NICOLA NENCI

The Oldest on Record.

A Study on the Sikyonian Kings Lists[*]

The question of which peoples are considered the oldest among the ancient Greeks has fascinated scholars for generations. According to Kastor of Rhodes "of all the Greeks, the Sikyonians and the kings who governed Sikyon are chronologically the oldest on record"[1]. As Kastor points out, attesting to the antiquity of the Sikyonians are traditions concerning their kings, whose earliest representatives are dated 1000 years back to the Assyrian dynasties[2].

Traditions about Sikyonian kings came down to us in the form of a list of kings derived from the *Chronika* of Kastor of Rhodes (*floruit* ca. 100-50 BC),

---

[1] Tr. ADLER & TUFFIN 2002, 136-137. The passage Πάντων μὲν Ἑλλήνων παλαιότατοι τοῖς χρόνοις ἀναγράφονται Σικυώνιοι καὶ βασιλεῖς οἱ Σικυῶνος ἡγησάμενοι by Eusebius, cf. KARST 1911, 80 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 156, is handed down by Synkellos 110.182.14-15 ed. MOSSHAMMER 1984, who mentions Kastor of Rhodes as his source; cf. *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 250 F 2. For Kastor of Rhodes, see *RE* 10.1, 2347-2357 *s.v.* Kastor von Rhodos [Kubitschek] and *BNP / DNP* 6, 325 *s.v.* Kastor von Rhodos [2] [Geus].

[2] The problem of which population is earlier in history than others is in Hdt. 2.2.1-2.3.2, where he recounts the story of pharaoh Psammetikon enquiring whether the Egyptians or the Scythians were the earliest populations on earth. While in our case the solution is chronographical, in the Herodotean tale, the problem of ancestry is solved on a linguistical scale. See LEVA 1965, 339-344, and VANNICELLI 1997, 201-217.

---

and a narrative sequence in the *Periegesis* by Pausanias (2.5.6-7.1 – *floruit* third quarter of the second century AD), who enumerates Sikyonian kings, and, for the majority of them, adds brief descriptions of the most relevant facts that he considered worth mentioning[3]. Kastor's list and Pausanias' sequence bear striking similarities and several differences: some kings' names show inconsistencies in the spelling, and the Traveller's sequence looks shorter than Kastor's list. However, the biggest gaps emerge when comparing the successions to both Leukippos and Orthopolis, as well as those following from king Polybos. Kings appear different in both number and order, and many of the names mismatch. Namely, after Polybos, Kastor presents the following succession: Inachos, Phaistos, Adrastos, Polypheides, Pelasgos, Zeuxippos, and a sequence of seven priests of Karnios (i.e., Karneios) who ruled the city for thirty-three years. Pausanias, instead, names Adrastos, Ianiskos, Phaistos, Zeuxippos, and then mentions Hippolytos and Lakestades as the last two kings in lieu of the sequence of priests of Karneios listed by Kastor[4].

These differences between the kings' sequences have been the subject of an intense academic debate among modern historians, who tried to put forward various explanations without reaching a general agreement. Part of the scholarly disagreement is due to the adoption of two opposed interpretative lines: one political/historical and the other one literary/historical. Because the dispute between these two fronts is propaedeutic to our analysis, scholarly arguments will be summarised next, starting from those by the two scholars who opened the debate, Carl Frick and Friedrich Pfister.

According to Frick, the chronology of the *Periegesis* is based on Sikyonian oral traditions handed down unaltered to Pausanias' period, while the list from Kastor depends on the so-called "Sikyonian *anagraphe*". Plutarch describes that text, which modern scholars interpret to be an inscription, as

---

[3] Pausanias explains his selective methodology in 1.39.4 and 3.11.1. See STEWART 2013, 231-256.

[4] See chart nos 1a and 1b. The chart are built according to the list from Kastor as provided by Jacoby *FGrHist* 250 F 2, Komm. 1135-1136, while Pausanias' sequence and genealogies are reconstructed by the author. Next to kings' names from Kastor are squares for which the height corresponds to units matching the number of years of each ruler, again as provided by Jacoby. An additional column has squares of a high of forty, which correspond to one generation of forty years. Argive kings' structure follows Jacoby *FGrHist* 250 F 3, Komm. 1137-1139. The spelling of kings' names follows that of Jacoby.

being "about the poets"[5]. Frick assumes that either this or one other analogous written record included a list of Sikyonian kings as part of the local history, and that this list of kings is the result of a manipulation by the Sikyonian tyrant Kleisthenes (ruling 600-570 BC), who, according to an account by Herodotus (5.67), pursued sharp anti-Argive politics[6]. On the basis of Herodotus' account, Frick argues that Kleisthenes' interventions on the list of rulers was aimed at purging the Sikyonian genealogies of Argive kings[7].

By contrast, Pfister attributes both Pausanias' and Kastor's lists to the Sikyonian ancient historian Menaechmus, who recorded a local tradition[8]. According to Pfister, the inconsistencies between the accounts of Kastor and Pausanias are not due to different sources nor political reasons. Instead, Pfister argues that Kastor's list is the result of a re-elaboration of Sikyonian traditions made by chronographers of the Hellenistic period, seeking to coordinate the Sikyonian dynasties with the rest of chronological traditions of the ancient world. Pfister thinks that the chronographers of the Hellenistic period could not use the version handed down to Pausanias, because that king's sequence was too short to be framed within the rest of Greek genealogies without encountering gaps and synchronic mismatches[9].

In more recent years, other scholars have returned to discuss the differences between the two lists. Brillante, for instance, accepts Frick's argument, thinking that Kleisthenes' political interventions on the kings'

---

[5] The text is mentioned in two passages only: Plu. *Mor. De Mus.* 3 = 1131f-1132a, and 8 = 1134a-b. Plutarch reports that the Sikyonian *anagraphe* included the names of the Argive priestess. See MÖLLER 2001, 248, 254-262 for the use of Argive priestess to record past events.

[6] On possible interpretations of Herodotus' controversial passage, see KELLY 1976, 124; BICKNELL 1982, 193-201; HAMMOND 1982, 345; OGDEN 1993, 353-363; PARKER 1994, 404-424; LOLOS 2011, 63; as well as the unconventional reading of the Herodotean passage by FORSDYKE 2012, 92-113.

[7] FRICK 1873, 709-710.

[8] Menaechmus' work on Sikyonian history was titled *Sikyonika* (Σικυωνικά), and was probably written in the second half of the fourth century BC; cf. *RE* 15.1, 698-699 *s.v.* Menaichmos [Laqueur], and CHRISTESEN 2007, 514-516. PFISTER 1913, 535 followed a suggestion by LÜBBERT 1884, 1, 3-4, according to whom the only extant fragment of Menaechmus on Sikyonian genealogies seems to match with Pausanias' account.

[9] PFISTER 1913, 529-537. Up until Pfister, Frick's argument was widely accepted by scholars. After Pfister's publication, scholarly debate split in two, preferring one or the other argument, although Pfister became generally the favourite. In favour of Frick's argument we can list: LÜBBERT 1883 and LÜBBERT 1884; BUSOLT 1893, 665, n. 4; HITZIG & BLÜMNER 1899, 518; GRIFFIN 1982, 34-36, and BRILLANTE 1981, 227, as in the following n. 10. On Pfister's side: ROUX 1958, 133; FRAZER 1898, 43; Jacoby in *FGrHist* 250 F 2, Komm. 821 although with judgements (discussed below in this article), and CHRISTESEN 2007, 518. Last, both SKALET 1928, 45-48 and FONTANA 2010a, 143-162 fully accept Pfister's argument.

dynasties only affected the removal of the last two rulers, Hippolytos and Lakestades[10]. Yet, Fontana has revived Pfister's proposal and tried to reconstruct how Kastor constructed his sequence[11]. She argues that Kastor's list is longer than Pausanias' as a result of insertions of kings' names taken from minor mythical and historical traditions, then integrated into the list at those points where kings are followed by grandsons[12]. As we will see, part of Fontana's argument conflicts with extant sources, and none of the other explanations summarised so far fully explains the complexity of the phenomena that led to the formation of the two lists[13].

This article, adopting literary criticism and following a comparative methodology, focuses on the similarities, rather than differences, between the two lists, and shows that inconsistencies emerging from a comparison of two texts, that of Pausanias and that from Kastor, mainly derive from modern readings and are not as significant for the understanding of Sikyonian traditions as stressed by modern scholars. The present work tries to analyse possible reasons behind the modern perceptions of dissimilarity between the two lists. In order to analyse what these differences are, we will break the lists down into sections according to characteristics common to groups of rulers, and each section will be discussed separately, starting from the discrepancies in the spelling of particular names.

Spelling of Names

Most of the names of rulers reported by Pausanias and Kastor coincide, but those in the following chart do not match in spelling:

---

[10] BRILLANTE 1981, 227. In more recent times, also MELE 2002, 86 agrees with a heavy intervention of Sikyonian tyrants in the past records of the city. As we will see in the course of this work, there is no strong evidence attesting to such a phenomenon.

[11] She published the same study in two articles: FONTANA 2010a, 143-162 and FONTANA 2010b, 57-85.

[12] FONTANA 2010a, 149-159.

[13] For instance, FONTANA 2010a, 157 uses a fragment by Ibycus (*PMG* fr. 1, 282a, vv. 40-41) as a genuine evidence attesting to an independent tradition that places Zeuxippos instead of Hippolytos as the Sikyonian king contemporary to Agamemnon during the Trojan war. A tradition, as Fontana argues, on which Kastor has grounded his placement of Zeuxippos in the list. The excerpt by Ibycus, however, is fragmentary, and the name of Zeuxippos is restored in the Greek text on the basis of Kastor's text. See BARRON 1969, 130. Therefore, Fontana's circular reasoning does not attest to an alternative version of the myth, as she claims. Thus, her reading of the list should be in part reconsidered.

Kastor of Rhodes (*apud* Eus.)	Pausanias
6. Egidros	6. Aigyros
10. Eratos	9. Peratos
15. Chyreus	12. Koronos
18. Laomedon	15. Lamedon
21. Inachos	19. Ianiskos

The lack of formal correspondence between these pairs of names has led some modern scholars to argue for different kings. Pfister, for instance, considers Inachos as a different individual than Ianiskos, and does Jacoby for Chyreus and Koronos[14]. These arguments contribute to widen the gap between the two lists, but slight differences in names may not be as relevant as they appear, and they can be explained by looking at the complexities of the transmission of proper names throughout the manuscripts. Let us summarise briefly the history of these texts.

Kastor's list of Sikyonian kings is not extant in its original form but survives only in reproductions within late antique chronographic works. Among these works, the *Chronicon* (ca. 304/311 AD) of Eusebius of Caesarea has particular importance because from him we know that the Sikyonian kings list derives from Kastor[15]. The Euesbian *Chronicon* itself is also lost, but has been handed down to us in different derivative versions: small fragments in Greek survive via excerpts, such as those in the Codex Parisinus Graecus 2600 edited by Cramer[16]. It was largely incorporated and quoted within later chronicles, such us the *Ecloga Chronographica* by the ecclesiastic Georgios

---

[14] PFISTER 1913, 533-534, and 533, n. 1. Pfister's idea is due to his genealogical reconstruction. PFISTER 1913, 532, IX, VIII considers Ianiskos as a son of Klytios, while Pausanias specifies that the latter is *apogonos*, i.e. descendant, of the latter. See n. 31 below in this text for a synthesis of Jacoby's argument.

[15] The first part of the *Chronicon* is called *Chronographia*, while the second part is known as *Canoni*. See COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 14-23 for the title(s) of this literary work of Eusebius, and 23-25 for a discussion on its date.

[16] CRAMER 1839, Vol. 2, 115-163.

Synkellos (*floruit* ca. 800 AD); and Eusebius' almost complete work survives in a Classical Armenian version and in a Latin translation, the *Chronicon* (382 AD) by St. Jerome[17]. One other author that likely drew from Kastor is [S.] Julius Africanus, in his *Chronographia* (221 AD), in Greek. This work, also extensively used by both Eusebius and Synkellos, is lost, but it was used to compile the compendium known as *Chronicum Alexandrinum* (or *Chronicon Paschale*), still in Greek, later translated into Latin in the so-called *Excerpta Barbari* or *Chronographia Scaligeriana*. It included the list of Sikyonian kings[18]. The list of these rulers was accessible by scholars from the Late Antiquity to the early twentieth century mainly from the Latin translations by Jerome and the *Excerpta Barbari*, because accurate editions of Eusebius' Armenian manuscripts were published only in 1818 and in 1911 by Aucher and Karst, respectively[19]. The latter editor demonstrated that both versions, that in Latin and that in Armenian, derive from the same original Greek text[20].

---

[17] See MOSSHAMMER 1979, 29.

[18] For the list of Sikyonian kings in Africanus, see [S.] Julius Africanus F51a (*Excerpta Barbari*) WALLRAFF 2007, 138-145; on Eusebius and Africanus, see WALLRAFF 2007, XXXI-XXXIV, and in particular XXXIII, where it is argued that "often it is impossible to say whether Eusebius copied them from him directly, or whether he took them straight from Africanus". BURGESS 2013, 2 explains that *Excerpta Barbari* is a title that Scaliger gave to derogate the ancient author of the Latin text, whom he considers an *idiota*; cf. BURGESS 2013, 2, n. 3. The title *Chronographia Scaligeriana* is more politically correct. See BURGESS 2013, 3.

[19] AUCHER 1818, 255-260, and KARST 1911, Arm. 81-83 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 157-159; KARST 1911, Ser. Reg. 146; Can. Arm. 156-227. COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 64-65 translates from Aucher's edition because it is based on the manuscript archetype, but acknowledges that Karst has improved our knowledge of the text, although with some minor flaws. DROST-ABGARJAN 2006, 255-262 is preparing a new edition of the Armenian text.

[20] For a comprehensive summary of the long and complicated history of the text, see the captivating account by MOSSHAMMER 1979, 29-83 and the effective summary by WALLRAFF 2007, XXIX-XXXVIII. As standard reference for Kastor's list, modern scholars generally rely on that by Jacoby (*FGrHist* 250 F 2), who, along with the relevant sections from Synkellos, re-publishes Karst's edition with emendations and comments in *FGrHist* 250 F 2, Komm. 819-821 but establishes a wrong absolute date to the beginning of the Sikyonian kings list. See BURGESS & KULIKOWSKI 2013, 364-365. For an up-to-date treatment and revision of Karst's edition, cf. CHRISTESEN 2007, 418-432, and 240-243 for an English translation of the relevant sections from Eusebius' *Chronikon*; a French translation is in COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 157-159. For Kastor's fragments handed down by Synkellos, we use here the text of the *Ecloga Chronographica* edited by MOSSHAMMER 1984, 109.23 - 110.22. In addition, see *FGrHist* 250 F 2, F 2a, and MOSSHAMMER 1984, 110.8-110.22, to which should be added Kastor's adaptations by Eusebius (MOSSHAMMER 1984, 110.1-7) and by Synkellos (MOSSHAMMER 1984, 109.23-28 and 177.20-178.3). NB: *FGrHist* 250 F2a = MOSSHAMMER 1984, 110.8 - 110.22, but Jacoby publishes two fragments as *FGrHist* 250 F 2a. The second, at p. 1137, is not relevant to our discussion because it refers to a certain Zeuxippos, mythical founder of Byzantium.

Given the troubled history of the transmission of the text, variants in the spelling may be due to a wrong *lectio* of some of the kings' names[21]. These misspellings may have derived either from one of Jerome's early versions, or, more likely, from variations resulting from Armenian and Syriac inferences in the transcription of the names[22]. Yet, as we mentioned above, difficulties with transmission of manuscripts were not the only reason contributing to different spellings that at times were similar and at other times substantially different[23]. Augustine (354-430 AD) offers examples relevant to our lists: for instance, he says (*civ.* 18.3) that the name of king Turimachus was also spelled as Thuriachus (*Thuriaco, quem quidam Thurimachum scribunt*), and addresses to Plemnaios as Lemmeus (*civ.* 18.7)[24]. It is curious that Augustine reports a variation of Plemnaios' name, while Pausanias and later traditions based on Kastor report the same spelling. From this, we may argue that in late antiquity, the names of the kings varied more than is attested by Pausanias and Kastor, and yet variations referred to the same individual, even if no textual corruption is attested[25].

---

[21] As also FONTANA 2010a, 149 concludes.

[22] Two of the three sources to the Armenian were Syriac versions. For a synthesis of Karst's reconstruction of the sources of the Armenian version, see MOSSHAMMER 1979, 50. An example is 'Sykon' for 'Sikyon', which KARST 1911, XL explains as a misspelling derived from Syriac translations that influenced the Armenian version. For instance, see also Eusebius' text by KARST 1911, 80, ll. 11, 21; 81, ll. 2, 7, 11, 16, 23-24, 27 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 156-158. On mistakes and Syriacisms in the Armenian text, see DROST-ABGARYAN 2016, 223-225.

[23] It is perhaps worth mentioning the example of Messapos, who was also known as Kephisios according to Augustine (*civ.* 18.4), raising the problem of whether the names referred to one or two individuals.

[24] Avg. *civ.* 18.9 agrees with Eusebius via Jerome's text.

[25] Lemmeus probably derived from Varro to whom Augustine refers as a source for Sikyonian history (Avg. *civ.* 18.2.2), where he recounts the *aition* for the Ancient Greek customs of both sacrifices and games. According to Varro, after king Thelxion died, Sikyonians worshipped him as a god because of his peaceful and wise rule, and honoured their former king for the first time among the Greeks with sacrifices and games. One other inconsistency is within Eusebius' Armenian text, where, in quoting Kastor, the name of the last Sikyonian king is spelled Leukippos, rather than Zeuxippos; cf. KARST 1911, 81.17 vs. 82.31 and COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 157 vs. 158, respectively.

Appendix – How Are They Spelled?

This section summarises variations of names as recorded in manuscripts. Five pairs of names are summarised here, together with bibliographical references to the different spellings of the names. Versions by chronographers derived from Kastor and Pausanias are marked with an (K) and a (P), respectively.

Αἴγυδρος/Egidros/Egydrus (K) vs. Aigyros (P)

In the tradition that followed Kastor's work we find the name of this king spelled as Αἴγυδρος in Greek, Egidros in the Armenian version of Eusebius' text, and Egydrus in Latin[26]. These minor changes in spelling (the prefix Αι- is in both Eusebius and Pausanias) are likely derived from the transliteration of the name in three languages, and we can safely argue in favour of a substantial consistency in the identification of this individual within the post-Hellenistic tradition. Because this name is not attested otherwise but in the Sikyonian kings' lists, we can assume that its rarity may have favoured a corruption either towards the form attested in the chronographic tradition, or the version Aigyros reported by Pausanias. The similarity between the two names, however, suggests that we are seeing the same king and not two distinct personas.

Ἔρατος/Eratos/Eratus (K) vs. Peratos (P)

Chronographers do not report many variations for the name of this king, which appears either as Ἔρατος/Eratos/Eratus, Ἔραστος/Erastos/Erastus, and Ἄρατος[27]. By contrast, Pausanias may have

---

[26] Egydrus: Afric. F51a, 140.1 (*Excerpta Barbari*) ed. WALLRAFF 2007; Jer. 25b.19 ed. HELM 1956 with some manuscripts spelling "aegidrus *P* egyerus *L* an̄ *L*". Αἴγυδρος: Synkellos 119.14 ed. MOSSHAMMER 1984. The same spelling, restored by MAI 1818, 541C (*Ægydrus*) is in SCHÖNE & PETERMANN 1875, "Appendix IV. Χρονογραφειον, Συντομον, Primum ab Angelo Maio Editum", 86.13, although SCHÖNE & PETERMANN 1875, Vol. 1, 173-174, and n. 9 give γϋδρος as the name appearing on manuscripts; cf. Γυδρος in the excerpts of Eus. on codex Parisinus Graecus 2600, CRAMER 1839, 134.20. Egidros: Eus. *Chron.* ed. KARST 1911, Arm. 82.2 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 158 and Êgidros in KARST 1911, Ser. Reg. 146.24, and n. 4: in GE also Zegigros for Zegidros.

[27] Ἔραστος: Synkellos 119.22 ed. MOSSHAMMER 1984. Eratos: Eus. *Chron.* ed. KARST 1911, Arm. 82.8 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 158, and KARST 1911, Ser. Reg. 146.28. Eratus: Afric. F51a, 140.22 (*Excerpta Barbari*) ed. WALLRAFF 2007; Jer. 33b.19 ed. HELM 1956 also spelled as

used the name Peratos as a local alias, perhaps because the root περα-alludes to the act of crossing (περάω, πέρα), often referring to the sea[28]. This allusion is suitable for an individual such as Peratos, who was believed to be a son of Poseidon (Paus. 2.5.7). Chronographers may have favoured Eratos as a *lectio facilior* of Peratos, as the former was a widely attested proper name[29].

Ἐχυρεὺς/Chyreus/Chereus (K) vs. Koronos (P)

Chyreus appears as Echyrus in Africanus (Ἐχυρεὺς in the *Excerpta Barbari* indirectly derived from him), while in the Armenian manuscript of Eusebius it is inconsistently spelled as both Chyreus and Chereus. The Greek versions of the Eusebian text through Synkellos, depending on the modern editor, report either Χυτρεὺς, Ἐχυρὲς, and Chereus, while in Jerome it is Echyreus[30]. All these variants provided by the chronographers diverge from that by Pausanias, and yet all of them may still refer to the same mythical ruler. The multiple forms in which the name has been handed down attests to a significant corruption of the manuscripts that yielded a plethora of spellings derived from different renditions of the text[31]. We may speculate

---

"atus *L* gratus (*darunter* al eratus)". Ἔρατος: in the excerpts of Eus. on codex Parisinus Graecus 2600, ed. CRAMER 1839, 134.26. Erastos: Eus. *Chron.* ed. KARST 1911, Can. Arm. 156. Erastus: Eus. *Chron.* ed. MAI 1818, 541D. Ἄρατος: Eus. *Chron.* ed. SCHÖNE & PETERMANN 1875, "Appendix IV. Χρονογραφειον, Συντομον, Primum ab Angelo Maio Editum", 86.17.

[28] Cf. *LSJ s.v.* περάω A.2.

[29] Ἔρατος is a relatively common Greek name, while Πέρατος is not attested elsewhere than Paus. 2.5.7. This may be suggested also by the alternative spelling Ἔραστος/Erastos/Erastus, also widely attested, as well as that of Ἄρατος.

[30] For a synthesis of the critical apparatus, see Jacoby *FGrHist* 250 n. 23. Echyrus: Afric. F51a, 140.22 (*Excerpta Barbari*) ed. WALLRAFF 2007. Chyreus: Eus. *Chron.* ed. KARST 1911, Arm. 82.16 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 158. Chereus: Eus. *Chron.* ed. KARST 1911, Can. Arm. 161, spelled as Chereus in KARST 1911, Ser. Reg. 146.1. Χυτρεὺς: SCHÖNE & PETERMANN 1875, "Appendix IV. Χρονογραφειον, Συντομον, Primum ab Angelo Maio Editum", 86.22. Ἐχυρὲς: Eus. on codex Parisinus Graecus 2600, ed. CRAMER 1839, 135.1 and n. 36 reporting Scaliger's spelling Ἐχυρεὺς, which is also in Synkellos 125.29 ed. MOSSHAMMER 1984. Echyreus: Jer. 43.21 ed. HELM 1956 with some manuscripts spelling "echireus *PN* ethyreus *BM* egyrbus *L* chereus *Arm*".

[31] FONTANA 2010a, 149 already argues in favour of the identification between the two names by questioning Jacoby, who, according to her, argues that Kastor replaced Koronos with Chyreus. However, *FGrHist* 250, Komm. 821 does not mention any replacement of names, but instead tries to explain why Kastor's list appears longer than Pausanias'. Jacoby explains that Kastor deleted Koronos, but then introduced made-up names (*erfundene namen*) of Messapos, Marathonios, Marathon, Echyreus, Polypheides, and Pelasgos. According to Jacoby, Kastor operated in such a way to match the length of the Sikyonian list with otherwise too high Assyrian chronologies.

that the original form should have been Koronos for the meaning of the name itself: carrion crow[32]. Koronos' son in both Pausanias and Kastor is Korax, which means raven, and for Koronos the connection with birds is strengthened by his father Apollo (Paus. 2.5.8), whose connection with ravens is well-attested in the myth of Koronis[33]. These two individuals belong to a group of rulers bearing bird's names, and Pausanias' list is consistent in presenting a sequence of kings with such names. Therefore, the form Koronos may show less manipulations than Chyreus[34].

