

PISISTRATUS' LEADERSHIP IN *A.P.* 13.4 AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TYRANNY OF 561/60 B.C.¹

1. PISISTRATUS' LEADERSHIP IN *A.P.* 13.4

It is well known from the sources that three Athenian factions were organized after Solon's reforms. Herodotus writes as follows:

In the course of time there was a feud between the Athenians of the coast under Megacles son of Alcmeon and the Athenians of the plain under Lycurgus son of Aristolaides. Pisistratus then, having an eye to the sovereign power, raised up a third faction. He collected partisans and pretended to champion the hillmen (συλλέξας δὲ στασιώτας καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῶν ὑπερακρίων προστάς).
(Her. 1.59, trans. A. D. Godley [Loeb])²

Aristotle was acquainted with Herodotus' work.³ However, his narration differs from that of Herodotus:

The factions were three: one was the party of Men of the Coast, whose head was Megacles, the son of Alcmaeon, and they were thought chiefly to aim at the middle form of constitution; another was the party of Men of the Plain, who desired the oligarchy, and their leader was Lycurgus; third was the party of the Hillmen, *which had appointed Peisistratos over it* (ἐφ' ἣν τεταγμένος ἦν Πεισίστρατος), as he was thought to be an extreme advocate of the people (δημοτικώτατος).
(*A.P.* 13.4, trans. H. Rackham [Loeb])⁴

If, with Rackham, we insist on the full significance of the passive (as other translators do not), then according to Aristotle Pisistratus was not the organizer of the Diakrioi, but was appointed over them. In that case there will naturally arise the question whether this was a fact or the author's own assumption, or simply the result of carelessness in his wording.⁵

Herodotus' account should in principle be preferred, since it is the earlier; but Aristotle's account still deserves to be examined.

2. PISISTRATUS AND THE FIRST ATHENIAN *PROSTATAI*

We have seen that the author of *A.P.* labels Pisistratus *demotikotatos*.⁶ Also he

¹ This paper owes much to the help and comments of Professor P. J. Rhodes, to whom the author addresses his sincere thanks. Professor Rhodes is in no way responsible for any errors which remain in it.

On the chronology of Pisistratus' tyranny see P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiou Politeia* (2nd edn, Oxford, 1993), pp. 191–8.

² The commentators have paid attention mainly to the order in which the factions appeared. W. W. How and J. Wells supposed that Pisistratus had formed his party after those of Lycurgus and Megacles (*Commentary on Herodotus* [Oxford, 1912], i, p. 81). B. Lavelle adds that 'Pisistratus' formation of a third party shows that he was an upstart, new to Athenian politics and without a significant established base of city-support' ('Note on the first three victims of Ostracism [*Ath. Pol.* 22.4]', *CP* 83 [1988], 133, n. 12).

³ Aristotle knew and used Herodotus' work. His treatise is much influenced by Herodotus' work and attitude as well (see on this question Rhodes [n. 1], pp. 89, 204–5).

⁴ As in Herodotus, the party of Pisistratus is mentioned here last.

⁵ In correspondence P. J. Rhodes has expressed the opinion that this passage was Aristotle's (or the author's) personal point of view.

⁶ I leave aside here Aristotle's inclination to reduce the struggle to one between democrats and

mentions him among the champions of the people (*προστάται τοῦ δήμου*). Pisistratus is *prostas* of the Hyperakrioi for Herodotus as well. In other words, Pisistratus' leadership of the Diakrioi could be identified with his *prostasia*. Thus the problem of his leadership in *A.P.* 13.4 turns into the problem of Athenian *prostasia*.

Prostates was a familiar term to the authors of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. It was, as Rhodes points out, the standard word for a political leader.⁷ Thucydides, he writes, first used it for a leader of the democratic party. In the time of Herodotus there was no rigid social polarization; but it was a commonplace in the time of Thucydides.⁸ Indeed social polarization caused by the troubles of the Peloponnesian War was a feature of the last decades of the fifth century. I am sure nevertheless that the use of *prostates* mainly for the people's (or the *demos*) leader was not casual.⁹ Thucydides, as we shall see, did not change the meaning of the term, but used it traditionally. From Herodotus to Thucydides what shifted was not the meaning of *prostates*, but that of *demos*. In Herodotus' time (and earlier) it does not yet mean the lowest class, but non-aristocrats.¹⁰ Perhaps the *demos* consisted of those who belonged to the hoplite class, as Fine holds.¹¹

As for Herodotus, he used the term *prostates* in the so-called Persian debate of Book 3. Darius here argued against democratic government because of the trouble that it entails: 'bad men . . . united by close friendship; for they that would do evil to the commonwealth conspire together to do it' (Her. 3.82). A *prostates* after all takes power in the state in his hand. 'This (i.e. the trouble) continues till someone rises to champion the people's cause (*προστάς τις τοῦ δήμου*) and makes an end of such evil-doing. He therefore becomes the people's idol and being their idol is made their monarch' (Her. 3.82.3–4). Darius, just like the Greek authors of the fifth and fourth centuries, advanced an opinion that democratic government turned inevitably into tyranny.

