

WHITE M., *The duration of the Samian tyranny*: JHS LXXIV 1954 36-43. |  
Étant donné la continuité de la politique samienne de 560 env. à la mort de  
Polycrate en 522, il semble raisonnable de faire remonter les débuts du régime  
tyrannique de Samos à la génération précédant Polycrate, c'est-à-dire au  
temps d'Aiakes.

*The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 74 (1954), 36-43.

## THE DURATION OF THE SAMIAN TYRANNY

HERODOTUS in the course of his description of Kambyses' conquest of Egypt gives both the earliest and the only detailed account we possess of Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos.<sup>1</sup> Thucydides makes a brief reference to him, also dating him to the reign of Kambyses (ἐπὶ Καμβύσου), 530-522 B.C.<sup>2</sup> Other references, as will appear, are late, scattered, and incidental. In attempting to determine the length of the Samian tyranny, Herodotus will, therefore, be our most important source of evidence. Although his interest is concentrated on the career of Polykrates, he provides enough information about Samian activities in the immediately preceding period to suggest that Polykrates is, in most cases, continuing a policy already initiated a generation before him. The difficulty of compressing into the brief period of Kambyses all that is referred to the tyranny of Polykrates is notorious, as is also the difficulty of reconciling with the usually accepted dates of Polykrates the chronological references to other people connected with the Samian tyranny. There is a similar problem about the dating of two of the great Samian works which Herodotus describes, the water tunnel of Eupalinos, and the Heraion of Rhoikos.<sup>3</sup> The usual assumption that the Samian tyranny began with Polykrates' seizure of power in the middle or late thirties is not, I think, adequate to explain the evidence. There are various indications that the Samian tyranny, or a régime at Samos which closely resembled the subsequent tyranny, had begun in the generation before Polykrates, and that Polykrates himself, because of his spirited resistance to Persia, has been credited with what was in reality the achievement of a continuous policy which had been begun earlier, perhaps by his father.

The date of Polykrates' death can be determined with reasonable certainty. Herodotus prefaces his account of Oroites' plot with the remark that 'these things occurred about the time of Kambyses' last illness',<sup>4</sup> thus fixing Polykrates' death to ca. 522 B.C. The beginning of his power is dated by Eusebius ca. Ol. 62, 532 B.C.,<sup>5</sup> and many historians accept this date since Herodotus<sup>6</sup> and Thucydides,<sup>7</sup> in putting him in the reign of Kambyses which began in 530 B.C., may be supposed to put the beginning of Polykrates' reign little, if at all, earlier than that.<sup>8</sup> Others, troubled by the difficulty of leaving a gap after the Phokæian thalassocracy, which must have ended with the capture of Phokaia by the Persians not long after the fall of Sardis, and also of accounting for all that is ascribed to Samos in this period,<sup>9</sup> push back the beginning of Polykrates' power to ca. 540 B.C.<sup>10</sup> It is not placed earlier than this because Polyainos says that Polykrates and his brothers seized the tyranny with reinforcements from Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos.<sup>11</sup> Lygdamis himself had assisted Peisistratos of Athens in his final seizure of power at the Battle of Pallene, 546 B.C.,<sup>12</sup> and in return

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. 3. 39-60; 120-5.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. 1. 13. 6. For the dates of Kambyses see R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology* 626 B.C.-A.D. 45 (Chicago, 1942), 12.

<sup>3</sup> Hdt. 3. 60.

<sup>4</sup> Hdt. 3. 120. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Eusebius, *Chronici Canones*, Armenian version ed. by J. Karst in *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Eusebius Werke*, Band V (Leipzig, 1911); Jerome's version ed. by J. K. Fotheringham, *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones Latine vertit . . . S. Eusebius Hieronymus* (Oxford, 1923). The dates given for the accession of Polykrates and his two brothers (as for many other events) differ by several years in the various MSS. of the Armenian and Latin versions; e.g. both a.a. Abr. 1481 (535 B.C.) and a.a. Abr. 1484 (532 B.C.) are found in the Armenian MSS. (Karst, *op. cit.* 189, n. 7). The reason for these discrepancies can easily be seen in the Bodleian MS. of Jerome, where the notice, *apud Samum tyrannidem exercent tres fratres Polycrates Sylus et Pantagnostus*, takes three lines, the first of which is above the line on which *LXII Olym.* is written. Some editors date the event in the last year of Ol. 61 (533 B.C.), others in the first year of Ol. 62 (532 B.C.). For the Bodleian MS. see *The Bodleian Manuscript of Jerome's Version of the Chronicle of Eusebius Reproduced in Collotype*, with an introduction by J. K. Fotheringham (Oxford, 1905), Fol. 81.

<sup>6</sup> Hdt. 3. 39. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Thuc. 1. 13. 6.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. by G. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* II<sup>2</sup> (Gotha, 1895), 508-9, n. 3; G. Glotz and H. Cohen, *Hist. gr.* I (Paris, 1948), 281; W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* I (Oxford, 1912), 267; F. Jacoby, *FGH* II BD (Berlin, 1930), 727, in commentary on Apollodoros F 29.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. K. J. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* I. 1 (Strassburg, 1912), 375; L. Burchner, *RE* I A 2 (Stuttgart, 1920), col. 2214, who gives 540 B.C. as the date for the three brothers and 537 B.C. with a question mark for Polykrates' sole power; P. N. Ure, *OCD* (Oxford, 1949), 711-12; E. L. Minar Jr., *Early Pythagorean Politics* (Baltimore, 1942), 2; T. Lenschau, *RE* XXI 2 (1952),

cols. 1727-8, argues for 538 B.C. and makes the tyranny of Polykrates coincide with a sixteen-year thalassocracy, 538-522 B.C. See below, note 31, for a discussion of the thalassocracy.

<sup>10</sup> After Kyros captured Sardis he left Ionia for the conquest of Babylon, putting Tabalos and Paktyes in charge of Lydia and Ionia. The revolt of Paktyes followed immediately (Hdt. 1. 154). Mazares was sent to subdue Paktyes; later he took Priene and the plain of the Meander, after which he died (Hdt. 1. 161). Harpagos was then sent to succeed him and directed a first attack on Phokaia. The Persian capture of Phokaia occurred, therefore, within one or two years of the fall of Sardis. J. L. Myres, *Herodotus Father of History* (Oxford, 1953), 163, places the fall of Phokaia after Kyros' capture of Babylon (539 B.C.), but Herodotus (1. 177) seems to imply that Harpagos' campaigns coincided with Kyros' earlier campaigns in upper Asia and that the attack on Babylon was later. The precise date of the fall of Sardis is not known; Herodotus certainly places it later than the battle of Pallene (547/6), and his authority seems to me as reliable as any. The difference between the various dates proposed (547 to 541/40) does not affect this argument; even at the latest it is well before the time of Polykrates. For the various dates and discussion of them see: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago, 1948), 40; Sidney Smith, *Isaiah Chapters XL-LV, Literary Criticism and History*, Schweich Lectures 1940 (London, 1944), 33-6; G. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* II<sup>2</sup>, 460 and 502; H. T. Wade-Gery, *JHS* LXXI (1951), 219, note 38.

