

5020

BICKNELL, P. J.

1976

C15

KROTON

THE TYRANNY OF KLEINIAS AT KROTON

A 1

Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Ant. Rom. 20.7 (from the excerpts de virtutibus et vitiis in the Codex Peirescianus = Turonensis 980).

ὅτι Κλείνιος ὁ Κροτωνιάτης τύραννος ὢν ἀφείλετο τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τοῖς πολίταις¹ φυγάδας ἀφροίσας ἐκ παντὸς τόπου καὶ δούλους ἐλευθερώσας· οἷς τὴν τυραννίδα κρατυνόμενος τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους Κροτωνιατῶν οὕς μὲν ἀπέκτεινεν, οὕς δὲ ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως. Ἀναξίλας δὲ Ρηγίνων τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κατελάβετο καὶ πάντα τὸν τοῦ βίου χρόνον κατασχὼν Λεόφρονι τῷ παιδὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν κατέλειπε.² καὶ ἄλλοι τούτων δυναστείας ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι κατασκευάσαντες πάντα τὰ πράγματα διέφθειραν. ἡ δὲ τελευταία τε καὶ πασῶν μεγίστη κἀκωσις ἀπάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν ἡ Διονυσίου τυραννὶς ἐγένετο τοῦ κρατήσαντος Σικελίας.

(Dionysios goes on to describe how the Lord of Syracuse attacked the Rhegines at the behest of Epizephyrian Lokroi, defeated a combined army of Italiote Greeks and took two of their poleis by storm. Continuing his operations in Southern Italy, he proceeded to the transplantation of the population of Hipponion and to the conquest of Rhegion and Kroton, both of which held for twelve¹ years).

¹ On this figure see note 40 below.

IN: KLEARCHOS

a. The ms has ταῖς πόλεσι. Reiske read τὰς πόλεις; unnecessary, for ἀγαγεῖν with accusative and dative is quite acceptable. What is out of place is a reference at this point to cities in the plural. A careful scrutiny of the passage reveals that within the framework of a general thesis to the effect that tyranny was the ruin of Magna Graecia, Dionysios of Halkarnassos was contrasting the depredations of local Italiote tyrants to individual poleis with the (comparatively) universal (ἀπάσας ταῖς πόλεις) havoc wrought by the Siceliote Dyonisios. τῇ πόλει would be appropriate enough to the context, but τοῖς πόλιντας has the added attraction of yielding a good contrast with the combination of φυλάσας and ἐούλους. ταῖς πόλεσι will have been the contribution of a copyist whose eye was caught by double appearance of the two words a few lines below.

b. Reiske substituted κατέλασε for the κατέλαττε of the ms. It is just possible, however, that there is a conative force to the imperfect.

c. Valerius inserted ἀπὸ before τοῦτον. This is quite unnecessary if τοῦτον = τοῖόντων². A result of the addition is the imparting of a definite chronological twist, lacking on the ms reading, to the first three sentences of the extract.

A 2

In 1940, after summarising Dionysios' account of Kleinias' revolution at Kroton, K. von Fritz concluded that «since the historian immediately afterwards speaks of Anaxilas (496-476), it would seem that he considered Kleinias as his contemporary»³.

Some two decades later von Fritz had come to modify

² See Liddel-Scott-Jones, *Greek English Lexicon*, s.v. οὔτος, C. III.

³ K. von Fritz, *Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy* (henceforward referred to as PPSI), New York, 1940, p. 68.

See also p. 90.

this view, although not significantly. Again after a synopsis of the contents of the Dionysios extract he went on to argue «da unmittelbar danach die Eroberung von Rhegion durch Anaxilas von Messene erwähnt wird, die im J. 494 stattfand, so liegt die Folgerung nahe, dass die Herrschaft des Kleinias in Zeit unmittelbar vorher... fallen müsse»⁴.

In 1942 E. L. Miuar observed that Kleinias' tyranny is dated approximately by the reference to Anaxilas in Dionysios' next sentence. «However», he continued, «it would be unwarranted to assume that it must fall in the year in which Anaxilas seized power, 494 B. C.»⁵. In a chronological table at the end of Miuar's book «the entry «Cleinias tyrant in Croton?» appears against the year 494.

The translation of the Dionysios excerpt cited by Miuar is based on a text that incorporated Valerius' ἀπὸ in the third sentence. It seems evident that von Fritz also accepted this conjecture.

As far as I am aware, a date between c. 500 and c. 494 for the inception of Kleinias' tyranny has not been challenged since its espousal by Miuar and von Fritz, and there is every reason for supposing that it has become a datum, even a dogma.

B 1

Corpus Pseudepigraphorum Graecorum I, Appendixis Centuria III. 46.

ζήβινος θάνατος • Κανίνας ἐν Κρότωνι τυραννίᾳ κατασχευασμένος περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀνθρώπων τὸν θεόν • ὃ δὲ ἀνεί-

⁴ K. von Fritz, s.v. Pythagoree, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Band XIV, col. 214.

⁵ E. L. Miuar, *Early Pythagorean Politics in Practice and Theory* (henceforward referred to as EPP), Baltimore 1942, p. 72.

⁶ EPP, p. 139.

⁷ EPP, p. 72.

