

“ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” UNIVERSITY OF IAȘI  
FACULTY OF HISTORY  
INTERDISCIPLINARY CENTRE FOR ARCHAEOHISTORICAL STUDIES

**STUDIA ANTIQUA**

**ET**

**ARCHAEOLOGICA**

**28/1, 2022**

EDITURA UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA”  
IAȘI – 2022

EDITORIAL BOARD

Lucrețiu Mihailescu-Bîrliba (**editor in chief**) (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Robin Brigand (French National Centre for Scientific Research, Besançon), Ashley Dumas (University of West Alabama), Alexander Falileyev (Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Sankt Petersburg), Svend Hansen (German Archaeological Institute, Berlin), Martin Hose (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich), Gheorghe Iacob (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Ion Niculiță (Moldova State University Chișinău), Attila Laszlo (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Ioan Carol Opriș (University of Bucharest), Daniele Vittorio Piacente (University of Bari), Alexandru-Florin Platon (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Adrian Poruciuc (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Alexander Rubel (Iași Institute of Archaeology), Ion Sandu (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Eugen Sava (National Museum of History of Moldova, Chișinău), Christoph Schafer (University of Trier), Wolfgang Schuller (University of Konstanz), Claire Smith (Flinders University, Adelaide), Acad. Victor Spinei (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Dan Gh. Teodor (Iași Institute of Archaeology), Nicolae Ursulescu (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Mihail Vasilescu (“Al. I. Cuza” Univ. of Iași), Olivier Weller (Pantheon-Sorbonne University, Paris).

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Roxana-Gabriela Curcă (**chief secretary**), Marius Alexianu, Neculai Bolohan, Octavian Bounegru, Vasile Cotiugă, Iulian Moga, Iulia Dumitrache, Andrei Asăndulesei, Felix-Adrian Tencariu (**members**), Casian Gămănuț, Radu Alexandru Brunchi (**web editor**).

Postal address (materials sent for reviewing purposes and other correspondence):

*Universitatea “Al. I. Cuza”, Facultatea de Istorie, Bulevardul Carol I, nr. 11, 700506 - Iași, Romania.*

Tel.: (+04) 0232 201 615; Fax.: +(4) 0232 201 201, +(4) 0232 201 156;

Website: saa.uaic.ro; Email: saa.uaic.ro@gmail.com, blucretiu@yahoo.com.

The responsibility for the content of the materials published falls entirely on the authors.

This volume uses the free open-source typeface *Gentium* by SIL International.



© 2022 by the authors; licensee Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza din Iași. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ISSN 1224-2284

ISSN-L 1224-2284

Power and Opposition in the Ancient Near Eastern and  
Mediterranean World

edited by Mait Kõiv and Vladimir Sazonov



# Table of Contents

## Power and Opposition in the Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean World

Mait KÕIV, Vladimir SAZONOV, Introduction .....	7
Walter SOMMERFELD, Sumerischer Widerstand gegen semitische Herrschaft. Migration, Machtkämpfe und Demographie im 3. Jahrtausend v. Chr. ....	11
Giulia TUCCI, Religious Syncretism and Control Over the Territory: Pharaohs in Southern Levant During the Late Bronze Age .....	41
Andres NÕMMIK, Egyptian Control in the Southern Levant and the Late Bronze Age Crisis .....	55
Vladimir SHELESTIN, Old Hittite Opposition in the Religious Aspect .....	83
Vladimir SAZONOV, Mait KÕIV, Justification of the Usurpation of Power by Hittite Kings .....	93
Siim MÕTTUS, Some Observations About Succession Principles in the Hittite New Kingdom .....	109
Lynette G. MITCHELL, The Politics of Power: The Rise and Fall of the Deinomenid Dynasty in Fifth-century Sicily .	123
Luca MACALE, «Like an unseen god» (Ctesias F1b §21, 7 Lenfant): The Unapproachability of the Near Eastern Kings in Greek Sources as Tool of Power .....	143

Priit-Hendrik KALDMA, The Tyranny of the Peisistratidai in Athens: Expenses, Revenues and the Opposition to the Sole Rule .....	157
Mait KÕIV, Monarchy in the Iron Age Levant and Archaic Greece: the Rulers of Corinth in a Comparative Context .....	179
Eleni TZOVLA, Compliance and Endurance. The Athenian Power Building through the Melian Dialogue .....	233
Salvatore TUFANO, Show Trials and The Opposition to Pelopidas and Epameinondas .....	245

## The Tyranny of the Peisistratidai in Athens: Expenses, Revenues and the Opposition to the Sole Rule

Priit-Hendrik KALDMA\*

**Abstract.** *The late archaic city-state of Athens was ruled first by Peisistratos who became a tyrant after three successive coup d'états. The rule of Peisistratos and his sons secured inner stability in Athens after the preceding internal conflicts. The tyrants promoted political and religious unification and centralization of the Athenian community, which involved the establishment or promotion of festivals and the construction of various public buildings. The architectural plans of the Peisistratids formed a major part of their politics. Their building policy required considerable resources, which could have been perceived as oppressive, and could have significantly contributed to their overthrowal.*

**Rezumat.** *În perioada arhaică târzie, orașul-stat al Atenei a fost condus initial de către Peisistratos, care a devenit tiran după trei uzurpări succesive. Domnia lui Peisistratos și a fiilor săi a garantat securitatea internă a Atenei, în urma precedentelor conflicte. Tiranii au promovat unificarea politică și religioasă și centralizarea comunității ateniene, ceea ce a implicat înființarea sau promovarea unor festivaluri, precum și construirea unor diverse edificii publice. Planurile arhitecturale ale acestora au constituit o coordonată majoră a politicii lor. Această politică edilitară necesita utilizarea unui volum semnificativ de resurse, ceea ce ar fi putut contribui la perceperea lor drept opresori chiar la înlăturarea lor de la putere.*

**Keywords:** Archaic Greek tyranny, Peisistratidai, Expenses, Revenues, Building projects.

### Introduction

Among the numerous tyrannies emerging in Greece during the Archaic period (from the eighth to the end of the sixth century BC<sup>1</sup>) one of the most remarkable was surely the dynasty of the Peisistratidai ruling Athens during the years 561–510. The power of Peisistratos and his sons Hippias and Hipparchos secured inner stability for the polis after the preceding internal conflicts. The tyrants promoted political and religious unification and centralization of the Athenian community, which involved the establishment or promotion of Panathenaian festivals and the construction of various public buildings. The era of the tyranny was indeed later remembered as the golden age of Kronos. All these activities as well as other measures

---

\* Tallinn University, priit23@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> All the following dates are BC.

for securing the power and suppressing the opposition required resources, which could have been gathered both from Athens and from abroad. The covering of these expenses could not always have been easy for the tyrants, and as far as they had to rely on the internal revenues, gathering these could have evoked opposition. As this could have caused problems for the tyrants and had effects on their popularity, the understanding of the ways the tyrants financed their power will be essential for properly understanding the motivation of the rulers and the reaction of the community.

The finances of Archaic poleis, not least of Athens, have been recently discussed by several authors, particularly by Hans van Wees emphasising the establishment of relatively developed financing systems during the period.<sup>2</sup> Attention has been paid also to the revenues of tyrants, and the ways how fundraising could have impacted the popularity of the rulers.<sup>3</sup> Concerning Athens, Marcello Valente has recently discussed the revenues of the Peisistratidai, viewing the tyrants as the founders of Athenian public taxation.<sup>4</sup> The present article naturally builds on these results. It will, however, pay special attention to the Peisistratid building programs as presumably the most expensive part of their policy, and especially, aims to establish how burdensome this could have been for the Athenians and which effects the problems with financing the activities had on the popularity of the rule.<sup>5</sup>

### **The finances of Peisistratos before the final confirmation of his power**

The social and economic situation in the late seventh and early sixth century Athens was highly precarious and the state was split by internal tensions. Two elite leaders, first Kylon in the 630s and later Damasias in the 580s, tried to use these difficulties for achieving power, but without an essential success. Kylon's attempt was followed by continuous civil strife which Drakon and Solon tried to solve with their legislations. Solon succeeded to reorganise the state in many important aspects, which included, among many other legislative measures, an establishment or re-validation of earlier tax – *eisphora*. He stated that the treasurers must be appointed from among the highest property class – the *pentakosiomedimnoi* – and some duties concerning the income and the expenditure were assigned to *naukrarioi* – the heads of twelve administrative and apparently taxation units (*naukrariai*) into which the state was divided.<sup>6</sup> All this demonstrates that public finances were of considerable importance for the proper functioning of the state.<sup>7</sup> The conflicts however continued,<sup>8</sup> and in the 560s there were three

---

<sup>2</sup> VAN WEES 2013; see also e.g. LYTTKENS 2013.

<sup>3</sup> ΚΟΪΥ 2021 and in the present volume.

<sup>4</sup> VALENTE 2019; but see also SPAHN 1998.

<sup>5</sup> The question if the Athenian tyrants did or did not differ public funds from their own private wealth will not be discussed in the current research because it deserves a further in-depth analysis.