Λαομέδων/Laomedon/Laomedus (K) vs. Lamedon (P)

Variants of this name are also abundant in chronographers' works, where it appears consistently as Λαομέδων/Laomedon/Laomedus. Manuscripts preserving the Armenian version of Eusebius propose Laosedon (N), Laomedô (G from A), Lamrmedô or Šamrmedô (EN)[35]. The variant Sarmedon seems to be a case similar to Egidros: most of the alterations of the name occur in the G manuscripts (deriving from A), as well as the EN ones, and therefore different spellings for this name are probably due to copiers' typos, but both the chronographers and Pausanias likely refer to the same individual. In addition, the two variants may reflect the use of this name in literature versus onomastics. The form Laomedon is commonly attested in literary works (being also the name of a legendary king of Ilion), while it rarely appears as a living person's name. For Lamedon it is the opposite: Lamedon in onomastics is more common than in literature, and the use of one or the other form for the Sikyonian kings' list may reflect the preference of an individual writer for the literary or the contracted form of the name.

---

[32] As the masculine of κορώνη (cf. *LSJ s.v.* κόραξ). See the following n. 171 and below in this text.

[33] See *LSJ s.v.* κόραξ and below in this text. For the myth of Apollo and Koronis, see GANTZ 1993, Vol. 1, 91 and below in the present text.

[34] This is not clear, however. Rulers bearing birds names re discussed below in this text.

[35] Λαομέδων: Synkellos 122.2 ed. MOSSHAMMER 1984. Laomedon: Eus. *Chron.* ed. KARST 1911, Arm. 82.20, and n. 4 "Laosedon N" = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 158; also Laomedôn in KARST 1911, Ser. Reg. 146.4, and n. 6, "Laomedô G nach A, Lamrmedô oder Šamrmedô EN"; as well as La<o>medon in KARST 1911, Can. Arm. 165; see also Laomedon in Jer. 50a.2 ed. HELM 1956 with some manuscripts spelling "lacmedon M an · APN M <OL". Laomedus: Afric. F51a, 140.30 (*Excerpta Barbari*) ed. WALLRAFF 2007.

Ἴναχος/Inachos/Inachus (K) vs. Ἰανίσκος (P)

The name of this king occurs in the Christian chronographers consistently as Ἴναχος in Greek, Inachos in Armenian, and Inachus in Latin[36]. Because this form is not too different from that of Pausanias' Ἰανίσκος, modern scholars explain the difference between Ἴναχος and Ἰανίσκος as a textual corruption[37]. However, where and why this corruption occurred is hard to establish: at a first glance, Inachos could be a *lectio facilior* elicitated by a connection to a widely attested Argive king. Pausanias' Ianiskos, however, is a rather rare name[38]. Instead, there are grounds to argue that in this very case we may face two distinct mythical characters.

As we will discuss further in this contribution, the variant Ἴναχος vs. Ἰανίσκος occurs in a section of the lists where the sequences of kings begin to diverge and where these two kings do not occupy the same slot: Inachos rules right after Polybos and before Phaistos, who precedes Adrastos. Ianiskos, by contrast, follows Adrastos and precedes Phaistos. This inconsistency of kings' sequence should not be surprising at this point of the lists, which corresponds to a complex era full of mythical events. On the one hand, Pausanias' sequence is coherent with traditions attested at both local and Panhellenic levels attesting to Adrastos as living one generation after Polybos (Hdt. 5.67.4, Sch. Pi. *N.* 9.30b), since the former married the latter's daughter[39]. On the other hand, Inachos and Ianiskos embody conflicting geographical associations: Inachos, the successor of Polybos, who, according

---

[36] Ἴναχος: Synkellos 173.1 ed. MOSSHAMMER 1984. Inachos: Eus. *Chron.* ed. KARST 1911, Arm. 82.24 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 158, KARST 1911, Ser Reg. 146.7, and Can. Arm. 169. Inachus: Afric. F51a, 142.34 (*Excerpta Barbari*) ed. WALLRAFF 2007; Jer. 56.5 ed. HELM 1956 with some manuscripts spelling "inachus (*daneben* ˡ ̓ianichus) *NLO* an. *APB<OL* XLIII *PN* (*a. Rd.* ΛI (XLII)".

[37] FONTANA 2010a, 149 on the basis of previous scholars (see previous n. 36) argues that Kastor's Inachos is a corruption from Pausanias' Ianiskos. She thinks that "Inachos al posto di Ianiskos è per Pfister un personaggio diverso, inserito da Castore per supplire all'eliminazione di Ianiskos, motivata, secondo lo studioso, da ragioni cronologiche". However, the point made by PFISTER 1913, 531, 534, n. 1 seems to be different than what Fontana reports. Pfister argues that Frick is wrong in interpreting the modifications of the lists as anti-Argive interventions by the tyrant Kleisthenes because many Argive names appear in Kastor's list, which includes the Argive name Inachos.

[38] There is only one other Ianiskos on record, who is mentioned in Sch. Ar. *Pl.* 701c ed. CHANTRY 1994 as one of the children of Asklepios. It recalls names such as the Hebrew name Ἰάννης or the Latin Ianus, suggesting possible cultural backgrounds in which the corruption of the name might have taken place. Roscher, *s.v.* Ianus, 23 suggests a possible etymology of Ianiskos from Ianus.

[39] Menaechmus of Sikyon, *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 131 F 10.

to Herodotus (5.67.4), died without a male heir, points to the homonymous Argive river, while Ianiskos is Athenian by birth, although from a family related to the Sikyonian kings. Pausanias (2.6.6) recounts that Ianiskos came from Attica and belonged to the same lineage as the Athenian Klytios, whose daughter wed the Sikyonian king Lamedon[40].

Ethnic belonging is perhaps the key to read the difference between Inachos and Ianiskos, because it is hard to imagine a king of Athenian origin bearing the name of an eponymous Argive river, i.e. Inachos. It is more probable therefore that Inachos and Ianiskos are two different mythical personas, one, Inachos, pointing towards Argos and the connections established since very early in the Panhellenic tradition, while the purpose of the other individual—Ianiskos—in the mythical Sikyonian past, is perhaps to mark a connection with Athens[41]. The presence of Athenian rulers in Pausanias is remarkable and according to the *Periegesis* (Paus. 2.6.5), the eponymous king Sikyon himself came from Attica and the story of Ianiskos is well suited to this Attic vein of the tradition.

Grandchildren in Charge

So far, we have argued that, besides Inachos and Ianiskos, different names do not necessarily refer to different rulers, and therefore spelling variations cannot attest to significant discrepancies in the formation of the two lists. Let us now analyse other differences in the lists, starting from the succession of Leukippos, Orthopolis, Sikyon, and Polybos, namely to those kings that Pausanias records being followed by a grandson.

In Kastor (*apud* Eus.) we find Messapos ruling before Eratos and after Leukippos, while Pausanias (2.5.7) records that Leukippos did not have male heirs but a daughter named Kalchinia. This Kalchinia, mating with Poseidon, begat Peratos, who inherited the kingdom from his grandfather. The two versions diverge in the presence of Messapos in Kastor and in his absence in Pausanias, but they coincide in the number of generations: Kalchinia appears in the 9th spot in our charts nos 1a and 1b as does Messapos. A similar case is that of Orthopolis.

---

[40] One could speculate that Inachos may have married one other daughter of Polybos.

[41] The possibility that the replacement of Inachos with Ianiskos was aimed at minimising the duration of Argive dominance is less convincing, because the subjection of Sikyon to Argos could not be denied. In the *Iliad*, Sikyon is subjected to Argos.

In Kastor's list, Marathonios rules after Orthopolis and before Marathon, after whom follows Chyreus[42]. Kastor assigns 30 and 20 years to the reigns of Marathonios and Marathon respectively, a period only slightly exceeding the average of 40 years that ancient Greeks assigned to one generation[43]. The result is four kings ruling across a timespan of three generations, with Marathonios and Marathon occupying the 14th and 15th spots (chart nos 1a and 1b). At the same point of the list, Pausanias (2.5.8) recounts that Orthopolis had a daughter named Chrysorthe, who, coupling with Apollo, begat Koronos. This short genealogy brings to the table, so to speak, three generations: that of Orthopolis, that of Chrysorthe, and that of Koronos, a sequence not matching with that derived from Kastor. However, if rulers do not match in this part of the lists, the number of generations— three—does[44]. In addition, in the two cases of Koronos and Eratos/Peratos, we have the pattern of a 'ruler's daughter generating a heir with a deity'. This pattern occurs in a third case involving kings Sikyon and Polybos in Pausanias, as we are going to see next.

The Periegete (Paus. 2.6.6) records that Polybos ruled after his maternal grandfather Sikyon, from whom the city got its name after that of Aigialeia. According to Pausanias, Sikyon's daughter Chthonophyle gave birth to Polybos, with Hermes being the father[45]. Pausanias' account about Polybos is substantially similar to those of Peratos and Koronos except for one detail: after having begotten Polybos, Chthonophyle married the son of Dionysos, Phlias, the eponymous founder of Phlious, and gave birth to

---

[42] Kastor *apud* Eus. *Chron.* ed. KARST 1911, Arm. 82 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 158. We discussed the difference in spelling between Chyreus and Koronos in the previous section.

[43] For a discussion about the amount of years that ancient Greeks assigned to one generation, see PRAKKEN 1940, 460-461, 468-470. For a more flexible understanding of generational count, see NASH 1978, 1-21.

[44] The generation of Marathonios and Marathon coincides with that of Apollo and Chrysorthe, while that of Chyreus corresponds to that of Koronos.

[45] Pausanias seems to be sceptical about the divine paternity of some of the Sikyonian kings as suggested by the φασὶ, λέγουσιν (they say), and νομίζουσιν (they think), that he uses whenever mentioning a ruler born or nursed by a god. This happens with Peratos (Paus. 2.5.7); Plemnaios (Paus. 2.5.8); Koronos (2.5.8); and Polybos (Paus. 2.6.6). However, Pausanias' use of these verbs is widely attested across the whole *Periegesis*. One instance that of Epopeus (Paus. 2.6.1), under whose reign, they say (λέγουσιν), a hostile army invaded Sikyon. Pausanias' use of φασὶ, λέγουσιν, and νομίζουσιν is debated among modern scholars; see for instance PRETZLER 2005, 243-249. In the case of Sikyon, it could even refer to the local guides who accompanied Pausanias in his trek at Sikyon (Paus. 2.9.7). For Pausanias' approach towards local traditions as opposed to what he himself thinks, see VEYNE 1988, 95-102.

Androdamas[46]. This short story of Chthonophyle, Phlias, and Androdamas (Paus. 2.6.6) seems to fulfil two narrative purposes. First, it is instrumental for Pausanias to explain who Androdamas is, as well as to introduce and contextualise this character, who is mentioned twice again in the *Periegesis*[47]. Second, it may represent an attempt by Pausanias to clarify the generational correlation between Sikyon and Polybos: Polybos is Sikyon's grandson, and therefore one would expect a generation between them, namely the generation of Chthonophyle. Yet, Pausanias' account suggests something different: the Periegete specifies that Polybos is the first born, out of wedlock, by Chthonophyle (and Hermes), and that afterwards she got married with a mortal man. It implies that Chthonophyle was still considerably young when she mothered Polybos. Therefore, the generational gap between Sikyon and Polybos should be reduced perhaps to half a generation, and in fact Kastor does not mention any ruler in between the two. After Polybos, the task of comparing the two lists becomes more complicated, especially for the analysis of one other ruler, Adrastos, who inherited the kingdom from his grandfather Polybos[48].

The succession of Adrastos is in Pausanias (2.6.6), as follows: Polybos gave his daughter Lysianassa to the Argive king Talaos son of Bias, and they begat Adrastos, who ruled Sikyon when Polybos died childless[49]. Adrastos is not the first ruler inheriting the kingdom from a grandfather—we have analysed already the cases of Eratos/Peratos, Koronos, and Polybos—but

---

[46] This is the variant of the genealogy accepted by Pausanias (2.6.6), who is against an Argive version (Paus. 2.12.6) giving Chthonophyle as the mother, rather than the wife, of Phlias. See also A.R. 1.115 (*apud* Paus. 2.6.6), and St.Byz. φ 79 Billerbeck *s.v.* Φλιοῦς.

[47] Paus. 2.7.6 and 2.12.6.

[48] Generational mismatches at this point of the list may even be due to the combination of two different and independent stems, that of Sikyon and that of Phlious. The concurrence between two distinct traditions, here, is further complicated by the presence of Adrastos, a big-time figure in Panhellenic mythology who could not be moved freely across generations.

[49] According to Pausanias (2.6.6), Adrastos ruled after Polybos, but the Periegete does not specify the parental relationship between the two. He only mentions that king Polybos gave his daughter Lysianassa to Talaos, the son of the Argive king Bias. From Herodotus (5.67.4) we know that Adrastos was grandson of Polybos through his mother, but he does not name any specific woman. We know that Talaos was the father of Adrastos not from Pausanias but from other authors (i.e., Apollod. 1.9.13, though pointing towards a mother other than Lysianassa). According to an anonymous author of a scholion to Pindar (*N.* 9.30b), Adrastos was not Polybos' nephew but his son-in-law. According to this anonymous scholiast, Adrastos should be one generation closer to Polybos than what stated by Herodotus and Menaechmus of Sikyon (*FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 131 F 10 = Sch. Pi. *N.* 9.30), who matches with Pausanias' version reporting that Adrastos was brother with Pronax and that they were sons of Talaos and Lysimache, daughter of Polybos.

distinct from the others there is no deity involved in begetting Adrastos. In addition, Adrastos' reign is also peculiar in terms of length. Pausanias' story implies that his rule was cut short by having left Sikyon to return to Argos, and this piece of information coincides well with the list derived from Kastor (*apud* Eus.), according to which Adrastos ruled for four years only. Yet, besides the time frame of Adrastos' office, the two lists do not agree about anything else concerning him, nor about the other rulers who come after Polybos, after whom concordances between the two lists become less straightforward, and the differences between Pausanias and Kastor become more evident.

After Polybos, Kastor (*apud* Eus.) names six kings followed by seven priests of Karneios in the following order: Inachos, Phaistos, Adrastos, Polypheides, Pelasgos, Zeuxippos, and the priests. By contrast, Pausanias mentions seven rulers: Adrastos, Ianiskos, Phaistos, Zeuxippos, Hippolytos, Lakestades, and Phalkes. Comparing this last part of the lists, we can see that both the rulers and their order vary, but the length is consistent across the two sequences. Differences and similarities of this last portion of the lists will be analysed next, starting from Adrastos.

Adrastos

Adrastos is a heavy weight of ancient Greek mythology. Leader of the Seven against Thebes as well as the Epigonoi, and highborn from one of the three noblest Argive lineage, he had to flee from his native city when members of the other two Argive royal houses killed his father Talaos. While away from Argos, he took refuge in Sikyon when his maternal grandfather Polybos was ruling the city, and took over the kingdom when Polybos died. He then returned to Argos and ruled over his native city after relations with the other two families were mended[50]. The Argive hero is secured as a king of Sikyon by the *Iliad* (2.572), and for his prominent participation in two of the most renowned mythical tales, that of the Seven against Thebes and that of the Epigonoi. For these reasons, he could not be moved easily across generations. Yet, we observe a mismatch of the position of this figure in the lists. Pausanias' version (Paus. 2.6.6) seems to be validated by other ancient authors, such as Herodotus (5.67.4) and Menaechmus of Sikyon, who all agree that Adrastos' rule over Sikyon came right after his grandfather

---

[50] See previous n. 49 for a synthesis of the traditions recounting this story.

Polybos[51]. Therefore, we should count a generation between Polybos and Adrastos—or, rather, half generation—namely that of Lysianassa (Polybos' daughter) and Talaos (husband of Lysianassa and father of Adrastos), resulting in Adrastos ruling Sikyon during the early phase of the 22nd generation. Something similar happens in Kastor's list, where Inachos follows Polybos, after whom comes Phaistos, and then Adrastos. If we look at the generations in this portion of the list (chart nos 1a and 1b), we can see that Inachos occupies the slot between the 21st and the 22nd generation, while Adrastos is located towards the end of the 22nd. The two lists, therefore, coincide in locating Adrastos' rule within the 22nd generation.

Pelasgos and Zeuxippos

If ancient literary sources offer some guidelines for locating Adrastos in a relative timeline, for Pelasgos and Zeuxippos we are not that lucky. Pelasgos is a rather unknown individual, while the only account offering some information about Zeuxippos is that of Pausanias (2.6.6)[52]. In the *Periegesis* we learn that Zeuxippos was the son of Apollo and the nymph Syllis, but Pausanias, by using an emphasised 'they say' (λέγεται), shows some scepticism about the king's divine origins[53]. Considering the scarce information about them, these three kings cannot provide a significant contribution to our discussion, nor we can have any data helpful to suggest why these kings are positioned differently in the two lists, but a reason could be found in the dating of the Trojan war, as we will see after having briefly discussed the Herakleidai rulers, i.e. Phaistos, Hippolytos, Lakestades, and Phalkes.

---

[51] Menaechmus of Sikyon, *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 131 F 10. There is general agreement among modern scholars in considering Pausanias' tradition as deriving from local Sikyonian sources, perhaps Menaechmus himself, and therefore reflecting more 'direct' and genuine local traditions than those used by Kastor, who was generally considered later, more intellectual, and manipulated regional traditions to match the general chronologies. No evidence, however, attests to a derivation of Pausanias' accounts from Menaechmus. Considering Pausanias' wide use of Herodotus, it is likely that the former author would have chosen a source not in contrast with the latter; see HAWES 2016, 322-345. Again, these sources are briefly summarised and referenced in n. 49 above.

[52] See pp. 219-220 below in this text for a discussion about Sikyonian rulers bearing the same names as Argive ones.

[53] More details about Zeuxippos are below in this text. The same scepticism is suggested by φασί, as expounded in n. 45 above.

Herakleidai

According to the lineage in Pausanias (2.6.7), Phaistos, Hippolytos, Lakestades, and Phalkes are the Herakleidai rulers of Sikyon. Phaistos was son of Herakles and father of Rhopalos, but the latter did not rule over Sikyon because the non-Herakleid Zeuxippos did when Phaistos, in accordance with an oracular response, moved to Crete to found the city of Phaistos[54]. From Zeuxippos follows Hippolytos, who was son of Rhopalos and therefore grandson of Phaistos. The successor of Rhopalos, his son Lakestades, ruled at the time when Phalkes, son of Temenos, the Herakleid who with his brothers had led the Dorians into the Peloponnese and received the Argolis as his lot, conquered Sikyon by night (Paus. 2.6.7). The conqueror and the conquered, then, ruled together in harmony, as they were both Herakleidai. In this portion of the list, Pausanias leaves little space to non-Herakleidai rulers—Ianiskos and Zeuxippos are the only ones—while four members of Herakles' lineage sit on the throne of Sikyon within three generations, resulting into a considerably influential dynasty, and with Phaistos establishing Sikyon as one of the *poleis*, if not the *polis*, claiming the earliest presence of Herakles' heirs. But in Pausanias' Sikyon, the Herakleidai are not only important for their substantial presence in the royal genealogies, but also for being used to calculate mythical time[55]. This can be inferred by looking at the story of Aristomachos' failure in conquering the Peloponnese (Paus. 2.6.7), which is used as a chronological reference for the introduction of the cult of Dionysos Lysios from Thebes to Sikyon by the Theban Phanes[56].

If the *Periegesis* presents the Herakleidai as a considerably influential dynasty in Sikyon, chronographers depict an opposite situation: they do not mention any heir of Herakles among Sikyonian rulers, and in the sequence derived from Kastor (*apud* Eus.) not even Phaistos can be considered as such. As we have seen, the *Periegesis* states that Phaistos is son of Herakles, and the position in the sequence confirms Pausanias' claim: Herakles is coeval either

---

[54] St.Byz. φ 6 Billerbeck *s.v.* Φαίστος, where Phaistos is considered son of Rhopalos and grandson of Herakles. Rhopalos (and not Phaistos) is son of Herakles in Eust. *Il.* 1.486.23-26 van der Valk, as well as in Ptolemaeus Ephaestion 'Chennos' *apud* Phot. *Bibl.* Codex 190, Bekker 148a.34-36, according to whom Rhopalos (and not Phaistos) sacrificed to Herakles as both a god and a man. Rhopalos is the club (of Herakles); cf. *LSJ s.v.* ῥόπαλον.

[55] Hosting a considerable branch of Herakleidai's lineage may suggest a competition with Athens. On the relationships of Sikyon with Attica, see above in this text and n. 60 below.

[56] The sequence of the Herakleidai of Sikyon should be parallel to the main lineage of Herakles, namely that leading to the return of the Herakleidai through Hyllos, and yet it seems to be half-a generation shorter, excluding that of Kleodaios.

with the Seven against Thebes or the Epigonoi, and therefore he is a contemporary of Adrastos, making Pausanias' sequence, where Phalkes rules right after Adrastos, coherent with the generational belonging of Herakles. By contrast, chronographers place Phaistos before Adrastos, making it impossible for Phaistos to be a son of Herakles[57].

Yet, while the two lists present a contrasting role of the Herakleidai in the Sikyonian monarchy, we can still consider Phaistos as eponymous of the Cretan *polis* in both lists. Pausanias tells the story, but according to the chronographer, Phaistos held the throne for eight years only, suggesting that he fled before completing his office. Establishing Phaistos as founder of the namesake Cretan city puts Sikyon in competition with Argos for colonial foundations[58]. Traditions reported by Ephorus (*floruit* fourth century BC) establish Argive foundations on Crete led by the Argive Althaimenes, son of Kissos and grandson of Temenos. The generation of Althaimenes corresponds with that following the last Sikyonian ruler Phalkes, and therefore Althaimenes came to power five generations after Phaistos, yielding a Sikyonian foundation in Crete long before the Argives did[59]. With the adoption of Phaistos, Sikyon becomes, in opposition with Argos, one of the earliest *metropoleis* on record, long before the Dorian invasion[60]. Claiming a primacy by antiquity of events and personas as opposed to other *poleis* is a phenomenon that we will find again in the course of this work, and that in the case of Phaistos is supported by both Kastor and Pausanias. Besides the role of Phaistos as *oikistes*, however, as we have seen, the sections of the lists including (or excluding) the Herakleidai diverge significantly, but one more striking difference emerges if we look at the chronology of the Trojan War in Pausanias as opposed to the chronographers.

---

[57] See chart nos 1a and 1b.

[58] Perhaps this tradition tries to compensate for the lack of Sikyonian colonial foundations.

[59] This is according to the Greek way of reckoning inclusively. Kissos is brother of Phalkes, therefore the generation after Phalkes is that of Regnidas, mentioned in n. 189 below.

[60] See pp. 213-216 below. The mythical theme of housing the Herakleidai bears anti anti-Argive connotations not only in Sikyon, but also in Athens, as it is in Euripides' *Heraclidae*. In the tragedy, the Athenian king Demophon welcomes the heirs of Herakles at Marathon, and refuses to hand them over to the Argive king Eurystheus so to generate a war between the two cities. In our case, Sikyon, receiving Phalkes, seems to establish itself over a primacy traditionally ascribed to Athens, of welcoming the Herakleidai right after the death of their progenitor.

The Trojan War

The synchronicity between the list of Sikyonian kings and the chronology of the Trojan War in Pausanias can be inferred from a passage of the *Periegesis* (Paus. 2.6.7) saying that Agamemnon led an army against king Hippolytos, "who agreed to be subject to Agamemnon and to Mycenae". Because Hippolytos and Agamemnon are contemporary, the Trojan War should have taken place during the reign of Hippolytos, who belongs to the 24th generation of our chart nos 1a and 1b. Kastor (*apud* Eus.), by contrast, places the fall of Troy at the time when Polypheides was king at Sikyon, which corresponds to the 23rd generation[61]. From this, a straightforward comparison between the two lists yields a gap of one generation in the dating of the Trojan War, but the gap becomes less obvious if we look at Kastor's synchrony between Sikyonian and Argive rulers.

On the basis of Kastor, Eusebius apparently shows a solid synchronic structure by establishing three synchronicities between Sikyonian and Argive kings: that of the Argive Inachos and the Sikyonian Thourimachos; that of the Argive Danaos and the Sikyonian Chyreus; that of the Argive Akrisios and the Sikyonian Sikyon[62]. These three correspondences are coherent with the fall of Troy under the Sikyonian king Polypheides, because both Polypheides and Agamemnon end up in the 23rd generation. However, things change if we compare Kastor's Sikyonian and Argive lists (*apud* Eus.) on the basis of absolute chronology. Reckoning backwards the dates provided by Kastor (*apud* Eus.), the capture of Troy occurs some 405 years before the first Olympiad (776 BC), which brings us to 1181 BC[63]. In that same year Kastor places Zeuxippos in charge at Sikyon, a ruler who belongs to the 24th generation, precisely the same generation where Pausanias places Hippolytos, a contemporary of Agamemnon[64].

---

[61] The synchronism between Agamemnon's generation and Polypheides is in Apollodorus' *Library* epitome by Tz. *H*. 1.459-461 ed. LEONE 2007.

[62] See the arrows in chart no. 1b.

