

## THE 'TYRANNIS' AND THE EXILES OF PISISTRATUS<sup>1</sup>

τρίς με τυραννήσαντα τοσαντάκις ἐξεδίωξε  
δῆμος Ἐρεχθῆος καὶ τρίς ἐπηγάγετο,  
τὸν μέγαν ἐν βουλαῖς Πεισίστρατον . . .

‘Thrice as a tyrant I reigned; yet as often the people expelled me,  
Sons of Erechtheus thrice summoned me homeward to rule.  
Weighty in counsel was I, Pisistratus . . .’<sup>2</sup>

THE Hellenistic epigrammatist does not break off at this point, but proceeds to state that Pisistratus collected the corpus of the songs of Homer—an appropriate tribute, in his view, to a ‘golden scion of Athens if, as is claimed, we Athenians founded Smyrna’ (Smyrna was commonly thought to be the native town of Homer). The ‘Pisistratid recension’ of Homer is an extremely vexed and unfashionable question in Homeric criticism and does not concern us here. More to the present point is the elementary logical mistake which is made in the lines which are quoted above. Pisistratus had three periods of tyranny, and is said to have been driven out three times, and to have been restored (or perhaps to have come to power) three times. The error is a transparent one, common in juvenile puzzles. Pisistratus died naturally in old age at the end of his third spell of power (probably 528/7 B.C.) and so was exiled only twice. The final exile of his son Hippias (511/10) would be the third occasion completing the chain of coup and expulsion. All this is amusing, and perhaps not very instructive. An illogical poetaster has confused the train of events in sixth-century Athens. As a versifier, he had some point in using the jingling and effective words *τρίς* and *τοσαντάκις*; he had no particular stake in accuracy. He may even have noted the mistake and shrugged it off in the interests of versification. The verse was, anyway, intended to be a puzzle, not resolved until late in the third line by the personal name—Pisistratus.

So much for our anonymous poet. This discussion, of course, is not really about his (deliberate?) mistake. However, his elementary error does point to one of the great cruces in the history of archaic Greece—namely the chronology of the Pisistratid tyranny. Few scholars appear to agree on the dates of the three (or two) periods of tyranny and the two periods (or one) of exile which Pisistratus enjoyed and suffered.<sup>3</sup> Many have renounced the task as hopeless or

<sup>1</sup> I am much indebted to Mr. J. R. Hamilton of Otago University, to Dr. A. J. Graham of Manchester University, and to Professor V. L. Ehrenberg of London University for their kindness in reading this paper during various drafts and making a number of suggestions which have no doubt led to improvements. I have also benefited from comments made by Professors E. Badian and R. Sealey, and have altered some points in response to criticism by Mary White. As this paper was originally read as a

paper at a Classical Conference in Auckland in 1968 a summary is printed there, Auckland Classical Conference, May 1968. The text of the full version has been much improved by all these comments and by those of the readers of *C.Q.*

<sup>2</sup> *Anth. Palat.* 11. 442.

<sup>3</sup> For tables of reconstructions by nineteenth and twentieth century scholars of the ‘true reading’ of the papyrus of *Athenaion Politeia* cf. the edition by Sandys (p. 58) where already in 1893 a table could be produced of

indeed not important.<sup>1</sup> Some pursue reconstructions which become ever more complicated. Their primary intention has been to reconcile the figures given in the *Athenaion Politeia* first with themselves and then with those few given by Herodotus and by Aristotle in his *Politics*.<sup>2</sup> A table of reconstructions is given below.

The relevant passages are well known and easily accessible. The basic account is in Herodotus (1. 59–64), which is the tale of the chequered career of Pisistratus and of his final success by the time when Croesus was enquiring about the relative strength of the major Greek states shortly before his own downfall. This is supplemented by Aristotle briefly in the *Politics* (1315<sup>b</sup>) and is

variants. The papyrus had been discovered only two years earlier! For the stage of scholarship by 1937 see the table in F. Schachermeyr 'Pisistratos' *R.E.* xix (1937), 171–2.

<sup>1</sup> Amongst these sceptics are T. J. Cadoux, 'The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsiechides', *J.H.S.* lxxviii (1948), 104–9; P. Oliva, *Studia Antiqua* (Prague, 1955), 25–30 and *Rana Řecka Tyrannis*, 324 ff.; H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte* (1960), 133; H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (1967), 47 ff., 543 ff.; V. Ehrenberg, *From Solon to Socrates* (1967), 400 n. 12; J. H. Schreiner, 'Aristotle and Perikles', *Symbolae Osloenses* Suppl. Fasc. xxi (1968), 36 ff. (I owe this last reference to Prof. Ehrenberg). Partial sceptics who nevertheless believed that the first exile must have been of 4 years duration (see below) were Kenyon and Th. Reinach. See *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens*, (ed. Kenyon, 1892); U. V. Wilamowitz, *Aristot. und Athen* (1893), 1 ff. More recently this view has been taken up by F. Heidebüchel (*Philologus*, ci [1957], 70 ff.) and G. V. Sumner (*C.Q.* xi [1961], 37–49) who believes that he has restored the original state of Aristotle's text, if not the history behind it. The theory of Beloch (*Gr. G.* i. 2. 289 ff.) was that Pisistratus had one exile and two spells of tyranny only. This was also Herschensohn's opinion (*Philologischeskoye Obozreniye*, x [1896], 119 ff.) and they were followed by Meyer (*Forschungen* . . . , 1899), De Sanctis (*Atthis*, 1912, 27 ff.) and Kahrstedt ('Megakles' *R.E.* xv. 1. 125–6). The latest holders of this view were W. Otto (*S.B.* [Munich, 1924], final vol., p. 9) and U. Wilcken (*Gr. G.* ed. 5 [1943], pp. 95, 266) but Schachermeyr's comprehensive article of 1937 and Cornelius's monograph of 1924 seem to have disposed thoroughly of Beloch's ingenious, but unlikely, suggestion. This had also brought the tyranny of Theagenes of Megara and the attempt of Kylon at Athens into the years at the middle of the sixth century B.C. (*Gr. G.* i. 2. 302 ff.). P. N. Ure, *The Origin of Tyranny* (1922), also

argued strongly against Beloch's view, but produced no set of dates for Pisistratus himself.

<sup>2</sup> Mathieu, in his edition (*Aristotle* [1915], 29 ff.) tended to a literal acceptance of the numerals in the text, and was followed in this by M. Lang (*A.J.P.* lxxv [1954], 59–73), who consequently had to make the first coup of Pisistratus as early as 566 B.C. In this she was following a hint in C. Seltman, *Athens, its History and Coinage* (1924), 36 ff., to the effect that Pisistratus may have been behind the first setting up of the Panathenaic Games in the archonship of Hippokleides (a Philaid) in 566 B.C. However, this suggestion has found no favour. M. Miller (*Klio*, 1959) follows in this tradition with some refinements (see below). Various emendations for the numerals concerning the second tyranny and the first exile have been offered by scholars who accept the *A.P.* numeral for the first tyranny. Bauer (*Forschung. zu Aristot.*, [1891], 50 ff.) set off this trend. Busolt (*Gr. G.* [1895], 317 n. 4), Bury (*History of Greece*, 1912 and 1951) and F. Cornelius were in this tradition (*Die Tyrannis in Athen* [1929], 5 ff.). Schachermeyr, in his great survey of the literature, argues for this kind of solution, with certain indebtedness to the ideas of Pomtow. Finally Pomtow (*Rhein. Mus.* li [1896], 500 ff.), Hiller v. Gaertringen (*I.G.* i<sup>2</sup>. 270 ff.), F. Adcock and F. Jacoby, *Atthis* 1949, 188–196, are in a tradition which the present writer wishes to join on this question. See also now J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford, 1971), 444–5. Pomtow suggested that the unit in the case of the first and second tyrannies should be changed to 'months' from 'years'. This group of scholars has normally assumed that the first exile lasted into the fourth or third year (τετάρτω, τρίτω). The whole argument has been made desperately complicated by the uncertainty whether Herodotus and Aristotle were using single inclusive or double inclusive reckoning in their ordinal numeration, cf. Schachermeyr, loc. cit.

retold more fully in the *Athenaion Politeia* (13–20), a treatise which is sometimes thought to have been written before, and sometimes subsequently to, the *Politics*.<sup>1</sup> The writer of the *A.P.* knows his Herodotus well, and the account is basically that of Herodotus but with an admixture of some other account (Androtion, Kleidemos?). It takes the form of anecdotes and of a timetable of events reckoned in years after the first coup, with four archon dates, which give an appearance of authenticity. Herodotus, by contrast, while giving the history rather fully, is sparing of numerals, and gives no absolute chronology.

