

## **XXI.—Cleisthenes of Sicyon and the Panhellenic Festivals**

MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

An analysis of the known data, aided by the evidence of a recently discovered inscription and the application of a proper chronology, construct of the reign of Cleisthenes a logical and comprehensible whole. He is revealed as a powerful despot, pursuing a vigorous and continuous western maritime policy. This study discusses the problems facing Cleisthenes and emphasizes his prominence at Delphi and Olympia. At the same time, it is urged that of the four Panhellenic festivals, only the Pythian and the Olympian owe a debt to the tyrants for their foundation; the other two were established as challenges to the Peloponnesian tyrannies.

This essay had its origins in an examination of the Panhellenic festivals and their connexion with the tyrants of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., and developed into a study of Cleisthenes of Sicyon, the problems which faced him in a rapidly changing age and his relations with his neighbours, in particular with the sanctuaries in which the Panhellenic games were held. A consideration of the ancient sources and a survey of the modern historians convinced me that the small body of evidence from antiquity which sheds light on the career of Cleisthenes is so scattered and so fastidiously employed by the moderns that an attempt merely to gather the testimony and state the issues would be of value, even though no affirmative results should be forthcoming.

My purpose, then, is twofold: to seek the clues, if they exist, which illustrate the policies and aims of Cleisthenes of Sicyon; to discover the extent to which the tyrants participated in the foundation of the Olympian, Pythian, Isthmian, and Nemean games.

The outlines (and much of the detail) of our picture of European Hellas in the century and a half following 700 B.C. are formed by our knowledge of the tyrants, or rulers, of Corinth, Sicyon, and Argos. The part played by them in the institution, or reorganization, of the great games is disputed. Were the festivals founded (at Delphi, Corinth, and Nemea) to celebrate the fall of the tyrants, or did the sixth century autocrats themselves remodel the games as a natural accompaniment of their notorious Panhellenic policies?

The modern champion of the tyrants as founders of the games is Bury,<sup>1</sup> whose views are summarized in the following paragraph.

The Olympian games, he believes, became nationally important only through the efforts of Pheidon of Argos. The Pythian and Isthmian festivals owed their prestige to Cleisthenes of Sicyon and Periander of Corinth respectively. The 'Nemea, instituted in opposition to Sicyon, were backed by an Argive successor of Pheidon. All these games were founded by tyrants to enhance their glory and the glory of the city over which each ruled; they were designed not for the nobles and aristocrats, whose rule had been overthrown by the tyrants, but for the common people, upon whose support the tyrants depended for their security. A parallel is found at Athens in Peisistratus and his revitalizing and enlarging of the *Panathenaia*.<sup>2</sup>

Bury's thesis, to the details of which reference will constantly be made, is an attractive one, yet it is doubtful whether it will withstand the weight of the ancient evidence and the test of historical probability. Peisistratus, for example, is not a true parallel, for whereas the games at Delphi, Nemea, Corinth, and Olympia were Panhellenic, those in Athens were not; they were meant to foster Athenian nationalism. The horizon of Peisistratus, in this respect, was limited to Attica.

We shall test Bury's theory by the evidence of the ancient authorities. This is scattered, it is true, and conjecture and assumption must play their part in the reconstruction of the history of the first half of the sixth century B.C. If the conclusions clash with those of Bury then we may at least claim that the evidence is open to an interpretation different from his.

The tyrant most closely connected with the games is Cleisthenes of Sicyon; with him we shall commence our investigation. Cleis-

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London and New York, 1890) 248-263 (Appendix D).

<sup>2</sup> The first *Panathenaia* were celebrated in the archonship of Hippocleides (Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 3); the date is set by Eusebius, Hieronymus giving 566/5 and the Armenian version 565/4 B.C. The foundation of the Great *Panathenaia* is attributed to Peisistratus by the scholiast to Aelius Aristides *Panathenaicus* 189.4 (Dindorf, 3.323). This is not a contradiction but implies that Peisistratus reorganized and glorified an existing festival.

For Hieronymus I cite the edition of J. K. Fotheringham, *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones* (London, 1923); for the Armenian version of Eusebius I use Josef Karst, *Eusebius Werke 5: Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen Übersetzt* (*Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte* 20 [Leipzig, 1911]).

thenes' career must, for the most part, be reconstructed from the four chief stories told of him: (1) his hatred of the Dorians, which caused him to change the tribal names in Sicyon; (2) his hatred of Argos, which caused him to expel the Argive hero Adrastus from Sicyon, ban the recital of the Homeric poems, and reorganize the local festivals which had done honour to Adrastus; (3) his championship of the Amphictyones in the first Sacred War; (4) the year's competition which he conducted for the selection of a suitable husband for his daughter Agariste. Of these the most informative and the most vital to the investigation is the last.

The wooing of Agariste, as told by Herodotus,<sup>3</sup> is undeniably a fascinating story, but it has met harsh treatment at the hands of the skeptics, who have questioned the historicity not only of the details but even of the general outlines of the tale.<sup>4</sup> I suspect, however, that Herodotus' narrative has much to offer of value for a study of the politics and international relations of the period.

There is no solid evidence to justify dismissing the story from the realm of history. If Herodotus allowed himself to insert into his history a dressed up version of the epic wooing of Helen, or attempted to foist upon his readers as fact a legend already current in Pindar, then Herodotus and his readers were far more gullible than we should expect. After all, we cannot deny that Cleisthenes the Alcmaeonid was the grandson of Cleisthenes of Sicyon through Agariste; it is reasonable that Megacles won his bride at the Sicyonian court, it is reasonable that he encountered competition. That his chief rival should be Hippocleides is also not remarkable, for the existing internal chaos at Athens followed closely upon the check administered to the nobles by Solon; so members of the two leading Athenian families may have been seeking to restore their prestige

<sup>3</sup> Hdt. 6.126-130; see also Ath. 6.273b-c; 12.541b-c; 14. 628c-d; Ael. *VH* 12.24; D.S. 8.19.

<sup>4</sup> Grote (*A History of Greece* [London, 1888] 2.413 with note 1) considers the passage "to be a story framed upon the model of various incidents in the old epic, especially the suitors of Helen." Stein (*Herodotus* <sup>4</sup> [Berlin, 1893], note on 6.126.6) infers that Herodotus may have borrowed the tale from a poem of Pindar. Cf. also W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1928), notes on 6.126-127 (Vol. 2.117-118); R. W. Macan, *Herodotus, The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books* (London and New York, 1895), notes on 6.126-128 (1.380-384 and 2.304-311); A. Holm, *The History of Greece*, Eng. trans. 1 (London, 1899) 317, note 9; A. Kirchhoff, *Über die Entstehungszeit des Herodotischen Geschichtswerkes* <sup>2</sup> (Berlin, 1878) 42-43; F. Zühlke, *De Agaristes Nuptiis* (Diss., Insterburg, 1880) especially 30-34; G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* <sup>2</sup> 1 (Gotha, 1893) 666, note 3.

by acquiring kinship with the powerful Sicyonian tyrant.<sup>5</sup> The old rivalry, continued into his own day, must have been well known in the Athens of Herodotus. The only detail which may owe something to decoration is the description of the dancing of Hippocleides; <sup>6</sup> it is the exaggerated type of gossip which the Alcmaeonidae may have spread about the rival Philaidae.<sup>7</sup> We must beware, however, of falling back upon the time-honoured explanation so often offered when Herodotus' report disagrees with modern theory: that Herodotus was distorting the truth to compliment the Alcmaeonidae.<sup>8</sup>

That one suitor was Dorian,<sup>9</sup> the objection most frequently made to the Herodotean account, is quite irrelevant to the issue and I shall later attempt to show that the significant fact about Leocedes<sup>10</sup> is not that he was Dorian but that he was Argive (or from the Argolid); Cleisthenes' anti-Dorianism has long confused the history of his reign. Similarly, the mystery surrounding Pheidon, cited by Herodotus as father of Leocedes, is open to a logical explanation.

