

Herodotos 5.68 and the Racial Policy of Kleisthenes of Sikyon

Peter J. Bicknell

WITHIN HIS ACCOUNT of the reforms of Kleisthenes the Alkmeonid at Athens Herodotos digresses to describe what he represents as comparable political activities of another Kleisthenes, father-in-law of the Athenian Kleisthenes and tyrant of Sikyon.

After a war with Argos, we are told (5.67.1), the older Kleisthenes forbade rhapsodes to contend at Sikyon any longer because Argos and the Argives were glorified in the Homeric poems. Herodotos then proceeds to narrate the, to us, bizarre efforts of Kleisthenes to obliterate the Sikyonian cult of the Argive hero Adrastos (5.67.2–5). Finally (5.68), he deals with a tribal reform of Kleisthenes at Sikyon, and with its aftermath. Without editorial supplementation the text of his account runs as follows:

ταῦτα μὲν ἐς Ἄδρηστόν οἱ ἐπεποίητο, φυλὰς δὲ τὰς Δωριέων ἵνα δὴ μὴ αἱ αὐταὶ ἔωσι τοῖσι Σικωνίοισι καὶ τοῖσι Ἀργείοισι μετέβαλε ἐς ἄλλα οὐνόματα. ἔνθα καὶ πλείστον κατεγέλασε τῶν Σικωνίων· ἐπὶ γὰρ ὄνος τε καὶ ὄνου τὰς ἐπωνυμίας μετατιθεὶς αὐτὰ τὰ τελευταῖα ἐπέθηκε, πλὴν τῆς ἑωυτοῦ φυλῆς· ταύτη δὲ τὸ οὐνομα ἀπὸ τῆς ἑωυτοῦ ἀρχῆς ἔθετο. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ Ἀρχέλαοι ἐκαλέοντο, ἕτεροι δὲ Ὑᾶται, ἄλλοι δὲ Ὀνεᾶται, ἕτεροι δὲ Χοιρεᾶται. τούτοισι τοῖσι οὐνόμασι τῶν φυλέων ἐχρέωντο οἱ Σικωνῖοι καὶ ἐπὶ Κλεισθέneos ἀρχοντος καὶ ἐκείνου τεθνεώτος ἔτι ἐπ' ἔτεα ἐξήκοντα· μετέπειτα μέντοι λόγον σφίσι δόντες μετέβαλον ἐς τοὺς Ὑλλέας καὶ Παμφύλους καὶ Δυμανάτας, τετάρτους δὲ αὐτοῖσι προσέθεντο ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀδρήστου παιδὸς Αἰγιαλέος τὴν ἐπωνυμίην ποιούμενοι κεκλήσθαι Αἰγιαλέας.

After ὄνου Sauppe inserted the words *καὶ χοίρου* on the basis of ἕτεροι δὲ Χοιρεᾶται below. His supplement has been accepted by the majority of editors. If it is well conceived, then the basic picture that emerges from the passage, albeit in a disconcertingly clumsy and opaque fashion, would be the following.

Before Kleisthenes' reform the citizen body at Sikyon was divided across *four* tribes, the Dorian Hylleis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanatai, and one other. Kleisthenes renamed three of the *phylai* Hyatai (boar-

ites), Oneatai (donkey-ites), and Choireatai (pig-ites). The remaining *phyle*, his own, he relabelled Archelaoi (rulers of the people). Sixty years after Kleisthenes' death his tribal nomenclature was abandoned. Three tribes got back their old names Hylleis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanatai, and the fourth was called Aigialeis.

On this basis has emerged the conception of a tyranny with a racial prejudice and a racial policy. I report two typical assessments. According to Andrewes,¹ Kleisthenes "changed the Dorian tribe-names because they were the same for Sicyon as for Argos, and called them Pigmen, Assmen and Swinemen instead of Hylleis, Pamphyloi and Dymanes, while he gave his own tribe the name of Archelaoi, the rulers . . . The war with Argos was a reality, and the ban on Homer has little point except as a gesture against Argos. But the change of tribe-names goes further than this . . . the new names, and above all the name 'rulers' given to his own tribe, are pointless if he is not asserting the superiority of the non-Dorians." Observes Sealey:² "The three names Hylleis, Pamphyli and Dymanatae, were the names of the Dorian tribes. Before the work of Cleisthenes the population of Sicyon evidently had a Dorian element which was divided into three tribes, and a pre-Dorian element which constituted the tribe of Aegialeis. The pre-Dorian element was at a disadvantage, possibly solely through being relegated to a single tribe. Cleisthenes carried out a change in the tribal system and thereby elevated his own tribe, the Aegialeis. Obviously the change must have been something more substantial than a change of names . . . In short, Cleisthenes appears as a social reformer of the type envisaged by the 'pre-Dorian' theory of tyranny. The reform was doubtless the source of his continued power."

