

PISISTRATID CHRONOLOGY AGAIN

P. J. RHODES

SINCE THE PUBLICATION of the *Athenaion Politeia*, in 1891, the problems of Pisistratid chronology have been endlessly discussed; "inclusive" and "exclusive" methods of counting have been combined in many permutations, emendations of *A.P.*'s text have abounded, and the principles involved have sometimes been obscured. In offering yet another discussion I hope to make these principles clear, and at any rate to narrow the range of possibilities.¹

Now, as in 1891, four texts are of major importance: Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristotle's *Politics*, and *A.P.* I briefly summarise what they tell us.

Herodotus gives no indication of when Pisistratus first seized power; he was first expelled *μετὰ . . . οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον*, with his tyranny *οὐ κω κάρτα ἐρριζωμένην* (1.60.1); for his second seizure of power there is again no indication; his second exile was due to his refusal to beget children by Megacles' daughter (1.61.1–2), so we should expect that again to be after a fairly short time; his third and final seizure of power occurred *διὰ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτεος* (1.62.1), and the implication of the whole digression in 1.53 sqq. is that this preceded the outbreak of the war in which Croesus of Lydia fell to Cyrus; Pisistratus' death is not mentioned. Hipparchus was killed when sending off the Panathenaic procession (5.56); the

¹Drafts of this paper have been read by Prof. A. Andrewes and Dr R. Ball, and Dr Ball has helped me over the fall of Sardis; an early version was read to an inter-university seminar in Leeds, and criticised by Hind (cf. below), 7 n. 2. I am grateful to all who have helped me to improve it (though I should not wish any one except myself to be blamed for the opinions expressed), and to the University of Durham, which from its Research Fund and Sabbatical Leave Fund has supported me in the work on the *Athenaion Politeia* of which this paper is a by-product.

I refer to the *Athenaion Politeia* and its author as *A.P.*, and cite the following by author's name only: F. G. Kenyon (ed.), *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens* (London: 1st and 2nd edd., 1891; 3rd ed., 1892); F. E. Adcock, "The Exiles of Pisistratus," *CQ* 18 (1924) 174–181; A. W. Gomme, "Two Notes on the *Constitution of Athens*, ii," *JHS* 46 (1926) 173–178; T. J. Cadoux, "The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hysichides," *JHS* 68 (1948) 70–123, esp. 104–113; N. G. L. Hammond, "Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.," *Historia* 4 (1955) 371–411, esp. 381–396; G. Sanders, "La Chronologie de Pisistrate: essai d'interprétation," *NouvClio* 7–9 (1955–7) 161–179; F. Heidbüchel, "Die Chronologie der Peisistratiden in der Atthis," *Philologus* 101 (1957) 70–89; M. Miller, "The Earlier Persian Dates in Herodotus," *Klio* 37 (1959) 29–52, esp. 42–46; G. V. Sumner, "Notes on Chronological Problems in the Aristotelian 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία,'" *CQ* 11 (1961) 31–54, esp. 37–48; J. S. Ruebel, "The Tyrannies of Peisistratos," *GRBS* 14 (1973) 125–136; J. G. F. Hind, "The 'Tyrannis' and the Exiles of Pisistratus," *CQ* 24 (1974) 1–18.

tyranny continued ἐπ' ἔτεα τέσσαρα (5.55); Hippias and his family were then expelled ἀρξαντες . . . 'Αθηναίων ἐπ' ἔτεα ἕξ τε καὶ τριήκοντα (5.65.3).

Thucydides states explicitly that it was at the Great Panathenaea that Hipparchus was killed (6.56.2); Hippias continued to rule ἔτη τρία . . . ἔτι and was deposed ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ (6.59.4); he came to Marathon with the Persians ὕστερον ἔτει εἰκοστῷ (*ibid.*). The Four Hundred were established ἐπ' ἔτει ἑκατοστῷ μάλιστα ἐπειδὴ οἱ τύραννοι κατελύθησαν (8.68.4).

In Aristotle's *Politics* we read that Pisistratus ἐν ἔτεσι τριάκοντα καὶ τρισὶν ἑπτακαίδεκα ἔτη τούτων ἐτυράννησεν, ὀκτωκαίδεκα δὲ οἱ παῖδες, ὥστε τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ πέντε (5.1315b31–34).

The London papyrus of *A.P.* gives us the following series of events: Pisistratus first seized power ἔτει δευτέρῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ μετὰ τὴν τῶν νόμων θέσιν, ἐπὶ Κωμέου ἄρχοντος (14.1); he was first expelled οὐπω . . . τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐρριζωμένης, . . . ἔκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὴν πρώτην κατάστασιν, ἐφ' Ἡγησίου ἄρχοντος (14.3); he seized power for the second time ἔτει . . . δωδεκάτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα (14.4); he was expelled for the second time ἔτει μάλιστα ἐβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον, after ruling οὐ . . . πολὺν χρόνον and failing to have intercourse with Megacles' daughter (15.1); he seized power for the third time ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει (15.2); and died ἐπὶ Φιλόνεω ἄρχοντος, ἀφ' οὗ μὲν κατέστη τὸ πρῶτον τύραννος ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ τρία βιώσας, ἀ δ' ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ διέμεινεν ἐνὸς δέοντα εἴκοσι (17.1); Hipparchus was killed τοῖς Παναθηναίοις (18.3); Hippias was expelled ἔτει . . . τετάρτῳ μάλιστα μετὰ τὸν Ἰππάρχου θάνατον (19.2), ἐπὶ Ἀρπακτίδου ἄρχοντος, . . . μετὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς τελευτὴν ἔτη μάλιστα ἑπτακαίδεκα, τὰ δὲ σύμπαντα σὺν οἷς ὁ πατὴρ ἦρξεν ἐνὸς δεῖ πεντήκοντα (19.6); Cleisthenes carried his laws ἔτει τετάρτῳ μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων κατάλυσιν, ἐπὶ Ἰσαγόρου ἄρχοντος (21.1); Marathon was fought ἐπὶ Φαινίππου ἄρχοντος (22.3).² The Four Hundred were established ἐπὶ Καλλίου μὲν ἄρχοντος, ἔτεσιν δ' ὕστερον τῆς τῶν τυράννων ἐκβολῆς μάλιστα ἑκατόν (32.2).

