



2014

Hippokleides, 'the Dance,' and the Panathenaia

Brian M. Lavelle

Loyola University Chicago, blavell@luc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/classicalstudies_facpubs



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lavelle, BM. "Hippokleides, 'the Dance,' and the Panathenaia." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 54, 2014.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classical Studies: Faculty Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
© Brian Lavelle, 2014.

Hippokleides, the ‘Dance’, and the Panathenaia

Brian M. Lavelle

HIPPOKLEIDES, the son of Teisandros and of the clan Philaidai, is an intriguing but obscure figure in the history of Athens in the early sixth century BCE.¹ There are only two testimonia of consequence about him, one quite brief, the other much longer. The briefer one states that he was archon of Athens when the Greater Panathenaia was established and has been taken to imply that he was the festival’s originator. The longer, less substantive testimonium is far more entertaining. It is of course Herodotos’ famous story of the ‘marriage of Agariste’, the daughter of Kleisthenes, tyrant of Sikyon (6.126–130). For the greater part of the story, Hippokleides seems to be the star of the show: a luminous paragon of Archaic Greek *noblesse*, he is outstanding among the many suitors at Sikyon vying for the girl’s hand, demonstrating ἀνδραγαθία and other qualities over nearly a year. Yet, for all of that and his year-long probation, things turn out quite badly for Hippokleides—and all at once. A shocking display of vulgarity at the exact moment when victory is imminent sinks him and his chances utterly. Such a catastrophic lapse in behavior and judgment is surprisingly inconsistent with Hippokleides’ chronically demonstrated excellence and moderation. The stunning reversal is in fact improbable—it is as if ‘Hippokleides’ is two different persons—and raises doubts about the story, to which may be added those created by its obvious folktale

¹ Cf. H. Swoboda, “Hippokleides (1),” *RE* 8 (1913) 1772–1773; J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971) 295–296.

elements and impossible chronologies. Notwithstanding its dubious nature, the tale has been taken as essentially factual by many scholars. The 'marriage of Agariste' story and Hippokleides' role in it and the relation of the two testimonia about him certainly merit re-examination. Could Hippokleides in fact have been responsible for establishing the Greater Panathenaia? If so, why is the only extensive information about such an important Athenian so vivid, yet so bizarre?

Hippokleides or Peisistratos?

One thing is certain: Hippokleides did not found the Panathenaia. Rather, according to Hellanikos and Androtion, the festival was inaugurated by Erichthonios (or Erechtheus) in the deep of Athens' mythic past.² Later sources, however, state that the festival was originally called the Athenaia after the city-goddess, but that it became the Panathenaia after Theseus synoecized Attika to Athens.³ There is in fact little of actual substance to help in determining the true foundation-date of the original Panathenaia, but clearly the Athenians believed

² Hellanikos *FGrHist* 323 F 2; Androtion 324 F 2 (apparently following Hellanikos, cf. Jacoby, IIIb Suppl. 631). On the Panathenaia see L. Ziehen, "Panathenaia (1)," *RE* 18 (1949) 457–489; J. A. Davison, "Notes on the Panathenaia," *JHS* 78 (1958) 23–42; H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (Ithaca 1977) 33–50; E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica* (Madison 1983) 55–72; N. Robertson, "The Origin of the Panathenaia," *RhM* 128 (1985) 231–295; J. Neils, "The Panathenaia: An Introduction," in J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Princeton 1992) 13–28; R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford 1996) 75–76 and 89–92; N. Robertson, "Athena's Shrines and Festivals," in J. Neils (ed.), *Worshipping Athena. Panathenaia and Parthenon* (Madison 1996) 56–65; and N. Evans, *Civic Rites: Democracy and Religion in Ancient Athens* (Berkeley 2010) 50–58. J. Mikalson, "Erechtheus and the Panathenaia," *AJP* 97 (1976) 141–153, argues that the Panathenaia originally honored Erechtheus. Cf. Robertson (1985: 254–269) on Erechtheus, Erichthonios, and the Panathenaia.

³ Plut. *Thes.* 24.3; *Suda* π152, τὰ δὲ Παναθήνια πρότερον Ἀθήνια ἐκαλοῦντο. Cf. H. Walker, *Theseus and Athens* (Oxford 1995) 42–43, on Theseus and the Panathenaia. Aristotle (fr.637 Rose) apparently attributed the beginning of the oldest Panathenaia to the slaying of the giant Aster by Athena.

that the yearly festival predated the Greater Panathenaia by many centuries. Erika Simon points out that the main rite of the Panathenaia, a garment-offering to the goddess, is represented in Mycenaean frescoes and that Homer describes the presentation of a *peplos* to Athena by Hekabe and her attendants (*Il.* 6.288–304).⁴ The focus of the Athenian festival was Athena Polias who resembles the ‘citadel-goddess’ of Mycenae.⁵ While it is possible that the annual Panathenaia came into being during the Dark Ages, it was in any case much older than the quadrennial version.⁶

The aggregate of testimonies involving the inauguration of the Greater Panathenaia points to 566/5 as its date; separate testimonies implicate as the founder either Hippokleides or Peisistratos, who became tyrant in 561/0. In his *Chronikon*, Eusebios whose source was most probably the Athenian chronographer Apollodoros, says that the “*agon gymnicus* which they call the Panathenaia was begun” in Olymp. 53.3 (566/5), and he must mean the Greater Panathenaia.⁷ This date roughly

⁴ E. Simon, “Theseus and Athenian Festivals,” in *Worshipping Athena* 23.

⁵ On Athena Polias cf. W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1985) 140. Cf. J. Kroll, “The Ancient Image of Athena Polias,” in *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography presented to Homer S. Thompson* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 20 [Princeton 1982]) 65–76.

⁶ Bronze Age date: E. J. W. Barber, “The Peplos of Athena,” in *Goddess and Polis*, esp. 111–112; Robertson, in *Worshipping Athena* 57–58; Simon, in *Worshipping Athena* 23. Cf. S. Forsdyke, *Exile, Ostracism and Democracy. The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece* (Princeton 2005) 114 n.147: “An annual festival for Athena certainly existed at least by late Geometric times; cf. *Hom. Il.* 2.549–51”; also D. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Leiden 1987) 24–25 and n.37.

⁷ Eus. (Jerome) *Chron.* p.102 Helm: *agon gymnicus, quem Panathenaeon vocant, actus*. Cf. Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 27. Eusebios’ chronology largely derived from the work of Apollodoros of Athens, who authored his own *Chronika* in the second century BCE: cf. F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin 1902), and A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebios and the Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Cranbury 1979). Apollodoros, in turn, derived his information from such as Timaios’ *Histories* (ca. 250 BCE) and, ultimately, the Atthides, the local chronicles of Athens, the earliest of which was composed by Hellanikos in

aligns with the establishments of other panhellenic festivals, including the Pythian (586), Isthmian (582), and Nemean (573), and it was ca. 565 that Athens ended its long and bitter war with Megara in a great victory.⁸ A festival of national identity was a fitting way to celebrate both the triumph of Athena's *polis* over Dorian Megara and Athens' now much brighter future.⁹ Finally, the earliest Panathenaic prize vase extant, the so-called Burgon Amphora, dates to the 560s.¹⁰ Taken all together, the evidence supports Eusebios' date for the festival's establishment.¹¹ In fact, the precision of Eusebios' (or rather, Apollodoros') date points to the festival's alignment with an Athenian archon-year in an older source, perhaps an Atthis.

The Greater Panathenaia became the most significant of festivals at Athens, the centerpiece of Athenian nationality as it was advertised to other Greeks and to the Athenians themselves. Its establishment may be justly viewed as Athens' declaration of its greater aspirations in the Greek world and so as a watershed event in its history.¹² The festival's grandiosity

the late fifth century.

⁸ Eus. *Chron.* p.101 Helm; cf. Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 26; H. Shapiro, *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens* (Mainz am Rhein 1989) 19; Neils, in *Goddess and Polis* 20; Parker, *Athenian Religion* 90.

