

the Hephaestia] . . . knew nothing of musical contests'. On this basis, he rejected the contrary evidence of [Xenophon] *Ath. Pol.* iii 4 which specifically mentions the Hephaestia and Promethia in a list of five festivals to which choregoi were allotted.<sup>2</sup> He suggested that either the author of *Ath. Pol.* was mistaken, or an emendation of the text proposed by Kirchhoff should be accepted; the emendation inserts seven words into the text, and so switches the reference from choregoi to gymnasiarchs.<sup>3</sup>

This is, however, at least open to question. Granted that the inscription does not refer to choregoi or choruses in the surviving text, neither does it in fact preserve the word *γυμνασίαρχοι*, which has been restored on the basis of the letters *PXOI* and *XOI* in lines 20/1 and 37 respectively. The restoration is convincing, particularly in view of the full evidence for gymnastic contests at the Hephaestia set out by Davies, but it does not in any way exclude the possibility of a reference or references to choregoi which may have existed elsewhere, perhaps in the very fragmentary passage immediately before line 20; this is perhaps the more likely since line 16 preserves *τ]ε̄ς μουικε̄ς*. To turn to the *Ath. Pol.*, it seems to be doing unnecessary violence to the author to suggest that he has made a mistake here. Admittedly, he is not always precise on detail, but his is contemporary evidence, and it is hard to see why he should have selected the five festivals which he refers to from so many which were celebrated in Athens if it were not for the common element which he states they contain—choral events involving choregoi. The suggested emendation, elegant as the hypothetical *homoeoteleuton* is, is an even more drastic solution; the *Ath. Pol.* is a primary source, and the onus of proof rests firmly on those who wish to make a total alteration of meaning by emendation. Until definite evidence emerges to show that there was *not* some form of choral singing at the Hephaestia and Promethia, the text should be left alone, and the evidence accepted at its face value.

In fact, there is circumstantial evidence which suggests strongly that the *Ath. Pol.* is probably right here. The form of cult of Prometheus in Athens was that of a public hero cult, and ritual songs appear to have been an essential part of this type of cult: typical examples out of a large number are the tragic choral songs to Adrastus in Sicyon which Cleisthenes transferred to Melanippus (Hdt. v 67), and Euripides' account of the cult to be established to Hippolytus in Troezen (*Hipp.* 1423–30), where the choral songs are clearly a vital part.<sup>4</sup> If, then, choral songs had some

part in the cult of Prometheus, the same must be true for that of Hephaestus, since not merely does the *Ath. Pol.* refer to both festivals equally, but, as Davies pointed out, their cults were closely linked in Athens and the celebrations very similar.

Two conclusions follow from the arguments outlined above; the text of *Ath. Pol.* iii 4 should not be emended, and the minimum annual total of 97 liturgies demonstrated by Davies (*op. cit.* 40) must be increased by at least two, one choregos for each festival; there may have been more choregoi than this involved, but it is not possible to be sure in the absence of evidence as to what form the choral events at these two festivals took. The arguments above tend to support the interpretation of *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1138 as referring to choruses (rejected by Davies); that inscription implies a contest, probably on a tribal basis. For the two festivals, a minimum contest entails four choregoi, and a maximum on a tribal basis would be twenty.

JOHN M. MOORE

*The Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington, DC*

### Cimon, Skyros and 'Theseus' Bones'<sup>1</sup>

Thucydides reports the capture of Skyros 'next' (*ε̄πειτα*) after that of Eion under the generalship of Cimon, as the first events in his digression (*ε̄κβολή*) on the Pentekontaëtia.<sup>2</sup> Further details are added by Diodorus (presumably following Ephorus<sup>3</sup>) and Plutarch.<sup>4</sup> It is of some importance to try to determine the date of this event, of even greater importance to see it in correct perspective for Cimon's rising star and Themistocles' falling one.

The only specific indication of time we have is Plutarch's reference to an oracle 'given to the Athenians when they made an inquiry after the Persian Wars in the archonship of Phaidon' (i.e., 476/5 B.C.).<sup>5</sup> This has generally been taken to provide a date for the capture of Skyros, and the transference of the bones of Theseus to Athens, which Plutarch says followed it. But it is worth pointing out again, with Busolt, that Plutarch's words give a 'date' only for the oracle.<sup>6</sup> Diodorus dates the Skyros campaign (along with Eion before and the Eurymedon victory after) to the archonship of Demotion, 470/69, but his evidence is worth very little on a point of chronology such as this. It is clear that on the only worthwhile

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank J. D. Smart and W. G. Forrest for their friendly criticisms of an earlier draft of this paper; the aberrations that remain are my own.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. i 98.2.

<sup>3</sup> Diod. xi 60. 2; cf. P. Oxy. 1610, *frs.* 6–7 (cf. *fr.* 35).