Other ancient sources for the chronology of Pisistratus are either derivative or highly tendentious. Into the latter category may fall Isocrates' statement that the Pisistratid faction and disturbances lasted forty years.<sup>2</sup> This is a figure which is found nowhere else, but possibly derives from an estimate in round figures from the battle of Pallene to the reforms of Clisthenes (c. 546 to 507 B.C.), if one can place the battle of Pallene in 546 B.C.<sup>3</sup> The Parian Marble chronicle of the third century B.C. gives dates only for the first coup of Pisistratus and the murder of Hipparchus, and in the case of the latter it confuses the murder with the downfall of the tyranny.<sup>4</sup> Finally the late compilers Eusebius and Jerome, and

<sup>1</sup> *The Athenaion Politeia* has recently been treated as by Aristotle himself (J. Day and M. Chambers, *Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy* [1967], 1–24). It will henceforth be abbreviated to *A.P.* Day and Chambers do not deal with Pisistratid chronology, but do touch on other economic and political aspects of the tyranny (90–7, 175–6). For my purpose it does not much matter whether *A.P.* is by Aristotle himself or by a 'research student' of his.

<sup>2</sup> Isocrates 16. 26 τεσσαράκοντα δ' ἔτη τῆς στράσεως γενομένης . . . Forty here may be a mere round number, but it could also refer to the period 547–508/7 B.C. (Raubitschek, *Rh. Mus.* xcvi [1955], 258–62). Andocides in *De Mysteries* 106 does not give any duration for the tyranny of the Pisistratids, although his was probably the same eupatrid tradition as that of Isocrates. He merely talks of a victory of his ancestors at 'Pallention'. The only Battle at Pallene of which we know is that won decisively by Pisistratus. It may be that Andocides is covering up for his great-grandfather, but, as MacDowell points out, the generations would fit better with the period elapsed by Andocides' time if a return of the nobles along with the Spartans in 510 is being referred to. MacDowell disapproves of Raubitschek's explanation of the 40 years of tyranny, on the ground that Isagoras was not a tyrant, even if the Spartans wished to make him so in 508/7 B.C. (D. MacDowell, *Andokides on the Mysteries* [1962], Appendix O, 212–13). However, we can reply to this that Aristotle certainly could call Isagoras and his party 'friends of the tyrants'. The Alcmaeonidae might well charge that the tyrant faction was not fully 'out' until Clisthenes had taken the people into partner-

ship (*A.P.* 20–1). At the other end of the 40 years a case could be made out that the first two short periods of power (certainly the second one, held in partnership with Megacles) were not considered by certain noble families to have been periods of true tyranny. Certainly, Herodotus describes the events after the first coup in terms of a tyranny, but if it was very brief it would hardly seem worth bothering about after the Battle of Pallene which ushered in the real 'tyrannis' based on armed might.

<sup>3</sup> The only support for this is in a figure given by Aristophanes of Byzantium, schol. on Aristophanes, *Vespae* 502, where the length of the tyranny is given as τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἑν. This, however, could be a corruption of the Greek numeral for 49 or 51. Eratosthenes, quoted by the scholiast ad loc., seems to have reckoned the duration of the tyranny at 50 years, a tradition also followed in the Parian Marble, see below, n. 4. Justin 2. 8. 10 gives a figure for the rule of the Pisistratids of 34 years, which seems to be an inaccurate reflection of the 36 years of power mentioned by Herodotus and *A.P.* and the 35 years in Aristotle, *Politics* 1315<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> The Parian Marble, which perhaps depends on Philochorus, the last of the Atthid historians, seems to have a base date of 263/2 B.C. Its calculations are: (a) Epoch 41. '297 years since Pisistratus became tyrant of Athens in the archonship of Komeas' (560/59 B.C.). (b) Epoch 45. '248 years since Harmodius and Aristogiton killed Hipparchus, and the Athenians drove out the Pisistratids from the Pelargikon Fort in the archonship of Harpactides' (511/10 B.C.). See F. Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin, 1904). In spite of the authority of Herodotus,

also Justin, give derivative information which is inaccurate, partly because of differences of counting method, or mechanical shifts in the tables.<sup>1</sup> In this unsatisfactory state of the later chronographers discussion inevitably centres on the versions of the history given by Herodotus and the *A.P.*

This paper arose from a dissatisfaction with the four most recent attempts to restore the chronology of the three periods of tyranny and two of exile which are attributed to Pisistratus by our most reliable ancient authorities. These modern restorations are mutually exclusive but none has been refuted in detail. It is, however, true that misgivings have been voiced by Shear, den Boer, Eliot, and by Miss White. Such reservations and others, orally expressed to me, encourage me to offer an alternative reconstruction.<sup>2</sup>

The scheme of Miller, although minutely argued, makes what seems to be the initial error of trying to reconcile the confused numerals in the papyrus of the *Athenaion Politeia* of Aristotle (14. 3-15. 2), while yet preserving as many as possible of them unemended. She is reduced to emending to her taste, or to translating awkwardly, several phrases and numerals in the text.<sup>3</sup> By this

Thucydides and Aristotle that Athens was freed in 511/10 B.C. by the Spartans at the request of Delphi and the Alcmaeonids, and that Hipparchus was murdered in the fourth year before that, the Parian Marble has succumbed to the vulgar Athenian version against which Herodotus (5. 55 and 123) and Thucydides (1. 20; 6. 54-9) had polemicized. Its account, at epoch 45 at least, is unreliable.

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius (Armenian version, ed. Schoene, 94, 96, 98, 100); Jerome, ed. Fotheringham, 181, 183, 185, 188. Four entries are given in each version. (a) 'Pisistratus apud Athenienses tyrannidem exerceat et in Italiam migravit' (Arm.); 'Pisistratus Atheniensium tyrannus in Italiam transgreditur' (Jerome). The name *Italia* appears to be a corruption of *Thracia* to which Pisistratus repaired during his later second exile. Eusebius dated this contemporary with the last year of Alyattes or the first years of Croesus. Probably he intended c. 561/60 or 560/59 which can be regarded as the most probable date of the first coup. (b) 'Pisistratus Atheniensium iterum imperavit' (Arm.); 'Pisistratus secunda vice Athenis regnat' (Jerome). This return of Pisistratus is variously dated in the manuscripts from c. 547 to 542/1 B.C. It is to be noticed that Eusebius implies for Pisistratus only one exile, and two periods of tyranny. It was on the strength of this fact, along with a version told by the unreliable Polyaeus (*Strat.* 1. 21. 1) who placed the 'Phye' episode during the Pallene campaign, that Beloch and Herschensohn thought that the two exiles and returns of Pisistratus were mere duplicates. We must, however, follow Herodotus and Aristotle in this matter, and they explicitly state the circumstances of the two exiles which are

quite different. (c) 'Iparchus et Ipias Atheniensium tyranni cognoscebantur' (Arm.); 'Hipparchus et Hippias Athenis tyrannidem exercent' (Jerome). The manuscripts again vary in allotting this event to various years between 529 and 521 B.C. with a preponderance in favour of c. 528/7 B.C. This year can be worked out independently of the chronographers as that of the accession of the sons and is not a subject of dispute. (d) 'Armodius et Aristogiton . . .' (Arm.); 'Harmodius et Aristogiton Hipparchum tyrannum interfecerunt et Leaea meretrix amica eorum . . .' (Jerome). The Hipparchus assassination was set in either 522 or 521 by the manuscripts. This event, however, can be fixed more reliably than almost any other sixth-century date, during the Panathenaea of 514/13 B.C. (Aug. 514). Obviously we can rely on neither the dates nor the information which is retailed by Eusebius, for exactitude.

