

## *FGrHist* 328 (Philochorus) F 181

*Charles W. Fornara and David C. Yates*

Harpocraton s.v. πομπείας καὶ πομπεύειν· ... πομπεία δὲ λέγεται τὰ εἰς τὰς πομπὰς κατασκευαζόμενα σκεύη, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ῥήτωρ <ἐν τῷ> Κατ' Ἀνδροτίωνος ὑποσημαίνει. “πομπείους δέ” φησι Φιλόχορος “πρότερον ἐχρῶντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τοῖς ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῶν λ' κατασκευασθεῖσιν. ὁπὲρ δέ” [φησί] “καὶ Ἀνδροτίων ἄλλα κατεσκεύασεν.”<sup>1</sup>

1 δὲ om. B Epit λέγονται Keaney 2 ὡς Epit Sud, καὶ Harp 3 <ἐν τῷ> Κατ' Ἀνδροτίωνος Keaney 4 τοῖς ἐκ Epit Sud, ἐκ Harp 5 κατασκευασθεῖσιν Epit Sud, -εισῶν Harp φησί om. Epit Sud, del. Keaney

Processions and parading: ... instruments made for the processions are called πομπεία, as the same orator (Demosthenes) mentions in his *Against Androtion*. “Earlier,” Philochorus says, “the Athenians used as processional instruments those which had been fashioned out of the property of the Thirty. Late, Androtion also fashioned others.”

Philochorus F 181, its intrinsic character, provenience and imputed date, has attracted no direct attention since its publication, after Müller (*FGH* I p.404 F 124), by Jacoby in 1954.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *FGrHist* 328 F 181. The text given here, a modified version of Jacoby's, takes into account the more recent work on Harpocraton done by John Keaney, *Harpocraton, Lexeis of the Ten Orators* (Amsterdam 1991) 217, Π 80.

<sup>2</sup> M. W. Walbank, “The Confiscation and Sale by the Poletai in 402/1 B.C. of the Property of the Thirty Tyrants,” *Hesperia* 51 (1982) 74–98, at 96 n.57, in his discussion of the stelai of 402/1, which record the confiscation and sale of the property of the Thirty and their adherents (74–98), examined the likely meaning of οὐσία and κατασκευάζω in Philochorus' leading sentence. D. M. Lewis, “Notes on Attic Inscriptions,” *BSA* 49 (1954) 17–50, at 43–49, revised Jacoby's date of the measure passed by Androtion, bringing it down from 377/6, where Jacoby erroneously placed it (IIIb Suppl. I 88.3–8), to just before 365/4. See further below, n.9.

Like Müller Jacoby printed Harpocration's entry as a verbatim quotation. Again like Müller he concluded that the fragment derives from the *Atthis* rather than from one of the special monographs written by Philochorus,<sup>3</sup> and he placed it in Book 5 of the reconstructed work at the year 403/2 (better, 402/1)<sup>4</sup> rather than in Book 4 (where Müller set it), which ends (hypothetically) with the fall of the Thirty.<sup>5</sup> In a rare instance of fundamental disagreement with the great historiographer, we venture to dissent from all these propositions, finding them impossible to reconcile with the language and implications of the text. We argue that the fragment resists classification as an Atthidographic entry whether at 402/1 (to amend Jacoby's date) or in some later archon year; that it cannot be a quotation; and that its information was more probably culled from one of Philochorus' other learned works.

Assuming, *argumenti causa*, that the fragment is a verbatim quotation from the *Atthis*, Philochorus' use of the adverb

<sup>3</sup> For Jacoby the decisive consideration was the fact that Thucydides in 2.13.4 had introduced the subject of the πομπεία, ἰερὰ σκεύη περὶ τὰς πομπάς, into the historical record. See further n.7 below.

<sup>4</sup> IIIb Suppl. p.550.31–32. The actual date was more probably, though not necessarily, in 402/1. The basis of Jacoby's claim (unstated in his treatment of the fragment) presumably was the interpretation and placement of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1503. A. B. West and A. M. Woodward, "Studies in Attic Treasure Records, II," *JHS* 58 (1938) 69–89, at 80–83, restored this fragment to refer to the receipt of ἰερὸν ἀργύριον for the construction of πομπεία and placed it with *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1370, 1371, and 1384 in the year 403/2. This placement has been challenged by Walbank, *Hesperia* 51 (1982) 98, who attaches it to the record of 402/1, simply noting Lewis' support for it *per ep.* The first appearance of the new πομπεία in the treasury lists likely occurs in 402/1 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1372: cf. W. S. Ferguson, *Treasurers of Athena* [Cambridge (Mass.) 1932] 113 n.2; West and Woodward 88–89; Walbank 97–98) and thereby arguably supplies the more plausible year for an entry relating to them in an *Atthis*. See further n.10 below. The process by which the property of the Thirty was converted into πομπεία has been convincingly described by Walbank (94–96). The real property was sold off by 402/1 (or 403/2), moveable property presumably at a slightly earlier stage. It is conceivable that articles made of precious metals were quickly melted down to make the πομπεία; more probably, perhaps, the vessels were fashioned and paid for out of the fund of money produced by the sales of real estate goods and chattels.

