

História Antiga: Relações Interdisciplinares.

Fontes, Artes, Filosofia,
Política, Religião e Recepção

Carmen Soares, José Luís Brandão &
Pedro C. Carvalho (coords.)

THUCYDIDES AND THE SEXUAL POLITICS OF TYRANNICIDE

THOMAS FIGUEIRA (figueira@classics.rutgers.edu)
Rutgers. The State University of New Jersey.
Department of Classics

ABSTRACT - I analyze the excursus on the would-be tyrannicides Harmodios and Aristogeiton in Thucydides book 6, which interrupts the crisis surrounding the mutilation of the Herms and profanation of the Mysteries before the Sicilian campaign. Thucydides' attention to the sexual motivations and distorted ideation of the tyrannicides was in deliberate opposition to a hagiographical tradition, enshrined in popular song, art, oratory, and Attidography. Thucydides recognized that this affair originated in a quarrel over pederastic relations but was reluctant to see in pederasty an organizing principle for archaic politics, unlike [Plato] *Hipparchus* (which considered the tyrannicides culpable as aggressors). Thucydides' hesitancy also reacted against an elite tradition which not only glorified pederastic lovers (with Harmodios and Aristogeiton as paradigmatic) as natural opponents of tyranny but also even considered opposition to pederasty an outgrowth of tyranny. First witnessed in Plato's *Symposium*, this interpretation is attested by Phainias, Heraclides Ponticus, and Hieronymos of Rhodes, authorities preserved or supplemented by Athenaeus and Plutarch. Thucydides digressed because of his distaste for the irruption of the personal, especially the sexual, into politics, a trait shared by the tyrannicides and the *demos* in its reaction against Alkibiades.

KEYWORDS - Thucydides; pederasty; tyrannicide; Harmodios & Aristogeiton; profanation of the Mysteries; Alkibiades, mutilation of the Herms; Peisistratids

The discussion by Thucydides of the would-be tyrannicides Harmodios and Aristogeiton is striking on many accounts.¹ This remarkable excursus is set within the narrative of the reaction to the mutilation of the Herms and the profanation of the mysteries on the eve of the Sicilian Expedition (415).² Here I

¹ Thuc. 6. 54. 3-59. 4. For simplicity, 'tyrannicides' will sometimes replace Harmodios and Aristogeiton. Thuc. 1. 20. 2 is a shorter excursus meant to stress the frailty of popular memory (here on the status of Hipparkhos as tyrant) and the historian's need for critical accuracy. See Hornblower *CT* 1. 57, but contrast how Thuc. 6. 54. 1 and 6. 55. 1 seem to echo 1. 20. 1 (cf. *CT* 3. 441). The most recent treatment is Meyer 2008: 26-32.

² See Osborne 1985, Quinn 2007: 82-95, 100-105, for cultural history of the Herms. That Hipparkhos was arguably the first to erect such monuments in number might well have started Thucydides thinking about his assassination here ([Plato] *Hipparch.* 228B-E; cf. Harp. s.v. 'Ἐρμαῖ).

intend to explore an aspect that has challenged scholarly interpretation, namely the historian's remarkable insistence that the motivation of the assassins lay in sexual impulse, as the words in bold indicate, a unique invocation of sexuality as an historical factor in the *Histories*.³

6. 54. 1: τὸ γὰρ Ἀριστογεΐτονος καὶ Ἀρμοδίου τόλμημα δι' **ἐρωτικὴν** ξυντυχίαν ἐπεχειρήθη ... the act of boldness of Harmodius and Aristogeiton was undertaken because of a **sexual** happenstance

6. 54. 3: ὁ δὲ **ἐρωτικῶς** περιαλήσας καὶ φοβηθεὶς τὴν Ἰππάρχου δύναμιν μὴ βία προσαγάγηται αὐτόν, ἐπιβουλεύει εὐθὺς ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἀξιώσεως κατάλυσιν τῇ τυραννίδι. [Aristogeiton] being in extreme **sexual** distress and *frightened* about the power of Hipparchus lest he bring him [Harmodios] over by force, straightway plotted the overthrow of the tyranny on the basis of whatever personal standing and resources he had.

6. 56. 2: **χαλεπῶς** δὲ ἐνεγκόντος τοῦ Ἀρμοδίου πολλῶ δὴ μᾶλλον δι' ἐκεῖνον καὶ ὁ Ἀριστογεΐτων παρωξύνετο. καὶ αὐτοῖς τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πρὸς τοὺς ξυνεπιθησομένους τῷ ἔργῳ ἐπέπρακτο ... '[in reaction to the insult toward Harmodios' sister] With Harmodios *reacting painfully*, much more for his sake was Aristogeiton goaded into rage. And the various measures were prepared by them with reference to those who were about to collude in undertaking the affair.'

6. 57. 2-3: καὶ ὡς εἶδόν τινα τῶν ξυνωμοτῶν σφίσι διαλεγόμενον οικείως τῷ Ἰππία ... **ἔδεισαν** ... τὸν λυπήσαντα οὖν σφᾶς καὶ δι' ὄνπερ πάντα ἐκινδύνευον ἐβούλοντο πρότερον, εἰ δύναιντο, προτιμωρήσασθαι ... περιέτυχον τῷ Ἰππάρχῳ παρὰ τὸ Λεωκόρειον καλούμενον, καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπερισκέπτως προσπεσόντες καὶ ὡς ἂν μάλιστα δι' ὀργῆς ὁ μὲν **ἐρωτικῆς**, ὁ δὲ **ὑβρισμένος**, ἔτυπτον καὶ ἀποκτείνουσιν αὐτόν. 'when they saw one of the fellow conspirators conversing familiarly with Hippias ... they were *afraid* ... they wished to take vengeance first, if they were able, on the one giving them distress, for whom they were risking everything ... they encountered Hipparkhos at the so-called Leokoreion and immediately falling on him heedlessly, as one [Aristogeiton] would on account of **sexual** rage and one [Harmodios] having suffered *hybris*, they struck and killed him.'

6. 59. 1: τοιοῦτῳ μὲν τρόπῳ δι' **ἐρωτικὴν** λύπην ἢ τε ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς καὶ ἡ ἀλόγιστος τόλμη ἐκ τοῦ παραχρῆμα περιδεοῦς Ἀρμοδίῳ καὶ Ἀριστογεΐτονι ἐγένετο. 'in such a manner through **sexual** distress

³ See Schwartz 1919: 184; Loraux 1985: 14-15; Stahl 2003: 2; Hornblower *CT* 3. 433-453 (and esp. 436, 440-441 on the sexual aspect); Meyer 2008: 15-18. This vehemence was recognized in antiquity and attributed to Thucydides' Peisistratid descent (Hermippus fr. 62W *apud* Marcell. *Vita Thuc.* 18; cf. Σ Thuc. 1. 20. 2).

occurred both the beginning of the conspiracy and the irrational audacity for Harmodios and Aristogeiton under the influence of an immediate *panic ...*.

Here collocations of erotic impulse coincide with other negative aspects of motivation: descriptions both of psychic pain, underlined above, and of fear, set in italics. Thucydides' deliberate sense of the tyrannicides characterizes them as individuals in the throes of strong irrational compulsions. They were dominated by *tolma* 'audacity' (above in double underline) and *orge* 'rage'.⁴ The erotic impulse is primary: the insult to Harmodios' sister is "processed" under its influence. The effect of the ring-composition in 6. 54. 1 and 6. 59. 1 heightens the emphasis on the unappealing motivations of the tyrannicides. This characterization hardly befits the aura of heroization that most other evidence on their actions bestows.⁵

Some scholarship on this passage has grappled with Thucydides' judgment on the status of Hippias and Hipparkhos in the tyrannical regime. Research has also focused on just whom and in what way Thucydides intended to correct here. And it has not escaped notice that his is also a strikingly favorable appraisal of the Peisistratid regime, especially in what Stahl has called an excursus within the excursus (6. 54. 4-7).⁶ All these approaches find their warrant, although, as we shall see, they do not quite amount to a complete rationale for the excursus. Surely in an author who was usually so reserved in first-person expressions of emotional judgment, Thucydides' coloring of the motives of Harmodios and Aristogeiton is doubly significant, as well as highlighted for its appearance within virtually a set-piece in historical methodology. He meant to dissent strongly from the hagiographical tradition on the tyrannicides.⁷ Herodotus was not his target for correction (cf. Hdt. 5. 55. 1- 58. 1, 61. 2). Herodotus did not believe Hipparkhos led Athens and did not credit the tyrannicides for overthrowing the Peisistratids, despite an implicitly favorable posture (Hdt. 5. 62. 1- 65. 2; 6. 123. 2; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 860D). Rather, Thucydides was reacting to a popular tradition that saw them as exemplary heroes. Their enhancement is apparent in the late

⁴ Meyer 2008: 17-19 interestingly suggests that that this reaction to *hybris* is meant to seem outmoded and is to be deliberately contrasted with Hippias' demeanor.

⁵ Other historical sources: *Ath. Pol.* 18. 1-19. 1; [Plato] *Hipp.* 229B-C; Arist. *Ach.* 979-980 (with scholia: 980, cf. 1093a, c-d), *Lys.* 626-635 (with scholia: 632-633); Plato *Sym.* 182C; Aris. *Pol.* 1311a36-39, *Rhet.* 1401b10-11; Aesch. 1. 132; DS 9. 1. 4, 10. 17. 1-3; Ael. *VH* 11. 8; Polyæn. *Strat.* 1. 22; 8. 45; Justin *Ep.* 2. 9. 2-6; Paus. 1. 23. 1; Sen. *De ira* 2. 23. 1; Pliny *NH* 7. 23. 87, 34. 19, 70, 72; Lucian *De parasito* 48; Athen. 13. 596f; Plut. *Mor.* 505E-F, 628D, 760C; Max. Tyr. *Diss.* 18.2b-e; also DL 1. 57. See Brunnsäker 1955: 1-29, with citation of earlier scholarship.

⁶ Stahl 2003: 3.

⁷ Note Brunnsäker 1955: 8: "Hipparchus was not killed because he was a tyrant".

