

CYPSELUS THE BACCHIAD

STEWART IRVIN OOST

AT THE opening of the seventh century B.C., Corinth was ruled by a tightly knit aristocracy known collectively as the Bacchiads. According to legend or tradition, the Dorian or Heracleid state in Corinth had been founded by a certain Aletes, who became king. One of his successors was named Bacchis; the latter's rule was so distinguished that the royal family ever after was called Bacchiad instead of Heracleid. Finally a minor named Telestes came to the throne, but was displaced by his guardian and uncle, who was succeeded in turn by a man named Alexander (the uncle's son?). But Telestes murdered Alexander and reasserted his own royal rights, reigning for twelve years. Then Telestes was himself slain by his kinsmen, and Automenes ruled for a year. The Bacchiad family decided to dispense with kings; the whole family would rule jointly. We are also told that at that time the (adult male?) Bacchiads were more than two hundred in number; this number may be approximately correct, whether then or at some later time. After the downfall of the monarchy, the Bacchiads were accustomed each year to choose one of themselves as *prytanis*, who held the position (*taxis*) of king. This arrangement is said to have lasted for ninety years, until the oligarchy was displaced by the rule of Cypselus.¹ One notes especially that this story explains how a family that claimed to be Heracleid was

called Bacchiad,² and that the tradition says that the last true king was overthrown by murder. Much of this early "history" of Corinth may be the literary invention of the epic poet Eumelus,³ said to be a Bacchiad himself, although some students have been loath to believe that a Bacchiad would in fact have condescended to the office of a mere epic poet. In any case, the possibility of later accretions to Corinthian legend cannot be excluded.

However sparse the surviving legends of early Corinth may be, the traces of the institutional arrangements of the Bacchiad oligarchy are fainter still. Nevertheless a few pieces of evidence for such institutions do survive. A group of some two hundred men ruling a body of many thousands of persons must have an executive to carry on business from day to day. Diodorus (7. 9. 6) and Pausanias (2. 4. 4) say this chief executive was the *prytanis*. Nicholas of Damascus (*FGH*, 90, F 57. 1, 6 [from Ephorus, it is generally thought]) indicates that the principal Bacchiad at the time of Cypselus' coup d'état held the title of king, although he presumably held office for only a year at a time. It seems almost certain that the titles king and *prytanis* refer to the same official; despite Pausanias, this clearly appears to be what Diodorus (Ephorus) means. On a priori grounds, it is likely that a state of archaic Greece would preserve an official with the title of king—for religious reasons especially. An-

1. Diod. 7. 9 (from Sync. and Euseb.); cf. Paus. 2. 4. 3-4. The latter calls Telestes the last king (cf. his name); on this reckoning presumably Automenes should be counted as the first *prytanis*. In general, cf. esp. G. Busolt, "Die korinthischen Prytanen," *Hermes*, XXVIII (1893), 312-20, at 317-18. L. Whibley, *Greek Oligarchies* (New York, 1896), p. 121, not without some plausibility suggests that the royal descent of the oligarchs may have been fictitious in some cases.

2. The grave discussions of some modern scholars about whether the Bacchiads were in point of fact Heracleid are largely out of place; the point is that they were Dorians, who claimed to be descended from a common ancestor. On the Heracleid origin of the Bacchiads, see esp. É. Will, *Korinthiaka* (Paris, 1955), pp. 296-98.

3. See esp. T. J. Dunbabin, "The Early History of Corinth," *JHS*, LXVIII (1948), 59-69, at 66-67.

cient Indo-European kings had important dealings with the gods on behalf of their people, and it would be unwise to upset any such long-standing arrangement which had apparently worked well in the past. Leaving the familiar examples of Athens and other Greek states aside, one may point to Rome, where there continued to be a *rex sacrorum* or *sacrificulus* after the downfall of the monarchy despite the strongly adverse emotional reaction which the political title of king among themselves excited in Romans for centuries after the fall of the last Tarquin. There are other instances of Greek kings who were also called *prytaneis*.⁴ Even if the Bacchiads (at first or always) officially referred to their annual chosen head as *prytanis*, it is likely that people at large would call him king, as the visible head of the state, acting toward men and gods. Again to cite an example from Rome, there is reason to believe that many of the vulgar assumed that an Augusta, with all the social and emblematic accouterments of an Emperor, had a real share in the imperial government by virtue of her position.⁵

4. See Busolt-Swoboda, I, 161, n. 2, for examples.

5. Most scholars have argued for the identity of king and *prytanis* under the Bacchiad oligarchy: see *ibid.*, 347; Busolt, *Hermes*, XXVIII (1893), 318; *idem*, *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia*, I² (Gotha, 1893), 631; G. Glotz, *Histoire grecque*, I (Paris, 1925), 319; D. E. W. Wormell, "Studies in Greek Tyranny: I. The Cypselids," *Hermathena*, LXVI (1945), 1–24, at 1; Toepffer, *s.v. Bakchiadai* (1), *RE*, II (1896), 2784–87, at 2784, is in doubt about the official title. Other scholars have held that there were two officials, one, presumably for religious purposes, the king; the other, the *prytanis* (thus corresponding to king and archon at Athens): Lenschau, *s.v. Korinthus (Geschichte)*, *RE*, Suppl. IV (1924), 1007–36, at 1013; apparently C. Mossé, *La tyrannie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1969), p. 26; and esp. Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 299–300. Since there was a polemarch at Corinth under the Bacchiad oligarchy, Will is happy to point to the Athenian parallel. And it must be admitted that oligarchies headed by a *prytanis* were not uncommon; cf. Whibley, p. 153 and n. 8. Yet Athens is not Corinth, and even at Athens the tradition about the distinction between king and archon is not entirely unequivocal; cf. *Ath. Pol.* 3. 3 on the Codrids with n. 5 *ad loc.* by K. von Fritz and E. Kapp in their translation (New York, 1950), pp. 151–52.

6. H. Schaefer, *s.v. Polemarchos* (4), *RE*, Suppl. VIII (1956), 1097–1134, at 1132–33.

7. Nic. Dam. F 57. 5. Mossé, pp. 28–29, sufficiently refutes

At least by the time the oligarchy was overthrown, there was also another officer of state, an official frequently encountered in aristocratic organizations, the polemarch.⁶ We may reasonably infer from the meaning of the title itself that the polemarch ordinarily exercised the chief military command, but the scanty sources for Corinth tell us only that he was in charge of collecting fines from those convicted by the courts.⁷ There were probably other officials as well, but we are not told of them by any surviving record or tradition.

There is no explicit attestation of a Bacchiad council, but it is morally certain on a priori grounds that there must have been one. We know that there was a council of chiefs (*basileis*) in the time reflected by Homer;⁸ a council exists in every place for which there is evidence bearing on early Greek institutions of deliberation (and usually later on as well). It is impossible to think that an active oligarchy like the Bacchiads (Hdt. 5. 92. β. 1), numbering some two hundred persons—or even fifty, let us say, if we distrust Diodorus—could transact business

Will's contention (*Korinthiaka*, p. 462) that the passage of Nic. Dam. refers to judicial rather than police functions (or better, in accordance with American usage, those of court constables or marshals). There have been scholars hypercritical enough to deny the existence of the Corinthian polemarchate (exercised by Cypselus); the burden of proof would seem to rest on them and to amount to more than merely asserting (1) that Ephorus was a fourth-century historian and unreliable, and (2) that this is merely a trait of a "typical tyrant" that he gained power by using a military office. On a priori grounds (other Greek usage), one almost expects a polemarch in seventh-century Corinth. It must have been an elementary and obvious fact to Greek aristocrats/oligarchs that they must in their own self-interest avoid the concentration of power in one man's hands; after all, that was why they had by evolution or revolution done away with the kingship in its original sense.

8. E.g., *Il.* 2. 53–84; again, there are scholars who have denied that the fact is relevant for archaic Greece, and specifically that the Areopagus at Athens was a lineal descendant from "Homeric" times. This is also hypercritical. The burden of proof rests on the objectors to the essential continuity of these institutions, and it is a burden which they can hardly shoulder. It is worth noting also that, among nearly all Indo-European peoples for whom we have records of early development, a council is found to exist.

without some sort of deliberative meetings as a corporate whole, i.e., as a council.⁹ Throughout Herodotus' discussion (5. 92) of the presumed perils of Cypselus as an infant, the Bacchiads are regularly conceived as acting corporately; whatever legend or folklore or propaganda may be conflated in the account, so Herodotus or his source understood. We are told that the Bacchiads, because of two oracles, sent ten of their number to kill the child (Hdt. 5. 92. γ. 1); later the ten reported back to those who had sent them (i.e., [all] the Bacchiads who arranged affairs in Corinth to suit themselves [Hdt. 5. 92. β. 1; cf. Diod. 7. 9. 6]). In all this, there is not the slightest hint that only the leading Bacchiads, or their magistrates, resolved on this course; rather it was an act of the Bacchiads as a whole. Certainly men of the fifth century must have understood the account so; by implication no one of them would have found anything odd in it, or at variance with what he already thought or knew. We need not suppose that such a council voted and that the votes were counted; nothing more than a consensus such as that arrived at in *Iliad* 2 need be thought of.¹⁰

One of the most important and interesting of the laws or *mores* of the Bacchiad kings was their rule of inheritance. If the letter of Diodorus may be trusted (7. 9. 3; in an account of this kind far from a matter of course), the eldest of the (living) descendants of Aletes was to be king, i.e.,

not merely the eldest son of the previous king (a rule like that established by Geiseric for his successors on the throne of the Vandals in the fifth century after Christ; there are other examples in history). If this is true, then the subsequent Bacchiad kings did not necessarily reign in the sequence of father to eldest surviving son, and there may have been some legal coloring to Telestes' having been shunted aside in favor of his uncle.¹¹ More important is the endogamous character of the Bacchiad oligarchy. We are told by Herodotus (5. 92. β. 1) that the Bacchiads married only among themselves, that is, sons of Bacchiads married only the daughters of other Bacchiads, and the reverse was true also. There may be another, indirect, confirmation of this rule; Heraclides (*ap. Rose, Arist. Frag.* 611. 19) says that Bacchis had three daughters and seven sons, from whom the Bacchiads grew so mightily in number that they were called Bacchiads instead of Heracleids. Unfortunately, one cannot be sure from the construction of the Greek text whether the growth of the numbers of the Bacchiads proceeded from the sons only or from the daughters and the sons, but we shall see that the parentage accredited to Cypselus (whose mother was a Bacchiad, although his father was not) is in accord with the idea that female Bacchiads could transmit Bacchiad rights. Indeed, if they could not, it would be hard to see why, according to Herodotus, Bacchiad girls

9. So Will, on *a priori* grounds, *Korinthiaka*, p. 303; Whibley, p. 152; and A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (New York, 1963), p. 48, take it for granted that the Bacchiads had a council. H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (2 vols.; Munich, 1967), I, 15; II, 521, thinks it "questionable."