As for Pisistratus, he was *prostas* of the Hyperakrioi as well. The historian adds that the future tyrant was *prostas* in word only (*τῷ λόγῳ*). Andrewes says that Pisistratus 'created a third party by collecting partisans and putting himself nominally at the head of the hillmen'.¹² I believe, however, that what Pisistratus could be 'in word'

aristocrats. As distinct from *A.P.* it is not so obvious in Herodotus that Pisistratus was the leader of the *demos*. A. Podlecki has referred Pisistratus' leadership over the *demos* to his fictitious identification with Solon ('Solon or Peisistratus? A case of mistaken identity', *Anc. World* 16 [1987], 8, n. 33).

⁷ Rhodes (n. 1), p. 97. W. R. Connor supposed that the term came into use in the lifetime of Pericles. It is then, as he writes, that the politicians began to represent themselves as the protectors of the whole city or of the *demos* (*The New Politicians of Fifth-century Athens* [Princeton, 1971], pp. 112–13). H. Schaefer and M. Lang dated its appearance to the sixth century (H. Schaefer, s.v. *Prostates*, in *RE Suppl.* 9 [1962], 1289–93; M. Lang, 'Cleon as the Anti-Pericles', *CP* 67 [1972], 161, n. 3).

Later, in the fourth century, *prostates* will be supplanted by 'demagogue' (see R. Zoepffel, 'Aristoteles und Demagogen', *Chiron* 4 [1974], 69–90).

⁸ Rhodes (n. 1), pp. 88, 345.

⁹ There was, I suspect, a special word for aristocratic leaders (or leaders of aristocratic *staseis*) in the Archaic Greek political vocabulary: it was *hegemon*. For this word see Sol. frs. 4.7, 6.1, 22a.2 (West), *A.P.* 26.1 (see below, n. 27). The appearance of *prostatai tou demou* and *ton gnorimon* in *A.P.* was not, I believe, theoretically grounded. It was simply casual word-usage.

¹⁰ On the meaning of *demos*, see W. Donlan, 'Changes and shifts in the meaning of *Demos* in the literature of the Archaic Period', *PP* 25/135 (1970), 381–95.

¹¹ According to J. V. Fine, in the time of the first tyrants the *demos* consisted mainly of the men of hoplite status (*The Ancient Greeks* [Cambridge, MA, 1983], p. 209, cf. p. 108).

¹² A. Andrewes, 'The tyranny of Pisistratus', *CAH²*, iii.3 (Cambridge, 1982), p. 394.

was the people's champion only, not a leader.¹³ In saying this, Herodotus is trying to convince his readers that Pisistratus was a deceiver. Firstly, he was a false *demos*-protector. Pisistratus deceived the *demos* and pretended to be the people's champion, while covertly he aimed at personal power. Herodotus was sure that the establishment of the tyranny went against the *demos*' interest. Pisistratus further deceived the Athenians when he wounded himself in order to have a bodyguard granted to him.

Prostates has the same meaning in *A.P.*, though Aristotle's time leaves its mark on his sociology.¹⁴ *Prostatatai* of the *demos* were for him the leaders of the lowest class, who were opposed by the leaders of the aristocrats (*προστάται τῶν γνωρίμων*).¹⁵ A full list of them may be found in *A.P.* 28.2–4. The first of the *prostatatai tou demou* was Solon (see also *A.P.* 2.2), the next one was Pisistratus. Cleisthenes became third *prostates* (see *A.P.* 20.4, 21.1).

Perhaps Solon deserved this title on account of his reforms (see, for example, *A.P.* 9.1–2).¹⁶ But he showed himself as protector of the *demos* before then. Solon first gained the people's respect during the war for Salamis (Plut. *Sol.* 8–10).¹⁷ This war was long and unsuccessful for Athens. That is why the Athenians, being tired of the war, decided to end it. They forbade by law that anybody should propose its recommencement in oral or written form. Solon, as Plutarch puts it, saw that many young men (*τῶν νέων . . . πολλούς*) aspired to continue the war. So he composed the poem 'Salamis', which calls on the Athenians to seize Salamis. The Athenians, inspired by the poem, repealed the said law and appointed Solon as their military commander (*προσθησάμενοι τὸν Σόλωνα*) (Plut. *Sol.* 8).¹⁸ Soon afterwards the island was captured.¹⁹

Then the Megarians, who had possessed the island, appealed to Sparta's arbitration. In the trial Solon succeeded in his defence of the Athenians' right to Salamis (Plut. *Sol.* 10). As Plutarch says, this made him famous and influential in Athens (*ἐνδοξος . . . καὶ μέγας*) (Plut. *Sol.* 11).

Some time later the feud between the nobles and the commons began (*A.P.* 2, 5.1–2, Plut. *Sol.* 13). Many Athenians worked on the land of the rich. The others were enslaved as insolvent debtors. Now Solon gained the *demos*' respect, for he sym-

¹³ The phrase *τῷ λόγῳ τῶν ὑπερακρίων προστάς* there could be equated, I suspect, with *τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ δήμου προστάς*.

