

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

May 25 1947

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my supervision by Donald William Braden
entitled A History of Chalkis to 328 B. C.

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by:

Ralston L. H. Long

A HISTORY OF CHALKIS TO 338 B.C.

A dissertation submitted to the

**Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of the University of Cincinnati**

**in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1947

by

DONALD WILLIAM BRADEEN

B.A. Bowdoin College 1940

M.A. University of Cincinnati 1943

ORIGINAL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

29 JI 47

UMI Number: DP15660

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform DP15660

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

A HISTORY OF CHALKIS TO 338 B.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iv
Table of Abbreviations	vii
Chapter I The City and its Early History	1
Chapter II Chalkis in the Age of Colonization	30
Chapter III The Lelantine War	86
Chronological Table, 736-660 B.C.	125
Chapter IV Chalkis in the Sixth Century	127
Chapter V Chalkis in the Fifth Century	157
<u>I.G.</u> , I ² , 39, with Bibliography and Commentary	203
Chapter VI Chalkis in the Fourth Century to Chaironeia	212
Bibliography	234

PREFACE

Despite the importance of the city of Chalkis in the Greek world, especially during the early period, her history has been on the whole neglected. The only detailed study is the dissertation, De Rebus Chalcidiensium, by H. Dondorff,¹ of which only two chapters, on the Lelantine War and on the commerce of Chalkis, were published, in 1855. Dondorff also incorporated another chapter in a separate monograph, Die Ionier auf Euböia. However, many of his conclusions have been invalidated or modified by more recent discoveries and investigations. Outlines of the history of Chalkis are presented by E. Oberhummer in his article, s.v. Chalkis, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real Encyclopädie, and by F. Geyer in his Topographie und Geschichte der Insel Euböia. Some work has been done on Chalkis in the general histories, of which I find that of G. Busolt the most thorough and helpful. There are also numerous articles which refer to various phases of Chalkidic history, particularly on the Lelantine War and the relations of Chalkis and Athens in the fifth century. For the relations of Chalkis with her neighbor Eretria I found very useful the dissertation of William Wallace, The History

-
1. Complete information on this and other works cited in the Preface can be found in the Bibliography, pp. 234-256.

of Eretria to 198 B.C.

There is, for the history of Chalkis, no continuous ancient source, and I have had to work, for the most part, from notices scattered throughout ancient literature. The inscriptional evidence from Chalkis itself, published in I.G., XII, 9, is very scanty, because of the lack of systematic archaeological excavation in the city and because of the destruction wrought there by many successive conquerors after the fall of the Roman Empire. However, we do have some important Athenian inscriptions which concern Chalkis, and the tribute-quota lists make a valuable contribution.

Although I have attempted to take into account all of the ancient evidence, there remain large gaps in the history of Chalkis of which we know very little. I have put this dissertation into the form of a continuous narrative, but I have not hesitated to discuss exhaustively, at the expense of the continuity of the narrative, individual problems, the most important of which are the colonization by Chalkis in Thrace, the Lelantine War, and the relations of Chalkis with Athens in the late sixth and early fifth centuries. I have chosen the battle of Chaironeia, 338 B.C., as a stopping point for this history because, after the victory of the Makedonians, Chalkis was held almost continuously by foreign garrisons throughout the remainder of the ancient period.

I wish to express here my appreciation to all those

who have helped me in the writing and preparation of this dissertation. I owe a special debt of gratitude to my adviser, Professor Malcolm F. McGregor, for his constant guidance and helpful criticism, and to Professor and Mrs. William T. Semple, through whose generosity I have been enabled to carry on my graduate study. I also wish to thank Professor Rodney P. Robinson, Mrs. Elizabeth G. Caskey, and Professor Cedric G. Boulter for their many timely criticisms. And finally I am glad to acknowledge the help of my wife and of Miss Pauline Morris in the typing of the manuscript.

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

- A.J.A. - American Journal of Archaeology
- A.J.P. - American Journal of Philology
- A.T.L. - Meritt, B. D., Wade-Gery, H. T., and McGregor, M. F.,
The Athenian Tribute Lists, I
- Am. Hist. Rev. - The American Historical Review
- Ath. Mitt. - Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen In-
stituts. Athenische Abteilung
- B.C.H. - Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique
- B.S.A. - The Annual of the British School at Athens
- C.A.H. - The Cambridge Ancient History, Vols. III-VI, ed.
 J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock
- Class. Phil. - Classical Philology
- Class. Quart. - The Classical Quarterly
- Class. Rev. - The Classical Review
- Diehl - E. Diehl, Anthologia Lyrica Graeca
- Eph. Arch. - 'Εφημερίς 'Αρχαιολογική
- Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. - Harvard Studies in Classical Phil-
ology
- I.G. - Inscriptiones Graecae
- J.H.S. - The Journal of Hellenic Studies
- J.R.S. - The Journal of Roman Studies
- Jacoby - F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker
- Jahrbuch des Arch. Inst. - Jahrbuch des kaiserlich deutschen
archäologischen Instituts

Jahreshefte des Öster. Arch. Inst. - Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien

Journal Int. d'Arch. Num. - Journal International d'Archéologie Numismatique

Leipz. Stud. zu Class. Phil. - Leipziger Studien zur Classische Philologie

Müller - C. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum

Nachr. Ges. Göttingen - Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse

Num. Chron. - The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society

P.B.S.R. - Papers of the British School at Rome

P.W., R.E. - Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Neue Bearbeitung (Stuttgart, from 1894);
ed. G. Wissowa (1894-1910, Vols. I-VI, 1), W. Kroll (from 1910), K. Witte (1914-1923, Zweite Reihe [R-Z], Vols. I-II), and K. Mittelhaus (from 1927, Zweite Reihe, from Vol. III, 1). Six supplements have been published, the first (1903) edited by G. Wissowa, the rest by W. Kroll.

Phil. Untersuchungen - Philologische Untersuchungen

Rev. Arch. - Revue Archéologique

Rhein. Mus. - Rheinisches Museum für Philologie

Riv. di Fil. - Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione classica

Röm. Mitt. - Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen In-
stituts, Römische Abteilung

Sitzb. Ak. Wien - Sitzungsberichte. Akademie der Wissenschaften
in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse

T.A.P.A. - Transactions of the American Philological Association

Univ. of California Publ. in Class. Arch. - University of Cali-
fornia Publications in Classical Archaeology

CHAPTER I

THE CITY AND ITS EARLY HISTORY

Chalkis is situated in Euboea at the point where that island is separated from Boiotia only by the narrow straits of the Euripos.¹ Thus located, the city controlled not only the easiest route from the mainland to Euboea but also the most common and the safest sea passage between northern and southern Greece.² This strategic position made it imperative that the masters of Greece should control Chalkis; in Hellenistic times it was held by a garrison and was considered, along with Korinth and Demetrias (in Magnesia), to be one of the three "keys" of Greece.³ The city was very

-
1. The width of the Euripos is given by Strabo (IX, 2, 8) as two plethra (200 feet). H. N. Ulrichs, Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland, II (Berlin, 1863), p. 219, states that the narrowest point is 55 meters wide.
 2. Livy, XXXI, 23, 12: nam ut terra Thermopylarum angustiae Graeciam ita mari fretum Euripi claudit.
 3. Pausanias, VII, 7, 6: κατεῖχε [Φίλιππος ὁ Δημητρίου] καὶ τρεῖς πόλεις φρουραῖς ὀρμητήρια εἶναι οἱ κατὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, καὶ ὠνόμαζε δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ὕβρεως καὶ τῆς ἐς τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ὑπεροψίας κλεῖς τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὰς πόλεις

strongly fortified, at least in Hellenistic times,⁴ but probably its defenses had been much strengthened since the time of Alexander, when the city walls were extended to include Kanethos, on the Boiotian side of the Euripos.⁵

Besides her strategic importance, Chalkis also enjoyed a location favorable for trade. Her port could be approached both from the north and south, and the agora was placed near the sea for the convenience of merchants. This is pointed out by the author ("Dikaiarchos") of a Periegesis composed in Hellenistic or Roman times. Since this work contains the only ancient description of Chalkis, I quote the pertinent section in full: Ἡ δὲ τῶν Χαλκιδέων πόλις ἐστὶ μὲν σταδίων ο', μείζων τῆς ἐξ Ἀνθηδόνου εἰς αὐτὴν φερούσης ὁδοῦ· γεώλοφος δὲ πᾶσα καὶ σύσκιος, ὕδατα ἔχουσα τὰ μὲν πολλὰ ἄλκυά, ἐν δ' ἡσυχῇ μὲν ὑπόπλατυ, τῇ δὲ χρεῖα ὕγι-

ταύτας· ἐπὶ μὲν γε Πελοποννήσῳ Κόρινθος καὶ ἡ Κορινθίων ἀκρόπολις ἐτετείσχιστο, ἐπὶ δὲ Εὐβοίᾳ καὶ Βοιωτοῖς τε καὶ Φωκεῦσι Χαλκὶς ἡ πρὸς τῷ Εὐρίπῳ, κατὰ δὲ Θεσσαλῶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ Αἰτωλῶν ἔθνους Μαγνησίαν τὴν ὑπὸ τὸ Πήλιον κατεῖχεν. Cf. also Polybios, XVIII, 11, 4-8.

4. Livy, XXVII, 6, 10-11: tum et oppidum alia parte clausum mari, alia ab terra egregie munitum praesidio-que valido firmatum...stabile atque inexpugnabile fuit.
5. Strabo, X, 1, 8.

εινὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς κρήνης τῆς καλουμένης Ἀρεθοῦ-
σης ῥέον ἱκανὸν, ὥς δυναμένης παρέχειν τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς πηγῆς νᾶμα
πᾶσι τοῖς τὴν πόλιν κατοικοῦσι. Καὶ τοῖς κοινοῖς δὲ ἡ πόλις
διαφόρως κατεσκευάσται γυμνασίοις, στοαῖς, ἱεροῖς, θεάτροις,
γραφαῖς, ἀνδριάσι, τῇ ἀγορᾷ κειμένη πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἐργασιῶν
χρείας ἀνυπερβλήτως. Ὁ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς Βοιωτίας Σαλγανέως
καὶ τῆς τῶν Εὐβοέων θαλάττης ῥοῦς εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συμβάλλων κατὰ
τὸν Εὐριπὸν φέρεται παρ' αὐτὰ τὰ τοῦ λιμένος τεῖχη, καθ' ὃ
συμβαίνει τὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐμπόριον εἶναι πύλην, ταύτης δ' ἔχεσθαι
τὴν ἀγορὰν πλατεῖάν τε οὖσαν καὶ στοαῖς τρισὶ συνειλημ-
μένην. Σύνεγγυς οὖν κειμένου τῆς ἀγορᾶς τοῦ λιμένος καὶ
ταχείας τῆς ἐκ τῶν πλοίων γινομένης τῶν φορτίων ἐκκομιδῆς,
πολὺς ὁ καταπλέων ἐστὶν εἰς τὸ ἐμπόριον. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Εὐριπος
δισσὸν ἔχων τὸν εἴσπλουν ἐφέλκεται τὸν ἔμπορον εἰς τὴν πόλιν.
Ἡ δὲ χώρα πᾶσα αὐτῶν ἐλαιόφυτος, ἀγαθὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ θάλαττα.
Οἱ δ' ἐνοικοῦντες Ἕλληνες οὐ τῷ γένει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ
φωνῇ· τῶν μαθημάτων ἐντός· φιλαπόδημοι· γραμματικοί· τὰ
προσπίπτουτα ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος δυσχερῇ γευναίως φέροντες·
δουλεύοντες γὰρ πολλὴν ἤδη χρόνον, τοῖς δὲ τρόποις ὄντες.
ἐλεύθεροι, μεγάλην εἰλήφασιν ἔξιν τοῦ φέρειν ῥαθύμως τὰ
προσπίπτουτα. Ὁ στίχος Φιλίσκου·

6

Χρηστῶν σφόδρ' ἐστὶ Χαλκὶς Ἑλλήνων πόλις.

-
6. "Dikaiarchos," 1, 26-30, in C. Müller, Geographi Graeci
Minores, I (Paris, 1853), pp. 105-109. This passage is

Because of the lack of systematic archaeological investigation at Chalkis, we can elaborate little on this

from a group of three fragments, generally assumed to be from the same work, of which both the date and the author are very uncertain. It must have been written after 290 B.C., for it mentions the city of Demetrias, which was founded then. But the generally accepted terminus ante quem, 171 B.C., based on the mention of Haliartos (1, 25), which was destroyed that year, is very questionable, since the city is named only in an almost proverbial quotation. The work is dated 250-200 B.C. by Müller, op. cit., pp. 97-98; 260-247 B.C. by E. Fabricius, "Über die Abfassungszeit der Griechischen Städtebilder des Herakleides," Bonner Studien für R. Kekule (Berlin, 1890), pp. 58-66; and 192-191 B.C. by G. F. Unger, "Herakleides Pontikos der Kritiker," Rhein. Mus., XXXVIII (1883), pp. 481-506. The author was not Dikaiarchos of Messenia, the pupil of Aristotle; he may have been a third or second century writer named Herakleides (Unger, loc. cit., and Fabricius, loc. cit.), but probably not an Athenian, as suggested by Müller (loc. cit.). Why the author should make the obvious statement that the Chalkidians are Greeks is difficult to explain, and it seems strange at any period. It

description of the city. The fountain Arethousa, famous in antiquity,⁷ which, according to "Dikaiarchos," supplied the whole city although its water was somewhat brackish, has been identified with some springs that lie about three miles to the southwest of the Euripos along an ancient wagon road⁸ which followed the coast line toward Eretria. The springs

must have been written by someone from outside mainland Greece, and perhaps after Chalkis had been known for some time as a town maintaining foreign garrisons. The whole problem of the fragments needs thorough study, both philological and historical. My own impression is that the essay is later than it is usually dated. The description of Chalkis is so general, however, that the exact date makes little difference for our purpose, once it is clear that the work is of the Hellenistic or Roman period.

7. Ion of Chios, frag. 17 (Müller); Strabo, X, 1, 13; Pliny, Nat. Hist., IV, 12, 21; Athenaios, VII, 278e; VIII, 331e; Stephanos Byzantios (ed. A. Meineke [Berlin, 1849]), s.v. 'Αρέθουσα.
8. Ulrichs, op. cit., pp. 215-216; G. Papabasileiou, "Περὶ τῆς ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ πόλεως Χαλκίδος," Athena, III (1891), pp. 607-608. On the map accompanying the latter article (opposite p. 606) Arethousa is not in its proper

are near the sea and empty into a small bay. In this area have been found ancient fragments of foundation blocks and capitals and a fourth century inscription which warns of a sacred temenos.⁹

Above Arethousa toward the north rises a hill on which apparently was located the early acropolis of Chalkis; on it there are remains of ancient walls.¹⁰ In the surrounding area have been found tombs ranging in age from the Neolithic Period down through the Mykenanian Age.¹¹ From the acropolis the city expanded north and west until it covered most of the wide peninsula which juts out to the Euripos.

The epigraphical and literary sources give us further information concerning the public buildings and landmarks which "Dikaiarchos" mentions, although the agora, which

place and does not agree with the description given in the text. The map in P.W., R.E., VI, col. 2079, is correct.

9. I.G., XII, 9, 935: μη ἐγβαίνειν εἰς τὰ χωρία. Cf. Papabasileiou, loc. cit.
10. Papabasileiou, op. cit., p. 608. He is not precise concerning the date of the walls, but calls them Pelasgian.
11. Papabasileiou, Περὶ τῶν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ Ἀρχαίων Τάφων (Athens, 1910), pp. 2-46.

especially impressed him, must lie under the modern town. Remains of an ancient theater, wall, and water-works have been¹² noted in the area between the acropolis and the Euripos, but they have not been excavated. There was a temple of¹³ Zeus Olympios at Chalkis in the middle of the fifth century, and an inscription of Roman times mentions a temenos of the Nymph Chalkis, daughter of Aisopos, which contained a grove¹⁴ and a stoa. To the west of the city, at the head of the Lelantine Plain, was found a fifth century inscription read-¹⁵ ing [T]έμενος [A]θηναίης. Although we know that Athene¹⁶ was worshipped at Chalkis, the provenience of the stone suggests that it should be connected with the temenos set¹⁷ up by the Athenian klerouchy on the Lelantine Plain.