<sup>11</sup> Polyainos, *Strategikon* I. 23. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Hdt. 1. 61. 4; 64. 1-2. It is unnecessary here to argue the date of the battle of Pallene; Hdt. 5. 65. 3, ἀφ' ὧν μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἐν ἑταῖς ἐξ τε καὶ τριήκοντα seems to be the crucial passage. It indicates a thirty-six-year period of continuous tyranny prior to the expulsion of Hippias in the archonship of Harpaktides, 511/10 B.C., and thus dates the battle of Pallene in 547/6 B.C. See F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), 188-96, and H. T. Wade-Gery, *JHS* LXXI (1951), 219.

2730 (248)  
WHITE, M.  
1954

## THE DURATION OF THE SAMIAN TYRANNY

HERODOTUS in the course of his description of Kambyes' conquest of Egypt gives both the earliest and the only detailed account we possess of Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos.<sup>1</sup> Thucydides makes a brief reference to him, also dating him to the reign of Kambyes (ἐπὶ Καμβύσου), 530–522 B.C.<sup>2</sup> Other references, as will appear, are late, scattered, and incidental. In attempting to determine the length of the Samian tyranny, Herodotus will, therefore, be our most important source of evidence. Although his interest is concentrated on the career of Polykrates, he provides enough information about Samian activities in the immediately preceding period to suggest that Polykrates is, in most cases, continuing a policy already initiated a generation before him. The difficulty of compressing into the brief period of Kambyes all that is referred to the tyranny of Polykrates is notorious, as is also the difficulty of reconciling with the usually accepted dates of Polykrates the chronological references to other people connected with the Samian tyranny. There is a similar problem about the dating of two of the great Samian works which Herodotus describes, the water tunnel of Eupalinos, and the Heraion of Rhoikos.<sup>3</sup> The usual assumption that the Samian tyranny began with Polykrates' seizure of power in the middle or late thirties is not, I think, adequate to explain the evidence. There are various indications that the Samian tyranny, or a régime at Samos which closely resembled the subsequent tyranny, had begun in the generation before Polykrates, and that Polykrates himself, because of his spirited resistance to Persia, has been credited with what was in reality the achievement of a continuous policy which had been begun earlier, perhaps by his father.

The date of Polykrates' death can be determined with reasonable certainty. Herodotus prefaces his account of Oroites' plot with the remark that 'these things occurred about the time of Kambyes' last illness',<sup>4</sup> thus fixing Polykrates' death to *ca.* 522 B.C. The beginning of his power is dated by Eusebius *ca.* Ol. 62, 532 B.C.,<sup>5</sup> and many historians accept this date since Herodotus<sup>6</sup> and Thucydides,<sup>7</sup> in putting him in the reign of Kambyes which began in 530 B.C., may be supposed to put the beginning of Polykrates' reign little, if at all, earlier than that.<sup>8</sup> Others, troubled by the difficulty of leaving a gap after the Phokàian thalassocracy, which must have ended with the capture of Phokaia by the Persians not long after the fall of Sardis, and also of accounting for all that is ascribed to Samos in this period,<sup>9</sup> push back the beginning of Polykrates' power to *ca.* 540 B.C.<sup>10</sup> It is not placed earlier than this because Polyainos says that Polykrates and his brothers seized the tyranny with reinforcements from Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos.<sup>11</sup> Lygdamis himself had assisted Peisistratos of Athens in his final seizure of power at the Battle of Pallene, 546 B.C.,<sup>12</sup> and in return

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. 3. 39–60; 120–5.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. 1. 13. 6. For the dates of Kambyes see R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology* 626 B.C.–A.D. 45 (Chicago, 1942), 12.

<sup>3</sup> Hdt. 3. 60.

<sup>4</sup> Hdt. 3. 120. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Eusebius, *Chronici Canones*, Armenian version ed. by J. Karst in *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Eusebius Werke*, Band V (Leipzig, 1911); Jerome's version ed. by J. K. Fotheringham, *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones Latine vertit . . . S. Eusebius Hieronymus* (Oxford, 1923). The dates given for the accession of Polykrates and his two brothers (as for many other events) differ by several years in the various MSS. of the Armenian and Latin versions; *e.g.* both a.a. Abr. 1481 (535 B.C.) and a.a. Abr. 1484 (532 B.C.) are found in the Armenian MSS. (Karst, *op. cit.* 189, n. 7). The reason for these discrepancies can easily be seen in the Bodleian MS. of Jerome, where the notice, *apud Samum tyrannidem exercent tres fratres Polycrates Sylus et Pantagnostus*, takes three lines, the first of which is above the line on which *LXII Olym.* is written. Some editors date the event in the last year of Ol. 61 (533 B.C.), others in the first year of Ol. 62 (532 B.C.). For the Bodleian MS. see *The Bodleian Manuscript of Jerome's Version of the Chronicle of Eusebius Reproduced in Collotype*, with an introduction by J. K. Fotheringham (Oxford, 1905), Fol. 81.

<sup>6</sup> Hdt. 3. 39. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Thuc. 1. 13. 6.

<sup>8</sup> *E.g.* by G. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* II<sup>2</sup> (Gotha, 1895), 508–9, n. 3; G. Glotz and H. Cohen, *Hist. gr.* I (Paris, 1948), 281; W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* I (Oxford, 1912), 267; F. Jacoby, *FGH* II BD (Berlin, 1930), 727, in commentary on Apollodoros F 29.

<sup>9</sup> *E.g.* K. J. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* I. 1 (Strassburg, 1912), 375; L. Burchner, *RE* I A 2 (Stuttgart, 1920), col. 2214, who gives 540 B.C. as the date for the three brothers and 537 B.C. with a question mark for Polykrates' sole power; P. N. Ure, *OCD* (Oxford, 1949), 711–12; E. L. Minar Jr., *Early Pythagorean Politics* (Baltimore, 1942), 2; T. Lenschau, *RE* XXI 2 (1952),

cols. 1727–8, argues for 538 B.C. and makes the tyranny of Polykrates coincide with a sixteen-year thalassocracy, 538–522 B.C. See below, note 31, for a discussion of the thalassocracy.