¹⁴ Rhodes (n. 1), pp. 88–9, 292, 345ff. On Aristotle's sociology, see also J. Day and M. Chambers, *Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961); J. Ober, 'Aristotle's political sociology', in C. Lord (ed.), *Foundations of Aristotelian Political Science* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1991).

¹⁵ See n. 9. Aristotle's sociological prejudice made itself felt especially in the *Politics*. He reduced the conflict that began after Solon's reforms to Pisistratus' struggle with the rich *pediakoî* (*Pol.* 5.1305a23–4). Pisistratus' enmity towards the rich was the basis of the *demos*' trust in him (a22–3).

¹⁶ See Rhodes (n. 1), pp. 97, 159ff. On Solon's *prostasia*, see Isocr. *Antid.* 230ff.

¹⁷ See on this A. French, 'Solon and the Megarian question', *JHS* 77 (1957), 238–46; F. J. Frost, 'The Athenian military before Cleisthenes', *Historia* 33 (1984), 281–94 at 288–9.

¹⁸ That appointment could first be made at a spontaneous meeting of armed citizens: 'In Greek cities', as R. Sealey writes, with reference to the time of the Thirty, 'a gathering of armed men for military action could easily develop into a political assembly' (*The Athenian Republic: Democracy or the Rule of Law?* [University Park and London, 1987], p. 96).

¹⁹ Frost (n. 17, p. 289) states that Salamis could have been captured by pirates and gangsters, and refers to the law ascribed to Solon (*Dig.* 47.22.4 = E. Ruschenbusch, *Σόλωνος Νόμοι* [Wiesbaden: *Historia Einzelschriften* 9, 1966], 98–9, fr. 76a). The sources, however, depict that operation as the result of the spontaneous mobilization of the citizens.

pathized with the people's distress.²⁰ He expressed this in the elegies 'To the Muses' and 'Eunomia'. The *demos* was going to begin the struggle with the rich. 'The majority', continues Plutarch, 'and the toughest characters among them (*ῥωμαλεύωτατοι*) began to combine forces.²¹ They encouraged each other not to tolerate the situation but to choose a single leader (*ἐλομένους ἓνα προστάτην*), someone they could trust—to liberate the foreclosed debtors; to redivide the land; and to make a clean sweep of the whole system' (Plut., *Sol.* 13, trans. A. French).²² Solon fully fits this. That is why, I presume, he became *prostates* or, to put it more precisely, the Athenians took him as their champion.²³ Thus if Plutarch is correct one may assume that the people's champions could be chosen by the *demos*.

The man named as the third *prostates tou demou* in *A.P.* is Cleisthenes. He became *prostates* during his rivalry with Isagoras, which began soon after the tyranny was overthrown. But according to Thucydides it could be far earlier. In Thuc. 6.89.4 Alcibiades said of the Alcmaeonids' *prostasia tou plethous* that it resulted from their old enmity with the tyrants. Thus Cleisthenes, being the senior member of the Alcmaeonid family,²⁴ could be *prostates* before his feud with Isagoras began: during the expulsion of the tyrants or earlier.

This obviously runs counter to *A.P.* We read there that Cleisthenes 'having been worsted in the comradeships (*ταῖς ἑταιρείαις*) enlisted the people on his side, offering to hand over the government to the multitude (*ἀποδιδούς τῷ πλήθει τὴν πολιτείαν*)' (*A.P.* 20.1, cf. Her. 5.66.2).²⁵ This was nothing other than the 'democratic (or demagogic) programme'.²⁶ Unlike Solon Cleisthenes himself appealed to the *demos*; in fact he offered himself as their *prostates*. But why should Cleisthenes appeal to the *demos* if he was already the people's champion? Alcibiades (or Thucydides) must, I think, have used the term incorrectly. Cleisthenes became *prostates* only after the democratic programme was proclaimed. On that basis the *demos* took him as its *prostates*. The Alcmaeonids' enmity to the tyrants was the prerequisite for the *demos*' trust in Cleisthenes.

It was known that the Athenians had played an active role in the struggle with Cleisthenes' enemies. After Isagoras and the Spartan king Cleomenes were defeated, 'the people having taken control of affairs, Cleisthenes was their leader and was head of the people' (*ἡγεμὼν ἦν καὶ τοῦ δήμου προστάτης*) (*A.P.* 20.4).²⁷

²⁰ Solon's interpretation of the *stasis*, as E. David remarks, conveys the impression of *demagogia* ('Solon's electoral propaganda', *RSA* 15 [1985], 7–22 at 13).

²¹ They were perhaps the same young men who desired the continuation of the war with Megara.

²² The citation is from A. French, *Sixth-century Athens: The Sources* (Sydney, 1987), p. 26. G. Ferrara wrote that the *demos* needed a champion when it was drawn into a struggle with the aristocrats ('Su un' interpretazione delle riforme di Solone', *PP* 15/70 [1960], 33).

