The Tyrannies of Peisistratos

James S. Ruebel

THE CHRONOLOGY of the successive tyrannies of Peisistratos has been a vexed problem ever since the first publication of the *Athenaion Politeia* by F. G. Kenyon in 1891; the text, as it stands, creates serious internal difficulties and runs counter to the chronological indications of Herodotos' account. In the 1890's there was a series of proposals, most of them ingenious and none very convincing, attempting to resolve the problem either by wholesale emendation or by strained interpretation of the text.[1] In 1924 F. E. Adcock published a remarkable article in which he also proposed a chronological reconstruction, based on certain theories about the nature and transmission of the text of the *Ath.Pol.*;[2] although Adcock modestly offered his theory as "merely one more hypothesis," it has in fact become, after a material substantiation of the basic chronology by F. Jacoby,[3] increasingly part of the *communis opinio* on sixth-century Greece, especially after its incorporation into standard works such as the *Cambridge Ancient History*. The Adcock-Jacoby system has come under heavy criticism, notably by F. Heidbüchel,[4] but since Heidbüchel and

[1] Summarized by A. Bauer, *Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte* (München 1899) 462–67. G. V. Sumner, "Notes on Chronological Problems in the Aristotelian 'ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ," *CQ* N.S. 11 (1961) esp. 37–48, tries to revive an old hypothesis of U. von Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen* I (Berlin 1893) 21–23, but this is unsuccessful since it requires emendation of the *Ath.Pol.*'s numerology.

[2] F. E. Adcock, "The Exiles of Peisistratus," *CQ* 18 (1924) 174–81; see also *CAH* IV 63–67. After Bauer, Adcock cites two attempts: F. Blass in *Album gratulatorium in honorem H. van Herwerden* (Keminck 1902) 27–31, and A. Oddo, *Peisistrato* (Palermo 1903).

[3] F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 188–96. A convenient overview of previous scholarship may be found in F. Schachermeyr, "Peisistratos (3)," *RE* 19 (1937) 156–91, esp. 164–74. Cf. also M. Lang, "The Generations of Peisistratus," *AJP* 49 (1954) 232–43 (against which is directed P. Oliva, "Die Chronologie der peisistratischen Tyrannis," *Studia antiqua Antonio Salac oblata* [Prague 1955] 25–30); G. Sanders, "La chronologie de Pisistrate," *NouvClio* 7–9 (1955–57) 161–89 (who makes no attempt to take account of the information in Herodotos). Also relevant are: A. R. Burn, "Dates in Early Greek History," *JHS* 55 (1935) 130–46; T. J. Cadoux, "The Athenian Archons," *JHS* 68 (1948) 70–119.

[4] F. Heidbüchel, "Die Chronologie der Peisistratiden in der Atthis," *Philologus* 101 (1957) 70–89, which has gained considerable currency, especially among German scholars. Based on the assumption that the chronologies of Herodotos and the *Ath.Pol* are quite contradictory, Heidbüchel purports to prove that no chronological reconstruction of the first two

his followers offer no concrete substitute for the Adcock-Jacoby scheme, it is still the one most often used in general works.[5]

The purposes of this article are: (a) to argue that the attractions of the Adcock-Jacoby system are outweighed by the historical difficulties it implies (so that its acceptance into the *communis opinio* is very perilous), and (b) to propose still another system, which requires a minor and plausible textual emendation and which permits complete (or nearly complete) agreement between the *Ath.Pol.* and Herodotos.

The nature of the problem in the text of the *Ath.Pol.* is well known: the total of the figures as given in *Ath.Pol.* 14-15 does not agree with the totals implicit in *Ath.Pol.* 17. To review briefly, the unemended chronology of *Ath.Pol.* 14-15 is:

First Tyranny	561/0;[6]
First Exile	556/5, after five years' rule;[7]
Second Tyranny	545, eleven years later;[8]

---

tyrannies and first exile is possible. Consequently, the bulk of this paper will be directed against the Adcock-Jacoby system, but the thesis of Heidbüchel will be treated where pertinent. *Cf.* G. Gottlieb, *Das Verhältnis der ausserherodoteischen Überlieferung zu Herodot* (Bonn 1963) 3-5, accepting Heidbüchel; also V. Ehrenberg, *From Solon to Socrates* (London 1968) 78f with 400 n.12.