<sup>10</sup> After Kyros captured Sardis he left Ionia for the conquest of Babylon, putting Tabalos and Paktyes in charge of Lydia and Ionia. The revolt of Paktyes followed immediately (Hdt. 1. 154). Mazares was sent to subdue Paktyes; later he took Priene and the plain of the Meander, after which he died (Hdt. 1. 161). Harpagos was then sent to succeed him and directed a first attack on Phokaia. The Persian capture of Phokaia occurred, therefore, within one or two years of the fall of Sardis. J. L. Myres, *Herodotus Father of History* (Oxford, 1953), 163, places the fall of Phokaia after Kyros' capture of Babylon (539 B.C.), but Herodotus (1. 177) seems to imply that Harpagos' campaigns coincided with Kyros' earlier campaigns in upper Asia and that the attack on Babylon was later. The precise date of the fall of Sardis is not known; Herodotus certainly places it later than the battle of Pallene (547/6), and his authority seems to me as reliable as any. The difference between the various dates proposed (547 to 541/40) does not affect this argument; even at the latest it is well before the time of Polykrates. For the various dates and discussion of them see: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago, 1948), 40; Sidney Smith, *Isaiah Chapters XL–LV, Literary Criticism and History*, Schweich Lectures 1940 (London, 1944), 33–6; G. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* II<sup>2</sup>, 460 and 502; H. T. Wade-Gery, *JHS* LXXI (1951), 219, note 38.

<sup>11</sup> Polyainos, *Strategikon* I. 23. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Hdt. I. 61. 4; 64. 1–2. It is unnecessary here to argue the date of the battle of Pallene; Hdt. 5. 65. 3, ἀρξάντες μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ ἑταῖ ἐξ τε καὶ τρήκοντα seems to be the crucial passage. It indicates a thirty-six-year period of continuous tyranny prior to the expulsion of Hippias in the archonship of Harpaktides, 511/10 B.C., and thus dates the battle of Pallene in 547/6 B.C. See F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949), 188–96, and H. T. Wade-Gery, *JHS* LXXI (1951), 219.

Peisistratos had subdued Naxos and handed it over to Lygdamis, depositing with him hostages of prominent Athenian families. Enough time must be allowed after Peisistratos finally established himself in 546 B.C. for him to set up Lygdamis, and then for Lygdamis to send aid to Polykrates. This is the reason why those who desert the Eusebian date of 532 B.C., supported as it seems to be by Herodotus and Thucydides, cannot put Polykrates much before 540 B.C. But, even if Polykrates is put as far back as this evidence will allow, it is not early enough to help materially towards a solution of the very difficulties which led to questioning the usual dates. We may, therefore, accept the chronographers' dates for Polykrates—*ca.* 532 B.C. for the beginning of his power and *ca.* 522 B.C. for his death—that is, as both Herodotus and Thucydides indicate, a period roughly contemporary with Kambyses of Persia (530–522 B.C.). The difficulties demand more drastic remedy.

A careful reading of Herodotus suggests that the same policy had been pursued in Samos since the time of Alyattes of Lydia and the early years of Amasis of Egypt, that is since the 560's at least.<sup>13</sup> The most reasonable inference to be drawn from this continuity of policy is that the tyranny, too, had begun as early as the 560's. *Ca.* 525/4 B.C., when the disaffected Samian oligarchs of whom Polykrates had hoped to rid himself by sending them as his contingent for Kambyses' attack on Egypt asked for help to depose Polykrates,<sup>14</sup> Herodotus tells us that Sparta was willing to assist them for two reasons: first, out of gratitude (εὐεργεσίας ἐκρίνοντες), because the Samians had helped Sparta against the revolting Messenians; secondly, for the sake of revenge, because the Samians had stolen the bowl the Spartans were sending to Kroisos, and the linen corselet which Amasis of Egypt was sending to them.<sup>15</sup> Corinth, similarly, joined in the attack on Polykrates because the Samians had intercepted the three hundred Corcyrean boys whom Periander had sent to Alyattes, 'a generation earlier and about the time of the seizure of the wine bowl'.<sup>16</sup> The natural interpretation of this incident is that the Samian oligarchs were able to claim Spartan gratitude for their help in the Messenian wars because Samos was under an oligarchy when the help was sent in the latter half of the seventh century; just as clearly were they able to appeal to the Spartan and Corinthian desire for revenge because the régime which had committed the thefts was the régime they were now wishing to overthrow, a tyranny which had been practising piracy since the days of Alyattes. It should be remembered that Herodotus, in describing Polykrates' career, says that he had a fleet of a hundred pentekonteres with which he plundered all shipping, friend or foe, and that this piracy was the occasion of bitter complaints.<sup>17</sup> It is clear that his policy was no innovation.

The significance of this incident has been overlooked. The Spartan and Corinthian willingness to help the Samian oligarchs is explicable only if the thefts were the work of Polykrates himself, or of a predecessor in a similar position, closely connected with him whose sins could justly be visited upon his head. The first alternative is difficult: Polykrates himself could hardly have committed either theft; the bowl was a gift on the occasion of the alliance made between Sparta and Kroisos shortly before the latter's fall, and Herodotus says that the theft of the corselet occurred the year before. The Corcyrean boys were a present from Periander to Alyattes, and must therefore have been sent at latest before the death of Alyattes *ca.* 560–555 B.C. This leaves the second alternative, that the thefts were committed under the same régime but by a predecessor of Polykrates. The obvious person would be the father of Polykrates, whose name Herodotus says was Aiakes, and to whom Suidas refers as ruling over Samos.<sup>18</sup> It is true that Herodotus tells no anecdotes and gives no further information about Aiakes, but the *argumentum e silentio* is particularly dangerous in the case of Herodotus, and should never be used to discredit other information he has collected. Herodotus' sources were oral tradition, which tends to gather about individuals, and often leaves gaps, even in the case of important persons and events. Moreover, his narrative is here concerned with Polykrates and his relations with Amasis and Kambyses, and a digression would be inappropriate. A similar and equally striking omission of all anecdotes or information about earlier or later members of a tyrant dynasty is to be found in the account of the Sikyonian tyranny, where two detailed stories about Kleisthenes are told, and his genealogy is the only mention of earlier members of the family; yet we know that the tyranny lasted a hundred years and that Kleisthenes had several predecessors and at least one successor.<sup>19</sup>

It is therefore fortunate that we possess a monument of Aiakes which provides valuable informa-

<sup>13</sup> For the reign of Alyattes see Hdt. I. 25 and 86. Kroisos' fall came in the fourteenth year of his reign; Alyattes, therefore, died *ca.* 560 or a few years later. Herodotus says he reigned for fifty-seven years; his dates for the seventh-century portion of the Lydian king-list and for the accession of Alyattes present certain difficulties, but the end of Alyattes' reign depends upon the date of the fall of Kroisos, for which see above, note 10. For Amasis, 568–525 B.C., see E. Drioton and J. Vandier, *Les Peuples de l'Orient méditerranéen*, II *L'Égypte* (Paris, 1938), 590–1.

<sup>14</sup> Hdt. 3. 47; cf. 1. 70 for the earlier story of the bowl.

