

## A NOTE ON THE DATING OF HESIOD\*

Hesiod is conventionally dated to the late eighth or early seventh century.<sup>1</sup> This seems to rest on two basic assumptions. First, many believe that the evidence of the language, style and attitude of the poetry places Hesiod after Homer and before the composition of the Homeric Hymns and the early lyric poetry.<sup>2</sup> Since the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are traditionally placed to the eighth century, while the Hymns and the lyric poems can be dated from the middle of the seventh century onwards, a late eighth-century to early seventh-century date for Hesiod seems a natural solution. This relative chronology has been seriously challenged, however, as a number of scholars prefer to place Homer after Hesiod,<sup>3</sup> and it seems increasingly clear that the comparison of the poetry is not likely to produce any firm dating for the poets. Secondly, scholars have often tried to fix Hesiod's date relying on the verses in the *Works and Days*, which state that the poet won a song competition in the funeral games of Amphidamas, a hero of Chalcis.<sup>4</sup> Since the ancients believed that Amphidamas perished during the so-called Lelantine War between Chalcis and Eretria,<sup>5</sup> and modern scholars have often dated the war to the late eighth and/or early seventh century,<sup>6</sup> they have accepted this particular time

\* I wish to thank Janusz Peters, who helped to correct my English, and the anonymous reviewer for many useful suggestions and remarks. The research was supported by Estonian Science Foundation Grant 6685.

<sup>1</sup> All the dates in this paper are B.C. For conventional dating of Hesiod see, for example, M.L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), 45–6 and *Hesiod Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), 30–1; A.J. Podlecki, *The Early Greek Poets and Their Times* (Vancouver, 1984), 21–2; R. Osborne, *Greece in the Making* (London and New York, 1996), 159; A.T. Edwards, *Hesiod's Ascrea* (Berkeley, CA, 2004), 28. W. Blümer, *Interpretation archaischer Dichtung: Die Mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiods*, vol. 1 (Münster, 2001), 223, places the poet somewhat earlier in the eighth century, while R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development of the Epic Diction* (Cambridge, 1982), 94–8 dates him to the first half of the seventh century. J.M. Hall, *A History of the Archaic Greek World ca. 1200–479 BCE* (Malden, MA, and Oxford, 2007), 25, notes a growing view among scholars towards accepting this later date.

<sup>2</sup> For a profound exposition of the linguistic argument see, above all, Janko (n. 1).

<sup>3</sup> On the chronological priority of Hesiod in relation to Homer, see West (n. 1), 46–7; idem, 'The date of the *Iliad*', *MH* 52 (1995), 203–19; Osborne (n. 1), 159; Blümer (n. 1), 107–260. This is presumably also accepted by other writers suggesting a mid-seventh-century or later date for Homer (for example, W. Burkert, 'Das hunderttorige Theben und die Datierung der *Ilias*', *Wiener Studien* 89 [1976], 5–21; M.S. Jensen, *The Homeric Question and the Oral-formulaic Theory* [Copenhagen, 1980]; E.F. Cook, *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins* [Ithaca, NY, 1995], 128–70). The discussion of the relative dating of Homer's and Hesiod's poetry has brought no general consensus.

<sup>4</sup> Hes. *Op.* 654–7, quoted below.

<sup>5</sup> Plutarch (*Mor.* 153f–154; Schol. Hes. *Op.* 650–62). The war is known above all from Thuc. 1.15.3 and Hdt. 5.99; but see also Plut. *Mor.* 674f–675a, 760a–761b.

<sup>6</sup> A. Blakeway, 'The date of Archilochus', in C. Bailey, et al. (edd.), *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on His 70th Birthday* (Oxford, 1936), 34–55, at 47–8; and W.G. Forrest, 'Colonisation and the rise of Delphi', *Historia* 6 (1957), 160–75, at 160–4. On the war continuing into the seventh century, see G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, vol. 1 (Gotha, 1893), 456; A. R. Burn, 'The so-called "trade leagues" in early Greek history and the Lelantine War', *JHS* 49 (1929), 14–37, at 31–7; K. Tausend, 'Der Lelantische Krieg: Ein Mythos?', *Klio*

as that of Hesiod.<sup>7</sup> The problems of dating the war are, however, enormous. No explicit ancient date for it has been preserved, and a number of scholars have not accepted the late eighth to early seventh century dating, placing the war instead in the later part of the seventh or even the sixth century.<sup>8</sup> The basis for dating Hesiod is, consequently, very uncertain.

However, when considering the date modern scholars have usually not paid attention to what the ancients themselves believed about Hesiod's lifetime. This can be well understood because the chronology of early Greek history, including the dates of the early poets, is not likely to be based on firm documentary evidence. It was demonstrated long ago that the dates given by the ancients were reconstructed (or constructed) by generations of Greek historians and chronographers making educated guesses and conclusions, mostly based on traditional stories and the evidence from poetry,<sup>9</sup> and can be hardly accepted as they stand. Attempts to use them may seem futile and naive. Nevertheless, understanding the ways in which the ancients calculated will reveal their assumptions and show the evidence at their disposal. Although the dates that they arrived at are probably unreliable, the data on which they were based could be, in some cases, trustworthy and useful for discussing the real chronology of the poets. Consequently, I shall explore here all the ancient datings for Hesiod, question the evidence and reasoning that produced them, and, finally, consider which of them, if any, could transmit reliable data for establishing the time when Hesiod really lived. Naturally, I shall rely on previous scholarship, particularly the works of Felix Jacoby and Alden Mosshammer,<sup>10</sup> but

69 (1987), 499–514. For dating to the first half of the seventh century, see D.W. Bradeen, 'The Lelantine War and Pheidon of Argos', *TAPA* 78 (1947), 223–41.

<sup>7</sup> Hesiod has been dated according to the war (H.T. Wade-Gery, 'Hesiod', *Phoenix* 3 [1949], 81–93, at 87; Podlecki [n. 1], 20; Blümer [n. 1], 178–211), and the war according to Hesiod (Blakeway [n. 6], 48; J. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth* [Oxford, 1984], 67). The circularity of this argument has been pointed out by Janko (n. 1), 95.

<sup>8</sup> A late seventh-century dating: M. Sordi, *La lege tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno* (Roma, 1958), 42–7. The early sixth-century dating: V. Constanzi, 'Guerra lelantica', *AR* 5 (1902), 769–89; K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, vol. 1.1 (Strassburg, 1912), 338–9; E. Will, *Korinthiaka* (Paris 1955), 391–404; and G.J. Szemler, 'Some problems of the late Archaic age', in E.W. Kase, G.J. Szemler, N.C. Wilkie and P.W. Wallace, (edd.), *The Great Isthmus Corridor Route: Explorations of the Phokis–Doris Expedition*, vol. 1 (Minneapolis, MN, 1991), 105–15, at 109. The latest studies accept a long duration for the war: V. Parker, *Untersuchungen zum Lelantischen Krieg* (Stuttgart, 1997), 91–2 (lasting most of the seventh century), and K.G. Walker, *Archaic Eretria: A Political and Social History from the Earliest Times to 490 BC* (London, 2004), 164, 168–71 (from the middle of the eighth century to the early sixth century). Hall (n. 1), 6–8 has recently doubted not only the possibilities of establishing the date but even of verifying the very reality of the war.

<sup>9</sup> Note especially E. Rohde, 'Studien zur Chronologie der griechischen Litteraturgeschichte', *RhM* 36 (1881), 380–434, 524–75; F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin, 1902) and A.A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, 1979). For the nature of what may be called documentary evidence, see C.W. Hedrick, 'The pre-history of Greek chronography', in V.B. Gorman and E.W. Robinson (edd.), *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World* (Leiden, 2002), 13–32. See also R. Bichler, 'Das chronologische Bild der "Archaik"', in R. Rollinger and C. Ulf (edd.), *Griechische Archaik: Interne Entwicklungen – Externe Impulse* (Berlin, 2004), 207–45; and P.-J. Shaw, *Discrepancies in Olympiad Dating and Chronological Problems of Archaic Peloponnesian History* (Stuttgart, 2003).

<sup>10</sup> The fullest summary of the ancient datings of Homer and Hesiod is, to my knowledge, given by F. Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin, 1904), 152–8; but see also Jacoby (n. 9), 118–21 and Mosshammer (n. 9), 193–7. A recent discussion of the problem can be found in M. Kivilo, *Early Greek Poets' Lives: The Shaping of the Tradition* (Leiden, 2010), 45–52.

shall point out some hitherto neglected evidence. Even if this discussion does not lead to any secure dating, it will, hopefully, shed some new light on the ancient vision of Hesiod and his contemporaries.

## I

An obvious starting point for establishing the lifetime of Hesiod has been given, for ancients and moderns alike, by Hesiod's verses in the *Works and Days* 654–7, where the poet claimed that he had won the song contest in Chalcis at the funeral games of Amphidamas:

ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼν ἐπ' ἄεθλα δαΐφρονος Ἀμφιδάμαντος  
Χαλκίδα [τ'] εἴσεπέρησα· τὰ δὲ προπεφραδμένα πολλὰ  
ἄεθλ' ἔθεσαν παῖδες μεγαλήτορες· ἔνθα μέ φημι  
ῥῆμα νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὠτῶεντα.

This statement can be approached in two ways. On the one hand, since Amphidamas was known as a hero of the Lelantine War, it gives the possibility of dating the poet according to what is known about the time of this conflict. This is the way adopted by many modern scholars. On the other hand, it would be possible to make guesses about Hesiod's opponent in the song contest, and to date Hesiod according to what is known about him. This way was often chosen by the ancients.

The standard version of Hesiod's text does not mention who his opponent was, but it was widely assumed in antiquity that the contest was between him and Homer. Proclus knew an alternative line (657) that stated explicitly that it was Homer who was defeated by Hesiod (Procl. schol. Hes. *Erg.* 655: Ὑμῶν νικήσαντ' ἐν Χαλκίδι θεῖον Ὅμηρον). There was indeed a famous story about a contest between Homer and Hesiod. Its most elaborate version was given in the *Certamen* deriving from the time of Hadrian,<sup>11</sup> but it had already been popularised by the early fourth-century sophist Alkidamas and is likely to date from an even earlier period.<sup>12</sup> This story obviously suggested that Homer and Hesiod must have been contemporaries. Their synchronicity was already widely assumed in the fifth century, as is testified by Herodotus, Pherecydes, Hellanicus and Damastes.<sup>13</sup> In the next century, Ephorus popularised a related view that Hesiod was slightly older than Homer, which, however, did not rule out the synchronism of the poets.<sup>14</sup> The later

<sup>11</sup> See *Cert.* 3.