[5] H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (München 1967), is impressed with Heidbüchel's argumentation (II.544f) but in fact leans toward Jacoby's scheme (I.48-51, II.545). Most recently, M. A. Levi, *Commento storico alla Respublica Atheniensium di Aristotele* (Milano-Varese 1968) I.162f, accepts the *Ath.Pol.*'s date of 556/5 for Hegesias (first exile), but follows Hignett (following Adcock-Jacoby), who maintains that the first tyranny and first exile were very short; and Levi believes that Hegesias actually represents the second exile, a variation on the suggestion of G. De Sanctis (*Atthis* [Torino 1912] 278) that the first two tyrannies are doublets.

[6] 14.1: κατέσχε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἔτει δευτέρῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ μετὰ τὴν τῶν νόμων θέςιν, ἐπὶ Κωμέου ἄρχοντος. This is one of the very rare instances where the numerology of the *Ath.Pol.* must be emended, to read 'thirty-fourth' instead of 'thirty-second'; but it still cannot be absolutely decided whether Komeas' year was 561/0 or 560/59; the former is the more probable and is now accepted by almost all scholars: *cf.* Cadoux, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 104-06 with full discussion.

[7] 14.3: οὔπω δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐρριζωμένης, ὁμοφρονήσαντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Μεγακλέα καὶ τὸν Λυκοῦργον, ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἕκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὴν πρώτην κατάςταςιν ἐφ᾽ Ἡγηςίου ἄρχοντος. *Cf.* Cadoux, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 107f.

[8] 14.4: ἔτει δὲ δωδεκάτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα περιελαυνόμενος ὁ Μεγακλῆς τῇ ςτάςει, πάλιν ἐπικηρυκευςάμενος πρὸς τὸν Πειςίςτρατον, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ τε τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ λήψεται, κατήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἀρχαίως καὶ λίαν ἁπλῶς.

SECOND EXILE   539, after about six years' rule;[9]
THIRD TYRANNY   529, after ten years' exile.[10]

Since Peisistratos' death is known to fall in 528/7,[11] only a year or so is left for the third tyranny. Scholars have been virtually unanimous in rejecting this chronology, the usual method being to shorten the first or second tyranny in favor of the third on the basis of οὔπω τῆc ἀρχῆc ἐρριζωμένηc (see n.7), referring to the first tyranny, and οὐ πολὺν χρόνον (see n.9), referring to the second. There is no point in cataloguing all the schemes produced in this endeavor;[12] Adcock's theory posits a very brief first tyranny, only a few months long, followed by an almost equally brief exile; the second tyranny would begin in the next year and last three or four years, followed by a ten-year exile; the third and final tyranny would begin in 546 and continue till Peisistratos' death. For convenience, I repeat the table given by Adcock (p.181) of his scheme:

FIRST TYRANNY   561/0;
FIRST EXILE   c. 560;
SECOND TYRANNY   560 or 559;
SECOND EXILE   ca. 556;
THIRD TYRANNY   ca. 546.

It is manifest that Adcock has expunged all but one of the numerical intervals given by the Ath.Pol. (he retains the ten-year second exile); he does this (as others do) by referring to the "authority of Herodotus." It would be well to examine what is meant by this phrase.

The chronological references in Herodotos are extremely vague and contain no absolute synchronisms; the only definite numbers given by Herodotos are 10 years for the second exile,[13] and 36 years for the

[9] 15.1: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα «ὡc» ἐξέπεcε τὸ δεύτερον, ἔτεϊ μάλιcτα ἑβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν (sc. πρώτην) κάθοδον (οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον κατέcχεν . . .)

[10] 15.2: . . . ἐλθὼν εἰc Ἐρέτριαν ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτεϊ τό‹τε› πρῶτον ἀναcώcαcθαι βίᾳ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεχείρει . . . 15.3: νικήcαc δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι μάχην, . . . κατεῖχεν ἤδη τὴν τυραννίδα βεβαίωc.