<sup>6</sup> *Eisphora*: Ath. Pol. 8.3; treasurers: Ath. Pol. 8.1; the duties of the *naukrarioi*: Ath. Pol. 9.3.

<sup>7</sup> The focus of this article does not allow to discuss Solonian reorganizations in detail, on his reforms see HIGNETT 1952, 90–103; DEVELIN 1989, 37–38; STANLEY 1999, 204–257; OWENS 2010, 97–145. Very little is known about Solonian

factions competing for the power. The *pedioi* (men from the plain) headed by Lykurgos were opposed to the *paralioi* (men from the shore) led by Megakles, to which Peisistratos added his own faction of *hyperakrioi* (men from beyond the hills)<sup>9</sup> At the same time, an implicit sign of the strengthening of the polis was the victory over Megara and the capture of its port Nisaia under the leadership of Peisistratos. However, the factional strife and the ease with which Peisistratos managed to seize the power in three succeeding times demonstrates the continuous instability of the political, economic and social situation.

During his first coup d'état Peisistratos seized Acropolis and achieved tyrannical power with the help of his bodyguard armed with clubs (*korynephoroi*), an event dated to 560/1.<sup>10</sup> Soon thereafter Peisistratos was overthrown by an alliance of Lykurgos and Megakles, but the latter was not content with the consequent political situation and proposed to Peisistratos to seize tyranny together with him. Peisistratos agreed and restated his tyranny by riding to the Acropolis on a chariot with a woman dressed as the goddess Athena, as if the goddess herself had established him to the power. The Athenians consequently surrendered to his rule. But this alliance did not last long and Peisistratos was again overthrown by Megakles and Lykurgos who re-established their alliance against him.<sup>11</sup>

We do not know much about the revenues or expenses of Peisistratos during these two short periods of tyranny. His family surely had considerable possessions, probably near Brauron in the eastern Attika if we can trust the evidence of our sources,<sup>12</sup> the revenues from which could have been used for both establishing and maintaining the power. Moreover, since all our sources agree that he left the Solonian constitution intact,<sup>13</sup> we can assume that as the head of the state he could exploit the taxes established by Solon. If the clubmen, with whom he first seized the power, were kept by him as a regular unit of bodyguard, he must probably have paid them. Moreover, we can suspect that the interest of Peisistratos and Megakles to conduct religious performances was not confined to the spectacle with the goddess Athena during Peisistratos' second coup d'état. There might have been still other expenses, which could have been covered from the public funds coming from the taxes fixed by Solon.

---

taxation but his *eisphora* was supposedly corresponding to four 'property classes' attested to him (*pentakosiomedimnoi*, *hippeis*, *zeugitai* and *thetes*) cf. VAN WEES 2013, 85–92 (according to Ath. Pol. 7.3 however the 'property classes' might have existed even before Solon).

<sup>8</sup> The reforms of Solon however were followed by two years without any archons, according to Ath. Pol. 13.1 in 586/5.

<sup>9</sup> Hdt. 1.59; according to Ath. Pol. 13.4 (cf. Plut. Sol. 29.1) Peisistratos became the leader of an already existing group of *diakrioi* (men from the hills).

<sup>10</sup> Hdt. 1.59.5; Plut. Sol. 30.2; Ath. Pol. 14.1; Marm. Par. FGrH 239 40; for the dating cf. CADOUX 1948, 104–106; DEVELIN 1989, 42.

<sup>11</sup> Hdt. 1.60–61.2; Ath. Pol. 14.4–15.1.

<sup>12</sup> Plut. Sol. 10.2; Plat. Hipp. 228b.

<sup>13</sup> Hdt. 1.59.6 (who confines this to the first period of Peisistratos' rule); Thuk. 6.54.4–5; Ath. Pol. 14.3, 16; Plut. Sol. 31.

When Megakles and Lykurgos concluded an agreement against Peisistratos and he had to go into exile, all these revenues were cut off. Herodotos reports that the tyrant and his family settled down first at Eretria where they accepted the plan of Hippias to recover the power and to collect gifts from all the cities which owed them some requital. The Thebans were allegedly the biggest contributors, the Argive mercenaries joined him when he returned to Attica, and Lygdamis from Naxos supported Peisistratos with money and men.<sup>14</sup> The *Athenaion Politeia* adds the Eretrian aristocracy of *hippeis* as the supporters.<sup>15</sup> We can only guess if Argos, Naxos and Eretria, apart from the Thebans, might have been these cities which owed to Peisistratidai and consequently supported them with money. Peisistratos second wife was an Argive Timonassa and one of his sons Hegesistratos brought thousand Argives to fight for him,<sup>16</sup> which indicates close relations with Argos.

These obligations towards Peisistratos obviously must date from the first two periods of his reign, or from the time before his tyranny. Herodotos' account infers that these cities were indebted to Peisistratos and not to the citizens of Athens, because otherwise the former tyrant could not have requested the requitals when expelled from his polis. The creation of these debts must have involved cost for Peisistratos, which could have been covered either from his own resources or from the Athenian public funds, so far as he commanded them during his first short periods of tyranny. His family was surely wealthy, but almost certainly not wealthy enough for helping multiple city-states, which suggests that during the first two periods of tyranny Peisistratos had used the public resources for creating ties of friendship, even sort of dependency, between his own family and the influential circles outside Athens.

According to the *Athenaion Politeia* the Peisistratidai first settled to Rhaikelos on the shore of the gulf of Thermae on the Macedonian coast, from where they moved to the neighbourhood of mount Pangaion, to gather money and hire soldiers.<sup>17</sup> Herodotos notes the same district around Strymon river in the vicinity of mount Pangaion as the major source of Peisistratos' subsequent wealth<sup>18</sup>, besides the gifts and contributions in money and men from his allies. This allowed them to return in the eleventh year to Eretria. The expenses of Peisistratos during this period were related to preparing his military actions in regaining the tyranny. After the ten years of preparation he landed with his army at Marathon, where collected gifts and gathered allies among the Athenians. He subsequently won a battle at

---

<sup>14</sup> Hdt. 1.61.

<sup>15</sup> Ath. Pol. 15.2.

<sup>16</sup> Ath. Pol. 17.3.

<sup>17</sup> Ath. Pol. 15.2.

<sup>18</sup> Hdt. 1.64.1. Herodotos and *Athenaion Politeia* mention Strymon as a source of revenues which may refer to the mines of noble metals of Mt. Pangaion or simply to the fertility of the Strymon plain (Strab. 7. F 33–34; Plut. Kim. 7.3).

Pallene against the citizen army trying to oppose him, and seized the power in Athens,<sup>19</sup> at 546/5 according to the ancient evidence.<sup>20</sup>

B. Lavelle has suggested that Peisistratos relied almost exclusively on domestic Athenian military, and that Herodotos was mistaken in naming the Argives as mercenaries since the *Athenaion Politeia* counts them as close allies led by Peisistratos' son Hegesistratos.<sup>21</sup> Peisistratos had not been successful previously in securing power with local Athenian support, which indicates the crucial role of foreign help in his *coup d'état*. The *Athenaion Politeia* is very clear that this was the first time when Peisistratos attempted to recover his power by force, while Herodotos notices that his local supporters started to join him only after he had landed in Marathon.<sup>22</sup> Peisistratos must have been prepared to face a battle without the help of his Athenian supporters, which means that these formed only a supplementary force to his main army. It is hard to believe that all his foreign force was based only on friendship and good faith, which suggests that at least a part of them were hired mercenaries. We do not know the size or the exact composition of Peisistratos' army, but the whole preparation, food, ships and other supplies, as well as the payment for the Argive mercenaries, must have been expensive. Moreover, the *Athenaion Politeia* notes that after the battle of Pallene, when the power in Athens was firmly established, Peisistratos conquered Naxos and appointed Lygdamis as ruler.<sup>23</sup> This demonstrates that Peisistratos had to reward his supporters, for which additional revenues were surely necessary.

A part of the revenues was provided by the outside allies, mentioned above, for which Peisistratos had apparently taken care during the first periods of reign. Besides that, the resources of Strymon were probably important. Ancient Strymon was rich in forests, and the timber for building the ships necessary for bringing the force to Marathon might have come from there. However, the building of the ships certainly involved considerable expenses besides the timber. We can suppose that the cost of these military actions were to a great extent covered with the noble metals of the nearby Mt. Pangaion.

### **The expenses of Peisistratos during his third tyranny**

The expenses of Peisistratos during his third tyranny can be divided into four categories: the expenses to the military, the loans to the poor farmers, the expenses on the cults and for the building projects. Thukydides states that the Peisistratidai embellished their city, but also

---

<sup>19</sup> Hdt. 1.62–63; Ath. Pol. 15.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. CADOUX 1948, 39, 42; DEVELIN 1989, 45.

<sup>21</sup> Ath. Pol. 17.3. It seems interesting that when almost in all another points B. LAVELLE counts *Athenaion Politeia* as 'an ancient copywriter' of Herodotos (LAVELLE 1992, 8–12) then in the matter of understanding Argive mercenaries he judges this as more reliable than Herodotos (1.61.4).

