



TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 19, 2004

2004

WOLZHAUSEN



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 19

2004


H O L Z H A U S E N

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Gemeinsam mit:

Wolfgang Hameter und Hans Taeuber

Unter Beteiligung von:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Franziska Beutler, Sandra Hodeček, Georg Rehrenböck und Patrick Sänger

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.
Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien

maggoschitz@holzhausen.at

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob.Barbara 8.

© 2005 by Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Wien

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar

Eigentümer und Verleger: Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien

Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien,
Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.

e-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder Bernhard.Palme@univie.ac.at

Hersteller: Holzhausen Druck & Medien GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien

Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Hans T a e u b e r (Wien): Schriftenverzeichnis Peter Siewert	1
Stamatios B u s s è s (Bari): Euripides, <i>Phoenissae</i> 469 and a Consular Date (Tafel 1)	9
Livia C a p p o n i (San Marino): Petizione tolemaica contro furto e violenza (Tafel 2)	15
Gerhard D o b e s c h (Wien): Einige Beobachtungen zu Politik und Tod des Haeduers Diviciacus und seines Bruders Dumnorix	19
Armin E i c h (Passau), Peter E i c h (Köln): Thesen zur Genese des Verlautbarungsstils der spätantiken kaiserlichen Zentrale	75
Peter K o s (Ljublana): The coin legend V·O·K·K = Caesar's <i>Voccio</i> ? (Tafeln 3–4)	105
Fritz M i t t h o f (Wien): Neue Papyrusurkunden zur <i>annona militaris</i> (Tafeln 5–7)	111
Victor P a r k e r (Christ Church, NZ): Two Notes on Early Athenian History	131
Robert R o l l i n g e r (Innsbruck): Cambodunum versus Augusta Vindelicum: Zur Frage des Statthaltersitzes der Provinz Raetien im 1. Jh. n. Chr.	149
Jacek R z e p k a (Warszawa): Philip II of Macedon and 'The Garrison in Naupactus'. A Re-Interpretation of Theopompus <i>FGrHist</i> 115 F 235 ..	157
Marta S o r d i (Milano): Le <i>staseis</i> di Turi e la guerra del Peloponneso ..	167
Jean-Yves S t r a s s e r (Confolens): Inscriptions grecques et latines en l'honneur de pantomimes (Tafeln 8–9)	175
Patrick T a n s e y (Sydney): The Consuls of 22 B.C. and the <i>fasti</i> of the Late Empire	213
Christian W a l l n e r (Graz): Der <i>Agon Minervae</i> : eine Dokumentation ..	223
 Franziska B e u t l e r, Vera H o f m a n n, Ekkehard W e b e r (Wien): <i>Annona Epigraphica Austriaca</i>	 237
 Bemerkungen zu Papyri XVII (<Korr. Tyche> 505–521)	 255
 Buchbesprechungen	 263
Reinhold B i c h l e r, Robert R o l l i n g e r, <i>Herodot.</i> Hildesheim u.a. 2000 (P. Siewert: 263) — Susanne F u n k e, <i>Aiakidenmythos und epeirisches Königtum. Der Weg einer hellenischen Monarchie.</i> Stuttgart 2000 (P. Siewert: 264) — Hilmar K l i n k o t t, <i>Die Satrapienregister der Alexander- und Diadochenzeit.</i> Stuttgart 2000 (P. Sängler: 265) — Rebecca K r a w i e c, <i>Shenoute and the Women of the White Monastery. Egyptian Monasticism in Late Antiquity.</i> Oxford, New York 2002 (H. Förster: 267) — Gustav Adolf	

L e h m a n n, *Demosthenes von Athen. Ein Leben für die Freiheit*. München 2003 (O. Schmitt: 268) — Dieter M e r t e n s, *Selinus I. Die Stadt und ihre Mauern*. Rom 2003 (A. Sokolicek: 269) — Helmut M e y e r, Peter R. F r a n k e, J. S c h ä f e r, *Hausschweine in der griechisch-römischen Antike. Eine morphologische und kulturhistorische Studie*. Oldenburg 2004 (G. Dobesch: 271) — Annapaola M o s c a, *Ager Benacensis. Carta archeologica di Riva del Garda e di Arco*. Trento 2003 (M. Pedrazzi: 273) — Sigrid M r a t s c h e k, *Der Briefwechsel des Paulinus von Nola. Kommunikation und soziale Kontakte zwischen christlichen Intellektuellen*. Göttingen 2002 (M. Zelzer: 274) — Meret S t r o t h m a n n, *Augustus – Vater der republica. Zur Funktion der drei Begriffe restitutio – saeculum – pater patriae im augusteischen Principat*. Stuttgart 2000 (G. Dobesch: 276) — Christoph U l f (Hrsg.), *Ideologie – Sport – Außenseiter. Aktuelle Aspekte einer Beschäftigung mit der antiken Gesellschaft*. Innsbruck 2000 (P. Siewert: 279) — Terry W i l f o n g, *Women of Jeme. Lives in a Coptic Town in Late Antique Egypt*. Ann Arbor 2002 (H. Förster: 281)

Indices 283

Eingelangte Bücher 287

Tafeln 1–9

VICTOR PARKER

Two Notes on Early Athenian History

I. Herodotus and Thucydides on Cylon's Conspiracy

The first event in Athenian history of which we have any real knowledge is Cylon's abortive attempt to establish a tyranny. We have no reason to deny the basic outline of the story, which remained in the collective memory of the Athenians on account of the sacrilegious massacre in which Cylon's minions fell and for which the Alcmeonids received the blame. The latter had many enemies who never ceased to dredge the old story up when it became politic so to do¹.

A.

Both Herodotus and Thucydides tell us the story; later authors (Pausanias, Plutarch, et al.) we may set aside for now. We begin with a point by point comparison of the incidents involved as described by Herodotus and Thucydides:

	Hdt. 5, 70, 2-71	Thuc. 1, 126, 2-11
1.	Cleomenes, the King of Sparta, in negotiating with the Athenians, demands that the „accursed“ (ἐναγέες), i.e. the Alcmeonidae, be driven out of Athens on account of their guilt for the murder	The Spartans, in the opening gambit of negotiations on the eve of the Peloponnesian War, demand that the Athenians drive out the „curse“ of the goddess
2.	Hdt. explains, „now the accursed got their name in the following way“	Thuc. explains, „now the matter of the curse is as follows“
3.	ἦν Κύλων τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀνὴρ Ὀλυμπιονίκης	Κύλων ἦν Ἀθηναῖος ἀνὴρ Ὀλυμπιονίκης
4.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	Cylon was the son-in-law of Theagenes who was tyrant of Megara at the time
5.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	Cylon received an oracle from Delphi which told him to seize the Acropolis during the „greatest festival of Zeus“

¹ See G. W. Williams, *The Curse of the Alkmaionidai, I-III*, *Hermathena* 78 (1951) 32-49; 79 (1952) 3-21 and 58-71, for an attempt to view the complete history of this family through the lens of the story of their guilt for the massacre. For Cylon in general see, e.g., H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, München 1967, 41-43, or K. W. Welwei, *Athen*, Darmstadt 1992, 133-137.

