

πόλιν ὅψ' ἐ προσελθόντα. Surely the idea that Cimon entered politics late is not only irrelevant for 462 but also singularly weak as an explanation of Ephialtes' success. But the problem has been created by treating the phrase as metaphorical and disappears if we note the context, remember that Cimon was away in Sparta at the time of the reforms, and translate literally, "reached the city late." The phrase then makes sense historically and has some point as an explanation. Aristotle is

pointing out that Ephialtes was successful because the conservatives had a leader who not only was a bit radical but also was actually absent at the time of the change and got back too late to do anything. This is the natural way to understand the Greek; it gains support from Plutarch's statement that Cimon, on his return from Sparta, did make an unsuccessful attempt to undo Ephialtes' reforms (*Cim.* 15. 2).

R. D. SCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

## TWO NOTES ON THE ORTHAGORIDS OF SICYON

### I. Andreas and Orthagoras, *Mageiroi*

Diodorus Siculus tells us (8. 24) that Andreas, the father of Orthagoras the first tyrant of Sicyon, was a *mageiros*.<sup>1</sup> We are further told by almost necessary implication that Orthagoras himself also started out as a *mageiros*, for he was educated as was proper for the son of one (*FGH* 105 F 2. 19–21). Under the circumstances we ought to trust Libanius,<sup>2</sup> when he calls Orthagoras a *mageiros* outright.<sup>3</sup> Most modern scholars, however, reject the datum on the grounds, express or implied, that in Sicyon of the seventh century B.C. it is inconceivable that a man of such low rank could have risen to become tyrant. H. Berve,<sup>4</sup> the author of the most recent exhaustive analysis of ancient Greek tyranny, suffices as an example of this view. Frequently *mageiros* is translated simply as "cook," but "cook-butcher" would be more accurate.<sup>5</sup> It is likely, however, that this regular interpretation of the sources rests upon a misunderstanding of the social status of at least some kinds of *mageiroi* in archaic Greece.

Diodorus (8. 24; cf. *FGH* 105 F 2. 4–8) clearly states that Andreas accompanied an embassy to Delphi (an embassy which received a prophecy of the future tyranny of the Orthagorids) as a *mageiros* for the sacrifices. But such a *mageiros* was no man of the proletariat in archaic Greek times. *Iliad* 3. 392–94 depicts Agamemnon himself slaying the victim for sacrifice. At Sparta the *mageiroi* (of this kind) ranked with the sacrosanct heralds (*Hdt.* 6. 60), and Cleidemus (*FGH* 323 F 5) says that at Athens too they ranked with the heralds; in that city the Kerykes were a well-known noble *genos*.<sup>6</sup> Hence we seem entitled to infer not only that Andreas and Orthagoras were men of social rank considerably above that of the common people, but that they may well have even been of noble birth. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that a descendant of Andreas and Orthagoras married a son of the noble Athenian family of the Alcmaeonidae, after suitors from many other noble *gene* had competed for her hand in vain (*Hdt.* 6. 126–30). The fact lends no little confirmation to the hypothesis of noble

1. As the text of the excerpt in Diodorus stands, it should mean that Andreas himself was the first tyrant, rather than his son, but one suspects corruption in more than the last sentence of the extract, which inspired the doubts of Jacoby, *FGH*, II C, 337, ad 105 F 2. Some scholars in the past, more from the failure of *Hdt.* to mention Orthagoras (although he does mention Andreas as ancestor of Cleisthenes, 6. 126. 1), than from this passage, have made Andreas the first tyrant and/or identified him with Orthagoras. But other sources, esp. *Plut. Ser. num. vind.* 7 (553A–B) and *FGH* 105 F 2 (= F. Bilabel, *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente* [Bonn, 1923], 2), make it clear that Orthagoras was distinct from Andreas and was the latter's son.

2. *Or.* 57. 52 (IV, 173 F); cf. *Helladius ap. Phot. Bibl.*, p. 530a (Bekker).

3. Although Jacoby, II C, 338, calls Libanius' assertion a mere "Flüchtigkeit."

4. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Munich, 1967), I, 27; cf. C. Mossé, *La tyrannie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1969), p. 39. G. Glotz and R. Cohen, *Histoire grecque*, I (Paris, 1925), 331, and n. 206, almost hit upon what is here argued as the true concept of *mageiros* in this connection.

5. *LSJ*, s.v.