<sup>2</sup> T. L. Shear, 'Three Women of Athens—Koisyra', *Phoenix*, xvii (1963), 104; W. den Boer, *Mnemosyne*, xx (1967), 57-8; C. W. J. Eliot, *Historia*, xvi (1967), 283 n. 24. Miss White (in an unpublished address given at Leeds in 1965 to which my attention was drawn by Mr. R. Lock of Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand, who was present and took notes) apparently still feels that the testimony of Herodotus is the best basis for considering the Pisistratid period. This is my own view.

<sup>3</sup> See M. Miller, 'The Earlier Persian Dates in Herodotus', *Klio*, xxxvii (1959), 41-5, esp. 42-3 for a table purporting to reconcile the numerals. Miller retains all the numerals in the text, as did Mathieu and Lang before her, but following Kaibel, Kiessling's edition of 1891, and Bauer, she attempts to save five or six years by taking

Procrustean process the individual numerals can be totalled up to forty-nine or fifty, the number of years which the tyranny is said to have spanned, including exiles. However, the demands of the narrative as told by Herodotus, and repeated in the *A.P.* itself, are less well served. She follows *A.P.* and allows to Pisistratus a first tyranny which seems too long (five years) to suit the events. Miller attributes to him a second tyranny of six years, which few would consider likely, in spite of *A.P.*'s numeral (*ἑβδόμῳ ἔτει*), and tortures the text of *A.P.* to give him a first exile of six years. She allocates too short a period to the third and last, more permanent, tyranny—a mere five years. Finally and most important, she, unjustifiably in the present writer's opinion, rejects Adcock's conclusion,<sup>1</sup> based on Herodotus, that the third tyranny of Pisistratus commenced c. 546 B.C. and that *A.P.*'s account has been influenced by that fact, while misunderstanding it.

A close study of the account given in Herodotus (1. 59–64; 5. 55–66) and the *A.P.* (14–19) has convinced the present writer that the first two tyrannies, separated by a brief exile, and followed by a second long exile, pursued one another in quick succession. Thus, Herodotus gives lapses of time in terms of years only for the second exile ('he returned in the eleventh year' (1. 62)) and, on Adcock's view, for the period from the Battle of Pallene until the expulsion of Hippias in 510 B.C.—36 years (5. 65). Hippias is also said to have ruled for 4 years after the murder of Hipparchus (5. 55). Herodotus is to be corrected slightly here by Thucydides (1. 20; 6. 54–9), by *A.P.* (19. 2) and Ps.-Plato (*Hipparchus* 229 b) who all make Hippias' sole rule between 3 and 4 years, but this is doing little more than dotting the i's in the account of Herodotus.

Sumner attempts to demonstrate the original chronology of *A.P.* by removing an internal inconsistency.<sup>2</sup> He does this by emending the figure for the first exile from *ἔτει δὲ δωδεκάτῳ* to *ἔτει δὲ πέμπτῳ* (*A.P.* 14. 4) in which he follows Wilamowitz and Meyer.<sup>3</sup> He claims this emendation as an absolutely certain correct reading since it makes the whole set of figures self-consistent. He further emends the total figure of forty-nine years' tyranny to thirty-six, positing in both cases an editing in ancient times of a text in which certain figures (*ε' = πέμπτῳ*; *λζ = 36*) had dropped out in the copying.

Now in the second instance Sumner's emendation has carried few people with it, probably because the total length of the Pisistratid period from

*ἔτει δὲ δωδεκάτῳ* to be the number of years elapsed since the first coup. This is an awkward, if not impossible, way of construing the Greek, since it should naturally refer to the 'twelfth year' from the intervening first expulsion. I argue below that Miller's scheme is open to the logical demand that the years of exile should total fourteen, since she makes the 36 years correspond to the total amount of all three tyrannies of Pisistratus plus that of the sons.

<sup>1</sup> F. E. Adcock, 'The Exiles of Pisistratus', *C.Q.* xviii (1924), 174–81; *C.A.H.* iv. 63 f. Adcock has been followed in this brilliant suggestion by almost all scholars in the English tradition until the recent articles mentioned above, e.g. C. Seltman, *Athens, Its Early History and Coinage* (1924), 43 n. 4; T. J. Cadoux, loc. cit. above, p. 2, n. 1;

C. Hignett, *History of the Athenian Constitution*, (Oxford, 1952), 114; A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*, 100–1; A. French, *The Growth of the Athenian Economy* (1964), 31; W. G. Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*, 180, and N. G. L. Hammond, *History of Greece to 323 B.C.* Miller has taken a retrograde step in thinking that the 36 years of Pisistratid tyranny covered the total period of power from 560/59 B.C. less the exiles.

<sup>2</sup> Sumner, loc. cit. (above, p. 2, n. 1), 37–48, esp. 38–41.

<sup>3</sup> Sumner, *ibid.* 41–8. He emends the numeral for the first exile in the papyrus text to *πέμπτῳ ἔτει*. He acknowledges that he is following Wilamowitz and Heidbüchel. Kenyon in his third edition of 1893 also follows this suggestion.

beginning to end does in fact work out at the figure given in the text, if Komeas' archonship was in 560/59 and if the exiles are included for good measure. The emendation seems to be superfluous.

In the former instance, although Sumner professes to be sparing of emendations, he carries us along in the name of self-consistency. By emending one numeral concerning the first exile, nineteen years of tyranny and fourteen years of exile are restored to Pisistratus out of his thirty-three years of natural life. One could achieve the same effect by emending two numerals, or three (that is, assuming that the figures for the first two tyrannies are also corrupt), and by stretching the elastic period of the third tyranny, which of course is nowhere given a fixed period by *A.P.* Such multiple emendations would also give a self-consistent scheme of nineteen years of tyranny, fourteen of exile, and thirty-three of life after his first coup. Sumner fixes on one emendation in this series of figures for no very good methodological reason. He also gives *no true cross-check* from the length of the exiles given at 17. 1, which is 'implied to be 14 years', but a circular argument. The whole discussion has been concerned with the working out of the first exile as of four years duration from the given figures of 19 and 33, since ten years is the generally acknowledged length of the second exile. It is then no surprise that an emendation πέμπτῳ chosen because with ἐνδεκάτῳ it gives a total of nineteen years of tyranny by subtraction from thirty-three, also by reverse subtraction gives fourteen of total exile, made up of four and ten. There is no cross check, merely circularity.

Sumner, however, does not stop here. He proceeds to try to restore the historical sequence of events behind the account in *A.P.* which is itself, he claims, wrong.<sup>1</sup> Thus he must have two stages of corruption: one before the text was written, and one in the text. He is, in the second part of his argument, prepared to jettison the credit of *A.P.* on the item concerning the second tyranny. He wants this period, reasonably, to be a period of merely a few months, or one or two years. But no explanation is attempted as to how the text of *A.P.* came to contain the figure 'in the seventh year', which on his own argument the author himself wrote.