6.	Cylon strove ἐπὶ τυραννίδι	(see Nr. 8 below)
7.	Cylon gathered a following of his contemporaries	Cylon received troops from Theagenes and persuaded his φίλοι („relations and associates“ [?]) to join him
8.	Cylon attempted to seize the Acropolis	Cylon seized the Acropolis ἐπὶ τυραννίδι
9.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	Thuc. explains how Cylon misunderstood the oracle: he failed to ask what region's most important Zeus-festival was meant
10.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	The Athenians rush in and besiege Cylon on the Acropolis
11.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	The people wearying of the siege turn matters over
12.	(See Nr. 19 below)	To the nine archons
13.	(See Nr. 20 below)	Who at that time administer most of the affairs of the Athenians
14.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	The conspirators run short of food and water
15.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	Cylon and his brother escape
16.	Being unable to gain control, Cylon sits as a suppliant beside the statue	The rest sit as suppliants at the altar
17.	The conspirators are „made to get up and go“ (ἀνίστημι) ...	The conspirators are „made to get up and go“ (ἀνίστημι)
18.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	So as to avoid their deaths in the sanctuary
19.	By the „Prytanies of the Naukrari“	(See Nr. 12 above)
20.	Who at that time governed Athens	(See Nr. 13 above)
21.	On the pledge that the conspirators would not be put to death	On condition (ἐφ' ᾧ) that „nothing evil“ would be done to them
22.	They are killed anyway	They are killed anyway
23.	(No correspondence in Herodotean account)	Some are killed at the altars of the „August Goddesses“ (i.e. the Furies or Eumenides)
24.	The Alcmeonidae are to blame	Thus did the „accursed“ (ἐναγχις) get their name; they and their descendants
25.	Final statement: This all happened before the time of Peisistratus	Final statement: Information concerning the Alcmeonids' previous exiles owing to the curse (both shortly after the event itself but also in the time of Cleomenes)

Even the mere putting of these two accounts side by side makes much apparent. The differences between them fall into two clear categories: in the first we find episodes, in the depiction of which the two historians disagree whether in nuance (Cylon attempted to seize/actually did seize the Acropolis) or in fact (the Prytanies of the Naukrari/the nine archons governed Athens at the time); in the second, instances in which one account includes an episode which is absent from the other.

B.

Let us begin with the second category. In reviewing them, a curious fact strikes: it is always Thucydides who includes an episode which we do not find in Herodotus. The reverse never occurs.

Thucydides tells the story of the Delphic oracle (Nr. 5), and how Cylon misinterpreted it (Nr. 9). Herodotus, despite his own love of oracles, does not mention it; Thucydides, who elsewhere caustically dismisses oracles², here seems to jump over his own shadow by indulging in an almost Herodotean account of how someone misunderstood a divine instruction. Like Croesus, who should have enquired as to what empire he would destroy³, Cylon should have asked a follow-up question: the greatest festival of Zeus, certainly; but in what region? The entire episode gives an Herodotean twist to the story of Cylon's fateful attempt, only it appears in Thucydides rather than in his predecessor in whose account we ought to expect to find it.

Less interesting, on the surface, are the other such episodes: Cylon's relationship to Theagenes (Nr. 4), the escape of Cylon and his brother (Nr. 15), and the slaughter of some of the conspirators at the altars of the Eumenides (Nr. 23). Let us look at what these inclusions add to the story: The relationship of Cylon to Theagenes involves Thucydides' additional statement that Cylon received military support from the Megarian tyrant (Nr. 7). The detail tantalises modern historians speculating on the border wars between Megara and Athens as well as analysts of the web of personal and familial bonds connecting the tyrants with one another⁴. But Thucydides makes nothing of this detail or of Cylon's connexion with Theagenes. Nor does the detail drive the story along: the story is self-sufficient as it appears in Herodotus. Why does Thucydides then add this information?

The same question needs to be asked of the final two such episodes. That the sacrilege involved took place at the altars of the Eumenides is an interesting detail for reconstructing how the Acropolis looked before the Peisistratid period, but again the story gains nothing: sacrilege is sacrilege, whether it occurs in regard to an object

² Thuc. 2, 54, 2–4.

³ Hdt. 1, 91, 4.

⁴ E.g. A. French, *Solon and the Megarian Question*, JHS 77 (1957) 241; L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece*, London 1976, 87; J. B. Bury, R. Meiggs, *History of Greece*, London 1983, 112 (The present author too has indulged in such speculation: *Untersuchungen zum Lelantischen Krieg und verwandten Problemen der frühgriechischen Geschichte*, Stuttgart 1997, 135). All the same, no ancient source attests Theagenes' involvement in the border wars between Athens and Megara (for which see e.g. Plut., *Solo*, 8–10; Hdt. 1, 30, 5 presumably refers to the same conflict).

sacred to Athena or to the Eumenides; murder is murder, whether it occurs at a specific place on the acropolis or not. Nor does Thucydides say that all the conspirators were killed there, only that some of them were. The sacrilege committed with regard to the rest may well have concerned Athena. The story as a whole hardly profits thereby: the detail about the altars of the Eumenides is unnecessary and this time utterly unconnected to anything else in the story. Why then does Thucydides bother to include it? Then we have the escape not just of Cylon, but also of an unnamed and totally gratuitous brother. As Cylon disappears completely from the historical record — whether he died on the Acropolis or escaped — and never again has anything to do with Athenian politics, we again wonder why Thucydides wishes us to know this. The sacrilege involved remains unaltered; and our knowledge of the early history of Athens hardly seems the richer for knowing that Cylon had a brother. And certainly Thucydides makes no use of this additional information in any way.

Finally, we come to Nrr. 10, 11, and 14. The information contained here can easily have been secondarily supplied to flesh out what Herodotus says in his account. The Athenians' initial absence on account of a festival was perhaps suggested by the story of the oracle, but could have been supplied easily enough as a *topos* anyway⁵. The initial siege by the entire populace, then the handing over of the management of the siege to the authorities are natural steps of the unfolding drama which anyone could have surmised; the same applies to the conspirators' running short of food and water.

Why then is all this additional information present in Thucydides' account? As it is well-known that Thucydides read his Herodotus carefully, one might suggest that Thucydides is here purposefully supplementing Herodotus. Let us pursue this issue further. Did Thucydides write his account with Herodotus' in mind?

C.

Even brief perusal of the above table should serve to show that this was indeed the case. To start with, we find clear correspondences in the layout of the story:

1) Both authors come to a demand by Spartan authorities for the expulsion of those affected by a curse (Nr. 1). Both then use the same type of transition to move the reader to the digression (Nr. 2), and both go on to start the story with nearly the same sentence (quoted in Nr. 3).

2) While simple consecutive narration will have stipulated that the episodes of the story had to follow the pattern of gathering supporters, seizing the acropolis, becoming trapped on the acropolis, seeking divine protection, receiving assurance of life, and being massacred anyway, this storyline did not dictate a comment on the government of the Athenians at the time in question (Nrr. 19 and 20, with 12 and 13).

3) Finally, both authors, once they have told the basic story, feel compelled to offer some details concerning how to insert the story into an outline of Athenian history. Theoretically, this information could have come in the introduction to the

⁵ Thus Polykrates (and his two brothers) allegedly seized power during a festival: Poly-aenus 1, 23, 2.

story; it hardly seems coincidence that both authors, having introduced the story in the same way, now bring conclusions of similar purpose.

Besides this structural correspondence, we find in Thucydides' account clear syntactical and verbal echoes of Herodotus'. The opening sentence of the story, already mentioned, is a clear example. In addition: ἐπὶ τυραννίδι (Hdt. 5, 71, 1; Thuc. 1, 126, 5); καταλαβεῖν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν vs. καταλαβεῖν τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἀκρόπολιν (Hdt. 71, 1; Thuc. 126, 4, cf. 5: κατέλαβε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν); ἰκέτης ἕζετο πρὸς τὸ ἄγαλμα vs. καθίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἰκέται (Hdt. 71, 1; Thuc. 126, 10); τούτους ἀνιστέασι vs. ἀναστήσαντες δὲ αὐτούς (Hdt. 71, 2; Thuc. 126, 11). While some of this phrasing may be attributed to the dictates of the story itself, surely there were other ways of describing the persuading of the conspirators to come down besides a form of ἀνίστημι — which does not necessarily even give the right idea of the negotiations which must have preceded the conspirators' actual starting to descend. They were persuaded (not made) to stand up and come down.

Finally, Thucydides' aside on the government of Athens at 126, 8 (τότε δὲ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ἔπρασσον) seems to reflect Herodotus' statement at 71, 2 (οἱ πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκράρων, οἱ περ ἔνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας) even though here the phrasing differs somewhat.

D.

Once we concede that Thucydides had Herodotus' account in front of him⁶ — whether physically unscrolled to that point or merely present in mind —, it becomes much clearer what Thucydides is doing in his account. He is engaging in a sort of historiographical one-up-man-ship.