[11] 17.1–2: Πειcίcτρατοc μὲν οὖν ἐγκατεγήραcε τῇ ἀρχῇ, καὶ ἀπέθανε νοcήcαc ἐπὶ Φιλόνεω ἄρχοντοc, ἀφ' οὗ μὲν κατέcτη τὸ πρῶτον τύραννοc, ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ τρία βιώcαc, ἃ δ' ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ διέμεινεν, ἑνὸc δέοντα εἴκοcι· ἔφευγε γὰρ τὰ λοιπά. Cf. B. Meritt, Hesperia 8 (1939) 59–65; Cadoux, op.cit. (supra n.3) 109.

[12] Cf. Schachermeyr, RE 19 (1937) 171f; supra nn.1–5.

[13] Hdt. 1.60: (First exile) μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον . . . ἐξελαύνουcί μιν. (Second tyranny) αὖτιc ἐκ νέηc ἐπ' ἀλλήλοιcι ἐcταcίαcαν. περιελαυνόμενοc δὲ τῇ cτάcι ὁ Μεγακλέηc ἐπεκηρυκεύετο Πειcιcτράτῳ. 1.61: (Second exile) τὰ μέν νυν πρῶτα ἔκρυπτε ταῦτα ἡ γυνή, μετὰ δὲ . . . φράζει

whole of the Peisistratid tyranny.[14] It is this latter figure which is used to construct a "Herodotean chronology"; Adcock follows Herschensohn in interpreting this number as 36 continuous years rather than a sum of separate periods; thus 36+510 (expulsion of Hippias)=546 for the beginning of the *third* tyranny; since Herodotos and the *Ath.Pol.* agree that the second exile was 10 years long, the second tyranny would accordingly have ended 546+10=556. This leaves only 5 years after the archonship of Komeas for the first two tyrannies and the first exile. In order to escape the figures in the *Ath.Pol.*, Adcock asserts that these figures were not in the first edition of the work but were interpolated into the narrative version (which was based on Herodotos) at a later time, on the basis of some unknown atthidographers' accounts; these *Atthides* supposedly contained dates for only one exile (the second); the other numbers are the interpolator's misreading of a marginal note containing alternative pairs of numbers (sixth and twelfth *or* seventh and eleventh).[15] Jacoby (see n.3) reached almost identical conclusions by a (relatively) more acceptable method; since there were only 5 years between the archonship of Komeas and the beginning of the second exile, he proposed the emendation of ἔτει at *Ath.Pol.* 14.3 and 15.1 to μηνί.[16] This error seems palaeographically improbable, but in any case the reading μηνί would raise even more serious questions about the sources of the atthidographic tradition than the reading ἔτει.

The problem of the *Ath.Pol.*'s sources and their value is a difficult one. It is certain that Herodotos was followed rather closely, but there was obviously an attempt to supplement his account, presumably on the basis of one or more *Atthis* which included synchronisms with the archon list. I cannot give full treatment to the question of the general reliability of the atthidographic tradition on such matters, but I must state briefly that I do not accept the counsel of despair

---

τῇ ἑωυτῆς μητρί, ἡ δὲ τῷ ἀνδρί, . . . μαθὼν δὲ ὁ Πεισίστρατος . . . ἀπαλλάσσετο. 1.62: (Third tyranny) διὰ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτεος ἀπίκοντο ὀπίσω.

[14] Hdt. 5.65.3: ἄρξαντες μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἐπ' ἔτεα ἕξ τε καὶ τριήκοντα. See also Hdt. 5.55.

[15] Adcock, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 179; the text slightly over-simplifies a quite complicated hypothesis by which Adcock explains the figures in the *Ath.Pol.*; but a more elaborate presentation would not make the supposed process any more believable, and its fallacies were long ago pointed out in detail by A. W. Gomme, "Two Notes on the Constitution of Athens," *JHS* 46 (1926) 171–78, esp. 175f.

