

TWO CHRONOGRAPHIC NOTES

I. THE TENTH THALASSOCRACY IN EUSEBIOS¹

THE average educated Greek, I am sure, knew the early history of Greece as well as the average educated European knows the history of modern Europe, and could no more separate Theopompos from the first Messenian War or put Pheidon after Kypselos than we can separate Wellington from Waterloo or make Frederick the Great follow Napoleon.

The professional historian, antiquarian, or chronographer would know much more, but could readily distort what he knew in trying to impose some theoretical pattern on the past. Where so many of our sources are theoretical (all the chronographers for example) and when they survive in fragments which are rarely substantial enough to show in detail the theory on which they worked, it is not easy to see through to the core of Greek belief on which they were based. But facts there were and in the main it was from them that the theorizing started.

The Eusebian list of thalassocracies is doubly theoretical; it is the product of an attempt to impose on the early history of Greece the idea that for the whole period back to the Trojan War a series of states could be credited with something like the authority at sea which was enjoyed by fifth-century Athens, an idea which is certainly false; and secondly of an attempt to give this pattern a precise chronological shape which is even more absurd. Can we recover any of the knowledge which its author or authors had?

Earlier studies² have established that the thalassocracies from that of Phokaia downwards (nos. XII–XVII; see Table 1) can be related to the real pattern of naval power in the Mediterranean in the sixth century, less firmly that some earlier entries match earlier interests, that the succession, Phrygia, Kypros, Phoenicia (nos. V–VII) makes sense in a late-eighth and early-seventh-century context.³

Secondly they have shown that the list was constructed around set-backs rather than successes, around defeats of the reigning thalassocrat, not always naval, not always disastrous, only rarely at the hands of its successor. This is the case without exception back to Phokaia and, less certainly again, for Phrygia, Kypros, and Phoenicia.

Thirdly they have shown that the idea which might produce such a list was already current in the late fifth century. Both Herodotos and Thucydides thought of naval history in a way which was broadly similar to that of the man who compiled the list; both may have had, Thucydides probably did have, something like this document in mind when he wrote.⁴ But only something like

¹ I am very grateful to Professor Andrewes and Dr. L. H. Jeffery for helpful criticism, also to members of the Oxford Classical Association and the Hibernian Hellenists who listened to versions of this paper in 1966.

² J. L. Myres, *J.H.S.* xxvi (1906), 84–130; J. K. Fotheringham, *J.H.S.* xxvii (1907), 75–89; Myres, *ibid.* 123–30; W. Aly, *Rh. Mus.*

lxvi (1911), 585–606; R. Helm, *Hermes* lxi (1926), 241–62; A. R. Burn, *J.H.S.* xlvii (1927), 165–77; F. Bork, *Klio* xxviii (1935), 15–20; M. B. Sakellariou, *La Migration grecque*, pp. 473–5.

³ A. R. Burn, *The Lyric Age* p. 58; cf. below, p. 96.

⁴ See Myres, *J.H.S.* xxvi (1906). His argument (p. 87) that Herodotos did not

the document; he did not have the list which Eusebios used. The succession of thalassocrats could have been the same, as is that of the Agiad kings in Herodotos and Pausanias, or different, as is that of the Eurypontids in the same authors,¹ but in neither case could it have offered any exact chronology such as Eusebios transmits—as with Spartan kings it was later scholarship which produced precision.²

Before considering the precise dates, then, let us fix the real contexts which the author of the list had in mind. With the first three entries, the Lydians, Pelasgians, and Thracians, it is profitless to speculate. Of the fourth, the Rhodians, it can only be said that Phoenician influence in Rhodes in the eighth century suggests more contact with the outside world than was usual and encourages some sympathy for stories of early adventures in the western Mediterranean which, true or false, were no doubt the basis of her claim to naval empire.³ But of defeat we know nothing.

From Phrygia onwards, however, the ground is fairly firm. Her thalassocracy can only belong to the reign of Midas and there are enough traces of Midas' influence on the coast of Asia Minor and across the Aegean to give the great land power of the hinterland some claim to naval authority as well,⁴ roughly in the third quarter of the eighth century. Midas died early in the seventh, during the Kimmerian invasion, and this event, well known to the Greeks, could have been taken to mark the end of Phrygian power. But such a date would play havoc with the credit of the next two entries and Phrygia's retreat before Assyrian pressure after about 720 could have offered just as good an opportunity for the tradition to turn its attention to the further east.⁵ Indeed this Phrygian withdrawal could be related directly to Greek maritime affairs, to the end of the Lelantine War about 715 and to Miletos' success in that war.⁶

For the next entry, Kypros, there is no literary evidence but archaeology has produced a case for strong Kypriot influence on the south coast of Asia Minor and in Syria in the last quarter of the eighth century⁷ while Assyrian records

know such a list is not decisive. When Hdt. names Polykrates as the first thalassocrat τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν (3. 22) we may surely put the emphasis on ἴδμεν, as at 1. 5. 3 we can assume that he is contrasting his certain knowledge of Kroisos' attacks on the Greeks (τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτός) with a less certain knowledge that Gyges had done the same (1. 15. 4).

¹ Hdt. 7. 204 with Paus. 3. 2-4; Hdt. 8. 131 with Paus. 3. 7.

² See Jacoby, Komm. on *F. Gr. Hist.* 241 F 1. I do not mean that the fifth century was incapable of producing an exact date (cf. Thuc. on the Sicilian colonies), only that it did not produce a system based on exact dates.

³ T. J. Dunbabin, *The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours*, pp. 31 f. and 49 and *The Western Greeks*, pp. 34-5; Strabo, p. 654.

⁴ For Midas and the Greeks see, for example, Burn, *op. cit.* (p. 95, n. 3), pp. 5-7.

⁵ For the danger of this argument, see below p. 102.

⁶ Given the Greek contact with Phrygia and Assyria (J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, pp. 64-70), the fighting between Assyria and Phrygia in the last third of the century might provide an otherwise missing backbone for the Lelantine War. Very crudely, the argument would run: Midas dedicated at Delphi (Hdt. 1. 14. 2-3) and would therefore be a friend of Chalkis (*Historia* vi [1957], 160-75); but Miletos, Chalkis' enemy, won in the east; Phrygia, then, with her Greek dependencies and friends must have lost. For this earlier dating of the war see below, p. 106.