The wooing has received minute scrutiny and perhaps the zealous historian, his perspective distorted, has not made a general examination in the proper context. For if we contemplate the story in its entirety, the whole procedure followed by Cleisthenes and reported by Herodotus smacks of the tyrants. The wooing was carried out in the grand manner; the announcement at Olympia,

<sup>5</sup> Athens and Sicyon had been allies during the Sacred War, when Alcmaeon, father of Megacles, had led the Athenian contingent (*Plu. Sol.* 11). Attempts to bolster a political position at home by a distinguished marriage abroad are of course common; shortly after the marriage of Megacles we find Peisistratus wedding Timonassa of Argos.

<sup>6</sup> Macan (2.304–311) discusses the parallel between the Herodotean story and the Indian fable of the dancing peacock. The real parallel is between the performance of Hippocleides and the strutting of the peacock. This does not, however, as Macan himself concedes, impair the historicity of the rivalry between Megacles and Hippocleides; thus the source of the story is not pertinent here.

<sup>7</sup> That Hippocleides was a Philaid can scarcely be doubted; see How and Wells, notes on 6.128 (2.119); Macan, note on 6.128 (1.384); H. T. Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.570.

<sup>8</sup> Joseph Wells, *Studies in Herodotus* (Oxford, 1923) 55: "... what is clearly a legend, embellished, if not invented, to glorify the house of the Alcmaeonidae." See also the references to Busolt, Kirchhoff, and Zühlke in note 4. For criticism of a similar rejection of Herodotus on the grounds of his "Alcmaeonid bias" see M. F. McGregor, *HSPH*, Suppl. vol. 1 (1940) 86.

<sup>9</sup> Macan, notes on 6.127 (1.381 and 382).

<sup>10</sup> K. O. Müller identifies Leocedes with Lacedas, penultimate Temenid ruler of Argos (*Die Dorier* <sup>2</sup> [revised by F. Schneidewin, Breslau, 1844] 2.104–105, note 1); cf. Paus. 2.19.2; *Plu. De cap. ex inimicis util.* 6 (*Moralia* 89 E).

made before all of Hellas, was a magnificent gesture, typical of the tyrants' policy. I agree with Grote that the story sounds like epic but this resemblance is of itself significant. Cleisthenes, we must grant, was familiar with the wooing of Helen, popularized in the songs of the rhapsodes, and I suggest, not that the Herodotean story is fictitious, a rewriting of the wooing of Helen, but that Cleisthenes deliberately arranged the wooing of his daughter Agariste on a scale that would invite comparison with the legends of the bygone age of Heroes. The contest of the suitors during a year's residence at the court of Cleisthenes was staged as a great event, meant to emphasize to Hellas the power and importance of the tyrant of Sicyon.

Suitors came from far and near, and possibly we may deduce, from the citizenship of the individual contestants, something of the relations and ambitions of Cleisthenes at the time of Agariste's wedding.

The suitors, as listed by Herodotus, were as follows: Smindyrides of Sybaris, Damasus of Siris, Amphinestus of Epidamnus, Males of Aetolia, Leocedes (son of Pheidon) of Argos, Amiantus of Trapezus (Arcadia), Laphanes of Paeus (Arcadia), Onomastus of Elis, Megacles of Athens, Hippocleides of Athens, Lysanias of Eretria, Diactorides of Thessaly, and Alcon of the Molossians.

The roster is an interesting one, as much for its absentees as for those present. There is no representative of Thebes, which may not yet have been a force in Greek politics,<sup>11</sup> although we shall see that later Cleisthenes deliberately offered friendship to the Boeotian city.<sup>12</sup> Of the alliance which fought for Chalcis in the Lelantine War<sup>13</sup> (Chalcis, Corinth, Samos, Thessaly) only Thessaly sends a suitor; from the opposition (Eretria, Aegina, Megara, Miletus) Eretria is present. In the west Croton was the ally of Samos<sup>14</sup> and no one from Croton is among the suitors. Sybaris,

<sup>11</sup> M. Cary, *CAH* 3.609.

<sup>12</sup> See p. 282 and note 65. P. N. Ure believes that Cleisthenes had failed in overtures made to Thebes for commercial reasons. (*The Origin of Tyranny* [Cambridge University Press, 1922] 262). This may be true, but his chronology (as will be demonstrated) is confused.

<sup>13</sup> For the Lelantine War see *IG* 12.9, p. 147; How and Wells, notes on *Hdt.* 5.99.1 (2.58), 6.21.1 (2.71–72), and 3.59.4 (1.272); Cary, *CAH* 3.603, 609, and 622–623 (the struggle was apparently long and drawn out, so that the repercussions could well have continued into the sixth century; Thgn. 891–894 speaks of it as recent).

<sup>14</sup> How and Wells, note on 5.99.1 (2.58); J. L. Myres, *CAH* 3.675.

on the other hand, was the close friend of Miletus<sup>15</sup> and the neighbour of Siris;<sup>16</sup> both these western *poleis* send prospective grooms to seek the hand of Agariste. An Epidamnian is at Sicyon and Holm<sup>17</sup> adds Epidamnus to the Eretrian group; this may have been the case, although, so far as I can discover, there is no ancient evidence to prove it. Thus, if there is anything to be gleaned from the muster at Sicyon, it would seem that Cleisthenes' sympathies lay with the Eretrian alliance.<sup>18</sup> The Thessalian is not an anomaly, for his journey to Sicyon may have been made as an aftermath of Cleisthenes' alliance with Eurylochus during the Sacred War.<sup>19</sup> As a matter of fact, Thessaly's participation in the Lelantine War has before this been noted as curious, for she alone of the Chalcidic group had no special interest in commerce or colonization.<sup>20</sup> How and Wells have already observed that the Chalcidic alliance was particularly interested in the west, whereas the Eretrians and their associates found their main sphere in the north-east.<sup>21</sup> So, if we can argue at all from evidence that is admittedly tenuous, Cleisthenes favoured the cities which had fought against the leaders of the western trade. This may be more significant when other arguments are presented to urge that Cleisthenes himself made a bid for commercial supremacy in the west. The incident of the wedding, furthermore, occurred before a genuine interest in the west had developed at Athens, and we have already observed, in addition to two Athenian suitors, ties between Sicyon and Athens.<sup>22</sup>

Most notable of all the absentees, however, is a Corinthian; this is least likely to be due to chance. The implication is unavoidable that at this time relations between Sicyon and Corinth were strained, that is, that the wooing occurred after the break between the two cities, for a break there must have been. In confirmation

<sup>15</sup> Hdt. 6.21.1; How and Wells, note *ad loc.* (2.71-72); Myres, *loc. cit.*

<sup>16</sup> This is before the attack on Siris by Sybaris, Croton, and Metapontum (Myres, *loc. cit.*; Philippon, *RE s.v.* "Siris," no. 1). Before this war Siris evidently imitated Sybaris in wealth and luxury (How and Wells, note on 8.62.2 [2.255]), and probably came into collision with Sybaris as the result of too dangerous a rivalry with Sybarite trade policies.