⁹ Cf. Shapiro, *Art and Cult* 19–20. On the date of the end of the Megarian war see R. Legon *Megara. The Political History of a Greek City-State* (Ithaca 1981) 138; and B. M. Lavelle, *Fame, Money, and Power: The Rise of Peisistratos and "Democratic" Tyranny at Athens* (Ann Arbor 2005) 48 and 213–216. Cf. A. Griffin, *Sikyon* (Oxford 1982) 51, on the proximity of the victory of Sikyonians over the Kleonaians and the Nemean games.

¹⁰ Cf. Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 27. On the Burgon Amphora see P. E. Corbett, "The Burgon and Blacas Tombs," *JHS* 80 (1960) 54, 57–58, and plates 1 and 2; D. Kyle, "Gifts and Glory. Panathenaic and Other Greek Athletic Prizes," in *Worshipping Athena* 118–119.

¹¹ Cf. Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 26–29; Shapiro, *Art and Cult* 19 ff. The doubts expressed by Corbett, *JHS* 80 (1960) 58, about the precise date are not well founded because they overlook Eusebios' sources. See also n.14 below.

¹² Cf. Neils, in *Goddess and Polis* 23–24; Kyle, in *Worshipping Athena* 116–118.

implies a singular, visionary Athenian patron and leading political personage, whose design for the Greater Panathenaia was to promote Athens, but also himself among the Athenians.¹³ That this patron expanded the games and sought a panhellenic character for the festival is quite significant.

Which of the two, Hippokleides or Peisistratos, was the founder of the Greater Panathenaia? Pherekydes of Athens, who was of the generation before Herodotos, states that the Panathenaia was established at Athens in the archonship of Hippokleides (*FGrHist* 3 F 2).¹⁴ This testimonium has implied to some that Pherekydes' date for the Panathenaia was the same as Apollodoros' and led them to conclude that Hippokleides was in fact the founder of the Greater Panathenaia.¹⁵ But the question is not so neatly resolved. The sponsor of the new festival should have stood out if only as a result of that sponsorship and might reasonably be expected to be mentioned further in

¹³ Cf. A. Boegehold, "Group and Single Competitions at the Panathenaia," in *Worshipping Athena* 96: "And certainly the sudden magnification of the festival in 566/5 or 530 has the look of a politically motivated happening."

¹⁴ Cf. Hellanikos 4 F 22 (Markellinos Βίος Θουκυδίδου 3). See Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* 294–296; R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record at Athens* (Cambridge 1989) 161–173. Davison's cautions (*JHS* 78 [1958] 28) aside, I take it that Pherekydes, apparently a contemporary of Kimon, was Didymos' source for the information and that Markellinos transmitted it from him, whether through an intermediary or completely faithfully (cf. M. Miller, *The Sicilian Colony Dates* [Albany 1970] 211–212). Although the Philaid genealogy presented is part myth—and the information is somewhat garbled—Pherekydes' association of Hippokleides with the Panathenaia and with an (unstated) archon year suggests a relatively solid basis for the connection, i.e. the Athenian archon-list: cf. T. J. Cadoux, "Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hysichides," *JHS* 68 (1948) 104; R. Develin, *Athenian Officials, 684–321 B.C.* (Oxford 1989) 41. Pherekydes' source, which must have been Philaid, supplied him with genealogy—or he chose to report it—only perhaps to the time of Miltiades, victor of Marathon: cf. F. Jacoby, "The First Athenian Prose Writer," *Mnemosyne* 13 (1947) 32; but see also Thomas 161–173.

¹⁵ Cf. Kyle, in *Worshipping Athena* 117, and n.14 above.

Athens' history. Apart from his archonship and the colorful but insubstantial Agariste-episode, however, Hippokleides is not heard of again. Coupled with that relative anonymity, a scholion to Aelius Aristides' *Panathenaikos* states unequivocally that "Peisistratos established (ἔποιήσε) the Greater Panathenaia."¹⁶ This association makes far more sense to many, since tyrants possessed considerable resources and desired to 'own' festivals. Pheidon of Argos, for example, commandeered the Olympic games in the earlier seventh century; Kleisthenes of Sikyon himself established Pythian games in the early sixth century; and Polykrates, tyrant of Samos, intended to found an agonistic festival on his home island in the later sixth century.¹⁷ The Peisistratids seem to have been very much involved with the Greater Panathenaia. Peisistratos' son Hipparchos, whom some sources credited with establishing Homeric recitations at the Greater Panathenaia, was marshaling its procession when he was slain by Harmodios and Aristogeiton; his brother Hippias was receiving it at the time of the murder.¹⁸ Their official

¹⁶ Schol. vet. Ael. Arist. *Pan.* 189.4–5 (III 323 D.). The connection of the scholion's Peisistratos-dating to Arist. fr.637 is by no means secure. Cf. R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* II (Oxford 2013) 457 n.18; Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 28–29; and Parker, *Athenian Religion* 89.

¹⁷ Cf. M. F. McGregor, "Cleisthenes of Sicyon and the Panhellenic Festivals," *TAPA* 72 (1941) 267: "All these games were founded by tyrants to enhance their glory and the glory of the city over each ruled." Pheidon and the Olympic games: Paus. 6.22.2; on his dates see M. Koiv, "The Dating of Pheidon in Antiquity," *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 1 (2000) 1–21 (online), who sets the "true Olympian date for Pheidon" at 668 BCE, "based on the chronicle of Hippias" (6). On the Pythian games at Sikyon: schol. Pind. *Nem.* 9 inscrip. 20, 25a–b; cf. McGregor 282–283, and Griffin, *Sikyon* 53. On Delian and/or Pythian games on Samos: *Suda* π3128 and τ175; cf. V. Parker "Some Aspects of the Foreign and Domestic Policy of Cleisthenes of Sicyon," *Hermes* 122 (1994) 414 and n.62.

¹⁸ On the Peisistratids and Homeric recitations at the Panathenaia: [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228B; cf. J. A. Davison, "Pisistratus and Homer," *TAPA* 86 (1955) 7 ff.; H. Shapiro, "Hipparchos and the Rhapsodes," in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics* (Cam-

roles indicate special attachment to the festival, the greater benefits of which are implied by the involvements of other Greek tyrants in such festivals. Those who take Peisistratos to be founder might argue that Hippokleides was really not politically significant.

Several proposals have been advanced for solving the *apparent* contradiction. Perhaps Hippokleides was a minion or cooperative of Peisistratos under whose auspices as archon the quadrennial festival was inaugurated.¹⁹ Or, Hippokleides represents one re-founding of the Panathenaia, while Peisistratos represents another later one.²⁰ Or, Hippokleides just happened to be archon when the Greater Panathenaia was established: it really had nothing to do with him.²¹ Or, very simply, Peisistratos was the founder.²² But there are substantial objections to these proposals apart from the explicit connection made by Pherekydes to Hippokleides' archonship and the Apollodoran foundation-date of the Panathenaia. For one thing, Peisistratos did not become tyrant until five years after

bridge 1993) 92–107; J. Burgess, "Performance and the Epic Cycle," *CJ* 100 (2004) 7 ff. (Some ancient sources, [e.g. Cic. *De or.* 3. 137, specify Peisistratos as the regularizer of Homeric texts and thus seem to imply that he, not Hipparchos, was responsible for the Homeric Panathenaic recitations. Cf. Davison 18 ff.) On the procession marshalling: Thuc. 1.20.2, *Ath. Pol.* 18.3; cf. P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelean Athenaiion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 231. Thucydides (6.57.1) depicts Hippias marshalling the procession from the Kerameikos; he also designates Hipparchos and Hippias as in charge of appointing the basket-bearers in the procession (6.56.1).

¹⁹ A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London 1956) 106.

²⁰ See Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 29 (on Ziehen).

²¹ Davison, *JHS* 78 (1958) 29; Neils, in *Goddess and Polis* 20–21.