<sup>12</sup> Stobaeus (4.52.2) attributes the lines found in *Cert.* 7 to the *Museion* of Alkidamas; *Cert.* 14 quotes Alkidamas for the story of Hesiod's death; *PMich.* 2754 refers to Alkidamas in connection with the death of Homer (see M.L. West, 'The contest of Homer and Hesiod', *CQ* 17 [1967], 433–50, at 433–8). There is no reason to think that it was Alkidamas' own invention (as suggested by West, 438–441). N.J. Richardson, 'The contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alkidamas' *Museion*', *CQ* 31 (1981), 1–10, at 1–3, and B. Graziosi, 'Competition in wisdom', in F. Budelmann and P. Michelakis (edd.), *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond: Essays in Honour of P.E. Easterling* (London, 2001), 57–74, at 60, date the story to the sixth and fifth centuries respectively. An early dating is also supported by Kivilo (n. 10), 20–24.

<sup>13</sup> Hdt. 2.53; Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 167; Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 5b; Damastes *FGrH* 5 F 11, the last three quoted in Procl. *Vit. Hom.* They were followed by many later writers quoted below. See also Jacoby (n. 9), 120.

<sup>14</sup> Ephorus (*FGrH* 70 F 1) believed Hesiod and Homer's mother to be cousins. Jacoby (n. 9), 120–1 has pointed out that Ephorus' view is a variant of the view making the poets contemporaries.

authors stated explicitly that the synchronism of the poets was sustained by the story of their contest,<sup>15</sup> and there is every reason to believe that this famous tale that explicitly tied the poets together was the very reason why they were believed to have been contemporaries.<sup>16</sup>

Since Hesiod's verses made it clear that he had performed at Chalcis, the standard story naturally located the contest there. However, there must also have been another version, recorded in a Pseudo-Hesiodic fragment, which mentioned Delos as the place of the competition (fr. 357 MW):

ἐν Δήλῳι τότε πρῶτον ἐγὼ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἀοιδοὶ  
μέλομεν, ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις ῥάψαντες ἀοιδὴν,  
Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορον, ὃν τέκε Λητώ.

Richard Janko has suggested that these verses were composed in the second half of the sixth century, when Polykrates of Samos organised the Pythian and Delian festival on Delos, on which occasion the Homeric Hymn to Apollo could have been composed from the earlier 'Homeric' and 'Hesiodic' parts.<sup>17</sup> If Janko is right, we can date the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod to the sixth century at the latest.<sup>18</sup> Be this as it may, the story was well known in antiquity, and the synchronisation of Homer and Hesiod was therefore thought highly natural. The problem was to find a suitable date for this couple.

## II

Herodotus placed Homer and Hesiod 400 years before his time,<sup>19</sup> thus *c.* 840. Mosshammer has noted the possibility that it could be connected with Thucydides' statement about the beginning of the *eunomia* at Sparta 400 years before the end of the Peloponnesian War.<sup>20</sup> Since the establishment of Spartan *eunomia* was usually ascribed to Lycurgus, this would mean that Herodotus believed that Homer and Hesiod were Lycurgus' contemporaries. This was certainly the opinion of Ephorus and some later authors (see below). However, Herodotus clearly did not place Lycurgus 400 years before his time, but connected him with King Leobotes,

<sup>15</sup> *Cert.* 5; Tzet. *Gen. Hes.* 41ff. and Philostratus (*Her.* 727.5ff Olearius, quoted in the text below); when Archemachus synchronised the poets in his *Euboica* (*FGrH* 424 F 3) the reason for this was also, in all likelihood, the story of the contest of the poets in Euboea. The story was related in full detail in *Cert.* 5ff and by Plutarch (*Mor.* 153f–154; 674f–675a; schol. *Hes. Op.* 650–62).

<sup>16</sup> As pointed out already by Rohde (n. 9), 422–5; Jacoby (n. 9), 120 and idem (n. 10), 152.

<sup>17</sup> Janko (n. 1), 112–14. On Polykrates' Delian festival and the origins of the composite Hymn to Apollo see also W. Burkert, 'Kynaithos, Polycrates, and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo', in G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert and C.J. Putnam (edd.), *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies presented to B.M.W. Knox* (Berlin, 1979), 53–62, at 58–62; idem, 'The making of Homer in the sixth century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichoros', in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World: Colloquium Sponsored by the Getty Center of the History of Art and Humanities and Symposium Sponsored by the J. Paul Getty Museum* (Malibu, CA, 1987), 43–62, at 53–5.

<sup>18</sup> Kivilo (n. 10), 21.

<sup>19</sup> *Hdt.* 2.53.

<sup>20</sup> Mosshammer (n. 9), 179; Thuc. 1.18.1.

who must have ruled, according to his counting, considerably earlier.<sup>21</sup> This makes Mosshammer's suggestion rather unlikely. Alternatively, it has been proposed that Herodotus simply halved the interval of more than 800 years between his present time and his dating for the Trojan War.<sup>22</sup> This is a sheer guess, and it seems to me better to confess our ignorance about Herodotus' calculations.

The calculations of many later writers are clearer and reveal two different ways of reasoning: they followed either Aristotle's or Ephorus' dating for Homer and, consequently, synchronised Hesiod either with the Ionian migration, as stated by Aristotle, or with the Spartan lawgiver Lycurgus, as assumed by Ephorus.

Aristotle believed that Homer was born at the time of the Ionian migration.<sup>23</sup> His own dating for this is not recorded, and he definitely did not believe in the synchronism of Homer and Hesiod, but his opinion about the time of Homer was followed by a number of later writers who provided more or less exact dates,<sup>24</sup> and often placed Hesiod as Homer's contemporary. Thus Archemachus, a Euboian historian from the Hellenistic era, and Euthymenes, a chronicler of an unknown date, placed both poets to the time of the Athenian archon Acastus, and dated them 200 years after the fall of Troy (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.117.4: *Εὐθυμένης δὲ ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς* [FGrH 243 F 1] *συνακμάσαντα Ἡσιόδῳ [φησὶ τὸν Ὅμηρον] ἐπὶ Ἀκάστου ἐν Χίῳ γενέσθαι περὶ τὸ διακοσιοστὸν ἔτος ὕστερον τῆς Ἰλίου ἀλώσεως. ταύτης δὲ ἐστὶ τῆς δόξης καὶ Ἀρχέμαχος ἐν Εὐβοϊκῶν τρίτῳ* [FGrH 424 F 3]). Indeed, the ancients marked Acastus' reign as the start of the Ionian migration.<sup>25</sup> Eratosthenes dated the migration 140 years, not 200, after the Trojan War.<sup>26</sup> Euthymenes and Archemachus might have followed a variant chronology,<sup>27</sup> or perhaps confused the dates of Homer's birth and his mature years, which must indeed have fallen about 200 years after the fall of Troy if he was born during the migration 140 years after this event.

Some authors dated the poets to the time of the archonship of Archippus in Athens, placing Hesiod at its beginning and Homer at its end (Tzetz. *Gen. Hes.*

<sup>21</sup> Lycurgus tutoring Leobotes in Hdt. 1.65.1. Leobotes was, according to Hdt. 7.204, the second descendant of Agis, the founder of the Agiad dynasty, and his position in the Agiad stemma suggests the dating to c. 600 years before Herodotus (this dating is inevitably uncertain, since Herodotus has not indicated any dates for the Spartan kings).

<sup>22</sup> R. Bichler, 'Die Datierung des Trojanischen Krieges als Problem der griechischen Historie', in C. Ulf (ed.), *Der neue Streit um Troia: Ein Bilanz* (München, 2003), 349–67, at 359, makes this suggestion (the interval of 800 years is stated in Hdt. 2.145.4). On the evidence for Herodotus' dating of the Trojan War see W. Burkert, 'Lydia between East and West or how to date the Trojan War', in J.B. Carter and S.P. Morris (edd.), *The Ages of Homer* (Austin, TX, 1995), 139–48, at 141–2.

<sup>23</sup> Arist. fr. 76 Rose.

<sup>24</sup> Note especially Philochorus (FGrH 328 F 211) and Aristarchus (ap. Tatianus *Ad Gr.* 31, Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.117; Aristarchus, however, synchronised the migration with Homer's acme, not birth), but also the authors quoted in the next note and in the main text below. Aristarchus', Aristotele's and Philochorus' dating of Hesiod will all be discussed below.

<sup>25</sup> Castor FGrH 250 F 4; Euseb. *Chron.* 176 Karst, 69 Helm; Syncellus 336. All these authors therefore dated Homer to the time of Acastus, although it is not always clear whether they kept in mind his birth or acme. Homer's acme was dated to the migration period by Aristarchus ap. Tatianus *Ad Gr.* 31, Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.117; Syncellus 340; Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 53–4; but possibly also by Philostratus (see below in the text), provided he was not writing about the birth of Homer. This version was followed also by the author of *Certamen* (16), who let Homer visit Athens at the time of Medon, Acastus' predecessor.

<sup>26</sup> Eratosthenes (FGrH 241 F 1), followed by Apollodorus (FGrH 244 F 61) and others.

<sup>27</sup> See Jacoby (n. 10), 156–7; FGrH 2 B 716 (comm. ad 243 F 1).

37–41: οἱ μὲν προγενέστερον εἶναι τοῦτον [Ἡσίοδον] Ὀμήρου δισχυριζόμενοι ἐν ἀρχαῖς εἶναί φασι τῆς Αρχίππου ἀρχῆς, Ὀμηρον δ' ἐν τῷ τέλει. ὁ δ' Ἀρχίππος οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν Ἀκάστου).<sup>28</sup> This is simply another expression of the synchronism with the Ionian migration: Archippus' archonship was known to have followed that of Acastus, so that if Homer was believed to have been born at the time of the Ionian migration during Acastus' reign, most of his life would inevitably have fallen within the period of Archippus. These authors apparently combined the dating to the time of Ionian migration with Ephorus' opinion that Hesiod was a generation older than Homer. Furthermore, there were 'some', according to Philostratus' *Heroicus*, who dated Homer and Hesiod 160 years after the Trojan War (Philostr. *Her.* 727.5ff Olearius: οἱ δὲ μετὰ ἑπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσι πρὸς ταῖς ἑκατὸν [τῶν Τρωικῶν], ὅτε τὴν ἀποικίαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐς Ἰωνίαν ἔστειλαν [Ὀμηρόν γεγενῆναι φασι], οἱ δὲ ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἔτη γεγενῆναι μετὰ τὴν Τροίαν ἐπὶ Ὀμηρόν τε φασι καὶ Ἡσίοδον, ὅτε δὴ ᾄσαι ἄμφω ἐν Χαλκίδι). Cassius, an obscure writer of unknown date, indicated exactly the same date for the poets (Gell. *NA* 17.21.3: *annis post bellum Troianum, ut Cassius in primo Annalium de Homero atque Hesiodo scriptum reliquit, plus centum atque sexaginta*). This dating was also calculated according to the Ionian migration,<sup>29</sup> which was simply placed slightly earlier than usual, perhaps 127 years after the fall of Troy, as noted by Philostratus. In absolute terms, all these dates place Hesiod around the turn of the eleventh and tenth century.<sup>30</sup>

Ephorus, on the other hand, suggested that Homer met Lycurgus, the future lawgiver and tutor of the Spartan king Charillos.<sup>31</sup> He thus synchronised the poet with the lawgiver and established Homer's date according to the supposed date of Lycurgus and Charillos, which he calculated according to the stemma of the Spartan kings. Lycurgus, the uncle of Charillos according to the tradition, was placed by Ephorus nine generations after the Trojan War, and Charillos' reign was dated from c. 870 onwards.<sup>32</sup> Ephorus' exact date for Homer is reported to have been 876,<sup>33</sup> which falls a few years before Charillos' accession. Since Hesiod was in Ephorus' opinion one generation older than Homer,<sup>34</sup> he must have belonged to the eighth generation after the fall of Troy and his date fell around the turn of the tenth and the ninth centuries. The synchronism of Homer and Lycurgus also produced the date for Hesiod given in the *Marmor Parium* and Diogenes Laertius. The Parian chronicler believed, like Ephorus, that Hesiod was about one generation older than Homer, placed the poets (again following Ephorus) to the eighth and ninth generations after the Trojan War, and dated them respectively to

<sup>28</sup> Philochorus (*FGrH* 328 F 211) also dated Homer to the time of Archippus, placing him 180 years after the Trojan War, without, however, synchronising him with Hesiod. Philochorus therefore apparently followed quite faithfully the opinion of Aristotle (see n. 23).

