



<https://publications.dainst.org>

---

# iDAI.publications

---

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

## Graeme F. Bourke **Bakkhylides 11 and the Rule of the «Slaves» at Argos**

aus / from

### **Chiron**

Ausgabe / Issue **41 • 2011**

Seite / Page **125–148**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/437/5045> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2011-41-p125-148-v5045.6

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin**

**©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://dainst.org)

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

## Bakkhylides 11 and the Rule of the «Slaves» at Argos

At Sepeia in the Argolid, Herodotos reports, the Lakedaimonians under the command of king Kleomenes defeated and massacred the Argives.<sup>1</sup> He goes on to relate certain events that followed the battle, generally dated c. 494 B.C.:<sup>2</sup>

Ἄργος δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἐχηρώθη οὕτω ὥστε οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτῶν ἔσχον πάντα τὰ πρήγματα ἄρχοντές τε καὶ διέποντες, ἐς ὃ ἐπήβησαν οἱ τῶν ἀπολομένων παῖδες. ἔπειτ' ἄσπετος οὗτοι ἀνακτώμενοι ὀπίσω ἐς ἑωυτοὺς τὸ Ἄργος ἐξέβαλον· ἐξωθεύμενοι δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι μάχῃ ἔσχον Τίρυνθα. τέως μὲν δὴ σφι ἦν ἄρθμια ἐς ἀλλήλους, ἔπειτα δὲ ἐς τοὺς δούλους ἦλθε ἀνὴρ μάντις Κλέανδρος, γένος ἑὸν Φιγαλεὺς ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίας· οὗτος τοὺς δούλους ἀνέγνωσε ἐπιθέσθαι τοῖσι δεσπότησι. ἐκ τούτου δὲ πόλεμος σφι ἦν ἐπὶ χρόνον συχρόν, ἐς ὃ δὴ μόγις οἱ Ἄργεῖοι ἐπεκράτησαν.<sup>3</sup>

«And Argos was so deprived of men that their δοῦλοι had charge of all affairs, functioning as magistrates and executive officers, until the sons of those who had been

---

I wish to thank G. R. STANTON, of the University of New England, Australia, and D. H. KELLY of the Australian National University, who read earlier drafts of this paper, and to acknowledge the generous assistance of G. H. R. HORSLEY, also of the University of New England. I am, in addition, thankful for the helpful suggestions offered by the anonymous referees and the editor of *Chiron*.

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. 6.75.3–82.2. Herodotos' account of the battle and subsequent events appears in the context of his record of three different explanations, each involving sacrilege, for Kleomenes' particularly violent suicide: that commonly held in Greece; that of the Athenians; and that of the Argives: Hdt. 6.75.1–3; cf. P. A. STADTER, *Plutarch's Historical Methods: An Analysis of the *Mulierum Virtutes**, 1965, 46.

<sup>2</sup> Date of Sepeia: G. GROTE, *A History of Greece* V, 1907, 36 with n. 1; G. BUSOLT, *Griechische Geschichte* II, 1895, 562; K. J. BELOCH, *Griechische Geschichte* II, 1914, 14 n. 1; R. F. WILLETTS, *The Servile Interregnum at Argos*, *Hermes* 87, 1949, 495; F. KIECHLE, *Argos und Tiryns nach der Schlacht bei Sepeia*, *Philologus* 104, 1960, 188; W. G. FORREST, *Themistokles and Argos*, *CQ* 10, 1960, 221; R. A. TOMLINSON, *Argos and the Argolid*, 1972, 93; I. H. M. HENDRIKS, *De interpolitieke en internationale betrekkingen van Argos in de vijfde eeuw v. Chr.*, Groningen Thesis 1982, 278; A. ANDREWES, *Argive Perioikoi*, in: E. M. CRAIK (ed.), «Owls to Athens»: *Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, 1990, 171, but see 178; D. M. LEWIS, *Mainland Greece, 479–451 B.C.*, *CAH*<sup>2</sup> 5.101, who says «or possibly a few years earlier»; E. W. ROBINSON, *The First Democracies: Early Popular Government outside Athens*, 1997, 84 with n. 76; M. PIÉRART, *Argos*, in: M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN (edd.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical *Poleis**, 2004, 603.

<sup>3</sup> Hdt. 6.83.1–2.

killed grew to manhood. When they regained Argos for themselves, they threw them out; but the δούλοι, who had been forced out in a battle, held Tiryns. For a time they were peaceful towards each other, but later a man who was a seer, Kleandros of Arkadian Phigaleia, came to the δούλοι and induced them to attack their masters. Because of this they fought a prolonged war, until, indeed, with difficulty, the Argives prevailed.»

There Herodotos' account of these events ends, apart from a further statement in a different context that the Argives later excused their reluctance to aid in the resistance to Xerxes by explaining that six thousand of them had recently been killed by Kleomenes and the Lakedaimonians.<sup>4</sup> His report is generally interpreted to imply that the Argive citizens, depleted in numbers, either lost control of the state to the members of a lower social order or shared it with them.<sup>5</sup> Further evidence, however, including a passage from an epinikian ode of Bakkhylides that appears to significantly predate Herodotos' account, rather suggests that those who had been invited to join with their counterparts in Argos in governing the state belonged to the elite among the perioikic communities of Argolis.<sup>6</sup>

### I. Bakkhylides 11

Bakkhylides 11 is an ode for the victory of Alexidamos of Metapontion in the boys' wrestling at the Pythian games. In the first twenty-three lines, the poet praises the goddess Nika, acknowledges Apollo, to whom the games were dedicated, and identifies the festival and the relevant contest, along with the victor, his father and his city, and thus fulfils «all the requirements of the commission».<sup>7</sup> He then claims that Alexidamos had been unfairly deprived of victory at Olympia on an earlier occasion. Artemis, nevertheless, had granted him success at Delphi (lines 24–39). Next comes a long digression in which the poet recounts the myth of the madness and cure of the daughters of Proitos, then ruler of Tiryns (40–112). Finally, the focus returns to Metapontion: the cult of Artemis at Arkadian Lousos, which Proitos and his daughters had founded in thanks

<sup>4</sup> Hdt. 7.148.2: νεωστὶ γὰρ σφέων τεθνάναι ἑξασιχιλίους ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Κλεομένεος τοῦ Ἀναξανδρίδew, τῶν δὴ εἵνεκα πέμπειν.

<sup>5</sup> BUSOLT (n. 2) 564f.; BELOCH (n. 2) 14 n. 3; P. A. SEYMOUR, The «Servile Interregnum» at Argos, JHS 42, 1922, 25–27; W. W. HOW – J. WELLS, A Commentary on Herodotus II, 1949, 97; WILLETTS (n. 2) 496–498; KIECHLE (n. 2) 185; FORREST (n. 2) 222–229, 240; M. WÖRRLE, Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte von Argos im 5. Jahrhundert vor Christus, 1964, 101–112; TOMLINSON (n. 2) 97–99; K.-W. WELWEI, Unfreie im Antiken Kriegsdienst I, 1974, 182–192; J. L. O'NEIL, The Exile of Themistocles and Democracy in the Peloponnese, CQ 31, 1981, 341–343; HENDRIKS (n. 2) 278f.; ANDREWES (n. 2) 177–178; ROBINSON (n. 2) 84–88; PIÉRART (n. 2) 605, 615.

<sup>6</sup> Bakkhyl. 11.24–36, 59–82; Hdt. 6.78.2–83.2; 7.148.2; Arist. Pol. 5.2.8, 1303a.8; Diod. 10.26; Plut. Mor. 245F; cf. Paus. 2.20.8; Polyain. 1.14, 8.33; P.Oxy. 222; Suda s.v. Τελέσιλλα.

<sup>7</sup> A. McDEVITT (transl.), Bacchylides: The Victory Poems, 2009, 178.

for persuading Hera to free the maidens from their madness, had been transferred to the Pythian victor's city by Akhaians returning from Troy (113–126).

The myth of the Proitids constitutes more than half of the ode and, since the claim that Artemis was instrumental in Alexidamos' victory introduces this myth, which in turn leads back to the foundation of her cult in his home city, is an integral component of its structure.<sup>8</sup> As JEBB notes, however, «the link between theme and myth is somewhat slender».<sup>9</sup> We may wonder what prompted Bakchylides to select this particular myth, set in the Argolid, for inclusion in an ode to a victor from Metapontion. Part of the answer may lie in the opportunity that it offered him to further digress on an earlier quarrel between Proitos and his brother Akrisios:

- ἤδη γὰρ ἔτος δέκατον  
 60 θεοφιλὲς λιπόντες Ἄργος  
 ναῖον ἀδεισιβόαι  
 χαλκάσπιδες ἡμίθειοι  
 σὺν πολυζήλῳ βασιλεῖ.  
 νεῖκος γὰρ ἀμαιμάκετον  
 65 βληχρᾶς ἀνέπαλτο κασιγνήτοις ἀπ' ἀρχᾶς  
 Προίτῳ τε καὶ Ἀκρισίῳ  
 λαοὺς τε διχοστασίαις  
 ἤρειπον ἀμετροδίκοις μάχαις τε λυγραῖς.  
 λίσσοντο δὲ παῖδας Ἄβαντος  
 70 γὰν πολὺκριθον λαχόντας  
 Τίρυνθα τὸν ὀπλότερον  
 κτίζειν, πρὶν ἐς ἀργαλέαν πεσεῖν ἀνάγκαν·  
 Ζεὺς τ' ἔθελεν Κρονίδας  
 τιμῶν Δαναοῦ γενεὰν  
 75 καὶ διωξίπποιο Λυγκέος  
 παῦσαι στυγερῶν ἀχέων.  
 τεῖχος δὲ Κύκλωπες κάμον  
 ἐλθόντες ὑπερφίαλοι κλεινᾶ π[όλ]ει  
 κάλλιστον, ἴν' ἀντίθειοι  
 80 ναῖον κλυτὸν ἰππόβοτον  
 Ἄργος ἤρωες περικλειτοὶ λιπόντ[ες].<sup>10</sup>

«For by now it had been ten years since the demi-gods with bronze shields, who did not fear the battle-cry, had left Argos, loved by the gods, and came to live [in Tiryns]

<sup>8</sup> McDEVITT (n. 7) 179; S. COSTANZA, Artemide e le Pretidi da Bacchilide (ep. 11) a Callimaco (h. 3, 233–236), ZPE 172, 2010, 4.

<sup>9</sup> R. C. JEBB (ed.), Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments, 1905, 58.

<sup>10</sup> Bakchyl. 11.59–81. Apart from the use of iota subscript, the text is based on the Teubner edition: B. SNELL – H. MAEHLER (edd.), Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis, 1970.

with their king, who was full of rivalry.<sup>11</sup> For from a trivial beginning a monstrous feud had sprung up between the two brothers, Proitos and Akrisios, and they were throwing down the people into both unjust dissension and mournful battle. They begged the sons of Abas, who had gained as their portion the land rich in barley, that the younger should found Tiryns before they fell into dire necessity. And Zeus the son of Kronos, honouring the kindred of Danaos and chariot-driving Lynkeos, wished to cause their hateful distress to cease. And the mighty Kyklopes came and built a most wonderful wall for the illustrious city, where the god-like, far-famed heroes lived after they had left horse-nourishing Argos.»