⁷ The Kypriot period at Al Mina was dated by Woolley (*A Forgotten Kingdom*, pp. 179-83) to c. 700-675, but J. Boardman has disproved the Kypriot monopoly while allowing strong influence rather earlier than 700 (*op. cit.*, p. 68; cf. Boardman, *J.H.S.* lxxxv [1965], 5 ff.).

provide the dramatic moment for its collapse. The island submitted to Sargon about 709.¹

The flight of Luli, king of Tyre and Sidon, before Sennacherib in 701, the submission of Tyre to Esarhaddon in 672 or again to Assurbanipal in 668; any of these could mark the end of the next empire, that of Phoenicia. To restrict Phoenicia's naval interests even to the longest period thus available must look ridiculous, but nevertheless this is a time when Phoenicia's power would be particularly noticeable to Greeks, involved as they were through Al Mina, and a little earlier Ashdod,² in this same Assyrian context. The sea-battle of 698 in which Greeks were defeated by the Assyrians, i.e. by a Phoenician fleet in Assyrian service, would have left a firm impression of thalassocracy on the losers.³

Egypt then succeeds to power at a time when Egypt had none. This is disturbing but not disastrous—failures matter more than successes and an Egyptian naval defeat is recorded precisely at the moment of transfer to the next thalassocrat, Miletos. This transfer is equated by Jerome (cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. *Ναύκρατις*) with the foundation of Naukratis which Strabo, who elsewhere shows himself familiar with the list,⁴ describes thus: ἀναπλεύσαντες (sc. οἱ Μιλήσιοι) εἰς τὸν Σαΐτικὸν νομὸν κατανανυμαχήσαντες Ἰνάρων πόλιν ἔκτισαν *Ναύκρατιν* . . . (p. 801). Inaros was defeated in a *naval* engagement.

Egypt then gave way, for once, to the power that had beaten her, Miletos, when Naukratis was founded, i.e. about 625.⁵ For the moment the date of Miletos' collapse may be left in doubt while we turn to the lower entries on the list. There is no need to repeat the evidence for their periods of glory⁶—Aigina, Eretria, Naxos, Sparta, Samos, and Phokaia carry the count back easily and confidently to about 540 for the end of Phokaia's reign and, since the absolute dates given by Eusebios are also roughly correct, it is reasonable to take his date for Phokaia's accession, following Lesbos, as a guide to the facts. A Lesbian set-back is therefore required around 573.

There are three possibilities, none of them satisfactory. (a) The chronographic tradition recorded two battles between Media and Lydia, the famous eclipse affair of Kyaxares (or Astyages) and Alyattes in 585 and another, nine years later in both Jerome and the Armenian version, between Astyages and 'the Lydians'.⁷ This could be a doublet but the entries are different in content as well as form (Astyages' aggression, according to Synkellos his victory, is the main feature of the second) and there may have been a second war.⁸ If so, it is to it that we should refer the fragmentary *POxy* 2506. 98, a text in which Astyages and Alyattes appear in conflict (Astyages in the accusative, Alyattes in the dative), a conflict which seems to have led to a third return from exile for the Lesbian Alkaios, presumably with Lydian support. The mechanics of the return do not emerge, but there is room here for a Lesbian defeat—the date

¹ Luckenbill, *Ancient Records*, no. 70.

² *Ibid.*, nos. 30, 62, 194.

³ Abydenos, *F. Gr. Hist.* 685 F 5. Associated with Sennacherib's Tarsus campaign. On one view the foundation of Carthage would fall in this period (Rhys Carpenter, *A.J.A.* lxii [1958], 35–53).

⁴ With Rhodes (no. IV) at p. 654, with Samos (XIII) at p. 637. The name Naukratis

is itself suggestive.

⁵ Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, p. 138, gives 640 to 620 as the probable limits.

⁶ See, for example, Myres, *op. cit.*

⁷ References in Helm, *Die Chronik d. Hieronymos*², p. 345 (f) and 346 (f).

⁸ See H. M. T. Cobbe, *Hermathena* (1967), 21–33; G. L. Huxley, *Gk. Rom. Byz. Stud.* vi (1965), 201–6.

would fit admirably.¹ (b) Equally suitable in date would be the battle produced in 568 by those who have seen Pittakos of Lesbos in the *-ku* of the Nebuchadnezzar inscription.² (c) If Polykrates of Samos had a father of the same name who held the tyranny before him, the defeat of Lesbos which Herodotos ascribes to the son might well belong to the father together with so much else and the father would have reigned at about the right period.³ But the Alkaïos battle is pure conjecture, there are better candidates than Pittakos for *-ku*, and not everyone believes in Polykrates' homonymous father.

The end of Lesbian power cannot, therefore, be fixed, nor can its length; Charaxos did not sail to Naukratis in search of naval conquest, nor did Arion rule the sea on his dolphin. We can do little more than equate Lesbian supremacy with the reign of Pittakos and take 585 as an approximate lowest figure for her predecessor's eclipse.

The limits for this predecessor (no. X on Eusebios' list) are narrow. At the upper end Miletos' compact with Alyattes about 610 might seem to some a setback; on the other Thrasyboulos' appearance in the harbour of Sikyon, which cannot fall much before 600, has a thalassocratic air about it—if we can believe in it;⁴ the end of Thrasyboulos would make a suitable terminus but that is undated. It can only be said that Herodotos noted Milesian command at sea about 615 and a marked decline in Milesian prosperity about three generations before 500, i.e. around 600.⁵ Between this decline and c. 585 someone else, according to Eusebios the Karians, ruled the sea.

By his own rules, then, the author of the list has given a reasonable account of Mediterranean sea-power between about 750 and 480. Sometimes our ignorance makes it difficult to judge him, once he has stretched the rules to the limit (in the case of Egypt), but even there they were not completely broken. Always there is some factual justification for a thalassocracy and, although what he makes of these facts seems ludicrous, for his own time it need not have been more ludicrous than modern attempts to see capitalists, or non-Dorians, or, it is now argued, our recent favourites, the hoplites,⁶ behind seventh-century tyrannies. Historians who have advanced these theories may have been misguided, they have not been ill informed. A man who could see a Karian thalassocracy c. 600–585 was worse than ill informed. I do not believe that any Greek would have made such a claim.

Myres's drastic solution, to move the Karians to the head of the list, will not do.⁷ His other suggestion, that the Karians had been coupled with the Milesians as they are in Herodotos' story of the bronze men of Psammetichos (2. 152) is at first sight attractive; less so when we remember that it is Naukratis not Psammetichos with which the list is concerned and that Karians are not visible there. Much better, with Burn, to suppose corruption, and his proposal, *Μεγαρεῖς* for *Κάρες*, is a good one.⁸ In the early sixth century Megara was

¹ For Lydia and Lesbos, D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alkaïos*, pp. 226 ff. On *POxy.* 2506 Page notes the possibility of *σα[α]χι* in line 21. I do not know whether *σα[α]χι* would be equally consistent with the traces (nothing can be seen on the photograph).