<sup>17</sup> Holm, *History of Greece* 1.317, note 9.

<sup>18</sup> Holm (*loc. cit.*) detects a substratum of truth in the story from the presence of Eretrian allies and the absence of Chalcidian.

<sup>19</sup> Sch. Pi. P. Hypotheses b, c, and d (ed. A. B. Drachmann, 2 [Teubner, 1910] 3-5); Polyæn. 6.13.

<sup>20</sup> Cary, *CAH* 3.622-623.

<sup>21</sup> How and Wells, note on 3.59.4 (1.272).

<sup>22</sup> See note 5.

of this assumption we may point to the suitor from Elis. Now Elis and Corinth had been unfriendly, certainly since Olympia's refusal to erase the names of the Cypselidae from the offerings made at the sanctuary by the Corinthian tyrants; Delphi, however, had complied. As a result, no Eleian was allowed to compete at the Isthmian games.<sup>23</sup> The chances are that both Corinth and Delphi were by this time hostile to Cleisthenes despite his championship of Delphi in the Sacred War and his prominence at the *Pythia* of 582 B.C.; sentiment had changed since the days when the oracle had aided the Orthagorids in their rise to the tyranny.<sup>24</sup> The conjectured split with Delphi is corroborated by the curt reply given to Cleisthenes when he sought support for his anti-Argive policy; this came very soon after the wedding of Agariste.<sup>25</sup>

Olympia maintained her popularity with the tyrants, as she had smiled upon them in the past, despite the influence of Sparta which was later opposed to tyranny. The situation may be partially explained by the hypothesis that the Eleians proper had not yet regained (with the aid of Sparta) control of the games, presidency over which had been bestowed upon the Pisatans by Pheidon of Argos.<sup>26</sup> The Pisatans would of course entertain a warm sympathy

<sup>23</sup> Plu. *De Pythiae oraculis* 13 (*Moralia* 400 D-E); Hdt. 1.14.2; cf. E. Norman Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London, 1910) 65 with note 1. The Cypselid Bowl now in Boston probably came from Olympia; see L. D. Caskey, *Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin* 20, No. 122 (Boston, December, 1922) 65-68.

<sup>24</sup> For Cleisthenes in the Sacred War see Paus. 10.37.6; 2.9.6; Frontin. 3.7.6; Polyæn. 3.5; introductory scholia to Pi. N. 9 (ed. Drachmann, 3 [Teubner, 1927] 149). For the oracle see Plu. *De ser. num. vind.* 7 (*Moralia* 553 A-B); *POxy* 11, No. 1365, pp. 104-111; D.S. 8.24.

<sup>25</sup> Hdt. 5.67.2. Macan's difficulty (note *ad loc.* 1.208) is typical of the confusion which has gathered about the career of Cleisthenes: "if this *θεωπία* took place during or after the First 'Sacred War,' in which Kleisthenes had espoused the cause of Delphi . . . , the reply to a benefactor is the more astonishing. It is probably unhistorical." A logical comprehension of the chronological developments in the first quarter of the century makes the incident easily credible.

<sup>26</sup> I accept the theory of a Pisatan interlude at Olympia, coinciding roughly with the tyrannies at Corinth and Sicyon; see Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.544-548, where I should adjust the dates (545) slightly. Under Olympiad 30 (660 B.C.) Eusebius gives: *Pisaei ab Heliensibus defecerunt, hancque (olympiadem) constituerunt, et alias deinceps XXII* (cf. Str. 8.3.30 [p. 355]). This must mean that the Pisatans presided over 23 Olympiads, from 30 (660 B.C.) to 52 (572 B.C.) inclusive; the Eleians, then, regained their position in 568 B.C., probably with the help of Sparta, with whom they promptly made their alliance (Wade-Gery, 548; cf. Wells, *Studies* 37-38). This, with the Argive-Cleonaean war against Sicyon, belongs to the general movement against tyranny in the Peloponnese; Cleisthenes himself died about 565 and the power of Sicyon waned. See A. Schoene, *Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo* 1 (Berlin, 1875) 197-198; H. F. Clinton,

for the tyrant and would welcome with open arms the friendship of Cleisthenes. For these reasons I am inclined to think it at least not impossible that the suitor from Elis was actually a Pisatan, who could loosely be termed Ἡλεῖος by Herodotus.<sup>27</sup>

It was at the Olympic games that Cleisthenes delivered his invitation to the suitors for the hand of Agariste. It is accordingly not surprising to find an entry from Elis and none from Corinth. This corresponds with the political alignment of the day. The wooing must be dated after Cleisthenes' split with Corinth and Delphi but before Sparta, building the foundations of the Peloponnesian League, opposed tyranny: that is, before 568 B.C. (when Elis regained the presidency of the games).

The objection may be (and has been) made that evidence exists for friendship between the Orthagorids and Corinth. Isodemus of Sicyon found refuge at Corinth after the accession of his brother Cleisthenes to the tyranny; Hippocleides of Athens led the other suitors for Cleisthenes' favour partly because he was related to the Cypselidae.<sup>28</sup> This is cogent enough for us to admit friendly feelings—but not at the time of the wedding. Each incident points in exactly the same direction; together they merely imply a degree of cordiality between the Orthagorids of Sicyon and the Cypselids of Corinth. The conclusions that have been drawn from them demonstrate once more that no real effort has been made to develop a logical chronology for the reign of Cleisthenes. Tyranny had by then disappeared from Corinth and Cleisthenes experienced no compunction in allowing his lack of sympathy for the commercial oligarchy which had replaced it to become known.

The most surprising member of the group which assembled at the court of Cleisthenes is without doubt Leocedes, whose presence

*Fasti Hellenici* 1 (Oxford, 1834) pp. 192 and 236 under 660 and 572 B.C. The *Hellano-dikai* were increased to two in 580 B.C. (Paus. 5.9.4), but this does not guarantee the restoration of Eleian primacy at the same time. Without analysing the chronological problems in detail, we may recall the evidence already cited to show that in the year of Agariste's wooing those in authority at Olympia were unfriendly to Corinth (where the tyranny had fallen) and friendly to Sicyon (where a tyranny reminiscent of Pheidon's maintained itself).

<sup>27</sup> I follow Wade-Gery's attractive argument (*loc. cit.*) that the Pisatans lived in a district of Elis and that no city called Pisa existed: "... the changes of management were not the result of a struggle between two states; rather within the one state of Elis, comprising both valleys, power shifted as elsewhere from aristocrats to tyrants, and then to oligarchs, and last to democrats" (547).

<sup>28</sup> Nic. Dam. *fig.* 61 in *FHG* 3.394–395; *Hdt.* 6.128.2.



has always discomfited commentators. In view of Cleisthenes' well-attested anti-Argive policy,<sup>29</sup> an Argive at the Sicyonian court has seemed strangely out of place.<sup>30</sup> To add to the confusion Herodotus calls Leocedes the son of Pheidon the tyrant, a chronological impossibility.<sup>31</sup> Various remedies have been proposed: the whole story is a legend and so has no historical value; the text is corrupt; Leocedes' removal from the list reduces the suitors to twelve (to correspond with the twelve Ionian tribes) and removes the single Dorian.<sup>32</sup> In brief, the objections are two: an Argive is inconsistent with Sicyonian policy, and a son of Pheidon seeking a sixth century bride is incredible.

