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Col. i. Col. ii.

\( \text{\(\tau\)o \(\delta\)e} \)

\( \beta\alpha\gamma\varepsilon\varepsilon\iota\tau\nu\nu\ \eta\nu\ \eta\tau\pi\varepsilon\iota\nu\nu\)

\( \text{\(\rho\)} \)

\( \tau\varepsilon\iota\nu\varepsilon\iota\sigma\varepsilon\iota\nu\nu\)

\( \text{(\(\lambda\)} \), \text{\(\epsilon\iota\)} \text{\(\delta\)} \text{\(\varepsilon\)} \)

\( \tau\varepsilon\iota\nu\varepsilon\iota\nu\nu \)

\( \text{\(\tau\)} \text{\(\epsilon\sigma\)} \text{\(\ldots\)} \text{\(\gamma\)} \)

\( \text{\(\tau\)} \text{\(\epsilon\sigma\)} \text{\(\ldots\)} \text{\(\sigma\)} \)

The above is the text as printed by Hunt in the Catalogue of Greek Papyri, i. 29 (Facsimile, Plate 6) in the John Rylands Library. A discussion of the text is there appended. The text as reconstructed by Hunt also appears in Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist, as No. 105, 1, and with the variant \(\text{\(\Pi\)t\(\iota\nu\nu\)}\) in 1. 13 in Bilabel, Die Kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus, No. 1. (Unless otherwise stated, references to these three writers will be to their respective commentaries on this fragment.)

A SMALL fragment containing the upper portions of two columns, written in a good-sized clear semi-cursive hand which can be assigned with security to the second century B.C., and with probability to the middle of the century.

Of the two columns partially remaining, the first, which has only a few letters from the end of the lines, is practically
useless, but the second, so far as it goes, is in a fair state of preservation, and is of an interesting, if tantalising nature. After an imperfect sentence (ll. 12-15) referring to the colonisation of a tract of country of doubtful identity, mention is made (ll. 16-21) of the Spartan ephor Chilon and the king Anaxandridas in connection with the suppression of the Greek tyrannies, amongst which those of Aeschines at Sicyon and Hippias at Athens are named. Unluckily the reading of this important passage is not quite certain.  

This is Hunt's general description of the fragment which it is the purpose of the present article to consider; and his choice of the epithet "important" to characterize the latter part of it is readily justified by the number of times it has been cited as evidence by writers on sixth-century Peloponnesian history. For, slight as it is, the fragment has considerable bearing on two major problems in that sphere—the development of Spartan policy and the chronology of the Sicyonian tyranny.

In the study of the policy pursued by Sparta in the critical but obscure period of her history which saw the rise of the Peloponnesian league, one of the chief landmarks is the commonplace of the ancient authorities that "The Spartans put down the tyrants"; but in fact the extant evidence for the several instances on which this generalization is based is extremely scanty. Thucydides merely records that the Spartans put down the tyrants of Athens and the older tyrannies of Greece (except for Sicily) not many years before Marathon: although Aristotle was completely acquainted with the facts he did not trouble to

1 In expressing my gratitude to the various persons who have given me the benefit of their advice and answered my questions in connection with the present article, I trust that I may be permitted to mention especially Dr. F. Taylor, Keeper of Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, and Mr. C. H. Roberts, who guided me in the actual examination of the papyrus fragment; also a former colleague, Mr. A. J. Earp, who placed at my disposal a thesis on the Orthagorids. They are, of course, not to be regarded as necessarily agreeing with such conclusions as are reached in this article.


3 Thuc. i. 18, 1.
quote them, merely pointing to the Spartan policy in a general way as exemplifying his theory about the natural antipathy existing between aristocracies and tyrannies; and to Isocrates it is simply a rhetorical τόπος. For a full list of the tyrants said to have been deposed there is no evidence other than that of Plutarch De Malign. Herod. 21, which gives a list of the nine cases, namely, the Cypselidae of Corinth, the same family in Ambracia, Lygdamis of Naxos, the Pisistratidae of Athens, Aeschines of Sicyon, Aules of Phocis, Symmachus of Thasos, Aristogenes of Miletus and Aristomedes and Angelus in Thessaly, the last being accredited to King Leotychidas.

The assumption that this list observes chronological order is, to say the least, not proven, and of the depositions mentioned only two cases (Athens and Thessaly) can be definitely substantiated by reference to other testimony—in each case that of Herodotus, with additional information as to the chronology for Athens in Thucydides and Aristotle. To these may be added the attempt to remove Polycrates, which is in fact the subject

1 Arist. Pol., 1312, 6.7
2 Isoc. IV. 125.
3 There is indeed also the scholiast on Aeschines, II. 77, which includes the following: Λακεδαμίαι ἐποιεῖτο ναόν τοῖς Ἑλλησίοις ως προστάται καὶ κυρεύονται τῶν πολέων. Αἱ προστάτες γὰρ ἐξήθαλαν τοὺς Πεισιστράτειδας, ἐκ τῆς Νάξου Διόγδαμος τύραννον, τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ Κλεαθένους ἐκ Σικυώνος. The one additional piece of information afforded—that the tyranny put down at Sicyon was that of the house of Cleisthenes—is in any case assumed by most historians on the grounds of general probability: otherwise the authority of the scholiast on this point in itself is not great, since the general quality of the note is poor, dealing in vague plurals, obscure in thought (appearing under the lemma Ἀρμοστήν it seems to associate the deposition of tyrants with the installation of harmosts), and the whole bears the appearance of stock material clumsily incorporated into the commentary—circumstances which suggest a late date of compilation. The value of the evidence of this scholiast for the present purpose is thus almost negligible.
5 V. 63 ff. (Athens); VI. 72 (Thessaly). The latter attempt would seem, according to Herodotus, to have been only partially successful.
6 The deposition of Hippias occurred, according to Arist. Const. Ath. 19, 6, in the archonship of Harpactides, i.e. 511/10 B.C. (see Cadoux, “The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides”, JHS, lxviii. 111-12). Thucydides' figure, twenty years before Marathon (VI. 59, 4), gives 510 B.C.
7 Her. III. 47 ff.
under discussion in this passage of the *De Malign. Herod.* The
deposition of Lygdamis, though not actually attested, appears
on grounds of general probability not unlikely.¹ The last cases,
of Phocis, Thasos and Miletus, may most probably be referred
to the period immediately after the defeat of Xerxes and so
connected rather with the removal of pro-Persian rulers than
with a doctrinaire opposition to tyranny as such,² but even the
names of these three tyrants are otherwise unattested. Finally,
the assertion that the Spartans deposed the Cypselid tyrants
of Corinth and Ambracia is, to say the least, subject to
doubts.³

The paucity of evidence for this important feature of Spartan
policy is thus obvious: and in such circumstances the present
fragment, slight though it is, is naturally of importance as being
considerably older than Plutarch. This importance is, moreover,
greatly enhanced by the fact that the fragment makes a significant
addition to our information on the subject by attaching to the
institution of the anti-tyrannical policy the name of Chilon,
already known as a Wise Man and as an important figure in
the constitutional development of Sparta,⁴ but not previously
associated with innovations in foreign policy; and it is therefore
not surprising that the fragment has been so often cited as
evidence for the history of Sparta in this period.