πεν ὡς κήρυκας αὐτὸν ἀναμένει θάνατος· ἐκ δὲ τῆς (θουρίας)⁸ οὗο νεανίαςαι ἐπέστρασαν γραμματίδιον ἀναδιδόντες, ἐν ᾧσιν δὲ λόγων τούτων ἀνεγίνωσκεν ὡς⁹ αὐτῶν ἀντιπέδη.

a. Thus the manuscripts, Schiller¹⁰ «corrected» the name to Κλέωνας.

b. There is no good reason for emending to θουρίας, and no reason at all for suspecting some more drastic corruption. Thucydides appears to use (θούριαι and (θουρία interchangeably¹¹. According to Stephanos of Byzantium in his entry on (θούριαι, λέγεσθαι καὶ (θουρία καὶ (θούριον¹².

B 2

Von Fritz and Minar give no hint of acquaintance with the gloss on κήρυκας θάνατος. Yet as long ago as 1838 Schiller had drawn attention to it and come to the inevitable conclusion that Kabinas and the Kleinias of the Dionysios of Halkarnassos extract were one and the same person¹³. Two main questions arise. Was the Krotoniate tyrant's name Kabinas or Kleinias and when did he rule? In the following sections C and D I deal respectively with these problems of nomenclature and chronology.

C

Schiller¹² opted for Kleinias despite the fact that both of the mss containing the gloss on κήρυκας θάνατος give the name as Kabinias. Almost certainly his instinct was right.

⁸ Schiller, *Die rebus Thourionum*, Göttingen 1838, p. 22.

⁹ Compare 6.61.6 (Thourioi) and 6.104.2 (Thouria). In the latter passage it must surely be the city not the territory to which Gyllippos makes approaches. At 7.35.1 the territory of Thourioi/Thouria is ἡ θουρία γῆ.

¹⁰ For this variant see, for example, Diodoros Siculus 12.10.6.

¹¹ See note 8 above.

¹² See note 8 above.

While there is no obvious reason for a transition from Κανίας to Κλέωνας, the latter might well have been corrupted to a name appropriate for the creator of a new political order.

Closely analogous, but more drastic, is the nomenclature of the tyrant of Hycle responsible for the arrest and death of the presocratic philosopher Zeno. At Plutarch, *adv. Kolot.* 32 (1126)¹³ Zeno's tormentor is Demyllos and I have argued elsewhere¹⁴ that didrachms of Hycle of suitable date bearing the legend ΔΠ on the reverse in addition to the obverse of the obverse, put this version of the tyrant's name¹⁵ beyond reasonable doubt. Elsewhere¹⁵ we find the variant Νέμεκος.

D

From what we can glean at second or third hand of the accounts of Aristoxenos¹⁶ and, more important, Timaios¹⁷

¹³ The correct name, as well as Nearchos, is also recorded at Clement, *Strom.* 4.57.

¹⁴ See *New Zealand Numismatic Journal* 12.iii (1968), pp. 113-116 and *Aperion* 2 (1968), pp. 18-20.

¹⁵ See Diodoros 10.18.2; Valerius Maximus 3 ext. 3; Philostratos, *vit. Apollon.* 7.2; Diogenes Laertios 9.26; and the *Suda* lexicon, s.v. Zenon Telentagoron. Diogenes and the *Suda* lexicographer, who derive from the same source, give a third variant, Diomedon, of the tyrant's name. At Tertullian, *Apologétique*, 50 and Nemesianus 30 the persecutor becomes Dionysios.

¹⁶ On the extensive F18 Wehrli (=Iamblichos, *Vita Pythagorica* 248-251) and another Aristoxenian traces see especially von Fritz, *PPSL*, chapters I and II.

¹⁷ The key passages are Polybios 2.39 and the long excerpt from Apollonios of Tyana's life of Pythagoras at Iamblichos, *VP* 254-264. Von Fritz (1951, p. 55) is not convinced that Timaios was Apollonios' sole source, following A. Delatte (*Revue de l'Institut phil.* 52 [1909], pp. 904) and W. Bertramm (*Die Iambliche Vita Pythagorica* Frontinus, *Diss. Königsberg* 1913, pp. 37 ff.) Minar (*EPF*, pp. 54 ff.) is less hesitant but considers that Iamblichos may have been careless in his

of the vicissitudes of the early Pythagoreans in Magna Graecia, there emerges a tolerably detailed and reasonably coherent picture of political developments at Kroton from the last decade of the sixth century until a few years before the middle of the fifth.

Shortly after the destruction of Sybaris in 511/10¹⁸, the city's dominant Pythagorean *hetaira* was seriously and effectively challenged by rival groups headed by Kylon¹⁹ and Ninon. Pythagorean himself withdrew before dissension came to a head. Then, in rapid succession, there followed a period of anti-Pythagorean agitation and populist harangues; attempted mob violence against the *hetairoi*; abrogation by the demos of allegedly repressive Pythagorean legislation; the death in battle with his fellow citizens of the Pythagorean Damakrides who was accused of aiming at tyranny; and finally, bringing one series of upheavals to an end, arbitration by Taras, Metapontion and Kaulonia, which led to the banishment from Kroton of intransigents of all affiliations²⁰. Among those who were permitted, or who chose, to remain in the city were Deinarchos²¹ and other moderate Pythagoreans.

¹⁸ Diodoros 11.90.3.