It is worth noting that while Andrewes and Sealey both assume identity of the Archelaoi and Aigialeis, the former carefully avoids claiming that Aigialeis was the tribe's original name. Sealey is less cautious. Andrewes' reticence, shared, for example, by Tomlinson,³ is instructive since it serves to emphasise one of the principal obscuri-

¹ A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London 1956) 58–59.

² R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek City States* (Berkeley 1976) 45–46.

³ R. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (London 1972) 84; at 188–89 with 273 n.3, however, he perhaps intends to be more committal. J. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (London 1976) 165, appears, not unreasonably, to envisage that the name Aigialeis was an innovation rather than a restoration. Focussing on Herodotos' association of it with Aigialeus son of Adrastus, she records her suspicion that Argos had once more exerted her influence on Sicyon. Such reassertion is out of the question if the second tribal 'reform' immediately followed suppression of the Orthagorid *tyrannis* by *Sparta* late in the sixth century. See *infra* with n.8.

ties in the Herodotean account, as conventionally treated. Why could Herodotos not have been more clear and forthcoming?

There can be no doubt, certainly, that the membership of the *phyle* Aigialeis was in some respect non-Dorian. At 7.94 Herodotos notes that the pre-Dorian inhabitants of Achaia were once known as Aigialeis, and Pausanias (2.5.6) preserves a tradition that before the coming of the Dorians neighbouring Sikyon itself was called Aigialeia. With respect, however, the rest of the conception endorsed by Andrewes and Sealey and so many others seems to me to be quite incompatible with the real implications of Herodotos, whose text requires not the *addition* of *καὶ χοίρου*, but the *excision* of *ἕτεροι δὲ Χοιρεᾶται*.

Let us scrutinise the final sentence of the passage quoted. Sixty years after the death of Kleisthenes, we are informed, the Sikyonians changed (*μετέβαλον*) the names of tribes to Hylleis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanatai. Herodotos then states that they added to these (*προσέθεντο*) a fourth *phyle*, Aigialeis. Other things being equal the only possible conclusion would be that there were *three* Sikyonian tribes at the time of Kleisthenes' demise and for sixty years thereafter.

The obvious sense of the final sentence of the passage is entirely consistent with that of the second *without the addition of καὶ χοίρου*. Here it is explained that Kleisthenes named one *phyle* after the *ἕς* and another after the *ὄνος* while adopting a different style of nomenclature for his own tribe. Other things again being equal we would naturally infer that at the time of Kleisthenes' tribal 'reform' there were *three phylai* to each of which Kleisthenes gave a new name.

Turning to the first, introductory, sentence, we are told that Kleisthenes changed the names of the Sikyonian *phylai*, which were the Dorian *phylai*, so that they should no longer bear the same appellations as the tribes, also the Dorian tribes, at Argos. There were *three* Dorian tribes, Hylleis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanatai (alternatively Dymanes). There is no hint of some fourth Sikyonian *phyle* whose name was a further candidate for alteration.

The third sentence as it stands is quite incompatible with the rest. *οὔτοι* (the fellow *phyletai* of Kleisthenes) *μὲν δὴ Ἀρχέλαοι ἐκαλέοντο, ἕτεροι δὲ Ὑᾶται, ἄλλοι δὲ Ὀνεᾶται, ἕτεροι δὲ Χοιρεᾶται*. The last three words are the root of the problem and in fact they are surely inadmissible. In the first place the sequence *ἕτεροι . . . ἄλλοι . . . ἕτεροι . . .* is peculiar, if not impossible.⁴ In the second, is it likely

⁴ Nothing like it is recorded in the entry on *ἕτερος* in J. E. Powell, *Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge 1938), and I have discovered no parallel elsewhere.

