*Classical Quarterly* **43** (ii) 353–363 (1993) *Printed in Great Britain* 

# CLEISTHENES OF SICYON, ΛΕΥΣΤΉΡ

It is the purpose of this paper to argue for a new interpretation of the Delphic response to Cleisthenes of Sicyon at Herodotus 5.67: the oracle's reference is to *pharmakeia*, the Greek 'scapegoat' ritual.

## CLEISTHENES THE LEUSTER

Herodotus (5.67–8) tells that Cleisthenes undertook a number of measures to rid Sicyon of Argive influence; it appears the city had been brought under Argive control in the course of Argos' imperialist venture to recover the 'heritage of Temenos'.[1] One of these measures was the attempted expulsion from Sicyon (ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκ τῆς χώρης) of the Argive hero Adrastus, whose heroon stood in the agora (the manipulation of heroes' bodies was a common theme in archaic political propaganda).[2]

Delphi however would not sanction the expulsion of Adrastus, and told Cleisthenes that Adrastus was king of the Sicyonians, but that he, Cleisthenes, was a *leuster*:

Ἄδρηστον μὲν εἶναι Σικυωνίων βασιλέα, ἐκεῖνον δὲ λευστῆρα.[3]

Although the basic meaning of the uncommon word λευστήρ is not in doubt, its significance in context has been misunderstood. Hesychius glosses it φονέα λίθοις ἀναιροῦντα, 'a murderer who slays with stones', and this makes good etymological sense (root of λεύ-ω + productive agent suffix).[4] Some of the other few attested uses of the word are compatible with this meaning:

1. Euripides *Troades* 1039–41: βαΐνε λευστήρων πέλας/πόνους τ' Ἀχαιῶν ἀπόδος ἐν μικρῶι μακροὺς/θανοῦσ', ἵν' εἰδῆις μὴ καταισχύνειν ἐμέ. Menelaus rails at Helen for her cuckoldry. Death by stoning is clearly ignoble, a fit punishment for adultery. The hypothetical stoning would be carried out by plural stoners.
2. Dio Chrysostom 3.41: τύραννον καὶ λευστῆρα, ὥς ποτε προσεῖπεν ὁ Ἀπόλλων τὸν Σικυωνίον τύραννον... This is a reference to the episode under discussion.
3. Aelian *NA* 5.15: Ἀπολλόδωρον τὸν Κασσανδρέων λευστῆρα καὶ τὸν Λακεδαιμονίων λυμεῶνα τὸν Νάβιν. Other harsh tyrants are listed. Here the word is evidently used to mean more generally something like 'oppressor' (as LSJ), and has a negative connotation. A *lumeon* is a 'destroyer' or 'corrupter.'

However, there is also one use of the term that is manifestly passive, to mean 'one who is (fit to be) stoned', and two adjectival uses that are probably passive:

4. Suda s.v. λευστήρ (incorporating Aelian fr. 115): ὁ δὲ παλαμναῖος καὶ λευστὴρ ἐκεῖνος ἤιτησεν λαβεῖν ἐπωνυμίαν εὐτυχής. ὁ καταλευσθῆναι ἄξιος, τουτέστι λιθοβοληθῆναι. καὶ Αἰλιανός. ἵνα τὸν τῶν κακῶν αἴτιον καὶ λευστῆρα ἀφανίσωσι.

[1] For the Argive claim to Sicyon, cf. Homer, *Il.* 2.59–80; Strabo C372; Paus. 2.6.4; L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (London, 1976), 134–5; A. Griffin, *Sicyon* (Oxford, 1982), 38.

[2] Particularly at Sparta: Hdt. 1.67–8, Paus. 3.3.6 (Orest[h]es); Paus. 7.1.3 (Teisamenos); Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀνθάνα (Anthes). Cf. also the Athenian use of Theseus: Plut. *Thes.* 36, *Cim.* 8.

[3] R. Crahay, *La littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote* (Paris, 1956), 247–9 and H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* (Oxford, 1956) ii 12 believe the oracle genuine. Griffin op. cit. (n. 1) 54–5 thinks the insulting response fits best early in Cleisthenes' reign, before he took control of the oracle through the Sacred War. Contra, J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle* (California, 1978), at Q74.

[4] Cf. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots* (4 vols, Paris, 1968–77) and H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Woerterbuch* (3 vols, Heidelberg, 1960–72) s.v. λεύω; LSJ s.v. λευστήρ. For the agent suffix, see E. Benveniste, *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen* (Paris, 1940) 35, 40.

5. Aeschylus *Septem* 199: λευστῆρα ... μόρον. Here *leuster* is used as an adjective, and the phrase must mean in context 'death by being stoned'. The adjective therefore probably has a passive significance; I concede that it is just possible that the adjective should in itself have an active significance, even though the phrase as a whole must have a significance that is tantamount to passive, i.e. 'death that comes from a stoner'.
6. Lycophron 1187: λευστῆρα πρῶτον ... ῥίψας πέτρον. An active or a passive significance could underpin this transferred usage: is the stone associated with its thrower or its target?

The use of a word with a distinctive agent-suffix and clearly attested active usages in a passive significance is curious but undeniable. The transition from active to passive can be made in this case, I shall argue later, because of a strange association between 'stoner' and 'stoned'. In sharing active and passive significance, the word is similar to that with which Suda associates it, παλαμναῖος, which means both 'one defiled by blood-guiltiness' (e.g. Aeschylus *Eumenides* 448; Sophocles *Electra* 587; Hyperides F85 Jensen) and 'avenger of blood' (e.g. Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 8.7.18); the usage at Euripides *IT* 1218 seems to fall between the two meanings.[5]

## 'SKIRMISHER'

Attempts to explain the oracle given to Cleisthenes have all focused on the active significance of *leuster*, and usually supposed that a 'stone-thrower' was the lowest and most contemptible rank in an archaic army, the role of a man who could not afford his ὅπλα, a mere 'skirmisher'.[6]

This 'skirmisher' explanation is unsatisfactory for three reasons:

1. Of the attested usages of *leuster* (cited above), none is in a military context. The usual Greek words for a soldier that threw stones from the hand were λιθοβόλος and πετροβόλος, and for a slinger, σφενδονήτης.[7] The presumption must therefore be that *leuster* is not a military word.

