

Charon of Lampsakos (cited by Athenaeus).¹³ The cup had appeared in art on the Chest of Kypselos at Olympia where Pausanias (v 18.3) saw Zeus giving a cup (kylix) and necklace to Alkmene. And in the sixth century Anaximander had called Alkmene's cup a skyphos, as imprecise a word as kylix.¹⁴ Charon says that the cup itself was still shown in Sparta.¹⁵ It seems likely that it was the fifth-century identification of the famous cup as a special variety of kantharos, the karchesion, that prompted, or was prompted by the representations of Herakles with his 'Sotadean' kantharos. It had been his mother's, and it showed him to be his father's (or fathers') son.

JOHN BOARDMAN

Lincoln College, Oxford

¹³ *FGrH* 31 F 16; 262 F 2.

¹⁴ *Ath.* 498c; *FGrH* 9 F 1.

¹⁵ Perhaps a Mycenaean gold or silver vessel like the gold stemless kantharos from Mycenae Shaft Grave IV (D. E. Strong, *Greek and Roman Gold and Silver Plate* [1966] 38 fig. 9 and cf. pl. 2b and 60, fig. 14a, a late Archaic silver cup).

Androtion F 6: τότε πρώτον

Androtion, *FGrH* 324 F 6, and Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 22, seem to differ about the date when ostracism was introduced in Athens. But the words τότε πρώτον in the text of Androtion have been attacked as unsatisfactory Greek. I hold that, on the contrary, they are perfectly acceptable and idiomatic.

For reference, I cite the text of Androtion, which is quoted in the lexicon of Harpocration, and of Aristotle.¹

Harpocration, s.v. Ἰππαρχος: . . . ἄλλος δέ ἐστιν Ἰππαρχος ὁ Χάρμου . . . περὶ δὲ τούτου Ἀνδροτίων ἐν τῇ β' φησὶν ὅτι συγγενὴς ἦν Πεισιστράτου τοῦ τυράννου καὶ πρῶτος ἐξωστρακίσθη, τοῦ περὶ τὸν ὄστρακισμὸν νόμου τότε πρῶτον τεθέντος διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν περὶ Πεισίστρατον, ὅτι δημαγωγὸς ὦν καὶ στρατηγὸς ἐτυράνησεν.

τότε πρῶτον PABG; τότε πρώτου QMKRVXZ Ald.; νόμου τὸ τεθέντος N; τοῦ . . . τεθέντος om. Ep.

Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 22.1: καινοῦς δ' ἄλλους (sc. νόμους) θεῖναι τὸν Κλεισθένη . . . ἐν οἷς ἐτέθη καὶ ὁ περὶ τοῦ ὄστρακισμοῦ νόμος.

22.3: τότε πρῶτον (488/7) ἐχρήσαντο τῷ νόμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸν ὄστρακισμὸν, ὃς ἐτέθη διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ὅτι Πεισίστρατος δημαγωγὸς καὶ στρατηγὸς ὦν τύραννος κατέστη. (4) καὶ πρῶτος ὠστρακίσθη Ἰππαρχος κτλ.

The chief modern attack on τότε πρώτον in the text of Androtion was launched by G. V. Sumner.² He objected

¹ For the apparatus to Harpocration I rely on J. Keaney, *Historia* xix (1970) 1.

² *BICS* xi (1964) 79–86. H. Bloch, *Gnomon* xxxi (1959) 493, also objected that 'the description of the law in Harpokration as "then given for the first time" is senseless'. Some critics also cite G. Kaibel, *Stil und Text der Pol.* *Ab.* (Berlin 1893) 174, as having condemned F 6 as an 'clendes Excerpt' from Aristotle; but Kaibel did not object to τότε πρώτον as meaningless, rather as lacking a chronological reference. Other criticisms of the text of F 6 are listed by Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* ii 884 n. 2, and by Jacoby, *FGrH* Suppl. ii 115 n. 7.