6th/early 5th century in popular *skolia* ‘drinking songs’ then circulating,⁸ in their two sets of statues (from 509)⁹ and the connected epigram,¹⁰ in the state cult in their honor,¹¹ and in other exemptions and honors¹² like perpetual hospitality in Athens’ town-hall (for the nearest descendant of each).¹³ Perhaps the tenacious

⁸ *Skolia*: PMG 893-896 (893, 896: murder of the tyrant making Athens *isonomos* ‘with equal laws’). Cf. Arist. *Ach.* 980, 1093 with scholia; *Vesp.* 1224-1227; *Lys.* 632-634 with scholia; fr. 444 KA; Antiphanes frs. 3, 85 KA; cf. Plato *Com.* fr. 216; Lucian *De parasito* 48; Aristid. 11. 1. 133D, 80. 3-5J; Hesych. s.v. Ἀρμοδίου μέλος, α 7317; Eustath. *Od.* 1. 33.6-7; Diogen. 2.68 CPG 1.207; Macar. 2.32, CPG 2.146; Apostol. 3.82, 7.26 CPG 2.306, 401; *Suda* s.vv. ἀγοράσω, α 305; Ἀδμήτου μέλος καὶ Ἀρμοδίου, α 493; Ἀρμοδίοι, α 3975; ἐν μύρτου κλαδί τὸ ξίφος κρατήσω, ε 1384; οὐδέποτ’ ἐγὼ τοῦτον ὑποδέξομαι, ο 812; πάροις, π 737; φορήσω τὸ ξίφος τολοπιπὸν ἐν μύρτου κλαδί, φ 592. Analysis and date: Ostwald 1969: 121-136; also Pleket 1972: 71-78; Taylor 1981: 69-70; cf. Podlecki 1966: 139-140; Lavelle 1993: 50-58. If Miltiades actually invoked the tyrannicides (to the *polemarch* Kallimakhos, their fellow demesman [cf. Plut. *Mor.* 628D-F]) as liberators on the eve of Marathon, this would be early corroboration of the tyrannicide tradition (Hdt. 6. 109. 3). See Scott 2005: 382-383, 412; cf. Podlecki 1966: 140.

⁹ Two sets of statues: one by Antenor (supposedly 509: Pliny *NH* 34. 9. 17, cf. 19. 69-70, 86; Val. Max. 2. 10. 1 ext.), appropriated by the Persians in 480 (later restored by either Alexander, Seleukos, or Antiokhos) and a replacement set of Kritias and Nesiotes (477/6: *Marmor Parium*, *FGh* 239 A54): Arist. *Lys.* 630-634; *Eccl.* 681-683; Aris. *Rhet.* 1368a17 (first honorific statues); Dem. 20 70; *Lyc. Leoc.* 51; Paus. 1. 8. 5; Arrian *An.* 3. 16. 8, 7. 19. 2; Luc. *Philops.* 18; [Dio Chrys.] 37. 41; [Plut.] *Mor.* 833B; DC 47. 20. 4; Philos. *VS* 1. 15. 3; Tim. *Lex. Plat.* s.v. ὀρχήστρα, 997 Herrman; Liban. *Dec.* 22. 11; 23. 71; also *IG* II² 450. 11-12, 646. 39-40. See Brunnsåker 1955: 33-83; Taylor 1981: 33-46 (placing the statues at the site of the assassination); Stewart 1990: 35-36. For the ceramic evidence: Brunnsåker 1955: 102-111. A provision in some decrees ordering the erection of statues for their honorands prohibits placement next to those of the tyrannicides, presumably in order to preserve their special prestige (*IG* II² 450.11-12, 646.39-40). This privilege was deliberately breached for Antigonos and Demetrios (DS 20. 46. 2; cf. DC 47. 20. 4 for Brutus and Cassius).

¹⁰ The later statue base bore a Simonidean epigram hailing the tyrannicides (fr. I Ca.: ll. 1-2 *apud* Heph. *Ench.* 4.6 [14. 22-15. 4]; Eustath. *Il.* 3. 696. 11-13), whom another couplet with a line, known only from the inscription (*IG* I³ 502 [CEG #430]), lauds for making Athens *eleutheros* ‘free’ or *isonomos*. Cf. Day 1985: 30-34.

¹¹ Their tomb in the Kerameikos (Paus. 1. 29. 15), with heroic cult and receipt of sacrifices by the polemarch along with war dead: *Ath. Pol.* 58.1 (cf. Pollux *Onom.* 8. 91), with Rhodes 1981: 651-652; Taylor 1981: 23. Ephialtes was buried near the tyrannicides in 462 (Paus. 1. 29. 15), which indicates the contemporary mood of the partisans of democracy. Calabi Limentani 1976: 15-19 believes that the erection of the statues and the inauguration of the cult are coordinated with the practice of annual state funerals for war dead. Shear (2012) argues rather for the Panathenaia as the venue for their rites.

¹² *IG* I³ 131 (dated to c. 440-432), which may well have been proposed by Perikles, indexes their *sitesis* as preexisting and as paradigmatic by the time of its issuance. See also Arist. *Hipp.* 786-787. Calabi Limentani 1976: 19-23, 26 argues that the privileges of the descendants of the tyrannicides are compensatory for their participation in the funerary cult (cf. *IErythrai* #503. 14-129).

¹³ According to Andoc. 1. 96-98 (Dem. 20. 159; 21. 170), a decree of Demophantos (410) offered the same honors as those of the tyrannicides, which a *stèle* memorialized, to those attacking persons subverting the democracy. These privileges (including *ateleia*) are cited so often that both the honors and their historical basis became paradigmatic in exemplifying

hold that these traditions exercised might be owed to their enshrinement in a poetic work, possibly even a longer elegiac work from which the epigram attributed to Simonides was derived (see n. 10 above).

Although oral tradition may have troubled Thucydides (1. 20. 1: τὰς ἀκοὰς), it is quite conceivable that he was also reacting to a written source, the first *Atthis*, that of Hellanicus,¹⁴ which encapsulated what Fornara called the *vulgate*.¹⁵ Hellanicus likely believed that Hipparkhos was the eldest son of Peisistratos,¹⁶ as Aelian, who cites him, says (*VH* 8.2), an opinion that Thucydides is at pains to refute (1.20.2; 6.54. 2, 55.1-3). The Ephoran account, transmitted by Diodorus Siculus, may also reflect Hellanicus. It has the souls of the tyrannicides armored by Solonian *nomothesia* (9. 1. 4), and their motivation being to seek the freedom of their fatherland (10. 17. 1-3, a truncated account). Diodorus treats Hippias and Hipparkhos as violent, harsh, transgressive tyrants, and, another son of Peisistratos, Thessalos, as wise, willing to renounce the tyranny, and favoring *isotetes* 'equality'.

Such exaggeration of the significance of Harmodios and Aristogeiton in popular memory may well have prevailed in some later Atthidography, just as it held sway among the orators (cf. n. 13). Yet the *Athenaion Politeia* seems to indicate that some Atthidographers - Fornara sensibly suggested Cleidemus and Androtion¹⁷ - tried to integrate the Thucydidean narrative, which provides the organizational spine for the *Ath. Pol.*'s account, with the more laudatory tenor of

patriotic service and its democratic recognition: Aesch. 1. 140; Dem. 19. 280; 20. 18, 29, 127, 159-160; 21. 170; Is. 5. 46-47 (*proedria*); Lyc. *Leoc.* 51; Din. 1. 101, cf. 63; Hyp. 6. 39; also Arr. *An.* 4. 10. 3; Cic. *Pro Milone* 29. 80; *TD* 1. 49. 116. Aeschines is an outlier with his admission of the pederastic nature of the relations of the tyrannicides, but he strikingly states that one of the *stratēgoi* will raise the issue (1. 132, 140). Could this have been Proxenos, a direct descendant of Harmodios, who served as general in this period (n. 47 below)? Their repute was protected against defamation and ridicule (Hyp. [*Philip.*] 2. 3); or against giving slaves their names: Gellius *AN* 9. 2. 10; Liban. 1. 71). See Liban. *Epis.* 208. 2. The *demos* dowered the granddaughter of Aristogeiton, after rescuing her from poverty on Lemnos (Plut. *Arist.* 27. 4).

¹⁴ Jacoby, 1949: 158-164; *HCT* 4. 321-322; Lavelle 1993, 52-53. One might point to the phrase τὸς ἄλλους in ... οὔτε τοὺς ἄλλους οὔτε αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίους περὶ τῶν σφετέρων τυράννων οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ γενομένου ἀκριβὲς οὐδὲν λέγοντας to allude to the non-Athenian Hellanicus (Jacoby 1949, 158-159; Brunnsäker 1955: 4-5). Cf. Tsakmakis 1996: 210. The wider conclusions of Jacoby, however, about the configuration of the traditions on the tyrannicides offer much material for criticism; see Fornara 1970: 164-169; Asheri 1981: 25-31.

¹⁵ Fornara 1968: 401. On the political valence of the tyrannicide "cult", see Podlecki 1966, who credits Themistokles (pp. 138-139), but most other commentators have opted for an earlier inauguration (n. 8 above).

¹⁶ Also *Marmor Parium*, *FGrH* 239 A45.

¹⁷ Fornara 1968: 409. See also Lang 1955: 402.

popular tradition.¹⁸ Here Hipparkhos is rendered positively,¹⁹ and the onus for the approach to Harmodios and subsequent retaliation is shifted to his younger brother Thessalos, who is rash and hybristic (18. 2).²⁰ Consequently, a spectrum of evaluation existed on Hipparkhos (and, by implication, on Thessalos), in which Thucydides occupies a medial position: on one flank, he stands apart from the hagiographical *vulgate* and Hellanicus, where Hipparkhos is implicated in a vicious tyranny and transgressive toward Harmodios; on the other, he is distinct both from the *Athenaion Politeia*, which exculpates Hipparkhos from any role, and from the author of the *Hipparchus* (attributed to Plato), who describes this eldest (n.b) son of Peisistratos as a wise and benevolent tyrant, edifying the Athenians as though in an age of Kronos (228B-229D). Moreover, in the *Hipparchus*, Harmodios and Aristogeiton are the aggressors and not Hipparkhos.

Another correction of the *Athenaion Politeia* was to contradict Thucydides' treatment of citizen deportment in the Panathenaic procession (18.4; cf. Thuc. 6. 58. 1-2): Hippias did not separate Attic hoplites from their shields and spears; he did not search for daggers; and, concomitantly, the Athenians did not then process under arms. This insistence that an armed procession only began after Kleisthenes implicitly exculpates the Athenians of passivity in the aftermath of Hipparkhos' killing. Also exculpatory is the detail that the plot had many participants rather than Thucydides' "not many" (18. 2; cf. Thuc. 6. 56. 3: ... οὐ πολλοὶ οἱ ξυνομωμοκότες ἀσφαλείας ἔνεκα). A further supplementation of Thucydides' version is directly attributed to *demotikoi* 'populist sources' and credited Aristogeiton for falsely implicating pro-Peisistratids as co-conspirators in order to taint the tyrants and weaken their following.²¹ This grants the tyrannicides a positive impact upon the eventual liberation. Moreover, the *Ath. Pol.* here attributes to ἔνιοι 'some' the view that Aristogeiton revealed the names of his true accomplices. And the pederastic relationship of the tyrannicides with each other is not made explicit in the *Ath. Pol.*²² Rather it is Hipparkhos, not

¹⁸ In general, see Rhodes 1981: 189-191; 227-233; also Fornara 1968; Vattuone 1975: 178 (positing a pro-Peisistratid, apologetic source for the shift in responsibility to Thessalos).