10. On voting and its origins, see J. A. O. Larsen, "The Origin and Significance of the Counting of Votes," *CP*, XLIV (1949), 164–81. Whether there was also an assembly of warriors at Corinth under the Bacchiads, as Will thinks, remains more problematical. Under a tight oligarchy such as the Bacchiads', such an assembly might be superfluous (although if one is going to wage a war, it is desirable to reconcile the majority of the fighting men to it). In any case, the problem seems not to be relevant to the purpose of this

paper, which is to try to interpret Cypselus' relations to his Bacchiad predecessors.

11. On the rule of succession of the Bacchiad kings (properly speaking), see M. Broadbent, *Studies in Greek Genealogy* (Leyden, 1968), p. 40. As Busolt, *Hermes*, XXVIII (1893), 317, points out, Diod. says that this rule of royal succession continued down to the time of Cypselus, thus implying that the "king" among the Bacchiad oligarchs was chosen by the same rule; this seems to be contradicted by the later statement that the oligarchs chose the "king" yearly. One can "forcibly" reconcile the two statements by arguing that the oldest members of the oligarchy were chosen by preference, or one can argue simply that Diodorus has made a mistake.

were expected to marry only Bacchiads. That such inheritance through females was customary in ancient Greece is obvious at Athens because of its institution of the *epikleros* or because Pericles, whose mother was an Alcmaeonid although his father was not, was nevertheless considered an Alcmaeonid. Perhaps more to the point is the fact that the epiklerate or something like it was also known in Dorian Crete and Sparta, as well as elsewhere in classical Greece.¹² In general, it was the aim of Greeks to retain the appurtenances of the *oikos* within close blood lines;¹³ a principal appurtenance of the Bacchiad *genos* was the rule of Corinth. One may well doubt that the *genos* drew any particular distinction between its public and its private functions. The Greeks of the seventh century were not yet abstract thinkers in any marked degree.¹⁴

It would probably, however, be a mistake to think that the Bacchiad oligarchy was monolithic in any sense; if it were, it must have been the only small ruling group in history of which that could be said. On purely a priori grounds, we might be fairly confident that there were factions and divisions among the ruling few. Fortunately, there exists some slight evidence that points to the same conclusion. At some time, probably in the period of the oligarchy, just possibly in the age of the kings, a Corinthian lawgiver named Pheidon (almost certainly a Bacchiad himself; from whom else would the Bacchiads have accepted laws?) legislated

for his city. Of his legislation we are told only that he ordained that the number of households or shares in the land and the number of citizens should remain constant, even if the former were unequal (Arist. *Pol.* 2, 1265b12–16). Obviously, Pheidon seems to have been a conservative reformer, who rationalized and tried to preserve the status quo.¹⁵ Surely we are entitled to see the appearance of such a lawgiver as the result of tension in the matter of rights to land and citizenship. If we are not to assume that the lots of all Bacchiads were identical in size or value (a situation of which there is not the slightest indication in the sources), then the laws of Pheidon will have preserved inequalities in land holdings among the Bacchiads themselves as well as among other Corinthians. If there is any truth in the tale that the Bacchiads sprang from the seven sons or the ten children of Bacchis, we should probably assume competition among the members of the oligarchy itself. A man named Pheidon is said to have perished in a *stasis* among the Corinthians (Nic. Dam. F 35). This is either the Corinthian Pheidon, or the Argive king of that name, who was interfering in the internal affairs of a Corinthian quarrel.¹⁶ The problem of identification seems insoluble, but unless we are to assume that the aristocracy as a monolithic unity was being opposed by rivals from outside, *stasis* which included members of the oligarchy on either side should be supposed, whether the Pheidon concerned was of Corinth or of Argos. In

12. On the right of succession through females among the Greeks, see L. Gernet, *Droit et société dans la Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1955), pp. 131–33; cf. *idem*, “Mariages de tyrans,” *Éventail de l’histoire vivante: Hommage à Lucien Febvre*, II (Paris, 1953), 41–53, at 45. Broadbent, pp. 56–57, considering the ramifications of legend and tradition about the Bacchiads, suggests that the rule of endogamy was not broken only by the marriage of Cypselus’ mother and father. Both H. Stein, *ad Hdt.* 5. 92. β. 1 (III⁴ [Berlin, 1882], 94) and W. W. How and J. Wells, *ad idem* (II [Oxford, 1928], 52), are almost certainly wrong in suggesting that the marriage of Cypselus’ parents was not completely legitimate and that Labda could not

transmit full Bacchiad rights to her son. In general, see also W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (Ithaca, 1968), pp. 202, 209, 210, 212–13, 230. On the specific case of Cypselus, see also below.

13. See Lacey, *passim*.

14. Cf. W. G. Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy* (London, 1966), p. 104.

15. Cf. Will, *Korinthiaka*, p. 318; Mossé, p. 27, n. 1.

16. So Forrest, *Democracy*, pp. 116–18. Unfortunately, neither Pheidon of Argos nor his namesake of Corinth can be dated exactly.

any case, one notes that the legislation of Pheidon of Corinth served presumably to protect the oligarchy from attack from without as well as from the more economically important members of the ruling elite within the oligarchy itself. There may be another bit of evidence which should be interpreted to indicate less than total harmony among the ruling Bacchiads on all subjects. Early in the seventh century a Bacchiad named Amphion had a lame daughter called Labda; we are told that for this reason he could find no husband for her in the select circles of the ruling family, so he married her to a non-Bacchiad and non-Dorian named Aetion.¹⁷ Obviously this marriage, which Amphion presumably arranged or to which he at least consented, was in contravention to the ordinary rule of the Bacchiad *genos* on the subject, and was also presumably an offense against either the letter or the spirit of the laws of Pheidon (if his code had been enacted at the time of the marriage). We are probably entitled to see in Amphion's act a defiance of the procedures and prejudices of his fellow *gennetai*, and a proof that the *genos* was not in fact monolithic. Since apparently Amphion escaped scot-free despite his breaking this rule or custom, we might well be tempted to guess that his act was not an isolated one, but perhaps reveals a

group opposed to at least the strict enforcement of the marriage rules of the Bacchiads.¹⁸ One may note that Aetion was almost certainly a non-Dorian nobleman, for he is provided by our sources with a distinguished ancestry. In fact, there are two versions in our sources of this aristocratic ancestry (Hdt. 5. 92. β . 1; Paus. 2. 4. 4, 5. 18. 7); the fact itself arouses suspicions of a later invention. Nevertheless, we are surely safe in assuming that whatever Aetion's ancestry, he was a distinguished and probably wealthy Corinthian. It is impossible to believe that the most "liberal" or actively dissident Bacchiad would have given even a lame daughter to anyone less. On the other hand, that Aetion should marry a lame Bacchiad, given the eminence of the *genos* as well as the inheritance laws regarding the transmission of Bacchiad rights through females, is quite understandable.¹⁹

We hardly need the assurance of a late source (Ael. *VH* 1. 19) that the Bacchiads were wealthy and given to luxurious living, by the standards of their time. Surely a part of this wealth, and probably its original base, was land. Strabo (8. 382) says that the land of Corinthia was poor; nevertheless, there are some very fertile lands near the sea—some of the best in Greece.²⁰ We can have little doubt that a

17. Hdt. 5. 92. β . 1; cf. Nic. Dam. F 57. 1–3 (from Eph., who is supposed by the source critics to have "rationalized" Hdt.; but it is also plain from a comparison of Nic. with Hdt. that Eph. or Nic. had some other source which is contaminated with the "rationalized" Hdt.). I have preferred the Dorian "Aetion" to Hdt.'s Ionic "Eetion."

18. We know nothing about Amphion except that he was a Bacchiad with a lame daughter; if we were to suppose that he was dead at the time of his daughter's marriage, then the responsibility for the marriage is merely transferred to the male guardian, who must also have been a Bacchiad and who permitted the marriage. On this lameness and the Cypselid version of early Bacchiad history, see below.

19. One might be tempted to suppose further that there could have been a group among the Bacchiads that favored a broadening of the base of the oligarchy and a rapprochement even with non-Dorians, but this remains an unprovable and therefore footless assumption. The possibility would be

favored if we could be sure that there was any basis at all to Hdt.'s story about the attempt to destroy Cypselus, the infant issue of this marriage, or especially if the Bacchiads opposed the marriage *per se*, but we simply cannot make history out of legend in this fashion. The legend undoubtedly came into being by applying the common folk tale of the wicked men trying to destroy the young prince, and the connection was provided by the folk etymology which derived the name Cypselus from *kypsele*. Nor is there any reason to believe that the Cypselid rulers themselves later invented the story. It may be worth noting, however, that not all Greek nobles were blind to changing times; witness the prejudiced polemics of Theognis against such men; presumably at Athens the nobles at least grudgingly acquiesced in Solon's accession to power and reform.

20. Cf. Dunbabin (citing Blegen), *JHS*, LXVIII (1948), 60; J. G. O'Neill, *Ancient Corinth*, I (Baltimore, 1930), 28–29.

genos which owed its power originally to developments in remote archaic times, and through conquest at that, should have occupied a sizable proportion of this best land.²¹ Strabo also tells us that the Bacchiads exploited the flourishing commerce of Corinth (8. 378), or more specifically the market (*emporion*) which Corinth, between her two seas and athwart the land route between central Greece and the Peloponnese, became. We cannot know whether this "exploiting" refers to actual participation in commerce, or to tolls on trade, or both. There is no real reason to believe that the Bacchiads would not have profited both ways. Sappho's brother was not the only Greek nobleman in archaic times who participated actively in trade. More specifically, at least the semi-legendary Demaratus, a Bacchiad of Corinth, who according to legend was to play an important role in the history of Italy, came to Etruria with his own merchant ship and cargo (Dion. Hal. *Ant. R.* 3. 46. 3). The commerce of Corinth *ca.* 700 B.C. is too safely attested by archaeology to be denied, although in their enthusiasm some historians in the past have described it in terms more appropriate to one of the great ports of England in the heyday of her imperial and commercial power. Corinth, or Athens, at her most commercially prosperous, was an emporion which flourished in an age, like

all ages before the Industrial Revolution, when wealth was mainly land, and the volume of trade and manufacturing in a relatively "nontechnological" era was at best conspicuous only by comparison with places where trade was even more primitive.²²

It seems obvious that, with a traditional agricultural economy being unsettled by the intrusion of new forms of wealth, there resulted for Corinth much the same unstable social and political situation as we know Attica was to witness around a century later. We know a little more about Attica *ca.* 600 B.C. than Corinthia *ca.* 700 B.C., but in a land smaller than Attica, with about the same sort of soil and degree of technological development, we are entitled to assume the same strains on the fabric of society—basically, growing pressure of the population upon the means of subsistence, and inequities of wealth greater than before, or at least more keenly felt.²³ Strains there certainly and obviously were: the undeniable fact of the overthrow of the Bacchiad oligarchy is proof sufficient. The Bacchiads may well have quarreled among themselves; their prestige may have been impaired by loss of control over Corcyra, their own colony, or even over neighboring Megara.²⁴ The Bacchiads would not have been slow to sense the growing restiveness of their subjects; the inevitable result was that,

21. The Corinthian settlers at Syracuse, a foundation of the Bacchiad oligarchy, notoriously established themselves as the *Gamoroi*, an aristocracy of landholders exploiting a quasi-enslaved peasantry. See the evidence collected and discussed by Busolt, *Gesch.*, I, 389 and n. 5. The fact ought not to be without value for estimating the social arrangements of the mother city at the time of the sending of the colony.

