Journal of Hellenic Studies cvii (1987) 40–50

TRIBES, FESTIVALS AND PROCESSIONS; CIVIC CEREMONIAL AND POLITICAL MANIPULATION IN ARCHAIC GREECE

In memory of Gerald Else

IN recent years classicists and ancient historians have devoted renewed attention to the Archaic Age in Greece, the period from approximately the eighth century to the fifth century BC. Important articles, excavation reports and monographs, as well as books by Moses Finley, L. H. Jeffery, Oswyn Murray, Chester Starr and others, not to mention a recent volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, bear witness to the vigor of recent scholarship in this area.[1] Among many of these treatments of the period, moreover, is evident an increasing recognition of the close connection between social and economic developments and the political life of the Greek cities of the period. At the same time that this renewed interest in the Archaic Age has become so prominent in classical studies, a group of scholars working in more modern periods has developed a fresh approach to the role of ritual and ceremonial in civic life, especially during the European Middle Ages and Renaissance. Deeply influenced by cultural anthropology, they have found in the often surprisingly rich documentation about festivals, processions, charivaris etc. important insights into the societies in which these activities took place.[2] Classicists looking upon this movement may be inclined to undervalue its originality and perhaps its controversiality, pointing out that a serious interest in ancient festivals has long been prominent in classical scholarship and is well represented in recent books such as those by Mikalson, Parke and Simon and such older works as Martin Nilsson's frequently cited *Cults, myths, oracles and politics in ancient Greece* (Lund 1951).[3] Yet there is a great difference both in method and in results between the traditional approaches to ceremonial represented in the study of ancient Greece and those being developed in more recent fields.[4] That difference is reflected in Simon Price's comment on 'methodological individualists', that is on scholars who couch their explanations of events in terms of the beliefs and goals of individuals:

> methodological individualists can study only the organization of ritual by the elite and the exploitation of . . . ritual for propaganda purposes. That is, they draw a sharp distinction between

Thomas Figueira and several colleagues at Princeton helped improve earlier drafts of this article. The final version was completed while enjoying the hospitality of the Institute for Advanced Study.

[1] J. Boardman and N. G. L. Hammond (eds.), *CAH*[2] iii. 3 (Cambridge 1982), M. I. Finley, *Early Greece: the bronze and archaic ages* (New York 1970), R. J. Hopper, *The early Greeks* (New York 1976), L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (New York 1976), Oswyn Murray, *Early Greece* (Brighton 1980), A. M. Snodgrass, *Archaic Greece: The age of experiment* (London 1980), Chester Starr, *The economic and social growth of early Greece, 800–500 BC* (Oxford 1977). Among the older studies A. Heuss, *Antike und Abendland* (1946) 26–62 is especially important. See now his 'Von Anfang und Ende' *Gnomosyne* Festchrift W. Marg (Munich 1981) 1–31. Recent periodical literature is too extensive to mention but note W. G. Runciman, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* xxiv (1982) 351–77.

[2] See, for example, Robert Darnton, 'A bourgeois puts his world in order: the city as a text' *The great cat massacre* (New York 1985) 107–43; Natalie Z. Davis, *Past and Present* lix (1971) 41–75; Le Roy Ladurie, *Carnival in Romans*, trans. M. Feeney (New York 1979), Edward Muir, *Civic ritual in Renaissance Venice* (Princeton 1981), R. C. Trexler, *Public life in Renaissance Florence* (New York 1980) and 'Ritual behaviour in Renaissance Florence' *Medievalia & Humanistica* N.S. iv (1973) 125–44. Two essays in *The pursuit of holiness in late medieval and renaissance religion*, ed. C. Trinkaus and H. A. Oberman (Leiden 1974) are also helpful: Natalie Z. Davis, 'Some tasks and themes in the study of popular religion' 307–36, and R. C. Trexler, 'Ritual in Florence; adolescence and salvation in the Renaissance' 200–64. Among the works dealing with earlier periods Sabine MacCormack, *Art and ceremony in late antiquity* (Berkeley 1981) and Simon Price, *Rituals and power* (Cambridge 1984) are especially important. Many of these works rely on studies in symbolic anthropology, e.g. Clifford Geertz, *Interpretation of culture* (New York 1973).

[3] H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca 1977), E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica* (Madison 1983), J. D. Mikalson, *The sacred and civil calendar of the Athenian state* (Princeton 1975).

[4] See also Nilsson's 'Die Prozessionentypen im gr. Kult' *Jahrbuch des k. Archäolog. Institut* xxxi (1916) 309 ff. (reprinted in his *Opera Selecta* i 166–214).

symbolism and the 'real' world of individuals and they cannot treat ritual as an articulation of collective representations.[5]

Thus traditional approaches to ancient Greek ritual have emphasized the link between specific political movements or leaders and the development of cult and festival. They emphasize the distance between the leader and his followers, and the consequent 'manipulation' of myth and religion for propaganda purposes. Although M. I. Finley and others have pointed out the limitations of this approach, works outside the field of ancient Greek history continue to provide the clearest articulation of the advantages of a new approach to ritual and ceremony.[6] These works often see ceremony as part of the symbolic expression of civic concerns and as a difficult to read but ultimately eloquent text about the nature of civic life, as in Edward Muir's observations about Renaissance Venice:

> Civic rituals were commentaries on the city, its internal dynamics, and its relationship with the outside world. In commenting upon civic realities, the rituals illustrated an ideal arrangement of human relationships, created a homily that stimulated or altered some formal political and social ideas, and provided a medium for discourse among the constituent classes and the literate elite and the masses. Although civic rituals often served the rulers' interests they were not just propaganda and did not pass messages in only one direction.[7]