<sup>22</sup> Ath. Pol.15.2; Hdt. 1.62.

<sup>23</sup> Ath. Pol. 15.3.

waged wars and provided sacrifices for the temples.<sup>24</sup> No wars of either Peisistratos or his sons before the murder of Hipparchos are recorded, but Thukydides could have meant Peisistratos' conquest of Sigeion from Mytilene and the conquest of Naxos.<sup>25</sup> These ventures required naval power which, however, must have been at least partially existent already when Peisistratos landed at Marathon. Maintaining of these ships must have been expensive.<sup>26</sup> The bodyguard of Peisistratos and his sons, referred to as *korynephoroi*, *doryphoroi*, or *phylakes* certainly required some more costs.<sup>27</sup>

In the field of the religious activities Peisistratos can be directly linked only with the purification of the island of Delos. As the removal of the bones of the dead from the temple area was carried out according to the bidding of the oracles,<sup>28</sup> we can suppose that Peisistratos was also active in Delphi. The promotion of the Panathenaian festivals has been attested for him and his sons.<sup>29</sup> The introduction of the city-Dionysia festival was dated to his reign in 534,<sup>30</sup> and a later tradition related him to the promotion of the cult of Dionysos.<sup>31</sup> The introduction of Eleusinian mysteries at Athens might have been founded also under the rule of Peisistratos.<sup>32</sup> The interest of the tyrant in the recitations of the Homeric epics during the Panathenaia festival is recorded by the tradition as well.<sup>33</sup>

Concerning the agricultural and economic politics of Peisistratos we have to rely on the notice of the *Athenaion Politeia* that he gave loans to the poor, so that they could maintain themselves by farming.<sup>34</sup> It seems however reasonable to suppose that these loans formed a smaller part of the total expenses of the tyrant.

### The building projects of Peisistratos

The evidence for the building projects in Athens and Attica which might be date from the period of tyranny comes mainly from the archaeological record, and in many cases the more

---

<sup>24</sup> Thuk. 6.54.5.

<sup>25</sup> Sigeion: Hdt. 5.94; Naxos: Ath. Pol. 15.3.

<sup>26</sup> APERGHIS 2013, 4–5.

<sup>27</sup> *Korynephoroi*: Hdt. 1.59.5; Ath. Pol. 14.1; Plut. Sol. 30.2–3; Polyb. 1.21.3; *doryphoroi*: Thuk. 6.56.2, 57.1, 57.4; *epikouroi*: Hdt. 1.64.1; Thuk. 6.58.2; *phylakes*: Arist. Rhet. 1357b 313–3.

<sup>28</sup> Hdt. 1.64.2; Thuk. 3. 104.2.

<sup>29</sup> According to Arist. F 637 Rose/ sc. Ael. Ar. 13.189.4–5 Peisistratos even founded the Great Panathenaia. For associations between Peisistratos and the Great Panathenaia see MYLONAS 1961, 78; PAGA 2021, 82, for a detailed criticism see PARKER 1996, 89–92. On the relation between the development of the festival and the construction of the Acropolis' ramps see PAGA 2021, 39 n. 22.

<sup>30</sup> Marm. Par. FGrH 239 A 43; Plut. Sol. 29.6; Suda s.v. *Thespis*; cf. SIMON 1983, 104.

<sup>31</sup> Athen. 12.533c.

<sup>32</sup> On the mysteries see SHAPIRO 1989, 67–69.

<sup>33</sup> HIGNETT 1952, 330–331; DAVISON 1958, 26ff; WEST 1999, 364f contra JANKO 1992, 29, 32 according to whom the text existed before Peisistratos' time.

<sup>34</sup> Ath. Pol. 16.2.

or less precise dating is debatable.<sup>35</sup> The most notable among the buildings which could date from the first two short periods of Peisistratos' tyranny are perhaps the temple of Athena Polias and the *Hekatompedon* on the Acropolis. Their construction could have started earlier, but almost certainly continued under Peisistratos.<sup>36</sup> Besides these, some other dwellings were erected on Acropolis, as well as the wells and possibly a watersystem supplying Acropolis.<sup>37</sup> On the Agora the temple of Apollo Patroos,<sup>38</sup> and some other buildings were constructed during Peisistratos' reign.<sup>39</sup> Some buildings were erected elsewhere in Attica.<sup>40</sup>

The buildings that can be securely dated to the third period of tyranny ca 545–528 are less numerous. The constructions in the town of Athens were confined above all to the temple of Zeus Agoraios on the agora.<sup>41</sup> In the other parts of Attica the main building was apparently the colonnade of the Athena Sounias temple at Sounion.<sup>42</sup> Outside Attica Peisistratos was apparently involved in the development of the sanctuary at Delos, where the Archaic temple of Apollo was restored or built c. 550 or slightly later and reveals close connections to

---

<sup>35</sup> Although the dating of them has remained a problematic issue: see APF, 444ff; RUEBEL 1973, 125–136; HIND 1974, 1–18; RHODES 1976, 219–233; DEVELIN 1989, 41–47; PAGA 2021, 8 n.11, 30 n.2, 68, 136, 265.

<sup>36</sup> The temple of Athena Polias has been dated c. 570–525 (BOERSMA 1970, cat. 48; HURWIT 1999, 109–125, 130–136, 341 n.47; ÉTIENNE 2004, 42–48), and the Hekatompedon c. 570–550 (WYCHERLEY 1978, 144–145; BANCROFT 1979, ch 1–3; HURWIT 1985, 236–48; 1999, 106–125, 341 n. 48; ÉTIENNE 2004, 42–48). According to PAGA 2021, 30, 33–39, 43–51, 65–66, 71–72 it was the Bluebeard temple that was first erected on the Acropolis ca. 570–560 and replaced in 500 with the Old Athena temple.

<sup>37</sup> The Athena Nike Precinct (dated mainly to the 550s cf. RAUBITSCHKE 1949, 359–364; BOERSMA 1970, 161; HURWIT 1999, 105–106, 116) and other small buildings (see PICARD 1935, 595; DINSMOOR 1947, 125; 1950, 70 n.1). On wells and the water supply system see CAMP 1977, 46–47; DIMITRIADOU 2019, 184–187.

<sup>38</sup> Dated to the middle of the 6<sup>th</sup> century (cf. THOMPSON 1937, 8–12; THOMPSON 1962, 59–60; PAGA 2021, 88f contra HEDRICK 1988, 185–191 who doubts in the use of the 6<sup>th</sup> century building as a religious site. On the site see BOERSMA 1970, 17, cat. IX); DIMITRIADOU 2019, 170, 192.

<sup>39</sup> Building C in the Agora is dated to c. 600–575 (cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 124; DIMITRIADOU 2019, 192). Building F in the Agora from the middle of the sixth century could have served as prytaneion (THOMPSON 1940, 40–44) or residence of the tyrants (THOMPSON 1962, 21; BOERSMA 1970, cat. 144; SHEAR 1978, 6–7; CAMP 1986, 38 (a mansion where tyrants had their court), 44–45 (palace) cf. MORRIS 1987, 68; HURWIT 1999, 120–121; DIMITRIADOU 2019, 192–194; PAGA 2021, 86); House of Thamneus dated to c. 550 by BOERSMA 1970, cat. 145; DIMITRIADOU 2019, 173, 220.

<sup>40</sup> The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore and the wall of the precinct at Eleusis date from the middle of the 6<sup>th</sup> century (BOERSMA 1970, cat. 18, 21). Few shrines from the early or middle of the 6<sup>th</sup> century in the countryside include these dedicated to Apollo Proopsios on the Hymettos, to Athena Sounias in Sounio (BOERSMA 1970, cat. 34, 38, 51) and to Zeus Ombrios on the Hymettos mountain (BOERSMA 1970, cat. 71; DIMITRIADOU 2019, 189). The wall of the precinct of Demeter and Kore in Athens is dated to c. 550 (BOERSMA 1970, cat. 22).

<sup>41</sup> The temple of Zeus Agoraios (cf. BOERSMA 1970, 17, cat. 32; cat. 69). The building D in the Agora is dated to 550–525 by BOERSMA 1970, cat. 127 while DIMITRIADOU 2019, 192–194 dates it to 530.

<sup>42</sup> The colonnade of the temple of Athena Sounias (temple itself dates from the early or the mid-sixth century cf. BOERSMA 1970, 17, cat. XVII, cat. 51 contra PAGA 2021, 220–224 who dates it to 500); on the house(s) in Thorikos dated to the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century see BOERSMA 1970, 17, cat. 159; the temple of Plouton has also been dated to the years 550–500 cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 62.