<sup>4</sup> Plut. *Thes.* 36, *Cim.* 8.

<sup>5</sup> *Thes.* 36.1.

<sup>6</sup> *Griech. Gesch.* ii 1 (1897) 105–6 n. 2. Busolt himself suggested that the capture of Skyros may have occurred as late as 474/3 or 473/2 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> . . . χορηγοῖς διαδικάσαι εἰς Διονύσια καὶ Θαργήλια καὶ Παναθήναια καὶ Προμήθια καὶ Ἡφαίστια ὅσα ἔτη.

<sup>3</sup> . . . καὶ Παναθήναια <ὅσα ἔτη καὶ γυμνασιάρχους διαδικάσαι εἰς Παναθήναια> καὶ Προμήθια κτλ.

<sup>4</sup> v. Eitrem, in *PW* viii 1 126 for lamentations and dances in connection with early stages in the development of the cult of the dead (from which the hero cult developed its form), and Roscher, *Lexikon* i 2.2502 f for further references to hymns to heroes.

ancient evidence we have, Plutarch's, the Skyros episode need not be placed *in its entirety* in 476/5; the siege and capitulation can have come at any time after that, and Busolt's suggestion of 474 or 473 may well be correct.<sup>7</sup>

A lowering of the date of Skyros closer to 470 is satisfying, for Cimon's triumphal enshrinement of the national hero then gains added point as one of the last attacks against the popularity of his rival, Themistocles. For there can be little doubt that the steps in the undertaking were carefully planned, and the significance of its effect greatly magnified, by Cimon.<sup>8</sup> Why did the Athenians consult Delphi in the first place? Scholiasts on Aelius Aristides and Aristophanes make the conventional guesses,<sup>9</sup> but the sequence of events suggested by Plutarch at *Cim.* 8 seems quite different. It is difficult to know how much truth there may be to the story of Dolopian pirates, condemned by the Amphictyony to pay a fine, calling in Cimon and promising to turn the island over to him.<sup>10</sup> This may have been more of a pretext than a reason for Cimon's intervention; he may have selected the island on antecedent grounds as suitable for an Athenian cleruchy, which is specifically mentioned by Diodorus and confirmed by Thucydides.<sup>11</sup> The whole enterprise thus had a double effect: not only a new Athenian settlement, but the reputation for Cimon of having 'freed the Aegean' of pirates,<sup>12</sup> a claim which had also been made for (and perhaps by) Themistocles.<sup>13</sup>

A further obscurity surrounds the causal nexus

<sup>7</sup> J. D. Smart ('Kimon's Capture of Eion,' *JHS* lxxxvii [1967] 136-38) suggests that there were two versions of the archon list, and that the oracle and the expedition to Skyros are to be dated to 469/8; I am not quite convinced.

<sup>8</sup> This point is well brought out by J. Wells, *Studies in Herodotus* (Oxford, 1923) 133-35.

<sup>9</sup> Σ Ael. Arist. *ὑπ. τ. τεττ.* iii. p. 688 Dind. (λιμός); Σ Aristoph. *Plut.* 627 (λιμός και λοιμός) and apparently referred to the time immediately following the murder of Theseus by Lykomedes.

<sup>10</sup> The account is given with a suspicious fullness of detail by Plutarch (*Cim.* 8.1-2) who, at *Thes.* 36.1 refers to their 'unapproachability and savagery'. This may be *post factum* justification by the Amphictyons, glad to be rid of a troublesome branch of their own kinsmen. (Diodorus calls the inhabitants of Skyros 'Pelagians and Dolopians').

<sup>11</sup> κτίστην Ἀθηναίων καταστήσας κατεκληροῦχησε τὴν χώραν (Diod. xi 60.2); ᾧκισαν αὐτοί (Thuc. i 98.2, with Gomme's comment *ad loc.*: 'it became a true cleruchy of Athenian citizens, and did not pay tribute to the League'). E. M. Walker long ago noted that Skyros 'was a position of considerable strategical importance, lying as it did on the route to Thrace and the Hellespont' (*CAH* v 51). See also Wells, *Studies in Herodotus* 133.

<sup>12</sup> Plut. *Cim.* 8.5. (Was Cimon, by this exploit, posing as the 'new Theseus'?)