2. There is only weak evidence that military slingers and stone-throwers were of low status in the archaic and classical periods. This therefore makes the oracle's rebuke to Cleisthenes seem rather pale.

In his discussion of the low status of stone-throwers, Pritchett quotes for the archaic period only the passage under discussion,[8] though he elsewhere describes the reference to slingers at Archilochus F3 West as 'scornful', following Burnett:[9]

> οὔτοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται, οὐδέ θαμειαὶ
> σφενδόναι, εὖτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγηι
> ἐν πεδίωι. ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον ...

Yet the scorn that Burnett finds there seems to be of no more than a faint and nostalgic kind: 'Archilochus' admiration for the arcane splendour of their aristocratic

[5] Cf. *LSJ* s.v.

[6] Thus *LSJ* s.v.; W. W. How and J. Wells *A commentary on Herodotus* (2 vols., Oxford, 1912) ad loc.; Crahay op. cit. (n. 3) 247; A. Snodgrass, *Archaic Greece: the age of experiment* (London, 1980), 98; Griffin op. cit. (n. 1) 50; W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek state at war* V (California, 1991), 53. However R. J. Hopper, *The Early Greeks* (London, 1976), 212 oddly glosses the term 'robber'. W. G. G. Forrest, 'The First Sacred War' *BCH* 80 (1956), 33–52 at 36, H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (2 vols., Munich, 1967), 533 and P. J. Bicknell 'Herodotus 5.68 and the Racial Policy of Kleisthenes of Sicyon' *GRBS* 23 (1982), 193–201 at 193 do not commit themselves.

[7] Pritchett op. cit. (n. 6) 1–67.

[8] Op. cit. (n. 6) 53–4.

[9] Op. cit. (n. 6) 6; A. P. Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (London, 1983) 40.

sword-work is set off here by his implicit scorn for the modern, bought efficiency of classless light-armed troops.' This is insufficient to warrant the use of 'stone-thrower' purely as a derogatory concept by the oracle.

Furthermore it is a difficulty that such scorn as there is is generalised against all light arms and not stone-throwers in particular; *σφενδόναι* are mentioned second after *τόξα*, and it seems that it was rather to bows in particular that scorn for light arms attached in the archaic period.[10]

This Archilochean passage is often associated with Strabo's report of an Eretrian stele banning the use of long-range weapons in the Lelantine war (*μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις*), where Strabo interprets *τηλεβόλοις* to include slingers.[11] There is little agreement on the genuineness and significance of this stele, but there is certainly no need to read any disparagement of stone-throwing in it.[12]

It is worth noting that in the *Iliad* heroes often pick up and lob stones at each other without any implied diminution of status (e.g. 11.265).[13]

For the disparagement of slingers in the classical period Pritchett quotes two passages, Demosthenes 23.148 and Xenophon *Cyr.* 7.4.15. Yet the point of Demosthenes' objection to Charidemus here is not that he was a slinger and a *ψιλός*, but that he fought against Athens in this station; indeed, to read the reference to slinging as disparaging is actually to weaken the force of Demosthenes' point. Only Xenophon's Cyrus is outrightly abusive of the sling ('*ὅπλον δουλικώτατον*'). Even so, the reason given for the sling's servility is a rather specific and rational one: slingers cannot be self-sufficient in battle (even so Cyrus concedes '*ἰσχυρῶς ὠφελοῦσι σφενδονῆται*').

The only iconographical evidence I know for a military stone-thrower is an archaic Spartan pithos fragment from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia.[14] He wears a helmet, a sword in a scabbard at his belt, and a leopard-skin loin-cloth. He holds up a large stone in his left hand, and was presumably throwing another from his lost raised right hand. He strides a pace behind a partially preserved archer who holds his bow aloft, and likewise has a sword at his belt. Between the feet of the two soldiers lies the corpse of one of their dead opponents. If the image ascribes any moral value to the stone-thrower (or his fellow archer), it must be a high one: he and the archer are fine and proud figures.[15]

I suspect that a chief reason the 'skirmisher' interpretation of *leuster* has been so popular is that it fits neatly into the old 'hoplite hypothesis' of tyranny:[16] as Cleisthenes as tyrant ought to have ridden on the crest of the hoplite wave, so it would have been particularly galling to him to be abused as the very antithesis of a hoplite.

3. If *leuster* meant only 'mere skirmisher', the meaning of the oracle as a whole was

[10] Thus Homer, *Il.* 11.385 (of Paris); cf. Aeschylus, *Persians* 147; Sophocles, *Ajax* 1120; Euripides, *Heracles* 160–2, with G. Bond, *Euripides Heracles* (Oxford 1981), at line 161.

[11] C448.

[12] Cf. Pritchett op. cit. (n. 6) 23, with references to discussion, to which add W. G. G. Forrest, 'Colonisation and the rise of Delphi', *Historia* 6 (1957), 160–75 at 163.

[13] References collected by Pritchett op. cit. (n. 6) 3–6.

[14] Illustrated, R. M. Dawkins, *The sanctuary of Artemis Orthia* (*JHS* suppl. n. 5, London, 1929), plates 15–16, cf. p. 92.