Athens.<sup>43</sup> This project could be connected to the religious purification of the island ordered by the tyrant.<sup>44</sup>

However, although Peisistratos erected some constructions on the Agora, it seems clear that Agora had become the civic centre of Athens already on the first half of the sixth century, thus before the tyranny.<sup>45</sup> This contradicts the view that Peisistratos was the main contributor to its the development.<sup>46</sup> Only two Agora buildings – the temple of Zeus Agoraios and the building D – can be securely attached to this period of reign. The story that after the victorious battle at Pallene Peisistratos assembled Athenians at Theseion, let his associates to gather their arms and lock into the buildings nearby may suggest that Peisistratos had a part to play in the construction of Theseion.<sup>47</sup> If excluding the doubtful account of Theopompos concerning the tyrant's initiative in founding Lykeion,<sup>48</sup> then Theseion is the only building that the literary sources link to Peisistratos. Outside the agora, the construction of the temple of Dionysos Eleuthereus and of the scene for the dramatic performances can be linked to Peisistratos because of the alleged foundation of the festival of city-Dionysia by the tyrant.<sup>49</sup>

It is however remarkable that on the Acropolis no new buildings appear to have been erected during the years 546–528, except of some small dwellings which might have been built at the beginning of the third tyranny of Peisistratos.<sup>50</sup> It has been suggested that Peisistratos used Acropolis as his residence,<sup>51</sup> although there is no hard evidence for establishing this. His sons' supposed residence at the Agora will be touched upon below.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> The stone and the technic used were Attic cf. COURBY 1931, 213–215; SANTERRE 1958, 302–303; BRUNEAU – DUCAT 1965, 82 n. 11; BOERSMA 1970, 17–18, cat. 34; GRUBEN 1976, 14. This modest temple of Apollo Delios within the sanctuary may have been a part of the Peisistratos' restoration process cf. SHAPIRO 1989, 48.

<sup>44</sup> COURBY 1931, 213–215; SCHEFOLD 1946; BRUNEAU – DUCAT 1965, 17, 82 followed by BOERSMA 1970, 17–18, cat. 34.

<sup>45</sup> CAMP 1986, 37ff, PAGA 2021, 80ff, for a different dating see THOMPSON 1981; FRANCIS – VICKERS 1988.

<sup>46</sup> SHEAR 1978, 4–9; STEUBEN 1989, 81–84; HURWIT 1999, 120 and BOERSMA 2000, 54–55 have argued that Peisistratos essentially contributed to the development of the agora. Cf. DIMITRIADOU 2019, 192–196, 211; PAGA 2021, 86–88.

<sup>47</sup> The story recorded in Ath. Pol. 15.4; Polyae. 1.21.2. Theseion has been dated to c. 575–550 cf. THOMPSON 1954, 36–44; 1966 (I), 47. On the site see BOERSMA 1970, cat. 30.

<sup>48</sup> Harpokration s.v. *Lykeion* referring to Theopomp. FGrH 115 F 136. According to Philochoros FGrH 328 F 37 it was Perikles not Peisistratos who was the *epistates* of Lykeion; cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. XVII, XXV.

<sup>49</sup> The temple of Dionysos Eleuthereus dated to c. 550–500 (BOERSMA 1970, cat. 55; HURWIT 1999, 106, 117; while PAGA 2021, 145–150 dates it to 506/5 and the construction of the theatre to 500) along with the initial space of dramatic performances dated to the last third of the 6<sup>th</sup> century (cf. MARTIN 1951, 322–324; WYCHERLEY 1957, 162–163; PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE 1962, 68–89; HURWIT 1999, 106, 117, 121).

<sup>50</sup> On the dwellings see *infra* n. 37.

<sup>51</sup> ANDREWES 1956, 113; 1982, 415; BERVE – GRUBEN 1961, 64; but BERVE 1967, 549 hesitates. The presence of the residence as the reason of decrease of dedications has been postulated by RAUBITSCHKEK 1949, 464–5; HURWIT 1999, 118–119.

<sup>52</sup> The number of dedications on the Acropolis increased during the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century (SCHRADER 1939, 9; RAUBITSCHKEK 1949, 456; SCHOLL 2006, 131–136), but the significance of this fact for establishing the residence of the tyrant is debatable.

All the other constructions in Athens or in Attika mentioned above could have resulted from local initiatives, or are dated too uncertainly for being securely linked to Peisistratos' reign. The Archaic non-religious dwellings in the periphery of Attika from the Peisistratos era are few (the most important are the house(s) of Thorikos).<sup>53</sup> All this considered, we can conclude that no single construction in Athens can be firmly attached to Peisistratos, although we must assume that as the ruler he probably contributed to the construction of the two buildings on Agora which were probably built during the period of his reign, and to the continuation of the temple building on the Acropolis. This would suggest that his expenses on the building projects were, in all likelihood, not significantly bigger than what the Athenians had spent before the tyranny.

### **The revenues of Peisistratos during the third tyranny**

According to Herodotos, Peisistratos started to collect money from the Athenians even before the battle at Pallene,<sup>54</sup> which clearly demonstrates his need for supplementary finances and reflects the high expenses for the seizure of the power at Athens. According to the *Athenaion Politeia* he subsequently collected a tithe from the agricultural production.<sup>55</sup> The amount of the tax is debatable, for which see below, but the fact of taxation can be trusted. The *Athenaion Politeia* connects the extraction of the tithe to the supporting of agriculture by the tyrant.<sup>56</sup> The author emphasizes that the loans to the poor farmers and establishing the juries for the *demoi* were intended to keep the farmers engaged in their private affairs and prevent from attending public business, while on the other hand his object was to increase his own revenues, as the growth of the agricultural production also increased the amount of the tithe he exacted. This shows that even the popular measure of supporting farmers was inspired mainly by Peisistratos' effort in securing revenues.<sup>57</sup>

There is no reason to doubt that Peisistratos continued to collect income from the district of Pangaion near the river Strymon. Since he had conquered Sigeion from Mytilene and his son Hegesistratos reigned there as a tyrant,<sup>58</sup> it seems possible that he collected revenues from Sigeion as well. Pangaion could have been the main source of silver used for the Athenian minting in this period. Despite the debates about the Athenian minting during the reign of Peisistratos and his sons it seems certain that the *Wappenmünzen* were already in use during the reign of the old tyrant.<sup>59</sup> The minting or even only the use of money issued by the

---

<sup>53</sup> *Infra* n. 42.

<sup>54</sup> Hdt. 1.62.2.

<sup>55</sup> Ath. Pol. 16.4.

<sup>56</sup> Ath. Pol. 16.3–4.

<sup>57</sup> VALENTE 2019, 268–269.

<sup>58</sup> Hdt. 5.94.

<sup>59</sup> Most scholars agree that 'Wappenmünzen' were minted under Peisistratos reign: SELTMANN 1924; KRAAY 1976, 58ff; KROLL 1981, 1–32; KROLL – WAGONER 1984, 325–340; HAYMEN 1987, 35–37; APERGHIS 2013, 14 ff.

tyrant brought at least indirectly some profit to Athens and to its ruler. It might also be that the first ditches at Laureion were in use, but their impact could have been only local.<sup>60</sup>

### **The expenses of Hippias and Hipparchos (528–510)**

Hippias and Hipparchos, the sons of Peisistratos who inherited the power of their father, more or less continued the previous policy, but there are indications that the expenses increased during their reign. The building of triremes as the new kind of warships instead of the previous *pentekonters* probably begun under their rule. Athenian trireme is recorded for the first time by Herodotos when he noted that the tyrants sent Miltiades to Chersonesos on a trireme,<sup>61</sup> which suggests that the new kind of warships were built during the reign of Hippias and Hipparchos. G. APERGHIS has proposed that the introduction of new Gorgoneion coins could coincide with the building of the triremes c. 515, caused by the needs to pay the navy.<sup>62</sup> In any case, the Peisistratidai probably renewed the Athenian navy, which must have required considerable funding, and although the aristocratic families who returned from exile during their rule might have partially covered these expenses,<sup>63</sup> this renewal must surely have put stress on the budget.

The military expenses of the tyrants included the bodyguard mentioned by Thukydidēs,<sup>64</sup> financing the loyal army of unknown composition and size but strong enough to take the Plataians under protection and support them against a Theban attack,<sup>65</sup> and to drive, after the assassination of Hipparchos, the Alkmeonidai and their supporters out of Attica.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, Hippias was able to invite Kineas with thousand of Thessalian cavalry to help him against the Spartans and the other enemies.<sup>67</sup> Even if Kineas came because of the friendship ties with the Peisistratidai we must assume that his cavalry needed supplies which were most probably covered by the Athenian tyrant.

---

<sup>60</sup> The first trenches from probable mining (so-called First Contact) date from the Bronze Age (NICOLET-PIERRE 1985, 31). Laureion was probably producing silver from the years of c. 515 (APERGHIS 2013, 12–50). PICARD 2001, 9–10 dates the 'introduction of the owls by Hippias' to 520–515. KRAAY 1962, 421 notes that Laureion might have started producing silver before 510 but from poorer upper levels.

<sup>61</sup> Hdt. 6.39.

<sup>62</sup> APERGHIS 2013, 16–20. According to VAN WEES 2013, 66, Athenian fleet could have been established using silver from Laureion c. 515.

<sup>63</sup> According to Hdt. 6.103. 1–3 Philaid Kimon Koalemos had already returned in c. 532. The archon list reveals that Alkmeonid Kleisthenes had returned from exile to Athens in order to serve as an archon c. 525/4 (IG. I<sup>3</sup>.1031.18).