[16] Jacoby, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 193f; his dates are: first tyranny: 561/0; first exile 560/59; second tyranny 558/7; second exile 557/6; third tyranny 547/6.

lately advocated by Heidbüchel.[17] According to him, the figures in the *Ath.Pol.* are based on an arbitrary process which began with Hellanikos, who reckoned one generation (33 years) for the whole length of Peisistratos' career as tyrant, one-half generation (17 years) for the reign of his sons, and then reckoned backward from the known date of Hippias' expulsion (511/0, archon Harpaktides) thus: 511/0+17= 528/7 for Peisistratos' death, 528/7+33=561/0 for his first accession; archon-names were *then* added to give these *termini* an air of authenticity, and the 33 years were divided into three periods arbitrarily, except that the ten-year second exile was adopted from Herodotos. Heidbüchel concludes that no reliable data can be obtained from this tradition and that the *Ath.Pol.* is valueless as a source for the dating of Peisistratos.[18]

Heidbüchel's thesis casts doubt on the whole system of archon-dating by the atthidographers, and he appeals for support to the well-known criticism of Hellanikos by Thucydides (1.97.2): βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήςθη. Thucydides' meaning is not entirely clear, for he proceeds immediately to a very imprecise (by our standards) account of the Pentekontaetia; elsewhere (5.20.2–3) he discredits the use of archon dates but not, as Heidbüchel thinks, because they were probably wrong, but rather because they could cause confusion in an account of military campaigns by compressing two campaigning seasons into one year.[19] On the question of the accuracy of archon dates Thucydides is silent, and there is no reason to suppose that he questioned them.

The most reasonable interpretation is that Hellanikos reported events out of sequence even though he may have labeled them with the right archon.[20] We cannot know precisely how the atthidographers obtained their information, but there was evidence available which did not find its way into Herodotos and which there is no

[17] Heidbüchel, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 80–83.

[18] Heidbüchel, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 87: "man muss hier resignieren: et quod vides perisse perditum ducas." On the basis of the 'Herodotean' chronology he accepts 547/6 as the beginning of the third tyranny and 557/6 as the beginning of the second exile, but refuses to speculate further.

[19] See Gomme's *Commentary* I.361: this interpretation also lies behind Jacoby, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 397 n.49. See next note.

[20] So Meritt, Wade-Gery, McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* III (Princeton 1950) 161f. Heidbüchel, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 81, arrives *a fortiori* at the conclusion that Thucydides considered the archon dates *overly* exact, an odd deduction to draw from οὐκ ἀκριβῶς.

necessary reason to doubt.[21] The postulate of arbitrary dating by generation does not explain all the intervals reported in the *Ath.Pol.*, such as the five-year duration of the first tyranny (5/33 of a generation?), from which the archonship of Hegesias must be dated;[22] some of the *Atthides'* sources may have been documentary, most were likely to have been oral, but whatever their nature there is no ground for rejecting *a priori* a numerology based on this tradition.[23] The impression given by the *Ath.Pol.*'s account of the Peisistratid tyranny is one of great chronological precision: in all cases but one the numbers are offered as exact figures; the one exception (see n.9) is carefully qualified by μάλιcτα. It is my view that the *Ath.Pol.* is deliberately making clear the ambiguous narrative version of Herodotos and that the numerals must all be accepted unless emendation is unavoidable.[24]

But there are other serious difficulties inherent in the Adcock-Jacoby scheme which must be emphasized.

(1) According to Adcock (and Jacoby), Pallene must fall in 546 because "Herodotus makes Croesus' last campaign synchronize with Peisistratus' last return" (p. 180). This is true only if Pallene is in 546 as Adcock-Jacoby contend; Herodotos nowhere states his intention to make such a synchronism, and to state that he does make it puts a prejudicial construction on the evidence. The 'synchronism' with Herodotos' account of Kroisos presents, in fact, a difficulty for Adcock's own scheme. Herodotos relates that an embassy from Kroisos (whose reign ended at Sardis in 546)[25] to Greece learned that Athens was at

---

[21] For example, an additional son of Peisistratos, Iophon, is named at *Ath.Pol.* 17.3, and the psephism of Aristion by which Peisistratos received a bodyguard (*Ath.Pol.* 14.1) is not mentioned by Herodotos.