<sup>29</sup> Kivilo (n. 10), 49.

<sup>30</sup> When counting from the Trojan era of Eratosthenes (1184 according to *FGrH* 241 F 1), the resulting dates for Hesiod will be 984 according to Archemachus and Euthymenes, and 1004 according to 'some' in Philostratus. However, we cannot be sure that all these authors followed Eratosthenes' chronology. For the different datings of the Trojan War see Jacoby (n. 10), 146–9; Burkert (n. 22), 141–3.

<sup>31</sup> Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 149 (and 173).

<sup>32</sup> See M. Köiv, 'The dating of Pheidon in antiquity', *Klio* 83 (2001), 327–47, at 339–40.

<sup>33</sup> According to Ephorus *FGrH* F 102, Homer flourished 100 years before the first Olympic Games, i.e. c. 876.

<sup>34</sup> See n. 14.

937 and 907.<sup>35</sup> Diogenes Laertius placed Hesiod and Homer vaguely in the time of Lycurgus, without indicating an exact date.<sup>36</sup>

### III

A number of ancient scholars, however, did not accept the synchronism of Homer and Hesiod, but dated Hesiod considerably later than Homer. Homer was already considered older than Hesiod by Xenophanes in the sixth century,<sup>37</sup> but we cannot tell which date he might have kept in mind, or which distance of time he assumed between the poets. Aristotle and Philochorus dated Homer to the time of the Ionian migration, but considered Hesiod to be the father of Stesichorus, which inevitably placed him several centuries later.<sup>38</sup> The statement of Tzetzes, in his *Life of Hesiod*, that Hesiod lived 400 years after Homer<sup>39</sup> may be following Aristotle's and Philochorus' point of view. I shall return to these dates in section V.

Aristarchus seems to have been of a similar opinion. He synchronised Homer's acme with the Ionian migration, dating this 140 years after the fall of Troy.<sup>40</sup> His date for Hesiod is not explicitly stated, but C.M. Schroeder has plausibly suggested that a number of Homeric and Hesiodic scholia that place Hesiod later than Homer follow Aristarchus' opinion.<sup>41</sup> Aristarchus seems to have made his conclusions according to the poetry, rather than the supposed details of the poets' lives. Thus Hesiod must have composed after Homer because he mentioned the Lydians, unknown to Homer, and called the Nile Neilos instead of Aigyptos, the name used by Homer and apparently regarded by Aristarchus as an older variant.<sup>42</sup> A more exact indication of Aristarchus' date for Hesiod may be given by the scholion stating that the poet must have composed after the fourteenth Olympiad (724), when running naked was introduced, because he depicted Hippomenes competing naked with Atalanta.<sup>43</sup> This would give the late eighth century as the earliest possibility but would not exclude a dating to an even later time.

Some other writers dated Hesiod from 100 to 138 years after Homer. Porphyry and 'many others' stated that Hesiod flourished 100 years after Homer, and placed him 32 years before the first Olympic Games (*Suda* s.v. *Ἡσίοδος*, *Πορφύριος* [FGrH 260 F 20] καὶ ἄλλοι πλείστοι νεώτερον ἑκατὸν ἐνιαυτοῖς ὀρίζουσιν, ὥς λβ μόνους ἐνιαυτοὺς συμπροτερεῖν τῆς πρώτης Ὀλυμπιάδος), which gives the date 809. Solinus placed Hesiod's death in the year of the first Olympiad at

<sup>35</sup> *Marm. Par.* FGrH 239 ep. 28 and 29. See Jacoby (n. 10), 153–4; Mosshammer (n. 9), 195–6. The Parian chronicler's date for Homer (907) falls almost exactly 300 years (9 generations of 33.3 years) after his date for the fall of Troy (1209, as stated in ep. 24). The dating of the Parian could have been, possibly, followed by Pliny the Elder in *HN* 14.3, where he states that Hesiod lived 1000 years before his time, thus in the tenth century (this is the suggestion of Jacoby [n. 10], 157).

<sup>36</sup> Diog. Laert. 1.38.

<sup>37</sup> Xen. DK 21 B 13.

<sup>38</sup> For Aristotle's and Philochorus' dating of Homer see nn. 23 and 28. The story about Hesiod begetting Stesichorus is noted in Arist. fr. 565 Rose and Philochorus FGrH 328 F 213.

<sup>39</sup> Tzet. *Gen. Hes.* 78–9.

<sup>40</sup> Tatianus *Ad Gr.* 31; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.117; Procl. *Chrest.* 59–62.

<sup>41</sup> C.M. Schroeder, 'A new monograph by Aristarchus?', *JHS* 127 (2007), 138–141.

<sup>42</sup> Schol. *Il.* 10.431 a (Lydians); schol. *Od.* 4.447 and schol. *Hes. Th.* 338 (Neilos).

<sup>43</sup> Schol. *Il.* 23.683; *Hes. fr.* 74 M-W. See Schroeder (n. 41), 140–1.

777/776, 138 years after Homer (Solin. 15.16.17: ... *Hesiodum poetam, qui in auspiciis olympiadis primae obit, centum triginta octo anni interfuerunt*). Jacoby and Mosshammer believe that these dates derive from the chronology of Apollodorus.<sup>44</sup> Apollodorus established Homer's date according to Lycurgus (placing the poet's acme at 944),<sup>45</sup> assumed the interval of 138 years between Homer and Hesiod, and let the latter die in the year of the first Olympiad. Thus Solinus transmits correctly the date of Hesiod's death and the interval of 138 years between the poets according to Apollodorus' reckoning. The date noted by Porphyry (809) falls very close to the Apollodorean acme for Hesiod (807, which is 138 years after 944 when counted inclusively), while his interval of 100 years between the poets is, according to Mosshammer, between the *Marmor Parium's* date for Homer (907) and Apollodorus' acme of Hesiod (807).<sup>46</sup> The reason why Apollodorus choose this date for Hesiod (or this particular interval with Homer) cannot be established. Jacoby and Mosshammer have suggested that he placed Hesiod immediately before the first Olympic Games because his poems showed no awareness of the Olympic festival,<sup>47</sup> in which case his methods were rather similar to those of Aristarchus, but any certainty is impossible.

The interval of a hundred years between Homer and Hesiod seems to have been accepted also by Eusebius when he dated Hesiod's acme to 766, which falls exactly a century after Sosibius' date for Homer (866).<sup>48</sup> On the other hand, Eusebius roughly synchronised Hesiod with several other epic poets. His *Chronicle* introduces the Spartan Cinaethon in 765, a year after Hesiod, and dates the Milesian Arctinus and the Corinthian Eumelus only slightly later, to c. 760.<sup>49</sup> Lesches of Lesbos, who was believed to have won a song contest against Arctinus, can be regarded as another contemporary of these poets.<sup>50</sup> This synchronism of the poets in Eusebius' *Chronicle* can scarcely be coincidental. Arctinus and Eumelus also appeared together c. 744, where Eumelus was dated in the *Chronicle* and Arctinus in the lexicon of *Suda*,<sup>51</sup> which demonstrates that they were indeed believed to have been contemporaries. Hesiod, too, must be intentionally included in this synchronism. According to Tzetzes' *Chiliades* he flourished during Ol. 11. (736–733), which marks the time of the foundation of Syracuse (734 according to Thucydides; 736 according to Eusebius). Clement in turn states that Eumelus was a contemporary of Archias the founder of Syracuse.<sup>52</sup> This demonstrates that both Eumelus and

<sup>44</sup> Jacoby (n. 9), 118–20; Mosshammer (n. 9), 193–6.

<sup>45</sup> Apollodorus *FGRH* 244 F 63 a–b; see Jacoby (n. 9), 98–100, and Mosshammer (n. 9), 176–8).

<sup>46</sup> Mosshammer (n. 9), 193–6.

<sup>47</sup> Jacoby (n. 9), 120; Mosshammer (n. 9), 195.

<sup>48</sup> Euseb. *Chron.* 87 Helm. Sosibius dated Homer to the first year of the Spartan king Charillos (*FGRH* 595 F 2) and thus made him contemporaneous with the Lycurgan legislation (Mosshammer [n. 9] 196–7).

<sup>49</sup> Arctinus and Eumelus appear together in 761 in the Armenian version (*Chron.* 181 Karst) and in 760 in Jerome (*Chron.* 87 Helm).

<sup>50</sup> Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.131: Φανίας δὲ πρὸ Τερπάνδρου τιθεὶς Λέσχην τὸν Λέσβιον Ἀρχιλόχου νεώτερον φέρει τὸν Τέρπανδρον, διημιλλήσθαι δὲ τὸν Λέσχην Ἀρκτίνῳ καὶ νενικηκέναι.

<sup>51</sup> Euseb. *Chron.* 182 Karst, 89 Helm. *Suda* s.v. Ἀρκτίνος dates the poet to Ol. 9. (744–741).

<sup>52</sup> Tzetz. *Chil.* 649–51: Ἡσίοδος δὲ ἤκμαζεν, ὡς εὖρον ἐν ἑτέροις, / κατὰ τὴν ἐνδεκάτην μὲν αὐτὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα. Eusebius' date for Syracuse's foundation is in *Chron.* 182 Karst, 89 Helm. Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.131: Εὐμήλος δὲ ὁ Κορίνθιος ... ἐπιβεβληκέναι Ἀρχία τῷ Συρακούσας κτίσαντι.



Hesiod were synchronised with Syracuse's foundation. In other words, Arctinus and Eumelus were synchronised at two different dates, *c.* 760 and *c.* 744, while Hesiod and Eumelus appeared together in the 760s and were also believed to have been living at the time of the beginning of western colonisation. The synchronisation of all these poets must have been intentional.