This emphasis on civic rituals as a means of communication, and especially on communication in two directions, derives from one of the central concerns of the newer scholarship on ceremonial, and is a major point of difference between this approach and that more familiar in the study of early Greece. This essay investigates the possibility of applying the newer approach to archaic Greece and thereby exploring the nature of political life and leadership, the role of propaganda, manipulation etc., and the significance of ritual festivals and ceremonial in civic life. Even a cursory study of the history of Archaic Greece points to the need for a closer examination of these issues. There is, for example, an apparent convergence between festivals and political disturbances. Cylon attempted his unfortunate coup at the time 'of the greatest festival of Zeus' (Thucydides i 126.4), although he perhaps misinterpreted the oracle which urged this timing upon him. Harmodius and Aristogiton carried out their plot against the Pisistratids at the time of the Great Panathenaea of 514. Recently Thomas Figueira has suggested that the principal periods of instability in the early sixth century in Athens coincide with the years of the Great Panathenaea.[8]

Clisthenes' career provides a further instance of the significance of civic ritual in political life, particularly when we bear in mind that the tribes which he created were not purely administrative conveniences. Each had as its namesake a traditional hero, and these in turn had their own myths and legends, most fully attested in the elaborate rendition in the sixtieth oration in the Demosthenic corpus. Cult places, shrines, treasuries, officials, meetings, communal meals on festival occasions are attested for many of the new Clisthenic tribes and may safely be presumed to have existed in all ten cases.[9] A monument with statues of the ten tribal heroes stood in a prominent place in the Athenian agora and served as a mustering place for the citizens and as a civic bulletin board. The tribes also competed with each other for the prestige conferred by the Athenian system of individual services to the state, especially in the choral competitions at

[5] Price (n. 2) 11.

[6] See M. I. Finley, *Politics in the ancient world* (Cambridge 1983) 95 f.

[7] Edward Muir (n. 2) 5. A similar approach has suggested that even the delivery of panegyrics on imperial occasions in late antiquity, often regarded as one of the most extreme examples of flattery and propaganda, is to be seen '. . . not merely as a method of making propaganda; it was also a token of legitimate rule and a form of popular consent, demonstrated by the presence of an audience' (MacCormack [n. 2] 9). The study of French festivals has shown their tendency to turn into protests, *trouble-fêtes*, and thereby communicate popular anger or demands. See C. Rearick, *Journal of Contemporary History* xii (1977) 437.

[8] Thomas Figueira, *Hesperia* liii (1984) 447–73. Note, however, that the events of 579/8 come in a year of preparation for the Panathenaea, rather than in the year of its celebration.

[9] See G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* xi (Munich 1926) 973–8, and M. Nilsson, *Cults, myths, oracles and politics* (Lund 1951) 30–7.

the Dionysia. The tribes also passed honorary decrees, awarded honorific crowns, and sponsored dinners for all members at the time of the Dionysiac and Panathenaic festivals.[10]

Perhaps the most productive topics for examination, however, come from earlier parts of the sixth century—Pisistratus' return to power in the 550s and Solon's establishment of a 'census' system in the preceding generation. These episodes provide an opportunity to test some of the approaches discussed above and to clarify the connection between ceremonial and civic life.

II

Pisistratus' return from his first exile in the 550s BC escorted in a chariot by a tall woman dressed as Athena has often produced perplexity and interpretive distress. Herodotus, again our earliest source, confesses his amazement at the apparent gullibility of the Athenians:

> . . . at last Megacles, wearied with the struggle, sent a herald to Pisistratus, with an offer to re-establish him. . . if he would marry his daughter. Pisistratus consented, and on these terms an agreement was concluded between the two, after which they proceeded to devise the mode of his restoration. And here the device on which they hit was the silliest to be found in all history, more especially considering that the Greeks have been from very ancient times distinguished from the barbarians by superior sagacity and freedom from foolish simpleness, and remembering that they contrived this for Athenians, who have the reputation of surpassing all other Greeks in cleverness. There was in the Paeanian district a woman named Phye, whose height was almost six feet, and who was altogether comely to look upon. This woman they clothed in complete armour, and, showing her the fashion in which she would appear most becoming, they placed her in a chariot and drove into the city. Heralds had been sent forward to precede her, and to make proclamation to this effect, 'Citizens of Athens, receive again Pisistratus with friendly minds. Athena, who of all men honours him the most, herself conducts him back to her own citadel.' This they proclaimed in all directions, and immediately the rumour spread through the country districts that Athena was bringing back Pisistratus. They of the city also, fully persuaded that the woman was the veritable goddess, worshipped her and received Pisistratus back.
>
> Herodotus i 60.2–5, trans. Rawlinson, with modifications.

Herodotus is greatly amused and somewhat perplexed by the episode, but he has no doubts that it took place. Modern scholarship commonly reverses the pattern. Many scholars deny its historicity; only a few deal with the interpretive problem posed by the procession. Most studies dismiss the reports of the procession as a 'legend' or as a story that 'even for Herodotus . . . [was] more than he could believe.'[11] Those who accept the story regularly treat it as manipulation of the masses by Pisistratus (or sometimes by Megacles) labelling it a 'charade' or 'propaganda blatant to the point of absurdity' etc.[12]

Only a small minority of scholars has accepted the episode as historic and attempted to read the messages implicit in it. But agreement has not been easy. Louis Gernet viewed the chariot as a symbol both of triumph and of marriage.[13] Pisistratus

> est le roi qui agrée la déesse du pays, et sa royauté est proclamée à l'occasion et par la vertu de son mariage. Pour la pensée mythique, les deux choses sont liées; et c'est la femme qu'on épose qui confere la royauté.[14]

[10] On the role of cults and ceremonial in Clisthenes' reforms see E. Kearns, 'Change and continuity in religious structures after Cleisthenes' *Crux* (Essays presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, 1985) 189–207.