[15] Pace P. A. L. Greenhalgh, *Early Greek Warfare* (London, 1973), 180 n. 30, who misinterprets the figure in front of the stone-thrower ('slinger') as a hoplite (and argues that the stone-thrower is thus shown in the second rank behind the hoplite) and therefore takes the image as evidence for the diminished status of the stone-thrower; but the remains of the bow are clear. Only his short sword connects him with a hoplite, yet our stone-thrower has a sword of the very same model.

[16] A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London, 1956) is the classic statement of the hypothesis.

extraordinarily banal, and not at all enigmatic (though the current obscurity of *leuster* may render it so to us). Delphic oracles should ideally bear easily two diametrically opposed interpretations (even if one interpretation – usually the false – is more immediately obvious than the other): e.g. '*τεῖχος Τριτογενεῖ ξύλινον διδοῖ εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς/μοῦνον ἀπόρθητον τελέθειν, τὸ σὲ τέκνα τ' ὀνήσει*' (Hdt. 7.141), and '*ἢν στρατεύηται ἐπὶ Πέρσας, μεγάλην ἀρχήν μιν καταλύσειν*' (Hdt. 1.53). The proponents of the 'skirmisher' interpretation do not offer a second, contradictory reading to complement the one they find immediately apparent.

## PHARMAKEIA

I therefore offer an alternative explanation, one which exploits both the active and passive significances of *leuster*, and so renders the oracle properly ambiguous: the casting of stones is characteristic of the driving out of the scapegoat, *pharmakos*, and it is to this ritual that the oracle refers.[17] Cleisthenes is compared, in his expulsion of Adrastus, to a man driving out the polluted *pharmakos*; but he is also abused by the oracle as himself a *pharmakos*. Thus the oracle means both 'Adrastus was king, and/but you are expelling him as if he were a lowly *pharmakos*' and 'Adrastus was king, but you are a lowly *pharmakos*.'

## ADRASTUS AS PHARMAKOS

Stoning was the usual method of expulsion for a *pharmakos*.[18] At Abdera the scapegoat was driven outside the city walls with stones (Burkert conjectures that this also happened at Athens);[19] at Massilia the scapegoat was stoned to death;[20] at Ephesus Apollonius of Tyana presided over the stoning to death of a beggar, to purify the city of plague.[21] The mythical eponym Pharmakos himself was stoned to death by Achilles' men for temple robbery.[22] Hipponax, from whose fragments 5–11 West (and Tzetzes' lines upon them) we gain our fullest knowledge of the *pharmakos*, wishes of his opponent: *ὅπως ψηφῖδι ⟨κακὸς⟩ κακὸν οἶτον ὀλεῖται/βουλῇι δημοσίηι παρὰ θῖν' ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο* (128 West),[23] and his opponent *ἐκέλευε βάλλειν καὶ λεύειν Ἱππώνακτα* (37 West).[24] (The scapegoat was also often beaten on the genitals with rods from different kinds of marginal plants such as squills and fig-branches.[25] This beating probably normally preceded the expulsion with stones. But at Chaeronea a slave, personifying hunger, *βούλιμος*, was actually chased out with rods of the willow-

[17] For the ritual of *pharmakeia*, and its many and varied representations and developments in mythical and historical narrative, see primarily: J. Bremmer, 'Scapegoat rituals in ancient Greece', *HSCP* 87 (1983), 299–320; W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1985) 82–4 (revised version of *Griechische Religion* [Stuttgart, 1977]), and *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (California, 1979) 59–77, 168–76; J. P. Vernant, 'Ambiguity and reversal: on the enigmatic structure of the Oedipus Rex', in J. P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (New York, 1988), 128–35 (originally published in French in *Echanges et communications, mélanges offerts à Claude Lévi-Strauss* [Paris, 1970], ii 1253–79); H. S. Versnel, 'Polycrates and his ring', *Studi storico-religiosi* 1 (1977) 17–46 at 37–43; A. Wiechers, *Aesop in Delphi* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1961), 31–42.

[18] Thus Bremmer op. cit. (n. 17) 315; Burkert, *Greek Religion* (n. 17), 82–3.

[19] Callimachus F90 Pf., with diegesis; Ovid *Ibis* 467f., with schol.; Burkert, *Greek Religion* (n. 17), 83.

[20] Lactantius ad Statius *Thebaid* 10.793: *saxis*.

[21] Philostratus *Vit.Ap.* 4.10.

[22] Istros FGH 334 F50.

[23] Does the reference to the sea shore imply that Hipponax has in mind a fate similar to that of the Leucadian scapegoat, who was thrown into the sea (Strabo C452)?

[24] The fragment is from Choerob. *in Hephaest.* p. 195.22 Consbruch, and the commentator glosses *λεύειν* here with *λιθοβολεῖν*.

[25] Cf. Bremmer op. cit. (n. 17) 308–12.

like *agnus castus*.)[26] Burkert observes that as the form of execution or expulsion in which the community as a whole can participate, stoning best serves *pharmakeia*'s function of restoring social cohesion.

The word that Herodotus twice uses of Adrastus' expulsion is *ekballein*, a word that seems very appropriate to the chasing out of a scapegoat (particularly an inanimate one).[27]

It is perhaps not surprising that Adrastus was such an unaccommodating *pharmakos*: his name consists simply of the adjective ἄδραστος, 'not inclined to run away' (the word is used in just this sense by Herodotus at 4.142).[28] The quotation of the name by the oracle lends more wit to its message: 'You're trying to chase Adrastus away, but he won't go!'