¹⁹ The distinction with the *politikos* and *emphron* Hippias is not necessarily pejorative. Cf. Rhodes 1981: 228.

²⁰ *Ath. Pol.* 17. 3 equates Thessalos with another son, Hegisistratos. Hegisistratos: Hdt. 5. 94. 1. Thessalos: Thuc. 1. 20. 2; 6. 55. 1; DS 10. 17; cf. Theophr. *HP* 2. 3. 3. See Fornara 1968: 411-413.

²¹ *Ath. Pol.* 18. 4, 5; cf. Justin. 2. 9. 3-4; Polyæn. *Strat.* 1. 22; Sen. *De ira* 2. 23. 1; also perhaps implied in DS 10. 17. 2-3. This motif may be borrowed from a tradition on Zeno of Elea: Val. Max. 3. 3. 2 (ext.); DL 9. 26-27 (where allusion is made to Aristogeiton). Cf. Rhodes 1981: 232. Further embroidery is probably a role for the faithful *hetaira* Leaina, who resists torture in order not to reveal the conspirators (Paus. 1.23.4, where it is explicitly oral tradition; Polyæn. *Strat.* 8. 45).

²² Yet one factor provoking Harmodios and Aristogeiton was that Thessalos had supposedly abused Harmodios for being effeminate (*Ath. Pol.* 18.2: λοιδορήσας τι τὸν Ἀρμόδιον ὡς

Thessalos, who is *paidiodes* ‘fond of amusements’ and *erotikos* ‘given to sexual affairs’ (18. 1).

Before proceeding, let me offer a thumbnail reconstruction.²³ Whatever personal motivation moved the tyrannicides, the nature of the regime necessitated that any vindication had to start with Hippias and encompass the fall of the tyranny.²⁴ It is chastening to admit that, despite Thucydides and a mass of references, obscurities persist.²⁵ Thucydides is probably correct about the seniority of Hippias over Hipparkhos in age and authority,²⁶ although they were likely near contemporaries, and Hipparkhos qualified as an important figure in the tyranny. He could issue orders, as he disqualified Harmodios’ sister and exiled Onomakritos, a literary servitor of the regime, over whom he acted as patron (Hdt. 7. 6. 3-4). Yet, regardless of any intimate consultations among family and *philoï*, business such as orders to the *doruphoroi* (although they also guarded Hipparkhos [Thuc. 6. 57. 4]) and diplomatic interchanges were probably channeled through Hippias. However, the ramifications of Thucydides’ establishing Hippias as **the** tyrant ought not to be overplayed.²⁷ Such nuances over the status of Hipparkhos have prompted some hasty judgments on Thucydides’ inconsistency.²⁸ Any role for Thessalos in this affair (as in the *Ath. Pol.*) seems highly

μαλακὸν ὄντα). This may reflect the protocols of archaic pederasty in that the *eromenos* must acquiesce in recognition of the *arete* of the *erastes* and not act for his own gratification.

²³ Cf. Scholte 1937, for discussion of the earlier scholarship.

²⁴ The two chief conspirators, therefore, took on murdering Hippias, not Hipparkhos, the object of their *orge*.

²⁵ E.g., no one bothers to specify how the other conspirators — be they “many” or “not many” — were tasked. Thucydides might be thought to imply some plans were subverted by describing Hippias’ disarming of the hoplites (6. 56. 2-3, 58. 1-2). Did Harmodios and Aristogeiton, however, preempt other accomplices assigned to attack Hipparkhos? That would explain why they did not merely rush at and overwhelm Hippias when they suspected the plot was already exposed: they feared that a commotion around Hippias would forestall those waiting to attack Hipparkhos and he would thus avoid assassination.

²⁶ Davies 1971: 447-448.

²⁷ Loenen 1948: 81-82; Lang 1955: 400-1.

²⁸ See Fitzgerald 1957: 281-282. Dover *HCT* 4. 318-319 offers a sensible review of the issues. Note that the application of the clause in 6. 54. 1 οὔτε τοὺς ἄλλους οὔτε αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίους περὶ τῶν σφετέρων τυράννων οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ γενομένου ἀκριβὲς οὐδὲν λέγοντας is limited (especially by τοῦ γενομένου) to the cause for the τόλμημα ‘act of daring’ being ἐρωτικὴν ξυντυχίαν ‘sexual happenstance’. Its charge of “saying nothing exact” need not apply to the generally agreed grounds for fear set out in 6. 54. 3, i.e., the final period of the tyranny was harsh and its end owed to the Spartans.

doubtful.²⁹ It is impossible to determine the exact location of Hippias,³⁰ although there is a palpable sense that the *Ath. Pol.* may right that the discomfited tyrannicides might naturally have descended from the Acropolis, hence toward the Kerameikos. Aristogeiton's supposed actions under torture seem *ben trovato* and thereby unlikely. Though the Alkmeonids and other important families had motivations to influence accounts of the *coup d'état*, it is both imprudent to believe that the posture of the Alkmeonids *vis-à-vis* the cult of the tyrannicides or the *vulgate* was determinative, and foolish to reduce Thucydides (or even, for that matter, Herodotus) to functioning as passive amanuensis for their partisanship.³¹ Surely the disconnection between the Alkmeonids and the tyrannicides paled beside the latter's real allure — less important that they were not Alkmeonids than that they were not **Spartans**.³²

To understand Thucydides' distaste for Harmodios and Aristogeiton, consider two facets of his account which position it within a particular historiographical framework. Both are elements of what might be termed sexual politics. One is archaic pederasty as a mechanism in the formation of elite factions; the other is the judgment that pederastic lovers are natural enemies of tyrants. Let us start with pederasty and faction formation. *Paidierastia* comprised sexuality between adult *erastai*, active sexual partners in seduction and intimacy, and *eromenoi*, adolescent passive partners.³³ The archaic Megarian elegiac poetry called the *Theognidea* is a virtual handbook for such elite sexual politics. The advice set forth in the *persona* of the poet — conventionally Theognis — is encoded

²⁹ See Fornara 1968: 410-14; Davies 1971: 448-449; cf. Lang 1955: 402-407. Brunnsäker 1955: 14-15 rightly notes the inexplicable disappearance of Thessalos from the *Ath. Pol.* after his introduction. But Fornara's view (1968: 414-420) that the attribution of responsibility to Thessalos in *Ath. Pol.* 18. 2 is an ancient interpolation (prior to the epitome of Heraclides Lembos as in fr. 4 Gigon) seems unconvincing. Plut. *Cato Maior* 24. 8 does indicate a likely separate source for the linkage of Thessalos with Iophon among the second and illegitimate batch of Peisistratos' sons, an idea exclusive to the *Ath. Pol.*, and implying (*pace* Fornara) his equation with Hegisistratos. See Rhodes 1981: 189-90, 228. For variants of the interpolation theory, see Loenen 1948: 85-86.

³⁰ *Ath. Pol.* 18. 3, with the Acropolis, differs from Thucydides' Kerameikos (6. 57. 1) over Hippias' location during the abortive coup. This difference probably resolves in a choice between placing Hippias where he might receive the Panathenaic procession (*Ath. Pol.* 18. 3) or supposing he might have been arranging the rear of the procession while Hipparkhos saw to its lead element at the Leokoreion (Thuc. 1. 20. 2; *Ath. Pol.* 18. 3).

³¹ Fornara 1970: 156-158, 168-169; Asheri 1981: 18-20; Taylor 1981: 160-161; Thomas 1989: 247-251 (in a comprehensive review). Cf., e.g., Jacoby 1949: 159-160; Podlecki 1966: 130-135; Fitzgerald 1957: 277; Fornara 1968: 405.

³² Thomas 1989, 244-246. Lavelle 1993: 16-22, 55-58 speaks of a "myth" of Attic anti-Peisistratid resistance and compares the phenomenon to French historical memories on Vichy collaboration and active anti-Nazism.

³³ Standard studies of pederasty do not delve too deeply into the sexual politics of tyrannicidal plots: e.g., Dover 1978: 62-63; Buffière 1980: 107-113; Davidson 2007: 401, 572, 573, 619-620.

within his mentoring of a young sexual protégé (1353-1356; cf. 371-372, 1102-1104), sometimes named Kyrnos (e.g., 237-254). The *Theognidea* are uninterested in family politics, and at times quite hostile to intergenerational succession (271-278, 903-932).³⁴ Kyrnos is a problematic *eromenos*, often warned against sexual infidelity and association with other *philoï* ‘friends’ whose baseness, inauthenticity, and lowborn extraction are posited.³⁵ Thus, the *Theognidea* offer instructions for forming a political *hetaireia* ‘fellowship’ through seduction and mentoring of young males in a competitive environment where other mentors are alike seeking to groom potential followers.

The traditions which Attic local history later transmitted about the relationship of Solon and Peisistratos essentially parallel that of Theognis and Kyrnos. Solon is reported to have been the *erastes* of Peisistratos.³⁶ This pair, however, is envisaged at a different maturational stage in the progression of their intimacy than Theognis and Kyrnos. The *Theognidea* dramatize the phases of courtship, tutelage, and active intimacy, with their risks. Conversely, Peisistratos is portrayed as an adult *eromenos*, who is no longer a passive politico-sexual partner, but an active collaborator within Solon’s faction, as in the campaign to recover Salamis (*Ath. Pol.* 17. 2; Plut. *Solon* 8. 3-4). However, he is also a grown-up Kyrnos, that is, a perverse protégé who has abused the “education” from his *erastes* to threaten tyranny for his *polis*. The historical machinations of Peisistratos actualize the very foreboding revealed by Theognis when he warns Kyrnos and predicts that the degeneration of the elite will engender a *polis* pregnant with a tyrant (949-954).