6. On archaic *mageiroi* connected with sacrifice, in general see E. M. Rankin, *The Role of the ΜΑΓΕΙΡΟΙ in the Life of the Ancient Greeks* (Chicago, 1907), pp. 23–25, 56 (a book cited by Glotz and Cohen [n. 4]); Latte, s.v. *Μάγειροι*, *RE*, XIV.1 (1928), 393–95, at 394.

rank for the Orthagorids. It seems doubtful that there would have been such competition among eminent Greeks for the daughter of even the powerful ruler of Sicyon, if he and she had been descendants of nobodies.

Herodotus (6. 60) also tells us that at Sparta the dignity of *mageiros*, like that of herald, was inherited by a son from his father; this agrees with what we are told about the upbringing of Orthagoras and his (presumably hereditary) profession. Hence there is no reason to disbelieve the account (FGH 105 F 2. 25–70) of Orthagoras' achieving military distinction as a soldier and officer of Sicyon.<sup>7</sup> The papyrus fragment that tells us most about Orthagoras (FGH 105 F 2) also informs us that Andreas (ll. 1–3 [almost certainly referring to him], 21–22) was a man of the common people, and links this status with his being a *mageiros*. This, however, must be later interpretation, based on the mistaken assumption that the lowly character of a *mageiros* of later Greece was appropriate to the *mageiros* of archaic times as well.<sup>8</sup> And modern scholars have made the same mistake, even before the discovery of the papyrus fragment (from Ephorus?). But the account is basically quite favorable to Orthagoras; except for this point it praises his achievements in tones of high commendation. We seem entitled to suppose a relatively early source of information (even of Orthagorid times?), contaminated by the addition of subsequent erroneous evaluation of the status of *mageiroi*. The term as applied to the Orthagorids would seem, then, not to be an invention, but an authentic piece of information; its authenticity is in some degree validated by the mistake in understanding its meaning.

One also notes that the Orthagorids were members of the non-Dorian tribe of Sicyon (Hdt. 5. 68). If non-Dorian nobles or persons

of high social status could be recognized as such in Dorian Sicyon, if a non-Dorian could hold the highest military offices and honors before becoming ruler of the state, then E. Will's thesis<sup>9</sup> that there was little real antagonism between Dorian and non-Dorian as such in archaic Greece receives a perhaps not inconsiderable confirmation as far as Sicyon is concerned.

## II. Cleisthenes the King

Nicholas of Damascus (FGH 90 F 61. 1) says that Myron, a descendant and successor of Orthagoras, was king of the Sicyonians. Little value has been attributed to this statement by modern authorities,<sup>10</sup> although recently, and presumably on the basis of this fragment, N. G. L. Hammond<sup>11</sup> thought that the Orthagorids held the office of *basileus*, but only in its sacral character. Presumably this interpretation rests on the fact that Nicholas lays heavy emphasis on the inability of Isodamus, the brother, murderer, and successor of Myron, to perform the duty of offering sacrifice because of his blood-guilt (sects. 2–3). But the same fragment goes on to say that Isodamus was afraid that he would lose his *arche*, his power or rule, because of this disability (3); Cleisthenes, Isodamus' other brother and malign adviser, schemed successfully to deprive Isodamus of his *arche* in order to succeed him (4); and when Cleisthenes did succeed to his brother's power, he succeeded to the *tyrannis* (5). The most natural way, then, to interpret this fragment of Nicholas would be to identify *basileia* with *arche* and *tyrannis*; in other words, the Orthagorids held the kingship of Sicyon which included both religious and general governmental functions. Disqualification from performing the sacral duties so characteristic of an archaic Greek king would make it

7. And criticism of the particular details about the military offices he held, on the grounds that the relevant terms may be taken from Athens and that the facts are imagined from the military exploits of a typical tyrant, is not sufficient in itself to warrant their rejection; cf. the discussion in *CP*, LXVII (1972), 16, n. 27. On the possible sources, cf. the *Sic. Pol.* of Aristotle (Poll. 9. 77), and the works of the local historian Menaechmus (cf. C. H. Skalet, *Ancient Sicyon* [Baltimore, 1928], p. 48); in general, see Jacoby, II C, 338, for belief in some sort of Sicyonian historiographical tradition.

8. On the change in social status, see Latte, *RE*, XIV.1 (1928), 394; cf. Rankin (n. 7), pp. 25–28, but he is probably wrong in dating the change to so late an epoch as the third century B.C.