[63] Here we follow the years stated in Eusebius, and they could be 405 or 415 because the years of office of Aigisthos are corrupted: next to the name could either a 7 or a 17. Because Kastor specifies that Agamemnon ruled for 30 years, and that Troy was captured in the 18th year of his reign, we can infer that Agamemnon came to power in 1190 BC. Again, number of years can vary slightly depending on the chronographers' texts (see Jacoby) but this calculation approximately matches with Eratosthenes' date of the fall of Troy, which is 1184 BC. CLARKE 2008, 74-75 rightly questions whether the years from the first Olympiad were from Kastor or Eusebius.

[64] Some of the ancient authors assign 33 years to Agamemnon's realm, as explained by HUXLEY 1982, 185-186, who convincingly argues that Aigisthos' years of rule are

Argive Kings

It is clear that the Argive kings list as we find in Eusebius shows internal incoherence, but possible reasons behind this incoherence are rather hard to be established, and there may be multiple factors to consider. A detailed analysis of these reasons goes beyond the purpose of the present discussion, but some possibilities deserve brief mention. Some scholars are in favour of interpolations that occurred during the redaction of later chronologies derived from Eusebius' *Chronikon*, and that altered Kastor's version of the Argive kings' list[65]. The idea of interpolations derives from philological analyses carried out on the versions of Kastor's lists as reported by Africanus, Eusebius, and Jerome, three versions that slightly differ each other and yet all claim to derive from the same source, Kastor[66]. Manipulations of Kastor's sequence may have occurred in Late Antiquity, but early Christian authors perhaps are not the only ones to blame. Ancient traditions themselves often report several versions of the same story—at times contradicting each other—and the case examined here is no exception[67].

If we look at the stemma of the Argive kings, not only the sequence derived from Kastor (*apud* Eus.), but for instance also the one handed down by Pausanias, we can single out several instances of generational mismatches that are intrinsic to the ancient traditions themselves[68]. In particular, mismatches and incoherencies emerge when trying to incorporate minor traditions within major tales, an attempt that we come upon frequently in ancient traditions and mythology, even before and regardless of Hellenistic chronographers like Kastor. Being connected or related to regional or Panhellenic sagas was an ageless and essential requirement for providing authority and authenticity to local sagas: the more a local tradition could

---

incorporated into those of Agamemnon. Avg. *civ.* 27.3 reports the synchronism between the Argive Inachos and the Sikyonian Leukippos, matching with the absolute chronology. The same is for Orthopolis and Kriasos (Avg. *civ.* 18.11). The same passage by Augustine, which creates a synchronism not only with Inachos and Leukippos, but also with Leukippos and Phoroneus, attests that chronographers took half-generations into consideration in constructing their lists.

[65] As explained by Jacoby in *FGrHist* 250 F 2, Komm. 821-822.

[66] Sources listed in this sentence are referenced in pp. 176-179 and n. 20 above. For a common derivation from Kastor, see Jacoby's contribution mentioned in previous n. 65.

[67] Listing them here would be impossible because they are the majority of ancient Greek traditions, but references to modern studies analysing the problem can be done. See n. 70 below in this text.

[68] Analysed in depth by DORATI 2004, 316-319, and DORATI 2005, 338-339.

have been included into a history common to all Greeks, the better strength and legitimacy it had[69]. The endeavour towards an integration of traditions, however, did not come without costs in terms of incoherencies, and often yielded results opposite to what was meant to be achieved. Several different versions of the same tradition—at times resulting in multiple variants themselves—often flourished either at the same time or at different times, and these traditions often developed in contrast with each other, depending on how and when single human communities acted in creating their identities and shaping their history[70]. As a result, what we get is a numberless series of unfixable mismatches and irremediable incoherencies among traditions that, despite our efforts, will never amalgamate without significant inconsistencies.

It may well be that the extant versions of the Argive list result from a combination of both ancient attempts to conjugate a number of traditions not always matching one another, and interpolations of later authors. Perhaps adjustments on a chronographical basis occurred, but the former hypothesis—that based on different traditions—seems to be more convincing if we take into account incoherencies occurring in authors that did not have later significant interpolations, such as, for instance, Pausanias, in whose list, as we have seen, we can single out a one generation gap[71]. As a result, none of the extant versions of the Argive kings seems to provide a flawless generational sequence. Instead, both versions, that by Pausanias and that by Kastor (*apud* Eus.), show a misalignment of one generation[72]. This one generation gap is particularly evident in Eusebius' version of the list. As briefly mentioned above, if we follow the relative chronology, Agamemnon ends up in the 23rd generation, while according to the absolute chronology, he lived in the ensuing one (24th). Now, if we compare the lists of Sikyonian rulers with that of the of Argive kings, we can see that Agamemnon living in the 23rd generation matches with the Sikyonian sequence of Eusebius, while him living in the 24th is congruent with the chronology provided by Pausanias: one generation separates Polypheides from Hippolytos, which is

---

[69] See MÖLLER 2001, 242-248 for a synthetic and effective difference between horography and chronography. On matching local sagas with broader ones, see CLARKE 2008, 227-243.

[70] HALL 1997, 67-107. FOWLER 1999, 3 writes: «[…] genealogies in oral cultures are fluid. They change constantly to fit new circumstances. A common use of genealogy is to support a claim of rightful succession to power. Conflicting claims are backed up by conflicting genealogies, and the tribal elders must meet to weigh their merits». For time measuring as an identity element of Ancient Greek *poleis*, see CLARKE 2008, 7-8.

[71] For inconsistencies of Pausanias' genealogies, see for instance DORATI 2004, 296.

[72] As we have seen, fixed in Augustine. See n. 64 above.

the same generation in between Agamemnon's earlier and later reign over Argos according to Kastor' list (*apud* Eus.). The one generation gap is therefore consistent in all versions of both Sikyonian and Argive lists, and next we are going to see possible reasons behind such inconsistencies[73].

Nature of the Literary Works

In the introductory section we have explained that some modern scholars consider the list derived from Kastor as the result of a manipulation by the chronographers (perhaps Kastor himself), whose work was aimed at incorporating local traditions into a chronological framework of universal histories. According to this argument, one would find a rigorous coherence within the absolute chronologies provided by the chronographers, which means a precise correspondence of major events, i.e., Agamemnon and the Trojan War, with their dates related to the first Olympiad. Instead, as, we have just seen, we find the opposite: the relative, and not the absolute, chronology of Argive kings matches with the absolute, and not the relative, chronology of the Sikyonians, and therefore we cannot safely argue that chronographers significantly altered traditional genealogies to comply with universal chronologies[74].

If the differences between the lists cannot be safely connected to the work of the chronographers, how can we explain the inconsistencies between Pausanias and the version derived from Kastor (*apud* Eus.)? Two reasons maybe behind these inconsistencies: one should be sought in the different natures of the literary works under analysis here—that of Kastor and his followers, and that of Pausanias—while for the other we should look into the history of Sikyon, and more specifically into the traditions referring to

---

[73] Both MOSSHAMMER 1979, 16 and CHRISTESEN 2007, 117-160, convincingly demonstrate that absolute chronologies in Greek chronographers are purely fictional, having weak correspondences with historical phenomena, and substantially mismatching with historiographical traditions. Even if MOSSHAMMER 1979, 157-168 shows that Kastor's chronographical system was based on Apollodorus and Eratosthenes, we cannot expect complete conformity between ancient chronographers. In Particular, MOSSHAMMER 1979, 160 explains that Greek chronographs have not been handed down with complete uniformity especially for some "important and controversial dates", such as the fall of Troy, of which "Clement of Alexandria, for example (*Strom*. 1.139), reports several dates". For the fluidity of Ancient Greek genealogies, see FOWLER 1999, 2-19 quoted in n. 70 above. See also n. 67.

[74] As we have seen above in this text, interpolations are not enough of an explanation because even other authors who do not have interpolations, such as Pausanias, show similar mismatches.

historical phenomena and local identity. Let us continue by comparing the two kinds of literary works and see how and why they differ.

The *Periegesis* by Pausanias and those early Christian chronographic accounts based on Kastor's *Chronika* are literary works of different nature. The latter are aimed at constructing lists of rulers in an annalistic form, reporting almost no information but year reckoning and some events functional to establish chronological synchronism (sometimes, as we have seen, not very effectively). The final product is nothing more than a bare and simple chart listing names of kings. Simplification of ancient traditions was not sought for clarity purposes only, but early Christian authors' main goal was to demonstrate the chronological priority of biblical narrations and characters over other civilisations, and they were not very much concerned with getting rid of whatever detail did not comply with their goal[75]. By contrast, in Pausanias we have a mix of genealogical table and kings list: he enumerates kings and at times—not always—provides some information about their genealogy[76]. Perhaps, the same was in Kastor's original work, which likely offered not only chronographical lists but genealogies, as well. The mixed nature of Kastor's work can be inferred by a passage in Apollodorus' *Library* (Apollod. 2.1.3) mentioning the *Chronika*: Apollodorus is recounting the story of the Argive priestess Io, and reports different versions (at least three) about her lineage, among which versions is one by "Kastor and many of the tragedians [who] allege that Io was a daughter of Inachos"[77]. The parental relationship expounded in this excerpt may represent one more similarity between Pausanias and Kastor, by attesting

[75] BURGESS & WITAKOWSKI 1999, 80-82; CARRIKER 2003, 42-44; and BURGESS & KULIKOWSKI 2013, 24, 25, 52.

[76] PRAKKEN 1940, 460-470 discusses the differences between chronological charts and genealogical tables, and presents several instances of ancient authors, such as Herodotus, reporting contaminated versions of genealogies and charts. Pausanias is one of these authors. For instance, from the *Periegesis* (2.5.6-7) only, and not the chronographers, we know that Aigialeus begat Europs, who fathered Telchin, and so Telchin did with Apis, Apis with Thelxion, and Thelxion with Aigyros. Aigyros was son of Thourimachos, and Leukippos of Thourimachos. Without Pausanias we would not know that with Leukippos, the direct male lineage of the royal house comes to an end. On the differences between genealogies an king lists, see the on point discussion by MÖLLER 2001, 251-254.

[77] This excerpt *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 250 F 8, belonging to a section dedicated to the genealogies of the Argive royal houses, is the main evidence for the dating of the *Library*, which, together with the chronology of his author, is highly debated. Phot. *Bibl*. Codex 186, Bekker 142a identifies Apollodorus with the Athenian grammarian who flourished about 140 BC. However, modern scholars are generally inclined to date the author in the second century AD. For a discussion of the problem, see SCARPI 2001, XII as well as SMITH & TRZASKOMA 2007, XXIX-XXX.

that the *Chronika* was not, or not only, a list of names and years, but it also may have included narratives of genealogies, perhaps in a similar fashion to Pausanias[78].

Pausanias, Traditions, and Realia

Yet, differently from Kastor, Pausanias' purpose is to provide royal genealogies as part of the local history in a wider discourse aimed at expounding the *archaiologia* of the city to the reader. In the *Periegesis*, rulers' names are not only relevant for annalistic purposes or as pivots for family stems, but they are also meaningful for the understanding of religious and civic customs, topographical dislocations of monuments, and the monuments themselves that Pausanias illustrates in his descriptions. Monuments (*theoremata*) and traditions (*logoi*), especially those related to the early kings, in Pausanias are mutually influenced. On the one hand, tales about ancient kings inform the history and the meaning of the monuments, while the material culture and social and religious customs provide a solid ground to the mythical past of the city[79]. A substantial part of the Sikyonian past recounted by Pausanias is embodied by those buildings and customs belonging and dating back to the Archaic and Classical city of which only few scattered remains have survived down to us. The city was destroyed by Demetrios Poliorketes in 303 BC, who built a new settlement on the site of the Archaic acropolis, corresponding to the area now occupied by the modern houses of the village of Vasiliko[80].

Pausanias mentions some monuments of the Archaic and Classical acropolis, which at his time were still visible, though in poor conditions, at the Eastern lip of Demetrios' settlement. One of these monuments is a sanctuary (*hieron*) of Demeter (Paus. 2.11.2) that, 'they say', was founded by king Plemnaios as a thank-giving to the goddess for having reared his son Orthopolis (Paus. 2.5.8) after all his other children died at their first wail[81]. One other king, Epopeus the Thessalian, is credited (Paus. 2.6.3) as founder

---

[78] See MOSSHAMMER 1979, 36-37 and 321, n. 13 for a suggestion that Kastor did not employ charts, which were perhaps introduced by Eusebius. See BURGESS & KULIKOWSKI 2013, 88 and n. 85 with further references.

[79] For Pausanias' methodology, see STEWART 2018, 281-283.

[80] LOLOS & GOURLEY 2012, 1.

[81] Pausanias (2.11.2) reports the temple along the way to the plane from the Sacred Gate. A discussion about the church of Agia Trias, at the entrance of the modern village of Vasiliko, as a possible location for the sanctuary of Demeter is in LOLOS 2011, 210. See n. 83 below.

of a sanctuary (*hieron*) to Artemis and Apollo, as well as of a temple (*naos*) to Athena, which Pausanias describes as the greatest of its times by size and ornaments. The dedication of the temple followed a sacrifice (*thysia*) as a thank giving for a victory against the Theban king Nykteus (Paus. 2.6.2.4), a war that we will mention later in this work. Pausanias saw the temple burned down to ground, allegedly destroyed by a divine thunder, but he claims that the altar was still in good shape as dedicated by Epopeus[82]. In front of the altar, Pausanias saw also the tomb of the king, where he perhaps received hero cult[83]. Located after (*meta*) the temple to Artemis and Apollo, Pausanias (2.11.1) reports a sanctuary (*hieron*) to Hera dedicated by Adrastos, behind which he built white marble altars to Pan and Helios[84]. We know that Adrastos received a cult in Sikyon, and in fact Herodotus (5.67.1) mentions a *heroon* to Adrastos located in the Sikyonian agora[85]. Perhaps this *heroon* is the cenotaph to Adrastos that Dieuchidas of Megara (*floruit* fourth century BC) mentions as being in Sikyon, while he reports that the actual tomb of the hero was in Megara[86]. Pausanias (1.43.1) acknowledges that the tomb of Adrastos was in Megara, and in fact in Sikyon he does not report any

[82] The desuetude of the *hiera* of Hera and Artemis, and of Apollo is also attested by the absence of the cult statues (Paus. 2.11.1).

[83] According to Pausanias (2.6.3), all these monuments are at the Sacred Gate, likely located at the church of Agia Trias, at the entrance of the modern village of Vasiliko. See n. 81 above as well as LOLOS 2011, 101, 121 and HAYWARD 2021, 110. Pausanias (2.11.1) uses 'they say'when mentioning Epopeus as the dedicator of the sanctuary to Artemis and Apollo, but he does not do so for the temple of Athena perhaps because in this case the Periegete's scepticism is mitigated by a certain number of narratives recounting anecdotes about Epopeus (Paus. 2.6.1-4); the myth of Antiope connected to him (Paus. 2.6.3); accounts from earlier authors, such as Eumelus of Corinth (*FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 451 F 1a-2a) and Asius of Samos (Paus. 2.6.3, 5 = *PEG I* 1, 11 = frs 1, 11 West). Pausanias used all these authors as sources to inform his accounts on Corinth and Sikyon. For Epopeus and early authors mentioning him see pp. 213-216 and pp. 220-226 below.

[84] See ns 81 and 83 above, as well as LOLOS 2011, 383-384 for a brief but well informed description of the cluster of monuments at the Sacred Gate.

[85] HUGHES 2019, 126 discusses the *heroon* of Adrastos as part of a custom to bury in the Sikyonian agora. However, there is no reason to argue, as HUGHES 2019, 127 does, that burying heroes in the agora implies that the 'ancient law' mentioned by Plu. *Arat.* 52.1-4 preventing burials within the city walls did not exist. Instead, in my opinion, is the opposite: that law was clearly applied to humans only, and the problem that Sikyonians faced was whether burying Aratos as a human or not. This can be inferred by looking at the content of the oracular response (Plu. *Arat.* 52.3), which deals with honours to Aratos, and not to his burial site. Because the god spoke in favour of bestowing (heroic) honours to him, Aratos transcended the human status, and his corpse was not subjected anymore to a burial law meant for humans. Therefore, his body could be hosted in the agora together with the other heroised individuals.

[86] *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 485 F 3 = Sch. Pi. *N.* 9.30.

monument dedicated to Adrastos, perhaps because the Archaic and Classical agora was not the same as that of Pausanias' times. The relocation of the Sikyonian settlement, which, as we have seen, occurred in 303 BC under Demetrios Poliorketes, maybe the reason behind the silence of Pausanias about one other temple allegedly founded by Adrastos: that of Athena Alea (i.e., of the exile). This temple is mentioned in a fragment from Menaechmus, who reports that the location of the temple is where Adrastos dwelled when had to leave Argos and fled to Polybos at Sikyon[87]. One more *anathema* relevant to our argument is the statue of Dionysos Bakcheios set up by Androdamas (Paus. 2.7.6). The statue acted as the leading attraction of a nocturnal procession, lit by torches and accompanied by hymns, during which the statue was transported from a dressing room (*kosmeterion*)—where a clothing ceremony likely took place—to the Dionysion, where the statue was concealed, together with other statues[88]. The statue is related to the story of the foundation of Phlias that Pausanias (2.6.6) recounts as having originated in Sikyon. Androdamas, who set up the statue, was grandson of Dionysos by mother, Chthonophyle. After having begotten Polybos by Hermes, she married Phlias, son of Dionysos and eponymous of Phlious (Paus. 2.12.6), and mothered Androdamas, who is both son of Phlias and grandson of king Sikyon by mother. Last, Phalkes son of Temenos founded the temple of Hera Prodromia (Paus. 2.11.2), whose epithet, according to Pausanias, is due to the fact that the goddess helped Phalkes in finding his way to Sikyon. The epiklesis Prodromia, however, may be due to the location of the *naos* along the way to the plain[89].

Another example of how material culture was part of the living memory of the community can be found in the tendency of the Sikyonians to connect noteworthy objects with historical and mythical events and personas. Pausanias (2.7.8-9) informs us that, according to the Sikyonians, a

---

[87] The fragment by Menaechmus is *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 131 F 10 = Sch. Pi. *N*. 9.30; One other temple (*naos* – Paus. 2.11.2), though not connected by Pausanias to any *logos* about ancient kings, in the same area as that of Adrastos, is the temple of Apollo Karneios that Pausanias saw in ruins, without even columns nor ceiling. On Apollo Karneios, see below in this contribution.

[88] The Dionysion, together with the hidden statues (ἀπόρρητα ἀγάλματα) was accompanied by white marble statues of bacchants. The *naos* to this god is "after the theatre" (μετὰ δὲ τὸ θέατρον Διονύσου ναός ἐστι) while heading from the acropolis towards the agora; see STEWART 2013, 248.

[89] The *Periegesis* does not provide any precise information useful to establish a possible position of this temple, but it was likely located next to that of Apollo Karneios because Pausanias (2.11.2) mentions these buildings one right after the other. See n. 87 above.

temple of Apollo in the agora was founded by the Argive king Proitos on the very spot where his daughters recovered from madness[90]. Besides setting in Sikyon a key Argive tradition such as that of the Proitides, the temple of Apollo is also worth mentioning for its contents[91]. Pausanias (2.7.8) reports Sikyonian stories according to which in the temple could be found the spear of Meleager, dedicated by the hero himself, and the flutes of Marsyas. The Traveller, however, did not have any chance to inspect these curiosities because at his times the temple, along with its contents, was burned down to ground. But from Lucius Ampelius (*floruit* second - third centuries AD) we have a more detailed account about these (Ampel. 8.5):

> «Sicyone in Achaia in foro aedis Apollinis est. in ea sunt posita Agamemnonis clipeus et machaera; Ulixis chlamys et thoracium; Teucri sagittae et arcus; Adrasti arca [quam deposuit] in qua quid sit ignoratur; sed et olla aerea, <quam Medea posuit> in qua Pelias coctus dicitur; item Palamedis litterae; Marsyae <tibiae> itemque corium; remi Argonautarum <cum> [et] gubernaculi <et> bracchia; cauculus quo Minerva sortita est de Oreste † ceravit una percomparasit † <ibi> palla pendet, quam si quis halitu afflaverit, tota patefit; <item> Penelopae tela. ibi de terra oleum scaturrit»[92].

> «At Sikyon in Achaia there is a temple of Apollo in the forum. In it are placed the shield and sword of Agamemnon; the cloak and breastplate of Ulysses; the arrows and bow of Teucer; a chest of Adrastos [which he placed there], the contents of which are unknown; there is a cauldron of bronze <which Medea put there> in which it is said that Pelias was cooked; also the letters of Palamedes; the flute of Marsyas and also his skin; the oars of the Argonauts along with the rudder and the sail-yards; the pebble by which Minerva decided the fate of Orestes †; a robe is suspended <there>; if anyone blows on it with a breath, all of it is exposed; also the weaving of Penelope. There olive oil gushes forth from the earth»[93].

Ampelius considers the Sikyonian Apollonion and its content one of the wonders of the world (*Miracula Mundi*) including, for instance, the temple of Zeus at Olympia, the Athenian Parthenon, and the altar of

---

[90] Sikyonians even identified Proitos' daughters on a set of bronze statues located near the temple of Apollo Lykios, in ruins, and a statue of Herakles by Lysippos. Pausanias (2.9.8), however, notices that the inscription to the female statues pointed towards women others than the Proitides. The temple of Apollo has been tentatively identified with that at the entrance of the archaeological site of Sikyon; see KRYSTALLI-VOTSI & ØSTBY 2010, 54-62.

[91] We have discussed Argive traditions being manipulated by Sikyonians. See pp. 192-194 above and pp. 216-218 below.

[92] Text from *BNJ* 551 F 3a = ASSMANN 1935, 66-75.

[93] Tr. Williams, *BNJ* 551 F 3a.

Pergamon[94]. Oral traditions, from which Pausanias' account on the curiosities seems to derive, partially match with the literary work by Ampelius, but the narratives behind these ancient relics likely belong to a chronology much later than the objects themselves[95]. Modern studies have argued Sikyonians collected these objects probably in the third century BC with the intention of appropriating for themselves traditions that belonged to sagas of other neighbouring cities, with the aim of connecting their own mythical past with traditions of Panhellenic scale[96]. Objects such as weapons, clothes, cauldrons, chests, musical instruments, etc. were common dedications to be found in sanctuaries, and linking a mythical tradition to some of those either genuinely Archaic or showing an archaising fashion was a practice not uncommon among ancient Greeks[97].

From these examples emerges that Sikyonians paid considerable attention to defining their history through material culture, with a particular focus on their remote past. Yet, Pausanias' text reflects the effort of reconstructing a mythical past that is not only based on the material culture of his times, but also on the immaterial, such as customs and practices of the community to which the mythical past, as well as old buildings and *mirabilia*, belonged. Phaistos, for instance, is not directly connected to any building, but to a cult, that of Herakles. Pausanias recounts that when Phaistos came to Sikyon, people were sacrificing to Herakles as a hero, but not agreeing with this practice, he established the custom of honouring Herakles as a god. Since that time, Sikyonians honoured Herakles as both a god and a deity: thighs of a lamb as an offer to the god were burned on an altar, while the flesh was

---

[94] Ampelius preserves the only mention of the Pergamon Altar in the whole ancient literature. See, for instance, RIDGWAY 1990, 20.

[95] Ampelius believed that both the temple and its contents were present during this time, but Pausanias (2.7.9) reports that all the objects stored in the temple burned together with the earlier building.

[96] SCHEER 1996, 371-373 and LOLOS 2021, 590-591.

[97] SCHEER 1996, 354-356. Not even Pausanias seems to give much credit to these Sikyonian claims. We know that in Sikyon he consulted some exegetes, to whom his 'they say' (*legousi*) may reference (Paus. 2.9.8) a group of female bronze statues that locals identified with the daughters of Proitos, founder of the museum/temple of Apollo. See n. 90 above. The Traveller, however, noticed that the inscription to the statues pointed towards women others than the Proitides. The statues were located (Paus. 2.9.8) near the temple of Apollo Lykios, in ruins, and a statue of Herakles by Lysippos. The exegetes are cited in relation to the abovementioned temple. Among the Sikyonian curiosities it is worth mentioning (Paus. 2.10.2) the bones of a huge sea-monster lying in the portico of the Asklepieion.

shared between the people and Herakles as a hero (Paus. 2.10.1)[98]. Pausanias connects these celebrations to Herakles with a sanctuary (*hieron*) that was located in the middle of a sacred precinct (*peribolos*) called Paidize, and these celebrations were perceived as belonging to a relatively ancient tradition[99]. That the cult of Herakles in Sikyon was considered as an early one is suggested by Pausanias when he mentions a wooden image (*xoanon*) of the hero/god that he attributes to Laphaes of Phlious. The name of this sculptor shows up in the *Periegesis* only, where it is mentioned twice, once as the sculptor of the Herakles' *xoanon* at Sikyon, and the second time as the author of a statue of Apollo hosted in the Apollonion at the Achaean city of Aigeira (Paus. 7.26.6). The attribution of the *xoanon* of Herakles in Sikyon with the statue of Apollo in Aigeira attests to the antiquity of the two statues. Via the antiquity of the pediment sculptures of the Apollonion of Aigeira, the Periegete derives the antiquity of the Apollo statue, which caught his eye, hosted into the sacred building. The Traveller does not conceal his disappointment for the fruitless effort of investigating among the locals, who proved themselves unable to provide any information about the statue. But the void was filled by connoisseurship, which led Pausanias to identify the author of the Apollo statue with that of the Sikyonian Herakles. The discourse about the statues of Apollo and Herakles shows how material culture, religious customs and mythical past interact with each other. Pausanias' actuality, in this case religious rituals, is informed by mythical tales, while material culture, such the style of cult statues related to those rituals, attests to the antiquity of the cult practice, which in turn are taken as confirmations to the authenticity of the traditions. In other words, Pausanias' account about Herakles' cults and his statue emphasises the antiquity of the Herakleidai presence in Sikyon, who, as we have seen above in the case of Phaistos, were claimed to be significantly early in the royal genealogy.