Moreover, Plutarch notes (*Solon* 1. 4) that Peisistratos was the *erastes* of Kharmos and that he dedicated a cult image of Eros in the Academy. That the ephebes in the torch race in the Panathenaia kindled their torches there probably establishes the regularity of pederastic tutelage for these late 6th-century elite contestants (*ΣPlat. Phaedr.* 231E). As for more direct evidence of politico-sexual formation of a *hetaireia*, consider the activity at Athens of Anacreon, the sympotic lyric poet from Teos. Attic vase paintings represent him in the company of an entourage of young males with whom he conducts sympotic *komoi* ‘revels’. Anacreon hailed the adolescent beauty of none other than Xanthippos, the Attic general of 480-78, and father of Perikles.³⁷ The father of Xanthippos

³⁴ Figueira 1985: 152-153.

³⁵ Defection from *erastēs* to *kakoi*: 1238a-4, 1311-18, 1372-80; cf. 1151-2 (Lewis 1985: 211-212, 219-221).

³⁶ *Ath. Pol.* 17. 2; Plut. *Solon* 1. 2; Ael. *VH* 8. 16. Plutarch cites Heraclides Ponticus fr. 147W certainly for the kinship of Solon and Peisistratos and probably for their pederastic relationship. Cf. Wehrli 1969: 7. 109. The Solonian law forbidding slaves (and initially perhaps *Hektemoroi*) the status of *erastes* is consistent with the reservation of such mentoring to (elite) free men (Plut. *Solon* 1. 4; *Mor.* 152D, 751B; Aesch. 1. 138).

³⁷ Anacreon *PMG* 493 (Himer. *Or.* 39. 10): ἔχαιρε μὲν Ἀνακρέων εἰς Πολυκράτους

was Ariphron, who can be independently put among the political confidants of Peisistratos himself (*POxy* #664, 50. 3544). Thus Anacreon, whom Hipparkhos brought to Athens,³⁸ seems to have played a complementary role to Hipparkhos in mentoring a *betaireia* of young men committed to the Peisistratid cause. When Aristophanes in *Lysistrata* 1150-1156 praises the Spartans for liberating Athens from the Peisistratids, he notes that they killed many Thessalians (allied cavalry), and not only *summakhoi* ‘allies’, but also *betairoi* of Hippias.³⁹

At Athens, pederastic recruitment of next-generation followers was pragmatically balanced with conventional elite family factionalism. As an actual society rather than a generic poetic construct, Athens was constrained by *realia* of procreative and productive processes, unlike the Theognidean *polis*. Here the account of Herodotus on the tyrannicides meaningfully complements Thucydides, as his emphasis falls not on their sexual relationship (which he does not mention, perhaps reflecting demotic sentiment), but on their membership in the *genos* of the Gephyreioi (identified as Phoenicians reaching Attica via Eretria or Tanagra).⁴⁰ A pederastic pair as *gennetai* is noteworthy. Yet the lineages within an Attic *genos* were subject to the same lack of unity in political affiliations as other *oikoi*. Thus, pederastic recruitment between them may have served to bind them in factional activity, much as marriages. The approach of Hipparkhos to Harmodios was probably not only sexual enticement, but also an invitation to align more intimately with the conduct of the regime. The *betairoi* whom the tyrannicides rallied to their plot may therefore be identified as elite men outside the ruling clique. When we learn that that Harmodios was afraid that Hipparkhos might use force ‘to bring him over’, note the passages in the *Theognidea* in which the poet juxtaposes entreaties toward his prospective *eromenos* with intended or renounced physical threats (949-54, 1278a-d, 1279-82; cf. 1235-8). Thucydides insists that Hipparkhos indeed rejected doing anything *biaios* ‘coercive’, the same rejection of force that the *persona* of Theognis asserts.

Nonetheless, the diction here shows that Thucydides is not ignorant of pederastic recruitment. The expression μή βίᾳ προσάγῃται αὐτόν ‘lest he bring him over by force’ employs the historian’s usual language for describing

στελλόμενος τὸν μέγαν Ξάνθιππον προσφθέγξασθαι ... Cf. Paus. 1. 25. 1. See Figueira 1986: 170-171.

³⁸ *Ath. Pol.* 18. 1-2; [Plato] *Hipparch.* 228C; Ael. *VH* 8. 2.

³⁹ This practice of pederastic recruitment probably continued in Attica for a period after the Kleisthenic reforms, because the rivalry of Themistokles and Aristides was said to have begun over their erotic competition for a brilliant young man called Stesilaos (Plut. *Arist.* 2. 2-3).

⁴⁰ Hdt. 5.55, 57. 1 - 58. 2. Cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Γέφυρα (*Eth.* 206. 12-14), with Hecataeus *FGrH* 1 F118; Strabo 9. 1. 10 C404; Photius s.v. Δόρυ κηρύκειον, δ 723 (Paus. Att. s.v. δ 23); *SEG* 30. 85 (*IG* II² 1096+); *IG* II² 3629-3630; also Antiochus-Pherecydes *FGrH* 333 F4(?); *EM* s.v. Γεφυρεῖς, Γέφυρα, γ, 228.58-229.7. See Parker 1996: 288-289.

enlistment of a foreign ally, however incongruous it may otherwise appear here (6. 54. 3).⁴¹ But Thucydides conceded only a partial politico-sexual interpretation. Note that the *skolia* highlight Harmodios; the insult to his sister is central elsewhere; and the pair are usually Harmodios and Aristogeiton. Yet Thucydides heads the excursus with *tolmema* of Aristogeiton and Harmodios, and Aristogeiton, not wronged Harmodios, is the more active agent, as befits an *erastes*.⁴² Notwithstanding his concession to the political aspect of Hipparkhos' approach, Thucydides does not portray its rejection as an action as much political as it was emotional. And any inclination to envisage a political struggle with pederastic overtones seems thwarted by Thucydides' emphasis that Aristogeiton was a *mesos polites* 'middle-rank citizen' (cf. Lucian *De parasito* 48), making the reactions of the parties solely those of personal agents. Thucydides perhaps viewed the affair in light of late 5th-century *hetaireiai*, groups of ideologically compatible near-contemporaries, in disregard of the existence of more age diverse archaic political *hetaireiai*.⁴³

Furthermore, the approach of Thucydides is also medially situated to that of the *Hipparchus*. This pseudo-Platonic dialogue centralizes the issue of pederastic recruitment, although it shares Thucydides' disenchantment with the *vulgate*. The *Hipparchus* shows an elitist perspective on the tyrannicides, explicitly attributed to the *khariesteroi* 'more sophisticated people'. They rejected the role of the insult to Harmodios' sister (otherwise prominent in *vulgate*). For the *Hipparchus* (229B-D), Aristogeiton viewed Hipparkhos (a beneficent successor to Peisistratos) as an *antagonistes* in his pride over having become the mentor of Harmodios in his stead. In this series of political seductions, Harmodios later aspired to become the *erastes* of an unnamed noble youth.⁴⁴ This *eromenos* entered the circle of Harmodios and Aristogeiton for a time, but then linked himself with Hipparkhos and treated them with contempt. Consider how this is precisely the sort of

⁴¹ Note the verb in the middle here and elsewhere: 1. 99. 2; 2. 30. 2; 3. 32. 2, 55. 3, 91. 2; 4. 86. 1, 88. 1; 5. 82. 5; 6. 22. 1, 47, 48, 71. 2, 75. 3, 94.3, 104. 2; 7. 7. 2, 55. 2; 8. 17. 2, 25. 5, 44. 1, 107. 1. There is only a single example of its use in internal politics, when Diodotos speaks hypothetically of an orator bringing the *plethos* (i.e., *demos*) over: 3. 42. 6. In a sexual or affectionate sense, the middle of προσάγω has an attenuated meaning 'embrace' (not 'seduce'): Eur. *Supp.* 1100; Arist. *Aves* 141; Plato *Rep.* 437B, C; 439B; Xen. *Cyr.* 7. 5. 39; 8. 4. 26. An interesting exception is Alkibiades' description of his attempt to seduce Socrates, which may hint at the political with the sexual (Plato *Symp.* 219D). Moreover, the use of καταγορεύε 'he denounces' to explain how Harmodios informs Aristogeiton of Hipparkhos' approach is borrowed from factional intrigue (Meyer 2008: 15; cf. Thuc. 4. 68. 6)

⁴² Cf. Loraux 1985: 6, 16.

⁴³ Note Murray 1990: 149-153.

⁴⁴ A Diokles appears in a badly garbled account of Justin (2. 9. 1-7) as a son of Peisistratos and brother of Hippias, as well as a rapist(!) of the sister of Harmodios (himself unnamed there). Conceivably this name was transferred in error from the man moving between factions in the *Hipparchus* (albeit nameless there).

defection troubling the poets of the *Theognidea*. The distress of the tyrannicides over this *atimia* ‘loss of status’ motivates their killing Hipparkhos. Juxtaposing the *Hipparchus*, we appreciate how Thucydides was tacking between two errant headings. He insists the tyrannicides were lovers despite a popular tradition generally silent on their sexual relationship, but downplays the political ramifications of their intimacy (membership in a *hetaireia*, united erotically) in face of elite commentators who were prepared to see the confrontation as a sexual-factional struggle. The *Hipparchus* may then signal a high cultural counter-narrative (a counter-*vulgate*). Hyperides reports a law which prohibited not only that anyone λέγειν ... κακῶς ‘speak ill’ of the tyrannicides, but, tellingly, when we remember the laudatory drinking songs, that anyone ᾄσαι ἐπὶ τὰ κακίονα ‘sing a song disparagingly’ (2. 3). Such legal condemnation certainly urges that the banned activities had meaningful constituencies among some classical *hetairoi*.

In this line of analysis, it would be interesting to know the exact chronology of the confrontation. The Panathenaia at which the murder of Hipparkhos occurred is that of 514, but the length of the plot’s gestation is unknown. The moment of initial approach by Hipparkhos to Harmodios is unknown, with most assuming this as recent. I offer three points. First, though Thucydides is not specific about the *pompe* at which Hipparkhos dismissed with contumely Harmodios’ sister, other sources identify it as the Panathenaia,⁴⁵ which would be the celebration of 518 at the latest.⁴⁶ Second, the right of *sitesis* in the *prytaneion* was notably accorded descendants of Aristogeiton **and** Harmodios. One would not normally expect an adolescent *eromenos* to have any issue at all, although Harmodios does seem to have had descendants,⁴⁷ unlike Aristogeiton, who, as adult *erastes*, may well have been married with children.⁴⁸ Third, Aristogeiton

⁴⁵ *Ath. Pol.* 18. 2; also *Ael. VH* 11. 8; *Max. Tyr. Diss.* 18. 2d. [Plato] *Hipparch.* 229C offers *kanephoría* ‘carrying of the basket’, which in isolation probably alludes to the Panathenaia (*Arist. Lys.* 646-647; cf. *Men. Epitir.* 438-439; also Philochorus *FGrH* 338 F8). Cf. Rhodes 1981: 230-231.