Although scholars appear unanimous in assuming that Herodotos' report is the earliest evidence available for the events that followed the battle of Sepeia, there are three sound reasons for believing that the mythical narrative in Bakkhylides 11.59–81 in part constitutes an oblique reference to the historical expulsion of the δούλοι from Argos and their sojourn in Tiryns reported by Herodotos. Firstly, in both cases, internal dissension in Argos results in one side retiring to Tiryns, after which rivalry between the two factions continues. Secondly, while both another passage of the same work and the metre employed in the ode suggest that Bakkhylides 11 was composed when Herodotos' δούλοι had been in occupation of Tiryns for twelve or so years, the mythical narrative commences when Proitos and his followers had been living in Tiryns for roughly a decade. Finally, although the myth of Proitos is older than the poem in question, so the apparent similarities between the passages in Herodotos and Bakkhylides could be seen as a simple coincidence, there is good reason to believe that the poet adjusted it to more closely parallel events in early fifth-century Argos.

Rivalry between the sons of those who had been killed at Sepeia and the δούλοι continued after the former had expelled the latter from Argos. Herodotos' claim that the two camps remained friendly at first simply indicates that open hostilities ceased for a time after the violent expulsion of the δούλοι,<sup>12</sup> and he soon has the exiles engaged in a long struggle with those who remained in the city. In Bakkhylides' ode, similarly, Proitos remains «full of rivalry». McDEVITT, pointing to other instances of Bakkhylides' use of the term (9.44 and 10.48), assumes that πολύζηλος (line 63) suggests that Proitos was «envied».<sup>13</sup> In both passages that he cites as proof, however, along with a further instance at Bakkhylides 1.184, the term used is in fact πολυζήλωτος. While this

<sup>11</sup> For πολύζηλος as «full of rivalry», see below.

<sup>12</sup> Hdt. 6.83.1: ἐξωθεύμενοι δὲ οἱ δούλοι μάχη ἔσχον Τίρυνθα. As WÖRRLE (n. 5) 112 n. 39 points out, the view of both SEYMOUR (n. 5) 27f. and WILLETTTS (n. 2) 499 that the δούλοι willingly left the city under agreement with the sons of those who had been killed at Sepeia «contradicts the unequivocal statement of Herodotos»; cf. KIECHLE (n. 2) 189; FORREST (n. 2) 225.

<sup>13</sup> McDEVITT (n. 7) 188; cf. JEBB (n. 9) 327; R. FAGLES (transl.), *Bacchylides: Complete Poems*, 1961, 32; D. A. CAMPBELL, *Greek Lyric IV*, 1992, 181; J. IRIGOIN (ed.), J. DUCHEMIN – L. BARDOLLET (transl.), *Bacchylide: Dithyrambes, épinicies, fragments*, 1993, 174; D. R. SLAVITT (transl.), *Epinician Odes and Dithyrambs of Bacchylides*, 1998, 49.

adjective seems invariably to indicate that the person so-described is greatly worthy of emulation, envy or admiration, the closely related πολύζηλος can have an active sense and thus be rendered as «full of jealousy and rivalry».<sup>14</sup> The context of πολύζηλος in this ode, the recent expulsion of Proitos from Argos in favour of his brother Akrisios, suggests that it is used in such a way. We may, however, temper the phrasing of the translation here by refraining from including «jealousy», since πολύζηλος is clearly meant as a term of praise.<sup>15</sup> The bold, rivalrous nature of the «heroes» is a quality to be admired, and there is none of the mean-spirited covetousness that the English «jealousy» suggests. Bakkhylides praises Proitos, the brave «demi-god» and «far-famed hero», for being «full of rivalry» rather than for any envy that he might receive or jealousy that he might feel. The objects of this rivalry, like that of Herodotos' δοῦλοι, can only have been those who had retained possession of Argos.

The historical events described by Herodotos and the mythology found in Bakkhylides' ode bear similarities that the audience of the latter, pan-Hellenic in composition,<sup>16</sup> can hardly have failed to notice, especially since the ode appears to have been composed a decade or so after the ejection of the so-called δοῦλοι.<sup>17</sup> Although the

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. the eighth edition of LIDDELL – SCOTT, 1897, published in the same year that the papyrus containing the poems of Bakkhylides was made available to scholars and thus prepared earlier: E. SCOTT, Preface, in: F. G. KENYON, *The Poems of Bacchylides: From a Papyrus in the British Museum*, 1897. In the 9<sup>th</sup> edition, the first LSJ, the entry for πολύζηλος appears to have been altered on the basis of a translation of Bakkhylides 11 in which the phrase under discussion was assumed to indicate that Proitos was greatly envied. This entry, therefore, cannot be used to support such an assumption.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Soph. *Trach.* 185.

<sup>16</sup> Longer *epinikia* such as that under discussion, unlike shorter odes (e.g. Bakkhyl. 2), are more likely first to have been performed in the *polis* of the victor than in the sanctuary where the victory was gained. It is thus probable that Metapontion rather than Delphi was the venue for the premiere performance of Bakkhyl. 11, and the poet himself need not even have been present: C. CAREY, *The Performance of the Victory Ode*, *AJPh* 110, 1989, 545, 557, 562. Bakkhylides, nevertheless, may have continued to perform the ode, perhaps at aristocratic *symposia*, since «a poet who won attention by a victory in a public festival might well have been invited to enter the personal world of a new *xenos*' sympotic circle», or, as HORNBLOWER has it, «powerful individuals and lyric poetry attract each other»: H. PELLICCIA, *Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides*, in: F. BUDELMANN (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, 2009, 245; S. HORNBLOWER, *Greek Lyric and the Politics and Sociologies of Archaic and Classical Greek Communities*, in: BUDELMANN, 2009, 56. As CAREY, 548 points out, furthermore, evidence from the epinikian odes of both Pindar and Bakkhylides reveals that they were regularly taken up by other singers and repeatedly performed: *Pind. Nem.* 4.13–16; Bakkhyl. 3.96–98; cf. McDEVITT (n. 7) 14. Written copies of these poems must have begun to circulate throughout the Hellenic world soon after their composition, so the audience of Bakkhyl. 11 is likely to have been far broader than that assembled to celebrate Alexidamos' victory upon his return to Metapontion.

<sup>17</sup> Bakkhylides was not averse to making allusions to contemporary affairs when relating what was ostensibly mythical or prehistoric. In another epinikian ode, the thirteenth, performed in 485 or 483 B.C., he relates events at the climax of the *Iliad*, where the Greeks defend their beached ships: Bakkhyl. 13.91–169; *Il.* 15.59–77; McDEVITT (n. 7) 200. We need not doubt that

metre of this ode suggests that it belongs to the early part of Bakkhylides' career, no scholar up until now has been able to put forward a precise date for its composition.<sup>18</sup> An earlier passage of the same ode, lines 24–36, nevertheless, presents an avenue of inquiry:

- φάσω δὲ καὶ ἐν ζαθέοις  
 25 ἄγνοῦ Πέλοπος δαπέδοις  
 Ἄλφεὸν πάρα καλλιρόαν, δίκας κέλευθον  
 εἰ μὴ τις ἀπέτραπεν ὀρθᾶς,  
 παγξένω χαίταν ἐλαία  
 γλαυκᾶ στεφανωσάμενον  
 30 πορτιτρόφον [. . .]. '[. . . .]ραν θ' ἰκέσθαι.  
 [ - υ υ - υ υ - ]  
 παῖδ' ἐν χθονὶ καλλιχόρῳ  
 ποικίλαις τέχναις πέλασσεν·  
 [ἀ]λλ' ἢ θεὸς αἴτιος, ἦ  
 35 [γ]νῶμαι πολὺπλαγκτοὶ βροτῶν  
 [ἄ]μερσαν ὑπέρτατον ἐκ χειρῶν γέρας.

«And I shall say that on the sacred plains of hallowed Pelops, beside the beautifully-flowing Alpheios, if someone had not diverted the path of upright justice, [Alexidamos] would have come to the calf-nurturing [plains of his fatherland] with his flowing hair crowned with the gleaming olive, open to all comers. . . . using skilful arts he brought a boy near [to the ground] in the land of beautiful choruses; but either a god was responsible, or the wayward thoughts of mortals kept the highest honour from his hands.»

---

the Greeks of this period associated the Persians with the Trojans, and the context of this passage on the eve of Xerxes' invasion of Greece alone is enough to suggest that a contemporary allusion is intended. Herodotos was aware of such an association, since, albeit probably fictitiously, he has the Persians see in the sack of Troy the origin of their struggle with the Greeks: 1.5.1, cf. 1.1.1–5.4. The Athenians in the late 460s placed a depiction of Marathon next to one of the sack of Troy in the Stoa Poikile: Paus. 1.15.2–3. An inscription at Athens that appears to have dated from the mid-470s B.C., furthermore, drew a similar parallel: Aisch. 3.183–185; Plut. Kim. 7.3–5. In the Iliad, the Aiginetan hero Aias plays the leading role in defending the Greek ships from the Trojans, and we may see in Bakkhylides' choice of this particular myth to honour an athlete from Aigina an ultimately highly successful exhortation to the Aiginetans, who had once given earth and water to Dareios, to fight with the Lakedaimonians and their allies against the invaders: Hdt. 6.48.1–49.1; 8.93.1, cf. 83.2–84.2, 90.2. Date of Bakkhyl. 13: KENYON (n. 14) ix; CAMPBELL (n. 13) 5; D. E. GERBER, *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, 1997, 279; D. FEARN, *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, 2007, 342–350.

<sup>18</sup> SNELL – MAEHLER (n. 10) XIV, XXVIII–XXXI; IRIGOIN et al. (n. 13) 165; D. CAIRNS, *Myth and the polis in Bacchylides' Eleventh Ode*, JHS 125, 2005, 35.

The victor celebrated in Bakkhylides 11, Alexidamos of Metapontion, had failed to receive the olive crown in the boys' wrestling at an earlier Olympic festival, presumably the most recent, since it is unlikely that a boy would have been competitive in such a sport for many years before he became a man.<sup>19</sup> The Pythian festival regularly took place two years after the Olympian one, so if we can determine the Olympiad at which Alexidamos was supposedly cheated of his victory, we can date the ode. In this ode for a Metapontian victor, Bakkhylides places considerable emphasis upon mythical events in the Argolid. By highly praising those in Tiryns but not their opponents in Argos, furthermore, he appears to imply that the inhabitants of the latter city are unworthy of such admiration. It is worth considering whether or not the available evidence permits us to conclude that the boy whom the poet suggests unfairly received the olive crown at Olympia came from Argos, in which case his account of this incident would be a further expression of anti-Argive feeling.