²² J. Camp, *The Archaeology of Athens* (New Haven 2001) 31; Mikalson, *AJP* 97 (1976) 152. The date of Peisistratos' first tyranny is established by its coordination with the archonship of Komeas (*Ath. Pol.* 14.1), which is dated in the *Marmor Parium* to 561/0 (cf. Rhodes, *Commentary* 201). The material for the *Marmor Parium* comes in part from an Atthis, probably Hellanikos' (F. Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium* [1904]). Thus the coordination dates to the fifth century.

566/5 and even then was so politically weak that he was expelled from Athens twice by Megakles, the son of Alkmeon. He was not at all wealthy before his Thracian sojourn many years later and was in no position to underwrite or manage such a festival, even to make minor adjustments until then at the earliest. Minor adjustments made several years after 566/5 would hardly make Peisistratos the 'founder' of the Greater Panathenaia.

In fact Hippokleides, who is most substantively linked to the festival, was a man of some consequence in his time.²³ Beyond mentioning his attainment of the archonship, the leading office until the democracy, Pherekydes' testimonium places him among the outstanding descendants of Philaios, the son of Ajax, down to Miltiades the *oikistes* of the Thracian Chersonesos.²⁴ An Athenian Kypselos, who is usually taken to be the grandson of the tyrant of Corinth, was an uncle of Hippokleides and probably the archon for 597/6.²⁵ Hippokleides' relation to Kypselos of Corinth is cited by Herodotos as most impressive to Kleisthenes of Sikyon.²⁶ As Thomas has pointed out, Pherekydes' Philaid genealogy highlights the luminous members of the family, while it omits embarrassments. Hippokleides was included among these luminaries because he was an ornament on the family tree, not a disgrace.²⁷ Apparently the Philaids did not know about the shameful behavior of Hippokleides described in Herodotos' marriage-story, else they would not have mentioned him. That fact bears substantially

²³ Cf. Kyle, in *Worshipping Athena* 117.

²⁴ This is Miltiades III, the original settler-ruler of the Chersonese: see Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* 294–295.

²⁵ Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* 295–296; Develin, *Athenian Officials* 34. According to J. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth* (Oxford 1984) 217, "[t]here was no doubt some special motive" for the marriage-union between Kypselos of Corinth and the Philaids of Athens.

²⁶ Hdt. 6.128.2; cf. L. Scott, *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6* (Leiden 2005) 425.

²⁷ Thomas, *Oral Tradition* 168–169.

upon the nature and authorship of the story about Hippokleides in Herodotos.

Hippokleides and Herodotos I: the story

The ‘marriage of Agariste’ is one of the most celebrated tales in Herodotos’ *Histories*.²⁸ In fact, it is not history at all. The story has been cited since Grote as a doublet of the mythical ‘wooing of Helen’ of Sparta.²⁹ The basis of it, that Kleisthenes would abandon political gain of any type simply for honor achieved in a kind of epic fashion, is implausible in a cynical age when tyrants and other politically ambitious men were making marriage-alliances for definite advantages, not abstract, honorific, or speculative gains.³⁰ Then again the roster of contestants for Agariste’s hand is a kind of fabulous ‘who’s who’ of Archaic Greece, thrown together with scant regard to the chronological problems created. Apparently these ‘heroes’ were meant to represent categories of superlatives. The comment of

²⁸ See McGregor, *TAPA* 72 (1941) 266–287; J. Alexander, “The Marriage of Megacles,” *CJ* 55 (1959) 129–134; E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, *Adelskultur und Polis-gesellschaft* (Stuttgart 1989) 118; E. Vandiver, *Heroes in Herodotus: The Interaction of Myth and History* (Frankfurt am Main 1991) 255–257; S. Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion* (Baltimore 1993) 218–222; Scott, *Historical Commentary* 417–430; and Z. Papakonstantinou, “Agariste’s Suitors: Sport, Feasting, and Elite Politics in Sixth-Century Greece,” *Nikephoros* 23 (2010) 71–93.

²⁹ G. Grote, *A History of Greece* II (London 1888) 413 and n.1; McGregor, *TAPA* 72 (1941) 268 and n.4, who nevertheless asserts that “there is no solid evidence to justify dismissing the story from the realm of history” and attempts valiantly to salvage the historicity of the Agariste-episode in Herodotos. See also Thomas, *Oral Tradition* 269.

³⁰ Athenian marriage-alliances: a Philaid with a daughter of Kypselos, tyrant of Korinth, Hdt. 6.128.2 (cf. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* 295–296); Kylon the Athenian with a daughter of Theagenes, tyrant of Megara, Thuc. 1.126.3 (cf. S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* I [1991] 205); Peisistratos with a daughter of Gorgilos of Argos, *Ath.Pol.* 17.4 (cf. Rhodes, *Commentary* 226–227). Attempts to construe the ‘marriage of Agariste’ as any kind of depiction of actual interstate policies or relationships in early sixth-century Greece (McGregor, *TAPA* 72 [1941] 266–287; Griffin, *Sikyon* 52 ff.) ignore the story’s folktale essence and fictional elements and so mislead.

How and Wells on the story sums things up: “The fact of the wedding of the daughter and heiress of Kleisthenes is doubtless historical, the details are obviously fictitious.”³¹

According to Herodotos, Kleisthenes announced the competition for the hand of his daughter at the Olympic games where he had just won the four-horse chariot race. (Of the dates proposed for this Olympiad, 576 and 572 are the most favored.)³² Any Greek who thought himself to be good enough to become Kleisthenes' son-in-law was to come to Sikyon in sixty days and then be scrutinized for one year. Kleisthenes had a running track and wrestling ground prepared so that the suitors might compete athletically.

The list of suitors seems impressive, even though we know little about them. Some of the more outstanding were the storied Sybarite Smindyrides, whose lifestyle had reached a peak of *χλιδή*.³³ Males of Aitolia was the brother of the strongest man in Greece, Titormos; Leokedes was the son of Pheidon, tyrant of Argos. (Both of these are impossibly synchronized with the date of the ‘marriage’.)³⁴ Laphanes' father, Euphorion, was famous for his hospitality, having entertained the Dioskouroi. Diaktorides of Krannon was a scion of the cattle-wealthy Skopadai of Thessaly. From Athens came Hippokleides, “outstanding among the Athenians in wealth and

³¹ W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus II* (Oxford 1912) 117. Cf. R. Macan, *Herodotus, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books* (London 1895) 386–387: “The recognition of a fabulous element in the wedding-tale leaves the historic substance unaffected”(!); Vandiver, *Heroes in Herodotus* 255. On the date see Griffin, *Sikyon* 44. Papakonstantinou's recent positivist interpretation of the story (*Nikephoros* 23 [2010] 71–93) overlooks its fundamental problems: cf. n.64 below.

³² McGregor, *TAPA* 72 (1941) 276–278 and n.42, who nevertheless favors 576 (cf. Papakonstantinou, *Nikephoros* 23 [2010] 72); cf. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* 372; Scott, *Historical Commentary* 420.

³³ Cf. Scott, *Historical Commentary* 421; Alexander, *CJ* 55 (1959) 131.

³⁴ Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary II* 117–118; Vandiver, *Heroes in Herodotus* 255; Scott, *Historical Commentary* 421–422.

appearance,”³⁵ and Megakles, the son of Alkmeon, otherwise undescribed. By the story’s end, these are the only two who matter.³⁶

For a year, Kleisthenes interviewed and tested the contestants for their manliness, character, education, and manners; he also wanted to know their lineages and to observe their athletic abilities. He watched them exercise and compete, but was especially keen to observe their social behavior.³⁷ At length, Herodotos says, Kleisthenes was most impressed with the Athenians—a statement of preference marking this as an Athenian-centered version narrated for an Athenian audience. Hippokleides was outstanding to the tyrant for his many attributes and his connection to the Kypselids of Corinth. On the day when Kleisthenes’ still pending decision was to be announced and the marriage was actually to take place, the tyrant held a feast for all of Sikyon, slaughtering a hundred cattle for his guests. At the marriage-banquet, the suitors continued to compete, singing and speaking; Hippokleides continued to lead the pack in the competitions.³⁸ But then, fatefully, Hippokleides summoned an ἀύλητής.