Let us consider the first objection. If Cleisthenes was bitterly hostile to Argos *at the time*, then it is inconceivable that an Argive should sue for the hand of his daughter; so much we must grant. But were Argos and Sicyon always hostile to one another? If we may make any inference (and we can do no more) from the scrap of ancient evidence, it looks as though the cities were fighting in a common cause during the Sacred War.<sup>33</sup>

Herodotus' account of the expulsion of Adrastus from Sicyon by Cleisthenes is conclusive proof that enmity with Argos existed.<sup>34</sup> But the account is not dated; furthermore, the action taken against Argos through Adrastus need not be automatically connected with Cleisthenes' anti-Dorianism, for Adrastus was a pre-Dorian.<sup>35</sup> Later the two policies coalesced (as they were perhaps bound to do), but until the war between Sicyon and Argos there is no reason to

<sup>29</sup> Hdt. 5.67-68.

<sup>30</sup> C. H. Skalet's remark is typical: "From the towns of lower Italy, from . . . Athens and even Argos came the suitors" (italics mine) (*Ancient Sicyon* [The Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in Archaeol. 3, 1928] 60).

<sup>31</sup> The date of Pheidon is, I believe, sufficiently well established to make lengthy discussion here superfluous. I place Pheidon in the first half of the seventh century. The problem has been thoroughly analysed by Ure, *Origin of Tyranny* 154-160; cf. Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.539-543 and 761-762.

<sup>32</sup> Macan, 1.381-382.

<sup>33</sup> Ath. 13.560b-c, quoting Callisthenes (*FGrH* 2B, no. 124, fig. 1), says that Argive women were among those mistreated while returning from the shrine at Delphi and that such outrages led to the confederate war against Cirrha. Years previously Sicyonians and Argives had jointly aided the Messenians against Sparta (Paus. 4.10.6 and 4.11.1-2).

<sup>34</sup> Hdt. 5.67-68.

<sup>35</sup> Macan, note on 5.68.2 (1.211). Skalet goes far beyond the evidence in asserting that "Cleisthenes' violent opposition to the Dorians led to a war with Argos. Sicyon had long been under Argive control" (*Ancient Sicyon* 57). That Sicyon had been subservient to Argos under Cleisthenes' immediate predecessors is a premise that rests on no ancient authority.

assert that the two cities did not live at peace with one another, at least nominally. So the Argive's presence at Sicyon is not in itself unbelievable if it preceded the outbreak of war, as it must have done. Thus the evidence shows that the war between Argos and Cleisthenes can be placed after the marriage of Agariste, and Leocedes' presence at Sicyon demonstrates that it must be so dated. The apparent inconsistency, then, has resulted from the lack of a precise chronology.

The real difficulty is that Leocedes is called the son of king Pheidon. I do not believe that the problem is a textual one. Macan discusses various emendations but he too is reluctant to change the text.<sup>36</sup> The most probable solution is that the name Pheidon was not unique in the Argolid and that Herodotus himself blundered; that, knowing Leocedes' father to have been a certain Pheidon, he at once connected the name with the great tyrant of the previous century and assumed that the two were identical. The adoption of more than one Pheidon as a solution to the problem has not met with the favour of the commentators.<sup>37</sup> Yet, apart from the historical considerations involved in the passage of Herodotus, a sixth century Pheidon can now be proved, and his appearance sweeps away much of the skepticism aroused by the mystery of Leocedes' antecedents. During the University of Cincinnati excavations at Nemea in 1926 there was found an inscription erected by a victor in the Nemean games.<sup>38</sup> The text (boustrophedon) is as follows:

'Αρίστις με ἀνέθηκε Δὶ Ῥρονίῳ φάνακτι  
πανκράτιον νικῶν τετράκις ἐν Νεμέῃ  
Φείδωνος φῑὸς τῷ Κλεοναίῳ.

The inscription belongs in the sixth century, probably in the first half; the *terminus ante quem non* is 567 B.C. (Aristis must be allowed the opportunity for four triumphs at the biennial *Nemea*, whose era date was 573 B.C.). For our purposes its importance lies in the name of the victor, Aristis the son of Pheidon of Cleonae.

We can now be sure of a Pheidon of Cleonae (very soon after the wedding of Agariste) and as Cleonae was under strong Argive

<sup>36</sup> Macan, 1.382.

<sup>37</sup> Macan, 1.382; Bury, *Nemean Odes* 252.

<sup>38</sup> The inscription was reported by C. W. Blegen, *AJA* 31 (1927) 432-433 with a photograph in Figure 10; it was published (without authorization) by Werner Peek, *'Αρχαιολογική Ἐφημερίς* (1931) 103-104.

influence we can no longer treat lightly the suggestion that Herodotus has been led astray by the mere glamour of the name Pheidon.

Herodotus knew that Leocedes was the son of Pheidon and that he came from the Argolid; whether from Cleonae or Argos made no difference. Herodotus promptly seized upon the name Pheidon and identified it with the Argive tyrant.<sup>39</sup> I venture to suggest that Pheidon of Cleonae was the father of both the epigraphic Aristis and the Herodotean Leocedes.

If this interpretation is correct the wedding must be dated before the war between Argos and Sicyon, since that war found Cleonae certainly on the side of Argos and very possibly the special cause of the struggle. While I contend that in pre-war days an Argive would not have been barred from the Sicyonian court, I am nevertheless aware that a Cleonaeon, whose home lay within Sicyonian jurisdiction, is even more to be anticipated among those paying court to Agariste.

Before bidding farewell to Agariste we may extract from the story one more implication of historical importance.<sup>40</sup> It has been remarked that suitors came from Eretria, Sybaris, Siris, and Epidamnus, cities which belonged to the Eretrian alliance; to these let us add Males of Aetolia and, finally, the Eleian. I here repeat the proposal that this group may be considered as indicative of Cleisthenes' interest in the west. Bury has before this attributed to Pheidon a western policy in refounding the Olympian festival in the seventh century.<sup>41</sup> It is far from improbable that Cleisthenes borrowed the aspirations of Pheidon; Cleisthenes too was prominent at Olympia and it was at Olympia that he announced publicly the "début" of Agariste. At any rate we may watch for further indications of Cleisthenes' ambitions in the west; if these should accumulate, they may be judged sufficiently strong to account in part for the ill-feeling which developed between Cleisthenes and Corinth.

The years 576, 572, and 568 B.C. have all been mentioned as

<sup>39</sup> How and Wells (2.118) feel that with Pheidon securely dated to the seventh century (rather than earlier), Herodotus' error of identification is understandable.

<sup>40</sup> We may here note that the suitors form a group thoroughly appropriate to the events of the time and that Busolt's statement (1.666, note 3) is quite the opposite of the truth: "Die Freier . . . bilden eine ohne besondere Rücksicht auf die Zeit zusammengestellte Gruppe bekannter Persönlichkeiten."

<sup>41</sup> Bury, *Nemean Odes* 259-262.

possibilities for Cleisthenes' victory at Olympia and opinion has leaned to 572.<sup>42</sup> The argument has here been made that the wooing of Agariste must be dated after Cleisthenes' open rupture with Corinth but before the war against Argos; I have elsewhere suggested that 570 is too late.<sup>43</sup> Any attempt to reach a more precise date leads us perforce to an examination of the circumstances surrounding the refounding of the Nemean games.