Although Thucydides' self-imposed rivalry with Herodotus is well-documented, we may allow ourselves to list the key elements briefly: First, Thucydides, though clearly well aware of Herodotus, will not deign to mention his predecessor's name. Second, Herodotus' history ends with the Athenians' taking of Sestus. Thucydides takes up the thread precisely there⁷. Third, Thucydides pours scorn on investigations into the past beyond what can be checked through eyewitnesses and clearly means Herodotus' work⁸. Occasionally, however, he blatantly recounts the history of the distant past (e.g. the Sicilian colonies in Book 5) — if Herodotus happened not to have covered that subject. Fourth, Thucydides exemplifies the cavalier attitude towards accuracy in

⁶ S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, I, Oxford 1991, 206 and 209, more or less admits that Thucydides is commenting on Herodotus' account, but fails to see the extent of Thucydides' dependency on the Herodotus-passage. A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, I, Oxford 1945, 426, likewise fails to see the dependence on Herodotus though he is willing to concede that the matter of the nine archons is „one of the very few (*sic*) instances in which Thucydides seems to be correcting Herodotus“. H. Stein, *Herodotos*, III, Berlin 1894, 73, puts the matter correctly: „vollständiger und zu beiläufiger Berichtigung Herodots ... erzählt Thukydides ...“.

⁷ Hdt. 9, 114–118; Thuc. 1, 89.

⁸ Thuc. 1, 21–22. (The word λογογράφοι in 21, 1 — despite earlier views — includes Herodotus.)

other writers by singling out two obscure (alleged) mistakes in Herodotus (whom, of course, he will not mention)⁹.

Therefore, in the story of Cylon, it is natural for Thucydides, when he was for once recounting something which Herodotus too had dealt with, to add details and even whole episodes missing from Herodotus; with the story of the oracle, if anything, he „out-Herodotus-es“ Herodotus — presumably to his grim satisfaction¹⁰.

E.

In this section let us first summarize Thucydides' corrections (as opposed to additions) to Herodotus' account. First, technically, Herodotus speaks only of an attempt to seize the Acropolis (Nr. 8). Thucydides tacitly corrects: κατέλαβε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν. The matter holds no significance, but is typical of Thucydides' over-zealousness. Second, Herodotus only spoke of Cylon's „following“; Thucydides makes clear that Cylon also received troops from Theagenes (Nr. 7). Third, Cylon (and his brother — a case of pedantic correction if ever there were one) was not amongst the suppliants on the Acropolis since he had previously escaped (Nr. 15–16). Fourth, the suppliants were not „by the statue“ of the goddess, but „at the altar“ in the „sanctuary“ (Nrr. 16, 18). Herodotus' statement concerning a „pledge“ not to kill the conspirators is weakened — the conspirators leave „on condition that nothing evil will be done to them“ (Nr. 21). Fifth, the nine archons governed Athens at the time (Nrr. 12–13)¹¹.

What are we to make of these supplements and corrections to Herodotus? I rule out the idea that Thucydides has wantonly fabricated material so as to be able to diverge from Herodotus' account. Clearly, Thucydides thinks he is right when he says that Cylon — and his brother — escaped from the Acropolis. Especially the gratuitous detail of the brother is one unlikely to be made up by anyone at anytime. Using this as a touchstone — how or why might the detail have been made up? — we can suggest that this correction with addition seems genuine. The same applies to Theagenes of Megara as Cylon's father-in-law. Theagenes is a shadowy figure at best, known to us mostly from a brief statement in Aristotle's politics and from Pausanias'

⁹ Thuc. 1, 20, 3. (The alleged mistakes are at Hdt. 6, 57 and 9, 53.)

¹⁰ Otherwise Hornblower, *Commentary* (n. 6) 206–207 and K. J. Dover, *Thucydides on Oracles*, in: *The Greeks and their Legacy*, Oxford 1988, 71.

¹¹ Various attempts to reconcile Thucydides' and Herodotus' statements with each other have failed: The prytanies of the naucrari and the nine archons were one and the same (Harpocration, s.v. Ναυκρατιτικά; Suidas, s.v. ναυκραρία; J. H. Wright, *The Date of Cylon*, HSCP 3 [1892] 28–33; F. R. Wüst, *Zu den πρυτάνειες τῶν ναυκράρων und zu den alten attischen Trittyen*, Historia 6 [1957] 176–178); the word ἐνεμον should be corrected to ἐνέμοντο, „they were collecting [taxes]“, i.e. not governing Athens (B. Jordan, *Herodotus 5.71.2 and the Naukraroi of Athens*, CSCA 3 [1970] 153–175 — on this see S. D. Lambert, *Herodotus, the Cylonian Conspiracy and the πρυτάνειες τῶν ναυκράρων*, Historia 35 [1986] 106–107); and, finally, Herodotus' ἐνεμον τότε means „they were (temporarily) in charge at that very moment“ (Lambert, 107–110) — yet Thucydides, who knew Greek far better than we can ever hope to know it, clearly did not think that ἐνεμον τότε could mean that (see also Stein [n. 6] 74). None of these views has won acceptance.

attribution of a fountainhouse to him¹². We know nothing of any other involvement of Theagenes in Athenian affairs, and it is difficult to suggest why Thucydides or anyone else would have made Cylon son-in-law of precisely this tyrant (as opposed to a better known tyrant such as Cypselus of Corinth or Cleisthenes of Sicyon who already had Athenian connexions¹³). This detail too (as well as Theagenes' military support) seems a genuine supplement.

With other details, however, we are on shakier ground. While no-one (probably) was interested in insisting that some (but not all) conspirators died at the altars of the Eumenides, it may have been known that these altars stood near the foot of the descent from the Acropolis where people in later times may have imagined the massacre to have taken place¹⁴. In that case, that some were slain at these altars may be a secondary deduction. Thucydides' specifications as to where the suppliants sat on the acropolis (not by the statue, but at the altar in the sanctuary) may have more to do with the groundplan of the acropolis in his own day than with what actually happened during the conspiracy. It is an open question where a statue of Athena in Cylon's day may have stood: did Thucydides assume that Herodotus was thinking of Pheidias' statue in the open court in ignorance of this statue's fifth-century date?

As for the toning down of the pledge not to kill the conspirators by replacing it with the vague connective phrase ἐφ' ᾧ and a perhaps euphemistic phrase about „nothing evil“, Thucydides may be simply trying to avoid saying too much: was he uncertain about an actual „pledge“? If not, we can only with difficulty imagine why he chose to weaken Herodotus' statement in this way. Given the sedulousness with which he is correcting Herodotus, his phrasing cannot be due to chance. Perhaps we should follow his cautious example and speak of a „gentlemen's agreement“ or an „understanding“ rather than a „pledge“ which the conspirators' killers violated.

Finally, we come to the detail concerning the government of Athens at the time. When we ask why Thucydides would have asserted that it was the nine archons, we can readily answer. Although the nine archons had become almost purely ceremonial figures by Thucydides' time¹⁵, everyone surely still knew that in an earlier period they had once truly governed Athens¹⁶. It was the natural guess that they had held the

¹² Aristotle, *Politica* 1305a; Paus. 1, 40, 1.

¹³ Hdt. 6, 128, 2 and 5, 67, 1 with 6, 130, 2.

¹⁴ Cf. the entirely fanciful story recounted by Plut., *Solo* 12, of how the conspirators, not entirely trusting the pledge which had been given them, descended from the acropolis whilst holding a string attached to the statue of Athena, under whose protection they thus remained. As they passed the shrines of the Eumenides (towards the bottom of the descent), the string snapped; and the besiegers, judging that the goddess had herself rejected those claiming her protection, promptly massacred them. The only inference I wish to draw from this concerns where later Athenians imagined the massacre to have taken place: at the foot of the descent from the acropolis.

¹⁵ In Thucydides' day the generalship (one of the few elective offices: Ath.Pol. 22, 2) was the most powerful office. In the absence of any prohibition against iteration (Ath.Pol. 62, 3) Pericles held such an office year in, year out and used it to dominate Athens (Plut., *Pericles* 16, 3; Thuc. 2, 55, 2; 65, 9). On the generalship and its powers in Thucydides' day see e.g. C. Hignett, *History of the Athenian Constitution*, Oxford 1952, 244–251.

¹⁶ See Hignett, *History* (n. 15) 74–75. 153.

government as early as the Cylonian conspiracy also. We should not so much ask why Thucydides might have made this guess as why Herodotus did not make it.

