

THE ARCHONSHIPS OF HERMOKREON AND  
ALKMAION:  
A FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF  
*ATH. POL.* 22:1-3

Τούτων δὲ γενομένων δημοτικωτέρα πολὺ τῆς Σόλωνος ἐγένετο ἡ πολιτεία· καὶ γὰρ συνέβη τοὺς μὲν Σόλωνος νόμους ἀφανίσαι τὴν τυραννίδα διὰ τὸ μὴ χρῆσθαι, καινοὺς δ' ἄλλους θεῖναι τὸν Κλεισθένη στοχαζόμενον τοῦ πλήθους, ἐν οἷς ἐτέθη καὶ ὁ περὶ τοῦ ὄστρακισμοῦ νόμος. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἔτει πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν ἐφ' Ἐρμοκρέοντος ἄρχοντος τῇ βουλῇ τοῖς πεντακσίοις τὸν ὄρκον ἐποίησαν ὃν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὀμνύουσιν. ἔπειτα τοὺς στρατηγούς ἤροῦντο κατὰ φυλάς, ἕξ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἓνα, τῆς δὲ ἀπάσης στρατιᾶς ἡγεμὸν ἦν ὁ πολέμαρχος. ἔτει δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα δωδεκάτῳ νικήσαντες τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην ἐπὶ Φαινίππου ἄρχοντος, διαλιπόντες ἔτη δύο μετὰ τὴν νίκην, θαρροῦντος ἤδη τοῦ δήμου τότε πρῶτον ἐχρήσαντο τῷ νόμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸν ὄστρακισμόν, ὃς ἐτέθη διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ὅτι Πεισίστρατος δημαγωγὸς καὶ στρατηγὸς ὢν τύραννος κατέστη.

The text of *Ath. Pol.* 22.1-3 continues to fascinate: its contents are essential for reconstructing the time frame of political development at Athens in the last decade of the sixth century B.C., yet a chronological puzzle exists that has not found correct solution. The difficulty is neatly stated by G.V. Sumner<sup>1</sup>): "If the dating point provided by *κατάστασιν* is identified with Kleisthenes' legislative activity in the year of Isagoras' archonship, 508/7 (21.1), then the archonship of Hermokreon is made to fall in 504/3. But (a) the succeeding chronological indication is *ἔτει μετὰ ταῦτα δωδεκάτῳ* for the Battle of Marathon and the archonship of Phainippos (22.3), and it is impossible to put them in the twelfth year from 504/3. And (b) according to Dionysius (*A. R.* 5.37.1) the archon of 504/3 was

---

1) "Notes on Chronological Problems in the Aristotelian *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*," *C.Q.* N.S. xi (1961), 35-36.

Akestorides.” The uncertainty of the reference of *κατάστασιν* which was discussed by Sumner in 1961 and earlier by T. J. Cadoux<sup>2)</sup> (both considered it possible that *κατάστασιν* referred to *καινούς δ' ἄλλους [νόμους]*) has now been removed by J. Day and M. Chambers<sup>3)</sup> who recognize that *πρώτον μὲν οὖν* are meant to tie 22.2 very closely to the opening of 22.1, thereby reflecting Aristotle's<sup>4)</sup> perception of the bouleutic oath and the selection of *strategoí* by tribes as indicative of the way in which the state was becoming more democratic. Sumner, who finds that this problem of reference has now been solved conclusively<sup>5)</sup>, nonetheless seems receptive to an idea of C. W. Fornara<sup>6)</sup> that the *κατάστασις* be dated to 507/6 and that *πέμπτω* be reckoned from that year. Fornara has made this suggestion on the evidence of Pollux 8.110, *ἐπὶ δὲ Ἀλκμαίωνος δέκα ἐγένοντο* (sc. *φυλαί*), which implies a distinction between the year of Kleisthenes' legislation and the year in which the reforms were implemented and, as well, on the basis of his belief that the laws could not have become operative until the following year. This implied distinction is valid and necessary (though selection of 507/6 as the year of implementation while probably correct is not the only possibility; see below, pp. 320–322 for a discussion of the issue); however, it is clear at 22.1–2 that the calculation *ἔτει πέμπτω μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν* is tied as much to *τούτων δὲ γενομένων [νόμων]* at the beginning of 22.1 – laws that were assigned earlier in 21.1 to the archonship of Isagoras – as the introduction of the bouleutic oath is to *δημοτικωτέρα ... ἐγένετο ἢ πολιτεία. πέμπτω* must therefore be corrupt, not an unpalatable conclusion since other numerals in the *Ath. Pol.* have suffered such a fate<sup>7)</sup>. Although there is very little control for emending the figures in this passage, a possible lower limit for the time frame can be established, the twelfth year before Marathon (501/0), unless *δωδεκάτω* (22.3) is corrupt, an attractive hypothesis, contemplated by Sumner, that could partially solve the problem<sup>8)</sup>.

