

## THE ORIGIN OF THE TYRANNIS.

### *Introduction.*

It is a commonplace that the age of the early tyrants was an age of extraordinary commercial development. The invention of coinage, the most important invention in the history of commerce, dates from that age. In what personal relationship did the tyrants stand to this commercial development? They are often assumed to have been merely one of its passive products.<sup>1</sup> Is it not possible that the founder of the tyranny was the man who turned to greatest advantage for political purposes the unique commercial conditions of the age in which he lived? Thucydides<sup>2</sup> connects the rise of tyrannies with money making. Does not the saying *χρήματ' ἀνήρ*, which dates from this time, suggest that the tyrants were the leading members of this new class of nouveaux riches, and that they owed their political supremacy to their previous commercial predominance? The indications are of course exceedingly slight. Only in two cases, those of Samos and Athens, where the tyranny arose unusually late, is there any solid material for our investigation. It will be best to consider in detail these two cases only, merely indicating in the barest outline how the seventh century legends and traditions may be severally brought into immediate connexion with the commercial theory.

### *Samos.*

The Samians had from early times been great sailors<sup>3</sup> and shipbuilders,<sup>4</sup> their ships being engaged mainly in the carrying trade.<sup>5</sup> From early times too they had enjoyed a great reputation as workers in metal, especially the fine metals,<sup>6</sup> and they were no less famous for their woollen manufactures.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the generally received view concerning the genesis of the tyrannis see Beloch, *G.G.* i. 312, 313; Plass, *Die Tyrannis*, i. 120, 121; Guiraud, *La main-d'œuvre industrielle dans l'ancienne Grèce*, 29; Radet, *La Lydie*, ch. iv.

<sup>2</sup> i. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Hdt. ii. 178; iii. 47, 48, 59; v. 99; *Et. Mag. Σαμοθράκη*; *ib.* 'Ἡραίων Τείχος'; Athen. vi. 267 A; Plut. *De Mal.* Hdt. 22; *Q. Gr.* liv.

<sup>4</sup> Thuc. i. 13; Pliny vii. ch. 57.

<sup>5</sup> Hdt. iv. 152.

<sup>6</sup> Collignon, *La sculpture grecque*, i. p. 151. The Samian voyage to Tarshish (620 B.C. Macan, Hdt. 4, 5, 6, i. p. 106) gives the latest date for the beginning of this industry; Apul. *Florid.* ii. 15.

<sup>7</sup> Theocr. xv. 125.

The island was not, however, exclusively commercial. There was a powerful landed aristocracy called γεωμόροι,<sup>8</sup> who doubtless owned the rich Samian oliveyards.<sup>9</sup> The power of the γεωμόροι explains the late date of the tyranny in Samos.

When at last the tyranny was established by Polycrates, the tyrant is found controlling the commercial activities of his state. All through his reign Polycrates was a great sailor and ship-owner.<sup>10</sup> He built the famous *περὶ λιμένα χῶμα*,<sup>11</sup> and was even credited with the invention of a new type of boat, called the *Σαμαίνη*.<sup>12</sup> The general conception of the Samian tyrant is indeed that he used his ships in naval and piratical operations rather than for any peaceful purpose. Thucydides<sup>13</sup> says of him *ναυτικῶ ἰσχύων, ἄλλας τε τῶν νήσων ὑπηκόους ἐποιήσατο καὶ Ῥήνειαν ἐλὼν ἀνέθηκε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δηλίῳ*. But even the capture of Rheneia, which Thucydides seems to regard as the principal warlike achievement of Polycrates' fleet, was one that may have had most important commercial consequences. By capturing Rheneia Polycrates became practically master of Delos. He celebrated the Delian games.<sup>14</sup> Considering the unrivalled situation of Delos, it is not unlikely that the festival was even in the sixth century the *ἐμπορικὸν πρᾶγμα*<sup>15</sup> that it was in later ages.<sup>16</sup> The tyrant's war with Sparta was in all probability a commercial struggle started by Corinth.<sup>17</sup> Systematic piracy again was probably Polycrates' only way of maintaining the unequal struggle with Persia. In any case Polycrates employed his fleet for commercial purposes as well as warlike. He traded with *Egypt*,<sup>18</sup> which was the one Eastern country that was during most of his reign independent of Persia and open therefore to Samian trade. The statement of Clytus the Aristotelian *Πολυκράτη τὸν Σαμίον τύραννον ὑπὸ τρυφῆς τὰ πανταχόθεν συνάγειν*<sup>19</sup> shows that Polycrates had a personal interest in the transport trade of the people who *μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων ἐκ φορτίων ἐκέρδησαν μετὰ γε Σάστρατον Αἰγυπνίτην*.<sup>20</sup> There is unfortunately nothing to show that he employed his own vessels in *φορτηγία*.

<sup>8</sup> Plut. *Q. Gr.* 57.

<sup>9</sup> Apul. *Florid.* ii. 15; Aesch. *Pers.* 833.