22. Discussions of the archaeological evidence are numerous: merely by way of example, see M. P. Nilsson, *The Age of the Early Greek Tyrants* (Belfast, 1936), p. 23; R. Bloch, *The Origins of Rome* (London, 1960), pp. 107–8; A. Blakeway, "Demaratus," *JRS*, XXV (1935), 129–49, at 144–45; C. Roebuck, *Ionian Trade and Colonization* (New York, 1959), pp. 77–79; Dunbabin, *JHS*, LXVIII (1948), 65; Mossé, pp. 25–26; C. G. Starr, *The Origins of Greek Civilization 1100–650 B.C.* (New York, 1961), index, s.v. "Corinth," for the whole latter part of the book, and esp. p. 364. Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 306–19 and elsewhere, although correctly recognizing the landed basis of Bacchiad wealth, probably goes too far in

denying its commercial aspects. For a brief and moderate refutation of Will, see Mossé, pp. 26–27; there is a sober estimate of Corinthian commerce and industry in H. W. Pleket, "De archaische Tyrannis," *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, LXXXI (1968), 22–53, at 32–33.

23. See esp. the cogent remarks of Forrest, *Democracy*, p. 75. There seems to be no hint of debt slavery in Corinthia, but nothing would be less surprising.

24. On Corcyra, see Thuc. I. 13. 2–5 (with Gomme, *ad loc.*), together with App. BC 2. 39, and the fact that the Cypselids, probably Periander, had to reduce Corcyra to submission. On Megara (the matter is hardly clear or well attested), see Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 7. 155 (fullest version); *Soud.* s.v. *Διὸς Κόρυθος*; Schol. Plat. *Euthyd.* 292E; Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 439; Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 359–60. Forrest, *Democracy*, pp. 108–9, may go too far in minimizing the effect of these, and possibly other, secondary causes or excuses; but surely he is right in emphasizing the underlying socio-economic conditions.

even if they had not been overbearing and arrogant before, they became so.²⁵

The end of the oligarchy came in the middle of the seventh century;²⁶ it was overthrown, not without violence, by one of its own members, Cypselus, the son of Labda and Aetion. We are explicitly told that Cypselus was a Bacchiad through his mother (Nic. Dam. F 57. 1); the statement seems confirmed by the facts that the Bacchiads recognized succession of males through female connection and that Cypselus had held the high office of polemarch while the Bacchiads still ruled and jealously limited such offices to their

own number. Unfortunately, we know next to nothing about Cypselus from the time of his birth to the time he became polemarch, and even his holding of that office has been doubted, probably wrongly.²⁷ The account of Herodotus—that the Bacchiads attempted to destroy the infant Cypselus, who had been shown by two oracles to be destined to overthrow their regime—has been demonstrated so many times to be folklore, attached to the hero because of the presumed etymology of his name, that it need not again be argued here.²⁸

We do not know the name of Cypselus'

25. Nic. Dam. F 57. 4; cf. Ael. VH 1. 19; M. White, "Greek Tyranny," *Phoenix*, IX (1955), 1–18, at 6.

26. The chronology has been debated for generations, at great length and inconclusively, among scholars. The date given in the text is approximately the traditional one from Eusebius and his predecessors among Hellenistic chronographers, i.e., ca. 655 B.C. The arguments for a date about a generation later depend upon the establishment of temporal coincidences between events in the reign of Cypselus' son Periander and other more or less well-attested events of the sixth century. The most elaborate discussion, which concludes in favor of the "low" dating (which was not entirely original with Beloch), is in Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 363–440. The present writer is quite suspicious of the ancient chronographic systems of dating by generation length (see the trenchant criticisms of R. van Compernelle, *Étude de chronologie et d'historiographie siciliotes* [Brussels, 1960]), but the evidence from the fragmentary list of Athenian archons (now in Meiggs and Lewis, *GHI*, 6. a. 2 [cf. edd. *ad loc.*, p. 11]) that Cypselus' grandson and namesake was archon toward the very beginning of the sixth century would compel a date ca. 650 for the Corinthian coup d'état, even if we did not have the "evidence" of the chronographers (which the writer refuses to accept as anything save a lucky coincidence). Most recent discussions of the Cypselids have a bibliographical note on the chronology; later than Will, see now Berve, II, 520. The most recent discussion, J. Servais, "Hérodote et la chronologie des Cypselides," *L'ant. class.*, XXXVIII (1969), 28–81, argues for the high dating, i.e., mid-seventh century, for Cypselus' coup.

27. A suggestion about methodology may not be amiss here. The Greeks were an imaginative and inventive people who used those talents not only in philosophy and literature, but in history as well. Accounts of earlier periods written in a much later time were likely to be extensively contaminated by such inventions; a fortiori this is true for the earliest periods of Greek history, where most of the extant evidence is at best, or earliest, Herodotean. Many scholars have pushed doubt beyond the limits of reason (this is the principal fault of G. Porzio, *I Cipselidi* [Bologna, 1912], which leaves us without much more than the existence of the Cypselid rule at Corinth). Specifically, instances in the account of any given "tyrant" have been rejected wherever they present a feature that is common to other famous tyrants. But tyrants certainly did have features in common (even more, later ones would have imitated the example set by earlier ones); to deny this is to

deny tyranny itself as a phenomenon of Greek history. As a *reductio ad absurdum*, we may inquire whether one should reject the different colored shirts of the followers of the fascist dictators of the 1930's on the ground that this is a mere result of the chroniclers of one of them copying the chroniclers of another. Certainly such invented details ought to be rejected when found, but merely that they happen to be specific items in accord with a generalization of common characteristics or habits among tyrants seems insufficient ground for rejection. In the case of Cypselus, that tyrants frequently used a military office as a road to power ought not to be, without other proof, sufficient reason for rejecting the authenticity of the statement that he was polemarch—especially when the source lays emphasis on the nonmilitary aspects of the office as a way to court popularity. Corinthian nobles will have remembered the tradition of the history of their city; surely many of them, and many other Corinthians, could write. We know that Periander wrote gnomic poetry, like Theognis and Solon among others (Athen. 14. 632d; cf. Diog. Laërt. 1. 97; Berve, I, 24); even if these poems had been supplanted or augmented by forgeries by Athen.'s time, why should we deny their existence? We cannot prove that such things were used directly or indirectly by later historians such as Ephorus (or Herodotus), but the possibility certainly exists and ought not to be dismissed out of hand. On possible sources for early Corinthian history or tradition, see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristoteles und Athen*, II (Berlin, 1893), 23 and n. 21; but cf. the criticism of Porzio, pp. 98–100. Despite assertions of some past scholars, we do not know that Aristotle simply copied Ephorus for early Corinth (cf. Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 462–64); one may add that the *Ath. Pol.* is not a great work, but despite mistakes and some internal contradictions, it is not an extremely bad account of early Athenian history. No one can cavil at its use of Solon's poetry (however much he may scoff at "the constitution of Draco"). At least the author of the *Ath. Pol.* worked with several sources, and most of his information is valid, his deductions frequently correct. We ought to be entitled to assume that similar care was used by Aristotle or a pupil for Corinth. On Ephorus' own use of multiple sources for earlier Greek history, cf. G. L. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 117–19 and 135.

28. E.g., see R. Crahay, *La littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote* (Paris, 1956), p. 238 (C. is hypercritical of the oracles themselves); M. Delcourt, *Oedipe, ou la légende du*

Bacchiad mother; that her real name was "Labda," meaning "lame," is to be rejected out of hand, as scholars have long realized.²⁹ We are told that the non-Dorian nobleman, Cypselus' father, Aetion, came from the "deme" of Petra. The whereabouts of this place are unknown.³⁰ The terrain of Corinth, indeed of all Greece, is such that the name is a possibility for a village or a district almost anywhere. In connection with the story of the Bacchiads' attempt to assassinate the infant Cypselus, Herodotus recites three "oracles" concerning Cypselus, and delivered presumably by the god or priests of Delphi. The first (in Herodotus' order of mention; this one is in 5. 92. β . 2) told Aetion that Labda would bear a stone which would fall upon the "monarchic men" of Corinth (there can be no doubt that the Bacchiads are meant) and "set

Corinth aright" (or "punish" her).³¹ The second oracle, actually given by "dramatic date" before the first (Hdt. 5. 92. β . 3), had warned the Bacchiads that an eagle (Aetion³² means "eagle") in the rocks (obviously Petra) would bear a ferocious lion, and in vague but dire terms warned the Corinthians to beware. The folktale had it that, putting the two oracles together (the composer of the oracles obviously thought that the puns were self-evident), the Bacchiads determined to destroy Labda's offspring in Petra ("Rockville"). Hence the concealment of the child born to Aetion by Labda. The child was named Cypselus, almost certainly not in connection with a Greek word meaning "jar," or "chest" (probably a late folk etymology), but perhaps with reference to the Greek word for "sandpiper."³³ In fact, the name had also been borne by a legendary king of

conquérant (Liège and Paris, 1944), pp. 16–22; H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1956), I, 116. The story is in Hdt. 5. 92. β . 1– ϵ . 2; cf. Nic. Dam. F 57. 2–4; Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 21 (163F); Paus. 5. 17. 5.