From the Sicyonian aspect the fragment has received perhaps
even more attention than from the Spartan. The history of the
Orthagorid dynasty at Sicyon presents a number of problems,
not the least of them being that of chronology, in which two
main schools of thought exist. The date of the deposition of
Aeschines is of prime importance in this matter, and no other
authority gives any direct indication of it. The present fragment
has repeatedly been held to provide just this indication, but such

¹ How and Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus,* ii. 346; Parke, "Polycrates
and Delos", CQ, xl. 105 ff.
² Though cf. v. Hiller in *PW,* s.v. "Thasos", col. 1314 (but no reasons
given).
³ Spartan intervention is denied, e.g. by Wade-Gery, op. cit. p. 556; cf. also
How and Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus,* II. 346.
⁴ Diog. Laert. 1. 68: καὶ πρῶτος εἰςηγήσατο ἐφόρους τοῖς βασιλέωι
παραζευγνύαι.
is the peculiarity of its wording that it has in fact been cited by both sides in the controversy. It is not my purpose here to rehearse in detail the arguments adduced on the two sides; suffice it to state that the one school of thought, relying on Pausanias’ statement that the second tyrant, Myron I, won an Olympic victory in 648 B.C., and on Aristotle’s figure of 100 years for the duration of the tyranny, postulates a date near or somewhat before 550 B.C. for the fall of Aeschines, whilst the rival school, starting from the assertion of Herodotus that the anti-Dorian tribe-names endured for sixty years after the death of Cleisthenes, and taking this to imply that the tyranny itself continued for the same period, arrives at a date in the region of 510 B.C. In the latter case either Aristotle’s figure is treated as inaccurate, or the correctness of Pausanias’ statement is denied, or it is supposed that Aeschines was not an Orthagorid, the tyranny having been revived under a different dynasty.

It will thus be readily clear that prima facie, at least, the present fragment can be claimed as support for each of the two systems of chronology; for the traditional date of Chilon’s ephorate, in Ol. 56 (i.e. 556-53), fits well with the earlier system, and the close association of the names of Aeschines and Hippias may seem to imply the later.

The importance of this fragment will thus be readily apparent, and accordingly I propose in what follows to re-examine it with the intention of ascertaining, as far as is possible, what testimony can in fact be extracted from it, and to what extent that testimony can be regarded as trustworthy. The latter problem in particular seems to me to have been neglected; for, despite repeated citation, there appears to have been no thorough-going examination of the soundness of the fragment as evidence; if one may

2 VI. 19, 2.
3 Pol. 1315b, 11; cf. also Diod. Sic. VIII. 24.
4 E.g. Lippold, loc. cit. col. 2537; Schachermayer, loc. cit. col. 1432.
5 V. 68, 2.
6 D.L. I. 68, according to the original manuscript reading πεντηκόστην ἐκτητική, restored by Jacoby (“Apollodors Chronik”, Ph. U. xvi. 183-4). Jacoby assumes that Ol. 56, 1 (i.e. 556 B.C.) is meant; Cadoux (op. cit. pp. 108-9), accepting this text, prefers 555 B.C.
judge from the tone of Dickins' remarks, the age of the papyrus appears to have been taken as a guarantee of its worth. However, there are, as I hope to show, certain difficulties inherent in the text which must be faced if a true evaluation is to be made. As a result of this process I hope to determine what contribution this papyrus can make to our understanding of events in Sparta and Sicyon in the sixth century.

As a first step, it is necessary to form some idea of the nature of the work to which this fragment belongs. The general impression is of a very sketchy narrative, passing rapidly from one fact to another; thus the colonization of a mainland of uncertain identity is followed immediately by a single sentence, joined to the previous one merely by δέ and taking only fifteen words to credit Chilon and Anaxandridas with putting down the tyrants in Greece; whilst the juxtaposition of Hippias and Aeschines in brief parallel phrases apparently leaves no room at all for elaboration. Writing of this kind appears to me impossibly summary and disjointed for an actual work of history, biography or the like, and strongly suggests that what we have is in fact an epitome or series of notes on salient features of a fuller narrative. This supposition gains some support, I believe, from the fact that, as Hunt notes, the same writer has elsewhere been employed on a florilegium of poetry; the type of work involved is not so very different, when allowance is made for the difference in genre.

If we assume this to be the case, the next step must be to inquire into the identity of the source being followed; but in fact no definite answer appears possible, though the field may be limited to a certain degree. There is no clear indication in the text, and we are informed by Plutarch that the deposition of tyrants by Sparta was treated by a number of writers, none of whom he names. The problem is not simplified by our inability to identify with certainty the subject of the participle διαβάσει or the scene of the operations to which reference is made in lines 12-14. It is perhaps possible that the work was a history

1 "The papyrus is of the second century B.C. and therefore deserves respect." (Op. cit. p. 26.)
2 περὶ ὧν ἐν ἄλλως ἀκριβέστερον γεγράπται (op. cit. 21 D).
of Sparta, and that the reference at this point was to the coloniza-
tion of Cyrene; some support might indeed be found for this
in the appearance of Σπαρ in Col. i, but, as Hunt says, this recon-
struction of the letters is doubtful, and in a history of Sparta the
designation of Chilon as ο Λάκων would be somewhat unlikely;¹ and,
moreover, such an interpretation of the text would imply a
large chronological gap between the subject-matter of the two
parts of the second column. The chance that the fragment
is taken from a history of Sparta is, I believe, remote; and
indeed the possibility is not so much as discussed by the various
editors.

Hunt and Bilabel, in their attempts to discover a connecting-
link which will make the fragment represent a coherent work,
suggest that we are dealing with a work on tyrants. The
possibilities they offer for the subject-matter of lines 12-15 are
the activities of Polycrates on the mainland of Asia Minor and
those of one of the Cypselidae or an agent thereof in N.W.
Greece. Of the two alternatives both editors prefer the latter,
Bilabel going so far as to read Ἡπειρον—i.e. the proper name.

This in itself seems reasonable, for the founding of colonies
in this area by the Cypselidae² is in general reconcilable with
what we have here, but the lines have to be read in conjunction
with what follows. Here Hunt sees a chronological difficulty in
the implied gap between the activities of the Cypselidae in this
region and the earliest possible date for the deposition of Aes-
chines. Bilabel denies that this difficulty is real, but I am
inclined to feel with Hunt that the result is awkward. In
particular it seems to me that in a work on tyrants a discussion of
the Orthagoridae might well be expected to follow after one on

¹ The chance that the last word of line 16 was longer (i.e. Λακώνος) is in
my opinion so remote that it can be dismissed at once. Even though Λάκωνος
is not actually impossible in a work of this kind, Λακεδαιμόνιος is much more
normal in official titles. (Cf. Bölte in PW, s.v. "Sparta", cols. 1283-4). Fur-
ther, a formal constitutional title is highly unlikely in conjunction with the
second participle. Finally, the letters of Λάκων are written large and spread
out as if it was the intention of the writer to make the short word fill the end
part of the line.