In Pausanias, then, a significant relationship emerges between the history of the city and the list of the kings as he narrates it. In the text, this relationship is embodied in the *realia* hat he has experienced: material culture such as buildings and objects, as well as customs emerge as part of a living memory that Pausanias records and elaborates and that is used to shape and construct the local history. While chronographers' list seems to be poorly connected with local beliefs and collective memory of the *polis*, the *Periegesis*

---

[98] In the same passage of the *Periegesis* (2.10.4) we can also read about a festival to Herakles, which seems to have had days dedicated to Herakles the hero, and other days to Herakles the god.

[99] The name Paidize may attest to the cult of Herakles as connected with educational and/or athletic activities of the youths.

shows that the reconstruction of the past as expressed in Pausanias' kings list was still active in the Sikyonian community of his times, and suggests a remarkable effort of the Sikyonians in constructing their history[100].

The Names of Sikyon

Sikyon and its land were known in antiquity for having had, besides Sikyon itself, five names throughout their history, and for having named the whole Peloponnese, too. One name, Demetrias, was given in 303 BC after Demetrios Poliorketes[101]. Two other names, Mekone and Asopia, are associated to Sikyon by literary accounts, and three out of the total of six names derive from Sikyonian mythical early rulers, the first of whom is Aigialeus[102].

Aigialeia

Traditions attest to Aigialeus as the founder and first king the city of Sikyon and its land[103]. Let us see what these traditions say and what we can learn from them. From Herodotus (7.94) we know that Aigialian Pelasgians was an appellation that the Greeks (*Hellenes*) used to define the inhabitants of Achaea before the Peloponnesians became Achaeans and Danaoi after Achaios son of Xouthos, and Danaos, respectively[104]. These two ethnics,

---

[100] In this respect, a remarkable difference between the lists are those traditions and *realia* connected with the Herakleidai. See above in this text.

[101] See p. 24 above in this text and the following n. 102.

[102] Demetrias was one other name gave to Sikyon, as Diodorus Siculus (20.102.3), Strabo (8.6.2.5), Plutarch (*Demetr*. 25.3), and Pausanias (2.7.1) record. This name was given by the last re-founder of the Sikyonian settlement, Demetrios Poliorketes, when he built the new city on the plateau in 303 BC, but Diodorus points out that Demetrias was in use for a limited time only. According to Diodorus (20.102.3), the toponym Demetrias was dropped when they stopped celebrating the honours to Demetrios Poliorketes that were instituted right after 303 BC. Yet, we have epigraphical evidence for the short time in which Demetrias was in use. See the decree I 2636: *Agora XVI* 182-186 and Lolos 2011, 72-74. As Griffin 1982, 5 and n. 17 remarkably notices, Demetrias was not forgotten in the Middle Ages, as attested by Nik. Greg. *Hist. Rom*. 4.9. Yet, we do not know whether in such late times this name was actually employed in real life or just used by erudites. Some ancient sources derive the name Sikyon from the word σικύα 'bottle gourd', or σίκυς 'cucumber'; see Lolos 2011, 38 for a collection of sources and further bibliography.

[103] For a brief summary, see Griffin 1982, 4.

[104] Hdt. 7.94: "before Danaos and Xouthos came to the Peloponnesians, the Greeks say [ὡς Ἕλληνες λέγουσι], they [the Ionians] were called Aigialian Pelasgians". See also Hdt. 1.56.2. Pausanias (7.1.1) elaborates on the traditions to which Herodotus alludes, and

Danaoi and Achaeans, are used in the *Iliad* to define the peoples ruled by Agamemnon during the Trojan war, and therefore, Herodotus' ethnic Aigialian Pelasgians seems to be equivalent of pre-Danaoi and pre-Achaeans. Therefore, in Herodotus the ethnic Aigialian pointed towards peoples inhabiting Achaea at quite early times, and in fact already in the *Iliad* (2.569-577) we find the choronym Aigialeus related to Achaea[105]:

> «And they that held Mycenae, the well-built citadel, and wealthy Corinth, and well-built Cleonae, and dwelt in Orneiae and lovely Araethyrea and Sikyon, wherein at the first Adrastos was king; and they that held Hyperesia and steep Gonoessa and Pellene, and that dwelt about Aegium and throughout all Aegialus, and about broad Helice, of these was the son of Atreus, lord Agamemnon, captain, with a hundred ships»[106].

The Homeric passage mentions Sikyon, together with other cities, as part of Agamemnon realm. But the Aigialos mentioned here seems to be a land, and not a city, other than Sikyon. Aigialos is referred to as 'a whole' (Αἰγιαλόν τ᾿ ἀνὰ πάντα), implying that the author of these verses has a territory in mind, and not just a single land. In addition, Sikyon and Aigialos are single items parcelled within a list, and therefore presented as separate entities. This reading of the Iliadic passage may be confirmed by the following excerpt from Istros the Callimachean (*floruit* third century BC)[107]:

> «Αἰγιαλός· μεταξὺ Σικυῶνος καὶ τοῦ Βουπρασίου τόπος καλούμενος ἀπὸ Αἰγιαλέως τοῦ Ἰνάχου, ὡς Ἴστρος ἐν Ἀποικίαις τῆς Αἰγύπτου»[108].

> «Aigialos: between Sikyon and Bouprasion [there is] a place named after Aigialeus, son of Inachos, as Istros [reports] in [his work] *Colonies of Egypt*»[109].

Istros presents Aigialos as a *topos* between Sikyon and Bouprasion. We know that Sikyon shared his western border with Achaea (thought its exact location is problematic), and that Bouprasion was a place in Elis close to its

---

continues with the stories of Xouthos and Achaios in Paus. 7.1.2-9. Pausanias (8.1.3-6) recounts that the ethnic Pelasgian derives from the name of Pelasgos, the first inhabitant of Arcadia, an 'interior' land, 'shut off from the sea'.

[105] Pausanias (5.5.1) reiterates this Herodotean information, while Hesychius (A 1703, 1-7 *s.v.* Αἰγιαλεῖς) seems to find a compromise between the *Iliad* and the later instances discussed below in this paragraph.

[106] Tr. from MURRAY 1928, 93.

[107] *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 334 F 44.

[108] The excerpt is in St.Byz. α 100 Billerbeck *s.v.* Αἰγιαλός.

[109] Personal translation.

eastern border with Achaea[110]. Therefore, the term *topos*, in this case, should be understood in its wider sense of 'region' or 'district', which is also the way in which Homeric poems employ the word *aigialos*: not as a settlement nor a toponym *stricto sensu*, but as an area defined by specific geographical characteristic, as Pausanias (7.1.1) himself explains[111]. In the *Periegesis* it is claimed that Aigialos is the ancient name of Achaea, and that it comes "from the land (*chora*), the greater part of which is coast (*aigialos*)"[112]. In the same passage, Pausanias specifies that this etymology is accepted by all the peoples but the Sikyonians, who are alone in deriving Aigialos from the name of their first king Aigialeus, a native of the area (Paus. 2.5.6)[113]. From Istros' fragment presented above, we know that, besides Sikyonians, the Aigialeus who gave the name to the coastal Achaea was believed to be Aigialeus son of the Argive Inachos, and therefore Aigialeia is considered as an Argive belonging.

Differently from Pausanias, Kastor (*apud* Eus.) claims that the first Sikyonian king Aigialeus gave the name of Aigialeia not to the Achaea, but to the whole Peloponnese[114]. This account by Kastor is particularly relevant because, to my knowledge, Aigialeus as both the first king and name-giver to Sikyon and its region does not appear in literary sources before Kastor himself (*floruit* early first century BC)[115]. If Kastor is the *terminus ante quem*

---

[110] For the borders between Sikyon and Achaea, see LOLOS 2011, 16-21, while for Bouprasion see *RE* 3.1, 1058 *s.v.* Buprasion [Oberhummer], and especially VISSER 1997, 556-560, as well as *BK* 2.2, 199, 615 *s.v.* Buprasion.

[111] For the meanings of *topos*, see *LSJ s.v.* τόπος. For *egialos*, see *BK* 2.2, 186, 574 *s.v.* Aigion, where it is explained that in the Homeric poems, except for *Il.* 2.855, the word is generally used as a common noun; see *Il.* 4.422 and 14.34, as well as *Od.* 22.385).

[112] Tr. JONES 1961, 167. Pausanias (7.1.1) provides coordinates for its location by specifying that the Achaean region is between Sikyonia, Elis, and the coastline of the Corinthian gulf. The inhabitants are called Aigialeis. For the meaning of the term *aigialos*, cf. *LSJ s.v.* αἰγιαλός. Linear B tables from Pylos attesting to *ai-ki-a₂-ri-jo* (*aigialioi*), possibly "men 'frequenting the seashore'" as translated by VENTRIS et al. 1959, 386, and 4-5 for a discussion on the reading, may be men who received barley rations (cf. VENTRIS, CHADWICK & WACE 1959, 91. Modern speculations (VERMEULE 1987, 134-138) suggest that the *aigialioi* from the Mycenaeans tablets refer to Sikyonians, but there is no evidence towards this direction; see LOLOS 2011, 60 for a summary of these modern theories.

[113] In Paus. 2.6.5 the name is Aigiale.

[114] *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 250 F 2. As we will see, another tradition (Apollod. 2.1.1) reports that the Peloponnese was called Aigialeia from Aigialeus brother of the Argive king Phoroneus, son of Inachos and Melias. See below in this chapter.

[115] The region Aegiali only and not the king is in Strabo (8.6.25 - *floruit* first century BC-first century AD) and Pausanias (2.5.6). The occurrences in Kastor and Pausanias are those analysed in this contribution. Strabo (8.6.25) reports that Sikyon was called Mekone, and in still earlier times Aegiali. These two names are also in Eust. *Il.* 1.449.20 van der Valk.

Aigialeia does not appear in relation to Sikyon, Herodotus provides a *terminus post quem* the two toponyms could have been associated. In his passage recounting Kleisthenes' anti-Dorian policy, Herodotus (5.68.2) reports that sixty years after the death of the tyrant, Sikyonians reformed the Kleisthenic tribal appellatives, and one of the four tribes received the name of Aigialeia after Aigialeus, son of Adrastos[116]. From Herodotus' account we understand that the name Aigialeia is not related to a mythical name of the city, but rather was aimed at overturning the tyrant's policy by honouring Adrastos through his son. From this account we may learn that at Herodotus' times—or, at least, after Sikyonians reformed Kleisthenic measures—Aigialeia was not considered as a primigenial name of the city, because designating just one of the four tribes with such a name would have been unsound and unfair towards the other three[117].

From this short analysis we can conclude that before Kastor's Sikyonian sources Aigialeia was considered as an Argive belonging. Therefore, Aigialeia as the original name of Sikyon with Aigialeus being its first king and founder, perhaps did not belong to a long-standing Panhellenic background. Instead, it appeared in Sikyon only at a time span that we cannot circumscribe any better that between the fifth and first centuries BC. But Kastor's claim of Aigialeus as name-giver not only to the coastal Achaea but to the whole Peloponnese may reflect the ambitions of the Achaean League under Aratos and the geo-political context of the late third-early second centuries BC. In those periods, thanks to the successful leadership of Aratos and the fortunate campaigns of Philopoimen against Sparta and Nabis, aspiration of the Achaean League in gaining control of the whole Peloponnese became real, although for a limited time[118]. As we will

---

[116] This is perhaps a son named after a territorial belonging based on the traditions (see above in this section *Il*. 2.569-577) making Aigialeia as the coastal area (Achaea, but excluding Sikyon) belonging to Agamemnon. We should not forget that the name of Adrastos' daughter was Argeia (Hellanicus of Lesbos, *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 4 F 98 = Sch. E. *Ph.* 71). Therefore, Adrastos' children were named after both Argeia and Aigialeia (the coast) perhaps to remark the territory on which Adrastos was entrusted. Sikyon, again, should be excluded because we have traditions stating clearly that he ruled there, but only temporary and without leaving heirs. About Argeia, see GANTZ 1993, 502-503, 508-10 and 520-1.

[117] *Contra* MUSTI & TORELLI 1994, 236, who considers the ambivalence of the name as suitable to be used in favour of both those who were close to the tyrant's policy, and those against it. MELE 2002, 74 thinks that Adrastos' son Aigialeus is an Argive claim over Sikyon, but we have just seen that at the time of Herodotus there is no evidence attesting Aigialeia as a name of Sikyon.

[118] The equation Aigialos = Peloponnesos is in opposition to Achaeans = Aigialian Pelasgians (cf. Hdt. 7.49 cited above) that we find in the *Catalogue of the Ships*; see VISSER 1997, 193-197.

see soon below, Pausanias' king Apis may indicate the same will of hegemony over the Peloponnese, and therefore, despite minor discrepancies, the versions of Pausanias and Kastor are not too different from each other as modern scholarship has stressed so far.

Telchinia

Together with Aigialeia, literary sources attest to Telchinia as another former name of Sikyon. This name is attested only by two Byzantine scholars: Stephanus of Byzantium (*floruit* sixth century AD) and Eustathius (ca. 1110-1194 AD)[119]. The former attests to the toponym Telchinia for Sikyon, as well as the ethnic Telchinios, while the latter author derives the names from the Telchines, who, according to Eustathius, once lived in the area[120]. It seems, however, that Sikyonian traditions traced back the name to an eponymous king, Telchin, the third one in the royal lists[121]. If the toponym comes from the namesake ruler, nephew of the first eponymous king Aigialos, Telchin is the second appellative king, followed by his son Apis.

Apia

After Aigialeus and, possibly, Telchin, Apis is the third Sikyonian eponymous king on record. The earliest occurrence of this individual as king of Sikyon is, again, in the list derived from Kastor (*apud* Eus.), where it is also claimed that the whole Peloponnese was called Apia after this ruler. We find the same claim in Pausanias (2.5.7). Apia as one of the ancient names of Peloponnese is widely attested from the Classical to the Late Antique periods, and it is involved in a long and controversial debate that put ancient scholars and authors on opposite fronts. The problem deals with whether Homer mentions Apia or not, and embroiled Alexandrian scholars in blaming what they called Neoteric poets (the *neoteroi*, i.e. all those later than Homer) of having misunderstood Homer's use of the term *hapios*. According to the Alexandrians, Neoteric poets named the Peloponnese as Apia after the Homeric poems, where the word *hapios* appears in passages recalling the Peloponnese[122]. The problem was so much discussed in antiquity that even

---

[119] St.Byz. σ 158 Billerbeck *s.v.* Σικυών, and τ 289 Billerbeck *s.v.* Τελχίς. Eust. *Il.* 1.449.24-27 van der Valk.

[120] For the Telchines, see FOWLER 2013, 45-59.

[121] For a brief summary, see GRIFFIN 1982, 5, 92-93.

[122] Most of the information in this paragraph, except for the following reference to Strabo, come from JACKSON 1998, 581-585.

Strabo (8.6.9-10) jumped into the *querelle* lending a hand to the grammarians. The Geographer, pointing the finger at the *neoteroi*, offers several instances of the Homeric employment of the toponym Argos, and not Apia, to name the Peloponnese, and explains that in the Homeric poems, the term *hapios* is used in its literal meaning—i.e. to refer to a rather far land[123]. Thanks to Stephanus of Byzantium (α 357 Billerbeck *s.v.* Ἀπία) we have an example of this Homeric misunderstanding, presented in the following fragment by Rhianus (*floruit* third century BC)[124]:

«ὑμετέρη τοι, τέκνα, Φορωνέος Ἰναχίδαο
ἀρχῆθεν γενεή. τοῦ δὲ κλυτὸς ἐκγένετ' Ἄπις,
ὅς ῥ' Ἀπίην ἐφάτιξε καὶ ἀνέρας Ἀπιδανῆας».

«With Phoroneus son of Inachos indeed, Oh children,
takes its origin your race. And to this man was born the famous Apis,
who then called [the region] Apie and the men Apidanians»[125].

From this excerpt we learn that the toponym Apie comes from Apis son of Phoroneus and grandson of Inachos, all of whom were kings of Argos. In using the toponym Apia to refer to Argos and its realm, Rhianus is on the same page of the Attic tragediographers, who, however, claim an origin of the name other than the son of Phoroneus. Aeschylus, in *The Suppliants* (260-270), derives the toponym from one Apis, son of Apollo, who was a seer and healer. In the tragedy, the Argive king Pelasgos recounts the story as follows: Apis once came to the king's possessions from beyond Naupaktos to free the land (*Apia chora)* from the plague of man-eating snakes that sprung by the Earth, which got polluted after old bloody deeds. When mentioning the *Apia chora* (A. *Supp.* 260), king Pelasgos seems to refer to Argos only, even if he claims a much larger realm, stretching out north to include Thrace (the land of river Strymon), Thessaly (Paionian's land), and Macedonia (Pindos

---

[123] See *Il*. 3.49 for the same meaning of the term (as well as *Od*. 7.25 and 16.18). See Strabo 1.1.16 for a quotation of *Il*. 1.270. Strabo's reference to Apia in 8.6.9-10 is part of a lengthy discourse aimed at demonstrating that Homer refers to the Greeks as Argives, as much as he does with Danaans and Achaeans. All these names of the Hellenes come from the Argives, who were so famous and renowned to give their name(s) to all the Greeks. Apollod. 2.1.2 agrees with Strabo and claims that the Peloponnese once was named Argos after king Argos. The same is in Pausanias (2.16.1).

[124] Second book of *Achaïka: FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 265 F 1 = fr. 13 POWELL. In the same passage, Stephanus of Byzantium (α 357 Billerbeck *s.v.* Ἀπία) explains that the Arcadians were also called Apians after either the river Apidon or Apis, the son of the Argive king Phoroneus.

[125] Personal translation.

Mountain)[126]. In the passage of *The Suppliants*, Argos is the addressee of the toponym Apia, which however seems to be comprehensive of the whole *chora*. Also Sophocles (*OC* 1303) mentions the Apia as the land of Adrastos and the Seven Against Thebes—i.e. the Argolid—but not all the protagonists of the myth are Argive in a narrow sense: Hippomedon was from Lerna in the Argolid, and Parthenopaios was native of Arcadia. The toponym Apia, therefore, seems to be related to Argos *stricto sensu* on the one hand, and on the other hand to an Argolid that extended beyond its borders. The inclusive taste of the toponym Apia is reflected in the glossa of Stephanus of Byzantium (α 357 Billerbeck *s.v.* Ἀπία), who articulates on different meanings between the ethnic Apian and the toponym Apia, acknowledging that the former—Apian, or either Apidonians and Apidonees—may be understood in a wider sense than Argive and that can stand for Peloponnesians or, he says, even Arcadians[127]. The ethnic, according to Stephanus, who accepts Rhianus' story, is derived either from the river Apidon or from Apis, the son of the Argive king Phoroneus. But from Istros the Callimachean, contemporary to Rhianus, we have a further attestation that Apia stood for Peloponnese, though showing an origin of the toponym radically different from those presented so far, pointing towards a fruit: the pears (*apioi*)[128]. Istros' account has been handed down in two later literary works: one is that by Stephanus of Byzantium (α 357 Billerbeck *s.v.* Ἀπία = *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 334 F 39b) already mentioned here above, and the other by Athenaeus of Naukratis (Ath. 14.650b Casaubon = 14.63 Kaibel = *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 334 F 39a):

---

[126] The Apian land is also mentioned in A. *Supp.* 117, 125, and 777. Aeschylus uses the same term also in *Ag.* 256.

[127] See SPANAKIS 2018, 4-5 for a reasoned collection of more sources mentioning Arcadians as Apidonees. In particular, SPANAKIS 2018, 5, on the basis of Rhianus' fragment presented above, argues that "Apia could be a geographical allusion recalling the revival of the Achaean League by Aratos of Sikyon in 251 BC" and that "Aratos of Sikyon could be seen as a historical parallel to the mythical hero Apis". Rhianus, however, points towards Argos as the origin of Apia, and not towards Sikyon, as one would expect from tradition endorsing the role of Aratos.

[128] About Istros, see BERTI 2009, 1-27.

Ath. 14.650b Casaubon = 14.63 Kaibel = *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 334 F 39a.	St.Byz. α 357 Billerbeck *s.v.* Ἀπία = *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 334 F 39b.
«ἑξῆς οὖν λέξω περὶ τῶν παρακειμένων ἀπίων, ἐπεὶ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ Πελοπόννησος Ἀπία ἐκλήθη διὰ τὸ ἐπιδαψιλεύειν ἐν αὐτῆι τὸ φυτόν, φησὶν Ἴστρος ἐν τοῖς Αργολικοῖς».	«[…] φησὶ δὲ καὶ τὰς ἀχράδας τὰς ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ γινομένας Ἴστρος ἀπίους ἀπὸ ταύτης ὑπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν λεχθῆναι. […]».
«I will therefore talk about the pears [*apioi*] that have been served, since the Peloponnese was called Apia after them because the tree is abundant there, as Istros says in his *Argolika*».	«[…] Istros says that the wild-pears [*achrades*] produced in this land were called *apioi* [cultivated pears] by those from outside, taking their name from this land. […]».

Both fragments refer to the Peloponnese as a land rich in pears, which name in ancient Greek is *apioi*, but from a comparison between the two texts we can single out substantial differences. The passage in Athenaeus says that the pears (*apioi*) gave the name to the region (Apia), while the passage from Stephanus states the opposite, namely that the region (Apia) gave the name to the pears (*apioi*)[129]. Stephanus reports that a fruit normally known as *achras* was instead called *apios* by people from outside (οἱ ἔξωθεν) for the reason that it was a product of the Apian land[130]. Perhaps an explanation about who "those people from outside" are, can be found in Plutarch (*Mor.* 303A-B = *Quaest. Graec.* 51), who, in the following passage, comments on an Argive custom performed during an unspecified religious festival:

---

[129] Surprisingly, this inconsistency is not discussed in the commentary to *BNJ* 334 F 39a-b by M. Berti and S. Jackson. For the same ancient author, see also *FGrHist* [and BNJ] 334 F 1a-b.

[130] That is to say, *apioi* are the pears of the Apia. *Achrades* is the Ancient Greek for wild-pears, and the excerpt seems to explain that the custom of naming *achrades* as *apioi* is due to the custom of non-Peloponnesians, which is the name of wild pears.

«διὰ τί Βαλλαχράδας ἑαυτοὺς Ἀργείων παῖδες ἐν ἑορτῇ τινι παίζοντες ἀποκαλοῦσιν; ἢ ὅτι τοὺς πρώτους ὑπ᾽ Ἰνάχου καταχθέντας ἐκ τῶν ἄκρων εἰς τὰ πεδία ἀχράσι διατραφῆναι λέγουσιν; ἀχράδας δὲ πρῶτον ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ φανῆναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἔτι τῆς χώρας ἐκείνης Ἀπίας προσαγορευομένης ὅθεν ἄπιοι αἱ ἀχράδες ἐπωνομάσθησαν. »

«Why is it that Argive children in a certain festival call themselves, in jest, 'Pear-throwers'? Is it because the first men that were led down by Inachos from the mountains to the plain lived, as they say, on wild pears? They also say that the Hellenes first discovered wild pears in the Peloponnese at a time when that country was still called Apia, wherefore wild pears were named *apioi*[131]».

Plutarch confirms the version handed down by Stephanus of Byzantium (the region gave its name to the pears), and gives more information that perhaps allows for a better understanding of the excerpt. The story goes that the eating of wild pears was limited to those people who lived at the time of Inachos, first king of Argos and grandfather of Apis, and who moved from the mountains to colonise the plain and found the settlement that would become Argos[132]. Three generations later, after the king Apis gave his name to the region, but before king Argos did so, it happened that the Greeks (οἱ Ἕλληνες) in general—and not the Apians/Peloponnesians only—learned to consume pears, and it was by those non-Peloponnesian Greeks that the fruit was named *apios*, because it came from Apia. The "those people from outside" mentioned in the Stephanus' excerpt may well be the Hellenes mentioned by Plutarch, but as to why Athenaeus' version differs from Plutarch's and Stephanus' it is rather unknown. However, modern scholarship has established that the two latter authors had direct access to Istros' texts, and therefore can be considered as reliable sources.