²³ This is confirmed to some extent by Aristotle's *Politics*. An oligarchy at Cnidus was overthrown by means of *prostasia* (see n. 28, below). In the same way Solon puts an end to unqualified oligarchy (*ὀλιγαρχίαν . . . καταλύσαι λίαν ἄκρατον*) (*Pol.* 2.1273b37–8).

²⁴ Rhodes (n. 1), pp. 234, 242ff.

²⁵ See the comments of Rhodes (n. 1), pp. 243–5. Herodotus narrates it in another way: *ἐσσοῦμενος δὲ ὁ Κλεισθένης τὸν δῆμον προσεταιρίζεται* (Her. 5.66.2). P. Lévêque translates *προσεταιρίζεσθαι* as 'faire entrer le peuple dans son hétéairie'; the same word, he writes, used in [Plat.] *Axiochos* 369a–b, refers there to the demagogues' activities. ('Formes des contradictions et voies de développement à Athènes de Solon à Clisthène', *Historia* 27 [1978], 538, n. 47). P. B. Manville, *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens* (Princeton, 1990), pp. 185–8, argues that the final phrase means, 'giving to all the people the citizenship', but see Rhodes (n. 1).

²⁶ D. Kienast, however, failed to notice Cleisthenes' demagogic programme ('Die innenpolitische Entwicklung Athens im VI. Jh. und die Reformen von 508', *HZ* 200 [1965], 279).

²⁷ Aristotle seems to differentiate *prostates* and *hegemon*. In *A.P.* 26.1 he wrote that 'the

These examples, I believe, make it possible to assume that *prostatai* (Solon and Cleisthenes as well) could be appointed as the people's champions.²⁸

Pisistratus' *curriculum vitae* was the same: first he gained the *demos*' respect, and then he was appointed, as the author of *A.P.* wrote, over the hillmen, the party of the *demos*. It was well known that Pisistratus had captured Nisaea (Her. 1.59.4, *A.P.* 14.1).²⁹ The Megarian war, once ended by Solon, was renewed.³⁰ It is then, as Herodotus and *A.P.* wrote, that Pisistratus achieved great fame.³¹ Above all he won the *demos*' confidence, because this war was the continuation of Solon's popular politics.³² The war and victory not only won him fame, but it was the fame of being *demotikotatos*. This fame strengthened during the feud that began between the Pediakoi and the Paralioi. Now Pisistratus, as Aristotle states in the *Politics*, displayed his enmity to rich men (*Pol.* 5.1305a22–4).

Thus *A.P.* may be trusted on the problem of Pisistratus' appointment over the Diakrioi. Moreover it does not, I believe, contradict what Herodotus writes. It does not matter that Herodotus keeps silence on Pisistratus' appointment. Herodotus (and *A.P.* as well) labels Pisistratus as *prostas*. It was enough for him and for his readers to understand that the Diakrioi (Hyperakrioi in Herodotus' work) were not an aristocratic faction. They were a political group which appeared as a result of the mutual agreement of Pisistratus and the *demos*. Pisistratus had to promulgate his democratic (or demagogic) programme in order to become the people's leader. Although we hear nothing of it, Pisistratus must have had such a programme. Herodotus hints at its existence when he says that Pisistratus was *prostas* in word only: he considers Pisistratus' programme to be a trick.

If this is correct, another question could be asked. Why had the procedure of appointment appeared? An answer, I suspect, may be found in Athenian military practice.

It has already been said that Solon was appointed by the Athenians as their military commander (Plut. *Sol.* 8). His election (or appointment) took place in the assembly, and obviously with a majority of the hoplites. It was the hoplites, I am sure, who passionately desired the war for Salamis to be continued. As for Pisistratus, he was a famous Athenian general. The sources label him as *strategos*. The appearance of the *strategia* before Cleisthenes has been discussed elsewhere.³³ Recently Develin has advanced the opinion that the *strategia* could already exist in the seventh century. He

aristocrats had no *hegemon*, but Cimon being youthful was their *prostates*' (see Rhodes [n. 1], p. 324). *Hegemon* here looks like a higher-grade leader than *prostates*.

²⁸ According to Aristotle it was the *demos* that 'took *prostatai*'. In *A.P.* 28.1 he writes that after Pericles' death 'the people for the first time adopted a head (*προστάτην ἔλαβεν ὁ δῆμος*) who was not in good repute with the respectable class'. In the *Politics* we hear that when at Cnidus *stasis* began among the oligarchs 'the common people seized the opportunity of their quarrel and, taking a champion from among the notables (*ὁ δῆμος . . . λαβὼν προστάτην ἐκ τῶν γνωρίμων*) fell upon them and conquered them' (*Pol.* 5.1305b16–18). In both cases it was the *demos* which took the initiative in choosing a leader.

²⁹ Rhodes (n. 1), pp. 199–200; Frost (n. 17), p. 290.

³⁰ How and Wells (n. 2), p. i.82.