So let us turn the spear around. Why would Herodotus for his part have invented the detail of the „prytanies of the naucraries“¹⁷ The „naucraries“ were an obscure institution at best¹⁸. If we can believe the author of the pseudo-Aristotelian Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, then there were twelve ναυκραρία in each of the four pre-Cleisthenic tribes. A ναύκραρος (later replaced by a demarch) presided over each ναυκραρία (later replaced by a deme)¹⁹. The information may or may not be correct. Of „pryta-

¹⁷ Older scholars frequently suggested that Herodotus claimed that the πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκράρων governed Athens in an attempt to exculpate the Alcmeonids: W. W. How, J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, II, Oxford 1912, 38; H. Hommel, *Naukraria*, RE 16, 2 (1935) 1945; Hignett, *History* (n. 15) 69; and see, more recently, P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Ath.Pol.*, Oxford 1981, 152. Yet if Herodotus had been trying to exculpate the Alcmeonids, he perhaps should not have included the statements φονεῦσαι δὲ αὐτοὺς αἰτὴ ἔχει Ἀλκμεονίδας, „the guilt for their having been murdered rested on the Alcmeonids“ (5, 71, 2), and οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι καὶ οἱ συστασιῶται αὐτῶν εἶχον αἰτίην τοῦ φόνου τούτου, „the Alcmeonids and their partisans were guilty of this murder“ (5, 70, 2). On the usage of αἰτὴ in these passages see H.-F. Bornitz, *Herodot-Studien*, Berlin 1968, 139–163, esp. 139 and 162–163. As Herodotus’ report stands, most impartial readers would probably assume that several (at least one) of the πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκράρων were Alcmeonids: *mutatis mutandis* cf. on this M. Stahl, *Aristokraten und Tyrannen im archaischen Athen*, Stuttgart 1987, 178 (who speaks with reference to Thucydides’ account).

¹⁸ None of the attempts to etymologise the name convinces: many have argued or at least accepted that ναύκραρος has the stem *ναϜ-, „ship“, in its opening (e.g. F. Solmsen, Ναύκραρος ναύκλαρος ναύκληρος, RhM 53 [1898] 151–158, or, more recently, Rhodes, *Commentary* [n. 17] 151). J.-C. Billigmeier, A. S. Dusing, *The Origin and Function of the Naukraroi at Athens: An etymological and historical explanation*, TAPA 111 (1981) 11–16, have argued for a connexion with the stem *νασϜ-, „temple“. T. J. Figueira, *Xanthippos, Father of Perikles, and the Prutaneis of the Naukraroi*, *Historia* 35 (1986) 257–279, has attempted to identify the πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκράρων in an obscure reference in a couplet composed against Xanthippus (text: *loc.cit.*, p. 257) and has suggested that such a board still existed in the fifth century.

¹⁹ Ath.Pol. 8, 3 and 21, 5. The ναύκραροι allegedly supervised revenue and expenditure, but the author of the Ath.Pol. probably deduced this from entries in allegedly Solonian laws (defunct in his day), that τοὺς ναυκράρους εἰσπράττειν, καὶ ἀναλίσκειν ἐκ τοῦ ναυκραρικοῦ ἀργυρ[ί]ου, „the Naucrari shall levy“, and ‘shall spend from the naucratic fund (lit. silver coin)’. Since Solon’s laws antedated the introduction of coinage (after all, Solon calculated wealth in terms of bushels of corn: Ath.Pol. 7, 4; Plut., *Solo* 18, 1–2), the reference to payments in silver disturbs: the laws to which the Ath.Pol. refers cannot be genuine (cf. Hignett, *History* [n. 15] 69; otherwise E. Ruschenbusch, Σόλωνος Νόμοι, Wiesbaden 1966, Fr. 79; Rhodes, *Commentary* [n. 17] 151–152, who, despite doubts as to the laws’ authenticity, interprets ἀργύριον as uncoined silver). Androtion, FGrHist 324, Fr. 36 = Scholiast to Aristophanes, *Aves* 1541b, states (most likely without any real authority) that payment for sacral ambassadors to Delphi came from the Naucratic funds. Additional notices connect the initial syllable of ναύκραροι with ναῦς and posit that the ναύκραροι had something to do with supplying the state with ships (Pollux, VIII 108; Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, p. 283, 20 [cf. p. 275, 20]); we may dismiss this as etymological speculation. The remaining mentions of ναύκραροι and ναυκραρία clearly depend entirely on the Ath.Pol.: Cleidemus, FGrHist 323, Fr. 8 = Photios, *Lexicon*, s.v.

nies“ (i.e. „presidents“ or „chairmen“) of the naucrari we hear not a word outside of Herodotus. If the naucrari had once been magistrates of sorts in the Attic towns (so that their functions might easily pass to the demarchs when Cleisthenes carried out his reforms), then there might have been a rotating „committee“ of them which was meeting in Athens at any given time — much as a „prytany“ of the Cleisthenic boule was in session in Athens at any given time. This is pure guesswork, but Herodotus may have been thinking of some such body²⁰. But why? In the same way that I do not believe that Thucydides made up the detail of Cylon’s brother, I refuse to consider that Herodotus invented otherwise unknown „prytanies of the naucrari“ and established them as the sitting government of Athens. But we can explain why Thucydides replaced them with a far better-known institution still extant in his own day²¹. Sound method thus requires us to reject Thucydides’ statement as not based on actual knowledge, but resulting from secondary reasoning instead.

So far as I know, of modern scholars only Detlev Fehling has been bold enough to state flatly that the archonship had not yet been instituted (at least not as the chief magistracy) and that another body did govern Athens in Cylon’s day²². I hereby concur.

The suggestion is far less radical than it may seem. Leaving aside Thucydides’ statement (which we have already dealt with), we have no evidence for the existence of the archonship in this early period other than the archon list itself, published some time during the late fifth century²³. The archon list, as it has come down to us, purports to list the archons all the way back to the death of the final king of Athens — Codrus in the year 1068²⁴. It begins with „archons for life“, followed by archons for

ναυκραρία (cf. s.v. ναύκραροι); Hesychius, s.v. ναύκλαροι (sic); scholiast to Aristophanes, *Nubes* 37c.

²⁰ There have been many attempts at explaining the πρυτάνειες τῶν ναυκράρων, none of them especially convincing: see most recently B. Jordan, *The naukraroi of Athens and the Meaning of νέμω*, AC 61 (1992) 60–79, who argues for a committee charged with collecting revenue. Others have thought of a sacral college (Billigmeier, Dusing, *Origin and Function* [n. 18]) or a naval board (Rhodes, *Commentary* [n. 17] 151). Hignett’s discussion, Hignett, *History* (n. 15) 67–74, frankly, serves only to emphasize the difficulty of the matter. The speculation given in the text above is meant purely as such: in the absence of additional evidence we simply cannot know much about these πρυτάνειες τῶν ναυκράρων beyond what Herodotus says.

²¹ A clear example of Thucydides’ blithely extrapolating from the institutions of his day to an earlier age comes at I 20, 3 when he acerbically „corrects“ Herodotus’ alleged mistake (9, 53, 3) in referring to a „Pitanate lochos“ in the Spartan army: ὃς οὐδ’ ἐγένετο πῶποτε, „such a thing has never existed“. On this see H. T. Wade-Gery, *The Spartan Rhetra in Plutarch, Lycurgus VI*, in: *Essays in Greek History*, Oxford 1958, 76–77; otherwise Hornblower, *Commentary* (n. 6) 58.

²² D. Fehling, *Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie*, Bern 1985, 110 with n. 253; n.b., with respect to Herodotus: „die ältere Quelle muß auch hier vorgezogen werden“.

²³ B. D. Merritt, *Greek Inscriptions*, Hesperia 8 (1939) 59–65.

²⁴ Eusebius, *Chronicon*, I, pp. 185–190 Schöne; pp. 86–88 Karst; cf. Velleius Paterculus 1, 2, 2; Paus. 4, 5, 10; and Justin-Trogus 2, 7, 1. In fact, as both Eusebius and the

ten years, followed by the annual archons beginning with Creon in the year 683/2²⁵. No-one (I think) has ever claimed that the list is genuine all the way back to Medon for the years 1068 to 1048. At some point the genuinely historical list ends and fiction begins.