29. That she was lame in fact has also been contested, but as will be proposed below, the relevant argument should probably be reversed. The *Etym. magn.* 199, s.v. $\beta\lambda\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{o}s$, tells us that this is the meaning of the name "La(m)bda" (i.e., the fanciful application of the name of the letter). In my attempts to determine exactly (a quite trivial point) how she was lame, I have been told by the *Etym. magn.* that the name refers to the feet's being turned outward; Professor D. Georgakas kindly tells me that the word $\beta\lambda\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{o}s$ in modern Greek means "knock-kneed," and it is so defined, in effect, in the *Mega Lexikon* of Demetarakos; but my colleague Professor B. Einarson suggests that the name refers to one foot's being shorter than the other (like a common epichoric form of the letter La(m)bda). The *Etym. magn.* probably had no certain information and was etymologizing on a popular level. At any rate, Labda was lame, in whatever way. G. Curtius, *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*⁹ (Leipzig, 1879), p. 655, argued that, etymologically, "Labda" is equivalent to "Lais" (unfortunately the most notorious bearer of that name at Corinth appears to have been an immigrant); it is, to put it mildly, extremely unlikely that the Corinthians of Labda's day could have etymologized from "Lais" to "Labda." Delcourt, p. 20, suggests with considerable probability that "Labda" was a label from popular slang. What, if any, is the relationship of this name, or fact, to Battus the Lame, king of Cyrene (Hdt. 4. 161. 1), or to Oedipus (cf. "Laius," "Labdacus"), the present writer is totally incompetent either to deduce or divine.

30. E. Meyer, s.v. *Petra* (I), *RE*, XIX: 1 (1937), 1165–66, at 1165, for possibilities, theories, and bibliography. The sole source appears to be Hdt. 5. 92. β . 1. Crahay, p. 235, knows that the name is fictitious, and points out that we have no (other) source which mentions a deme of Petra. It is true that

we have puns on the name in the oracles quoted in Hdt. 5. 92. β . 2–3. The word *demos* is used as early as the *Iliad* to indicate a territorial district (LSJ, s.v.); the implicit principle, that every word not mentioned in a given connection more than once (including, presumably, mention in inscriptions) cannot be right, is not sound; *hapax legomena* do occur. We have so little information about the internal arrangements and institutions of Corinth in any period of her history that to reject as fictitious such a term on such grounds constitutes the weakest kind of argument from silence. There seems, further, no adequate reason to argue that the Delphic oracle did not use puns, whether the oracles were fictitious or not. Crahay, p. 238, seems unduly pessimistic in thinking, largely because of the puns, that the name "Aetion" is an invention (as well as the names of other persons in Cypselus' ancestry). No one after the fall of the Cypselids would have any reason to invent a flattering genealogy for Cypselus; and if the oracles do date from Cypselid times, then they can hardly have deceived, or expected to deceive, Corinthians (or Athenians, see below) about the names or identities of Cypselus' father and mother.

31. W. den Boer, "The Delphic Oracle Concerning Cypselus," *Mnemosyne*, Ser. 4, X (1957), 339, emphasizes the characteristic ambiguity of the oracle (or its imitator) in using this term; cf. Berve, II, 523.

32. A possible variant "Aetos" as Aetion's name may be implied in the third oracle (Hdt. 5. 92. ϵ . 2) by the patronymic "Aetides," but the variant may merely exist for metrical convenience.

33. This can almost be said to be *communis opinio*; cf., e.g., Delcourt, pp. 21–22; G. Roux, "Cypsele," *REA*, LXV (1963), 279–89. I must confess to some reservations about a man named "Eagle" giving the name "Sandpiper" (a kind of swallow) to his son; but some totemistic significance, or similar idea, if the name did actually mean "Sandpiper," and if his parents were consciously thinking of that meaning, may well escape us. One can only admire the ingenuity of P. N. Ure,

Arcadia.³⁴ On the face of it, the oracles are obviously so definite, especially with their puns, that they can only be *post eventum* fabrications. Obviously, they glorify and legitimize the rule of Cypselus and his successors, although a third oracle, said to have been delivered to Cypselus when he was a man, and hailing him as king of Corinth (Hdt. 5. 92. ε. 2), has been tampered with after the fall of the Cypselids from power at Corinth, for its third verse limits their rule to the lifetime of Cypselus and his son, but excludes the third generation.³⁵ On the principle of *cui bono*, we may date these "oracles" to the time of Cypselid rule, and attribute their authorship, if not to Cypselus himself, at least to those favorably disposed to him. As such, they offer invaluable contemporary evidence that Cypselus wished to appear to his subjects as legitimate, god-favored ruler of Corinth.

Herodotus implies (5. 92. δ. 2–ε. 2) and Ephorus states (Nic. Dam. F 57. 3) that Aetion (we hear no more of Labda from any source) went into exile. According to Ephorus, Cypselus grew to boyhood at Olympia under the protection of Zeus and thereafter lived (presumably while the boy was growing to manhood) at Cleonae.

The Origin of Tyranny (Cambridge, 1922 = New York, 1962), pp. 184–213. He argues that "Cypselus" means "potter," and that Cypselus was the head of a movement of artisans against the Bacchiad aristocrats; the argument is unpersuasive.

34. Paus. 4. 3. 6 and 8. J. Schubring, *De Cypselo Corinthiorum tyranno* (Göttingen, 1862), p. 14, argues with great mythological learning, but unconvincingly, that there is a traceable connection; see also Berve, II, 522, who remarks that the same name may even be found in Mycenaean Greek. If so, it is almost certainly pre-Dorian. One may note that a minor proof, not ordinarily noticed, that the second oracle is in fact *post eventum* is the fact that the child was not named something like Leon or Leonidas.

35. On the oracles, see esp. Crahay, p. 239 (who holds that the first two oracles are, in effect, doublets and part of the same forgery—which is probable); on the *communis opinio* that the oracles date from Cypselid times (possibly from Cypselus' own lifetime), see Will, *Korinthiaka*, p. 451, with citation of earlier discussions; Parke and Wormell, I, 117. On the third oracle in particular, see Crahay, pp. 240–41 (who rejects the whole third oracle as post-Cypselid), followed by Berve, II, 522–23. But surely Forrest, *Democracy*, p. 111, goes too far in believing that the third oracle was delivered to Cypselus while

Olympia might well be "deduced" from the favorable relations of Cypselus, once in power, with the shrine of Zeus there. But why Cleonae, among the least distinguished of all Greek *poleis*? The only relationship that we can suppose or guess is its proximity to Corinth. But why not Megara, or even Sicyon? One strongly suspects an independent source, and that source can only have been favorable to Cypselus (or the Cypselids), for it specifies that even as a boy Cypselus was distinguished in physical form and *arete*. In turn, one is almost driven to think, *prima facie*, that Cypselus may well have grown up away from Corinth, and returned to take his rightful place among the Bacchiads only as a man grown, for any account favorable to the Cypselids (and especially to Cypselus himself, who never attained even questionable rank among the Seven Sages as his son Periander did) must antedate the fall of the Cypselids, given the general odium which attached to their name thereafter.³⁶

At any rate, the next testimony which deserves some confidence finds Cypselus serving as polemarch at Corinth, after Delphi, it is said, had by the third "oracle" made clear his distinguished future as ruler of his native town.³⁷ The

the Bacchiad oligarchy still ruled [!]. On the Cypselid authenticity of the first two lines, see Schubring, p. 66; E. Wilisch, "Spuren altkorinthischer Dichtung ausser Eumelos," *Jahrb. für class. Philologie*, XXVII/CXXIII (1881), 161–76, at 170; Parke and Wormell, I, 119–20; R. W. Macan, *ad* Hdt. 5. 92. ε. 2 (I [London, 1895], 239); P. Knapp, *Die Kypseliden und die Kypseloslade* (Separatabdruck aus dem *Korrespondenz-Blatt für die Gelehrten- und Realschulen Württembergs* [Tübingen, 1888]), p. 8 (who is inclined to accept even the third line). There is yet a fourth "oracular" utterance concerning Cypselus (Oen. *ap. Eus. PE* 5. 35 = Parke and Wormell, II, 6, No. 9); since it is hostile, saying he will bring many calamities on Corinth, it is probably post-Cypselid, or at least a forgery of his enemies.

36. Further speculation might lead one to think that Aetion himself may have been a trader, who found it prudent to absent himself and his family from a Corinth where (a faction of) the Bacchiads was ill-disposed. But this must remain only speculation, for it goes too far beyond the evidence we have.

37. Hdt. 5. 92. ε, "rationalized," as modern critics put it, by Eph. in Nic. Dam. F 57. 4.

ultimate source goes on to tell us that, once the manly, moderate, and popular-minded Cypselus had returned to Corinth, he quickly became the object of general admiration, especially in contrast with the other, hateful Bacchiads. Again one notes the adulatory tone which must bespeak a contemporary or nearly contemporary ultimate source. It is particularly interesting to note the emphasis laid on Cypselus' membership in the Bacchiad family, although the hero was a good Bacchiad. If, then, the ultimate source, which is conflated in Ephorus with the "rationalized" version of Herodotus, is contemporary, we ought with some confidence to accept its further assertion that Cypselus became polemarch. Not even an enthusiastic encomium would lie about a gross fact which must necessarily have been known to people in general. Hence, if this reasoning is correct, the existence of the office itself in Bacchiad Corinth is also proved. As polemarch (surely we are dealing with "official" history) Cypselus became even more beloved—in contrast to the horrid oligarchs—and was the best, or most noble, polemarch that Corinth had ever had. The source of this overpowering affection was not Cypselus' valiant leading of his troops in battle, but his mild discharge of his civil duties: the polemarch was to imprison or fetter those convicted until they paid up (and he derived a portion of their fines as his recompense). Cypselus never did this, but accepted the pledges of bondsmen, even stood as bondsman himself in some cases, and never accepted his due portion of the fines.³⁸

38. Nic. Dam. F 57. 4–5. Some of this, one admits, sounds too "modern" for the seventh century, but there should be no difficulty in accepting some "interpretation" or "explanation" in the version that has passed from the primary source directly or indirectly to Eph., thence directly or indirectly to Nic. Dam., thence directly or indirectly to these medieval extracts. If one can agree that the origin of this highly favorable version must be contemporary, or nearly contemporary, with Cypselus himself, then it seems hypercritical to reject such an elementary fact as the holding of the office of polemarch, and its ad-

The same source goes on to say that Cypselus saw that the Corinthians were ill-disposed to the oligarchs, but were without a leader, so Cypselus, encouraged by the oracle which had foretold his destiny and therefore his success, "demagogued" the majority (*plethos*), whose confidence he already enjoyed, and conspired against the oligarchy. He gathered a group of adherents about him and slew the current Bacchiad "king," who, conveniently for those whose moral convictions might otherwise be offended by murder, is stigmatized as "lawless."³⁹ The "people" thereupon set him up as king (Nic. Dam. F 57. 6). There can be no doubt that Cypselus' formal title was king, partly because of this statement, mainly because he is so called in the third contemporary oracle (Hdt. 5. 92. ε. 2 [*basileus*]; in his own proper person Hdt. simply says [*ibid.*] that he became tyrant).