³¹ Herodotus wrote that Pisistratus was granted a bodyguard since he became famous (*πρότερον εὐδοκμήσας*) in the war with Megara 'when he had taken Nisaea and performed great exploits' (Her. 1.59, cf. *A.P.* 14.1).

³² See French (n. 17), p. 241.

³³ The authenticity of the term has been discussed elsewhere. How and Wells (n. 2, i, p. 82) thought that Herodotus was using this word in a non-technical sense. Andrewes supposed that it was the *polemarchos* who commanded in this war (*CAH*², iii.3, p. 397).

also supposes that *strategoî* could be elected by a body of hoplites.³⁴ If this was so, Pisistratus could have been elected as general (or *strategos*) by the hoplites.³⁵ We know nothing about Cleisthenes' military career (if we set aside his probable military command during the expulsion of the tyrants).

On these grounds I dare to presume that the appointment of the *prostatai* was the duplication of that of the military commanders (perhaps of the *strategoî*). In both procedures the same men perhaps took part. The same men could be νέων πολλοί and ῥωμαλεώτατοι, who appointed Solon first as a general, and then as their *prostates* (see Plut. *Sol.* 8, 13). It seems they were the hoplites. The hoplites' support is obvious in the case of Solon. As for Pisistratus, their support makes itself obvious only when he is granted a bodyguard.³⁶ This problem I will examine separately.

3. PISISTRATUS' BODYGUARD AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TYRANNY

Herodotus was sure that Pisistratus aimed at tyranny from the beginning (Her. 1.59, cf. A.P. 14.1). His excursus on Pisistratus begins with the prophecy made to the father of the future tyrant at Olympia. According to this, Pisistratus' tyranny was predestined before he was born.³⁷ The approach of the authors of the fifth and fourth centuries was far more rational. Plato in the *Republic* wrote of the popular roots of a tyrant (ὅταν φύηται τύραννος, ἐκ προστατικής ρίζης καὶ οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἐκβλαστάνει, *Rep.* 5.565d). The same ideas may be found in Aristotle's *Politics* (e.g. *Pol.* 5.1305a20ff.).³⁸

Indeed tyranny could have a popular root. Plutarch writes that the Athenians desired a tyranny on the eve of the Solon's reforms: 'It seemed that only through the establishment of a tyranny could a way be found to achieve stability and put an end to conflict' (Plut. *Sol.* 13, trans. A. French). Plutarch erroneously dates the appearance of the three Athenian *staseis* to that time. Plutarch's mistake might, perhaps, lead us to distrust his narration. However, we hear from Solon himself that the tyranny was offered to him (*Sol.* frs. 32.2, 33.6, 34.7–8 West). The suggestion of a tyranny could be advanced soon after (and because) Solon became *prostates*. *Prostasia* was the prerequisite for his probable tyranny. The Athenians seemed to offer Solon an elective tyranny. Solon's friends, as Plutarch narrates, often referred to the examples of Tynnondas and Pittacus, who were elected as tyrants (Plut. *Sol.* 14).³⁹ But Solon refused tyranny categorically.

Pisistratus also was *prostates tou demou*. But we do not know that the tyranny

³⁴ R. Develin, *Athenian Officials, 684–321 B.C.* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 4.

³⁵ Develin (*ibid.*, p. 42) assumes that Pisistratus could still be a general when he became a tyrant.

³⁶ For Andrewes's doubts see *CAH*², iii.3, p. 397. R. J. Hopper was inclined to assume the support of the hoplites for Pisistratus and saw it in the assignment of a bodyguard to him ("Plain", "shore", and "hill" in early Athens', *ABSA* 56 [1961], 206, n. 169).

³⁷ Herodotus, as has already been said, was conscious of the popular roots of the early tyranny (see pp. 15–16). Nevertheless, he tried to persuade his readers that Pisistratus was an exception to the rule.

³⁸ Plato wrote of democracy which develops into tyranny (*Rep.* 5.564a). Aristotle supposes that more often revolution from democracy to oligarchy occurs (*Pol.* 5.1304b35ff.). See also W. L. Newman, *The Politics of Aristotle*, iv (Oxford, 1902), p. 334.

³⁹ According to David tyranny used to be the 'natural' outcome of demagoguery: thus 'Solon gave the people no reason to believe that he would not follow the example of other demagogues' (n. 20,

was offered to him: he was forced to seize power in Athens. The sources inform us that Pisistratus resorted to cunning:

Wounding himself and his mules, he drove his carriage into the market place with a tale that he had escaped from his enemies, who would have slain him (so he said) as he was driving into the country. So he besought the people that he might have a guard from them.

(Her. 1.59, cf. *A.P.* 14.1–2, Plut. *Sol.* 30)⁴⁰

With the aid of the guard Pisistratus ‘rose against the people and seized the acropolis’ (*A.P.* 14.1, cf. Her. 1.59).