² See Winckler, *Altö. Forsch.* I (1897), pp. 511 ff. but also, e.g., Mazzarino, *Fra Oriente*, pp. 150 ff.

³ J. P. Barron, *C.Q.* xiv (1964), 210–29.

⁴ Frontinus, 3. 9. 7.

⁵ Hdt. (5. 28) specifies two generations of trouble but must have thought of something like another generation to allow for recovery before 500.

⁶ A. Snodgrass, *J.H.S.* lxxxiv (1964), 107 ff.

⁷ Burn, *J.H.S.* xlvii (1927), 168; cf. p. 102, n. 5.

⁸ Loc. cit.

important, and the Athenian capture of Salamis is movable enough to act as a final blow to Megara *c.* 585.

But there is one power which more than any other deserves a mention at this point, the Korinth of Periander. Its absence has been noted and explained away by the eastern bias of the author; not very satisfactorily in view of the presence of Phokaia and Rhodes whose claims also lay in the west, or of the fact that Periander was said to have kept a fleet on both the seas.¹ And there are suitable disasters to hand, the death of Periander in 585 or the revolt of Kerkyra a little earlier which, I shall suggest, may have involved a Korinthian naval defeat.

We must now turn from dates to 'dates'.² The bulk of ancient dates for the period before 550 are the product of theory not of information, and even some of the most solid may have an element of guesswork about them. Pheidon's seizure of the Olympic festival was fixed to 668 by Olympic records,³ but did the tradition say more of Hysiai than that it happened shortly before? The date for Hysiai is firmer than most but it may well have been fought in 671 rather than in 669. By comparison, however, the dates of the thalassocracy list belong to the world of dreams and must be disregarded completely unless the theory which produced them can be understood. No ordinary theory will do: Mr. Burn's 'stretched chronology' in his own simple formulation⁴ will work wonders for the foundations of Histros and Olbia or for the two battles in Thyrea which in fact reflect Hysiai,⁵ but it cannot cope with a foundation of Naukratis in '748'. No ordinary theory—perhaps no theory at all, for if the man responsible for the dates was thinking in terms of a series of single events, the disasters which closed each thalassocracy, he might well take over established dates from different sources, dates arrived at by very different methods.⁶

But one date gives a clue to the source of some others. The end of the 'Karian' thalassocracy is placed by Eusebios in '669'. Is it a coincidence that Thucydides dates two events in Korinthian naval history, the first, the building of ships by the Korinthian Ameinokles for Samos, 'about 300 years before the end of this war', the second, a sea-battle between Korinth and Kerkyra, outcome not stated, 'about 260 years' before the same point? '721' or '704' and '681' or '664', the former well within the period of the tenth thalassocracy, the latter so near the end of it that I have no hesitation in identifying this battle with the defeat that marked its close.⁷

The emendation is thus confirmed and it would then follow: (a) that there was a fifth-century tradition of Korinthian thalassocracy from which Thucydides took Ameinokles and the sea-battle and from which a later compiler took the sea-battle and the fact of Korinthian defeat; (b) almost certainly, that this tradition provided a 'date' since later writers are not likely to have combined Thucydides' 'date' with another's information on a point as obscure as this; (c) in common sense, that the tradition was already written down in

¹ *F. Gr. Hist.* 90 F 58. 3.

² In what follows a date is in inverted commas if it is the result of a translation into an annual system of an ancient date which was or may have been arrived at by a non-annual method.

³ *C.Q.* xlii (1949), 77 and 80.

⁴ *J.H.S.* lv (1935) 130; 'the majority of

dates should be scaled down by a certain proportion of their distance from 500 B.C.'.

⁵ Burn's law has been confirmed by excavation, *Dacia* ii (1958), 69–92; on Hysiai, *The Phoenix* xvii (1963), 166–7.

⁶ See Jacoby on *F. Gr. Hist.* 595 F 1–3 and cf. *The Phoenix*, art. cit. 158.

⁷ Thuc. i. 13. 2–5.

some form—the odds are heavily against the unique survival of what Thucydides merely heard or thought; (d) that instead of using the word ‘list’ to include everything from an idea in Thucydides’ head to Eusebios’ words (compare ‘the Spartan king-list’), we can now distinguish between a fifth-century author who had dates of a sort and a later compiler who indulged in later precision.

How did the fifth-century author arrive at his dates and how did he state them?

Herodotos’ chronology of the sixth century is a mixture of precise intervals (διὰ ἑνδεκάτου ἔτεος, 1. 62. 1), of straight generation statements (ἐπὶ δύο γενεὰς ἀνδρῶν, 5. 28), and of statements of duration which are probably but not necessarily based on generations (ἐπ’ ἔτεα ἐξήκοντα, 5. 68. 2). For earlier centuries he uses generations as such (4. 147. 5) or durations clearly based on generations (2. 145. 4; 4. 15. 1; 2. 53. 2), some of these on a forty-year count and therefore taken over as durations from another source (in view of his own preference for a thirty-three-year count; 2. 142. 2). Thucydides, though the examples are few, seems to favour absolute duration, again based on precise intervals for the sixth century (3. 68. 5), again in many cases for the earlier period taken over as durations from earlier authorities with different methods, mainly genealogical, behind them.¹

Assuming that the later compiler paid some attention to his source for dates as well as facts we see that this source is likely to have followed Herodotos and Thucydides fairly closely. Back to the middle of the sixth century the dates must either be based on exact figures or be precise interpretations given to a Herodotean-type μετὰ οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον; for the earlier period they are either inventions based on an original ἐπὶ μίαν γενεάν or calculations from a statement of an epochal event (κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλείδων κάθοδον) or variations from a simple generation length (ἐπ’ ἔτεα ὀγδώκοντα). In short, for anything before the thalassocracy of Phokaia (no. XII) the fifth-century author has relied on a generation count—hence, of course, the absurdly long period for Lesbos at the point of transition from one system to another.

From the interval that Thucydides gives between Ameinokles and the sea-battle we should guess that a forty-year generation was used, that his 260 and 300 years are translations of $6\frac{1}{2}$ and $7\frac{1}{2}$ generations. On the list as it survives there are two other intervals that point to the same origin—the foundation of Naukratis is placed eighty years all but a year before the collapse of ‘Karia’; the end of Phrygia’s power is exactly 120 years above the foundation of Naukratis. Either Thucydides and the compiler have both used a forty-year count to produce absolute figures from the author’s generation statements, or, and this is more likely, the author had already done the translation for them.