<sup>10</sup> Thuc. i. 13; Hdt. iii. 39; cf. also Euseb. *Chron.* Armenian version, mare obtinuerunt Samii, just after the notice of Polycrates becoming tyrant. Latin version Dicearchiam Samii condiderunt, just after the notice of Polycrates' accession.

<sup>11</sup> Hdt. iii. 60.

<sup>12</sup> Hesych. *Σαμαϊκὸς τρόπος*; Phot. *Σαμαίνη*; Plut. *Pericles* xxvi.; Athen. xii. 540 e.

<sup>13</sup> i. 13.

<sup>14</sup> Phot. and Suid., *Πύθια καὶ Δήλια* φασὶ Πολυκράτη τὸν Σάμου τύραννον, Πύθια καὶ Δήλια ποιήσαντα ἕμα ἐν Δήλῳ πέμψαι εἰς θεοῦ χρησόμενον κ.τ.λ. τὴν δὲ Πύθιαν ἀνελεῖν ταῦτά σοι

καὶ Πύθια καὶ Δήλια, βουλομένην δηλοῦν ὅτι ἔσχατα μετ' ὀλίγον γὰρ χρόνον αὐτὸν ἀπολέσθαι συνέβη.

<sup>15</sup> Str. x. 486.

<sup>16</sup> Is it conceivable that the repeated purifications of Delos in the sixth and fifth centuries may not only have had a religious signification, but may also have meant the repeated restriction of a commercial element that was constantly reasserting itself?

<sup>17</sup> Hdt. iii. 47 and 48, where observe the causes to which Herodotus attributes the war.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Hdt. iii. 39 with Diod. i. 95 and 98.

<sup>19</sup> Ath. 540 c.

<sup>20</sup> Hdt. iv. 152.

It is difficult again with the evidence at our disposal completely to identify the tyrant with Samian industry. There is no direct evidence that Polycrates was engaged in the metal industry during his reign,<sup>21</sup> but he seems to have patronised and developed the Samian manufacture of woollen goods. Among the things which Athenaeus (540 c, quoting Clytus, cf. supra) declares that Polycrates when tyrant introduced into Samos are *ἐκ Μιλήτου πρόβατα*.<sup>22</sup>

Polycrates the tyrant has therefore been shown to have taken some part in the commercial and industrial activities of the city that he ruled.<sup>23</sup> There is strong evidence that he was engaged in the leading branches of Samian industry before he became tyrant, and that his political power was the direct result of these activities. Athenaeus, in the passage above quoted, still speaking of Polycrates, says *πρὸ δὲ τοῦ τυραννῆσαι κατασκευασάμενος στρωμνὰς πολυτελεῖς καὶ ποτήρια ἐπέτρεπε χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἢ γάμον ἢ μείζονας ὑποδοχὰς ποιουμένοις*. It could scarcely be more definitely stated that Polycrates owed his throne to his wealth in *στρωμναί* and *ποτήρια*. The *στρωμναί* are surely the manufactured article for which he introduced the Milesian and Attic *πρόβατα*. The word is apparently technical. Theocritus uses another form of it (*ἔστρωται*) in the passage where he refers to the famous wools of Miletus and Samos.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Note however that he was the patron of Theodorus, who was famous not only as a jeweller but also as a maker of metal vases (Hdt. i. 51, Ath. xii. 514f). It will be shown immediately that Polycrates owed his throne to the *κατασκευὴ* of *ποτήρια*. The *ποτήρια* were almost certainly of metal. *ποτήρια κεραμεῖα* are only once mentioned in the passages quoted by Liddell and Scott (Ath. 464a), whereas there are numerous passages in which *ποτήρια* are specifically stated to be of metal (*χάλκεα* Hdt. ii. 37; *ἀργυρᾶ, χρυσᾶ* C.I. 138 7, 19, 27 et alibi. Hdt. iii. 148). The fact of their being *lent* for *μείζονας ὑποδοχὰς* is most decisive of all. It may well be the case therefore that Theodorus was something more to Polycrates than merely his crown jeweller and silversmith. Some ancient authorities held that Theodorus flourished 150 years before Polycrates, Plin. N.H. xxxv. 43 (152). Theodorus is always associated with Rhoecus, and the two names may have been borne in alternate generations by one family of artists. This would not require the Rhoeci to have flourished longer in Samos than the Wedgwoods have in Staffordshire. Whether or no this explanation holds, the divergence in dates points to the industry having flourished for a long time in the island. If one date for Theodorus be insisted on, that of Herodotus (i. 51), which makes the artist the elder contemporary of

Polycrates, must of course be chosen (see Frazer, Paus. iv. p. 237).

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* 540 D (from Alexis) *πρόβατα ἐκ Μιλήτου καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς*. Cf. also Hdt. iv. 164. Polycrates' support of Arcesilaus, the banished tyrant of Cyrene, in *μηλοτρόφος* Διβύη (Hdt. iv. 155, cf. the oracle in iv. 159 where reference is made to Cyrenean fleeces).