[22] *Cf.* Levi, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 162; Cadoux, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 108.

[23] The reference to the psephism of Aristion implies documentary evidence, as Cadoux, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 104, suggests. For the argument on the atthidographic tradition, *cf.* Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 260–90; Jacoby, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3); summary and discussion by Heidbüchel, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 70ff. One should keep in mind the judicious remark of Sumner, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 46: "An examination of A.P.'s use of archon-dates suggests that they only appear where we know that there was, or can see that there is likely to have been, definite authority for them."

[24] Sumner, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 38, finds that the transmission of the numerals in the *Ath.Pol.* was exceptionally reliable.

[25] The date of the fall of Sardis is, of course, problematic. Herodotos (1.130) makes this the first exploit of Kyros' reign following the expulsion of Astyages; a purely Herodotean chronology would seem to date Astyages' deposition to 559, so that Sardis should come two or three years later, 557 or 556. The Chronicle of Nabonidus, however, implies that the

that time being oppressed by the tyranny of Peisistratos (Hdt. 1.59.1); this embassy presumably came some time prior to 546; in 547 Peisistratos (by the Adcock-Jacoby scheme) was in the tenth year of his exile, having been out of power since 556, and it would be odd for the embassy to say that he was oppressing Athens at this time (κατεχόμενόν τε καὶ διεσπαςμένον). The only possibility which would save this scheme would be to put Pallene in late 547[26] or early 546, the embassy immediately thereafter, and then the defeat of Kroisos at Sardis later in 546. This would require not only remarkable coincidence but also unusually rapid travel time.[27]

(2) If Pallene belongs to 546 (or, even worse, 547), then the story in Herodotos 1.63, that Argive troops were brought over to aid Peisistratos at Pallene by Hegesistratos, his son by the Argive Timonassa, is rendered quite improbable by the statement at Ath.Pol. 17.4 that the marriage which produced Hegesistratos took place either in the first tyranny or in the first exile. By the Adcock-Jacoby chronology Hegesistratos could not have been born before 560 and would then have been 14 years old, at the most, at Pallene.[28]

(3) It is improbable that Argos would have supplied troops to help Peisistratos at a time when war with Sparta was imminent: Herodotos tells us (1.82–83) that Argos and Sparta fought the famous Battle of the Champions at "about the same time" that Kroisos was preparing for Sardis.

(4) Herodotos 1.61 relates that Peisistratos consulted Hippias as to his future course during the second exile. Hippias was archon in 526/5 and an "old man" at Marathon; he and Hipparchos are said to

---

deposition of Astyages was in 549, and other sources favor the later date of 547/6 for Sardis. Hence, the generally accepted date is 546. For discussion of all this, cf. H. Strasburger "Herodots Zeitrechnung," Herodot, ed. W. Marg (München 1962) 677–725; H. Kaletsch, "Zur lydischen Chronologie," Historia 7 (1958) esp. 39–43; S. Smith, Babylonian Historical Texts (London 1924) esp. 112–16; Sumner, op.cit. (supra n.1) 42f n.4.

[26] Gomme, op.cit. (supra n.15) 174, points out that Adcock's figures are imprecise: by his own figures Pallene should be in 547/6 (19 years before 528/7), thus leaving Adcock with only 14 (not 16) years between the first tyranny (561/0) and the second exile. Jacoby's dates (see n.16) are consistent.

[27] C. Hignett, History of the Athenian Constitution (Oxford 1952), accepts by implication the Adcock-Jacoby scheme (see p.114), but conveniently moves the date of Sardis down to 541 to avoid this difficulty (p.328); yet the Adcock-Jacoby chronology rests on the 'synchronism' of Pallene with Kroisos' last campaign; Sardis and Pallene, according to Adcock-Jacoby, must go together. The objections to putting Pallene in 546 apply also to Heidbüchel, op.cit. (supra n.4).

[28] Also noted by Gomme, ibid. (supra n.26).

have been grown up at the time of the second tyranny.[29] On the Adcock-Jacoby scheme, Hippias' birth would have to fall *ca.* 577, making him at least 87 at Marathon (probably closer to 90 if he were more than a year older than Hipparchos), and only 20–22 when consulted by Peisistratos. This is not a decisive objection, but Hippias takes on a more reasonable age under the chronology I shall advance below.