What is needful is serious consideration of where that point lies. It is the suggestion of this note that it lies after Cylon's attempt to establish a tyranny²⁶.

F. Appendix: Cylon's Date

Herodotus' sole comment on Cylon's date is that this attempt at a tyranny preceded the Peisistratid tyranny²⁷. To go farther than Herodotus carries risks. Cylon won at Olympia²⁸, but his name cannot have stood in the (genuine) list of Olympic victors which listed only those who won the footrace²⁹. From Pausanias we learn that Cylon won the double-footrace, the diaulus³⁰. Yet in the absence of any list of victors in that contest, the date for Cylon's victory which we find in Africanus (640) can have only been some chronographer's guess³¹. Cylon cannot, for us at least, be dated by means of his father-in-law Theagenes, whose dating (for us) rests instead on that of Cylon³².

I think it a plausible assumption that Cylon seized the acropolis before Solon's reforms. This is probably compatible with Herodotus' presentation of the material.

Marmor Parium (FGrHist 239) shew, the Athenian kings and the Athenian archons were taken together as one continuous list.

²⁵ Eusebius, *Chronicon*, I, pp. 189–190 Schöne; p. 88 Karst; cf. Marmor Parium, FGrHist 239, A 32.

²⁶ In my opinion the trenchant criticisms of W. H. Plommer, *The Tyranny of the Archon List*, CR 83 (1969) 126–129, have never been answered to satisfaction.

²⁷ Hdt. 5, 71, 2.

²⁸ Hdt. 5, 71, 1. Moretti, *Olympionikai*, Roma 1957, Nr. 56.

²⁹ Hippias of Elis (FGrHist 6, Fr. 2 = Plutarch, *Numa* 1, 6) published the list in the late fifth or early fourth century B.C. K. Adshead, *Politics of the Archaic Peloponnese*, Aldershot 1986, 58, has shown that the most prestigious and best-known event before Hippias' publication of the list was the Pancration. Thucydides cites Olympiads by pancratiasts (III 8, 1 [cf. Paus. 6, 7, 1] and 5, 49, 1) not because he had by some chance seen a list, but because that event was memorable and he expected his readers immediately to recognise the name of Dorieus of Rhodes and to remember that pugilist's victory. Once Hippias' work became known, however, writers (e.g. Dionysius of Halicarnassus or Diodorus) wishing to give a date valid for all Greece cited Olympiads by the victor in the footrace instead. Given the prestige and popularity of the Pancration down to Thucydides' day, the reason that later historians cite by victors in the footrace must lie in the list which Hippias presented. That is to say, Hippias published a list of these victors; and his reason for doing so in turn lay in the material available to him: the names of the victors in that event were recorded from the year 776 B.C. onward. The evidence which F. Jacoby cites at FGrHist IIIB Kommentar, Text, pp. 222–223 (Phlegon of Tralles, FGrHist 257 Fr. 12 = Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 97, who gives a list of the victors in all contests for the 177th Olympiad, i.e. 72 B.C.) in favour of a list which encompassed the victors in all contests fails to convince as it has no relevance for older periods. Finally, on the historicity of the list of victors in the footrace see (with certain reservations) W. den Boer, *Laconian Studies*, Amsterdam 1954, 48–54.

³⁰ Paus. 1, 28, 1.

³¹ Eusebius, I, pp. 197–198 Schöne; p. 35 Karst.

³² See Berve, *Tyrannis* (n. 1) 536.

According to Herodotus Solon promulgated his reforms only a little earlier than the Peisistratid tyranny³³; and there seems (on his presentation) little room for an event as important as the Cylonian conspiracy to come between Solon's year in power and the first tyranny of Peisistratus. This gives us a slightly more precise relative date for Cylon: before Solon. Solon's date is, however, yet another vexed question, in particular as it depends on the archon list.

II. Peisistratus and the Great Panathenaean Games

We begin with a passage from a pseudo-Aristotelian work, the Πέπλος, of which a quotation is found in the scholia to Aelius Aristides:

ὁ τῶν Παναθηναίων· τῶν μικρῶν λέγει· ταῦτα γὰρ ἐπὶ Ἐριχθονίου τοῦ Ἄμφικτύονος γενόμενα ἐπὶ τῷ φόνῳ τοῦ Ἄστεριου τοῦ γίγαντος· τὰ δὲ μεγάλα Πεισίστρατος ἐποίησε. τὰ δὲ Ἐλευσίνια ἐπὶ Πανδίωνος ἐγένετο, ὃς πέμπτος ἦν βασιλεὺς ἀπὸ Ἐριχθονίου· διὰ δὲ τὸν καρπὸν ἐτέθησαν.³⁴

The Panathenaea: He means the „lesser“ Panathenaea; for these were instituted under Erichthonius, the son of Amphictyon on the occasion of the slaying of the giant Asterius. Peisistratus, however, instituted the „greater“ Panathenaea. Now

³³ Hdt. 1, 30, 1: Solon's travels abroad during the ten years after his reforms are synchronized with the reigns of Amasis of Egypt (570–526 B.C.) and Croesus of Lydia (trad. 561–547: deposed in 547 [see below, n. 53] after a reign of fourteen years [Hdt. 1, 86, 1]). Peisistratus' second tyranny ended in the year 557 (see below). If we assume that (in Herodotus' view) Solon visited Croesus towards the very end of his travels and at the very beginning of the latter's reign, then Solon ended his reforms and left Athens in 571. That gives us an absolute maximum of fourteen years (on Herodotus' presentation of events) in which to arrange the lengths of Peisistratus' first two tyrannies and his first exile. The accuracy of Herodotus' presentation of events holds no interest for us here: merely how he seems to have arranged matters chronologically for his purposes. That he almost always managed to maintain an inner coherence within his own chronology was shown long ago by H. Strasburger, *Herodots Zeitrechnung*, Historia 5 (1956) 129–161 (= *Scripta Minora*, II, 627–675); see now also P. J. Rhodes, *Herodotean Chronology Revisited*, in: P. Derow, R. Parker ed., *Herodotus and his World*, Oxford 2003, 58–72.

³⁴ Aristotle, Fr. 637 alt. Rose = Scholium to Aelius Aristides, *Panathenaicus*, 362 Lenz-Behr (p. 308 Dindorf; but p. 189 by the bold numbers in Dindorf's margin according to which he gives the scholia in vol. III of his edition; see there, p. 323). Although this particular scholiast to this passage does not state what work he is copying out of, comparison with the first scholium proves Rose's inclusion of this passage to be correct. We cite from the first scholium: ἡ τάξις τῶν ἀγῶνων καθὰ Ἀριστοτέλης ἀναγράφεται· πρῶτα μὲν τὰ Ἐλευσίνια διὰ τὸν καρπὸν τῆς Δήμητρος· δεύτερα δὲ τὰ Παναθηναία ἐπὶ Ἀστέρι τῷ γίγαντι ὑπὸ Ἀθηνᾶς ἀναιρεθῆντι ..., „the order of games is recorded according to Aristotle: first, the *Eleusinian games on account of the harvest* of Demeter; next, the *Panathenaea on the occasion of the slaying of the giant Asterius* by Athena ..". Both scholiasts were clearly making excerpts from the same source which the first one happened to name. Which allegedly Aristotelian work they were using emerges from the *Testimonia* which Rose collects; for this work see C. A. Forbes, Πέπλος, 2, RE 19, 1 (1937) 561 and Gercke, *Aristoteles*, RE 2, 1 (1895) 1054. Forbes suggests, however, that the work did derive from Aristotle's school.

the Eleusinian games were instituted under Pandion, who was the fifth king after Erichthonius; and they were instituted on account of the harvest.

On the surface everything seems to be in order: Peisistratus, *a priori* as tyrant, instituted the Greater Panathenaea. And yet most scholars who care to issue an opinion on the subject of the institution of the Greater Panathenaea either ignore, reject, or reinterpret this passage³⁵.