Unfortunately there are too many imponderables for us to be able to see any further towards the exact form of the work. Did Thucydides count from 421 or 404? Did he add half-generations for himself to figures which he knew were published about 441 or 424 in the form ἔτεα ἐς ἐμέ, or did he add 80 or 60 years to figures given in the form ἔτεα ἐς τὰ Μηδικά? One or both of the Spartan

¹ The western colonial dates may have been recorded by notches on a piece of wood or whatever (Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, pp. 450–2; but see also K. J. Dover,

Thucydides Bk. vi, comm. on chs. 2–5) but no one notches the Dorian Invasion, Spartan *eunomia*, a sea-battle, or the first trireme; cf. Gomme, *HCT* ad 1. 12. 3.

king-lists will have provided the framework but how did a fifth-century author use such a framework? Did he take account of beginnings or ends or fractions of generations, and if so, how? What did 'six generations before 424' mean?

The content of the work may also have differed substantially from that of the later versions. Korinth, Phokaia, and Samos will have figured in it, perhaps Miletos, Naxos, and Aigina as well.¹ But that is as far as the evidence goes. The sea-battle between Korinth and Kerkyra was the earliest that Thucydides knew; he had not heard of one at the founding of Naukratis (unless he regarded it as insufficiently Greek or insufficiently ἐγγὺς τοῦ νῦν τρόπου).²

Again the lengths of the first three thalassocracies as they survive suggest that the Lydian may have been thought to occupy the two generations between the fall of Troy and the return of the Herakleidai, the Pelasgian the next two generations until, say, the expedition of Althaimenes to Krete and Rhodes (with the capture of Lemnos as an early success),³ the third, that of the Thracians, the similar interval before the Ionian migration. The first of these, indeed, could have been related directly to the epochal event for, on Herodotos' reckoning, the Heraklid kings of Lydia belonged to the same generation as Temenos, Kresphontes, and Aristodemos, and their coming did put an end to the Maionian royal house with which Synkellos seems to identify the Lydian seafarers.⁴

But a fifth-century chronographer, beginning his calculation in 480, arrived at a date for Troy a good half-century higher than those of later scholars who either, with Ephoros, used a shorter generation, or began their generation reckoning at some point near 776 rather than 480.⁵ To fill the resultant gap below the Ionian migration the fifth-century author must either have imagined much longer reigns for, say, Rhodes and Phrygia, or he must have had an extra thalassocrat. There is a hint in Eusebios that he may have chosen the second course. Eusebios entered the Thracians twice⁶ and described their successors, the Rhodians, as 'fourth but according to some fifth'. The numerical doubt could result from the double entry, the double entry could be a slip, but it is also possible that the second Thracian entry conceals a corruption of another name.⁷

We have no name for and no clear picture of the early author or of his work. The reviser, who added precision and, perhaps, tampered with the facts, is a little less shadowy.

¹ Thucydides mentions the first three and hints at Aigina (1. 14. 3); Hdt. could add Miletos and Naxos, 1. 17. 3 and 5. 30. 5.

² Thuc. 1. 13. 2 and, for Thuc.'s standards, 1. 49. 2.

³ Althaimenes, Konon, *F. Gr. Hist.* 26 F 1; Lemnos, Hdt. 4. 145. 2.

⁴ Hdt. 1. 7: Agron is fourth from Herakles. There cannot have been 22 generations between Agron and Kandaules and I am sure that Hdt. wrote 12; cf. H. Kaletsch, *Historia* vii (1958), 1-47.

Pre-Aiolic Smyrna had a reputation as a naval base (cf. Steph. Byz. s.v.) and its capture by the Aiolians would make a good end for Lydian power but there is no trace of

a sufficiently early date in the tradition except for the no doubt accidental '1056' and '1046' in Jerome for the end of Lydia and capture of Smyrna respectively. Synkellos calls the Lydians οἱ καὶ Μαίονες.

⁵ Gross but not misleading oversimplification.

⁶ Fotheringham, art. cit. (p. 95, n. 2), p. 80.

⁷ So, more or less, W. W. Goodwin, *De potentiae veterum gentium maritimarum epochis apud Eusebium* (1855), p. 51, who plausibly suggested Karians; cf. D.S. 5. 53 and 84 (pace Myres, μετὰ τὴν τῆς Τροίας ἄλωσιν does not necessarily mean immediately after).

J. K. Fotheringham's reconstruction of Eusebios' list is the best to date and except in minor details perhaps the best we can hope for.¹ But it cannot be the text of Eusebios' source, for no one in his right mind would have dated Xerxes' invasion to the year we call 475. The simple answer, proposed by Fotheringham, was to assume a slip of five years throughout, thus raising the starting-point of the list from '1172' to '1177'. It is a possible solution and one that can to some extent be tested, though the test does admit the circular argument that has marred much earlier discussion of the list:² this date is correct; therefore it stood in the original; therefore the original is correct. But the circle is not very vicious; the dates of the last six thalassocracies are exact enough to make further correction legitimate if some regular pattern of error can be detected, and there is a pattern, of a sort.

Aigina lost her command with Xerxes' invasion; Eretria was sacked by Datis—in both cases the list is five years too low. Naxos suffered from the joint Ionian and Persian attack of 500, until when she still had a navy and some influence in the Kyklades;³ the death of Dorieus or the defeat of Anchimolios in 510 makes a better end for Spartan power than Dorieus' first failure in the west—in both cases the list seems to be correct. Samos, above Sparta, was sacked in 517 rather than 512; Phokaia was defeated at Alalia in 534 rather than 529 (the sack of the city is too early on any reckoning)—again the list is five years too low. So, to add five years throughout damages the credit of the Spartan and Naxian entries but otherwise makes excellent sense.

Nevertheless I am reluctant to accept this as the answer. For one thing such a steady slip throughout is not easy to explain. More important, among all the variant dates that survive for the fall of Troy I have not yet found any trace of a '1177'. But '1172' was Sosibios' date (*F. Gr. Hist.* 595 F 1) and although 1177 is not unattractive in itself, a round 400 years before the first Olympiad, better the calculation we have than another we can only imagine.

Alternatively one might think of emendation. To read the Eretrian figure as ten instead of fifteen would bring the last four entries into line with the facts, but one would have to be fairly strong-minded to ignore the coincidence of the Samian and Phokaian errors.