<sup>64</sup> Thuk. 6.55–57.

<sup>65</sup> Hdt. 6.108; Thuk. 3.68.5. For the Peisistratid wars see VALDÉS GUIA 2019, 139–142.

<sup>66</sup> Hdt. 5.62; Ath. Pol. 19.3.

<sup>67</sup> Hdt. 5.64; Ath. Pol. 19.5. For the Peisistratid military expenses see VALENTE 2019, 270–271.

Concerning the religious activity of the Hippias and Hipparchos we know that they continued to organise the festivals of Panathenaia,<sup>68</sup> where the regular recitation of the Homeric epics probably begun during their rule.<sup>69</sup> They might have introduced the cult of Artemis Brauronia on the Acropolis,<sup>70</sup> they probably celebrated the festival of city-Dionysia, and could have been engaged in the organisation of the Eleusinian mysteries and other cultic celebrations. They were credited with the establishment of the cult of the Twelve Olympian gods and erecting the herms in Athens.<sup>71</sup> Like their father, they invested in buying the oracles.<sup>72</sup> The *Athenaion Politeia* describes Hipparchos as fond of amusement, love-making and poetry.<sup>73</sup> The tyrants invited poets, such as Anakreon and Simonides, Onomakritos and others,<sup>74</sup> who were probably active in the poetic contests of the major religious festivals.

Outside Attica Hipparchos probably dedicated a statue in the Boiotian Ptoion.<sup>75</sup> The dowry to Hippias daughter Archedike married to the son of the tyrant of Lampsakos also must have caused expenses.<sup>76</sup> All this shows that the younger tyrants were more personally engaged in cultic and related activities and carried on their father's religious policy.

### The building projects of Hippias and Hipparchos

The buildings that can be dated to the reign of the sons of Peisistratos are numerous compared to the buildings of their father. On the Acropolis the temple of Athena Polias was renovated,<sup>77</sup> and the new temples of Athena Nike and Artemis Brauronia were erected.<sup>78</sup> Many edifices were built in the other places of Athens, especially at the Agora were the erection of the stoa basileios,<sup>79</sup> the Eleusinion at Athens,<sup>80</sup> the Enneakrounos fountain-house,<sup>81</sup> and other

<sup>68</sup> Hdt. 5.56; Thuk. 6.56–58; Ath. Pol. 18.2–3.

<sup>69</sup> On the recitation of the Homeric epics in Athens see *infra* n. 33.

<sup>70</sup> On the temple of Artemis Brauronia see SCHRADER 1939, 262–264, nr. 377–378; BOERSMA 1970, cat. XII; KAHIL 1981, 253–263; OSBORNE 1985, 154–157; SHAPIRO 1989, 65; HURWIT 1999, 117 n. 78; PAGA 2021, 236–240.

<sup>71</sup> Twelve Olympian gods: Thuk. 6.54.6–7 (for the testimonia see WYCHERLEY 1957, 78 (n. 203), 119–122 (n. 363–378), 210–211 (n. 698)) cf. PAGA 2021, 88 n. 27, 169f; the erection of herms: Pl. Hipparch. 228d–229b; Hesych. s.v.

*Hipparcheias hermas*.

<sup>72</sup> Hdt. 5.90.

<sup>73</sup> Ath. Pol. 18.1.

<sup>74</sup> Anakreon and Simonides: Hdt. 6.59.3; Ath. Pol. 18.1; Onomakritos and others: Ath. Pol. 18.4; Pl. Hipparch. 228c; Hdt. 7.6; Aelian. Var. Hist. 8.2.

<sup>75</sup> BIZARD 1920, 237–241.

<sup>76</sup> Hdt. 6.59.3–4; the epitaph for Archedike, written by Simonides, is mentioned in Arist. Rhet. 1.9.

<sup>77</sup> BOERSMA 1970, cat. XVI; HURWIT 1999, 105–106, 116 together with Athena Polias sanctuary's old propylon dated to 520–10 or after 510 cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 73; HURWIT 1999, 111.

<sup>78</sup> The temple of Athena Nike dates from the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 46; HURWIT 1999, 116.

According to PAGA 2021, 41f the earliest phase of the temple dates to the second quarter of the 6<sup>th</sup> century. On the temple of Artemis Brauronia see *infra* n. 70.

<sup>79</sup> Chronology is not settled: CAMP 1986, 38 dates the *royal stoa* to the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century, THOMPSON 1981 to the 6<sup>th</sup> century but DIMITRIADOU 2019, 195ff to c. 500 and PAGA 2021, 108, 297 even to the period following 490.

constructions took place. Many structures were built in the other parts of Attica, such as fortification systems, temples, aqueduct, fountain houses, roads and other public constructions.<sup>82</sup> Many of these works served the purpose of the unification of distant regions with Athens (e.g. the roads). At the same time, bringing the different cults to the capital promoted the centralization of Attica, thus continuing the political line of Peisistratos. The most obvious examples of this policy were the altar of the Twelve Olympian gods dedicated by Peisistratos the younger,<sup>83</sup> serving as the zero point for measuring the distances, the erection of herms that marked out these roads,<sup>84</sup> and the Athenian waterworks.<sup>85</sup> These were the symbols of the unified and centralized Attica.<sup>86</sup>

The Agora was reshaped during the rule of the younger Peisistratidai. The 'palaces' of the archaic tyrants could have been remarkable buildings and often preserved over time: the residence of Polykrates of Samos was referred to even as late as the Roman times.<sup>87</sup> The residence of the Peisistratidai, however, is not mentioned in the literary sources, but it seems probable that if not Peisistratos himself then his sons lived on the agora, supposedly in the

---

<sup>80</sup> Travlos 1971, 198, fig. 260; THOMPSON – WYCHERLEY 1972, 152; PARKER 1996, 73 n. 24; HURWIT 1999, 106, 117, 121; DIMITRIADOU 2019, 173, 191, (including remains of some early buildings on this slope of the Acropolis) while PAGA 2021, 153–157 estimates that the whole site was developed not before the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century. The nearby temple of Triptolemos however is dated to the second quarter of the sixth century cf. DIMITRIADOU 2019, 194 or to 500 by PAGA 2021, 155f.

<sup>81</sup> BOERSMA 1970, 18, cat. 100 and another fountain house mentioned by BOERSMA 1970, cat. 98; PAGA 2021, 81, 130f. The Southeast fountain house was believed to come from the Peisistratid era but dated to 490 by PAGA 2021, 108, 130–132.

<sup>82</sup> These include the Academy sanctuary cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. VII and the precinct wall cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 16; the temple of Artemis Brauronia at Brauron cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. XIII; cat. 42; Mounichia fortification cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 2; Eleusis city wall cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 8 (city-wall fortifications) and BOERSMA 1970, cat. 15 (precinct wall – fortifications); Eleusis Telesterion/Demeter and Kore temple c. 525 cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. VI (sanctuary) and cat. 53 (Telesterion and fortifications); Eleusis Temple – contemporary to the Peisistratid Telesterion c. 520 cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 33; Thorikos theatre dated to 525 cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 85; the aqueduct dated to the early last quarter of the 6<sup>th</sup> century cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 104; Themis temple at Rhamnous from the end of 6<sup>th</sup> century cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. XXIX, cat. 67; PAGA 2021, 202, 205. Rhamnous temple precinct wall from the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 26; Old Poseidon temple at Sounion from the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 63; the half-points of the roads of Attica were marked out by Hipparchos' herms (Pl. Hipp. 228c; CEG, 304) cf. SLINGS 2000, 58–60; PAGA 2021, 83, 219–220 n. 134.

<sup>83</sup> Thuk. 6.54.6–7; for the testimonia see *infra* n. 71.

<sup>84</sup> On the herms see *infra* n. 71.

<sup>85</sup> On the inscription see MEIGGS – LEWIS 1971, 11. On the dating see CADOUX 1948, 111–2; THOMPSON 1966 (II), 273. Cf. BOERSMA 1970, 13; FORNARA 1983, n. 37. On the possibility that wells were initiated by private ownership see PAGA 2021, 81–82 n. 8.

<sup>86</sup> When mentioning the embellishment of Athens Thukydides (6.54.5) had most probably in mind the development of the city as a whole, but he could have meant also that some buildings themselves were beautiful or meaningful, as when Hipparchos had inscribed moral messages on the herms. Cf. PEEK 1935, 461–463; CROME 1935/6, 300–313; KIRCHNER – DOW 1937, 1–3.

<sup>87</sup> Suet. Calig. 21.4.

Building F.<sup>88</sup> Thukydides mentions that the inscription of tyrants was later effaced from the altar of the Twelve Olympian gods by Athenians,<sup>89</sup> which suggests that the democratically minded citizens were prepared to destroy the monuments of the tyrants. This might have happened to the former residence of the Peisistratidai. The fortification of Mounichia and later of Acropolis, where Hippias found refuge when he had to face the growing opposition,<sup>90</sup> also must have involved considerable expenses.