When the Greeks used ordinal numerals their standard method of reckoning was to include both terminal points. Athens and Sparta made the Thirty Years' Peace in 446/5, and began the Peloponnesian War in 432/1: "fourteen years afterwards," we should say, but Thucydides says τέσσαρα μὲν γὰρ καὶ δέκα ἔτη ἐνέμειναν αἱ τριακοντούτεες σπονδαὶ . . . τῷ δὲ πέμπτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει . . . (2.2.1). This is normal practice, and (though some scholars have invoked "exclusive" counting in some places to remove difficulties) there is no good reason to believe that *A.P.* ever departed from it. Cardinal numerals are slightly more difficult. Certainly they could be used, and frequently were used, as in the passage from Thucydides just quoted: one state of affairs persisted for so many years,

²The papyrus' text of *A.P.* 22.1–3 allows too few years between the archonships of Isagoras (508/7) and Phaenippus (490/89). Kenyon proposed to substitute ὀγδόῳ for πέμπτῳ in 22.2, thus placing Hermocreon in 501/0, and no alternative solution has been proposed which is clearly better: cf. Cadoux 115–116.

but in the next year there was a change and a different state of affairs came about; that is, the year in which a state of affairs began is included in the reckoning but the year in which it ended is not. There are, however, a few texts in which the use of cardinals seems not to fit that pattern. Irrespective of when Philip of Macedon was actually killed and when Alexander the Great was first actually recognised as having succeeded him,³ Alexander's reign was regularly expressed in terms of Athenian archons as Pythodelus (336/5)—Hegesias (324/3); its precise length was said to be twelve years and seven or eight months (Diod. Sic. 17.117.5, Arr. *Anab.* 7.28.1): when this has to be given as a whole number of years, Diodorus says ἐν ἔτεσι . . . δώδεκα (17.1.4), but another writer, while agreeing with the other sources on the terminal years, says ἀρξας ἔτη δέκα τρία (*P. Oxy.* 1.12 = *FGrHist* 255, §9 cf. §6). We may say of the latter either that he has rounded up to the nearer whole number or that he has used the cardinal numeral as the ordinals are used (Alexander died in the thirteenth year of his reign): the practical implications are the same.⁴ So, when we look at our sources' accounts of the interval between the killing of Hipparchus (early 514/3) and the expulsion of Hippias (511/0),⁵ we find that Thucydides uses the cardinal and ordinal as he did for the duration of the Thirty Years' Peace (ἔτη τρία . . . ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ), *A.P.* uses the ordinal alone (ἔτει . . . τετάρτῳ μάλιστα), and [Plato], *Hipparchus* 229b3–4 uses the corresponding cardinal alone (τρία ἔτη); but Herodotus says ἐπ' ἔτεα τέσσερα—and we may say either that he has rounded up to four years a period that may well have been more nearly four years than three or that he has used the cardinal as the ordinals are used, to include both terminal years. There is some room for confusion—if we had Herodotus alone we should not be certain whether Hippias was expelled “after three years” or “after four years”—but we must not exaggerate the uncertainties, and we are not at liberty to make writers alternate arbitrarily between “inclusive” and “exclusive” counting to reach the totals which we think they ought to reach.⁶

In *A.P.*, which provides our fullest set of chronological data, the reader will most naturally assume that the interval before each of the fixed points has been reckoned from the fixed point immediately preced-

³See, conveniently, K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² 3.2 (Berlin/Leipzig 1923) 59–60.

⁴In *A.P.* 33.1 μῆνας . . . ἵσως τέτταρας is applied to a period of about three and a half months: cf. 32.1.

⁵I believe that these two dates were known, as archontic dates, and not disputed (except by those who wished to suggest that the killing of Hipparchus led immediately to the downfall of the tyranny); for different explanations of the four accounts see Hammond 384–385, Miller 42.