From literary sources we learn of other monuments. In the agora could be seen a stele commemorating the exploits

12. Papabasileiou, Athens, III (1891), p. 610.

13. I.G., I², 39, 61-62.

14. I.G., XII, 9, 906; cf. Papabasileiou, Athens, I (1889), pp. 311-313.

15. I.G., XII, 9, 935; cf. Papabasileiou, Athens, III (1891), p. 612.

16. Suidas (ed. A. Adler [Leipzig, 1928-1938]), s.v. Παλληνίς· ἡ Ἀθηναῖα ἐν Χαλκίδι.

17. Ailian, Var. Hist., VI, 1; see below, pp. 149-155.

of Kleomachos of Pharsalos in the Lelantine War,¹⁸ and on a road that led to the Euripos was a spot called the ¹⁹τάφος ²⁰καίδων. There were also places with mythological connections called ²¹'Αρπάγιον and ²²'Αμαζόνειον. Plutarch mentions a Πυρσόφιον, which was probably a watch-tower or a lighthouse, and near it a building called 'Ακμαίων Λέσχη, in which ²²picked young men lived. Finally, we know that there were in Chalkis, at least in the second century B.C., a gymnasium dedica-

18. Plutarch, Amatorius, 17.

19. Plutarch, Aetia Graeca, 22.

20. Athenaios, XIII, 601f: οἱ δὲ προειρημένοι Χαλκιδεῖς παρ' αὐτοῖς φασιν ἄρπασθῆναι τὸν Γανυμήδην ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τὸν τόπον δεικνύντες 'Αρπάγιον καλοῦσιν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ μυρρίναι διάφοροι πεφύκασιν.

21. Plutarch, Theseus, 27, 6: τὰς τετρωμένας φασὶ τῶν 'Αμαζόνων...εἰς Χαλκίδα λάθρα διαπεμφθείσας τυγχάνειν ἐπιμελείας, καὶ ταφῆναί τινας ἐκεῖ περὶ τὸ νῦν 'Αμαζόνειον καλούμενον.

22. Aetia Graeca, 33. The meaning of Πυρσόφιον is not clear, but C. Bursian's suggestion (Geographie von Griechenland, II [Leipzig, 1872], p. 415, note 1) that it is equal to Πυρσοφόρειον (i.e., fire-bearing) seems likely. Cf. W. R. Halliday, Greek Questions of Plutarch (Oxford, 1928), pp. 147-148.

23

ted to Herakles and a Delphinion of Apollo.

Although "Dikaiarchos" stresses trade at Chalkis, he does not mention the city's products, except to say that the land grew olives and that "the sea is good." We know that the Chalkidians took from the sea not only fish for food,²⁴ but also murex for purple dye.²⁵ From other sources we hear more of agricultural products. The Lelantine Plain, which stretched south and west of the city, was noted for its wine.²⁶ Chalkis was praised for her figs,²⁷ and her grass

23. Plutarch, Flamininus, 16, 5. Plutarch states that out of gratitude to Flamininus the Chalkidians dedicated these buildings Τίτῳ καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ and Τίτῳ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι, but they may well have been older structures merely re-dedicated. I.G., XII, 9, 952, is a list of victors in contests held in honor of Herakles in the second century B.C., and traces of the gymnasium have been noted to the west of the city; I. Matsas, "Ἐπίγραφαὶ Εὐβοίας," Athens, XI (1899), p. 294.

24. Athenaios, IV, 132c; VII, 288b, and 330a.

25. Aristotle, de Anim. Hist., V, 547a; Athenaios, III, 88c.

26. Theognis (ed. E. Diehl, Anth. Lyr. Gr.,^f [Teubner, 1936]), 784: ἀμπελόεν πέδιον; the present name of the plain is Ἀμπέλιο. Cf. also Athenaios, I, 30f; scholia (ed. W. Dindorf [Oxford, 1863]) to Euripides, Phoen., 238.

27. Athenaios, III, 75f.

and almond trees were considered beneficial in the produc-
tion of honey.²⁸ Livestock raising must have been important.²⁹
The very name of the Chalkidic aristocracy, the Hippobotai,²⁹
testifies to the prevalence of horse-breeding, and we have
references to the sheep and goats of Chalkis.³⁰ There is no
specific mention of cattle raised in the territory, unless
there is some truth in the statement of Hekataios³¹ that
Chalkis formerly was called Euboia; the very name is evidence
that cattle were raised there. But the Lelantine Plain was
often in dispute between Chalkis and Eretria, and even when
in possession of it, Chalkis probably did not have enough
productive land to support her population. This is shown by
her extensive colonization, which, in one case, is connected
by the sources directly with a famine.³²

The most important resources of Chalkis, especial-
ly for trading purposes, must have been her metals. Both

28. Aristotle, de Mir. Ausc., 832a.

frag. 603 (ed. V. Rose [Teubner, 1886]).

7a/ 30. Aristotle, de Part. Anim., 676~~b~~; de Anim. Hist., 449b.

7a/ 30. Aristotle, de Part. Anim., 676~~b~~; de Anim. Hist., 449b.
Aristotle's interest is in reporting that these animals
had no spleen.

31. Frag. 129 (Jacoby).

32. See below, pp. 78-79.

copper and iron were mined and worked there.³³ The supply
 had been exhausted by the time of Strabo,³⁴ but it seems to
 have lasted at least until the second half of the fourth cen-
 tury B.C.³⁵ Although the sources which state outright that
 metals were mined and worked at Chalkis are relatively late,
 their evidence is confirmed by the mention of Chalkidic metal
 products as early as Alkaios.³⁶ Because of the lack of ex-

-
33. Strabo, X, 1, 9: καὶ μέταλλον δ' ὑπῆρχε θαυμαστὸν χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου κοινόν, ὅπερ οὐχ ἱστοροῦσιν ἀλλαχοῦ συμβαῖνον· νυνὶ μέντοι ἀμφοτέρω ἐκλέλοιπει. Eustathios, in Dionys., 764: 'Ἰστορεῖται δὲ καὶ σιδήρου καὶ χαλκοῦ μέταλλα εἶναι κατὰ τὴν Εὐβοϊκὴν Χαλκίδα, καὶ ὅτι ἄριστοι ἐκεῖ σιδηρουργοί. Cf. also Eustathios, in Iliad., X, 435; Steph. Byz., s.v. Χαλκίς.
34. Loc. cit.; cf. also Plutarch, de Defectu Graec., 43.
35. Strabo (IX, 2, 18) mentions μεταλλευτὴς Κράτης ἀνὴρ Χαλκιδεύς, who started to drain Lake Kopais during Alexander's reign.
36. Frag. 54 (ed. E. Diehl, Anthologia Lyrica Graeca, I² [Teubner, 1936]): Χαλκιδικὰ σπάθαι. See also Aischylos, frag. 356 (ed. A. Nauck, Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta [Leipzig, 1889]): Εὐβοϊκὸν ξίφος. I.G., I², 241, 108, has a ποτέριον ἀργ[υ]ρῶν Χαλκιδικόν among the items in the account of the Treasurers of Athens for 425/4 (cf.

cavation at Chalkis and since metal work, unlike pottery, has not survived in quantity, there is little bronze work which

also lines 87-88). Κύλικες Χαλκιδικαί are also included in a Delian temple inventory of 364 B.C. (T. Homolle, "Inventaires des Temples Déliens," B.C.H., X [1886], p. 462, line 15). These apparently were cups of a particular type; whether they were made in Chalkis or not, the name implies that metal cups were made there or in the colonies in Thrace. In view of the other evidence for metal working in Chalkis, the more likely inference is that the term came from Euboea, as pointed out by A. Böckh, Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener, II (3rd edition, revised by M. Fränkel, Berlin, 1886), pp. 149-150. But the possibility of the type having come from the Thracian Chalkidike can not be precluded. In Aristophanes, Equites, 237, the sight of a Χαλκιδικὸν ποτήριον leads Kleon to accuse Agorakritos of plotting the revolt of the Chalkidians. The type of cup here meant is uncertain although the reference is obviously to the Chalkidians in Thrace, even though the scholiast (ed. W. Dindorf [Oxford, 1835]) refers it to those in Euboea, adding: ἐχρῶντο δὲ τοῖς ὀστρακίνοις εἰς τὰ συμπόσια. Athenaios, XI, 502b, although he is describing the various shapes of cups, is only guessing

can be attributed with certainty to Chalkis. However, the literary evidence by itself seems strong enough to prove that

from the context of the Equites when he says: Χαλκιδικὰ ποτήρια, ἴσως ἀπὸ τῆς Χαλκίδος τῆς Θρακικῆς εὐδοκιμοῦντα. It is really impossible to determine the origin of the term Χαλκιδικόν as applied to a cup in the passage of Aristophanes, for whether it came from Eubœia or Thrace makes little difference to the joke. It might even be a pun on a bronze cup. We can not insist on the passage as evidence for Chalkidic metal work, as does H. Dondorff, De Rebus Chalcidensium (Halle, 1855), p. 21.

37. A. Blakeway, "Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Commerce with the West, 800-600 B.C.," B.S.A., XXXIII (1932-1933), p. 207, note 2. Some bronzes found on the Athenian acropolis have been attributed to Chalkis; A. de Ridder, "Un Bronze Chalcidien sur l'Acropole," B.C.H., XX (1896), pp. 401-422, and Catalogue des Bronzes Trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes (Paris, 1896), pp. XIV-XVII. One bears an inscription in what is probably the Chalkidic alphabet (de Ridder, Catalogue, no. 55). Many metal vases were formerly attributed to Chalkis, but K. A. Neugebauer, "Reifarchaische Bronzevasen mit Zungenmuster," Röm. Mitt., XXXVIII-XXXIX

there was a metal industry in Chalkis. Besides finished³⁸ products, it is probable, as Dondorff suggests, that the Chalkidians also exported copper or bronze to Korinth, which had no supply of its own even though it had a metal working³⁹ industry.

In view of the copper in the vicinity of the city, it seems almost certain that the name Chalkis is in its root connected with χαλκός.⁴⁰ The only other possibility is to derive it from χάλκη,⁴¹ which means the murex. According to⁴² Hekataios, an earlier name of the city was Euboia, and it

(1923-1924), pp. 341-440, has maintained that they were products of the cities of Southern Italy, and his conclusions are generally accepted (cf. W. Lamb, Greek and Roman Bronzes [London, 1929], pp. 133-134).

- 38. Op. cit., p. 22.
- 39. Pausanias, II, 3, 3.
- 40. Other meanings of χαλκίς are: an unknown bird (Iliad, XIV, 291), a type of fish (Aristotle, de Anim. Hist., 543a), and a lizard (Aristotle, op. cit., 604b).
- 41. Dondorff, Die Ionier auf Euboia (Berlin, 1860), p. 29. The ordinary spelling is κάλχη, but Suidas has χάλκη· πόρφυρα.
- 42. Frag. 129 (Jacoby).

is quite possible that the name of its most important city might spread to the whole island, which would lead to the renaming of the city.⁴³ Stephanos records that the earliest name of the town was Στύμφηλος.⁴⁴

We have seen that the area around Chalkis was inhabited from the Neolithic Age.⁴⁵ The earliest inhabitants of whom we hear are the semi-mythical Kouretes, who are said to have fought over the Lelantine Plain and to have gone to Aitolia when expelled from Euboia.⁴⁶ The tradition of their

43. Pliny, Nat. Hist., IV, 12, 21, states that the island was once called Chalkis. This is probably only a confusion of the change mentioned by Hekataios.
44. Σ.Υ.Χαλκίς; Hesychios gives the form Στύμφη. Stephanos also adds that Chalkis was called Hypochalkis, but this is a confusion with Aitolian Chalkis; A. Meineke, Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum Quae Supersunt (Berlin, 1849), pp. 683-684. Pliny, Nat. Hist., IV, 12, 21, is mistaken in equating Chalkis with Oichalia; the latter was in Eretrian territory (F. Geyer, Topographie und Geschichte der Insel Euboia, I [Berlin, 1903], p. 77).
45. Above, p. 6.
46. Archemachos, in Strabo, X, 3-6; see above, p. 15, note 44.

origin was much confused in antiquity and Strabo⁴⁷ gives several theories: they were autochthonous, Akarnanians, Phrygians, Kretans. They were, however, credited with having introduced⁴⁸ bronze into Euboia. If this is true, we may identify them tentatively with the inhabitants of the Early Helladic Period, who apparently invaded Greece from Asia Minor, bringing the⁴⁹ art of working metal with them.

The early inhabitants of Chalkis of whom we hear the most were the Abantes. They controlled the whole island of Euboia and thus gave it one of its early names, 'Αβαντίς.⁵⁰ According to tradition, their King Chalkodon, before the Trojan War, also ruled over part of the mainland, and the Thebans were subject to him until they revolted under Amphitryon and⁵¹ killed Chalkodon in battle. Elphenor, the son of Chalkodon,

47. X, 3.

48. Strabo, X, 3, 19; Eustathios, in Dionys., 764.

49. J. B. Haley and C. W. Blegen, "The Coming of the Greeks," A.J.A., XXXII (1928), pp. 141-154. Αήλαντον is probably a pre-Greek name.

50. Hesiod, frag. 186 (ed. A. Rzach [Teubner, 1913]); Strabo, X, 1, 3; Pliny, Nat. Hist., IV, 12, 21; Suidas, s.v. 'Αβαντίς.

51. Plutarch, Narrat. Amat., 3, 774c: 'Αμφιτρυών ... εἰς τὴν Θηβαίων ἀφίκετο πόλιν καὶ Χαλκιδεῦσιν ὑποφόρους

is credited with leading to Troy the Abantes from all of Eu-
52
boia:

οἱ δ' Εὐβοίαν ἔχον μένεα πνεύοντες Ἀβάντες,
Χαλκίδα τ' Εἰρέτριάν τε πολυστράφυλόν θ' Ἰστίαίαν
Κήρινθόν τ' ἔφαλον Δίου τ' αἶψ' πτολίεθρον,
οἳ τε Κάρυστον ἔχον ἡδ' οἱ Στύρα ναιετάασκον,
τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευ' Ἐλεφήνωρ, ὄζος Ἀρῆος,
Χαλκωδοντιάδης, μεγαθύμων ἀρχὸς Ἀβάντων.
τῷ δ' ἄμ' Ἀβάντες ἔποντο θροί, ὅπιθεν κομόωντες,
αἰχμηταὶ μεμαῶτες ὀρεκτῆσιν μελίσσιν
θώρηκας ῥήξειν δηῖων ἀμφὶ στήθεσσι.
τῷ δ' ἄμα τεσσαράκοντα μέλαινα νῆες ἔποντο.

From this passage in the Homeric "Catalogue of Ships" ⁵³ we

λαβὼν ἔπαυσε τὸ δάσμον, Χαλκῳδοντα τὸν βασιλέα τῶν
Εὐβοιέων ἀποκτείνας. Pausanias, IX, 19, 3, mentions
the tomb of Chalkodon in Boiotia. Perhaps to this per-
iod should be referred frag. 212 (Jacoby) of Theopompus:
ὕστερον δὲ οἱ Χαλκιδεῖς πολεμήσαντες Αἰολεῦσι τοῖς τὴν
ἡπειρον ἔχουσι, Χαλίοις καὶ Βοιωτοῖς καὶ Ὀρχομενίοις
καὶ Θηβαίοις.