¹⁹ An erstwhile Pythagorean ejected from the brotherhood on the initiative of Pythagoras himself (Aristoxenos, F.18). According to Lamblichos, VP. 7.4 Kylon was ἐξαρξος Συβαρίτων at the time of this humiliation. I suggest that wealthy and aristocratic (Aristoxenos, loc. cit.) he had been given official responsibility for the welfare of the 500 Sybarite exiles whose reception at Kroton on Pythagoras' advice precipitated the war that culminated in Sybaris' ruin (see Diodoros 12.9.2-4).

²⁰ For all these developments see Lamblichos, VP. 255-262.

²¹ On Deinarchos, whose role must to some extent be inferred, see Lamblichos, VP. 257 and 263. As Morrison (op. cit., p. 148) observes the-

reans who had apparently dissociated themselves from the excesses of such colleagues as Demokrates. Under their direction the Pythagorean association went a long way towards or even achieved the recovery of its hegemony at Kroton and, through local branches of the order established in other poleis of the area, gradually succeeded in extending its influence throughout Magna Graecia. This renewed ascendancy of the Pythagoreans, which the partisan Aristoxenos²² saw as a kind of golden age, was abruptly shattered in 454 or 453²³. At Kroton and elsewhere their meeting houses were burned down and the leading *hetairoi*, Deinarchos among them²⁴, lost their lives. The aftermath was murder, stasis and every kind of disturbance among the Italiote Greek communities²⁵. As far as we are able to discern, there was not a hint in Aristoxenos and Timaios, nor in other writers, such as Dikaiarchos and Neanthes²⁶, who dealt with the same

¹⁸ other peril¹⁸ of the latter passage is obviously the 454/3 uprising against the Pythagoreans. Since F, the best ms, has Δεωδέγων at 257 and not the Δευδέγων of the inferior C, I cannot understand Minar's note 35 on p. 61 of EPP. Puzzling is the listing of Deinarchos as a Paros in the general catalogue of Pythagoreans at Lamblichos, VP. 267. Together with him appear Alkimachos and Meton, who like Deinarchos and Damokrides figure as members of the Krotoniate council at 257. There are three possible explanations: 1. the text of the catalogue is profoundly disturbed; 2. like Pythagoras all three were immigrants to Kroton; 3. confusion was generated by the fact that all three were members of a Krotoniate *deme* (or some other unit of the citizen body) named Paros.

²² See Aristoxenos, F.18.

²³ See the entry for OL. 81.3 in the Armenian version of Eusebios together with the comments of Minar at EPP, pp. 77 ff.

²⁴ See note 19 above.

²⁵ For Timaios' account of the upheavals see especially Polybios 2.36.

²⁶ For features of the accounts of these two writers see respectively Porphyrios, Vita Pythagorica 56-57 = Dikaiarchos, FF 34 and 35a Wehrli, and 55. In view of Diogenes Laertios 8.40 = Dikaiarchos, p.35b Wehrli, it is difficult to follow Morrison (op. cit. p. 147 note 3), in making Neanthes

events, of a Krotonate tyranny between the fall of Sybaris in 511/10 and the great uprising against the Pythagoreans of 454/3. And yet such activities as the liberation of slaves, the indiscriminate granting of politeia to other cities' exiles and refugees and, especially, the execution and banishment of the ἐπιγυρόεστας could not but have brought Kleinias into direct conflict with the Pythagoreans around whose fortunes our other sources' accounts revolve. Saddled with their deduction from Dionysios that Kleinias was active in or close to 451, von Fritz²⁷ and Minar²⁸ were compelled to regard his rule as a very transitory episode. A similar expedient would be the inevitable consequence of attempting to intrude him anywhere else in the half century plus between the stated termini. But then a paradox, for if Kleinias regime very truly such a fleeting and ephemeral affair, what possessed Dionysios to cite it alongside the durable and influential Anaxila dynasty at Rhegion as a star example of the catastrophic effects of tyrannis on polis of Magna Graecia?

Were Dionysios our sole informant concerning Kleinias, then, in the light of the above considerations, one might justifiably feel constrained to explore the possibility of setting his tyranny earlier than 511/10. This expedient, however, runs into direct conflict with Timaios' assertion²⁹ that until the departure of Pythagoras, shortly after the fall of Sybaris, Kroton had continued to enjoy the form of government established when the city was founded. All difficulties are far

rather than Dikaiarchos responsible for all the material from Θεπεχόρν at Porphyrion, VP 56 to ἀναγεῖναι at 57. Despite Minar's (EPP, pp. 65-68) insistence to the contrary there seems to be no avoiding the conclusion that like Neanthos (see EPP, p. 68) Dikaiarchos ended up confusing the anti-Pythagorean disturbances that followed the fall of Sybaris with those that erupted towards the middle of the fifth century.

²⁷ VP51, p. 90.

²⁸ EPP, pp. 71 and 73.

²⁹ See Janolichos, VI, 255.

more tidily and satisfactorily resolved as soon as we accept the evidence of the glossator that the death at least of Kleinias was subsequent to the inception of Thouria in 444/3³⁰, and recognise that once an ἀνὶ that Valesius intruded into the Dionysios excerpt is discarded³¹, there is no longer any objective reason for insisting that its first three sentences have chronological import. It now becomes possible to set Kleinias' rule entirely within the more than usually ill-documented period of Krotonate history between the anti-Pythagorean holocaust of 454/3 and the first invasion of Southern Italy by Dionysios of Syracuse in 390/98³². If there is any significance in the order, Kroton then Rhegion, of the two haliole exemplars of Dionysios' thesis concerning the effects of tyrannis in Magna Graecia, it is that in his opinion Kleinias' regime was even more pernicious and injurious than its Anaxila counterpart.