From this analysis we learn that except for Kastor and Pausanias, the toponym Apis, regardless its various possible *aitia* and geographical sphere of pertinence, is associated with Argos and never is to Sikyon. The association with Argos emerges in a period between the composition of the Homeric pomes and the fifth century BC, while the extant sources attesting to a Sikyonian Apia are not earlier than the Hellenistic period. This chronological framework is coherent with the case of Aigialeia discussed above. Even in Pausanias' Apis we may read a Sikyonian will of seeing the

---

[131] Tr. BABBITT 1936, 239.

[132] The reference here is to a tradition mentioned in Sch. E. *Or.* 932, where it is said that Inachos, a "man of the earth" was the first king of Argos (followed by Pelasgos and Danaos). After the deluge, Inachos brought to the valley the Argives (called Akrites) who lived dispersed in the mountains, and bought them together folding the first communities.

city as dominant over the Peloponnese accordingly with its prominent role within the Achaean League, hegemonic over the whole peninsula in the early second century BC.

Mekone

Mekone was believed to be one other name of Sikyon and the site where two mythical episodes took place: one recounted by Hesiod (*Th*. 535-570), and one mentioned in a fragment of Callimachus[133]. Hesiod narrates the story of the division (*krisis*) between gods and men, all gathered at Mekone. Prometheus was in charge of preparing the meal for all deities and humans, but when it came the time to decide who had to eat what, Prometheus deceived Zeus making the bones of an ox more attractive than its flesh[134]. Zeus choose the bones, which went to the gods, and the flesh went to the men; ever since then, sacrifices were carried out keeping that partition. A different story is that by Callimachus, who locates at Mekone the episode of the establishment of different *timai* among deities:

«Μηκώνην μακάρων ἕδρανον αὖτις ἰδεῖν,
ἧχι πάλους ἐβάλοντο, διεκρίναντο δὲ τιμάς
πρῶτα Γιγαντείου δαίμονες ἐκ πολέμου[135].

«[. . .] to see again Mekone, seat of
the Blessed Ones, where the gods
drew lots and first distributed the
honours after the war against the
Giants»[136].

This Callimachean fragment alludes to an episode of the *Iliad* (15.187-193) that mentions a lot among the Olympian gods. The lot took place after the battle against the giants, and consisted in assigning the 'grey sea' to

---

[133] To my knowledge, the earliest source attesting to Mekone as a name of Sikyon is Strabo (8.6.25). Later explicit associations between Mekone and Sikyon are in Eust. *Il*. 1.449.20 van der Valk; and *EM* 583.55-58 Gaisford *s.v.* Μηκώνη. Cf. St.Byz. σ 158 Billerbeck *s.v.* Σικυών where it is said that Sikyon was also Telchinia and Mekone. See GRIFFIN 1982, 5 for a brief synthesis. For the passage by Hesiod, see *Th*. 535-570. The reference to Callimachus is Fr. 119 Pfeiffer. See n. 135 below for more information about the fragment.

[134] On the episode, see WECOWSKI 2012, 45-54.

[135] This fragment (119 Pfeiffer) is a modern combination of two excerpts: Μηκώνην… ἰδεῖν = (Sch. Pi. *N*. 9.23) and ἧχι …πολέμου = Sch. Vat. E. *Hec*. 467; cf. fr. 119 Pfeiffer pp. 134-135.

[136] Tr. after TRYPANIS 1973, 91.

Poseidon, the 'murky darkness' to Hades, and the 'broad heaven' to Zeus[137]. This episode is commented on in the treatise about 'Homeric problems' written by a certain Heraclitus (*floruit* first century AD)[138]. Heraclitus says that "the mythical lot" of the *timai* "is not that drawn at Sikyon", as to reject the information reported in Callimachus' fragments, but indirectly to confirm that a divine allocation was believed to have happened in Sikyon, perhaps that of the Hesiodian *krisis*[139]. However, neither Hesiod nor Callimachus specify the location of Mekone, which we find associated with Sikyon for the first time in Strabo (8.6.25), and we do not know where this association comes from, nor when or why it was established.

Yet, we know (*PEM* 583.55-58 Gaisford *s.v.* Μηκώνη), that the name Mekone derives from the poppy flower (*mēkōn*), which Demeter discovered in the place that has been named after it, but the myth is silent as to where Mekone was[140]. However, another tradition handed down in Latin literature points towards Attica and not Sikyon for the *aition* of the flower name: Mekone was an Athenian youth loved by Demeter, whom the goddess turned into the poppy flower and took him/it under her protection[141].

The toponym Mekone has nothing to do with early Sikyonian rulers, but literary sources connecting it to Sikyon are, again, much later than the tradition mentioning Mekone itself. Even in this case, it seems that the connection with Mekone occurred intentionally to ascribe to Sikyon a prominent event of the mythical history of Greek religion, which happened later than the time of Aigialeus, as Strabo (8.6.25) remarks. The result would have been to stress the antiquity of the Peloponnesian *polis* and through a connection with prominent mythological episodes, its relevance at a Panhellenic scale[142].

---

[137] The myth is also in Apollod. 1.21.1.

[138] Sch. Tb *Il*. 15.41.5, referred to *Il*. 15.187-193. Cf. RUSSELL & KONSTAN 2005, 76-77. For a definition of the author and his date, see DICKEY 2006, 26.

[139] For an edition of Heraclitus' commentary, and the passage cited here, see RUSSELL & KONSTAN 2005, 77.

[140] Modern scholars argue that the story of the poppy was a sign of the fertility of the Sikyonian plain. Cf. LOLOS 2011, 385.

[141] Serv. Dan. *Georg*. 1.121. The episode, perhaps coming from a Greek tradition, is similar to those of Attis, who originates the narcissus, and Hyakinthos the hyacinth. See MANNHARDT 1884, 235-236, n. 5 and KNOEPFLER 2010, 159-189.

[142] It is curios to have traditions assigning Sikyon as the place where the distribution of *timai* took place, as well as where Phaistos established which *timai* should have been assigned to Herakles. See above in this text.

Asopia

Asopia is also attested as one other ancient names of Sikyonia. According to the *syngraphe* that modern scholars attribute to Eumelus of Corinth (*floruit* perhaps early Archaic Period) "Asopia was renamed after Sikyon", and this nomenclature is part of mythological sagas about the early days of Corinth and its neighbouring territories[143]. Pausanias (2.1.6, 4.6) recounts a Corinthian tradition holding that when Poseidon and Helios partitioned the land of Corinth among themselves, the latter took the Acrocorinth, while the Isthmus went to the former. Pausanias (2.3.10), drawing from Eumelus, adds to the story that "Helios gave the Asopian region (*chora*) to Aloeus, and Ephyraia to Aietes"[144]. Eumelus' story—reconstructed in chart no. 2—continues with Aloeus passing the power over Asopia to his son Epopeus, and Aietes, leaving to Kolchis, entrusted Ephyra to Bounos, son of Hermes and Alkidameia. At the death of Bounos, Epopeus extended his power to Ephyra, but when he died, his son Marathon, who in the meanwhile had fled to Attica because of father's "lawlessness and arrogance", lot the country again between Asopia and Ephyra. According to Eumelus, Marathon re-establishes the due order disrupted by Epopeus' haughtiness by assigning the Asopia to his son Sikyon, after whom the land was renamed Sikyonia, and Ephyra to his other son Korinthos, after whom Corinthia got its name[145]. The lot, then, and the naming of the two lands, are the result of an act of justice and rightfulness in contrast with the negative behaviour of Epopeus, a Sikyonian king who ruled over Corinth.

---

[143] *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 451 F 2a = fr. 19 West = *PEG I* 4 = Paus. 2.1.1. Pausanias read the *syngraphe*, and not the actual verses of the Archaic poet. The Traveller is sceptical that both the *Korinthiaka* and the *syngraphe* were by Eumelus, while modern scholars argue that the *syngraphe* is an actual epitome of Eumelus' work; see the introduction by Jacoby to *FGrHist* 451 F 1a and *BNJ* 451 T 2 also in the following n. 144. For what concerns the argument of our work, we refer to the *syngraphe* without entering in the debate of its attribution.

[144] *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 451 F 2a = fr. 17 West = *PEG I* 5. According to *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 451 F 2c = Sch. Pi. *O*. 13.74, Aloeus and Aietes were sons of Helios and Antiope, as opposed to another tradition claiming Antiope as Epopeus' spouse. See below for a discussion about this other Epopeus, and n. 147 for literary sources and bibliography. For a synthetic discussion on Eumelus' chronology, see the excellent commentary to *BNJ* 451 T 2 by D. L. Toye. See also *FGrHist* 451 T 2.

[145] Again, *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 451 F 1a = fr. 19 West = *PEG I* 4 = Paus. 2.1.1. In Eumelus, Asopia, though closely bound to Corinth, is considered as a country with its own territory and kings, while Strabo (8.6.24) reports that Asopia is "part of the Sikyonia". See Lolos 2011, 11-12 for a discussion about Strabo's Asopia as the valley formed by the river Asopos at its northern end. For the Asopos river in connection to the traditions under examination in this contribution see below pp. 225-226.

As we will see below in this contribution, Eumelus offers a peculiar and yet significant testimony concerning traditions about Ancient Sikyon. First, Eumelus was from Corinth, and therefore his version can be ascribed to a Corinthian variant of the tradition; second, he is one of the earliest sources mentioning both an early name of Sikyonia, i.e. Asopia, and a king ruling before king Sikyon, i.e. Epopeus; and third, Eumelus reports one other ruler, Marathon, who is also in the list derived from Kastor (*apud* Eus.). In the list, Marathon is too high to be effectively associated with Eumelus' Marathon, but if we consider that Pausanias' Korax, Epopeus, and Lamedon may belong to the same one and a half generation, the two Marathons get significantly closer to each other[146]. Let us now focus on Epopeus and Asopia, starting from the former, and then moving to the latter.

In addition to king Sikyon, to my knowledge Epopeus is the only ruler among those of the kings' lists who is mentioned by the extant source of the Archaic period[147]. In other words, prior to literary sources of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, only Epopeus and Sikyon are recorded as Sikyonian kings, and on these early mythical figures, Eumelus elaborates a tradition that we can no doubt define as Corinthian. According to this tradition, the kingdom of Sikyon originates by mitosis from that of Corinth, and therefore it implies a bond between the two *poleis*, but the majority shareholder among the two fellow cities is indeed Corinth. Sikyonians, as we will see in a further section dedicated to one other Epopeus, had different ideas, but before moving forward, it is worth spending some words about the toponym Asopia itself.

In addition to Eumelus, the choronym Asopia is variously attested in antiquity along with the name Asopos, often associated with water streams[148]. It is the case of Sikyon, where the choronym is well documented and bound with that of the river Asopos, which flows to the south of the Sikyonian plateau, and still nowadays bears the same name[149]. Reading Strabo (9.2.23), it seems that the river itself gave the name to the region Asopia, and modern scholarship identifies the Asopia with the valley hosting

---

[146] The chronographical succession of these kings, as well as the length of their rule in the lists are discussed below in the section about birds; pp. 220-226.

[147] Besides the already mentioned Eumelus, Epopeus shows up on the Epic Cycle Poem *Kypria* (*PEG I* p. 40 = West p. 70, 4) and Asius of Samos, Paus. 2.6.3, 5 = *PEG I* 1, 11 = frs 1, 11 West). For a discussion about these sources, see below.

[148] Strabo 7.2.24, 9.2.23 names some of them. See KÖLLIGAN 2012, 216 for a collection of attestations to Asopos.

[149] Though it was known as Agiorgitikos (Agios Giorgos). Cf. LOLOS 2011, 11 and n. 14.

the Asopos river to the south of the Sikyonian plateau[150]. As for other choronyms and toponyms analysed so far, also for the river Asopos ancient traditions recount possible eponymy, though still resorting to mythology. Pausanias (2.12.4) reports a Phliasian version according to which the Sikyonian Asopos was named after a local hero, son of Poseidon and Kelossa, the mountain from which the river springs[151]. Apollodorus (3.12.6) recounts that the Sikyonian Asopos is named after the same Boeotian river-god: he was a son of Okeanos and Thetys, and that, among other children, begat Aegina with Metope. Aegina got kidnapped by Zeus, and Asopos, looking for her daughter, ended up in Corinth, where Zeus kept his prey. In order to rescue Aegina, Asopos pursued the god, who threw a thunderbolt and pushed Asopos back to his stream[152].

Besides myths, the only attempt at linguistic etymology for this name is in the *EM* (1335 and 161.2002 Lasserre & Livadaras and 161.45-49 Gaisford *s.v.* Ἀσωπός), where the word is considered as a compound of ἄσις (mud) + ὤψ (sight), to the effect of 'muddy-looking river', perhaps meaning 'swampy', and this etymology perhaps can explain the 'historical' Asopia mentioned by Strabo[153]. A swampy ground is consistent with a portion of flat land enclosed by hills (Sikyonian plateau to the North and Megali Lakka to the South) and occupied by a stream. These characteristics are typical of

---

[150] The valley stretches towards the sea from the north of Megali Lakka. Cf. LOLOS 2011, 12 and map no. 1.

[151] See Strabo 8.6.24.

[152] According to Pausanias (2.12.4), Sikyonians thought that their Asopos was not linked with Boeotia, but with Ionia. Pausanias (2.5.3) reports that they believed the subterranean waterway of the Asopos being connected with those of the river Meander, stretching out to Kelainai in Phrygia (where Hdt. 7.26.3 places one of the affluents of the Meander), and through Karia and the sea via Miletus reached Sikyon. The subterranean flow of these waters brought Marsyas' flute—which Sikyonians kept in the Apollonion—from the Phrygian river Marsyas to the Sikyonian Asopos (Paus. 2.7.9). The tradition establishing Phrygian origins to the Sikyonian Asopos dates back to Ibycus *PMG* 322, fr. 41 = Strabo 6.2.4; see NAGY 2011, 67-68. Subterranean interconnections of waters were common in antiquity; see BALERIAUX 2016, 104-110. For the myths on the origin of the Asopos, see GANTZ 1993, 219-232 and in particular FOWLER 2013, 79-80. Pi. *I.* 8.16-31 claims that both the nymphs Aegina and Thebe are daughters of Asopos.

[153] For a brief discussion about the etymology of Asopos, see Gerhard in *LfgrE* 1470 *s.v.* Ασωπός, who also explains the difficulties of the linguistic reconstruction proposed here. Recent scholarship has heavily questioned the etymology from the *EM.* See KÖLLIGAN 2012, 215-229, who, drawing from NAGY 1990, 151-153 (and especially 151, n. 30), argues that the name Asopos derives from an Indo-European root meaning 'coal'. According to Kölligan, this meaning is coherent with one of the mythical *aitia* to the name of the Asopos river as recounted by Apollodorus (3.12.6), who claims that the story of Asopos hit by Zeus' thunderbolt is the origin of the coals fetched from the river stream in Corinth.

---

fertile soils, and the fertility of Sikyonian lands was renowned in antiquity[154]. In addition, swampy surfaces form suitable habitats for birds, which, as we will see later in the course of the present study, are relevant to Sikyon[155].

From this excursus on the names of Sikyon we can conclude that the earliest safe evidence for the name of the city is the *Iliad* (2.575), where the toponym Sikyon appears, followed by Eumelus (*FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 451 F 1a-2a), who attests to Epopeus (perhaps in addition to Marathon) as the only ruler preceding king Sikyon, and to Asopia as one of the former names of Sikyonia. All the other names appear in much later periods, and they seem to be aimed at pre-dating the foundation of Sikyon over that of other Hellenic *poleis*. But the competition of Sikyon to excel in antiquity over other *poleis* is remarkably evident if compared, once again, with Argive traditions, and particularly with those handed down in Apollodorus' *Library*, as we are going to see next.

Apollodorus and the Argive Traditions

In book 2 of the *Library*, Apollodorus (or whichever individual authored this literary work), drawing from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, narrates the lineage of Inachos, born from Okeanos and Thetys, who gave his name to a river of the Argolid[156]. The myth plays on the metaphor connected with the waters: the river Inachos is generated by a nymph of the waters Thetys, and Okeanos—the river *par excellence*. Being son of Okeanos and grandson of Ouranos and Gea implies belonging to the third generation of the Kosmos, and therefore Inachos is dated back to one of the earliest eras of the Universe. The genealogy continues with Inachos begetting Phoroneus and Aigialeus. The latter died childless and gave his name to the region, while the former inherited the kingdom of Argos and ruled over the land

---

[154] For the well-known fertility of the Sikyonian plane, see n. 140 above and the reference to LOLOS 2011, 28, where it is explained that such a fertility is due to the alluvial deposits of marly white sands. Going back to an etymology of the word Asopos from ἄσις, Hesychius (α.7672.1 *s.v.* ἄσις) defines the word ἄσις as κόνις, dust or sand; cf. *LSJ s.v.* κονία (κόνις). For Hesychius (α.7672.1 *s.v.* ἄσιν), the ἄσιν is the clay used for pottery, and ἄσιον is a λειμών, a meadow (Hsch. α.7671.1 *s.v.* ἄσιον). White sands do not play in favour of the reconstruction involving coal, which is remarkably dark.

[155] See below. Still in relation to the word ἄσις discussed in previous n. 154, the ἀσίδα is the stork, which favours boggy habitat. See *LSJ s.v.* ἀσίδα. Hesychius α.7672.1 *s.v.* ἄσις defines ἀσίδα as a εἶδος ὀρνέου, a 'type of bird'.

[156] This section of the *Library* is used to reconstruct Hesiod's Catalogue of Women; see FOWLER 2013, 235-259.235, WEST 1985, 76-77, and below in this section. Phoroneus is the first man of the Phoronis.

that later will be called Peloponnese. Phoroneus had two children, Apis and Niobe. According to Apollodorus, Apis established a tyrannic power, and imposed his name to the Peloponnese before being killed by Thelxion and Telchin[157]. Because Apis died childless, the office went to his nephew Argos, son of Zeus and Niobe, who gave his name to "the realm of Phoroneus" (Apollod. 2.1.2), i.e. the Peloponnese (Apollod. 2.1.1).

This account by Apollodorus presents significant similarities, alongside remarkable differences, with the Sikyonian kings' lists. Similarities are evident in the peculiar homonymies emerging from a comparison between the two chapters of the *Library* summarised above, with both the initial parts of the Sikyonian kings' lists. In both Argive and Sikyonian genealogies, Aigialeus is the first name-giver and first ruler, and Apis is the second name-giver king, who in Apollodorus was killed by two individuals, Telchin and Thelxion[158]. These two names are also in the Sikyonian kings' lists as father and son of Apis (in Paus 2.5.7 only), and as those who rule before and after him, respectively (in both Pausanias and Kastor). On the other hand, a major difference emerges with king Europs, son of Aigialeus and father of Telchin, whom Apollodorus does not mention. Second, in the *Library*, those personas stemming out from Inachos belong to a much later period than that of their Sikyonian counterparts. For instance, as we can understand from our chart nos 1a and 1b, the Argive Aigialeus lived nine generations later than his Sikyonian homonym, and so it happens with the other rulers. From this comparison between Apollodorus and the Sikyonian kings' lists, it emerges that Sikyonians considered some of their early kings as homonyms of much later Argive rulers. However, as we are going to see next, Argive traditions may be antecedent to the Sikyonians'.

Literary sources offer indications that Argive traditions were well established much earlier than the times of Kastor and Pausanias. If we look at the initial lineage of the Argive royal house as it appears in the *Library*, we can see that it is attested by early authors such as the Argive Acusilaus (*floruit* late sixth-early fifth centuries BC). Acusilaus is one of the first mythographers on record, of whom we have an excerpt (*FGrHist* [and *BNJ*]2 F 23c) mentioning Inachus and Phoroneus as the first kings of Argos. This

---

[157] Apollod. 2.1.1 is not explicit in reconstructing the sequence of the names of Peloponnese. First he states that Aigialeus gives the name to the region (*chora*), and then he recounts that Apis gave his name to the Peloponnese, but in the *Library* it is never said that Apia and Aigialeia are two names for the same geographical area. The text seems to be designed to distinguish between Aigialeia (which then became Ionia and Achaea) and the whole area later named Peloponnese. On Apis/Apia, and Telchin, see above.

[158] Though Apollodorus (Apollod. 2.1.1) does not define him explicitly as such, and in fact we do not find him in Kastor's list of Argive rulers, nor in Pausanias.

excerpt provides the sixth century BC as a relatively safe *terminus post quem* this tradition was established in Argos, but it could have been known even earlier. Modern scholars suggest that from the *Library* we can largely reconstruct a section of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, implying that the content of this section of the Library can be dated back to a considerably early period[159]. As a consequence to this chronological comparison of the extant literary sources, we can consider Argos as a city that boasted historical traditions much earlier than Sikyon, and, therefore, we can argue that Sikyonian traditions may have been derived or drawn from Argive ones, but perhaps not the opposite. Because the kings' names under discussion here do not appear in any other Ancient Greek royal lineage, it is allowed to assume that Sikyonians claimed themselves some of the onomastic lineage that belonged to Argos, and predated the period when this lineage came into being[160].

But one other aspect emerges from our comparison: Kastor's and Pausanias' lists are similar to each other if compared with the traditions recounted in the *Library*, and this characteristic is consistent with the conclusions that we have reached with the analysis of the toponyms Apia and Aigialeia. Further in the *Library* are myths matching, though with minor variations, with Pausanias' account, as, for instance, in the cases of Antiope and Epopeus, and Polypheides. Yet, these myths belong to a genealogical horizon much lower than that of the forefathers of the royal dynasties, namely to a period that was highly contaminated by the *epos*, and that left little space to substantial manipulation of the tradition than the horizons to which belonged, for instance, the rulers from Aigialeus to Thourimachos[161].

---

[159] See n. 156 above. In addition, the author of the *Library* uses Acusilaus as source. Acusilaus' mention of Inachos is *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 2 F 23c = Synkellos 71.25-27 ed. MOSSHAMMER 1984. See also ANDOLFI 2019, 96-100 and Clem.Al. *Strom.* 1.21.102.6. Apollodorus mentions Acusilaus several times while recounting Argive traditions, i.e. Apollod. 2.1.1, 3, 2.3, 5. For a critical and well informed discussion about Acusilaus, see FOWLER 2013, 623-629.

[160] The case of Europs may be significant for our argument. Apollodorus does not mention him perhaps because this king was believed to be an illegitimate son of the Argive king Phoroneus, as Pausanias (2.34.4-5) reports, and wed him in a very high position in the Sikyonian lists.

[161] The Story of Antiope and Epopeus is in both Pausanias (2.6.1-4) and Apollodorus (Apollod. 3.5.5). King Polypheides is not in Pausanias, but he is mentioned by Kastor and Apollodorus; see Tz. *H.* 1.459-461 ed. LEONE 2007 and n. 61 above.

Horses

One more aspect to note is the presence of names deriving from animals, mainly birds and horses. Let us start analysing names linked with horses, namely Leukippos, Zeuxippos, Zeuxippe (Laomedon's daughter and spouse of king Sikyon), and Hippolytos. We know that Sikyon was renowned for this kind of animal in antiquity[162]. The first mention is in the *Iliad* (23.293-299), where the Sikyonian Echepolos, presented in the poem as a wealthy man, donated a mare named Etes to Agamemnon, to avoid following his lord to Troy[163]. The name of Echepolos itself is revealing, being composed of ἔχω (to have/own) + πῶλος (foal), i.e. 'foal owner', and once again in mythology, Sikyonian horse breeders are involved in the Theban cycle, where they were believed to have nurtured Oedipus[164]. The reputation of Sikyonian horses, however, went beyond mythology, as historical accounts confirm. Two tyrants of Sikyon, Myron and Kleisthenes, of whom the latter we have discussed above, owned valuable racehorses that won chariot *agones* at the Olympic games, and Kleisthenes obtained a victory at the Pythian games, as well[165]. Victory over hippic contests went to the owners of the winning chariot-team, and not to the charioteer, who was generally a slave or a hired professional. Racing on a chariot was a remarkably risky task, and only rarely horse owners put themselves in danger onto hippodromes[166]. In antiquity, owning and breeding a horse was a privilege generally reserved for wealthy individuals, mostly aristocrats, and horses were considered a symbol of wealth themselves[167]. Sikyonian horses in particular were considered so, as it is well attested in the case of the Athenian rhetor Meidias, who received Demosthenes' reprimands (D. *Meid.*

---

[162] In this section we will pay attention mainly to Leukippos, Zeuxippos, and Hippolytos because Zeuxippe is the feminine for Zeuxippos and she is not one of the rulers.

[163] This passage of the *Iliad* suggests that Sikyon was subject to Agamemnon like any other participant to the military expedition. Echepolos, however, and consequently Sikyon, proved their pride and courage as being inversely proportional to their wealth.

[164] They were horse-risers (ἱπποφορβοὶ) according to Sch. *Od.* 11.271, and an old horse tender (ἱπποβουκόλος), according to a controversial and discussed fragment by Peisander (*floruit* third century BC); see *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 16 F 10 = Sch. E. *Ph.* 1760. For a brief analysis of *hippophorboi*, see BLAINEAU 2015, 6-13.