<sup>5</sup> Müller, *FGHI* p.398, and Jacoby IIIb Suppl. p.254.3–6.

πρότερον is sufficient to rule out Jacoby's date for the entry.<sup>6</sup> πρότερον in the (alleged) quotation makes it self-evident that the fragment appeared in the *Atthis* at a later year than 402/1; it specifies that Philochorus' reference to the conversion of the property of the Thirty into πομπεία and the Athenians' use of them is retrospective. Philochorus could not have described the use of πομπεία initiated by the event of 402/1 at the year 402/1 with the declaration that "previously the Athenians were wont to use as processional vessels those which had been fashioned out of the property of the Thirty." He would need to say "the Athenians began in this year to use" such πομπεία. The fragment, if it is a quotation and was taken from the *Atthis*, must therefore have been embedded in a later entry.

Were we not constrained by the language of the fragment, it would be natural to allocate it to the year in which Androtion fabricated other πομπεία by melting down gold crowns (Dem. 22.69–77, cf. 24.176–186) since his renovation would make the use of πρότερον intelligible as a backward reference to the earlier status quo. The date of Androtion's legislation is unknown, but probably is to be set in the interval 368/7–365/4.<sup>7</sup> Our fragment, however, cannot have been entered at the archon-year in which Androtion passed his decree, whatever its putative date. If the fragment is a quotation and was taken from the *Atthis*, its formulation necessitates its entry in a preceding year. Just as πρότερον expresses reminiscence, so too does ὀψὲ δέ express anticipation. It guarantees that the reference to Androtion occurred in the context of a report anterior

<sup>6</sup> Jacoby did not comment on πρότερον; Müller addressed the implication of the adverb forthrightly (see below) by translating it as "primitus."

<sup>7</sup> For our purposes it is unnecessary to explore this complex question as the actual date is immaterial to our argument. The fundamental study is Lewis, *BSA* 49 (1954), esp. 43–47; cf. P. Harding, "Androtion's Political Career," *Historia* 25 (1976) 186–200, at 190–192 (more recently in his *Androtion and the Atthis* [Oxford 1994] 19–20), and L. Moscati Castelnovo, "La carriera politica dell'attidografo Androzione," *Acme* 33 (1980) 251–278, at 257–259. Jacoby, perhaps following Kirchner's comments on *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 216–217 (= *FGrHist* 324 T 5), connects Androtion's restoration of the πομπεία with the archonship of Kalleas (377/6), which is mentioned in the body of that decree (*IIIb* Suppl. I p.88.3–8), but this suggestion is no longer tenable.

to it. “Earlier, the Athenians used as processional instruments those fabricated out of the property of the Thirty. Late, Androktion also fabricated others.” Clearly, the phraseology requires a *tertium quid* occurring between 402/1 and 368–365 which will allow for both the reminiscence and the anticipation. One cannot shoehorn this “quotation” into 368–365 as if it belonged in an *Atthis* at one of those years.

That something unknown to us relevant to πομπεία took place at Athens in the thirty years or so separating our terminal dates such that it prompted these references backwards and forwards in time is too unlikely to be worthy of serious thought. For in that case we would need to postulate the creation of still other πομπεία in the interim. Perhaps needless to say, any other kind of entry—for instance, one that might have referred to a melting down of the “oligarchic” πομπεία when the new Nike was fabricated in 374/3<sup>8</sup> or their loss in the fire that destroyed the Opisthodomos<sup>9</sup>—will not suit. The entry which *ex hypothesi* we seek must refer to replacement, not destruction, since the fragment turns on the use (χρησθαι) of πομπεία, not on their removal. Though our record is not detailed or complete, the action of the reinstated *demos* after the fall of the Thirty and the *psophisma* of Androktion slightly more than a generation later reasonably comprise the sum of actions dealing with the creation of πομπεία by the Athenians within that span.<sup>10</sup> It follows that there is no *tertium quid*; if the fragment is a

<sup>8</sup> For a brief discussion of the new Nike, see Ferguson, *Treasurers* 122–123 n.2 and 137.

<sup>9</sup> The fire was previously assigned to the archonship of Kalleas (377/6) by A. C. Johnson, “An Athenian Treasure List,” *AJA* 18 (1914) 1–17, and W. B. Dinsmoor “The Burning of the Opisthodomos at Athens,” *AJA* 36 (1932) 143–172, but is now convincingly dated to between 370 and 354 by Lewis, *BSA* 49 (1954) 47–49.

<sup>10</sup> Added support can be found in the record of the silver *hydriai* that Ferguson, *Treasurers* 113 n.2, suggests were made from the property of the Thirty. If we accept this connection, the treasury lists attest the presence of a considerable part, though probably not all (cf. Walbank, *Hesperia* 51 [1982] 97–98, and D. Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion* [Oxford 1995] 29), of the “oligarchic” πομπεία down to 341/0 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1444.1–8). For a full list of the attestations of the silver *hydriai* from 402/1 to 341/0, see Harris 161–162. In the years after 341/0 the lists are poorly pre-

quotation it cannot be from the *Atthis*.