Close to the end of the tyranny, probably in the years 515–513, there began the construction of the enormous temple of Zeus Olympios.<sup>91</sup> This could have been inspired by the construction of the gigantesque Heraion on Samos by Polykrates,<sup>92</sup> but was surely intended also for securing the divine benevolence for Athens and its rulers. The Athenian Olympeion was so colossal that at the time when the Peisistratidai were overthrown estimably only the foundation and several column drums of the Olympeion were ready.<sup>93</sup> One of its architects, Kallaischros according to Vitruvius,<sup>94</sup> could have belonged to the clan of Medontidai as suggested by Kallaischros' name,<sup>95</sup> which implies that the initiative was shared with other major aristocratic families besides the tyrants. There are no indications until what period the construction works of this temple were carried on, but we can suppose that they were continued even as late as 511 when Athens became under attack and the tyrants had to find a shelter inside the walls of Acropolis.<sup>96</sup>

It is difficult to estimate which other buildings apart from the Olympeion, the fortification of Mounichia, and possibly Acropolis as the shelters of Hippias, could have been constructed at the end of the tyranny. However, it seems clear that the constructions of the sanctuary of Zeus Olympios which was supposed to become the landmark of Athens and their ruler, required enormous resources and must have put a huge pressure on the budget. The fact that a Medontid was probably an architect of the temple suggests that the construction of the Olympeion was not entirely a private initiative of the tyrants, but they reached out to find an acceptance or support from other aristocrats in securing this major project.

---

<sup>88</sup> According to KLUWE 1966, 33 tyrants lived in the lower city. For support and cemetery adjacent to the Building F thought to have belonged to the Peisistratidai see *infra* n. 39.

<sup>89</sup> Thuk. 6.54.6–7. Cf. *infra* n. 71.

<sup>90</sup> Ath. Pol. 19.2; Thuk. 6.59.2; Hdt. 5.64; BOERSMA 1970, 15.

<sup>91</sup> Arist. Pol. 5.11. For the dating cf. BERVE – GRUBEN 1961, 394ff; WYCHERLEY 1964, 163ff; PAGA 2021, 132–136.

<sup>92</sup> The construction of the Samian Heraion is mentioned in Hdt. 3.60; Arist. Pol. 5. 1313b 22ff. On the competitive element between the two tyrannies see SHAPIRO 1989, 6–7, 112.

<sup>93</sup> Arist. Pol. 5.1313b 22ff; Paus. 1.18.6–9; Vitruvius 7. praef. 15; BOERSMA 1970, 25; DE LIBERO 1996, 106f.

<sup>94</sup> Vitruvius 7. praef. 15; JUDEICH 1931, 383.

<sup>95</sup> APF 8792 IV; TRAILL 10, 2001, 29 n. 552215.

<sup>96</sup> For these events cf. Thuk. 6.59.4; Ath. Pol. 19.6; Hdt. 5.64.1–2, 65.1–2; Ar. Lys. 1153; sc. Ar. Lys. 1153; Mar. Par. FGhR 239 A 45.

The amount of the projects built under the rule of Hippias and Hipparchos was thus certainly bigger than what was erected by their father.<sup>97</sup> Their achievement is especially remarkable when considering that they reigned only about sixteen years. The majority of the buildings the construction of which has been dated from 528/7 until approximately 515 had mainly public function, which probably made the spending of public funds on their erection justified in the eyes of the Athenians. We can suppose that during Peisistratos' rule the political and social tensions were still smouldering so that the tyrant had to be cautious in his investments. Moreover, both the public and the private wealth might have been reduced because of these tensions as well as by the exile of many powerful aristocratic families. This could have been the reasons for the different extent of building activity of the old tyrant and his sons.

### The revenues of Hippias and Hipparchos

Thukydides, our best source for the incomes of the tyrants, wondered that they managed to embellish their city, wage wars and provide sacrifices for the temples, while at the same time exacting from the Athenians only one twentieth (5%) of their income.<sup>98</sup> However, the 1/10 tax mentioned by Atenaion Politeia for Peisistratos and the 1/20 tax noted by Thukydides for the tyrants represent different traditions concerning the same tax, in which case the more specific figure of Thukydides would be preferred, and there would be no need to suppose a reduction of the taxation between Peisistratos and his sons.<sup>99</sup> The tyrants continued receiving revenues from the Strymon area,<sup>100</sup> probably also from Sigeion which was under the control of Hegesistratos,<sup>101</sup> and for a certain period they might have received revenues even from Chersonesos where they sent their friend the Philaid Miltiades to reign.<sup>102</sup>

The list of Athenian archons shows that Alkmeonidai and Philaidai were present at the city during the tyranny.<sup>103</sup> The mighty aristocratic families probably supposedly contributed considerably to the revenues, either directly by paying taxes, or indirectly by contributing to the building projects of the tyrants.<sup>104</sup> The Medontid participation in the construction of

---

<sup>97</sup> It is remarkable that one of the two buildings at the agora that was constructed during their father's rule (building D) was shortly afterwards demolished and replaced by the Peisistratos' sons cf. BOERSMA 1970, cat. 127. The buildings C and D might have served as a meeting-place for the Boule see MARTIN 1951, 263, 270; BOERSMA 1970, 15 n. 182.

<sup>98</sup> Thuk. 6.54.5.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. BERVE 1967, 64; DE LIBERO 1996, 126; VALENTE 2019, 266–267.

<sup>100</sup> *Infra* n. 18.

<sup>101</sup> Hdt. 5.94.2.

<sup>102</sup> Hdt. 6.39, 103.4, Mark. Vit. Thuk. 10. Miltiades governed Chersonesos until was driven out by the Scythians, but retained the city with assistance of the Dolonkoi (Hdt. 6.40).

<sup>103</sup> For the details see DEVELIN 1989, 47.

<sup>104</sup> CADOUX 1948, 109; DEVELIN 1989, 46f.

Olympeion appears as an indication for this. Moreover, it seems possible that the ditches of Maroneia at Laureion already gave enough silver for minting coins from it (although the origins of the silver coins of Peisistratidai is debatable), and we can suppose that the silver from Laureion converted into the minted money was supposedly an important source of income for the young tyrants.<sup>105</sup> Hippias presumably charged a fee for compulsory re-minting.<sup>106</sup> In addition to that he allegedly called in the existing currency, promising to pay the holders at a fixed rate. But when they came to receive the new mintage, he reissued the old coins.<sup>107</sup>

As pointed out by M. Valente, this latter measure was one of the financial stratagems invented by Hippias for increasing the revenues beyond what was provided by the taxation inherited from his father. The Aristotelean *Oikonomika* states that, besides the deception with the currency, he offered for sale the upper stories which projected over the public streets, together with flights of steps, railings, and doors that opened outwards. The owners of the buildings bought them, and in this way a large sum of money was collected. He moreover offered exemption from performing liturgies in return of paying a presumably regular tax, and required an amount of barley and of wheat, and an *obolos*, to be paid to the priestess of Athena when somebody died or was born.<sup>108</sup> The details may be questionable, but the tradition leaves no doubt that Hippias was remembered for his concern for increasing the revenues.

### **The crisis of the budget, increase of the opposition, and the causes of the tyranny's overthrow**

The years 528/7–15/4 were the culmination of the peaceful reign of the Peisistratid family, the period when the Alkmeonidai, the Philaidai and probably the majority of the exiled aristocrats returned to Athens. The 'golden age of Kronos' ascribed to Peisistratos continued after his death.<sup>109</sup> Only some indications show tensions, like the killing of Kimon Koalemos in 528 by the young tyrants.<sup>110</sup> This era ended with two crucial events: the murder of Hipparchos in 514, and the loss of Strymon to the Persians, which took place at roughly the same time, at 515–513.<sup>111</sup> When the conspirators had murdered Hipparchos, Hippias became crueller, suspicious and harsher, wishing to avenge for his brother, killing and exiling many people

---

<sup>105</sup> VALENTE 2019, 201–202. On the debatable origins of the Laureion silver see *infra* n. 60.

<sup>106</sup> Probably refers to the minting of owls cf. VAN WEES 2013, 98, 125–126.

<sup>107</sup> Arist. Oen. 1347a.

<sup>108</sup> Arist. Oen. 1347a; see VALENTE 2019, 271–273.

<sup>109</sup> Ath. Pol. 16.7; Ps.-Plat. Hipparch. 229 b3–4.

<sup>110</sup> Hdt. 6.34–38, 103.2–4.

<sup>111</sup> For the dating see BERVE 1967, 50, 69f; COLE 1975, 42–44; KRAAY 1976, 59f; ANDREWES 1982, 408f; BALCER 1988, 1–21; HAMMOND 1980, 53–61; LAVELLE 1992, 5–23.

and becoming untrusting and bitter towards everybody,<sup>112</sup> which in turn led to a growing opposition and the exile of many influential Athenians.