[165] Myron: Paus. 6.19.2, and his victory is the reason for the dedication of the treasury of the Sikyonians at Olympia. Kleisthenes: Hdt. 6.126.2, as introduction to the story of the careless Hippokleides (horse encloser), and Paus. 10.7.6.

[166] MILLER 2004, 75-82.

[167] See previous n. 166.

21.158) for his ostentatious display of a pair of expensive Sikyonian white horses[168].

In light of the available evidence, three reasons may be behind the presence of -*hippos* names in the Sikyonian royal genealogies: they are proper nouns common to aristocrats, and, as such, bore by members of royal families; they reflect the reputation of Sikyonian horse breeders; they are a reverberation of mythical traditions. I think that a combination of the three reasons may be a reasonable solution. Leukippos is the 'white horse rider', and in both myths and history, the *Iliad* and Meidias' story, we find noteworthy Sikyonian horses, white in one case[169]. Zeuxippos/Zeuxippe and Hippolytos are the 'horse bridler' and 'horse liberator', respectively, and both kings, clearly aristocrats, lived at the time of Agamemnon and the Trojan war[170]. For traditions dealing with events contemporary to the Trojan war, the influence of Homeric poems is heavy handed, and the *Iliad* refers to Sikyon only twice: once is among the peoples listed in the *Catalogue* (*Il.* 2.572) and the other time in the episode of Echepolos (*Il.* 23.299). It is understandable that these two accounts of the *Iliad* were influential enough to trigger traditions building up on Homeric authority, and this is perhaps the reason why in Pausanias (2.6.7) we find both kings Zeuxippos and Hippolytos in a direct relationship with Agamemnon. Zeuxippos is the ruler who dies right before the lord of Mycenae conquers Sikyon and associates Hippolytos in kingship. On top of the historical reputation of Sikyonian horses, the Homeric tradition has had a decisive role in stressing such a reputation; role that may have left its sign in the elaboration of later tradition, of which we do not know much.

Birds

Some Sikyonian rulers bear names of birds. First of this group is Koronos (Κόρωνος), carrion crow, followed by his son Korax (κόραξ), raven, and by Epopeus (ἔποψ), hoopoe. One more individual who may belong to

---

[168] For Sikyonian horses, see LOLOS 2011, 51 and, in particular, GRIFFIN 1982, 30, who presents one more historical anecdote about Aratos attacking Sikyon to capture the king's horses. This episode, however, does not say much about Sikyonian horses. More relevant is the argument in *LSAG Supp.* 142, n.2 according to which Sikyonians reared a peculiar breed of horses called *samphoras*. See also SKALET 1928, 32.

[169] As a combination λευκός (white) and ἵππος (horse), cf. *LSJ s.v.* λεύκιππος.

[170] Zeuxippos = ζεῦξις (yoking) + ἵππος (horse). *LSJ s.v.* ζεύξιππος points towards the meaning of *apobates* in *CGL s.v. desultor*. Hippolytos = ἵππος (horse) + λυτ-ός (untied). Cf. *LSJ s.v.* ἱππόλυτος.

this group is Pheno (Φηνώ), perhaps from φήνη, vulture, who is the wife of Korax's brother Lamedon (Paus. 2.6.5), and daughter of the Athenian Klytios[171]. All these mythical individuals belong to the same section of the Sikyonian royal genealogy, and looking at our reconstruction in chart nos 1a and 1b, we can see that the sequence of rulers from Koronos to Lamedon is the same in both Pausanias and Kastor, but the length seems to be different. While in the sequence derived from Kastor (*apud* Eus.) these rulers occupy a space of four generations, in Pausanias they do not go beyond two and a half generations, and perhaps even less. According to the Periegete's version, we can assign one full generation to the office of Koronos (between the 15th and 16th gens), and the same can be done with his son Korax, who belongs to the ensuing generation (the 16th). At the death of Korax, Epopeus came from Thessaly, but he died from a war wound and therefore he cannot be counted as ruling throughout his whole life (Paus. 2.6.3; see below). Part of his generation is occupied by Lamedon, kid brother of Korax and cadet son of Koronos. Lamedon is bound to rule, as his own name (ruler of the people) suggests, but still preserving, through his wife Pheno (vulture), the family link with birds[172]. From this brief summary three aspects emerge: first, as we have just seen, four kings occupy two and a half generations; second, as we will discuss later, there is an Epopeus coming from Thessaly other than Eumelus' Epopeus, who is autochthonous; and third, birds-named rulers occupy a considerable portion of the lists, but this should not be surprising, as we are going to expound next.

Birds were an important matter at Sikyon; a dove is the signature symbol of Sikyonian coinage since its very early stage, and still nowadays birds dominate the plateau of the Hellenistic and Roman city[173]. In addition, a

---

[171] Klytios is an ancestor of king Ianiskos (Paus. 2.6.6). References to the meaning of the names Koronos and Korax are as follows: Koronos, *LSJ s.v.* κορώνη; Korax, *LSJ s.v.* κόραξ; Epopeus, *LSJ s.v.* ἔποψ; Pheno, *LSJ s.v.* φήνη.

[172] For the meaning of the name Lamedon, or his equivalent Laomedon, see *LSJ s.v.* λαομέδων. Pheno, being daughter of an Athenian, is perhaps the bridge with Sikyon, who came from Attica to help Lamedon to win a war against the Achaeans (Paus. 2.6.5). A possible explanation to the swift shifts between Korax, Lamedon, and Epopeus may be that Korax died too young to have heirs, and when he passed away, his brother Lamedon was, in turn, too young to receive the office. Epopeus, then, acted as regent until he died and Lamedon reached the appropriate age to seize power.

[173] Referring to all the coins bearing the Sikyonian dove would yield an endless list. As a reference to birds as a signature feature of Sikyonian coinage it is perhaps enough to mention WARREN 2009, Plate I, where nearly all denominations have a bird in three different iconographic fashions. As for the presence of birds in the city, I have witnessed myself wonderful swarms of majestic white birds flying over the archaeological site every morning at the crack of dawn, shortly before the excavation activities began.

settlement named Orneai was known to have been in relation with Sikyon, though literary sources are vague on this regard[174]. The place where traditions about birds were strong was Titane, a place—*choros*, as Pausanias (2.22.5) defines it—off the road from Sikyon to Phlious (Paus. 2.11.3 and 11.11.5)[175]. From the *Periegesis* (Paus. 2.11.5-12.1) we know that the Asklepieion at Titane, founded by Alexanor, grandson of Asklepios, hosted a wooden statue (*xoanon*) of Koronis, mother of the healer deity. When the god received honours, the statue of his mother was moved away from the sanctuary into the neighbouring temple of Athena (Paus. 2.11.7, cf. 12.1), where to Koronis they burned birds on an altar, while thighs, likely cut out of bigger animals, were set on fire right on the ground. The sacrifice of thighs attests that they honoured Koronis as a goddess, but birds were offerings common to minor deities. And yet the reservation of the altar to the birds, as opposed to the ground for bigger and more succulent victims, may suggest that birds were considered as an offer particularly fitting to a goddess bearing the name of one of them.

The name of Koronis (Κορωνίς) means the same as Koronos, crow (*korone*), and the sense that ancient Greeks gave to the name is significant for the understanding of ancient traditions recounting her giving birth to Asklepios, in which another bird, the raven (*korax*), is involved. Koronis was a daughter of Phlegyas, a Thessalian king, eponym of the mythical people Phlegyans. Apollo knocked her up, and while she was carrying Asklepios, cheated on Apollo with Ischys. A raven (*korax*), having discovered the affair, spied on Koronis for Apollo, who, once he received the message, changed the bird's white feathers into black. This story of Koronis, including the raven messenger (but excluding the feather colouring), is in Hesiod, and therefore the two birds, crow and raven, are attested in mythical traditions since early times[176]. Koronis' story is not directly related to traditions about Sikyonian

---

[174] On Orneai, see LOLOS 2011, 301-302.

[175] On Titane and the road leading there from Sikyon, see LOLOS 2005, 275-298, and LOLOS 2011, 129-136.

[176] Hes. fr. 239 Most = 60 Merkelbach-West = Sch. Pi. *P.* 3.52b. Pindar (*P.* 3.5-20) also recounts the story, though excluding the raven, a non-needed messenger for the all-knowing Apollo (πάντα ἰσάντι νόῳ, Pi. *P.* 3.29). See also ANDOLFI 2019, 68-72. In the Hellenistic period, the myth reached out Callimachus, of whom we have a fragment (fr. 260.50-61 Pfeiffer), which is well discussed by LLOYD-JONES & REA 1968, 125-145. The same Callimachean fragment is used in a well-informed contribution by ROBERTSON 1999, 57-79 along with Sikyonian kings bearing bird-names, but his conclusions are too speculative to be profitably employed in investigating Sikyonian traditions and history. For instance, ROBERTSON 1999, 66, n. 37 judges Pausanias' work as that of an amateur who employs a 'grudging view' in reporting accounts that were originally by Menaechmus and that reached

kings, but some assonances may not be accidental. First, Koronos, the earliest bird-king, is a son of Apollo (Paus. 2.5.8) analogous to Asklepios, son of Koronis; and second, king Korax son of Koronos, and therefore Apollo's grandson, bears the same name as the messenger-bird of Koronis' story. Thus, Apollo is the deity both having a major role in the plot of Koronis' myth, and the progenitor of the Sikyonian bird-kings dynasty. One may notice that the dynasty does not include Epopeus because he comes from Thessaly (Paus. 2.6.1), but the ethnicity of Epopeus is perhaps the third assonance with Koronis, who is Thessalian, as well.

As we have mentioned above, the traditions related to early Sikyonian kingship deal with two different rulers bearing the name of Epopeus: one is the son of Aloeus and grandson of the Helios starring in Eumelus' narrative (*FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 451 F 1a = Paus. 2.1.1), and the other is the Thessalian Epopeus mentioned in the *Periegesis* (Paus. 2.6.1) as the successor to Korax. The Thessalian Epopeus of the *Periegesis* certainly is the same individual born by Poseidon and Kanake mentioned in Apollodorus' *Library* (Apollod. 1.7.4), more precisely in an account involving birds: Alkyone was daughter of Aiolos, king of Thessaly (Apollod. 1.7.3), from whom his people were named Aiolians, and married Keyx, son of Lucifer (Heosphoros). Alkyone and Keyx, according to Apollodorus, "perished by reason of their pride; for he said that his wife was Hera, and she said that her husband was Zeus". To punish their *hybris*, Zeus turned them into birds, her into a kingfisher (*alkyon*), and him into a gannet (*keyx*)[177]. Alkyon was uncle to Epopeus because, among other siblings begotten by Aiolos, he was brother of the Kanake mothering Epopeus by Poseidon (Apollod. 1.7.4). Both Pausanias and Apollodorus provide relatively abundant information about Epopeus, especially in relation to one other mythical figure, Antiope, about whom these two authors perhaps offer the most comprehensive accounts. According to Apollodorus (Apollod. 3.5.5; see chart no. 3), Antiope was not Epopeus' grandmother, as she is for Eumelus, but the Theban king Nykteus' daughter, who was impregnated by Zeus[178]. Nykteus threatened Antiope for her divine intercourse so that she fled to Sikyon and married Epopeus. After the daughter's departure, Nykteus killed himself out of despair after having charged his brother Lycus to march out to Sikyon and seek revenge. Lycus

---

Pausanias via later intermediaries. From stating such a judgement on, Robertson considers the whole account by Pausanias as being literally based on Menaechmus. The detail about the change in colour of the crow's feathers is attested for the first time in Ov. *met*. 2.630-633.

[177] See *LSJ s.v.* ἀλκυών and *LSJ s.v.* κήξ.

[178] Eumelus *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 451 F 2c = fr. 17 West = *PEG I* 5 = Sch. Pi. *O*. 13.74 See above, n. 144.

did so capturing the city, killing Epopeus, and leading Antiope away. Pausanias (2.6.1-3) recounts a variant of the same story: Antiope, pregnant by Zeus, was abducted by Epopeus for her beauty, for which she was second to none (Paus. 2.6.1), and her father revenged by besieging Sikyon. Both kings were wounded in battle (Paus. 2.6.2) and died sometime after the war (Paus. 2.6.3). Epopeus' successor Lamedon returned Antiope to Nykteus' brother Lykos, who in turn got the office at Thebes, and the war between the two cities came to an end. The two strands of the myth converge at this point. On her way back from Epopeus, Antiope gave birth to the two Theban twins Zethos and Amphion[179].

We have recounted this story of Epopeus and Antiope because it is well represented in both Apollodorus and Pausanias, but we know that the two mythical figures, Epopeus and Antiope, are mentioned in earlier authors, too. Epopeus appears in the Epic Cycle poem of the *Kypria* (*PEG I* p. 40 = West p. 70, 4) and he features in a fragment of Asius of Samos (*floruit* sixth century BC)[180]. The *Kypria* does not associate Epopeus with Sikyon explicitly, but alludes to an abduction of Antiope by Epopeus, while Asius' fragment only acknowledges Epopeus' status of ruler without naming his realm[181]. Asius, however, is explicit about the birth of Zethos and Amphion from Antiope, and declares that the two twins were sons of both Zeus and Epopeus[182].

From our analysis of these myths, we can preliminarily conclude the following in Sikyonian royal narratives: one, we have mythological personas—Zethos and Amphion—considered as fathered by a mortal and human at the same time[183]; two, a Thessalian Epopeus is attested in ancient sources perhaps as early as the Corinthian Epopeus (see the *Kypria* above); and last, the idea of birds is remarkable alongside a significant Thessalian influence. Let us see how these preliminary conclusions can help further analysis. Point one brings us back to the other portions of the lists, discussed

---

[179] Apollod. 3.5.5; Paus 2.6.3-4 = *PEG I* 1, 11 = fr. 1 West. On Epopeus and Antiope, see BURKERT 1972, 207-2011. Pausanias (2.10.4) saw a statue of Antiope in the sacred precinct to Aphrodite. The Periegete explains that locals think that Antiope's sons were Sikyonians, and that through them Antiope was Sikyonian, too.

[180] Asius of Samos: Paus. 2.6.3 = *PEG I* 1 = fr. 1 West.

[181] Perhaps Paus. 2.6.5 indirectly suggests that Asius supported the Thessalian origins of the Sikyonian king Epopeus, and narrated a story different than that of Eumelus.

[182] On Epopeus and Antiope, see BURKERT 1972, 207-2011. Pausanias (2.10.4) saw a statue of Antiope in the sacred precinct to Aphrodite.

[183] Instead, HUXLEY 1969, 92 argues that Zethos was born to Zeus and Amphion to Epopeus. See also a more prudent GANTZ 1993, 486. On Epopeus, Amphion, and Zethos, see FOWLER 2013, 361-365.

above, where rulers follow their maternal grandfathers, such as in the case, for instance, of Koronos: he was son of Apollo, but Marathon could have been his mortal father, for the same principle that the seed generating Zethos and Amphion is divine, but Epopeus is considered as 'biological' father, as well[184]. Point two confirms what we have already concluded in our discussion about the choronym Asopia. Besides Sikyon (and perhaps Marathon) Epopeus is the only Sikyonian ruler mentioned by early sources, while all other rulers surface from the Hellenistic period on. And yet, about Epopeus we have two contrasting traditions, both attested before the Hellenistic and Roman periods: that of the Corinthian and that of the Thessalian Epopeus, and here we come to point three. It is significant that Pausanias, who, as we have seen, collects traditions that were still in fashion among the Sikyonians of his times, mentions both Epopeus, and he does so by quoting Eumelus in mentioning the Corinthian Epopeus while at the same time names (on the grounds of Asius) the Thessalian Epopeus as the king of Sikyon. This detail perhaps suggests that Sikyonians preferred to disassociate themselves from a tradition, that by Eumelus, that implies a dependence from the Corinthian neighbour. Pausanias (2.6.5) himself acknowledges the contradiction between two versions of the story, and points out that the Sikyonians were in favour of the tradition pointing towards a Thessalian Epopeus[185]. The effort of the Sikyonian in stressing those traditions that unbounded their city from the neighbouring ones is something that we will find again in the course of this contribution, but now let us return briefly to the Asopia.

The choronym Asopia is not even echoed in the lists of kings, perhaps because, as we have seen, it belongs to the Corinthian version of Epopeus' myth, a version on which Sikyonians were not in favour. Perhaps the choronym Asopia could have been perceived as reminiscent of a land sharable by tradition with the Corinthians. And in fact we have explained that Pausanias (2.12.4) reports an *aition* to the name of the river Asopos involving Phlious and the hero Asopos, son of Poseidon and Kelossa. The

---

[184] Asius of Samos (Paus. 2.6.3 = *PEG I* 1 = fr. 1 West) refers to Antiope as being κυσαμένη, i.e. impregnated, by both Zeus and Epopeus. Perhaps in this case can also be included Peratos, whose mortal father could have been Messapos. Even if Pausanias states that the office passed from Leukippos to Peratos, the generation of Messapos should be counted.

[185] In the same passage, Pausanias (2.6.5) mentions one other tradition, by Ibycus *PMG* 308, fr. 27, according to which Sikyon was a son of Pelops. According to MELE 2002, 85, this version reflects an Argive tradition. The link between Sikyon and Corinth may be also reflected in the Sophoclean Theban saga where Polybos is king of Corinth; S. *OT* 774. See GANTZ 1993, 492.

Asopia, however, may have never lost this connection with Epopeus via its association with birds. We have seen that the word Asopos/Asopia is reminiscent of a fertile but also swampy land ideal for birds, and therefore where bird kings could flourish.

The End of the Lists

If we compare the two sequences, we can see Pausanias' list from Zeuxippos onwards follows parameters similar to those adopted in Kastor's chronology. According to Pausanias (2.6.7), Hippolytos belongs to Agamemnon's generation; Lakestades succeeds to Hippolytos, and last comes Phalkes, who lived one generation after Tisamenos, son of Orestes and grandson of Agamemnon. Between Hippolytos, under whom, as we can infer from Pausanias, Troy fell, and Phalkes, who accomplished the Dorian invasion (Paus. 2.6.7), are two generations[186].

Pausanias (2.7.1) states that under Phalkes, Sikyonia became an Argive domination (μοῖρα τῆς Ἀργείας), but two aspects of Pausanias' account suggest the passage from an Achaean independent *polis* to a Dorian Argive possession was mild[187]. First, with respect to the relationship with Argos, in the generation before Phalkes, when Hippolytos was king, Sikyon became object of conquest by Agamemnon, but Pausanias (2.6.7) recounts that Hippolytos acknowledged Agamemnon's supremacy and accepted to become his subject. The voluntary subjection of Hippolytos to Argos/Mycenae is perhaps what smoothened the path to Phalkes' conquest of Sikyon[188]. Second, based on the Herakleidai lineage, Phalkes was a son of

---

[186] The count of two generations is done on the bases of the Greek way of reckoning inclusively, which means that the generation of Hippolytos precedes that of Lakestades and Phalkes.

[187] On the relationships between the Argolid and the Corinthia, see LOLOS 2011, 61. Homer considers Sikyon as a part of the Argolid already in the *Iliad* (2.572), where it was a member of Agamemnon's contingent, as also the passage about Echepolos (*Il.* 23.293-299) suggests. On this passage, see above. Despite modern arguments questioning the historicity of the account *Il.* 2.572 (cf. MORGAN 1999, 351-353), Pausanias' list seems to reflect more adherence to older traditions than Kastor's sequence. The connection between Argos and Sikyon has been always attested as a strong one (the authority of the *Iliad* was unquestionable). Even a possible emancipation of Sikyon from Argos did not imply a deterioration of ties between the two cities, which perhaps kept friendly relations up until Kleisthenes' rule. See McGREGOR 1941, 274-275, and PARKER 1994, 417-418; cf. LOLOS 2011, 62 and n. 24 for a summary of the argument.

[188] Because Phalkes is a son of Temenos, king of Argos, it implies that Sikyon was conquered by the Argive Dorian branch of the Herakleidai, thus, again, we have a 'friendly' subjection to Argos. The subjection to Argos does not appear with Hippolytos and

Temenos, thus a Herakleid, and acknowledged that Lakestades shared the same kinship with him. Therefore, Phalkes' conquest of Sikyon occurred without striking a blow, and led to a diarchy by Phalkes and Lakestades[189]. This reading of the lists implies that the generation of Phalkes, the first of the Dorian era, corresponds to the rule of Karneios' priests in Kastor's sequence (*apud* Eus.), and therefore they belong to the period of Dorianisation of Sikyon. Thus, the two lists seem to express the same phenomenon—that of the Dorianisation—recounted in two different ways: one, that by Pausanias, is in continuity with the royal dynasties, and in connection with Argos; the other one, that by Kastor, where the Dorian invasion coincides with the end of the Sikyonian monarchy. But the two Dorianisations of Sikyon show a major difference that it is worth mentioning: the continuity of the royal house in Pausanias is granted by a strong presence of Herakleidai, while in Kastor they are completely absent, and the Dorianisation, corresponding with the end of the monarchy, does not come with the heirs of Herakles, but with Karneios' priests[190]. Let us see now why these priests appear at this stage of the list and why they are suitable to embody the passage to the Dorian era, by starting from the former problem.

Appearing at the end of the list, priests of Karneios mark the end of the Sikyonian royal houses, and seem to represent a time of passage between monarchy and a more republican-oriented form of government, similarly to what happened in Athens with the institution of the ten-year Archontate[191]. In this respect, the priests of Karneios may have worked like eponymous magistrates, in charge of the chief civic office. We obviously do not expect priests in charge of civic offices at the time of a mythical Dorian invasion. Their inclusion in the sequence might have been either completely fictional,

---

Agamemnon for the first time in the tradition, but it had its beginning with Adrastos. And this may be the reason why Adrastos is mentioned in the *Iliad* as king of Sikyon: to stress the fact that even in the Homeric perception of the past, Sikyon is connected with Argos. The rule of Adrastos, however, does not imply a direct control of Argos over Sikyon, but somehow the opposite. Adrastos ruled in Sikyon in open contraposition with the Argive royal ruling the city, and Argive dynasties had no direct control over Sikyonian kingships.

[189] According to Pausanias, Phalkes and Lakestades are those who finalised the hegemony of Argos over Sikyon, and as the story goes it implies the end of a royal house that is exclusively Sikyonian. Regnidas, Phalkes' son, is suggested as being in charge in both Argos and Sikyon. Paus. 3.13.1 writes that Regnidas son of Phalkes attacked Phlious from both Argos and Sikyonia. FONTANA 2010a, 160-161 argues that the priests of Apollo Karneios attest to a Sikyon without a proper royal house, which instead was at Argos and Sikyon was subjected to Argive rule.

[190] On the presence (and absence) of the heirs of Herakles in Kastor and Pausanias, see the section dedicated to the Herakleidai above, pp. 188-190.

[191] See HARDING 2008, 86-106.

i.e. they never existed as eponymous magistrates, or they may mirror an actual function they performed later in time than the period they belong to in the list. A detail reported by chronographers may provide a chronological hint as to the late origin of this part of the list. In both Eusebius and Synkellos we read that Charidemos, the last priest in charge, resigned from the office for not being able to bear the expenses[192]. It has been noted that the expenses born by priests may reflect a phenomenon particular to the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and we may argue that the Sikyon of those times employed priests as eponymous magistrates[193]. Why then were priests of Karneios, and not of other deities, the most suitable subject to embody such a major turning point in the traditional history of the *polis*? Perhaps an answer could be sought in the divine figure served by the priest: Karneios. We know that Karneios was an epiklesis of Apollo, and literary sources inform us that the cult of Apollo Karneios was considered as belonging to all Dorians. Herodotus (484-425 BC) writes that close in time to the battle of Salamis (480 BC), Peloponnesians sent troops to build a defensive wall on the Corinthian Isthmus. The Historian (Hdt. 8.72) lists the *poleis* that participated in the venture and specifies that only some of them attended the construction of the wall, while "the rest of the Peloponnesians cared nothing, though the Olympian and Karneian festivals were now past"[194]. Thucydides (460-397 BC; Th. 5.54), reporting an episode that happened shortly before the battle of Mantinea (419/418 BC), says that Spartans performed sacrifices before

---

[192] Eus. *Chron*. ed. KARST 1911, Arm. 81.20-21, 83.7-8 = COHEN-SKALLI 2020, 157, 159. Synkellos 110.182.12-13 ed. MOSSHAMMER 1984.

[193] See DIGNAS 2002, 208-213.