Nemea was in the territory of Cleonae, a town lying on the road between Corinth and Argos, adjacent to Phlius, which in its turn was situated due south of Sicyon. Thus in a war between Argos and Sicyon Nemea and Cleonae would stand directly in the path of the combatants. It is difficult to believe that Cleisthenes himself founded the Nemean festival. These games are connected most directly with Adrastus, an Argive by origin, whom Cleisthenes deprived of all honour in Sicyon, and with Heracles, a hero whose descendants led the hated Dorians into the Peloponnese—and so into Sicyon.<sup>44</sup> The *Nemea* were strongly Dorian.<sup>45</sup> Further, we know that the Nemean festival was celebrated first in 573 B.C.<sup>46</sup> and that the men of Cleonae held the presidency.<sup>47</sup>

It has been deduced that for a time at least during the reign of Cleisthenes Cleonae found herself under the domination of Sicyon.<sup>48</sup> In view of the associations of the Nemean festival it is illogical to suppose that Cleisthenes allowed Cleonae to found such a celebration. The only alternative is that Cleonae, with the help

<sup>42</sup> Macan, note on 6.126 (1.380–381); How and Wells, note on 6.126 (2.117); Johannes Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* 2 (Berlin, 1903) stemma opposite p. 53.

<sup>43</sup> *HSPh* Suppl. vol. 1 (1940) 79, note 2.

<sup>44</sup> See the hypotheses to the scholia on the *Nemean Odes* of Pindar (Drachmann, 3.1–5).

<sup>45</sup> Gardiner suggests that the *Nemea* were founded by the Dorians of the north-east Peloponnese as an eastern counterpart of Olympia (*Athletic Sports* 66–67). Later, the festival represents Argive influence at Nemea as against Spartan at Olympia.

<sup>46</sup> Hieronymus (Fotheringham, 179) gives Ol. 51.4 (573/2 B.C.) and the Armenian version (Karst, 187) the following year.

<sup>47</sup> This is clear from the references in Pindar, from hypotheses c and d in the scholia to Pindar's *Nemeans*, and on the basis of historical probability. Pindar's ode for the Argive Theaeus praises him as a victor at Corinth and at the hands of the men of Cleonae (N. 10.41–42; cf. 4.17: Κλεωναίου τ' ἀπ' ἀγῶνος). This shows that in Pindar's day there existed no ill feeling between Argos and Cleonae over the festival and implies that the tradition was amicable, i.e., that the Cleoneans presided with the full approval of Argos.

<sup>48</sup> Plu. *De ser. num. vind.* 7 (*Moralia* 553 A–B); Bury, *Nemean Odes* 250; the actual evidence appears to me to be weak but the inherent probability is very strong.

of Argos, instituted the *Nemea* in opposition to Cleisthenes, i.e., to celebrate the winning of her freedom.<sup>49</sup>

Thus the war between Argos and Sicyon must be dated, as historical credibility demands, between the marriage of Agariste and the first Nemead. It is not too hazardous to suggest that Cleonae herself caused the outbreak of a "shooting war" between Sicyon and Argos. Relations between the latter city, with her Dorian associations, and Cleisthenes, champion of the pre-Dorians, must always have been nearer to what is today called non-belligerency than peaceful friendship; Cleonae merely set the smouldering racial fires aflame.

Bury agrees that the first Nemead fell in 573 but adds that according to Eusebius the Argives usurped the conduct of the games in 567 B.C.<sup>50</sup> For this sequence I can find no authority and I suspect that Bury has inadvertently used Eusebius twice. It is agreed among commentators today that the first Nemead fell in 573 B.C. The source of this information is Eusebius; under Olympiad 51.4 (573/2 B.C.) Hieronymus (Fotheringham 179) gives: *Agon Nemeacus primum ab Argivis actus post eum qui sub Archemoro fuerat.*<sup>51</sup> This is obviously the statement on which Bury based his contention that the Argives usurped the conduct of the *Nemea* in 567 B.C. The rest of Bury's thesis is convincing: "Eusebius had got hold of a fact, but he distorted it. His statement readily proves the close connexion of Argos with the Nemean games in the earliest stages of their history. We may infer that the Cleonaeans administered the *agon* under the patronage of Argos."

If the first Nemead belongs in 573 and was instituted to celebrate a defeat administered to Cleisthenes by Cleonae and Argos, then the war between Sicyon and Argos and Cleisthenes' expulsion of Adrastus belong before 573; so also does the marriage of Agariste. The year of Cleisthenes' Olympic victory must then be placed no later than 576. Actually, this very year (576 B.C.) is the likeliest (although it must be admitted that 580 is not impossible), since

<sup>49</sup> Perhaps the Sicyonian defeat by Orneae belongs at this time; Plu. *De Pyth. or.* 15 (*Moralia* 401 D); Paus. 10.18.5; Skalet, *Ancient Sicyon* 58 with note 27. Cleisthenes, however, may have balanced his losses by a gain at Phlius (Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.556 with note 1).

<sup>50</sup> Bury, *Nemean Odes* 250-251. A dispute between Argos and Cleonae is unlikely; see note 47.

<sup>51</sup> The Armenian version places the first *Nemea* in Ol. 52.1 (572/1 B.C.) without mentioning Argives or Cleonaeans (Karst, 187).

this would accord most conveniently with the marriage of the daughter of Agariste and Megacles to Peisistratus in 559<sup>52</sup> and with the legislation of Cleisthenes of Athens in 508/7 B.C. The marriage of Agariste, on this basis, occurred in the late autumn of 575 B.C.<sup>53</sup>

This means that the open hostility between Sicyon and Corinth, as well as between Sicyon and Delphi, antedates 576 B.C.<sup>54</sup> As late as 582 B.C., however, Cleisthenes was not yet out of favour with Delphi, for in that year he won a victory at the *Pythia*. 582 B.C. has been accepted as the era year of the first Pythiad, Pausanias to the contrary.<sup>55</sup> The confusion concerning the date arose no doubt from the fact that there were various stages in the refounding of what was formerly an eight year festival. Cleisthenes himself played a leading part in the reorganization after the fall of Cirrha in 591/0 B.C.;<sup>56</sup> these first steps in the reorganization must hence be dated to 590. Pausanias<sup>57</sup> may give incorrectly the numbering of the Pythiads, but the details of the development in the games supplied by him are important. According to his account additions and changes were made in 586 and 582. In 586 for the first time the stewards offered prizes for athletes and added foot-races. In 582 the prizes were discontinued and crowns were substituted, i.e., the *ἀγών* became *στεφανίτης* instead of *χρηματίτης*.<sup>58</sup> In the same year the chariot-race was added and Cleisthenes was the victor. This marked the culmination of the reorganization. It is no co-

<sup>52</sup> For the chronology of Peisistratus' exiles I accept F. E. Adcock's conclusions (*CQ* 18 [1924] 174-181, esp. 181).

<sup>53</sup> The suitors were to report to the court of Cleisthenes within sixty days of the tyrant's announcement after his Olympic victory, and the decision was to be rendered after a year's trial (*Hdt.* 6.126.2).

<sup>54</sup> The expulsion of Adrastus from Sicyon and the rebuff received by Cleisthenes at Delphi (both incidents related to the Argive war) fall between 575 and 573 (*Hdt.* 5.67).