to the statement that 'Hipparchus was the first man to be ostracized, the law on ostracism having been passed τότε πρώτον'. For Sumner, τότε πρώτον ought to mark the beginning of a series of occasions or of a process of change or transformation. But in Androtion, τότε πρώτον does not refer to the beginning of a series of occasions on which a law on ostracism was passed (much less the beginning of a process of making such a law). Androtion's words had been confused through faulty condensation; the text of F 6 was corrupt. Accordingly—and this is the important conclusion—we have no evidence for the often-stated view that Aristotle and Androtion differed on the date of the law.³

John Keaney accepted Sumner's belief that τότε πρώτον does not make sense.⁴ Rudi Thomsen agreed that τότε πρώτον τεθέντος was meaningless and that we do not know what Androtion wrote.⁵

But three passages in Plato use these words with the meaning that they evidently have in the usual text of F 6, namely 'that was the moment when', 'only then', 'exactly then'.

a. *Parm.* 127c: Socrates and others attend a reading from the writings of Zeno, τότε γὰρ αὐτὰ πρῶτον ὑπ' ἐκείνων κομισθῆναι, 'for they (Zeno and Parmenides) had just then brought his works to Athens'. This was not the first of a series of occasions on which Zeno and Parmenides brought Zeno's writings to Athens.

b. *Tim.* 53b: The four elements are mentioned; οὕτω δὴ τότε πεφυκότα ταῦτα πρῶτον διεσχηματίσατο [ὁ θεός] εἶδει τε καὶ ἀριθμοῖς, 'only then did God mould them in shapes and numerical relationships'. God did this, as the aorist may also show, at some certain time—for the first time, indeed, because down to then the elements had not been so conformed; but this is not the first of a series of occasions on which God shaped the elements.

c. *Pol.* 271d: τότε γὰρ αὐτῆς πρῶτον τῆς κυκλήσεως ἤρχεν ἐπιμελούμενος ὁ θεός, 'God began at that moment to look after this entire revolution'; but this was not the first in a series of occasions when he began to do so: rather, the exact moment when he took this action.⁶

We might now look again at some of the passages that Sumner analysed. Thucydides (i 96.2) reports that, when the Delian League was founded, the office of the *Hellenotamiai* τότε πρῶτον Ἀθηναίους κατέστη ἀρχή, 'was then

³ Androtion in fact differed with the *communis opinio* in the fourth century: Philochorus (see Jacoby on 328 F 30) and Ephorus (in Diodorus xi 55) seem to have shared Aristotle's view, that the law was passed by Cleisthenes, presumably c. 508 (for we may pass over the attempts to bring Cleisthenes out of retirement, or back to life, in order to enable him to pass the law c. 488). K. J. Dover, *CR* xiii (1963) 256, produced another argument against the usual theory (*viz.* that Aristotle and Androtion disagreed). Dover shows that they *need not* have disagreed, although they may have done so: if Androtion, like Aristotle, wrote that the Athenians made Hipparchus the first victim of a law ὃς ἐτέθη διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν κτλ., Harpocration may not have realized that Androtion intended ἐτέθη to have a pluperfect meaning; and he may have paraphrased Androtion wrongly, making him say that the law was passed just at the time of Hipparchus' ostracism. If Dover's reconstruction is accepted, the responsibility for the phrase τότε πρῶτον τεθέντος (to which Dover made no objection) lies with Harpocration. I prefer, however, to accept that Harpocration quoted or paraphrased Androtion without distorting his meaning.

⁴ *Loc. cit.* (n. 1). Keaney discussed reactions to his article, *Historia* xxv (1976) 480–2.

⁵ *The Origin of Ostracism* (*Humanitas* iv: Copenhagen 1972) 51 ff.