All these actions certainly had an impact to Athenian economy and decreased the revenues of the tyrant. Before this the expenses were not enormous and were balanced by the multiple revenues: the taxes, the revenues from Strymon and other colonies, and the aristocratic families who had returned from exile and probably contributed to the Athenian well-being. Now, on the one hand, the surely significant revenues from the region of Strymon fell out, while on the other hand Hippias obviously was not willing, perhaps not able, to cut his expenses. The construction of Olympeion was surely planned by that time, perhaps on the initiative of Hipparchos who has been described as the initiator of cultic and cultural innovations.<sup>113</sup> It seems possible that the Peisistratidai started to build this most expensive project when they believed that their revenues would cover the expenses. The exact time of the beginning of the construction cannot be established, but it is almost certain that the project was planned, and probably decided upon, when the tyrants still controlled the district of Strymon, and when the ditches of Maroneia at Laureion gave enough silver.<sup>114</sup> The increase of silver from Laureion opening the perspective of even more income in the future might have triggered the decision to start with the project. Moreover, the tyrants could have hoped that the expenses could be partly covered by members of other aristocratic families. Be this as it may, Hippias certainly continued with the project after the loss of Strymon and the murder of Hipparchos.<sup>115</sup> He might have seen Olympeion not as only a symbol of the family's rule, but also as the memorial for his brother whose initiative he did not want to suspend. Peter Spahn has suggested that the tyrants justified their tax collection with a religious argument, presenting it as a common contribution to the gods.<sup>116</sup> If this is true, Hippias could hardly have allowed to stop building the temple and thereby weakening the legitimacy of the taxation at the time of political and financial crisis. He almost certainly needed the construction as a symbol of his power and a pledge for divine favour, which suddenly became questioned at this time.

Additional costs were caused by the fortifications of Mounichia started by Hippias during his last years of rule,<sup>117</sup> and by perhaps an additional fortification of Acropolis,<sup>118</sup> again in response to the smouldering of his power. All this must have strongly burdened the diminishing budget of the tyrant. This must have caused difficulties, and the need of replacing the lost income. We can therefore suppose that the additional and unusual fund-

---

<sup>112</sup> Ath. Pol. 18ff; Thuk. 6.57ff.

<sup>113</sup> *Infra* n. 73–75, 82.

<sup>114</sup> *Infra* n. 60.

<sup>115</sup> For the continuation of the works see DE LIBERO 1996, 106ff.

<sup>116</sup> SPAHN 1998, 201–202.

<sup>117</sup> Ath. Pol. 19.2.

<sup>118</sup> Hdt. 5.64; Ath. Pol. 19.5.

raisings of Hippias were introduced in this period.<sup>119</sup> As H. van Wees has pointed out, fund-raising was an exceptional measure in the Archaic period. It is mentioned only on five occasions: in addition to Hippias in relation to Kypselos, Lygdamis and the Spartans.<sup>120</sup> Hippias however was the only one to whom more than one stratagem was ascribed, which implies financial difficulties faced by the tyrant, while the circumstance that this fund-raising was remembered by the tradition indicates the extraordinary nature of this measure and probably that it was perceived as a burden by the citizens. In any case, as the external income from Strymon had fallen out, more revenues had to be gathered from Athens for enabling the continuation of the highly expensive projects.<sup>121</sup> Although the estates of the exiled aristocrats remained in Attica and might have been exploited by the tyrant, it seems still reasonable to suppose that the burdening of the common people increased as well, since they were the largest group of tax payers in Athens. The tyranny must have become more burdening not only by the cruelty of Hippias but also because of the increasing taxation. All this must have increased opposition.<sup>122</sup>

The tyranny was overthrown by the Spartans on the initiative of the Alkmeonidai and other aristocrats going into exile after the assassination of Hipparchos,<sup>123</sup> But we can suppose that an anti-tyrannical opposition existed in Athens already before the plot. Thukydides notes that although the conspirators were few, as was necessary for maintaining the secrecy, they expected that many Athenians would join them for overpowering the tyrants.<sup>124</sup> The plotters could hardly expect to receive a broad support without being aware of an opposition against the tyranny. However, there is no doubt that the opposition against Hippias increased significantly after the plot and the murder of Hipparchos, allegedly because of the growing harshness of the tyrant. The sources, probably based to a great extent on the traditions of the elite families, overlook the economic factors including the possible economic pressure of the people. But given the decreased revenues and growing expenses of the ruler, thus the unavoidable need to fill the gap in the budget, we have every reason to suppose that this was an important factor contributing to the increase of the discontent. As the income from Strymon had fallen out, Hippias had no other option than to rely more heavily on the internal resources. He probably did not wish to increase the direct taxation, and tried to rely on extraordinary fund-raising testified by Aristotle. However, the economic burden of the people must have increased. This was probably a part of the 'harshness' of Hippias remembered by the Athenian tradition, and must have strongly contributed to the tyranny's growing

---

<sup>119</sup> According to KRAAY 1962, 421 the minting from Laureion silver started long before 510. PICARD 2001, 7, followed by APERGHIS 2013, 12, have supposed that the minting started in 520–515.

<sup>120</sup> VAN WEES 2013, ch 2 n. 35, 38.

<sup>121</sup> Increase of expenses and taxation under Hippias is pointed out by VALENTE 2019, 268.

<sup>122</sup> VALENTE 2019, 270–271.

<sup>123</sup> Hdt. 5.62–65; Thuk. 6.59.4; Ath. Pol. 19.

<sup>124</sup> Thuk. 6.56.3.

hatefulness and its overthrow. Perhaps the exiling of the wealthy opponents was partly caused from the desire of the tyrants to embezzle the possessions and incomes of the aristocrats.

### **Conclusion**

This discussion suggests that dynamics of the revenues and expenses of the Peisistratidai did strongly affect their popularity and success as rulers of the Archaic Athens, and had an impact to the eventual fall of the dynasty. As long as the poor Athenians had, in the form of the loans, a share of the revenues of the tyrant, and the Peisistratidai had no need to become burdensome, their tyranny was popular and successful, but as soon as the funds were spent and the growing expenses had to be compensated by increasing taxation, the tyranny became to be felt oppressive, which evoked opposition and can be seen as a reason of its eventual overthrow.

During the reign of Peisistratos the expenses were comparatively modest. The buildings which can be clearly related to him were rather modest in numbers and character. Many of these constructions were started before the tyranny and only completed during his rule, which suggests that the costs did not exceed the previous expenses. Although the expenses of the tyrant were surely not limited to the building costs, the sources of wealth in his disposition were sufficient for covering them. Strymon region provided a considerable income, the tyrant had enough resources to give loans to the poor which in turn increased their production and thus the taxes they paid. This, combined with the economic and political stability brought by the monarchy – a major positive change compared to the previous internal tensions and civil strife – secured the popularity of the reign.

When Hippias and Hipparchos inherited the power the expenses probably started to increase. A simple comparison of the numbers indicates that the cost of the buildings erected during their reign was considerably higher than the cost of the constructions initiated by their father. This however did not reduce the dynasty's popularity until the tyrants possessed adequate revenues and need not to increase the taxation. This situation ended with the conquest of the Strymon region by Persians and the assassination of Hipparchos, which, on the one hand cut off a considerable part of the income, and on the other hand necessitated more attention, and expenditure, for the maintenance of the power. The recently started construction of the Olympeion alone needed vast amount of incomes, creating an additional tension for the revenues. All this probably led to the increasing taxation, partly in the form of fundraising exercised by Hippias. The growth of expenses due to their building programs gouged tyrannical reign but was difficult to be stopped because the cessation of the projects could have been interpreted as a sign of weakness. The unwillingness and incapability to avoid this kind of spending, and the consequent increase of the financial burden of the

Athenians must have increased the already significant opposition, enhanced repressions, which contributed further to the unpopularity of the tyranny and to its decline.

## Bibliography

- ANDREWES, A. 1956. *The Greek Tyrants*. London.
- ANDREWES, A. 1982. The Tyranny of Pisistratus. In: Boardman, J., Hammond, N. G. L. (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History III.3: The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries BC Second edition*, 392–416. Cambridge.
- APERGHIS, G. 2013. Athenian Mines, Coins and Triremes. *Historia* 62, 1–24.
- APF = Davies, J.K. 1971. *The Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* Oxford.
- BALCER, M. 1988. Persian occupied Thrace. *Historia* 37, 1–21.
- BANCROFT, S. 1979. *Problems Concerning the Archaic Acropolis at Athens. Dissertation*. Princeton.
- BERVE, H., GRUBEN, G. 1961. *Griechische Tempel und Heiligtümer*. München.
- BERVE, H. 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen. Vol I–II*. München.
- BIZARD, L. 1920. Inscriptions du Ptoion. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 44, 227–262.
- BOERSMA, J. S. 1970. *Athenian building policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.* Groningen.
- BOERSMA, J. S. 2000. Peisistratos' building activity reconsidered. In: Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H.(ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence*, 49–56. Amsterdam.
- BRUNEAU, P., DUCAT, J. 1965. *Guide de Délos*. Paris.
- CADOUX, T. J. 1948. The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 68, 70–123.
- CAMP, J.M. 1977. *The Water Supply of Ancient Athens from 3000 to 86 B.C.* Princeton.
- CAMP, J.M. 1986. *The Athenian Agora: Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*. London.
- CEG = HANSEN, P.A. 1983. *Carmina epigraphica graeca saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr.* Berlin.
- COLE, J. W. 1975. Peisistratos on the Strymon. *Greece and Rome* 22, 42–44.
- COURBY, F. 1931. *Les temples d'Apollon*. Athènes.
- CROME, J. F. 1935/6. Hipparcheioi Hermai. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 60/61, 300–313.
- DAVISON, J. A. 1958. Notes on the Panathenaea. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 78, 23–42.
- DE LIBERO, L. 1996. *Die archaische Tyrannis*. Stuttgart.
- DEVELIN, R. 1989. *Athenian Officials 684–321 BC*. Cambridge.
- DIMITRIADOU, E.M. 2019. *Early Athens: Settlements and Cemeteries in the Submycenaean, Geometric and Archaic Periods*. Los Angeles.
- DINSMOOR, W.B. 1947. The Hekatompedon on the Athenian Akropolis. *American Journal of Archaeology* 51, 109–151.
- DINSMOOR, W.B. 1950. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece. An Account of Its Historic Development*. London.