Of the Olympiads during the conceivable lifespan of Bakkhylides, we have records of victors in the boys' wrestling for all from the 75<sup>th</sup> to the 83<sup>rd</sup>, 480–448 B.C.<sup>20</sup> A boy who won the wrestling at the 75<sup>th</sup> Olympic festival, held in 480, the year of Thermopylai and Salamis, is the only Argive victor in this event recorded for any of these Olympiads. If this were indeed the occasion upon which Alexidamos was supposedly misused, his victory at Delphi might be placed in 478. Bakkhylides, who lived until at least 452, appears to have been born at some time after c. 518, but may not have composed poetry until 483,<sup>21</sup> so an ode composed in 478 B.C., or perhaps in the following year, would belong early in his career and thus to the period that its metre, as noted above, already suggests. In view of the lack of evidence for an alternative date, we are able to conclude that Bakkhylides 11 was more likely composed in 478 B.C. than at any other time.

Scholars generally agree that the battle of Sepeia should be dated c. 494 B.C.<sup>22</sup> The sons of those who were killed there may have been young men rather than boys at the time, so there is no obstacle to placing their expulsion of the δούλοι within a few years after the battle.<sup>23</sup> There is, rather, good reason to do so, since in 480 Tiryns, in contrast

<sup>19</sup> Cf. McDEVITT (n. 7) 180.9. In Bakkhyl. 4.11–14, Hieron of Syrakousai is also cheated of a victory. For the relevant chronology, McDEVITT, 108–110.

<sup>20</sup> P.Oxy. 222; L. MORETTI, *Olympionikai* 204, 217, 230, 243, 255, 264, 275, 289, 302.

<sup>21</sup> KENYON (n. 14) VIII-X; CAMPBELL (n. 13) 5; GERBER (n. 17) 278f.; FAGLES (n. 13) XVII; FEARN (n. 17) 342–350; McDEVITT (n. 7) 17.

<sup>22</sup> See n. 2 above.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. ANDREWES (n. 2) 178, who observes that «the counter-revolution [as he sees it] need not wait till the youngest of the Sepeia orphans was fully grown»; K. ADSHEAD, Aristotle, *Politics* V.2.7 (1302B34–1303A11), *Historia* 35, 1986, 376f. The conclusions of FORREST (n. 2) 227 that the δούλοι were ejected as late as between c. 470 and c. 465 and O'NEIL (n. 5) 344 that the expulsion should be placed after 478 B.C. are founded upon the assumption that the «sons of the slain» or «Epigonoí» who expelled them were aristocrats and the regime of the δούλοι was democratic. WÖRRLE (n. 5) 105f. places the expulsion c. 470 on the grounds that the Argive upper class would have been slow to regenerate. His claim that the δούλοι must still have held

to Argos, fought on the Spartan side against Persia. The Argives of Herodotos' day made it clear that the reluctance of their forebears to help the Lakedaimonians to resist the Persian invasion was a consequence of the loss of 6,000 men at Sepeia, more, perhaps, the result of the natural hostility that men might feel towards those who had massacred their fathers than of a persisting ὀλιγανδρία.<sup>24</sup> Because of the fate of their fathers, we can expect the Argive government of the sons of those who had been killed both at Sepeia and in the subsequent slaughter to have been hostile towards Sparta,<sup>25</sup> and their enemies, the δοῦλοι in Tiryns, to have taken the Spartan side. There is certainly no suggestion by the Argives who informed Herodotos, who might easily thus have excused their forebears' hesitancy, that the regime in place in 480 B.C. was that of the so-called δοῦλοι.

We may, indeed, push the date of the expulsion even further back. When the Athenians campaigned against Aigina, at some time before the battle of Marathon in 490 B.C., the Argives refused an Aiginetan request for assistance.<sup>26</sup> Herodotos makes it clear that the authorities in Argos rejected the request because the Aiginetans had provided Kleomenes with marine transport during the Sepeia campaign, but also because they had subsequently refused to pay a fine that the Argives had imposed upon

Argos in 481 because Herodotos' Argive sources excused their hesitation to help the Spartan alliance against Xerxes on the basis that they had not recovered their numbers, however, need not be accepted. At 7.149.1, as WÖRRLE himself points out, Herodotos has the Argives say that one of the conditions for fighting on the Spartan side was that the latter grant them a thirty years' truce to give their sons the chance to grow up. The δοῦλοι who had replaced those who had been killed at Sepeia, however, would have had no need to ask for time for *their* sons to grow up. Only the restored sons of those who had been killed (and not a council supposedly composed of the survivors of Sepeia and tolerated by the δοῦλοι: SEYMOUR [n. 5] 25f.; cf. WILLETTS [n. 2] 500), and only in regard to the *grandsons* of those who had been killed, might have made such a request, and they would not have been in a position to make it if they had not already ejected the δοῦλοι. Nor does Herodotos' report preclude an early expulsion, as suggested by WÖRRLE, 111, cf. 115. By his own admission, 113, «ist die zeitliche Begrenzung des «δοῦλοι-Regimes» durch Herodots ἐς ὃ ἐπήβησαν οἱ τῶν ἀπολομένων παῖδες für eine exakte Datierung der oligarchischen «counterrevolution» (FORREST, a.O. 225) zu vage». Even an inexact dating is hardly possible on this evidence alone.

<sup>24</sup> Hdt. 7.148.2: νεωστὶ γὰρ σφῶν τεθνάναι ἑξακισχιλίους ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Κλεομένεος τοῦ Ἀναξανδρίδου, τῶν δὴ εἵνεκα πέμπειν. The Argives were, as it turns out, more inclined to oppose than assist the Spartans: HOW – WELLS (n. 5) 188f., 289, 291. That the Lakedaimonians marched to Plataiai *via* Arkadian Oresthion instead of taking the usual route through Argive territory suggests that the Argives were at least strong enough by then to block their way: Hdt. 9.11.2–12.1; cf. HOW – WELLS 290f.; KIECHLE (n. 2) 187.

<sup>25</sup> LEWIS (n. 2) 106f.

<sup>26</sup> Hdt. 6.92.1f, cf. 88.1–91.2. BUSOLT (n. 2) 563 n. 2 dates the expulsion to 487, apparently on the basis of placing the war between Athens and Aigina after Marathon; cf. KIECHLE (n. 2) 187; FORREST (n. 2) 225; WELWEI (n. 5) 190. Later scholars have argued convincingly, however, that the war took place before Marathon: N. G. L. HAMMOND, *The War Between Athens and Aegina*, *Historia* 4, 1955, 406–411; L. H. JEFFERY, *The Campaign Between Athens and Aegina in the Years Before Salamis* (Herodotus, VI, 87–93), *AJPh* 83, 1962, 44–54; cf. WÖRRLE (n. 5) 111.

them and the Sikyonians as a consequence of that assistance.<sup>27</sup> The fine must have been imposed before the Athenian campaign against Aigina, and thus before Marathon. BUSOLT's argument that the δούλοι had been ejected from Argos by the time that the fine was imposed because only «das alte dorische Argos» could have made such a demand upon the Aiginetans and Sikyonians has considerable merit,<sup>28</sup> since the Sikyonians did indeed pay a part of the fine and thus accept the legitimacy of the regime that had imposed it. This suggests a resumption of the previous state of affairs (though not necessarily, as BUSOLT proposes, a Dorian restoration). It is easier, furthermore, to accept that this fine was imposed by the «the sons», who had good reason to penalise those whose actions had facilitated the slaughter of their fathers, than to believe that it was brought about by a regime established in the wake of that event. The δούλοι are thus likely to have been expelled from Argos at some time before Marathon and to have lived in Tiryns for at least twelve years before 478 B.C., the date suggested above for the composition of Bakkhylides 11, in which Proitos and his followers had been in Tiryns for ἔτος δέκατον. We must keep in mind that in Greek literature such expressions tend to be formulaic rather than precise, so Bakkhylides is likely to have used ἔτος δέκατον to indicate a period of only roughly a decade. By this means, he may have hoped to encourage his audience to associate the mythical narrative of the departure of Proitos and his followers from Argos with the expulsion of a section of the Argive citizen body twelve or so years earlier. The most compelling chronological reconstructions available, it seems, tend to support the view that the passage of Bakkhylides 11 under discussion alludes to contemporary political developments in Argos, a fact of which we can expect the poet's pan-Hellenic audience to have been sharply conscious.

The third reason for believing that Bakkhylides 11 refers to contemporary events in Argos concerns the origin of the two myths about Proitos found in this ode. The first

---

<sup>27</sup> Hdt. 6.92.2. WÖRRLE (n. 5) 115 n. 45 finds the suggestion that Argos fined the Sikyonians and Aiginetans on the basis of an amphictyony «unbeweisbar»; cf. PIÉRART (n. 2) 603. Pausanias, on the other hand, says that the Argives and Sikyonians had sent help to the Messenians in the second Messenian war (4.15.7: ἔτι δὲ ἔξ Ἄργους ἀφίκετο καὶ Σικυῶνος βοήθεια). The conclusion of A. GRIFFIN, *Sicyon*, 1982, 60, citing Hdt. 1.68.6, that it is «likely, though nowhere actually stated» that Sicyon became a Spartan ally when the tyranny was overthrown in the mid-sixth century is placed in doubt by her subsequent observation that there is no record of Sikyonian participation in Spartan military operations of the second half of the sixth century. She does, on the other hand, 60f., present evidence of ties to Argos late in the sixth century, and we might assume that the contribution to Kleomenes' invasion of Argos was the first instance of Sikyonian support for Sparta. Herodotos reports that in a late sixth-century phase of the conflict between Athens and Aigina, the Argives had indeed responded to an Aiginetan plea (5.86.4). Perhaps both the Aiginetans and Sikyonians had previously been allies of the Argives, and it was under the terms of such an alliance that the latter were entitled to fine them; cf. HENDRIKS (n. 2) 277.

<sup>28</sup> BUSOLT (n. 2) 564 n. 2. The objections of WÖRRLE (n. 5) 114f. may be disregarded, since it is not the degree of «Argiveness» that is a factor here, but the legitimacy or otherwise of the regime.

of these, related in the main digression mentioned above, deals with the madness of Proitos' daughters, and the second, under discussion here, with the quarrel between Proitos and Akrisios. In the first passage, Hera had become angry with the Proitids for claiming that their father was wealthier than the goddess and so sent them mad and caused them to flee Tiryns, running off to the mountains and leaving Proitos so grief-stricken that he had to be restrained from committing suicide. After the maidens had wandered in their madness for thirteen months, Proitos came to the river Lousos in Arkadia, where he prayed to Artemis to free them from their frenzy. Artemis persuaded Hera to relent, so Proitos and his daughters built there a precinct and altar for Artemis, where they sacrificed and founded a dancing chorus of women. Thence its Akhaian founders took the cult of Artemis to Metapontion, the home of Alexidamos, whose victory is celebrated in this ode.<sup>29</sup>

Although Proitos is mentioned in the *Iliad*,<sup>30</sup> the earliest references to elements of the myths found in Bakkhylides 11 come from two fragments of the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. In the first of these Proitos gives a share of his kingdom to both Melampous, the healer and diviner, and his brother Bias, who have come to Argos, and in the second Akrisios rules in Argos while Proitos lives in Tiryns.<sup>31</sup> This does not tell us much, but Apollodoros, clearly relying upon a complete version of the same text, relates that the three daughters of Proitos had gone mad because they would not accept the rites of Dionysos but had finally been purified by Melampous, who had demanded the shares in the kingdom as his fee.<sup>32</sup> We have, in other words, a complete enough idea of what was reported at length in the Catalogue of Women about the madness of the Proitids to know that it is not identical to what is found in Bakkhylides 11.