⁶For a glaring example of this see Ruebel 133–134, supposing that 19 years of tyranny were obtained by reckoning the first two periods in one way but the third in a different way.

ing, and (since the intervals are expressed by means of ordinals) includes both terminal years; the summary figures, expressed by means of cardinals, have most probably been obtained by deducting one from each of the ordinals in the series (a Greek should have been able to proceed automatically from *ἔτει τετάρτῳ* to *ἔτη τρία*) and adding together the resulting figures. If this is so, and strong arguments would be needed to show that it is not so, something has gone wrong at two points.⁷

First, the figures for the separate periods in Pisistratus' own career conflict with the summary figures in 17.1 (and leave an implausibly short time for the third period of tyranny, whose duration *A.P.* has not specified). The totals in 17.1 appear to be sound, since the figure of 33 years is given also by the *Politics*, and the difference between *A.P.*'s 19 years and the *Politics*' 17 years is most easily explained on the assumption that different methods of reckoning have been applied to the same data.⁸ With no figure for Pisistratus' third period of tyranny, we cannot check the figures for the first two periods against the total; but if the 33 years and the 19 years are both correct we have 14 years left for Pisistratus' periods of exile, whereas the separate figures given in 14.4 and 15.2 amount to 21 years; the figure for the second exile is supported by Herodotus, but that for the first is unsupported. The simplest way to restore consistency to *A.P.*'s account (and to allow a plausible length of time for the third period of tyranny) is to suppose that the figure for the first period of exile in 14.4 is corrupt, and that for *δωδεκάτῳ* we should read *πέμπτῳ*:⁹ this is not the only place in *A.P.* where a numeral has been corrupted.¹⁰ This solution has not been widely accepted: many have emended *A.P.*'s text far more drastically, to obtain agreement with Herodotus;¹¹ a few have argued that we ought if possible to make sense of *A.P.*'s text without emending it at all. Unnecessary emendation

⁷The interval between the archonships of Solon (594/3) and Comeas (561/0: cf. n. 41, below) need not be discussed at length here: *A.P.* 14.1 says *ἔτει δευτέρῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ*, and this is best explained by supposing that the correct figure would be *τετάρτῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ* but either the text has been corrupted or *A.P.* was led by the intervening troubles over the archonship to make a mistake in his reckoning.

⁸*A.P.* will with his cardinal numerals have excluded the year in which each state of affairs came to an end; the *Politics* will have had the duration-figures *ἔτη πέντε* and *ἔτη ἑνδεκα* for the two periods of exile and by reckoning the sum of these as 16 years will have allowed too little time for the three periods of tyranny. (It would not remove the difficulty in *A.P.* 17.1 if for the 19 years we were to substitute the *Politics*' 17.)

⁹First proposed by Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin 1893) 1.22–3; accepted by Kenyon³ on *A.P.* 14.4 and more recently by Heidbüchel 85 with n. 3, Sumner 40 with n. 3.

¹⁰Cf. 22.2 (n. 2, above); 22.8 with Cadoux 118–119; 34.1 with Kenyon *ad loc.*, Sumner 31–33.

¹¹Cf. p. 223 with n. 22, below.

should of course be avoided (it is a sin to which historians are perhaps especially tempted, believing that they have discovered the truth and that their text must have told the truth), but manuscript texts are not always sound, and it is better to emend a numeral than to cling to an explanation which imposes greater strains on one's credulity. Some have suggested that once but only once *A.P.* departed from the practice which he normally followed both in these chapters and elsewhere, and calculated an interval not from the fixed point immediately before it but from the fixed point before that:¹² this is most improbable in itself, and in each solution attempted on these lines unnatural methods of reckoning have to be postulated to obtain the totals of 17.1. Hind argues that the inconsistency in *A.P.* is authentic, and that in combining material from different sources *A.P.* failed to realise that his summary figures in 17.1 were incompatible with his figures for the two periods of exile in 14.4 and 15.2.¹³ Now it is true that *A.P.* experienced difficulty in combining material from different sources, and that in the chapters under discussion he has at least combined a narrative drawn from Herodotus with chronological material derived from elsewhere. Hind's theory, however, requires two sources of figures in addition to Herodotus, disagreeing and not properly reconciled by *A.P.*; I think it far likelier that *A.P.* drew on a source which had a fully worked-out and consistent chronological scheme, and that the consistency has been lost by textual corruption. If we emend in 14.4 we can restore consistency with a single textual change: this is not demonstrably correct, but on the data available to us it should be accepted as probable. *A.P.*'s chronological scheme will then have dated Pisistratus' three periods of tyranny 561/0–556/5, 552/1–546/5 and 536/5–528/7, followed by the killing of Hipparchus in 514/3 and the expulsion of Hippias in 511/0.

In 19.6 the papyrus' figure for τὰ . . . σύμπαντα σὺν οἷς ὁ πατὴρ ἤρξεν is

¹²Miller and Ruebel, taking up a suggestion of A. Bauer, *Literarische und historische Forschungen zu Aristoteles 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία* (Munich 1891) 50–1, base slightly different chronological schemes on the assumption that δωδεκάτῳ in 14.4 is reckoned from the first coup; Sanders supposes that ἐνδεκάτῳ in 15.2 (and ἐνδεκάτου in Herodotus) is reckoned from the second coup.

¹³Hind 12–14. He attempts to save the 33 years by supposing them to be the total of the four ordinals in 14.3, 14.4, 15.1 and 15.2, with no allowance for the third period of tyranny; but a Greek will have known what his ordinal numerals meant and ought not to have added them in that way.

In Hdt. 8.43–48, on the Greek fleet at Salamis, the total is greater than the sum of the items, but this is perhaps to be resolved by emendation in 46.1. In Diod. Sic. 17.17.3–4, on the army with which Alexander the Great invaded Asia, the totals are less than the sums of the items: again some emend, but others have thought that Diodorus may have been careless in combining figures from different sources (e.g. P. A. Brunt, *JHS* 83 [1963] 33).