⁴⁶ Some do opt for the same Panathenaia as the coup, but that either puts the dismissal at the festival itself against the implication of Thucydides or unduly compresses preparations to a short period from Hipparkhos’ dismissal of Harmodios’ sister to the festival itself. Cf. Brunnsäker 1955: 15; Fitzgerald 1957: 283.

⁴⁷ See Davies 1971: 476-479. Direct descendants are well attested and quite prominent (*pace* Davies): for example, Proxenos, son of Harmodios, *strategos* in 410/9 (*SGHI* #84, see also *IG II²* 5765). His son was Dikaiogenes (the focus of *Is.* 5). Iphikrates spoke (c. 372-371) against another son of Harmodios (*Is.* 5. 11; cf. *Lys.* 1. 41), and in opposition to a speech in defense of his worthiness for an honorific statue (a speech wrongly attributed to Lysias: *DH Amm.* 1. 11; *Lys. fr.* 335 BT). See *Aris. Rhet.* 1397b30-34, 1398a18-25, cf. 1365a28-29, 1367b17-18(?); *Plut. Mor.* 187b; *Aristid.* 49.518D [384-5]. His son was Proxenos, a *strategos* in 347/6 and 339/8 (*IG II²* 207; *Aesch.* 2. 133-134; *Dem.* 19. 50, 52, 73-74, 154-155; *Din.* 1. 74), imprisoned at the instance of Demosthenes (*Din.* 1. 63; cf. perhaps 19. 280-281 with scholia). See also *IG II²* 1622. 156-164; 1623. 163-164; 1629. 522-524.

⁴⁸ Note *Is.* IV. 3-4; *IG II²* 5752, 6569. See Davies 1971: 473-476.

and Harmodios were portrayed in the statues of Kritios and Nesiotes as a mature bearded man and a young adult non-bearded ephebe.⁴⁹ Accordingly, one wonders whether Harmodios and Aristogeiton nursed their anger for a while until their *hetaireia* decided to strike at the Peisistratids. Did the initial failed attempt at seduction belong to the 520s? We know from the archon list (*SGHI* #6) that the sons of Peisistratos were actively seeking rapprochement with other aristocratic groups after their father's death to broaden the appeal of their regime. In pederastic pairs who strike at tyrants, the younger partner in the assault is by convention an ephebe in his late teens or early manhood.

My second counterweight to Thucydides is the preconception that pairs of pederastic lovers are natural tyrannicides.⁵⁰ To understand the singularity of this assumption, it is useful to ponder briefly a more neutral way of accounting for the fall of dynasties. Aristotle in *Politics* 1311a34-b1 describes how tyrannies fall because of *hybris* that gives rise to *orge* 'rage' in its victims. His supporting evidence starts with the tyrannicides' attack (accordingly seen in the Thucydidean manner). That is followed by the assassination of Periandros, tyrant of Ambrosia, killed by his *eromenos* (to be considered soon). Yet Aristotle's enumeration soon leaves the realm of sexuality for other outrages required murderously. Moreover, his list next shifts explicitly from tyrants to monarchs. In other words, an entire gamut of insults or offences could motivate someone in a ruler's ambit to seize that advantage for murderous requital. Thus, Aristotle explores assassination through political psychology, as does Thucydides. However, other explanations of tyrannicide as a phenomenon are more often grounded in sexual ideology. These accounts segregate the murderous impulses of *erastai* and *eromenoi* in a special realm of motivation,⁵¹ and they tend to treat Harmodios and Aristogeiton as the archetypes of such assassins even despite the historical priority of the other cases.

A story similar to theirs was told by Phainias of Eresos, Aristotle's pupil, who wrote several works on tyranny (c. 390-300); it was transmitted through Parthenius' *Narrationes Amatoriae*.⁵² At Herakleia in Magna Graecia, Hipparinos, an *eromenos*, challenged a prospective *erastes*, Antileon, to a seemingly impossible act of defiance of a local tyrant. His achievement of this quest established their relationship, which was next threatened by the desire for Hipparinos of the

⁴⁹ Brunnsäker 1955: 81-82, 102-120, where the evidence in various media, especially ceramic representations, concurs in representing Harmodios as a young adult (in some large part in reflection of the statues). Ferrari 2002: 129-130, 138, recognizes this problem, which she resolves conversely to my interpretation, seeing Harmodios and Aristogeiton's sexual relationship as one between adults.

⁵⁰ Cf. Asheri 1981: 18-19.

⁵¹ See Dover 1978: 191-192; Buffière 1980: 106-121.

⁵² Phainias fr. 16W *apud* Parthenius *Narr. Amatoriae* 7 (Wehrli 1969: 9. 32-33). Cf. also Aris. *EE* 1229a23; Plut. *Mor.* 760C; Aelian fr. 70 Hercher.

tyrant himself, and the menace that he might resort to force. Thereupon Anti-leon assassinated the tyrant. The role of the tyrant's own desire for an *eromenos* parallels the story of Harmodios and Aristogeiton. Phainias' narrative almost certainly belonged to his treatise *Τυράννων ἀναίρεσις ἐκ τιμωρίας* 'Destruction of Tyrants for the Sake of Vengeance', a treatise whose very existence helps us understand how the stories of tyrannicidal pederastic lovers were memorialized.⁵³

Athenaeus usefully amassed other cases of this phenomenon, and naturally mentions Harmodios and Aristogeiton. He notes Khariton and Melanippos, citing Heraclides Ponticus (c. 390-310) in his *On Erotica*.⁵⁴ They were lovers who struck at the notorious Phalaris, 6th-century tyrant of Akragas. Failing, they were tortured by Phalaris, who was eventually moved to spare them because of their fortitude. This act of mercy was later endorsed by an oracle from Apollo. Aelian offers a more detailed version (*VH* 2. 4), which locates the origins of the antipathy in a lawsuit in which the tyrant interfered to pervert justice. Here, interestingly, Khariton the *erastes* makes his attack by himself to spare his lover the risk. Aelian's version undoubtedly reproduces fact more closely. However, the generalized version in Athenaeus conforms more closely to the paradigmatic combined-attack motif and assumption of fully sexualized causation. Accordingly, it embodies the template patterned on Harmodios and Aristogeiton. Elite resonances of this vision of them as liberators differ from populist heroization in the *vulgate*: not proto-democrats but elite lovers, upholding the *arete* of aristocrats against *hybristic* violation.⁵⁵

Also helpful is Athenaeus' citation of programmatic material revealing an expectation that such pairs are putative or probable tyrannicides. This material shows the paradigm's persistence, and hints at other cases, no longer extant. To this end he cites Hieronymos of Rhodes that pederasty was conventionalized for the very reason of its political benefits in protection against tyranny.⁵⁶ Athenaeus

⁵³ See also frs. 14 (Athen. 10.438c), 15 (Athen. 3.90e), with Wehrli 1969, 32. The discussion in the *Politics*, noted just above, indicates the secondary purpose to which such evidence was collected.

⁵⁴ Heraclides Ponticus fr. 65W *apud* Athen. 13. 78. 9 602a-b (possibly cited through Hieronymus fr. 34W). See Wehrli 1969: 7. 82. See also Plut. *Mor.* 760C; Euseb. *PE* 5. 35. 2-3; *Suda* s.v. Ἀναβολή, α 1812; Ἀντέρως, α 2634; Φάλαρις, φ 43; Χαρίτων καὶ Μελάνιππος, χ 128. Cf. *FGrH* 577 F3.

⁵⁵ This perspective tended to compound the confusion about the status of Hipparkhos because such lovers do indeed strike at true tyrants. Note Stahl 2003: 4-5.

⁵⁶ Hieronymus fr. 34W (Athen. 602a): Ἱερώνυμος δ' ὁ περιπατητικὸς περισπουδᾶστος φησὶν γενέσθαι τοὺς τῶν παιδῶν ἔρωτας, ὅτι πολλὰκις ἢ τῶν νέων ἀκμῆ καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐταιρικὸν συμφρονῆσαν πολλὰς τυραννίδας καθεῖλεν. 'Hieronymos the Peripatetic says erotic relationships with boys became a serious preoccupation because the prime age of young men and their harmonious comradeship with each other destroyed many tyrannies.' Cf. Wehrli 1969: 10. 39. Bion of Borysthenes exploited this tradition to joke about

on his own authority summarizes such tyrannicides by asserting that tyranny was the natural adversary of pederasty, recognizing in ‘boy-love’ a source of danger.⁵⁷ He briefly alludes elsewhere to another claim in this same vein: the god Eros was responsible for the Athenian achievement of *cleutheria*, so that the Peisistratids in exile began to slander (διαβάλλειν) activities associated with him (Athen. 13. 562a).⁵⁸

Plutarch recognized the force of this commonplace. One speaker in his dialogue *Amatorius* offers a restatement of this principle. He invokes the famous tyrannicidal *erastai* Aristogeiton, Melanippos, and Antileon. He asserts that, when no else dared to oppose the local tyrant, these men were motivated to do so by the threat to their *eromenoi*.⁵⁹ Hence sexual exploitation by tyrants is remedied by pederastic lovers. In contrast, in the *persona* of his father, Plutarch is careful to strip pederastic tyrannicide of its heroic overtones.⁶⁰ While he helpfully

the course of pederastic relationships by calling the developing hirsute features of pretty boys “Harmodios and Aristogeiton” for their freeing *erastai* from tyranny (Plut. *Mor.* 770B-C).

⁵⁷ Athen. 13. 78. 87 602d: διὰ τοὺς τοιοῦτους οὖν ἔρωτας οἱ τύραννοι (πολέμιοι γὰρ αὐτοῖς αὐταὶ αἱ φιλῖαι) τὸ παράπαν ἐκώλυον τοὺς παιδικούς ἔρωτας, πανταχόθεν αὐτοὺς ἐκκόπτοντες. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ τὰς παλαιστράς ὡσπερ ἀντιτειχίσματα ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀκροπόλεσιν ἐνεπίμπρασάν τε καὶ κατέσκαψαν· ὡς ἐποίησε Πολυκράτης ὁ Σαμίων τύραννος. ‘On account of such erotic relationships, tyrants (such friendships being inimical to them) prevented pederastic relationships entirely, excising them from everywhere. There are some who set fire to and demolished the wrestling grounds as though they were counter-fortifications to their own citadels, just as Polykrates the tyrant of the Samians.’