Synchronisation of famous singers, known as second only to Homer, and their dating to a 'round' number of years after the greatest poet may have been a natural solution not requiring any specific justification. Alternatively, there may have been a particular reason. Arctinus and Lesches were believed to have been rivals. And from Plutarch we learn that Lesches was in some way involved in Hesiod's song contest. In the *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men*, when Plutarch lets Periander mention the contest between Hesiod and Homer, the difficulties of the judges in reaching the decision according to the performed songs, and the continuation of the contest on the basis of questions and responses, he suddenly brings Lesches into play:

ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ παρεσκευασμένα τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἔπη χαλεπὴν καὶ δύσκολον ἐποίει τὴν κρίσιν διὰ τὸ ἐφάμιλλον, ἧ τε δόξα τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν, Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου, πολλὴν ἀπορίαν μετ' αἰδοῦς τοῖς κρίνουσι παρείχεν, ἐτράποντο πρὸς τοιαύτας ἐρωτήσεις, καὶ προέβαλ' ὁ μὲν, ὡς φησι Λέσχης, (οἱ ὡς φασὶ Λέσχης). (Mor. 153f–154a)

Unfortunately, the different readings in the manuscripts make Plutarch's meaning unclear: he could have believed that Lesches has referred to the contest of Hesiod and Homer (if the correct reading is ὡς φησι Λέσχης – 'as Lesches said'), or that Lesches himself was Hesiod's opponent (if the correct reading is ὡς φασὶ Λέσχης – 'as it is said, Lesches').<sup>53</sup> However, both cases could have given reasons for viewing Lesches as Hesiod's contemporary. Since Lesches was also believed to have competed against Arctinus, and Arctinus was in turn believed, for unknown reasons, to have been the contemporary of Eumelus, the synchronisation of them all would have been an obvious conclusion. No exact reason can be given for the inclusion of Cinaethon.

Some assumptions can be made about the reasons for dating the poets to the years 766–760. As noted above, the date of Hesiod in Eusebius' *Chronicle* falls 100 years after Sosibius' dating of Homer, and we cannot exclude the possibility that these poets were simply placed in a 'round' number of years (marking three generations) after their great predecessor. On the other hand, we have seen that Hesiod and Eumelus were synchronised with the foundation of Syracuse. This can hardly be coincidental, because the years 766–760 (the date of the poets in Eusebius' *Chronicle*) fall slightly before another dating of the foundation of Syracuse. According to *Marmor Parium*, Syracuse was founded in the twenty-first year of the Athenian archon Aeschylus, which fell, according to the chronology of Castor, in 758.<sup>54</sup> This chronology was, in all likelihood, also followed by Diodorus, who seems to have dated the Sicilian foundations 23 years earlier than Thucydides,

<sup>53</sup> The first reading has been preferred by T. W. Allen (ed.), *Homeri opera* 5 (Oxford, 1912), 136, 218; *ibid.*, *Homer. The origins and the transmission* (Oxford, 1924), 25–6, the second by U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1916), 405 n. 2; M. J. Milne, *A Study in Alcidas and his relation to contemporary sophists* (Diss. Bryn Mawr, 1924), 57f; but see also West (1967) 438–40 who denies Lesches' role in relation to the contest.

<sup>54</sup> *Marm. Par.* FGrH 293 ep. 31; Castor FGrH 250 F 4. See Mosshammer (n. 9), 202.

which would yield the date 757 for the founding of Syracuse.<sup>55</sup> There are, consequently, traces of a chronology, followed by *Marmor Parium* and Diodorus, which dated Syracuse's foundation to c. 758/757. The dating of the poets to 766–760 could have been calculated to fall a few years before this foundation, thus not very different from the solution of Tzetzes (or his source) in placing Hesiod in the year of Syracuse's foundation according to Thucydides' chronology.<sup>56</sup> The reason for connecting the poets with the start of western colonisation may come from the Euboians' participation in the foundation:<sup>57</sup> the ancients could have believed that Amphidamas' death during the Lelantine War coincided with some event in the history of colonisation.<sup>58</sup> Or, perhaps more probably, it could have been the Corinthian Eumelus who was for some reason connected with Syracuse's foundation and thus served as the chronologically fixed point for establishing the dates for other poets as well.

Consequently, although there seems to be no way of arriving at a definite conclusion concerning the exact reasoning of the ancients, we can still state that Hesiod was sometimes considered to be a contemporary of Arctinus, Eumelus, Lesches and Cinaethon. However, Hesiod's synchronicity with Homer and with the other poets could have been reconciled. When Tzetzes in the *Chiliades* dates Hesiod to the years of Syracuse's foundation, he also mentions this as the date of Homer's death:

Ἡσίοδος δὲ ἤκμαζεν ὡς εὔρον ἐν ἑτέροις,  
κατὰ τὴν ἐνδεκάτην μὲν αὐτὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα.  
τοιιάδε τῷ Ὀμήρῳ δὲ ἡ τελευτὴ συνέβη

(Chil. 649–51)

Homer could indeed have been considered to be living during this period, because Lycurgus, his supposed contemporary, was believed to have participated in the foundation of the Olympic Games and was therefore sometimes dated to 776.<sup>59</sup> Homer's death in his old age 40 years later, at the time of Syracuse's foundation, would have made perfect sense.

<sup>55</sup> Diodorus 13.49 states that Selinus was founded 242 years before its destruction in 409, which gives 651 as the date of the foundation (the same chronology was followed by Eusebius in dating the foundation to 650 – *Chron.* 95 Helm). Thucydides dated the foundation to 628, which is 23 years later than Diodorus' date. See Köiv (n. 32), 336.

<sup>56</sup> Tzetz. *Chil.* 649–51, quoted in n. 52.

<sup>57</sup> For an overview of the evidence for Euboian western colonisation see Parker (n. 8), 52–5.

<sup>58</sup> Plutarch (*Mor.* 293) reports the expulsion of the Eretrians from Corcyra by the Corinthians under the leadership of Charicrates who can be identified with Chersicrates, the founder of the Corinthian colony on Corcyra (Strab. 6.2.4; Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.1212, 1216). According to Strabo (loc. cit.), Corcyra was settled when the Corinthians were on the way to found Syracuse. Supposing that the ancients connected the expulsion of the Eretrians from the island with the Lelantine War, as modern scholars have done (note, for example, Parker [n. 8], 143; Walker [n. 8], 166), they could have had a reason for synchronizing the war with Syracuse's foundation. However, there is no evidence suggesting that the ancients ever made such a connection, or that they connected the war with the history of western colonisation.

<sup>59</sup> Hieronymus fr. 33 Wehrli; Pausanias (compare 5.4.5; 5.8.5; 8.26.4); probably Phlegon *FGrH* 257 F 1.

## IV

In addition to the calculations that either pushed Hesiod, together with Homer, to a rather distant past or assumed that Hesiod lived considerably later than Homer, there is one more way of dating these poets, which relies on their synchronism, but dates it to a comparatively late period. We know that several authors regarded Homer as a contemporary of Archilochus and the Lydian king Gyges, and placed them 500 years after the Trojan War:

ἔτεροι δὲ κάτω τὸν χρόνον ὑπήγαγον, σὺν Ἀρχιλόχῳ γεγονέναι τὸν Ὅμηρον εἰπόντες· ὁ δὲ Ἀρχιλόχος ἤκμασε περὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα τρίτην καὶ εἰκοστήν, κατὰ Γύγην τὸν Λυδόν, ὕστερον τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ἔτεσι πεντακοσίοις (Tatianus, *Ad Gr.* 31)<sup>60</sup>

Among others, this was the opinion of Theopompus of Chios and Euphorion of Chalcis, writers from the fourth and third centuries: according to Clement, Theopompus reckoned a span of 500 years between Homer and the fall of Troy, while Euphorion dated Homer to Gyges' time:

ναὶ μὲν Θεόπομπος [*FGrHist* 115 F 204] μὲν ἐν τῇ τεσσαρακοστῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν μετὰ ἔτη πεντακόσια τῶν ἐπὶ Ἰλίου στρατευσάντων γεγονέναι τὸν Ὅμηρον ἱστορεῖ. Εὐφορίων δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀλεαδῶν κατὰ Γύγην αὐτὸν τίθησι γεγονέναι, ὃς βασιλεύειν ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τῆς ὀκτωκαιδεκάτης Ὀλυμπιάδος, ὃν καὶ φησι πρῶτον ὠνομάσθαι τύραννον (*Stromata* 1.117)<sup>61</sup>

Euphorion pointed out that Gyges was the first ruler to be called *tyrannos*, clearly referring to Archilochus' verses about Gyges' tyranny.<sup>62</sup> He thus established the connection between Homer and Archilochus, which makes it virtually certain that Archilochus was, for him, also a part of this synchronism. The absolute dates for Gyges and the poets fell in this counting either to Ol. 18 (708–705), as stated by Euphorion,<sup>63</sup> or Ol. 23 (688–685), according to the authors followed by Tatian,<sup>64</sup> which concur with the dates for the accession of Gyges according to the different chronologies of the Lydian kings (705 and 687), recorded in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius.<sup>65</sup> Both these dates fall almost exactly 500 years after the different dates

<sup>60</sup> The margin of 500 years between the fall of Troy and Archilochus, dated to Ol. 23, is also given by Eusebius (67 Helm; 174 Karst) and Syncellus 340.

<sup>61</sup> On this whole set of synchronisations see Jacoby (n. 9), 143–8; Mosshammer (n. 9), 210–14.

<sup>62</sup> Archil. fr. 19 West. By the time of Hippias of Elis (*FGrH* 6 F 6) these verses were reckoned to be the first use of the word *tyrannos*.

<sup>63</sup> However, Ol. 18 was, according to Euphorion, the first year of Gyges, but it is not explicitly stated exactly how he dated Homer and Archilochus (I shall return to this in section V).

<sup>64</sup> Ol. 23 is also given by Eusebius and Syncellus (see above, p. 362, and n. 60).