<sup>15</sup> Hdt. 3. 48. 1. ὕβρισμα γὰρ . . . γενεῇ πρότερον τοῦ στρατεύματος τοῦτου, κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον τοῦ κρατῆρος τῇ ἀρπαγῇ γεγονός.

<sup>17</sup> Hdt. 3. 39.

<sup>18</sup> Hdt. 2. 182; 3. 39. See below p. 42 for a discussion of the Suidas' passage.

<sup>19</sup> Hdt. 5. 67–8; 6. 126–30. See Aristotle, *Politics*, 1315b, for the hundred-years duration of the tyranny; for the earlier and later members of the dynasty see Nic. Dam. Fr. 61; *Oxyrh. Pap.* XI 1365; *P. Ryland* 18 (Jacoby, *FGH* II A (Berlin, 1926), 358–60, 504–5).

An even more surprising omission in Herodotus, in view of the full information he has of Athenian history from the time of Peisistratos to the Persian war, is any account of the reforms of Solon, whom he mentions only in the story of his visit to Kroisos (Hdt. I. 29–33). And examples could be multiplied.

tion corroborating Herodotus' account of Samian piracy. A headless seated statue, in style about the middle or last third of the sixth century, was discovered in 1905 in the excavation of the Samian Heraion. The statue itself, Buschor suggests, was of Hera.<sup>20</sup> On the left side of the chair or throne on which the figure is seated is an inscription reading:

Αἰάκης ἀνέθηκεν | ὁ Βρύσωνος· ὃς τῇ Ἥρῃ·  
τὴν σύλῃν· ἐπῆρσεν· κατὰ τὴν ἐπίστασιν.

'Dedicated by Aiakes, the son of Bryson, who secured the booty for Hera while he was ἐπιστάτης.' The inscription was thought by Curtius, who first published it, to be contemporary with the statue; but comparison of its letter forms with other sixth-century Samian inscriptions and the fact that it is written stoichedon have led to the opinion that the inscription was cut later, soon after 500 B.C.<sup>21</sup> Dittenberger suggests that the younger Aiakes, son of Syloson, who was restored as tyrant of Samos by the Persians after the collapse of the Ionian revolt in 494 B.C.,<sup>22</sup> had the inscription cut on his grandfather's monument. The younger Aiakes, reimposed by Persia on a reluctant Samos, may well have cut the inscription about his grandfather in order to stress the legitimacy of his own position and the fact that the power had been in the hands of his family for three generations.

The inscription makes three contributions to our knowledge of Aiakes. First, the use of the rare word σύλη found in the singular only in this inscription, and its reappearance in the unusual name of Polykrates' brother Syloson,<sup>23</sup> make it almost certain that this Aiakes is the father of Polykrates; secondly, it corroborates the fact that he pursued the same semi-piratical commercial policy as his son; and finally, the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐπίστασιν indicates the position Aiakes held while he exercised what later generations called a tyranny. In very few cases do we know the actual office which a tyrant held, although it seems probable that either a specially created office or a regular magistracy was usually used as the legal basis for a power in reality more far-reaching.<sup>24</sup> That Aiakes called himself ἐπιστάτης is, therefore, of great interest.

Plutarch tells of the overthrow of the Samian aristocracy of γεωμόροι, ca. 600 B.C. by a faction under the leadership of the generals who had successfully defended Perinthos against a Megarian attack.<sup>25</sup> He does not say, however, what type of government was then set up. There may well have been a period of stasis during which Aiakes found the opportunity to seize a predominating position which may have been inoffensively, even democratically, described as that of an ἐπιστάτης. Polykrates, we know, had brothers to get rid of before he could establish his position. The very fact that Aiakes' three sons share the Samian tyranny for a time is evidence in favour of an inherited rather than of a newly acquired power. Herodotus in two places uses the word ἐπαναστάς of Polykrates when he first tried to obtain control of Samos, adding in the second passage the detail that he had only fifteen hoplites to assist him.<sup>26</sup> Polyainos gives a more detailed account of the festival of Hera during which the three brothers disarmed the citizens and seized the citadel of Astypalaia; Lygdamis of Naxos later brought the reinforcements with which their power was finally secured.<sup>27</sup> How long the three brothers shared the rule Herodotus does not say; that it was a brief period is suggested by his narrative. After stating that Polykrates in the beginning shared the kingdom with his brothers, Herodotus in the same sentence recounts how, having killed Pantagnotos and banished Syloson, he held the whole island. It is not surprising that there should have been trouble both at the death of Aiakes and later between the three brothers, although it would be strange to have a *coup d'état* planned and carried through by three conspirators who were at odds with each other from the beginning. The use of the word ἐπαναστάς need indicate no more than that Aiakes' power lapsed briefly on his death, and that Polykrates had to employ the stratagem which Polyainos describes to regain control for himself and his brothers. One need not press the word, as Bowra does, into meaning only a first seizure of power, and rule out thereby the possibility of Aiakes having been tyrant before his sons.<sup>28</sup>

Herodotus mentions two other features of Polykrates' policy which seem on examination to go back to the preceding generation, and which strengthen the probability that the tyranny began

<sup>20</sup> L. Curtius, 'Samiaca I', *Ath. Mitt.* 31 (1906), 151-85, Pl. XIV; E. Buschor, *Alt-samische Standbilder* (Berlin, 1934), 41, with figs. 141-3. Buschor dates the statue about the middle of the sixth century. Miss Richter, *Archaic Greek Art Against its Historical Background* (New York, 1949), 168, places it on stylistic grounds a little later, in the last third of the sixth century.

<sup>21</sup> For a full bibliography see M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* I<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1946), 10 and 258, No. 7. Dittenberger in *SIG* I<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1915), 9-10, No. 10; and 18-19, No. 20, agrees with Pomtow about the early fifth-century dating of the inscription because of the stoichedon style and the letter forms, especially the straight-barred alphas. This is followed by Schede, *Abh. Berl.* 1929, 3. 22 and Bilabel, *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 1934, 133 (V. Ehrenberg, *JHS* LVII (1937), 149, n. 7). Ehrenberg observes that Bilabel was the first to suggest that the word ἐπίστασις denotes a political office rather than the position of a temple-guardian.

<sup>22</sup> Hdt. 6. 25.

<sup>23</sup> This brother of Polykrates is, so far as I can discover, the only person known to have borne the name; Pape and Benseler, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen* II, 1456-7, s.v. (Συλοσσών).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Pittakos of Lesbos who was αἰσυνμήτης, although Alkaios can call him τύραννος (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1285, 29-10); Peisistratos of Athens had probably been polemarch in the wars with Megara, and was therefore a member of the Areiopagos. His care to have members of his family and party hold the archonship and become Areiopagites suggests that he worked through the Areiopagos (Thuc. 6. 54. 6).