Bakkhylides' version differs from that of the Catalogue in three significant ways. Firstly, in the latter, Proitos is resident in Argos at the time of the cure, but Bakkhylides has him in Tiryns.<sup>33</sup> Secondly, while in the Catalogue Dionysos causes the madness of the Proitids, in Bakkhylides 11 Hera takes this role.<sup>34</sup> In this, Bakkhylides appears to

<sup>29</sup> Lousoi: T. H. NIELSEN, *Arkadia*, in: HANSEN – NIELSEN (n. 2) 516f.; COSTANZA (n. 8) 6 with nn. 42, 43. The cult of Artemis in Metapontion: CAIRNS (n. 18) 37; COSTANZA, 6f. with n. 44. Metapontion as an archaic Akhaian colony: Antiokhos, *FGrHist* 555 F 12; Ps.-Skymn. *periegesis* 326–329. Strab. 5.2.5, p.222; 6.1.15, p.264; 8.3.14, pp.343f. makes it a foundation of Homeric Akhaians; cf. T. FISCHER-HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN – C. AMPOLO, *Italia and Campania*, in: HANSEN – NIELSEN (n. 2) 279.

<sup>30</sup> *Il.* 6.157–169, where he removes Bellerophon from the *demos* of the Argives; cf. Paus. 2.4.2.

<sup>31</sup> Hes. *Cat. fr.* 37, 129 M-W; cf. Strab. 8.6.11, pp.372f.

<sup>32</sup> Apollod. *Lib.* 2.2.2, cf. 1.9.1, 3.5.1; Strab. 8.3.19, p.346, 6.6, p.370.

<sup>33</sup> Hes. *Cat. fr.* 37 M-W; Bakkhyl. 11.69–84.

<sup>34</sup> Hes. *Cat. fr.* 131 M-W from Apollod. *Lib.* 2.2.2; Bakkhyl. 11.107–10. COSTANZA (n. 8) 4, cf. 3, says that in Hes. *Cat. fr.* 37 M-W the punishment is ascribed to Hera. The name Ἡρῆ, however, although restored by MERKELBACH and included by G. W. MOST, *Hesiod I*, 2007, fr. 35, is not found on the papyrus and does not appear in M-W. Given the direct statement of Apollodoros that Hesiod ascribed the madness of the Proitids to Dionysos (Hes. *Cat. fr.* 131 M-W), this restoration must remain doubtful.

have followed an alternative version of the myth, reported by the late sixth-century Akousilaos of Argos, whom Apollodoros informs us ascribed the madness of the Proitids to their disparagement of the wooden image of Hera.<sup>35</sup> Thirdly, while in the Hesiodic version Melampous cures the Proitids in Argos, Bakchylides makes Artemis responsible and shifts the scene of the cure to the river Lousos in Arkadia, where there was a sanctuary of that goddess in his day.<sup>36</sup> His motive in making this change appears to have been to introduce into the ode the cult of Artemis, prominent at Metapontion, the home of the victor Alexidamos.<sup>37</sup>

Bakchylides also transforms the story of the quarrel between Proitos and Akrisios. Apollodoros, again appearing to rely upon the Hesiodic Catalogue, reports that Akrisios drove out Proitos, who fled to Lykia, where he married the king's daughter.<sup>38</sup> Proitos' new father-in-law, at the head of an army of Lykians, restored him to his own land,

---

<sup>35</sup> Akous. FGrHist 2 F 28 from Apollod. Lib. 2.2.2; Bakchyl. 11.43–56. Contrary to the claim of COSTANZA (n. 8) 4, who refers to Akousilaos' report as «la versione primitiva», it seems that the latter published prose versions of Hesiod's poems as history, «correcting» (διορθώω) as he went: FGrHist 2 T 5, 6; Klem. Alex. Misc. 6.2.26; Jos. Against Ap. 1.16. This makes COSTANZA's conclusion that Bakchylides was faithful to the «nucleo primigenio» difficult to accept. Akousilaos may have altered the Proitid myth in order to construct a cautionary tale encouraging respect for the ancient and simple ξόανον of Hera; cf. Paus. 5.17.1, where the statues of Zeus and Hera in the Heraion at Olympia are ἀπλόος. The same innovation is found in Pherekydes, a contemporary of Bakchylides: Pherekyd. FGrHist 3 F 114. Both Akousilaos and Pherekydes, nevertheless, retain the role of Melampous as healer.

<sup>36</sup> In Paus. 2.7.8, Sikyon is the scene of the cure. Later authors also placed Proitos in Argos and made Melampous the healer: Pindar calls Argos «this horse-rearing city of Proitos» (Nem. 10.40–2); and Herodotos, although he makes no specific mention of the daughters of Proitos, says that the Argives wanted Melampous to heal the women of Argos (9.34.1); cf. Diod. 4.68.4; Paus. 2.18.4, 5.5.10, 8.18.7–8; COSTANZA (n. 8) 5f. Diodoros and, in one passage, Pausanias (2.18.4) call the Argive king Anaxagoras rather than Proitos, but the myth is the same in all other respects. R. SEAFORD, *The Eleventh Ode of Bacchylides: Hera, Artemis, and the Absence of Dionysos*, JHS 108, 1988, 130, rightly dismisses the suggestion that there «has been a confusion between two similar myths, one about Hera and the Proitids, the other about Dionysos and the married women».

<sup>37</sup> SEAFORD (n. 36) 120f., claiming that «the pattern of the narrative emerges ... not from (or not only from) the individual creativity of Bacchylides but from a type of ritual», cites Kallimakhos' Hymn to Artemis 233–236, assuming that Kallimakhos and Bakchylides used a common source, «an aetiological (Argive?) myth of this cult». Bakchylides himself, however, may have been the third-century B.C. Kallimakhos' source, and it is also possible that in shifting the location of the cure of the Proitids he was the first to provide the sanctuary of Artemis at Lousoi with a foundation myth.

<sup>38</sup> Note that at Il. 6.157–169, Proitos sends Bellerophon from Argos to his father-in-law, the king of Lykia, whose daughter in the Hesiodic version he does not marry until after his heroic exploits, which follow his own expulsion from Argos. For the Homeric and Hesiodic versions to be consistent, Proitos would need to have regained Argos from Akrisios before removing Bellerophon from that city. The attempt of the δοῦλοι in Tiryns to regain Argos (Hdt. 6.83.2) was perhaps further encouraged by Bakchylides' suggestive reference to a mythological cycle of which we have a less complete knowledge than he and his audience.

where he occupied Tiryns, fortified for him by the *Kyklopes*. The two brothers then divided the territory, *Akrisios* ruling from Argos and *Proitos* from Tiryns.<sup>39</sup> There are elements in common, but *Bakkhylides* seems to tailor the narrative to save face for the «demi-gods» in Tiryns, who, instead of being driven out by the faction of *Akrisios*, leave for the good of the people under the judgement of *Zeus*. He also omits any mention of the Lykian exile and return in force, so that *Proitos* goes directly to Tiryns. In this way, the myth is made to parallel more closely the civil disturbance in the Argolid reported by *Herodotos*.<sup>40</sup> It has recently been observed that *Bakkhylides* «seems to suggest something less than the full-scale civil war of the *later* sources».<sup>41</sup> Since, however, the narrative of *Proitos*' expulsion and return with a Lykian army found in *Apollodoros* and other late sources appears to have originated in the *Hesiodic Catalogue*, *Bakkhylides* is more likely to have scaled down a mythical war among the Argives in order to make it better suit early fifth-century events.<sup>42</sup> While the mythology concerning *Proitos* is clearly more ancient than *Bakkhylides*' ode, it is evident that the poet adapted it in ways that were not solely intended to facilitate praise of the victor *Alexidamos*.

*Bakkhylides* 11 appears to celebrate a victory won in 478 B.C. If so, the reference that it contains to a period of exile from Argos of broadly a decade is entirely congruous with the likelihood that the *δοῦλοι* were ejected from that city late in the 490s, a dozen or so years earlier. That *Bakkhylides* intended to make a contemporary reference is quite credible when we consider that the long, early fifth-century conflict between the parties in Argos and Tiryns, rendered highly topical by their divergent responses to the very recent Persian invasion, may have ignited at around the time that the ode was composed.<sup>43</sup> *Bakkhylides*, too, while maintaining an appropriate

---

<sup>39</sup> *Apollod.* Lib. 2.2.1; cf. *Schol. Eur. Or.* 965; *Strab.* 8.6.11, p.373; *Paus.* 2.16.5, 25.7, 8, where the brothers fight for the throne, but the result is a draw followed by reconciliation; *Hesych.* s.v. *Δαῦλις*; *CAIRNS* (n. 18) 38.

<sup>40</sup> *CAIRNS* (n. 18) 35, cf. 38f. finds that «*Proetus*' foundation of Tiryns resolves the civil strife which threatened to destroy Argos and commends colonization as a means of social and political progress», thus praising *Metapontion*, the victor's home. This does not, of course, make it any less likely that in the process *Bakkhylides* also made a reference to current affairs in the Argolid. Much the same can be said about the interpretation of *COSTANZA* (n. 8) 3–12. While *COSTANZA*'s assertion that *Bakkhylides*' introduction of *Artemis* is dictated by cultic motives concerned with the transformation of boys into citizen-soldiers and of girls into married women is rendered doubtful by the lack of any mention in the ode of either a future military career for *Alexidamos* or marriage for the *Proitids*, many of the nuances that he detects may indeed have been intended by the poet. If so, their presence is more a testimony to *Bakkhylides*' artistry than a negation of the arguments presented here.

<sup>41</sup> *CAIRNS* (n. 18) 38 (my italics).

<sup>42</sup> On *Bakkhylides*' manipulation of myth, cf. *McDEVITT* (n. 7) 118, 154.