49 years. If *A.P.* was consistent in his methods of reckoning in the Pisistratid chapters his figure for the interval between Pisistratus' first *coup* and Hippias' expulsion should have been 50 years;¹⁴ some have postulated "inclusive" counting and have made the easier correction to 51;¹⁵ others defend the 49.¹⁶ But Sumner was surely right to object that τὰ . . . σύμπαντα σὺν οἷς ὁ πατήρ ἤρξεν should mean not the whole period from the first *coup* to the expulsion of Hippias but the total extent of the tyranny within that period: in the *Politics* this is 17 + 18 = 35 years, and in *A.P.* it should be 19 + 17 = 36 years. Presumably, as Sumner suggests, the correct figure fell out and the doubly incorrect 49 was supplied by some one who misunderstood the text.¹⁷

The figure of 36 years is found in Herodotus, who says that Hippias and his family were expelled after ruling for 36 years—but the most natural interpretation of that is that 36 years was the duration of the continuous tyranny, from Pisistratus' third and final *coup* to Hippias' expulsion.¹⁸ He implies that the third *coup* preceded the fall of Sardis: 546/5 was certainly a date for the fall of Sardis that was current in antiquity, and it is far from certain that any alternative date was current;¹⁹ almost certainly it was well known that Hippias was expelled in 511/0 (scarcely any one has doubted this date²⁰), and if we reckon back 36 years from 511/0 we arrive at 546/5 (if both terminal years are included) or 547/6. Like *A.P.* Herodotus places Pisistratus' third *coup* in the eleventh year after his second expulsion, implying that that occurred in 556/5 or 557/6. For the earlier episodes he gives no chronological information, but his narrative suggests that both of the first two periods of tyranny were short—and *A.P.* has faithfully reproduced Herodotus' narrative, although it is hard to reconcile that with his chronological scheme. Herodotus has not given a complete scheme, but the details that he does give point to a scheme very different from that of *A.P.*²¹

¹⁴50 years was the total given by Eratosthenes, 241 F 40 *ap. schol. Ar. Vesp.* 502 (500 Dindorf); the same scholium quotes "Aristotle's" figure as 41.

¹⁵E.g., Jacoby, *Athis* (Oxford 1949) 373–374 n. 107; 51 years is the total of the figures in the *Politics*.

¹⁶E.g., Gomme 177–178; Miller 43; Hind 5–6.

¹⁷Sumner 41. See also Wilamowitz (above, note 9) 1.23, Heidbüchel 86, for ways in which the interpolator could have arrived at his figure of 49.

¹⁸Said to have been first asserted by M. Herschensohn, *Philologischeskoye Obozreniye* 10 (1896) 119–123; reaffirmed by Adcock 175–176, and accepted by most subsequent writers (for exceptions see n. 23, below).

¹⁹See pp. 230–231, below.

²⁰But Hammond 384–385, and Miller 42, argue for 510/09.

²¹Cf. Adcock 175–176 (his use of the word "interpolation" is unfortunate), Heidbüchel, Sumner. I forbear to discuss how long a "short" period of tyranny may be, or how long a tyranny requires to be "rooted": the narrative common to Herodotus and *A.P.* surely requires that the first two periods of tyranny should be short and the third much longer.

This conflict is inevitable if we make the minimum of correction in *A.P.* to obtain a consistent account, and I believe that it should be accepted as authentic. Many have believed that the chronology deducible from Herodotus is correct and that *A.P.* must have agreed with Herodotus: but to secure this agreement they have to make so many changes in *A.P.*'s text, and can achieve their desired result with such a variety of different changes, that if what *A.P.* wrote was in agreement with Herodotus we can only conclude that the text has been hopelessly corrupted, its original state is irrecoverable, and it must be abandoned as unusable.²² Others suppose that *A.P.* as they emend or interpret him is correct, and bring Herodotus into line with *A.P.* by arguing that his 36 years cover not the continuous tyranny but the whole extent of the tyranny:²³ but it seems unlikely that this is what Herodotus meant, or that the duration of the whole tyranny rather than of the continuous tyranny would have been remembered. More subtly, Hind claims to reconcile *A.P.* with Herodotus not by emending but by supposing that the first three intervals—for the first tyranny, the first exile and the second tyranny—were originally remembered as so many months but *A.P.* or an Atthidographer before him wrongly recorded them as so many years.²⁴ We have already seen that Hind has to convict *A.P.* of not providing the $19 + 14 = 33$ years required by his summary figures in 17.1; he has to suppose also that *A.P.* misinterpreted the 36 years (applied by Herodotus to the continuous tyranny) and applied them to the whole tyranny. This "agreement" is scarcely worth fighting for: Hind admits that what *A.P.* actually wrote is not in agreement with Herodotus; what remains to be done is to determine the correct chronology and explain how the incorrect came into being.

The following table summarises the results that we have obtained so far: archons' names are in capital letters; information deduced from other material in the same column is enclosed in square brackets.

The account which we are given by Herodotus depends on oral tradition; the complete scheme which we have in *A.P.* is presumably derived from an *Atthis* (perhaps ultimately that of Hellanicus), and the crucial question is, what authority the Atthidographers had for their scheme. Sceptics believe that they had none: they had Herodotus and on the significance of the 36 years misunderstood him, and beyond that they allocated a generation to Pisistratus and half a generation to Hippias, and had 511/0 for the expulsion of Hippias as a single fixed date to make

²²Jacoby (above, note 15) 188–196 with 370–380, will serve as an example: he concludes that in *A.P.* "out of seven numbers relating to intervals five must be altered;" only two "are certainly sound, and both occur in Herodotos" (194).