that Kleisthenes would name *two* tribes after the same creature?⁵ Third, how could Kleisthenes have acceptably rechristened a *phyle* Choireatai, given the ubiquitous obscene connotation, which apparently originated in the Peloponnese,⁶ of the word *χοῖρος*? Obsessively anti-Argive Kleisthenes may have been, but he was evidently not insane.⁷ Even if he was, the Sikyonians would hardly have tolerated the name decade after decade after his death. The conclusion is surely inevitable that *ἕτεροι δὲ Χοιρεᾶται* is not part of Herodotos' text but a vulgar gloss on *ἕτεροι δὲ Ὑᾶται* which has crept into it.

If my analysis is right, then it is the following picture that in fact emerges from Herodotos' account. When Kleisthenes became tyrant at Sikyon its citizen body consisted exclusively of the three regulation Dorian *phylai*, Hylleis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanatai. At some stage Kleisthenes changed the appellations to Hyatai, Oneatai, and Arche-laoui. The sole motivation, so Herodotos implies, of this as of other Kleisthenean measures, was the tyrant's extreme antipathy to Argos, whose tribes were also named Hylleis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanatai. There is not a hint to encourage the supposition that Kleisthenes' tribal 'reform' involved anything more—such as a reshuffling of membership of or the introduction of new elements into the *phylai*—than a change of nomenclature. Sixty years after Kleisthenes' death, immediately after the fall of the now centenarian Orthagorid *tyrannis*,⁸ the old Dorian names were restored. In addition a new, non-Dorian, *phyle*, christened Aigialeis was created.

As to which Dorian *phyle* received which Kleisthenean name absolute certainty is impossible. The distinct implication of Herodotos' ac-

⁵ *χοῖρος* may, it is true, connote a *young* pig or porker, but frequently it is used generally and is exactly equivalent to *ῥῆς* or *σῦς*; see LSJ s.v.

⁶ According to the Suda (s.v. *χοῖρος*) the usage commenced in Corinth, which is close enough to Sikyon. The earliest 'living' examples of *χοῖρος* functioning as our 'pussy' are to be found in Old Attic comedy, but it is unlikely that the perceived resemblance eluded the Greeks until the fifth century.

⁷ I have in mind especially the anecdote preserved by Aristotle (*Pol.* 1315b18–19) according to which Kleisthenes placed a wreath on a judge who awarded a victory (presumably athletic) *away* from him.

⁸ I totally endorse the conclusions of Mary White ("The Dates of Orthagorids," *Phoenix* 12 [1958] 2–14) that Aischines, the Sikyonian tyrant whose deposition by the Spartans is recorded in *P.Ryl.* I 18 (*FGrHist* 105F1) and at Plut. *Mor.* 859D, was the last of the Orthagorids, and that his fall, sixty years after the death of Kleisthenes, is to be dated to the penultimate decade of the sixth century. The hundred years' duration of Orthagorid rule is noted by Arist. *Pol.* 1315b12; see also Diod. 8.24. At *Historia* 17 (1968) 1–23, D. Leahy supports the traditional view that the Orthagorid tyranny is to be dated *ca* 656/5–556/5. His central argument, involving Spartan foreign policy, is adequately refuted by Sealey (*supra* n.2) 62–63. I am not disturbed by the short time that White's chronology allows for the predecessors of Kleisthenes, especially Orthagoras, and I concur in particular with her comments on and conclusions with respect to Paus. 6.19.1.

count, however, is that Hylleis became Hyatai, Pamphyloi Oneatai, and Dymanatai Archelaoi. I am aware of no counter-indication to the conclusion that Kleisthenes was a Dorian. Andreas, the salaried scourge-bearer who accompanied a fateful Sikyonian mission to Delphoi to have charge of its sacrifices and who subsequently had a son Orthagoras, founder of Sikyon's tyrant dynasty, is, it is true, described as *δημότης* and *φάυλος*, but there is no hint at all that his inferiority was racial.⁹

It seems to me that the minimal inference from this reassessment of Herodotos 5.68 is that Kleisthenes' régime had no anti-Dorian overtones. Both before and after his 'reform' full citizens' rights were confined to Sikyonians of Dorian stock. Only after the deposition of Aischines, the last of the Orthagorid tyrants, were some non-Dorians conceded *politeia* within the context of a newly constructed fourth *phyle*.