⁶ It is worth noticing that words meaning 'first' in some other languages by no means always imply that an action or state of affairs will be repeated. *Cum primum ueni* means 'just as I arrived', and *Ich bin erst jetzt gekommen*, 'I've only just now got here'; compare *er ist erst zwanzig*, 'he's only twenty'.

established as an Athenian magistracy'. The office was established once only. Again, *Ath. Pol.* 41.2: Ion and his colleagues immigrated to Attica; 'then for the first time, τότε πρώτον, the Athenians were divided into the four tribes and established the tribal kings'. The division of people into the four tribes and the establishment of the kings took place once only, and at that exact moment.

But in these last two passages, as Sumner observes, the idea of continuity is also present. The *Hellenotamiai* were established in 478/7 (and *Hellenotamiai* continued to be appointed). The division of Athenians into tribes and the establishment of tribal kings happened, once, in the time of Ion (but successive generations took their places in the tribes and kings continued to exist). The same connotation of permanence can be found in the examples from Plato. Zeno and Parmenides had just then brought Zeno's writings to Athens (and they continued to be available). God imposed form on the elements (and they continued to exist in such a state; perhaps God kept on seeing to it that they retained their forms). God began, just at the specified time, to look after the revolution (and has never given up looking after it).

The combination of one action, fixed at a certain time, and the continuation of the result of that action, is obvious in Androtion F 6. Hipparchus was the first to be ostracized, the law having just then⁷ been passed (and it continued to be on the books as a law). Sumner is right in saying that this is not the first of a series of occasions on which such a law was passed, but τότε πρώτον need not imply any such series of occasions, as the examples from Plato show.

So far as concerns Greek idiom, then, τότε πρώτον is neither meaningless or senseless; it is normal Greek.⁸

MORTIMER CHAMBERS

University of California,
Los Angeles

⁷ I find unconvincing the attempt of Carcopino to interpret τότε as meaning 'in that general period': this weakens Androtion's purported words to the point of emptiness (*L'ostracisme athénien*² [Paris 1935] 25 ff.; revised by D. Kagan, *Hesperia* xxx [1961] 394).

⁸ Keaney, *Historia* xix (1970) 2, points out that τότε πρώτον are found only in manuscripts PABG of Harpocration; the archetype, according to his stemma, will have had τότε πρώτον, which is well and truly meaningless. Keaney supposes that τότε πρώτον is either a further corruption or a correction by three scribes. The latter is possible—but it is also possible that τότε πρώτον is the true reading, somehow transmitted, despite its absence from the archetype.

Archaic Greek Trade: Three Conjectures

1. The Diolkos

Not much attention is given to the *diolkos* across the Isthmus of Corinth, nor is much known about it. There are a dozen or so explicit or probable references to it in ancient literature,¹ one relevant inscription² and some remains of its track.³ The remains, principally at the west

A. M. Snodgrass kindly read my typescript and M. I. Finley and B. B. Shefton drafts of the second and third sections. I am grateful for their comments and especially those of Shefton, who did not agree with me.

¹ See *Corinth* i 50 n.1 and *RE* ix 2258–9: I assume their collections of references are fairly complete.

² *Corinth* viii 2, no. 1.

³ N. M. Verdels *Ath. Mitt.* lxxi (1956) 51–9 and lxxiii (1958) 140–5; *PAE* 1960, 136–43 and 1962, 48–50.

and close to the modern canal,⁴ are from a paved roadway with two parallel channels about 1.50 m apart, evidently to hold the wheels of some sort of carrier; and associated pottery and inscribed letters suggest that it was constructed in the late seventh or early sixth century B.C. The written references tell us that the eastern end of the *diolkos* was at Schoinos,⁵ that it was said to be 40 stades long,⁶ that warships were transported across the Isthmus in 412, 220, 217, 102 and 30 B.C.,⁷ that the *diolkos* was in use in the early period of the Roman Empire,⁸ and that some ships were too big for it:⁹ there is, though, no precise statement of the commercial use of the *diolkos*.

