

494. Or is it unspecified? The sensitive girl would not use “widow” of herself, but she does allude to it in a bit of Sophoclean word play. In addition to fearing a painful report, Tecmessa is pained at the possibility of being sent away subject (*χειρίαν*) to another man. The first use of this adjective for the older *ὑποχείριος* comes in a context in which, one suspects, homophony with *χήραν* has suggested the clipped form to Sophocles. It is not so odd, therefore, that this clipped form

of the adjective is used thereafter only in the feminine.<sup>4</sup> Sophocles made the word noteworthy by its judicious use in Tecmessa’s sensitive speech; Euripides, adopting the word, remained true to its original context by using it only of the subjugation of women.

THOMAS D. WORTHEN

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

4. See Stanford’s note on line 495.

# ARISTOTLE *ATH. POL.* 26. 1 ON CIMON

At *Ath. Pol.* 26. 1, Aristotle disparages Cimon’s value as a leader, describing him as *νεώτερον ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὀψὲ προσελθόντα*. Both parts of the description have been considered inept. Some defense is in order.

First *νεώτερον*. The passage has a context of about 462 when Cimon was probably at least 48 and so not guilty of excessive youth. Scholars have sought a solution in emendation: *ἐνέωτερον* or *νωθέστερον* (Weil), *νωθρότερον* (Kaibel and Wilamowitz), *ἀνούστερον* (Van Herwerden), *ἀβέλετερον* (Sandys). All a little unfair to “le grand héros de la lutte nationale,” as G. Radet pointed out (*REG*, XXXII [1919], 429–32), and, more pertinently, quite inappropriate for a skillful politician, who was capable of exploiting archeology for political ends (Plut. *Cim.* 8. 6), and whose approach to vote-catching served, as Aristotle himself noted, as a model for Pericles (*Ath. Pol.* 27. 4). Nor yet is Radet’s defense of the reading, with the meaning “assez novice,” consistent with Cimon’s already long career by 462.

The context here requires a word that signifies a quality unsuitable in a conservative leader. This in itself appears to make the problem more difficult, since Cimon is generally held to be reactionary rather than progressive. Nevertheless, some of the ancient evidence, if it does not belie the label, at least suggests that Cimon was tainted with innovatory ideas. One (admittedly dubious) source goes so far as to make him leader of the democrats (scholion BD on Aelius Aristides, p. 446 Dindorf; cf. W. R. Connor, *Theopompus and*

*Fifth-century Athens* [Cambridge, Mass., 1968], pp. 32–38), but even the *Ath. Pol.* does mention Cimon’s liberality and significantly sees in this a prototype for Pericles’ demagogic techniques (27. 4). So *νεώτερον* may possibly be defended as meaning “too revolutionary” or “too fond of innovation.” However, as only the neuter is attested with this meaning (*νεώτερόν τι ποιεῖν*), it is more likely that for *νεώτερον ὄντα* we should read *νεωτερίζοντα* or *νεωτεροποιούντα*. This notion aptly explains *συνέβανεν ἀνίσθαι μᾶλλον τὴν πολιτείαν* (26. 1) and also perhaps tells us why the conservative Spartans decided they could do without Cimon’s aid. Support, or at least an interesting coincidence, is to be found in Thucydides (1. 102. 3), who makes the Spartans refer to Cimon’s force of conservative hoplites with the words *νεωτεροποιία* and *νεωτερίζειν* (which troubled A. W. Gomme, *ad. loc.*); likewise Plutarch (*Cim.* 17. 2) uses *νεωτερισταί* in the same context. Was it perhaps their leader who, against expectation, proved to be the trouble-maker?

The usual rendering of *πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὀψὲ προσελθόντα* is “entered politics late,” which gains support from Plutarch (*Cim.* 4. 3). But, as the passage implies a context of 462, by which stage Cimon had already managed a lengthy public career, the statement, even if true, is irrelevant. Aristotle’s context is important. He is explaining the success of Ephialtes’ reforms, for which he gives two reasons. The first, the lack of a worthwhile conservative leader, is supported by two points: that the leader was an innovator and *πρὸς τὴν*

πόλιν ὀψὲ προσελθόντα. Surely the idea that Cimon entered politics late is not only irrelevant for 462 but also singularly weak as an explanation of Ephialtes' success. But the problem has been created by treating the phrase as metaphorical and disappears if we note the context, remember that Cimon was away in Sparta at the time of the reforms, and translate literally, "reached the city late." The phrase then makes sense historically and has some point as an explanation. Aristotle is

pointing out that Ephialtes was successful because the conservatives had a leader who not only was a bit radical but also was actually absent at the time of the change and got back too late to do anything. This is the natural way to understand the Greek; it gains support from Plutarch's statement that Cimon, on his return from Sparta, did make an unsuccessful attempt to undo Ephialtes' reforms (*Cim.* 15. 2).