These relatively imprecise conclusions granted, can we go on to encompass Kleinias' tyranny within somewhat narrower dates?

A first, and major step, is constituted by recognition of

³⁰ On the final neo-Sybaris on the original site and the early years of its successor Thouria see especially V. Jochenberg, AP 59 (1948), pp. 149-170 and C.M. Kraay, Numismatic Chronicle 1958, pp. 24-29. In my view the literary and numismatic indications together are best satisfied by the following time-table of events: 446/5 - foundation of the last neo-Sybaris on the site of the original foundation; 444/3 - panhellenic reinforcement and (minimal on the present state of the archaeological evidence) resting of the settlement whose name is changed to Thouria/Thourioi/Thourion (see at B1 above); c. 440 - after communal founding the remaining Sybarites withdraw from Thouria to a site on the Traeis river. The primary ancient account is that in Diodoros (see 12.9 ff.). As not infrequently, his chronology is deficient and the precise sequence of events becomes confused due to the author's oscillation between a strictly annalistic arrangement and *ad hoc* κατὰ γένος summation.

³¹ See A1 above.

³² Diodoros 14.103.1.

the improbability of a radical tyranny at Kroton anywhere in the years from c. 440 to 390/89, the lower theoretical terminus.

A few years at the most after Thouria's emergence, what survived of its Sybarite element after communal feuding left the city and founded the so-called Sybaris-on-Traeis.³³ Again shortly after its crystallisation Thouria concluded a treaty of friendship with Kroton³⁴. There can be little doubt that both the transplantation or migration and the accommodation were results of the diplomatic activity in Magna Graecia of an Achaian embassy from old Hellas. This was summoned to the region, so Timaios informs us³⁵, in the wake of the period of turmoil ushered in there by the anti Pythagorean outbreaks of 454/3, for the purpose of resolving the Italiote poleis' troubles. A further consequence, manifested after its departure, of the mission's good offices³⁶ was the formation by Kroton, Kaulonia and Sybaris-on-Traeis³⁷ of an Achaian league analogous to that of the Peloponnesian motherland and

³³ See note 28 above.

³⁴ Diodoros 12.11.3 bearing in mind the final sentence of note 28.

³⁵ See Polybios 2.39.

³⁶ Its only signal failure seems to have been in achieving accord between Thouria and Taras. According to Diodoros (12.23.2) war between the two poleis broke out in 444/3, but this may be too early. Whatever the precise date of their commencement, hostilities between the two poleis did not finally tail off until their joint foundation of Herakleia, probably in 433/2 (Diodoros 12.36.4 together with Strabo 6.1.14 [264]). The *ioartan* *apokia's* original intransigence will have been determined by Athens' role in Thouria's creation and the pro-Athenian bias (which in 917 was to provoke direct Spartan intervention; see Thucydides 6.82.1) of the Achaian league.

³⁷ Hardly, as von Fritz (PPSI, pp. 72 ff.) would have it on the basis of Diodoros 12.11.3 (where there is no mention of Kaulonia), Thouria. Only about one-tenth of the Thourioi, the members of the phyle Achais (see Diodoros 12.11.3 where the other nine tribes, as Athenais, Iuthoi, Nesioi, Boioia, Amphikyonis, Doris, Arkas, Achais and Eleia, are also listed) were of Achaian origin.

their adoption of appropriate individual constitutions. It was only the despotism of Dionysios of Syracuse, the Sikeliot historian adds, and the waxing power of the native peoples of Magna Graecia that enforced the reluctant abandonment of these institutions. Although eventually reduced to a membership of two after the fifth century Brutian conquest of Sybaris-on-Traeis³⁸, the league, then, together with the concomitant Achaian style individual politics continued in existence until Dionysios' transplantation of the Kaulonians in 389/8³⁹ and his occupation of Kroton not long after⁴⁰.

³⁸ The exact date of the destruction is not known. The wording of Diodoros 12.22.1 suggests that the foundation survived for only a few years. The numismatic evidence (for which see Kraay, Numismatic Chronicle 1958, pp. 29-32) points the same way.

³⁹ Diodoros 14.105.3.

⁴⁰ The implication of the latter part of Dionysios of Halkarnassos, 20.7 is that Kroton fell to Dionysios of Syracuse after the tyrant's transplantation of the Hipponiates and before his capture of Rhegion. Diodoros (14.107.2) sets the breaking up of Hipponion early in 388/7, not long after the similar fate of Kaulonia towards the end of 389/8. The same author (14.111.1) dates the fall of Rhegion, after a siege of over ten months, to the first months of 387/6. Disconcertingly, Diodoros fails to include the capture of Kroton among the events of either 388/7 or 387/6. The lapse could well be due, however, to his manifest preoccupation with the epic contest between Dionysios and Pktyon. During the investment of Rhegion the former might well have essayed a shock camp de main against a state which, though formally neutral after the Italian disaster at the Eleporos river in late 389/8 (Diodoros 14.104), would have been profoundly sympathetic to the beleaguered Livy (24.3.8) recalls that Dionysios' attack was a treacherous one and that the issue was decided by a surprise assault in which a body of troops scaled the cliffs below Kroton's supposedly impregnable acropolis. *ἄδελφα* at 12.11.20.7 as the number of years of Dionysios' occupation of Kroton and Rhegion is not necessarily wrong, for Dionysios may have temporarily lost control of them in 383/2 (see Diodoros 15.15.2) and the years immediately following. If his sway *was* uninterrupted then we must suppose, for example, that at some stage in the transmission of 12.11's text *10* was corrupted to *18*.