<sup>23</sup> One reported act of Polycrates seems quite out of keeping with his character as a great merchant. He is said to have debased the coinage (Hdt. iii. 56). But Herodotus mentions this report only to reject it as *ματαιώτερος*. In any case it was only a desperate expedient for getting rid of an invader.

<sup>24</sup> It seems probable that Polycrates' brother and partner at first in the tyranny was also originally a merchant or manufacturer of woollen goods. At any rate after his banishment we find Darius wanting to buy a *χλαρίς* from him. According to Herodotus (iii. 139) it was the one that Syloson was at the moment wearing. The incident took place in Egypt. Syloson was one of the Greeks who had followed Cambyses there. Some of these had come *κατ' ἐμπορίην*, some *στρατευόμενοι*, some as mere sightseers. Syloson, who *ἠγόραζε ἐν τῇ Μέμφι* at the moment of Darius' request, replied *ἐγὼ ταύτην πωλέω μὲν οὐδενὸς χρήματος· δίδωμι δὲ ἄλλως*. The incident suggests that Syloson was in Memphis *κατ' ἐμπορίην* as a merchant in

Polycrates probably had a connexion, direct or indirect, with Samian shipping before his accession, for the Samian silversmiths got their silver from Spain.<sup>25</sup> There is however no evidence that Polycrates procured his silver in his own ships.

The two references in Athenaeus, the one to Polycrates' importations as tyrant, the other to his bribes *πρὸ τοῦ τυραννῆσαι*, though from the same passage, are not from the same source. The first is explicitly from *Κλύτος ὁ Ἀριστοτελικός*. The second is presumably from Alexis, who has been definitely quoted as the authority for the previous sentence. Even if Athenaeus is no longer quoting Alexis, there is not the least reason for thinking that he is quoting Clytus again.

In his domestic policy Polycrates won great fame as the promoter of great public works. The sums that he spent and the number of hands that he employed on the *ἔργα Πολυκράτεια* must have been very large.<sup>26</sup> He maintained his power by means of mercenaries, native, it should be noticed, as well as foreign.<sup>27</sup> These mercenaries were undoubtedly a development of the *πεντεκαίδεκα ὀπλίται*<sup>28</sup> with which he had seized supreme power.

It is natural to ask at this point how far the labour employed by seventh and sixth century capitalists was free labour. Free labour must of course have been employed to a different extent in different occupations, and the question must be decided in detail for the different industries with which the tyrant will be found connected. In Samos, after the fall of the tyranny, a large number of slaves purchased the citizenship.<sup>29</sup> This might seem a reason for assuming that Polycrates had relied on highly trained servile labour, which the city had not known how to deal with after the fall of the tyranny. There is however a simpler explanation. Syloson, when restored by Persia, had almost annihilated the free population.<sup>30</sup> As regards shipping in particular the evidence points to the general use of free labour. Thucydides<sup>31</sup> states that the *ἐρέται* of the Corinthian fleet of 433 B.C., when slaves were much easier to procure than in the sixth century, were nevertheless free men working for pay. Polycrates' *τεχνῖται* were free men engaged *ἐπὶ μισθοῖς μεγίστοις*.<sup>32</sup>

Speaking generally, free labour was much more employed in *χειροτεχνία* in the seventh and sixth than in the succeeding centuries.<sup>33</sup> Büchschütz<sup>34</sup> in a most instructive passage points out that in early times the *τέχναι* were

*χλανίδες*. The unromantic commercial aspect of the transaction between Syloson and Darius, which is already obscured in Herodotus' account, has quite [disappeared in that of Strabo (xiv. 638), who makes no mention of Darius' offer to purchase.

<sup>25</sup> Hdt. iv. 152.

<sup>26</sup> Ar. *Pol.* viii. 11, p. 1313 b; Athen. 540 D.

<sup>27</sup> Hdt. iii. 39 and 45.

<sup>28</sup> Hdt. iii. 120.

<sup>29</sup> Suidas, *Σαμίαν ὁ δῆμος*.

<sup>30</sup> Strabo, xiv. 638 *ἔκκητι Συλοσῶντος εὐρυχωρίῃ*; Phot. and Suid. *loc. cit.* *σπάνει τῶν πολιτευομένων*.

<sup>31</sup> i. 31 *μισθῶ πείθοντες*.

<sup>32</sup> Ath. 540 D; cf. Hdt. iii. 131.

<sup>33</sup> Hdt. ii. 167 *μεμαθήκασιν δ' ὦν τοῦτο* (contempt of *χειροτέχναι*) *πάντες οἱ Ἕλληνες*.

<sup>34</sup> *Besitz und Erwerb*, S. 321.

in the hands of freemen,<sup>35</sup> but each man was his own master, there being no factories or division of labour. In classical times there was considerable division of labour, and there were businesses employing a large number of hands,<sup>36</sup> but citizens took small part in them.<sup>37</sup> The age of the tyrants was therefore the age in Greek history when apart from all details of evidence there is the greatest a priori possibility of an individual having secured the political power which falls naturally to the employer of organised free labour on a large scale. The employment of servile labour in commercial enterprises was the result, not the cause, of the commercial expansion and development of the seventh and sixth centuries.