With approval, however, they often refer to another passage, from Pherecydes but quoted in Marcellinus' life of Thucydides, from which we here cite:

Φιλαίας δὲ ὁ Αἴαντος οἰκεῖ ἐν Ἀθήναις. ἐκ τούτου δὲ γίνεται Δαΐκλος· τοῦ δὲ Ἐπίλυκος· τοῦ δὲ Ἀκέστωρ· τοῦ δὲ Ἀγήνωρ· τοῦ δὲ Οὐγγίλιος· τοῦ δὲ Λύκης· τοῦ δὲ †Τόφων· τοῦ δὲ Λαΐος· τοῦ δὲ Ἀγαμήστωρ· τοῦ δὲ Τίσανδρος· [ἐφ' οὗ ἄρχοντος ἐν Ἀθήναις· τοῦ δὲ Μιλτιάδης] τοῦ δὲ Ἴπποκλείδης, ἐφ' οὗ ἄρχοντος (ἐν Ἀθήναις) Παναθηναία ἐτέθη· (τοῦ δὲ Κύψελος)· τοῦ δὲ Μιλτιάδης, ὃς ὄκισε Χερρόνησον.³⁶

Philaeas, the son of Ajax, dwelt in Athens. He begat Daiclus who begat Epilykus who begat Acestor who begat Agenor who begat Ulius who begat Lyces who begat Tophon who begat Laius who begat Agamestor who begat Tisander who begat Hippocleides, during whose Archonship <in Athens> the Panathenaea were instituted, <who begat Cypselus> who begat Miltiades, who settled the Chersonese.

³⁵ E.g.: T. J. Cadoux, *The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides*, JHS 68 (1948) 104 (ignores); J. A. Davison, *Notes on the Panathenaea*, JHS 78 (1958) 24–29 (rejects); H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians*, London 1977, 34 (ignores, but suggests that Peisistratus developed the games farther); R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684–321 B.C.*, Cambridge 1989, 41 (ignores).

E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, III, Stuttgart u.a. ²1937, 617 (with n.) and 728, argued that Peisistratus gave the impetus for the introduction of the Panathenaea during Hippocleides' archonship; Ziehen, *Panathenaia*, RE 18, 3 (1949) 459, suggested that the gymnastic events at the Panathenaea were introduced under Hippocleides, but that Peisistratus developed the festival farther while tyrant; Hignett, *History* (n. 15) 113 and 326–331, suggests that Peisistratus added gymnastic events while Hippocleides was archon; J. S. Boersma, *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.*, Groningen 1970, 13–14, suggests that Peisistratus as an influential aristocrat reorganized the festival in 566 on the way to the tyranny. Similar reasoning in, e.g., Berve, *Tyrannis* (n. 1) 59, T. L. Shear, Jr., *Tyrants and Buildings in Archaic Athens*, in: *Athens Comes of Age. From Solon to Salamis*, Princeton 1978, 3; and J. Neils, *The Panathenaea: An Introduction*, in: *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Princeton 1992, 20–21.

C. Seltman, *Greek Coins*, London ²1955, 49, however, does write: „By 566 B.C. it is obvious that he [i.e. Peisistratus] was already in complete control of the state machinery including the state religion for in that year in the archonship of his friend Hippocleides, he founded the celebrated quadrennial festival known as the Greater Panathenaea“.

³⁶ Pherecydes, FGrHist 3, Fr. 2 = Marcellinus, *Vita Thucydidis* 2–4. On the athetised passage (omitted from the translation) see Jacoby's note. Marcellinus' text is somewhat disordered, and it is not absolutely certain that the not-athetised relative clause beginning with ἐφ' οὗ ἄρχοντος has been attached to the correct name: the athetised one, for example, clearly was mis-attached.

The „greater“ games are clearly meant. Let us concede now, for argument's sake, that the Philaid Hippocleides³⁷ really was archon when the games were instituted. Why cannot Peisistratus have been tyrant at that time? Here is what Herodotus has to say about how Peisistratus became tyrant for the second time:

περιελαινόμενος δὲ τῇ στάσει ὁ Μεγακλῆς ἐπεκηρυκεύετο Πεισιστράτῳ, εἰ βούλοιτό οἱ τὴν θυγατέρα ἔχειν γυναῖκα ἐπὶ τῇ τυραννίδι.³⁸

Meanwhile, Megacles [the leader of the Alcmeonid clan], finding himself hard-pressed by the factional strife [with the Philaid clan], made Peisistratus an offer, if he [Peisistratus] might wish to take his [Megacles'] daughter to wife in exchange for the tyranny.

In other words Peisistratus colluded with the Alcmeonid clan during his second tyranny. Simple folk might conclude from this that collusion between Peisistratus and the Philaids (or any other powerful aristocratic clan for that matter) during his first tyranny can hardly be ruled out. So, allowing that Pherecydes' information about Hippocleides is true, this evidence does not rule out that Peisistratus could have been tyrant when the games were founded³⁹.

I would now like to apply elementary *Sachkritik* to the information which the author of the Πέπλος gives concerning the action which he attributes to Peisistratus: the foundation of a festival. Did tyrants do such things? Very often, in fact. Cleisthenes of Sicyon participated in the Pythian Games at Delphi and won in the chariot race⁴⁰; he also founded Pythian Games in Sicyon⁴¹. Polycrates of Samos was about to found games dedicated to Apollo — he hesitated as to whether to call them „Delian Games“ or „Pythian Games“ — when he fell into the Persians' hands and was executed⁴². Not only did tyrants found such festivals, they sometimes managed them (Pheidon of Argos at Olympia⁴³) and loved competing in them (especially in the chariot races)⁴⁴. So, to return to the Panathenaean Games, their institution is just the sort of thing that tyrants did⁴⁵.

We have seen, then, that elementary *Sachkritik* substantiates the Πέπλος whose testimony Pherecydes does not contradict. We now come, however, to the putative *pièce de résistance* in the case of those who know that Peisistratus did not institute the

³⁷ On whom see Hdt. 6, 127, 4.

³⁸ Hdt. 1, 60, 2.

³⁹ Those who accept the historicity of the epigraphically transmitted archon list (GHI 6) should also note that during Peisistratus' third tyranny not only a Philaid (Megacles), but even an Alcmeonid were allegedly archons. Who ingests this without a murmur, can surely stomach a Philaid as archon during the first tyranny.

⁴⁰ Paus. 10, 7, 6.

⁴¹ Scholiast to Pindar, *Nem.* 9, inscr.

⁴² Suidas, s.vv. Πύθια καὶ Δήλια, ταῦτά σοι Πύθια καὶ Δήλια.

⁴³ Hdt. 6, 127, 3.

⁴⁴ E.g. Cleisthenes of Sicyon, Hdt. 6, 126, 2.

⁴⁵ Boersma, *Athenian Building* (n. 35) 13–14, makes the additional argument that Peisistratus' ruse at Hdt. 1, 60, 4–5, shews that Peisistratus knew well to manipulate in his favour the religious sentiment attached to the cult of Athena.

Greater Panathenaea: it is chronologically impossible⁴⁶. Eusebius of Caesarea, the fourth-century A.D. chronographer, says that the first celebration of the Greater Panathenaea fell in the year 566 B.C.⁴⁷. No-one who has experience with Eusebius' dates will put his hand into the fire for any one date, at least not without substantiating independent evidence⁴⁸. There is always a bit of leeway, sometimes a great deal of it. Finally, how do we know that Peisistratus could not have been tyrant in 566 or thereabouts?

Peisistratid chronology is a vexed matter⁴⁹. The last tyrant of the house, Hippias, was deposed in the year 511⁵⁰. Before that, so Herodotus tells us, the family had ruled for 36 years⁵¹. A brief argument suffices to show that the 36 years refer to the final, continuous tyranny alone rather than to all three tyrannies put together: Herodotus states that Peisistratus seized power for the third and final time before the Persians took Sardis⁵². They did so — and here we have a Babylonian chronicle as evidence — in the year 547⁵³. $511 + 36 = 547$. Unless we assume that the first two tyrannies of

⁴⁶ See e.g. L. de Libero, *Die archaische Tyrannis*, Stuttgart 1996, 108 n. 387: „Mit dieser ... Neuerung [i.e. the founding of the Panathenaea] kann der Tyrann also allein schon aus zeitlichen Gründen ... nicht in Verbindung gebracht werden“.

⁴⁷ Arm. Can. Karst, p. 188; Schöne, p. 94; Hieronymus, Helm, p. 102b; Schöne, II, p. 95.