This account gives rise to several important questions, most of which have been discussed by previous scholars. The Greek verb "to be a demagogue" means to be a leader of the people, or some large fraction of it, especially those beneath the hereditary nobles or aristocracy in social rank. Its use for seventh-century Corinth is certainly anachronistic and undoubtedly derives from "interpretation" which entered this account at some time in the lengthy history of its transmission from author to author before it reached the form in which we have it (Arist. *Pol.* 5, 1310b29–31, 1315b27 also calls Cypselus a "demagogue"). But there is considerable reason for use of the term: the very fact

ministration in such fashion as to gain popularity (stated in detail rather than as a mere verdict). For argumentation on the question of Cypselus' polemarchate: Andrewes, p. 46; Will, *Korinthiaka*, p. 461; Schaefer, s.v. *Polemarchos*, *RE*, Suppl. VIII (1956), 1121–22; Knapp, p. 12; Pleket, *Tijdsch. v. Geschied.*, LXXI (1968), 35.

39. *Paranomos*; I hesitate to lay emphasis on the basic meaning of this word, "contrary to the laws (or constitution)," "illegal," hence "illegally ruling," although it would agree with the theory of Cypselus' rule advanced in this paper.

that Cypselus overthrew the oligarchy and ruled successfully for the rest of his life shows that the old regime had become unpopular; further, there can be no doubt that Cypselus himself was generally popular, or made himself so during his reign. That he had no bodyguard (Arist. *Pol.* 5, 1315b28; Nic. Dam. F 57. 8; cf. Heraclid. *ap.* Rose, Arist. *Frag.* 611. 20) is ample testimony to the fact. Likewise *plethos*, "majority" or "multitude," frequently a synonym for the (common) people in general in later Greek, ought not, because it is an anachronistic word, to cause any difficulty.⁴⁰ It is usually, and probably rightly, held that the mainstay of Cypselus, in his coup d'état as well as during his reign as a whole, was the hoplite middle class. Unfortunately, the fact most often offered in support of this theory probably does not prove it: it is frequently said nowadays that Cypselus had the support of the army, that is, the hoplites, because he needed no bodyguard. But that is probably irrelevant. Bodyguards do not suffice as protection against an army as such; they serve rather to guard against conspiracies or assassination by indi-

viduals or small groups.⁴¹ Yet, on a priori grounds, if the Corinthian proletariat was not politically conscious yet (we have no evidence that it became so to any important degree until some two hundred fifty years after Cypselus' coup), it is likely that the hoplite class was, and as polemarch Cypselus had been their leader. Furthermore, the story about fines and securities probably implies benefits conferred primarily upon the middle class; such things are beyond the scope of the truly poor in any age. We may also believe that non-Bacchiad nobles, both Dorian, or claiming to be, and non-Dorian in origin, would have been "politically conscious," as far as the concept has relevance in mid-seventh century Greece, and would willingly have supported an attempt to overthrow the monopolists of power and social status, especially if they thought the attempt had a good chance of succeeding.⁴²

Finally, if there is any validity in the suggestion made above about Bacchiad factions, some of the Bacchiads are likely to have supported Cypselus, and others probably did not offer any effective

40. Arist. *Pol.* 4, 1297b16–26 says that hoplite polities in earlier times were called democracies. Unfortunately the word is not nearly so early as the seventh century, although *demos* in that sense might be (LSJ, *s.v.*). We cannot be sure that Aristotle has not been affected by the anti-democratic, oligarchic propaganda of the fourth century; the milder oligarchs of that time maintained that they were advocating true democracy and manufactured all sorts of "historical documents" to support their case. See A. Fuks, *The Ancestral Constitution* (London, 1953). Methodologically speaking, however, a verbal anachronism in something that does not claim to be an original document by itself proves nothing about the authenticity or inauthenticity of the fact described. With reference to the principal subject of argument here, the use of a word in an anachronistic meaning, such as *tyrannos*, proves or disproves nothing about the fact represented. There may well have been mob scenes, which included some of the socially lowest among the populace of Corinth, attendant upon the overthrow of the oligarchy (or later, upon the overthrow of the Cypselids); even if this fact were attested, it would not prove that such elements were politically active, any more than the mob which successfully demanded the head of Cleander before the gates of the Emperor's suburban villa in the reign of Commodus was playing a truly political role.

41. Otherwise, if one can accept the story, after trying to

rule with a bodyguard, why did Pisistratus at Athens later disarm, or attempt to disarm, the people—if any examples are needed? The hoplites had arms, which as individuals they could use to assassinate the king, but so did the nobles; and even the poorest could presumably lay hands on something with a piercing point or a cutting edge, with which he could kill, if he was determined to make the attempt. The army, loyal to the President of the United States, does not protect him from assassination or conspiracy; insofar as he is so protected it is by the Secret Service or the FBI.

42. It can be only a guess, but one notes that the three pro-Cypselus oracles in Hdt. actually refer primarily to the coup d'état or its results; could they have been invented immediately before that event to reassure doubters, rather than to justify it afterwards? That the ultimate source of Nic. Dam. F 37. 6 apparently said so is no proof whatsoever; the statement is obviously Cypselus-serving. On the groups supporting Cypselus, see Berve, I, 16; Andrewes, pp. 36 and 49; Pleket, *Tijdsch. v. Geschied.*, LXXXI (1968), 29, 34–35; White, *Phoenix*, IX (1955), 6; H. T. Wade-Gery, *CAH*, III, 550; O'Neill, p. 122; Forrest, *Democracy*, pp. 112–15. On the economic and social status of the hoplites, see A. M. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks* (Ithaca, 1967), pp. 48–49, 57, 62, 68, 77; F. E. Adcock, *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War* (Berkeley, 1962), p. 5.

resistance to the overthrow of the oligarchy. It remained, however, to deal with the members of the oligarchy as such. Herodotus (5. 92. ε. 2) tells us that Cypselus exiled many of the Corinthians, deprived many others of their property, and executed many more. One is reminded of Cassius Dio's summary of the repression of his enemies by Octavian after his victory over Antony (51. 2. 4): "He fined many, he also slew many, and some he even spared." Presumably first and foremost among the persons thus punished were the oligarchs. Ephorus (Nic. Dam. F 57. 7) specifically mentions that Cypselus exiled the Bacchiads and "confiscated" their estates (and property). Polyaeus,⁴³ in a passage generally (and in the main rightly) regarded as unhistorical, tells us that Cypselus by a ruse got "the most distinguished" and "the most nobly born" Bacchiads away from Corinth and out of the country and, by forbidding their return, exiled them. There may be a vestige of truth in this account. It is easy to assume that the leaders among the oligarchs were those who were slain or exiled and had their property seized; presumably one should also include their most devoted and anti-Cypselus adherents among the Bacchiad lesser fry. But it seems quite unlikely that all the Bacchiads (especially those who may have aided or favored the coup d'état) were thus harshly treated by the new king. Some rather tenuous evidence suggests that there still remained Bacchiads in Corinth after Cypselus' seizure of power. When the Corcyraeans founded Epidamnus, according to Greek practice they sought and obtained an oecist from their

mother city, Corinth; this oecist was one Phalius, a Heracleid, which almost certainly means a Bacchiad.⁴⁴ It has also been recently suggested—not without some cogency or at least plausibility—that Cypselus could not rule alone without some assistance in government of a sort that the hoplites were not qualified to give;⁴⁵ of all Corinthians, the Bacchiads, if they were willing, were best qualified to render this assistance. Their conversion to the service of the king may have been rendered easier by the justification of the "oracles," or by other justifications (see below) which Cypselus adduced to support his power.⁴⁶

Thus the Bacchiad oligarchy was overthrown and Cypselus seized power as king of Corinth. Herodotus (5. 92. ε. 2) and his successors, both ancient and modern, have almost universally held that Cypselus became tyrant of Corinth, although some of these writers, unlike Herodotus, have explicitly or implicitly characterized his rule as mild or even statesmanlike. It is the purpose of this paper to argue the contrary—that Cypselus' rule was mild, but not statesmanlike, and that he did not become "tyrant" in any sense save the harmless and original one in which *tyrannos* is simply a synonym for "king." It is to advance the argument of this thesis that the rule of the Bacchiads, their ancestry, and their overthrow have once again been analyzed here. It will be argued in what follows that Cypselus wished his seizure of power to be understood as the restoration of the true and ancestral monarchy of the Bacchiads, that the overwhelming majority of his subjects accepted

43. 5. 31. E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alterthums*, II¹ (Stuttgart, 1893), 622, thought that Eph. was also the source of this passage; it is uncertain why.

44. Thuc. 1. 24. 2 (with Gomme *ad loc.*, I. 159); cf. O'Neill, p. 122. It would probably be going too far beyond the evidence to suggest that perhaps the only Bacchiad actually to perish because of the coup was the unfortunate "king," although hostility among ancient historians was quite capable of

multiplying one instance into many.

45. Forrest, *Democracy*, pp. 114–15.

46. The exiled Bacchiads fled, we are told, in all directions: to Sparta (Plut. *Lys.* 1. 2, with Jacoby *ad Nic. Dam. F 57. 7* [II C, 249]) and even to Italy (Demaratus, e.g., Liv. 1. 34. 2). In general, cf. Paus. 2. 4. 4; Berve, I, 17; II, 523; Busolt, *Gesch.*, I, 640–41, 643 and n. 3.

this interpretation, and even that Cypselus himself may well have believed that this was what he was doing. This is not to deny the personal ambitions of Cypselus as a man greedy for power, or to argue that he was primarily motivated by idealistic reasons—he probably was not.

Modern scholarly discussions of Cypselus' seizure of power have regularly failed to comment upon the circumstance incidental thereto, i.e., that he killed the last Bacchiad *prytanis*/king. Yet since this man held only an annual office as the mere executive (secretary?) of the Bacchiads, who themselves administered the whole force and direction of the government, it seems odd that Cypselus should have slain him (perhaps with his own hand), and that this murder should have been the principal, externally obvious feature of his coup d'état.⁴⁷ Hence it seems significant that according to tradition, as noted above, Telestes, the last Bacchiad king, killed his predecessor, only to be killed in turn by his own kinsmen. Since his successor Automenes reigned for only a year, he was regarded apparently as the first *prytanis*/king.⁴⁸ It is difficult to see any practical reason why Cypselus should have killed the last *prytanis*/king; but if the murder was symbolical, it becomes comprehensible. Just as the true Bacchiad monarchy had been violently overthrown by the oligarchs, so they and their "king" were overthrown by violence and the true Heracleid-Bacchiad monarchy restored in

right and symbol. If this interpretation is correct, then the tradition of the violent overthrow of the earlier monarchy truly antedates Cypselus, and could even be authentic. And if the ancient rule of royal succession had not been from father to son, it would be the easier for Cypselus to push his claim. It is doubtful, however, that at the time of his accession he was in fact the eldest living male Bacchiad; that would be too great a coincidence. We may also instantly reject the hypothesis that Cypselus killed all Bacchiads senior to himself; such a crime would surely have been remembered by the predominantly anti-Cypselid tradition. Besides, there is nothing in the tradition to make us think Cypselus was a monster, and much to lead us to the opposite conclusion.