(5) This objection forms the starting-point for my own proposal: the statement by Herodotos that the Peisistratids ruled 36 years (see n.14) does not obviously or necessarily refer to continuous years. Indeed, if we consider the 36 years continuous, we must assume Herodotos ignored the first two tyrannies. This seems improbable.

The *Ath Pol.* observes (see n.11) that the *sum* of Peisistratos' tyrannies was 19 years; if Herodotos was referring to a sum as well, the two accounts would be in accord, for Hippias ruled 17 (527–510) of the 36, leaving 19 years for Peisistratos. Indeed, this interpretation would be in line with what seems to me a consistent tendency of the *Ath.Pol.* to specify statements in Herodotos: the *Ath.Pol.* understood Herodotos' "36 years" as the sum of the three periods of tyranny, and proceeded to clarify the figure.[30] The *Ath.Pol.* gives no figure for the length of the third tyranny, but if the account were self-consistent, we should expect a number near 6 or 7 since the figures for the first two tyrannies are 5 years (exclusive) or 6 years (inclusive) and 6 years (exclusive) or 7 years (inclusive), and the total is declared to be 19. But this implies that the total of Peisistratos' exiles was 14 years (33–19; see n.11), which is in blatant contradiction to the apparent figures in *Ath.Pol.* 14–15, where the total seems to be 21; how is this difficulty to be resolved?

Bauer long ago proposed that the reading μετὰ ταῦτα at *Ath.Pol.* 14.4

---

[29] Plut. *Cat.Mai.* 24.

[30] Arist. *Pol.* 1315b records that Peisistratos reigned 17 years, Hippias 18. The attribution of the *Ath.Pol.* to Aristotle is still questioned by some (mainly English) scholars, but the discrepancy might be accounted for in several ways. Two explanations are current, of which the easiest is the suggestion that the *Ath.Pol.* is a later, more careful treatment and that the *Politika* is therefore inaccurate; or, since the accepted figure for the length of Hippias' reign is 17, not 18 years, it is possible that the respective figures for Peisistratos and Hippias should be reversed (Oddo). It is evident, at any rate, that the two works reckon the tyrannies somewhat differently, for the sum of the figures in the *Politika* is 35, whereas the *Ath.Pol.* accepts Herodotos' figure of 36. That the *Ath.Pol.* interpreted Herodotos' figure as the total of the three periods of rule was also recognized by Heidbüchel, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 79, 88f; see also Sumner, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 39 n.4.

(see n.8) be emended to μετὰ ταύτην (sc. τὴν πρώτην κατάςταςιν).[31] This would alter our point of reference from the first exile (to which μετὰ ταῦτα most logically refers) to the beginning of the first tyranny.[32] There is nothing intrinsically implausible about the reading ταύτην; indeed, one can readily understand a scribe's altering μετὰ ταύτην to the more familiar μετὰ ταῦτα.[33] Nor does the sentence become awkward by this emendation: ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἕκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὴν πρώτην κατάςταςιν ἐφ᾽ ῾Ηγηςίου ἄρχοντος, ἔτει δὲ δωδεκάτῳ μετὰ ταύτην περιελαυνόμενος, κτλ; the same point of reference is used for two intervals. Bauer, however, did not stop with this, but continued with further unnecessary and conjectural emendations.[34] By pursuing the implications of ταύτην alone, we derive the following chronology:

First Tyranny	561/0;
First Exile	556/5, after 5 years' rule;
Second Tyranny	550/49, 11 years after the first κατάςταςις;
Second Exile	ca. 544/3, after about 6 years' rule;
Third Tyranny	ca. 534/3, after 10 years' exile;
Death	528/7

This gives us 6 years (exclusive) or 7 years (inclusive) for the length of the third tyranny. Much depends here on the manner in which the totals for the respective tyrannies are added, but the Ath.Pol.'s "19

[31] A. Bauer, Literarische und historische Forschungen zu Aristoteles' 'Αθ. Πολ. (München 1891) 51.