Kleinias' tyranny cannot be accommodated within the tradition of a confederation whose institutions were quite incompatible with repressive dictatorship, nor is an autocratic ruler likely to have tolerated, let alone sought, outside intervention in his polis' affairs such as that of the Achaeans in Southern Italy c. 440. The period c. 440-390/89 thus excluded, only the years immediately after Thouria's inauguration provide a context for the tyrant's death.

It follows that Kleinias' coup d'état was staged prior to Thouria's creation, for a maximum of about four years is far too short a period for his rule given the implications of the reference to it by Dionysios of Halikarnassos. If, as seems inevitable, we allow close to a decade at least, Kleinias' accession to power must fall in the 450's. Within this decade 454/3 is a solid terminus ante quem since the anti-Pythagorean outbreak at Kroton in that year is nowhere linked with a tyrant and according to Timaios was inspired by one Liktates or Liktages⁴¹. Ideal years for the establishment of tyrannies would be late 453/2 or 452/1. In the summer of 453 or the spring of 452 Sybaris was refounded⁴². The timing was hardly fortuitous. The displaced Sybarites took advantage of their inveterate enemy's preoccupation with the stasis which had commenced with an attack on Demarchos and his hetairoi. Powerless to respond to external crises due to her internal dissension Kroton was ripe for authoritarian rule.

Once in the saddle Kleinias, perhaps a strategos⁴³ or its local equivalent before his assumption of supreme power, proceeded to strengthen his following by way of wholesale

⁴¹ Iamblichos, VP, 263.

⁴² Diodoros 11.90.3.

⁴³ At Ηεσυχίος, s.v. *Thourion*, a bearer of that name is described as στρατηγός of the Krotoniates. This, however, is scarcely probative. According to the *Suda* Leisimon (s.v. *Thourion*) a Thourion of Kroton was wounded at the battle of the Sagra river (fought in 580 or 576; for full discussion of the date see Phoenix 20 [1966], pp. 294-301).

grants of citizenship to manumitted slaves and to fugitives and exiles from other poleis. Influential opponents were killed or banished. By 448⁴⁴, after this initial contribution to the troubles of Magna Graecia, Kleinias was sufficiently strong to attack and destroy the new Sybaris. Within two years another had taken its place⁴⁵. Perhaps deterred by fear of Athens from precipitous action against this penultimate incarnation of the perennial foe, the tyrant was preventively struck down by assassins despatched from its successor. In extenuation of the murder an oracle was concocted implying divine sanction.

The immediate consequence of Kleinias' death, close to 440, was an attempt by Thouria to exploit militarily her neighbour's resulting internal turmoil. The first move may have been an attack⁴⁶, conducted by Kleandridas⁴⁷, on Terna, Kroton's sub-colony on the Tyrrenian side of the isthmus of Catanzaro. Hard-pressed the Krotoniates endeavoured to close political ranks. Through mainland Achaian intermediaries, surviving Pythagoreans were recalled from exile to participate, and in some cases perish, in the conflict⁴⁸. Shortly after their return, the Achaians were requested, no doubt on the initiative of Kroton which had so recently benefited from their services, to become general arbiters of the turbulente affairs of Magna Graecia.

⁴⁴ See Diodoros 12.10.1; there is no reason for expelling from the text πέρυτε ἑταίρων τῶν Σερτίεσθου συνοικιστῶν and ἔπειτα Σερτίεσθου Σερτίεσθου καλλικλέους συνοικιστῶν. I do not share Kraay's view that Kroton tolerated the existence of a neo-Sybaris in the period c. 500-470; see appendix 1.

⁴⁵ See note 28 above.

⁴⁶ For which see Polybios 2.10.1.

⁴⁷ Thouria's commander (see Strabo 6.1.14 [264] = Antiochos, FGH 555 F 11) in her early war with Taras (see note 34 above) Kleandridas, a disgraced Spartan, was an original settler of Thouria (see Plutarch, Perikles 22.4 and Nikias 28.4 = Timaios, FGH 566 F100).

⁴⁸ Iamblichos, VP, 263, 264.

E.

It would be satisfying to be able to point to some feature of Kroton's coinage of the decade c. 450-440 which could be brought into connection with Kleinias' tyranny. This, however, is not possible.

After a brief experiment⁴⁹ with the double-relief technique⁵⁰ c. 475-470, Kroton reverted to the issue of the dumpy⁵¹ incuse staters with crane sub-symbol which had become her staple coinage by 480. The tripod/crane combination was persevered with until, and briefly survived, her final abandonment of the incuse fabric⁵². There can be little

⁴⁹ Inspired, not doubt, by Poseidonia's and Kaulonia's (final) abandonment of the incuse fabric at this time; see Kraay NC 1959, pp. 59 ff.