The slaying of the *prytanis*/king, however, is far from being the only indication that Cypselus wanted to rule, or to appear to rule, as a genuine Bacchiad king, as opposed to the discredited oligarchy which had overthrown the ancestral monarchy. We have noted that the (third) oracle in Herodotus gave Cypselus the title of king, *basileus*, which goes back to Mycenaean Greek (whether the *pa₂-si-re-u* was at that time subordinate to the *wanax* or not). Moreover, the (first) oracle refers to the "monarchic men" who rule Corinth, i.e., the Bacchiads.⁴⁹ Thus in these pro-Cypselus oracles, the *basileus* Cypselus is contrasted with the "monarchs." Aside from the oracles, which are probably older

47. Eph. in Nic. Dam. F 57. 1, 6. Although in some other cultures, beliefs have existed that the king must be killed when he is no longer fit, and even that his murderer should succeed him, J. G. Frazer was able to find no direct parallel to the King at Nemi elsewhere in Greco-Roman culture; cf. *The Golden Bough* (1 vol. ed.; New York, 1940), pp. 1–2, 265–83, 703–4. The phenomenon is mentioned here only to indicate a canvass of the possibilities.

48. This seems to be the implication of Diod. 7. 9. 5–6 (cf. Paus. 2. 4. 4), but the *Exc. lat. barb.*, ed. A. Schoene (Berlin, 1875), in Appendix 6 to his ed. of Eus. *Chron.*, p. 219, apparently regards Automenes as the last king and credits him with a four-year reign; this latter version may be independent,

or it may rest on a misapprehension of the presentation of Automenes' name as the successor of Telestes, whose "name" certainly indicates he should be the last. The other versions of Eus. *Chron.* and works based on it list Automenes as the last king, but with a reign of one year (see these versions in Schoene's ed., with a bewildering variety of page and col. numbers in text and appendixes). On Telestes as the last true Bacchiad king, see Busolt, *Hermes*, XXVIII (1893), 312–14.

49. Such doubts as those of V. Costanzi, "L'oracolo di Aezione," *Riv. fil.*, XXXII (1904), 10–40, at 11–12 and 16, are surely misplaced; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 4, 1292b4–10, where "tyrannical" (in the pejorative sense), i.e., monarchical, oligarchies are defined.

still, the first use of the word *mo(u)narchos* (-oi) is in Theognis.⁵⁰ There can be no doubt that in both the oracle and in Theognis the word is used pejoratively of men "who rule alone," or "by themselves."⁵¹ In other words, in propaganda uttered in his favor, Cypselus is king (the ancestral title of the Bacchiad rulers); those he overthrew and supplanted at Corinth are stigmatized, in effect, as illegitimate.

Cypselus' hereditary, legitimate, Bacchiad kingship is probably confirmed, at least as propaganda, by another curious circumstance. Labda was lame, but so was Bacchis himself (Heraclid. *ap.* Rose, Arist. *Frag.* 611. 19). This is such a coincidence that it raises grave doubts (apart from any other consideration) that it is veracious; it seems probable that the lameness of one of the two is an invention. There can be no doubt that the invention is of the lameness of Bacchis, who may well be an entirely fictitious person created to explain the *genos* name Bacchiad.⁵² There can be hardly any doubt that Cypselus' mother, whatever her real name, was a real person, who must have been well known, together with her infirmity, in Bacchiad Corinth. Hence it must be the lameness of the legendary Bacchis which was invented.⁵³ Only one reason why Bacchis should have been said to be lame readily occurs, that it profited Cypselus thus to utilize the historical fact of his mother's lameness not only to emphasize his membership in the

Bacchiad *genos*, but probably also to imply his direct descent from the revered Bacchis—again, that is, to show himself a legitimate king of the true line.⁵⁴

Yet obviously the descendants of Cypselus are called Cypselids, not Bacchiads, by both ancients and moderns.⁵⁵ But if we regard Cypselus' propaganda (or belief) as arguing that he was a new Bacchis, this is quite understandable. The tradition says (one hesitates between the arguments favoring its existence before Cypselus and its invention by Cypselus or the Cypselids) that the kings (and *genos*) following Bacchis were called by his name because he was more distinguished than those who preceded him (Diod. 7. 9. 4); hence Bacchiads rather than Heracleids. The implication is that Cypselus was the equal of Bacchis, or a new Bacchis; hence *his* descendants were Cypselids. At the same time, Cypselus dissociated himself from the name used by the former oligarchs. Both his supporters and his enemies would use the new designation for his family, but with different connotations. That the name "Cypselidae" is contemporary seems proved by a passage in Pseudo-Theognis.⁵⁶ Yet Cypselus was a "tyrant." This is not an objection, however, to his being a legitimate king; the word is non-Greek (Lydian?) and was originally only a synonym for *basileus*; apparently the first Greek to use the word "tyranny" was Archilochus, an approximate contem-

50. 52; cf. context, 39–52; note that Diehl³ follows the best MSS in reading the plural form, and the word may very well in view of its context refer to a group of men concurrently, rather than successively, existing; if so, it presents an exact parallel to the probably earlier use in the oracle in Hdt. Solon *Eleg.* 10. 3 clearly uses the word in a pejorative sense; cf. Costanzi, *Riv. fil.*, XXXII (1904), 11.

51. So, for the oracle, Schubring, p. 50, followed by Will, *Korinthiaka*, p. 450; cf. Knapp, p. 7; Forrest, *Democracy*, p. 111; in general, see Busolt-Swoboda, I, 382, n. 1.

52. Toepfler, *s.v.* *Bakchiadai* (I), *RE*, II (1896), 2785.

53. Thus reversing the argument of Knapp, p. 6, who used it to demonstrate that Labda was not a Bacchiad, and therefore that Cypselus himself did not belong to the *genos*—despite all the evidence which both implicitly and explicitly

says that he did.

54. We may probably detect the same emphasis on Bacchiad descent in the statement (Diog. Laërt. 1. 94) that Cypselus' son Periander was a Heracleid.

55. On the question whether in Greek usage the "X-idae" of a given name include the possessor of the name itself, see J. Servais, "Le 'colosse' des Cypselides," *L'ant. class.*, XXXIV (1965), 144–74, at 149–51.

56. 894. It would be otiose to will the destruction of the Cypselids after their fall from power in Corinth and elsewhere. It is the generally received, and undoubtedly correct, opinion that numbers of early gnomic verses were attached in the course of time to the authentic ones composed by Theognis.

porary of Cypselus, and he used it probably merely in the sense of "kingship."⁵⁷ If Cypselus, seizing power in the middle of the seventh century B.C., was not the first Greek *tyrannos*, he was certainly among the very first. Under the circumstances we may well inquire how, not only before the rise of the idea of a "tyrant" as a ruler who seized power by force, illegally or unconstitutionally, but also long before the invention of political theory by the Greeks, the Bacchiad Cypselus and others would have conceived of what he was doing. As a Bacchiad, and a man who must have been overweeningly ambitious, politically speaking (it seems obvious that no man who did what Cypselus did could have been without great political ambition), how should or could he or his contemporaries envision his seizure of power except as a restoration of the true, ancient monarchy in Corinth? One is reminded of the example of Pheidon of Argos, who, whenever he lived, obviously conceived of or rationalized his seizure of real royal power as a return to the proper, ancient state of affairs. Later, the forceful and unpopular policies of Cypselus' son Periander caused him to be regarded, and hated, not merely as a tyrant (the word rapidly acquired unfavorable connotations, while "monarch" came frequently to be used in a neutral or even a good sense), but as an archetypical tyrant, although in some quarters he was numbered among the Seven Sages. And since Periander was what he was because of what his father had been, Cypselus too came to be thought of as a tyrant in the bad sense; Herodotus clearly so regarded him, although the historian's anti-tyrant bias (he had suffered from the tyrants of Halicarnassus) fails entirely to mask the fact that the tradition he was using was originally predominantly favorable to Cyp-

selus. If this argument is correct, Cypselus' coup was not viewed as a revolution either in his propaganda, or by himself, or by his contemporaries (perhaps even his adversaries), but as a counterrevolution, a return to the "good old" pre-oligarchic days. His success, and almost certainly the success of this view, is demonstrated by his having no need for a bodyguard. The traditional kings of early archaic Greece had not been protected by bodyguards. *Sic semper tyrannis* had not yet been conceived.

There is reason to think that Cypselus not only took power as a Bacchiad, but also ruled as a Bacchiad, now "Cypselid" king. The name of the Bacchiad *prytanis*/king whom Cypselus slew is unfortunately transmitted to us by Nicholas of Damascus (F 57. 1, 6) first as Hippoclides, then a few lines later as Patroclides. But the Cypselids intermarried with the noble Philaid family of Athens; the name Cypselus recurs in that family at Athens.⁵⁸ And the name Hippoclides, as is well known, also occurs among the Philaids.⁵⁹ It has been argued that one cannot use the relationship of the Philaids to the Cypselids to decide in favor of "Hippoclides" instead of "Patroclides" in the text of Nicholas. But if, as argued here, Cypselus was, and regarded himself as, a true Bacchiad, then the transmission of the name "Hippoclides" to the Philaids seems explained, and preference must be given to "Hippoclides" as the true name of the last Bacchiad *prytanis*/king. True, Cypselus killed him, but in view of the well-known repetition of the same name in various generations of a noble Greek family, there is no reason to think that the name could not also have reappeared elsewhere in the Bacchiad stemma, even, conceivably, in the ancestry of Labda, and therefore of

57. LSJ, s.vv. *τύραννος* and *τυραννίς*; Andrewes, pp. 21–22.

58. See above, n. 26.

59. Cf. Jacoby *ad* Nic. Dam. F 57. 1 (II C, 248).

Cypselus himself (this is intended as a purely speculative possibility).⁶⁰ If this transmission of the name "Hippoclidēs" is correct, it may not be entirely circular reasoning to reverse it, and see in it another indication that Cypselus was accepted as a Bacchiad. It should not, then, be an occasion for surprise that a recent study of Cypselid and Bacchiad institutions has discovered resemblances.⁶¹