2) “The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides,” *J. H. S.* lxxviii (1948), 116.

3) *Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy* (1962), 104ff.

4) For the purposes of this paper, the question of authorship is not acute and will be avoided.

5) “Androtion F 6 and *Ath. Pol.* 22,” *B. I. C. S.* xi (1964), 84.

6) “A Note on *Ἀθπ.* 22,” *C. Q. N. S.* xiii (1963), 104 n. 3.

7) E. g., Sumner, art. cit. (1961), 37–48.

8) Art. cit. (1964), 84.

The simplest solution, first suggested by Kenyon<sup>9</sup>), is to emend *πέμπτω* to *ὀγδόω*; however, the text, as understood by him, implied that the introduction of the bouletic oath and the tribal selection of *strategoî* be dated from the same year. Cadoux<sup>10</sup>) has questioned such an interpretation and proposed that the event introduced by *ἔπειτα* need not belong to the same year as that preceded by *πρῶτον μὲν*. Fornara<sup>11</sup>) as well subscribes to this view but neither has advanced compelling argument to support it, nor have objections raised by Sumner been answered as fully as would be desirable<sup>12</sup>). Sumner's criticism is as follows<sup>13</sup>): "... it is contrary to *Ath. Pol.*'s practice to use *ἔπειτα* unsupported to mark a time interval in terms of years." As well (*loc. cit.*) he notes: "... on Fornara's hypothesis, *Ath. Pol.*'s carefully constructed chronological chain would have a missing link." Regarding this chronological chain Sumner has more to say in an earlier study<sup>14</sup>): "From the archonship of Solon to that of Xenainetos, he has constructed what is evidently intended to be a continuous chronological chain by marking the intervals between events." While acceptance of Fornara's proposal creates a "missing link", the chain, as it were, is not otherwise perfect. Indeed its character ought to be better understood. Several "links" have been marked in terms of years, a few of which signalize long periods of time<sup>15</sup>), though most designate short intervals<sup>16</sup>). What results is a principal linkage devoted to providing a continuum between the archonships of Solon and Xenainetos, and subordinate chains, for example, the one between Solon's archonship and the year of the ten archons. The principal linkage is such that Sumner is correct to assert

9) Noted by Sandys, *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens* (1893), 84.

10) *Art. cit.* 116.

11) *Art. cit.* (1963), 104. Fornara observes that the formula *πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα* can be used in the *Ath. Pol.* as a temporal separative of connected items in chronological sequence, and that this is the case at 22.2-3.

12) Cadoux does not present an argument but simply mentions this as a possibility; see the previous note for Fornara's position and below, n. 21, for elaboration of his views in his reply to Sumner.

13) *Art. cit.* (1964), 85.

14) *Art. cit.* (1961), 32.

15) Thirty-two years from Solon to Komeas; forty-nine years from Komeas to Harpaktides; forty-eight years from the battle of Salamis to Pythodoros.

16) E. g., six intervals are designated and linked for the period 412/11-401/0; see Sumner's chart (*art. cit.* [1961], 32) for other examples.

that a continuous chronological chain is evidently intended (achieved, of course, with corrected numerals); however, the subordinate series cause trouble, to wit, the problems at 22.8. Sumner clearly wishes to "...[repair] the break in the chronological chain between 22.8...and 23.5." To realize this end, notwithstanding the several numerals he is willing to emend elsewhere in the text (because they must be changed), Sumner chooses to excise the archonship at 22.8, ἀρχοντος Ὑψιχίδου, rather than believing that the numeral ἔπειτα is wrong. Excision of this archonship is justified, according to Sumner (p. 34), "...because it is at variance with A.P.'s formula...", yet he is forced to concede a similar exception at 22.7. The author of the *Ath. Pol.* in this kind of usage is obviously not consistent. The numeral must remain suspect. Sumner also notes that the accounts of Herodotos and that of the *Ath. Pol.* differ in that Herodotos seems to believe that the ostracized Aristides did not return from Aigina until just prior to the Battle of Salamis (480/79), whereas the *Ath. Pol.* version is explicit and precise in stating that *all* the ostracized were received back in the archonship of Hypsichides (481/0). Possibly this is another instance of Herodotos' inaccuracies being corrected in the *Ath. Pol.*, an alteration that Sumner is quite able to explain. The archonship of Hypsichides ought to be retained, the numeral corrected, and the linkage of the chain left unrepaired. The problem at 22.2 can now be resolved, for ἔπειτα most probably introduces an event in the year immediately following the archonship of Hermokreon.