⁵⁰ The coins concerned are staters struck on extremely squat flans with a tripod unaccompanied by sub-symbols on both obverse and reverse: in addition to the ethnic alongside the tripod some of the obverses have the letters $\alpha\gamma$ or $\gamma\alpha$ (not $\alpha\iota$ or $\iota\alpha$: the single barred letter must be gamma since three-barred iota continued in numismatic use among the Achaian apoikiai of Magna Graecia well into the second half of the fifth century - see L.S. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, pp. 248-249), either progressive or retrograde in exergue. The surest indication of their position within (compare Kraay, NC 1959, p. 62 note 2) the dumpy (see the following note) incuse tripod/crane series is the treatment of the tripod. In some cases there are three circular handles, in others a single circular handle between two straight projections. The earlier dumpy incuse tripod/crane staters, like the analogous medium (see again the following note) incuse pieces that preceded them have a three-handled tripod. Later on in the series the one-handled variety takes over.

⁵¹ For distinction and definition of three successive phases («spread» - with flan diameter above 25 mm.; «medium» - with flan diameter of 24-22 mm.; «dumpy» - with flan diameter of 21 mm. or less) of the incuse coinages of Magna Graecia, and for a rough chronology of their succession see Kraay, NC 1959, pp. 59 ff.

⁵² The earliest batch of Kroton's second issue of double-relief staters is represented by SNG Oxford-Ashmolean Museum, No. 1499. Tripod and crane appear on the obverse. The reverse has an unaccompanied

doubt that this occurred later than 440. The crucial evidence is provided by two hoards, Noe 277 (133 coins) and Noe 506 (24 coins), found in Southern Italy in 1927. Both contain Thuriote didrachms which indicate a burial date well after 440. Of the 51 coins of Kroton in Noe 277 only two are not incuse and these belong to the early double relief group of 475/470. All three Krotoniate staters in Noe 506 are incuse⁵³.

The coexistence of political upheaval and numismatic conservatism is not, of course, remarkable. After rapid stabilisation⁵⁴ the format of Athens' «owls» with the head of Athena unwreathed remained unchanged through the final years of the Peisistratid tyranny, the 511/10-509/8 oligarchy, the «dominatio» of Isagoras, and almost three decades of Kleisthenic democracy⁵⁵.

tripod within a relief border, obviously modelled on its incuse analogue, of roughly concentric dashes; within the exergue appears the letter π .

⁵³ A similar picture emerges from Metapontion (which unlike Kroton did not indulge in early experiments with the double-relief technique). Of 11 Metapontine staters in Noe 277, 10 are incuse and single double relief specimen is N. 310 which shares an obverse die with the incusi. Of the pair of Metapontine staters in Noe 506 one is incuse and the other N. 310.

⁵⁴ Within Seltman's group II.

⁵⁵ On the chronology of the early owls see especially Kraay NC 1956, pp. 43-68 and NC 1962, pp. 417-423 and my own observations at *Ant. Class.* 38 (1969), pp. 175-180.

APPENDIX I

At Diodoros 11.90.3-4 we are informed that in the archon year of Lysikrates (453/2, fifty-eight years after the destruction of Sybaris by the men of Kroton, a man named Thesalos gathered together the surviving Sybarites and ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὥρᾳσι τῶν Σιγῶν. Since the settlers possessed a fertile land they rapidly prospered, κατὰσχόντες δὲ τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ ὀλίγῃ πάλιν ἐξέπεσον ἐκ τῆς Σιγῶς. Diodoros then promises to give more detail about the catastrophe in the following book. The promise is honoured, in a fashion, at 12.10.1-2. As a prelude to an account of the inception and the institutions of Thouria, Diodoros summarily recapitulates the chequered history of its predecessor. The refoundation of 453/2 is recalled and then he continues: καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον ὑπὸ Κροτωνίων ἐξέπεσαν πέντε ἔτεσι ὕστερον τοῦ δευτέρου συγκαταθεῖν καὶ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις καίτοις. This statement, which goes back probably to Timaios, possibly to Ephoros, is obviously incompatible with the view of G. M. Kraay¹ that c. 500, about a decade after the total and literal obliterating² of the original polis, Kroton permitted the accretion or foundation of a neo-Sybaris ('a Sybaris II') which minted staters, triobols and obols and survived until c. 470. I am unable to accept the existence of such an entity and offer the following observations by way of justification and defence of this negative position.

1. Having described the fall and sack of Miletos, the final act in the Ionian revolt against Persia instigated by A-

¹ Numismatic Chronicle 1958, pp. 14-16. Up to a point his view is anticipated by, for example, Miliar at ERP, pp. 36-37.

² See Herodotos 5.44-45 and Diodoros 12.10.1.

ristagoras, Herodotos³ notes that the men of Sybaris who dwelt in Laos⁴ and Skidros⁵ after the loss of their city did not reciprocate the gesture of the Milesians in response to the extirpation of Sybaris. The Milesians, he hastens to explain, had shaved their heads and gone into deep mourning because of the friendship between the two poleis. The logical deduction is that c. 494 there were no Sybarites in the Sybaritis and thus no Sybaris II.