## CLEISTHENES AS PHARMAKOS

To call Cleisthenes a *leuster* in the passive sense, that of *pharmakos*, was intensely abusive: individuals driven out as *pharmakoi* in attested rituals (as opposed to representations in myth, which will be discussed below) were all that was vile and disgusting. Athenian *pharmakoi* were λίαν ἀγενεῖς καὶ πένητας καὶ ἀχρήστους[29] and ἀηδέστατον καὶ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως ἐπιβεβουλευμένον πηρὸν, χωλὸν;[30] Aristophanes in the *Frogs* complains at the enfranchisement of people not even fit to be *pharmakoi*.[31] At Colophon an ἀμορφότερον man was expelled;[32] at Abdera a poor man or slave;[33] at Chaeronea a slave;[34] at Leucas a criminal;[35] at Ephesus Apollonius chose a beggar to be *pharmakos*;[36] in the Diodoran romance of Iamboulos a stranger of another race is used.[37]

Tyrants were often treated or represented as *pharmakoi*. Most obviously, Coes of Mytilene was taken out and stoned to death at the start of the Ionian revolt (Hdt. 5.38, ἐξαγαγόντες κατέλευσαν).[38] Pittacus, tyrant of Lesbos, is abused by Alcaeus as fit to be stoned, λαβολίωι (F298 V 1.3);[39] in the same poem Alcaeus reminds the Mytileneans that the Greeks were drowned because they forebore to stone Ajax (for his outrage to Cassandra).[40]

## BASILEUS-PHARMAKOS

Whereas in attested rituals it is the lowly that are expelled, in mythical *pharmakeiai* it is usually the king. But in both cases a link with the opposite status can be made: for according to myth Codrus was expelled dressed as a slave,[41] whereas at Massilia

[26] Plut. *Mor.* 693f.

[27] Thus Hdt. 3.40–1 ἀπόβαλε and ῥίπτει of Polycrates' ring (cf. Versnel op. cit. [n. 17]); for animate scapegoats the preferred verbs are ἐξάγω (Harp., Suda s.v. Φαρμακός), ἐξελαύνω (Call. F90 Pf., with diegesis; Plut. *Mor.* 693f) and ῥίπτω (Strabo C452; Ammonios n. 494 Nickau); βάλλω (Hipponax F6 West).

[28] The word's etymology is transparent: ἀ-privative+verbal adjective built on root of διδράσκω. Cf. LSJ s.v.; R. M. Macan, *Herodotus. The 4th, 5th and 6th books* I (London, 1895), 208; Crahay op. cit. (n. 3) 248; Chantraine op. cit. (n. 4) s.v. διδράσκω.

[29] Schol. Aristoph. *Knights* 1136c.

[30] Schol. Aesch. *Sept.* 680.

[31] 733; cf. Suda s.vv. κάθαρμα and φαρμακός.

[32] Tzetzes *Chil.* 5.731, cited at Hipponax F5 West.

[33] Callimachus F90 Pf., with diegesis; Ovid *Ibis* 467f., with schol.

[34] Plut. *Mor.* 693f.

[35] Strabo C452; Ampelius 8.

[36] Philostratus *Vit.Ap.* 4.10.

[37] Diod. 2.55.

[38] Cf. Suda s.v. Φαρμακός, ἐξῆγον... κατελεύσθη.

[39] Hesychius s.v. ληβόλε: λιθοβόλε, ἄξιε λιθασθῆναι. Cf. also λιθόλευστοι (Diod. 3.47).

[40] Cf. Paus. 10.31.1; Burnett op. cit. (n. 9) 199.

[41] Pherecydes FGH 3 F154; Hellanicus FGH 323a F23; Lycurgus *Leocr.* 84f.

the lowly real-life scapegoat was fed like a king for a year before his expulsion.[42] It is agreed that kings and the assorted lowly individuals actually attested as *pharmakoi* have in common an exteriority or marginality to society, with the king being the 'lonely marginal at the top'.[43]

The original direct form of the oracle probably used *basileus* and *leuster* both in the nominative (e.g. *βασιλεὺς Ἄδραστος τῆς πολέως, λευστὴρ δὲ σύ*).[44] The oracle will thus have acknowledged the association between king and scapegoat by jingling with the syllable *λευσ-*.[45] Indeed both Adrastus and Cleisthenes appear to embody both *basileus* and *pharmakos*. It is significant that Adrastus should be given the title *basileus* here where he is being expelled as *pharmakos*. But the association is almost certainly made in the case of Cleisthenes too. It is probable that the Orthagorids knew themselves as *basileis* rather than *tyrannoi*, and that one of the oracle's functions is to deny implicitly to Cleisthenes the title to which he aspires: 'You are a *pharmakos*, not a *basileus*, like Adrastus.'[46]

## THE IDENTITY BETWEEN EXPELLER AND EXPELLED

The oracle therefore highlights the paradoxical identity between expeller and expelled, both by its equivocation in *leuster* and its representation of Adrastus and Cleisthenes as each both *basileus* and *pharmakos*. This curious identity can be well paralleled from a particular development of the *pharmakeia*-complex: the abuser.

The most renowned 'abuser' in Greek literature is Thersites (*Il.* 2.211–393). Physically, he is the ideal scapegoat: 'the most disgusting man to go to Troy, stammering, lame, hunchbacked, pointy-headed and virtually bald' (216–19). His punishment by Odysseus, a blow with a rod (his sceptre, 265) is one entirely appropriate to a scapegoat. Furthermore, Odysseus envisages his expulsion proper: *ἀφήσω/ πεπληγὼς ἀγορῆθεν ἀεικέσσι πληγῆισιν* (263–4). He specifies that he will first expose his genitals (261) – perhaps for something akin to a squill-beating, like the Colophonian *pharmakos*? (Perhaps too it is significant that the abuse Thersites gives here is largely of a sexual kind; Thersites is also attributed with sexual obloquy at *Aithiopis* F1, where he is killed by Achilles for abusing his love for Penthesilea). Thersites delights in making the people laugh at those he ridiculed (215), but ends up by drawing the laughter of the community onto himself (270), a laughter which fulfils the same integrative function as communal stoning. Thersites is himself the embodiment of his abuse, and himself deserves to be abused; indeed, according to Schol. *Il.* 2.212–16b, Homer was the first to write *silloi*, lampoons (the word also means 'squint-eyed'), and in them Homer abused Thersites, and Thersites the

[42] Lactantius ad Statius *Theb.* 10.793: *anno tot publicis sumptibus alebatur purioribus cibis.* Cf. schol. Aristoph. *Knights* 1136 on Athens; Call. F90 Pf. with diegesis and Ovid *Ibis* 467f. with schol. on Abdera.