[11] Among the other sources reporting the procession are: Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 14.4, Clidemus *FGrH* 323 F 15, Polyaenus *Strat.* i 21.1, Athen. xiii. 609; *cf.* J. B. Bury, *History of Greece*⁴, revised by R. Meiggs (New York 1975) 128, which treats it as a legend that Herodotus did not himself believe.

[12] See, for example, J. Boardman, *Revue archéologique* (1972) 62, Snodgrass (n. 1) 114, W. G. Moon 'The Paris Painter' in W. G. Moon (ed.), *Ancient Greek art and iconography* (Madison Wisc. 1983) 101 f.

[13] L. Gernet, 'Mariages des tyrans' *Eventail de l'histoire vivante, Hommage à L. Febvre* ii (Paris 1953) 52. The essay is reprinted in Gernet, *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique* (Paris 1968) 344–59, and is also included in the collection of Gernet's works translated by J. Hamilton and B. Nagy (Baltimore 1981).

[14] *Ibid.*

Was this, as Helmut Berve has explicitly suggested, part of a *hieros gamos*, a ritual re-enactment of divine fertility?[15] Surely there are marriage elements in the tale—later elaborated into the story that one of Pisistratus' sons married Phye.[16] But the notion of a ritual marriage between Pisistratus and the analogue of Athena, a perpetual virgin, gives other scholars pause. Athena is, after all, not elsewhere associated with such rites.

John Boardman has also attempted to interpret rather than simply dismiss the procession. Like Gernet he focusses on the procession by chariot but his analogies are drawn from art rather than fertility rituals. He notes that while before the period of Pisistratus' rule Athena was only occasionally depicted in chariots, 'later she is increasingly associated with them', especially in the company of Heracles.[17] He concludes that Pisistratus was, on this occasion as on others, associating himself with Heracles and hinting that his procession to the Acropolis was an analogue to Heracles' elevation to Olympus.[18] The procession then reflects a major theme in Pisistratid propaganda—the association of Pisistratus with Heracles. Boardman's discussion of the scenes showing Athena and Heracles is a useful reminder that the episode is far richer than his characterization of it as a 'charade' suggests. But it is precisely the identification of Pisistratus with Heracles that is missing in the story. Have our sources suppressed the most interesting detail of all—that Pisistratus donned a lion skin and club? Or did Pisistratus for some reason avoid making explicit the parallel between himself and Heracles? If so, why, and just what message was conveyed by the form of this procession?

Other scholars have turned to literary parallels. Gerald Else noted that the story echoed in some respects Athena's support for Odysseus. 'Surely it depends integrally upon the *Odyssey* and upon the *Odyssey* being well known to the whole population of Athens at the time.'[19] The closest Homeric analogue, however, is *Iliad* v, as Stein long ago pointed out in his commentary on Herodotus (i 60). In this passage Athena elbowed Sthenelos aside, entered the chariot next to Diomedes ' and drove the horses hard and straight at Ares' (trans. R. Fitzgerald). Athetized lines follow saying that the 'dread goddess led on the man who was the bravest'. But Else's essential point is well taken. The ceremony calls to mind many stories of Athena's willingness to become involved with human favorites—Odysseus, Diomedes, Heracles and now Pisistratus.

All these explications of the ceremony have something to commend them, even if none seems precisely right. They pose, moreover, rather sharply the more general interpretive problem of how one explicates, or 'reads', a ceremony of this sort. Surely we are not forced to choose a single model for the procession. Elements from marriage processions, epic interventions, arrival ceremonies, parades celebrating athletic or military victories, myths, rituals and legends may all be present simultaneously.[20] No single 'explanation', no minimalist aetiology, can catch the richness and multivalence of the event. But in determining which elements are most revealing about the ceremony it is important to look not only at the similarities but also to try to understand the contrasts between the ceremony and other patterns within the culture. As in literary criticism, a powerful interpretation will be recognized not by precise parallelism in all elements but by its ability to make sense of both similarities and differences.

It is important then to look widely at the elements present in such a ceremony. The list may be a long one. The procession, for example, acts out a verbal pattern of praise in which a young woman is likened to a goddess. The pattern of praise goes back to the earliest Greek literature, for example, Odysseus' smooth words to Nausicaa when, branch in hand, he first meets her:

[15] H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Munich 1967) 545, paraphrasing and expanding on Gernet.

[16] Clidemus *FGrH* 323 F 15. On the problems in chronology see J. K. Davies *Athenian propertied families* (Oxford 1971) 450–5.

[17] Boardman (n. 12) 60 f.

[18] For an important challenge to Boardman's views see Moon (n. 12) 97–118; R. M. Cook, below pp. 167–9.

[19] G. F. Else, *Hermes* lxxxv (1957) 36 f.

[20] On the possibility that the arrival ceremonies of late antiquity have an origin in much earlier phases of Greek civilization see MacCormack (n. 2) 19 ff. and 281 n. 14.

Mistress: please: are you divine, or mortal?
If one of those who dwell in the wide heaven,
you are most near to Artemis, I should say—
great Zeus' daughter—in your grace and presence.
If you are one of earth's inhabitants,
how blest your father, and your gentle mother,
blest all your kin.