<sup>43</sup> *Hdt.* 6.83.2; 7.148.1–152.3; 9.11.2–12.2, 28.4. The contingent of 400 hoplites from *Mykenai* and Tiryns that fought at *Plataiai* appears to have been only a fraction of those available, since they would have been entirely insufficient for the assault on Argos soon afterwards. Perhaps the rest remained at home in order to hinder the Argives from aiding the Persians.

focus upon the praise of his subject, the victor Alexidamos, appears to have selected and adapted the myths concerning Proitos and his daughters to better suit contemporary events in the Argolid. The link between the myth of the Proitids and the victor whom the ode celebrates, tenuous enough as it stands, is made possible only by the deliberate device of making Artemis rather than Melampous responsible for the Proitids' cure. Bakchylides appears to have chosen this particular myth for the main narrative of the ode partly, at least, because of the opportunity that it provided him to include and transform the story of Proitos and Akrisios and thus comment indirectly upon Argive political developments during the decades following the battle of Sepeia.<sup>44</sup>

## II. Demi-gods or slaves?

A fragment of Diodoros that appears to refer to Argos records that, when the right time came, the malice that the citizens felt towards the many, hidden earlier, broke out all at once, and their ambition caused them to free the δοῦλοι, preferring to make their οἰκέται free than make their free men citizens.<sup>45</sup> Aristotle says that «at Argos when those on/in the seventh [day of the month?/tribe?] had been destroyed by Kleomenes the Lakonian they were forced to receive certain of the περίοικοι».<sup>46</sup> «In making up for the shortage of men,» Plutarch declares, «they did not, as Herodotos reports, make the women live with the δοῦλοι, but made the best of the περίοικοι (τῶν περιόικων ... τοὺς ἀρίστους) into citizens and made the women live with them.»<sup>47</sup> In order to establish the identity of those called δοῦλοι by Herodotos, δοῦλοι and οἰκέται by Diodoros and περίοικοι by Aristotle and Plutarch, we need to examine each of these four texts in turn.

<sup>44</sup> This may be so, even if this digression is itself inessential to the main mythical narrative, as proposed by McDEVITT (n. 7) 179.

<sup>45</sup> Diod. 10.26: ὁ γὰρ τοῖς πολλοῖς παρὰ τῶν πολιτῶν φθόνος τὸν ἔμπροσθεν χρόνον ἐγκρυπτόμενος, ἐπειδὴ καιρὸν ἔλαβεν, ἄθρους ἐξερράγη. διὰ δὲ τὴν φιλοτιμίαν τοὺς δούλους ἠλευθέρωσαν, μᾶλλον βουλόμενοι τοῖς οἰκέταις μεταδοῦναι τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἢ τοῖς ἐλευθέροις τῆς πολιτείας. The implied subject of ἠλευθέρωσαν must here be οἱ πολῖται, since, in the previous sentence, the malice that is directed towards the many (τοῖς πολλοῖς) comes from them (παρὰ τῶν πολιτῶν).

<sup>46</sup> Arist. Pol. 5.2.8, 1303a.8: καὶ ἐν Ἄργει τῶν ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπολομένων ὑπὸ Κλεομένους τοῦ Λάκωνος ἠναγκάσθησαν παραδέξασθαι τῶν περιόικων τινάς; LEWIS (n. 2) 101; cf. ANDREWES (n. 2) 174–177.

<sup>47</sup> Plut. Mor. 245F; Sokrates of Argos FGrHist 310 F 6: Ἐπανορθοῦμενοι δὲ τὴν ὀλιγανδρίαν, οὐχ ὡς Ἡρόδοτος ἱστορεῖ, τοῖς δούλοις, ἀλλὰ τῶν περιόικων ποιησάμενοι πολίτας τοὺς ἀρίστους, συνήκισαν τὰς γυναῖκας. While accounts of events following Sepeia are to be found in further texts, none contains a statement about the identity of the new citizens: Polyain. 8.33; Paus. 2.20.8–9; Suda s.v. Τελέσιλλα.

Despite the doubts of some scholars, it seems best to conclude that Diodoros 10.26 is indeed relevant to a discussion of events in the Argolid after Sepeia.<sup>48</sup> This fragment suggests an opposition between the citizens on the one hand and a free but politically less privileged population on the other.<sup>49</sup> Since they opposed «the many», those called «the citizens» must have been in the minority. Diodoros makes no suggestion that «the many» acted first, threatening revolution: «the citizens», out of malice (φθόνος) towards their opponents, take the initiative. Yet we must look beyond sheer malice, since Diodoros also makes it clear that a share of the citizenship was at stake. «The citizens» would not have taken unprovoked action against «the many» in regard to political rights unless the latter possessed some such rights. If there were, indeed, no provocation on the part of «the many», «the citizens» would thus appear to have seized the opportunity that followed in the wake of a catalytic event, such as the defeat at Sepeia, to deprive them of such rights as they possessed. «The citizens», on the other hand, may have acted in response to a revolutionary threat that Diodoros does not mention, in which case a privileged minority composed of οἱ πολῖται would have enlisted the support of οἱ δοῦλοι either to forestall or oppose a popular uprising on the part of οἱ πολλοί, who were also οἱ ἐλεύθεροι, entirely distinct from οἱ δοῦλοι.<sup>50</sup> Whichever of these two alternatives we choose, the most pressing concern of «the citizens» appears to have been to preserve or extend their own privileges.<sup>51</sup>

Diodoros, unlike Herodotos, additionally describes οἱ δοῦλοι as οἱ οἰκέται, reporting that they were freed rather than enfranchised. This identification may reflect affinities with a passage in Pausanias where, after Sepeia, the Argive οἰκέται take part in

---

<sup>48</sup> T. J. DUNBABIN, *The Western Greeks*, 1948, 414 with n. 3 acknowledges the suggestion of ANDREWES that this passage may refer to events at Syrakousai in the same period. Despite this and the doubts of WÖRRLE (n. 5) 101 with n. 3, 107 n. 21, WELWEI (n. 5) 182 with n. 2 convincingly maintains that this fragment cannot concern Syrakousai and concludes that «on the grounds of its order in the *Excerpta de sententiis* (ed. Boissierain p.300), it arguably refers to the troubles in Argos after the destruction of the Argive army», a connection first made by DE SANCTIS; cf. BELOCH (n. 2) 14 n. 3; KIECHLE (n. 2) 185 n. 2. ROBINSON (n. 2) 85, 86 n. 83, nevertheless, urges caution.

<sup>49</sup> On the specific identity of the Argive πολλοί, WÖRRLE (n. 5) 102 n. 4; cf. O'NEIL (n. 5) 343 n. 93; ANDREWES (n. 2) 177; LEWIS (n. 2) 101 n. 17.

<sup>50</sup> In either case we may call the Argive constitution before Sepeia a πολιτεία. Aristotle sees this form of government variously as one between democracy and oligarchy, in which power was held by those who bore arms (Pol. 2.3.9, 1265b.26–29), as government by τὸ πλῆθος, but unlike democracy in that the multitude governed on behalf of the common interest rather than just in the interest of the poor (Pol. 3.5.2–4, 1279a.37–1279b.10), or as a mixture of some kind between oligarchy and democracy (Pol. 4.6.2, 1293b.33–34, 7.1–6, 1294a.30–1294b.42). While KIECHLE (n. 2) 185, followed by WÖRRLE (n. 5) 101 f. and WELWEI (n. 5) 183, finds a hoplite *politeia* the best suggestion, it remains possible that the poor enjoyed some kind of political role.

<sup>51</sup> Despite the doubts of ROBINSON (n. 2) 87, the fact that the Argives denied citizenship to «the many» at a time when there was a shortage of citizens is unlikely to have had any harmful effect upon the military, since the poorer Argives would already have served as light-armed troops, and admission to the citizenship could not in itself have allowed them to become hoplites.

the defence of the city from a Lakedaimonian attack.<sup>52</sup> Diodoros, however, does not mention any such attack, and οἱ δοῦλοι are recruited for the sole purpose of saving the citizens from sharing their privileges with the many. He thus seems to conflate two episodes in the series of events that followed Sepeia, resistance to the Lakedaimonians and the admission of οἱ δοῦλοι to Argive citizenship, and his identification of οἱ δοῦλοι who were recruited to preserve or extend the privileges of the citizens with the house-slaves whom Pausanias reports were freed to help defend the city-walls from the Lakedaimonians appears misguided. While Diodoros 10.26 remains valuable because it distinguishes οἱ δοῦλοι from οἱ πολλοί, this passage takes us no further in identifying the former.

Aristotle, in calling the new citizens «certain of the περίουχοι», makes a clear statement as to their identity. Scholars, nevertheless, have been divided in their view of how this is to be interpreted. In the passage in question, the philosopher explains that in δημοκρατία and πολιτεία a proportional increase in the number of the poor (τὸ τῶν ἀπόρων πλῆθος) can lead to constitutional change.<sup>53</sup> He gives three examples. The first is Taras after the Persian Wars, when the Iapygians defeated and killed so many of «the notables» (οἱ γνώριμοι) that a change took place from πολιτεία to δημοκρατία. The second is the report of events at Argos under discussion here. The third occurred at Athens when οἱ γνώριμοι suffered disasters in land warfare during «the Lakonian war».<sup>54</sup> The fact that Aristotle has named both δημοκρατία and πολιτεία earlier but after giving three examples says that «this also happens in democracies» strongly implies that these examples all concern the transformation of πολιτεία.<sup>55</sup>

In Aristotle's first example, Taras, the change is explicitly from πολιτεία to δημοκρατία. In his third, however, when he says that ἐν Ἀθήναις ἀτυχούντων πεζῆ οἱ γνώριμοι ἐλάττους ἐγένοντο διὰ τὸ ἐκ καταλόγου στρατεύεσθαι ὑπὸ τὸν Λακωνικὸν πόλεμον, it is not immediately clear which is «the Lakonian war»: if he means the Arkhidamian War, this can only be a reference «to a transition from one to another of Aristotle's types of democracy (Pol. 1291<sup>b</sup>30–1292<sup>a</sup>38)».<sup>56</sup> It is likely, however, that an earlier conflict is meant. In another passage of the Politics, Aristotle makes it clear that in his view, while Solon established for the δῆμος a place in the affairs of the πόλις by

<sup>52</sup> Paus. 2.20.9; WELWEI (n. 5) 183.

<sup>53</sup> WÖRRLE (n. 5) 103, setting the passage from Aristotle under discussion here, Pol. 5.2.8, 1303a.8, in the wider context of 5.1.1–6.9, 1301a.19–1307b.26, convincingly argues against the view of KIECHLE (n. 2) 184 that the depletion of the upper class is the only common element between the three examples, showing that Aristotle meant this to be seen as a precipitating cause of actual constitutional change.

<sup>54</sup> Arist. Pol. 5.2.8, 1303a.1–11.

<sup>55</sup> Arist. Pol. 5.2.9, 1303a.15: συμβαίνει δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν ταῖς δημοκρατίαις.