2. In the archon year of Phaidon (476/5) Sybarites besieged by the Krotoniates sought the aid of Hieron of Syracuse. The tyrant promptly gathered an expeditionary force and instructed his brother Polyzelos to cross with it into Southern Italy. Suspecting that Hieron, resentful of his popularity, was deviously endeavouring to encompass his exile or even death, Polyzelos refused to embark. Thus Diodoros 11.48.3-5. According to scholion b⁶ to Pindar, Olympian 2.29 (15) which in all probability is based on the same source, Hieron is represented as attempting to despatch Polyzelos εἰς ἀνακαταβὴν Σιγῶν. If Sybaris was in need of refoundation at the time of the appeal to Hieron, there can have been no Sybaris II in existence in 476/5. The appellants were the Sybarites resident at Laos and Skidros. Kroton's attacks were no doubt motivated by the threat, actual or potential, which the exiles, together with the Lainoi and Skidranoi, presented to her control of overland portages between the Ionian and Tyrrhenian seas. From Hieron's point of view the refoundation of Sybaris would have served to relieve

³ Herodotos 6.21.

⁴ Situated on the western coast of Southern Italy close to the mouth of the river Laos, see Strabo 6.1.1 (253) and J. Berard, *La Colonisation Grecque*, Paris 1957, p. 147.

⁵ Almost certainly situated close to Laos, perhaps in the vicinity of Belvedere Maritima, see Berard, *op. cit.* pp. 146-147.

⁶ I do not share the view of, for example, E. Ciaceri (*Storia della Magna Grecia*², Vol. ii, p. 231) and F. Jacoby (*Commentary on Timaios*, FGH 566 F 93) that there was a rival tradition to the effect that Polyzelos deferred to his brother and brought the war in Southern Italy to the required conclusion. The author of Scholion d has confused the declined campaign with Polyzelos' successfully undertaken one (on which see scholion c) against Syracuse's non-Greek perioikoi. On this occasion too Hieron allegedly gave his brother the command with ulterior motives.

Krotoniate pressure on Epizephyrian Lokroi, an Italiote satellite of the Deinomenidai⁷, and to ensure the goodwill of the strategically placed Laos and Skidros in his confrontation⁸ with Carthage's Etruscan allies.

3. The three destructions of Sybaris referred to in an oracle cited at Plutarch, *de ser. num. vind.* 12 (557 c) are those of Sybaris proper in 511/10 and 449/8 and that of Sybaris-on-Traeis some years after c. 440⁹.

4. Coins that Kraay¹⁰ regards as issues of Sybaris II are to be reallocated as follows:

a. Staters, all struck from a single obverse die, bearing the name and tripod of Kroton on the obverse, and the name and bull of Sybaris incuse on the reverse are a victory issue of Kroton¹¹.

b. Triobols and obols with bull (of somewhat maturer style than that of the bulk of the Sybarite staters and drachms and of the earlier obols with reverse MY obverse and amphora and acorn reverse respectively represent mass issues of the tyrant Telys for military purposes in the period imme-

⁷ See, for example, Jindar, *Pythian* 2.18-29 together with the scholia.

⁸ Which culminated in the battle of Kymai in 474.

⁹ See note 38 to the main text.

¹⁰ See NG 1958, pp. 14-16 and 32-36.

¹¹ So too the staters with the name and tripod of Kroton on the obverse and on the reverse the bull of Sybaris facing either right or left within an incuse frame and the legend ΠΑΥΣΩ. At least five obverse dies are coupled with five or six reverses in various combinations. *Παυσοστρα* has hitherto been taken for the community Pandosia on Akheron (see Bierard, *Colonisation*, pp. 148-149) which coined in the second half of the fifth century. But is it inconceivable that the Krotoniates, influenced as they were at the time by Pythagoras' puritanical prescriptions, labelled the vanquished Sybaris (not entirely unreasonably to judge by the tenor of the legend ΣΥΒΑΡΙΣΚΙΩ) as «harlot» (for this application of *παυσοστρα* see Anakreon, F 122 Edmunds and Gonn. *Adesp.* F 1352 Kock)? Recourse to the incuse frame reverse was no doubt dictated by technical difficulties (surmountable with a reverse type such as a flying eagle) in coupling the tripod obverse with a straight bull incuse. The Kroton/Pandosia stater Vienna 5.597 shares a common obverse with the unique tripod/helmet (typifying spoils of the Sybaris war offered as prizes at a victory athletic contest?) incuse stater Berlin 370/1875. This is surely proof of minting at Kroton.

diately before and including 511/10. Hence the coarseness of design and crudity of technique often in evidence.

c. Also to be reassigned to Sybaris I are three incuse staters, all struck from the same pair of dies, on which, as on the amphora triobols and acorn obols, the bull is rendered in an unusually sophisticated manner. The width of the flans (c. 30mm) of these pieces is quite inconsistent with a date later than 511/10. But that year Kroton was striking staters, for example the victory coins, on reduced (24.22 mm.) flans¹², and there are extant a few staters¹³, for independent reasons clearly late in the series, of Sybaris I itself of similar dimensions.

d. Most troublesome are the tripod/bull. Sybaris/Laos staters discussed at considerable length by Kraay in 1958¹⁴. Their authenticity was confirmed by the subsequent appearance of a further specimen in a hoard¹⁵. On the obverse the tripod of Kroton is accompanied by an octopus sub-symbol and the ethnic MY retrograde. On the reverse within an incuse border of radiating lines appear the Sybarite bull in relief together with the ethnic AAF retrograde. The closest parallel is offered by the Krotoniate victory staters of 511/10, but the absence of direct reference to Kroton and heterodox and uncoth features¹⁶ of the types and fabric seem to guarantee an origin elsewhere. These pieces are best regarded, I suggest, as an omission of Laos shortly after the arrival there of displaced Sybarites. Laiioi and refugees from the metropolis (hence the appearance of the Sybarite ethnic on the obverse rather than the reverse) sought to ensure the survival of the subcolony by timely, but purely tactical to judge by the situation in 476/5, acknowledgement of Krotoniate hegemony.