The third recent scheme is that of Hammond.<sup>2</sup> Here the final tyranny is indeed made to commence in 546 B.C., but the second expulsion, ten years earlier, is linked with a hypothetical intervention in Athenian affairs by Sparta, on the very thin evidence of the fragmentary Rylands Papyrus 18.<sup>3</sup>

Yet a fourth interpretation of the possibilities allowed by emending the figures in *A.P.* was made by G. Sanders in 1956.<sup>4</sup> This reconstruction accepted the first three figures in *A.P.* but curiously curtailed the figure for the second period of exile from ten years to three years. This final figure is the only one

<sup>1</sup> For attempted explanations of the differences between the vulgar version of the assassination of Hipparchus, and the accounts by Herodotus, Thucydides, and *A.P.*, M. Lang, 'The Murder of Hipparchus', *Historia*, iii (1954), 395-407; C. Fornara, 'The Tradition about the Murder of Hipparchus', *Historia*, xvii (1968), 400-24.

<sup>2</sup> N. G. L. Hammond, 'Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth centuries B.C.', *Historia*, iv (1955), 393-6; 'The Philaids and the Chersonese', *C.Q.* vi (1956), 113 f.

<sup>3</sup> *F. Gr. Hist.* 105 F1 (Jacoby). Hammond tries to show that the second expulsion occurred in the ephorate of Chilon and the kingship of Anaxandridas at Sparta (i.e. 556 B.C. according to traditional dating). The papyrus, however, seems to be too fragmentary to support the conclusion that it is an expulsion of Pisistratus which is meant, and not the much better-known and later flight of Hippias in which the Spartans certainly had a hand.

<sup>4</sup> 'La Chronologie de Pisistrate', *La Nouvelle Clío* vii-ix (1955-7), 161-80.

vouched for also by Herodotus, and the historical circumstances do seem to require the lengthy period mentioned in the texts of the two authors. In short little consideration need have been given to this reconstruction had it not been accepted as the current theory, without acknowledgement of its author, by Professor Cl. Mossé. She proffers the same approximate dates, with one minor change concerning the first tyranny, in her recent monograph on the subject of ancient Greek tyranny.<sup>1</sup> Neither the detailed argument of Sanders, nor the bare presentation of the chronological framework by Mme Mossé, carries conviction.

Of former reconstructions the present writer favours the three alternative versions offered by Jacoby,<sup>2</sup> who developed Adcock's line of argument. They seem best to fulfil the historical requirements of the context, and the variants which he offers differ only in allowing a latitude of a year or two. To obtain this restoration, however, and yet to save Aristotle from the charge of having himself fallen into confusion, Jacoby laid the responsibility for the trouble at the door of the scribe of *A.P.* and emended five recalcitrant numerals in a short passage of text. As even then not all inconsistencies are removed, one might well say with von Fritz and Kapp<sup>3</sup> that part of the confusion at least does seem to go back to the writer of *A.P.* himself.

#### RECENT CHRONOLOGICAL SCHEMES FOR PISISTRATUS

Earlier ones are to be found in *R.E.* xix (1937), 'Peisistratiden', 171-2 (F. Schachermeyr).

A: M. Miller, *Clio* xxxvii (1959), 42-3

First Coup	560/59 (Komeas)
Expulsion	555/4 (Hegesias)
Second Coup	549/8
Expulsion	543/2
Third Coup	533/2 (battle of Pallene)
Death	528/7 (Philoneos)
Murder of Hipparchus	514 (August)
Expulsion of Hippias	510 (July, in archonship of Scamandrios?)

B: G. V. Sumner, *C.Q.* xi (1961), 37-49

First Coup	561/60 (Komeas)
Expulsion	556/5 (Hegesias)
Second coup	552/1
Expulsion	551/0
Third coup	541/0 (Battle of Pallene)

<sup>1</sup> *La Tyrannie dans la Grèce antique* (1969), 64.

<sup>2</sup> F. Jacoby, *Atthis*, 1949, 188-96. In a recent short note on the exile of the Alcmaeonidae P. J. Bicknell adheres to the scheme given by Jacoby, *Historia*, xix (1970), 129-30, as does J. K. Davies, *Ath. Prop. Fam.* 444. A similar line has recently been taken by P. J. Rhodes at a seminar held at Leeds University on 22 Nov. 1972. But as he accepts the emendation of the first exile to four years'

duration (as the slightest emendation to produce consistency in *A.P.*), he leaves no time whatsoever for the first and second periods of tyranny. He also has no explanation for the ordinal numerals which appear in the text of *A.P.* In fact his reconstruction requires two numerals to be emended and two to be discounted altogether.

<sup>3</sup> K. von Fritz and E. Kapp, *Constitution of Athens and Related Texts* (1961), x-xi.

Death 528/7 (Philoneos)  
 Expulsion of Hippias 511/10 (Harpaktides)

C: N. G. L. Hammond, *Historia* iv (1955), 389; *C.Q.* vi (1956), 117

First Coup 561  
 Expulsion *c.* 560?  
 Second Coup 557/6  
 Expulsion 556 (In ephorate of Chilon and kingship of Anaxandridas at Sparta?)  
 Third Coup 546 (autumn?)  
 Death 528/7  
 End of Tyranny 510

D: G. Sanders, *La Nouvelle Clío* vii-ix (1955-7), 161 ff.: Cl. Mossé, *La Tyrannie dans la Grèce antique*, 1969, 64

First Coup 561 (Komeas)  
 Expulsion 556 (Hegesias)  
 Second Coup 545  
 Expulsion 539  
 Third Coup 536 (Battle of Pallene)  
 Death of P. 528/7 (Philoneos)

E: F. Jacoby, *Atthis* 1949

	<i>1st Version</i>	<i>2nd Version</i>	<i>3rd Version</i>
First Coup (Komeas)	561/0	560/59	560/59
Expulsion (Hegestratos)	560/59	559/8	559/8
Second Coup	558/7	558/7	557/6
Expulsion	557/6	557/6	556/5
Third Coup (Pallene)	546/5	546/5	546/5
Death (Philoneos)	528/7	528/7	529/8
Expulsion of Hippias (Harpaktides)	511/10	511/10	511/10

In view of the attacks on Jacoby by Heidbüchel and Sumner, which remain unanswered, a new approach to the problems of the text seems to be called for. The suggestion presented below differs hardly at all from that of Jacoby in its historical results, but arrives at almost the same dates by a different method. Thus, instead of positing a series of emendations to the text, it is suggested that a single process was at work in the thinking of the writer of *A.P.* concerning the lengths of the first two tyrannies and the first exile (for which periods we have no evidence other than the papyrus in question). The original oral, or written, tradition, it is suggested here, attributed to the first tyranny 'five months', to the first exile 'eleven months', and to the second tyranny 'six months'. This certainly fits the quick succession of events, and might explain why Herodotus thought it unnecessary to give the insignificant lapses of time involved, if he knew them. If such precise knowledge of the chronology of events in the sixth century seems unbelievable one can refer to instances of greater precision in Herodotus.<sup>1</sup> When Aristotle or his assistant came to write his *A.P.* he may have

<sup>1</sup> The use of *μείς* to signify lapse of time in Greek narrative occurs in connection with both cardinal and ordinal numerals. By *A.P.* (13) the archon Damasias was said to have



been influenced by the length of the second exile, specified by Herodotus (1. 62 διὰ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτεος) and repeated by himself (§ 15 ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει), and may consequently have emended this tradition to a course of events in terms of years.

An interesting possible parallel to this proposed confusion is the case of the Athenian intervention in the Sacred War (448/7 B.C.) on behalf of the Phocians. This event is known to us from Thucydides (1. 112. 5) and (with indication of the time lapse between the Lacedaemonian and the Athenian interventions) from Philochorus (F. 34).

ὕστερον δὲ τρίτῳ ἔτει τοῦ πρώτου πολέμου Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ὑπὲρ Φωκέων, καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀπέδωκαν Φωκεῦσι.