52. Iliad, II, 536-545.

53. I accept the catalogue as representing the distribution
of the Greeks in Mykenaiian times; T. W. Allen, The Ho-
meric Catalogue of Ships (Oxford, 1921), especially
pp. 142-146.

may assume that the Abantes were the inhabitants of Euboia in the Mykenian Age. As such they must have been Greeks who had come from the north either in the general invasion about 2000 B.C. or in a smaller incursion thereafter.⁵⁴ The best ancient tradition agrees that they came from the north, specifically, from Thrace by way of Phokis.⁵⁵

-
54. For the northern origin of the Greeks and their arrival in Greece ca. 2000 B.C. see C. W. Blegen, "Pre-classical Greece," Studies in the Arts and Architecture (Univ. of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference, Philadelphia, 1941), pp. 9-11.
55. Aristotle, frag. 601 (from Strabo, X, 1, 3): φησὶ δ' Ἀριστοτέλης ἐξ Ἀβας τῆς Φωκικῆς Θράκας ὁρμηθέντας ἐποικῆσαι τὴν νῆσον καὶ ἐπονομάσαι Ἀβαντας τοὺς ἔχοντας αὐτήν. See also Arrian, frag. 68 (Jacoby). The eponymous hero Abas was connected both with Argos (Pausanias, II, 16, 2; Apollodoros, I, 9, 13; scholiast [ed. Drachmann] to Pindar, Pyth., VIII, 73) and with Athens (Eustathios, in Iliad., II, 540; scholiast to Iliad., II, 536). Dondorff maintained that the Abantes were Karians (op. cit., p. 54), since Karians and Abantes from Euboia were said to have been in Chios in mythical times (Pausanias, VII, 9, 4). But more recent archaeological evidence seems to have disproved this theory; cf. Blegen, op. cit., pp. 9-11.

We can only conjecture on the basis of late tradition to which branch of the Greeks the Abantes belonged. Strabo, discussing the foundation of Chalkis and Eretria, gives the following version: ⁵⁶ ἀμφοτέραι δὲ πρὸ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων ἐκτίσθαι λέγονται, καὶ μετὰ τὰ Τρωϊκὰ Αἰκλῶς καὶ Κόθος, ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν ὀρμηθέντες, ὁ μὲν τὴν Ἐρέτριαν ᾤκισε, Κόθος δὲ τὴν Χαλκίδα. καὶ τῶν Αἰολέων δέ τινες ἀπὸ τῆς Πενθίλου στρατιᾶς κατέμειναν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ, τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν καὶ Ἄραβες οἱ Κάδμω συνδιαβάντες. The story of the Athenian founding must represent the arrival of the Ionians in Euboea. There is no mention of the Abantes in the above account, even though Strabo has just said that they ruled all of Euboea, and it is a fair assumption that one of these three races---the Ionians, the Aiolians, or the Ἄραβες---were the Abantes. ⁵⁷ The Ἄραβες most likely were the pre-Greek peoples, perhaps the Kouretes; ⁵⁸ they would not be the Greek Abantes. And

56. X, 1, 8.

57. The only reference to another race at Chalkis is in Nonnos Panopolitanos, *Dionysiaca*, XIII, 166: Χαλκίς, ὀπισθυκόμων μητρόπολις Ἑλλοπιῶν. But the Ellorians were found only in northern Euboea; Geyer, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

58. See above, pp. 15-16. Geyer, *op. cit.*, p. 22, considers the tradition of the Ἄραβες to have come from a

Herodotos states that the Abantes were not Ionians, although⁵⁹ they took part in the Ionic colonization of Asia Minor.

Therefore we are left with the Aiolians as the Abantes. This⁶⁰ is supported in a story, told by Plutarch, of the Athenian founding of Chalkis after the Trojan War; in it the Athenians are said to have taken the city from the Aiolians.

We have seen that there are traditions of two Ionian invasions of or migrations to Chalkis, one before and one after the Trojan War.⁶¹ The later one is proved by the fact that in the fifth century the Chalkidians were considered⁶² Ionians. The tradition regarding the earlier Ionic invasion

Boiotian invasion. But they would still seem to be the pre-Greeks in Boiotia.

59. I, 146, 1.

60. Aetia Graeca, 22.

61. Strabo, loc. cit.; for the early invasion see also Skymnos (ed. A. Meineke [Berlin, 1846]), 572-574, and scholia (ed. C. Wendel [Berlin, 1935]) to Apollonios Rhodios, Argonautica, I, 97; for the later see Plutarch, Aetia Graeca, 22, and Velleius Paterculus, I, 4, 1.

62. Herodotos, VIII, 46, 2: Χαλκιδέες τὰς ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ εἴκοσι παρεχόμενοι καὶ Ἑρετριέες τὰς ἑπτὰ· οὗτοι δὲ Ἴωνές εἰσι. Thuc., IV, 61, 2: τὸ δὲ Χαλκιδικὸν τῇ Ἰάδι συγγενείᾳ. The Chalkidians were connected with

may only be a projection into the past of the later. But if,

the myths and worship of Apollo (Klearchos, frag. 46 [Müller]; Hymn to Apollo, 425), and worshipped at the Ionic shrine, Delos (Pausanias, IX, 13, 6: ἄσμα πεποιημένου ἐστὶ [ἐς] προόδιον ἐς Δῆλον τοῖς ἐπ'Εὐρίπῳ Χαλκιδεῦσι). Although the obvious assumption from this evidence is that the Chalkidians were Ionians from the time of the Ionic migration, Geyer, op. cit., pp. 21-22, maintains that Euboea was not considered Ionic until after the middle of the sixth century, basing his argument on Herodotos, VII, 51, 1: Κῦρος ὁ Καμβύσῃ 'Ιωνίην πᾶσαν πλην Ἀθηνέων κατεστρέψατο δασμοφόρον εἶναι Πέρσῃσι. From this he infers that Herodotos did not consider Euboea to have been part of Ionia at the time of Kambyzes, since that island was not under his control. But the passage is from a speech by Artabanos, who is trying to persuade Xerxes not to attack Greece or trust the Ionians, and is rhetorical exaggeration (to the glory of Athens?); it can not stand against the specific statement of Herodotos (VIII, 46, 2) quoted above. Certainly the population of the island did not change between 550 and 480, and one Attic klerouchy could not, as Geyer suggests, Ionicize it in 26 years (506-480). In any case the natural interpretation of

63

as is suggested by Blegen, the earliest Greeks were Ionians, it may really represent the earliest Greek invasion. If this is true, we may make the following tentative reconstruction of the changes in population at Chalkis: in the general invasion about 2000 B.C., Greeks of Ionic stock arrived and overcame the pre-Greek Kouretes; then, perhaps about 1600-1400, the Abantes, of Aiolic stock, took the power from the Ionians; finally, in the general upheaval after the Trojan War and under pressure of the Dorian invasion, more Ionians migrated to Euboia. We know that the Abantes took part in the Ionic colonization of Asia Minor,⁶⁴ and it is most likely that they had become intermingled with the earlier Ionians, and almost lost their identity after the arrival of the later group. However, the coming of the Ionians was perhaps peace-

'Ιωνίην πᾶσαν would not include all the Ionic poleis in the Hellenic world.

63. "Athens and the Early Age of Greece," Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., Suppl. Vol. I (1940), p. 8.

64. Herodotos, I, 146, 1: τῶν [Ἰώνων ἐν Ἀσίᾳ] Ἀβαντες μὲν ἐξ Εὐβοίης εἰσὶ οὐκ ἐλαχίστη μοῖρα, τοῖσι Ἰωνίης μετὰ οὐδὲ τοῦ οὐνόματος οὐδέν. To this migration belong the Abantes in Chios (Pausanias, VII, 4, 9) and the Chalkideis near Teos and Erythrai (Strabo, XIV, 1, 31).

65

ful, and the name of the Abantes may have survived at Chal-
 kis among the wealthy nobles, the Hippobotai.⁶⁶

-
65. There may be a hint of this in Plutarch's story (Aetia Graeca, 22) that the Athenians first bought the land before invading it, although they are said to have obtained it from children with toys, to satisfy an oracle.
66. The evidence, however, is slight. 'Αβαντίς was the name of one of the tribes in Chalkis in the first century after Christ (I.G., XII, 9, 946). Plutarch (The-
 seus, 5, 2) says that it was to the Abantes that Archi-
 lochos referred in his lines which mention the δεσπότες
 Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί and seem to be connected with the
 Lelantine War (frag. 3, [ed. E. Diehl]; see below,
 pp. 94-95); however, the word Abantes does not appear
 in the passage of Archilochos, and probably their as-
 sociation with the lines was Plutarch's idea, not that
 of Archilochos. Philochoros (frag. 89 [Müller]; see
 below, pp. 175-179), in referring to Perikles' victory
 over Chalkis in 446, says that he conquered the Abantes.
 All of these references may well be conscious archaisms;
 yet the word seems strange in Philochoros in a descrip-
 tion of the campaign of 446. This campaign was di-
 rected primarily against the Hippobotai, the landed
 nobility of Chalkis, who were exiled thereafter (Plu-

After the unsettled times following the Trojan War, when Chalkis escaped the destruction caused by the Dorians throughout much of Greece, the city probably recovered rapidly from the disturbances of the Ionian migration. She seems to be prosperous when next we hear of her; funeral games, on a grand scale, were held for King Amphidamas of Chalkis by his sons and his brother Panedes. At these games, according to tradition, took place the contest in which Hesiod⁶⁷ defeated Homer and won the tripod which he dedicated to the

tarch, Pericles, 23). Therefore, in the passage of Philochoros Abantes may equal Hippobotai. It is possible that these wealthy knights were the descendants of the Abantes and would continue to claim the name of their ancestors, who had been made famous in the Iliad, long after their blood was in reality Ionian. But whether the Hippobotai claimed the name of the Abantes or not, there can be no doubt that Chalkis was Ionian (see above, p. 20, note 62).

67. Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi, 60-70; Plutarch, Septem Sapientum Convivium, 10, 153E; Comm. in Hesiod., 62. The sources for the contest are conveniently grouped by T. W. Allen, Homeri Opera, V (Oxford, 1911), pp. 218-238.

68

Muses on Mt. Helikon. The fancifulness of the tradition of the contest affords no reason for doubting the historicity of Amphidamas or the games. The tradition seems to go back at least to the seventh century,⁶⁹ and it probably was based on lines 650-662 of the Works and Days of Hesiod, who states that in Chalkis he won a contest at the funeral games of Amphidamas. Since there is no mention of Homer in these lines, there seems to be no valid reason for rejecting them.⁷⁰ Therefore Amphidamas was an historical person contemporary

68. Pausanias, IX, 31, 3.

69. The tradition can be traced back through Alkidamas in the fourth century, perhaps to the Cyclic poet Lesches; T. W. Allen, "Lives of Homer," J.H.S., XXXIII (1913), pp. 24-26; J. G. Winter, "A New Fragment on the Life of Homer," T.A.P.A., LVI (1925), pp. 120-129; C. Gallavotti, "Generi e Tradizione Letteraria dell' Agone tra Omero ed Esiodo," Riv. di Fil., LVII (1929), pp. 31-59.

70. The verses are bracketed by Rzach, pp. 88-89, with this explanation: "Suppositos indicavit Plutarchus" (Sept. Sap. Conviv., 10, 153E). But if the lines had been interpolated after the tradition of the contest had arisen, the name of Homer certainly would have appeared in them; see Gallavotti, op. cit., pp. 40-41.

with Hesiod, in the later part of the ninth century.⁷¹ The only other information we have concerning him is Plutarch's statement that he died fighting the Eretrians at sea over the⁷² Lelantine Plain. This story probably comes from the early tradition of the contest of Homer and Hesiod, the validity of which Plutarch is denying; yet that tradition may well be trustworthy in details of this kind, for, although the contest was imaginary, it was built on the story of the funeral games of a real king. Amphidamas probably died in a war with Eretria, one of many over the Lelantine Plain, which was a⁷³ constant bone of contention between Chalkis and Eretria.

71. I accept the dating of the Works and Days ca. 800 B.C. by T. W. Allen, "The Date of Hesiod," J.H.S., XXXV (1915), pp. 85-99.

72. Comm. in Hesiod., 62: ναυμαχοῦντα πρὸς Ἐρετρίεας ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀηλάντου ἀποθανεῖν. F. Hermann, "Der Kampf zwischen Chalcis und Eretria um des Lelantische Gefilde," Rhein. Mus., I (1832), pp. 91-92, emends ναυμαχοῦντα to μονομαχοῦντα because Thucydides (I, 13, 4) states that the first sea battle did not take place until 664. But we know that fighting by individual ships took place earlier (see below, pp. 95-96), and so the emendation is unwarranted.

73. Their enmity became almost proverbial. Plutarch, de

Shortly after the death of Amphidamas the reign of hereditary kings came to an end at Chalkis. In the first half of the eighth century, the government passed into the hands of the wealthy knights, the so-called Hippobotai,⁷⁴

Herod. Mal., 35, with reference to the war against Persia, writes: οὐτε γὰρ Αἰγινήτας ἐκώλυσεν ἡ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους διαφορά καὶ Χαλκιδεῖς ἡ πρὸς Ἑρετριέας καὶ Κορινθίους ἡ πρὸς Μεγαρέας τῇ Ἑλλάδι συμμαχεῖν. Amphidamas has sometimes been connected with the Lelantine War (e.g., A. R. Burn, "The So-called 'Trade-Leagues' in Early Greek History and the Lelantine War," J.H.S., XLIX [1929], pp. 33-36). This is chronologically impossible, as the war took place after the founding of the western colonies of Chalkis, as Burn himself admits (loc. cit.), and these colonies were sent out under the government of the Hippobotai, after the period of the kings (Aristotle, frag. 603). See below, Chapter III.

74. Aristotle, Politica, IV, 1289b:... ἵπποτροφίας (τοῦτο γὰρ οὐ ῥάδιον μὴ πλακοῦντας ποιεῖν· διόπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων ὅσαις πόλεσιν ἐν τοῖς ἵπποις ἡ δύναμις ἦν, ὀλιγαρχίαι παρὰ τοῦτοις ἦσαν· ἐχρῶντο δὲ πρὸς τοὺς πολέμους ἵπποις πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας, οἷον Ἑρετριεῖς καὶ Χαλκιδεῖς καὶ Μάγνητες οἱ ἐπὶ Μαιάνδρῳ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πολλοὶ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν). The date is determined by

75

who may have been the descendants of the Homeric Abantes.
 The only detail of the oligarchic constitution of the Hippobotai which we know is that no one under fifty years of age
 76
 could hold office. There was a similar government at Eretria, and the two new oligarchies must have settled, temporarily, their differences over the Lelantine Plain; for very soon the two cities are found colonizing together in
 77
 an apparently friendly manner.

78

Under the rule of the Hippobotai, Chalkis prospered,

Aristotle, frag. 603, where it is stated that the colonies of Chalkis were sent under the Hippobotai; the first of these colonies in the West, Kyme, can be dated between 775 and 750, and the colonies in Thrace were probably settled about the same time (see below, pp. 70 and 74).

75. See above, p. 23, note 66.

76. Herakleides, frag. 31, 2 (Müller): νόμον δὲ ἦν Χαλκιδεῦσι μὴ ἄρξαι μηδὲ πρεσβεῦσαι νεώτερον ἐτῶν πεντήκοντα. Aristotle, frag. 603:... ἡνίκα ἡ τῶν ἱπποβοτῶν ἐπεκράτει πολιτεία· προέστησαν γὰρ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τιμημάτων ἄνδρες ἀριστοκρατικῶς ἄρχοντες.

77. See below, p. 30.

78. Strabo, X, 1, 8: αἱ δ' οὖν πόλεις αὗται [Χαλκίς καὶ Ἐρέτρια] διαφερόντως αὐξηθεῖσαι καὶ ἀποικίας ἐξέστειλαν ἀξιολόγους....

and her prosperity was undoubtedly based on sea-borne trade as well as on her metal industry. Chalkidian sailors must have been among the first to explore the western seas and to trade with the Etruscans,⁷⁹ and Euboia had very early gained the epithet ναυσικλειτή.⁸⁰ Therefore when their population became too great for the land to support, the Chalkidians naturally turned to the areas across the seas with which her sailors were familiar.