<sup>56</sup> ANDREWES (n. 2) 176. WÖRRLE (n. 5) 101 n. 2, cf. 104, supporting such a view, cites Isok. 8.88–89, where losses among elite Athenian families during the period of the empire are reported. This passage, however, could equally apply to the First Peloponnesian War.

opening the δικαστήρια to all and thus unintentionally paved the way for democratic reform, it was only much later that popular leaders replaced the πολιτεία with the δημοκρατία current in his own day. Ephialtes and Perikles, he explains, curtailed the powers of the Council of the Areiopagos, and further democratic reforms followed.<sup>57</sup>

A passage of the Athenaiion Politeia appears to refer to the same events as that from the Politics under discussion.<sup>58</sup> Here we find that the majority of οἱ ἐπιεικέστεροι, whose leader was Kimon, had been killed in warfare during the period following the reform of the Areiopagos.<sup>59</sup> Thousands of οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς from among both the δῆμος and the wealthy, the author explains, were regularly lost in campaigns at this time.<sup>60</sup> The context of ἐπιεικῆς elsewhere in the Athenaiion Politeia shows that this term is reserved for the socially «respectable»,<sup>61</sup> so οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς here seem to be men of at least sufficient means to serve as hoplites. The battle of Tanagra, 458/57 B.C., provides an example of high infantry casualties in this period about which we are relatively well-informed. Thucydides records that «there was much slaughter on both sides», and Plutarch that one hundred of Kimon's followers (οἱ ἐπιεικέστεροι in the Athenaiion

<sup>57</sup> Arist. Pol. 2.9.2–4, 1274a.1–23. As G. R. STANTON, *Athenian Politics c. 800–500 B.C.*, 1990, 78 n. 3 concludes, «Aristotle makes a good case for the view that Solon had no intention of becoming the father of Athenian democracy and that the constitution after his reforms was oligarchic in character». K. A. RAAFLAUB, *The Breakthrough of Demokratia in Mid-Fifth-Century Athens*, in: K. A. RAAFLAUB – J. OBER – R. W. WALLACE (edd.), *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*, 2007, 144 points out that «the political system Solon instituted was far from *demokratia* in its fifth-century meaning». He concludes, 150, that only after the reforms of 462–50 did it come about that «the demos, fully including all citizens, controlled government and politics».

<sup>58</sup> In both cases a high casualty rate among the upper classes is attributed to the fact that the army was recruited ἐκ καταλόγου: Ath. Pol. 26.1: τῆς γὰρ στρατείας γιγνομένης ἐν τοῖς τότε χρόνοις ἐκ καταλόγου; Arist. Pol. 5.2.8, 1303a.10: διὰ τὸ ἐκ καταλόγου στρατεῦσθαι. The θῆτες, on the other hand, were ἔξω καταλόγου: J. E. SANDYS, *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*, 1912, 111, ἐκ καταλόγου, cf. 112, ἀνὰ δισχιλίους ἀπόλλυσθαι, where Arist. Pol. 1303a.9 is cited in relation to Ath. Pol. 26.1. On the meaning of ἐκ καταλόγου, P. J. RHODES, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiion Politeia*, 1993, 327.

<sup>59</sup> Ath. Pol. 26.1: τοὺς ἐπιεικεστέρους ... ἐφθάρθαι τοὺς πολλοὺς κατὰ πόλεμον.

<sup>60</sup> Ath. Pol. 26.1: ἀναλίσκεσθαι τοὺς ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν εὐπόρων. RHODES (n. 58) 326f. finds that since «the fleet was manned by the poorer citizens ... the claim that the wars of the League occasioned deaths particularly among the upper classes is implausible» and concludes, 328, that in Ath. Pol. 26.1 «ἐπιεικεῖς is used not in a political but in a moral sense». If we take this passage to refer to Aristotle's infantry battles (πεζῆ), rather than, with RHODES, primarily naval campaigns such as that in Egypt, however, those who were killed are likely to have been hoplites.

<sup>61</sup> Ath. Pol. 27.4: after Perikles' introduction of payment for jury service, ordinary people rather than οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς became δικασταί; 28.1: up until the death of Perikles, the leader of the δῆμος had always come from οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς; 36.2: Theramenes, arguing that in wanting to give a share of power to οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς the Thirty had given it to only three thousand men, even though ἀρετή was not limited to this number, has at 36.1 called for οἱ βέλτιστοι to be given a part in affairs and so appears to use both ἐπιεικῆς and ἀρετή as indicators of socio-political status.

Politeia) were killed.<sup>62</sup> The loss of a high proportion of the members of an exclusive, politically conservative elite in the land battles of the First Peloponnesian War, along with large numbers of οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς, many of whom may have been content with the existing πολιτεία, is indeed likely to have tipped the scales in favour of democratic reform. There is, furthermore, sound evidence to suggest that the curtailment of the powers of the Areiopagos was merely the first in a series of measures that established Athens' democratic constitution. While Aristotle in the Politics places the introduction of payment for jury service within the period that followed,<sup>63</sup> the Athenian Politeia reports that democratic reforms, including the elevation to the archonship of Mnesitheides, the first of the ζευγῖται to receive this honour, continued.<sup>64</sup> The period of democratic reform, like that of high Athenian casualties on land, extended from 462–450 B.C.<sup>65</sup>

Aristotle at Politics 5.2.8, 1303a.2–11 is succinct, but he makes a clear causal connection between the decimation of the notables in warfare and the transformation of the constitution from πολιτεία to δημοκρατία in both Taras and Athens. He might thus appear to mean that in Argos after Sepeia a πολιτεία,<sup>66</sup> similar to that which had once prevailed in Taras and Athens, was replaced by a δημοκρατία.<sup>67</sup> The Argive example, nonetheless, is problematic, since it does not quite match the others. While in Taras and Athens the heavy losses among the notables were *in themselves* sufficient to bring about this transformation, in Argos «they were compelled to admit some of the περίοικοι». If military losses among the notables had already caused the poor to constitute a larger proportion of the population than they had before Sepeia, why, ac-

<sup>62</sup> Thuc. 1.108.1: καὶ φόνος ἐγένετο ἀμφοτέρων πολὺς; Plut. Kim. 17.4–5.

<sup>63</sup> Arist. Pol. 2.9.3, 1274a.9–12.

<sup>64</sup> Arist. Ath. Pol. 26.2, cf. 26.3. Mnesitheides appears to have become archon in the year of the battle of Tanagra, 458/57 B.C., and to have held that position in 457/56: Diod. 11.81.1–2; SANDYS (n. 58) 112 ἔκτιψέ τε; J. M. MOORE, Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy, 1983, 253; RHODES (n. 58) 330; cf. RAAFLAUB (n. 57) 115. It is unlikely that there was time for the reform to be introduced between the battle and Mnesitheides' selection, but the losses at Tanagra may have encouraged the actualisation of an earlier resolution. The admission of the ζευγῖται to the archonship, an office previously restricted to the πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι and ἱππεῖς, may have been enacted because of the losses of οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς from both the δῆμος and the wealthy referred to at Ath. Pol. 26.1. It would then constitute a clear instance of a democratic reform that came about because of the high casualty rate suffered by the Athenian upper and upper-middle classes during the First Peloponnesian War.

<sup>65</sup> Thuc. 1.104.1–114.3; Diod. 11.78.1–84.8, 88.1–3; 12.3.1–7.1; RAAFLAUB (n. 57) 115, 128, 138–142. We need not agree with ADSHEAD (n. 23) 377, cf. 372–376 that the process in Athens referred to by Aristotle took place over five decades, since the argument upon which she bases her claim that Aristotle's three examples constitute «a series of increasingly gradual and increasingly thorough political transformations» is based upon a survey of a selected few of the very many groups of examples, illustrating various points, that can be found in the fifth book of the Politics.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Diod 10.26: WÖRRLE (n. 5) 101f.; KIECHLE (n. 2) 185.

<sup>67</sup> It is unlikely that, as claimed by WÖRRLE (n. 5) 104, Aristotle is simply discussing a further democratisation of the Argive hoplite πολιτεία.

ording to the theory that Aristotle is expounding here, would the Argive citizens have exacerbated the danger to their privileged position by recruiting more members of τὸ τῶν ἀπόρων πλῆθος?<sup>68</sup> It is indeed unlikely that they would have taken such a step, so we must consider the possibility that Aristotle meant that the Argives were compelled (ἀναγκάζω) to admit some of the περίοικοι in order to *avoid* the establishment of a democracy.<sup>69</sup> Since the military losses, as in Taras and Athens, furthermore, are likely to have been among οἱ γνώριμοι, we should expect their replacements to have been members of the hoplite class rather than of a lower social order. We cannot, nevertheless, arrive at any certainty about this without first considering the evidence for the opposing proposition, that Aristotle meant to say that constitutional change actually took place, that the Lakedaimonian victory at Sepeia led to the establishment of democracy in Argos by means of the recruitment of a previously politically unprivileged element of the population into the citizen body.

A correct interpretation of this passage from the Politics hinges in part upon the extensively debated question of what Aristotle understood by the term περίοικος.<sup>70</sup> He

---

<sup>68</sup> Aristotle sees the admission of the περίοικοι as an Argive reaction to the defeat at Sepeia, but he does not indicate, as assumed by WÖRRLE (n. 5) 102f., cf. 12, that the Argive citizens were motivated by the desire to strengthen their forces against the possibility of a renewed Spartan attack, instead reporting this recruitment as a consequence of the imbalance between the social classes.

<sup>69</sup> WÖRRLE (n. 5) 103 claims that παραδέξασθαι τῶν περιόικων τινάς in Aristotle cannot, as KIECHLE (n. 2) 187 suggests, indicate an anti-democratic supplementation of a weakened upper class through the admission of suitable men from the neighbouring states on the grounds that it «would hardly have been in accordance with the class consciousness that, as generally and so probably also in Argos, prevailed in high-ranking families». If these men were members of the elite, however (rather than, as KIECHLE, speculating that «Argive local patriotism» wrote ἄριστοι into the record, proposes, ordinary citizens of the perioikic towns), they are likely to have shared in such a «Klassenbewusstsein». KIECHLE's view, followed by WELWEI (n. 5) 190–192, that the περίοικοι consisted of the «old Tirynthians», who were admitted to the Argive citizenship after the ejected δοῦλοι had in turn expelled them from Tiryns, is difficult to accept, since Aristotle, as KIECHLE himself notes, indicates that their admission was the immediate consequence of Sepeia, and Plutarch explicitly declares that Herodotos is wrong to report that those admitted at that time were δοῦλοι when they were actually περίοικοι; cf. WÖRRLE (n. 5) 111 with n. 37. WELWEI, 191 suggests that actual slaves were armed by their masters and then rose up against them without the aid of οἱ πολλοί. It is unlikely, however, that the Argive masses, whom Diodoros' report demonstrates were not bereft of political interest, would have remained quiet while their decimated rulers fought with their own house-servants over control of the state. The same can be said about the theory of HENDRIKS (n. 2) 278f. that while the slaves took over immediately after Sepeia and expelled the aristocrats, democracy came later, with the admission of the περίοικοι. O'NEIL (n. 5) 343, concluding that in Aristotle «the Argive περίοικοι are clearly an example of ἄποροι», does not consider the possibility suggested above.