Yet transport of warships is not likely to have been the normal use of the *diolkos*: ancient historical writers were more interested in war than commerce, and warships cannot have needed transporting very frequently.¹⁰ Even then the *diolkos* was not always satisfactory: in 428 B.C. the Spartans could not move their ships across the Isthmus without first preparing δλκοί for them¹¹ and in 217 B.C. the larger warships were sent round Malea.¹² Further, Strabo and Pliny, writing in times of peace, imply that currently the *diolkos* was in regular service.¹² It seems then that its main use must have been for commerce.

The original purpose too is likely to have been commercial.¹⁴ If the *diolkos* was constructed around 600 B.C., when Corinth was governed by tyranny, it is hard to think of any defensive or offensive need for so big an undertaking. On its commercial value, though, one particular point is worth noting. Because of its location the *diolkos* could scarcely have served trade to and from the city area of Corinth: for freight coming from or going to

⁴ J. G. Frazer had previously reported remains of a 'tramway' on the east side of the Isthmus (*Pausanias's Description of Greece* iii 5): they have now, it seems, disappeared.

⁵ Pliny (*NH* iv 10) and Hesychius (s.v. 'Diolkos') seem to say that the *diolkos* was from Lechaem to Cenchreae; if so, they were wrong.

⁶ Strabo viii 335, though if this is meant as the direct distance across the Isthmus, the *diolkos* would have been rather longer.

⁷ Thuc. viii 7–8; Polyb. iv 19.77–9 and v 101.4; *Corinth* viii 2, no. 1; Dio Cass. li 5.2 Cf. Thuc. iii 15.1 (preparations in 428 B.C.). Though the *diolkos* is not mentioned, its use on these occasions is assumed generally and reasonably, since it existed earlier and was available later. On the other hand I do not think that the transport of warships across the Isthmus in 883 A.D. (Georgius Phrantzes i 33; in *Corp. Script. Hist. Byz.* xx, ed. Bekker) is likely to have been on the *diolkos*, since by then there had been too long a period of anarchy for a public utility of its kind to have remained serviceable (see also n. 8); still less do I believe G. F. Hertzberg's assertion, for which he gives no evidence, that small ships still used the *diolkos* in the twelfth century A.D. (*Gesch. der Byz.* 306).

⁸ Strabo viii 335, κατὰ τὸν διολκόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πορθμεῖα ὑπερνεωλοῦσαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑτέρας εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν θάλατταν. Pliny (*NH* iv 10) 'Lecheae hinc, Cenchræae illinc angustiarum termini, longo et ancipiti navium ambitu quas magnitudo plaustris transvehī prohibet'. Incidentally, use of the *diolkos* may have ended in 67 B.C.; first, its track is interrupted near its western end by the modern canal, which here was preceded by the cutting for Nero's canal (B. Gerster, *BCH* viii [1884] 225–32) and, secondly, a bridge over a 40–50 m cutting would have been impracticable nor was any trace of a diversion of the *diolkos* observed in the stretches on either side of the interruption, where—unless spoil heaps prevented it—one might expect a diversion to have started.

⁹ See n. 8. Pliny is unambiguous, and conceivably Strabo's πορθμεῖα were a particular kind of ship (cf. perhaps Hdt. vii 25).

¹⁰ The Latin inscription at Corinth (*Corinth* viii 2, no. 1) even describes the transport of a fleet in 102 B.C. as unprecedented.

¹¹ Thuc. iii 15.1. His δλκοί τῶν νεῶν must, I suppose, have been slipways, by analogy with Hdt. ii 54, where δλκοί τῶν νεῶν survived long after a site had been abandoned (cf. also Hdt. ii 159). This implies that the difficulty encountered by the Spartans was one of structure rather than equipment.

¹² Polyb. v 101.4; cf. *fr.* 162.

¹³ See n. 8.

¹⁴ Cf. C. Roebuck, *Hesp.* xli (1972) 127: he thinks the purpose commercial and fiscal.