79. This is shown by the fact that the first Greek colonies in the West were Chalkidic; see below, pp. 71-74.

80. Hymn to Apollo, 31 and 219. This is the earliest of the Homeric Hymns and probably dates back into the eighth century; T. W. Allen, S. R. Halliday, and E. Sikes, The Homeric Hymns² (Oxford, 1936), pp. 183-185.

CHAPTER II

CHALKIS IN THE AGE OF COLONIZATION

Chalkis was one of the first of the Greek cities to send out colonies and seems to have founded more than any other town,¹ a fact which proves her power and prosperity in the eighth and seventh centuries and explains her decline thereafter. There was little good land in Euboea to support growing populations,² and it was natural for the cities of the island to seek outlets overseas. That Chalkis was the first city to send settlers to Sicily and Italy we may be sure,³ and it is almost certain that even earlier she and Eretria had founded colonies in the Thracian Chalkidike.

However, the evidence for this northern coloniza-

-
1. Her closest competitor was Miletos, for which A. G. Dunham, The History of Miletus (London, 1915), pp. 56-62, lists thirty colonies, including joint foundations with other states and secondary colonies. We shall see that Chalkis may be credited with about thirty in the North and at least eleven in the West.
 2. There can be little doubt that this was the original cause of colonization; A. Gwynn, "The Character of Greek Colonisation," J.H.S., XXXVIII (1918), pp. 88-123.
 3. See below, pp. 73-75.

tion is vague and scattered, as compared with Thucydides' concise account⁴ of that in Italy. The early date of the colonies,⁵ their subsequent formation into the Chalkidic League under Olynthos with its accompanying partial syn-oikismos, and the destruction of the League by Philip of Makedon⁶ all combine to make the evidence difficult, and

4. VI, 1-5.

5. The only definite date we have, Ol. 31, 2 (654 B.C.), is that given for Akanthos and Stageiros by Eusebios (in the Latin version of Hieronymos, edited by J. K. Fotheringham [London, 1923], p. 167). Yet these were joint Andrian-Chalkidic colonies placed on the west coast of the Chalkidike, and are certainly later than the other settlements on that peninsula (see below, p. 82). The very lack of dates points to an early period, as does the confused tradition which places the founding of Torone both before and after the Trojan War. See Steph. Byz., s.v. *Τορώνη· πόλις Θράκης, ἀπὸ Τορώνης, τῆς Πρωτέως ἢ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Φοινίκης. ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη Τορώνη μετὰ Τροίαν κτισθεῖσα*. But there was only one Torone, to which both of these traditions must belong.
6. The difficulty is usually glossed over with general statements; see, e.g., K. Beloch, Græchische Geschichte,

this difficulty has even led a modern scholar⁷ to maintain that these Chalkidians in Thrace⁸ were not colonists of Euboic Chalkis.

The first step toward the North taken by the Chalkidians was the colonization of the small islands north of Euboia (Skiathos, Peparethos, and Ikos)⁸ which were well

I², 1 (Strassburg, 1912), p. 253: "eine lange Reihe griechischer Pflanzstädte, die zum grossen Teil von Chalkis gegründet waren, wie namentlich Torone und die übrigen Städte auf Sithonia." Cf. also G. Busolt, Griechische Geschichte, I² (Gotha, 1893), pp. 452-454; Geyer, Topographie und Geschichte, pp. 41-42. I can find no account which separates and enumerates the colonies of Chalkis, although Geyer makes a beginning.

7. E. Harrison, "Chalkidike," Class. Quart., VI (1912), pp. 93-103, 165-178. Cf. below, pp. 36-50.

8. Skymnos, 580-586:

Σκυῖρος Πεπάρηθος Σκίαθος, ὧν Κρηῖτες μὲν οἱ
μετὰ Στοφύλου διαβάντες ἐκ Κνωσσοῦ ποτε
Πεπάρηθον ἐγγὺς κειμένην τ' αὐτῆς Ἴκον
νῆσον συνοικίζουσι, τὴν Σκυῖρον δὲ καὶ
τὴν Σκίαθον ἐκ Θράκης διαβάντες, ὡς λόγος
Πελασιῶται· πάλι δ' ἐρήμους γενομένας
αὐτὰς ἀπάσας Χαλκιδεῖς συνέκτισαν.

situated to serve as stepping stones to Thrace.

In the Chalkidike, the Chalkidians are found mainly in and above Sithonia, and probably along the west coast above Pallene. There are no Chalkidic colonies on Pallene itself, and the appearance of Eretrian colonies there, in the area nearest to Greece proper, suggests that Eretria sent settlers Thraceward before Chalkis. Our main source regarding these colonies is Strabo. In X, 1, 8 he says of Chalkis and Eretria, αἱ δ' οὖν πόλεις αὗται ἀνέστησαν καὶ ἀποικίας ἔστειλαν ἀξιολόγους εἰς Μακεδονίαν· Ἐρέτρια μὲν γὰρ συνώκισε τὰς περὶ Παλλήνην καὶ τὸν Ἄθω πόλεις, ἡ δὲ Χαλκὶς τὰς ὑπὸ Ὀλύμπῳ, ὅς φησι Φίλιππος διελυμήνατο.⁹ In VII,

The author was wrong about Skyros, for we know from Thucydides, I, 98, 2, that in the fifth century that island was populated by Dolopians. But it is probable that during the period of Euboic sea power Chalkis controlled the island, just as Eretria controlled many of the central Kyklades; cf. W. Wallace, The History of Eretria to 198 B.C. (Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1936), pp. 29-33.

9. This passage continues, καὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας δὲ καὶ Σικελίας πολλὰ χωρία Χαλκιδέων ἐστίν· ἐστάλησαν δὲ αἱ ἀποικίαι αὗται, καθάπερ εἴρηκεν Ἀριστοτέλης, ἥνικα ἡ τῶν Ἱπποβοτῶν καλουμένη ἐπεκράτει πολιτεία. It is uncer-

frag. 11 (ed. A. Meineke [Leipzig, 1915]), he writes, ἔπ-
 ἦλθον δὲ καὶ Χαλκιδεῖς οἱ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν Σιθῶνων καὶ
 συνώκισαν πόλεις ἐν αὐτῇ περὶ τριάκοντα, ἐξ ὧν ὕστερον ἐκ-
 βαλλόμενοι συνῆλθον εἰς μίαν οἱ πλείους αὐτῶν, εἰς τὴν Ὀλυ-
 νθον· ὠνομάζοντο δ' οἱ ἐπὶ Θράκης Χαλκιδεῖς.

Thucydides often speaks of οἱ ἐπὶ Θράκης Χαλκιδεῖς
 and seems to take their origin from Euboeia for granted, but
 he specifically names only Torone and Olynthos¹⁰ as Chalkidic.
 We know, however, from Herodotos that Olynthos was not colon-
 ized direct from Chalkis but belonged to the Bottiaioi until¹¹
 479 B.C., when it was burned by the Persians and handed

tain whether the statement from Aristotle refers to the
 northern as well as the western colonies; in any case
 the passage does not show that colonists to both areas
 were sent out at about the same time, despite Beloch,
Gr. Gesch., I², 1, p. 253.

10. IV, 110, 1: Τορώνην τὴν Χαλκιδικὴν. IV, 4, 1: Ὀλυ-
 νθον τὴν Χαλκιδικὴν.
11. B. V. Head, Historia Numorum² (Oxford, 1911), p. 207,
 states that Olynthos was a colony of Chalkis before
 being taken over by the Bottiaioi, but he cites no evi-
 dence. The obvious implication in Herodotos, that the
 Chalkidians first obtained the town in 479, has been
 confirmed by excavation. The pottery of the pre-Bottic

over to the Chalkidians¹² under Kritoboulos of Torone.

Aristotle¹³ tells us of Chalkidians from Thrace coming to the aid of Euboic Chalkis in the Lelantine War, and the obvious inference is that it was kinship which brought this help. He further mentions¹⁴ that Androdamos of Rhegion, a colony of Chalkis, was a lawgiver to the Chalkidians of Thrace. Polybios, however, in a passing remark,¹⁵ is the earliest author from whom we have a specific statement that οἱ ἐπὶ Θράκης Χαλκιδεῖς were colonists of Chalkis. Diodoros calls Torone a Chalkidic colony,¹⁶ but his information undoubtedly came from Thucydides.¹⁷ After Strabo there are

period seems to be related to early Makedonian ware; see G. E. Mylonas, Excavations at Olynthus, V (Johns Hopkins Press, 1933), pp. 60-63.

12. Τὸ Χαλκιδικὸν γένος (VIII, 127). Herodotos uses the same phrase in VII, 185, 2, when listing the peoples who supplied troops to Xerxes.
13. Frag. 98, from Plutarch, Amatorius, 17.
14. Politica, II, 1274b.
15. IX, 28, 2: ἦν τι σύστημα τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης Ἑλλήνων, οὓς ἀπέκισαν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Χαλκιδεῖς.
16. XII, 68, 6: ἄποικον μὲν Χαλκιδέων.
17. We can not be sure whether Diodoros himself or Ephoros, his immediate source, changed Thucydides' Τορώνην τὴν

several references which connect Chalkis directly with the Chalkidians in Thrace,¹⁸ but these have little independent value.

It has been necessary to review the above evidence¹⁹ fully because Harrison challenges the founding by Chalkis of the Chalkidic towns in Thrace. His main theses are (1), that the Thracian Chalkidians were a northern Greek tribe like their neighbors, the Bottiaioi, and (2), that the name Chalkidike did not include the whole peninsula, as it does in modern times, but was confined to its central prong and part of the interior. Harrison himself does not think that he²⁰ has proved the first of these theories, but his success in

Χαλκιδικήν. For the derivation from Thucydides, through Ephoros, of Diodoros' account of this period see G. L. Barber, The Historian Ephorus (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 108-109.

18. Appian, Bell. Civ., IV, 102; scholia (ed. C. Hude [Teubner, 1927]) to Thuc., I, 57, 5; scholia to Aristophanes, Equites, 237.
19. See above, p. 32, note 7.
20. Op. cit., p. 93: "Further enquiry, though it has strengthened these suspicions, has not established them beyond doubt; but it seems to me worth while to set out the evidence, in the hope that others may throw light

developing the second has led to the rash acceptance of the
 21
 whole.

As may be seen from the above review of the evidence, there is no statement, or even an obvious implication, in ancient sources which would suggest that the Thracian

on a question of some importance for the history of Greece. At least I may expect that in future 'Chalkidike' and 'Chalkidians' will be used with care."

21. E.g., M. Gude, A History of Olynthus (Johns Hopkins Press, 1933), p. 4, note 11; Wallace, op. cit., p. 42; A. Gwynn, op. cit., p. 121; U. Kahrstedt, "Chalcidic Studies," A.J.P., LVII (1936), pp. 416-444, especially p. 416, note 1. Kahrstedt's statement that D. M. Robinson, Excavations at Olynthus, V, pp. 15-63, treats "the Chalcidians, Bottiaean, and Macedonians as kindred north Greek tribes" is false; there is no such treatment of the Chalkidians in the chapter referred to ("Pre-Persian Pottery"), which was written by G. E. Mylonas and deals only with the period before 479 when the Bottiaioi still held Olynthos; see below, p. 47. Harrison's theory of the origin of the Chalkidians was not accepted, however, by Allen West, The History of the Chalcidic League (Madison, 1918), p. 7, note 9; p. 8, note 14.

Chalkidians were a northern Greek tribe. Therefore Harrison's arguments depend mainly on the fact that only relatively late authors specifically connect the Thracian Chalkidians with Euboic Chalkis, on Thucydides' *Τορώνην τὴν Χαλκιδικὴν*, and on Herodotos' use of *τὸ Χαλκιδικὸν γένος*; such phrases, he argues, imply that their authors thought of these Chalkidians as a separate tribe.

The use of *τὸ Χαλκιδικὸν γένος*, however, may be explained as an attempt to avoid the word *Χαλκιδεῖς*, which might more easily be confused in a reader's mind with the Euboic Chalkidians. And it certainly is a simple way of describing as a group the inhabitants of several towns, whether these be Chalkidic colonists or not.²² So there is in the phrase no evidence one way or the other. Even weaker is Harrison's attempt to draw a tendentious inference from Thucydides, based on that author's customary use of *ἀποικία* or *ἄποικοι* to describe a colony or its inhabitants, as in *Στάγειρος Ἀνδρίων ἀποικία*,²³ while the adjectival form, according to Harrison,

22. Cf. West, *op. cit.*, p. 7, note 9. Furthermore, Harrison's rendition of the phrase as "the Chalkidic tribe" (pp. 94 and 95) is misleading, because it gives in English a notion of primitiveness not present in the Greek. "Race" is a better translation.

23. IV, 88, 2; see also IV, 84, 1, and 109, 3.

usually denotes only race or location, as in Σπάρτῳ τὴν²⁴
Βοττικὴν and Πάνορμον τὸν Ἀρχαϊκόν.

At first glance and by a comparison of Τορώνην τὴν Χαλκιδικὴν with Σπάρτῳ τὴν Βοττικὴν and Στάγειρος Ἀνδρίων ἀποικία, the employment of Χαλκιδικὴ appears to show a distinction in the mind of Thucydides between the Chalkidians and regular colonists. But when we look further we discover that he describes two western cities, Naxos²⁵ in Sicily and Kyme in Italy, in the same way; both of these²⁶ were certainly colonies of Euboic Chalkis. In the face of this evidence there is no reason to assume that Χαλκιδικὴ, when applied to Torone, does not mean a Chalkidic colony.

Neither does the lack of a definite statement in any author earlier than Strabo bear much weight; if anything, it points to a Euboic origin for the Thracian Chalkidians. For it would be natural to equate the two Χαλκιδεῖς, and a precise statement of origin is more to be expected if they²⁷ were different races.

24. II, 79, 2, and 86, 1.

25. IV, 25, 7: Νάξον τὴν Χαλκιδικὴν. VI, 4, 5: Κύμης τῆς ἐν Ὀπικίᾳ Χαλκιδικῆς πόλεως.

26. Thucydides himself states this of Naxos (VI, 3, 1).

For Kyme see below, pp. 71-74.

27. The argument from silence can not be pressed, but it is

The rest of Harrison's arguments consist for the most part of attempts to discredit all of the ancient evidence pointing to the connection of the two groups of Χαλκιδεῖς. At times he is successful in casting doubt on individual references,²⁸ thanks to the vagueness of the tradition; but the accumulated weight of the evidence remains against him.

Harrison, in his argument based on a comparison of

strengthened by the fact that in II, 99, 3, in a discussion of the rise of Makedonian power, Thucydides tells of the fate of the northern tribes which were evicted. The Bottiaioi, Harrison's analogy for the Chalkideis, are mentioned, but not the Chalkideis themselves. Herodotos (VIII, 127) also reports the expulsion of the Bottiaioi from Makedonia.