² For a convenient summary of this, with references, cf. How and Wells,
op. cit. ii. 341; also Wade-Gery, CAH, iii. 551-2.
the Cypselidae on the grounds that the great days of Cleisthenes, the greatest of the dynasty, belonged in a considerable measure to the period when the glory of the Corinthian tyranny, if not the tyranny itself, had passed away;\(^1\) and moreover it would, I believe, be all the more natural for a discussion of the Sicyonian tyranny to be placed here in that the end of that tyranny is referred to in lines 16-22. I am thus somewhat doubtful about the suitability of this suggestion.

If one considers the other possible candidate mentioned by Hunt and Bilabel, Polycrates, a straightforward discussion of whether the choice involves an unlikely order of narration of the main events is here precluded by the fact that the deposition of Aeschines is itself one of the points at issue in this article, and the reign of Polycrates falls in the period between the alternative dates for that event. But there are, nevertheless, sufficient indications to enable us to doubt the suitability of Polycrates as a possible candidate without any danger of *petitio principii*. First is the consideration which led Hunt and Bilabel to this course—the unsuitability of *ektisiv* as a description of the activities ascribed to Polycrates in Her. III. 39, 4. This is not in itself decisive; I shall have reason at a later stage to question the accuracy of the terminology of this fragment, and Jacoby does not rule out Polycrates as manifestly impossible on this score. Nevertheless, the argument is not without some weight.

In addition, it seems not unlikely that if Polycrates were the subject under discussion, one might expect a reference to the famous Spartan attempt to depose him to come between his

\(^1\) This is the natural view of those who believe in the early date (i.e. c. 582 B.C.) for the fall of the Corinthian tyranny; so, e.g. Wade-Gery, op. cit. pp. 554-5. The summary of divergent views given by Schachermayer in *P-W*, s.v. "Peryandros", col. 712, readily indicates the lack of agreement amongst modern scholars as to the accuracy of this dating, but the point at issue here is rather what date would have been accepted by a writer of the period to which the work represented by this fragment belongs; and it would appear from extant notices (e.g. Sosicrates of Rhodes, ap. D.L. I. 95 (on which cf. Jacoby, *Ph. U.* XVI. pp. 150 ff.); Diod. Sic. VII, fr. 7; Eusebius, *Chron.* Ol. xlviii) that, rightly or wrongly, the Hellenistic historians and chronographers, perhaps following Eratothenes, (cf. H. R. V. Smith, "The Hearst Hydria", *Univ. California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, i, no. 10, pp. 255-6), accepted the early date as canonical.
achievements and an account of the successful Spartan moves against tyrants. That such a reference might actually have preceded the events discussed in lines 12-15 is the more unlikely in that the achievements of Polycrates on the mainland are clearly represented by Herodotus as prior to the Spartan attack, so that an involved chronology would be implied. It is, I suppose, possible that the main theme is Sparta and the tyrants, and that a reference to the attempt on Polycrates was followed by a mention of his achievements and that in turn by a discussion of other anti-tyrannical activities, but if so a somewhat involved construction must be implied, and the resumption of the main line of argument by the phraseology of lines 16-21 seems awkward, even for an epitomizing account; one would rather have expected, if not a resuming statement to the effect that Polycrates was not put down, at least something like τὰς ἄλλας τυραννίδας (despite Jacoby's suggestion that ἐν τοῖς Ἐλλησι might indicate a distinction between Polycrates and the others, I am myself more inclined to think that the appearance of this phrase is due simply to the commonplace nature of the general statement), and that the placing of Chilon and Anaxandridas at the beginning of the sentence is also a little awkward if this is the train of thought; for it would have been a somewhat clearer connection had the object of the verb (i.e. the tyrannies, being the link with what had gone before) stood first.

The ascription to Polycrates is thus, I am inclined to believe, not very convincing.

The unsatisfactoriness of both these explanations is an additional reason for accepting as probable what is in itself a neat and attractive solution, namely, the suggestion of Jacoby that the work was one on the Seven Wise Men. He is led to make this suggestion by the striking prominence of Chilon's name placed before that of Anaxandridas; according to this theory, the work would consist of a series of chapters, each beginning with the name of one of the Seven and containing an account of his activities. On this basis, the structure is simple, chronological difficulties recede, since there is no continuous history of a subject involved, and the ascription of lines 12-15 to Periander present no trouble, for he was regarded by many
as one of the Seven. Moreover, the description of Chilon as ὁ Δάκων is entirely appropriate in this case, and, indeed, much more so than it would be in a work on tyrants.

It is, I believe, possible to pursue the enquiry a little further. The few details which we have are all concerned with practical politics; if we assume this fragment to represent an epitome, it is possible to suppose that this is because these aspects were picked out and others disregarded by the epitomist, but it is, I think, much more likely that they represent the general character of the work. Writings on the Lives of the Seven Wise Men appear to commence among the Peripatetics immediately after the death of Aristotle,¹ and are of a different character from the hotch-potch which appears, for example, in Diogenes Laertius, where unco-ordinated and even incompatible elements are thrown in together. The Lives of the Wise Men written in this period are related to the great controversy which raged amongst the successors of Aristotle as to the respective claims of the speculative and the practical life as the ideal for the philosopher, the various writers each seeking to demonstrate that the great men of the past had subscribed to the particular attitude which he himself favoured. The first and most famous exponent of the claims of the practical life in this controversy, Dicaearchus of Messene, is known to have written on the Lives of the Seven Wise Men, stressing this aspect of their characters; such details as we have seem to preclude us from supposing the present fragment to be taken from his work, since amongst his six candidates for the last three places in the company of the Seven, if we may believe the testimony of Diogenes Laertius,² Chilon stood third, and Periander last, which would conflict with the presumed order followed in this fragment: but it is, I believe, not unlikely that we have preserved here something of a work belonging to this school of thought, and thus of a date somewhere between the beginning of the third century B.C.³ and the middle of the second when, according to the editors, the papyrus itself was written.

² I.41. = FHG. Dicaearchus, fr. 28 (ii. 244).
³ His *floruit* not later than 310 B.C., cf. Martini, *PW*, s.v. col. 547.
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This appears to be about as much as it is possible to state with any degree of confidence concerning the origins and nature of the narrative before us. As the next step, I propose to consider the actual text of the crucial lines which mention the activities of Chilon, and to seek to establish as exactly as possible what the correct reading is. There are two points at which greater certainty than is provided in Hunt's commentary appears to me attainable, namely, lines 17 and 21.

On the first of these, Hunt's note discourages the supposition that the mark over the α at the end of the line is a blot, though without finally precluding such an interpretation. The στασιάς which he mentions would be a most attractive reading, well in accordance with what one can conjecture to have been the position in Sparta at the time, and free from any complications of a constitutional nature; it appears, however, that this reading must be definitely ruled out.

For, if one is to assume the mark over the α to be a blot, then it must be admitted that (i) its shape is remarkably like that of a ρ, (ii) its position is exactly where one would expect an inserted ρ to be. This is in itself to demand a double coincidence. In addition, one would also have to claim that the mark on the edge of the papyrus, where the letter after the α would have been is also a blot; for if it is part of a letter, the remains make it clear that the letter cannot have been a σ but may well have been a τ, the other possibility. The further coincidence thus required makes the supposition that the word should be στασιάς practically untenable.