<sup>65</sup> Eusebius' *Chronicle* gives three different time spans for the Lydian Mermnad dynasty: 141 years in the Armenian version (*Chron.* 33 Karst), 151 or 153 years in the *Canon* (*Chron.* 92–103 Helm, 183–9 Karst) and 159 years in *Series Regnum* (*Chron.* 151 Karst), which, counted back from the year of Croesus' fall (546), will yield the dates 687, 699 and 705 for Gyges' accession (see H. Gelzer, 'Das Zeitalter des Gyges', *RhM* 30 [1875], 230–68, at 239; H. Kaletsch, 'Zur lydischen Chronologie', *Historia* 7 [1958], 1–47, at 2; see also S. Berndt-Ersöz, 'The chronology and historical context of Midas', *Historia* 57 [2008], 1–37, at 3–12). The dates 687 and 705 coincide with Ol. 23 and Ol. 18.

for the fall of Troy (1209 according to *Marmor Parium* and 1184 according to Eratosthenes).<sup>66</sup>

Altogether, the fact of the synchronisation of Homer, Archilochus and Gyges, and dating them 500 years after the fall of Troy, stands beyond doubt. For the many who believed that Hesiod was Homer's contemporary, his date also must have been set to this period. Moreover, there is evidence suggesting that, in fact, he specifically was dated to 500 years after the Trojan War. In *Genos Hesiodou* 78–9, Tzetzes stated that Hesiod lived 400 years after Homer (λογίζομαι τούτον [Ὅμηρον] τοῦ Ἡσιόδου εἶναι υἱ ἐτῶν προγενέστερον). This figure makes sense when connected with the data from Eratosthenes who placed Homer 100 years after Troy's fall,<sup>67</sup> which will yield for Hesiod the date 500 years after Troy. Although Tzetzes himself clearly did not synchronise the poets, he must have followed an authority dating Hesiod 500 years after the Trojan War, which was probably connected to the similar dating for Homer and Archilochus. Tzetzes could have conflated the data from different traditions, taking the date for Homer (100 years after Troy) from Eratosthenes, who may or may not have synchronised the poets,<sup>68</sup> and the date for Hesiod (500 years after Troy) from the other chronology where the poets were synchronised and placed in the time of Gyges and Archilochus. Alternatively, he might have followed a version according to which it was Hesiod, but not Homer, who lived at the time of Archilochus and Gyges (for such a possibility see section V).

Thus, we have evidence suggesting that three great poets – Homer, Hesiod and Archilochus – were dated to the time of Gyges, 500 years after the fall of Troy. The reason for synchronising Archilochus with Gyges is obvious: he mentioned the Lydian king in one of his poems, which indicates that they were contemporaries and makes the dating of Archilochus to Gyges' reign, particularly to its first year, a perfectly reasonable solution.<sup>69</sup> For Homer this date could have been connected with the tradition that the poet composed the epigram on the tomb of the Phrygian king Midas, who was believed to have committed suicide when defeated by the Cimmerians invading Anatolia.<sup>70</sup> This story could have established the synchronism of Homer and Midas' death. Since Herodotus noted Midas as ruling before Gyges,<sup>71</sup>

<sup>66</sup> *Marm. Par.* FGrH 239 ep. 24; Eratosthenes FGrH 241 F 1. See Mosshammer (n. 9), 213.

<sup>67</sup> Eratosthenes FGrH 241 F 9.

<sup>68</sup> Eratosthenes' dating for Hesiod is, to my knowledge, not attested.

<sup>69</sup> Archil. fr. 19 West. This was well known to Herodotus (1.12) and Hippias of Elis (FGrH 6 F 6) as well as to the later authors: Euphorion and Tatian as quoted above in the text, and others. See Jacoby (n. 9), 142–50; idem, 'The date of Archilochus', *CQ* 35 (1941), 97–109.

<sup>70</sup> For the epigram on Midas' tomb see Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 11; *Certam.* 15. For the Cimmerian invasion see Hdt. 1.15; Callisthenes FGrH 124 F 29 (ap. Strab. 13.4.8); Strab. 1.3.21; Eust. *Od.* 11.14; Strab. 14.1.40; Callim. *Hymn* 3.251–58; Ath. 12.525c. For the defeat of Midas, see Strabo 1.3.21 and Eust. *Od.* 11.14. On the Cimmerians' invasion and its dating see G.B. Lanfranchi, *I Cimmeri: Emergenza delle élites militari iraniche nel Vicino Oriente (VIII–VII sec. a.C.)* (Padua, 1990); A.I. Ivantchik, *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient* (Göttingen, 1993); V. Parker, 'Bemerkungen zu den Zügen der Kimmerier und der Skythen durch Vorderasien', *Klio* 77(1995), 7–34; H. Sauter, *Studien zum Kimmerierproblem* (Bonn, 2000), 225; I. Lebedynsky, *Les Cimmériens: Les premiers nomades des steppes européennes IX–VII siècles av. J.-C.* (Paris, 2004); M. Köiv, 'Cimmerians in the Western Anatolia: a chronological note', in: T.R. Kämmerer, (ed.), *Studies on Ritual and Society in the Ancient Near East* (Paris and New York, 2007), 153–70; Berndt-Ersöz (n. 65), 21–9.

<sup>71</sup> Hdt. 1.14.2.

the ancients could have had good reason to equate Midas' death with Gyges' accession and to date Homer to the early years of the reign of the Lydian king.<sup>72</sup> Furthermore, this synchronism might have found some support in the fact that a line in the *Odyssey* mentions Cimmerians.<sup>73</sup> The synchronisation of Homer and Archilochus, a contemporary of Gyges and probably of the Cimmerian invasion (Archilochus' poetry mentioned the 'woes of Magnesia', understood by the ancients as an allusion to the sack of Magnesia by Treres, a 'Cimmerian people'),<sup>74</sup> might have resulted, in this case, from the fact that both poets were believed to have lived at the time of Gyges. Hesiod as Homer's opponent in the song contest could simply have been attached to this synchronism.

However, this is not likely to have been the only reason for dating Homer and Hesiod to the time of Archilochus and Gyges. Tatian explicitly points out that Homer was the contemporary of Archilochus, and notes Gyges, whose date was established by the stemma of the Lydian kings, simply for fixing the time of the poets (*Ad Gr.* 31: ἔτεροι δὲ ... σὺν Ἀρχιλόχῳ γεγονέναι τὸν Ὅμηρον εἰπόντες· ὁ δὲ Ἀρχιλόχος ἤκμασε περὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα τρίτην καὶ εἰκοστήν, κατὰ Γύγην τὸν Λυδόν). Similarly, when Euphorion dated Homer to the time of Gyges, he referred to Archilochus by pointing out that Gyges was the first to be called tyrant (*Clem. Al. Strom.* 1.117: Εὐφορίων δὲ ... κατὰ Γύγην αὐτὸν [Ὅμηρον] τίθησι γεγονέναι, ὃς βασιλεύειν ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τῆς ὀκτωκαιδεκάτης ὀλυμπιάδος, ὃν καὶ φησι πρῶτον ὠνομάσθαι τύραννον). This reference to Archilochus in the context of stating the synchronism of Homer and Gyges suggests that, for Euphorion, it was above all Archilochus who was synchronised with Homer, while Gyges was noted only for providing the date. We must therefore look for something that connected Homer and Archilochus, rather than Homer and Gyges, and this link can be easily found. Homer was indeed believed by some to have contested with Hesiod in the funeral games of Amphidamas in Euboea during the Lelantine War. Archilochus (fr. 3 West), on the other hand, mentions a fight between the 'lords of Euboea' in which only swords, and not missile weapons, were used on the battlefield:

οὔτοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται, οὐδὲ θαμειαὶ  
σφενδόνας, εἴτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἀρης συνάγῃ  
ἐν πεδίῳ· ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον·  
ταύτης γὰρ κείνοι δάμονές εἰσι μάχης  
δεσπόται Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί.

Although the verses do not specify the conflict in question, the 'lords of Euboea' could have been regarded as referring to the Hippobotai and Hippioi, the ruling

<sup>72</sup> The ancients dated the defeat of Midas to 696 (Euseb. *Chron.* 92 Helm, 184 Karst) or to 676–673 (see Gelzer [n. 65], 252, n. 6). The first of these was probably calculated to fall in the early years of Gyges, and the second to the early years of Gyges' successor, Ardys, in whose time the Cimmerians were believed to have ravaged the Lydian capital Sardeis (Hdt. 1.15) – see Kōiv [n. 70], 164–6; Berndt-Ersöz (n. 65).

<sup>73</sup> Hom. *Od.* 11.14. The correspondence of the Homeric passage and the dating has been noted by both ancient (Strab. 1.2.9) and modern scholars (Rohde [n. 9], 555–7; Jacoby *FGrH* II D, 385). The *Odyssey*, however, placed the Cimmerians near Oceanus on the border of the earth, not in Anatolia.

<sup>74</sup> Archil. fr. 20 West ap. Strab. 14.1.40: κλαίω τὰ Θασιῶν οὐ τὰ Μαγνήτων κακά. Archilochus was connected with the sack of Magnesia by both Strabo (loc. cit.) and Athenaeus (12.525c). See especially Jacoby (n. 69), 106–7. For the Cimmerians' invasion note the literature quoted in n. 70.

oligarchies of Chalcis and Eretria,<sup>75</sup> in whose time the Lelantine War was probably believed to have taken place.<sup>76</sup> Archilochus' verses might have been connected with an inscription that Strabo saw in the Eretrian sanctuary of Artemis at Amarynthus, which bore an agreement forbidding the use of missiles in the war over the Lelantine plain.<sup>77</sup> If the ancients believed that Archilochus referred to the Lelantine War, or had any other reasons to connect him with this conflict, it would have given them a perfect reason for synchronising Archilochus with Homer and Hesiod.

It must be admitted that the connection between Archilochus' verses, the Amarynthian inscription and the Lelantine War (in the course of which Homer and Hesiod were believed to have contested) is not certain. Strabo believed that the inscription referred to a war over the Lelantine plain but did not suggest any connection between it and Archilochus. Immediately below, he quoted Homer as evidence for the military bravery of the Euboians,<sup>78</sup> which might suggest that in his opinion the inscription, and thus the war, was to be dated to Heroic times. Plutarch, quoting the verses of Archilochus, certainly viewed them as a reference to the method of close fighting of the mythical Abantes, mentioned by Homer,<sup>79</sup> who were believed to have fought for control of the Lelantine plain.<sup>80</sup> The Abantes were probably not explicitly mentioned by Archilochus; had they been, Plutarch would hardly have failed to quote it. But the reference to the use of swords clearly suggests hand-to-hand combat, supposed to have been characteristic of the Abantes, which makes Plutarch's interpretation perfectly reasonable.<sup>81</sup>

However, we have good reasons to suppose that this was not the opinion of Euphron of Chalcis. When he stated the synchronism of Homer, Archilochus and Gyges, he probably did this in the context of the Lelantine War during which he believed that Homer and Hesiod contested, and made this synchronism exactly because he assumed that the war took place in Archilochus' time. It is remarkable that his dating of Homer was stated in a book about the Aleuads (*Εὐβορίων*

<sup>75</sup> Hippobotai mentioned in Hdt. 5.77 and Arist. fr. 603 Rose, and Hippioi in Arist. *Pol.* 1306a 36.

<sup>76</sup> We have some circumstantial evidence for suggesting that this was the point of view of Aristotle (see below). Modern scholars have often accepted that Archilochus was referring to the Lelantine War: see Blakeway (n. 6), 47–9; Burn (n. 6), 33; Bradeen (n. 6), 227; W. Donlan, 'Archilochus, Strabo and the Lelantine War', *TAPA* 101 (1970), 131–42, at 135–6; Janko (n. 1), 95–6; Parker (n. 8), 59; Walker (n. 8), 158. The refusal to accept this (Jacoby [n. 69], 107–8; Forrest [n. 6], 163–4; and Blümer [n. 1], 192–3) has been caused mainly by the reluctance to date the war to the time of Archilochus.