[32] The suggestion of Cichorius (reported in Oppermann's Teubner text, p.17 app.crit.) that μετὰ ταῦτα means the same as μετὰ ταύτην, that is, refers to the first κατάςταςιν, puts a severe strain on the Greek.

[33] Jacoby, op.cit. (supra n.3) 378 n.135, declares μετὰ ταύτην contrary to Aristotelian usage; Pomtow, "Die Peisistratos-Jahre," RhM 51 (1896) 566–68, attempted to prove that μετὰ ταύτην was foreign to the Ath.Pol. Such a question cannot be decided by statistics: there is no doubt that the usage is abnormal; that is why a scribe would alter it. There are in fact four examples of μετὰ ταύτην used in this manner, all in Ath.Pol. 41.2. The first of these exhibits precisely the sort of confusion I postulate at 14.4; the scribe of the papyrus first wrote μετὰ ταῦτα (the normal phrase), but later corrected to μετὰ ταύτην, doubtless because the three remaining examples in this passage revealed the error. Cf. Oppermann's Teubner text, p.53, app.crit. ad loc.

[34] Bauer, loc.cit. (supra n.31); Bauer, uncomfortable with the 6 years reported by Ath.Pol. 15.1 before Megakles' daughter complained to her mother, suggested that μηνί be read for ἔτει, and thus obtained 550/49–549/8 for the second tyranny and 539/8 for the beginning of the third. He was followed in this by Schachermeyr (RE 19 [1937] 167–71), who also allowed an alternative reckoning from 560/59 as the year of Komeas instead of 561/0. This emendation is ill-considered; cf. Sumner, op.cit. (supra n.1) 44.

Blass, loc.cit. (supra n.2) and in his fourth edition of the Ath.Pol. (appendix, pp.126f),

years" can be reached by reckoning inclusive+inclusive+exclusive, viz. 6+7+6=19. There is no difficulty in showing that the ancients were quite inconsistent in such matters, but in this case the method could be justified; the year of Peisistratos' death (528/7) was also the first year of Hippias' reign and may have been reckoned with Hippias instead of Peisistratos.[35] It is an anomaly of this sort of reckoning that the figures for the exiles calculate to 17 years (inclusive) or 15 years (exclusive), and neither will quite yield 33 years for Peisistratos' *floruit*. But it is doubtful that the *Ath.Pol.* made any such calculation: the "33 years" is the period 561/0 to 528/7, reckoned exclusively, and the "19 years" was calculated as suggested above; the *Ath.Pol.* does not in fact give the implied figure of 14 years for the exiles, but merely states (17.2) ἔφευγε γὰρ τὰ λοιπά. The simple emendation of ταῦτα to ταύτην makes the *Ath.Pol.* numerically consistent both with itself and with the figures implied in Herodotos' "36 years."

From an historical viewpoint, this scheme is more suitable than that of Adcock. Pallene now falls in 534, and no 'synchronism' of Pallene with Kroisos' last campaign is to be imputed to Herodotos; the embassy from Kroisos to Greece before Sardis now comes during the second tyranny (550–544), when the report of an Athens oppressed by tyranny would be more cogent. The birth of Hegesistratos could now fall anywhere between 560 and 550, so that there is no difficulty in postulating for him at least the ephebic 18 years at Pallene. The Battle of the Champions, still in 546, would not affect Argive policy at Pallene, now in 534. Hippias' age also becomes more reasonable: his birth would fall *ca.* 568, so that he would be 24–34 during the second exile and a more believable age at Marathon.[36] I might also

---

accepted μετὰ ταύτην but also emended δωδεκάτῳ at 14.4 to ἐνδεκάτῳ on the basis of ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν at 15.2; this is unnecessary: πάλιν refers to ἐλθών, not ἐνδεκάτῳ. Blass neither explicates nor defends historically the implications of his text, but they lead to a thesis quite close to the one proposed here; he would place Komeas in 560/59 and should reckon thus: first exile 555/4, second tyranny 550/49, second exile 544/3, third tyranny 534/3. Of the older theories, that of Blass is to be preferred since it grants the most integrity to the text of the *Ath.Pol.*

[35] *Cf.* Jacoby, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 371 n.99.