R. D. SCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

## TWO NOTES ON THE ORTHAGORIDS OF SICYON

### I. Andreas and Orthagoras, *Mageiroi*

Diodorus Siculus tells us (8. 24) that Andreas, the father of Orthagoras the first tyrant of Sicyon, was a *mageiros*.<sup>1</sup> We are further told by almost necessary implication that Orthagoras himself also started out as a *mageiros*, for he was educated as was proper for the son of one (*FGH* 105 F 2. 19–21). Under the circumstances we ought to trust Libanius,<sup>2</sup> when he calls Orthagoras a *mageiros* outright.<sup>3</sup> Most modern scholars, however, reject the datum on the grounds, express or implied, that in Sicyon of the seventh century B.C. it is inconceivable that a man of such low rank could have risen to become tyrant. H. Berve,<sup>4</sup> the author of the most recent exhaustive analysis of ancient Greek tyranny, suffices as an example of this view. Frequently *mageiros* is translated simply as "cook," but "cook-butcher" would be more accurate.<sup>5</sup> It is likely, however, that this regular interpretation of the sources rests upon a misunderstanding of the social status of at least some kinds of *mageiroi* in archaic Greece.

Diodorus (8. 24; cf. *FGH* 105 F 2. 4–8) clearly states that Andreas accompanied an embassy to Delphi (an embassy which received a prophecy of the future tyranny of the Orthagorids) as a *mageiros* for the sacrifices. But such a *mageiros* was no man of the proletariat in archaic Greek times. *Iliad* 3. 392–94 depicts Agamemnon himself slaying the victim for sacrifice. At Sparta the *mageiroi* (of this kind) ranked with the sacrosanct heralds (*Hdt.* 6. 60), and Cleidemus (*FGH* 323 F 5) says that at Athens too they ranked with the heralds; in that city the Kerykes were a well-known noble *genos*.<sup>6</sup> Hence we seem entitled to infer not only that Andreas and Orthagoras were men of social rank considerably above that of the common people, but that they may well have even been of noble birth. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that a descendant of Andreas and Orthagoras married a son of the noble Athenian family of the Alcmaeonidae, after suitors from many other noble *gene* had competed for her hand in vain (*Hdt.* 6. 126–30). The fact lends no little confirmation to the hypothesis of noble

1. As the text of the excerpt in Diodorus stands, it should mean that Andreas himself was the first tyrant, rather than his son, but one suspects corruption in more than the last sentence of the extract, which inspired the doubts of Jacoby, *FGH*, II C, 337, ad 105 F 2. Some scholars in the past, more from the failure of *Hdt.* to mention Orthagoras (although he does mention Andreas as ancestor of Cleisthenes, 6. 126. 1), than from this passage, have made Andreas the first tyrant and/or identified him with Orthagoras. But other sources, esp. *Plut. Ser. num. vind.* 7 (553A–B) and *FGH* 105 F 2 (= F. Bilabel, *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente* [Bonn, 1923], 2), make it clear that Orthagoras was distinct from Andreas and was the latter's son.

2. *Or.* 57. 52 (IV, 173 F); cf. *Helladius ap. Phot. Bibl.*, p. 530a (Bekker).

3. Although Jacoby, II C, 338, calls Libanius' assertion a mere "Flüchtigkeit."

4. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Munich, 1967), I, 27; cf. C. Mossé, *La tyrannie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1969), p. 39. G. Glotz and R. Cohen, *Histoire grecque*, I (Paris, 1925), 331, and n. 206, almost hit upon what is here argued as the true concept of *mageiros* in this connection.

5. *LSJ*, s.v.

6. On archaic *mageiroi* connected with sacrifice, in general see E. M. Rankin, *The Role of the ΜΑΓΕΙΡΟΙ in the Life of the Ancient Greeks* (Chicago, 1907), pp. 23–25, 56 (a book cited by Glotz and Cohen [n. 4]); Latte, s.v. *Μάγειροι*, *RE*, XIV.1 (1928), 393–95, at 394.