<sup>70</sup> SEYMOUR (n. 5) 28f.; WILLETTS (n. 2) 496–498; HOW – WELLS (n. 5) 97; KIECHLE (n. 2) 186–188; FORREST (n. 2) 222–224; WÖRRLE (n. 5) 108f.; TOMLINSON (n. 5) 97–99; WELWEI (n. 5) 185–187; O'NEIL (n. 5) 343; ANDREWES (n. 2) 171–178; LEWIS (n. 2) 101; ROBINSON (n. 2) 87f.

mentions *περίοικοι* on eight occasions, all in the Politics. In the first four passages, they are Kretan serfs who are clearly comparable to *οι εἰλωτες* rather than *οι περίοικοι* of the Lakedaimonians.<sup>71</sup> In two other passages, Aristotle advises that the tillers of the soil should be either *δοῦλοι* or *βάρβαροι περίοικοι*.<sup>72</sup> He also points out, however, that the existence of good numbers of *περίοικοι* and tillers of the soil ensures a plentiful supply of sailors, thus appearing to distinguish the *περίοικοι* from the agricultural workforce.<sup>73</sup> Six of Aristotle's seven other references to *περίοικοι* are thus in two contexts only, and in the seventh he implies that they are distinct from the farmers.<sup>74</sup> All that we can conclude from this handful of references is that it is *possible* that by *περίοικοι* in the passage under discussion Aristotle meant bonded tillers of the soil.<sup>75</sup> There is ample evidence, however, that Greek writers before Aristotle's time understood this term to mean the citizens of neighbouring towns, whether subject or not,<sup>76</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Arist. Pol. 2.6.3, 1269b.3, 7.1, 1271b.31, 7.3–4, 1272a.2, 19, 7.8, 1272b.18; cf. WILLETTS (n. 2) 496; KIECHLE (n. 2) 184; TOMLINSON (n. 5) 97f.; ANDREWES (n. 2) 173f.; ROBINSON (n. 2) 87.

<sup>72</sup> Arist. Pol. 7.8.5, 1329a.27, 9.9, 1330a.29.

<sup>73</sup> Arist. Pol. 7.5.7, 1327b.11.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. KIECHLE (n. 2) 184; WELWEI (n. 5) 186. WÖRRLE (n. 5) 108 n. 26 assumes that these must be close categories.

<sup>75</sup> Pollux Onom. 3.83 lists the *γυμνήτες* of the Argives with the *εἰλωτες* of the Lakedaimonians and the *κλαρώται* of the Kretans, among others, as belonging to a class between *ἐλεύθεροι* and *δοῦλοι*; cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Χίος; Eustath. ad Dion. Per. 533. Some scholars have seen in the members of this class both the *δοῦλοι* of Herodotos and the *περίοικοι* of Aristotle: WILLETTS (n. 2) 496f.; TOMLINSON (n. 5) 98f.; O'NEIL (n. 5) 343; LEWIS (n. 2) 101; ROBINSON (n. 2) 87f.; cf. WÖRRLE (n. 5) 107–111; WELWEI (n. 5) 185 with n. 13. Those admitted to the citizenship, however, cannot have been the counterparts of the Lakedaimonian Helots and Kretan *περίοικοι*, since, as WILLETTS is forced to concede, if all of the rural labour force were admitted to the citizenship and then expelled, none would have remained to work the estates of the remaining citizens: WILLETTS, 499; cf. KIECHLE (n. 2) 185. As KIECHLE points out, WILLETTS must after all postulate a division between these serfs, some of whom received the citizenship and were expelled and others of whom remained. «The assertion of Sokrates,» he further observes, «that it was the *ἄριστοι* of the *περίοικοι* to whom they had given the citizenship at that time prohibits us from seeing these as bondsmen in his statement – nor in the remark of Aristotle Pol. 1303a.» Aristotle, it must be remembered, reports that only *some* of the *περίοικοι* were admitted: τῶν *περίοικων* τινάς. WELWEI, 189 highlights the practical obstacles to incorporating serfs into the ruling class, which would necessitate changes to «the economic basis of society». It appears «undenkbar», he explains, that the Argive state, without regard for the inheritance rights of the sons of those who had been killed, should simply have transferred property to underprivileged members of the rural population. W. SCHMITZ, Die geschorene Braut: Kommunitäre Lebensformen in Sparta?, HZ 274, 2002, 573f. n. 32 suggests that an Argive law requiring that women have a beard when sleeping with their men (Plut. Mor. 245F) was intended to prevent the children of these arrangements from becoming legitimate heirs. If so, the *δοῦλοι* themselves are unlikely to have taken possession of the property of the men whom they replaced, and seem to have been independently wealthy enough to serve as hoplites.

<sup>76</sup> In Herodotos, Thucydides and Xenophon's Hellenika, *περίοικοι* are neighbouring communities or peoples, often, particularly in Thucydides and the Hellenika, those of the Spartans: Hdt.

so he must have been familiar with such usage and, whatever he meant by the expression elsewhere in the *Politics*, may yet have intended to indicate that the new Argive citizens were free men. Even if Aristotle did understand *περίοικοι* when used of certain inhabitants of Argolis a century and a half before his time to indicate politically unprivileged serfs, furthermore, we would still not be entitled to assume that this is what his sources meant the term to convey.<sup>77</sup> All that we can really be sure of from Aristotle's report is that some inhabitants of the region of Argolis who had previously not been full citizens of the *πόλις* of Argos received this honour in the wake of the defeat at Sepeia.

Plutarch, fortunately, dispels any ambiguity about the identity of the new citizens by emphatically contradicting Herodotos and stating that they were, in fact, the elite among the *περίοικοι* (*τῶν περιούκων τοὺς ἀρίστους*).<sup>78</sup> In an earlier part of the same text, recording that the other Lakedaimonian king, Demaratos, had managed to get inside the city and capture the Pamphyliakon, Plutarch acknowledges the undated Sokrates of Argos as his source.<sup>79</sup> It may be that Sokrates' text is also the origin of the considerable amount of additional information supplied by Plutarch, but we cannot be certain.<sup>80</sup> Whatever the case, it is clear from two separate passages that Plutarch was familiar with texts that contained more information about events in the Argolid at

1.166.1, 173.3, 175; 3.159.5; 4.31.5, 90.1, 159.4, 161.3; 5.91.2; 6.58.2; 7.61.2, 201; 8.73.3; 9.11.3; Thuc. 1.17, 101.2; 2.5.3; 3.92.5; 4.8.1, 53.2; 8.6.4, 22.2; Xen. Hell. 1.3.15; 3.3.6; 5.1.33, 2.24, 3.8, 4.39; 6.1.19, 5.21, 25, 32; 7.2.2, 4.27; cf. ANDREWES (n. 2) 171–174. While Aristotle appears not to use this term in any other work, Plato uses it twice, at *Kritias* 118b referring to «many rich villages of *περίοικοι*» and at *Rep.* 8.547c alluding to the Spartan *περίοικοι*, as does Isokrates 4.131; cf. ANDREWES, 172; J. ADAM, *The Republic of Plato*, 1921, 211 n. 16. Nowhere in any of these texts can it be inferred that *περίοικοι* is used as an equivalent to the Lakedaimonian Helots. WELWEI (n. 5) 185–158 exposes the difficulties inherent in identifying Aristotle's *περίοικοι* with various categories of unfree person, concluding with good reason, 191, that he uses the expression as a synonym of *γείτονας*.

<sup>77</sup> SEYMOUR (n. 5) 29 finds it probable that «Aristotle has simply taken over the word *περίοικοι* which he found in his authority».

<sup>78</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 245F; Sokrates of Argos, FGrHist 310 F 6. As W. JAEGER, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture I* (G. HIGHET, transl.), 1939, 7, cf. 5, points out, «the *aristoi* are distinguished by that name from the mass of the common people.» SEYMOUR (n. 5) 28f. accepts the incorporation of inhabitants of neighbouring towns alongside that of the *δοῦλοι*, whom he believes were serfs.

<sup>79</sup> This Sokrates wrote a *periegesis* of Argos: Diog. Laert. 2.47; FGrHist 310 T 1. The doubts of O'NEIL (n. 5) 343 concerning the reliability of Sokrates would only be valid if he were Plutarch's sole source. Even if Sokrates were from the Hellenistic rather than the Classical period, furthermore, he may still have had access to a range of local Argive sources, so Plutarch could easily have found much reliable information in his work.

<sup>80</sup> WÖRRLE (n. 5) 106f.; cf. STADTER (n. 1) 52f. The scepticism of scholars such as STADTER, 45–53 in regard to the defence of the city led by the poetess Telesilla in these passages of Plutarch and at Pausanias 2.20.8–10 relies upon a considerable amount of conjecture about the development of Argive traditions. There is no compelling reason to disbelieve these reports, since women and slaves often participated in the last-ditch defence of a city: TOMLINSON (n. 5) 97.

this time than is found in Herodotos.<sup>81</sup> He reports various opinions, one of which associates these events with a later festival tradition,<sup>82</sup> but it is significant for our appraisal of his value as a source for the events under discussion here that he appears sceptical about this association and thus, whatever doubts we may wish to cast upon his reliability in other cases, gives the distinct impression that he closely scrutinised his sources before concluding that Herodotos was wrong about the identity of the new citizens.<sup>83</sup>

Plutarch's criticism of Herodotos is, admittedly, in one sense misdirected: he wrongly accuses the historian of reporting that the Argive women were made to live with the δούλοι.<sup>84</sup> While Herodotos' report may imply that this was the case, Plutarch is unlikely to have inferred it from this source alone, and his apparent carelessness reveals that he had access to additional evidence which suggested that, whoever these men were, they indeed became citizens and lived with Argive women. O'NEIL objects that Plutarch's «best of the περίοικοι» would not have suited Aristotle's purpose.<sup>85</sup> As shown above, however, the validity of the assumption about the meaning of Aristotle's

<sup>81</sup> Plut. Mor. 223A-C, 245C-F. While Plutarch corrects Herodotos on the identity of the new citizens, we need not discount his report on the basis that he is writing polemically: BUSOLT (n. 2) 564 n. 2; WÖRRLE (n. 5) 106; WELWEI (n. 5) 185; cf. TOMLINSON (n. 5) 98; ROBINSON (n. 2) 87. Although Plutarch often repeats both quotations and anecdotes in separate works, the correction of Herodotos concerning the identity of the new Argive citizens found in this passage is not repeated in «The Malice of Herodotos» (Mor. 854E-874C). In the passage under discussion, Plutarch's aim is to highlight the ἀρετή of the Argive women, who were believed to have (ἐδόκουν) treated their new husbands as inferiors, despite the high status of the latter in their own communities: Mor. 245F. He corrects Herodotos here not in order to illustrate the historian's supposed κακοήθεια, but to make the status of the new citizens clear.

<sup>82</sup> We need not, with WÖRRLE (n. 5) 107, find in this grounds to reject Plutarch's entire testimony. Nor need we assume that Plutarch's report was distorted by an anachronistic or transitory interpretation of his sources: WÖRRLE, 108 n. 27; TOMLINSON (n. 5) 98.