A third answer is at once more drastic, more elegant, and even less satisfactory.⁴ Eusebios intended to begin his first thalassocracy with his date for the fall of Troy, '1181', but pressure of space forced the entry down and his copyists then increased or maintained the error and later entries suffered as a result. The starting-point is plausible, and although one must then reduce an initial error of about ten years to five by '485', the central part of the list is uncertain enough to make this possible. But there is an insuperable objection. The durations of thalassocracies I–VII are firm (with a doubt of one year on VI);⁵ two of Jerome's absolute dates match the more doubtful durations of the later part and two more match a stretch of three thalassocracies earlier (IV–VI) = $23 + 25 + 33 = 81$, to be compared with '916' and '836'. It follows that Jerome has copied these absolute dates correctly from Eusebios. But if '836' stood in Eusebios and the durations are firm, we are taken back to '1172' by simple arithmetic and must therefore suppose that Eusebios took the trouble to

¹ Art. cit.

² Especially that of Myres, *J.H.S.* xxvi (1906). But see too p. 96, above.

³ Hdt. 5. 30. 4 and 31. 2.

⁴ Helm, art. cit. (p. 95, n. 2).

⁵ For the details see Fotheringham, art. cit.

maintain exactly the same ten-year slip through seven thalassocracies when there was absolutely no pressure of space to encourage him and no point in doing so. It is much more likely that he took over the whole list from someone with a different date for Troy.

None of the three solutions is attractive. One must certainly prefer a raising of the last six entries by five years to emendation, but on the other hand '1172' should be preserved. With the greatest diffidence I offer a fourth answer which allows us to do both these things.

If '1172' is correct, Sosibios must be a strong candidate for the role of reviser. Eusebios elsewhere transmits a Sosibian date;¹ Sosibios did indulge in precision (on the Spartan kings);² and even if his *Χρόνων Αναγραφή* was restricted to Spartan affairs, the Spartan thalassocracy would provide an excuse for a short digression.³

But how did Sosibios' chronology really work?⁴ On the date of Homer he disagreed fundamentally with Eratosthenes and Apollodoros. Otherwise all his surviving dates which can be compared with the Apollodoran tradition (there is none after about 700) appear to be roughly twelve years too low. But were they? Our evidence is that he reckoned a shorter interval between the fall of Troy and the first Olympiad than did Apollodoros and logically the shortening could equally have resulted from a higher date for the first Olympiad, 788 not 776, with the same date for Troy. Nor is this so mad a suggestion as it seems at first sight. The Eleans reckoned that there had been three Anolympiads—*ταύτας . . . οὐκ . . . ἐν καταλόγῳ . . . γράφουσιν*.⁵ I see no reason why Sosibios should not have decided that these three celebrations, omitted from the records and therefore from the count, should be written in as three bonuses of four years, one in 364, one in or near 668 and one somewhere in the neighbourhood of 600 (plus or minus 40).⁶ Thus the 'fourth Olympiad' would mean for him 776 not 764, but when translated by some later chronographer would appear as 764; all his dates down to 668 would seem twelve years too low, those between 668 and about 600 eight years too low, those between 600 and 364 four years too low.

There are several twelve-, eight-, and four-year discrepancies that survive—Diodoros' apparent dating of the first Olympiad to 788,⁷ the contradiction between Pausanias' absolute dates and statement of duration for the second Messenian War,⁸ the disagreement between Africanus, Pausanias, and Strabo on the date of the first Anolympiad and the confusion over the victories of the Spartan Chionis,⁹ Pausanias' four-year slips in the correlation of Olympiads and Pythiads¹⁰—and these are enough to suggest that the Olympic backbone of Greek chronography may have been less rigid than we think. But none can be traced to Sosibios; all have passed through many hands and may have been translated many times, from Olympiads to archons, from archons to kings,

¹ e.g. the battle in Thyrea in 720 (above, p. 99, n. 5) and probably the entry in Jerome under 1094 for Eurysthenes and Prokles.

² *F. Gr. Hist.* 595 F 2.

³ Jacoby, *Komm.* on F 1-3; the surprising appearance of Sparta might even be a pointer to Sosibian authorship.

⁴ For what follows compare Jacoby on F 1-3.

⁵ Paus. 6. 22. 3.

⁶ On the confused tradition about the dates see Jacoby, on *F. Gr. Hist.* 416 T 5-7 with introduction.

⁷ 1. 5. 1.

⁸ Paus. 4. 15. 1, 17. 2, 20. 1, and 23. 4.

⁹ Above, p. 99, n. 3; Paus. 3. 14. 3 and 4. 23. 2 and 5; Eusebios s.a. 664, 660, 656; Strabo, pp. 354-5.

¹⁰ Paus. 10. 7. 2-5.

from kings back to Olympiads. Nevertheless it is worth testing the hypothesis against one connected series of dates which we have some reason to suppose may be Sosibian, the Thalassocracies, to see if anything emerges.¹

The result is set out in Table 1 under the heading 'Eusebios' dates, Scheme II', where I have adjusted the beginning of each thalassocracy by twelve years down to 669 (no. XI), by eight for no. XII, by four thereafter. The results are interesting in several ways.

1. The forty-year intervals so far noticed are undisturbed, but a new one is produced. The significant figures so far mentioned, 669, 748, and 868, become 681, 760, and 880, exact (in the first case almost exact) multiples of forty above the base date of 480.

2. Phokaia's rule now begins in 581, a hundred years below the sea-battle of 681, a hundred years plus one above 480. Could Sosibios, for the sake of neatness, have decided to give two and a half generations to the six powers for whom there was real chronological information to make things easier at the higher levels? The higher levels occupy almost exactly 600 years, 520 to the Return of the Herakleidae, a neat figure for the thirteen generations from Eurysthenes and Prokles to the predecessors of Leon and Agesikles (who probably came to the throne around 580).²

3. The unhappy Eusebian 475 becomes 479, and no one will worry unduly over a one-year error in a Eusebian date. Naxos and Sparta suffer.³

4. The end of the Lesbian thalassocracy is brought very close to the traditional date for Pittakos' retirement;⁴ the Milesian thalassocracy is made to include the traditional (early) date for the foundation of Kyzikos.⁵ These events might therefore have been related to the thalassocracy tradition.

5. If perchance Thucydides did count from 421 rather than 404, his 260 years take us back to 681, precisely the date given by the list for the sea-battle.