*Athens.*

The chief early industry of Athens was pottery:<sup>38</sup> the large finds of Dipylon ware show that from an early time Attic pottery had a character of its own.<sup>39</sup> But Athens was not exclusively commercial like Corinth and Aegina. Her large territory made her, like Samos, partly agricultural. To this fact may be due her failure<sup>40</sup> to compete commercially with Aegina and Corinth in the seventh century. Hence too, as in Samos, the late rise of the tyranny. There was of course the attempt of Cylon, but Cylon failed because, though wealthy (*ὄλυμπιονίκης*) and influential (*δυνατός*), he could not possibly, in the Athens of his day, be the leader of any dominant organised commercial activity. He was merely a progressive member of the aristocracy (*τῶν πάλαι εὐγενῆς*) connected with the great band of merchant princes only by marriage.<sup>41</sup> The attempt and its result are both what might have been expected from the position of Athens at the time. Athens never became the ideal home for a tyranny. Soon after Cylon's attempt she did indeed begin to supplant Corinth in the pottery trade,<sup>42</sup> and the influence of the rich city merchants and exporters must have greatly increased, but Solon's measures for encouraging the growth of olives and the exportation of olive-oil belong also to this period,<sup>43</sup> and the importance of the *εὐγενεῖς* who owned the oliveyards must have increased almost equally. No merchant therefore attempted to secure all the labour of the town and seize the tyranny. The country aristocracy employed labour too. Tyranny was almost impossible.<sup>44</sup> But

<sup>35</sup> Hes. *Op.* 309 *ἔργον οὐδὲν δνειδος* and Homer, *passim*; cf. Plut. *Sol.* xxii. *πρὸς τὰς τέχνας ἔτρεψε τοὺς πολίτας.*

<sup>36</sup> Demosth. *κατ' Ἀφίβου*, p. 816; Lysias, xii. 19; Xen. *de Vect.* 4. 14 (Nicias' mining works).

<sup>37</sup> Ar. *Pol.* iv. 9, 1328, *οὔτε βάνασον βίον οὔτ' ἀγοραῖον δεῖ ζῆν τοὺς πολίτας.*

<sup>38</sup> Pliny, vii. 57 (Delphin. p. 1425), Figlinas Corœbus inuenit Atheniensis.

<sup>39</sup> Perrot, vii. p. 160.

<sup>40</sup> Hdt. v. 82-88.

<sup>41</sup> Thuc. i. 126.

<sup>42</sup> B.M. *Vases*, vol. ii. Introduction p. 2.

<sup>43</sup> Plut. *Sol.* 24.

<sup>44</sup> Another proof that Athens was at this time too backward commercially to have been overcome by the wealth of a would-be despot and to have established a tyrant, yielding to gain' (Theog.) is that the first Athenian colony was not founded till between 560 and 555, during the first reign of Peisistratus, Busolt, i. 2, 316; *Ann.* 3.

though the wealth and power of the land-owning aristocracy prevented any Athenian merchant from making himself tyrant, the commercial development of Athens must have made it daily more difficult for the Athenian aristocracy to exclude the rich merchants from political power. Hence the leading man at Athens at this time was not a mere millionaire, as in Corinth and the other more exclusively trading states. Solon had indeed some experience of trade,<sup>45</sup> but he was essentially a politician with a gift for finance, not a financier with political ambitions. He became not a tyrant but a lawgiver.

Solon tried to provide for the difficulties which he saw resulting from the existence of two evenly-matched parties, the landowners of the plain and the traders of the shore. The tyranny arose from the formation of a new interest, that of the *Διάκριοι*, by Peisistratus.<sup>46</sup> Of the means by which Peisistratus gained the throne less is known than is often imagined. The ruse by which he secured his club-bearers and the Acropolis is a detail. Peisistratus was careful to observe the Solonian constitution, especially before his third restoration. It is therefore not to be expected that the means that he took originally to secure his power would have been patent to everybody. But after his second restoration he threw off the mask more. *ἐρρίζωσε τὴν τυραννίδα ἐπικούροισί τε πολλοῖσι καὶ χρημάτων συνόδοισι, τῶν μὲν αὐτόθεν, τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος ποταμοῦ συνιόντων.*<sup>47</sup> So Aristotle,<sup>48</sup> *παρῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς περὶ Πάγγαιον τόπους, ὅθεν χρηματισάμενος καὶ στρατιώτας μισθωσάμενος, ἔλθων εἰς Ἐρετρίαν ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει τὸ πρῶτον ἀνασώσασθαι βία τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεχειρεῖ. . . κατεῖχεν ἤδη τὴν τυραννίδα βεβαίως.* That is to say, Peisistratus used money gained in business (*χρηματισμός*) to compass his second restoration. The question arises, did Peisistratus use similar means, only less openly, to secure his original *ἀρχή*? in other words, was Peisistratus a merchant and financier before he became tyrant? What evidence there is leads to the conclusion that he was.