The suggestion that τρίτῳ ἔτει may be a corruption of τρίτῳ μηνί is as old as Clinton; it certainly would make much more sense of the train of events since they all happened in one campaigning season.<sup>1</sup>

It should be pointed out that the emendation μηνί for ἔτει was suggested many years ago for individual entries—for the first or the second tyranny.<sup>2</sup> What is new here is to suggest it for all three entries in the *A.P.* before the final exile. It is not to be seen as an emendation to the papyrus text, but rather as a suggestion as to what the local historical tradition may have contained before it encountered the rationalizing mind of the writer of *A.P.* or some earlier Attid historian.

This 'emendation' fits the fairly rapid succession of events far better than the same numerals of *A.P.* in terms of years, which at times seem to combat his own wording about the insecurity or brevity of these first phases of tyranny or exile. But still more interesting is the fact that, starting from a first coup dated to 560/59 B.C. in the archonship of Komeas,<sup>3</sup> the sequence fits exactly the time available down to the Second Return and Battle of Pallene. This battle can be dated about spring 546 B.C., some months before the fall of Sardis (Hdt. 1. 84) which probably occurred in Oct./Nov. of that year.<sup>4</sup> It is a weakness of Miller's

held on to office 'for two years and two months'. Herodotus (4. 44) says of the fleet of Scylax sailing westwards around Arabia, πρὸς ἑσπέρην πλέοντες τριηκοστῷ μηνί ἀπικνεύονται. It is clear that such and greater precision was retained in the tradition for some events in the sixth century. Herodotus speaks of the agreement of Hippias to withdraw from Athens within five days (5. 65). Sardis fell after a siege of fourteen days (1. 84). Thucydides (2. 21) gives a certain example of μηνί with an ordinal numeral for an event in the later fifth century, whether the numeral is correct or corrupt. Given the general practice that ordinal numerals were used with the unit of months, there seems no real reason why the Greek form should be considered unidiomatic.

<sup>1</sup> F. Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.* III B, 328, F34. I owe this parallel to the reader of *C.Q.* who kindly drew my attention to it.

<sup>2</sup> H. Pomtow, *Rh. Mus.* li (1896), 560 f.

<sup>3</sup> The year 560/59 was thought to be the

more likely by Miller. T. J. Cadoux preferred 561/60, although he recognized that 560/59 was possible, loc. cit. 104 f.

<sup>4</sup> Herodotus 1. 84–5. For recent attempts to fix the fall of Sardis, H. Kaletsch, 'Zur Lydischen Chronologie', *Historia*, vii (1958), esp. pp. 39–47; M. Miller, 'The Herodotean Croesus', *Klio*, xliii (1963), 75–6, and 'Herodotus as Chronographer', *Klio*, xlvii (1965), 109–28. In the past it has been dated in 546 or to 541 B.C. More lately the date Oct./Nov. 547 B.C. has become fashionable. Some scholars accept the Nabonidus Chronicle (discussed in the above-mentioned articles) as referring to the destruction of Lydian power by Cyrus. There is the difficulty that the king of Lu?—mentioned in the Chronicle—is said to have been killed by Cyrus and he may have resided in a direction distinct from Sardis, near Arbela. For a list of a number of scholars who have reservations concerning the reference of the Nabonidus Chronicle entry to the fall of

and Sumner's schemes that both put Pallene several years *after* the fall of Sardis and Croesus, although it is a basic point of Herodotus (1. 59) that the battle occurred before Croesus' campaign beyond the Halys (summer 546).

It was, as we have seen, Sumner's argument (following Wilamowitz and Heibüchel) that the first exile must have lasted four years and that the text must have originally read *πέμπτω ἔτει*. This was obtained by simple subtraction from *A.P.*'s summing up that Pisistratus ruled for nineteen out of thirty-three years (17. 1). Therefore the total number of years of exile might appear to have been fourteen. Since the second exile lasted ten years, therefore the first one lasted four years. This argument seems unanswerable, but it is so only for those who take the nineteen years to cover all three periods of tyranny. It is true that *A.P.* seems to do so, but there is good reason to think that he may not fully have reconciled data from different sources. Not least is the fact that his ordinal numerals add up to thirty-three years as they stand without any emendation at all, and they do seem to account for the rest of Pisistratus' natural life.

If, with Adcock, we realize that Herodotus intended his thirty-six years of tyranny to include only the consecutive years to which the sons succeeded (19 + 17), then Pisistratus must have had in fact a period of total rule (including the first two spells of power) which exceeded nineteen years, and consequently the two exiles totalled less than fourteen years. But the second exile is fixed at between ten and eleven years (Herodotus 7. 62), therefore the first exile will have lasted considerably less than four years, which is consistent with our table (see below).

It may be noted that Miller's reconstruction, which is subject to the necessity of assigning four years to the first exile, since she does take the nineteen years to cover all three periods of tyranny, in fact gives to that period the too-long period of six years. This discrepancy helps to destroy Miller's otherwise impressive table of calculated dates. On the other hand Sumner's argument seems to be based on the wrong belief that the first exile must at all events have been of four years duration. There is no such logical necessity, and in fact this emendation, which seeks to establish complete consistency, sacrifices the obvious but incomplete consistency in *A.P.*'s text as it stands.

I insert at this point a set of tables setting out a revised chronology based on the substitution *μηνί* for *ἔτει*.

#### SUGGESTED CHRONOLOGY

c. 605–600 B.C.	Birth of Pisistratus.
c. 575–70	Marriage of P. to an Athenian woman.
c. 575–70	Births of Hippias and Hipparchus.
566 (trad.)	First Panathenaea.
c. 565–60	Successes of P. at Salamis and Nisaea. Friendship with Solon?

Sardis, see C. W. J. Eliot, *Historia*, xvi (1967), 284 n. 24. If Sardis fell in 546 B.C. then there is time for Croesus to discover the Athenians under a tyranny and the Spartans newly strengthened by victories over Tegea. The year 546 has the greater traditional

support among the chronographers, and the only modern scholar who is inclined to assign the capture of Sardis to 541/0 B.C. is S. Mazzarino, *Fra Oriente e Occidente* (1947), 162–4.

- 560/59 (April 559?)  
Ol. 55. 1 First coup and decree of Aristion. (*A.P.* 14. 1)  
Archon Komeas.
- 559/8 (Sept. 559?)  
Ol. 55. 2 First expulsion. Archon Hegesias, perhaps the  
same as Hegestratus.<sup>1</sup> (*A.P.* 14. 3 *ἔκτω μηνί*)  
Death of Solon early in the archon year.
- 559-558 During exile, marriage to the Argive woman  
Timonassa? Birth of Hegesistratus?
- 558/7 (Aug. 558?)  
Ol. 55. 3 Second coup. Archon unknown. Phye episode  
and marriage to Megacles' daughter, Koisyra.  
Perhaps the Phye story is a reflection of P.'s use of  
the Panathenaic procession in August. (*A.P.* 14. 4  
*μηνὶ δὲ δωδεκάτῳ*)
- 558/7 (Mar. 557?)  
Ol. 55. 3 Break with Megacles and second expulsion.  
Archon unknown. (*A.P.* 14. 4 *μηνὶ μάλιστα*  
*ἑβδόμῳ*)
- 548/7  
Ol. 58. 1 Temple of Apollo burned, allegedly by P. Archon  
Erxikleides. P. perhaps in central Greece prior to  
his return to Athens. (Herodotus 2. 180; Philo-  
chorus, *Fr. G. H.* IIIB F 115; Pausanias, 1. 5. 8)
- 547/6 (Feb./March 546?) Third coup of P. and battle of Pallene. Archon  
unknown. (Herodotus 1. 62 *διὰ ἑνδεκάτου ἔτους*,  
*A.P.* 15. 3. *ἑνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει*)  
Note: the second exile was not ten years but a  
little short of eleven years.
- 528/7 (First half of 527?)  
Ol. 63. 1 Death of P. Archon Philoneos. P. died after 19  
years of consecutive rule. (*A.P.* 17. 1. *ἔτη διέμεινεν*  
*ἑνὸς δέοντα ἑξοσὶ*)  
Note: *A.P.* did not himself take it to be consecu-  
tive rule from 546 B.C. since he adds *ἔφεινγε γὰρ*  
*τὰ λοιπά*.
- 514/13 (Aug. 514)  
Ol. 66. 3 Assassination of Hipparchus at the Panathenaea.  
Archon unknown.
- 511/510 (June/July 510?)  
Ol. 67. 2 Expulsion of Hippias, after the second expedition  
of the season. Archon Harpaktides. (*A.P.* 19. 2  
*ἔτει δὲ τετάρτῳ μάλιστα*: 19. 6 *ἔτη μάλιστα ἑπτα-*  
*καίδεκα*)  
Note: the archon year 511/10 is favoured by T. J.  
Cadoux over 510/09.
- Sept. 490  
Ol. 72. 3 Battle of Marathon  
'In the twentieth year' (Thuc. 6. 59. 4).