Sumner's first criticism is not applicable at 22.2; as Fornara points out<sup>17</sup>), neither event is "unsupported" chronologically: the year of the introduction of the bouletic oath is "linked" to the year of Kleisthenes' reforms while that of the first election of *strategoî* by tribes dates from the twelfth year before Marathon. However, usage of the formula *πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα* in the *Ath. Pol.* warrants further consideration. Excluding 22.2, *πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα* is found twelve times in the text of the *Ath. Pol.*<sup>18</sup>). Twice a temporal indicator occurs *that is to be shared* and, in both instances, it is placed *before πρῶτον*

17) *The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404* (1971), 5 n. 12 (quoted below, n. 21).

18) *Ath. Pol.* 9.1, 21.1-2, 25.2, 27.3, 29.4, 34.1, 36.2, 43.3, 51.3, 56.2-3, 57.1 and 59.1.

μέν<sup>19</sup>), in keeping with a practice in the *Ath. Pol.* of positioning *πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα* after an element common to both parts<sup>20</sup>). Because of such usage in the *Ath. Pol.*, it is likely that *ἔτει πέμπτῳ μετὰ ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν ἐφ' Ἑρμοκρέοντος ἀρχοντος* would have appeared *before* *πρῶτον μὲν* at 22.2 if this temporal expression were to be shared with the events introduced by *πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα*. However, its position *after* *πρῶτον μὲν* suggests that sharing was probably not intended and that only the first event was meant to be qualified with this date; a similar situation exists at 25.2 where a date is given after *ἔπειτα* for the event it introduces, with the obvious implication that the subject matter of *πρῶτον μὲν* is of a different, earlier time (the interval is vague and not marked in terms of years). Thus the word order at 22.2 is critical for it reveals the author's probable intention<sup>21</sup>).

19) 1. *Ath. Pol.* 21.1-2: τότε δὲ πλείους προεστηκώς, ἔτει τετάρτῳ μετὰ ἣν τῶν τυράννων κατάλυσιν, ἐπὶ Ἰσαγόρου ἀρχοντος, πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα ....

2. *Ath. Pol.* 34.1: ἔτει δ' ἑβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν τετρακοσίῳν κατάλυσιν, ἐπὶ Καλλίου τοῦ Ἀγγεληθέν ἀρχοντος, γενομένης τῆς ἐν Ἀργινοῦσας ναυμαχίας, πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα ....

20) Cf. 21.1-2, 27.3, 29.4, 36.2, 43.3, 51.3, 56.2-3. A slight variation occurs at 57.1 and 59.1 where the verbal part of a common element appears after *πρῶτον μὲν* with the shared subject coming before. At 9.1 and 25.2, prefatory remarks are shared and these naturally come first.

21) Having noted Sumner's 1964 criticism (the first two points in my text), Fornara counters (*Athenian Board of Generals* 4-5 n. 12): "In *CQ* (cited above [1961 art.]) I argued that Aristotle's use of *πρῶτον μὲν οὖν, ἔπειτα* and *μετὰ ταῦτα* serve the purpose of separating events of different years so that Hermokreon's year, in which the buleutic oath was passed, was an earlier year than that which witnessed the strategic reform. Sumner (see above [1964 art.]) p. 84, however, asserted that "it is contrary to *Ath. Pol.*'s practice to use *ἔπειτα* unsupported to mark a time interval in terms of years" and that on my hypothesis "*Ath. Pol.*'s carefully constructed chronological chain would have a missing link". There is circularity in the idea that Aristotle did not do *x* not because *x* is unlikely or the sort of thing he should not have done but because elsewhere he does not do *x*. It does not seem to me that we can exclude a possibility that renders the Greek intelligible and obviates the necessity for emendation merely because it would rob Aristotle of a rigid consistency in a matter of usage about which there is no reason to suppose he took pains. The idea that he carefully constructed a chronological chain - that it was his intent to do so - rather than that he paid due regard to chronology seems gratuitous. On my hypothesis there is no chronological gap. He gave a date for the buleutic oath (it is, after all, a date) - the archonship of Hermokreon - and a date for the strategic reform (which is not, therefore, an "unsupported" datum). Similarly, Aristotle's having refrained elsewhere from using *ἔπειτα* when it is a matter of a time interval of a year does not suggest, surely, that this reflects his adoption of an intentional limit upon the way he could use the word. He