Odyssey vi 149–155, trans. R. Fitzgerald

But this is not merely a pattern of verbal praise. In processions the formula can actually be acted out, as can be seen in the much later novelistic account by Xenophon of Ephesus of a procession in honour of Artemis. The heroine of his *Ephesian Tale*, Anthia, is introduced dressed as Artemis in a procession where all can behold her beauty:

> The girls in the procession were all decked out as if to meet lovers. Of the band of maidens the leader was Anthia . . . a prodigy of loveliness [who] far surpassed the other maidens. Her age was fourteen, and she had bloomed into mature shapeliness . . . Her eyes were lively, shining sometimes like a girl's and sometimes severe as of a chaste goddess. Her dress was a frock of purple . . Her wrap was a fawn skin, and a quiver hung down from her shoulder. She carried bow and javelins and dogs followed at her heels. Time and again when the Ephesians saw her in the sacred procession they bowed down as to Artemis. And now too when Anthia came into view the entire multitude cried out in astonishment; some of the spectators asserted that she was the very goddess, others declared she was a replica fashioned by the goddess. But all did obeisance to her and bowed down and called her parents blessed.[21]

These parallels to the chariot ride with Phye help elucidate the likely relationship between those in the procession and the surrounding crowds. The on-lookers are not deluded by the similarity between Anthia's dress and the conventions for representing Artemis. They know perfectly well this girl is a human but they delight in her beauty and express that delight by their responses. The populace joins in a shared drama, not foolishly, duped by some manipulator, but playfully, participating in a cultural pattern they all share. We may assume that a similar situation existed when Pisistratus and Phye processed. The crowds might have chosen to express coolness, disinterest or downright hostility. Instead it appears that they delighted in the shared drama and let their enthusiasm be known. The ceremony thus served as an expression of popular consent—two-way communication, not, as so often assumed, mere manipulation.[22]

But there is more to be gleaned from this analogy. The pattern of ceremonial appearance in the guise of a god is not restricted to females. Xenophon says that Anthia's lover-to-be, Habrocomes, also brought thoughts of divinity to mind when he marched among the *ephebes* in the procession:

> The people gazed at him, were smitten by the sight, and cried out, 'Habrocomes is beautiful!' 'None is so fair!' 'He is the image of a beautiful god![23]

[21] Xenophon of Ephesus *An Ephesian tale* i 2.2. f. trans. Moses Hadas. The description is paralleled in other novels, e.g. Heliodorus iii 4.

[22] The other side of manipulation is flattery, and this is the common interpretation of the Athenians' response to another famous ceremonial arrival, that of Demetrius Poliorcetes at Athens. One would like to know much more about this occasion, e.g. how Demetrius dressed etc., but the close association between himself and Athena is evident in the stories in Plut. (*Demetr.* 10–12) about his conduct in Athens. See also A. D. Nock, 'SUNNAOS THEOS' *HSCP* xli (1930), reprinted in *Essays on religion and the ancient world* i ed. Z. Stewart (Cambridge Mass. 1972) 202–51, esp. 204, and Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum*² (Munich 1970) 232 f.

[23] Xen. *Ephesian tale* i 2.8, trans. M. Hadas. The passage raises the important question whether the formula *male name in nominative + kalos* ('X is beautiful'), so common on Greek vase painting, may sometimes reflect acclamation and community consensus rather than purely individual erotic attachments. Note, for example, the scene on the psykter in the Metropolitan Museum 10.210.18 (*c.* 520–10 BC) on which the boy Epainetos is being presented with garlands and *tainiai*. Next to him is the inscription *kalos*. (On Epainetos *cf.* the *halter* found at Eleusis, *IG* i² 802). This inscription seems likely to reflect an acclamation at or on returning from the games, analogous to *kallinikos*. *Cf.* Pi. *Ol.* 9.1 ff.

There is no reason to think that Habrocomes adopted a special dress to make himself resemble a god. But we know that some Greeks who enjoyed special success or claimed special powers dressed from time to time as divinities, perhaps thereby drawing on exceptional sources of psychic energy, expressing their gratitude for divine support, or making clear to all the role and status they claimed for themselves.[24] The use of divine dress both by men and women on cult occasions is well attested.[25] Chresmologoi and other claimants to exceptional wisdom—Pythagoras, Empedocles, Hippias and Gorgias—are said to have appeared in exotic, perhaps god-like, garb, as did Menecrates, the healer at Syracuse.[26] Nikostratos of Argos, Milo of Croton, Dionysius I of Syracuse are all said to have dressed as a divinity at some point in their careers.[57] The historian Ephippus claimed that Alexander the Great put on the horns of Ammon and at other times appeared as Artemis, Hermes and Heracles—he was certainly represented as Heracles from time to time.[28] There are, of course, Hellenistic and Roman analogues, perhaps the best known of which concern Marc Antony and Cleopatra.[29]

But although there was a cultural pattern among the Greeks of dressing as a divinity on certain ceremonial occasions, Pisistratus did not use it. Similarly, although there *are* similarities between this procession and the representations in the visual arts of Athena and Heracles in a chariot, Pisistratus avoided representing himself as Heracles.[30] His message is much more restrained: he comes back accompanied by Athena, honored and approved by her, but as a human being not a superman or god-to-be. He is her associate and her assistant, but a fully human one.

This restraint is all the more striking if we may accept a detail reported in both the *Athenaion Politeia* (14.4) and Clidemus' *Atthis* I (*FGrH* 323 F 15): Pisistratus drove the chariot and Phye was the *parabates*. This is often interpreted to mean simply that Phye was 'standing at his side'. But the Greek is stronger and perhaps more technical. The *parabates* or *apobates* was a person who in certain festivals leaped from the chariot in full armor and nimbly back again.[31] Athena is represented this way in art from time to time, perhaps in reflection of her original arrival in Athens at the time of the contest with Poseidon.[32] The Panathenaic and Eleusinian festivals included contests of this sort.[33] Walter Burkert has detected a ritual of kingship underlying this performance, whereby a new king seizes the kingship and sets himself within a complex context of deeply rooted Athenian myths and rituals.[34]

Surely there can be something very special in the ritual descent from a chariot, as the arrival

[24] See O. Weinreich, *Menekrates Zeus und Salmoneus* (Stuttgart 1933) and E. Wunderlich, *Die Bedeutung der roten Farbe . . . , RGVV*, xx 1.