6. There was a tradition, possibly Ephoran, that Homer was a younger contemporary of Midas of Phrygia.⁶ The fact that Sosibios' date for Homer, '866',⁷ comes so close to the thalassocracy list's date for the end of Phrygia's rule, '868', is a further hint that he may be the author of the list. More significantly, with twelve years added to both dates, his date for Homer would come very close indeed to that of Ephoros, whom in general he seems to have followed.⁸

¹ Unfortunately one important change of power falls inside a period of doubt on the date of an anolympiad. I have assumed that Pheidon's anolympiad was the 28th and have therefore added the full bonus of 12 years to '669' (Ol. 27.3 on the standard reckoning). See above, p. 99, n. 3 but also G. L. Huxley, *B.C.H.* lxxxii (1958), 588 ff.

² See, e.g., *C.A.H.* iii, pp. 565-6.

³ Myres, art. cit., pp. 97-8, infers a democratic coup in Naxos in 505 from Hdt. 5. 30 putting an end to the 'commercial oligarchy's' thalassocracy. Unhappily this is quite unjustified, and it is better to admit that the list is wrong. Sparta on the other hand did suffer a set-back about 515—the failure of Dorieus' first western adventure.

⁴ Diog. Laert. 1. 75.

⁵ Jerome, s.a. 756.

⁶ The chronological implication of the story that Homer wrote Midas' epitaph (*Vit. Herodotea* 131; *Certamen* 260) is explicitly accepted only, so far as I know, by Strabo p. 149, and there obscurely. But Strabo's fondness for Ephoros, the importance of Kyme in the story, and Ephoros' low date for Homer (below, n. 8), are slight hints that Ephoros may have given it his blessing. The story itself was old enough to be denied by Simonides (frg. 48d).

⁷ F 2.

⁸ For Ephoros' date, perhaps 876, see *F. Gr. Hist.* 70 F 149, F 102, and F 223 with Komm. For Sosibios and Ephoros, *ibid.*, Komm. on 595 F 1-3.

TABLE I

<i>No.</i>	<i>Power</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Eusebios' dates</i>		<i>Context and final set-back</i>	<i>Approximate real date</i>
			<i>Scheme I</i>	<i>Scheme II</i>		
I	Lydians	92	1172-1080	1184-1092	Fall of Troy to arrival of Herakleidae in Lydia.	
II	Pelasgians	85	1080-995	1092-1003	Capture of Lemnos to ???	
III	Thracians	79	995-916	1003-928	?	
IV	Rhodians	23	916-893	928-905	Exploration of west to ???	
V	Phrygians	25	893-868	905-880	Reign of Midas to defeat in Lelantine War.	
VI	Kypriots	32	868-836	880-848	Power in E. Med. to submission to Assyria.	750-720
VII	Phoenicians	45	836-791	848-803	Power in E. and W. Med. to defeat by Assyria.	720-710
VIII	Egyptians	43	791-748	803-760	??? (the Dodekarchy!) to foundation of Naukratis.	710-668
IX	Milesians	18	748-730	760-742	Founding of Naukratis to death of Thrasyloulos.	668-625
X	(Karians)	71	730-669	742-681	??? to ???	625-600
XI	Lesbians	96	669-573	681-581	Reign of Pittakos.	600-585
XII	Phokaians	44	573-529	581-533	Influence in W. Med. to Alalia.	585-575
XIII	Samians	17	529-512	533-516	Power in Aegean (Polykrates) to Persian sack.	575-540
XIV	Spartans	2	512-510	516-514	? Expedition of Dorieus to death of Dorieus.	540-516
XV	Naxians	10	510-500	514-504	Empire in the Aegean to Persian attack.	516-510
XVI	Eretrians	15	500-485	504-489	Help to Ionia to Persian sack.	510-500
XVII	Aiginetans	10	485-475	489-479	? Success against Athens to Xerxes' invasion.	500-490
						490-480

All this is not enough to prove anything, but it is perhaps enough to leave the questions open—was Sosibios the compiler and did he work in this way? I do not know the answers. But of one thing I am sure. The Eusebian list is the product of at least two hands,¹ and in spite of the doubts at every step the relationship between them was something like what I have suggested. The first was a man who, like Herodotos, Thucydides, and another Athenian of the same period, the so-called Old Oligarch, felt the fascination of sea-power and chose to trace its history back to the Trojan War (or perhaps to Minos),² using the typical chronographic method of his day. The editor belonged to a more sophisticated world, to the post-Timaian school of chronographers, and to adapt his data to his own rules may have tampered quite severely with the facts as he certainly invented many of the dates. Yet, whether he was Sosibios or not, he seems to me to have had a little more respect for traditional dates than some of his brethren had—the implied dates for Periander or for Midas are high for a Hellenistic author—perhaps he also had some respect for traditional facts. It is a pity that only Eusebios preserves a hint of his work.

The profit in all this is not great. The sea-battle between Korinth and Kerkyra becomes a defeat for Korinth in the reign of Periander and must be withdrawn from discussions about the rise of Kypselos; the revolt of Kerkyra late in Periander's reign makes a suitable context, although Herodotos makes no mention of a battle.³ Ameinokles and his shipbuilding must remain undated but again he must be withdrawn from arguments about the Lelantine War⁴ and left to drift somewhere in the third quarter of the seventh century. We may ask who beat Rhodes about 750 and who, if anyone, beat Lesbos about 575 but there are no ready answers. That is all. But my faith in the average educated Greek survives.

II. THE SPARTAN KING-LISTS IN DIODOROS

Eusebios, as he survives in the Armenian version of the *Chronographia*, preserves lists of both the Spartan royal houses from the Return of the Herakleidai to the ends of the reigns of the Agiad Alkamenos and the Eurypontid Theopompos together with a note of the length of each reign, lists which he claims to have taken over from Diodoros (= Diodoros 7. 8). He also inserts in his *Canons*, at what he regards as the proper moments, the names of the Agiads over the same number of generations and again records the durations of their

¹ Kastor of Rhodes has been favoured as Diodoros' and thence Eusebios' source. He certainly composed a list (*F. Gr. Hist.* 250 T 1) but his date for Troy was at the lowest 1184 (so Schwartz, *Die Königslisten* followed by Jacoby, who do not seem to me to have countered the case for something about a decade higher; cf. Gelzer, *Julius Africanus* i, pp. 209 ff. and ii. 63 ff.). He cannot therefore be directly responsible—though he may have played some part.

² Hdt. 3. 122. 2; Thuc. 1. 4.

³ The history of Kerkyra would then be: Bakchiad until 657 and on good terms with Korinth; reinforced by exiled Bakchiads in

657 and hostile to Korinth; subdued by Periander, say about 625; in revolt about 590 but subdued again by 585. The foundation of Epidamnos will belong to the period of Periander's domination (Thuc. 1. 24. 2; Jerome, s.a. 626).