<sup>83</sup> Even though scholarly opinion is divided over whether Plutarch read all of the several hundred works that he quotes from or paraphrases, he must still have been familiar with a great many: W. C. HELMBOLD – E. N. O'NEIL, *Plutarch's Quotations*, 1959, vii, 1–76. His sources for the events under discussion may well have included Aristotle's *Politics*: TOMLINSON (n. 5) 99; O'NEIL (n. 5) 343; cf. the list of Plutarch's quotations in HELMBOLD – O'NEIL, 1–76. The passages from Aristotle and Plutarch have some common elements, and, despite WÖRRLE's objections, KIECHLE seems correct in concluding that these authors used the term περίοικοι in the same way: KIECHLE (n. 2) 183; WÖRRLE (n. 5) 108 n. 27. Several scholars claim that Plutarch's description of the new Argive citizens as οἱ ἄριστοι reflects later Argive patriotism, or even, as maintained by WELWEI, an attempt to cover up an episode of actual slave rule: KIECHLE (n. 2) 187; STADTER (n. 1) 50; WÖRRLE (n. 5) 108 n. 27; WELWEI (n. 5) 185; O'NEIL (n. 5) 343. If Herodotos' δούλοι were indeed the members of a lower social order, however, his tale of their prompt ejection by the brave sons of those who had been killed at Sepeia is more likely to have engendered pride than shame, and it is unlikely that Argive patriots would have attempted to obscure such a glorious episode in their history.

<sup>84</sup> WELWEI (n. 5) 185; ANDREWES (n. 2) 171.

<sup>85</sup> O'NEIL (n. 5) 343.

text that underlies this objection is doubtful. The evidence for the identity of the new citizens found in the text of Plutarch is, rather, admirably well-suited to an interpretation of the passage from Aristotle in which the surviving Argive citizens act to *prevent* the advent of democracy by admitting into their diminished circle «the best of the περίοικοι», already privileged in their own communities.

Plutarch's statement that the new citizens were τῶν περιοίκων ... τοὺς ἀρίστους appears to have been founded upon a careful examination of the available evidence and makes it look very much as if Aristotle meant to say that the full citizens of Argos were compelled to admit these men into their own circle in order to avert rather than facilitate the introduction of democracy. Diodoros similarly reports that the citizens avoided making the mass of politically unprivileged or underprivileged free inhabitants of Argos full citizens by mobilising οἱ δοῦλοι to oppose them.<sup>86</sup> Bakkhylides' use of aristocratic terminology to describe the mythical refugees at Tiryns in an ode that may belong to the same period as the events described by Herodotos, Aristotle, Diodoros and Plutarch, despite its lack of directness, clearly strengthens the case for accepting Plutarch's report that the περίοικοι who came to rule or share power in Argos after Sepeia consisted of the social elite of their communities. But how might we explain Herodotos' use of the expression δοῦλοι, often translated «slaves», to describe a privileged elite?

Apart from the passage under discussion here, Herodotos employs forms of δοῦλος and the related δουλεία, δουλόω, δουλεύω and καταδουλόω no less than forty-five times to indicate the subjection of one or more peoples or states to another,<sup>87</sup> and on

---

<sup>86</sup> The suggestion of WÖRRLE (n. 5) 112 that Herodotos' δοῦλοι consisted of Aristotle's δῆμος reinforced by the περίοικοι is difficult to reconcile with the report of Diodoros that the citizens marshalled οἱ δοῦλοι to oppose either the existing rights or the political aspirations of οἱ πολλοί. WÖRRLE's attempt to compare the situation of Argos with that in Syrakousai in the same period (Hdt. 7.155.2) faces the difficulty, as WELWEI (n. 5) 188f. points out, that while in Syrakousai the γαμφοί were expelled, in Argos the upper class remained. This suggestion, furthermore, compels WÖRRLE, 113, since the whole δῆμος cannot have been expelled from Argos, to speculate that only the leaders were ejected.

<sup>87</sup> Many of these concern the actual or projected subjection of Greeks or other peoples to the Persians. Greeks: Hdt. 1.169.2, 174.1; 2.1.2; 4.142; 5.49.2, 3; 6.11.2, 12.3, 22.1, 32, 109.3; 7.8β.3, 51.2, 108.1, 168.1, 235.3; 8.22.1, 100.3, 5, 101.3, 144.1; 9.45.2, 60.1. Other peoples: 1.94.7 (Lydians); 1.129.3, 4 (Medes); 4.93 (Getai); 5.109.3, 116 (Kyprians); 6.44.1 (Makedonians); 7.1.3 (Egyptians); 7.9.2 (other nations in general); 7.11.4 (Phrygians); 7.19.1 (all men); 7.96.2 (contingents in Persian army); 8.68γ (subjects of Persians counted as their σύμμαχοι); 8.116.1 (Thracians); 9.48.2 (contingents in Persian army). The Persians, however, are not the only real or potential threat to the ἐλευθερία of other peoples. At 1.27.4, Kroisos subjects the Greeks on the Asian mainland, and subjection is mentioned in relation to the Persians themselves: 1.210.2; 9.122.4. The Skythians, too, know subjection. At 4.20.1 we find that the «royal» Skythians consider the other Skythians their subjects, which illuminates the Skythian women's resort to δοῦλοι in the long absence of their husbands (4.1.3) and the resistance offered by the sons of such unions to the return of these husbands (4.3.1). This episode, indeed, suggests a parallel with Herodotos' report of events in Argos.

three occasions for the high-ranking subjects of a ruler.<sup>88</sup> There are, on the other hand, just eighteen instances of him using such expressions to indicate actual slavery,<sup>89</sup> and only once are the members of what might be a distinct servile class described as δοῦλοι.<sup>90</sup> The fact that Herodotos uses δοῦλος and related words far more often than not to indicate political subjection than to describe actual slavery, whether individual or communal, clearly suggests that the Argive δοῦλοι in the passage under discussion were members of the communities surrounding the city, to whom Herodotos' sources half a century later gave this name because, in the intervening period, they had become dependent upon Argos.<sup>91</sup> Although Plutarch often employs δοῦλος and related terms to describe actual slaves, he, too, also uses them to describe subjects, including both individual subordinate rulers and whole communities,<sup>92</sup> so he could easily have understood that Herodotos, in using the expression δοῦλοι, was referring to the inhabitants of subject cities neighbouring Argos.<sup>93</sup> Plutarch, using περίοικοι in the geographical sense, appears to be claiming that Herodotos was mistaken not in stating that the new Argive citizens were actual slaves, but in believing that the members of the communities neighbouring Argos were subject to that city at the time. Both Aristotle and Plutarch, it seems, had reason to believe that, early in the fifth century B.C., those whom Herodotos describes as δοῦλοι were independent περίοικοι rather than Argive subjects.

Herodotos' report, at the very least, presents no impediment to the belief that those who were newly admitted to the ranks of the minority of Argives who had held the full citizenship before Sepeia belonged to the elite of some of the neighbouring towns. Such an identification is stated emphatically by Plutarch, can be understood from the

<sup>88</sup> High-ranking subjects: Hdt. 7.135.3 (Spartans say Hardanes knows how to be a δοῦλος); 8.102.2, 3 (Mardonios is a δοῦλος of Xerxes).

<sup>89</sup> Hdt. 1.7.4, 89.1, 114.5, 173.5; 2.56.2, 134.3; 3.14.2, 125.3, 138.1, 140.5; 4.1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 3, 4, 95.1; 5.35.3; 7.39.1.

<sup>90</sup> Hdt. 7.155.2 (Kyrillians of Syrakousai).

<sup>91</sup> Paus. 8.27.1. For Tiryns and other neighbours of Argos as Argive περίοικοι, FORREST (n. 2) 223–224; cf. ANDREWES (n. 2) 175–177; PIÉRART (n. 2) 602f. KIECHLE (n. 2) 186, nevertheless, believes that those admitted were περίοικοι only in the geographical sense, and WELWEI (n. 5) 188 n. 28 concludes that «die bei Paus. VIII.27,1 erwähnten περίοικοι der Argiver standen zweifellos nicht in einem staatsrechtlich fixierten Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zu Argos». Such an extension of citizenship need not, as claimed by J. M. HALL, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, 1997, 71, «have represented a process of synoicism which did not take place in the Argive plain until nearly a generation later», since the expulsion of the δοῦλοι after just a few years would have put a temporary end to any moves towards unity, revived, nonetheless, by their political opponents after the defeat of their forces at Tiryns and, perhaps, Mykenai and Midea. Herodotos' Argive informants: Hdt. 6.75.3, 84.1; KIECHLE (n. 2) 189 with n. 1; WÖRRLE (n. 5) 105. These Argives were probably high-ranking: WÖRRLE, 106 n. 17, citing Hdt. 6.83 and 7.148f.; cf. FORREST (n. 2) 222f. Even the members of aristocratic families, however, may have been democrats, and no indications are given of the political inclinations of «the Argives» who informed the historian.

<sup>92</sup> Ages. 12.4; Alex. 10.3; Kim. 11.3; Thes. 32.1; Mor. 88A, 190F, 213C, 222E, 240B, 801D, 1129C.

<sup>93</sup> WELWEI (n. 5) 186 notes that Plutarch's critique of Herodotos would have no point if the περίοικοι named there were unfree like Herodotos' δοῦλοι; cf. KIECHLE (n. 2) 183.

report of Aristotle and seems to underlie the fragment from Diodoros. These are the men whom the Argive citizens appear to have chosen, on both political and, since they are likely already to have been serving as fully-equipped hoplites, military grounds, to replace those of their number who had fallen in that battle. The relevant ancient texts, despite the various interpretations of modern scholars, encourage the view that the δούλοι who took part in the government of Argos and were later obliged to take refuge in Tiryns were the kind of men whom one such as Bakkhylides would be willing to honour, by association, with the appellations «demi-gods» and «god-like, far-famed heroes», terms that we might expect to be used of the high aristocracy and unlikely expressions for one such as he to use in connection with former slaves, or even the members of an unenfranchised social order. Bakkhylides 11.59–81, admissible as evidence for these events on the grounds presented above, lends substantial support to what already appears to be an accurate description of the identity of those whom the Argive citizens chose to welcome into their circle in the wake of Sepeia: they were privileged members of the communities surrounding Argos.

The contradictions between the sources for events in Argos following Sepeia cannot be entirely resolved. Diodoros, appearing to conflate elements of two separate episodes from this period, identifies the δούλοι who were freed by the citizens as οικήται rather than περίοικοι. The evidence from Bakkhylides 11, furthermore, suggests a «fraternal» conflict rather than one between the established and the newly-admitted citizens of a πόλις, so the refugees in Tiryns may have included the old Argive citizens who, surviving Sepeia and the subsequent slaughter, had invited the perioikic elite to join them in governing the state. The so-called «δούλοι» may thus have constituted a less dominant component of the post-Sepeia regime than Herodotos' report suggests. Keeping in mind both the conclusion reached above concerning the identity of the δούλοι and an awareness that Herodotos may have placed too much emphasis upon their role in the new Argive regime, fresh investigations might now begin into further matters, including: the specific topographical and social origin of the Argive περίοικοι who were admitted to the citizenship; the nature of the constitution that followed their incorporation; the role, if any, of Kleomenes and the Lakedaimonians under his command in the establishment of the new constitution; and the character of the regime that «the sons» who overthrew it established around 490 B.C. Bakkhylides' motive in praising the exiles in Tiryns, while, it seems, publicly accusing the Eleian judge at Olympia of unfairly awarding the olive crown to a young Argive wrestler in the year of Thermopylai and Salamis, also deserves attention.

*Milton Building  
School of Education  
University of New England  
Armidale 2351  
New South Wales  
Australia*