⁵⁸ The manuscripts describe them as πρῶτοι ‘the first’ which accords them a pioneering role in politically-motivated disparagement of aristocratic pederasty. Musurus conjectured that the text should read πρῶτον ‘for the first time’ which would place the emphasis on the point at which they changed their minds on the institution.

⁵⁹ Plutarch *Amatorius*, *Mor.* 760B-C: πόθεν γάρ, ὅπου καὶ τοῖς τυράννοις ἀντιλέγων μὲν οὐδεὶς οὐτ’ ἀντιπολιτευόμενός ἐστιν, ἀντερῶντες δὲ πολλοὶ καὶ φιλοτιμούμενοι περὶ τῶν καλῶν καὶ ὠραίων. ἀκούετε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ Ἀριστογεῖτων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ Ἀντιλέων ὁ Μεταποντίνος καὶ Μελάνιππος ὁ Ἀκραγαντίνος οὐ διεφέροντο τοῖς τυράννοις, πάντα τὰ πράγματα λυμαινομένους καὶ παροινούντας ὀρώντες· ἐπεὶ δὲ τοὺς ἐρωμένους αὐτῶν ἐπειρών, ὡσπερ ἱεροῖς ἀσύλοις καὶ ἀθίκοις ἀμύνοντες ἠφειδίησαν ἑαυτῶν. ‘For why? Wherever there was no one opposing and contending with tyrants, there were many rivals in love and competitors for boys that are beautiful and in the prime of their years. Note then that Aristogeiton the Athenian, Antileon of Metaponton, and Melanippus of Akragas never were at odds with tyrants, beholding them ruining all affairs and acting in drunken violence, but, when they found them seducing their own *eromenoi*, they spared nothing of themselves, as though they were defending sanctuaries, inviolable and sacrosanct.’

⁶⁰ Plut. *Amatorius*, *Mor.* 768E-F: ὅσοι δὲ μὴ κακοὶ πεφυκότες ἐξηπατήθησαν ἢ κατεβιάσθησαν ἐνδοῦναι καὶ παρασχεῖν ἑαυτοὺς, οὐδένα μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων ἢ τοὺς διαθέντας ὑφορώμενοι καὶ μισοῦντες διατελοῦσι καὶ πικρῶς ἀμύνονται καιροῦ παραδόντος Ἀρχελάσον τε γὰρ ἀπέκτεινε Κρατέας ἐρώμενος γεγονώς, καὶ τὸν Φεραῖον Ἀλέξανδρον Πυθόλαος Περίανδρος δ’ ὁ Ἀμβρακιωτῶν τύραννος ἠρώτα τὸν ἐρώμενον εἰ μήπω κρεῖ, κάκεῖνος παροξυνθεὶς ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν. ‘Those who not bad naturally were deceived and coerced into yielding and providing themselves end up suspecting and hating no one of mankind more than those who turned them out, and they retaliate relentlessly if opportunity

provides several more examples of tyrannicide, these cases feature *eromenoi* who turn against tyrannical *erastai* in attacks which do not fit the paradigm neatly. Plutarch has favored heterosexuality in the *Amatorius*, and he portrays relationships of these older tyrant *erastai* with their protégés as pathological. In doing so, he interestingly provides an early appreciation of what might be considered the psychology of victims of child abuse.

Thucydides does not countenance the assumption, later so widespread, that the status of Harmodios and Aristogeiton as pederastic lovers predisposed them to tyrannicide or that such pairs naturally “graduate” into tyrannicide, but, in order to believe that he did so in direct reaction to these conventions, we need to determine whether this *topos* existed when he was composing his *Histories*. The authorities already cited bring us well into the mid-4th-century for Heraclides arrived in Athens c. 365-360.⁶¹ The second book of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* (1401b10-11) suggests that the motif was already conventional (although in a compressed reference) in the third quarter of the 4th century: ταῖς πόλεσι συμφέρουσιν οἱ ἐρῶντες· ὁ γὰρ Ἄρμωδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ἔρωσ κατέλυσε τὸν τύραννον Ἴππαρχον ‘lovers profit cities, for the love of Harmodios and Aristogeiton destroyed the tyrant Hipparkhos’. Xenophon illustrates this commonplace from the opposite perspective of the tyrant. The early 5th-century Syracusan tyrant, Hieron, in Xenophon’s dialogue of that name,⁶² speaking with his interlocutor, the lyric poet Simonides, bewails the tyrant’s fate in pederastic relationships. He must shun the use of force (alluding to the elegiac motif), for it robs him of pleasure, but even then he will be unsure whether emotional reciprocation from his *eromenos* is genuine, since he knows that tyrants have been harmed by those who profess affection for them. Notwithstanding the inverted perspective, Xenophon provides here further early support for the idea that a partner in pederastic relations is a potential assassin. Hieron’s sentiments, which mirror the motif of a pederastic lover as inimical to the tyrant, may imply that the commonplace of lovers threatening a tyrant already existed c. 360-58.

The earliest surviving use of the theme appears in Plato’s *Symposium*, usually dated to 386-71. In the mouth of Pausanias, an exponent of traditional pederasty, the later canonical contours of the paradigm can already be

is given. For example, Krataes who had been his *eromenos* killed Arkhelaos, and Pytholaos [killed] Alexandros of Pherai; Periandros, the tyrant of the Ambrakiots, asked his *eromenos* if he was pregnant yet, and that one driven into rage killed Periandros’. See also Max. Tyr. *Diss.* 18. 1e-f.

⁶¹ Wehrli 1969: 7, 59 dates Heraclides’ birth c. 388 (fr. 102W = Plut. *Cam.* 22. 2; cf. fr. 46a = Strabo 8. 7. 2 C384); he had arrived in Athens early enough to depute for Plato during his second trip to Sicily (fr. 2 = Ἡρακλείδης, η 461). Phainias is a little later, with an acme of 336-332 (fr. 1W = *Suda* s.v. Φαίνιας, φ 73).

⁶² Xen. *Hieron* 1. 29-38. See Cic. *TD* 5. 20. 58, 60 for Dionysios I, tyrant of Syracuse, as a tragic *erastes*.

discerned.⁶³ Harmodios and Aristogeiton are so prominent here, as in the other contexts illustrating this leitmotif, that serious consideration must be given to the conjecture that the tradition on these early pederastic tyrannicides provided a template for the configuration of the entire *topos*.

Thucydides stands resolutely for seeing Harmodios and Aristogeiton as selfishly motivated and behaving without due deliberation. His remark that Aristogeiton was ‘acting on the basis of whatever personal standing and resources he had’ (6. 54. 3) was clearly meant to point up a disproportion between the planned coup and the resources of those undertaking it. Furthermore, he affirms that Hipparkhos was planning nothing *biaios* (54. 4), an intention that was part and parcel of his general non-autocratic demeanor (54. 5). This favorable judgment is set against the background of a virtual encomium on Peisistratid government. They practiced *arete* ‘excellence’ and *ksunesis* ‘intelligence’ at a high level. Their five-percent tax on agriculture was moderate. They adorned the city, excelled in war, and saw to public sacrifices. The *nomoi* were preserved except in their contrivance that one of the Peisistratids or their partisans should be in office (54. 6-7). As an example, Thucydides notes the archonship of Peisistratos, the son of Hippias.

This eulogy of Peisistratid government might seem excessive unless its role in a causative sequence is understood. The assassination of Hipparkhos released a cascade of negative outcomes. The tyranny became much harsher (59. 2-3). Hippias was now motivated by fear both to kill many Athenians and to make a marriage alliance through his daughter Arkhedike with Aiantides, son of the Lampsakene tyrant Hippokles. His rationale was Hippokles’ influence with Dareios. Hippias fell four years later through Alkmeonid and Spartan intervention. He withdrew to Sigeion, the Peisistratid *apoikia* in the Troad, thence to Aiantides, and finally to the Persian court (59. 4). Thucydides closes this excursus by reminding readers that Hippias had attempted to return at Marathon. The momentous events at Athens in the late 6th and early 5th centuries are so well ingrained in us that we may fail to recognize their implications as enumerated by Thucydides. Athens faced tremendous danger in the Marathon campaign. This existential risk flowed from the personally motivated, rash, and

⁶³ Plato *Sym.* 182B-C: τοῖς γὰρ βαρβάροις διὰ τὰς τυραννίδας αἰσχρὸν τοῦτό γε καὶ ἢ γε φιλοσοφία καὶ ἢ φιλογυμναστία· οὐ γὰρ οἶμαι συμφέρει τοῖς ἄρχουσι φρονήματα μεγάλα ἐγγίγνεσθαι τῶν ἀρχομένων, οὐδὲ φιλίας ἰσχυρὰς καὶ κοινωνίας, ὃ δὴ μάλιστα φιλεῖ τά τε ἄλλα πάντα καὶ ὃ ἔρωσ ἐμποιεῖν. ἔργω δὲ τοῦτο ἔμαθον καὶ οἱ ἐνθάδε τύραννοι· ὁ γὰρ Ἀριστογεΐτονος ἔρωσ καὶ ἢ Ἀρμοδίου φιλία βέβαιος γενομένη κατέλυσεν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀρχήν. ‘because of the tyrannies this [pederasty] is shameful for the *barbaroi* as well as philosophy and the love of activities in the *gymnasia*, for I think that it does not profit rulers that lofty thoughts be engendered in their subjects nor strong friendships and associations, all of which sexual love is wont to inspire. The tyrants here learned this by experience, since the *eros* of Aristogeiton and the friendship of Harmodios becoming firm subverted their regime.’

incompetently-handled assassination plan of Harmodios and Aristogeiton.⁶⁴ Therefore, Thucydides implies there were alternative endings to Peisistratid supremacy that might not have included either Hippias' turn toward savagery or his rapprochement with Persia. For Thucydides, it took the tyrannicides — with their singular lack of perspective beyond their sexual circumstances — to bring Hippias to the fateful moment of Marathon, where Athens teetered on the edge of disaster.⁶⁵

Some recent scholarship has recognized that the digression on Harmodios and Aristogeiton has programmatic relevance in its placement by Thucydides.⁶⁶ Unfortunately, the contributions of Vickers and of Wohl,⁶⁷ while they have perceived that the political *persona* of Alkibiades was sexualized, have centered their interpretations of the narrative of the Sicilian expedition exhaustively on this motif. Such an emphasis is at odds with Thucydides' treatment of Alkibiades.⁶⁸ In direct presentation, however, Thucydides constructed this remarkable excursus to address why the Athenians had such a profound fear of tyranny and to correct misconceptions about the Peisistratids and the coup of Harmodios and

⁶⁴ Fornara 1968: 404: “that the attack on Hipparchus was not provoked out of political animus and that the death of Hipparchus accomplished nothing but evil”. Loraux 1985: 13-15 sees the tyrannicides as *stasiotai* with analogies to the treatment of the Corcyrean *stasis*.