[43] R. Girard, *Violence and the sacred* (Baltimore, 1977) 12 (trans. of *La violence et le sacré* [Paris, 1972]); Bremmer op. cit. (n. 17) 303–5 (to whom the quotation belongs); Burkert, *Structure...* (n. 17), 62f., *Greek Religion* (n. 17), 84; Vernant op. cit. (n. 17) 131–6. Other sorts of marginal too are cast out in myth, such as youths in transition (Burkert, *Greek Religion* and esp. Bremmer locc. citt.).

[44] This is the original direct text conjectured by Parke and Wormell op. cit. (n. 3) n. 24. Macan op. cit. (n. 28) ad loc. suggests: *ἦν ὁ μὲν Ἄδρηστος βασιλεὺς, λευστὴρ δὲ σύ γ' ἔσσι.* Clearly Homer, *Il.* 2.572, *καὶ Σικυῶν', ὅθ' ἄρ' Ἄδρηστος πρῶτ' ἐμβασίλευεν*, was recalled.

[45] The jingle is rightly noticed by Macan op. cit. (n. 28) and How and Wells op. cit. (n. 6) ad loc.

[46] So Griffin op. cit. (n. 1) 49, 54; Berve op. cit. (n. 6) 532; S. I. Oost, 'Two notes on the Orthagorids of Sicyon', *CP* 69 (1974), 118–20.

*aristoi*.[47] We may compare Hephaestus, *pharmakos* among the gods: lame,[48] expelled from heaven,[49] and drawing upon himself the laughter of the gods,[50] but also directing their mockery towards others (Ares and Aphrodite).[51]

Other aspects of the Thersites legend represent him as a *pharmakos*.[52] The scholiast to *Il.* 2.212–16 reports that Euphorion (F106 Powell) tells how he participated in the Calydonian boar-hunt, but out of cowardice abandoned his station, and went off to a high place; he was chased and abused by Meleager, and fell from a crag to become such as Homer describes him: *ὀνειδίζων δὲ ὑπὸ Μελεάγρου ἐδιώκετο, καὶ κατὰ κρημνοῦ πεσὼν τοιοῦτος ἐγένετο οἷον ὁ Ὅμηρος αὐτὸν παρίστησιν*. A fragment of Pherecydes quoted by the same scholiast tells that Meleager actually threw Thersites from the crag, and defiled his body: *ὑποδείσαντα δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ συὸς ἐκκλίνοντα μάχην ὑπὸ Μελεάγρου κατακρημνισθῆναι. διὸ καὶ λελωβῆσθαι τὸ σῶμα*.[53] Here also Thersites exhibits three important aspects of *pharmakeia*: he is abused, pursued, and cast down from a rock (just as the *pharmakoi* were at Leucas).[54] Although the tale operates as an aetiology of Thersites' ugliness, one suspects a double-think of the sort underlying the tales of the expulsion of lame Hephaestus from heaven: the god is both deformed because expelled and expelled because deformed.[55]

Thersites was also, curiously, often represented as an ape.[56] At Plato *Rep.* 620c he takes on the *φύσιν* of an ape: *πόρρω δ' ἐν ὑστάτοις ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦ γελωτοποιοῦ Θερσίτου πίθηκον ἐνδυομένην*; Lycophron *Alexandra* 1000 calls Thersites *πιθηκομόρφωι* (cf. schol. ad loc.). He is probably the subject depicted by the anthropomorphic ape on the handle of the Caeretan hydria Louvre E696; Plaoutine notes that the figure is lame, pointy-headed and baldish.[57] The Greeks thought of apes as ugly,[58] stupid,[59] ridiculous,[60] and also as (uncomplementary) mimics,[61] and so the animal constituted a very suitable model for Thersites.[62] Two Aesopic fables in particular present apes in scapegoat-like aspect. In Aesop 218 Perry we are told that a mother ape bears two young at a time, one of which she loves too much and smothers to death, and the other of which she casts out: *ὡς περισσὸν καὶ μάταιον*

[47] For Thersites as a scapegoat who unites the giving and receiving of abuse, see G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the hero in archaic Greek poetry* (Baltimore, 1979) 259–64, 279–82; W. G. Thalmann, 'Thersites: comedy, scapegoats and heroic ideology in the Iliad', *TAPA* 118 (1988), 1–28 at 17–22, comparing the socially integrative laughter that the lame Hephaestus draws upon himself in Homer, *Il.* 1.599f. (cf. schol. *Il.* 2.212–16 at H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* [7 vols., Berlin, 1969–88] I pp. 227f.).

[48] Homer, *Il.* 18.411 etc.

[49] Homer, *Il.* 1.590–4 etc.

[50] Homer, *Il.* 1.599–600.

[51] Homer, *Od.* 8.326–7.

[52] The following information is collated by N. Plaoutine, 'La représentation de Thersite par le peintre des hydries dites de Caere et les sources littéraires qui ont inspiré cet artiste', *REG* 55 (1942), 161–89 at 163–5.