Calling upon the flute-player to play an ἔμμελία, the son of Teisandros began to dance—and dance and dance. While Hip-

³⁵ Hdt. 6.127.4, πλούτω καὶ εἶδεῖ προφέρων Ἀθηναίων.

³⁶ Cf. H. Strassburger, “Herodotus and Periclean Athens,” in R. S. Munson (ed.), *Herodotus, Volume 1, Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past* (Oxford 2013) 311 (originally “Herodot und perikleische Athen,” *Historia* 4 [1955] 16).

³⁷ Hdt. 6.128.1, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, ἐν τῇ συνεστοῖ διεπειρῶτο. Cf. Scott, *Historical Commentary* 425: “As to why this is called the most important test, in view of what happened in §129, it is tempting to think that Cleisthenes wanted to see if they continued to behave like gentlemen even in liquor.” Quite, for while this would seem to have been sorted out long before by the prospective father-in-law, it is the *exact* realm in which Hippokleides needs to fail *on this occasion*.

³⁸ There is no sense in Herodotos’ text at 6.12.9.2 that Hippokleides was out-drinking every other contestant (cf. Scott, *Historical Commentary* 426–427), but rather that he was maintaining his overall superiority.

pokleides enjoyed what he was doing a great deal, Kleisthenes did not. At length, Hippokleides mounted a table and began to dance upon it. He first performed some “Laconian figures,” then some Attic ones. Finally, standing his head on the table, he gesticulated with his legs in the air. With that, Kleisthenes, who now could not bear the idea of Hippokleides being his son-in-law because of his dancing and shamelessness (ἀναίδεια), had enough and said, “Son of Teisandros, you have danced away (ἀπορχήσαό) your marriage.” To which Hippokleides famously replied, οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ—usually translated as “Hippokleides doesn’t care!” And that, according to Herodotos, became a saying among the Greeks.³⁹ Kleisthenes then proceeded to award or, rather, to marry Agariste on the spot to the Athenian who had proved superior simply by maintaining his cool, Megakles, the son of Alkmeon.

This curious, fascinating tale has generated a great deal of interest. To quote one appraisal: “The real origin of the whole story is puzzling as it seems to have archaic and poetic elements combined with the tale of Hippokleides’ undignified behaviour which would be more appropriate to a popular milieu.”⁴⁰ Before anything else, let us look at the famous words of Hippokleides because they essentially end his story. What did Hippokleides mean when he answered Kleisthenes or, rather, what did Herodotos’ ultimate source intend for Hippokleides to mean? Was it pretense and face-saving, on the order of “Never mind: I really didn’t want the girl anyway”? Or was it an arrogant rebuff to the tyrant? “*My* dancing is more important than *your* daughter, you stone-thrower.⁴¹ (The noble) Hippokleides never really wanted such a girl and couldn’t care less about her!”⁴² In both cases, the responses would be more clear-

³⁹ Cf. Scott, *Historical Commentary* 429.

⁴⁰ Thomas, *Oral Tradition* 269.

⁴¹ λευστήρα: Hdt. 5.67.2. Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary* II 34–35.

⁴² Cf. Scott, *Historical Commentary* 429: “We may speculate whether, behind the story, lurks an unwillingness on the part of Hippocleides to marry Agariste.”

headed and purposeful than the implication of heavy drinking leads us to imagine. They would also be at odds with the purported point of the exercise: one whole year wasted contending for Agariste and *then* dismissal of the girl and her father? Or was it a simpler, drink-induced response, an aside really, produced by the wine and the heat of the dance? Something like “I can’t be bothered now, I’m dancing.”⁴³ Or was it a very brief moment of lucidity and self-realization amidst the haze of inebriation, a confession really that Hippokleides was out of his mind? So: “Hippokleides’ brain is not home at the moment and he doesn’t really care about anything. Don’t bother to leave a message.” Of course, both of these suggest Hippokleides’ total loss of sense and situation.

Although some have proposed to construe the tale in light of the famous remark—the tail wagging the dog, so to speak—it is surely the context and the way that Herodotos’ (ultimate) source meant the response to be taken as part of the story that must guide our interpretation.⁴⁴ The saying, which, in the story, is undeniably attached to Hippokleides, can nevertheless have been delivered in very different circumstances with rather different intent and meaning from that in Herodotos. The phrase originated years before the Halikarnassian heard it from an Athenian, but what it meant was really up to Herodotos’ source, not to him. And this source can have fashioned the story to supply an origin for the saying when the actual circumstances of its origin were otherwise unknown, lost, obscured—or meant to be obscured. If we place the saying in the context of the story, we may eliminate the first two possibilities earlier

⁴³ According to A. Cook, “Hippokleides’ Dance,” *CR* 21 (1907) 169–170, Hippokleides’ final dance was a Kabeiric dance after Athenian and Spartan ones; but cf. the solid criticisms of A. Solomon, “Hippokleides’ Dance,” *CR* 21 (1907) 232–233, which are founded on Cook’s failure to contextualize the ‘dance’, especially ignoring Kleisthenes’ censure of him.

⁴⁴ Cf. Thomas, *Oral Tradition* 269: “If we think of the tale from the point of view of the proverb, there is a hint that Hippokleides’ retort is approved...”

mentioned, since the story’s author(s) did not intend that the words approve of Hippokleides in any way. The impact of his gross indiscretion is quite evident: profound drunkenness is implied; Kleisthenes’ embarrassment and reproval are underscored by what he says to the dancer. The word ἀνάιδεια marks Hippokleides as shamed in the eyes of the tyrant, but also of the company attending the bride-feast. Hippokleides’ final demonstration of vulgarity is the *coup de grace* of base misconduct, amounting to the very opposite of ἀνδραγαθία: the occasion of his outrageous dancing was, after all, the actual marriage-feast (κατάκλισις τοῦ γάμου) and the bride-to-be was present.⁴⁵ Hippokleides seems quite detached from place and time, senseless and stupid.

The ‘dance’

Hippokleides’ dancing is the defining moment of his failure and the set-up for the famous saying at the story’s end. That definition begins with the summoning of the αὐλητής.⁴⁶ For Aristotle, the αὐλός was a dangerous instrument at drinking-parties: it was immoral and excited emotions.⁴⁷ Greeks likened its sound to the honking of a goose because it could be very

⁴⁵ That seems to be how Athenaios (628C–D) took it. Cf. Scott, *Historical Commentary* 426. Papakonstantinou, *Nikephoros* 23 (2010) 80, suggests that Hippokleides’ intoxication disgusted Kleisthenes, but disregards the fact that it is the dance, not the inebriation, that is featured in the story. As Papakonstantinou himself points out, intoxication itself was not automatically regarded as a negative attribute. Cf. Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play* 220 ff., and n.51 below. On the eastern motif of the ‘Dancing Peacock’ see Macan, *Herodotus* 303–311; cf. How and Wells, *Commentary* II 119; McGregor, *TAPA* 72 (1941) 269 n.6.

⁴⁶ On the *aulos* see J. Landels, *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome* (London 1999) 24–46; T. Mathiesen, *Apollo’s Lyre. Greek Music and Musical Theory in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Lincoln 1999) 177–222; R. Martin, “The Pipes are Brawling: Conceptualizing Musical Performance in Athens,” in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.), *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge 2003) 153–180.