28. E.g., p. 165, where he attacks a fragment from Hera-
 kleides concerning Chalkidians at Kleonai (see below,
 pp. 67-69). Sometimes he goes much too far, as when he
 suggests that Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς was Plutarch's
 source (Amatorius, 17) for the story of Kleomachos.
 Harrison himself admits (p. 167) that Plutarch thought
 his source was the philosopher Aristotle, and since we
 have three other fragments from an Ἑρωτικός of Aris-
 totle (frags. 95-97), such a conjecture is worthless.

the languages of Euboia and of the Thracian Chalkidians, comes to the conclusion that the evidence from the north points "not to Chalkis, nor to Euboea at large, but to Eretria, although the Olynthian inscription lacks the most striking feature of the Eretrian, which appears also at Oropos, the rhotacism of the intervocalic σ."²⁹ He had for the northern Chalkidic language only two inscriptions,³⁰ one a treaty of the Chalkidic League with Amyntas of Makedonia in the early fourth century and the other a decree of banishment from Amphipolis of about 357, by which time that city was predominantly Chalkidic. But the paucity of evidence which he had for the analysis does not damage this part of his argument, for later finds have substantiated his conclusions. The points upon which he lays the most stress, namely, the Ionic vowel changes and the use of εἶν for εἶναι, are supported by inscriptions found at Olynthos during the excavations conducted there between 1928 and 1938 by the Johns Hopkins University.³¹ Although these inscriptions are of

29. Op. cit., p. 170.

30. W. Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, I³ (Leipzig, 1915), nos. 135 and 194.

31. The inscriptions have been published by D. M. Robinson, "A Deed of Sale at Olynthus," T.A.P.A., LIX (1928), pp. 225-232; "New Inscriptions from Olynthus and Environs,"

the fourth century, except for two early Korinthian dedications predating the Chalkidic occupation, and were inscribed in the Eastern alphabet,³² their language is "the Western³³ Ionic of Euboea, as found at Chalcis and her colonies" and the texts show two examples of the main peculiarity which Harrison had previously noted, the use of εἶν³⁴ for εἶναι. Although these later finds have substantiated Harrison's analysis of the northern Chalkidic tongue, his conclusion that the evidence points to Eretria, not Chalkis, can not stand. There is in reality little basis for comparison, because of the lack of inscriptional evidence from Chalkis itself. We have from that city one inscription of the sixth century,³⁵ two of the fifth,³⁶ and six short dedicatory in-

T.A.P.A., LXII (1931), pp. 40-56; "Inscriptions from Olynthus, 1934," T.A.P.A., LXV (1934), pp. 103-137; "Inscriptions from Macedonia, 1938," T.A.P.A., LXIX (1938), pp. 43-76.

32. Robinson, T.A.P.A., LXII (1931), p. 48. This alphabet was used at Chalkis itself by the fourth century (I.G., XII, 9, 935 and 1073).
33. Robinson, T.A.P.A., LXV (1934), p. 108.
34. Robinson, T.A.P.A., LXV (1934), p. 105: ἀναθεῖν (line 8); ἐξεῖν (line 10).
35. I.G., XII, 9, 922: Εὐφημος ἀνέθ[η]κεν.
36. I.G., XII, 9, 923 and 957.

scriptions from the fourth.³⁷ Of all those of any length and
 continuity,³⁸ one, no. 909, is of the third century and the
 others are later. Thus we have here in effect no evidence at
 all for the early dialect of Chalkis. Attempts to uncover it
 have been based on inscriptions from the northern and western
 colonies and a general grouping of all Euboic dialects as
 West Ionic.³⁹ Smyth's conclusion⁴⁰ is enlightening: "Until
 we come into possession of documents of an antiquity suffi-
 cient to free their phonetical and inflectional system from the
 suspicion of Atticism, we are not in a position to hold that
 there are sharply marked differences in speech between the
 Chalcidians, Eretrians, and Styrians. In the present state
 of our knowledge, Eretrian Ionic seems to possess a more dis-
 tinct individuality than that of Chalcis or Styra. It alone
 shows examples of rhotacism, a phenomenon scarcely indigenous
 in Eretria, though its ultimate provenance is still a matter
 of dispute." The lack of rhotacism in the northern Chalkidic
 does not damage the claims of an Eretrian origin, since this

37. I.G., XII, 9, 935, 1073, 1109, 1166, 1167, 1171.

38. I.G., XII, 9, 898-911.

39. C. D. Buck, Greek Dialects (New York, 1928), pp. 8 and
 171; H. W. Smyth, Sounds and Inflections of the Greek
 Dialects---Ionic (Oxford, 1894), pp. 11-13.

40. Op. cit., p. 12.

change did not take place in Eretria until after the middle of the fifth century, long after the founding of the northern colonies.⁴¹ Yet we may conclude only that the language of the northern Chalkidians points to Euboia in general. In view of the prima facie connection with Chalkis, we may assume it points there.

As regards coinage, Harrison's arguments are again negative, in his attempt to break down an apparent connection between the early coinages of Olynthos and Chalkis. The earliest Olynthiac coins had various designs of horses and chariots on the obverse, with irregular patterns on the reverse; later coins, with the same obverse types, have on the reverse a flying eagle, a type common in coins of Chalkis.⁴² It is generally supposed that this change occurred after 479 and reflects the taking over of the town by the Chalkidians. Harrison, however, attempts to discredit the alleged borrowing from Chalkis by calling the eagle "an agonistic type," occurring on the coins of Elis, "which makes it unnecessary to suppose such a loan".⁴³ But, as West pointed out,⁴⁴ this evi-

41. Cf. Smyth, op. cit., p. 288.

42. Cf. Head, Historia Numorum², pp. 208 (for Olynthos) and 358 (for Chalkis).

43. Op. cit., p. 171.

44. Op. cit., p. 8, note 14.

dence from the coins by itself might be weak, yet when viewed in conjunction with the other testimony it can not be cast aside lightly as a coincidence.

Harrison also ignored one Olynthiac coin⁴⁵ of the fifth century which carries the inscription $\begin{smallmatrix} A\checkmark \\ \checkmark K \end{smallmatrix}$. This has on one side a cantering horse and on the other an eagle and is⁴⁶ similar in type to later coins bearing the inscription $\Delta\Lambda\checkmark\checkmark$. The use in this early coin of the Chalkidic alphabet, particularly the form $\checkmark$,⁴⁷ points directly to Euboic Chalkis. This

45. Head, op. cit., p. 208; West, loc. cit.

46. These were struck on the Phoenician standard, whereas the earlier were on the Euboic. The change was probably caused by the anti-Athenian rebellion in Thrace in 432; H. Gähler, Die Antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands, III² (Berlin, 1935), p. 87.

47. The coin has been attributed on these grounds to Chalkis instead of Olynthos by Gähler, loc. cit., and "Zur Münzkunde Makedoniens VI," Zeitschrift für Numismatik, XXXV (1925), pp. 201-212. But Gähler dates it in the first half of the fifth century and says that it is the archetype of the Olynthiac coinage after 432. There are, however, no examples of Chalkidic coins between the defeat in 507 and the fourth century and it is unlikely that Chalkis struck money in this interval (cf.

evidence makes it almost certain that we have in all these
 coins settlers⁴⁸ adopting the coinage of their mother city.⁴⁹
 In the case of Olynthos it is easy to see why this copying
 was done; common descent from Chalkis was the closest bond
 among the Chalkidians who took over the town from the Bottiaioi.

From the evidence uncovered by the recent excavations
 at Olynthos, there is for Harrison's theory no proof or dis-
 proof which, by itself, would be definitive. However, there
 are indications, in both the pottery and the names of the

below, p. 156). Furthermore, the horse type is other-
 wise unknown to Chalkis, but is common on Olynthiac coins.
 D. M. Robinson and P. A. Clement (Excavations at Olynthus,
 IX, p. 293) leave this coin's attribution unassigned.
 Yet, even if Gäbler is right, the fact that Olynthos
 copies so closely the coinage of Chalkis implies that
 at the time Chalkis was her mother city.

48. Much has been made by Gäbler (loc. cit.) of Head's er-
 ror (op. cit., p. 207) in calling Olynthos a colony of
 Chalkis originally. But since all the coins with the
 Chalkidic eagle come after those without this symbol,
 Head's error does not affect our conclusions.
49. Just as Dikaia and Neapolis, both Eretrian colonies,
 copied the octopus and gorgoneion devices of their
 mother city; Gäbler, Ant. Munz. Nord-Gr., III², pp.
 57 and 79.

months at Olynthos, which, when added to the other evidence, seem to make certain a Euboic origin for the Thracian Chal-
⁵⁰
 kidiāns. In the pottery, a clear break was found after the destruction of the city by the Persians in 479. Before this date, which is marked by a burned layer, most of the pottery was a native ware, related to early Makedonian pottery and influenced by quasi-Mykenāian designs, probably from Asia Minor. This undoubtedly was made by the Bottiaioi. But after the Chalkidiāns took over the town in 479, Attic red-figure ware predominates. This shows, of course, only that the Chalkidiāns were a more advanced people, which might possibly be explained by their coastal position which facilitated communication with the outside world. A more likely explanation is that they were regular Greek colonists, for, if they had been a tribe like the Bottiaioi, we should naturally expect to find them making some similar, rather primitive pottery.

It is, however, in the names of the months that we find our most conclusive proof of the Euboic origin of the Thracian Chalkidiāns. From inscriptions at Olynthos bearing
⁵¹
 deeds of sale we know seven of the twelve months. Of

50. D. M. Robinson, Excavations at Olynthus, V, especially the chapter "Pre-Persian Pottery," by G. E. Mylonas, pp. 15-63. I summarize his results here.

51. See above, p. 41, note 31.

these, five (Ἀθηναίων, Καλαμαίων, Ἀρτεμισίων, Ἀπατουριών, Ταργηλίων) are common Ionic months, and all but Ἀρτεμισίων⁵² occur in Chalkis, from which city we know nine names.

Furthermore, the form Ταργηλίων for Θαρρηλίων was used at Chalkis, as well as at Tenos and Delos.⁵³ Of the other two Olynthiac months, Ἰππίων is known at Eretria and, in the form Ἰππιος, at Rhegion, a colony of Chalkis; the other, Πανθεών, is known only from Naples, also a Chalkidic colony. Robinson, in a poorly preserved painted inscription, restores⁵⁴ Ἡρακ[λειος] as the name of the month. Such a month is

52. For the calendar I have used the article by E. Bischoff, s.v. Kalender, in P.W., R.E., XX, cols. 1568-1602. He gives a month Ὀλυυθίων for Chalkis, taken from I.G., XII, 9, 900b. On the stone all that we have is Ολυ[...]^ωνος, and A. Wilhelm's restoration (Eph. Arch. [1904], p. 103) Ὀλυ[μπι]^ωνος seems better. We know² that Zeus Olympios was worshiped at Chalkis (I.G., I, 39, lines 61-62), and it is very difficult to connect the name of the town Olynthos, which was originally Bottic, with Chalkis and use this as evidence for the name of a Chalkidic month.

53. Cf. I.G., XII, 9, 900c, line 1; Robinson, T.A.P.A., LXII (1931), p. 46.

54. T.A.P.A., LXIX (1938), p. 56 and plate VII, fig. 9.

known only from Delphoi, Halikarnassos, Antiocheia, and Bithynia, and its non-Ionic form looks suspicious when compared to the regular Ionic of the other seven months. On the plate, at least, this part of the inscription is illegible, and, since the restoration is so dubious, it should not be admitted as evidence. Thus we may safely say that all the known months at Olynthos are Ionic; four of them (Ληναιών, Καλαμαιών, Ἀπατουριών, Ταργηλιών) actually occur in Chalkis, two (Πανθεών, Ἰππιών) point directly to Chalkis, and the spelling of Ταργηλιών is most significant.⁵⁵ Yet if the Thracian Chalkidians were, as Harrison claims, a native tribe like the Bottiaioi, we should expect month names resembling those of Thessaly or Makedonia,⁵⁶ which vary greatly

-
55. By combining the known Chalkidic months with those from Olynthos, we have twelve names---perhaps the complete Chalkidian calendar. The nine we know at Chalkis are Ποσιδεών, Ληναιών, Ταργηλιών, Καλαμαιών, Κυκλειών, Βοηδρομιών, Κυανοψιών, Ἀπατουριών, and Ὀλυ[μπι]ών. The three to be added from Olynthos are Πανθεών, Ἀρτεμισιών, and Ἰππιών ("Ἰππιος).
56. No names of the months used among the Bottiaioi are preserved. But since they came from Makedonia (Thuc., II, 99, 3), it is reasonable to assume that their months would be reminiscent of northern Greece. At least, they would not be Ionic.

from the Ionic. For the names of the months, with their religious significance, did not readily lend themselves to change and their form certainly indicates the race of those who used them. Thus we may conclude that the Olynthians (after 479 B.C.) were Ionians; and once this is established, it can hardly be denied that Chalkis was their mother city.

It is still no easy task, however, to determine exactly which cities of those in the Chalkidike were founded by Chalkis. Of the ancient references dealing with the actual colonization the least vague are the two general statements by Strabo,⁵⁷ one to the effect that Chalkis founded τὰς ὑπὸ 'Ολύνθῳ,⁵⁸ the other that the Chalkidians established about thirty towns after coming ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν Σιθωνίων. Besides this we have scattered references citing various towns as Chalkidic. These references, however, must be handled with care, because of the expansion of the meaning of the term Χαλκιδική.

57. X, 1, 8; VII, frag. 11 (quoted above, pp. 33-34).

58. This probably is a general reference to the hegemony of Olynthos in the Chalkidic League. But membership can not be used as a strict test for the Chalkidic character of any particular town, since in the fourth century the League expanded and took in non-Chalkidic communities such as Poteidaia and Skione; West, op. cit., pp. 97-102.

It is safe to assume that in a writer of the fifth or fourth century this word would be applied only to Chalkidic towns, but in later authors the term came to mean the whole peninsula, the sense which it retains today.⁵⁹ Also, much evidence can be gleaned from the tribute-quota lists⁶⁰ of the Athenian Empire both for the location of towns and for the extent of the revolt of 432 by the Chalkidians and Bottiaioi⁶¹ against Athens. The Thracian panels for the years 432/1 and 430/29 survive intact and the absence of a town which formerly had paid is cogent evidence for its participation in the revolt. It must be remembered that by itself this participation does not prove that a community was Chalkidic, since the Bottiaioi and the towns at the head of the Thermaic Gulf near Makedon also revolted; when combined with the lit-

59. Harrison's arguments (op. cit.) against attributing this modern idea to early writers seem conclusive.

60. Published by B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor, The Athenian Tribute Lists, I (Harvard Univ. Press, 1939). All of the information concerning tribute on the following pages is taken from this work and may be found conveniently arranged there under the various towns in the Register (pp. 215-441) and the Gazetteer (pp. 461-566).

61. Thuc., I, 58.

erary sources, however, the evidence of the tribute lists is of great importance.

In VII, 121 Herodotos, describing the route of the fleet of Xerxes, gives a list of the Greek towns along the coast of Sithonia, the area stated by Strabo to have been colonized by Chalkis. In geographical order, from the head of the Singaian Gulf, the towns are Assa,⁶² Píloros, Singos,⁶³ and Sarte on the east coast; Torone, Galepsos,⁶⁴ Sermylia, Mekyberna, and Olynthos on the west. Further investigations of the individual towns confirm Strabo's statement and make it certain that all of these were Chalkidic colonies.⁶⁵

For three of the towns, Assa (Assera),⁶⁶ Torone,⁶⁷ and Sermylia, we have ancient references which specifically call them Chalkidic. Furthermore, all but Torone and Sarte joined the revolt and stopped paying their tribute. The rea-

62. The Assa of Herodotos is the Assera of the tribute records.

63. Herodotos' Galepsos is represented by the Γαλαῖοι (from Gale) of the tribute lists; see A.T.L., I, p. 477.

64. This, in a sense, excepts Olynthos, which we know was not Chalkidic until 479; see above, pp. 34-35.

65. Theopompos, frag. 174 (Jacoby): πόλις Χαλκιδέων.

66. Thuc., IV, 110, 1: Τορώνην τὴν Χαλκιδικήν.

67. Scholia to Thuc., I, 65, 2: Χαλκιδικὴ πόλις.

son for the continued payment by these two cities was undoubtedly an Athenian garrison in Torone which remained until the arrival of Brasidas in 424/3.⁶⁸ For Singos, Gale, and Mekyberna we have confirmation in the fact that they not only revolted but also participated in the withdrawal to Olynthos which was urged on the Chalkidic towns near the coast by Perdikkas.⁶⁹ This is shown by the clause in the Peace of Nikias directing the inhabitants to return to their former homes and by the marked decrease in their assessed tribute to only 10 drachmai each in 425/4 and 421/0 B.C.⁷⁰ Thus we have, for seven of the eight towns, independent evidence supporting Strabo's statement, and so we can accept it as a whole and call all of the towns on Sithonia colonies of Chalkis.⁷¹ The

68. Thuc., IV, 110-116. There is no mention of a garrison in Sarte, but it was situated near enough to Torone to be controlled from there.