Peisistratus became tyrant originally as leader of the *Διάκριοι*.<sup>49</sup> Now M. Guiraud in his interesting but sober account of *La main-d'œuvre dans l'ancienne Grèce* (pp. 30, 31), sees from the words of Herodotus *χρημάτων τῶν μὲν αὐτόθεν κ.τ.λ.* that Peisistratus worked the mines at Laureium. Can the *Διάκριοι* be the mining population of Attica, almost exclusively in the employment of the great mine owner Peisistratus, who carried on operations in Thrace as well as Attica, and was in close commercial connexion with the famous mining industries of Euboea?<sup>50</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Plut. *Sol.* 2.

<sup>46</sup> Hdt. i. 59 *στασιαζόντων τῶν Παράλων καὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Πεδίου, ἤγειρε τρίτην στάσιν.*

<sup>47</sup> Hdt. i. 64.

<sup>48</sup> *Resp. Ath.* 15 of Peisistratus' second banishment.

<sup>49</sup> *Ar. Resp. Ath.* 13, 14.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Alcaeus fr. *Χαλκιδικὰ σπάθαι*; Aesch.

fr. *Εὐβοϊκὸν ξίφος*; Strabo, x. 447 § 9 and name Chalcis. Hesychius says that there were *Διακρίεις* in Euboea as well as in Attica. *Διάκριοι* is a literal translation of Bergleuten, the German for miners. The mining population of South Wales is always spoken of in Cardiff as the people up (in) the hills.

There are two arguments against this conjecture.

(1) The *Διάκριοι* were a political faction, *i.e.* citizens. Could citizens work in mines?

(2) The *Διακρία* was a district. The orthodox view places this district away from the mines.

(1) In classical times the mines were worked almost entirely by slaves.<sup>51</sup> Only very occasionally poor citizens worked their own allotments.<sup>52</sup> There is not a single instance of a citizen working in a mine for wages.<sup>53</sup> This does not however prove that citizens did not work for wages in the mines in Peisistratus' time, when, as has been pointed out in dealing with Samos, the conditions of labour were unlike anything seen in Greek history before or after. In fact the words of Solon<sup>54</sup> show that it was quite usual for citizens to work in mines with their own hands, though whether for pay or on their own account is not stated.<sup>55</sup> Plutarch describes the *διάκριοι* as *θητικὸς ὄχλος*. From this fact Cauer<sup>56</sup> reasonably conjectures that they were *μισθωτοί* (Lohnarbeiter).

(2) It is generally assumed that the triple division of Attic territory into *πεδῖον*, *πάραλος*, and *διακρία* is definite and absolute, and that it is for instance out of the question that coast land north of Brauron was ever called *πάραλος*, or mountain land south of Brauron *διακρία*. The evidence for the triple division is in fact of the weakest possible. It consists of a passage in Thucydides<sup>57</sup> which suggests that the tongue of Attica running out into the Aegean was called par excellence the coast land, and one from Hesychius, which by a clever but not certain emendation is made to tell us that *ἡ Διακρία* stretched from Parnes to Brauron.<sup>58</sup> Now it was very natural that the name Mountain should be given to the part of Attica where there were most mountains, and the name coast land to that which had in fact a larger proportion of coast to Hinterland than any other portion of Attica. But in regard to the evidence of Thucydides,<sup>59</sup> we cannot assume that the Peloponnesians ravaged the whole of the apex of the triangle. They may well have marched down one coast and up the other. In fact this is just what Thucydides in the very next sentence says they did, *καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἔτεμον ταύτην ἢ πρὸς Πελοπόννησον ὄρη, ἔπειτα δὲ τὴν πρὸς Εὐβοίαν τε καὶ Ἄνδρον τετραμμένην*. In regard again to Hesychius' evidence, it would only be valid for the purpose of the argument if his definitions were mutually exclusive. As a matter of fact he never mentions *τὸ πεδῖον* at all, and describes *ἡ παραλία* as *ἡ Ἀττικὴ, ἔνθεν καὶ ἡ ναῦς πάραλος*. Can it be claimed, in view of the fact that Strabo

<sup>51</sup> Hyp. fr. 33 Blass; Xen. *de Vect.* 4. 14 and 15 and *passim*; Thuc. vii. 27.

<sup>52</sup> Dem. xlii. § 20.

<sup>53</sup> Ardaillon, *Les Mines de Laurium*, p. 91.

<sup>54</sup> Bergk 12 (4). 49, 50.

<sup>55</sup> Pythes of Phrygia is reported to have used citizen labour in his mines a generation after Polycrates (Plut. *de Mul. Virt.* ii. 262).

<sup>56</sup> *Parteien in Megara u. Athen*, p. 85.

<sup>57</sup> Thucydides does indeed speak of *τὴν*

*παραλον γῆν καλουμένην*, which suggests that the word *πάραλος* is conventional. But by this expression Thucydides surely only means that this was the Attic word for the Attic coast. His own word for the Peloponnesian shore in the very next sentence is *τὰ ἐπιθαλάσσια*.