Conceivably, and here I turn from what I regard as certainty to speculation, one should go still further and consider *reversal* of the new orthodox view of the Sikyonian tyranny, at least in its Kleisthenean phase, as the champion and exploiter of non-Dorian rights. There is at least a strong possibility, I would suggest, that the whole house of Orthagoras should be seen as a bastion of Dorian supremacy. One could conceive, for example, that in the war, which featured the rise to prominence of Orthagoras, between Sikyon and its Achaian neighbour Pellene (*P.Oxy.* 1365), the non-Dorian Sikyonians manifested disconcerting sympathy for the enemy. The Dorian citizenry was confronted with the choice between concessions to the *katonakophoroi*, the local equivalent of Sparta's helots,¹⁰ and the sacrifice of some of their own

⁹ On Andreas see *P.Oxy.* XI 1365 (*FGrHist* 105F2) and Diod. 8.24. He had at least two sons, Orthagoras and Myron. Myron's son Aristonymos married his first cousin, the daughter of Orthagoras. Three of their sons, Myron II, Isodemos, and Kleisthenes, became tyrants in succession. See White (*supra* n.8) 9–12, for the evidence, doxography, and discussion.

¹⁰ See Poll. *Onom.* 3.83 and Steph.Byz. s.v. *Χίος*. In both passages, going back to a common source, *κατωνακοφόροι* must be understood for *κορυννηφόροι* on the basis of Theopompos, *FGrHist* 115F176, on which see *infra* with n.16. Serfs would hardly be allowed to go around with clubs. In fact, the *κορυννηφόροι* were Athenian, the bodyguards of Peisistratos during his first period of rule (*Hdt.* 1.59.5; *Ath.Pol.* 14.1; *Plut. Sol.* 30; *Diog.Laert.* 1.66). *κατωνακοφόροι* at Sikyon are implicit at Poll. 7.68, where we are told that a modified *κατωνάκη* was prescribed by its tyrants and by the Peisistratidai of Athens so that citizens would be ashamed to enter their cities. Here the Sikyonian *katonakophoroi* are wrongly assumed to be analogous to those of Athens and the product of similar circumstances. Aristophanes (*Lys.* 1150–56) represents Hippias, Peisistratos' successor, as having forced *all* Athenian citizens to wear the servile (see schol.*Eccl.* 724) *katonake*. As well as Poll. 7.68 a literal interpretation of his lines underlies schol.*Lys.* 619 and Hesych. and Suda s.v. *κατωνάκη*. From Theopompos F311 it

liberty. They opted for the dictatorship of Orthagoras. The longevity of his dynasty, as remarkable for Aristotle as for us, would forcefully reflect the intensity of Sikyonian Dorian exclusiveness.

I proceed now to formulate and to attempt to undermine two anticipated objections to the interpretation and the suggestions that I have put forward.

First, does not Kleisthenes' choice of the names Hyatai and Oneatai for two of the Sikyonian *phylai* imply contempt and militate in favour, after all, of the conventional view that his sentiments were to some extent at least anti-Dorian? It is true, certainly, that Herodotos claims that Kleisthenes *κατεγέλασε τῶν Σικυωνίων*, but all that this implies is that the names seemed ridiculous to at least one non-Sikyonian. The fact that the Sikyonians tolerated the names for such a long period suggests that they themselves did not regard them as despicable and offensive, and not surprisingly scholars have felt compelled to argue¹¹ that both had connotations—for example, geographical or religious—that rendered them quite acceptable in a local context. The Corinthians, it may be noted, evidently did not find it insulting that one of *their* tribes was named *κυνόφαλοι* or *κυνοκέφαλοι*.¹² My personal guess is that Kleisthenes renamed two of the Dorian *phylai* on the basis of the emblems that their members, when serving in their tribal regiments, bore on their shields. Boar and donkey or mule blazons on the shields of individual hoplites are attested with respect to other Greek states,¹³ and such would scarcely have been adopted, or prescribed, if the motifs were commonly regarded as demeaning or distressful. Although there is no literary evidence for shield devices symbolising tribes within a city, it has been pointed out by Dow¹⁴ that the custom might reasonably be inferred with respect to Corinth at least on the basis of the recurrence of certain blazons in vase paintings. As for Corinth, so for early Sikyon.¹⁵ The boar emblem would symbolise ferocity, the donkey

emerges that the Athenian tyrant made the garment compulsory only for readmitted exiles so that they would be deterred from activity in the *asty*.