It might be objected that the reference of *μετὰ ταῦτα* at 22.3 is to more than one event and that a plural antecedent is required; however, to judge from *Ath. Pol.* 13.2, *μετὰ ταῦτα* can be used with explicit reference to a single item, in this case, the second suspension of the archonship.

In the concluding chapter of *Coastal Demes of Attika*<sup>22</sup>), C. W. J. Eliot draws attention to the magnitude of the task of tribal reorganization that faced Kleisthenes, as well as the difficulties of trying to judge the length of time needed to implement

---

would have expected his meaning to be gathered from the context in question. In this context he mentioned two measures, separated them by the word *ἔπειτα* (note also the position of *πρώτον μὲν οὖν*) and gave *two* dates.” To these remarks I make the following reply:

1. While Fornara is correct in rejecting Sumner’s argument on the grounds that it is circular, he could as well have dismissed it as being irrelevant since he recognizes that *ἔπειτα* is “supported”.

2. Fornara’s comment about the chronological chain is itself gratuitous; intention to construct a chronological chain (actually a series of chains) does not imply a lack of regard for chronology.

3. It is difficult to respond to Fornara’s assertion that there is no chronological gap on his hypothesis since the hypothesis itself seems to be of a fluid nature. In 1961, having made the point that the formula *πρώτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα* could be used as a temporal separative, and having recognized at 22.1–3 that the numeral *πέμπτῳ* may be corrupt, he created the impression that a few years could separate the events introduced by *πρώτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα*, by drawing attention to the years in which, on his reckoning, Hermokreon may have been archon – 506/5, 505/4, 503/2 (it is not clear why 502/1 is omitted), thereby indicating various intervals that were possible. Sumner (1964) has correctly asserted that this hypothesis creates a “missing link”, that is, a period of unspecified length that cannot be determined using the *Ath. Pol.* information. Fornara’s reply, that there is no chronological gap on his hypothesis, is possible because the hypothesis seems to have been changed: a vague “earlier year” (than 501/0) for the bouleutic oath and the archonship of Hermokreon has now been replaced by an apparent belief that *ἔπειτα* at 22.2 is marking an event of the year immediately following the archonship of Hermokreon, i.e., an interval of a year or less; thus he can assert that his hypothesis has no chronological gap! If this is not an accurate reflection of Fornara’s view, if, indeed, he is simply making a further retort to Sumner with his remark about Aristotle having refrained elsewhere from using *ἔπειτα* when it is a matter of *a time interval of a year* (my italics) and thus still believes in as wide a variety of possible intervals as indicated in his 1961 article, then Sumner’s identification of a “missing link” remains valid.

4. Without doubt the *Ath. Pol.* provides two dates (two calculations in fact) but for the same year or different years?

5. Although Fornara does not tell us what to note about the position of *πρώτον μὲν οὖν*, analysis of the usage of *πρώτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα* has provided a solution for this problem.

22) (1962), 146–147 n. 18.