⁴⁷ *Pol.* 1341a.17 ff.: ἔτι δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ αὐλὸς ἠθικὸν ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὀργιστικόν (21–22).

loud and dominating: its sound was shrill or blaring, but overpowering in any case.⁴⁸ Perhaps the closest modern instrument to the ancient *aulos* is the Turkish *zambir* or Lebanese/Syrian *mijwiz*, although musicology scholars have sought to recreate its sounds by constructing models from vase-paintings.⁴⁹ The *aulos* was used by Greeks to keep soldiers marching in formation, rowers rowing together, athletes continuously training, and, of course, dancers dancing. The music of the *aulos* simply takes over the body and governs it. As Richard Martin states, *aulos* music “in Athenian culture makes one *do* things.” It could “bind the listener” and, in the case of dancing, make the dancer one with the ἀύλητής and the music being piped.⁵⁰ The *aulos* is of course often depicted in symposion-scenes in Greek vase-painting and is especially associated with Dionysos, *bacchai*, and satyrs. It is the instrument’s connection to Dionysos that explains Aristotle’s remarks about it.

Kleisthenes’ mounting doubts about Hippokleides were accelerated by the kind of dances he danced inasmuch as they seemed to have gone from barely acceptable to completely intolerable.⁵¹ The inventory of dances precisely recorded in the story is astonishing: Hippokleides began with an ἐμμελία, ap-

⁴⁸ Ath. 626 ff.; cf. Martin, in *The Cultures* 166.

⁴⁹ S. Hagel and Ch. Harrauer (eds.), *Ancient Greek Music in Performance* (Vienna 2005: CD); cf. S. Hagel, *Ancient Greek Music: A New Technical History* (Cambridge 2010) 327–341.

⁵⁰ Martin, in *The Cultures* 173. Cf. J. Fitton, “Greek Dance,” *CQ* 23 (1973) 273: “According to Longinus [*Subl.* 39.2], it is a more ‘dancy’ instrument than the lyre, and it forces men to move in rhythm.”

⁵¹ Cf. Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play* 220: by dancing, “Hippocleides usurps the role of Cleisthenes as organizer of the contest ... He loses a sense of the collective context of the gathering as he shifts to perform narcissistic solo dances which are to his own liking, but totally inappropriate for the banquet.” While we may agree that Hippokleides is certainly portrayed as going too far, his vulgar dancing display overpowers and occludes the marriage-competition while he is performing. As Lonsdale himself implies (221 ff.), Hippokleides is portrayed as thoroughly detached from any sense of appropriate conduct.

parently a slow, sober, and stately dance associated with the tragic chorus, which nevertheless did not please the tyrant. For all its reputed stateliness, the ἔμμελία incorporated miming gestures.⁵² When Hippokleides began to dance upon a tabletop, he became at once acrobatic and outlandish. The Laconian σχημάτια may have included the πυρρίχη for which the Spartans were famous.⁵³ This dance involved bending, leaping, and crouching—it was something all Spartans and Athenian aristocratic youth learned. (It is noteworthy that dancing the πυρρίχη was one of the competitions of the Panathenaia.)⁵⁴ There are several other possibilities for the Laconian σχημάτια including the βίβασις and the ὑπόρχημα, which is sometimes related in sources to the πυρρίχη. These were very vigorous dances, the former involving repeated jumping up and slapping the buttocks with the soles of the feet; the latter, with an element of pantomime, was “rapid, flashing, joyous, fiery.”⁵⁵ The

⁵² On the ἔμμελία: Pl. *Leg.* 816B–C; Hesych. s.v. Cf. P. Larcher, *Notes on Herodotus* (London 1829) 326–327; L. Lawler, *The Dance in Ancient Greece* (Middletown 1964) 82–85; G. Ley, “Modern Visions of Greek Tragic Dancing,” *Theatre Journal* 55 (2003) 474–476; Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play* 220. Larcher asserts that Kleisthenes would have had no cause to be displeased with Hippokleides if he were dancing a solemn dance, therefore there had to be at least one other type of ἔμμελία that was indecent. Of course, such reasoning proceeds from a desire to fit a square peg in a round hole. The tyrant’s displeasure was kindled by the increasing vulgarity of Hippokleides’ self-absorbed dancing, for which the anachronized ἔμμελία acts as a kind of benchmark (see 332 below).

⁵³ On the πυρρίχη (and Sparta): Ath. 630E–631B; Lucian *Salt.* 10. Cf. P. Ceccarelli, *La pirrica nell’antichità greco romana* (Pisa 1998); Lawler, *The Dance* 107–108; S. Buxton, *Music and Image in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 2005) 79–80. Hippokleides’ σχημάτια have been considered the “essential, defining figures of the dance” (Ley, *Theatre Journal* 55 [2003] 476), but as Fitton (*CQ* 23 [1973] 262) observes, “Showing-off dances, such as the leaping of young men between points of swords ... tend toward a circus act.” When Hippokleides stands on his head and waves his legs about, he has become a veritable circus acrobat: see n.58 below.

⁵⁴ Cf. Neils, in *Goddess and Polis* 56–57; Buxton, *Music and Image* 80.

⁵⁵ βίβασις: Arist. *Lys.* 82, Poll. 4.102; cf. Lawler, *The Dance* 121. A

tempo of *aulos* playing clearly picked up as Hippokleides danced. The crescendo of the incident—the highwater mark of Hippokleides’ meltdown—was the finale when he stood on his head, became an acrobat in fact, and “made his legs gesture like hands” (τοῖσι σκέλεσι ἐχειρονόμησε).⁵⁶ The impression is of frantic movements and the gesticulations of a man with his legs, buttocks, and genitals exposed above the heads of the wedding guests, flailing away with his bride presumptive present.

Hippokleides’ head-standing and leg-gesturing amounted to the supreme indecency for a mortified Kleisthenes: what was merely offensive had become intolerable. One interpreter offers the following:⁵⁷

The dance which offended Cleisthenes was clearly an obscene one that displayed Hippocleides’ genitals: not only would his tunic have fallen back when he turned upside down, but he enhanced the effect by waving his legs around. The genital display is saluted in Cleisthenes’ address to Hippocleides, which provoked the response that was to become proverbial, “Hippocleides doesn’t care.” Cleisthenes’ response ostensibly means “you have danced away (*aporchêsao*) your marriage,” but the hapax *aporchêsao* also puns significantly on *orcheis*, ‘testicles’: “You have lost your marriage by displaying your testicles,” possibly even “You have balled up your marriage.” It is appropriately then to the great tyrant that the true wit of the exchange belongs.

While this interpretation is inventive, lively, and even witty, it is oblivious both to representations of Greek hand-stand dancing

Korinthian black figure aryballos, ca. 600 BCE (Korinth C-54-1), may depict the *bibasis*. ὑπόρχημα: Plut. *Mor.* 748B–C, Ath. 631C, Lucian *Salt.* 16; cf. Lawler 101–102 (quotation at 101).

⁵⁶ The word ἐχειρονόμησε is also associated with ancient pantomime; on χειρονομία see Ath. 631C; cf. Ley, *Theatre Journal* 55 (2003) 476–477. Telestes, a stage actor, is said to have become so proficient at χειρονομία that he was able to mime Aischylos’ *Seven against Thebes* in its entirety (Ath. 22A; cf. Lawler, *The Dance* 128).

⁵⁷ D. Ogden, *The Crooked Kings of Ancient Greece* (London 1997) 117.

and what is humanly possible. The only way that Hippokleides could “make hand gestures with his feet” is if he was head-standing faced away from the audience regarding his dancing. Proof positive for this is not only offered by nature, but also by a number of vase paintings, which, while they do not show head-standing, nevertheless depict dancers and acrobats standing on their hands and gesticulating with their legs. A Campanian red-figure hydria by the Foundling Painter (BM F232) dated ca. 340–330 shows a hand-standing female acrobat whose legs are deployed in the only way possible for any ‘hand-gesturing’ by means of legs. A Campanian bell-krater (LACMA Hearst 50.9.45) from ca. 330–310 depicts two dancer-acrobats. The hand-standing female might be dangling something from her feet. There are several other such examples.⁵⁸ Nearer in time and most pertinent is the famous red-figure *psykter* ascribed to Douris, dated c. 500–490.⁵⁹ In this scene of revels, satyrs are drinking and dancing and some have become sexually aroused—all activities associated with Greek *symposia*. In one part of the revels, a satyr is performing a handstand, very similar to the female acrobat/dancers in the other depictions. Another satyr, moving toward the hand-stander, is aroused to erection not because of his view of the genitals of his fellow satyr, but rather apparently because of his buttocks, which are right in front of him.