69. Thuc., I, 58, 2.

70. For this interpretation of Thuc., V, 18, 6 and the emendation Παλαίους for Σαυαίους see the convincing arguments of A. B. West, "Thucydides V, 18, 6," A.J.P., LVIII (1937), pp. 166-173; for the assessment see A 9, IV, 109-111, and A 10, V, 22-24, in A.T.L., I, pp. 157 and 158.

71. There may be additional evidence for Sarte in that she

only question might be whether Mekyberna, the port of Olynthos, was an original Chalkidic colony or was taken over along with Olynthos in 479. Its position on the coast would point to its Greek character.⁷²

seems to have shared to a limited degree in the withdrawal of the Chalkidians to the interior. For down through 429/8 she regularly paid a tribute of 1500 drachmai; in her next appearance, in 421, the payment is only 100 drachmai. The reason for such a reduction, at a time when quotas were generally being raised, may lie in a withdrawal of much of the population to Olynthos during the year between the freeing of Torone by Brasidas (424/3) and its recapture (423/2). Thus the reduction would be a modified parallel to that granted Gale, Mekyberna, and Singos. Such an explanation seems preferable to supposing that Sarte remained loyal of its own accord in 432 and that the reduction in tribute is a reward for that loyalty. If such was the case, we should expect the reduction earlier, as in the case of Sane, whose tribute was reduced from one talent in 432/1 to 750 drachmai in 430/29.

72. For a preliminary report on the excavations carried out at Mekyberna in 1934 and 1938 see G. E. Mylonas, "Excavations at Mecyberna 1934, 1938," A.J.A., XLVIII

Of Chalkidic towns located inland to the northwest
of Sithonia, we have direct ancient evidence for four, Arnai,⁷³
⁷⁴Stolos, ⁷⁵Milkoros, ⁷⁶and Polichne. Of these towns, Stolos

(1943), pp. 78-87. He mentions the pre-Persian settlement only briefly and does not state whether there was a discernible break in the pottery in 479 as there was at Olynthos.

73. Thuc., IV, 103, 1: ἐξ Ἀρνῶν τῆς Χαλκιδικῆς. Stephanos has Ἀρνη τῆς Ἐρασινίων πρὸς τῇ Θράκῃ. K. Böhnecke (Demosthenes, Hypereides, Lykourgos [Berlin, 1864], p. 389) emends Ἐρασινίων to Ἐρμυλίων. Arnai does not appear in the tribute lists and probably was one of the συντακτεῖς of Sermylia.
74. Steph. Byz., s.v. Στώλος· πόλις μία τῶν ἐν Θράκῃ βαρβαρικῶν ἃς μετήνεγκαν ἐκ τῶν Ἠδωνῶν οἱ Χαλκιδεῖς εἰς τὰς αὐτῶν πόλεις. In Thuc., V, 18, 5, the town is called Σκῶλος and is one of those left autonomous but tributary by the Peace of Nikias. For its position to the east of Olynthos see West, "Thucydides V, 18, 5," A.J.P., LVIII (1937), pp. 157-165.
75. Steph. Byz., s.v. Μίλκωρος· Χαλκιδικὴ πόλις ἐν Θράκῃ... Θεόπομπος με' Φιλίππικῶν (Theopompos, frag. 152 [Jacoby]).
76. Known only from the tribute lists; it paid with Mekyberna and Stolos in 454/3, by itself in 453/2, and is

and Milkoros stopped paying tribute in 432/1; the other two do not appear in the lists in the years preceding. For Arnai we have further evidence in a fourth century coin⁷⁷ which bears the head of Apollo and a lyre, the types of the coinage of the Chalkidic League, and has the inscription A P N.

There are ancient references calling two other⁷⁸ Thracian towns Chalkidic. These are Tinde⁷⁹ and Skapsa,

absent thereafter until the assessment of 425/4. There the ethnic, Πολι[χνῖται] παρὰ Σ[τῶλον], establishes its location. It seems to have been a town almost as important as Stolos, judging from its tribute. Although the exact amount of its payment in 453/2 is unknown, the total paid by Polichne, Mekyberna, and Stolos in 454/3 was approximately 2 1/3 talents. After the apotaxis, Mekyberna paid one talent and Stolos 2/3 of a talent. This leaves for Polichne about 2/3 of a talent, the same amount as for Stolos.

77. B. V. Head, Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum, Macedonia, Etc. (London, 1879), p. 62.

78. Steph. Byz., s.v. Τίνδη· Θράκης Χαλκιδικῆ πόλις.

79. Steph. Byz., s.v. Κάψα· πόλις Χαλκιδικῆς χώρας κατὰ Παλλήνην, ὁμοροῦσα τῷ Θερμαίῳ Κολπῷ. Skapsa is the form given by the tribute lists; it is the same town as the Kapsa of Stephanos and the Kampsas of Herodotos.

located in the area called Κρουσίς, which extended along the coast of the Thermaic Gulf above Poteidaia to Aineia. In a description of this district, which he calls Κροσσίη,⁸⁰ Herodotos⁸¹ names the towns from south to north: Lipaxos, Kombreia, Haisa,⁸¹ Gigonos, Skapsa, Smilla, and Aineia. Although Tinde does not appear in this list we know that it was in the same district from a syntelic payment in the tribute record for 434/3 and the assessment of 421/0. Under the heading Πόλεις Κροσσίδος are grouped Tinde, Kithas, Smilla, Gigonos, and Haisa, which combined to pay 3000 drachmai. Skapsa paid 1000 drachmai by herself from 452/1 to 433/2. All of the cities of Krousis, with the exception of Aineia, joined the revolt⁸² and defaulted. This fact and the two references

80. VII, 123, 2.

81. The text of Herodotos has Lisai, but this probably is a corruption of the Haisa known from the tribute lists; A.T.L., I, p. 466.

82. See Thuc., II, 79, 3-4, where peltasts from Krousis are found aiding the Chalkidians against Athens: καὶ οἱ μὲν ὀπλῖται τῶν Χαλκιδέων καὶ ἐπίκουροί τινες μετ' αὐτῶν νικῶνται ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἀναχωροῦσιν εἰς τὴν Σπάρτην, οἱ δὲ ἱππῆς τῶν Χαλκιδέων καὶ ψιλοὶ νικῶσι τοὺς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἱππέας καὶ ψιλοὺς· εἶχον δὲ τινὰς οὐ πολλοὺς πελταστὰς ἐκ τῆς Κρουσίδος γῆς καλουμένης. The

quoted above from Stephanos are the only evidence we have for the nationality of these cities;⁸³ the implication is that they were Chalkidic. That they are separated from the other Chalkidic colonies may be explained by the coming of the Bottiaioi in the seventh or sixth century, which was later than the Chalkidic colonization in Thrace.⁸⁴ Pressure from the Bottiaioi would also explain why these towns remained relatively unimportant. However, since we do not know what sources Stephanos used,⁸⁵ we can only say that very probably

subject of εἶχον is not clear, but the whole tenor of the passage inclines one to believe that it is οἱ Χαλκιδεῖς. That these cities stopped paying tribute makes that interpretation certain.

83. Stephanos calls Haisa, Smilla, Gigonos, and Lipaxos simply πόλεις Θράκης. The founding of Aineia is lost in the Aineias story, but apparently it was not Ionic. Its earliest coins have the non-Ionic forms Αἰνέας and Αἰνειάτων, which later became Ionic Αἰνεήτων; Gäbler, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-27, nos. 1, 5, 8, and 10.
84. See E. Oberhummer, *s.v.* Bottia, in P.W., *R.E.*, V, col. 794, and below, pp. 69-70.
85. If the source was Theopompos, as Kahrstedt (*op. cit.*, pp. 441-442) thinks it was for most of Stephanos' information concerning the Thracian cities, we could be

the towns of Krousis, except Aineia, were colonies of Chalkidic.⁸⁶

There are nine other towns in the Thracian Chalkidike which we know revolted in 432/1; but participation in the revolt is in itself not sufficient to show that a town was Chalkidic, for the Bottiaioi, as well as the cities at the head of the Thermaic Gulf, were also concerned. Members of this latter group, regardless of their nationality, were undoubtedly forced into the revolt by their exposure to the power of Perdikkas. Such is probably the explanation for the

almost sure the towns were Chalkidic. But the possibility remains that the source was a late one which applied the word Χαλκιδική to any town on the peninsula.

86. It seems justifiable to consider all of the towns, except Aineia, the same ethnically, because of their syncretic payments of tribute and their joint action in the revolt. Aineia, which was the northern boundary of Krousis (A.T.L., I, pp. 464-465), apparently remained loyal to Athens of her own accord; her tribute was reduced from three talents in 432/1 to 1000 drachmai in 430/29. That Aineia, a non-Ionic city (see above, p. 58, note 83), alone of the cities of Krousis remained loyal may be indicative of the nationality of the revolting towns.

surprising appearance of an Eretrian colony, Dikaia,⁸⁷ among the rebels, even though the more important Eretrian colonies on Pallene remained loyal to Athens. For the others at the head of the gulf, Serme, Sinos, Strepsa, and Chedrolioi, we have no evidence concerning their nationality, and they may have been Chalkidic.⁸⁸ It is also probable that Pharbelos,⁸⁹ another Eretrian colony,⁹⁰ was in the same district.

-
87. It is called Δίκαια Ἐρετριῶν (or the like) in the tribute lists.
88. If we may trust Eudoxos' statement (cf. below, p. 65, note 105) that the Thermaic Gulf was also called Chalkis, we should expect some of the cities in this area to be Chalkidic.
89. Steph. Byz., s.v.: πόλις Ἐρετριέων.
90. Besides the fact that this best explains the revolt of an Eretrian colony, the frequency with which Pharbelos is found in the tribute lists in association with towns located on the Thermaic Gulf would indicate that it lay in that district. In the lists it occurs with no towns of Thrace until List 10; from then on it appears next to Othorioi (3), Chedrolioi (2), Aineia (2), Strepsa (1), Sane (1), Olophyxioi (1), Stageiros (1), Argilos (1), Stolos (1), Eteokarpathioi (1), Milkorioi (1), and Kallipolitai (1). The Othorioi were probably situated

Three more of the rebels in 432, Pistasos, Phegetioi, and Skabla, are still to be accounted for. We can not even approximate the position of Pistasos, as it appears only in the list for 434/3 and in the assessment of 421/0. It may have been Chalkidic, Bottic, or of some other race if it was located near Makedonia.⁹¹ The location of the Phegetioi is likewise uncertain, although they usually appear in the tribute lists with the peoples of the Chalkidike.⁹² West suggested that the town was situated in the district of Olynthos, Skabla, and Assera. If this be so, it probably was Chalkidic,⁹³ but there is no proof.

Skabla presents a special problem. It paid tribute

on the west coast of the Thermaic Gulf (A.T.L., I, p. 528). Therefore one-half of the towns associated with Pharbelos are located on that gulf; the others are scattered over the whole Thracian area, with the insignificant exception of the single occurrence with Ἐτεοκαρπάθιοι, from the island of Karpathos (in the Karic area).

91. Steph. Byz., s.v. Πίστιρος· ἐμπόριον Θράκης, may refer to Pistasos. If so, an ἐμπόριον was more likely to be on the coast, and therefore not Bottic.
92. Cf. Gude, op. cit., p. 9, note 7.
93. Cf. A.T.L., I, p. 560, where its position is left undecided.

with Olynthos and Assera in 454/3 and thereafter by itself until 432/1. Its grouping with Olynthos and Assera places⁹⁴ it somewhere to the north of the peninsula of Sithonia.

It has commonly been equated with Σκάβαλα, χώρα Ἐρετριέων,⁹⁵ quoted from Theopompos⁹⁶ by Stephanos, and so considered an Eretrian colony. No one, however, has pointed out the difficulty involved in explaining the existence of an Eretrian colony in Sithonia, an area otherwise exclusively Chalkidic, and its participation in the revolt of 432, unless it was⁹⁷ located near the borders of Makedonia. A glance at the

94. See A.T.L., I, p. 549.

95. Frag. 151 (Jacoby).

96. Wallace, op. cit., pp. 44-45; Geyer, op. cit., p. 12; West, History of the Chalcidic League, p. 7, note 6.

97. I. Svoronos, Journ. Int. d'Arch. Num., XV (1913), pp. 233-234, ignores the evidence of the tribute lists and places Skabla near Neapolis far to the east on the Thracian coast, basing his argument on the analogy of its name with that of the modern town of Kavalla. Strangely enough, Wallace (loc. cit.) accepts this without mentioning the difficulty involved in the syntelic payment. He has perhaps confused the Neapolis mentioned by Svoronos with Neapolis on Pallene, an Eretrian colony.

fragments of Book XXIV of Theopompos casts further doubt on the identity of Skabala and Skabla. Of the six fragments the first two mention cities in Makedonia and Thrace, the third speaks of a χωρίον Εὐβοίας, the fourth mentions fighting in Eubolia near Eretria, the fifth names a χωρίον Ἐρετριέων⁹⁹, and the last calls Skabala a χώρα Ἐρετριέων. It is clear that the book dealt with fighting in Eubolia (represented by frags. 148-149) as well as with events in Thrace (frags. 146-147); and it is much more likely that the last two citations are from the section which concerned Eubolia.¹⁰⁰ Χώρα and χωρίον are strange words to apply to colonies, but are not surprising in a detailed description of military operations in the vicinity of Eretria. On this supposition

98. Frags. 146-151 (Jacoby).

99. Frag. 146: Βαίτιον· πόλις Μακεδονίας. Frag. 147: "Ασσηρα· οὐδετέρως· πόλις Χαλκιδέων. Frag. 148: "Αρης· "Αρητος...χωρίον Εὐβοίας. Frag. 149: ἀποστήσας δὲ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ περιοικίδι τῶν Ἐρετριέων ἐστράτευσαν ἐπὶ πόλιν Δύστον. Frag. 150: "Οκωλον· χωρίον Ἐρετριέων. Frag. 151: Σκάβαλα· χώρα Ἐρετριέων.

100. We should expect πόλις. Stephanos uses this word for Pharbelos, which was probably smaller than Skabla. It paid a tribute of only 1000 drachmai as compared to Skabla's 3000.

there is in the fragment of Theopompos no evidence for Skabla as an Eretrian colony; it merely testifies that there was a district or a town with a somewhat similar name near Eretria. On the other hand, the evidence that the northern Skabla was Chalkidic, namely, its position, its participation in the revolt, and especially its tribute payment along with Olynthos¹⁰¹ and Assera, is stronger than any similarity of names. West,¹⁰² although elsewhere he considers Skabla to be Eretrian, makes the plausible suggestion that the joint payment in 454/3 shows an incipient union of the Chalkidians, while the individual payments by the same towns in 453/2 reflect an Athenian policy of breaking up such combinations. With this dissolution he connects the change of the legend on Olynthiac coins from ∇ALK to $\text{O}\nabla\text{VN}$.¹⁰³ If this theory is correct, Skabla must have been Chalkidic, for certainly no Eretrian city would join in a political union with Chalkidic towns and use a common coinage so marked. But even if this interpretation of the Olynthiac coinage is not accepted,¹⁰⁴ the weight of the evidence points to Skabla as a colony of Chalkis.

This completes the list of towns in Thrace for which

101. *Op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

102. *Op. cit.*, p. 7, note 6.

103. See above, p. 45.

104. See above, p. 45, note 47.

we have any evidence of Chalkidic origin, and the number

105. There are, however, three others which have erroneously been called Chalkidic. One of these is Aioleion, which Theopompos (frag. 144 [Jacoby]) calls πόλιν τῆς Ἀττικῆς μὲν οὖσαν, πολιτευομένην δὲ μετὰ τῶν Χαλκιδέων. However, Meineke's suggestion (ad Steph. Byz., s.v. Αἰόλειον) that Βοττικῆς should be read for Ἀττικῆς seems correct. The reference in Theopompos is probably to the extension of the Chalkidic League in the fourth century. The Αἰολῖται, who appear in the tribute lists, defaulted in 432/1, but this would fit a Bottic as well as a Chalkidic town.