<sup>58</sup> *Διακρία*—*χώρα ἡ ἀπὸ Πάρνηθος εἰς Βαβυλῶνος* (editors *ἕως Βραυρῶνος*).

<sup>59</sup> ii. 55.

uses the word *πάραλος* of all the coast as distinguished from the Hinterland—mentioning *ἡ παράλια ἢ κατὰ Σαλαμίνα* and the *παράλια* from Sunium to Oropus—and that an inscription of about 320 B.C. (*I.G.* ii. 1059) mentions *παράλια* as part of the land of the *δῆμος Πειραιεύς*—that the evidence for the conventional view is sufficient?

It is far more probable that mountainous country, wherever it occurred in sufficient bulk to distinguish it in character from that of the sea-faring population, would be included under the name *διακρία*, and that sailors, even if they did happen to live north of Brauron, sympathised with the views of the 'shore.' Doubtless it would be difficult in some cases to determine where the line should be drawn, but it is against all reason to include in the sea-faring population the miners who inhabited the mountainous Hinterland of the apex of the Attic triangle. It is worth remarking that the mines which Peisistratus worked were not those nearest the sea, but were well inland at Maronea, a place where the ground varies from 170 m. to 370 m. in height (*Bursian Gr. Geogr.* i. 254).<sup>60</sup> If once it be admitted that the mining population of the *γουνὸς Σουνιακὸς* formed part of the *Διάκριοι*, it can hardly be disputed that they must have been politically more important than the scattered inhabitants of the Northern Uplands.

When once established Peisistratus took care to control the labour of the city by legislation.<sup>61</sup> There is no mention of his having regulated the coinage, but his son Hippias, who appears to have followed closely in his father's steps, declared the coinage out of currency, called in all the coins at a reduced price and then *ἐξέδωκε τὸ αὐτὸ ἀργύριον*.<sup>62</sup> Numismatists are agreed that what Hippias did was to issue not the same coins again, but the same silver recoined with a more refined type. Hippias doubtless made some immediate profits himself from this recall and re-issue of the coinage, but he may well have had the design of improving the reputation abroad of the Athenian mintage. Beloch (i. 329) well insists upon the acute commercial instinct of Peisistratus in getting a footing on the coast of the Hellespont by seizing

<sup>60</sup> The Attic *μέταλλα* first appear in history in 484 B.C. (Hdt. vii. 144; Plut. *Them.* iv; Ar. *Resp. Ath.* 22), when *τὰ μέταλλα τὰ ἐν Μαρωνείᾳ ἐφάνη*. But this does not show that they had not previously influenced Attic history. They had certainly been worked ages earlier. 'La disposition des gisements' (at Maronea), says Ardaillon (*Les Mines de Laurium* pp. 132, 133), 'est telle que les plus riches ne sont pas ceux qui pouvaient être atteints les premiers.' A technical explanation of the veins follows. 'Il fallut donc des siècles de recherche et d'efforts [Cf. Xen. *de Vect.* iv. 2, οὐδεὶς οὐδὲ πειρᾶται λέγειν ἀπὸ ποίου χρόνου ἐπεχειρήθη (τὰ ἀργύρεια)] pour en soupçonner l'existence et en atteindre le niveau' (i.e. of the rich vein 'discovered' in 484). Athens was tempted to work the somewhat poor upper veins in the sixth century by the great demand

for silver caused by the introduction of a silver coinage. The poorness of the veins which Peisistratus worked is confirmed by the fact that to root his tyranny firmly he had to start fresh workings in Thrace. For Thracian silver mines see Strabo Z 331 fr. 34 *καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ Πάργαιον ὕψος χρυσεῖα καὶ ἀργύρεια ἔχει μέταλλα* (cf. *Resp. Ath.* 15 sup.) and Hdt. v. 17 near lake Prasias on the Strymon (cf. Hdt. i. 64 sup.).

<sup>61</sup> Plut. *Sol.* 31 *τὸν δὲ τῆς ἀργίας νόμον οὐ Σόλων ἐθηκεν ἀλλὰ Πεισίστρατος*. Cf. Periander, *Nic. Dam.* fr. 58 (Bus. i. 1. 646 Anm. 2), *ἐκάλυε τοὺς πολίτας δούλους κτᾶσθαι καὶ σχολὴν ἔγειν, ἀεὶ τινα αὐτοῖς ἔργα ἐξευρίσκων*. Her. Pont. fr. 5. Wilisch *Die Altkorinthische Thonindustrie*, p. 15.

<sup>62</sup> Aristot. *Oecon.* ii. 4.