<sup>1</sup> Cadoux, loc. cit., 108, and Sumner, loc. cit., 47 n. 1, declined to believe that the archon Hegesias could be a corruption of Hegestratus, as was suggested by Pomtow, *Rh. Mus.* li (1895), 565, and by Jacoby, *Atthis*, 1949, 378 n. 143. Perhaps there were indeed two such archons but the *A.P.* might

well have transferred events of the one year to the later year, because the author believed that the first tyranny lasted several years. It is unlikely that an expulsion decree dated by Hegesias' name survived the subsequent tyranny of Pisistratus to be used as evidence by the fourth-century B.C. writers.

A: *Total Period of Tyranny at Athens*

49 years (*A.P.* 19. 6); 50 (Eratosthenes, schol. Aristophanes, *Vespae* 502). 41 (Aristophanes of Byzantium, schol. *Vespae* 502).

40 years of Pisistratid faction (Isocrates 16. 26), referring to 547–508?

Suggested period: Komeas archon 560/59 to Harpaktides archon 511/10.

B: *Life of P. after first coup*

33 years (Aristotle, *Pol.* 1315<sup>b</sup>), 33 (*A.P.* 17. 1); 33 or 34 (Justin 2. 8. 10).

Suggested Period: Komeas archon 560/59–Philoneos archon 528/7. This is

32 years but *A.P.* has counted the last year of P. and the first of Hippias twice ( $33 + 17 = 49$ ).

C: *Period of Tyranny from Pallene*

36 years (Herodotus 5. 65, acc. to Adcock's interpretation); 35 (Aristotle, *Politics* 1315<sup>b</sup>, a misinterpretation of Herodotus?), 36 (*A.P.* 19).

Suggested Period: six or seven months before the fall of Sardis 546 until the archonship of Harpaktides 511/10 B.C. (36 years).

D: *Length of P.'s reign from Pallene*

17 years (Aristotle, *Pol.* 1315<sup>b</sup>), 19 (*A.P.* 19. 1). Suggested period: early 546–528/7 (Archon Philoneos). (19 is the more correct later version.)

Thus, following Adcock's and Jacoby's lead, and with one adjustment to *A.P.*, we are able to reconstruct a story which fits the historical account and which explains satisfactorily the few numerals found in Herodotus. It also explains how the increasingly precise data in Aristotle's *Politics* and the *A.P.* may have been arrived at, including a possible source of the misunderstanding. It is especially to be noticed that these dates fit exactly between 560/59 and 511/10 B.C., even though the third tyranny is not an unknown quantity to be expanded or contracted at will. All scholars who reject Adcock's view are free to do this, in order to accommodate their emended numerals. In other words, using only the numerals found in the text of *A.P.*, the number of months and years said to have elapsed fits the time available, and a reasonable framework for the events is arrived at.

A significant point is that the length of the third and most important tyranny of Pisistratus is not known or transmitted by Aristotle in the *Politics* or by *A.P.* This is best explained by the supposition that *A.P.* misunderstood the thirty-six years of tyranny mentioned by Herodotus. He did not deliberately correct Herodotus, *pace* Sumner,<sup>1</sup> for he would have openly stated that he was doing so. Herodotus intended to refer to the continuous tyranny 546–510 B.C. Since *A.P.* clearly took the thirty-six years to include also the earlier brief periods of power enjoyed by Pisistratus, he naturally lost all knowledge of the length of the third tyranny. Certainly the text of *A.P.* does give figures for all the periods of tyranny and exile with that most important exception. Further, the sum of the first two tyrannies and the two exiles given in the text does by normal Greek

<sup>1</sup> Sumner, loc. cit. 46, comes to the opposite conclusion that the version given by Aristotle and *A.P.* was not a false interpretation as Heidbüchel suggested, loc. cit. 79, but 'a deliberate reinterpretation'. Yet

*A.P.* does not criticize the tale as told by Herodotus as we should expect of an ancient author. I rather follow Heidbüchel on this point.

inclusive reckoning total thirty-three years. This is the extent of Pisistratus' life after the first coup in the archonship of Komeas 560/59 B.C., until his death in 528/7 B.C. It was this fact, that *A.P.* left no room in its calculations for the third and longest period of tyranny, which first led scholars to emend the numerals. But, as we have already seen, it is not they which require emending.<sup>1</sup>

Rather the confusion is to be explained as having been caused by the author of *A.P.* failing to reconcile fully the 36 years mentioned by Herodotus (expanded by others into component parts of 19 years + 17 years) with a separate oral, or written, Attid tradition concerning the lengths of the earlier tyrannies and exile which was given in ordinal numerals. In particular he failed to observe that the figures he transmitted did not give 19 years of tyranny and, by subtraction, the 14 years of exile which full consistency required if the 19 were to cover all periods of the tyranny. Our argument is that Herodotus either did not know these data concerning the length of the earlier tyrannies or that he ignored them knowing them to be very brief periods, with the exception of the second exile. The writer of *A.P.* or his Attidographer source, on the other hand, got hold of the local tradition concerning the length of these periods, and converted the months into units of years. He thought himself confirmed in so doing because by inclusive reckoning the numerals accounted for the rest of Pisistratus' life from 560/59 B.C.

The reason why *A.P.* could leave out of account the all-important third tyranny is a curious and characteristic one. He was surely misled into this by the fact that Herodotus nowhere describes it at length.<sup>2</sup> The vicissitudes of

<sup>1</sup> The numerals are written in full in two clear hands on the papyrus which dates from c. A.D. 70–100. The better of the two scribes was still at work in sections 14–19. Of course, in the original text or in any of the intermediate copies, the numerals may have been in acrophonics and much more liable to become corrupt. Some ingenious emendations of the ordinal numerals depend on this latest supposition, although D. M. Lewis doubts that acrophonics were used for ordinals, *Historia*, xi (1953), 415. Jacoby suggested on palaeographic grounds the emendation 11 for Δ11 (i.e. δευτέρω for δωδεκάτω ἔτει). Thus his interpretation of the text and of the history behind it differs little from that put forward by me now since it is proposed to substitute 'in the twelfth month' for the return after the first exile. This is only a few months less than the version as Jacoby gives it. For favourable comments on the quality of the papyrus text, Jacoby, *op. cit.* 194; Sumner, 37–8.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus was in general no fanatic for chronology. He presents us with a mass of relative chronological material covering the whole Greek and much of the Near Eastern world, presenting king-lists, and correlations between contemporaries or successive generations. Yet he gives only one absolute date in the whole of his history (8. 51) where Xerxes crosses into Europe and four months

later appears in Attica, Καλλιάδew ἀρχοντας. This year, 480/79, appears to be a base line for Herodotus from which he worked backwards (7. 7; 7. 20. 1). Thucydides is also useful in the matter of the relative chronology of the fall of Hippias, the battles of Marathon and Salamis, and other sixth-century events such as the first alliance of Plataea with Athens, which took place probably during the Pisistratid tyranny in 519 B.C. (3. 68. 5; 6. 59. 4). But Thucydides was also influenced by the new fashion for fixing events, particularly contemporary ones, by archon years (2. 2) and other Greek magistracies. He showed himself to be fully aware of the difficulties involved in working out the chronology even for the immediately preceding fifty years. He criticises Hellanicus (1. 97. 2) and himself puts up a performance scarcely better in the 'Pentekontaetia' than Herodotus had done for the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. (1. 89–117) in spite of his criticisms of his great predecessor (1. 20. 3). The new interest in dates as such seems to have arisen in the latter part of the fifth century B.C., with such historians as Hellanicus and the compiler of Olympic lists, Hippias of Elis. It is instructive that that good ancient scholar Plutarch was very sceptical of the early items in these lists (Plutarch, *Numa*, 1). The archon dates in the *A.P.* are the product of the same tendency