[36] No chronological difficulties are raised by the question of the relationship of Miltiades and his descendants to the Peisistratids: (a) Herodotos 6.35ff synchronizes Kroisos' aid to Miltiades I (son of Kypselos) with one of Peisistratos' tyrannies; the story of the embassy from Kroisos (1.59.1) now makes this later story most compatible with the second tyranny. (b) Miltiades' stepbrother Kimon, who was in exile during some part of Peisistratos' reign, won three Olympic horseraces, the second before Peisistratos' death, the third after (Hdt.

point out, with some diffidence, that the date of the beginning of Peisistratos' final tyranny now coincides with the traditional date of the first dramatic victory of Thespis in 534;[37] Peisistratos' connection with the Great Dionysia is well known.

Certain objections to the proposed chronology are bound to arise: (a) the *Ath.Pol.* states (14.3, see n.7) that the first tyranny was "not yet rooted," and it has frequently been claimed that this does not agree with the stated time-period of 5 years' duration: "wenn die Herrschaft in 5½ Jahren noch nicht recht festgewurzelt war—ja, wie lange brauchte dann überhaupt die griechische, kurzlebige Tyrannis dazu, um festzuwurzeln?"[38] This objection is not compelling; as Gomme points out, "Caesar did not 'root' *his* tyranny in five years, nor did Euphron."[39] The statement in the *Ath.Pol.* refers to the fact that Peisistratos did not have the necessary political support of the powerful families, such as the house of Megakles, rather than to a duration of time. (b) The *Ath.Pol.* (15.1, see n.9) says that the second exile began 6 years after his second accession, and that he had not held power very long (οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον κατέσχεν). The question is whether οὐ πολὺν χρόνον can refer to a period of 6 years, but we must assume that it could unless we emend the text still further; we have no evidence on which to base such an emendation, and it was just this attempt which led to the scholarly chaos of the 1890's. Moreover, the *Ath.Pol.* is quite willing to assign 5 years' duration to Herodotus' οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον for the *first* tyranny (see nn.7 and 13); perhaps the 6 years of the second tyranny were viewed as "no long time" compared to the 23 or 24 years of settled tyranny after 534/3. (c) Adcock (p.174) states that the narrative of the *Ath.Pol.* "implies that Peisistratus had a long final tyranny at Athens before he died in 528/7 B.C., ἐγκατεγήρασε τῇ ἀρχῇ (17.1)." But this is not the only possible interpretation; the *Ath.Pol.* is summarizing here, and the implication may rather be that

---

6.103: therefore the victories were in 532, 528 and 524); he allowed the second victory to be accredited to Peisistratos. Kimon must have been exiled by Peisistratos in 534 (third tyranny) and recalled either by Peisistratos himself in 528 or 527 or, less probably, by Hippias in the general amnesty after Peisistratos' death, which also allowed the return of the Alkmeonidai. The story of the murder of Kimon is not relevant to our purposes: *cf.* Hignett, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.27) 329.

[37] F. Jacoby, *Marmor Parium* (Berlin 1904) 172: naturally, the years 536/5 or 535/4 cannot be ruled out, as Jacoby indicates; *cf.* also Jacoby on *FGrHist* 239 A 43.

[38] Pomtow, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.33) 573.

[39] Gomme, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.15) 173.

Peisistratos grew old *in office* (rather than in exile), for the text proceeds immediately to the division of the 33 years, from Peisistratos' first accession till his death, into periods of exile and periods of power (totaling 19 years).

The Adcock-Jacoby chronology proceeds from faulty premises to an untenable conclusion, as Heidbüchel tried to show on grounds different from those indicated in this study; but Heidbüchel was compelled to abandon the numerology of the *Ath.Pol.* altogether. The heart of the account in the *Ath.Pol.* is the numerical precision it attempts to bring to the Herodotean narrative, and it is just these figures which Adcock, Jacoby and Heidbüchel would expunge, emend or discredit, respectively. No theory which does not reconcile these figures with the historical narrative of Herodotos is acceptable.[40]