<sup>77</sup> Strab. 10.1.12. The connection between the treaty and the verses of Archilochus has been suggested, for example, by Burn (n. 6), 33; Janko (n. 1), 95–6 and Parker (n. 8), 102–3.

<sup>78</sup> Strab. 10.1.13.

<sup>79</sup> Plut. *Vit. Thes.* 5.1–4: ἐκέειρατο δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς τὰ πρόσθεν μόνον, ὥσπερ Ὅμηρος (*Il.* II 542ff) ἔφη τοὺς Ἀβαντας ... οἱ δ' Ἀβαντες ἐκέειραντο πρῶτοι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον, ... ὄντες πολεμικοὶ καὶ ἀγχιμαχοὶ καὶ μάλιστα δὴ πάντων εἰς χεῖρας ὠθείσθαι τοῖς ἐναντίοις μεμαθηκότες, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ἐν τούτοις (here follow the verses of Archilochus). The method of close fighting used by the early Euboians was also referred to by Strabo (10.1.13). This context for the quotation of Archilochus' verses has been justly pointed out by Donlan (n. 76). Walker (n. 8), 158, views these verses as a mutual allusion to both the Abantic ancestors and contemporary hoplite warfare.

<sup>80</sup> As suggested by the fact that Strabo (10.3.6), speaking about the wars of the Curetes over the Lelantine plain, seem to have identified them with the Abantes (as shown by ὅπισθεν κομῶντας – a usual characteristic of the Abantes, assigned here to Curetes) – see Donlan (n. 76), 131–2.

<sup>81</sup> Modern scholars have often seen in Archilochus' verses a reflection of hoplite warfare (see Forrest [n. 6], 163–4; Donlan [n. 76], 138–9; Parker [n. 8], 95–107; Walker [n. 8], 158–61).

δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀλευαδῶν κατὰ Γύγην αὐτὸν τίθησι γεγονέναι),<sup>82</sup> who were one of the mightiest clans in Thessaly, and whose ancestor, Aleuas the Red, was believed to have established what may be called the principles of the Thessalian confederation.<sup>83</sup> Homer had little to do with Thessaly or the Aleuads,<sup>84</sup> and nor had Archilochus or Gyges; thus the dating in a Thessalian context might seem surprising at first sight. But there certainly existed a well-known story connecting the early history of Thessaly with the Lelantine War. Cleomachus of Pharsalus was said to have assisted Chalcis: the Chalcidians suffered losses at the hands of their opponents' cavalry, and thereafter won a battle with the aid of Cleomachus and his knights; Cleomachus himself fell, and his grave was afterwards honoured by the thankful Chalcidians.<sup>85</sup>

Euphorion certainly wrote about the Thessalians' ventures into central Greece – we know that he glorified the fighting of the Thessalian Eurylochus in the First Sacred War,<sup>86</sup> and, as a native of Chalcis, he is likely to have dwelt on the stories connecting it with the history of the region forming the subject of his study. There is, therefore, every reason to believe that the story of Cleomachus' aid to the Chalcidians, and thus the Lelantine War, figured in his account. On the other hand, he wrote a poem about Hesiod, and, although its exact content is lost to us,<sup>87</sup> we need not doubt that the song contest at the funeral games of Amphidamas in Chalcis was an important event for him. His dating for Hesiod is not recorded, but the Lelantine War context for stating the date of Homer strongly suggests that he synchronised Homer and Hesiod and let them compete during the war in Euboea. The description of its events would have given him a perfect reason for mentioning the supposed song contest, which must have been the very reason for giving Homer's date in the Thessalian book. Since he synchronised Homer with Archilochus, he obviously must have believed that the war was going on in Archilochus' time. For Homer and Hesiod the synchronism with the war was given by the assumption of their contest; for Archilochus it could have been deduced from his verses describing the fighting of the Euboian lords.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>82</sup> Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.117.

<sup>83</sup> Arist. fr. 497–8 Rose. For Aleuas and his reform see especially A. Andrews, 'Jason of Pherae and Aleuas the Red', *JHS* 44 (1924), 55–64; Sordi (n. 8), 65–84; B. Helly, *L'état thessalien* (Lyon, 1995), 170–81.

<sup>84</sup> There are some vague Thessalian connections in the story of Homer's birth (Ps.-Hdt. *Vit. Hom.* 2), but these date the poet to the time of the foundation of Smyrna, not of Gyges and Archilochus (the *Vita* dates the foundation of Smyrna and Homer's birth to 622 years before Xerxes' invasion [38], thus to 1102). These connections explain why Thessaly figures in the list of the places of Homer's origin (Diehl, *Anth. Lyr. Graec.* 16.296; *Suda* s.v. Ὅμηρος).

<sup>85</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 760a–761b. Cleomachus, coming from Pharsalus, could not have belonged to the Aleuads, who originated from Larissa, but, since the Aleuads were almost certainly influential throughout the Archaic period (Pind. *Pyth.* 10; Hdt. 7.6.2, 9.1), Euphorion's work must have touched upon the history of the whole of Thessaly.

<sup>86</sup> Hypoth. Pind. *Pyth.* b = fr. 85 in B.A. v. Groningen, *Euphorion* (Amsterdam, 1977), 150–1.

<sup>87</sup> The poem is mentioned in *Suda* s.v. *Εὐφορίων*. On what can be supposed about its content see section V below.

<sup>88</sup> There is evidence suggesting that Lesches, to whom Plutarch assigned a part in Hesiod's song contest, was also synchronised with Archilochus. Eusebius dated Lesches to the time of the foundation of Istria on the Black Sea, which according to Ps.-Scymnus took place when the Scythians invaded Asia in pursuit of the Cimmerians (Euseb. *Chron.* 94–5 Helm, 185 Karst; Ps.-Scymnus 767–72; see Mosshammer [n. 9], 222–3.). The invasion of the Cimmerians was indeed believed to have taken place during Archilochus' time (see n. 74). Clement, too, might

The reason for synchronising Homer, Hesiod and Archilochus was thus the belief that they all were active during the Lelantine War. However, the reason for dating all of them, together with Gyges, 500 years after the Trojan War remains unclear. As stated above, the interval was attached to different dates of the beginning of the Merminad dynasty and of Troy's fall, which demonstrates its significance in different chronological calculations. No doubt Gyges was believed to have ascended about 500 years after the sack of Troy, but this does not tell us the reason for giving this interval. We cannot even tell which was the principal event connected to the Trojan fall by this margin. No doubt it could have been the accession of Gyges which was, for some reason, believed to have taken place 500 years after the fall of Troy. Equally, such a round number of years was suitable for separating Homer from the Trojan War, and Gyges could have been connected with it only in passing, by synchronising him with Homer. Or these 500 years could have been primarily the interval between the sack of Troy and the Lelantine War, which, according to Thucydides, was the first great conflict after the war against Troy,<sup>89</sup> and was therefore suitable to be separated from it by a round number of years.

## V

The dating of Hesiod to the time of Archilochus and Gyges could match the date proposed for Hesiod by Aristotle. A well-known story that made Hesiod the father of Stesichorus was related in the Aristotelian *Orchomenion politeia*, perhaps also in the *Peplai* preserved among the works of the philosopher (Ἀριστοτέλης γὰρ ὁ φιλόσοφος, μᾶλλον δ' οἶμαι ὁ τοὺς πέπλους συντάξας, ἐν τῇ Ὀρχομενίων πολιτείᾳ Στησίχορον τὸν μελοποιὸν εἶναι φησιν υἱὸν Ἡσιόδου),<sup>90</sup> and was accepted by Philochorus.<sup>91</sup> Cicero recounted a variant version that made Stesichorus Hesiod's grandson, but rejected it on chronological grounds.<sup>92</sup> The story was a part of the tradition concerning Hesiod's death in Locris, where he was supposedly killed by Amphiphanes and Ganyctor, who suspected that the poet had raped their sister, subsequently the mother of Stesichorus according to this account.<sup>93</sup> Stesichorus was thought to have been a contemporary of Alcaeus, Pittacus and

have viewed Lesches and Archilochus as contemporaries: he noted that when Phainias of Eresus placed Terpander after Lesches he in fact placed him after Archilochus as well (fr. 33. Wehrli ap. *Strom.* 1.131: Φανίας δὲ πρὸ Τερπάνδρου τιθεὶς Λέσχην τὸν Λέσβιον Ἀρχιλόχου νεώτερον φέρει τὸν Τέρπανδρον), which makes perfect sense when accepting that he assumed the synchrony of Archilochus and Lesches. If Lesches was synchronised with Archilochus, it could have been because they were both connected with the Lelantine War.

<sup>89</sup> Thuc. 1.15.2.

<sup>90</sup> Arist. fr. 565 Rose ap. Tzetz. *Gen. Hes.* 80–4 (for the quotation see below in the text).

<sup>91</sup> Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 213; but also *Suda* s.v. Στησίχορος.

<sup>92</sup> Cic. *Resp.* 2.20. Cicero clearly believed, in accordance with most of the ancient chronographers, in a much earlier date for Hesiod.

<sup>93</sup> *Cert.* 205–40; *Vit. Hes.* 3–4; Plut. *Mor.* 162d–f; Paus. 9.31.6. For Hesiod's mother see also Philochorus (n. 91). The story was already well known in the fifth century, as is attested by Thucydides (3.95.3–69.1), and, although the historian did not mention Stesichorus, the father–son relationship between the poets could well have been known at that time. The tradition could have been current in Italy, particularly in Epizephyrian Locri, the place with which traditions most strongly connected Stesichorus (see U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Sappho und Simonides* [Berlin, 1913], 233–8; M. West, 'Stesichoros', *CQ* 21 [1971], 302–14, at 302–5; Kivילו [n. 10], 82–3), and the link was elaborated by the Pythagoreans, who took an interest in Stesichorus'



Sappho,<sup>94</sup> and was connected with both the tyrant Phalaris of Acragas and the battle of Sagras between Locri and Croton.<sup>95</sup> All this demonstrates that, in the opinion of the ancients, he was active between the end of the seventh and the middle of the sixth century – his birth, indeed, was dated to Ol. 37 (632–629) and his death to Ol. 55–56 (560–553).<sup>96</sup> In other words, all those who accepted the tradition of the relationship between Hesiod and Stesichorus – Aristotle, the author of *Peploi* and Philochorus – must have accepted that Hesiod was alive during what we call the second half of the seventh century: the date of his death must, for them, have coincided with the birth-date of Stesichorus.<sup>97</sup>

Modern scholars have not paid attention to this tradition when dating Hesiod, quite understandably, because there are not likely to be many prepared to believe that Stesichorus was, in reality, Hesiod's son.<sup>98</sup> However, regardless of the incredibility of the story, we cannot completely disregard its chronological implications. Aristotle and Philochorus must have been well acquainted with what was known in their time about early Greek chronology,<sup>99</sup> and the fact that such a dating for Hesiod did not seem strange to them is certainly noteworthy.