[194] Tr. GODLEY 1961, 69, 71. For the full Herodotus' passages, cf. Hdt. 7.206 and 8.72. The tradition of the seer Karnos killed by the Herakleidai is attested for the first time in Theopompus of Chios (378-320 BC - *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 115 F 357 = Sch. Theoc. *Id*. 5.83b) followed by Conon (late first century BC - early first century AD), Apollodorus (second century BC or second century AD), Pausanias (ca. 110-180 AD), Oenomaos of Gadara (117-138 AD), and the Scholia to Theocritus and Callimachus. These authors report the same story with variants. From Apollodorus (Apollod. 2.8.3 = 174-175.5) and Oenomaos (*FPhilGr 2* fr. 2 = Eus. *PE* 5.20) we know that the murder happened when the Herakleidai were stationing the navy in present-day Naupaktos. Apollodorus does not mention the name of the murdered seer but that of the killer: Hippotes son of Phylas, grandson of Antiochos, and great-grandson of Herakles. Pausanias (3.13.4) mentions the same killer, while in Oenomaos' tale, the murderer is Phylandros' son. According to the Scholia to Callimachus (Sch. Vet. in *Hym*. 2.71), Karnos was killed by Aletes, who was son of Hippotes. In Conon (*FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 26 F 1, 26 = Phot. *Bibl*. 186, 135a ll. 22 ff. = 186.26) Karnos is a *phasma* of Apollo killed by Hippotes. Conon and Apollodorus write that as retribution for having killed Karnos, the Herakleidai had to chase away the killer Hippotes. In addition, the two versions, namely the chase of Hippotes and the establishment of the cult in honour of Karnos, are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but none of the sources mention the two things together.

crossing the Lakonian borders. After having obtained a bad omen, they decided to postpone the expedition to the following month, the month Karneios, which was "sacred for all Dorians" (ἱερομηνία Δωριεῦσι). These accounts by Herodotus and Thucydides offer information on how the Karneia festival was perceived in the fifth and early fourth centuries BC. Both historians consider the Karneia as a festival of all Dorians. Relatively soon after Thucydides, Theopompus of Chios (378-320 BC) is the earliest ancient author offering a narrative on the origin of the Karneia, narrative that is relevant to our Sikyonian kings list. Theopompus reports a tradition that locates the genesis of the festival within the Herakleidai saga. During their return to the Peloponnese, one of the Herakleidai, Hippotes, grand-grandson of Herakles and father of Aletes, killed a seer of Apollo named Karnos; as a consequence to this murder, the Herakleidai established sacrifices (*thysiai*) in order to appease the deity, who was furious for the death of his seer[195]. Because the Herakleidai were considered as companions of the Dorians, this tradition of Karnos consolidates the ethnic belonging of the cult of Apollo Karneios to a common Dorian heritage. In addition, the generation in which

---

[195] *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 115 F 357 = Sch. Theoc. *Id.* 5.83b = GRENFELL & HUNT 1909, fr. 321. For the cult of Apollo Karneios we have a fragment by the Sikyonian poetess Praxilla (*floruit* mid-sixth to mid-fifth centuries BC). The fragment is in Sch. Theoc. *Id*. 5.83a, in *Paus*. 3.13.5, and Hsch. K.42 *s.v.* Καρνεῖος, who though does not mention the poetess; cf. also *PMG* 386-390, fr. 7 and CAMPBELL 1992, 379. The scholion to Theocritus reports that, according to Praxilla herself, the festival Karneia is named after one Karnos, son of Europa and Zeus, and *eromenos* of Apollo. The story in Pausanias (3.13.5) is the same as that of the scholion but Karnos was nursed by the god. The difference between being nursed and being an *eromenos* is perhaps minimal. The role of the *erastes* among Ancient Greeks was not distant from the figure of a nurse (τροφός), because the relationship between the *eromenos* and his *erastes* went beyond a mere sexual rapport. Pederasty was essentially conceived as part of the *paideia*. Unfortunately, the one Karnos mentioned by Praxilla cannot be the same one who was killed by the Herakleidai. Being son of Europa, Praxilla's Karnos is brother of Minos, who lived two generations before the Trojan war, i.e. Praxilla's Karnos seems to be contemporary of Polybos. Apollo Karneios was worshipped in Sikyon from very early times, as suggested by Pausanias (2.11.2), who singles out a temple of this deity among those that belonged to the 'city of Aigialeia'. The building, according to the Periegete, was in ruins at his time, and the god dwelled within the sanctuary of Asklepios (Paus. 2.10.2), precisely in the inner (τὸ ἐνδοτέρον) chamber of a dual building (διπλοῦν οἴκημα), like the Erechtheion (Paus. 1.26.5). GRIFFIN 1982, 21 cautiously suspects that the cult was moved from the Archaic temple in ruins to the sanctuary of Asklepios. ROUX 1958, 153-156, followed by MUSTI & TORELLI 1994, 250, thinks that the cult of Asklepios occupied a sacred space originally belonging to Apollo, similarly to what happened in Corinth and Epidauros. According to these modern scholars, healing properties credited to both deities might have favoured a soft transition from one god to the other. A recent archaeological surface survey conducted with the aid of magnetometry and resistivity did not identify any suitable site for an Asklepieion. See LOLOS 2021, 12.

the cult of Apollo Karneios is established corresponds to that of Zeuxippos, the last ruler before the priests of Karneios[196]. Thus, the priests of Karneios ruled Sikyon right after the establishment of the cult of Apollo Karneios, and this may be another signal pointing towards the priests as a form of rulership that surrogates the Herakleidai while at the same time symbolises Dorianisation of the city[197].

But the connection of the Sikyonian priests of Karneios with the return of the Herakleidai may have implications in the relationship of Sikyon with its Corinthian neighbour, as well, implication that might be sought in the murderer of Karnos. As Conon recounts, Hippotes was responsible for the death of the seer, who does not distinguish himself as a virtuous model, and in fact an oracle compelled him into exile for his impious act[198]. Son to Hippotes was Aletes, the Herakleid who accomplished the Dorianisation of Corinth by capturing the city and founding the royal dynasty of the Aleteai. The cult of Apollo Karneios as narrated in the story of Karnos, then, seems to have established an explicit contraposition with the Corinthian branch of the Herakleidai, as the exile of Hippotes suggests. The presence of priests representing a cult by establishment in contrast with the Corinthian rulers-to-be, could perhaps be read as a symptom of separation from Corinth, a city which, as we have seen while analysing birds-kings, was strictly connected with Sikyon[199].

If on the one hand the Dorianisation is an unavoidable episode of the mythical background of the city, on the other hand its presence in the tradition can be read according to a broad-spectrum of connotations. As we have seen, Pausanias' version of the Dorianisation stresses the link with Argos, while in Kastor a strong presence of a Dorian component in the traditions of the *polis* may imply not only an enfranchisement from Corinth, but also a neat separation from the Achaean past. There may have been specific historical phenomena that pushed towards a loosening of both the Achaean and the Corinthian presence in the mythical past of the city; and the Achaean War (146 BC) could be the main one. It is likely that during this

---

[196] Hippotes is father to Aletes, and great-grandson of Herakles. Phalkes is son of Temenos, another great-grandson of Herakles.

[197] For the ties between the Herakleidai and the Dorians, see Th. 1.12.3.

[198] The exile was aimed at expiating the pollution derived from the murder. For Conon, see n. 194 above.

[199] See the above discussion about Eumelus claiming that the two cities stemmed from the same common origin, that from Helios. Pseudo-Scymnus (*floruit* second century BC), who claims to follow Ephorus (*floruit* fourth century BC), reports that the Sikyonians in ancient times founded the city of Corinth (*FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 70 F 18c). Perhaps this account draws on the same traditions recounted by Eumelus.

war, Sikyon opted for a neutral position, as a number of benefits that the city obtained after the sack of Corinth suggest. First, Sikyon was given the *possessio* of most of the Corinthian territory, and second, the city gained control over the Isthmian games[200]. It is likely that the valorisation of the cult of Apollo Karneios, with its wealth of connections with the Dorian migration, was perceived as functional in the period of the Achaean War, and perhaps even later, to show that Sikyon was a well-suited *polis* to embrace the trust of the new hegemonic Roman power against the defeated Achaean League: Sikyonians, thanks to the priests of Karneios could show throughout their mythical past that they were truly Dorians rather than Achaeans, and that a cult established in contrast with the impiety of an ancestor of the Dorian Corinthians had a central political role in the city[201].

Conclusions

In our long analysis we argued that the two lists, that by Pausanias and that derived from Kastor, are more similar than they appear. Despite a number of differences emerging mainly towards the end, both lists show structural similarities especially in the higher portion, suggesting that what we find in Pausanias and Kastor may be based on a common ground. It is likely that Kastor resorted from local Sikyonian traditions that were probably developed in the Hellenistic period, perhaps when Sikyon was member of a still powerful Achaean League. The *Periegesis*, in contrast, perhaps draws on (a) later arrangement(s) or re-elaboration(s) of the local historiography, but the fundamental principles behind the two lists emerge into significant similarities (see chart no. 4). Among the most significant ones is the length. If we reckon according to generations, rather than number of rulers as previous scholarship did, Pausanias' and Kastor's list yield the same result: 25 generations of rulers spread across ca. 1000 years of reign, which results in the standard average of 40 years per generation. Adopting a generation-based approach, we have seen that a smaller number of rulers in the *Periegesis* (24) as opposed to a bigger amount in the *Chronika* (26 plus the priests) is not directly related with the measuring of time, but it may be due

---

[200] Lolos 2011, 77 with further bibliography. Mele 2002, 85-86, suggests that with the adoption of Karneios' priests, the Sikyonian connections with Corinth and Argos as depicted by early mythographers come to an end, and the city is ushered in a new era of traditional relationship, but his idea of the priests naming a tribe in Sikyon is hard to follow. For Sikyon as a μοῖρα τῆς Ἀργείας, see above in this section.

[201] To the same period can be dated Attic rulers, especially Sikyon, who fought against the sons of Achaios (Paus. 2.6.5). See above in this text.

to the different nature of the two literary works. On the one hand, Pausanias employs a narrative that combines the succession of kings with genealogies, and therefore is not aimed at naming every single ruler or regent. On the other hand we have Kastor, whose work perhaps included some narrative, but his text has been translated into bare chronographical charts, the form handed down to us, that offer little more than enumerations of kings.

As we have seen, similarities come along with differences, especially in the final portion of the lists. Among some of the most significant discrepancies are the chronology of the Trojan war, the role of the Herakleidai in the kingship, as well as the presence of Karneios' priests. We have seen that late chronographers' interventions may have determined some of these discrepancies—the date of the Trojan war, in particular—because the intellectual personalities and individual knowledge of local historians may have played a role in offering compelling arrangements of the past. In this process, the individual agency of single authors in collecting and reporting the collective memory of a community is an undeniable part of the form in which traditions have been handed down to us, but perhaps their role was not as significant as some modern scholarship has argued. Even if their purpose was producing a coherent presentation of the traditions, we cannot expect that they always succeeded in doing so. More than being the result of interventions of ancient authors, the differences between the two lists give a hint of the effort in adapting the past of the Sikyonians along a path established by the major Panhellenic traditions according to incidental historical needs. Our analysis has pointed out that a significant presence of four Herakleidai in Pausanias contrasts with Kastor mentioning none. This divergence cannot be explained on the basis of chronographical interventions because, as we have seen, the length is the same in both the lists. Instead, there must have been contrasting versions about two aspects of the traditions related to the Herakleidai: one is their role in Sikyon prior to the Dorian invasion, and the other is their significance in the Dorianisation of the city (as opposed to its Achaean earlier past) in which the priests of Karneios are involved.

These contrasting versions should be read within the same continuous considerable effort that Sikyonians put into shaping their history, and that is reflected in lists of their kings. As we have seen in our analysis, from the jungle of extant fragmentary traditions, we could establish that only four figures are safely attested in early sources as Sikyonian rulers: Epopeus, Sikyon, Polybos and Adrastos, and that these rulers connect Sikyon mainly with Argos and Corinth. The rest of the list seems to result from a combination of traditions that do not surface until the Hellenistic period, and

for which Kastor seems to be, for the most part, the earliest source. In the course of this work, we have seen that this phenomenon occurs in several instances, such as in the mythical names of the city and its territory. Except for Asopia, all the other toponyms and choronyms are connected with rulers positioned high in the list, and in the Archaic period they seem to belong to Argos, rather than Sikyon. This includes claiming some Argive rulers as Sikyonian, such as Inachos and Apis, establishing itself as the *polis* that gave its name to the coastal Achaea as well as the whole Peloponnese. Dating these claims to a horizon earlier than any other Greek *polis* may suggest that Sikyon tried to compete with other communities by antiquity and prestige, and at the same time aimed at building its own history, autonomous from that of other neighbouring *poleis* such as Argos and Corinth. If Sikyonians enfranchising themselves from Corinth could have been relatively easy, claiming a full separation from Argos must have been rather hard. The *Iliad* is clear in ascribing Sikyon as a city under a robust Argive influence, and in fact both lists reflect this condition. Where Sikyonian traditions could ride free were earlier chronological horizons, and the effort in populating these periods with local history and pride emerged clearly in the course of this contribution. The scope of such an effort, however, extended beyond localised interests and winks at Achaean ambitions.

According to Archaic traditions, the region later known as Achaea was a province of the Argive kingdom, and Argive genealogies reflect this original subjection through the eponymous Aigialeus son of Inachos. Aigialeus permits dating the Aigialos as attested in the *Catalogue of the Ships* back to the time of the primigenial origins. A Sikyonian Aigialeus, tellingly placed at the very beginning of the list, severs the link between Argos and the most ancient history of Aigialos, securing, instead, a Sikyonian link to it. It is significant that, according to Kastor, the first Sikyonian king Aigialeus gave his name not solely to the region later called Achaea, but to the whole Peloponnese. This part of the list, therefore, seems to reflect a precise moment of Sikyonian history—and an especially glorious one: the time when Sikyon was a member of the Achaean league and expressed a prestigious leader such as Aratos. The first king of Sikyon establishes both the original autonomy of the region and the pride of the city within the Achaean league.

Yet, other portions of the list, particularly in Pausanias, reflect the opposite and point towards anti-Achaean feelings. King Sikyon, as the Periegete recounts (Paus. 2.6.5), became ruler after he was called from Attica by his predecessor Lamedon as an ally in the war against Archander and Architeles, both sons of Achaios. Sikyon, in this passage of the *Periegesis*, is the eponymous of the city who establishes his power by defeating the two

scions of the Achaean race. In other words, in Pausanias anti-Achaean feelings do not involve Phalkes and Lakestades but Sikyon, and they are more than just reflected—as it is in Kastor—but clearly declared in the tradition. In the story of Sikyon, ties with Attica acquire particular significance since they come together with eponymous king himself; ties that are renewed and strengthened with Ianiskos, one other king of Attic origins. The tangible enfranchisement from the Achaeans emerging from Pausanias' story, suggests that we are facing traditions suitable with the geo-political context that followed the Achaean War, when Sikyon benefitted from the Roman rule, and had all the convenience to appear as a city not too tied with an Achaean past.

If historical and political events, as we have seen, matter to the formation of the Sikyonian kings lists, not all of their components can be ascribed to such events. A significant component that is perhaps unrelated to specific historical events is the presence of Herakleidai rulers in Pausanias. A reason behind their inclusion in the *basileia* could be the prestige and pride in displaying among the civic royal genealogies one of the most, if not the most, eminent dynasties of the whole peoples of Hellas, and, as the case of Phaistos attests, Sikyonian believed to be themselves as one of the earliest *poleis* to assign royal prerogatives to the Herakleidai.

But the Sikyonian effort of strengthening its historical prestige is also reflected in the material culture, as we have seen for the curiosities hosted in the Apollonion and as Pausanias' descriptions of monuments attest. Sikyon was not only a city that struggled to acquire its strong identity in the Archaic and Classical periods, but in the Hellenistic and Roman eras may have been considerably hard for its inhabitants to rely on tangible marks of their past. The early city was rebuilt in 303 BC, with the consequence that very few monuments survived to the relocation of the settlement from the plain to the plateau, and most of those that did, as Pausanias well remarks, were not in good conditions. Thus, one of the few means to elaborate on their past were scattered shreds of material testimonia on which they set down their collective memory and own local traditions, in an attempt to build a glorious past for the city and its community, orphan of the antique settlement. Either connected with realia or not, local traditions and collective memory, in order to acquire strength and acknowledgment by non-locals, had to be connected with Panhellenic sagas, but only at times this process was accomplished successfully and without flaws. This, I think, could be one of the phenomena that may have led to a lack of consistency between the last portions of the two lists. It should not have been easy for mythographers from the Hellenistic period on, to try to find their way out of a labyrinth of complex

local, regional, and Panhellenic tales, but while Kastor may have had a more intellectual approach, though surely well informed, Pausanias collects and reports traditions that at his time were still vibrant, and part of a collective memory shared among the Sikyonians and still alive in the second century AD.

The act of constructing a collective memory is a complex task, and generally involves long-standing processes that include multiple factors and broad-spectrum phenomena. These characteristics are particularly evident in our analysis of the lists, which seem to be the result of a long stratification of multiple interventions, rather than the adaptations of chronographers, or the result of a single historical event. For this latter aspect in particular, I urge scholars to reconsider an approach oriented towards over-interpretations of Sikyonian history on the basis of the Herodotean discourse about Kleisthenes, which we have encountered several times in this article. Herodotus' narrative is fundamental for our understanding of a key part of Sikyonian history, including phenomena that, on the basis of the available evidence, seem to have occurred much later than Herodotus himself. A major contribution, though indirect, that Herodotus can provide to our argument is perhaps in his genealogies. Although Herodotus does not deal with the antiquity of the times of Aigialeus, it is curious that in his text there is no mention about Sikyonian genealogies if they were considered as ancient as the Sikyonians claimed. Perish here the thought of proposing an *argumentum e silentio*, it is perhaps gauche to think that at the time of Herodotus, Sikyonian traditions either did not exist or were just confined within a local and irrelevant dimension, but his silence is perhaps not against a later date for the codification of the high portion of the Sikyonian lists. And this may be applied to the Herakleidai, as well, with whom Herodotus deals quite extensively.

Given the complexity of factors that concurred in the formation of the two lists, we should not be surprised if they show differences and inconsistencies, not all of which can be explained fully and exhaustively. Problems still remain, such as, for instance, chronographical variabilities, like the date of the Trojan war, and the many missing concordances between genealogical systems and royal successions. The often fragmentary condition of the vast reaches of myths and traditions, of which just a small portion lies before us, does not allow us to assign arithmetical arrangement to all the details of the genealogical narratives, nor should we expect it. Ancient people themselves could not create a solid order among the complexity of ancient traditions, many of which they could not rework nor reinterpret easily so to provide them with universal and univocal significance. This lack

of solid order may look contradictory to us, and even in antiquity it could have been so, but certainly modern interpreters cannot still grasp the vast majority of them. Any modern attempt to derive a universally acceptable coherent narrative from ancient traditions is doomed to defeat, and our will of constraining them into rigid and rational schemes is inevitably bound to fail.

Nicola Nenci
Dipartimento di Lettere.
Lingue, letterature e civiltà, antiche e moderne
p.zza Morlacchi, 11 – 06123
Perugia, Italy
nicola.nenci@gmail.com
on line dall'11.12.2021

References

Abbreviations

Agora XVI	A. G. Woodhead, *The Athenian Agora. 16, Inscriptions: The Decrees*, Princeton, NJ 1997.
Billerbeck	M. Billerbeck, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, Berlin and New York, NY 2006–2017.
BK	J. Latacz – M. L. West – M. Stoevesandt – A. Bierl – M. Krieter-Spiro – M. Coray – C. Brügger – E. Visser – R. Führer, eds., *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar - Basler Kommentar*, München, Berlin, Leipzig and New York, NY 2000–.
BNJ	*Brill's New Jacoby*, Leiden 2007–.
BNP	H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds), *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. Antiquity*, Boston, MA 2002-2010.
Casaubon	I. Casaubon, *Isaaci Casavboni Animadversionvm in Athen. Dipnosophistas libri XV. Opvs praeclarvm in lvcem iam ante editvm*, Secunda editio postrema, authoris cura diligenter recognita & ubique doctissimis additionibus aucta, suisque indicibus illustrata, Leiden 1621.
CGL	G. Loewe – G. Goetz – F. Schoell (eds), *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, Berlin and Leipzig 1888-1924.
DNP	H. Cancik – H. Schneider (eds), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, Stuttgart 1996-2003.
FGrHist	F. Jacoby (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin 1923–.
FPhilGr 2	F. W. A. Mullach, *Fragmenta philosophorum Graecorum, vol. 2*, Paris 1881.
Gaisford	T. Gaisford, *Etymologicon Magnum, seu Verius Lexicon Saepissime Vocabulorum Origines Indagans Ex Pluribus Lexicis Scholiastis Et*

	Grammaticis Anonymi cuiusdam Opera Concinnatum (Oxford 1848).
Kaibel	G. Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucratitae Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, Leipzig 1887.
Lasserre & Livadaras	F. L. Lasserre – N. Livadaras, *Etymologicum Magnum genuinum. Symeonis Etymologicum una cum magna gramatica. Etymologicum Magnum auctum*, Roma 1976.
LfgrE	B. Snell, *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, Göttingen 1955.
LSAG Supp.	A. W. Johnston – L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: a Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C. Rev. Ed. with a Supplement by A.W. Johnston*, Oxford 1990.
LSJ	H. G. Liddell – R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., Oxford 1996.
Merkelbach-West	R. Merkelbach – M. L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodea*, Oxford 1967.
Most	G. W. Most, *The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*, Cambridge, MA 2007.
OCD⁴	S. Hornblower – A. Spawforth – E. Eidinow, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th rev. ed., Oxford and New York, NY 2012.
PEG I	A. Bernabé Pajares – R. Olmos Romera, *Poetae epici graeci: testimonia et fragmenta. Pars I*, 2nd ed., Stuttgard and Leipzig 1996.
Pfeiffer	R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus, Vol. 1: Fragmenta*, Oxford 1949.
PMG	D. L. Page, *Poetae melici graeci: Alcmanis, Stesichori, Ibyci, Anacreontis, Simonidis Corinnae poetarum minorum reliquias carmina popularia et convivialia quaeque adespota feruntur*, Oxford 1962.
RE	A. F. v. Pauly – G. Wissowa (eds), *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart and Munich 1893-1978.
van der Valk	M. v. d. Valk, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, Leiden, New York, NY, København, and Köln 1971-1987.
West	M. L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*, Cambridge, MA and London, UK 2003.

Bibliography

ADLER & TUFFIN 2002

W. Adler – P. Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos: a Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY 2002.

ASSMANN 1935

E. Assmann, *Lucii Ampelii Liber memorialis*, Leipzig 1935 [1976 2nd ed.].

ANDOLFI 2019

I. Andolfi, *Acusilaus of Argos' Rhapsody in Prose: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*, Berlin 2019.

E. Assmann, *Lucii Ampelii Liber memorialis*, Leipzig 1935 [1976 2nd ed.].

AUCHER 1818

G. B. Aucher, *Eusebii Pamphili caesariensis episcopi Chronicon bipartitum nunc primum ex*

armeniaco textu in latinum conversum, Venice 1818.

BABBITT 1936

F. C. Babbitt, *Moralia in Fifteen Volumes*, vol. 4: *Roman Questions. Greek Questions. Greek and Roman Parallel Stories. On the Fortune of the Romans. On the Fortune or the Virtue of Alexander. Were the Athenians More Famous in War or in Wisdom?*, Cambridge, MA 1936.

BALERIAUX 2016

J. Baleriaux, *Diving Underground: Giving Meaning to Subterranean Rivers*, in J. McInerney - I. Sluiter (eds), *Valuing Landscape in Classical Antiquity: Natural Environment and Cultural Imagination*, Leiden and Boston, MA 2016, 103-121.

BARRON 1969

J. P. Barron, *Ibycus: to Polycrates*, «BICS» 16.1 (1969), 119-149.

BERTI 2009

M. Berti, *Istro il Callimacheo*, Tivoli 2009.

BICKNELL 1982

P. J. Bicknell, *Herodotus 5.68 and the Racial Policy of Kleisthenes of Sikyon*, «GRBS» 23 (1982), 193-201.

BLAINEAU 2015

A. Blaineau, *Le cheval de guerre en Grèce ancienne*, Rennes 2015.

BRILLANTE 1981

C. Brillante, *La leggenda eroica e la civiltà micenea*, Rome 1981.

BURGESS, W. 2013

R. Burgess, W., *The Date, Purpose, and Historical Context of the Original Greek and the Latin Translation of the so-Called 'Excerpta Latina Barbari'*, «Traditio» 68 (2013), 1-56.

BURGESS & KULIKOWSKI 2013

R. Burgess, W., M. Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time: The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century Bc to the Sixth Century AD. Vol. 1: A Historical Introduction to the Chronicle Genre from Its Origins to the High Middle Ages*, Turnhout 2013.

BURGESS & WITAKOWSKI 1999

R. Burgess, W. – W. Witakowski, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, Stuttgart 1999.

BURKERT 1972

W. Burkert, *Homo necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*, Berlin and New York, NY 1972.

BUSOLT 1893

G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia*, vol. 1., Gotha 1893.

CAMPNELL 1992

D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric: Bacchylides, Corinna, and Others*, vol. 4, London, UK and Cambridge, MA 1992.