9. *Doriens et Ioniens* (Paris, 1956), pp. 39–44, for Sicyon in the time of Cleisthenes.

10. Berve, II, 532, denies it any validity, and holds, I, 29, that Cleisthenes held no legal, formal position.

11. *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1967), p. 148.

impossible for Isodamus to hold the office of *basileus*, priest-king regularly in archaic Greece and commonly among other Indo-European peoples at a similar stage of development. The terms *basileus* and *tyrannos* are interchangeable as late as Isocrates;<sup>12</sup> Herodotus (6. 127. 3), for example, refers to Pheidon, legitimate "god-descended" king of Argos, as a tyrant (cf. Arist. *Pol.* 5. 1310b26–28). And the inability of Isodamus to perform effectively the duties of archaic Greek kingship because of blood-guilt has a ring of authenticity (although the details of Nicholas' story may well awaken some distrust). If the tyrants or kings of Sicyon had been mere political bosses, like a Peisistratus, for example, it is difficult to see how blood-guilt could have incapacitated them for an informal position for which there were no set qualifications. Isodamus was not worried about mere unpopularity or mistrust which might overthrow him, but outright disqualification.

Furthermore, it is likely that Herodotus himself, who calls Cleisthenes a tyrant (5. 67. 1, 6. 126. 1), confirms that the latter did in fact bear the official title of king. Notoriously Cleisthenes wished to expel (the cult of) the hero Adrastus from Sicyon for reasons of political expediency. Asking permission from Delphi, he was told that Adrastus was king of the Sicyonians, but that *he* was a *leustêr* (Hdt. 5. 67. 2). The meaning of *leustêr* is obscure,<sup>13</sup> but there can be no doubt that it is a term of some objurgation. Adrastus had been many things, but that Apollo said he was king of the Sicyonians, as opposed to the *leustêr* Cleisthenes, almost certainly implies that the response should be expanded to mean that "Adrastus was king of the Sicyonians, but you, Cleisthenes, (calling yourself king) are only a *leustêr*."<sup>14</sup> The oracle is almost certainly genuine; since the insult of Delphi was not

confirmed by the outcome (Cleisthenes had a glorious and successful reign at Sicyon), it is not *ex eventu*, but probably contemporary,<sup>15</sup> and hence is valuable implicit testimony to the formal title given to Cleisthenes' power at Sicyon. One may note that Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 3. 41) seems to have interpreted the oracle in Herodotus in the fashion here argued. If it be true that Cleisthenes outfitted the Sicyonian fleet in the First Sacred War, and thereafter received the lion's share (a third) of the booty,<sup>16</sup> then in effect he was, as king, conducting the government by his own resources, and receiving a proportionate share of the war revenues as properly his. Both aspects of the matter are characteristic of the office of Homeric or archaic king.<sup>17</sup>

Hence it appears that Cleisthenes and his Orthagorid predecessors were kings of Sicyon, in religion and politics, and in the economic base of their power. That a noble family should accede to the royal office is not surprising; one recalls that the noble suitors of Penelope had the same ambition. After all, the Orthagorids were presumably noble (see above), and thus kingly (*papabile*!) in early Greece. We would give much to know how Orthagoras in fact and propaganda acceded to that office in the first place. The argument has elsewhere been advanced that it would be the most natural thing in the world for some of the first tyrants of archaic Greece to conceive their office in terms of the traditional kingship of the not-too-distant past.<sup>18</sup> If this is right, then one should have little hesitation in accepting statements of sources which may descend from archaic tradition that some of the earliest tyrants took the title of king.

STEWART IRVIN OOST

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

12. LSJ, *s.v.* *τύραννος*.

13. LSJ *s.v.*; R. Crahay, *La littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote* (Paris, 1956), p. 247; H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* (Oxford, 1956), I, 125, n. 17.

14. For the interpretation of the oracle, cf. W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, II (Oxford, 1928), 34, *ad loc.*; Crahay (n. 13), p. 247 (although one may doubt, in view of the information in Part I, that Orthagoras was so "obscure" as C. opines).

15. Argument of Crahay (n. 13), pp. 248–49; his argument is the more persuasive since he ordinarily takes an adverse view of the authenticity of "oracular literature."

16. Pref. schol. Pind. *Nem.* 9 (III, 149 Drachmann).

17. See, e.g., G. Glotz, *The Greek City* (London, 1929), pp. 42–43.

18. *CP*, LXVII (1972), 24.