In almost every major aspect of his policies as ruler of Corinth that tradition has preserved to us, Cypselus appears as a conservative, or as a continuator of Bacchiad habits and institutions. It is significant, in view of the importance of religion in archaic Greek life and modes of thought, that in this area too Cypselus' regime made no important break with the Bacchiad past. Apparently both Cypselus and members of his family made rich dedications to Zeus at Olympia.⁶² One also notes that there was a proverbial expression among the Greeks of the fifth century and later, "Corinth of Zeus." Various extant sources claim to explain its meaning, but one of the fullest explanations tells us that the expression was first uttered by Bacchiad ambassadors who were trying (in vain) to prevent a revolt of Megara.⁶³ Whatever the merits of the presentation of

that historical situation may be, at least there was a tradition which survived in this reference that the Bacchiads were followers of Zeus, presumably specially devoted to the king of the gods. The story is the more interesting in that, in post-Cypselid times, the cult of Zeus received remarkably little attention at Corinth.⁶⁴ It is probably too bold to suggest that a possible reason for this later disregard for Zeus might have been precisely the association with the Bacchiads and the Cypselids. One should also note that Cypselus did not forget Apollo who had supported his claims one way or another. He is credited with erecting a treasury at Delphi and making rich offerings to the god.⁶⁵

Cypselus' administration is said to have been characterized by moderation and, in large degree, by observance of the laws (Arist. *Pol.* 5, 1315b14–17, 26–27). But these laws which Cypselus ordinarily observed were the very conservative principles of the lawgiver Pheidon. And insofar as customary institutions and procedures not affected by Pheidon's work are concerned, only the laws and customs of the Bacchiad oligarchy and monarchy can be meant. Presumably Solon of Athens, conservative though he was in

60. It must be admitted, however, that the precise genealogy of the Philaids, including the proper placing of the names Hippoclidēs and Cypselus, is anything but clear, for the tradition is perplexingly confused. For one reconstruction, see H. T. Wade-Gery's stemma, *CAH*, III, 570. But if K. Kinzl's recent Vienna dissertation, *Miltiades-Forschungen* (Vienna, 1968), pp. 6–8 and 17, genealogical table on p. 25, is correct, that "Hippoclidēs" represents an adoptive element in the Philaid clan, then the argument in the text loses most, if not all, its force.

61. Broadbent, summarizing her conclusions, p. 59.

62. *IGA* (Add.), 27d; Plat. *Phaedr.* 236B; possibly Arist. *Pol.* 5, 1313b22; [Arist.] *Oec.* 2, 1346a32–33; Strab. 8. 353 and 378; Dio Chrys. 11. 45; Paus. 5. 2. 3; Plut. *Pyth. or.* 13 (400E); Soud. and Phot. *Lex. s.v.* Κυψελιδῶν ἀνάθημα (both citing earlier authors). Fortunately, we need not go into the tangled question of what offerings were dedicated by Cypselus himself, or whether the famous *cypsele* was even of Cypselid date. In general on the statue ("colossus") of beaten gold, see Servais, *L'ant. class.*, XXXIV (1965), 144–74; on the chest or

cypsele, J. Miller, *s.v.* *Kypselos* (2), *RE*, XII (1925), 119–21, at 121; Frazer *ad* Paus. 5. 17. 5 (III, 601). What is of interest here is that there can be no doubt that Cypselus made rich offerings to Olympian Zeus, together with, or before, other offerings made by other members of his family.

63. Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 7. 155; see the discussions by Wilisch, *Jahrb. für class. Phil.*, XXVII/CXXIII (1881), 162; and H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 129–31.

64. Will, *Korinthiaka*, p. 236 and n. 7 (cf. 115, n. 1); even if he is wrong (as opposed to A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, I [Cambridge, 1914], 247 and n. 4), it is certainly true to say that in later Corinth the cult of Zeus was minimal. The legends on which Cook lays so much emphasis may well be Bacchiad.

65. Hdt. 1. 14. 2; Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 21 (164A); *Pyth. or.* 12–13 (400D–F). In general, on the offerings, see W. Deonna, "L'ex-voto de Cypsélus à Delphes," *RHR*, CXXXIX (1951), 162–207; CXL (1951), 5–58. On Delphi's lack of hostility toward the Cypselids, at least in Cypselus' own time, see G. Forrest, "The First Sacred War," *BCH*, LXXX (1956), 33–52, at 37 and 47.

fact, would have seemed radical to the government of Cypselus. But this conservatism coheres well with the view that Cypselus the Bacchiad was trying to restore the good old days, not to make any innovations. We may accordingly suppose that the new king retained some sort of council from the past, although he presumably ended its exclusive limitation to the ranks of the Bacchiad *genos*, for such a council was traditional. We may also assume the abolition of the office of polemarch, both because it had not existed under the kings and because it would be desirable to remove the ladder by which Cypselus himself had climbed to power.

The Heracleid-Bacchiad-Cypselid monarchy ultimately rested its title to rule on the Dorian conquest. It is not surprising therefore to find that Corinth under Cypselus retained some of the most characteristic Dorian institutions, common messes (*syssitia*), aristocratic associations (*hetairiai*), and warlike or aristocratic

education. We are even told that there were *perioeci*.⁶⁶ It is unlikely that there was any non-Dorian versus Dorian element in Cypselus' coup d'état.⁶⁷ Whatever differences there may have been between Dorian and non-Dorian after the conquest, one strongly suspects that they had largely disappeared by the time Cypselus came to power. If, in their exclusiveness, the Bacchiads could even grudgingly tolerate the marriage of Labda, one of their own, to a non-Dorian, one suspects that there must have been a good deal of mingling and intermarriage between the two groups on less exalted levels, with a consequent fading of ancient grudges. One is reminded of the eventual union of Norman and Saxon in England. Yet one should also not forget that in England a poet living no less than eight hundred years after the Norman Conquest could use "Norman blood" as a symbol of worldly aristocracy—and expect to be understood by his readers.⁶⁸ In Corinth, after a much shorter interval since the Dorian conquest, some

66. *Perioeci* in Nic. Dam. F 59. 1; the other things, mentioned as done away with by Periander in Arist. *Pol.* 5, 1313a36–37 and 41–42, must therefore have existed under Cypselus. Surely we are entitled, despite O'Neill, p. 127, to take the passages in Aristotle in the sense stated (intervening is a reference to the practices of the Persian Empire). Aristotle is discussing the policies of a typical tyrant, but of such tyrants he mentions (apart from the Persians) Periander in the place of honor. It is true that these institutions are not otherwise attested for Corinth, but this is the weakest sort of argument from silence, since almost all the little known about internal institutions of the city happens to be told us offhand in accounts of the activities of the Cypselids. *Hetairia* may be equivalent to phratry, as it was on Dorian Crete (cf. R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* [London, 1955], pp. 23–24); on the other hand, in later Dorian Cyrene the phratry is apparently mentioned alongside the *hetairia* (cf. Meiggs and Lewis, *GHI*, 5. 15–16). How successful Periander was in abolishing phratries (if such are indeed meant by *hetairiai*) is problematical; presumably he could only interdict their meetings and common practices such as sacrifices. Apparently there were phratries in post-Cypselid Corinth; see Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13. 137. Since there is only this one reference to Corinthian *perioeci*, Knapp, pp. 36–37, would reject the term (because there could not have been any at the foundation of Dorian rule in Corinth!). If one wishes to do away with these *perioeci*, probably the best way is to take the word in its general significance of "neighbors" (so E. Wilisch, *Beiträge zur inneren Geschichte des alten Korinths* ["Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Gymnasiums zu Zittau, Ostern,"

1887], p. 15), rather than to try to emend it away as does Will, *Korinthiaka*, p. 521, n. 5. (Neither the app. crit. of Jacoby nor of the Constantinian Excerpts lists any variation for the word.) Yet it seems the most natural thing in the world to find them in an archaic Dorian state, especially since Syracuse, daughter-city of Corinth, had her "Penestae" or "Helots," called *Kallikyrioi* (*Soud.*, s.v.). The possibility occurs that Petra, home of Aetion, could have been a perioecic community; in general, J. A. O. Larsen, s.v. *Perioikoi* (1), *RE*, XIX: 1 (1937), 816–33, at 816. There could even be *kaloi k'agathoi* among *perioeci* (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 5. 3. 9, speaking of the Lacedaemonian *perioeci*)—men something like Aetion? At any rate, the *perioeci* are mentioned in the time of Periander; hence, whatever they were, they existed in the time of Cypselus. If there was reform of the tribes under the Cypselids (S. Dow, "Corinthiaca," *HSCP*, LIII [1942], 89–119, at 105 [before 450 or 395 B.C.], and the whole article on the question of the Corinthian tribes), then according to the tenor of the evidence and arguments here presented, it must have occurred in the time of Periander, not Cypselus (*contra*, Berve, I, 18). See now also R. S. Stroud, "Tribal Boundary Markers from Corinth," *Calif. Studies Class. Ant.*, I (1968), 233–42.

67. Historians of Greece have generally much exaggerated this conflict of Dorian and non-Dorian: see É. Will, *Doriens et Ioniens* (Paris, 1956), *passim* (I am not, however, entirely convinced that there were no non-Dorian overtones to the tyranny in Sicily); on Corinth and the Cypselids, pp. 37–38.

68. Tennyson, *Lady Clara Vere de Vere*, stanza 7.

resentment is likely to have remained, even against "Dorians" who were as much or as little Dorian by descent as Cypselus or Periander. Cypselus, we have argued, ruled as a Dorian, Heracleid, Bacchiad king, the new "Bacchis" of his day. Yet his father had been non-Dorian; the fact called for explanation to the satisfaction of Dorian and non-Dorian alike. Hence the legend was invented that Cypselus was the descendant (through his father) of Melas, a non-Dorian who had joined the Dorian expedition to seize Corinth, originally against the wishes of Aletes because of the objections of Apollo. But despite the god, Aletes changed his mind and allowed Melas to rejoin him. Thus non-Dorians were present at the conquest of Corinth, non-Dorians were as good as Dorians, and Apollo punished the descendants of Aletes through their displacement by Cypselus, again showing the good will of the god toward Cypselus.⁶⁹ Thus Cypselus had the best of both worlds. We may perhaps further assume (apart from this, it seems a priori likely) that on Cypselus' council the voices of non-Dorian as well as Dorian nobles were heard. We must agree with the recently expressed opinion⁷⁰ that Periander's attack on the Dorian institutions of *syssitia*, etc., was much more anti-noble than anti-Dorian. In turn, this argues that Cypselus tried to live with the nobles, and his leaving these noble institutions untouched meant that he, once again, wished to reign as an ancient king, "kingest of all" in Homer's language, among the lesser chiefs, whether non-Dorian, or claiming

Dorian ancestry. Corinth was to return to those palmy days to which only a despicable Thersites would object. Cypselus, of course, with his heirs, would be the Agamemnon, or Aletes, or Bacchis, at the apex of the pyramid.