Sigeum.<sup>63</sup> His unsuccessful rival Miltiades had already established a *τυραννίς* on the opposite coast. It is important for our purpose to emphasise the fact that the policies of the several tyrant dynasties were from first to last coherent in themselves and analogous to one another. Hippias not only kept his hold on Sigeum to the last and eventually retired thither, but actively developed his father's line of policy by forming a close personal connexion with the tyrant of Lampsacus,<sup>64</sup> and effecting a reconciliation with the Philaids on the European side of the strait.<sup>65</sup> That his reformation of the coinage was intended to further his foreign and colonial commercial policy is made the more probable by extant coins, some found in the Thracian Chersonese with the Hippias Athena type on one side and the Milesian lion on the other,<sup>66</sup> others with the same Athena head, and on the reverse the type of Lampsacus. Lermann<sup>67</sup> argues that the Thracian coins must have been struck when the Chersonese was independent of Athens, because when dependent it would not have been allowed to strike coins. But though this may be true, the use of the Athena type points to some close connexion with the mother city. The analogy of the coins of the Corinthian colonies makes this practically certain, and the Lampsacus coins are a parallel still more to the point. Lampsacus could only have used the Hippias Athena consciously as an ally of the Athenian tyrant. It is therefore to be inferred that Hippias' monetary reforms were not a mere isolated speculation, but part of the broad and widely extending commercial policy on which his power was based. In carrying out these schemes Hippias was but following in the path of his father, who had himself laid the foundations of them, and who probably owed his position to the fact that he was enabled, through his large mining interests, to take the lead in the commercial development which Solon had inaugurated with his financial reforms.

It is more than a coincidence that as the Peisistratids secured their *ἀρχή* by a mixture of commercial enterprise and political intrigue, so it was by a mixture of political intrigue and commercial enterprise that they were driven out, through the Alcmaeonidae undertaking the contract for rebuilding the temple at Delphi.

#### *The Seventh Century Tyrannies.*

*Lydia.*—Gyges, the first ruler to be called tyrant,<sup>68</sup> was famous for his wealth.<sup>69</sup> He possessed gold mines,<sup>70</sup> and was probably the first to coin in Lydia. Can the legend<sup>71</sup> of the magic gold ring point to a tradition that Gyges possessed gold mines before his accession and owed his throne to

<sup>63</sup> Hdt. v. 94 *κρατήσας δὲ αὐτοῦ (Πεισίστρατος Σιγέλου) κατέστησε τύραννον εἶναι παῖδα ἑωυτοῦ νόθου.* Cf. Periander and Coreyra.

<sup>64</sup> Thuc. vi. 59.

<sup>65</sup> Hdt. vi. 39.

<sup>66</sup> Cardia and Limnae in the Thracian Chersonese were Milesian colonies (Str. xiv. 635, vii. 331, fr. 52).

<sup>67</sup> *Athenatypen*, pp. 20–21.

<sup>68</sup> *F.H.G.* iii. p. 72 fr. 1; *Et. Mag.* *τύραννος*.

<sup>69</sup> Archil. Bergk, 19 (2); Str. xiii. 626, xiv. 680.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Str. xiii. 1. 22 and 23 with Radet, *La Lydie*, pp. 172–3.

<sup>71</sup> *Pl. Rep.* ii. 359 D.

them? For the financial basis of the power of even the later Mermnadae cf. Nic. Dam. ed. Tauchn. p. 270 (based on Xanthus of Lydia, see *Bus.* i. 2. 451-2).

*Miletus.*—We only know that the tyranny was preceded by a struggle between two parties called *Ploutis* and *Cheiomache*,<sup>72</sup> names which sound remarkably like capital and labour. The accession of Histiaeus, the later tyrant, seems to have synchronised with a revival of the commercial prosperity of Miletus.<sup>73</sup> Histiaeus showed great eagerness to secure a commercial settlement in Thrace, which was regarded by his enemies as the proposed basis of a new political power.<sup>74</sup> ὁ βασιλεὺς, κοῖόν τι χρήμα ἐποίησας, ἀνδρὶ Ἑλληνι δεινῷ τε καὶ σοφῷ δούς . . . πόλιν; . . . ἵνα . . . ἔστι μέταλλα ἀργύρεα, ὄμιλός τε πολλὸς περιοικέει.

*Ephesus.*—Radet<sup>75</sup> makes out a good case for believing that the Ephesian tyrants shared with the Mermnadae the monopoly of the great trade route that ran through Sardis to Ephesus. It is impossible positively to prove or disprove that the basis of the power of the Ephesian tyrants was commercial, but it appears to have been at any rate financial, cf. Suid. Πυθαγόρας—τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τῷ πληθύϊ ἦν τε καὶ ἐδόκει κεχαρισμένος, ἅμα τὰ μὲν αὐτοῦς ὑπελπίζων ὑποσχέσεσιν, τὰ δὲ ὑποσπείρων αὐτοῖς ὀλίγα κέρδη.<sup>76</sup>

*Argos.*—It was surely Pheidon's invention of μέτρα for the Peloponnesians rather than his ὕβρις or impiety that caused him to be regarded as a different kind of ruler from his forefathers, as a τύραννος instead of a βασιλεύς.