All remaining doubt is, however, dispelled by a closer examination of the mark over the α. For the downward line must be the tail of a ρ; it is a deliberate stroke of the pen, for it crosses the grain of the papyrus at right angles and does not spread along it as one would expect of a blot. Hence it is quite certain that, as Hunt himself believed, a word with a στρατ- base is required.

His note at this point is, "Hence στρατ(ηγη)σας or στρατ(ει)σας is the most suitable reading: it may be connected with Χιλων as in the text, or, if the τε be dropped, with Ἀναξανδρίδης." This statement may best be considered by
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taking its two parts separately, and for the sake of clarity, I propose to deal with the latter part first.

The question of whether the ς should be dropped or not is one which cannot be settled by palaeographical considerations. Without the ς, the line would be short (fifteen letters) but not impossibly short; the following line has only one more letter, and line 16 only thirteen letters. Admittedly the other short lines are followed by lines which begin with a long word, whereas if ς be omitted the next word, τάς, might possibly have fitted into its place, but this is not certain; perhaps the three letters might not have fitted, and though the writer of the papyrus does break words he apparently carries at least a syllable over into the following line: so, even if we suppose the ς to be omitted, it does not necessarily follow that the text of the fragment which we now possess would necessarily have been different. Thus no sound conclusions can be drawn from this type of fragment, and the decision whether to read ς or not must be based upon the general sense of the passage.

If one omits it and connects the second participle with Ἀναξάνδρις, the resultant reading is a chiasmus, presumably designed to emphasize the parts played by the two men, Chilon being the politician who originated the project, Anaxandridas the military commander who put it into effect. Such an antithesis is, however, rather forced, requiring as it does a great deal to be read into ἔφορεύσας. And further, such a device of style seems foreign to the type of account under consideration, though perhaps this may be a somewhat bold judgement in view of the slightness of the fragment. It is, however, supported by an examination of the second of the disputed readings mentioned above—l. 21.

Hunt’s observations on this point are, “the termination of the verb (sc. καταλυς) is too doubtful to found any argument upon . . . Either σ(α)ν or σ(ε)ν might be read”. The caution of this statement seems, however, unduly great; for the remnant of the letter following the σ strongly suggests that it cannot have been an α but can have been an ε, the only other possibility.

1 The chiasmus in lines 21-3 seems, on the other hand, the sort of thing which might easily occur in summarizing a list of persons and places.
Thus we may assume that the verb was most probably singular. This fact, I feel, goes far towards ruling out the possibility of a chiasmus; that a writer should include so stylistic a turn of phrase and then follow it immediately with a syntactical irregularity seems extremely unlikely.

We are, therefore, left with the conclusion that, for better or worse, the second participle, like the first, must agree with Chilon; the reading (allowing for Hunt's alternatives) being Χίλων δὲ δ' Λάκων ἐφορεύσας καὶ στρατηγήσας (στρατεύσας), Ἄναξανδρίδης τε, τὰς ἐν τοῖς Ἐλλησι τυραννίδας κατέλυσεν.

There is admittedly still an irregularity of syntax, but it is a wholly natural one, for the second subject of the verb κατέλυσεν is introduced almost parenthetically, as if by an afterthought, since the writer was interested mainly in Chilon's part in the affair but wished to mention Anaxandridas, who also participated, for the sake of completeness.

This leaves us with the task of determining if possible what status or action is accredited to Chilon—i.e. in particular, what the correct reading for the second participle is. The two alternatives suggested by Hunt do indeed seem to exhaust the possibilities—there is no other word which will fit the remains of the papyrus and make good sense. Of the two it is to be assumed that he himself preferred στρατηγήσας since he incorporated it in his reconstruction of text; and on the whole it seems perhaps the better reading.

There is indeed a prima facie case against this reading, on four counts. Firstly, the line must, whatever the reading, be the longest on the page (eighteen letters with στρατεύσας, nineteen with στρατηγήσας), so that the longer is on palaeographical grounds the less plausible; secondly, the verb στρατηγεῖν normally means "to be general", an office which is not attested at Sparta, even in the period when persons other than kings or regents were entrusted with military commands;1 thirdly, the tense of the participle is awkward.

1 The term used in the earliest instances for a field commander other than a king is admittedly uncertain; but in the latter part of the fifth century it was apparently ἀρχομετής (on this see Parke, "The Second Spartan empire", JHS, l. 39, 49-50), and it seems not unlikely that this was the usage from the first.
The tense of participle normally used with this verb to denote status at the time of action is the present, and so one would naturally expect οπταρτήγησας to imply "having been general". Now, to describe Chilon as "having been ephor" (ἐφορεύσας), though in my opinion presenting historical difficulties, is at least a sensible statement, for Chilon was noted for his ephorate, which marked an epoch in Spartan affairs, and thus to say that an action of his took place at a time subsequent thereto would be to add a significant piece of information. But no one, apparently, described the "generalship" of Chilon as marking a notable stage either in his career or in Spartan history (it would in fact be surprising if anyone did), so that the sort of time-indication implied by taking οπταρτήγησας in the normal way seems very implausible. Alternatively, if one accepts this tradition as possible and allows that the two participles are intended only to indicate that two events in Chilon's career were over when he first took action against tyrants, the statement still falls between two stools; on the one hand, it is lacking in sufficient emphasis to give the fact such importance in the sentence as it might deserve—something like ἧδη would, I feel, be almost obligatory—and on the other, it is surprisingly prolix for a narrative otherwise so notable for lack of detail.

Finally, though I have admitted its possibility, is it really plausible that ἐφορεύσας is meant to convey "having been ephor?" Ehrenberg does indeed so take it, but on the whole it seems to me unlikely. For, apart from the consideration of comparative lack of pertinence, referred to in the last paragraph, it must be stated that if Chilon did play a major part in promoting the anti-tyrannical policy (or, not to pre-judge the point at issue, if he was supposed by the historian being followed to have done so) it is difficult to see in what capacity this could be conceived

1 Thus the aorist part. of οπταρτήγειν is never used by Thucydides except in the sense of "having been general" (cf. Van Essen, Index Thucydideus); in Herodotus two cases occur where the aorist part. refers to the status then held by the person concerned (cf. Powell, Lexicon to Herodotus). Of these, one (vii. 233) is readily explicable (cf. Goodwin's Syntax of Greek Moods and Tenses, paragraph 152). The other (v. 28) may be a genuine case of aorist with no difference from present. See below, n. 2, p. 421.

as likely, if not as ephor. That Chilon afterwards became a member of the Gerousia is not in itself improbable, but that such an office would allow him to be a driving force in Spartan foreign policy seems less probable; and this supposition is less plausible for Chilon than for almost anyone else, for it was precisely his ephorate which was in later times recognized as marking an epoch in the balance of constitutional power at Sparta.

If, on the other hand, στρατεύσας be read, these difficulties are surmounted. The line is shorter; the past tense is natural, since whatever the shade of meaning the verb denotes an action not a status, and describes the events leading up to the action represented by the main verb; and a natural explanation of the difficult ἐφορεύσας appears. For since the aorist is so natural as to be virtually inevitable, it is quite possible to suppose that, though there is in this case no true parallelism between the ideas conveyed by the two verbs, he may have allowed the attraction ἐφορεύσας καί στρατεύσας to usurp the place of the more exact but less simple ἐφορεύων καί στρατηγήσας, though in fact meaning to assert that Chilon was at the time ephor. The cumulative force of these considerations would thus seem to build a not inconsiderable case for στρατεύσας.