But is it a quotation and, if not a quotation, can it then be from the *Atthis*? To us the answer to the first question is obvious enough, in spite of the word φησί. Philochorus would have been very careless, indeed, slipshod, to have made the statements imputed to him, at least in this form, for they present an erroneous simplification and other anomalies as well. There is something quite wrong about the leading sentence. It does not state (as it should) that some of the πομπεία used by the Athenians came out of the property of the Thirty. Instead (as Müller well understood) it tells us by necessary implication that the Athenian πομπεία originated in the property of the oligarchs—“primitus,” indeed, as Müller “translated.” Of course, Philochorus did not need Thuc. 2.13.4 to know full well that processions with their πομπεία immemorially predated 402/1 and that πομπεία continued to exist throughout the final years of the Peloponnesian War, even if all the items made from precious metals among them were consigned to the melting pot.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, the sweeping formulation given in the fragment suggests that Philochorus was misquoted as well as simplified.

Furthermore, the reference to Androtion is inadmissibly vague, the kind of allusion we expect from an abbreviator, but hardly the precise terminology we require of Philochorus. We expect a patronymic and demotic along with other identifying remarks, and especially a date, not the very peculiar and uninformative word ὀψέ. Indeed, ὀψέ is absurd as coming from the mouth of Philochorus in an *Atthis* or out of it. By what process of the historical imagination could Philochorus have termed the new fashioning of πομπεία by Androtion some thirty-five years after the action in 402/1 a “late” develop-

---

served, but by 321/0 (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1468*) a massive reorganization of the inventory is apparent. Almost none of the dedications from the earlier lists can be identified, prompting the inference that those objects were melted down in the general restoration sponsored by Lycurgus (Ferguson 122–124, Harris 33–34). Such a conclusion would necessarily contradict Jacoby’s suggestion that the πομπεία made by Androtion were those still used in Philochorus’s own time (*IIIb Suppl.* p.551.1).

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps in 407/6 along with the golden Nikai (328 F 141): cf. Jacoby *IIIb Suppl.* p.550.34–35 and Ferguson, *Treasurers* 91.

ment?<sup>12</sup> Should it have been earlier? It was when it was. Although it is well known that temporal adverbs are often used subjectively, the interval 402/1 to 368–365 certainly does not justify the use of ὀψέ by one to whom the lapse of one generation was a short span of time in the history of Athens. With this word the author of the sentence seems perhaps to condemn the Athenians for a belated enactment—as if the πομπεία realized from the confiscation were improperly adventitious. Whoever was responsible for ὀψέ had a different temporal perspective from Philochorus just as he was imprecise about the tradition he transmitted when in effect he stated that the Athenians earlier used as their sacred vessels those fashioned from the property of the Thirty. Since the fragment looks like a poorly integrated summary, it may be that an original quotation was ground down into its present form, φησί remaining as a fossil.<sup>13</sup> Thus the contents of the citation might be due to an intermediate source such as Didymus, subsequently abbreviated and telescoped. For all these reasons, we must take φησί *cum grano salis*.

At best, then, F 181 is a summary report in modified language of a *formally different entry* made by Philochorus in his *Atthis* either at the year 402/1 or at the year of Androtion's *psephisma*. But, surely, if we are reduced to this extremity, it is unreasonable to insist upon it. If it does not look like a fragment from the *Atthis* and does not permit hypothetical interpolation into it without radical reformulation of its contents, it is not good method to insist that it must have originated in the *Atthis*—whether or not the *Atthis* included this subject at either of the terminal years or, for that matter, at an earlier time. On the other hand, it seems plausible to infer that our intermediate source gave a modified account in more or less strict alignment with the narrative before his eyes, that is, that he summarized

<sup>12</sup> LSJ s.v. provides no instance of the adverb used to mean “later,” though it is rendered in this fashion (in a paraphrase) by Harding, *Historia* 25 (1976) 191, reasonably enough; Müller translates “multo vero post.”

<sup>13</sup> It is not invariably the case that when Harpocration uses φησί he intends to provide an exact quote (though that is certainly its appearance here). See, e.g., Keaney, *Harpocration* 3, A 13.

material in the order in which he found it. What that narrative may have been, however, defies reconstruction because one cannot know the extent to which this fragment preserves the structure of the original text. Thus (for instance), if πομπείως δέ ... [ὁψὲ] δέ could be trusted, ὁψὲ having replaced, perhaps in an abbreviated form, more appropriate phraseology, it might follow that the data was given in a plain sequence, and that πομπείως δέ immediately followed a discussion of some other feature of festivals as they evolved in the period after the conclusion of the Peloponnesian War. If so, it might have been taken from an antiquarian, not a historical, excursus in, perhaps, the Περὶ ἑορτῶν. But it is idle to guess.

*September, 2006*

Department of Classics  
Brown University  
Providence, RI 02912  
Charles\_Fornara@brown.edu  
David\_Yates@brown.edu