[53] FGH 3 F123.

[54] Strabo C452, *ἀπὸ τῆς σκοπῆς ῥιπτεῖσθαι*; Ampelius 8.

[55] Expelled to become deformed: Homer, *Il.* 1.590–4, 15.18–25, 19.130–1; expelled because deformed: *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 314–18.

[56] The evidence is collated by Plaoutine op. cit. (n. 52).

[57] *CVA* Louvre 9 III Fa plate 1 (609) nos 1 and 2 and plate 2 (610) nos 1–7; cf. Plaoutine op. cit. (n. 52) 161–5.

[58] Aesop 364, 496 Perry.

[59] Cf. Aesop 14, 73, 81, 203, 218, 463, 569, 643 Perry.

[60] Aesop 463 Perry; one type of ape was actually called *σάτυρος* (Aelian *NA* 16.21). Note the word *πιθηκισμός*, 'monkey games' at Aristoph. *Knights* 887; cf. C. Garcia Gual, 'Sobre *πιθηκίζω*: hacer al mono', *Emerita* (1972), 454–5.

[61] Cf. Aesop 73, 203, 463, 464, 569, 643 Perry; cf. F. Cairns, 'Cleon and Pericles: a suggestion', *JHS* 102 (1982), 203–4.

[62] A. Seeberg, 'Astrabica' *SO* 61 (1966), 48–74 at 57 n. 1 well argues that the archaic Greeks tended to view the ape as a human/demonic grotesque.

ἐκβάλλει. In Aesop 364 Perry an ape baby is said to be σιμὸν and, like *pharmakos* Hephaestus, laughed at by all the gods, γέλως δ' ἐπ' αὐτῶι τοῖς θεοῖς ἐκινήθη (cf. also the laughter of the audience to the apes in Aesop 463 Perry).

We may compare also the dwarf Cercopes, who laughed at Heracles' blackened bottom (sexual mockery again), and who were transformed appropriately into either stones or apes.[63] We shall return to apes.

Aesop too was a *pharmakos*, stoned to death by the Delphians for the crime of the eponymous Pharmakos, theft of a phiale from a temple.[64] He was also chased over a crag, like Thersites and the Leucadian scapegoat.[65] The descriptions of his deformity and general scapegoat-like marginality in the *Vitae* are remarkable: a Phrygian slave, bad-looking, exceedingly decrepit, pot-bellied, pointy-headed, snub-nosed, bad at Greek, stammering and booming-voiced, swarthy, stunted, lame, weasel-armed, pole-necked, hunchbacked, crooked, a portentous error.[66] Nagy notes that his execution followed his claim that the Delphians were slaves and his telling of a tale that compared them to driftwood, and that his abuse was characterised as ridicule.[67]

Two rather amusing archaic pots illustrate stone-throwers in a non-military context, and the subjects of both seem well qualified to be *pharmakoi*. The first is the Protoattic crater *CVA* Berlin A32 (plates 18–21), by the so-called 'Oresteia painter' (he draws his name from an insecure interpretation of the vase in question). Under one of the handles is a grotesque, squat, bald but hairy little man, with chubby (though not necessarily deformed) limbs; he is turning round to throw stones at three more dignified, statuesque figures (2 male, one female), behind him. He has one stone raised ready to throw, and a second waiting in his other hand. Under the opposite handle two similarly bald, bearded but otherwise smooth men throw stones, apparently at each other. The three stone-throwers are all black, whereas the other characters have white skins. The little man owes something to the ape, and one wonders whether he is some relation of Thersites.[68]

The second vase is a Corinthian olpe, Villa Giulia 46781, the illustration of which has been brilliantly explained by Seeberg as an episode from the myth of Astrabacus

[63] Ptolemy Claudius 5.2; Hdt. 7.216; Suda s.v. *Κέρκωπες*; Harpocration s.v. *Κέρκωψ*; Eustath. 1430.35, 1669.60, 1864.32; Ovid *Met.* 14.88–100.

[64] *Pap. Soc. Ital.* 1094, reprinted R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (2 vols, Oxford, 1949–53), I p. 165, οἱ δὲ λιθόλευστον ποιῆσαί [φασιν]; P.Oxy 1800 fr. 2 col.ii 11.49–51: πολλοὶ λίθοις αὐτὸν βάλλοντες κατὰ κρημνοῦ ἔωσαν.

[65] *Vita* W 134, 140, 142, G 134, 140.

[66] *Vitae* G and W 1 Perry; Nagy op. cit. (n. 47) 260, 279–88; Wiechers op. cit. (n. 17) 31–42.

[67] *Vitae* G and W 125–6; P.Oxy. 1800 fr. 2 col.ii 1.48, ἐπέσκωψεν; Nagy op. cit. (n. 47) 282–3, 288. The death of Aesop brings us close to the career of Cleisthenes, for according to the *Vitae* it was Aesop's reproach and subsequent death that was the cause of the First Sacred War, a war which in fact Cleisthenes orchestrated to gain control of the Delphic oracle. Griffin op. cit. (n. 1) 53; Forrest op. cit. (n. 6).

The more historical Sotades, '*kinaidologos*', like Thersites an exponent of sexual obloquy and scourge of kings in particular (most notably he abused Ptolemy Philadelphus' mistress Bilistiche, and his incestuous marriage to his sister Arsinoe II), similarly met a scapegoat's fate when dumped in the sea in a leaden vessel by Ptolemy's admiral Patroclus: εἰς μολυβῆν κεραμίδα ἐμβαλὼν καὶ ἀναγαγὼν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος κατεπόντωσε (Athen. 620f–621a; cf. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* [Oxford 1972], I 117–18, II 210 nn. 204–6). This recalls the fate of the Leucadian scapegoat (Strabo C452), and also demonstrates the similarity between *pharmakeia* and *ekthesis* (see below for *ekthesis* by sea).