Plutarch adds some details to that narration. Having been wounded, Pisistratus stirred up the people in the agora. There were Athenians summoned there, ready to defend their leader with arms in their hands (πλήθος ἦν ἑτοιμον ὑπερμαχεῖν τοῦ Πεισιστράτου). During a spontaneous meeting of the assembly (συνήλθεν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ὁ δῆμος) the Athenians complied with Pisistratus’ request and granted him a bodyguard (Plut. *Sol.* 30). After that Pisistratus himself came openly to collect the guard.⁴¹

Herodotus and Plutarch wrote that Pisistratus’ guard was chosen from the citizens (τῶν ἀστών) (Her. 1.59, Plut. *Sol.* 30).⁴² Aristotle does not say ‘of the citizens’, but gives us to understand it: Pisistratus, he writes, ‘persuaded the people to give him a bodyguard’ (*A.P.* 14.1).

Why did Pisistratus need a bodyguard? The sources narrate that he seized power with its aid. But what about the Diakrioi? Perhaps they were not a sufficient force for that? Welwei is sure that the guard enlarged and strengthened Pisistratus’ faction.⁴³ In that case it is unclear why his guard was obliged to support the tyranny. Certainly Pisistratus may choose the bodyguard from his followers and friends as well. But what difficulties made a bodyguard necessary at all? Pisistratus’ followers could, I am sure, seize power without turning into a bodyguard.

The sources describe his guard as ‘club-bearers’ (*korynephoroi*). Herodotus stressed especially οἱ δορυφόροι μὲν οὐκ ἐγένοντο . . . κορυνηφόροι δέ (they were not spear-bearers but club-bearers, Her. 1.59).⁴⁴ But I am sure (together with Lavelle) that club-bearers were hardly a convenient and formidable force for a *coup d’état*.⁴⁵

Boardman explains the appearance of *korynephoroi* in another way. He saw in Pisistratus’ yearning for a bodyguard the imitation of Heracles: the latter was often painted in the Athenian vases of Pisistratus’ time accompanied by men armed with

p. 14). David guesses that this was a part of Solon’s electoral propaganda; the verses condemning tyranny will have been written after his archonship (ibid.). On Pittacus’ tyranny, see Arist. *Pol.* 3.1285b25–6. See also A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London, 1956), pp. 96–9; H. Martin, *Alcaeus* (New York, 1972), pp. 29–31; W. Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece* (Lawrence, 1980), pp. 61–2.

⁴⁰ ‘The resolution’, Aristotle continues, ‘being proposed by Aristion (Ἀριστίωνος γράψαντος τὴν γνώμην)’ (*A.P.* 14.1). That the proposal survived in written form is doubtful (see Rhodes [n. 1], p. 200).

⁴¹ According to Plutarch their number was fifty (Plut. *Sol.* 30).

⁴² B. M. Lavelle thinks that citizens, not mercenaries, were recruited for the tyrant’s bodyguard (‘Herodotus, Skythian archers, and the “Doryphoroi” of the Peisistratids’, *Klio* 74 [1992], 78–97).

⁴³ K.-W. Welwei, *Die griechische Polis* (Stuttgart 1983), p. 165.

⁴⁴ C. Mossé compares Pisistratus’ *korynephoroi* with the *korynephoroi* (or *katonakophoroi*) of Sicyon (*La Tyrannie dans la Grèce antique* [Paris 1969], pp. 62–4). W. Donlan (n. 39, p. 62) wrote that ‘club-bearers’ was a pejorative name for the common people.

⁴⁵ ‘Club-bearers’, as Lavelle supposes, would have been ineffective against even a few heavily armed citizens (n. 37, p. 94 n. 91; id., ‘The Compleat Angler: observations on the rise of Peisistratos in Herodotos (1.59–64)’, *CQ* n.s. 41 [1991], 317–24 at 318, n. 9).

clubs.⁴⁶ Boardman leaves unsettled, however, the question why it was necessary to ask for club-bearers at the assembly. It would be easier, I believe, to arm with clubs men from Pisistratus' followers.

Thus club-bearers can hardly be good support for Pisistratus. Unlike Herodotus I suspect the bodyguard were not *korynephoroi* but *doryphoroi*.⁴⁷ Indirectly, Herodotus himself confirms it by arguing, I believe against one of his informants, that they were not *doryphoroi*. A fragment of Solon gives some support for the view that they were *doryphoroi*.⁴⁸ Solon reproaches the Athenians with indulgence to the tyrant's followers in these words: αὐτοὶ γὰρ τοὺτους ἡῤῥήσατε ῥύματα δόντες (you yourselves empowered them by giving *rhymata*) (Sol. fr. 11.3 West). *Rhymata* is usually translated as 'the means of defence', i.e. arrows or spears.⁴⁹ This fragment, then gives us the possibility of thinking of *doryphoroi* rather than *korynephoroi*. By the way, it is *doryphoroi* that was the usual name of early Greek tyrants' guards.⁵⁰ If this was so, Pisistratus could have made himself tyrant with their aid. But it is still unclear to me why he did not rely on the support of his faction.