The dating of Hesiod to around the middle of the seventh century could fit with the assumption of his synchronicity with Archilochus and Gyges. This cannot have been accepted by those who synchronised Archilochus with Gyges' accession, and dated him accordingly to the end of the eighth or the beginning of the seventh century.<sup>100</sup> But Archilochus could also have been dated somewhat later: in Eusebius' *Chronicle* he was noted not at the first but at the last year of Gyges' reign, in 664, and Cornelius Nepos synchronised him with King Tullus Hostilius of Rome (traditionally dated to 672–640).<sup>101</sup> This date made Archilochus almost exactly synchronous with Hesiod begetting Stesichorus and being murdered in about 630.

life and poetry and are likely to have been interested in Hesiod as well (West, 302–4; idem, *The Orphic Poems* [Oxford, 1983], 9; Kivilo [n. 10], 54–6, 82–3).

<sup>94</sup> *Suda* s.v. Σαπφώ.

<sup>95</sup> The connection with Phalaris is stated by Aristotle (*Rh.* 1393b) and in Tzetz. *Gen. Hes.* 84f. For the connection with the battle of Sagras see Paus. 3.19.11–13; for this battle see T.J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford, 1948), 358–60.

<sup>96</sup> Since Acragas was probably founded around 580 (see Dunbabin [n. 95], 436), Phalaris must have reigned somewhat after this date. The date of the battle of Sagras, although not attested, must have been around the middle of the sixth century (Dunbabin, 359–60). The exact dates of Stesichorus are mentioned in *Suda* s.v. Στησίχορος and Eusebius (*Chron.* 98 Helm) – see Mosshammer (n. 9), 218–25.

<sup>97</sup> The suggestion of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (n. 93), 235–6, that Stesichorus the son of Hesiod was believed to have lived in an unspecified but distant past remains unfounded.

<sup>98</sup> As far as I know, the story's significance for dating Hesiod has been considered only by A. Fick, *Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung Sprachform wiederhergestellt* (Göttingen, 1887), 4.

<sup>99</sup> Aristotle indeed composed the list of *Pythonikai* (Dittenberger, Sylloge 275 = *FGrH* 124 T 23), as far as I know, a version of *Olympionikai* (Shaw [n. 9], 50–1).

<sup>100</sup> See above, p. 365, with nn. 60–1, 63–5.

<sup>101</sup> Euseb. *Chron.* 92–4 Helm, 183–4 Karst, dates Gyges to 699–664 and notes Archilochus at the end of his reign; Cornel. Nep. ap. Gell. 17.21.8. Mosshammer (n. 9), 214–17, suggests that the date was arrived at by placing Archilochus to the time of Gyges' son, Ardys, when the Cimmerians were believed to have ravaged the western parts of Asia Minor (Hdt. 1.15; Callisthenes *FGrH* 124 F 29), an event to which Archilochus' 'woes of Magnesia' were believed to have referred (Strab. 14.1.40; Ath. 12.525c; see Jacoby [n. 69], 106–7), and which was used by the later chronographers for establishing the date of the Cimmerian invasion (see Mosshammer [n. 9], 222–5).

Whether or not this was Euphorion's opinion cannot be established. We know that Euphorion placed Homer, and thus Archilochus and Hesiod, in the time of Gyges, and dated his reign from Ol. 18 (708–705) onwards (*Εὐφορίων δὲ ... κατὰ Γύγην αὐτὸν [Ὅμηρον] τίθησι γεγονέναι, ὃς βασιλεύειν ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τῆς ὀκτωκαιδέκατης ὀλυμπιάδος*).<sup>102</sup> Since the king was believed to have reigned for 38, 36 or 35 years, his last year must have fallen, according to Euphorion, in c. 670.<sup>103</sup> Euphorion's exact date for the poets, if he gave this at all, is not expressly stated: it might have been at either the beginning or the end of Gyges' reign. Nor do we know Euphorion's opinion about the exact date of Stesichorus. Nevertheless, in his poem on Hesiod he must have related the story of the poet's death, which is demonstrated by the fact that he was quoted in connection with the Aetolian town Molycria, known as the place where the dolphins carried the corpse of the poet.<sup>104</sup> It seems very probable that he told the story in its full length and implications, which would have included the begetting of Stesichorus. This could have conformed well to his dating Hesiod to the time of Archilochus and Gyges, supposing he assumed that the poets were active during the latter part of Gyges' reign – the date around 670 would have been obviously suitable for dating Hesiod's death during the 630s. However, in this case Euphorion could not have dated Homer, Archilochus and Hesiod exactly 500 years after the Trojan War, and the dating to Ol. 18, attested by Clement, could have concerned only the accession of Gyges, not the poets.

It is also a pity that we have no evidence of how Aristotle, our principal authority for the connection between Hesiod and Stesichorus, dated Archilochus, or resolved the question of the relationship between Archilochus, Hesiod and the Lelantine War. Some guesses can still be made. It is probably not without significance that Tzetzes, our source for Aristotle's statement about Hesiod begetting Stesichorus, notes this in connection with his dating of Hesiod 400 years after Homer (*Gen. Hes. 78–84: ἐκ τούτου οὖν λογίζομαι τοῦτον [Ὅμηρον] τοῦ Ἡσιόδου εἶναι υἱὸν προγενέστερον. Ἀριστοτέλης γὰρ ὁ φιλόσοφος ... Στησίχορον τὸν μελοποιὸν εἶναι φησιν υἱὸν Ἡσιόδου*). There is, therefore, some reason for supposing that Tzetzes' dating of Hesiod, which places him 500 years after the fall of Troy and thus probably to the time of Gyges and Archilochus, was connected to Aristotle's opinion about Hesiod's fatherhood and might reflect the point of view of the philosopher. Aristotle must have believed that Homer, who was born during the Ionian migration, lived much earlier than Hesiod the father of Stesichorus. Whether or not he postulated the interval of exactly 400 years between them cannot be said with certainty.<sup>105</sup>

Although Aristotle obviously cannot have accepted the story of the contest between Homer and Hesiod, he must have known Hesiod's statement about his victory at the funeral games of Amphidamas, and thus dated him to the time of

<sup>102</sup> See above, in section IV.

<sup>103</sup> See Gelzer (n. 65), 239; Kaletsch (n. 65), 2.

<sup>104</sup> Steph. Byz. s.v. *Μολυκρία, πόλις Αἰτωλίας*. ... *Εὐφορίων δὲ Μολυκρίαν αὐτὴν φησι*. = fr. 23 in Groningen (n. 86), 65. Molycria was connected to the story of Hesiod's death in Plut. *Mor.* 984d (see Groningen, loc. cit.).

<sup>105</sup> We have no evidence about Aristotle's exact dates for Homer and Hesiod, nor about his interval between the poets. However, Tzetzes' interval of 400 years applied to the Eratosthenean/Apollodorean date 1044 for the Ionian migration (*FGrH* 241 F 1; 244 F 61 b) will yield the date 644 for Hesiod, which falls close enough to Stesichorus' birth-date (632) according to the chronographers.

the Lelantine War, regardless of who he believed to have been his opponent in this song contest.<sup>106</sup> Aristotle very probably gave an account of the Lelantine War in his *Chalcideon* and *Eretraion politeiai* and he could well have believed that the war took place at the time of Archilochus. He probably knew the story of the death of the Thessalian Cleomachus in the cavalry engagement, and assigned some part in the war to the auxiliary forces from Chalcidice in Thrace.<sup>107</sup> He certainly believed that the power of the Euboian nobles was based on their strong cavalry,<sup>108</sup> and that the Chalcidian colonies, whence the aid came, were founded during the time of the rule of the Hippobotai.<sup>109</sup> All this makes it very probable that in his opinion the war took place during the reign of the Hippioi and Hippobotai. Archilochus' verses about the fight of the 'lords of Euboea', which must have been known to the philosopher, fit perfectly into this context. Since Aristotle generally reconstructed the past by combining the traditional stories with ancient poetry and supposedly early documents,<sup>110</sup> we are justified in supposing that he used the inscription from the Amarynthian sanctuary mentioned by Strabo. Thus, he could well have posited a connection between the Lelantine War, the treaty and the verses of Archilochus. If he believed that Archilochus composed during this war, he obviously must have assumed that Hesiod and Archilochus were approximate contemporaries.

We must go no further with such reconstructions, but accept that the exact opinions of the ancients inevitably remain a matter of guesswork. However, despite all uncertainties we can be fairly confident that some of the ancients, notably Euphorion, believed that Hesiod's victorious song contest in Chalcis took place at the time of Archilochus and Gyges. And there can be no doubt that some authors, including Aristotle and Philochorus, believed that Hesiod lived around the middle of the seventh century.

## VI

In conclusion, we can present the following list of ways in which the ancients dated Hesiod:

- (1) He was synchronised with Homer and dated to the time of the Ionian migration (Euthymenes, Archemachus, Cassius and 'some' according to Philostratus and Tzetzes in *Genos Hesiodou*).
- (2) He was dated, again together with Homer, to the time of the Spartan lawgiver Lycurgus (Ephorus, *Marmor Parium* and Diogenes Laertius). These two ways

<sup>106</sup> Lesches could be a suitable candidate, providing he was described by Plutarch (*Mor.* 153f–154a, quoted above) as Hesiod's opponent, not as a witness of the contest.

<sup>107</sup> Assuming that the Aristotle quoted by Plutarch (*Mor.* 760a–761b: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τὸν μὲν Κλεόμαχον ἄλλως ἀποθανεῖν φησι, κρατήσαντα τῶν Ἐρετριέων τῇ μάχῃ· τὸν δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωμένου φιληθέντα τῶν ἀπὸ Θράκης Χαλκιδέων γενέσθαι, πεμφθέντα τοῖς ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ Χαλκιδεῦσιν ἐπικούρον) was not a local Chalcidian historian (*FGrH* 423) but the philosopher (see Parker [n. 8], 110–11).

<sup>108</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 1289b36–40.

<sup>109</sup> Arist. fr. 603 Rose.

<sup>110</sup> Note, for example, his reconstruction of early Spartan history based on the story about Lycurgus and Charillos, the Great Rhetra, Tyrtaeus' poetry and the disc of Lycurgus and Iphitus (*Pol.* 1271b25ff, 1316a34–5; fr. 533–7, 611.10 Rose) or his discussion of Athenian history based on the poetry of Solon (*Ath. Pol.* 5–12). See also G. Huxley, 'Aristotle as antiquarian', *GRBS* 14 (1973), 271–86, at 280–4.

of dating followed what was assumed about Homer's lifetime and Hesiod was simply placed as his contemporary.