Archilochus' sexual mockery has also been seen as verbal *pharmakeia* (Burnett op. cit. [n. 9] 87 on F154 West; Nagy op. cit. [n. 47] 243–52); it is therefore appropriate that he portrays himself as the son of a slave-woman *Enipo*, 'Abuse' (F295 West).

[68] For discussion of this pot, and possible interpretations of these figures (early comic figures? protosatyrs?), see S. P. Morris, *The black and white style* (New Haven, 1984), 59–62.

and Alopecus.[69] Three bizarrely deformed men hunt a hare. The two to the rear have legs and feet badly twisted inwards. The first hunter has sound legs, but a grossly distended arm, which reaches to the floor, though he walks upright; with his other, normal arm he hurls a stone at the hare. Behind the party gambols, as if a suitable companion, a crazy ape, its legs even more deformed and inwardly twisted than those of the hunters. Here again then is a stone-thrower, who himself, together with his companions, seems as well qualified to receive as to give *pharmakeia*.

## FURTHER ASPECTS OF THE PHARMAKEIA OF ADRASTUS

### *1. Cleisthenes and pollution*

The expulsion of the *pharmakoi* normally freed the community from the pollution that caused λιμός and λοιμός. Herodotus makes no actual mention of such pollution at Sicyon in the context of the proposed expulsion of Adrastus; this need not be significant, for Cleisthenes may have considered himself primarily to be freeing the Sicyonian community of the metaphorical pollution of Argiveness.

But there is circumstantial evidence that Cleisthenes may have been represented as arguing, that Adrastus was in some way genuinely polluted, for Cleisthenes was explicitly attributed with eagerness to expel the polluted in the episode of his accession. Nicolaus of Damascus (FGH 90 F61), drawing, probably, on Ephorus, tells that Cleisthenes worked his way to the throne by persuading his second eldest brother Isodamos to murder their eldest Myron, and then chasing the former from the throne and the city on the ground that he was polluted by the murder of Myron and therefore unfit to perform the sacrifices integral to kingship.

### *2. Adrastus as polluting corpse*

Cleisthenes could have argued that Adrastus was polluting simply as a corpse. Herodotus tells that the tyrant Pisistratus purified the island of Delos by digging up all the dead buried within sight of the temple and took them to another part of the island.[70] Unlike Cleisthenes' attempted purification, Pisistratus' was undertaken at the behest of Delphi. In 426, as a result of the plague, the Athenians continued the process begun by Pisistratus and removed altogether all the corpses from the island.[71]

It was ironic that Cleisthenes should attempt to dig up the bones of Adrastus of all men, for Adrastus was renowned for himself championing the burial of the dead. He fled to Athens and begged for help in burying the fallen members of the Seven against Thebes: μὴ περιορᾶν... ἀτάφους γιγνομένους (Isoc. *Paneg.* 55); σῶσον νεκρούς μοι... ὡς νεκροὺς θάψωσιν (Euripides *Suppl.* 168, 174).

### *3. The chest of Adrastus*

Adrastus may be associated with *pharmakeia* in another context. Ampelius (*Lib. Mem.* 8.5) tells of a chest of Adrastus that was on display at the temple of Apollo in Sicyon: *Sicyone in Achaia in foro aedis Apollinis est: in ea sunt posita... Adrasti arca, quam deposuit, in qua quid sit ignoratur.*[72] This chest may well have been one in which Adrastus was supposed to have been exposed as a baby. The *larnax* was a significant symbol of exposure, as is indicated by Hesychius' gloss of ἐκ λάρνακος by νόθος, and by the many myths in which unwanted children are abandoned in them (often at

[69] Op. cit. (n. 62).
[70] 1.64; Thuc. 3.104.
[71] Thuc. 1.8, 3.104, with N. S. R. Hornblower, *A commentary on Thucydides* (2 vols, Oxford, 1991– ) ad loc.; Diod. 12.58.6.
[72] Griffin op. cit. (n. 1) 17.

sea, together with their mothers, for whom the experience is rather an 'ordeal of chastity').[73] Adrastus' chest may have been akin to the '*larnax* of Cypselus' that Pausanias saw displayed at Olympia – the chest in which one tradition held that baby Cypselus had been concealed.[74] Cypselus' concealment has rightly been seen as a sort of exposure.[75] The cherished 'ignorance' of the contents of Adrastus' chest also suggests that it was an exposure vessel: the supposedly 'unknown' contents of the *kistai* carried by the little girls in the Athenian Arrhephoria are persuasively argued by Robertson and Brulé to have been believed to be the exposed child Erichthonius.[76] The existence then of a 'chest of Adrastus' implies the existence also of the myth of his exposure as a child. Exposure, at any rate in myth, is closely identified with *pharmakeia* (Oedipus is the obvious example of the identification: an exposed child who returns home bringing back his pollution, and then has to be expelled a second time as *pharmakos*).[77] Thus it is likely that Adrastus was a 'scapegoatable' figure at Sicyon, and this affords suitable context to Cleisthenes' action, and Delphi's response to it.