<sup>13</sup> Nepos, *Them.* 2.3.

between the two parts of *Cim.* 8, the pretext for intervention in Skyrian affairs of 8.3-4 and the story of the oracle regarding Theseus' bones of 8.5-7. Here a detail in Diodorus may be of help: Σκῦρον . . . ἐξεπολιόρκησε [*sc.* Κίμων],<sup>14</sup> and further light is shed by a notice in Pausanias:

Similar to the oracle about the bones of Orestes was the one afterwards given to the Athenians, that they were to bring back Theseus from Skyros to Athens; otherwise they could not take Skyros.<sup>15</sup>

The comparison with the incident of 'Orestes' bones', as told by Herodotus,<sup>16</sup> is instructive; can Cimon have had trouble taking Skyros and solicited a second oracle to supplement the earlier one of 476/5, one which would meet his own specifications as to where the 'bones of Theseus' were to be found? For one thing is immediately clear from Plutarch's two accounts of the oracle: Cimon's eager responsiveness to Delphi's injunction and his ingenuity in interpreting it:

πυρθανόμενος . . . ἐσπούδασε τὸν τάφον ἀνευρεῖν . . . τότε δὴ πολλῇ φιλοτιμίᾳ τοῦ σηκοῦ μῦξις ἐξευρεθέντος (*Cim.* 8.5-7).

φιλοτιμούμενος ἐξανευρεῖν (*Thes.* 36.2)

There is inscriptional evidence, too, for a thank-offering at Delphi from Athens and 'the allies,' for a victory won 'in response to an oracle'; the suggestion that this was for the Skyros victory is an attractive one.<sup>17</sup>

Plutarch's account at *Thes.* 36 is replete with the Herodotean riddling 'sign', the key which must be unlocked if the puzzle is to be solved: the eagle pecking and clawing at a mound, which Cimon 'divines', *θεῖα τῶι τύχῃ συμφρονήσας*. What he discovers is a skeleton of extraordinary proportions — suspiciously like 'Orestes'. Which of the stories influenced the other I should not venture to guess, but there must have been a good deal of 'embroidery' added to the circumstances of Theseus' discovery, which, if he did not foster, Cimon will not have been concerned to discourage. Plutarch also makes clear that enormous popularity accrued to Cimon from the exploit.<sup>18</sup> He was able to celebrate the deed as vengeance for Theseus' murder;<sup>19</sup> 'the Athenians joyfully welcomed [Theseus] with a magnificent procession and sacrifices as one who was

<sup>14</sup> Diod. xi 60.2.

<sup>15</sup> Paus. iii 3.7, trans. W. H. S. Jones (Loeb Classical Library); my italics.

<sup>16</sup> Hdt. i 67-8.

<sup>17</sup> W. G. Forrest, *Rev. Belge de Phil. et. d'Hist.* xxxiv (1956) 541-42 (I have had the benefit of examining a photograph of the stone and discussing it with Forrest who suggests that an analysis of letter-forms may yield a closer date).

<sup>18</sup> ἐφ' ᾧ και μάλιστα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἠδέως ὁ δῆμος ἔσχεν (*Cim.* 8.7).

<sup>19</sup> δίκην δὴ τοῦ Θησέως θανάτου Paus. i 17.6. This is also the suggestion of Ephorus' account, where, after Cimon's capture of Skyros in P. Oxy. 2610 *fr.* 6, Lycomedes is mentioned in *fr.* 7.

returning home to the city'.<sup>20</sup> Plutarch's account in *Thes.* 36 contains a discussion of the sacrifice to Theseus at the annual *Theseia* on the eighth day of Pyanepsion,<sup>21</sup> and mentions his sanctuary 'in the heart of the city near the present gymnasium', which the Agora excavators believe may lie to the south-east of the classical Agora. It was probably a building of generous proportions which will have been decorated by the leading artists of the day;<sup>22</sup> it was to become a favourite asylum of the oppressed.<sup>23</sup> It would be satisfying to be able to determine how much of the circumstantial detail surrounding Theseus' exile may have arisen from stories told at this time, as embellishments of the material in the traditional *Theseid*;<sup>24</sup> Theseus was said to have been 'falsely accused of (aiming at) tyranny and ostracized',<sup>25</sup> an anachronism which would have been peculiarly appropriate if supporters of the exiled and disgraced Themistocles had wished to turn Cimon's Theseian propaganda back against himself.

Cimon's motive in establishing and fostering a cult of Theseus is easily discerned. Plutarch mentions the story of the apparition of Theseus at the battle of Marathon 'in armour and leading on against the barbarians'.<sup>26</sup> Marathon was Miltiades' victory, as Salamis was Themistocles'.<sup>27</sup> Themistocles had solved the riddle of the 'wooden walls'; Cimon, *σοφία χρησάμενος καὶ οὐτός*,<sup>28</sup> had divined the Pythia's reference to 'Theseus' bones'. Marathon replaced Salamis as the victory against the Medes *par excellence* and Theseus (who, men said, had special links to the Philaids) was presented to the people as their substitute hero, whose political achievements were celebrated in the *Synoikia* and who was now being honoured by a new, more personal, festival of his

<sup>20</sup> Plut. *Thes.* 36.3.