Yet on the whole, when due account is made for the unelaborate nature of the fragment, the natural flow of the sentence seems to me decisive in favour of the other reading, for it creates a strong presumption of a second participle of such a kind that it balances the first in sense—i.e. one derived from a verb indicating a status, and this can only be στρατηγήσας. By contrast, despite all that can be said in its favour, στρατεύσας seems unbalanced and awkward. Against this flow of the sentence, the first arguments can have but little weight: it is not a practical impossibility to get nineteen letters into the line, and correctness of terminology is not always found even in the early writers. The arguments against the meaning "having been ephor and general", however, seem to me still valid, and one

2 Note, e.g. Herodotus' use of στρατηγήναυ of Leotychidas in VI. 71. Thucydides uses ἡγεσίοναυ in such cases. (E.g. II. 47, 2; III. 1, 1.)
must assume that though \textit{στρατηγήσας} be read, the meaning of
the participles is other than it would seem to be at first sight.
Hunt translates the phrase as “having become ephor and
general”—treating the usage as ingressive, which is very common
with verbs of this type.\textsuperscript{1} This gives a much more satisfactory
meaning to the phrase and may very well be the correct explana­
tion: alternatively, we may have here an instance of the aorist
participle used without any regard for connotation of past time,
as sometimes occurs elsewhere.\textsuperscript{2} In either case the position
ascribed to Chilon is that which he occupied at the time of
his action against the tyrants, so that the phrase is pertinent.
Whichever of these explanations be correct, it would appear that
the only major obstacle to the reading \textit{στρατηγήσας} can be
satisfactorily removed, and I therefore tend to the view that,
though \textit{στρατεύσας} is not demonstrably impossible, \textit{στρατηγήσας}
is the more likely reading.

Since, however, much of the argument which is to follow
will turn upon the second participle it will be advisable to show
that the difficulties raised by the text cannot be avoided by
adopting the variant reading; and I therefore proceed to con­
sider whether \textit{στρατεύσας} would in fact make any material
difference to the sense of the text.

The verb \textit{στρατεύειν} (in the active voice and with a singular
object) most commonly means “to lead an army out on a cam­
paign”, the sense of “serve as a soldier” being normally
expressed by the middle voice. That \textit{στρατεύσας} might perhaps
be meant to convey “having gone as a member of the army”
(i.e. active for middle, perhaps by attraction from \textit{ἐφορεύσας}),
may not in itself be outside the bounds of possibility, but it is
I believe ruled out by the immediate addition of \textit{Ἀναξανδρίδης}
τε. Even when one allows that the mention of the king is
almost a casual one, the form of the sentence does strongly
suggest that the status of the two men as regards the army is
visualized as similar, and we must surely suppose Anaxandridas
to have been fulfilling the normal function of a Spartan king and

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Goodwin, op. cit. sec. 55. For examples, cf. Kühner-Gerth. II. 1,
155.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. e.g. Her. V. 28; \textit{oθτὸς μὲν τοσάδα ἐφεργάσατο στρατηγήσας}. 
acting as a commander in the field. If this had not been what the writer wished to convey some other form of expression would surely have been essential, even in so slight an account as this. I therefore take the text, if στρατεύοντας be read, to assert that Chilon led a force, together with Anaxandridas, to put down tyrants. And in fact, since στρατηγήσας cannot, in view of Spartan usage, be regarded as denoting an actual title held by Chilon, there is no real difference of meaning between the two readings, on this point. Moreover, since it has been argued above that ἐφορεύοντας καὶ στρατηγήσας can only be accepted as meaning that Chilon was both ephor and general, and similarly that with στρατεύοντας the most reasonable assumption is that ἐφορεύοντας would need to be explained as due to attraction, the meaning on this point also is identical. Thus, even were we to read στρατεύοντας, it would make no difference whatever to the sense of the text, which must be "Chilon of Sparta, being ephor and leading an army, together with Anaxandridas, put down the tyrants amongst the Greeks".

It should be added, for the sake of completeness, that there is indeed one other way of reconstituting the text, which would give a considerably different sense. This is to drop the τε, substitute Ἰ for σ at the end of line 17, and translate στρατεύοντας as "accompanying on the expedition", thus making the sentence refer to the practice of having ephors attend on the king in the field which is discussed in the Xenophontic Constitution of the Lacedaemonians and is attested for the period of the Persian wars by a casual reference in Herodotus. (This would, of course, avoid the objections raised above to στρατεύοντας as in this case the second participle also would denote the status of Chilon at the time of action.) If this reading could be accepted as correct, then much of the argument of the following pages would be unnecessary; but in fact it seems to me a highly unlikely reading.

That line 18 would be short is not a fatal argument; it would be only slightly shorter (by reason of ending in Ἰ instead of σ) than the "chiasmus" reading discussed above; the real difficulty lies in the construction of στρατεύοντας with the dative. More accurately the phrase rendered as "accompanying on the

¹ XIII. 5. ² IX. 76, 3.
expedition" would be translated as "serving under", but this might well be near enough in an epitomizing account; it is the rarity of the construction itself which makes its appearance here so improbable. To date I have discovered only one instance, viz. Appian Civil Wars I, 42, and to suggest that this fragment, which in any case is considerably older than Appian, does preserve in these few lines traces of this rare construction seems to me to demand a degree of coincidence so great as to make it virtually impossible to believe in this reading. The meaning must, I feel certain, be what I indicated above.

To complete the discussion of the actual text, it remains to add a few words about the end of the papyrus—"ἐν Σικυωνὶ μὲν Ἀιακυνὴν Ἰππιαν δὲ Ἀθηνησίν Πεισιστράτῃ ἔποισαν " The chance that ἐν Σικυωνὶ μὲν begins a new sentence appears slight; what indications there are suggest that the work was written as a continuous narrative, with the normal connecting particles, so that a new sentence here would require γὰρ or something of the sort in addition to μὲν. It appears to me almost certain that the construction of the sentence was such that the names of the tyrants put down in the different places were simply placed in the accusative in a loose opposition to τυραννίδας and that there was no further verb in the sentence; and even if there was originally another verb at the end of the sentence, no matter if other cities and tyrants were listed, it is difficult to see how it could have been other than something more or less synonymous with κατέλυσεν and redundant to the general sense.

The meaning of the relevant lines I therefore take to be "Chilon the Spartan, being an ephor, and leading an army, together with Anaxandridas, put down the tyrannies amongst the Greeks, Aeschines at Sicyon, Hippias the son of Peisistratus at Athens . . ."

This concludes the attempt to make clear the meaning of the text itself; I turn now to a consideration of the nature and value of the evidence it offers.