<sup>25</sup> Plutarch, *Greek Questions* 57 (*Moralia* 303E-304C).

<sup>26</sup> Hdt. 3. 39. 1, ὃς ἔσχε Σάμον ἐπαναστάς and 3. 120. 3. πεντεκαίδεκα ὀπλίτησι ἐπαναστάς ἔσχε καὶ νῦν αὐτῆς τυραννεύει.

<sup>27</sup> Polybios I. 23. 2.

<sup>28</sup> C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 1936), 260.

then. The friendship between Polykrates and Amasis of Egypt is famous; yet, when describing Naukratis which Amasis made the Greek trading post for Egypt, Herodotus says that Samos was one of the three Greek cities which had separate sanctuaries there, the other nine cities which traded with Egypt shared in a common sanctuary, the Hellenion.<sup>29</sup> This would seem to indicate that the Samian friendship with Egypt dates back to the period before the conquest of the Greek cities of the Asia Minor coast by Persia, when they were all trading freely with Naukratis and built both the Hellenion and the separate sanctuaries, probably in the 560's.

Like Samian friendship with Egypt, the beginnings of Samian sea-power should be dated to the generation before Polykrates; in all probability Polykrates inherited from a predecessor the fleet of a hundred pentekonters which Herodotus says he had at the beginning of his tyranny and later replaced by triremes.<sup>30</sup> The Thalassocracy List in Eusebius' *Chronicon* places Samos' sea-power after that of Phokaia. As was pointed out earlier, Phokaia must have ceased to command the sea when she was captured by the Persians soon after the fall of Sardis. The Samian thalassocracy must, therefore, have begun when that of Phokaia ended in the second half of the 540's, well before the time of Polykrates. In this the independent testimony of Herodotus and of the Thalassocracy List concur. In my opinion the Thalassocracy List cannot be used either to fix a more precise date for the beginning of the Samian thalassocracy nor to determine its exact duration. Since the List has been much discussed and attempts have been made to deduce from it both date and duration, it is necessary at this point to digress and examine it.<sup>31</sup>

The 'List of Thalassocracies', ascribed to Diodorus, appears in the *Chronographia*, one of the two books of Eusebius' *Chronicon*. It purports to give in order the seventeen powers that ruled the sea from the Trojan to the Persian War, with the years of the duration of each power. Only the Armenian version of the List is preserved, and this is defective. The name is omitted in the tenth place (Cares), and the years of duration are missing in places VIII–XI (*Aegyptii*, *Milesii*, *Cares*, *Lesbii*) and again in XIII (*Samii*). Myres thinks that there was an early lacuna in the List at its middle point which involved damage to the name column as well. Working back from the end, where the years are preserved, the List can be reconstructed as follows: XVII Aeginetans (10 years), 490–480; XVI Eretrians (15 years), 505–490; XV Naxians (10 years), 515–505; XIV Lacedaemonians (2 years), 517–515. The Samian thalassocracy (XIII) ends, then, according to the List in 517, which is about the time when the Persians captured Samos from Maiandrios, Polykrates' successor, and set up Syloson. No years of duration for Samos are provided by the List, nor is it possible to calculate the duration by working down from the earlier part, because of the lacuna in the middle portion; the Phokaia (XII) preceded the Samians with forty-four years, but for the Lesbians (XI), Carians (X), and Milesians (IX) no years of duration are preserved. The only information about the Samian thalassocracy in the List itself is, therefore, that the forty-four-year Phokaian sea-power (the dates of which are lost) was followed by the Samian and the Samian by the Spartan in 517.

The other book of Eusebius' *Chronicon*, the *Chronici Canones* or *Canons*, a chronological table extending from the birth of Abraham to the twentieth year of Constantine, is preserved in the Armenian version, a few entries in a Syriac version, a Latin version by Jerome, and quotations in Syncellus and other writers. The thalassocracies are entered here and there in the *Canons*, and attempts have been made to reconstruct the whole List with precise dates by combining with the List these thalassocracy-entries in the *Canons*. But, as Myres pointed out, the List is not treated as an organic whole and incorporated into the *Canons* with the same durations, nor even consecutively. On the contrary, there are both many omissions and many discrepancies between the List and the *Canon*-entries: e.g. in Jerome's version no thalassocracies are quoted after the Lesbian until the end of the List where the Aeginetans are given twenty years instead of the ten of the List; in the same portion of the Armenian version the Egyptians (VIII), Milesians (IX), and Naxians (XV) are omitted entirely, and no duration is assigned to the Samians (XIII). These differences are so great as to suggest that the List and the *Canon* dates for the thalassocracies are derived from different chronological sources. The List should, therefore, be treated by itself and the evidence of the *Canons* added to it only where the two agree.

Neglect in observing this caution has produced a surprising result in the case of Samos where the entry of the Samian thalassocracy in the Armenian version of the *Canons* has been combined with the List in an attempt to secure precise dates. The thalassocracy appears in the Armenian *Canons* with the ordinal numeral XVI instead of the XIII of the List, under the year of Abraham 1486, 530 B.C.

<sup>29</sup> For friendship with Amasis see Hdt. 2. 182; 3. 39–42; Naukratis, 2. 178. C. Roebuck, 'Grain Trade between Greece and Egypt', *CP* 45 (1950), 236–47, discusses relations between the eastern Greek cities and Egypt in the sixth century.

<sup>30</sup> Hdt. 3. 39, 3; cf. 44. 2. J. A. Davison, 'The First Greek Triremes', *CQ* 41 (1947), 18–24, argues convincingly that the forty triremes which Polykrates sent to Egypt ca. 525/4 B.C. were part of the first navy of triremes, and that Polykrates played an important part in the change from pentekonters to triremes.

<sup>31</sup> For discussion of the List see: J. L. Myres, *JHS* XXVI (1906), 84–130, XXVII (1907), 123–30; *Herodotus Father of History*, 163, 193, 195, 198–9; J. K. Fotheringham, *JHS* XXVII (1907), 75–89; W. Aly, *Rh Mus* 66 (1911), 585–606; R. Helm, *Hermes* 61 (1926), 241–62; F. Bork, *Klio* 28 (1935), 16–20; W. Kubitschek, *RE* XX (1919), cols. 2354–5 s.v. Kastor; T. Lenschau, *RE* XXI<sub>2</sub> (1952), cols. 1727–34, s.v. Polykrates.

Jerome's version throws no light on the corruption of the numeral; it names no thalassocrats from the Lesbians (XI) to the Aeginetans (XVII). Myres suggested that the numeral XVI had been transferred by mistake from the column of durations to the ordinal column and represented 'an attempt to calculate the duration numeral of the Samians by simple subtraction'. A sixteen-year thalassocracy ending in 517 would begin in 533, *i.e.* about the date of Polykrates' accession which is noted in the MSS. of the Armenian version under a.a. Abr. 1481 (535) or 1484 (532). This has been regarded as a corroboration of Myres' suggestion, and the 'sixteen-year thalassocracy of Samos' has become a commonplace. And this in spite of Myres' own insistence on the independence of the List from the *Canons*, and on the fact that from the Spartan thalassocracy upward we are thrown back so far as dates are concerned on external evidence.