I suppose that there was another reason for granting Pisistratus a bodyguard. That reason was similar for early Archaic tyrants. 'According to ancient sources', as Lavelle notices, 'not a few Archaic tyrants were assisted in acquiring or maintaining their tyrannies by *epikouroi* or *doryphoroi*.'⁵¹ The explanation I find in Aristotle's *Politics*: 'The men of old time used to assign a bodyguard whenever they appointed somebody as what they termed *aisymnetes* or tyrant of the state' (*Pol.* 3.1286b38–40). The bodyguard 'must be only so large as to be stronger than a single individual or even several individuals banded together, but weaker than the multitude' (b35–8). It was in this way, continues Aristotle, that Dionysius of Syracuse asked for a guard (b40–1, cf. *Rhet.* 1.1357b30–6).

Aisymnetia is treated in the *Politics* as an elective tyranny (αἵρετὴ τυραννίς): 'This (*aisymnetia*), to put it simply, is an elective tyranny, and it differs from the monarchy that exists among the barbarians not in governing without guidance of law, but only in not being hereditary' (*Pol.* 3.1285a31–4, cf. b25–6).⁵² The appointment of an *aisymnetes* was often caused by social conflicts (*staseis*), as the examples of Pittacus and Dionysius show. The Archaic age was a time of bitter rivalries among aristocratic

⁴⁶ J. Boardman, 'Herakles, Peisistratos and sons', *RA* (1972), 57–72; id., 'Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis', *JHS* 95 (1975), 1–12. For criticism, see R. M. Cook, 'Pots and Pisistratan propaganda', *JHS* 107 (1987), 167–9. Boardman's response: 'Herakles, Peisistratos and the unconvinced', *JHS* 109 (1989), 158–9.

⁴⁷ Why did Herodotus insist on the *korynephoroi*? It may be the result of his investigations; I suspect, however, that we are dealing here with Herodotus' hostility to Pisistratus again. By referring to the 'club-bearers' he connected him not with ordinary Athenians (or indeed with hoplites) but perhaps with marginal men or with the dregs of society. Herodotus (intentionally or not) takes Pisistratus out of the ranks of early Greek tyrants who were often the people's champions. Perhaps Herodotus' 'club-bearers' stimulated Aristotle's treatment of Pisistratus' party in A.P. 13.5.

⁴⁸ That is stated by some late sources (e.g. schol. Plat. *Rep.* 8.556b). See also Rhodes (n. 1), p. 200.

⁴⁹ LSJ in fact distinguishes two words ῥύμα, corresponding to the two verbs ῥύω: (A) that which is drawn, e.g. a bow; (B) a defence. See T. E. Rihll, 'Lawgivers and tyrants (Solon, fr. 9–11 West)', *CQ* n.s. 39 (1989), 277–86 at 277–9; but she substitutes ῥύσια for ῥύματα (279 and n. 13).

⁵⁰ Lavelle (n. 42), pp. 93ff. See also How and Wells (n. 2), i, p. 82.

⁵¹ Lavelle (n. 42), p. 78 and n. 1.

⁵² On *aisymnetes* and *aisymnetia*, see G. Busolt, *Die griechische Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer* (2. Aufl., München, 1892), pp. 38ff. = *Griechische Staatskunde*, i (München, 1920), pp. 372–4; Vasilij Bauer, *The Age of Ancient Tyranny* (St Petersburg, 1864), pp. 26–71 (in Russian).

factions and clans, and the appointment of an *aisymnetes* was an attempt to put an end to that. It took place perhaps at a public meeting to which many citizens were summoned (the *demos* or the people). They elected an *aisymnetes* (perhaps not unanimously) and granted him a bodyguard.⁵³

If this was the case, early Greek tyranny has a strong tint of *aisymnetia*. That, I think, is why Aristotle wrote that early Greek tyrants were named *aisymnetai* (τοὺς τυράννους . . . τὸ πρότερον αἰσυμνήτας προσαγορεύεσθαι) (schol. Soph. *O. T.* = Arist. fr. 524 Rose [Tbnr.]).

The first elective tyrant could be Solon. It is *aisymnetia*, I am sure, that was suggested for him: that is why Solon's friend made reference to the examples of Pittacus and Tynnondas. Nevertheless Solon refused the tyranny. He preferred the role of *diallaktes* (reconciler) rather than *aisymnetes*. He wanted to be a *horos* (border-marker) between the opposite groups (Sol. fr. 37.9–10 West).