the reforms because of the possible use of earlier surveys<sup>23</sup>). He is prompted to distinguish between the year in which the reforms were passed (508/7) and a later year of implementation, partly because of the evidence of Pollux 8.110 (noted above, p. 316), that in the archonship of Alkmaion the phylai became ten, and also, I think, because of his realistic appreciation of the problems that underlay formation of the demes, trittyes and phylai. Of greatest importance is his recognition (modestly introduced by "should we assume") that the bouleutic oath was probably administered at the first opportunity<sup>24</sup>), that is, at the first meeting of the new council which he dates (cautiously: "it is a reasonable assumption that") at the opening of the conciliar year<sup>25</sup>). Surely Eliot is correct; the archonship of Hermokreon therefore would follow immediately that of Alkmaion. Between 508/7, the archonship of Isagoras, and the *Ath. Pol.* year of the first selection of *strategoï* by tribes (before which the archonship of Hermokreon comes), there are five unoccupied years: 507/6, 506/5, 505/4, 503/2 and 502/1. Given the relationship of Hermokreon's archonship to that of Alkmaion and the uncertainty over the number of years that separate Hermokreon's archonship from 501/0, his archonship may have occurred in 506/5, 505/4 or 502/1. The possibilities are thereby reduced. Although firmer control is not possible, a dictum of Eliot (p. 146 n. 18) is worthy of consideration: "While it was to Kleisthenes' advantage to get the reforms carried out *as quickly as possible* [my italics], it was also his advantage to get the job done well." It is doubtful that Kleisthenes proceeded at the

23) *Coastal Demes* 146 n. 18 (in part): "The administration of Peisistratos' title on produce (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 16.4) must have demanded extensive knowledge of rural conditions throughout the whole of Attika, perhaps even a cadastral survey. The revision of the citizen rolls after the expulsion of Hippias (ibid. 13.5), if carried out methodically, may have been the equivalent of a censal survey."

24) When Eliot wrote, his interpretation of the *Ath. Pol.* text was that the events introduced by *πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα* dated from the same year; as both depended upon creation of the ten phylai, he wondered, rhetorically, if it was coincidence that both took place for the first time at the first opportunity. While this is most probably true of the bouleutic oath, it is possible to account for an interval between implementation of the tribal reforms and the first election of *strategoï* by tribes; see Fornara, *Athenian Board of Generals* 8, who suggests that the *phylarchoi* (increased, according to Herodotos [5.69.2], from four to ten) may have had the military role assumed subsequently by the *strategoï*.

25) *Coastal Demes* 146 n. 17.

leisurely pace of a Canadian Royal Commission. The task might have been completed by the end of 507/6; the archonship of Alkmaion would then fall in this year with that of Hermokreon coming in 506/5: *πέμπτω* at 22.2 would have to be changed to *τείτω*<sup>26</sup>).

Bishop's University,  
Quebec, Canada

David J. McCargar

### *Addendum*

After this paper was accepted, an important study by Wesley E. Thompson came to my attention, "The Deme in Kleisthenes' Reforms," *S.O.* xlvi (1971), 72-79. Thompson (p. 72) argues that Kleisthenes did not treat the demes as "... land masses with precisely defined boundaries"; he correctly recognizes that this is an inference which is without the support of any evidence, and suggests (p. 74) that "... when Kleisthenes introduced his new constitution his primary concern in the demes was establishing the citizenship roles and that he could easily accomplish this without drawing deme boundaries ...". In fact, he believes (p. 76) that if Kleisthenes used a map at all, it was like "... a businessman's map with colored pins indicating the branch offices of his firm in various cities of the continent." On this view, then, Kleisthenes was concerned only with a *census* (registration in the demes taking place, as it were, at the various points [villages] on the map) rather than with a *census* and a *cadastral survey*. Thompson wishes to make an exception for the city of Athens, where, he concedes, existing roads and rivers would have sufficed to established whatever boundaries were necessary for [initial] registration; once the first lists were compiled, [since membership in the demes was hereditary] deme boundaries of the city were apparently forgotten (p. 75).

---

26) In light of the uncertainties, 506/5 is equally probable as the year of tribal reorganization and the archonship of Alkmaion, in which case Hermokreon's archonship would fall in 505/4 and *πέμπτω* would require change to *τετάττω*; I find it difficult to believe, notwithstanding the unknown factors, that more than two or three years were necessary to implement the reforms (contra Eliot, *Coastal Demes* 146 n. 18, who considered possible the reconstruction 508/7 [Isagoras] - 502/1 [Alkmaion]; 501/0 [Hermokreon]).



Obviously Thompson's hypothesis embodies a minor contradiction but it is not serious; certainly a *detailed cadastral survey* of the whole of Attika becomes an irrelevant consideration: Kleisthenes' task could easily have been completed within two years. Indeed, given Eliot's own words, "... while it was to Kleisthenes' advantage to get the reforms carried out as quickly as possible...", when viewed in conjunction with Thompson's insight and the arguments presented in this paper, the archonship of Alkmaion, the year of the implementation of Kleisthenes' reforms, surely ought to be placed in 507/6.