### *4. Adrastus in the Thebaid*

Possibly Adrastus exhibited aspects of the *pharmakos* in the *Thebaid*. Paus 8.25.8 tells that in the *Thebaid* *Ἄδραστος ἔφευγεν ἐκ Θηβῶν εἵματα λυγρὰ φέρων*. He thus seems to resemble Codrus in his flight from Athens as a scapegoat, dressed as a slave.[78]

### *5. A second Herodotean Adrastus*

Herodotus employs another, apparently unrelated character called Adrastus, a Phrygian, son of Gordias, son of Midas, in his tale of Croesus and Atys (1.34–45), but like Herodotus' Argive Adrastus, the Phrygian one is polluted and expelled: he is

[73] E.g. Danae and Perseus (Pherecydes FGH 3 F10); Auge and Telephus (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.7.4, 3.9.1; P.Mediol. 1, apud E. W. Handley and J. Rea, *The Telephus of Euripides* [BICS Supplement n. 5, London, 1957], 18, lines 5–6); Semele and Dionysus (Paus. 3.24.3); cf. G. Glotz, *Études sur l'antiquité grecque* (Paris, 1906) 69–97; M. Delcourt, *Stérilités mystérieuses et naissances maléfiques dans l'antiquité classique* (Liège and Paris, 1938) passim, esp. 37–43; J. Bremmer and N. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London, 1987), 26–30; G. Sissa, *Greek Virginity* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1990) 119–21 (trans. of *Le corps virginal* [Paris, 1987]); P. Brulé, *La fille d'Athènes* (Paris, 1987), esp. 132–5.

[74] Paus. 5.17.5–19.10. Despite what Pausanias says, the *kypsele* in which Herodotus has Cypselus concealed was not a *larnax*, but a ceramic beehive: G. Roux, 'Kypselé: où avait-on caché le petit Kypselos?' *REA* 65 (1963), 279–89.

[75] Vernant op. cit. (n. 17) 470 n. 30, adverting Plutarch's use of a technical term for exposure, *ἀποτεθέντα* (on which cf. P. Roussel, 'L'exposition des enfants à Sparte', *REA* [1943], 5–17) to describe Cypselus' concealment at *Mor.* 163f.

[76] N. Robertson, 'The Riddle of the Arrhephoria at Athens', *HSCP* 87 (1983), 241–78 explains that the myth in which the daughters of Cecrops were entrusted with a basket containing the earthborn infant Erichthonius and two guardian snakes (Apollod. 3.14.6; Callimachus *Hecale* F70 Hollis, etc.) was an aition for the Arrhephoria; cf. Brulé op. cit. (n. 73) 124–39. The secrecy of the contents of the *kistai* gave rise to a folk etymology of the name Arrhephoria: *ἐπειδὴ τὰ ἄρρητα ἐν κίσταις ἔφερον τῇι θεῶι αἱ παρθένοι* (Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 642); cf. Robertson op. cit. 248. For the similarity between the *larnax* and the *kiste* in the context of exposure, see Brulé op. cit. (n. 73) 124–30.

[77] For *ekthesis* as a subcategory of *pharmakeia*, see G. Glotz, *L'ordalie dans le Grèce primitive: étude de droit et de mythologie* (Paris, 1904); M. Delcourt, *Oedipe ou la légende du conquérant* (Paris and Liège, 1944), 29–35, op. cit. (n. 73) 50–66; Vernant op. cit. (n. 17) 127–8, 433 n. 87; Brulé op. cit. (n. 73) 124–39, esp. 132.

[78] Pherecydes FGH 3 F154; Hellanicus FGH 323a F23; Lycurg. *Leocr.* 84f.; cf. Burkert *Structure...* (n. 17) 62, 170n13.

polluted after inadvertently murdering his brother, and has been 'driven out'; he therefore comes to Croesus to be cleansed, but subsequently again kills accidentally.[79]

*6. Mockery*

We have seen the association between ridicule and *pharmakeia* in the cases of Thersites, Aesop and Archilochus: Herodotus says of Cleisthenes that he πλεῖστον κατεγέλασε τῶν Σικυωνίων in a measure associated with the attempted expulsion of Adrastus, the renaming of the Sicyonian tribes after pigs and asses.[80]

*7. Apollo*

It is particularly appropriate for the god of Delphi, Apollo, to make accusations of *pharmakeia*, for it is at his festival, the Thargelia, that *pharmakoi* are expelled (and it is Apollo indeed that sends *loimos*, as in the *Iliad* ad init.). Istros explained the fate of the eponymous Pharmakos in his 'Epiphanies of Apollo', which suggests that Apollo had a hand in his fate.[81] In the stoning of Aesop as a *pharmakos* Apollo is actually said to have taken part himself (Ἀπόλλωνος συνεργοῦντος).[82]

Thus the theme of *pharmakeia* can be traced elsewhere in the legend of Cleisthenes and the myth of Adrastus, and this fact lends further support to the theory that it is *pharmakeia* that is the subject of Herodotus' oracle.

*University College, Swansea* DANIEL OGDEN

[79] φονεύσας ... ἐξελαμένος (35); ἐκάθηρα (41); Δία καθάρσιον (44); φονεὺς ... τοῦ καθήραντος (45). How and Wells op. cit. (n. 6) at 1.35 note that both the Phrygian and the Argive Adrastus are victims of 'inevitable fate' (cf. Aesch. *PV* 936 for the goddess 'Adrasteia').

[80] 5.68. It is disputed whether Herodotus is right about the ridicule. For my immediate point it is enough that Herodotus should think an act of ridicule was the sort of thing Cleisthenes would have done. The renaming is considered insulting by Griffin op. cit. (n. 1) 51, but insult is denied by Bicknell op. cit. (n. 6) 198 (animals represent shield blazons); Macan op. cit. (n. 28) 210 and Jeffery op. cit. (n. 1) 164–5 (animals have local or religious significance); E. Will, *Doriens et Ioniens* (Paris, 1956), 42 is undecided.

[81] Harpocrat. s.v. φαρμακός = Istros FGH 334 F50; cf. also Suda s.v.; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin, 1932), 179–88; Wiechers op. cit. (n. 17) 33, 35.

[82] *Pap. Gol.* 122; Wiechers op. cit. (n. 17) 36.