¹¹ See for example R. W. Macan, *Herodotos; the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books* I (London 1895) 210, on Hdt. 5.68.3, and Jeffery (*supra* n.3) 164–65.

¹² See S. Dow, "Corinthiaca," *HSCP* 53 (1942) 89–119, at 91–101.

¹³ On shield emblems of the Greeks in general see G. H. Chase, "The Shield Devices of the Greeks," *HSCP* 13 (1902) 61–127. Evidence for boar and donkey or mule blazons is collected and discussed at 98 and 114–15 respectively. Additional examples are noted at Dow (*supra* n.12) 102 n.18.

¹⁴ See Dow (*supra* n.12) 101.

¹⁵ In the fourth century, it appears, all Sikyonian hoplites bore shields simply featuring the letter Σ; see Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.10 and Phot. *Bibl.* 532a18. Chase (*supra* n.13) 72

stubbornness (note *Il.* 11.558–65). In such a context Archelaoi as the name of Kleisthenes' own *phyle* makes good sense and, conceivably, loses some of its apparently arrogant overtones. Presumably Kleisthenes, whom Aristotle (*Pol.* 1315b16) describes as warlike, personally led the Sikyonians in war. On the march he and his tribal regiment will have been in the van, and in battle the Archelaoi, the commander-in-chief among them, will have taken precedence on the right wing.

Second, the tyranny at Sikyon, we are informed, was put down by the Spartans. Would Sparta have endorsed immediate concessions by the new régime to the non-Dorian population? It may be noted first that given the creation of only one new *phyle*, the concessions cannot have been sweeping. Further, Athenaios indicates that Theopompos brought Sikyonian *katonakophoroi*, on which see above, into connection with the Lakedaimonian *epeunaktoi*, whom he represented¹⁶ as helots who, during the critical period of the Messenian wars, were induced to cohabit with Spartiate women in order to boost Spartan manpower, and were eventually granted citizenship. Whatever the merits or demerits of Theopompos' view of the *epeunaktoi*, there could be some substance to his implication about certain of the *katonakophoroi*. If this is so, it is conceivable that the only non-Dorians who were accorded citizenship in a new tribe, after Aischines' fall, were those, together with their progeny, who had contracted irregular unions, condoned because of the inroads of war¹⁷ on the Dorian population, with Dorian women. Whatever the precise circumstances, considerations of *Realpolitik* doubtless contributed to Sparta's toleration.

By way of conclusion I draw attention to possible ramifications of my exegesis of Herodotos 5.68 and consequent reassessment of the dynamic of Orthagorid rule.

and 77 adduces further evidence for the employment of a single shield device, symbolic of their city, by whole Greek armies.

¹⁶ Ath. 271D (Theopomp. *FGrHist* 115F176): Theopompos, asserts an interlocutor, *ιστορεῖ . . . παρὰ Σικωνίοις κατωνακοφόρους καλεῖσθαι δούλους τινὰς παραπλησίους ὄντας τοῖς ἐπεινάκτοις*. Jacoby brackets *δούλους*. I take it, however, that two distinct statements of Theopompos are telescoped. The first, reflected in the common source (which confused *κορνηφόροι* and *κατωνακοφόροι*) of Poll. 3.83 and Steph.Byz. s.v. *Χίος* (*supra* n.10) was to the effect that the (non-Dorian) serfs at Sikyon, counterparts of Sparta's helots, were called *katonakophoroi*. Secondly, some *katonakophoroi* were comparable to the *epeunaktoi*. Athenaios adds that Theopompos' views were shared by Menaichmos of Sikyon (*FGrHist* 131F1).

¹⁷ Such, perhaps, as that with Orneai mentioned, without clear chronological indications, at Paus. 10.18.5 and Plut. *Mor.* 401D.