It is clear, however, that the Phokaian sea-power was brought to an end by the Persian capture of the city at a date not exactly determinable, but soon after 546; the Samian thalassocracy followed upon it. The exact number of years for the duration of the latter is not given in the List nor can it be derived from the *Canons*, but it must be considerably more than sixteen since the period must extend from soon after 546 to the capture of Samos from Maiandrios *ca.* 517. Aly, realising that the historical evidence pointed to this conclusion, suggested that the entry in the *Canons* was inserted in connexion with Polykrates at the middle point of the thalassocracy, and that an equal period before and after should be assumed. This complicated reckoning is itself unlikely, and is necessary only because of the assumption of the 'sixteen-year thalassocracy'. More serious objection can be urged against Helm's suggestion that the Phokaian thalassocracy lasted until the battle of Alalia and the expulsion of the Phokaiaans from Corsica *ca.* 535. Bork, on the other hand, assumed a corruption in the numeral XVI for the duration of the Samian thalassocracy and corrected it to twenty-seven years (544–517). This yields highly probable dates for the thalassocracy, but is mainly derived not from the List but from the narrative of Herodotus. Lenschau, in the latest discussion of the problem, reduces the period again by terminating the Phokaian thalassocracy with the battle of Alalia *ca.* 538, four years after the fall of Phokaia, and lengthening the Spartan thalassocracy to seven years, 522–515. He thus preserves the sixteen-year thalassocracy of Samos, 538–522, which he thinks coincides with the tyranny of Polykrates. A recognition that the List provides no date for the beginning of the thalassocracy other than its position after the fall of Phokaia, and no exact duration (certainly not sixteen years) would have rendered unnecessary these elaborate calculations and devious shifts to reconcile the supposed evidence of the List with the narrative of Herodotus.

Thucydides is probably referring to this period which later tradition included under the Phokaian and Samian thalassocracies in Book I, where he says: 'The Ionians possessed great naval strength in the reign of Kyros, the first king of the Persians, and of his son Kambyses, and while they were at war with Kyros for some time commanded their own sea.'<sup>32</sup> Later writers also speak of war between the Samians and Kyros.<sup>33</sup> It is not unlikely that both Thucydides and these later writers refer to resistance offered to Persia by Phokaia and Samos directly after the fall of Lydia. When Phokaia was taken and Persia occupied the Asia Minor coast, Herodotus says: '... and when the Ionians of the islands saw their brethren upon the mainland subjugated they also, dreading the like, gave themselves up to Kyros'.<sup>34</sup> This suggests that Samos made at least a token submission to Persia at this time, and that Persia which had no navy of account until the Phoenician and Egyptian navies came into its service on the conquest of Egypt did not protest against the Samian naval activity. The same situation still prevailed when Polykrates offered his services to Kambyses for the expedition against Egypt, begging him not to omit to ask aid from Samos.<sup>35</sup> Overt hostile action against Persia, and aggressive extension of Samian authority in the Aegean should be dated, as Parke has argued, only to the last years of Polykrates' life.<sup>36</sup> What might be described as a policy of non-aggression characterised Samian–Persian relations during most of the period; it was initiated by Aiakes and continued by Polykrates until he altered it, to his own undoing, after the trouble with Sparta.

Herodotus says that he has dwelt longer on the affairs of Samos because three of the greatest works in Greece were to be seen there: the tunnel, the engineer of which was the Megarian Eupalinos, the harbour mole, and the Heraion, the architect of which was Rhoikos.<sup>37</sup> If the fleet, as seems likely, antedates Polykrates' accession, it is probable that the harbour and its mole are also earlier. The tunnel and the Heraion must have taken many years to complete, and the greater part of their construction should be attributed to the earlier generation of the tyranny. The tunnel is one of the most interesting engineering works of the sixth century. Its purpose was to bring water into the city of Samos from a spring on the north side of Mt. Ampelos. An underground conduit led from the spring by a tortuous course following the contour of the mountain for about

<sup>32</sup> Thuc. I. 13. 6, ... τῆς τε καθ' ἑαυτοῦς θαλάσσης Κύρω πολέμου ἔκράτησάν τινα χρόνον. This passage has puzzled commentators unnecessarily; *e.g.* A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides I* (Oxford, 1945), 123.

<sup>33</sup> Malalas, *Chronographia* 50. 6. 201 (ed. Dindorf, Bonn, 1831, p. 158); Cedrenus, *Synops.* 243. Malalas is obviously wrong

in attributing Kyros' death to this war, but the war itself is not improbable.

<sup>34</sup> Hdt. I. 169.

<sup>35</sup> Hdt. 3. 44.

<sup>36</sup> H. W. Parke, 'Polykrates and Delos', *CQ* 40 (1946), 105–8.

<sup>37</sup> Hdt. 3. 60.

half a mile, and then entered the tunnel to be carried through the mountain for a distance of about 3300 ft. The water emerged inside the walls of the city, and was thereafter carried by another conduit, 1000 ft. of which can be traced, to a fountain house in the city the location of which is unknown. The purpose of the tunnel was to safeguard the water-supply of the city in time of siege, and perhaps also to provide a means of escape from the city in case of need. That it served both purposes we know from Herodotus. Samos was able to withstand a forty-day siege when the Spartans tried to overthrow Polykrates in 525/4 B.C., and later Maiandrios escaped by the tunnel when Dareios came to seize Samos and make Syloson tyrant.<sup>38</sup> In a recent study by an engineer, F. R. Bichowsky,<sup>39</sup> the period of construction for the tunnel is estimated as at least fifteen years. Bichowsky assumes, without discussing the question, that Aiakes was tyrant but was confused with his famous son Polykrates, and places the beginning of the construction within Aiakes' reign. The estimate of fifteen years for the construction of the whole system is based on the time necessary for the cutting of the tunnel—ten years at the rate of 6 in. a day at each face in a bore 8 ft. high and 8 ft. wide—and five years for the rest of the work. Since the rock is 'a hard, somewhat bedded limestone', the estimate is, so far as I can ascertain, conservative. The technical knowledge needed for the surveying was considerable, and Bichowsky suggests that Thales and his pupil Anaximandros may have been hired as consultants. If the tunnel was complete by the siege of 525/4, it must surely have been begun before 532, probably many years before. The project, then, was initiated and completed, in whole or in part, before Polykrates, and thus provides further evidence of the continuity of regime and policy in Samos.