The first observation must necessarily be that, whatever else may be said about the fragment as thus elucidated, it can in no way support the later date for the deposition of Aeschines. To attempt to use it in this way is to incur major difficulties. For,
if one accepts the traditional date of Chilon’s ephorate as approximately correct, ἐφορεύσας will have to bear the meaning “having been ephor”, which is, as I have attempted to show above, very unlikely in the present context. Moreover, it will have to imply that not only was Chilon’s action in respect of Sicyon after his ephorate, but that it was *forty years or more after it*, which is barely credible, even if we ignore as anachronistic the Herodotean story ¹ which makes him advise Hippocrates, later the father of Peisistratus, against having a family. If, on the other hand, one keeps what I have suggested as the more likely sense of the participle and explains it by the supposition that the writer of the papyrus or the authority he is following held an unorthodox view as to the date of Chilon’s ephorate, placing it near 510 B.C., the result is no better, for the association with Anaxandridas then becomes impossible. It is clear from Herodotus that not only was Anaxandridas not king in 510 B.C., but he had by that time been dead some years. The latest possible date for the accession of Cleomenes is c. 516 B.C., ² and c. 520 B.C. is more likely. ³ If we are to suppose that whoever is responsible for the narrative under consideration did not realize this, we ipso facto reject him as an authority in chronology; if, on the other hand, we do him the credit of assuming him to have reckoned with Herodotus, as would be normal in an historian of any worth in the period to which I have suggested the narrative under consideration can be traced back, it becomes quite clear that he is certainly not favouring the later date for the deposition of Aeschines. For the death of Anaxandridas is so far distant from the end of the Athenian tyranny that any argument from the close association of the name of Aeschines and Hippias is practically valueless. Any serious attempt to substantiate the later chronology for the Orthagoridae must in my opinion abandon any hope of deriving support from the present fragment, and seek rather to deny that it has any historical worth whatsoever.

¹ I. 59, 2.
² Cf. e.g. VII. 148, which represents Cleomenes as being on the throne at the time of Maeandrius’ appeal (i.e. c. 515 B.C.).
³ This is the latest date possible if that given by Thucydides (III. 68) for the Platanean affair (described in Her. VI. 108) be accepted. Cf. Beloch, op. cit. i. 1, 391, n. 2; Wells, *Studies in Herodotus*, 81-6.
This leads naturally to the question whether the fragment has in fact any such worth: and it must be immediately conceded that there are difficulties in the statements which it makes.

One difficulty is, I would suggest, apparent rather than real. This is the close association of the names of the two tyrants, which, if the text be taken literally, requires us to believe that Chilon and Anaxandridas put down both, a proposition manifestly incredible. The solution of this difficulty is to be found in the nature of the fragment itself; for if the conjecture that what we have is an epitome of a fuller narrative is correct, it is not hard to suppose that the epitomist, in crediting Chilon and Anaxandridas with the inauguration of the anti-tyrannical policy by their action in the case of Aeschines, may have loosely ascribed to them the responsibility for later instances of the same policy at Athens and perhaps elsewhere, since the way in which the papyrus ends leaves open the possibility that there were other cases on the list. This point, then, need not be a major stumbling-block: the real difficulties arise when the evidence is considered in relation to the Spartan constitution, and they are three in number.

The first of these is that the text makes a man who is neither king nor regent a field commander, and there is no good evidence for such an appointment before the fifth century; Parke \(^1\) goes so far as to assert that non-royal commanders were unknown in early Sparta, and this is highly probable when the natural conservatism of Sparta is taken into account. There is one event which might perhaps at first sight suggest that such appointments did exist at least in the late sixth century, but in fact it is more probably an indication of the opposite state of affairs. This is the case of Anchimolius, who led the first Spartan expedition against Hippias.\(^2\) The important fact about this case is that the attempt was made by sea, and it is not unlikely that Anchimolius was a navarch, this office being presumably as old an institution as the Spartan fleet itself.\(^3\) The fact that a sea attack was


\(^2\) Her. V. 62. 2.

\(^3\) i.e., at least as early as the expedition to Samos, 525 B.C. (cf. Her. III. 47), and, if Herodotus is to be trusted as to detail, as early as the fall of Sardis, c. 545 (I. 83).
preferred is curious; certainly an overland one was possible almost immediately afterwards, and one explanation which seems to me not unlikely is that the Spartan intention was to keep control of events out of the hands of the kings—which would at that time have meant virtually the hands of Cleomenes alone. If this was the aim, it would strongly suggest that a land expedition could take place only under the command of a king, even as late as 510 B.C. The first certain case of a non-royal person holding an independent command is that of Euainetos, who was sent to hold Tempe in 480 B.C., and indeed it is not improbable that this was actually the first time that the Spartans found it necessary to institute this type of command; the lack of precedent may even perhaps be reflected in the tone of Herodotus' narrative at this point.

This denial of non-royal commands in early Sparta may on the face of it appear unwarranted in view of the often-repeated story of the "generalship" of Tyrtaeus in the Second Messenian war; and admittedly if it should be established that he did hold the position of field commander at that time, the assertion that such appointments were unconstitutional must be considerably shaken, although it might still be argued that the crisis was so great that it called for extraordinary measures—as was indeed the case in 480 B.C.—and that an isolated instance such as this need not imply that this type of appointment became regular from then on. The evidence for the command of Tyrtaeus is, however, far from convincing.

The story that he was an Athenian whom the Spartans at the bidding of Delphi made a fellow-citizen and entrusted with command against the Messenians is not traceable in literature earlier than the fourth century B.C. It was related with varying degrees of detail by Callisthenes and Philochorus, and is referred to by Lycurgus as being common knowledge; Plato mentions

1 Her. V. 64. 1.
2 Her. VII. 173. 2.
3 The evidence for the "generalship" of Tyrtaeus; Strabo, p. 362 (cf. esp. Kramer's edition, ad. loc.), F. Gr. Hist. 124, F. 24 (Callisthenes) and 328, F 215-16 (Philochorus); Lycurgus, Leocr. 105 ff. Athenaeus, XIV. 630; Diod. Sic. VIII. 27, XV. 66; Suda s.v. See also Plato, Laws, 629A, and Paus. IV. 15, 3; 16, 1; 16, 3.
only his change of citizenship. The most general opinion now appears to be that his Athenian origin is a fiction.¹

Now the rejection of this part of the Tyrtaeus legend does not automatically entitle us to reject also that part which tells of his appointment to command a Spartan army; indeed the latter has even been cited as evidence for the improbability of his having been anything but a Spartan.² But at least we may look with some doubt upon such references as may be based on the "Athenian" legend; for, once having claimed the poet as their own, Attic writers would naturally be ready to ascribe to him as much importance as possible, and the tone of the poems might suggest a position of authority readily misinterpreted by patriots who were not well acquainted with the niceties of the early Spartan constitution. (This might, for example, be the case if the root of the whole legend is the reference to Tyrtaeus' Athenian birth in the Laws, which is certainly the earliest one known and may perhaps have been the outcome of one of Plato's peculiar ideas about early Greek history, on a par with his ascription of Theognis to Megara Hyblaea.)³ One cannot, for example, absolve Diodorus from depending ultimately on this "Athenian" tradition, and the activities with which Tyrtaeus is credited in Pausanias' account of the second Messenian war⁴ are in all probability merely an attempt on the part of his authorities to add substance to the same tradition, which he himself obviously accepts.