The orthodox view of an eventual anti-Dorian bias to the *tyrannis* at Sikyon has seduced some historians into hariolating similar manifestations with respect to other Peloponnesian tyrannies. Thus both Pheidon of Argos and Kypselos of Corinth have been tentatively canvassed as champions of the non-Dorian element in their *poleis*.¹⁸ In neither case is there any positive evidence for such a stance. While generalisation from one Greek state to another is always dangerous, I would suggest, very cautiously, that once again the true situation *might* be the reverse of what is frequently envisaged.

At Argos, as Tomlinson, who favours ascribing its creation to Pheidon, admits, Hyrnathioi, the city's non-Dorian *phyle*, is not found in inscriptions until the fifth century, and a board of nine magistrates epigraphically attested in the sixth is more readily squared with three than with four tribes.

For all we know, the creation of a fourth, non-Dorian *phyle* at Corinth may also have been late.¹⁹ The dynamic, or part of the dynamic at least, of Kypselos' revolution could have been the threat to Dorian supremacy posed by a combination of Bacchiad exclusivity with increasing Bacchiad incompetence.

But was not Kypselos a non-Dorian? So current dogma, backed by Herodotos' description of his father as *Λαπίθης τε καὶ Καινείδης* (5.92β1). Caution, however, is indicated. Pausanias (2.4.4, 5.18.7) recounts that Kypselos was a descendant of Melas son of Antasos of Gonoussa above Sikyon. Melas joined the Dorians in the expedition that established their control over Corinth. At one stage Aletes, Corinth's purported founder, requested that he withdraw to other Greeks, but eventually he received him as *σύννοικον*. It seems unlikely that Pausanias' genealogy is a late fabrication.²⁰ Since Kypselos' mother, Labda, was a Bacchiad (Hdt. 5.92β1), it is the tyrant's lineage on his father's side that is in question. Whether or not the connection with Melas is compatible with Herodotos' representation it is difficult to say. While it is not impossible that Melas' descent was traced back to Kaineus the Lapith, it is also quite conceivable that some Corinthians of Herodotos' day, ashamed that *tyrannis* had once taken root in their *polis*, sought to misrepresent Kypselos' origins. As well as invulnerable, but not unburiable, Kaineus was impious. However this may be, the implication of Pausanias' account is that the

¹⁸ See Tomlinson (*supra* n.3) 189 (Argos) and Andrewes (*supra* n.1) 56 (Corinth).

¹⁹ Eventually there were eight tribes at Corinth, but it is likely that an intermediate phase of four intervened between the period of Dorian exclusivity and their emergence; see Dow (*supra* n.12) 101–05.

²⁰ Cf. E. Wilisch, *JKIPhil* 27.123 (1881) 171.

house of Aetion and Kypselos enjoyed, and had long enjoyed, equal status with Corinthians of strictly Dorian stock. Such status is eminently compatible with the distinguished career, including tenure of the polemarchy, that brought Kypselos to the threshold of monarchy.²¹ As 'honorary' Dorians the Kypselids may have been quite as exclusive as their racially purer peers.

According to Aristotle (*Pol.* 1313a41–61) Periandros, Kypselos' security-conscious successor, tolerated neither *syssitia* nor *hetairiai*. As Oost points out, these characteristically Dorian institutions evidently continued to flourish under Kypselos; following Will he declines to infer that Periandros' attack on them was intrinsically anti-Dorian as well as a police measure.²² There is nothing to indicate that Periandros abolished the *perioikoi*, still in existence, significantly, during his period of rule.²³

MONASH UNIVERSITY
June, 1982

²¹ See Nikolaos of Damaskos, *FGrHist* 90F57; his source is Ephoros. Aetion's years of exile with his son first at Olympia and then Kleonai imply no more than that he feared the Bacchiads. As soon as Kypselos returned to Corinth he found it possible to enter public life.

²² S. Oost, *CP* 67 (1972) 26; E. Will, *Korinthiaka* (Paris 1955) 507 n.2. Oost does not, of course, as I contemplate doing, envisage the Kypselids in the rôle of Dorian supremacists. Rather, again following Will, he feels that tension between Dorians and non-Dorians at Corinth, and elsewhere, has been much exaggerated. He admits (n.67), however, that he is unprepared to dissent from the conventional view as to race relations at Sikyon; so entrenched is the orthodox interpretation of Hdt. 5.68.

²³ See Nikolaos, *FGrHist* 90F59.