The Διακρεῖς ἀπὸ Χαλκιδέων of the tribute lists are referred to the Thracian region by Kahrstedt (op. cit., pp. 421-423). However, he is undoubtedly wrong, since they appear in the Insular panel in the assessment of 425/4; see A 9, I, 83-84 in A.T.L., I, p. 156, and the geographical discussion, pp. 480-481.

Stephanos (s.v. Χαλκίς) speaks of a city called Chalkis on Athos: ἔστι καὶ ἐν Ἀθῶ ἄλλη Χαλκίς, ὡς Εὐδοξος τετάρτῳ "μετὰ δὲ τὸν Ἀθῶ μέχρι Παλλήνης, ἥ ἐπὶ θάτερα πεποίηκε κόλπον βαθὺν καὶ πλατὺν Χαλκίδα ἐπονομαζόμενον." How Stephanos found a reference to a city on Athos in this quotation is impossible to explain,

approaches fairly closely the thirty mentioned by Strabo. In summary, we have twelve towns which were certainly Chalkidic: Torone, Assera, Piloros, Singos, Gale, Mekyberna, Sarte, Sermylia, Arnai, Stolos, Polichne, and Milkoros; ten which were probably Chalkidic: Tinde, Skapsa, Kithas, Smilla, Gigonos, Haisa, Lipaxos, Kombreia, Phegetioi, and Skabla; and five which possibly were: Pistasos, Chedrolioi, Strepsa, Serme, and Sinos.

and it is most probable that no such city existed, since both Herodotos (VII, 22, 3) and Thucydides (IV, 109, 3) give lists of the cities on Athos, in which Chalkis does not appear. In the quotation from Eudoxos, Chalkis is surely the name of a gulf, but which gulf is meant is uncertain. Oberhummer (s.v. Chalkis, 9, P.W., R.E., VI, cols. 2089-2090) thinks it includes both the Toronic and Singic Gulfs, while F. Gisinger (Die Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos von Knidos [Berlin, 1921], pp. 79-80) refers it to both the Toronic and Thermaic. But since the first section of the quotation, μετὰ δὲ τὸν Ἄθω μέχρι Παλλήνης, seems to have been lifted from its context, it shows us only that the description is being given from east to west, and in this case ἐπὶ θάτερα must refer to the western side of Pallene and so to the Thermaic Gulf only.

Undoubtedly all of these towns, especially those inland, were not founded directly from Chalkis; many were settled from the original colonies.¹⁰⁶ Although there is no direct evidence to indicate which were the original foundations, it seems obvious that they would be Torone and the other cities near the coast, both on Sithonia and in the area north of Pallene. Torone was the leading Chalkidic town in Thrace until the rise of Olynthiac power in the fourth century, as is shown by the fact that the leader of the Chalkidic founders of Olynthos was one of her citizens,¹⁰⁷ and by the amount of her regular tribute, which was six talents, as compared to two for Olynthos. Chalkidic expansion inland was probably gradual and was accomplished first by expelling the native Sithonians and E-donians.¹⁰⁸ We know too that the Chalkidians penetrated to a certain degree into the peninsula of Athos, which, except for the Andrian colony of Sane, had been populated mostly by barbarians.¹⁰⁹ The center of these Chalkidians in Athos, who came directly from Euboia, must have been Kleonai, since we

106. This was the case in the West. See below, pp. 76-78.

107. Herodotos, VIII, 127.

108. Steph. Byz., s.v. Στῶλος (quoted above, p. 55, note 74).

109. Thuc., IV, 109, 3: ...Θυσσὸν καὶ Κλεωνὰς καὶ Ἀκροθῶρον καὶ Ὀλόφυξον καὶ Δῖον· αἱ οἰκοῦνται συμμείκτοις ἔθνεσι βαρβάρων διγλώσσων, καὶ τι καὶ Χαλκιδικὸν ἐνὶ βραχύ.

learn from Herakleides Pontikos that the town was settled by Chalkidians from Elymnion, which we know was an island near, or a district in, Euboea.¹¹⁰ Probably the number of barbar-

-
110. Frag. 31 (Müller): κατώκησαν δὲ καὶ Κλεωνᾶς Χαλκιδεῖς ἐν τῷ ᾠθῷ, ἐξαναστάντες ἐξ Ἐλυμνίου, ὥς μὲν μυθολογοῦσιν, ὑπὸ μυῶν, οἳ τὰ τ' ἄλλα κατήσθιον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν σίδηρον. All the manuscripts except A C d read Χαλκιδεῖς οἳ ἐν τῷ ᾠθῷ, but all except A C and p (*in marg.*) omit the section ἐξαναστάντες...μυθολογοῦσιν. Although he does not seem to have investigated the manuscripts very carefully, Müller (*F.G.H.*, II, p. 201) states that A and C are among the best and he accepts the reading given above (*op.cit.*, p. 222). The οἳ probably came into the text after the loss of the following phrase; we can draw no conclusions on the basis of grammatical neatness in an excerpt of this kind. For Ἐλύμνιον Stephanos (*s.v.*) gives νῆσος Εὐβοίας πόλιν ἔχουσα, and a scholiast to Aristophanes (*Pax*, 1126) says: Καλλίστρατός φησι τόπον Εὐβοίας τὸ Ἐλύμνιον. Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ ναόν φησι εἶναι πλησίον Εὐβοίας.... μέμνηται καὶ Σοφοκλῆς "πρὸς πέτραις Ἐλυμνίαις" καὶ ἐν Ναυπλίῳ "νυμφικὸν Ἐλύμνιον." It could have been either an island or a district near Chalkis, and there is no inconsistency in the story of Chalkidians coming from there.

ians on Athos, driven there from the rest of Thrace, prevented Kleonai from becoming an exclusively Chalkidic town, as it did not join the rest of the Chalkidic colonies in the revolt of 432.

We have no ancient evidence for the date of the Chalkidic colonies in Thrace, but the most likely time is in the 8th century (before 735). We have already noted that the confused and vague traditions of their founding point to an early date,¹¹¹ and after 735 the colonizing activity of Chalkis was in the West. It is most improbable that colonists would be sent to both areas concurrently, and it is reasonable to assume that the Thraceward region, being nearer Greece proper,

However, on the ground that Pomponius Mela (II, 2, 30) mentions a town Echinia near Akanthos, it has been common to emend (e.g., Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 165; West *op. cit.*, p. 6, note 5) the text of Herakleides to read 'Εχυνίου, thus making the Chalkidians come to Kleonai from Thrace, not Euboia. Although this emendation may not be too difficult palaeographically, it is certainly unwarranted when made only to fit a preconceived notion that these Chalkidians should have come from Thrace and when the existence of Elymnion in Euboia is better attested than that of Echymnion in Thrace.

111. See above, p. 31, note 5.

was chosen first. We know that a Chalkidic settlement was made at Campanian Kyme and on the island of Pithekoussai¹¹² early in the eighth century, probably two generations before the founding of Sicilian Naxos, and this long period between the opening and the settling of the West may best be explained by the colonizing of Thrace.¹¹³ The reason for the founding of these northern colonies must have been the pressure of population, although probably the first contact with the region came from trading, and the commercial value may¹¹⁴ have been important in the choosing of sites.

When we turn to the Chalkidic colonies in the West, we find no problems comparable to those met during the investigation of the North, for Thucydides has given us a concise

112. See below, pp. 71-74.

113. The fact that the northern colonies sent help to Chalkis during the Lelantine War also points to an early date, if that war took place in the first half of the seventh century as will be urged later (Chapter IV).

114. This argument finds an analogy in the West, where a colony at Kyme was planted near an earlier trading post. But for purposes of trade one city was enough, as shown by the period between the founding of Kyme and the other western colonies. The basic reason for sending numerous emigrants was the problem of population.

outline of colonization in Sicily,¹¹⁵ and the rest of the ancient evidence fits in well with his sketch.

There are indications of a very early interest in the West on the part of the Euboians. There was a settlement in Illyria called Euboia, attributed to the Abantes returning from Troy,¹¹⁶ and we know that the Eretrians settled at Kerkyra before the Corinthians took it over.¹¹⁷ However, we do not hear of any settlements specifically designated as Chalkidic before the founding of Pithekoussai and Kyme in Italy.¹¹⁸

These two settlements, situated in Italy, are not included in Thucydides' outline of colonization, but he does

115. VI, 3-5.

116. Steph. Byz., s.v. Εὐβοία; Strabo, X, 1, 15.

117. Wallace, op. cit., pp. 24-29.

118. Wade-Gery (Q.A.H., III, p. 535) states that Chalkis in Aitolia (Steph. Byz., s.v. Χαλκίς) was a Chalkidic colony which was later absorbed by Corinth. But since it is mentioned in the Iliad (II, 690), it must have been founded too early to be a regular colony. If there is any connection in the similarity of names, we should rather connect it with the tradition that the Kouretes, when expelled from Euboia, settled in Aitolia (Strabo, X, 2, 4).

119
speak of Kyme as a Chalkidic colony. Pithekoussai was the
earlier settlement, located on an island in the Bay of Naples,
120
but it later merged with Kyme. It was very likely a
trading post; this is the most logical explanation for the
earliest Greek settlement in the West lying so far afield and
121
near Etruria. The ancient sources agree that Kyme was a
122
Chalkidic colony, but tradition is confused concerning what
123
other cities shared in the founding. Strabo, in our full-
est account, states that Kyme was settled by Chalkidians and
Kymaians under Megasthenes and Hippokles respectively, and
124
Skymnos adds that the Kymaians were from Aiolic Kyme. But
125
elsewhere Strabo says that Pithekoussai was colonized by

119. VI, 4, 5: Κύμης τῆς ἐν Ὀπικίᾳ Χαλκιδικῆς πόλεως.

120. Livy, VIII, 22, 5-6.

121. Greek trade with Etruria predated the founding of Kyme and Pithekoussai, so these settlements are the result, not the cause of it; A. Blakeway, "'Demaratus'," J.R.S., XXV (1935), pp. 129-149, especially p. 136.

122. Those sources which mention only Chalkidians are Livy, loc. cit.; Velleius Paterculus, I, 4, 1; Steph. Byz., s.v. Κύμη; Eustathios, in Iliad., II, 764.

123. V, 4, 4.

124. 236-240.

125. V, 4, 9.

Chalkidians and Eretrians, while to the same peoples Dionysios of Halikarnassos¹²⁶ attributes the founding of Kyme. There was a village of Kyme in Euboia,¹²⁷ undoubtedly the namesake of Aiolic Kyme; in the tradition these two could easily become confused. It is far more likely that settlers from the Euboic town joined the Chalkidians and Eretrians in founding Italian Kyme. Our conclusion must be that Kyme was a joint Euboic enterprise under the official leadership of Chalkis.

Strabo¹²⁸ also tells us that Kyme was the oldest of the Greek colonies in Italy and Sicily, but the traditional date given by Eusebios, about 1050 B.C.,¹²⁹ can not stand.

126. Ant. Rom., VII, 3, 1.

127. Steph. Byz., s.v. Κύμη.

128. V, 4, 4.

129. See Fotheringham's edition of Hieronymos, p. 115: My-cena in Italia condita. Fotheringham relegates quae nunc Cumae (vel sim.) to his apparatus. The clause may be a gloss but is actually printed in the text by A. Schöne, Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo, II (Berlin, 1866), p. 61; see also R. Helm, Eusebius Werke, VII, Die Chronik des Hieronymus, Erster Teil (Leipzig, 1913), p. 69: Mycena in Italia condita vel Cumae; Zweiter Teil (Leipzig, 1926), p. 182.

It is obviously a confusion with the founding date of Aiolic Kyme. Strabo's statement might seem suspect on the ground that Kyme is too far north to be the earliest Greek colony in the West,¹³⁰ but it has been substantiated by a comparison of archaeological finds at Syracuse and Kyme, which place the founding of Kyme earlier than that of Syracuse and, in conjunction with the literary evidence, in the second quarter of the 8th century.¹³¹ The settlement on Pithekoussai was undoubtedly a little earlier, although we have no archaeological evidence from that site.

The next western colony was Naxos in Sicily, and from here on we may follow closely the account given by Thucydides (VI, 3-5). He states that the first Greek colony in Sicily was Naxos, settled by the Chalkidians under Theokles

130. Cf. Beloch, Gr. Gesch., I², 2, p. 227: "es ist von vornherein klar, dass die Griechen sich am Golfe von Neapel erst ansiedeln konnten, nachdem die Strasse von Messinia in ihrer Gewalt war."

131. Cf. Blakeway, "Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Commerce with the West, 800-600 B.C.," B.S.A., XXXIII (1932-1933), p. 200, note 3. It should be noted that the exact dating is only relative and depends on Thucydides' chronology for the founding of the western colonies; see below, p. 75, note 134.

one year before the founding of Syracuse. Thucydides makes¹³² no mention of any other peoples involved, but Hellanikos reports that Naxians took part. Ephoros adds that there were¹³³ some Ionians as well as Chalkidians. The date was approximately¹³⁴ 735.

132. Frag. 82 (Jacoby).

133. Frag. 137 (Jacoby), from Strabo, VI, 2, 2, and Skymnos, 270-277. He includes in the same group the Megarians who founded Megara Hyblaia. But from Thucydides it is clear that these Megarians came a few years later, although the confusion was easy since they lived with the Chalkidians in Leontinoi for a short while.

134. This is based on computations made from Thucydides' account and depends ultimately on his statement (VI, 4, 2) that Megara Hyblaia stood 245 years before its destruction by Gelon. The date is only approximate because we do not know the exact year of either the founding or the destruction of Megara Hyblaia. For a complete discussion of the question see G. Busolt, "Bemerkungen über die Gründungsdata der Griechischen Colonien in Sicilien und Unteritalien," Rhein. Mus., XL (1885), pp. 466-469. There was also another tradition, apparently based on the 40 year generation, which placed the founding of the western colonies much earlier.

Six years later, about 729, Chalkidians from Naxos,

Ephoros put the settlement of Naxos in the tenth generation after the Trojan War. His fragment 137 (Jacoby) in the text of Strabo reads, φησὶ δὲ ταύτας "Εφορος πρῶτας κτισθῆναι πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας ἐν Σικελίᾳ καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ μετὰ τὰ Τρωικά, but Scaliger's emendation of καὶ τῇ to δεκάτῃ seems certain when compared with lines 270-271 of Skymnos (εἶθ' Ἑλληνικάς ἔσχευ πόλεις, ἀπὸ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ), which also are based on Ephoros. In view of this passage, attempts to reconcile Ephoros' date with that of Thucydides by emending to πεντεκαίδεκάτῃ (as does Müller, II, pp. 246-247) or by supposing that IF has been lost from the text (B. Schweitzer, "Geometrische Stile in Griechenland," Ath. Mitt., XLIII [1918], p. 25) are surely in error. For the whole problem of "long" chronologies based on the 40 year generation see A. R. Burn, "Dates in Early Greek History," J.H.S., LV (1935), pp. 130-146.

Thucydides' source for the western colonies probably was Antiochos of Syracuse, who had access to records which should have been reliable; see K. M. T. Atkinson, "Two Tomb-Groups from Selinus," P.B.S.R., XIV (1938), pp. 115-146. On this account rests the chronology of the archaeological finds in the West; it has

still under Theokles, founded Leontinoi, and, after that and under Euarchos, Katane. The next colony was Zankle, which was first settled by pirates from Campanian Kyme, then reinforced by colonists from Chalkis and the rest of Euboea. The oikists were Perieres of Chalkis and Krataimenes of Kyme.

been accepted as trustworthy by Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 8-49; K. Johansen, Les Vases Sicyniens (Paris, 1923), pp. 179-185; H. Payne, Necrocorinthia (Oxford, 1931), pp. 21-27; and Atkinson, loc. cit. A. W. Byvanck, "Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Funde in Italien aus dem VIII und VII Vorchristlichen Jahrhundert," Mnemosyne, IV, ser. 3 (1936-1937), pp. 181-225, argues that the dates of the archaeological finds should be later than those given by Payne (loc. cit.) which are based on Thucydides; yet Byvanck in general retains the founding dates of Thucydides by claiming that a period of about 25 years would elapse between the founding date of a colony and the date of the earliest archaeological evidence found there. Such a period, however, is doubtful, especially for Selinos, on which Payne's chronology primarily depends; see Atkinson, op. cit., pp. 130-136.

