded in 431. Even Bauer, who thinks 491 not an impossible date for the attempt of Aristagoras, admits that 431 is inconceivable in the case of Amphipolis. It is perhaps unnecessary to discuss his proposed emendation of the text of Thucydides.

Our third test was the year in which Aegina surrendered. As the name of Aegina appears in the first of the quota-lists, that for the year 454-3, the capitulation cannot well have taken place after the summer of 454. We have seen that, if we admit the presence of Themistocles in Athens in 462-1, the earliest possible date for the revolt of Thasos would be the year 459. The question then arises, whether the various events which Thucydides narrates between the revolt of Thasos and the surrender of Aegina can be squeezed into so short an interval as that between 459 and 454. Undoubtedly they can, if we assume that Thucydides in his narrative of these events does not adhere to their strict chronological order; and undoubtedly one must make this assumption, if the reading *δεκάτῳ* be retained in i. 103. If this reading is the right one, Thucydides, in relating the fall of Ithome at the beginning of ch. 103, must be anticipating the actual course of events by several years. Krüger's arguments in favour of substituting *τετάρτῳ* for *δεκάτῳ* are familiar to every one; we need here only point out two objections to the hypothesis that we are in this passage dealing with an 'anticipation.' If in this section of his work (i. 98-119) Thucydides allowed himself to depart from the chronological order, so as to finish off one subject before passing on to the next, we should expect to find that, in all cases where he is dealing with events which occupied more than a year, he would tell the story from start to finish without a single break. His practice in these chapters is the exact reverse of this. He twice interrupts the history of the revolt and siege of Thasos, in order to adhere to the real order of events; apparently for the same reason, the revolt of the helots and the siege of Ithome is also twice interrupted; while the beginning of the Egyptian expedition is separated from the final catastrophe by five chapters, which treat of the war in Greece. In one instance only is the story told continuously—the second expedition to Cyprus and Egypt, after the five years' truce; and it is significant that in this case Thucydides expressly asserts that the event which in the

narrative precedes the expedition—the conclusion of the five years' truce—was really anterior to it in point of time, and that the fleet had returned to Athens before the next event which he records, the so-called Sacred War (i. 112). Secondly, we may well ask, Why should Thucydides have interrupted the history of the alliances formed by Athens by inserting, between the Thessalian and Argive on the one hand and the Megarian on the other, a notice of the fall of Ithome eight years before its proper place?

If then we read *τεράτῳ*, the fall of Ithome could not be placed earlier than the end of 456; for it is evident from ch. 101 that the earthquake was some months later than the revolt of Thasos. The earliest date for the Egyptian expedition would be 455, and a comparison of *C.I.A.* 1,433 with Thucydides i. 104–106 renders it probable that the blockade of Aegina was begun in the autumn of the same year. At any rate the battle of Tanagra cannot be put in the same year as the Egyptian expedition (see *C.I.A.* 1,433): and thus we should get 454 as the date of Tanagra and Oenophyta. But between the investment of Aegina and its surrender come, in addition to the battles in the Megarid, the Phocian expedition of the Spartans, the battles of Tanagra and Oenophyte, and the establishment of Athenian control over Phocis and Locris. As the Phocian expedition could hardly be earlier than April, and as two months elapsed between Tanagra and Oenophyta, it looks as if Aegina could not have surrendered before the winter. This would mean the winter of 454–3; is it probable then that it would have paid its tribute in time for the quota to appear in the list of that same year?

Lastly let us consider what conclusion we shall be driven to with regard to the events which come between the surrender of Aegina and the thirty years' peace.

In spite of Bauer's endeavours to prove the contrary, it can hardly admit of question that the destruction of the Athenian armament in Egypt must be placed between the periplus of Tolmides and the Athenian expedition into Thessaly; the words at the beginning of ch. 109 (*οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἐπέμεινον, καὶ αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἰδέαι πολέμων κατέστησαν. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον ἐκράτουν κ.τ.λ.*) can only mean that the narrative of the Egyptian expedition is parallel to the chapters that precede it (105–108), and not, as Bauer supposes, to the chapters that follow (111, 112). Common-sense, indeed, would suggest that the reason why Thucydides returns to the affairs of

Egypt at this particular place is, that the capture of Prosopitis was effected in the interval between the periplus of Tolmides and the invasion of Thessaly. Now the fleet was destroyed six full years after the ships had first sailed to the aid of Inaros (110 *ad init.*); if therefore the expedition began in 455, the end cannot have come before 449, and Pericles' attack on Oeniadae will have to be assigned to 448. This was three years before the five years' truce (112 *ad init.*), which cannot therefore have been concluded before the beginning of the year 445–4; that is, some six months after the real date of the thirty years' peace (see Thucydides ii. 2 and i. 87 *ad fin.*).