<sup>55</sup> The scholia to Pindar *P.* 3 (Drachmann, 2.62-63) place the first *Pythia* in the 49th Olympiad (584-580 B.C.); cf. *Marm. Par.* 37-38 with F. Jacoby's notes *ad locc.* (Berlin, 1904) 165-167; F. G. Kenyon, *The Poems of Bacchylides* (London, 1897) 35 and 37; Sir John Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar* ("Loeb Classical Library," London, 1919) xxvii with note 2; L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* 2 (London, 1932) 107; contrast Paus. 10.7.4-6.

<sup>56</sup> The fall of Cirrha did not, apparently, end the hostilities of the Sacred War, for the Cirrhaeans maintained themselves for a further six years; see the discussion of the scholiast to Pindar by Jacoby, *Marm. Par.* 37 (pp. 165-166); cf. Clinton, *Fasti* 1.224 and 226 under 595 B.C.; 2<sup>3</sup> (1841) 239. If the war continued for six years then we have a sound motive to account for Cleisthenes delaying his Pythian triumph and the regular institution of the games until 582 B.C.

<sup>57</sup> Paus. 10.7.4-6.

<sup>58</sup> *Marm. Par.* 38 (Jacoby, 166): 'Ἐν Δελφοῖς στεφανίτης ἀγὼν πάλιν ἐτέθη.

incidence that the *ἀγών* became finally *στεφανίτης* in the very year of Cleisthenes' great victory.

The reorganization appears to have passed through three stages:

- 590 Revival after the Sacred War
- 586 Gymnic contests added
- 582 Victory of Cleisthenes in the chariot-race.  
*ἀγών στεφανίτης*. Era date.

It will be noted that the additions to the Panhellenic games in this era are for the most part democratic. The contrast between the sixth century games and those depicted by Homer<sup>59</sup> in his description of the funeral of Patroclus illustrates the change which was taking place in society. The contests arranged by Achilles for the funeral were typically aristocratic and the major contest was a chariot race. It is obvious that none but the wealthy could participate in sports such as these. While the chariot-races never lost their popularity at the great festivals of Greece, by the sixth century the programme had been enriched by contests purely athletic in which the poor man was on an equality with the rich and in which the mere honour of victory was tremendous. When all Hellenes of all ranks were eligible to compete, the games had become truly democratic. It is for this reason that Bury attributes the sixth century foundations to the tyrants, since this tendency agrees with their policy of giving a place of dignity and importance in society to the common people.

So far as the *Pythia* are concerned the evidence bears out Bury's view. Cleisthenes, the champion of Delphi in the Sacred War, is so closely connected with the revived *Pythia* that we must yield to him the major credit for their reorganization. Yet by 576 Cleisthenes, as we have seen, is not only a prominent figure at Olympia, but there are grounds for believing that his one-time friendship with Delphi is no more. We cannot hesitate to associate the Delphic and Corinthian attitudes; we should also attempt to explain them.

I believe that we possess knowledge of events which affected relations between Cleisthenes and Delphi. The most crucial is the fall of the tyranny in Corinth, which must have exerted a serious influence upon international relations in the vicinity of the Isthmus. Obviously, it will be necessary to determine when the tyranny

<sup>59</sup> *Il.* 23.

ended before fitting the political metamorphosis at Corinth into the larger scheme of things.

The problem is not a new one and I do not intend to discuss it in detail. For our purposes, a *terminus ante quem* will be sufficient. Diogenes Laertius tells us that Periander flourished in the 38th Olympiad (628/7–625/4; so also Suidas) and that he ruled for 40 years (so also Aristotle). Aristotle adds that Psammetichus was tyrant for three years. Under Ol. 48.1 (588/7) Hieronymus gives: Corinthiorum monarchia destructa est. The Armenian version of Eusebius dates this a year later.<sup>60</sup> It is evident that Eusebius dated the tyranny to the death of Periander and ignored the insignificant Psammetichus; in a discussion of so important a move as the foundation of the Isthmian games we could very well do the same. Diogenes Laertius (quoting Sosicrates) places Periander's death in Ol. 48.4 (585/4), 40 or 41 years (see note 61) before the fall of Croesus (πρότερον Κροίσου τελευτῆσαι αὐτὸν ἔτεσι τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἐνὶ πρὸ τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς ἐνάτης Ὀλυμπιάδος). This is the latest date given for the death of Periander and it places the final fall of the tyranny (allowing three years for Psammetichus) no later than 582/1; historians have placed it earlier but never later.<sup>61</sup>

Now 582 is the year of the foundation of the *Isthmia* and *Pythia*; Eusebius placed both in the same year (Ol. 49.4 Hieronymus = 581/0; 50.1 Armenian) and we have already accepted 582 as the era date of the *Pythia*. In other words, the Isthmian games fall at the very end of the tyranny, some years after the death of Periander, who has sometimes been given the credit for their foundation; we need spend no time considering Psammetichus, who by 582 was probably no longer tyrant of Corinth. The coincidence of dates is so striking that we can no longer hesitate to link the foundation of the *Isthmia*, not with the tyrants, but with the fall of the tyranny in Corinth.<sup>62</sup> It is also instructive to observe that three or four

<sup>60</sup> D.L. 1.95 and 98; Suid. s.v. Περίανδρος; Arist. Pol. 5.9.22 (1315b); Hier. p. 177 (Fotheringham); Eus., Arm. vers., p. 187 (Karst).

<sup>61</sup> Karl Julius Beloch, by an attractive emendation of Diogenes Laertius (1.95, quoted above), harmonizes the chronological testimony on the Cypselids. He thus dates Cypselus' accession in 657/6 B.C., agreeing with Diodorus (7.9.3), and Periander's death in 587/6, which agrees well enough with Eusebius. In Diogenes he would read . . . ἔτεσι τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἐνὶ τρισὶ πρὸ τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς ἐνάτης Ὀλυμπιάδος, and count the 41 years exclusively. See *Griechische Geschichte*<sup>2</sup> 1.2 (Strassburg, 1913) 274–275.

<sup>62</sup> Ure (*Origin of Tyranny* 187, 212, and 260), curiously enough, dates the accession of Cypselus in 657 and the death of Periander in 587, yet appears to concur in the view that Periander reorganized the *Isthmia*.



months later the *Pythia* were celebrated with particular pomp, that Cleisthenes won a notable victory, and that the Pythian era dated from this year. The celebration at Delphi in 582 may mark a reaction against the fall of the Corinthian tyranny and the institution of the *Isthmia*.

In the period immediately following I should date the end of cordial relations between Sicyon and Corinth; and Cleisthenes did not long enjoy the friendship of the oracle. Corinth, freed of the tyrants, lost no time in establishing its influence at Delphi and in the ensuing years Cleisthenes fell into disfavour with Apollo. We may assume that this transfer of alliance was motivated by commercial strategy in the Corinthian gulf. Cleisthenes must have realized what had occurred, but apparently the hostility was latent<sup>63</sup> until Cleisthenes petitioned for support in the ejection of Adrastus: ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρῆ φᾶσα "Ἀδρηστον μὲν εἶναι Σικυωνίων βασιλέα, ἐκείνον δὲ λευστήρα."<sup>64</sup> Herodotus connects this incident with the Argive war, which we have set between 575 and 573, as a result of which, he tells us, Cleisthenes effected changes in the festivals of Sicyon, drove Adrastus from the city by the introduction of his enemy, the Theban Melanippus, and gave the tragic choruses back to Dionysus and the rest of the worship to Melanippus.<sup>65</sup>

It happens that we possess independent evidence concerning Cleisthenes' treatment of the Sicyonian festivals. The scholia to Pindar assert that Cleisthenes established Pythian games at Sicyon. I cannot believe that Cleisthenes, while still in high favour at Delphi, established in his own city a Pythian festival that was sure to invite comparison with that at Delphi.<sup>66</sup> A far more comprehen-

<sup>63</sup> But it was at Olympia, and not at Delphi, that Cleisthenes (in 576?) announced his readiness to receive suitors for the hand of Agariste.