The tombstone of Arniadas (Tod, *G.H.I.*, no. 2) shows that Kerkyrans were fighting someone around 600 (L. H. Jeffery, *Local Scripts*, p. 233).

⁴ As he was not in *Historia* vi (1957), 161. Without him there is nothing in the evidence to prolong the war after about 715. Orsippus of Megara fought Korinth after his Olympic victory in 720, not necessarily long after.

rule. The names of the kings match each other in both versions and with two small exceptions the durations match as well. There is, therefore, a case for believing that the list used for the *Canons* also came to Eusebios through Diodoros from an earlier source or that, even if transmitted by different routes, both lists went back to one common source somewhere behind Diodoros.

Since Eusebios follows Apollodoros in his date for the Return (1104 B.C. in our terms) and since Diodoros both at 1. 5. 1 and, less clearly, in Eusebios' excerpt, claims to follow Apollodoros in his date for the Return, it has been thought that Apollodoros must be this common source, and that both the excerpt in the *Chronographia* and the entries in the *Canons* can be used as evidence for the reconstruction of Apollodoros' list.¹

But there are the two discrepancies of duration—the Agiad Echestratos is given 31 years in the excerpt, 35 in the *Canons*; Alkamenēs is given 38 years in the excerpt, 37 in the *Canons*—and there is another much more serious discrepancy. The excerpt states that the last Agiad, Alkamenēs, was in the tenth year of his reign at the time of the first Olympiad while the table, with equal firmness and internal consistency, will have him die in the year before the first Olympiad. In other words Diodoros' Agiad list ends twenty-nine years lower than the list of the *Canons*.

Diodoros' Eurypontid list (7. 8) is corrupt, obviously so in that it omits the name of Eurypon himself. But this is easily corrected and since we are given by Cicero² a duration for Eurypon's predecessor Prokles (41 years), which can be assumed to be standard and which also provides an easy explanation of the corruption (Προκλῆς <ΜΑ', Εὐρυπῶν> ΝΑ'),³ there can be no doubt that he, with Prokles' 41 years, must be written in to Diodoros' list. This done, Diodoros is once more about thirty years short in his total figure.

The line of Korinthian kings cited from Diodoros (7. 9) in the *Chronographia* and again set out *sub annis* from 1104 in the *Canons*, extending now not to the first Olympiad but to the accession of Kypselos in 657, shows much more variation of detail, but once again is approximately thirty years too short. The entries in the *Canons* end in 777/6 with the one-year rule of Automenes and no duration is given for the period of annual *prytaneis* which the *Chronographia* puts at 90 years, thus implying that for Diodoros 747, not 777, was the year of Automenes.

Again, according to Synkellos, Diodoros cited a Makedonian list (7. 17) which was lighter by one king than an alternative which he also mentioned; once more a likelihood that the former was about thirty years short, though in this case we do not know which of the two Diodoros himself favoured. Finally, Diodoros' list of thalassocrats (7. 11) as cited in the *Chronographia* lacked one thalassocrat, but this is probably not significant.

The coincidence, at least of the Spartan and Korinthian lists, is striking, but their Apollodoran origin seemed so certain that Jacoby could write, 'Wer soll der mann sein . . . der einflussreich genug war Diodoros . . . zur nachfolge zu zwingen, während kein späterer eine spur dieser vorgeschichte zeigte?', and concluded, 'So bin ich doch geneigt, in dem fehlen von 30 jahren . . . ein zufall zu sehen.'⁴

¹ See F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Phil. Untersuch. xvi), 80 ff. who gives full references and acknowledgements to earlier discussions.

² *De Div.* 2. 90.

³ So, basically, Jacoby.

⁴ *F. Gr. Hist.* 244 F 62 Komm. Jacoby ignored the correspondence of the Eurypon-

But let us suppose that the Diodoran lists are independent of those in the *Canons*, not entirely, for the correspondence in durations is too close, but independent enough to allow that they should have passed through the hands of two men with different dates for the Return of the Herakleidai. If so, figures in the *Chronographia* may not be corrected by reference to the *Canons* and Diodoros' lists become:

AGIADS		EURYPONTIDS		KORINTHIANS	
Eurysthenes	42	Prokles	41	Aletes	38
Agis	1	Eurypon	51	Ixion	38
Echestratos	31	Prytanis	49	Agelas	37
Leobotes	37	Eunomos	45	Prymnis	35
Doryssos	29	Charillos	60	Bakchis	35
Agesilaos	44	Nikandros	38	Agelas	30
Archelaos	60	Theopompos	47	Eudamon	25
Teleklos	40			Aristomedos	35
Alkamenes	38			Agemon	16
Olympiad I falling in the tenth year of Alkamenes and Theopompos.				Alexandros	25
				Telestes	12
				Automenes	1
				Bakchiads	90

The totals are 293 years for the Agiads and 293 years for the Eurypontids both reckoned back from the first Olympiad, giving 1069 as the date for the Return; for Korinth 417 years reckoned back from 657, i.e. 1074 for the Return. It is impossible not to be struck by the agreement between the two Spartan lists, an agreement that is produced without emendation of the text except for the necessary inclusion of Eurypon and the incorporation of the figure 41 for Prokles. Impossible too not to notice that we are thus taken back to a very respectable date for the Return, Ephoros' date¹—'Wer soll der mann sein?'

Had the Korinthian list produced precisely the same result, the case would have been complete. The fact that it does not does no positive harm. The Korinthian durations are less stable than the Spartan and out of the variety in the texts it would be easy to emend away the surplus five years. Nevertheless, as things are such emendation must follow decision on the Spartan lists; it cannot be allowed to produce another argument for decision.

But there is another argument, the amount and kind of emendation needed to carry the Diodoran lists back to 1104. The Eurypontid Nikandros must be given an additional two years,² Echestratos an additional four (following the *Canons*); more seriously an extra king must be found for each line. Soos must be supposed to have vanished from the Eurypontids and some other king from

tid list (with Eurypon added) and the slender hint given by the Makedonian list. But he added Nepos' date for Homer (see *F. Gr. Hist.* 244 F 63 Komm.) which raises problems too complicated to be discussed here.

¹ *F. Gr. Hist.* 70 F 223. The point was made by Unger, *Philologus* xl (1881), 95 ff., who therefore argued that Ephoros was Diodoros' source. His case was refuted by

Busolt (*Gr. Gesch.* i². 584) and dismissed by Jacoby, but the objections only hold against a direct use by Diodoros of Ephoros throughout, not against an intermediary who based himself on Ephoros.