⁶⁵ Herodotus (5. 55-57. 1) tells the story of Harmodios and Aristogeiton as a digression within his account of the visit of Aristogoras to Athens, which led to Attic involvement in the Ionian Revolt. For him, this embassy and the ensuing intervention headed the fateful sequence to the Persian War, and not the botched assassination. The parallel accounts of Herodotus and Thucydides probably track variant currents of speculation about the etiology both of the Persian Wars and of Athenian expansion.

⁶⁶ Meyer 2008: 13-15 offers a comprehensive review of suggestions linking excursus to context. Some traditional explanations tend to skirt the issue of rationales for inclusion, offering scholarly enthusiasm (Dover *HCT* 4. 327-329; cf. Hornblower *CT* 3. 434); emulation of Herodotus as storyteller (*CT* 3. 438-439); an unfinished text and the publication of Hellanicus (Jacoby 1949: 158, 338), retention of a duplicate digression in an interrupted composition (Wilamowitz 1877: 337-338; Hirsch 1926: 131-138), and even editorial interpolation (Schwartz 1919, 180-186). The careful ring-composition argues against decontextualizing interpretations (Connor 1984, 257). Cf. Tsakmakis 1996: 202-206. Other rationales: critique of ahistorical beliefs of the *demos* (Schadewalt 1929: 84-94); Hippias and the *demos* alike in overreacting (Pearson 1949); Alkibiades and/or *demos* both reminiscent of Hippias (Momigliano 1975; Rood 1998: 180-182; Meyer 2008: 22-24); Aristogeiton and the enemies of Alkibiades alike (Meyer 2008: 18-22); similarity of *demos* to the tyrannicides in reckless daring (Taylor 1981: 162-163, 170-173); contemporary fear of Alkibiades' tyrannical aspirations (Rhodes 2006: 529-530). Stahl's point that misconceptions affect decision-making is correct as far as it goes.

⁶⁷ Vickers 1995: 195-200, equating the sons of Peisistratos with Alkibiades; Wohl 1999: 350, 369-373; 2002: 152-157, opts for a set of allusions juxtaposing Alkibiades with the tyrannicides.

⁶⁸ The treatment of Wohl is quite cavalier in its “mash-up” of disparate, often contradictory, sources in support its deployment of sometimes far-fetched ideological construals of Athenian 5th-century social conditions. Note also Hornblower *CT* 3. 337-343.

Aristogeiton.⁶⁹ There was also the happenstance that the crisis of 415 concerned the Herms, whose early use was associated with Hipparkhos (see n. 2 above). Moreover, contemporary politics may also have aroused Thucydides' animosity toward glorification of the tyrannicides. His *bête noire* Kleon may have been a brother-in-law of a Harmodios, a descendant of the tyrannicide.⁷⁰ On a deeper level, moreover, Thucydides exposed a pathological tendency in Attic politics. The Athenians who were confused about the tyrannicides were the same people equally muddled about the current crisis.⁷¹ Without due scrutiny, they credited informants about possible sacrileges who were *poneroi*, 'criminals', and arrested their best fellow citizens (6. 63. 1-3, 70. 2-4).⁷² Eventually revelations concerning the identity of those who mutilated the Herms would quiet the city, but only at the cost of sacrificing the interests of justice in a rush to judgment in punishing those thought guilty (70. 4-5). Moreover, the *demos* irrationally concluded that vandalism of the Herms and profanation of the mysteries by Alkibiades and his circle involved actual plots on behalf of tyranny or oligarchy (71. 1-4).⁷³ The mere coincidence of a small Spartan force appearing at the isthmus was misinterpreted to justify public alarm and suspicions of subversion. This was the same brand of irrationality that motivated the tyrannicides to overreact in concocting their assassination plot.

Born in irrationality, the botched conspiracy eventually put Athens at terrible risk at Marathon. Similarly, the irrationality of the *demos* over the profanation of the mysteries endangered Athens by causing Alkibiades' flight to avoid prosecution.⁷⁴ Athens lost a skilled leader during the Syracusan expedition, whose defection brought crucial intelligence and counsel to the enemy. Indeed, Thucydides, in a striking direct authorial assertion, attributes to the Athenian refusal to leave military affairs in the hands of Alkibiades their defeat in the war (6.15.3-4). An existential risk was dodged at Marathon, but mismanagement of the Sicilian campaign debilitated Athens substantially, opening a path to a previously infeasible Spartan victory. Responding to the subversive mischief of

⁶⁹ See Lang 1955: 398-399 for misconceptions: Hipparkhos was tyrant; the attack liberated Athens; the tyranny was oppressive.

⁷⁰ In Davies' reconstruction (1968: 219; 1971: 145, 319-320, 476-477), this Harmodios, the father of the Ionian War *stratēgos* Proxenos (n. 47 above), and Kleon had both married the daughters of Dikaiogenes (Is. 5. 42).

⁷¹ The conspirators misunderstanding the quality of Peisistratid rule made of Hippias the sort of tyrant they had already thought him to be, and the *demos* misconstruing Alkibiades as a subversive made him the traitor he had not yet become. See Stahl 2003: 7-10; also Rawlings 1981: 103-113; his reading of class into the affair, however, is overwrought.

⁷² The parallel accounts: Andoc. 1. 11-20; Hellanicus *FGrH* 323a F24; [Lysias] 6. 51; Plut. *Alcib.* 22. 1-4; *Vita Alcib.* (*POxy* 3. 411) ll. 22-27; Nepos *Alcib.* (7) 3. 5.

⁷³ See Seager 1967: 15-16; Rawlings 1981: 110-111; Connor 1984: 179-180.

⁷⁴ E.g. Gribble 1999: 192-193 (with Figueira 2000).

Hermokopidai proportionately to their misdeeds was required; yet even reacting disproportionately did not court military disaster. However, embarking upon an entirely unnecessary inquisition into the profanation was calamitous.⁷⁵ In his retrospective laudation of Periklean leadership, Thucydides offers his famous précis on Attic failure in Sicily, not faulting the dispatch of the expedition itself, but blaming disadvantageous decisions made back at Athens, where self-seeking partisan infighting impeded operations and threw political affairs into turmoil for the first time.⁷⁶

Moreover, it is striking how the tyrannicides and the *demos* of 415 erred over matters belonging to intimate personal life, while they exaggerated the political danger to themselves. Harmodios and Aristogeiton overreacted to Hipparkhos' attempt at seduction. The celebration of the mysteries by Alkibiades and his friends took place in mixed-gender peer social occasions,⁷⁷ quite unlike elite *symposia*, and were not parodies.⁷⁸ It is unlikely that the celebrants were indulging in a 5th-century version of a "Hell-Fire Club", where sheer defiance of ordinary taboos stimulated deviancy.⁷⁹ The expression "to dance out the mysteries", which became proverbial, may indicate a genuine effort by gender-mixed assemblages to celebrate modified rituals.⁸⁰ Some of the *dromena* of the

⁷⁵ Cf. Brunt 1952: 62–65.

⁷⁶ Thuc. 2. 65. 11: καὶ ὁ ἐς Σικελίαν πλοῦς, ὃς οὐ τοσοῦτον γνώμης ἀμάρτημα ἦν πρὸς οὐς ἐπῆσαν, ὅσον οἱ ἐκπέμψαντες οὐ τὰ πρόσφορα τοῖς οἰχομένοις ἐπιγινώσκοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας διαβολὰς περὶ τῆς τοῦ δήμου προστασίας τὰ τε ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἀμβλύτερα ἐποίουν καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν πόλιν πρῶτον ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἐταράχθησαν. See, most recently, Rood 1998: 176–180.

⁷⁷ As attested by the ability of the elite Agariste, wife of Alkmeonides, to denounce Alkibiades for a profanation in a house not her own, that of Kharmides (Andoc. 1. 16). Given Attic attitudes on women in public life, she had almost certainly denounced on the basis of autopsy. Cf. MacDowell 1962: 75–76; Wallace 1992: 333–335; Bremmer 1995: 77–78. Also observe that, according to Xenophon, Alkibiades' beauty caused him "to be hunted by many *semnai* [sacred, majestic, elite, or proud] women" (*Mem.* 1.2.24).

⁷⁸ Murray 1990: 158–160. See also Todd 2004: 87–88, Graf 2000: 123–125; Leão 2012: 188. Cf. Dover *HCT* 4. 283; Wallace 1992: 328–329 (n.2); Bremmer 1995: 77–78; Hornblower *CT* 3. 378; Rubel 2014: 92–95. Andoc. 1.11: ... τὰ μυστήρια ποιούντα ... 'performing the mysteries', 16: ... μυστήρια ποιεῖν ..., 17: ... μυστήρια γίνεσθαι ...; Plut. *Alcib.* 22.3–4 offers verbatim the *eisangelia* of Thessalos (son of Kimon) which offers ἀπομιμούμενον ... δεικνύοντα 'imitating ... revealing'. Nepos *Alcib.* (7) 3: ... *facere mysteria*. These texts provide no comfort to the parody hypothesis (cf. [Lys.] 6.51).

⁷⁹ E.g., Murray 1990: 158–160; Wallace 1992: 328–329 (n.2). Hell-Fire Clubs: Lord 2008: 1–44.

⁸⁰ *Vita Alcib.* (*POxy* 3.411) ll. 22–27: ἐξορχήσασθαι τὰ μυστήρια ... 'dance out the mysteries' (cf. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.12, also *Strom.* 1.2.21; Ael. Aristid. 22. 260.4J; Alciph. 3.72). This phrase becomes a cliché for impropriety: Luc. *Pisc.* 33, *Salt.* 15; Ach. Tat. *L&C* 4. 8. The prefix ἐξ- seems to shade the base verb with connotations of publicness, vigor or excess, and finally deviancy, of which the first two seem most applicable to the *vita* and the third arises from this incident itself (Ael. Arist. 34 [κατὰ τῶν ἐξορχουμένων]: ἀλλ' ἐν ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις ἀπάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἐξορχεῖσθε ... [415.24J]; Philostr. *VA* 4. 21; Heliod.