To sum up. If we make the supposed fact of Themistocles' presence in Athens in 462–1 the starting-point of our chronology, we shall arrive at a date for the five years' truce which is at the least three or four years too late, and a date for the surrender of Aegina which is at best barely possible; but this latter date can only be rendered even barely possible by cutting down the interval between Themistocles' ostracism and his arrival at Ephesus to the improbably short space of six months. More than this, even if we do not make any assumptions as to the order in which Thucydides narrates the events, even if we leave the reading *δεκάτῳ* unaltered, and even if we allow that Themistocles may have been ostracised in the spring of 461, we shall still get dates both for Themistocles' letter to Artaxerxes and for the disaster at Drabescus, which it is absolutely impossible to harmonise with the statements of Herodotus and Thucydides.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that it is not ch. 25 only that is at stake. We shall not get rid of our difficulties as to the dates either by banishing the chapter to the bottom of the page with the French translator, or conjecturing with a Dutch editor a confusion between Themistocles and Pericles. Chapter 25 cannot be reconciled with Thucydides, but it is in perfect harmony with the other chronological statements of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, as far as they relate to the years under discussion. It is only when we recognise that the author of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* put the battle of the Eurymedon some eight years too late, and that the interval between Tanagra and the five years' truce found no place in his historical retrospect, that we can understand how he comes to apply to Cimon in the year 462 those much-discussed words, *νεώτερον ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὀψὲ προσελθόντα*, or how he can assert at one and the same time

that Pericles introduced pay for the dicasts ἀντιδημαγωγῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος εὐπορίαν, and yet that he took no active part in politics until after the year 451. One service at least the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία renders us; it proves the existence among the writers of the fourth century B.C. of a very different chronology for the Pentecostaetia from that which we have in Thucydides, and it enables us for the first time to explain more than one hard saying in Plutarch and Diodorus. Would Plutarch's statement that Cimon

was recalled after the battle of Tanagra, and at once negotiated the five years' truce, have occasioned any difficulty to the author of this long-lost work? ¹

E. M. WALKER.

¹ Bauer is certainly right in seeing a reference to the five years' truce in Plut. *Cim.* 18, and *Per.* 10. The hypothesis that these two passages refer to the four months' truce of which Diodorus speaks simply illustrates the desperate shifts to which 'harmonists' are wont to have recourse.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF'S EDITION OF THE *HIPPOLYTUS*.

Euripides Hippolytos: Griechisch und Deutsch: von ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. 8 Mk.

THE name of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf deserves to be better known than it is in England. He stands in the very forefront of modern scholarship. No such combination of literary genius with philological accomplishment has appeared since Ottfried Müller died. In linguistic and metrical science, in archaeology and mythology, in textual and in literary criticism he is equally at home, and of each and all these subjects he treats with profound originality and with the grace of easy mastery. In his translation from Greek poetry he is adding the rôle of patriot to that of the philologist:—'es ist vielleicht nur ein schwaches Mittel, aber wir Philologen verfügen allein darüber: wir müssen das unsere tun als Deutsche.' This *Hippolytus*-volume is interesting in various ways. The text is constituted with some boldness, but on the whole with strong probability and without perversity. The translation has a peculiar charm. It has a rich flavour of the original, and it reads like poetry. It would not become a foreigner to say more. But it may be allowed in him to hail with gratitude the theory of translation which this author seeks to vindicate before his countrymen.

Translation from Greek poetry, according to him, is the duty and privilege of the philologist. He alone is sufficiently steeped with the meaning and spirit of the original to render it rightly. And the more he is possessed with it, the farther he will get away from literal adherence to the idiom and the metrical form of the original; the more confidently he will dare to give out freely

from himself the thoughts, the emotions, the tone of the poet, because he has so completely appropriated them.

'Das ist übersetzen; nicht mehr, aber auch nicht weniger; es ist kein dichten (ποιεῖν); das dürften wir nicht, gesetzt wir könnten es. Aber der Geist des Dichters muss über uns kommen und mit unsern Worten reden. Die neuen Verse sollen auf ihre Leser dieselbe Wirkung tun, wie die alten zu ihrer Zeit auf ihr Volk und heute noch auf die, welche sich die nötige Mühe philologischer Arbeit gegeben haben. So hoch geht die Forderung. Wir wissen wol, wie wenig wir sie erfüllen; aber auf Erden wird überhaupt die Mögliche nur gebietet, wenn das Unmögliche gefordert wird, und man muss das Ziel kennen, damit man den Weg findet.'

The whole essay—'Was ist übersetzen?'—betrays a consciousness that such an ideal is a new thing in Germany. Goethe is blamed for having given undeserved currency to the 'carpenter's work' of Voss and Donner, but he and they are excused on the ground that these men had no great native literature behind them, and that the poet's intuition divined the beauty of the Greek though 'peering in so mean a habit.' The notion of 'translating in the metres of the original' is justly condemned.

'Wer ein Gedicht übersetzen will, muss es zunächst verstehn. Ist diese Bedingung erfüllt, so steht er vor der Aufgabe, etwas, das in bestimmter Sprache vorliegt, mit der Vermass und Stil auch gegeben sind, in einer anderen bestimmten Sprache neu zu schaffen, mit der Vermass und Stil auch gegeben sind. Nur in so weit, als das Original etwas in seiner Sprache neues gab zu seiner Zeit, darf das gleiche in der Nachbildung geschehn.'

By way of illustration several fine examples are given of translation from German into Greek. I cannot forbear quoting the lyrical rendering of