²³E.g., Sanders, Miller, Ruebel; cf. Gomme 177.

²⁴Hind 8–12.

	Herodotus	Thucydides	Arist. <i>Pol.</i>	<i>A.P.</i>
Reforms of Solon				SOLON, 594/3
Pisistratus' first seizure of power				"in 32nd year" (error for 34th), COMEAS, 561/0 (14.1)
First expulsion	after short time (1.60.1)			after short time, in 6th year, HEGESIAS, 556/5 (14.3)
Second seizure of power				"in 12th year" [corrupted from 5th, 552/1] (14.4)
Second expulsion	(after short time) (1.61.1-2)			after short time, in 7th year, [546/5] (15.1)
Third seizure of power	in 11th year (1.62.1), before war ending in fall of Sardis (1.53 sqq.), trad. date 546/5			in 11th year, [536/5] (15.2)
Pisistratus' death				[in 9th year], PHILONEOS, 528/7 (17.1)
Years in power			17	19
Years in exile			[16]	[14]
Years from first seizure of power to death			33 (5.1315 b31-4)	33 (17.1)
Assassination of Hipparchus	Panathenaea (5.56)	Great Pan- athenaea (6.56.2)		Panathenaea [514/3] (18.3)
Expulsion of Hippias	after 4 years (5.55)	in 4th year (6.59.4)		in 4th year, HARPACTIDES, 511/0 (19.2,6)
Years of Hippias' rule			18 (<i>ibid.</i>)	17 (19.6)
Years of tyranny in all	36 (5.65.3)		35 (<i>ibid.</i>)	"49" [corrupted from 36] (19.6)

Reforms of Cleisthenes		in 4th year, ISAGORAS, 508/7 (21.1)
Battle of Marathon	in 20th year from expulsion of Hippias (6.59.4)	PHAENIPPUS, 490/89 (22.3) (ISAGORAS—HERMO- CREON—PHAENIPPUS corrupt, 22.1-3)
Institution of Four Hundred	about 100th year after end of tyranny (8.68.4)	CALLIAS, 412/1, about 100 years after end of tyranny (32.2)

their relative chronology absolute; what they could not deduce from Herodotus they supplied by arbitrary construction.²⁵ Underlying the sceptics' view is the doctrine that there can have been no good oral tradition which did not find its way into the pages of Herodotus: "Wenn Herodot im Jahre 445 in Athen keine exakten Angaben für die Zeit vor Pallene fand, wie soll sie Hellanikos eine Generation später gefunden haben?"²⁶ The doctrine has only to be stated openly, however, for its improbability to be seen: it is most unlikely that the "publication" of Herodotus' history immediately killed all pieces of tradition which were not included in it; and although Herodotus recorded the chronological information that he was given, as he recorded other information that he was given,²⁷ he wrote before the publication of the archon list, and he lacked Hellanicus' interest in systematic chronology. It is entirely possible that Herodotus omitted to ask some questions to which he could have discovered the answers, and to which Hellanicus did discover the answers, and we are not justified in rejecting automatically all information that was in the *Atthides* but not in Herodotus or Thucydides. In principle we should be prepared to find some authentic dates in the *Atthides*: though it was Hellanicus who first realised that an annalistic history of Athens could be based on the archon list, the realisation was surely made possible by the fact that some important events were already remembered as having occurred in particular archontic years.²⁸

²⁵This sceptical view is elegantly expressed by Heidbüchel; the idea of a generation count was first suggested by Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² 1.2 (Strassburg 1913) 160-162, cf. 291, and has been explored also by M. L. Lang, *ATP* 75 (1954) 59-73.

²⁶Heidbüchel 80; similar views have been expounded in England by C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford 1952) 1-32, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* (Oxford 1963) 7-25.

²⁷Cf. Hdt. 2.123.1, 3.9.2, 4.195.2, 7.152.3.

²⁸Cf. S. S. Markianos, *Historia* 23 (1974) 4 n. 13; W. H. Plommer, "The Tyranny of the Archon List," *CR*² 19 (1969) 126-129, is too pessimistic.

Sumner makes a more sophisticated attempt to assess the worth of *A.P.*'s material. He believes that the 36 years of tyranny were misunderstood by Herodotus and correctly understood by the Atthidographers; but, noticing the tension between the implied shortness of the second period of tyranny in the narrative repeated by *A.P.* from Herodotus and *A.P.*'s duration-figure of $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota \dots \epsilon\beta\delta\delta\acute{o}\mu\omega$ (curiously he is less impressed by the tension between the alleged shortness of the first period of tyranny and $\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega \epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota$), he proposes to make the second period of exile run from 551/0 or 550/49 to 541/0 or 540/39; with this adjustment he believes that *A.P.*'s scheme is correct. To justify his reconstruction he supposes that the Atthidographers did have some authentic material in addition to Herodotus, and that their authentic material may be recognised by the use of an archon's name; but indications of time which are neither derived from Herodotus nor guaranteed by an archon are based simply on theoretical reconstruction. This formula is as unsatisfactory as Heidbüchel's scepticism. *A.P.* 22 has a chronological scheme running from Cleisthenes' reforms to the invasion of Xerxes, and quotes both intervals of time and names of archons: it happens that no archon's name is directly attached to any of the ostracisms of the 480's,²⁹ and that the name is not given of the third $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu \tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\omega\nu \phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ to be ostracised;³⁰ but here the explanation must surely not be that "there merely was no authority, literary or documentary, for attaching the archon's name to the event."³¹ Ostracism was as likely to generate an official document as any other item in that chapter, and since the victim of ostracism had to leave Athens for a specified period a dated document was more necessary in the case of ostracism than in the other cases. Had he chosen to do so, *A.P.* could probably have named all the archons relevant to chapter 22, and the man ostracised in 486/5 also: but he chose not to do so, probably for no better reason than to avoid the monotony of a list.³² In his Pisistratid chapters *A.P.* gives an archontic date for Hippias' expulsion but not for Hipparchus' murder, but it is most unlikely that one of these dates was considered certain but the other not.³³ Hellanicus and his successors had a complete list of archons for the sixth century, and a complete chronological scheme for the