- ÉTIENNE, R. 2004. *Athènes, espaces urbains et histoire: Des origines à la fin du IIIe siècle ap. J.C.* Paris.
- FORNARA, C. W. 1983. *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War.* Cambridge.
- FRANCIS, E.D., VICKERS, M.J. 1988. The Agora revisited: Athenian chronology c. 500–450 B.C. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 83, 143–167.
- GRUBEN, G. 1976. *Die Tempel der Griechen.* München.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. 1980. The Extent of Persian Occupation in Thrace. *Chiron* 10, 53–61.
- HAYMEN, C. 1987. The Wappenmünzen. *The Journal of the Numismatic Association of Australia* 3, 35–48.
- HEDRICK, C.W. Jr. 1988. The Temple and Cult of Apollo Patroos in Athens. *American Journal of Archaeology* 92, 185–210.
- HIGNETT, C. 1952. *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.
- HIND, J.G.F. 1974. The 'Tyrannis' and the Exiles of Pisistratus. *The Classical Quarterly New Series* 24, 1–18.
- HURWIT, J.M. 1985. *Art and Culture of Early Greece, 1100–480 B.C.* New York.
- HURWIT, J.M. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present.* Cambridge.
- JANKO, R. 1982. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13–16.* Cambridge.
- JUDEICH, W. 1931. *Topographie von Athen.* München.
- KAHIL, L. 1981. Le 'craterisque' d'Artemis et le Brauronion de l'Acropole. *Hesperia* 50, 253–263.
- KIRCHNER, J. E., DOW, S. 1937. Inschriften vom attischen Lande. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 62, 1–12.
- KLUWE, E. 1966. *Tyrannis der Peisistratiden und ihr Niederschlag in der Kunst. Dissertation.* Jena.
- KRAAY, C.M. 1962. The early coinage of Athens: a reply. *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society*<sup>7</sup> 2, 417–423.
- KRAAY, C.M. 1976. *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins.* London.
- KROLL, J.H. 1981. From Wappenmünzen to Gorgoneia to Owls. *American Numismatics Society Museum Notes* 26, 1–32.
- KROLL, J.H., WAGONER, N.M. 1984. Dating the earliest coins of Athens, Corinth and Aegina. *American Journal of Archaeology* 88, 325–340.
- KÖIV, M. 2021. Why Did the Greeks hate the Tyrants? A Comparative View on Monarchy in Archaic Greece. *Historia* 70, 134–184.
- LAVELLE, B. M. 1992. The Pisistratids and the Mines of Thrace. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 33, 5–23.
- LYTTKENS, C. H. (2013), *Economic Analysis of Institutional Change in Ancient Greece: Politics, Taxation and rational Behaviour.* London – New York.
- MARTIN, R. 1951. *Recherches sur l' Agora grecque.* Paris.
- MEIGGS, R., LEWIS, D.M. 1971 (1969). *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.

- MORRIS, I. 1987. *Burial and ancient society: The Rise of the Greek City-State*. Cambridge.
- MYLONAS, G.E. 1961. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Princeton.
- NICOLET-PIERRE, H. 1985. Monnaies archaïques d'Athènes sous Pisistrate et les Pisistratides. *Revue Numismatique* 27, 23–44.
- OSBORNE, R. 1985. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika*. Cambridge, New York.
- OWENS, R. 2010. *Solon of Athens. Poet, Philosopher, Soldier, Statesman*. Brighton.
- PAGA, J. 2021. *Building Democracy in Late Archaic Athens*. Oxford.
- PARKER, R. 1996. *Athenian religion: A History*. Oxford.
- PEEK, W. 1935. Eine Herme des Hipparch. *Hermes* 70, 461–463.
- PICARD, C. 1935. *Manuel d'archéologie grecque: La sculpture. I. Période archaïque*. Paris.
- PICARD, O. 2001. La découverte des gisements de Laurion et les débuts de la chouette. *Revue Belge de numismatique et de sigillographie* 147, 1–10.
- PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, A. W. 1962. *Dithyramb: Tragedy and Comedy*. Cambridge.
- RAUBITSCHKE, A. E. 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis. A catalogue of the inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries B. C.* Cambridge.
- RHODES, P.J. 1976. Pisistratid Chronology Again. *Phoenix* 30, 219–233.
- RUEBEL, J.S. 1973. The Tyrannies of Peisistratos. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 14, 125–36.
- SANTERRE, H.G. de 1958. *Délos primitive et archaïque*. Paris.
- SCHEFOLD, K. 1946. Kleisthenes. *Museum Helveticum* 3, 59–93.
- SCHOLL, A. 2006. ANAΘHMATA TΩN APXAIΩN. Die Akropolisvotive aus dem 8. bis frühen 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. und die Staatswerdung Athens. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 121, 1–174.
- SCHRADER, H. 1939. *Die archaischen Marmorbildwerke der Akropolis (Vol. I)*. Frankfurt am Main.
- SELTMANN, C.T. 1924. *Athens, Its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion*. Cambridge.
- SIMON, E. 1983. *Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary*. Madison.
- SLINGS, S.R. 2000. Literature in Athens, 566–510 BC. In: Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H.(ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence*. Amsterdam. 57–77.
- SHAPIRO, H.A. 1989. *Art and Cult Under the Tyrants in Athens*. Mainz.
- SHEAR, T. L. Jr. 1978. Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C. Series: *Hesperia Supplement* 17. Princeton.
- SPAHN, P. 1998. Die Steuer der Peisistratiden – idion, koinon, oder hieron? *Ktema* 23, 197–206.
- STANLEY, P. V. 1999. *The Economic Reforms of Solon*. Chicago.
- STEUBEN, H. v. 1989. Die Agora des Kleisthenes. In: Schuller, W., Hoepfner, W., Schwandner, E.-L. (eds.), *Demokratie und Architektur. Der Hippodamische Städtebau und die Entstehung der Demokratie. Wohnen in der klassischen Polis II*. München. 81–90.
- THOMPSON, H. A. 1937. Buildings on the West Side of the Agora. *Hesperia* 6, 1–226.
- THOMPSON, H. A. 1940. The Tholos of Athens and its Predecessors. Series: *Hesperia Supplement* 4. Princeton.

- THOMPSON, H. A. 1954. Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1953. *Hesperia* 23, 31–67.
- THOMPSON, H. A. 1962. *The Athenian Agora, A Guide to the Excavation and Museum*. Athens.
- THOMPSON, H. A. 1966 (I). Activity in the Athenian Agora 1960–1966. *Hesperia* 35, 37–54.
- THOMPSON, H. A. 1966 (II). Review of A. N. Oikonomides, *The Two Agoras in Ancient Athens*, Chicago 1964. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 86, 273.
- THOMPSON, H. A., WYCHERLEY, R. E. 1972. *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape, and Uses of an Ancient City Center. Series: Athenian Agora XIV*. Princeton.
- THOMPSON, H. A. 1981. Athens Faces Advertis. *Hesperia* 50, 343–355.
- TRAILL, J.S. 1994–2012. *Persons of Ancient Athens I – XXI*. Toronto.
- TRAVLOS, J. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. New York.
- VALDÉS GUIA, M. 2019. War in Archaic Athens: polis, Elites and Military power. *Historia* 68, 126–149.
- VALENTE, M. 2019. Archaic Athens and tyranny. The origins of the Athenian public finance. In: Graml, C., Doronzio, A., Cappozoli, V. (eds.), *Rethinking Athens Before the Persian Wars*, 265–275. München.
- WEES, H. v. 2013. *Ships and Silver. Taxes and Tribute: A Fiscal History of Archaic Athens*. London, New York.
- WEST, M. L. 1999. The invention of Homer. *Classical Quarterly* 49, 364–382.
- WYCHERLEY, R. E. 1957. *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia. Series: Athenian Agora 3*. Princeton.
- WYCHERLEY, R. E. 1964. The Olympieion at Athens. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5, 161–179.
- WYCHERLEY, R.E. 1978. *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton.



© 2022 by the authors; licensee Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza din Iași. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).