*Corinth.*—Corinth had long been a great emporium,<sup>77</sup> but a great commercial development took place about 700 B.C. in (1) pottery<sup>78</sup> and (2) ship building and trade by sea.<sup>79</sup> The activity of the Cypselids in this new marine commerce is beyond dispute. Wilisch<sup>80</sup> attributes to the Cypselids the development of the Corinthian export trade in pottery. Cypselus was a metic<sup>81</sup> and therefore probably originally a trader.<sup>82</sup>

*Megara.*—Theagenes<sup>83</sup> secured his power τῶν εὐπόρων τὰ κτήνη ἀποσφάξας. The preservation of this statement becomes more comprehensible if Theagenes' coup was a simple but effective way of securing the monopoly of the famous Megarean woollen industry.<sup>84</sup>

### Conclusion.

The commercial origin of the tyrant's power seems fairly certain in the case of Samos and very probable in that of Athens. In the case of the

<sup>72</sup> Plut. *Q. Gr.* 32.

<sup>73</sup> Hdt. v. 28.

<sup>74</sup> *Ib.* v. 23.

<sup>75</sup> *La Lydie*, pp. 134 and 148.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. *Sol.* 2 (13) 6 χρήμασι πειθόμενοι; Theogn. 823 κέρδεσιν εἰκων.

<sup>77</sup> Thuc. i. 13; Str. viii. 378.

<sup>78</sup> Wilisch, *Die Ailkorinthische Thonindustrie*, p. 151.

<sup>79</sup> Thuc. i. 13, τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὸ πάλαι κατὰ γῆν

ἐπιμισγόντων, and the account of Ameinocles' invention in the same chapter.

<sup>80</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 151.

<sup>81</sup> From Gonussa, Paus. v. 18. 7.

<sup>82</sup> Can the story of the infant Cypselus being concealed in a kypsele mean that the future tyrant spent his earlier days in the obscurity of a pottery?

<sup>83</sup> *Ar. Pol.* viii. 1305 A.

<sup>84</sup> *Xen. Mem.* ii. 7. 6; *Bus. G.G.* i. 1. 471.

seventh century tyrannies it is more conjectural, but the legends that have been preserved about the early careers of Gyges, Pheidon, Cypselus, and Theagenes give some support to the conjecture. Further, the careers of the seventh century tyrants bear such a remarkable resemblance to those of Polycrates and Peisistratus, that it is reasonable to infer that the origin of the tyrannies was the same in both centuries, especially as it has been shown that Athens and Samos became predominantly commercial somewhat later than Corinth, Megara, and the other cities where tyrants arose in the seventh century. Neither the accumulation of probabilities nor the argument from analogy is quite convincing in itself, but each gives additional weight to the other. If once the commercial origin of the tyrant's power is admitted, the various facts recorded about the tyrants certainly gain in meaning and coherence. The mercenaries, the monetary innovations and reforms, the public works and labour legislation and the foreign alliances which are so repeatedly found associated with the early tyrants and which give the preserved accounts of them such a distinct stamp, become far more significant if the tyrant's power was based on his control of the labour and trade of his city. It is scarcely conceivable under any other theory, that there should not have been at least occasional cases of commercial retrogression or stagnation under the *τυραννίς*. The fact that the commercial theory gives the most coherent explanation of the policy of the typical early tyrant is again no proof that the theory is true, but it is a further perfectly sound reason for accepting it on a less amount of direct evidence than would otherwise be required.

But perhaps the best test of the truth of any theory upon the origin of the early tyrannis is the evidence afforded by contemporary literature, especially the political poems of Solon and Theognis. Has the commercial theory the support of this contemporary evidence?

The political aim of Theognis was to prevent a recurrence of tyranny in Megara. What does the poet bid his townsmen beware of? Not of eloquence, not of violence, not of rashly appointing a *νομοθέτης* or *αἰσυμνήτης*. All his warnings are directed against wealth. The whole town of Megara had become commercial.<sup>85</sup> Birth had lost its prestige,<sup>86</sup> and wealth acquired unprecedented power.<sup>87</sup>

It was the wealth of the would-be tyrant that Solon too feared.<sup>88</sup>

Solon and Theognis wrote with the examples of Gyges, Pheidon, Orthogoras, Cypselus, and Theagenes before them.<sup>89</sup> If they constantly feared that some *πλούσιος φορτηγός*<sup>90</sup> would make himself tyrant, it must surely have

<sup>85</sup> 117, 449, 499, 1105, 1164 g.h. (money); 576, 619, 671 f., 691, 856, 1202 (shipping), and note the large number of similes and metaphors in the oligarchic Theognis drawn from money and shipping.

<sup>86</sup> 679, 318, 523-6, 683.

<sup>87</sup> 621, 679, 699, 1157.

<sup>88</sup> 4. 3 and 2. 5 (Bergk); cf. Theog. 44 f., 823.

<sup>89</sup> Is it possible to see in Solon 12, 29-32 a reference to the fates of the various tyrant families of the seventh century?

<sup>90</sup> Theog. 679.

been because the tyrants of the seventh century had sprung from the new class of *πλούσιοι φορτηγοί*. If the poems of Solon and Theognis are carefully read through, they will, I think, be found throughout to dwell specially upon the danger of the *πλούσιος* making himself tyrant by means of his *πλούτος*.

PERCY URE.

*University College, Cardiff.*