Eleusinian Mysteries may well have been performed at times for personal gratification, perhaps a *hieros gamos*, a ritual act of sexual intimacy.⁸¹ Uninhibited Alkibiades might have seen its potential for a new style of elite sexuality. Such a purpose would qualify for Thucydides' assertion "[the mysteries] were performed ... for *hybris*" (6. 28. 1). Under this interpretation, his earlier specification that ordinary Athenians were frightened at "the magnitude of the *paranomia* [defiance of norms] regarding his body" would appear an apposite euphemism for sexual misconduct (6.15.4). All that would have been extraordinary recklessness, but it was not subversion nor political except insofar as changing the configuration of elite groups is necessarily political.⁸² The *demos*, however, assumed tremendous risk in taking cognizance of such behavior.⁸³ In the admonishment of Perikles in the *Epitaphios*, his demarcation of the line between public and private behavioral spheres was quite relevant. He had praised the avoidance of targeting private self-gratification for public disdain.⁸⁴ To be sure, both the tyrannicides and the Athenian *demos* crossed the public/private boundary in different senses, but their action under the influence of *orge* united them (6. 57. 3, 60. 2). Nevertheless, the common motif in the anti-Peisistratid coup and the witch-hunt at the beginning of the Sicilian campaign was the conversion of intimate behavior, however objectionable, into public preoccupation. Rather than constituting an antiquarian excursus, the Thucydidean narrative on Harmodios and Aristogeiton teaches the reader a vital lesson. Playing sexual politics can turn out to become an expensive game for offender and offended.

Aeth. 6.15.3). Some applications are conventional ritual: Dem. 22. 68; Herod. *Hist.* 5. 5. 3; cf. Clem. Al. *Paed.* 3. 3. 20. If MacDowell (1962: 211) has surmised correctly that three comic poets were implicated in the profanation, the choreographic aspects were likely a factor in their participation.

⁸¹ As suggested to me years ago by my esteemed mentor, the late Martin Ostwald.

⁸² The idea that the profanation was directly political or ideological is absurd, as, for example, in Alkibiades' gesture against pro-peace Eleusinian influence. See Furley 1996: 31-40; cf. Todd 2004: 93-93; Hornblower *CT*3. 369-371.

⁸³ Meyer 2008: 21 stresses that the mysteries were enacted ἐν οἰκίαις 'in households' (Thuc. 6. 28. 1).

⁸⁴ Thuc. 2.37.2: ἐλευθέρως δὲ τὰ τε πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν πολιτεύομεν καὶ ἐς τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὑποψίαν, οὐ δὲ ὀργῆς τὸν πέλας, εἰ καθ' ἡδονὴν τι δρᾷ, ἔχοντες, οὐδὲ ἀζημίους μὲν, λυπηράς δὲ τῇ ὄψει ἀχθηδόνας προστιθέμενοι. See Connor 1984, 180; Meyer 2008: 20-21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asheri, D. (1981), "Ellanico, Jacoby e "la tradizione Alcmeonida"", *Acme* 34: 15-31.
- Bremmer, J. (1995), "Religious Secrets and Secrecy in Classical Greece", in H.G. Kippenberg & G.G. Stroumsa, eds., *Secrecy and Concealment. Studies in the History of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Religions*. Leiden, 1995, 61-78.
- Brunnsåker, S. (1955), *The Tyrant-Slayers of Kritios and Nesiotes*. Lund.
- Brunt, P.A. (1952), "Thucydides and Alcibiades", *REG* 65: 59-96. Buffière, F. (1980), *Eros adolescent: la pédérastie dans la Grèce antique*. Paris.
- Buffière, F. (1980), *Eros adolescent: la pédérastie dans la Grèce antique*. Paris.
- Calabi Limentani, I. (1976), "Armodio e Aristogitone. Gli uccisi dal tiranno", *Acme* 29: 9-27.
- Connor, W.R. (1984), *Thucydides*, Princeton.
- Davidson, J. (2007), *The Greeks and Greek Love*, London.
- Davies, J.K. (1968), "La storia di Atene e il metodo del Münzer", *RSI* 80: 209-221.
- Davies, J.K. (1971), *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford.
- Day, J.W. (1985), "Epigrams and History: the Athenian Tyrannicides, A Case in Point", in *The Greek Historians. Literature and History. Papers Presented to A.E. Raubitschek*, Saratoga CA, 25-46.
- Dover, K.J. (1978), *Greek Homosexuality*, New York.
- Ferrari, G. (2002), *Figures of Speech. Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece*. Chicago.
- Figueira, T.J. (1985), "The Theognidea and Megarian Society," in T. Figueira and G. Nagy (ed.) *Theognis of Megara: poetry and the polis*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 112-158.
- Figueira, T.J. (1986) "Xanthippos, Father of Perikles, and the *Prutaneis* of the *Naukraroi*," *Historia* 35: 257-79.
- Figueira, T.J. (2000), review of Gribble 1999, *CO* 77: 173.
- Figueira, T.J. and Nagy, G. (1985), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, Baltimore.
- Fitzgerald, T.R. (1957), "The Murder of Hipparchus: A Reply", *Historia* 6: 275-286.
- Fornara, C.W. (1968), "The "Tradition" about the Murder of Hipparchus", *Historia* 17: 400-424.
- Fornara, C.W. (1970), "The Cult of Harmodius and Aristogeiton", *Philologus* 114: 155-180.
- Furley, W.D. (1996), *Andokides and the Herms. A Study in Crisis in fifth-century Athenian Religion*, London, *BICS Supplement* 65.

- Graf, F. (2000), "Der Mysterienprozess", in L. Burckhardt & J. Ungern-Sternberg, eds., *Grosse Prozesse im antiken Athen*, Munich, 114-127.
- Gribble, D. (1999), *Alcibiades and Athens: A Study in Literary Presentation*. Oxford.
- HCT* = Gomme, A.W., Andrewes, A., Dover, K.J. (1945-1981), *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford.
- Hirsch, M. (1926), "Die athenischen Tyrannenmörder in Geschichtschreibung und Volkslegende", *Klio* 20: 129-167.
- Hornblower *CT* = Hornblower S. (1991-2008), *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols. Oxford.
- Jacoby, F. (1949), *Attthis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
- Lang, M. (1955), "The Murder of Hipparchus", *Historia* 3: 395-407.
- Lavelle, B.M. (1993), *The Sorrow and the Pity*, Stuttgart.
- Leão, D.F. (2012), "The Eleusinian Mysteries and Political Timing in the *Life of Alcibiades*", in L.R. Lanzilotta & I.M. Gallarte, eds., *Plutarch in the Religious and Philosophical Discourse of Late Antiquity*, Leiden, 181-192.
- Lewis, J.M. (1985), "Eros and the *Polis* in Theognis Book II", in T. Figueira and G. Nagy (ed.) *Theognis of Megara : poetry and the polis*, Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press: 197-222.
- Loenen, D. (1948), "The Pisistratides: A Shared Rule", *Mnem.*⁴ 1: 81-89.
- Loroux, N. (1985), Enquête sur la construction d'un meurtre en histoire *L'écrit Du Temps* 10: 3-21.
- Lord, E. (2008), *The Hell-Fire Clubs. Sex, Satanism and Secret Societies*. New Haven.
- MacDowell, D. (1962), *On the Mysteries*. Oxford.
- Meyer, E.A. (2008), "Thucydides on Harmodios and Aristogeiton, Tyranny, and History", *CQ* 58: 13-34.
- Momigliano, A. (1975), "Lexcursus di Tucidide in VI, 54-59", *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Rome, 2. 677-681.
- Murray, O. (1990), "The Affair of the Mysteries: Democracy and the Drinking Group", in O. Murray, ed., *Symptica. A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford, 149-161.
- Osborne, R. (1985), "The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai", *PCPS* 31: 47-73.
- Ostwald, M. (1969), *Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy*, Oxford.
- Parker, R. (1996), *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford.
- Pearson, L. (1949), "Note on a Digression of Thucydides (VI, 54-59)", *AJP* 70: 186-189.
- Pleket, H.W. (1972), "Isonomia and Cleisthenes: a Note", *Talanta* 4: 63-81.
- Podlecki, A.J. (1966), "The Political Significance of the Athenian 'Tyrannicide-Cult'", *Historia* 15: 129-141.

- Quinn, J.C. (2007), "Herms, Kouroi and the Political Anatomy of Athens", *G&R* 54: 82-105.
- Rawlings, H.R. (1981), *The Structure of Thucydides' History*, Princeton.
- Rhodes, P.J. (1981), *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2006), "Thucydides and Athenian History," in A. Rengakos & A. Tsakmakis, eds., *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden, 2. 523-546.
- Rood, T. (1998), *Thucydides. Narrative and Explanation*, Oxford.
- Rubel, A. (2014), *Fear and Loathing in Ancient Athens*, Durham.
- Schadewalt, W. (1929), *Die Geschichtsschreibung des Thukydides. Ein Versuch*. Berlin.
- Scholte, A. (1937), "Hippias ou Hipparche?," *Mnem.*³ 5: 69-75.
- Schwartz, E. (1919), *Das Geschichtswerk de Thukydides*, Bonn.
- Scott, L. (2005), *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6*. Leiden.
- Seager, R. (1967), "Alcibiades and the Charge of Aiming at Tyranny", *Historia* 16: 6-18.
- Shear, J.L. (2012), "The Tyrannicides, Their Cult and the Panathenaia: A Note", *JHS* 132: 107-119.
- Stahl, H.-P. (2003), *Thucydides. Man's Place in History*. Swansea.
- Stewart, A.F. (1990), *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*. 2 vols. Princeton.
- Taylor, M.W. (1981), *The Tyrant Slayers: the Heroic Image in Fifth Century B.C. Athenian Art and Politics*, New York.
- Thomas, R. (1989), *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
- Thompson, W.E. (1971), "The Prytaneion Decree", *AJP* 92: 226-237.
- Todd, S.C. (2004), "Revisiting the herms and the mysteries", in D.L. Cairns & R.A. Knox, eds., *Law, Rhetoric, and Comedy in Classical Athens*, Swansea, 87-102.
- Tsakmakis, A. (1996), "Thukydides VI 54,1 und Herodot", *Philologus* 140: 201-213.
- Vattuone, R. (1975), "L'excursus nel VI libro delle storie di Tucidide", *RSA* 5: 173-184.
- Vickers, M. (1995), "Thucydides 6.53.3-59: not a 'digression'", *DHA* 21: 193-200.
- Wallace, R.W. (1992), "Charmides, Agariste and Damon: Andokides 1.16", *CQ* 42: 328-335.
- Wehrli, F. (1969), *Die Schule des Aristoteles²*, Basel.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. (1877), "Die Thukydideslegende", *Hermes* 12: 326-367.
- Wohl, V. (1999), "The Eros of Alcibiades", *CA* 18: 349-380.