Pisistratus' career are fully told, up to the battle of Pallene, by him in Book 1, but the next full account of the tyrant family at Athens is taken up at a much later point (5. 55-66). The death of Pisistratus and the accession of the sons is dealt with later still in the work as a part of the family history of the Philadae (6. 103). Other events concerning the Pisistratidae are to be found elsewhere in the History; Hegesistratus appears at 5. 94; Pisistratus himself is either in his first period of tyranny, or in his third, at the time of Miltiades' departure for the Chersonesus at 6. 35. Thus, Herodotus' consecutive account is broken at this crucial point (battle of Pallene), and the Atthidographers and *A.P.* concentrated on filling the chronological gaps in the account in Book 1. That is, they gave exact dates to the relative chronology offered by Herodotus' account in a way very characteristic of the writers of the late fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

If this *was* the process, there is still the question whence came the ordinal numerals found in the text of *A.P.* Of course, they may have been invented to fill a gap in the absolute chronology. This would not have been foreign to the practice of the followers of Hippias of Elis. But as we are dealing with Athens in the mid sixth century, from which date archon lists were surely in existence, and as some of these archon years appear in the course of the narrative, perhaps there is more than invention of these numerals 'out of the air'.

Adcock believed that the numerals 6th and 12th and 7th and 11th might be doublets of figures for the same events, that is for the sum of the first two tyrannies and the first exile (five years or six years) and for the second exile (eleven or ten). But, with Gomme, we can find a difficulty in such figures 'creeping into the text' from a marginal note which has no basis.<sup>1</sup> There is no known variant of the second exile lasting eleven years (all the sources specify 'in the eleventh year'), so this theory of alternatives finding their way into the text seems unlikely, especially when the whole succession of ordinal numerals seems to be designed to account for thirty-three years, not to be a chance sum of two sets of doublets.

Our alternative, that the source of these numerals was a local tradition that the first tyranny lasted into the sixth month, the first exile into the twelfth month, and the second tyranny into the seventh month, gives a chronological framework which fits the years 560/59-546 B.C. and a possible explanation of how that original framework was expanded to fill the whole period from 546-528/7 as well. The writer of *A.P.* was quite capable of presenting us with muddles, and irreconcilable data; the career of Themistocles (*A.P.* 25) is another case in point.

Other events in the panorama of sixth century Greek history given by Herodotus fit satisfactorily into this chronological scheme. Miltiades the Elder (Hdt. 6. 34) went out to the Thracian Chersonesus at the invitation of the Dolonkoi, leaving an Athens where Pisistratus held total power (εἶχε μὲν τὸ πᾶν κράτος) but he himself held some sway (ἀτὰρ ἐδυνάστευε καὶ Μιλτιάδης). This situation might well suit the brief first or second periods of Pisistratus' tyranny. Certainly, the eventful career of Miltiades (before he was captured by the men of Lampascus and freed on King Croesus' representation) will fit better between 559 or 558 B.C. and 546 B.C., than into the mere few months of

among the Atthidographers. Cf. F. Jacoby, *Atthis*, 1949, *passim*; H. Strasburger, 'Herodots Zeitrechnung,' *Historia*, v (1956), 129-61;

M. Miller, *Klio* xliii (1965), 109-25; W. den Boer, *Mnemosyne*, xx (1967), 30-60.

<sup>1</sup> Gomme, *J.H.S.* xlvii (1926), 173-8.

546, between Pisistratus' third coup and Croesus' downfall. Both Miller and Sumner would also have to put Miltiades' emigration to Thrace in the first or second tyrannies of Pisistratus, since on their views the third tyranny began years after the fall of Sardis.

Secondly, the careers of the Alcmaeonidae, Alcmaeon and Megacles (Hdt. 6. 125-31). Miller turned upside down the normally held chronological sequence of Alcmaeon and Megacles, supposing that Megacles may have enriched his family through his wedding with Agariste (*c.* 580-70) before his father was enriched by Croesus in the 550s. This is perverse overturning of Herodotus' order of events. Alcmaeon more naturally fits into the generation of Solon and Cleisthenes of Sicyon, but he might well have lived on until the early years of Croesus in 560 B.C. or at least to that potentate's governorship in Adramyttion, which he held before succeeding to the throne. Megacles would be the later head of the family who succeeded him as leader of the Coast party, a rival of, and briefly a collaborator with, Pisistratus (*c.* 559, 558 B.C.).

The third point is the career of Kimon Koalemus (6. 103), both in exile and at Athens. He won three Olympic victories, (536, 532, 528 B.C., or 532, 528, 524 B.C.), the second of which he yielded to Pisistratus, and the third of which led to his death at the hands of Hippias and Hipparchus through jealousy (after 527 B.C.). This man's career is hard to reconcile with Miller's scheme bringing Pisistratus back to power only in 533/2 B.C. By 524 B.C. the younger Miltiades was 'archon' at Athens as the archon list proves, and this office was probably given to him to hide the secret enmity for his father which Herodotus says had led Hippias and Hipparchus to have him murdered.

A further point lies in the history of Argos. It is known that this city aided Pisistratus in his final return to Athens with a considerable army, and this must have occurred not long before the enquiries which King Croesus made in Greece concerning Athens and Sparta. Several months later, by late in 546 B.C., both Croesus and Argos had been utterly defeated by Persia and Sparta. On our reconstruction, with the battle of Pallene early in 546 B.C., Argos would still be strong and confident to aid a friend back to power. When Sumner would have the battle occur, however, she would be in a much weakened state (*c.* 541 B.C.) and the same would probably be true of the date favoured by Miller (533/2 B.C.). By far the most likely date for Argos to intervene in central Greek affairs independently of Sparta would be shortly before her crushing defeat and loss of the Thyreaté territory to Sparta in the year of the fall of Sardis.

No real help in the matter of chronology can be derived from the subsequent careers of the tyrant Lygdamis of Naxos (1. 64) who probably ruled *c.* 545-525 B.C., and of Polycrates of Samos (Hdt. 3. 39-46, 54-8, 120-5) whose dates are in themselves disputed (*c.* 540-523 B.C.). The former was a supporter of Pisistratus at the battle of Pallene and in turn was aided to power by him in Naxos. Later, Lygdamis helped Polycrates into the tyranny on Samos. As the latter became notorious for his sea power he probably ruled for at least fifteen years. It is not likely that the chain of aid from Pisistratus to Lygdamis started as late as 533/2 B.C. when Miller places the third coup of Pisistratus. If anything, the probable dates of these two Ionian tyrants point to an earlier battle of Pallene.

The activities of Callias the tyrant-hater (6. 121) who purchased goods and chattels belonging to the Pisistratids when they were in exile is of even less use in confirming the dates of the tyrannies themselves. They belong to some time at the start of Pisistratus' second enforced absence which cannot be determined.