⁴⁸ Some of Eusebius' dates: The Messenian Wars began in 742 B.C. (far too early on any chronology of the Messenian Wars) (Arm.Can., Schöne, II, p. 82; Karst, p. 182); Chalcedon was founded in 1038 B.C. (Arm.Can. Karst, p. 176; Schöne, II, p. 60) or 1039 (Hieronymus Helm, p. 69b; Schöne, II, p. 61); Cumae in Italy was founded in 1050 B.C. (Hieronymus Helm, p. 69b; Schöne, II, p. 61). Eusebius does not get every date so wildly out of place, but we should always remain aware of what mistakes he is capable. To give another example, the entry in the Armenian Canon for the year 562 reads: „Peisistratos übte die Gewaltherrschaft der Athener aus und fuhr nach Italia über“ (Karst, p. 188; Schöne, II, p. 94) and in Hieronymus, *Pisistratus Atheniensium tyrannus in Italiam transgreditur* (Helm, p. 102b; Schöne, II, p. 95). Obviously, we can enjoy Eusebius only *cum grano salis*.

⁴⁹ The table on p. 171 of F. Schachermeyr's 1937 article „Peisistratos“ in the RE 19, 1 (1937) is an attempt to provide an overview of only a portion of scholars' divergent conclusions up to that time. The situation since then has only grown worse: see P. J. Rhodes, *Peisistratid Chronology again*, Phoenix 30 (1976) 219–233 for the latest major treatment of the question.

⁵⁰ By way of an exception this date is not in serious dispute; see, however, N. G. L. Hammond, *Studies in Greek Chronology*, Historia 4 (1955) 384–385, who argues for 510. The date 511 is based on Thucydides 6, 59, 4 and 8, 68, 4: the tyranny fell three years, that is to say, in the fourth year after Hipparchus' assassination on the occasion of the Greater Panathenaea; in the twentieth before the battle of Marathon (in 490); and in the hundredth before the Athenians installed an oligarchy (in 411). The latter two numbers have clearly been rounded off. The Greater Panathenaea were penteteric: Hipparchus will have been assassinated during the festival of 514, the tyranny deposed in 511.

⁵¹ Hdt. 5, 65, 3.

⁵² Hdt. 1, 64, 1 (Peisistratus seizes power just before, in the farther narrative, Croesus attacks Persia and loses his empire to Cyrus the Great.).

⁵³ Nabonidus-Chronicle, Col. II, Ll. 15–17 (A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, Locust Valley 1975, 107). The reading *lu-u[d-di]* (despite the objections of Fehling, *Weisen* [n. 22] 134–135) is certain: Cyrus crosses the Tigris (i.e. is marching westwards) against a *king*. Of the two kingdoms west of the Tigris Lydia alone fought

Peisistratus lasted only a few days, the 36 years leave no room for two additional tyrannies which are anyway far more likely — at least on Herodotus' presentation of events — to have spanned several years. (Herodotus says that the second tyranny ended when Peisistratus' marriage with Megacles' daughter remained childless for so long that her mother, Agariste, began to suspect that something out of the ordinary was the matter — the salacious gossip about the tyrant's private life, of course, presupposes that the marriage was childless long enough for the fact to be publicly remarked upon⁵⁴. As everyone knows, newly-wed wives do not always become pregnant immediately upon marriage; and even couples who desperately want children sometimes find that it can take years before a pregnancy ensues. According to the story Herodotus recounts, this particular couple did not produce a pregnancy for a period of time that exceeded what might pass without notice. It can hardly have been fewer than several years according to the internal logic of the story as Herodotus presents it.) Therefore, we must assume that the 36 years apply only to the third and final tyranny. I am in agreement on this point both with F. Heidbüchel and P. J. Rhodes, who represent the two opposite poles of the last round of discussions of Peisistratid chronology⁵⁵.

So let us proceed. The second exile, Herodotus tells us, lasted ten years⁵⁶. $547 + 10 = 557$. Therefore, the second tyranny ended in the year 557. At this point the specific chronological information which Herodotus provides runs out. We note that on the basis of Herodotus we cannot rule out that Peisistratus was tyrant in 566 — those who know that he cannot have been tyrant in that year must derive their knowledge from some other source.

That source is another pseudo-Aristotelian work, the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* (henceforth: Ath.Pol.), which has this to say about the lengths of the three Peisistratid tyrannies: the first ended in the sixth year, the second in the seventh, and the third after twenty-three⁵⁷. Let me here say that every time when I have presented this information to undergraduate classes, at this point half-a-dozen have blurted out, without any

against the Persians — Cilicia did not. We may observe the distinction in the way in which the Persians treated the royal families of the two countries: they deposed the Lydian line; the Cilician line they allowed to rule Cilicia (officially, presumably, as satraps). The Syennesis at Hdt. 5, 118, 2 still bears the title „King of the Cilicians“ though Cilicia has by this time long been part of the Persian Empire; this Syennesis may well be a descendant of the Syennesis who ruled Cilicia as an independent kingdom at 1, 74, 3. Indeed „Syennesis“ may in actuality be not a name, but rather a royal title. If Cilicia is not the kingdom against which Cyrus marched, then the only other country (besides Lydia) in Anatolia at the time was Lycia (Hdt. 1, 28). Although the Lycian cities had many dynasts, Lycia was never united under a single King. *Per exclusionem* only „Lydia“ can be read in the chronicle.

⁵⁴ Hdt. 1, 61, 1–2.

⁵⁵ F. Heidbüchel, *Die Chronologie der Peisistratiden in der Attis*, *Philologus* 101 (1957) 72–75; Rhodes, *Peisistratid Chronology* (n. 49) 230.

⁵⁶ Hdt. 1, 62, 1.

⁵⁷ Ath.Pol. 14, 3; 15, 1; 17, 1 (Peisistratus' total time of rule was 19 years); and 19, 6 (the tyranny endured for 17 years after Peisistratus' death). This implies that Peisistratus dies some 6 years after seizing the tyranny for the third time ($19 - 7 - 6 = 6$); and that the total length of the third tyranny was 23 years ($6 + 17 = 23$).

prompting from me, the blindly obvious. $6 + 7 + 23 = 36$ ⁵⁸. The author of the Ath.Pol. (or whatever authority he was following) took Herodotus' 36 years, failed to comprehend that they applied only to the third and final tyranny, and *arbitrarily* divided them up into three periods in much the same way as Diodorus arbitrarily assigned events during the Pentecontaëtia to specific years⁵⁹. Of the anonymous author's results Heibbüchel has said, „es muß alles falsch sein, was auf einer falschen Interpretation beruht“⁶⁰. Rhodes does not agree; I do.

All the same Rhodes too rejects almost every chronological datum in the Ath.Pol.⁶¹. The only datum he is prepared to accept is that Peisistratus became tyrant for the first time in the archonship of Comeas⁶². Unfortunately, at first glance we cannot determine if this datum is secondary or primary in the Ath.Pol.; that is to say, did the author (or his source) work out the figures first and then give the archon for the calculated year or did he know that Peisistratus seized power in that archonship and then make the figures fit that datum? Rhodes inclines to the latter view; Heibbüchel and I to the former. After all, the Ath.Pol. does list at least one archon date (for the first expulsion of Peisistratus) which can only have been given on the basis of the (incorrectly worked out) chronology⁶³. Heibbüchel and I have then a parallel for our assumption; Rhodes does not. All the same, for the purposes of argument, Rhodes' view shall be adopted here. We now add that Plutarch also states that Peisistratus' first seizure of power took place in the archonship of Comeas⁶⁴, but in all likelihood he was merely following the tradition represented by the Ath.Pol.

When then was Comeas archon? If we take the figures given by the Ath.Pol. for the individual tyrannies and exiles, then its author believed Comeas to have been archon around the years 570/69 to 567/6⁶⁵. However, the Ath.Pol. also dates Peisi-

⁵⁸ Addition of the total length of all Peisistratus' tyrannies to the length of the tyranny of his sons ($19 + 17 = 36$) provides the countercheck for this equation.

⁵⁹ Heibbüchel, *Chronologie* (n. 55) 78–79, first demonstrated this.

⁶⁰ Heibbüchel, *Chronologie* (n. 55) 79.