² This is necessary if Nikandros' predecessor, Charillos, is to be taken back to the fixed Apollodoran point of 885 (see Jacoby on 244 F 62).

the Agiads. For Soos there is a case—some lists could exist without him but others certainly found him a place.¹ But for the additional Agiad there is no case. The *Excerpta Barbari* preserve, between Agesilaos and Archelaos, the name Cemenelaus, and before him, attached to Agesilaos, the figure 30. Out of this has been fashioned a King Menelaos (καὶ Μενέλαος) to whom it is surely enough to apply an old Agiad formula of rejection—ἀλλ' οὐ Δωριεύς ἐστὶν ἀλλ' Ἀχαιός. It is not easy to believe that Apollodoros could have introduced such a monstrosity to an otherwise respectable list. The aberration must be the result of a much later and less informed attempt to reconcile the two traditions. Less dramatic but equally unjustifiable emendation is needed to bring Korinth into line. There the one year reign of Automenes (one year in all the sources) is simply altered to 30.²

The argument for two traditions is strong, (a) because an almost unemended Diodoros produces something different from the vulgate, (b) because what it produces corresponds in its most essential detail, the date for the Return, with a known independent tradition, that of Ephoros, and (c) because attempts to reconcile the two lead to measures with which it is hard to credit Diodoros, let alone his more reputable predecessors. Against it there stands only Diodoros' assertion that he is following Apollodoros. But he cites Apollodoros only for the fixed points in his *parapegma*, not for the individual lengths of the Spartan reigns, and the man who can send one Spartan king into battle five years after he has recorded his death would not blench at taking a 'system' from one source and his 'facts' from another.³

The result is not comforting. The evidence of Diodoros was central to the reconstruction of Apollodoran chronology worked out by Jacoby and his predecessors; without it doubt returns. It remains possible that Apollodoros began his Agiad line in 1103 and dismissed the last of them, Alkamenes, where Diodoros does, some 28 years below 776, by inserting an additional king (more respectable than Menelaos) somewhere in the series or by adjusting the lengths of the reigns.⁴ But since we know that he had King Agesilaos on the throne as early as 944/3 (F 63 a and b), he must have found much of the extra thirty years below that point (for Diodoros Agesilaos came to the throne in 930). But it would not be easy to increase the Diodoran 60 for Archelaos or 40 for Teleklos (who was assassinated) and neither Agesilaos with 44 years nor Alkamenes with 38 looks like a candidate for a dramatically longer reign. Adjustment, therefore, is unlikely. And so, in view of the consistency of the Agiad succession in all sources except the *Excerpta Barbari*, is an additional king. The only alternative for which there is any support in the evidence is that the

¹ Most recognized him (Plut. *Lyc.* 1; cf. Paus. 3. 7. 1, Phlegon, *F. Gr. Hist.* 257 F 1) but Hdt. did not (8. 131). Ephoros' view is doubtful; in F 149 (18) Lykourgos is sixth from Prokles (i.e. Soos is included), in F 118 Eurypon, not Soos, is Prokles' son. From the manner of Strabo's citations I should prefer to think that F 118 was reliable, but one cannot be certain.

² *F. Gr. Hist.* 244 F 331–2 Komm. There did exist an alternative tradition with a shorter list because Didymos provides an alternative solution (ap. Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13.

17), that the first Korinthian king came to the throne thirty years after the Return.

In Pausanias (2. 4. 4) Telestes is the last king, Automenes, therefore, the first annual *prytanis*. His one year of rule must then be part of the story, not the result of textual corruption.

³ 12. 35. 4 with 47. 1 and 52. 1.

⁴ Different reign lengths from those of Diodoros/Eusebios are implied by Pausanias, 3. 2. 4, for Doryssos and Agesilaos, both of whom δι' ὀλίγον . . . τὸ χρεῶν ἐπέλαβεν; so other traditions were possible.

Eusebian *Canons* preserve Apollodoros' list, that for Apollodoros Alkamenes did indeed die in 776.

On the other hand it does seem likely that Apollodoros extended his last Eurypontid, Theopompos, down to something like the Diodoran *terminus*. For on any story Theopompos must coincide with the Messenian War and Apollodoros dated it 757–738.¹ Again his Lykourgos is fixed to 885 and it is unlikely that anyone would place the accession of Charillos thirty years before Lykourgos' legislation.² Since Soos lies ready to hand to fill a gap above Charillos, this extra reign is an easy answer. The consequent readjustment of the relationship between the two houses raises no problems: Theopompos stands firm to cover the years of Apollodoros' First Messenian War and no chronographer would fail to welcome an increased overlap between him and Alkamenes' successor, Polydoros;³ nor need he have objected to having Polydoros rather than Alkamenes on the throne for the institution of the ephorate in 754;⁴ higher up the lists Lykourgos will legislate and Charillos will come to the throne well within, rather than at the very start of, the reign of Archelaos, but nothing in the tradition demands otherwise.

To sum up: the reconstruction of an Eratosthenic/Apollodoran vulgate by Jacoby and his predecessors made serious study of ancient chronography possible. But in reconstructing it they were perhaps too ready to adapt everything to it. In particular the Diodoran lists for Sparta and, possibly, for Korinth and Makedon are more readily explicable as the work of a man who followed an earlier tradition in his dating of the Return of the Herakleidai, the tradition of Ephoros, whom he may also have followed in his omission of Soos (and possibly of Polydektes),⁵ conceivably even in his date for Lykourgos.⁶

Wadham College, Oxford

W. G. FORREST

¹ *Apollodoros Chronik*, 128 ff. The argument is circumstantial but impressive.

² *F. Gr. Hist.* 244 F 64 Komm. It would imply an astonishingly long guardianship, on the length of which see *Apollodoros Chronik*, 111.

³ Cf. *The Phoenix* xvii (1963), 158.

⁴ In view of Paus. 3. 11. 10; cf. *F. Gr. Hist.* 596 F 15 Komm.

⁵ For Soos, above, p. 109, n. 1; on Polydektes, *F. Gr. Hist.* 70 F 173–5 Komm. (though I do not quite understand Jacoby's case for saying that Polydektes did not come to the throne).

⁶ Ephoros put Lykourgos' travels after the accession of Charillos and, since his story closely matched that of Sosibios (*Apollodoros Chronik*, 115 f.), he may, like Sosibios, have dated Lykourgos' meeting with Homer to the eighth year of Charillos. But for our hypothetical chronographer Charillos' eighth year was 876 (776 + 9 (Theopompos) + 38 (Nikander) + 60 (Charillos) = 883 for the accession), precisely the year in which Ephoros brought Homer and Lykourgos together (*F. Gr. Hist.* 70 F 102 with Komm. and above, p. 104, n. 8).