²⁹But twice an archon's name is attached to another event, followed by the record of an ostracism in the same year.

³⁰H. B. Mattingly, *Univ. of Leeds Rev.* 14 (1971) 282, believes that *A.P.* did name this man and the text of 22.6 is defective.

³¹Sumner 46, on the chronology of the tyranny.

³²Cf. 28.2, where I believe that Themistocles is to be regarded as democratic and Aristides as aristocratic (in contrast to 23.3) and that *A.P.* has made his meaning unclear by his avoidance of monotony.

³³Noted by Gomme 176 as an obstacle to the view that the dates to which an archon's name are attached are the more secure.

tyranny: even if the whole of their earlier history was not cast in an-alistic form,³⁴ it is overwhelmingly likely that they assigned each episode in the history of the tyranny to an archontic year,³⁵ perhaps giving some duration-figures as well. *A.P.* is not an *Atthis*: it must have had at any rate literary authority, the authority of an *Atthis*, for the archontic dates which it omits as well as for those which it includes, and it would be unsafe to assume that the dates which it does include were chosen because they were the best attested.

Hind, as we have seen, agrees with Heidbüchel that the 36 years were interpreted correctly by Herodotus and incorrectly by the Atthidographers, but supposes that intervals remembered as so many months were mistakenly recorded as so many years, and that with this mistake corrected *A.P.*'s intervals between one fixed point and the next are all correct. That intervals of so many months should have been remembered is possible (though I know no parallel in Greek writing for a series of such intervals);³⁶ but Hind gives no adequate reason for the change from months to years, and we have seen that his account involves other improbabilities. Comprehensive formulae for interpreting the Atthidographic tradition are not to be trusted, and each date must be judged on its merits.

The later dates in the series are almost universally accepted, and the case for them need not be presented again: Pisistratus died in 528/7, Hipparchus was killed in 514/3, and Hippias was expelled in 511/0; it is not evidence of theoretical reconstruction but simply coincidence that Hippias ruled for half a generation.³⁷ On the date of the third *coup*

³⁴Suggested by Cadoux 80–81; A. E. Raubitschek, *ClMed* 19 (1958) 105–106, argues that the *Atthis* of Androtion (from which *A.P.*'s account of ostracism is derived) treated the first ostracisms not year by year but in a single list.

³⁵Cf. Jacoby (above, note 15) 90–96 with 306–310, *FGrHist* 3b, Supp. 1.14–19 with 2.10–18.

³⁶The mss of Arist. *Pol.* 5. 1315b22–26 give the duration of the tyranny in Corinth as $30 + 44 + 3 = 73$ years 6 months (editors correct Periander's 44 years to $40\frac{1}{2}$). Of the fifth-century tyrants in Syracuse Hieron is given 11 years 8 months by Diod. Sic. 11.38.7, 11 years by Diod. Sic. 11.66.4, and 10 years by Arist. *Pol.* 5. 1315b37; Thrasybulus is given 1 year by Diod. Sic. 11.66.4 but τῷ ἐνδεκάτῳ μηνὶ ἐξέπεσεν according to Arist. *Pol.* 5. 1315b38 (see W. S. Barrett, *JHS* 93 [1973] 31–33). In 215–214 Hieronymus reigned μῆνας οὐ πλείους τριῶν καὶ δέκα (Polyb. 7.7.3). *A.P.* 13.2 gives 2 years 2 months for the illegally prolonged archonship of Damasias in the 580's; and 33.1 gives 4 months for the rule of the Four Hundred in 411. It has been suggested that years should be emended to months in Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.7 (A. Andrewes, *JHS* 73 [1953] 2 n. 1) and Philochorus 328 F 34b; for the reign of Alexander the Great see p. 000, above. M. B. Wallace reminds me that the duration of a siege was frequently remembered as so many months. For events of the fifth and later centuries accurate records were no doubt available.