[25] Paus. iv 27, vii 18.7. F. Back, *de Graecorum ceremoniis* (Berlin 1883) and W. Burkert, *Greek religion* trans. J. Raffan (Cambridge Mass. 1985) 97, 100, 186, 279.

[26] Hdt. I 62.4, Ael. *V.H.* xii 32, Empedocles *VS* 31 B 112. On Menecrates see Athen. vii 289 a–c and the parallel passages cited in Weinreich (n. 24) 92.

[27] Nikostratos: Diod. xvi. 44.2 f; Menekrates: Athen. vii 289 a–c and the parallel passages cited by Weinreich (n. 31) 92; Dionysius I: Dio Chrys. *Or.* 37.21 (as emended by Casaubon); Milo of Croton: Diod. xii 9.6. The prominence of Western Greek settings for these stories may be significant. The appearances may in part be modelled on the ritual of the Great Oath described in Plut. *Dion* 56.

[28] Ephippus (*FGrH* 126 F 5) apud Athen. 537 d ff. On the passage see A. B. Bosworth, *JHS* c (1980) 8.

[29] Plut. *Ant.* 24 and 26. On Roman examples see especially F. Drexel, *PhW* xlvi (1926) 157–60, and A. Alföldi, *Mitt. d.A.I. Rom* xlix (1934) 1–118.

[30] See M. B. Moore, *AJA* xl (1986) 35–9.

[31] See Dion. Hal. *A.R.* vii 73, especially sec. 3 where he discusses the relationship between the terms *apobates* and *parabates*. The practice seems concentrated in Attica and Boeotia and a few other areas: See Harpocration s.v. 'apobates', and F. Brommer, *Der Parthenonfries* (Mainz 1977) 221 f. In Thebes the practice gave a name to the military élite, the Heniochoi and Parabatai: Diod. xii 70 and M. Detienne, 'La phalange' in J. P. Vernant (ed.) *Problèmes de la guerre* (Paris 1968) 134 f. Perhaps Herodotus' observation that Megacles and Pisistratus showed Phye 'the fashion in which she would appear most becoming' masks instruction given her in the art of leaping in and out of the chariot.

[32] On the representation of Athena in the west pediment of the Parthenon see J. Binder, 'The 'West Pediment of the Parthenon: Poseidon' *Studies . . . S. Dow* (Durham N. C. 1984) 15–22.

[33] Cf. *Il.* v 837. Artistic representations of the activity include the Parthenon Frieze, see Brommer (n. 31) 221 f. On the *parabates*' role in the Eleusinia see A. Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen* (Leipzig 1898) 188 n. 4; in the Panathenaea, Mommsen *Feste* 89–92, Plut. *Phoc.* 20. See also H. A. Thompson, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* lxxvi (1961) 228 (and fig. 4) and Simon (n. 3) 62.

[34] W. Burkert, *Hermes* xciv (1966) 24 f.; *cf.* his *Greek religion* 232 f.

of Demetrius Poliorcetes in Athens reminds us. When he arrived in the city the Athenians dedicated an altar to Demetrius *katabates* on the spot where he first stepped down.[35] But Pisistratus' procession reverses the expected pattern. Not Pisistratus but Phye acts as the *parabates*. The reversal is eloquent, perhaps even programmatic.[36] Pisistratus is not seizing the kingship but serving as the subordinate and helper of Athena. He is not claiming to be Heracles, or a monarch, but Athena's attendant, a brave but subordinate charioteer, and thereby the agent of the true protector and ruler of the land, Athena.[37]

The reversal of an ancient kingship ritual which may be suspected in this procession, corresponds to another reversal closer to the surface of recent events. In the recently expanded Panathenaic festival the citizens of Athens processed, some by chariot, many with spear and shield (Thuc. vi 58), to honor Athena at her shrine on the Acropolis.[38] In the procession under investigation Phye, representing Athena, is armed and moves through the citizenry to her citadel and sanctuary.[39] Like the exiled Pisistratus, she too has been away from Athens. The reversal of the festival pattern may then hint that under the previous regime the goddess had been offended and withdrawn from the Acropolis, but was now returning to her proper place and traditional role as Athens' protector.

As one looks more closely at the procession of Pisistratus and Phye it appears constantly richer and more evocative of underlying cultural patterns and more eloquent as an expression of the closeness between Pisistratus and the residents of Attica at this point in his career. The leader seems not to stand at a great distance from the attitudes and the behaviour of his fellow countrymen. Rather both appear to be linked by shared patterns of thought and united in a communal drama. The citizens are not naive bumpkins taken in by the leader's manipulation, but participants in a theatricality whose rules and roles they understand and enjoy. These are alert, even sophisticated, actors in a ritual drama affirming the establishment of a new civic order, and a renewed rapport among people, leader and protecting divinity.

The episode, attested by relatively early and reliable authorities, cannot then be dismissed as a fabrication of ancient story tellers or as mere manipulation by a cynical politician.[40] Its rich symbolism evokes patterns deeply rooted within the culture. Why then has it produced such scepticism and interpretive difficulty? Part of the answer may be our reluctance to enter into the playful and mimetic mentality of what Gerald Else has called 'the histrionic period' of Greek history.[41] We are not, however, alone in our difficulties. Even Herodotus, our earliest source, reports it with a mixture of amusement and puzzlement. He perhaps underestimates the popularity of Pisistratus, and the spontaneity and enthusiasm for his return. He may also be

[35] Plut. *Demetr.* 10. There was also an altar of Zeus Kataibates in the Academy: Scholia Soph. *OC* 705 = Apollodorus *FGrH* 244 F 120. See Burkert (n. 25) 126. The moment of descent from the chariot is often the crucial one. Hence one must be very cautious in interpreting vase scenes showing Athena (or other figures) with one foot in a chariot and another out. These are often construed as representations of the start of a journey, but in some cases, e.g. the Elvehjen Museum hydria described by Moon (n. 12) 98, the scene may actually be another way of representing the arrival of Heracles and Athena at Olympus. Note the presence of Hebe, and the motion of Hermes to check the forward movement of the horses—both suggestive of the completion of the journey.