<sup>64</sup> Hdt. 5.67.2.

<sup>65</sup> Hdt. 5.67. The appearance of Melanippus on the Peloponnesian political scene must be interpreted in terms of overtures made to Thebes by Cleisthenes; see note 12. His strategy was to establish a friendly Boeotia behind an unfriendly Delphi. For the commercial significance of Thebes see Ure, *Origin of Tyranny* 262.

<sup>66</sup> Introductory scholia to Pi. N. 9 (Drachmann, 3.149). (The scholiast says that the Delphians gave to Cleisthenes one third of the spoils of the Sacred War, and that from these the Sicyonians established their own *Pythia*. The second statement is obviously an inference from the first and provides no evidence of date.) Ure (*Origin of Tyranny* 261) grasps the point and so is unable to reconcile Cleisthenes' foundation of local Pythian games with his championship of the festival at Delphi. The difficulty is again chronological, although this has escaped the commentators. The situation is impossible only so long as Cleisthenes' support of Delphic and Sicyonian *Pythia* is conceived of as simultaneous; if the installation of the Sicyonian *Pythia* is placed in its correct setting,

sible sequence of events is obtained if the foundation of the Sicyonian *Pythia* coincided with the Argive war and also represented a deliberate challenge of Delphi by Cleisthenes, who, with Delphi's rude treatment of his request fresh in his mind, had now taken off the velvet glove of expediency and made a bid for Panhellenic prominence by installing a Pythian festival at Sicyon. In this way Cleisthenes achieved a double purpose.

Corroboration for the thesis that what Herodotus describes is in reality the reorganization of the Sicyonian *Pythia* after war with Argos is to be found in Pindar. The ninth Nemean ode was composed for a victor in the Pythian games at Sicyon and Pindar connects Adrastus with the festival. The scholiast, however, corrects the poet, asserting that it was Cleisthenes who founded or reorganized the celebration at Sicyon.<sup>67</sup> It is clear, then, that what was originally a festival in honour of Adrastus (mentioned by Herodotus) developed into Pythian games held under the aegis of Sicyon.

This helps to date the Sicyonian innovation to the same period as the Argive war, i.e., between 575 (wedding of Agariste) and 573. In the latter year Adrastus, evicted from Sicyon, found new honour at the Nemean festival, instituted by Cleonae and protected by Argos. To the same interval belongs the ban against the singing of the Homeric poems; the changing of the names of the Dorian tribes, as part of Cleisthenes' anti-Dorian policy, probably came very early in his reign.

The basic cause of the differences between Corinth and Sicyon is not far to seek. As early as 591/0 we find Cleisthenes with a powerful fleet in the Corinthian (once the Cirrhaean) Gulf; this fleet broke the resistance of Cirrha and destroyed its hold on the neighbouring waters.<sup>68</sup> We have already noted that western aspirations may be traced in the roster of suitors and in Cleisthenes' prominence at Olympia. We may now add that Cirrha owed her prosperity to the tolls levied on importations and voyagers from Sicily and Italy. Thus the smashing of the Cirrhaean hold on the gulf may be interpreted as a bid for mastery of the western route.<sup>69</sup> Sicyon

then we may remain unworried by Cleisthenes' *earlier* prominence in the reorganization of the Delphic festival.

<sup>67</sup> Pi. N. 9.9 and 11 (ed. Schroeder, Teubner, 1930); sch. *ad locc.* (lines 20 and 25 in Drachmann, 3.152).

<sup>68</sup> Introductory scholia to Pi. N. 9; cf. Ure, *Origin of Tyranny* 259-260.

<sup>69</sup> Str. 9.3.4 (pp. 418-419) with the commentary of F. M. Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London, 1907) 35.

and Corinth were probably rivals even in the days of the Cypselids, but that rivalry was kept beneath the surface in the usual way of dictators when common interests are involved. With the fall of the Cypselids the natural antipathy between the commercial Dorian oligarchy of Corinth and the commercial anti-Dorian tyrant of Sicyon could not long be hidden.

The changes of front that have been detected in these pages were not, of course, sudden and clean cut. Cleisthenes and Periander managed to live side by side because it suited their purpose. Actually they watched one another closely; they knew they were rivals but they maintained a nominal friendship, since they were both anti-Dorian tyrants and their aims and interests appeared similar.<sup>70</sup> The fall of either tyranny without the other would naturally lead to a more intense bitterness between the cities. Such changes of front should not surprise us, for a dictator's policy seldom remains static; failure to comprehend this has led to considerable bewilderment, a bewilderment that is by no means confined to the ancient world.

In the case of Argos, we have proposed the dating of the open break and the war with Sicyon after the wedding of Agariste; certainly the war must be tied closely to the foundation of the *Nemea*. But this is not to say that Argos and Sicyon were firm friends before that time. Cleisthenes' whole reign was marked by his persecution of the Dorians and Argos was a Dorian city with Dorian tribe names. Yet that persecution was confined originally to his own city and did not preclude a degree of friendship with Argos. It was only after war with Argos (over Cleonae?) that Cleisthenes' anti-Argive complex developed, and this could very easily coalesce with his earlier crusade against the Dorians.<sup>71</sup> Even so, we must remember that Adrastus, through whom Cleisthenes expressed his enmity to Argos, was not a Dorian. In fact, it was as an Argive that he was ejected from Sicyon: τοῦτο δέ, ἡρώιον

<sup>70</sup> Yet it is worth observing that Cleisthenes had accused Isodemus of plotting with the Cypselids against him (Nic. Dam. fg. 61 in *FHG* 3.395).

<sup>71</sup> Herodotus (5.68.1) fell into the trap. He knew of the war with Argos, he knew of the anti-Dorian persecution; Argos was Dorian, hence Cleisthenes was anti-Argive because he was anti-Dorian. So he can say that Cleisthenes changed the names of the Dorian tribes in Sicyon ἵνα δὴ μὴ αἱ αὐταὶ ἔωσι τοῖσι Σικυνωίοισι καὶ τοῖσι Ἀργείοισι. At this rate Cleisthenes should have been at war with most of the Peloponnesian *poleis*; for this we have no evidence, nor would it conform to what we know of the tyrants' peaceful diplomacy. Herodotus has contaminated two distinct feuds—and has been followed by historians ever since.

γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἔστι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀγορῇ τῶν Σικυνωίων Ἀδρήστου τοῦ Ταλαοῦ, τοῦτον ἐπεθύμησε ὁ Κλεισθένης ἔοντα Ἀργεῖον ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκ τῆς χώρας.<sup>72</sup> The two great enmities of the tyrant's career were really quite separate; it was a happy accident that one could be made to include the other, and this is what led Herodotus astray.