- (3) Hesiod was dated 100 to 138 years after Homer (Porphyrius and Solinus, following Apollodorus who placed Homer to the time of Lycurgus, and Hesiod immediately before the first Olympic Games). The reason for this interval between the poets and the dating for Hesiod cannot be established.
- (4) He was dated after Ol. 14 (724) because the poetry ascribed to him depicted running naked, which was believed to have been introduced at this particular Olympiad (so probably Aristarchus).
- (5) He was synchronised with Cinaethon, Eumelus, Arctinus and Lesches, dated 100 years after Homer (so, apparently, Eusebius), and probably to the time of the foundation of Syracuse (Eusebius, and Tzetzes in the *Chiliades*). The reason for this synchronism cannot be established. However, the dating to the time of colonisation could have been reconciled with the synchronism with Homer (Tzetzes' *Chiliades*).
- (6) Hesiod's and Homer's supposed song contest during the Lelantine War was synchronised with Archilochus and Gyges (Euphorion), and all these figures were dated 500 years after the fall of Troy. This synchronism was, as far as we can tell, the only statement about Hesiod's lifetime that was calculated according to what was believed about the time of the Lelantine War. It could have been based on Archilochus' verses about the fighting of the 'Euboian lords', suggesting that the Lelantine War took place in his time.
- (7) Hesiod was believed to have been the father of Stesichorus, which placed him around the middle of the seventh century (Aristotle and Philochorus). This dating could have been connected with the synchronism of Hesiod and Archilochus (a connection that could have been made by both Euphorion and Aristotle).

This list demonstrates that the ancients had no clear understanding about when Hesiod lived. He was a floating figure who could have been placed, with or without Homer, at any time between the Ionian migration and the reign of Gyges. Aristarchus apparently tried to establish the date by comparing the poetry transmitted under his name with the evidence from the Homeric poems. All other ancients whose opinions we can detect proceeded from what was believed about the lives of Hesiod and his supposed contemporaries. Notably, Hesiod's verses about his performance at the funeral games of Amphidamas did not give them a generally accepted indication for establishing the date, which suggests that there was no compelling evidence for dating the Lelantine War. Therefore, the ancients mostly relied on the evidence (or pseudo-evidence) about the poets who were viewed as Hesiod's contemporaries, and dated Hesiod accordingly. The question for us is which of these synchronisms, if any, can be relied on.

I think we can dismiss the dates based on what was believed about Homer's life, the acceptance of which would require trusting both Homer's biography and the historicity of the song contest between Homer and Hesiod. So we must disqualify Hesiod's synchronisation with the Ionian migration and with the Spartan Lycurgus. The synchronism with Arctinus, Eumelus, Lesches and Cinaethon could possibly be based on some reliable evidence that we cannot detect, but does not help much because these poets are far too shadowy figures and their dating too

uncertain to be helpful.<sup>111</sup> If the connection with Syracuse's foundation could be accepted (something we cannot be certain about), it would suggest a date in the latter part of the eighth century. But we cannot establish which poet provided the link with colonisation (Eumelus seems the likeliest candidate), and must accept the possibility that Hesiod happened to be dated to this time only because of his supposed synchronism with some other poet. All these uncertainties make this link unreliable.

The synchronism with Archilochus and Gyges, and the late dating accepted by Aristotle, deserve perhaps more attention. These indications obviously conform, placing Hesiod around the middle of the seventh century. Although the ancients pushed Gyges' accession back to the eighth century, which caused similar dates for the poets synchronised with him, the Assyrian sources leave no doubt that in reality he ruled during the 660s and perished in the course of the Cimmerian attacks c. 645.<sup>112</sup> Archilochus' verses in turn fix him within the time of Gyges and the Cimmerian invasion, or slightly afterwards.<sup>113</sup> This evidence produces a mid-seventh-century date for Archilochus, and consequently for Hesiod, placing the latter several decades after the late eighth or early seventh century that is usually accepted as his date.

Of course, there is no definite proof for the actual synchronism of Hesiod and Archilochus and the consequent date. Even if we accept that the details related in the *Works and Days* are truly autobiographical and that Hesiod had actually performed at the funeral games of Amphidamas,<sup>114</sup> that the ancients were right in connecting Amphidamas' death with the Lelantine War,<sup>115</sup> and that Archilochus' verses refer to this great conflict, we still cannot be sure that Amphidamas perished and Hesiod performed during Archilochus' lifetime. The war could have broken out long before Archilochus and continued after him. The archaeological evidence suggesting some conflict in central Euboea around the turn of the eighth and seventh centuries (the abandonment of Lefkandi, the destruction layer and the construction of fortifications in Eretria) indicates that the hostilities had already begun then, but can by no means exclude the possibility that they continued for

<sup>111</sup> Modern scholars have dated the poems that the ancient tradition ascribes to them to dates in the eighth century (A. Bernabé, *Poetarum epicorum graecorum testimonia et fragmenta*, vol. 1 [Stuttgart, 1996], suggesting dates in the eighth and seventh centuries) to the late sixth century (the date of the Epic Cycle according to M. Davies, 'The date of the Epic Cycle', *Glotta* 67 [1989], 89–100).

<sup>112</sup> See Lanfranchi (n. 70), 193–205; Ivantchik (n. 70), 94–105; Parker (n. 70), 28–32; Sauter (n. 70), 225, 231–7; Lebedynsky (n. 70), 30–4; Köiv (n. 70), 159–60; Berndt-Ersöz (n. 65), 7.

<sup>113</sup> Jacoby (n. 69); Parker (n. 8), 59–80. This argument requires, of course, that we accept Archilochus' poetry as the reflection of the life and attitude of one historical poet, not as a cumulative synthesis of long poetic tradition (as suggested by G. Nagy, *The Best of Achaeans: Concept of Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* [Baltimore, MD, 1979], 243–9; idem, *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* [Baltimore, MD, 1990], 436; I. Morris, *Archaeology as Cultural History* [Oxford, 2000], 158–9; see also J. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* [Chicago, IL, 2002], 236–8), and that the 'wealth of Gyges' and 'woes of Magnesia', alluded to by Archilochus, were not proverbial expressions used by the poet who in fact lived in a later period (a possibility considered and rejected by Blakeway [n. 6], 44).

<sup>114</sup> On the supposedly fictitious personality of Hesiod see, for example, M. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (London, 1981), 1–11; R. Lamberton, *Hesiod* (New Haven, CT, 1988), 3–48; R. Martin, 'Hesiod's metanastic poetics', *Ramus* 21 (1993), 11–33.

<sup>115</sup> For scepticism about the reliability of this connection see, for example, Hall (n. 113), 232–4.

several more decades.<sup>116</sup> The involvement of the Thessalians is perhaps best dated not too long before the early sixth century, from which time we have evidence for their activity in central Greece,<sup>117</sup> and the continuation of the war at this time might be supported by the complaints of Theognis about troubles on the Lelantine plain at the time of the Cypselids.<sup>118</sup> Consequently, Amphidamas could have perished and Hesiod performed at his funeral games at any time between the late eight and early sixth century.

On the other hand, the mid-seventh-century dating has its merits. It is based on the combined evidence of Hesiod's and Archilochus' poetry, and was accepted by well-informed and very respectable writers: Euphorion, Aristotle and Philochorus. The date does not depend on the synchronism with Homer. Aristotle definitely rejected this, and although his own statement about Hesiod's relationship to Stesichorus is no more credible, the consequent date is likely to have suited some other evidence that the philosopher accepted about Hesiod. He probably connected the poet with the Lelantine War, and we can suppose that part of his evidence came from that quarter. Euphorion, it is true, accepted Hesiod's synchronism with Homer, but dated the two poets according to the war in Euboea, not the supposed details of the life of Homer. The synchronism with Archilochus is in fact the only dating for Hesiod arrived at by what was assumed about the time of the Lelantine War. Nor is there anything in Hesiod's attitude or language that could exclude this dating. The emphasis on the shared responsibility for the welfare of the polis is certainly comparable to the ideology of the seventh-century Spartan Tyrtaeus exhorting his compatriots to fight for the common cause, and the date suggested here falls relatively close to what has been proposed by Janko based on the language and diction.<sup>119</sup> Moreover, if accepted, it could, perhaps, explain the story of the birth of Stesichorus. The distance between Hesiod's and Stesichorus' lifetimes would be relatively short in this case; given some resemblance in the subject matter of the poems of Stesichorus and the Hesiodic epics, including the *Catalogues*,<sup>120</sup> there easily could have emerged, perhaps as early as the Archaic period, the story connecting them as father and son.

All this makes the synchronism with Archilochus probably the best indication of Hesiod's lifetime. It is certainly better founded than placing him to *c.* 700, for

<sup>116</sup> For the archaeological evidence see A. Mazarakis Ainian, 'Geometric Eretria', *Antike Kunst* 30 (1987), 3–24, at 18–19; Parker (n. 8), 30–8; Walker (n. 8), 86–7, 91–3. Blümer (n. 1), 201–11, suggesting that Amphidamas' funeral games could be dated only to the eighth century, has greatly overstated the following decline (for Eretria as a flourishing city in the seventh and sixth centuries see Walker [n. 8], 90–206).

<sup>117</sup> The leadership in the Sacred War against Crisa-Cirra (Strab. 9.3.4 and 10; Thessal. *Presb.* (27) 17; Hypoth. Pind. *Pyth.* b, c and d; Hypoth. Pind. *Ol.*; Polyainus 6.13) during the first decades of the sixth century (on the details see P. Sánchez, *L'amphictyonie des Pyles et de Delphes* [Stuttgart, 2001], 75–7); the wars against the Phocians (Hdt. 8.27–8; Paus. 10.1.3–11; Plut. *Mor.* 244), dated by Herodotus (8.27.2) 'not many years' before Xerxes' invasion, and the defeat in the battle of Cersesos in Boiotia (Plut. *Vit. Cam.* 19; *Mor.* 866e–f), dated to either *c.* 570 (*Vit. Cam.* 19) or immediately before Xerxes (*Mor.* 866e–f).

<sup>118</sup> Theogn. 891–4: *Οἱ μοι ἀναλκίης ἀπὸ μὲν Κήρινθος ὄλωλεν, / Αἰγλάντου δ' ἀγαθὸν κείρεται οἰνόπεδον / οἱ δ' ἀγαθοὶ φεύγουσι, πόλιν δὲ κακοὶ διέπουσιν. / ὥς δὴ Κυβελιδῶν Ζεὺς ὀλέσειε γένος.* The verses' reference to the Lelantine War has been accepted by Constanzi (n. 8), 778–80, and Beloch (n. 8), 339, n. 1, but naturally rejected by those preferring an earlier date for the war (for recent discussion see Parker [n. 8], 82–8; Walker [n. 8], 212–20).

<sup>119</sup> See n. 1.

<sup>120</sup> M.L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford, 1985), 133–5.

which there is no evidence whatsoever. If it cannot be accepted as reliable, we must simply admit the lack of trustworthy evidence, other than that suggesting the synchronism with the Lelantine War and therefore placing the poet anywhere within the period from the late eighth to the early sixth century.

*University of Tartu*

MAIT KÕIV  
mait.koiv@ut.ee