Solon managed to relieve the *stasis*, but for a time only. The feuds were continued after his reforms. *Stasis* begins with the struggle of the *Pediakoi* and *Paralioi*. The party of Pisistratus appeared some time later;⁵⁴ or, to put it more accurately, he was appointed over it as *prostates*.⁵⁵

Our sources refer to Pisistratus' cunning, which made it possible for him to seize power. But I imagine he could have obtained the tyranny without any contrivances. Solon's refusal of *aisymnetia* and the obvious failure of the policy of reconciliation could revive the idea of an elective tyranny. Perhaps it was not offered to Pisistratus, and for that reason he resorted to cunning (if the alleged attack by his enemies was a trick, of course). Pisistratus appealed to the assembly, and it made him *de facto* an elective tyrant, granted him *doryphoroi*. Ancient authors also were conscious of the connection between the grant of a bodyguard and the establishment of tyranny. With the aid of his bodyguard, as they narrated, Pisistratus seized the Acropolis and made himself tyrant. So he is depicted as a deceiver again. But after that he 'ruled the Athenians, disturbing in no way the order of offices nor changing the law' (Her. 1.59). Aristotle adds that Pisistratus 'proceeded to carry on the public business in a manner more constitutional than tyrannical' (πολιτικῶς μᾶλλον ἢ τυραννικῶς, *A.P.* 14.3). This would not have been possible, I believe, if he had seized power by force. He could not be the city's master or tyrant (elective or not) without occupying the acropolis and strengthening his position there.⁵⁶ Pisistratus was aiming not, I am sure, against the Athenian *demos* but against his opponents. In this way he (and the Athenians, of course) put *aisymnetia* into practice. Plutarch wrote that the seizure of the acropolis led to the withdrawal of Megacles and the Alcmeonids (Plut. *Sol.* 30). Perhaps it put an end to the conflict in Athens. But for a time only.⁵⁷

4. A FEW ADDITIONAL REMARKS

The sources, I believe, give us the real possibility of considering a *prostates* to be a genuine feature of Athenian history in the sixth century. The term is applied at that

⁵³ This was in the case of Pittacus (see Diog. Laert. 1.75, Val. Max. 6.5. ext.1, Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 53; also Bauer [n. 52], p. 47). ⁵⁴ See n. 2.

⁵⁵ I am not sure whether it is necessary to differentiate or not. Pisistratus could be a leader of his own faction as well as *prostates*. See n. 58.

⁵⁶ See also Rhodes (n. 1), p. 201.

⁵⁷ Pisistratus' first tyranny lasted from a few months (Rhodes [n. 1], pp. 191–9) to a few years (cf. Andrewes, *CAH²*, iii.3, pp. 399–400).

time mainly to leaders who were strongly inclined to democracy. As the sources testify, *prostatai* could be appointed as the people's champions, or the *demos* took them as their leaders. This does indeed presuppose a high degree of organization among the *demos* already in Archaic Athens. That might at first seem hard to believe, but the Athenians may have acquired the necessary degree of organization through their military practice. The ongoing conflict with Megara was of special importance: during that war new skills could be acquired, which would also give the *demos* a kind of cohesion and solidarity (though one need not attribute this specifically to the use of the phalanx). It was for this war, perhaps, that military commanders were first elected. Solon was the first general of the people, if Plutarch is correct. As for Pisistratus, we have no evidence that he was appointed as general; but the Megarian war earned him the fame of being *demotikotatos*.

Future *prostatai* may be men at the head of their own (aristocratic?) faction at the time of their appointment.⁵⁸ This would not prevent them from sympathizing with the *demos* and obtaining the *demos*' confidence as well. Irrespective of the *demos*' confidence, future *prostatai* had to have a kind of 'democratic programme': Solon obviously had such a programme;⁵⁹ the sources hint at it for Pisistratus; Cleisthenes was perhaps forced to promulgate one.

The 'programme' opened a door not only to *prostasia* but also to tyranny. That is why Aristotle connected demagoguery with tyranny: 'The largest number of tyrants of early days have risen from being leaders of the people (ἐκ δημαγωγῶν γεγόνασιν). And the reason why this used to happen then but does not do so now is because the leaders of the people were drawn from those who held the office of general (οἱ δημαγωγοὶ ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν στρατηγούντων)' (*Pol.* 5.1305a9–12, cf. a7–9, *A.P.* 22.3).⁶⁰

In Archaic Greece a tyranny was not yet blameworthy. It has, then, a strong tinge of *aisymnetia*. First an elective tyranny was suggested for Solon, but he refused it categorically. Pisistratus, being famous, and perhaps the people's general and *prostates*, had a good chance (just like Solon) of becoming an elective tyrant: if the above is correct, he could have been appointed not only as leader of the Diakrioi (as stated in *A.P.* 13.4) but as elective tyrant too.

Perm, Russia

VALERIJ GOUŠCHIN
valerii.gushchin@psu.ru

⁵⁸ It is well known that Cleisthenes was a leader of his own *stasis*. J. Ellis and G. Stanton refer to Solon as a leader of his faction, and treat Solon's friends as a *hetaireia* ('Factional conflict and Solon's reforms', *Phoenix* 22 [1968], 100–1); but J. K. Davies denies the authenticity of the evidence referring to Solon's friends, and considers this story to be a late invention (*Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.* [Oxford, 1971], p. 506). As for Pisistratus, we hear of his *στασιῶται* in Herodotus (1.59). He too could be a leader of a faction and a *prostates* as well.

⁵⁹ David (n. 20) erroneously regarded this as propaganda before his election as archon.

⁶⁰ See also Newman (n. 38), p. 339.