The Heraion was likewise a work conceived on the grand scale so characteristic of tyrants. The earlier structure was a temple of the Ionic order, enormous in size (*ca.* 300 ft by 150 ft.) and with a large number of columns (134 in all), rivalling oriental structures, perhaps especially those of Egypt, with which Samos had close connexions. It was famous for the column bases, the channelling of which shows great precision and a variety of patterns unequalled in any other Greek temple. Buschor dates the temple, of which Rhoikos was the architect, to the middle or shortly before the middle of the sixth century. The date is determined by the stratification of levels. Dinsmoor follows Buschor in his analysis of the two successive temples, but dates the earlier temple to 575 rather than 560–555.<sup>40</sup> His reason is given on p. 124, note 2, 'But a slightly earlier date (there being no contrary evidence) seems desirable in view of the probability that Samos was the inspiration for the double façade colonnades at Syracuse and Selinus (see p. 75).' On p. 75 Dinsmoor says that the temple of Apollo at Syracuse, the earliest of the Western temples to use double façade colonnades, dates 'perhaps from about 565 B.C.'. He assumes a ten-year 'cultural lag' between it and the Heraion at Samos. These dates are admittedly tentative and relative; even assuming that the Heraion was the inspiration of the double-façade colonnades of the West, its construction need not be dated earlier than the first part of the decade 570–560.

This temple was destroyed by fire soon after its completion, and a new and still larger temple was laid out a trifle farther west but partly overlying its predecessor. The bases of the old columns were used for the new foundations, and part of the superstructure was completed (*e.g.* the cella, pronaos, and portion of the east peristyle corresponding to the pronaos, three rows each of four columns); then the work was interrupted. It was finally completed in Hellenistic and Roman times, as was the Olympieion of the Peisistratids at Athens. Buschor dates to the time of Polykrates the destruction by fire and the beginning of the rebuilding. Rhoikos was perhaps again the architect, for the new temple and the old one were very similar in style. The Spartan attack of 525/4 B.C. may have been the occasion of the destruction; this would allow time for Polykrates to begin the rebuilding before his own death in 522 B.C., but not time for the work to proceed far. It is reasonable to attribute the cessation of the work to the political troubles following the death of Polykrates. Thus the Heraion in its two stages belongs to the same régime as the tunnel. Rhoikos, and Theodoros, whom some of our authorities associate with Rhoikos as joint architect of the Heraion, were the most famous Samian artists of the period.<sup>41</sup> They were said to have invented the hollow-casting of bronze statues,<sup>42</sup> and to have made many well-known works of art; *e.g.* Theodoros made the bowl dedicated by Kroisos at Delphi, and the emerald ring of Polykrates.<sup>43</sup> Although both artists are often associated with Polykrates, the evidence of their connexion with the earlier Heraion, with

<sup>38</sup> Hdt. 3. 54 for the Spartan siege; the Samians probably used the tunnel to make the sally from the ridge of the hill here mentioned. See Hdt. 3. 146 for Maiandrios.

<sup>39</sup> F. R. Bichowsky, 'Eupalinos—First Civil Engineer', *Compressed Air Magazine* 48–49 (1943–44), 7086–90. For a map of the course of the tunnel see E. Fabricius, 'Die Wasserleitung des Eupalinos', *Ath. Mitt.* 9 (1884), 163–92.

<sup>40</sup> E. Buschor, 'Heraion von Samos', *Ath. Mitt.* 55 (1930), 1–90, and plate XXVII. W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*<sup>3</sup> (London, 1950), 124–5 and 134–6. For the column bases see H. Johannes, 'Die Säulenbasen von Hera-tempel des Rhoikos', *Ath. Mitt.* 62 (1937), 13–37; the photographs show the way in which these early bases were cut and

fitted into the foundations of the succeeding temple.

<sup>41</sup> Pliny, *N.H.* 34. 83; 36. 90. Cf. Diog. Laert. 8. 1–3: Mnesarchos, the gem-engraver, father of Pythagoras, was probably an older contemporary of Rhoikos and Theodoros. Charles Seltman, on the evidence of this passage, would include Pythagoras himself among the artists of the period, *Num. Chron.* Sixth Series, Vol. 9 (1949), 5–9.

<sup>42</sup> Paus. 9. 41. 1; 10. 38. 5; 8. 148; cf. Pliny, *N.H.* 35. 152 where it is confused with clay modelling and the two artists dated to the period before the expulsion of the Bacchiads from Corinth. See also A. W. Byvanck, 'La Statuaire en Bronze de Samos', *Mnemosyne*, 3rd series, 12 (1945) 318–19.

<sup>43</sup> Hdt. 1. 51; 3. 41.

Kroisos, and with the Artemision at Ephesos<sup>44</sup> suggests that they properly belong to the generation of Aiakes, and were still working at the time of Polykrates.

The dates given for three other persons connected with Samos, the poet Ibykos, and the philosophers Anaximandros and Pythagoras, present chronological difficulties due, it may be suggested, to a confusion between Polykrates and his father, and to the belief that the Samian tyranny was confined to the years 532–522 B.C. Suidas' note on Ibykos says that he came to Samos ὅτε αὐτῆς ἦρχεν ὁ Πολυκράτης ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ. χρόνος δὲ ἦν οὗτος ἐπὶ Κροίσου Ὀλυμπιάς νδ' 'when Polykrates, the father of the tyrant, ruled it; this was in the time of Kroisos in the 54th Olympiad' (564–561 B.C.). Eusebius' date for Ibykos is Ol. 61 (536–533 B.C.). Bowra rejects Suidas' entry on three grounds: that Eusebius gives another date, though he admits that the two dates are not incompatible; that the father of Polykrates is called by the same name, whereas his name was really Aiakes; and finally, that the father is made to rule Samos.<sup>45</sup> Of these three objections, only the second has any value. Schmid, commenting on the passage, emends Πολυκράτης to Πολυκράτους, and so removes the difficulty; the passage then reads: 'when the father of the tyrant Polykrates ruled in Samos'.<sup>46</sup> But, even without this emendation, there is no need to reject the entry; Wilamowitz is on sounder ground in accepting the tradition that Ibykos went to Samos in the days of Polykrates' father, whose name is the one mistake and should be Aiakes.<sup>47</sup> His interpretation of the forty-eight-line poem found at Oxyrhynchus,<sup>48</sup> the last two lines of which are a compliment to a young Polykrates, as a personal tribute to the still youthful son of the tyrant is more convincing than Bowra's attempt to connect the poem with the son of Polykrates mentioned by Himerios, who says that Anakreon was brought to be his tutor.<sup>49</sup>

The difficulty over Anaximandros concerns one passage only; Diogenes Laertios, quoting from the *Chronicle* of Apollodoros, says that in the second year of Ol. 58 (547/6 B.C.) Anaximandros was sixty-four and that he died not long afterward; then he adds that he flourished almost at the same time as Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos, ἀκμάσαντά πη μάλιστα κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τυράννον. Diels and, following him, Jacoby transfer this last phrase to the life of Pythagoras on the ground of chronological impossibility.<sup>50</sup> I suggest that this is as unnecessary as it is violent, that here there is a similar confusion between the names of Aiakes and Polykrates, and that the tradition is sound which places the ἀκμή of Anaximandros in the period of the Samian tyranny.