³⁷Thucydides' 20 years between Hippias' expulsion and Marathon must be a round number, while his 100 years between Hippias' expulsion and the institution of the Four Hundred (though qualified with μάλιστα) are exact. Unlike Hammond 381–385, I

Herodotus (546/5 or 547/6 if we reckon from 511/0³⁸) and *A.P.* (536/5) conflict, and despite what I have said above in answer to the sceptics I have no hesitation in preferring Herodotus. *A.P.* repeats from Herodotus the narrative which suggests that the first two periods of tyranny were short (but adds figures which do not make those periods very short); it seems an irresistible coincidence that Herodotus has 36 years of continuous tyranny while *A.P.* has 36 years of tyranny in all, and it is surely the continuous tyranny rather than the whole extent of the tyranny whose duration is likely to have been remembered. It is therefore very likely (as Heibüchel suggested) that the Atthidographers misunderstood Herodotus and drew up their scheme on the assumption that the whole extent of the tyranny amounted to 36 years, and they they had no other authority for their later dating of the third *coup*: because it is wrongly derived from Herodotus (but not simply because it is different from Herodotus) *A.P.*'s later date is to be rejected. The second exile, Herodotus and *A.P.* agree, ended in the eleventh year; so we may accept the implication of Herodotus and date Pisistratus' second expulsion 557/6 or 556/5³⁹ and his third seizure of power 547/6 or 546/5.⁴⁰

In *A.P.*'s scheme the only date earlier than 556/5 is 561/0,⁴¹ the year assigned to Pisistratus' first *coup*. Nothing can be done to demonstrate that this detail is or is not authentic. 561/0 is a 33-year generation before Pisistratus' death in 528/7, but the fact that Hippias' half-generation is authentic could be used on either side of the argument. However, the year when Pisistratus first tried to make himself tyrant is a detail which could well have been remembered, and though not certain this date should be given the benefit of the doubt. If 561/0 is the date of the first *coup*, and 557/6 or 556/5 is the date of the second expulsion, there

believe that for events before the Peloponnesian War Thucydides normally reckoned by archontic years, because no other kind of dating was available. Cf. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford 1945) 132, 389–394.

³⁸Since he uses the cardinal numeral we cannot be sure which of these years is implied.

³⁹Hammond, 394 and *CQ*² 6 (1956) 49–51, tries to confirm the date of 556/5 from *PRyl.* 18 = *FGrHist* 105 F 1, col. 2, 11–12, but his interpretation of the papyrus is unconvincing.

⁴⁰M. F. McGregor, *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 18–21, suggests that the Phormio *μετὰ Σόλωνα ἄρχας* of schol. Ar. *Pax* 347 should be restored in Meiggs & Lewis, 6b, col. 2, 6, as the archon of 546/5, remembered because his was the year of Pisistratus' final *coup*—which is possible but very far from certain. I suspect that Herodotus' attachment of the rise of Pisistratus to the fall of Sardis points to 546/5 as the date of the final *coup*: cf. pp. 232–233, below.

⁴¹This, rather than 560/59, must be *A.P.*'s date if he was consistent in his method of reckoning in these chapters; it is also likely that 561/0 rather than 560/59 is the date implied by *Marm. Par.* (*FGrHist* 239) A 40, since by placing Comeas in 561/0, Hegesias in 556/5 and Euthydemus in 555/4 we obtain a series of "orthodox" dates ending at A 40 and a series of "unorthodox" dates beginning at A 41 (cf. Cadoux 83–86, 106–109); on the interval between the archonships of Solon and Comeas see n. 7, above.

remain only two serious possibilities for the intervening period: either all three intervals in the scheme are alike invented, or tradition preserved the length of the first exile as it preserved the length of the second but the first and second periods of tyranny were too short for their duration to be remembered. On the latter view the first period of exile will have run from 561/0 or 560/59 to 557/6 or 556/5.⁴² I do not insist on this chronology, but it is possible and would accord with the Herodotean narrative; several other scholars have arrived by different routes at a similar chronology; if it is not accepted the only reasonable alternative is to admit with Heidbüchel that we cannot recover the earlier dates in the sequence. The scheme constructed by the Atthidographers cannot be completely explained; but if the dates implied by Herodotus for the second expulsion and third *coup* are (or were thought by his readers to be) 556/5 and 546/5 I suspect it is no coincidence that these appear in the Atthidographers' scheme though attached to different episodes: these dates, or at any rate 546/5, may have been extracted from Herodotus and regarded as elements which had to be accommodated somewhere in the scheme. A second table will summarise my conclusions:

	implied by Hdt.	Atthido- graphers	P.J.R.
First <i>coup</i>		561/0	561/0?
First expulsion		556/5	(561/0 or 560/59??)
Second <i>coup</i>		552/1	(557/6 or 556/5??)
Second expulsion	557/6 or 556/5	546/5	556/5?
Third <i>coup</i>	547/6 or 546/5	536/5	546/5?
Death of Pisistratus		528/7	528/7
Murder of Hipparchus	514/3	514/3	514/3
Expulsion of Hippias	511/0	511/0	511/0

Various further points have been raised by scholars wishing to show that it is or is not possible that Pisistratus' third *coup* was as early as 546/5: the ages of Pisistratus' sons, the tyrannies of Lygdamis of Naxos and Polycrates of Samos, the careers of Miltiades son of Cypselus and Cimon son of Stesagoras, and the fall of Sardis. There is no need to rehearse all the arguments again:⁴³ none makes it impossible that the third *coup* should have been as early as 546/5, though the ages of Pisistratus' sons would prevent us from dating it significantly earlier than that.

⁴²Despite the criticism of Hind 7 n. 2, I do not of course leave "no time whatsoever" for a period of tyranny when I suggest (as he too does: p. 11) that it began and ended within the same archontic year.