[36] In a less elaborate fashion the ceremony serves one of the functions that Muir (n. 2) 187 detects in some Renaissance ceremonies: 'In Renaissance Europe ceremonies were in broadest terms an expression of the world order and more narrowly a formulation of political rules that usually appeared in written theory much later. Civic ceremonies thus provided a continuous discourse in the constitutional order.'

[37] I see no hint of impiety as has sometimes been suspected, e.g. by Moon (n. 12) 101.

[38] There may be a further echo of the Panathenaea in the presence of those crowned with the *thallos* in Polyaenus' account of the Phye episode (i 21.1) and the *thallophoroi* of the Panathenaea (Mommsen *Feste* 102 n. 4).

[39] On the appearance of a priestess of Athena dressed as the goddess in full armor see Polyaenus viii 59.

[40] *Cf.* the remarks of Nicole Loraux on the myth of Attic autochthony in *Annales: E.S.C.* xxxiv 1 (1979) 19 f.: '. . . soucieux de décrire les multiples manipulations dont le mythe est l'objet dans le monde des cités, les historiens de la Grèce ont trop souvent réduit ce qu'ils appellent sa "fonction politique" à celle, purement instrumentale, de support inerte et malléable, au service de toutes les propagandes . . . '.

[41] Else (n. 19) 36. On the dramatic element in processions during Venetian festivals see Muir (n. 2) 141 f.

carried away by his amusement that the Athenians, who in his day made pretensions to the greatest urbanity and sophistication, acted so differently in an earlier period. His story builds to a climax as he shows that it was not only the country-dwellers who were involved but the residents of the town themselves. But the story simultaneously attests Herodotus' perplexity at the great change in the style of Athenian politics from Pisistratus' time to his own.[42] Yet his reporting of episodes such as this attests his familiarity with older traditions and his ability in transmitting them. It challenges us to attempt to attune ourselves to the Archaic Greeks, even as it underlines the difficulties that confront any such effort.

III

Our third case study concerns a problem central to the agrarian reform achieved by Solon in the early sixth century BC. Solon established, as is well known, a new basis for political privileges and prerogatives within his city, by substituting wealth for birth as the principal criterion. Citizens were classified into four groups, determined by the number of units of agricultural production each year. Those with 500 such units, the *pentekosiomedimnoi*, constituted the highest class and enjoyed the widest range of political privileges. Those with 300 or more were classifed as 'knights', with somewhat reduced privileges, and so on, down to the fourth class, the *thetes*, with very restricted prerogatives.

This much is clear. Far less evident is the way wealth was assessed and the classification determined. The one serious attempt to deal with these questions, by K. M. T. Chrimes in *Classical Review* for 1931, posited an elaborate census—a sensible way of handling the problem, but one without good parallels from Greece of this period. It seems most unlikely that the Attic state in Archaic times possessed a mechanism of assessment and enforcement of such complexity.

There is a further difficulty with the conventional view of the Solonian system of classification, clearly set forth by A. Andrewes in the new *Cambridge Ancient History*:

> . . . the base was the dry measure, *medimnos*. Wheat and barley, however, differed in value and *Athenaion Politeia* 7.4 says that dry and wet measures . . . were to be taken together, a more serious disparity in that the standard wet measure (*metretes*) of oil was worth a good deal more than a *medimnos* of any produce, and a measure of wine had another value. A tariff of equivalents for the *medimnos* of wheat is not in principle impossible, but there is no trace of any such arrangement. . . [43]

The classification of those whose wealth was based in significant part on the production of salt, honey, or from the wool, meat and milk products from flocks of sheep or goats, or from fishing, or services such as hauling, quarrying, carpentry, or blacksmithing must have been even more troublesome. I omit entirely the question of income derived from manufacturing or trade, a controversial subject at this point in the study of the Attic economy, and one made more difficult by the belief that the Solonian classification system is itself evidence that there was little trade or manufacturing in Solon's time.

The Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* (7.3) indicates that the classification system was not an invention of Solon's but had in some form already existed: 'he divided the people into four property classes according to wealth, *as had been done before*.'[44] Where in the Athenian system would such a classification have existed, and why would it have made sense to Solon to adopt it

[42] In Pericles' day it is hard to imagine a similar event (pace Frontinus *Strategemata* i 11.10) but the leader might allow a more subtle artistic analogue: the representation of his likeness on the shield of the Athena Parthenos (Plut. *Per.* 31).

[43] A. Andrewes *CAH*² iii, 3.385. The equivalencies in Plut. *Sol.* 23.3 imply an economy making extensive use of coinage, hence considerably later than Solon's time.

[44] *Cf.* Plut. *Sol.* 18. This statement may be an allusion to the 'Constitution of Draco' in ch. 4 of the *Ath. Pol.*, as C. Hignett, *History of the Athenian constitution* (Oxford 1952) 99 f. suggested. See also R. Sealey, *Hist.* ix (1960) 161, and P. J. Rhodes' commentary on the *Ath. Pol.* 7.3.

for his new political schema? The efforts to find an occasion where a legal or constitutional schema of this sort would have arisen have not been successful.[45] But the use of *medimnoi* may provide a clue: the other place where *medimnoi* of grain figure prominently in Athenian civic life are the first-fruit offerings presented in agricultural festivals.[46] The number of *medimnoi* of agricultural produce determines the amount of offering to the divinity, and one's relative position among those making the offering. Thus a person who had enjoyed divine favor resulting in at least 500 *medimnoi* of production would be expected to present the divinity with an offering of the various types of produce reflecting his gratitude for the blessings enjoyed. Presumably he would then rank among the first citizens in his contribution, and take a prominent place in the procession presenting the offerings. Citizens of such prominence are likely to have driven chariots and hence may be identified with *heniochoi* attested in some late sources as rich Athenian citizens who maintained chariots.[47] Their close association with Athena is reflected in her representation as a chariot driver.[48] If this suggestion is correct the Pentekosiomedimnoi in the early Archaic period would drive their chariots in the festival procession; the Hippeis would ride horses; the Zeugitae would march.