There is certainly a sense of abandon and great impropriety in Hippokleides’ dance, which, as with Douris’ satyr, highlights his buttocks and suggests that the dance has become both satyric and homoerotically suggestive: Hippokleides was apparently advertising for male penetration in the midst of what

⁵⁸ Female acrobat, Paestan red-fig. *kalyx* krater, Asteas Group, ca. 350, Museo Eoliano, Lipari (inv. 82S); female acrobat, Paestan red-fig. *skyphos*, Asteas Group, ca. 350–325, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; female acrobat, terracotta statuette, third century BCE, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Taranto; female acrobat, terracotta statuette, second century BCE, Museo Provinciale Campano, Capua.

⁵⁹ BM E768: *ARV*² I 446 no. 262.

should have been his own wedding feast! Whether his head-standing and gestures were lascivious, it was certainly not what Greek sons-in-law-to-be should be up to, especially at wedding banquets, especially before the assembled multitude of Sikyonians, apparently including the bride. If we may judge from the subjects of the artistic representations of hand-standing and his “using legs to gesture like hands,” it was not only unseemly, but unmanly.⁶⁰ Hippokleides had humiliated himself by showing, as it were, his true colors: his reputation for ἀνδραγαθία was instantly replaced by μαλακία, its opposite. There could be no wedding for him.

Hippokleides and Herodotos II:

the story's source and the source's intentions

There are good reasons for considering the ‘dance of Hippokleides’ a fiction.⁶¹ One of them is that context of the story within the story, the ‘marriage of Agariste’. The ‘marriage’s’ obvious parallel to the ‘wooing of Helen’, the roster of suitors—whose own or whose kin’s superlativeness corresponds in many cases to distinct categories like wealth (Smindyrides, Diaktorides), intelligence (Leokedes), social grace (Laphanes), athleticism (Males), etc.—its folkloric elements, and obvious chronological problems mark the ‘marriage of Agariste’ as heavily embellished, if not made up from whole cloth. Again, this is no new idea.⁶² As to the ‘dance of Hippokleides’, apart from the implausibility of Hippokleides’ total reversal of character and complete loss of restraint at the very last minute of a

⁶⁰ Cf. Fitton, *CQ* 23 (1973) 260: “Bending, stretching, whirling, hand gestures ... are ‘closer motions’ and as such more feminine.”

⁶¹ Cf. McGregor, *TAPA* 72 (1941) 269 ff., well lays out the story’s problems, although he essentially takes the tale as historical.

⁶² On the parallels see n.29 above; on the renown of the suitors’ fathers, Vandiver, *Heroes in Herodotus* 255; on the problems of chronology, How and Wells, *Commentary* II 117–118. I find Papakonstantinou’s statement (*Nikephoros* 23 [2010] 74), “In this sense, it is quite likely that Herodotus’ narrative approximates the way Cleisthenes himself wanted the whole episode of Agariste’s betrothal perceived,” rather astonishing.

whole year of good behavior, there remains a further pernicious detail cited by Graham Ley. Hippokleides is said to have performed the ἐμμελία, a dance associated with tragedy which incorporated miming gestures. According to Ley:⁶³

Herodotus does not suggest how Hippokleides came to know these dances, and anachronism is vigorously at play in the story if tragic dances are being suggested, since tragedy was not established at Athens until the later sixth century, a generation after the time of this event.

This detail in the story certainly appears anachronized, as does the remarkably specific litany of the different types of dances danced in rather precise order by Hippokleides on the occasion.⁶⁴

This brings us round again to the question—and motivation—of source. That Hippokleides shamed himself and his family by his vulgarity on any occasion is highly questionable. The later Philaids did not consider Hippokleides at all a disgrace. To the contrary, Pherekydes' Philaid-derived testimony placed Hippokleides in the constellation of their most luminous ancestors well-worthy of recollection. Herodotos' sources for the 'dance of Hippokleides', which depict him as addled and extremely vulgar, were obviously not these Philaids. Since the story marks the Athenians as the best among the suitors, Herodotos' sources should be Athenian. Inasmuch as Megakles triumphed at the expense of Hippokleides, won Agariste, and

⁶³ Ley, *Theatre Journal* 55 (2003) 475–476.

⁶⁴ Detached from text and context, the story of Hippokleides' dance seems to inspire imaginative but quite misleading interpretation: e.g., R. Sutton, "The Good, the Base and the Ugly: The Drunken Orgy in Attic Vase Painting and the Athenian Self," in B. Cohen (ed.), *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art* (Leiden 2000) 183: "It is better to recognize that in this tale, which contains many elements of folklore, Hippokleides enacts a widespread conflict between the staid, old fashioned aristocratic values of Kleisthenes, of an essentially heroic world of dignity, responsibility, and measured self-control, with a new more individualistic ethic of personal self-expression." Cf. Papakonstantinou, *Nikephoros* 23 (2010) 71–93.

became thereby, as it were, ‘the best of the Athenians’, the likeliest sources for the story of the ‘marriage of Agariste’ and the ‘dance of Hippokleides’ are his relatives, the Alkmeonidai.⁶⁵ There are further grounds for believing this.

The ‘marriage of Agariste’ and, in it, the ‘dance of Hippokleides’ are embedded in a series of stories about the Alkmeonidai in Herodotos, which flatter or defend them and which must have originated with them (6.121–131).⁶⁶ The series begins with a special plea that the Alkmeonidai could not possibly have been responsible for the notorious shield-signal at Marathon (6.121) because the enemy consisted of Persians and tyrants (6.121.1), because the Alkmeonidai hated tyranny (6.123.1), and because they were in any case in exile from Athens for the whole period of Peisistratid tyranny from the time of Pallene (6.123.1).⁶⁷ Of course the latter two grounds are outright lies that Herodotos seems to have swallowed whole: Kleisthenes, the son of Megakles, was an Athenian archon during the period of Peisistratid rule.⁶⁸ In the passage preceding the ‘dance of Hippokleides’, Herodotos goes on to say that the Alkmeonidai achieved prestige and distinction among their fellow Athenians in the time of Alkmeon and then again of his son Megakles—the victorious groom in the competition at

⁶⁵ Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary* II 116–117; McGregor, *TAPA* 72 (1941) 269; Griffin, *Sikyon* 55; and Lavelle, *Fame, Money, and Power* 242 n.54.

⁶⁶ F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 160 ff.; Strassburger’s counter-arguments (in *Herodotus, Volume 1* 297 ff., 310 ff.) cannot be taken up in detail here, but his attempt to construe the lion-dream of Agariste as negative is unconvincing (see n.70 below).

⁶⁷ Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary* II 115; Lavelle, *Fame, Money, and Power* 284–285 and nn.77–78.

⁶⁸ The sixth-century archon-list fragment (*IG* I³ 1031; cf. Lavelle, *Fame, Money, and Power* 239 n.12) shows conclusively that Kleisthenes—son of that Megakles who married Agariste—was archon eponymous under the tyrants (cf. Cadoux, *JHS* 68 [1948] 109–110; Develin, *Athenian Officials* 47). Not only does this prove that the Alkmeonidai were not permanently exiled from Athens, but also that they were politically active and apparently trusted collaborators of the Peisistratid tyrants.