<sup>21</sup> Jacoby gives a good deal of miscellaneous information, along with some speculation, about the festival at *FGrH* iii b. Suppl. i 207–209 (on Demon 327 F 6). I suggest that some of the material which Plutarch gives at *Thes.* 36.4–5 may also come from Demon (whom Plutarch mentions at *Thes.* 19.1 and to whom Jacoby assigns *Thes.* 23), along with Diodorus the Periegete, whom Plutarch cites (probably for the building).

<sup>22</sup> The paintings in the Theseion might have been by Polygnotus; see C. Robert, *Die Marathon schlacht in der Poikile* (Halle 1895) 46 ff.; A. Rumpf in *EAA* vi 294–95.

<sup>23</sup> Pherecrates, *Doulodidaskalos fr.* 49; Aristoph. *Eq.* 1312, *fr.* 567 (from *Hōrai*); cf. *frs.* 458, 459.

<sup>24</sup> On the epic *Theseid*, see now G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* (London 1969) chap. ix.

<sup>25</sup> The scholia on Aelius Aristides and Aristophanes mentioned above (note 9) are in practically *verbatim* agreement. <sup>26</sup> *Thes.* 35.8.

<sup>27</sup> See, in general, P. Amandry in *Θεωπία—Festschrift Schuchhardt* (Baden-Baden 1960) 6–8; W. G. Forrest, *CQ* n.s. x (1960) 237 n. 4.

<sup>28</sup> Paus. iii 3.7 (though the reference is not specifically to the oracle).

own.<sup>29</sup> Salamis and Themistocles, whose star had been for some time on the wane, were finally and firmly eclipsed.

The Skyros chapter in Cimon's career is not quite closed. If anything can be made of the garbled scholion on Aelius Aristides,<sup>30</sup> part of which reads, *κατηγορηθείς δὲ ὁ Κίμων ὑπὸ Περικλέους ἐπὶ Λανικῇ [Ἐλπωρικῇ?] τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ ἐπὶ Σκύρω τῇ νήσῳ, ὡς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προδομένου, ἐξεβλήθη*—if, that is, Σκύρω is not merely a slip for Θάσσω—Cimon's part in the capture of Skyros was turned against him (whether in 463 or 461 it seems impossible to be sure from the Scholiast's abbreviated reference) by Pericles.<sup>31</sup>

It is somewhat ironical that both Themistocles and Cimon were later to become Theseus-like heroes (how much truth there may be to these traditions is another matter). A Scholiast on Aristophanes tells the strange story of the Magnesians' refusal to surrender the bones of Themistocles, at the request of an Athenian embassy which had come 'when the Athenians were suffering from a plague, [since] the God (*sc.* of Delphi) had told them to "restore the bones of Themistocles"'.<sup>32</sup> At the end of his *Life of Cimon* Plutarch tells a matching story from Nausicrates of Kition: 'the people of Kition honour a certain "tomb" of Cimon . . . because in a time of *plague and famine*,<sup>33</sup> the God enjoined them "not to neglect Cimon, but to worship and reverence him as superhuman"'.<sup>34</sup> Neither of these stories is, I imagine, true, although, if a plausible context were to be suggested for the first, it might be the Great Plague of 430–29. Had the rehabilitation of Themistocles' memory (and we should recall here the eulogy of Thucydides' anonymous Athenian at i 74) already begun?

A. J. PODLECKI

*Pennsylvania State University/Wolfson College, Oxford*

<sup>29</sup> It may be significant that there appears to be some confusion in the scholion on Aristoph. *Plut.* 627 between the *Theseia* and *Synoikia*.

<sup>30</sup> Σ Ael. Arist. *ὑπ. τ. τεττ.* (iii p. 446 Dind.).

<sup>31</sup> Thuc. ii 15.

<sup>32</sup> Arist. *Eq.* 84 b (II) (Koster, *et al.*, *Scholia in Aristoph.* i 2, p. 31), tentatively ascribed by Jacoby to Possis of Magnesia (*FGrH* 480 F 1).

<sup>33</sup> This may be nothing more than an embellishment of the *λιμός* which followed Cimon's death at Kition (Thuc. i 112.4).

<sup>34</sup> Plut. *Cim.* 19 fin. (Nausicrates of Kition has generally, although not very plausibly, been identified with the fourth century rhetorician and pupil of Isocrates, Naucrates of Erythrae.)

#### Note on a Note

In *JHS* xc (1970) 196 f., Professor G. L. Huxley writes a column criticising what he takes to be a belief of mine, that seven-stringed lyres came in later than the seventh century B.C.; he says 'I hope that I do not misunderstand Dr West's contention'. I am sorry to say that I meant the opposite of what he supposes.

M. L. WEST