There is in fact only one piece of testimony which suggests an independent authority for Tyrtaeus' command, and that is the passage in Strabo, p. 362. In this the writer, quoting Tyrtaeus as evidence for the dates of the two wars, speaks of the second as that in which the poet said that he had been a general (ἡνίκα φήσων αὐτὸς στρατηγῆσαι τῶν πόλεμον τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις). But even this testimony is not so good as might at first sight

¹ See e.g. refs. in art. by v. Blumenthal in PW, s.v. "Tyrtaeus", col. 1943-5.
² So, e.g. Bowra in OCD, s.v. and "Early Greek Elegists", pp. 40-1.
³ Laws, 630A.
⁴ He is never described as "general", and it is distinctly stated in 16. 1 that he took no active part in the battle of the Boar's Grave (IV. 16. 1); but in IV. 16. 3 he is described as enrolling Helots in regiments to replace the fallen.
appear. The text of Strabo is confused at this point, and there is probably a lacuna; one manuscript, however, adds that Tyrtaeus said this in the “Isonomia”, which is presumably an error for “Eunomia”. This being so, it is clear that neither the word στρατηγός nor any derivative thereof can have appeared in the text of Tyrtaeus, as the elegiac metre would not have permitted it. There must therefore have been some other phrase which Strabo interpreted as a statement by Tyrtaeus to the effect that he had held a field command. It is not metrically impossible that the original reading was πολέμαρχος; this would be a possible title historically, since it was applied at Sparta to a subordinate commander;¹ and might easily be taken as meaning something higher; but it seems more likely that if the reference was a personal one at all it merely employed a vague phrase appropriate to the position of prestige which Tyrtaeus certainly enjoyed, as the tone of his poems shows.² Such a reference Strabo, who was clearly acquainted with the tradition which said that he had been a commander, could then have readily misinterpreted. It may be added that in the very next sentence of the text as it now stands Strabo is guilty of taking a reference of Tyrtaeus to the coming of the Spartans ἐκ Ἐπικεφαλείων as an autobiographical statement concerning the poet’s nationality. Thus one can hardly place great faith in Strabo as an interpreter of Tyrtaeus, and I would suggest that the evidence for the appointment of Tyrtaeus to anything in the nature of a field command is extremely poor, and can hardly weigh against the natural improbability of such a thing in seventh-century Sparta.

The existence of a field commander who was neither king nor regent in mid-sixth century, as alleged by the present fragment, thus remains unsupported.

The second difficulty is this: what is to be made of the association of a non-royal personage as an equal with a king in

¹ Thuc. V. 66. 3; (Xen.) Resp. Lac. XI. 4.
² Thus his status would be somewhat analogous to that of the Elean seer Tisamenus (Her. IX. 33), who, though described by Herodotus as ἄμα Ἦρακλείδων τοιοὶ βασιλέωι ἡγεμόνα τῶν πολέμων, was clearly not invested with any powers which would justify the description στρατηγός. (Cf. Macan and How and Wells, ad loc.)
command of an army? This is even more difficult to understand than the appointment of such a person to the sole command of an army. Appointments of the latter kind were in fact common enough in the later years of the fifth century, but not only is there no evidence for a commoner actually sharing the command with the king but it is difficult to conceive of circumstances where this might be expected to happen; the whole purpose of appointing “harmosts” lay in the need to provide commanders of forces where it was not possible or desirable for the king to take charge, and if the king was present, then ipso facto this need must cease to exist. Thus the association of Chilon with Anaxandridas in command of an army is, to say the least, surprising.

Finally, there is the difficulty inherent in the phrase ἐφορεύσας καὶ στρατεύσας. I have already argued that if this phrase is to have any significance it must almost certainly be taken to mean that at the time of deposing Aeschines, Chilon was both ephor and field commander. Now this assertion, though apparently required by the general sense of the passage, is nevertheless from the constitutional aspect difficult to accept. Even if one tries to argue that only a subordinate command is intended—and, as has been maintained above, this is far from being the natural implication of the text—such an appointment is quite out of keeping with what we know of the character of the ephorate. For although the ephors had the duty of ordering expeditions (φροφοραν φαίνειν) they took no active part in them, their duties in the field being merely to advise the king if called upon by him to do so, and to continue their normal supervision of the behaviour of the citizen body. There seems to be no known case, if we except the one alleged in the papyrus under discussion, of military authority being exercised by a person actually holding the ephorate at the time. It is in fact clear that, at least

1 Note especially the case of Dercylidas (Xen. Hell. III. 4. 6), who, although commanding an army in the field in Asia Minor before the arrival of Agesilaus with a separate force, was evidently reduced automatically to the status of a subordinate commander when the king commenced operations in the same area.

2 For the probability that this function of the ephors was of very ancient origin cf. Chrimes, Ancient Sparta, pp. 402-12.

3 (Xen.) Resp. Lac. XIII. 5; cf. Chrimes, op. cit. p. 403, n. 6.
in the period where adequate evidence for the constitutional arrangements of Sparta is available, the ephorate was essentially a civil office.

There are then these three difficulties in the text of the papyrus, and it seems that there is no comprehensive explanation which will clear them all away convincingly. It may indeed be the case that the appointment of persons other than royalty to military commands did begin at least seventy-five years earlier than the date suggested in this article; again, it may be that the ephorate had in earlier times a military aspect which it subsequently lost; but each of these propositions would need far more cogent evidence than is afforded by the present fragment before even a reasonable degree of probability could be admitted. And even so, it would be impossible to reconcile the two in one theory save on the assumption that the military aspect of the ephorate lasted just long enough to overlap with the introduction of independent commands and then died out, which seems particularly unconvincing. Finally, no explanation short of a complete breach of the constitution appears capable of explaining the alleged joint command.

There are in fact only two solutions which can at all reasonably be held. The first is that the prestige of Chilon was such that it enabled him to transgress the constitution to the extent of assuming a joint control of an army together with a king whilst serving as ephor; and for so startling a departure from normal practice the evidence of this solitary fragment can afford scant justification. We are therefore thrown back on the alternative explanation, which is simply that the writer of the fragment did not in fact understand what he was asserting. This is, I feel sure, the true solution.

The facts as recorded are thus highly suspect, and raise in a crucial form the question whether any reliance whatsoever can be placed on the evidence of the fragment. In attempting to deal with this question, I would emphasize that the difficulties all arise from presence in the text of the second participle, στρατηγίας, and this may be due simply to a misunderstanding of the authority being followed. If so, in the original form the statement would have made satisfactory sense historically, and only
ceased to do so as a result of garbled transmission. But even if we put the case at its worst, and suppose the papyrus to be merely repeating an error of the original, one must remember that the difficulties are all bound up with matters of Spartan constitutional practice, and that of a period several centuries before the time at which that work was composed; and it is an open question whether, in a work of the kind on which I have suggested that the present fragment depends, one can reasonably expect accurate and detailed understanding of a constitution which, until a comparatively late stage in its development, was almost proverbially little-known outside its own state. The knowledge which would be required is of a different order to that of the straightforward historical matter of the deposition of Aeschines, and by no means as essential to the writer.