The advantages of using such a system for the new political arrangements introduced by Solon were considerable. It was familiar, adaptable and self-enforcing. The major innovation of the Solonian system would be legitimized by the use of a pattern sanctioned by long custom and religious usage. The public display of the first-fruit offerings would provide a control on those who might otherwise exaggerate their wealth and claim a disproportionate role in society. In a relatively small community in which status was carefully watched and jealously guarded social pressure would provide effective enforcement.[49] Even much later in Attica inappropriate participation in a festival might become a cause célèbre calling for immediate action.[50] In an earlier period less formal action is perhaps more likely—expressions of scorn, derision or even outright threats.

At the same time this arrangement could respond to public attitudes about various types of wealth. Grain producers were of course the standard setters. But lavish contributions of purchased grain by the producers of grapes, olive oil, or perhaps even by traders and manufacturers might win the donors a place among the *pentekosiomedimnoi*, if public sentiment were favorable. The state would not be forced to develop an elaborate tariff of equivalencies, any more than it would need to conduct a formal census. Although the system might eventually be formalized and codified, there was no need at the outset to give the various classes 'a precise meaning defined by law'.[51] Social pressure would suffice.

The Solonian system of political classification is likely then to depend not upon a Roman-style census or a Byzantine-like bureaucracy, but upon a characteristic pattern of Archaic Greek civic life, the festival with its parade and offerings.[52] Solon need have done little more than

[45] *Cf.* Hignett (n. 44) 99f.

[46] See, for example, the Eleusinian first-fruits decree of the fifth century BC, *IG* i³ 78. This decree specified a minimum contribution of a *hekteus* from every *medimnos* for the offering to Demeter and Kore.

[47] Photius *Lexicon* s.v. 'heniochoi', Aelius Dionysius fr. 196 (Schwabe) *apud* Eustathius 576.44 on *Il.* E 505 (ii p. 136, line 22 ff., van der Valk). On the Heniochos of Pallas as a civic official see *IG* ii/iii² 2245, 299 and W. Burkert *Zeitschrift für Rel. u.G. geschichte* xxii (1970) 358 n. 8. On Heniochides as a personal name see *PA* 6427 ff. See also n. 31 above.

[48] Ar. *Nu.* 602; *cf.* Eur. *Hec.* 467.

[49] Note the treatment of social outcasts reported in Plut. *Mor.* 538 a, and Aelian fr. 245.

[50] Isaeus vi 50.

[51] A. Andrewes in *CAH*² iii. 3 385.

[52] Which festival? Since grain production seems so central, one expects a major festival with an offering procession, occurring not far from the time of the grain harvest—roughly the end of June. (For the date of the wheat harvest see P. Deane, *Thucydides' dates* [Don Mills, Ont. 1972], Appendix, p. 135.) The Thargelia is perhaps not impossible: see Hesychius s.v., but an early form of the Panathenaea is perhaps more attractive. This may have included first-fruit offerings (see Mommsen [n. 33] 57 f.) especially before the Eleusinian festivals were fully developed and integrated into the state festival cycle. Note Hdt v. 82f. and Mommsen's discussions of the passage, *Feste* 147 and 156 n. 1. On Athena as a goddess associated with the fertility of grain see L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek states* i (Oxford 1896) 289–93. On the date of the incorporation of the Eleusinian festivals see J. Boardman, *RA* (1972) 52 f., and *JHS* xcv (1975) 1 f.

utilize a festival pattern that antedated his form and extend it to the political privileges as allocated in his new system.

Along with privileges, of course, went responsibilities, especially military ones. The hypothesis that the Solonian system utilized a festival procession can thus help with a further problem in the interpretation of the Solonian reforms. It has often been questioned whether the system was essentially a political classification or whether military considerations were paramount.[53] But many such festivals combine several kinds of display: individual status, civic order and affluence, and military strength. The procession in such festivals showed an individual's affluence and status in the community, and also reflected his military obligation to that community. The procession in honour of Artemis Amarynthia at Eretria, for example, was described on an inscription reported by Strabo: 'they are said to have made their festival procession with three thousand heavy-armed soldiers, six hundred horsemen, and sixty chariots.'[54] Likewise Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*A.R.* vii 71–2) described a Roman festival based on Greek models in which young Romans whose fathers had the assessments of knights rode on horseback, and those who were to fight on foot marched on foot in the parade, etc. The festival procession then becomes a reflection of divine favour, social status, military obligation and, in Solon's case, political privilege as well.