Ephorus (Nic. Dam. F 57. 7) tells us that Cypselus recalled the exiles and those deprived of "civic rights" by the oligarchy; this is probably fourth-century conceptualization, but it hardly seems necessary to deny the fact because of the use of terms appropriate to a later time. In any age, those at variance with the powers that be are likely to flee. Cypselus allowed such persons to return; what politician can have too many adherents? We have argued that he tried to please the nobles and presumably the hoplites. What did he do for the common people? The answer is that he founded colonies: Anactorium, Leucas, Ambracia.⁷¹ When Nicholas of Damascus tells us that those unfriendly to Cypselus were sent to colonies, it is hardly original to infer that he was trying to alleviate the land hunger, i.e., the pressure of the population on subsistence, which was presumably felt most severely by the proletariat. That pressure thus relieved, he was indeed able to rule those left at home more tranquilly.⁷² Again, we note that this was a traditional Bacchiad policy. About the beginning of the last third of the eighth century (traditional dating), the oligarchy had founded both Corcyra and Syracuse as colonies, and perhaps even earlier the Bacchiad kings had established an apparently not long-lived settlement on

69. Paus. 2. 4. 4; at the very least, the connection of Cypselus with this myth must be contemporary with Cypselus himself, or with the Cypselids (cf. Wilisch, *Jahrb. für class. Philol.*, XXVII/CXXIII [1881], 171).

70. Will, *Korinthiaka*, p. 507, n. 2; *idem*, *Doriens*, pp. 37–38.

71. Evidence and discussion in E. Oberhummer, *Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas im Altertum* (Munich, 1887), pp. 73–74; cf. Knapp, p. 17; Berve, II, 524; Porzio, p. 31, n. 2; Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 517–18; Busolt, *Gesch.*, I,

642–43; Mossé, pp. 31–32.

72. Nic. Dam. F 57. 7; cf. Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 511 and 528; Berve, I, 18; Mossé, pp. 31–32; fortunately the vexed question of the legal relationships of these colonies to Corinth is irrelevant to our present purpose. One may suggest commercial considerations, or access to precious metal, as additional motives for these colonies, but the present writer firmly believes that the primary purpose (as in Greek colonies generally) was to secure additional land for the excess population of the mother city.

Ithaca.⁷³ Cypselus, again, was proceeding according to Bacchiad precedents; from another point of view, we may note that he was not finding, even if he was searching for (which seems doubtful), new or imaginative solutions to the problems of Corinth. We may be entitled to infer, however, that he stood off complaints for the time being—he had no need for a body-guard and died, presumably in his bed, as king of Corinth.

If the interpretation, however, of some students, ancient and modern, is correct, in one important respect he deviated from the traditional ways of Bacchiad Corinth (we may take it for granted that whatever excessive hauteur on the part of the oligarchs had displeased their fellow Corinthians ceased abruptly at Cypselus' accession); he is said to have inaugurated a new, and amazing, fiscal policy. In the first place, according to Herodotus (5. 92. ε. 2; cf. Eph. in Nic. Dam. F 57. 7), he deprived his enemies, Bacchiad or other, of a good deal of their property; in fourth-century terms he "made it public," or "confiscated" it. More than one modern scholar has rejected this datum, particularly as "confiscation" implies a concept of the state which is too advanced for the seventh century B.C. It seems we have here an excellent example of "interpretation" in anachronistic terms of something early in date: apparently "deprivation of property" in Herodotus became "confiscation" in Ephorus. The word used by the later historian need not confuse us; what is actually meant is probably nothing more sophisticated than the action of Agamemnon when he took Briseis from Achilles in the *Iliad*.⁷⁴ We may take it for granted that

Cypselus seized lands belonging to his adversaries in the same fashion (as a traditional king he had to live, after all, on a huge and generous scale), and may well have given some of the rewards of a successful coup to his followers. Later Greeks, victims or witnesses of the results of a hundred *staseis* since Cypselus' time, naturally read into the king's seizure of property a sophisticated interpretation which was originally lacking. How could a later conservative such as Aristotle have written that Cypselus for the most part obeyed the laws if he had embarked on any revolutionary redistribution of land?

The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica* (2, 1346a32–b6) has an astounding tale about Cypselus' taxation policies. Before his coup d'état, he had vowed to Zeus that, if he succeeded, he would dedicate to the god all the property of the Corinthians. Once in power, he caused the Corinthians to draw up official lists of their possessions. Then each year he took one tenth and in ten years all; but the Corinthians had from the beginning used each year what was left to them to increase their wealth, so that in ten years they had as much as they had started with, although Cypselus had fulfilled his vow. Now this story is not only fantastic, it is miraculous and economically impossible. Not even a highly industrialized power of the twentieth century could attain such a rate of economic growth that it could double its wealth in ten years. Presumably "all the property" of the Corinthians included their land; how that could be doubled, or uncultivated and uncultivable land put under cultivation, is beyond explanation.⁷⁵ At very best, we have a highly garbled account that

even then may have been merely hypothetical, not practical politics.

75. On the economic impossibility involved, see B. A. van Groningen's ed. of [Arist.] *Oec.* 2 (Leyden, 1933), pp. 51–52. It may or may not have been possible to make such a register of property, a Domesday Book, in Cypselus' Corinth, but one is strongly inclined to doubt it. Some later sources connected

73. Cf. Dunbabin, *JHS*, LXVIII (1948), 65.

74. I cannot accept the far-reaching hypotheses of Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 477–81, based on the fear in Solon's Athens of a redistribution of land (cf. Berve, II, 523), that this amounts to a reference to a general redistribution of Bacchiad lands to Cypselus' followers. Solonian Athens, two generations later, also had other tyrannies to draw on for examples; the idea

indicates that Cypselus levied a ten-per-cent tax on something (certainly not capital, an *eisphora* in the classical Athenian sense), but possibly on "harbors and markets." Periander is described by Heraclides (*ap. Rose, Arist. Frag.* 611. 20) as a tyrant who changed the monarchy of Cypselus, but one of his moderate policies was his levying no tax except for harbor and market fees. We are reminded also that the Bacchiad oligarchs "exploited" the commerce of Corinth, perhaps by collecting such fees. Perhaps Cypselus continued a levy of this kind, thus introducing no innovation or financial revolution; one of the moderate aspects of the rule of his much-feared, and perhaps sometimes terrible, son was to continue the same system. An attractive suggestion is that of Pleket,⁷⁶ who sees in this garbled version in the *Oeconomica* an echo of a policy of Cypselus to encourage work. Certainly one of the principal tenets of the policy of Periander was to encourage work (by limiting number of slaves, enacting sumptuary laws, and compelling Corinthians to live in the country [*Heraclid. ibid.*; *Nic. Dam.* F 58. 1]). It is plausible that this policy was in continuation of that of his father.⁷⁷ An age of relatively rapid economic and social changes, such as we must certainly postulate for seventh-century Corinth, will have seen a widening of the gap between rich and poor. Many of the latter will have found it very difficult to support themselves and would necessarily seem idle. It is "obvious" that a man who remains idle in a booming economy where fortunes are being made by other men must be lazy; so he must be made to work. Twenty-six centuries after Cypselus some men think that maxims of individual

frugality and will do not apply to large groups in certain circumstances. Certainly such an idea in general never crossed the mind of the ancients. Cypselus provided land in colonies for those ill-disposed to him; the rest he may have commanded to work—almost assuredly, if that is so, to the approbation of the serious, grave, and important elements of society. Periander may also have grasped the fact that psychologically the luxury of the rich made poverty more hateful to the poor. So, with a futility common among politicians in history, he issued sumptuary laws to prevent this sort of inflammatory display. But Cypselus, aiming only at restoring the good old days, may have merely tried to force the spiritual descendants of Ther-sites to work, while catering to the middle class, the noble, and the rich.

So Cypselus, the new Bacchis, died peacefully in possession of power, and his son Periander succeeded to the throne as king (*Nic. Dam.* F 58. 1). Herodotus tells us (5. 92. ζ. 1–2) that Periander at first ruled more mildly than his father, but then he learned (hardly from Thrasybulus, as Herodotus says) that the only way to safety was to remove eminent competition (noble and rich). Hence he changed and became a typical tyrant, striking at rich, noble, and poor alike, to make them behave, to produce a proper state. And *he* had to employ a bodyguard. Since his power was owing to his father, in the eyes of later Greeks his father also came to be regarded as a tyrant in the pejorative sense. It is plausible that Periander at first ruled even more mildly than his father; at least he probably continued his father's mild, let-live policies. He may even have relaxed some of the policies of Cypselus, if

this story with the "colossus" of beaten gold at Olympia; this also is ridiculous. The speculations of Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 481–88, are generally unconvincing.

76. *Tijdschr. v. Geschied.* LXXXI (1968), 42–44.

77. Numismatists frequently credit the beginning of Corinthian coinage to the Cypselids. If Cypselus was as conservative as has been argued in this paper, the credit should probably go to Periander.

Herodotus should be taken literally (what is said may be only rhetorical exaggeration of the fact that at first Periander was as mild as his father). If so, the implication is that, by the end of Cypselus' reign, opposition was beginning to crystallize against the conservative policies of the father; it is a psychological possibility that Periander tried at first to placate this opposition by relaxing his father's mildness even further.

Cypselus, at least at the crucial moment, must be rated a consummate politician. He sensed that the times were ripe to gratify his ambition by overthrowing the oligarchs and by restoring the ancient monarchy to his own profit. But he was no statesman; unlike Solon of Athens, he did

not realize that the times were ready for change, change looking forward not back. Corinth, and especially his own family, was to suffer thereby. A new Bacchis was not enough, not even with colonies. Hence when the tyranny was overthrown, at a time when the less dominant personality of Psammetichus was unable to hold things together against the rising tide of protest and dissent led by the nobles and the upper middle classes, the houses of the tyrant (and his family) were destroyed, their property seized, the dead Cypselus and Cypselids dug up, and their remains thrown out (Nic. Dam. F 60. 1). "May Zeus destroy the race of the Cypselids!"⁷⁸

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

78. [Theogn.] 894; on the imprecation on the "colossus" in the Olympian Heraeum, see Servais, *L'ant. class.*, XXXIV (1965), 159–60, 168 and n. 67, 170–71. Various scholars, ancient and modern, have said more or less explicitly that Cypselus ruled as king, and Periander became a tyrant. No one to my knowledge, however, has tried to prove this thesis, or to argue, as is done here, that Cypselus ruled not only as king, but as a restored Bacchiad king, quite likely accepted as such in his lifetime (perhaps he even believed it himself, with one or two reservations)—the thesis of the present paper.

Cf. Andrewes, pp. 24 and 48. Exactly the opposite opinion is held by Berve, I, 17, 22; as the argument in the text above has tried to show, this requires the flat rejection of several pieces of evidence, both explicitly and implicitly congruent among themselves. Berve's point of view seems primarily dictated by his placing excessive reliance on the expression in Nic. Dam. F 57. 6 that the *demos* chose Cypselus king. In general, Berve (I, 16) is unduly selective about what he will or will not believe in Nic. Dam. F 57.