We must see in Cleisthenes of Sicyon a worthy follower in the footsteps of Pheidon of Argos. As Pheidon essayed to recover the heritage of Temenus, so Cleisthenes aimed at securing control of the Corinthian gulf and the routes to the west. He was diplomat enough to combine his own interests and those of Delphi in 591/0, when his fleet brought Cirrha into submission and assumed hegemony in the gulf.<sup>73</sup> That he continued to look west is an easy assumption, even though we must wait until 576 for the evidence in Cleisthenes' prominence at Olympia and in the list of suitors for the hand of Agariste. He nevertheless managed to live alongside his rival Periander, not falling out with Corinth until her strength was, temporarily, on the wane. Similarly, he had little in common with Argos, yet contrived to postpone hostilities until about 574 B.C. It is proper here to note Wade-Gery's suggestion that Cleisthenes set up a tyrant in Phlius; as he lost Cleonae, perhaps he bolstered his own influence at Phlius, which would act as an outpost against Argos.<sup>74</sup>

At home Cleisthenes inaugurated his reign with the great Dorian persecution; this gave the people a "cause." After the fall of the tyranny in Corinth and the subsequent rupture of relations with Delphi Cleisthenes marched carefully. The victory and announcement at Olympia, followed by the wooing of Agariste, represented an outright bid for supremacy along the Corinthian Gulf and to the north-west and west. The rebuff at Delphi and the loss of prestige at the hands of Argos must have made the tyrant's position precarious, but Cleisthenes was astute enough to shift his people's attention by another great crusade, this time against Adrastus and Argos, and by all the pomp and propaganda attendant upon the institution of Pythian games at Sicyon. The able Greek tyrant has little to learn from his modern counterpart.

<sup>72</sup> Hdt. 5.67.1-2 with Macan's note *ad loc.* (1.208).

<sup>73</sup> That he combined diplomacy with military power (and a willingness to use it) is suggested by Nic. Dam. (fg. 61 in *FHG* 3.395: βιαίωτατος . . . καὶ ὤμωτατος, καὶ βοηθείας πολλοῖς ἐκπέμπων, ὡς ἂν ἔχοι συμμάχους) and Arist. (*Pol.* 5.9.21 [1315b]: καὶ διὰ τὸ πολεμικὸς γενέσθαι Κλεισθένης οὐκ ἦν εὐκαταφρόνητος).

<sup>74</sup> See note 49.

We have seen that the great games were founded neither by the tyrants nor against the tyrants, that if the *Olympia* and the *Pythia* owed much to Pheidon of Argos and Cleisthenes of Sicyon, still the *Isthmia* celebrated the fall of the Cypselids and the *Nemea* were begun in defiance of Cleisthenes.<sup>75</sup> Furthermore, Cleisthenes' own favour at Olympia in all likelihood belongs to the Pisatan interlude, before Elis, surely with Spartan support, regained the presidency of the Olympic festival.

The institution of the games, three of them in the first thirty years of the sixth century, is indicative of the growth of the Panhellenic spirit. Bury has made much of the coincidence of date and has linked the growing Panhellenism with the tyrants. But the tyrants did not create Panhellenism although they were clever enough to make capital of it and to exploit it.<sup>76</sup> "Tyrants recognized and tried to utilize the movement for their own advantage. But Panhellenism was independent of tyrants; it was a spontaneous movement of the people, and it need cause no surprise that one Panhellenic festival should owe its origin to a tyrant, another to the people."<sup>77</sup> The democratic process and the popularizing of the games went on after the tyrannies. That no strong reaction occurred is due to the fact that the oligarchies had learned their lesson and were willing to avoid a repetition of tyranny in the future by compromise in the present.

#### APPENDIX

I have constructed the following chronological table to illustrate the sequences urged in the preceding pages:  
600–595 B.C. Accession of Cleisthenes. Persecution of Dorians in Sicyon.

<sup>75</sup> For Bury's unknown despot of Argos (*Nemean Odes* 252 and 263), "who plays the same part in relation to Cleonae that Phidon had played in relation to Pisa," there is no evidence. Pheidon, technically (though not in effect), was hereditary king; his successors were in practice kings (and not tyrants).

<sup>76</sup> Peisistratus in Athens took advantage of the same general spirit by his renovation of the *Panathenaia* along democratic lines. From this time on the cult of Athena became the national cult of Athens, designed to give to the *demos* a worship superior in dignity and magnificence to the old local cults of Attica, whose administration was under the hereditary control of the great noble families who were the persistent enemies of the tyrants. The new festival was also meant to bring unity to Attica in religion and politics in place of the disunity which resulted from the rivalry of the noble houses. The glorification of Athena, the goddess of artisans, coinciding with the growing middle class nationalism, was an astute political move on the part of Peisistratus to win the support of the *demos*.

<sup>77</sup> Gardiner, *Athletic Sports* 66.

- 594 Legislation of Solon in Athens.  
 592 *Olympia* 47 (August).  
 591 Sacred War. Sicyon (Cleisthenes), Athens (Alcmaeon),  
 Thessaly (Eurylochus), Argos allied on behalf of Delphi.  
 590 Cleisthenes' naval power results in fall of Cirrha. Be-  
 ginning of reorganization of *Pythia* (August). Begin-  
 ning of decade of political confusion in Athens.  
 588 *Olympia* 48.  
 587-586 Death of Periander (?).  
 586 *Pythia*; further reorganization; *ἀγών χρηματίας*.  
 585-584 Death of Periander (latest possible date).  
 584 Final defeat of Cirrha. *Olympia* 49.  
 584-583 Fall of tyranny at Corinth (?).  
 582 Fall of tyranny at Corinth (latest possible date). *Isthmia*  
 1 (April). *Pythia* 1 (era date, August); Cleisthenes'  
 victory; *ἀγών στεφανίτης*.  
 582-576 Deterioration of relations between Corinth and Elis,  
 Corinth and Sicyon, Sicyon and Delphi. Strengthening  
 of relations between Corinth and Delphi.  
 580 *Isthmia* 2. *Olympia* 50; two *Hellandodikai*.  
 578 *Isthmia* 3. *Pythia* 2.  
 576 *Isthmia* 4. *Olympia* 51; Cleisthenes' victory and invita-  
 tion to the suitors.  
 575 Marriage of Agariste (late autumn). Deterioration of  
 relations between Sicyon and Argos. Cleonae restless.  
 574 Sicyon at war with Argos and Cleonae (and Orneae?).  
 Cleisthenes, rebuffed at Delphi, expels Adrastus, bans  
 Homeric poems, establishes Pythian festival at Sicyon.  
 With Cleonae lost to Sicyon, Cleisthenes makes diplo-  
 matic overtures to Thebes, instals pro-Sicyonian tyrant  
 at Phlius (?). *Isthmia* 5. *Pythia* 3.  
 573 *Nemea* 1 (July), established by Cleonae with Argive pro-  
 tection.  
 572 *Isthmia* 6. *Olympia* 52.  
 571 *Nemea* 2.  
 570 *Isthmia* 7. *Pythia* 4.  
 569 *Nemea* 3.  
 568 *Isthmia* 8. *Olympia* 53, under presidency of Elis, regained  
 with Spartan help. Beginnings of Peloponnesian  
 League.  
 567 *Nemea* 4; Aristis' fourth victory (earliest possible date).  
 566 *Isthmia* 9. *Pythia* 5.  
 566-565 Institution of *Panathenaia* (mid-summer, 565?), soon after-  
 wards reorganized and popularized by Peisistratus.  
 570-565 Death of Cleisthenes. Tyranny at Sicyon ends a short  
 time later.