CARRIKER 2003

A. J. Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, Leiden and Boston, MA 2003.

CHANTRY 1994

M. Chantry, *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas, Ranas, Ecclesiazusas et Plutum*, Groningen 1994.

CHRISTESEN 2007

P. Christesen, *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History*, Cambridge, MA and New York, NY 2007.

CLARKE 2008

K. Clarke, *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY 2008.

COHEN-SKALLI 2020

A. Cohen-Skalli, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Chronique I. – Textes introduits par A. Cohen-Skalli, traduits par A. Ouzounian et commentés par S. Brillante, S.H. Aufrère, S. Morlet et A. Ouzounian*, Paris 2020.

CRAMER 1839

J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis*, Oxford 1839.

DICKEY 2006

E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship: a Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY 2006.

DIGNAS 2002

B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY 2002.

DORATI 2004

M. Dorati, *Pausania, le Pretidi e la triarchia argiva*, in P. Bernardini (ed.), *La città di Argo: mito, storia, tradizioni poetiche. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Urbino, 13-15 giugno 2002*, Roma 2004, 295-320.

DORATI 2005

M. Dorati, *Pausania e il Modello Erodoteo*, in M. Giangiulio (ed.), *Erodoto e il modello erodoteo. Formazione e trasmissione delle tradizioni storiche in Grecia*, Trento 2005, 315-348.

DROST-ABGARJAN 2006

A. Drost-Abgarjan, *Ein neuer Fund zur armenischen Version der Eusebios-Chronik*, in W. Martin (ed.), *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, Berlin and Boston, MA 2006, 255-262.

DROST-ABGARYAN 2016

A. Drost-Abgaryan, *The Reception of Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 264–339) in Armenia*, in F. Gazzano - L. Pagani - G. Traina (eds), *Greek Texts and Armenian Traditions: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Berlin and Boston, MA 2016, 215-229.

FONTANA 2010a

F. Fontana, *Ricerche cronografiche di Castore di Rodi intorno alla lista dei re di Sicione*, «IncidAntico» 8 (2010a), 143-162.

FONTANA 2010b

F. Fontana, *Sicione: evoluzione politica di un mito*, «QUCC» 125. Nuova Serie 96.3 (2010b), 57-85.

FORSDYKE 2012

S. Forsdyke, *Slaves Tell Tales: And Other Episodes in the Politics of Popular Culture in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, UK and Princeton, NJ 2012.

FOWLER 1999

R. L. Fowler, *Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue, and the Creation of the Hellenes*, «Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society» 44 (1999), 1-19.

FOWLER 2013

R. L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography*, vol. 2., Oxford 2013.

FRAZER 1898

J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece*, vol. 1: Translation, London 1898.

FRICK 1873

C. Frick, *Der Tyrann Kleisthenes und die ἀναγραφή von Sikyon*, «Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik» 107 (1873), 702-712.

GANTZ 1993

T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myths*, London 1993.

GODLEY 1961

A. D. Godley, *Herodotus: In Four Volumes, Books 8 and 9*, vol. 4, London, UK and Cambridge, MA 1961.

GRENFELL & HUNT 1909

B. P. Grenfell – A. S. Hunt, *Hellenica oxyrhynchia cum Theopompi et Cratippi fragmentis*, Oxford 1909.

GRIFFIN 1982

A. Griffin, *Sikyon*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY 1982.

HALL 1997

J. M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, MA 1997.

HAMMOND 1982

N. G. L. Hammond, *The Peloponnese*, in J. Boardman - N. G. L. Hammond (eds), *Cambridge Ancient History* vol. 3 1982, 321-359.

HARDING 2008

P. Harding, *The Story of Athens. The Fragments of the Local Chronicles of Attika*, Abington, MA 2008.

HAWES 2016

G. Hawes, *Pausanias and the Footsteps of Herodotus*, in J. Priestley - V. Zali (eds), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden and Boston, MA 2016, 322-345.

HAYWARD 2021

C. L. Hayward, *Geoarchaeological Survey*, in LOLOS 2021b, 77-151.

HELM 1956

R. Helm, *Eusebius von Caesarea Werke 7. Die Chronik des Hieronymus, Hieronymi Chronicon*, 2. Aufl., Berlin 1956.

HITZIG & BLŪMNER 1899

H. Hitzig – H. Blūmner, *Des Pausanias Beschreibung von Griechenland mit kritischem Apparat*, vol. 2., Leipzig 1899.

HUGHES 2019

D. D. Hughes, *The Cult of Aratus at Sicyon (Plutarch, Aratus, 53)*, «Kernos» 32 (2019), 119-150.

HUXLEY 1969

G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis*, London 1969.

HUXLEY 1982

G. L. Huxley, *Problems in the 'Chronography' of Eusebius*, «Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature» 82C (1982), 183-196.

JACKSON 1998

S. Jackson, *Callimachean Istrus and the Land of the Pears*, «Mnemosyne» 51.5 (1998), 581-585.

JONES 1961

W. H. S. Jones, *Pausanias, Description of Greece, Books 6-7 (1-21)*, vol. 3, London, UK and Cambridge, MA 1961.

KARST 1911

J. Karst, *Eusebius Werke: fünfter band. Die Chronik: aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentarher*, Berlin 1911.

KELLY 1976

T. Kelly, *A History of Argos to 500 B.C*, Minneapolis, MN 1976.

KNOEPFLER 2010

D. Knoepfler, *La patrie de Narcisse: un héros mythique enraciné dans le sol et dans l'histoire d'une cité grecque*, Paris 2010.

KÖLLIGAN 2012

D. Kölligan, Ἀσωπός, «Annali del Dipartimento di Studi Letterari, Linguistici e Comparati. Sezione Linguistica. Napoli : Istituto Universitario Orientale.» N.S. 1 (2012), 215-229.

KRYSTALLI-VOTSI & ØSTBY 2010

K. Krystalli-Votsi – E. Østby, *The Temples of Apollo at Sikyon*, «Bollettino di Archeologia On-Line» 1 (2010), 54-62.

LEONE 2007

P. L. M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Galatina 2007.

LEVA 1965

A. E. Leva, *Discorso sulla prima indagine di Erodoto in Africa*, «Africa: Rivista trimestrale di studi e documentazione dell'Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente» 20.4 (1965), 339-344.

LLOYD-JONES & REA 1968

H. Lloyd-Jones – J. Rea, *Callimachus, Fragments 260-261*, «HSPh» 72 (1968), 125-145.

LOLOS 2005

Y. A. Lolos, *The Sanctuary of Titane and the City of Sikyon*, «ABSA» 100 (2005), 275-298.

LOLOS 2011

Y. A. Lolos, *Land of Sikyon: Archaeology and History of a Greek City-state*, Princeton, NJ 2011.

LOLOS 2021a

Y. A. Lolos, *A Profile of an Ancient City*, in LOLOS 2021b, 581-591.

LOLOS 2021b

Y. A. Lolos (ed.), *Sikyon I. Volume 1: Text*, Athens 2021

LOLOS 2021c

Y. A. Lolos, *The Sikyon Survey Project: an Interdisciplinary Approach* in LOLOS 2021b, 11-13.

LOLOS & GOURLEY 2012

Y. A. Lolos, B. Gourley, *The Town Planning of Hellenistic Sikyon*, «AA» (2012), 87-140.

LÜBBERT 1883

E. Lübbert, *Diatriba in Pindari locum de Aegidis et sacris Carneis*, Bonn 1883.

LÜBBERT 1884

E. Lübbert, *Diatriba in Pindari locum de Adrasti regno Sicyonio*, Bonn 1884.

MAI 1818

A. Mai, *Chronicorum canonum libri II, A. Maius et J. Zohrabus ediderunt,* Milan 1818.

MANNHARDT 1884

W. Mannhardt, *Mythologische Forschungen*, Strassburg 1884.

MCGREGOR 1941

M. F. McGregor, *Cleisthenes of Sicyon and the Panhellenic Festivals*, «TAPhA» 72 (1941), 266-287.

MELE 2002

A. Mele, *Gli Achei da Omero all'Età Arcaica*, in E. Greco (ed.), *Gli Achei e l'identità etnica degli Achei d'Occidente*, Paestum 2002, 67-93.

MILLER 2004

S. G. Miller, *Ancient Greek Athletics*, London, UK and New Haven, CT 2004.

MÖLLER 2001

A. Möller, *The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' Hiereiai*, in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford 2001, 241-262.

MORGAN 1999

C. Morgan, *Isthmia VIII: The Late Bronze Age Settlement and Early Iron Age Sanctuary*, Princeton, NJ 1999.

MOSSHAMMER 1979

A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*, Lewisburg, PA 1979.

MOSSHAMMER 1984

A. A. Mosshammer, *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica*, Leipzig 1984.

MURRAY 1928

A. T. Murray, *Homer, The Iliad, Books 1-12*, vol. 1. 2nd. London, UK and New York, NY 1928.

MUSTI & TORELLI 1994

D. Musti – M. Torelli, *Pausania, Guida della Grecia: Libro 2, La Corinzia e l'Argolide*, vol. 1, Milan 1994.

NAGY 1990

G. Nagy, *Greek Mythology and Poetics*, Ithaca, NY 1990.

NAGY 2011

G. Nagy, *Asopos and His Multiple Daughters: Traces of Preclassical Epic in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar*, in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina. Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC*, New York, NY 2011, 41-78.

NASH 1978

L. L. Nash, *Concepts of Existence: Greek Origins of Generational Thought*, «Daedalus» 107.4 (1978), 1-21.

OGDEN 1993

D. Ogden, *Cleisthenes of Sicyon, Λευστήρ*, «CQ» 43.2 (1993), 353-363.

PARKER 1994

V. Parker, *Some Aspects of the Foreign and Domestic Policy of Cleisthenes of Sicyon*, «Hermes» 122 (1994), 404-424.

PFISTER 1913

F. Pfister, *Die Lokalhistorie von Sikyon bei Menaichmos, Pausanias und den Chronographen*, «RhM» 68 (1913), 529-537.

POWELL 1925

J. U. Powell, *Collectanea alexandrina: reliquiae minores poetarum graecorum aetatis ptolemaicae, 323-146 A.C., epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum*, Oxford 1925.

PRAKKEN 1940

D. W. Prakken, *Herodotus and the Spartan King Lists*, «Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association» 71 (1940), 460-472.

PRETZLER 2005

M. Pretzler, *Pausanias and Oral Tradition*, «CQ» 55.1 (2005), 235-249.

RIDGWAY 1990

B. S. Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture. I, The Styles of ca. 331-200 B.C,* Bristol 1990.

ROBERTSON 1999

N. Robertson, *Callimachus' Tale of Sicyon ("SH" 238)*, «Phoenix» 53.1/2 (1999), 57-79.

ROUX 1958

G. Roux, *Pausanias en Corinthie (Livres II, 1 à 15)*, Paris 1958.

RUSSELL & KONSTAN 2005

D. A. Russell – D. Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems*, Atlanta, GA 2005.

SCARPI 2001

P. Scarpi, *Apollodoro. I miti Greci*, 6th ed., Milan 2001.

SCHEER 1996

T. S. Scheer, *Ein Museum griechischer Frühgeschichte im Apollontempel von Sikyon*, «Klio» 78 (1996), 353-373.

SCHÖNE & PETERMANN 1875

A. C. I. Schöne – J. H. Petermann, *Eusebi Chronicorum Liber Prior. Armeniam uersionem latine ad libros manuscriptos recensuit H. Petermann, Graeca fragmenta collegit et recognouit, appendices chronographias sex adiecit A. Schoene*, Berlin 1875.

SKALET 1928

C. H. Skalet, *Ancient Sicyon: with a Prosopographia Sicyonia*, Baltimore, MD 1928.

SMITH & TRZASKOMA 2007

R. S. Smith – S. M. Trzaskoma, *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae: Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology*, Cambridge, MA and Indianapolis, IN 2007.

SPANAKIS 2018

M. Spanakis, *Images of the Hellenistic Peloponnese in Rhianus' Ἀχαϊκά and Ἠλιακά, Eikasmóς 29, 2018*, «Eikasmos» 29 (2018), 313-34.

STEWART 2013

D. R. Stewart, *Most Worth Remembering. Pausanias, Analogy, and Classical Archaeology*, «Hesperia» 82.2 (2013), 231-261.

STEWART 2018

D. R. Stewart, *Pinpointing Pausanias: Ethnography, Analogy, and Autopsy*, in E. Varto (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Classics and Early Anthropology*, Leiden 2018, 279-300.

TRYPANIS 1973

C. A. Trypanis, *Aetia, Iambi, lyric poems, Hecale, minor epic and elegiac poems, and other fragments*, Cambridge, MA 1973.

VANNICELLI 1997

P. Vannicelli, *L'esperimento linguistico di Psammetico (Herodot. II 2): c'era una volta il frigio*, in R. Gusmani – M. Salvini – P. Vannicelli (eds), *Frigi e frigio: atti del 1° simposio internazionale, Roma, 16-17 ottobre 1995*, Roma 1997, 201-217.

VENTRIS & CHADWICK & WACE 1959

M. Ventris – J. Chadwick – A. J. B. Wace, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek: Three Hundred Selected Tablets from Knossos, Pylos, and Mycenae*, London, UK and New York, NY 1959.

VERMEULE 1987

E. Vermeule, *Baby Aigisthos and the Bronze Age*, «Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society» 33 (1987), 122-152.

VEYNE 1988

P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*, Chicago, IL 1988.

VISSER 1997

E. Visser, *Homers Katalog der Schiffe*, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1997.

WALLRAFF 2007

M. Wallraff, *Iulius Africanus Chronographiae. The Extant Fragments*, Berlin and New York, NY 2007.

WARREN 2009

J. A. W. Warren, *Sikyon: a Case-Study in the Adoption of Coinage by a Polis in the Fifth Century BC*, «NC» 169 (2009), 1-13.

WECOWSKI 2012

M. Wecowski, *Can Zeus be Deceived? The Mekone Episode (Hes. Theog. 535–561) Between Theodicy and Power-Politics*, «Klio» 94 (2012), 45-54.

Nicola Nenci, *The Oldest on Record. A Study on the Sikyonian Kings Lists*

|244

WEST 1985

M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: its Nature, Structure, and Origins*, Oxford, UK and New York, NY 1985.

WEST 1985

M. L. West, *'Eumelos': A Corinthian Epic Cycle?*, «*JHS*» 122 (2002), 109-133.

Abstract

According Kastor of Rhodes, Sikyonians are chronologically the oldest on record among all the Greeks. Such a claim is based on two lists of their kings, one deriving from Kastor himself, and another from Pausanias. The two lists bear differences in the spelling of names, length, and the number and order of some of the kings.
Modern debate splits along two fronts: one proposes that discrepancies are due to ancient political interventions, while the other focuses on modifications made by chronographers. Yet, neither front has fully explained possible phenomena behind the formation of the lists. This article, adopting literary criticism and a comparative methodology, stresses the similarities rather than the differences between the two lists, and analyses possible reasons behind inconsistencies. The present work shows that a complexity of factors involving mythical traditions, identity, political matters, and agency of ancient authors are all interrelated in the formation of the two lists.

Parole chiave: Sicione, re, Castore, Pausanias, cronografi

Secondo Castore di Rodi, i Sicionii sono i più antichi Greci di cui si ha notizia. Tale asserzione è basata su due cataloghi dei re di Sicione: uno deriva da Castore stesso, e l'altro è in Pausania. Le due liste presentano differenze sia nella trascrizione dei nomi, che nella lunghezza e nell'ordine di alcuni re.
Il dibattito moderno si scinde in due filoni interpretativi: uno sostiene che queste differenze sono dovute a interventi antichi di natura politica, mentre l'altro ad adattamenti dei cronografi. Tuttavia, nessuno dei due filoni ha affrontato esaustivamente possibili fenomeni che stanno alla base della formazione dei cataloghi.
Questo articolo, analizzando e confrontando le fonti antiche, pone l'accento sulle affinità fra le liste e propone possibili ragioni dietro le loro incongruenze. Il presente lavoro mostra che la loro redazione è il risultato di molti fattori concomitanti, fra cui tradizioni mitiche, fenomeni identitari, istanze politiche, e modifiche degli autori antichi.

Keywords: Sikyon, Kings, Kastor, Pausanias, chronographers

Chart no. 1a. Sikyonian Kings Lists
Aligned to Argive kings according to absolute chronology.
For the spelling of names, see n. 1 in the text.

Sikyonian Kings

Gen. no.

From Pausanias

From Kastor

Argive Kings from Kastor

From Pausanias	Gen. no.	From Kastor		
1. Aigialeus	1	1. Egialeus	2123/2	52 yrs
2. Europs	2	2. Europs	2071/0	45 yrs
3. Telchin	3	3. Telchin	2026/5	20 yrs
4. Apis	4	4. Apis	2006/5	25 yrs
5. Thelxion	5	5. Thelxion	1981/0	52 yrs
6. Aigyros	6	6. Egidros	1929/8	34 yrs
7. Thourimachos	7	7. Thourimachos	1895/4	45 yrs
8. Leukippos	8	8. Leukippos	1850/49	53 yrs
	9	9. Messapos	1797/6	47 yrs
Poseidon==Calchinia	10		1750/49	
9. Peratos		10. Eratos		46 yrs
	11		1704/3	
10. Plemneos*	12	11. Plemneos		48 yrs
11. Orthopolis	13	12. Orthopolis	1655/4	63 yrs
	14	13. Marathonios	1592/1	30 yrs
Apollo==Chrysorthe	15	14. Marathon	1562/1	20 yrs
12. Koronos	16	15. Chyreus	1542/1	55 yrs
13. Korax	17	16. Korax	1487/6	30 yrs
14. Epopeus*	18	17. Epopeus	1457/6	35 yrs
15. Lamedon	19	18. Laomedon	1422/1	40 yrs
16. Sikyon	20	19. Sikion	1382/1	45 yrs
Hermes==Chthonophyle		20. Polibos	1337/6	40 yrs
17. Polybos	21		1297/6	
Talaos==Lysianassa		21. Inachos		40 yrs
18. Adrastos*	22	22. Phestos	1255/4	8 yrs
19. Inachos		23. Adrastos	1243/2	4 yrs
20. Phestos*		24. Poliphides		31 yrs
21. Zeuxippos	23	25. Pelasgos	1212/1	20 yrs
22. Hippolytos	24	26. Zeuxippos	1192/1	31 yrs
23. Lakestades	25	27.1. Archelaos 1 year	1162/1	
24. Phalkes		27.2. Otomedon 1 year		
		27.3. Theoklitos 4 years		
		27.4. Euneos 6 years	1122/1	
		27.5. Theonomos 9 years		
		27.6. Amphichies 12 years		
		27.7. Charidemos 6 years		

Herakleidai →

Herakles
|
Hyllos
|
Kleodaios
|
Aristomachos
|
Temenos

Rhopalos

Argive Kings from Kastor

1. Inachos	1856/5	50 yrs
2. Phoron<eus>	1806/5	60 yrs
3. Apis	1746/5	35 yrs
4. Argos	1711/0	70 yrs
5. Kriasos	1641/0	54 yrs
6. Phorbas	1587/0	35 yrs
7. Triopas	1552/1	46 yrs
8. Krotopas	1506/5	21 yrs
9. Sthenelos	1485/4	11 yrs
10. Danaos	1474/3	50 yrs
11. Linkeus	1424/3	41 yrs
12. Abas	1383/2	23 yrs
13. Proitos	1360/59	17 yrs
14. Akrisios	1343/2	31 yrs
15. Euristheus	1312/1	45 yrs
16. Atreus	1267/6	65 yrs
17. Thie<s>tes		
18. Agamemnon	1202/1	30 yrs
19. Egistos	1169/8	7 or 17 yrs
20. Orestes	1162/1	58 yrs
21. Tisamenos		
22. Penthilos		
23. Kumetes	1105/4	

Fall of Troy

Gener. 27 to 32

33

34 | 776/5 First Olympic

1120 to 774

1103 to 774

* Rulers from abroad

Chart no. 1b. Sikyonian Kings Lists
Aligned to Argive kings according to relative chronology.
For the spelling of names, see n. 1 in the text.

Sikyonian Kings

From Pausanias — Gen. no. — From Kastor

Gen. no.	From Pausanias	From Kastor	Year	Years
1	1. Aigialeus	1. Egialeus	2123/2	52 yrs
2	2. Europs	2. Europs	2071/0	45 yrs
3	3. Telchin	3. Telchin	2026/5	20 yrs
4	4. Apis	4. Apis	2006/5	25 yrs
5	5. Thelxion	5. Thelxion	1981/0	52 yrs
6	6. Aigyros	6. Egidros	1929/8	34 yrs
7	7. Thourimachos	7. Thourimachos	1895/4	45 yrs
8	8. Leukippos	8. Leukippos	1850/49	53 yrs
9		9. Messapos	1797/6	47 yrs
10	9. Peratos	10. Eratos	1750/49	46 yrs
11	10. Plemneos*	11. Plemneos	1704/3	48 yrs
12			1655/4	
13	11. Orthopolis	12. Orthopolis		63 yrs
14		13. Marathonios	1592/1	30 yrs
15		14. Marathon	1562/1 / 1542/1	20 yrs
16	12. Koronos	15. Chyreus		55 yrs
17	13. Korax	16. Korax	1487/6	30 yrs
18	14. Epopeus*	17. Epopeus	1457/6	35 yrs
19	15. Lamedon	18. Laomedon	1422/1	40 yrs
20	16. Sikyon	19. Sikion	1382/1	45 yrs
21	17. Polybos	20. Polibos	1337/6	40 yrs
22	18. Adrastos* / 19. Inachos / 20. Phestos*	21. Inachos / 22. Phestos / 23. Adrastos	1297/6 / 1255/4 / 1243/2	40 yrs / 8 yrs / 4 yrs
23	21. Zeuxippos	24. Poliphides	1212/1	31 yrs
		25. Pelasgos	1192/1	20 yrs
24	22. Hippolytos	26. Zeuxippos	1162/1	31 yrs
25	23. Lakestades / 24. Phalkes	27.1. Archelaos 1 year / 27.2. Otomedon 1 year / 27.3. Theoklitos 4 years / 27.4. Euneos 6 years / 27.5. Theonomos 9 years / 27.6. Amphichies 12 years / 27.7. Charidemos 6 years	1122/1	

Poseidon==Calchinia

Apollo==Chrysorthe

Herakleidai →

Hermes==Chthonophyle

Herakles
|
Hyllos
|
Kleodaios
|
Aristomachos
|
Temenos

Talaos==Lysianassa

Rhopalos

Fall of Troy

Argive Kings from Kastor

	Argive Kings	Years
1.	Inachos	50 yrs
2.	Phoron<eus>	60 yrs
3.	Apis	35 yrs
4.	Argos	70 yrs
5.	Kriasos	54 yrs
6.	Phorbas	35 yrs
7.	Triopas	46 yrs
8.	Krotopas	21 yrs
9.	Sthenelos	11 yrs
10.	Danaos	50 yrs
11.	Linkeus	41 yrs
12.	Abas	23 yrs
13.	Proitos	17 yrs
14.	Akrisios	31 yrs
15.	Euristheus	45 yrs
16.	Atreus	65 yrs
17.	Thie<s>tes	
18.	Agamemnon	30 yrs
19.	Egistos	7 or 17 yrs
20.	Orestes	58 yrs
21.	Tisamenos	
22.	Penthilos	
23.	Kumetes	

Gener. 27 to 32

1120 to 774

33

34 776/5 First Olympic

* Rulers from abroad

Okeanos ═══ Tethys

Ephyra ═══ Asopos
(*)

(*)

Helios ═══ Antiope

Asopia   *Ephyra/Corinthia*   Hermes ═══ Alkidameia

Aloeus   Aites

Bounos

Epopeus

Marathon

Sikyon   Korinthos

Medea and Jason

Sisyphos

(*) Reconstructed by WEST 2002, 120.

Chart no. 2. Genalogies and rulers in Eumelus

Okeanos ══ Tethys
                |
           Asopos
                |(1)
Tantalos   Antiope ══ Zeus / Epopeus
    |
  Niobe ══ Amphion   Zethos   Poseidon ══ Tyro

                              Chloris ══ Neleus

                        Deimachos   Asterios ══ Amphiktyon
                              | (2)
              Aiolos ══ Ainarete   Heosphoros   Dotis ══ Ares

Polyxo ══ Nykteus   Poseidon ══ Kanake   Alkyon ══ Keyx   Phlegyas
         | Aloeus
  Antiope ══ Zeus / Epopeus   Koronis ══ Apollo

Zethos   Amphion   Asklepios

This chart is reconstructed from Apollodorus' *Library* except for:
(1) *Il*. 11.260-265;
(2) Pherecydes of Athens, *FGrHist* [and *BNJ*] 3 F 172.

Chart no. 3. Genealogies in Apollodorus

L1

K   L2

P

L (1-2) = Local tradition(s)/historian(s)

K = Version by Kastor

P = Version by Pausanias

Chart no. 4. How different traditions on Sikyonian kings
            may have stemmed