⁶¹ Rhodes, *Peisistratid Chronology* (n. 49) 231.

⁶² Ath.Pol. 14, 1.

⁶³ Ath.Pol. 14, 3: archonship of Hegesias.

⁶⁴ Plutarch, *Solo* 32, 3.

⁶⁵ The Ath.Pol. accepts Herodotus' figure of 36 years and applies it, falsely, to all three tyrannies. The Ath.Pol. states that the first exile ended in the 12th year (14, 4), the second in the 11th (15, 2). Taking the individual figures as they stand, we can add them exclusively (although the numerals are ordinals, the ordinals for the tyrannies' lengths are clearly to be added exclusively) to reach a sum of 59 or inclusively to reach a sum of 56. $511 + 59$ or $56 = 570$ or 567.

Granted, the individual figures given do not tally with the sums provided at Ath.Pol. 17, 1 (Peisistratus dies 33 years after having seized power for the first time) and 19, 6 (the family was in power for 49 years all told), but we have no idea whether the individual figures themselves or the sums are wrong. It does not solve the problem to refer to the genuine Aristotle's *Politica* 1315b, which also sets the period between Peisistratus' first seizure of power and his death at 33 years: the real Aristotle, *horribile dictu*, may have taken the sum, unchecked, from the Ath.Pol. Any emendation involves a degree of *petitio principii*, and there is no simple way to „fix“ the mathematics. One can emend the figure for the length of the first exile to „in the 5th year“: then the figures for Peisistratus himself add

stratus' first seizure of power to the thirty-second year after Solon's legislation⁶⁶. Assuming that the author of the Ath.Pol. was working with a date of 594/3 for Solon's legislation⁶⁷, that would place Comeas in 563/2. The Marmor Parium either for the year 562/1 or for 561/0 states that Peisistratus became tyrant ἄρχωντος ... Κ[ω]μ[έ]ου⁶⁸. In Jacoby's printing of the name one must here guard against the wish's becoming father to the thought: the point below the μ shows that one might conceivably read another letter. The present author has no wish to play amateur epigrapher, but cannot help wondering if other readings would fit what is on the stone⁶⁹; and if Κωμέου on the stone be another instance of what Ernst Badian has memorably apostrophised as „history from square brackets“⁷⁰. However that may be, the Marmor Parium does in any case place Peisistratus' first usurpation into 562/1 or 561/0. Last, and not least, Eusebius places Peisistratus' seizure of power into 562/1⁷¹, but, as Cadoux notes, „Eusebios and his versions, however, may easily be as much as two or three years wrong“⁷². In fact, Eusebius frequently errs by even more⁷³.

We could, then, at need make a case for Comeas' archonship anywhere between 570/69 and 561/0. Any proposed date, however, would rest on tottering supports. I do

up correctly (5 and 11 added inclusively give 14 years of exile; 19 years in power added to 14 in exile give a total of 33 years from Peisistratus' first usurpation to his death). The figure of 49 years in power for the entire family must then be emended to 36; or we must decide that the author meant to say not that the family ruled for 49 years, but rather that it had been 49 years between Peisistratus' first usurpation and the family's final deposition: i.e. 36 years in power + 14 years in exile, added inclusively, to give 49. But only the wish to reach a certain result drives this process of emendation and re-interpretation. One could just as easily emend the sum of 33 at 17, 1 to, e.g., 42 (19 years in power + 23 in exile = 42 added exclusively) and the sum of 49 at 19, 6 to 36 (19 + 17).

Finally, assuming that we wished to keep the figure of 49 (and „fixed“ the mathematics accordingly), we should point out that 49 years is just a variant for „in the 50th year“ – i.e. if 49 must stand, then the entire scheme smacks of construction. The interval between Peisistratus' first seizure of power and his son's deposition comes to precisely 50 years with the 36 years arbitrarily distributed within the 50. Again, we would have to presume that the construction came first and that only then was the name of the archon in the year of Peisistratus' first seizure of power taken from the archon list.

⁶⁶ Ath.Pol. 14, 1.

⁶⁷ Thus Diogenes Laertius I, 62, following (ultimately) the published archon list.

⁶⁸ Text according to Jacoby, FGrHist 239 (A 40).

⁶⁹ Both Boeckh (CIG, II, p. 301, cf. the facsimile on p. 296) and Hiller von Gärtringen (IG XII 5.1, p. 106) print Κ[ωμέ]ου, though Hiller does in his facsimile on p. 102 draw in part of a Μ (without comment in his notes). (J. A. R. Munro, in his careful review of Boeckh's text, *Notes on the Text of the Parian Marble*, II, CR 15 [1901] 356, also has no comment on this passus.) Boeckh's note on it, however, does raise suspicions as to whether the wish here has indeed become father to the thought: „Nomen archontis habes ap. Plutarch. Solon. extr.“ (p. 317). Imagine the consternation if another copy of the *Marmor Parium* were to appear bearing, immaculately written, the words, e.g., ἄρχωντος ... Κριτίου.

⁷⁰ E. Badian, *History from 'Square Brackets'*, ZPE 79 (1989) 59–70.

⁷¹ Arm.Can., Karst, p. 188; Schöne, II, p. 94; Helm, p. 102b; Schöne, II, p. 95.

⁷² Cadoux, *Athenian Archons* (n. 35) 104.

⁷³ See above, n. 48.

not seriously believe that anyone, on neutral review of this evidence and whatever he ultimately decided on as the most likely date, would not be prepared to admit a few years' leeway as to when Comeas was archon and, hence, when Peisistratus became tyrant for the first time.

Let us recall that Herodotus gives us precise information only as far back as the end of the second tyranny (557) and then deserts us: he had no specific information anymore. Yet he does tell us a story which implies that the second tyranny lasted a couple years. If we move up from 557 to the nearest round figure we come to 560. We could *guess* that the second tyranny began *ca.* 560. The first exile could then fall in the late 560's and the first tyranny could easily fall in the mid- or late 560's. This is not necessarily incompatible with the other evidence, reviewed above.

To recapitulate this tedious chronological discussion. First, the date given by Eusebius for the institution of the Greater Panathenaea, 566, is emphatically not revealed truth: Eusebius could be wrong by several years. Second, it is difficult to determine when exactly Peisistratus became tyrant for the first time even if we do cede credibility to the Ath.Pol. (as I do not). The very low date of 561, which Rhodes opts for, gives, to use a phrase of his, an „implausibly short time“⁷⁴ for the duration of the second tyranny (according to what Herodotus tells us about it; and we should remind ourselves that Herodotus stood closer in time to Peisistratus than all our other sources on this matter). Moreover, even if Herodotus is ignored, the evidence for 561 is very weak⁷⁵. It could have been 562. Or 563. Or even earlier. All of this, I hope, will serve to show that we should not argue that it was chronologically impossible for Peisistratus to institute the Greater Panathenaea. There is too much uncertainty regarding both the date of the festival's institution and the date of the tyranny's beginning.

To conclude then: We have no reason to doubt the statement in the Pseudo-Aristotelian Πέπλος that Peisistratus founded the Greater Panthenaea. Tyrants loved such festivals; they participated in them often and frequently founded new ones. What we read in the Πέπλος about Peisistratus fits perfectly into what we otherwise know about the tyrants. One methodological parting shot: this debate turns on two pseudo-Aristotelian writings and places the one's demonstrably plausible statement (Peisistratus founded the Panathenaea) against the other's demonstrably false chronology (combined with the chronological statement of a notoriously inaccurate late antique chronographer).

Department of Classics
University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800
Christchurch
New Zealand

Victor Parker

⁷⁴ Rhodes, *Peisistratid Chronology* (n. 49) 222.

⁷⁵ Cadoux, *Athenian Archons* (n. 35) 104, arrives at the date of 561/0 for Comeas through this reasoning: „no reasonable interpretation of the ancient statements about the *duration* of the Peisistratid tyranny will yield a date earlier than 561/0 for Peisistratos' first usurpation“. I.e. Cadoux's belief that Peisistratus cannot have become tyrant before 561/0 compels his choice of the lowest possible date for Comeas. One cannot then argue that Comeas was archon in 561/0 and that therefore Peisistratus cannot have been tyrant in 566.