Sikyon (6.125.1). After the 'marriage of Agariste', Herodotos notes that the union produced that Kleisthenes, the namesake of his Sikyonian grandfather, who established the ten Athenian tribes and the democracy (6.131.1). Kleisthenes' brother, Hippokrates, begat another Megakles and another Agariste, named after their mother of Sikyon, who married Xanthippos, the son of Aripbron.⁶⁹ According to Herodotos, while this Agariste was pregnant, she dreamed that she gave birth to a lion. A few days later, Perikles was born (6.131.2)—an outright flattery of Herodotos' contemporary and apparent patron.⁷⁰ The story of the 'marriage of Agariste', which includes the 'dance of Hippokleides', was part of a chain of positive publicity for the Alkmeonidai in Herodotos. The information reflected favorably upon Megakles and his descendants, in the case of the 'dance', at the expense of the Philaid Hippokleides.

The 'dance of Hippokleides' fits further into a tradition of scurrility directed at Athenian rivals and political enemies of the Alkmeonidai, the episodes of which show those rivals or enemies to be immoral and even depraved. Most involve sexual misconduct and reflect quite badly upon the subjects of the stories. For example, when Peisistratos sought to become tyrant of Athens for the second time, he married the daughter of Megakles and Agariste.⁷¹ The marriage was part of the agreement made between him and his father-in-law for Megakles' support. However, according to Herodotos, once restored, Peisistratos did not want to beget children with the unnamed

⁶⁹ Cf. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* 379.

⁷⁰ *Contra* Thomas, *Oral Tradition* 271, this is a "clear glorification" of Perikles: cf. How and Wells, *Commentary* II 119–120; Lavelle, *Fame, Money, and Power* 285; M. Munn, *The Mother of the Gods, Athens and the Tyranny of Asia* (Berkeley 2006) 125–126.

⁷¹ Hdt. 1.60.2–61.3. Cf. R. Sinos, "Divine Selection: Epiphany and Politics in Archaic Greece," in *Cultural Poetics* 73–91; J. Blok, "Phye's Procession: Culture, Politics and Peisistratid Rule," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence* (Amsterdam 2000) 17–48.

Alkmeonid girl because he had grown sons and because the Alkmeonidai were cursed with the Kylonian miasma. To avoid impregnating the girl, Herodotos says that Peisistratos had sex with her οὐ κατὰ νόμον, “unconventionally” or “unnaturally.” According to the story, the naïve girl suspected something was amiss and told her mother Agariste who in turn told her husband. When Megakles got wind of Peisistratos’ misconduct, he was furious because of the insult to him and ran Peisistratos out of Athens. Megakles is thus depicted as an upright father, reacting righteously to an insult to him and his family brought about by the perverted conduct of the tyrant. Peisistratos, on the other hand, is unrighteous, sexually deviant—and archly tyrannical in his disregard for social and sexual convention.

The story is pure fiction. First, it deals in the actual thoughts and exchanges of its principals. Herodotos uses words like βουλόμενος “wanting” and μαθών “having learned” of Peisistratos, describing the tyrant’s actual thinking process and reactions in what seems to be real time. To whom would Peisistratos have communicated such thoughts and how were these transmitted faithfully to Herodotos verbatim? How did the “insult” to the girl, her own intimate thoughts, words, and actions—all of which could have earned great shame at the time—become record? (In another place in the *Peisistratos-logos* [1.61.3] Herodotos reports the actual assertion of an adolescent Hippias in conference on Eretria one hundred years before the historian’s time. Who could have been the source for this?) On the other hand, sexual outrage is typical of ‘evil’ tyrants. Abuse of women and boys was routine for Archaic Greek tyrants, their hybris symptomatic of their depravity and disregard for social convention. In the famous ‘Debate on Constitutions’ in Herodotos (3.80.5), Otanes the Persian says precisely that of tyrants. The story of Peisistratos’ sexual outrage was plausible to the ancient Athenians. It shames Peisistratos for gross sexual misconduct on the one hand, while it praises Megakles for right

conduct on the other.⁷²

In another such narrative, Isagoras, a political rival and enemy of Kleisthenes, the son of Megakles, vied for power with him after the Peisistratids had been expelled from Athens (Hdt. 5.66.1, 70 ff.). Getting the worst of it, Kleisthenes took the *demos* into partnership, temporarily trumping his rival. Isagoras retaliated by summoning Kleomenes, the king of Sparta, who arrived in Athens with an army at his back and put Kleisthenes to flight. According to Herodotos, Isagoras was a ξείνος of Kleomenes, but then the historian adds the following *obiter dictum* (5.70.1): τὸν δὲ Κλεομένεα εἶχε αἰτίη φοιτᾶν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰσαγόρεω τὴν γυναῖκα (“Kleomenes was guilty of having intercourse with Isagoras’ wife”). The word αἰτίη indicts Isagoras; the statement is meant to be a slander of him.⁷³ While the sentence explains why Kleomenes responded as he did to Isagoras’ summons to come to Athens, it shames Isagoras by suggesting that he offered his wife to Kleomenes as a way to influence him to do so. Isagoras is guilty of gross sexual misconduct by Athenian standards (though not necessarily by Spartan ones). The authors of the story and the *obiter dictum* are surely the Alkmeonidai, but its publicist is Herodotos. It is noteworthy that, though the tie of hospitality to Kleomenes is observed, the charge against Isagoras is not repeated in the Aristoteleian *Constitution of the Athenians*.⁷⁴

Finally, in Plutarch’s *Life of Kimon* (14.2–4), the renowned

⁷² The fictional elements of the story are more fully examined in Lavelle, *Fame, Money, and Power* 98 ff.

⁷³ Herodotos is not saying that Kleomenes “seduced” Isagoras’ wife (M. de Bakker, “Herodotus Proteus: Myth, History, Inquiry and Storytelling,” in E. Baragwanath and M. de Bakker [eds.], *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* [Oxford 2012] 116) nor that “Isagoras’ wife wins Spartan support for her husband’s political ambitions by granting her favours to the Spartan king” (C. Dewald, “Women and Culture in Herodotus’ Histories,” in R. Munson (ed.) *Herodotus, Volume 2, Herodotus and the World* [Oxford 2013] 166 n.20).

⁷⁴ The author follows Herodotos, but only so far as to say that Isagoras was a ξείνος of Kleomenes (20.2), thus highlighting the omission.

Philaid Athenian general of the fifth century and political enemy of Perikles, was brought to trial for bribery through the latter's machinations. During the time of the trial, Elpinike, the sister of Kimon, with whom he was accused of having incestuous relations, was said to have come to Perikles requesting that he intercede on Kimon's behalf. According to Stesimbrotos of Thasos, the fifth-century source quoted by Plutarch, Perikles replied to Elpinike that she was "too old, too old at your age to bring off this business" (14.4).⁷⁵ The imputation of this gratuitous barb was not only that an over-aged Elpinike was offering herself sexually to Perikles, who, with such a brush-off, put himself quite above such conduct, but also that Kimon had somehow put his sister up to her attempt. Kimon is variously slandered as depraved and possessed of a sister of such character. Here the Alkmeonidai seem to embellish in their own interests what seems to have been comic scurrility alleging Elpinike's sexual indiscretions and an incestuous relationship of Kimon and his sister.⁷⁶

All these aspersions are directed at rivals of the Alkmeonidai and men of political consequence. Herodotos was quite willing to transmit these slanders as he obtained them from the Alkmeonidai.⁷⁷ Of course, denigrating a *philos*' rivals and enemies is simply the flipside of praising his kin and allies: it is to do what a good Greek 'friend' does for a 'friend', especially a patron. Herodotos certainly profited from his friendship with Perikles by being sent out to the new, very promising Athenian colony of Thurii in southern Italy in 443.⁷⁸ And, from the last

⁷⁵ γραῦς εἶ φάναι γραῦς, ᾧ Ἐλπινίκη, ὡς τηλικαῦτα διαπράττεσθαι πράγματα. Cf. *Per.* 10.5, ᾧ Ἐλπινίκη, γραῦς εἶ, γραῦς εἶ, ὡς πράγματα τηλικαῦτα πράσσειν; 28.5, οὐκ ἂν μύροισι γραῦς ἐοῦσ' ἠλείφεο.