Finally, there is the passage in Strabo on Pythagoras' sojourns in Egypt and Babylon and his departure for Italy, which should mean that some thirty-five years separate the beginning of tyranny at Samos and Pythagoras' flight from it on his return to Samos after travelling abroad. Strabo says, 'ἐπὶ τοῦτου (i.e. under Polykrates) Pythagoras seeing the tyranny springing up (or growing, φυομένην) left the city and went off to Egypt and Babylon to satisfy his love of learning; that when he returned, and saw the tyranny still enduring (συμμένουσσαν) he set sail for Italy and spent the rest of his life there'.<sup>51</sup> Since Pythagoras is elsewhere recorded to have spent twenty-two years in Egypt and twelve years in Babylon,<sup>52</sup> Strabo's notice has been regarded as chronologically untenable; as von Fritz observes, '... this would presuppose that Pythagoras already saw tyranny approaching in 571'.<sup>53</sup> But that, far from being a *reductio ad absurdum*, fits the thesis of this paper very well. The only difficulty is that the figures for the years which Pythagoras spent abroad are suspiciously high and have little authority. It is worth while, I think, to suggest that he may have spent less long abroad, and have reached Italy a good deal earlier than the date suggested by his flight 'from Polykrates', for this phrase probably means no more than from 'the tyranny in Samos'—if Pythagoras hated tyranny, he will not have waited for Polykrates' accession to leave the island a second time. He may well have seen the tyranny growing in the early years of Aiakes, spent some years in travel, returned to Samos to find that he disliked it even more, and departed finally for the West, reaching Kroton in time to be responsible for the extraordinary 'incuse' coinages in the cities of South Italy which some scholars believe were issued to exemplify his philosophy of opposites.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Diog. Laert. 2. 103; Pliny, *N.H.* 36. 95. The Artemision is probably slightly later than the earlier Heraion; Kroisos paid for the erection of some of the columns. See Dinsmoor, *op. cit.* 127.

<sup>45</sup> C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 1936), 251–60.

<sup>46</sup> Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* I (Munich, 1929), 490, n. 2.

<sup>47</sup> *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1929), 512; fr. 20 with the mention of Κυάρας ὁ Μηδείων στρατηγός indicates Ibykos' acquaintance with Asia Minor.

<sup>48</sup> *Oxyrh. Pap.* 1790, Vol. 15, 73 ff. Tab. III; C. M. Bowra, *New Chapters in Greek Literature*, Third Series (Oxford, 1933), 30–6. The last two lines read;

καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἀφθιτον ἔξεις  
ὥς κατ' αἰοῖδαν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.

<sup>49</sup> Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 260–4.

<sup>50</sup> Diog. Laert. 2. 1. 2; H. Diels, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* I (Berlin, 1922), 14, n. 14; F. Jacoby, *FGH* II BD (Berlin, 1930), 727.

<sup>51</sup> Strabo 14. 1. 16 (C636).

<sup>52</sup> Iamblichos, *de vita Pythagorica*, 19.

<sup>53</sup> K. von Fritz, *Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy* (New York, 1940), 54; cf. p. 49 for a chronology of Pythagoras' life reconstructed from various data.

<sup>54</sup> The theory that these coins were Pythagoras' invention was first put forward by the Duc de Luynes (*Nouvelles Annales de l'inst. arch. de Rome*, 1836, 388 ff.). It has been accepted by some scholars, including Babelon (*Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines* I (Paris, 1901), 1373–4), Sir George Hill (*Historical Greek Coins*, London, 1906, 21–5) and Seltman (*Greek Coins*, London, 1933, 76–9), but has more often been rejected—e.g. by Head (*Historia Numorum*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1911), 99), by Noe (*The Coinage of Metapontum, Part I*, Num. Notes and Monog. (New York, 1927), 15), and by Sutherland ('The Incuse Coinages of South Italy', *A.N.S. Museum Notes* III (1948), 18)—these last three scholars give three different explanations of the coinages, none of them entirely satisfactory. The case for the Pythagoras theory has recently been restated vigorously by Seltman in 'The Problem of the First Italiote Coins', *Num. Chron.* 6th Series, Vol. 9 (1949), 1–21. The question can hardly be discussed here in detail, but it is worth while to

That theory seems to be the most reasonable explanation yet proposed for these curious coinages, and if it is correct it shows that the tyranny in Samos was established before, and flourishing at the middle of the century. The uncertainties here are numerous, and little weight could be put on such an argument by itself; but it does not stand alone.

It remains only to sum up the argument. The testimony of Herodotus makes it clear that Samian policy is consistent from the early 560's to the death of Polykrates: the seizure of the bowl and corselet, and the interception of the Corcyrean boys are evidence of the same sort of piracy as Polykrates continued; the Samian navy was built up before Polykrates, and the Samian thalassocracy followed the Phokaian shortly after the fall of Sardis. It seems reasonable to connect this with Aiakes and to see the establishment of the tyranny during his lifetime. Polykrates inherited the power after an interval of uncertainty at his father's death and made the tyranny famous. Corroboration is provided by the building programme, especially by the dates of the tunnel and the earlier Heraion. Finally, the incidental references to the Samian tyranny, *i.e.* the date of Ibykos' arrival in Samos, the *floruit* of Anaximandros, and the probable date for Pythagoras' final departure for Kroton, strengthen the suggestion that there was a tradition of a tyranny in Samos in the generation before Polykrates.<sup>55</sup>

MARY WHITE

Trinity College,  
Toronto,  
Canada.

point out that the opponents of the theory have been influenced chiefly by the chronological difficulty, the fact that the accepted date of the first issues—about 550 B.C. or not much later—cannot be reconciled with Pythagoras' arrival in Italy about 530. All those who discuss the coinages emphasise the fact that this peculiar and difficult 'fabric' appears suddenly in South Italy, and only there, and that the best coins are the earliest. Paul Naster, seeking antecedents for the unusual technique, points out the similarity of these dies to the core and mantle of 'cire perdue' bronze casting, a Samian invention

of the same period ('La technique des monnaies incuses de la Grande-Grèce', *Rev. Belge de Num.*, 1947, 1-17). I have discussed this point in some detail with W. P. Wallace of University College, Toronto.

<sup>55</sup> I should like to express my gratitude for the generous assistance given by the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, and the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. The materials for this paper were assembled during the year I spent in these two institutions.