If we set aside this particular statement (and of course the mention of Hippias discussed above), we are left with a reference to the ephorate of Chilon, King Anaxandridas, and the deposition of Aeschines. There is nothing in the association of these three ideas which is manifestly impossible: there is nothing self-contradictory about it. That the ephorate of Chilon fell in the reign of Anaxandridas is chronologically reasonable; that he should be involved in a major departure of Spartan policy is well in keeping with the tradition which represents him as raising the ephorate to a status rivalling the kingship; and, as Hunt remarks, there may be some memory of this episode at the back of his appearance as a ἀνάθεμα in Herodotus. Provided that we suppose the deposition of Aeschines to be dated correctly by the “early” chronology, the whole fits neatly into a pattern.

With this type of argument, a definite proof is impossible; any attempt to manipulate the evidence to arrive at such would manifestly result in a circular argument; but the fact that the evidence of this fragment and that adduced by the supporters of

---

1 τῆς πολιτείας τὸ κρυπτόν: Thuc. V. 68. 2.
2 The evidence available makes it probable that the accession of Anaxandridas is to be placed c. 560 B.C., cf. Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, ii. 207; Wade-Gery, CAH, iii. 565-6.
the "early" system of Orthagorid chronology appear mutually supporting creates a considerable presumption in favour of the correctness of both.

But one must face the possibility that the neatness of pattern is not due to the veracity of the statements, but to pure artifice. If anyone wished to invent details of Spartan sixth-century history, Chilon would be one of the few convenient names on which to hang them; his importance and reputed hatred of tyrants would make him a suitable protagonist for an affair such as is here described; and a little care could ensure that the "historian" did not obviously stultify his narrative by picking an impossible king to associate with Chilon. It is thus necessary to choose between these alternative explanations of the pattern displayed by the fragment.

Now, if it should be demonstrated on independent grounds and with a very high degree of probability that the deposition of Aeschines was late, I believe that the latter explanation would be tenable, and would justify the total rejection of this fragment as evidence—which, as I suggested above, would be necessary; particularly since the constitutional difficulties might in that case be cited as additional testimony against the worth of the papyrus. But in default of so clear a demonstration, I am myself inclined to accept the view that the neatness of the pattern is due to its veracity.

The details of the deposition of Aeschines appear neither in Herodotus nor in Thucydides, and in fact (despite later generalizations mentioning the end of the Sicyonian tyranny) do not seem to have caught the popular imagination as did, e.g. those of the disastrous Spartan attack on Tegea, around which circumstantial details of various kinds wove themselves in the period which separates Herodotus from Pausanias:¹ they fall on the contrary into precisely that class of comparatively obscure historical material which the research of the Peripatetic and Alexandrian type sought to recover.² That the scholars of this

¹ Contrast the accounts of the affair as they appear in Her. I. 66, and in Paus. III. 7. 3; VIII. 5. 9; VIII. 48. 4.
² It is, for example, highly probable in my opinion that the affair was described in the Aristotelian Constitution of the Sicyonians.
period were not always above inventing history is only too obvious, but at least in their fabrications “in character” concerning great men, if we leave aside the ascription of stock anecdotes of a general nature,\(^1\) the tendency is rather to associate them with persons of similar importance (cf. e.g. the story of the tripod, which is intended to show a relation between the seven sages)\(^2\) and when one has to decide whether a writer of this period has taken a given tradition (in this case the importance and the anti-tyrannical temperament of Chilon) and related it to an event whose details had never been considered of first-rate importance, or whether the pattern fits together because it describes what actually happened I would be inclined *ceteris paribus* to regard the latter as somewhat the more probable.

Thus, as far as concerns the Sicyonian problem, I would conclude that in default of a strong case to the contrary we have in this fragment a not wholly negligible piece of evidence, the earliest available on the subject of Aeschines’ deposition, and coming from a type of source which can preserve good historical material, which tends to confirm the earlier date for that event, placing it in the ephorate of Chilon and relating it to the efforts of the latter.

To go further than this it is, I believe, to resort almost wholly to conjecture. In particular no attempt to reconstruct the episode from the Spartan side can command any great measure of confidence. The evidence would seem to me to warrant only the assumption that Chilon promoted the deposition of Aeschines, and that an army went under Anaxandridas to implement it. Whether Chilon, in addition to promoting the affair, actually went to Sicyon in person, and if so in what capacity must remain problematical. On purely *a priori* grounds it would seem not unlikely that he may have gone as one of the ephors attending on Anaxandridas in a formal capacity, since presumably two out of the five ephors of his year went, and as one of the duties to be performed was to advise the king if requested to do so, he would have been an obvious choice; but whether a purely formal

---


\(^2\) This dates at least from the *Tpˇnovs* of Andron of Ephesus (F.H.G. II. 346).
attendance of this kind would be of sufficient note to be preserved in tradition and so handed down until it found a confused echo in the text before us is debatable. A special commission to help the king in the political settlement would be a far more likely thing to be so preserved, but for this I feel that the authority of the fragment under discussion is but poor. As I have attempted to show, the account which it presents gives us a garbled version of what are most probably historical facts; and in such a case the simple facts that Chilon persuaded the Spartans to depose Aeschines and that Anaxandridas went with an army to do it may well have undergone a sufficiently violent process of misunderstanding and telescoping to produce the present text without the actual presence of Chilon at Sicyon ever being involved. Thus, whilst it might make it a little easier to explain the confusion if Chilon was originally represented as going to Sicyon in person, it would, I believe, be rash to rely on this fragment as evidence for such a state of affairs.

Nor, finally, is the fragment good evidence on the alleged Spartan deposition of the Cypselidae. The writer of the papyrus does indeed apparently regard the deposition of Aeschines as the prototype, which would seem, on chronological grounds, to preclude him from having supposed that the Cypselidae were amongst the tyrants put down, if the traditional dating be correct, no matter whether the list given in the papyrus continued after Hippias or not. But, if the papyrus represents, as I believe it does, a work of Dicaearchean tendencies on the Seven Wise Men, Periander would be the only member of the Cypselidae due for mention, and as he was certainly not deposed by the Spartans there is no reason why any mention of Spartan intervention at Corinth should have occurred in the work, so that silence on the subject is no indication either way: whereas the same writer, not having concerned himself with the fate of Periander's successors, but finding that Chilon was responsible for the deposition of Aeschines, may readily be supposed, in a work of this type, to have stressed the importance of Chilon's action by suggesting that it created the precedent for the famous Spartan crusade against the tyrants. This being so, nothing certain can be derived from the fragment on this point either.
I end by summarizing as briefly as possible, the conclusions of this long and somewhat involved argument. They are as follows:

1. The fragment appears to be part of an epitome or series of notes on a work, after the school of Dicaearchus, on the Seven Wise Men.

2. It dates the deposition of Aeschines to the ephorate of Chilon, thereby supporting the "early" chronology for the Orthagoridae.

3. The balance in favour of the veracity of the testimony of the fragment is, however, not so great that a convincing case on other grounds for the "late" chronology could not outweigh it and render the fragment historically worthless.

4. The fragment ascribes to Chilon an important part in promoting the affair, which also involved an army led by Anaxandridas.

5. On the exact details of the event, and in particular on the circumstances on the Spartan side, it can, however, have no guidance.

6. Nor can it be regarded as worthwhile evidence on the alleged Spartan deposition of Cypselidae.