Felix Jacoby long ago showed how much attention Solon paid to festivals and civic ritual and how important they were to his political reforms.[55] Part of their rationale may have been to provide a civic alternative to the lavish aristocratic displays at funerals and on other occasions. Festivals such as the Genesia may thus reflect a similar tendency to that of sixth century sumptuary legislation—a curtailing of the political advantage enjoyed by those who could make a lavish display of their wealth and status. In any event, Solon, like many politicians of the Archaic period, worked in large part with and through ceremonies, rituals and festivals. Indeed even the name of his famous *Seisachtheia*, the shaking-off-of-burdens, may echo those of festivals ending in -eia.[56] And Plutarch *Solon* 16 suggests the actual event may have taken the form of a festival, perhaps a procession through some of the countryside or a ritualized destruction of the boundary markers.[57] When we think of this reform, then, we should envision not only legislative and legal measures (although certainly not a complex series of administrative arrangements) but also a ceremony expressing a new community consensus, the celebration of the end of past abuses by the pulling up of the old *horoi*, with all the symbolism implicit in such an act, a proclamation that those who had been sent abroad as virtual slaves under the old system might return with impunity, and, surely, thanksgiving sacrifices to the gods.[58]

IV

The examples we have examined indicate the importance of festival and ritual in the political life of Archaic Athens. Such acts of ceremonial were a central part of civic life and some of the

[53] This position has been argued most recently by D. Whitehead, *CQ* xxxi (1981) 282–6.

[54] Strabo x, 1.10, 448 C. with F. W. Walbank's commentary on Plb. ii, 416. Is there also a hint of a military structure behind the Samian Tonaia festival in the corrupt last line of the fragment of Asius *apud* Athen. xii 525 e ff.? On the importance of processions in ancient festivals see Nilsson (n. 4 and 9), Burkert (n. 25) 99–102, J. Mikalson, *GRBS* xxiii (1982) 213–21. On the Amarynthia festival see I. C. Ringwood, *AJA* xxxiii (1929) 384–92; D. Knoepfler, *BCH* xcvi (1972) 283–301; L. Breglia, *Contribution à l'étude . . . Eubéennes* (Naples 1975) 37–47. *Cf.* also Plato *Laws* xii 947c on a procession arranged in part by military roles.

[55] F. Jacoby, *CQ* xxxviii (1944) 65–75, reprinted in Jacoby's *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leiden 1956) 243–59.

[56] For example, the Chalkeia, Dipoleia, and Nemeseia.

[57] It may be significant that none of these *horoi* has ever been found. This may suggest exceptionally thorough destruction or a removal of the stones over the boundaries of Attica, as was sometimes done with the bones of polluted individuals or with other objects.

[58] Compare the burning of written mortgages in Hellenistic Sparta at the time of Agis' reform: Plut. *Agis* 13. Solon's claim (fr. 36 West) that he freed those who had been sold into slavery need not reflect an elaborate plan to negotiate or buy back their freedom but simply the assurance that if they could escape to Attica no effort would be made to deport them.

principal means and objects of political activity. At the same time the episodes we have examined raise some more general questions about the relation between leader and follower and even the nature of politics in the Archaic Greek state.

The leader, in the examples we have studied, often uses tribal structures, processions, or festivals to articulate community values and emerging consensuses about state policy. But while he utilizes various forms of ceremony and civic religion, the distance between the leader and his followers seems rather smaller than has commonly been thought. The successful politician is closely linked to his community and shares many of its values, recognizes emerging consensuses and knows how to utilize familiar patterns to express and confirm new patterns of civic life. His success derives not so much from his intellectual or emotional distance from the community or his cleverness at seeking his own advantage at the expense of the community, as in his attunement to civic needs and aspirations, and his ability to give them form and expression. Thus leader and follower are linked by a shared, even if often rapidly evolving, set of expectations. They play different roles in a shared drama.

Hence it may be neither accidental nor trivial that in each of the cases we have studied, *mimesis* (best thought of not as 'imitation' but as 'creative adaptation') has an important role to play.[59] The actual term is used in Herodotus' account of Clisthenes' reforms, which he alleges were a *mimesis* of those made by his maternal grandfather. It is implicit in Phye's dressing as Athena and in Pisistratus' restrained adaptation of procession patterns deeply rooted in the culture. In Solon's case the *mimesis* is both more direct and more subtle. A traditional festival form, if we are correct, is reshaped to fulfil a further function—arranging and displaying a new ordering of the civic body. The leader, like a tragic poet or actor, adapts familiar material to a new setting and structure.

Approached in this way Archaic politics shares elements with drama and other creative arts. It can be a histrionic activity, not simply in the tension and drama often implicit in political events, but in the importance of mutually understood roles and expectations. Its creativity derives from the fact that the effective politician has the skill and knowledge, the *techne* and *sophia*, to use traditional forms and inherited material to develop new patterns of civic order and to give expression to evolving civic feeling, and beliefs.

This is not to deny that individual politicians, including some very effective ones, sought their own personal advantage. Surely many of them did. But it would appear that this goal was most likely to be achieved not solely by their careful calculation of personal or family self interest, but by merging their sense of individual advancement into the community's evolving sense of its needs and aspirations. 'Manipulation', then, is an inadequate formulation of the relationship between leader and follower. The merging of individual and community interest, the sense of shared goals and well-being, the ability of the effective leader to recognize and give expression to new civic attitudes are all central to political leadership in this period. Success in politics in the last analysis depended on the ability to understand the needs, hopes and anxieties of the community, to give them expression through rite and ritual, and to find the patterns of speech and act that console or that celebrate an underlying order. The politics of that age cannot be fully understood as the manipulation of those patterns, but must also be seen as the invention, articulation and adaptation of ceremonial to the changing needs and consciousness of the community.

W. R. CONNOR

Princeton University

[59] In the visual arts *mimesis* 'usually implied something beyond the simple process of copying a natural model' as J. Pollitt points out in a useful discussion in his *Ancient view of Greek art* (New Haven 1974) 37–52. The term can betoken not a literal replication but 'imitation by psychological association'. This is not to suggest that political leaders of the archaic period would themselves have used the term *mimesis*, but that the concept, later of such prominence in Greek culture, may usefully be retrojected into this period. On the development of the term *mimesis* see the suggestive observations of H. Koller, *Die Mimesis in d. Antike* (Berne 1954) and the cautious assessment by G. F. Else *CPh* liii (1958) 73–90.