¹² That is «medium» incuse; see note 51 to the main text.

¹³ For example, the medium incuse Vienna 4.599 which I discussed, and misguidedly attributed to Kraay's Sybaris II, at *New Zealand Numismatic Journal* (12.iv (1969), pp. 148-151. Above the bull, again abnormally sophisticated, of the obverse is a dentate leaf. Is it meant for a leaf of the τῆλας (trougreek: one of the Trigonella Family) and thus a canting device of the tyrant Telys?

¹⁴ NG 1958, pp. 32-36.

¹⁵ Kraay: private communication.

¹⁶ In particular the bull in full relief and the strange treatment of the octopus.

APPENDIX 2

Tamblichos, V.P. 265.

ὁ δὲ οὖτος δὲ πρὸς πάντων ἐμολογείται Πυθαγόρου γενέσθαι Ἀριστάρκας Διμοσῶτος ὁ κροτωνιάτης, καὶ αὐτὸν Πυθαγόραν τοῖς χρόνοις γενόμενος ... καὶ οὐ μόνον τῆς σχολῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς πολιτείας καὶ τοῦ θεανοῦς γάμου κατηξιώθη ... αὐτὸν μὲν γὰρ Πυθαγόραν ἀπηγάσαντα λέγεται ἐνὸς θεόντος ἔτη προσεφασκόντα, τὰ πάντα βιώσαντα ἔτη ἑγγύς τῶν ἑκατὸν, παρὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς δὲ Ἀριστάρκην τῶν σχολῶν προσεφασκόντα, μεθ' ἧν ἡγήσαντο Μήσαρχον τοῦ Πυθαγόρου, τοῦτον δὲ βεβαιήσαντα παραδιδόναι, ἑφ' οὗ διαπρασθῆναι συνέβη, τῇν κροτωνιάτῳ πάλιν, μεθ' ἧν ἡγεσθῶν τῶν κροτωνιάτῳ διαδοχὸν γενέσθαι, ἐπανεξιόντα ἐκ τῆς ἀποδημίας ἣν ἐπεψύσαστο πρὸ τοῦ πολεμοῦ· οὗ μὲντοι τῶν συμφορῶν τῆς παρούσης ἐλάττειν τὸν βίον.

The ultimate source of this section of the V.P., as of 251-261², is likely to be Timaios.

In that case, having dated Pythagoras' arrival in Southern Italy to 529/8³ and assigned him 20 years of activity at Kroton⁴, the Sicilian historian had the reformer teach for

¹ Boeckh's emendation to *Τοργιάδαν* (on the basis of Claudianus Mamertus, *de stat. anim.* 2.7) is gratuitous. See further note 9 below.

² See note 17 to the main text.

³ See Mann, *op. cit.* p. 133. The crucial ancient testimony is Cicero, *Rep.* 2.15-26.

⁴ Justins 20.4.17. For demonstration of Justins/Trogos' use of Timaios see A. Einaudi, *Über die Quellen der Sicilischen Geschichte* (in *Fontes Troici*, Dorpat 1880).

19 years at Metapontion⁵ before his death there c. 490. The aged Aristaios who, encouraged by the political successes of Deinarchos and his associates⁶, was probably responsible for the reversion to Kroton of the spiritual direction of the Pythagorean Order, will not have functioned as «Grand-master» for too many years. The primacies of Mnesarchos⁷, relatively young, it is implied, when his father died⁸, and of Boulagoras could bring us easily into the 450's or even beyond.

It seems logical to connect Gartydas⁹ apodemia with the 454/3 anti-Pythagorean outbreak and the subsequent spell of tyrannies. If this right *διπρασθῆναι* and *πέλαμος* must conceal colourful partisan hyperbole. If more than the lamentable internal state to which Iliates and then Kleinias reduced Kroton, the συμφορά represented as responsible for Gartydas' demise is the war with Thouria that followed the tyrant's assassination.

P. J. BICKNELL.

⁵ See Justins 20.4.17-18.

⁶ See the main text with note 21.

⁷ Named after his paternal grandfather Mnesarchus apparently acquired the sobriquet Τελαμης; see, for example, Diogenes Laertius 8.43. It does not necessarily follow from the passage that in the view of Diogenes' source Pythagoras' son was his *direct* successor.

⁸ Pythagoras, then, must have married Thraimo late in life. We are duly informed at Diogenes Laertius 8.42 that she was the daughter of a Krotoniate. Her father's name Diogenes gives as Brouthinos. His appearance at Tamblichos, V.P. 267 among the Pythagoreioi of Metapontion indicates that he accompanied Pythagoras when the latter withdrew from Kroton.

⁹ His tenure of a magistracy as a young man could well be the explanation of the letters γα on the first double-relief statues of Kroton described in note 50 to the main text.