A little more may be said about the fall of Sardis, to which Herodotus has attached his digression on Pisistratus' rise to power. Jacoby denied that any synchronism was intended;⁴⁴ Sumner stresses that what Herodotus implied is that Pisistratus' third *coup* took place before Croesus began his war against Cyrus (but himself believes that the third *coup* was in fact several years later);⁴⁵ Hind places the third *coup* in 547/6 and the fall of Sardis in 546/5,⁴⁶ which requires a very tight schedule but is perhaps not impossible. Now it is most likely that the date determined by Apollodorus for the fall of Sardis, and accepted by later chronographers, was 546/5; and there is no clear evidence of an alternative tradition.⁴⁷ In *Marm. Par.* (*FGrHist* 239) A 42 Jacoby restored 541/0,⁴⁸ but he was certainly mistaken: we cannot know what *Marm. Par.*'s date was, but on internal evidence alone we should expect a date not long after its date for Croesus' embassy to Delphi (555/4: A 41), and rather earlier than Apollodorus' date. The *Nabonidus Chronicle* records under 547/6 a war of Cyrus against the king of Lu—, whom he killed; but according to Herodotus (1.86–90) and almost all other sources Cyrus spared Croesus' life,⁴⁹ so almost certainly the *Chronicle* does not refer to the conquest of Lydia. If we try to estimate the actual date of the fall of Sardis from Herodotus' narrative, our starting-point must be Cyrus' overthrow of Astyages (1.107–130), dated by the *Nabonidus Chronicle* to 550: after that (1.46.1) Croesus set about testing Greek oracles and acquiring Greek allies; he invaded Cappadocia and fought an indecisive battle, and was pursued to Sardis when he thought there would be no more fighting until the next spring; a bronze bowl made for Croesus by his newly-acquired allies the Spartans was sent too late to reach him (1.46–58, 69–86.1). Croesus' explorations and preparations could have taken until 546; there is no need to suppose that they lasted longer, and they could well have been accomplished more quickly.⁵⁰

⁴⁴For a brief review of the arguments see Hind 14–17 (but I cannot share his readiness to tolerate the account of Thessalus in *A.P.* 18.2).

⁴⁵*Atthis* 371–372 n. 100.

⁴⁶Sumner 45–46. At 42–43 n. 4 he succinctly reviews dates suggested for the fall of Sardis, concluding as I do that there is no clear evidence for a date other than 546/5.

⁴⁷Hind 9 with nn. 4, 16.

⁴⁸The best pointer is Sosicrates *ap.* Diog. Laert. 1.95; other texts point to a date within the range 548/7–546/5.

⁴⁹He restored 277, but probably this section of *Marm. Par.* used “unorthodox” dating and the equivalent of 541/0 would be 278: cf. n. 41, above.

⁵⁰But according to Bacchylides 3.23–63, Croesus was carried off from the pyre to the Hyperboreans by Apollo; a story of Croesus on a pyre was known to the vase-painter Myson, of the early fifth century (J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase Painters*² [Oxford 1963] 1. 238, no. 1). On the *Nabonidus Chronicle*, see now Postscript, below 233.

⁵⁰Wade-Gery (*JHS* 71 [1951] 219 n. 38 = *Essays in Greek History* [Oxford 1958] 166 n. 3) constructed an argument for 544—Herodotus synchronises the fall of Sardis

Pisistratus' third *coup* was in 546/5 or the year before, but hardly earlier than that; Cyrus' capture of Sardis was dated 546/5 by the chronographers, and can hardly have been later than that. It remains barely possible that the full implication of Herodotus' narrative is correct, that Pisistratus gained control of Athens in 547/6 (probably early in that year) and Croesus fought his war against Cyrus in 546. Alternatively I suspect that Herodotus may by his narrative method have broken an authentic synchronism, that Pisistratus' *coup* and the fall of Sardis are both to be dated to 546/5 but by telling the story of one in a digression from the other Herodotus has been led to suggest that one happened appreciably before the other.⁵¹

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

POSTSCRIPT

With the help of Professors G. V. Sumner, A. K. Grayson, and T. D. Barnes I am able to add a further note on the *Nabonidus Chronicle*. According to the standard translations of the *Chronicle* Cyrus killed the king of Lu— (S. Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon* [London 1924] 116, cf. 101; A. L. Oppenheim in J. B. Pritchard [ed.], *Ancient Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*³ [Princeton 1969] 306), but in fact the verb used may mean either “kill” or “defeat” (Chicago University Oriental Institute, *Assyrian Dictionary* 3 [1959] *s.v.* *dâku*, p. 37 no. 1.9.a and p. 41 no. 5.a: see Grayson's *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles. Texts from Cuneiform Sources* 5 [Glückstadt and Locust Valley 1975] 107). It therefore remains an open question whether Lu— is Lydia: if it were Lydia, that would point to 547 as the year of the war, and I should then be more inclined to date Pisistratus' third *coup* to 547/6 (which is compatible with Herodotus: my suggestion that Herodotus has broken an authentic synchronism could stand).

and a war between Sparta and Argos (1.82–83), which was followed by a fifty-year peace treaty (he supposed), whose expiry was promptly followed by another war between Sparta and Argos, at the same time as the fall of Miletus and therefore *ca* 494 (6.77.2)—but this is very precarious.

⁵¹In either case, if we are to retain the story of Miltiades' rescue by Croesus (Hdt. 6.34–38.1), his departure from Athens to the Chersonese must be placed in one of Pisistratus' earlier periods of tyranny: J. K. Davies, who places his departure in the final period of tyranny, dates his birth before *ca* 585 (*Athenian Propertied Families* [Oxford 1971] 299), so an earlier departure is not to be ruled out. Cf. Hind 14–15.