It has already been seen that the year 546 B.C. was extremely crowded with events. This was so for the Greeks (Argives, Spartans, and Athenians). But these years were equally so for King Croesus. After taking alarm from the fall of the Median King Astyages (c. 554 or 550) (Hdt. 1. 46), Croesus sent to the Greek oracles to test them, then sent gifts to Delphi, Sparta, and to the Theban shrine of Amphiaraus (1. 50, 69, 52). He then consulted the favoured oracles again and gave the Delphians a money gift of two staters each (1. 54). The Delphians responded by giving to Croesus the first place in consulting their oracle and Croesus sent a third embassy to Delphi (1. 54, 55). All this diplomatic activity must have taken two or three years at least, and the time might well have come down to c. 547/6 B.C. It was at this point that Croesus learned of Athens' recent subjection to the tyrant, and of Sparta's growing power after the conclusion of the Tegean War (1. 63-8). He naturally asked for an alliance with Sparta, which was accepted. They had a bronze bowl made for him, which none the less did not reach him before the fall of Sardis late in the year. Meantime in the same season he had marched into Cappadocia, had retreated, and had been besieged, and Sparta had won a glorious victory in the Thyreat War with Argos (1. 82). This latter chain of events leading from the Spartan alliance with Croesus, and the tyrant's recent victory at Athens, might just fit into the campaigning season (March-October/November) in the one year 546 B.C. The course of events as described by Herodotus is given without indication of time elapsed, but the Spartan gift of the cauldron, which failed to reach Croesus before his downfall, should have been dispatched as promptly as it could be commissioned in his honour and be made by the bronze-smith. The period from spring to late autumn 546 B.C. is not unreasonable for this.

There remain three prosopographical difficulties which are made much of by those who deny that a date as early as 546 B.C. is possible for Pisistratus' final *coup d'état*.<sup>1</sup> These concern the ages of Hippias at Marathon, of Hipparchus at the Panathenaea of 514, and of the half-brother Hegesistratus at Pallene. To take the last case first. On our dating, Hegesistratus, if born during the first tyranny or first period of exile, would have been only a boy at the battle. On Miller's dating he could be in his twenties, and on Sumner's scheme he could be in his late teens. In what sense might he have brought 1,000 Argives to aid his father? Surely, it is a reasonable interpretation that they followed him out of loyalty to his mother's family (and also for pay), since he was the son of Pisistratus and Timonassa, an Argive woman of noble birth. He need not have been of age to lead troops in the battle line. There is no doubt that he was much younger than Hippias and Hipparchus; he was later made governor of Sigeum when his father had won it from the Lesbians, and he may have been identical with the Thessalus who started a love quarrel with the family of Harmodius in 514 B.C. (A.P. 18. 1).<sup>2</sup> It may be that his very name ('leader of the host') led to the tradition that he personally led an army from his mother's city. At any rate

<sup>1</sup> M. Lang, loc. cit. (above, p. 2, n. 2), 66-7; Miller and Sumner, loc. cit. The point here is that according to Herodotus (1. 61), Hippias and Hipparchus were 'youths' old enough to object to the father's marriage with Megacles' daughter. Therefore they should have been born fifteen to twenty years before that event. See now J. K. Davies, *Ath. Prop. Fam.* 445-8.

<sup>2</sup> Davies distinguishes Thettalos from Hegesistratus, following Thucydides' statement (5. 55. 1) that the former was a γνήσιος brother of Hippias and Hipparchus, while Hegesistratus was the non-citizen son by an Argive wife (Hdt. 5. 94. 1). He believes that A.P. (17. 3-4 and 18. 2) has conflated the two (*Ath. Prop. Fam.* 448-9).



one cannot rule out an early date for Pallene on the strength of his presumed age.

The second difficulty is in the age of Hipparchus, if *he* was the provoker of the love quarrel in 514 B.C. as Thucydides says, and not Hegesistratus/Thessalos. If he was already a young man on his exile from Athens ten years before the battle of Pallene (Hdt. 1. 61) then he must have been born *c.* 575–570 and have been at least sixty to sixty-five years of age in 514 B.C. This is perhaps not too old to have been pestering a youth for his favours, if indeed he was responsible.

Finally, there is a problem of the same kind with Hippias, also no doubt a young adult at the time of the second exile. He was still alive at the battle of Marathon in 490 B.C., some fifty-six years later, on our date for Pallene, and twenty years after his own expulsion from Athens. Thus his life breaks into 19+17+20 plus the minimum period for a man to reach adulthood before 556 B.C., say fifteen to twenty years. This would put Hippias at eighty to eighty-five years of age when he returned to Athens in 490 B.C. Herodotus relates that he was aged (*πρεσβύτερος*), and he did sneeze out his teeth when disembarking (6. 107). Later he died on his way back to Asia Minor of old age and disappointment. If the romantic story told by Kleidemos is true (*F. Gr. Hist.* 323 F 15, Jacoby) that after the second coup Hipparchus married Phye, and Hippias married the daughter of Kharmos of Kollytus (*c.* 558/7 B.C.), then there is additional reason for believing that Hipparchus was about 60 in 514 B.C. and Hippias 80 in 490. But such stories are largely worthless, and were often entirely invented. However, it is worth stating even so that the ages to which the Pisistratids then lived are not impossible.<sup>1</sup> The family was a tough one.

All these cases are in some sense inconclusive. They leave it open that the battle of Pallene could have taken place *c.* 546 B.C. or somewhat later, *c.* 540 B.C. Yet the synchronism of the fall of Croesus with the battle of Pallene (and the Argive participation in the latter), and the swift course of the Spartan alliance with Croesus, all seem to point to the earlier date, *c.* 546 B.C. Difficulties raised by the ages of Pisistratus' sons in 546, 514, and 490 B.C. are less crucial than the basic order of things in Herodotus, which recent chronological schemes have set aside. When the incomplete consistency of the figures presented by *A.P.* is recognized (due to his misunderstanding of Herodotus' data on the length of the tyranny), then the case for the early battle of Pallene seems to be very strong.

If our view of what happened in the Atthid tradition is correct, the months of Pisistratus' early ins and outs became years, in a very typically Atthid attitude to facts. But if it seems preferable to believe that there were no reliable data for the first two tyrannies and exile, but only invention by Atthidographers, then the position for us remains little different. The period available is only some three years or over, for the second exile lasted between ten and eleven years. Thus there remains little over a matter of months for each period, which yields the same historical result as would our emendation. These dates are, however,

<sup>1</sup> Gomme, loc. cit. 174, and note 7. Lucian in his treatise *Makrobioi* has an interesting section (10–17) on princes who lived to an active old age. Among these were Ateas and Hieron of Syracuse. Hippias himself does not figure in the fairly long list, probably

because neither Herodotus nor *A.P.* gives his exact age when he died. He was, however, *πρεσβύτερος* (Hdt. 6. 107, supported by Thuc. 6. 59. 4) and was the son of a tough father who also lived to a ripe old age (*A.P.* 17. 1).

considerably different from those current in the specialist journals of the last twenty years, as this writer has been at pains to point out. The burden of this paper is to urge a return to the history implied by Jacoby's set of dates, but to avoid his emendation of a series of numerals in the text of *A.P.*

*University of Otago, New Zealand*

J. G. F. HIND

#### ADDENDUM

Since this article went to press, another attempt at Pisistratid reconstruction has appeared, James S. Ruebel, 'The Tyrannies of Peisistratos', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, xiv, no. 2 (1973), 125-36. His solution is identical to that of Mrs. Miller discussed above, although he does not appear to know her article (see p. 4 n. 3 and p. 7, above). The only difference is that Pisistratus' first coup is placed in 561/0 B.C. and so all his dates are one year earlier than those given by Miller. Ruebel makes up Pisistratus' nineteen years from  $6+7+6$ , but can only make this work by using a mixture of inclusive reckoning for the first two, and exclusive reckoning for the third.