⁷⁶ Plut. *Cim.* 4.5–7; cf. L. O'Higgins, *Woman and Humor in Classical Greece* (Cambridge 2003) 112–114.

⁷⁷ See nn.66–67 above.

⁷⁸ Strab. 14.2.16, *Suda* η536, Steph. Byz. s.v. Θεόρυτοι. Cf. R. Munson, "Introduction," in *Herodotus, Volume 1* 6–7 and n.18, and Strassburger, in *Herodotus, Volume 1* 318–319.

example, it is reasonable to consider Perikles or those close to him as the likeliest sources for Herodotos' Alkmeonid 'history'.

While the slander involving Hippokleides is more elaborate and embellished with folktale overtones, the 'dance of Hippokleides' is nevertheless a denigration of a rival in the same spirit and roughly in the same way as the others: it is a citation of sexual misconduct and makes its object, Hippokleides, look very bad. It is also a praise of Megakles whose triumph is achieved through moral superiority and benchmarked by nothing other than Hippokleides' catastrophic lapse. When Hippokleides reveals that one enormous, implausible flaw, all that he is, all that superiority and "manly excellence," is made over on the spot to Megakles, who because of his implied self-restraint and righteousness, establishes himself as superior not just to Hippokleides but to the generation of 'heroes' assembled to win Agariste. Hippokleides is one more victim of Alkmeonid calumny; Megakles, one more beneficiary.

Hippokleides and the Panathenaia

The historical Hippokleides, who is masked and costumed to some extent in the 'marriage of Agariste' by the role that he must play for its authors, is nevertheless discernible in outline. That Megakles' victory would be measured against him implies reputation and status, and not just among the Athenians. Herodotos' sources had other options, but Hippokleides was somehow necessary to gauge Megakles' victory. The necessity to build Hippokleides up and then knock him down, taken together with his archonship and his family's pride in him, supports the conclusion that Hippokleides was not only a memorable person for the Athenians because important in his time, but also that he was in fact a rival of Megakles. The name 'Hippokleides' must have resonated with the audience for those things for which he is singled out in Herodotos: wealth, athleticism, lineage, and "manly excellence."⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Cf. D. Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World* (Oxford 2007) 153: Hippokleides "was a member of an agonistic family, he had shown athletic

It is significant that Hippokleides' superlatives, which become Megakles' in the story, are demonstrated by means of athletic and other competitions. Herodotos says that, right after Kleisthenes made the announcement at Olympia about the contest for Agariste, he prepared a running track and a wrestling ground. He tested the suitors for manliness (ἀνδραγαθία), temperament (ὄργή), training (παίδευσις), and character (τρόπος). Above all, he tested them for "sociability" (συνεστῶ)—the last accented as a set-up for Hippokleides' failure.⁸⁰ Hippokleides was superior in every contest: even on the wedding day, he continued to compete and to excel all others in both music and speech. The emphatically articulated benchmark of excellence in the 'marriage of Agariste' is agonistic. Because of this emphasis, it seems plausible to imagine that the story took the form it did in Alkmeonid lore—and lore it is, not history—because Megakles' most formidable Athenian opponent was particularly tied in popular memory to athletic and musical competitions, including dancing. It seems rather more than coincidental that the Panathenaic games included these competitions and that Hippokleides was linked by a different source to the establishment-year of the Greater Panathenaia.

On the present evidence, we cannot say for certain who established the Greater Panathenaia in 566/5. There is no direct statement about that organization. But Hippokleides, rich, well-born, politically connected and successful and worthy enough to warrant such singling out and shaming by the Alkmeonidai, is far more apt as founder of that most significant of Athenian festivals than Peisistratos. Whereas ca. 566/5 Hippokleides was wealthy, politically prominent, and apparently

training as a suitor at Sikyon, and Herodotus calls him the wealthiest man in Athens. Hippokleides perhaps just responded to the desire of Athenians, rich and poor, for a popular form of ceremony, competition, and recreation." Cf. Kyle, in *Worshipping Athena* 117.

⁸⁰ Cf. Scott, *Historical Commentary* 424–425: "ἀνδραγαθίης ... τρόπου Roughly 'character, disposition, education, manners' ... συνεστῶς is generally translated 'at [communal] dinner'." See n.37 above.

famously tied to athletic and musical competitions, Peisistratos was linked to none of those things. The latter came to wealth and his final tyranny only two decades later. The only evidence linking Peisistratos to the Greater Panathenaia is a single scholiast’s note attached to a speech in praise of Athens composed nearly eight centuries after the festival was founded. On the other hand, the Philaids’ own tradition, transmitted to Pherekydes, active ca. 450, expressly ties the ancestor, Hippokleides, as archon to the establishment date of the Panathenaia. The Philaids were proud of their connection to Hippokleides, who held Athens’ most important office at the time of the festival’s founding.⁸¹

Whether Hippokleides was an actual suitor of Agariste is also impossible to say, but it may be that the saying ascribed to him, which we should expect did not actually originate at the ‘games’ in Sikyon in the heat of a drunken dance, had perhaps something to do with Megakles’ match. When confronted with the fact by the Alkmeonidai to whom the match obviously meant so much, the son of Teisandros may have issued the rejoinder—perhaps a variation on a popular catchphrase not Hippokleides’ own⁸²—that became famous as an aristocratic dismissal of an implied inferior: “(Such a thing) matters not to (a) Hippokleides.” The gist would perhaps be that an Athenian *aristos* like himself, tied to the more resplendent Kypselids of Corinth, would have no truck with a Sikyonian “stone-

⁸¹ Cf. Thomas, *Oral Tradition* 168.

⁸² The versified saying, οὐδὲν μέλει μοι, which occurs famously at Eur. *Hec.* 1274 and is found in the *Tragicorum fragmenta adespota* 513 (II 145: ἐμοῦ θανόντος γὰρ ἀ μὴθῆτω πυρί· / οὐδὲν μέλει μοι· τὰ μὰ γὰρ καλῶς ἔχει) and was probably old by the time of Hippokleides’ alleged utterance, may well have provided the basis for the variation attributed to him. Solomon, *CR* 21 (1907) 232–233, is much too literal in distinguishing οὐδὲν μέλει μοι from οὐ φροντὶς Ἴπποκλείδῃ. The joke could be increased by the substitution of specifics in the well-recognized phrase. Cf. E. I. McQueen, *Herodotus. Book VI* (Bristol 2000) 220: “Attempts to explain the origin of the saying will have resulted in the application of a less specific story to one particular individual.” See also note following.

thrower's" daughter and thus that the marriage was nothing to crow about for any Athenian who mattered. Such a rebuff would have been stinging indeed to the tainted Alkmeonidai who could never quite shake off the muck of the Kylonian miasma. Thorough Alkmeonid revenge had to wait until the fifth century, however, and their spokesman, Herodotos, who transmitted their account of the 'origin' of the saying after they had set its context as they pleased rather than as Hippokleides intended it when or where he uttered it. On the other hand, it could be that the 'saying' of Hippokleides was entirely made up as a variant on a popular phrase, falsely attributed, and then purported to be famous to Herodotos whose publication of it as Hippokleides' in turn helped it to become so from his time.⁸³

April, 2014

Dept. of Classical Studies
Loyola University Chicago
Chicago, IL 60660
blavell@luc.edu

⁸³ The number of misattributions of sayings of the famous, whose false connections are popularly ignored, is considerable: cf. for example P. F. Boller and J. George, *They Never Said It: A Book of Fake Quotes, Misquotes, and Misleading Attributions* (Oxford 1990).

Versions of this paper were presented at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest on 15 March 2013 and at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association on 5 January 2014. I thank colleagues at those meetings for their very kind and helpful comments and discussion. I also thank the anonymous reader/s of this article and, in particular, the editor of the journal whose expertise improved the article greatly. As always, errors that remain in it are entirely my own.