135. Pausanias (IV, 23, 7) calls Krataimenes a Samian, but probably this confusion was caused by the settlement at Zankle of Samian refugees after the Ionian Revolt.

Himera was founded later by Chalkidians from Zankle along with Syracusan exiles.

This ends Thucydides' outline of Chalkidic colonization in Sicily and there is little to add. We do know of four more towns which were founded by the Sicilian Chalkidians:
¹³⁶
 Kallipolis, Euboia, Mylai, and Tauromenion.

The only other colony of Chalkis in the West was Rhegion. Since it was in Italy, Thucydides did not include it in his chronological account, but twice he calls its inhabitants Chalkidians.
¹³⁷ Herakleides Pontikos ¹³⁸ informs us that the town was founded by Chalkidians who had consulted the Delphic oracle because of a famine and by Messenian exiles
¹³⁹ who joined them at the suggestion of Delphoi. Strabo elaborates on this story and adds a variant tradition from Antiochos that the Chalkidians were called out by the inhabitants
¹⁴⁰ of Zankle, who furnished the oikist, Antimnestos. These two

136. Skymnos, 286-290. Strabo, X, 1, 15, also mentions the town of Euboia.

137. III, 86, 2; VI, 44, 3.

138. Frag. 25 (Müller).

139. VI, 1, 6.

140. Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom., XIX, 2, implies that the leader was Artimenes, a Chalkidian, who is said, at least, to have interpreted the oracle.

traditions are not contradictory and we may assume that the need for relief from famine dictated the settlement of Rhegion; the colonists were despatched with the sanction of Delphoi to a spot suggested by the Zankleians, who must have been eager to have fellow countrymen settled across the straits from them.

The date of the foundation can be judged only approximately from its having occurred after the settlement of Zankle and from the presence of the Messenians who had been exiled as pro-Spartan during the First Messenian War.¹⁴¹ Zankle was founded some time after the settlement of Leontinoi in 729, but how long the interval was Thucydides does not say. It was probably not great, however, for the importance of the straits must have been realized soon after the first colonization of Sicily. We can place the First Messenian War with some precision from the Olympic victor lists, in which the last Messenian appears in Ol. II (736), the first Spartan in Ol. IV (720).¹⁴² The Messenians must have been exiled early in this period. Therefore the most logical time for the

141. Strabo, loc. cit.

142. J. Karst, Eusebius Werke, V, Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen Übersetzt (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte, XX, [Leipzig, 1911]), p. 91. For the other evidence on the Messenian War see Wade-Gery, C.A.H., III, pp. 537-539.

founding of Rhegion is soon after that of Zankle, roughly 725 B.C. We should not expect an area on the straits to remain long unoccupied.

It has been stated above that trade as well as the problem of overpopulation influenced the colonization of the West; it is interesting to note the course of Greek trade in the West during and after the period of colonization.¹⁴³

From some time before the founding of Kyme down to ca. 735, the imported pottery found on western sites comes from many parts of the Greek world. The product of no particular state predominates, although the Kykladic type is in the majority.¹⁴⁴ None of the pottery can be identified as Chalkidic, and it is apparent that Chalkis, whose strong interest in this western trade is shown by the founding of Kyme, acted as a carrier, probably for the Kyklades; as yet there was no monopoly. During the period between ca. 735 and ca. 690, the character of western imports of pottery changes; Korinthian wares far outnumber all others and almost monopolize the market. The change is too great to be explained by any superiority of Korinthian pottery or by Korinth's favorable situation for

143. This section is based on the convincing articles of Blakeway (cited above, p. 72, note 121, and p. 74, note 131).

144. For the so-called Chalkidic pottery of the late seventh and sixth centuries see below, pp. 135-138.

the westward trade. Coming at a time when Chalkis and Korinth were settling peacefully near one another in Sicily and when Chalkis had gained control of the straits of Messina, the influx of Korinthusian pottery must be the result of a deliberately monopolistic policy on the part of these two states. What induced Chalkis to enter into such a practice is perplexing. The advantage to Korinth is obvious, but Chalkis, which really held the upper hand by control of the straits, must have derived some equally great advantages. Undoubtedly there was a tax for the use of the straits, and perhaps she received a share of the Korinthusian carrying trade. She had no ceramic industry to compete with the Korinthusian; probably her exports¹⁴⁵ were for the most part metal work. At least we know that

-
145. For evidence of a metal industry at Chalkis see above, pp. 10-14. Chalkis' share in the western trade had always been considered to lie in metalwork, until this interpretation was denied by K. A. Neugebauer, Röm. Mitt., XXXVIII-XXXIX (1923-1924), pp. 341-440. He has assigned the origin of most of the known bronze vases, formerly attributed to Chalkis, to southern Italian cities. However, much of his argument against Chalkis is based on a comparison of the metal work with the "Chalkidian" pottery, which almost certainly was made in Italy, not Chalkis; cf. below, pp. 135-138. Further-

from about 735 Chalkis and Korinth were working together on a friendly basis in the West.

After the conclusion of this western colonization before the end of the eighth century, there was a long lull in the colonizing activity of Chalkis. The drain on the population of the city during that century must have been great and, too, the energy of the city was directed to the Lelantine War. Her great period of colonization was over, and when, in the last half of the seventh century, Chalkis sent out her last colonists, they went under the official leadership of Andros, just as the Naxians had accompanied Chalkidians to Naxos in Sicily. The three colonies founded were Sane, Akanthos, and Stageiros in Thrace, situated to the north of Athos along the east coast of the Chalkidic peninsula. We know from Thucydides¹⁴⁶ that these were all offi-

more, the metal vases with which he deals were made at least a century after the period we are discussing. Therefore, in view of the literary evidence for a metal industry at Chalkis and the fact that she must have had an interest in the western trade other than pottery, the most reasonable explanation is that her exports were metal.

146. IV, 84, 1 (for Akanthos); 88, 2 (for Stageiros); 109, 3 (for Sane).

cially Andrian, but Plutarch¹⁴⁷ tells of the joint capture of Sane from the barbarians by Andrians and Chalkidians and of their seizure of deserted Akanthos. A dispute over the ownership of the latter city arose because a Chalkidian had reached the city first but had been beaten by an Andrian spear hurled into the gate. The city was awarded to the Andrians by a board of arbitration, with Samos and Erythrai supporting Andros, while Paros sided with Chalkis. There is no reason to doubt the essential details of the story,¹⁴⁸ which is given credence by the fact that all the states involved in it are known from other sources to have been on friendly terms earlier in the seventh century---a condition implied both by the joint colonization and the arbitration.¹⁴⁹ For Chalkidians in Stageiros¹⁵⁰ we have only one ancient reference; Dionysios of Halikarnassos

147. Aetia Graeca, 30.

148. See Halliday, Greek Questions of Plutarch, p. 140. Gwynn, op. cit., p. 102, speaks of Eretrians and Andrians settling in these cities, but cites as evidence "Plut. Qu. Gr. 57," which deals with Megara and Samos; 57 must be a misprint for 33. He later mentions Eretria's domination of Andros (Strabo, X, 1, 10), and probably had this in mind.

149. See below, Chapter III.

150. Πρὸς Ἀρχαίον, 5.

states that Aristotle's mother was a descendant of one of those who led colonists to that city from Chalkis. Since, according to Eusebios,¹⁵¹ Akanthos and Stageiros were founded in the same year, these two cities and Sane must have been the result of the same joint expedition. Another indication of Chalkidian activity in the same region is the town near Lake Bolbe named Arethousa,¹⁵² probably after the famous fountain in Chalkis.¹⁵³

The date given by Eusebios for the founding of Akanthos and Stageiros is Ol. 31,2 (655/4), but we can not rely on this, since Eusebios' chronology was almost certainly based on a forty year generation, as Burn has pointed out,¹⁵⁴ and so

151. See above, p. 31, note 5.

152. Strabo, VII, frag. 36: πρὸς δὲ τῇ λίμνῃ τῇ Βόλβῃ Ἀρέθουσα. Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἀρέθουσα· πόλις Θράκης.

Ammianus Marcellinus, XXVII, 4, 8: Acontisma, cui proxima Arethusa cursualis est statio, in quo visitur Euripidis sepulcrum, ...et Stagira. Steph. Byz., s.v. Βορμίσκος, states that Euripides was killed near Bormiskos, which was also near Lake Bolbe (Thuc., IV, 103, 1). Possibly Bormiskos too was Chalkidic, but we have no evidence except its position near Arethousa.

153. See above, pp. 5-6.

154. Op. cit., p. 141.

was inflated. Probably the date of the founding of the two cities should be placed at least twenty years later, ca. 630-625.

CHAPTER III

THE LELANTINE WAR

The next problem in the history of Chalkis is the vexed question of the so-called Lelantine War between Chalkis and Eretria and their respective allies. The issue has been much debated and there is as yet no common agreement. The war has been placed in various periods ranging from the eighth to the sixth centuries, with the more recent authorities favoring a later date.¹ There has been a similar divergence of

-
1. The war is set in the late eighth century by Busolt, Gr. Gesch., I², pp. 456-457; E. Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums, II (Stuttgart, 1884), pp. 539-540; Dondorff, De Rebus Chalcidensium, pp. 6-18; E. Curtius, "Studien zur Geschichte von Korinth," Hermes, X (1876), p. 220. The first part of the seventh century is favored by Burn, J.H.S., XLIX (1929), pp. 14-37; M. Cary, C.A.H., III, p. 622; Geyer, Topographie und Geschichte, pp. 24-27; E. L. Highbarger, The History and Civilization of Ancient Megara (Baltimore, 1927), pp. 108-109; Dunham, The History of Miletus, pp. 65-68. The end of the seventh and the early sixth century is supported by Wallace, History of Eretria, pp. 50-69; Beloch, Gr.

opinion concerning the war's extent and ramifications.² Such a diversity of views reflects the lack of precision and the paucity of our evidence. There are only four ancient references which are universally accepted as pertaining to the war.

³
Thucydides, after stating that land warfare between the cities of early Greece was carried on by individual states without allies against their neighbors, makes the

Gesch., I², 1, pp. 338-339; A. A. Trever, "Economic and Political Conditions in Megara," Class. Phil., XX (1925), pp. 120-122; J. G. O'Neill, Ancient Corinth, I (Baltimore, 1930), pp. 162-164 and 246-250. V. Costanzi, "La Guerra Lelantea," Atene e Roma, V (1902), pp. 768-790, dates the war more closely, putting it between 580 and 570 B.C.

2. For the two extremes see Burn, loc. cit., who believes that most of the Greek world was involved through trade relations, and P. Gardner, "A Numismatic Note on the Lelantine War," Class. Rev., XXXIV (1920), pp. 90-91, who considers it a "knightly combat" involving only the possession of the Lelantine Plain. K. F. Hermann, Rhein. Mus., I (1832), pp. 84-97, suggested that the war was between oligarchies and democracies; he has been decisively refuted by Dondorff (loc. cit.).

3. I, 15.

following exception to his statement: μάλιστα δὲ ἐς τὸν πάλαι ποτὲ γενόμενον πόλεμον Χαλκιδέων καὶ Ἑρετριῶν καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ἐς συμμαχίαν ἑκατέρων διέστη.

⁴ Herodotos gives the following reason for Eretria's aid to Miletos during the Ionic Revolt: οἱ γὰρ δὴ Μιλήσιοι πρότερον τοῖσι Ἑρετρίεῦσι τὸν πρὸς Χαλκιδέας πόλεμον συνδιήνεικαν, ὅτε περ καὶ Χαλκιδεῦσι ἀντία Ἑρετρίεων καὶ Μιλησίων Σαμῖοι ἐβοήθεον.

⁵ Plutarch, partly on the authority of Aristotle, tells this story of the war: Κλεόμαχος ὁ Φαρσάλιος... ἦκεν ἐπικουρος Χαλκιδεῦσι τοῦ θεσσαλικοῦ πολέμου πρὸς Ἑρετρίεῖς ἀκμάζοντος· καὶ τὸ μὲν περὶ ἐδόκει τοῖς Χαλκιδεῦσιν ἐρρωσθαι, τοὺς δ' ἱππέας μέγ' ἔργον ἦν ὤσασθαι τῶν πολεμίων· παρεκάλουν δὴ τὸν Κλεόμαχον ἄνδρα λαμπρὸν ὄντα τὴν ψυχὴν οἱ σύμμαχοι πρῶτον ἐμβάλλειν εἰς τοὺς ἱππέας. ὁ δ' ἠρώτησε παρόντα τὸν ἐρώμενον, εἰ μέλλοι θεᾶσθαι τὸν ἀγῶνα· φήσαντος δὲ τοῦ νεανίσκου καὶ φιλοφρόνως αὐτὸν ἀσπασαμένου καὶ τὸ κράνος ἐπίθεντος, ἐπιγανυραθεὶς ὁ Κλεόμαχος καὶ τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν θεσσαλῶν συναγαγὼν περὶ αὐτὸν ἐξήλασε λαμπρῶς καὶ τρέψασθαι τὸ ἱππικόν· ἐκ δὲ τούτου καὶ τῶν ὀπλιτῶν φυγόντων, ἐνίκησαν κατὰ κράτος οἱ Χαλκιδεῖς. τὸν μέντοι Κλεόμαχον ἀποθανεῖν συνέτυχε. τάφον δ' αὐτοῦ δεικνύουσιν ἐν ἀγορᾷ Χαλκι-

4. V, 99, 1.

5. Amatorius, 17.

δεῖς, ἐφ' οὗ μέχρι νῦν ὁ μέγας ἐφέστηκε κίων· καὶ τὸ παιδε-
 ραστεῖν πρότερον ἐν ψόγῳ τιθέμενοι τότε μᾶλλον ἐτέρων ἡγάπη-
 σαν καὶ ἐτίμησαν. Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τὸν μὲν Κλεόμαχον ἄλλως
 ἀποθανεῖν φησι, κρατήσαντα τῶν Ἑρετριέων τῇ μάχῃ· τὸν δ'
 ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐρωμένου φιληθέντα τῶν ἀπὸ Θράκης Χαλκιδέων γενέσθαι,
 πεμφθέντα τοῖς ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ Χαλκιδεῦσιν ἐπίκουρον... (In the
 first sentence Hermann's <μετὰ> τοῦ θεσσαλικοῦ or something
 similar should be read. It is clear that the Lelantine War
 is under discussion, but it is not necessary to emend to
 Ἀηλαντικοῦ, as suggested by Wilamowitz.)

6

Finally, Strabo gives an account of the war: τὸ
 μὲν οὖν πλεον ὁμολόγουν ἀλλήλαις αἱ πόλεις αὗται, περὶ δὲ
 Ἀηλάντου διενεχθεῖσαι οὐδ' οὕτω τελέως ἐπαύσαντο, ὥστε τῷ
 πολέμῳ κατὰ ἀνθάδειαν δρᾶν ἕκαστα, ἀλλὰ συνέθεντο, ἐφ' οἷς
 συστήσονται τὸν ἀγῶνα. δημοῖ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ Ἀμαρυνθείῳ
 στήλῃ τις, φράζουσα μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις.

From these references we learn that the war started
 over possession of the Lelantine Plain and extended to what,
 in Thucydides' opinion, was the most extensive struggle of
 the period between the Trojan and Persian Wars. The number
 of allies on each side must have been considerable, although

7

6. X, 1, 11.

7. That the allies involved were numerous seems certain
 when we compare the number of states active in the Mes-

we know only that Samos, Thessaly, and the northern Chalkidic

senian Revolt (Argos, Arkadia, the Pisatans, and Sikyon on the side of Messenia [Strabo, VIII, 5, 10; Pausanias, IV, 15, 7]; Samos and Korinth on the side of Sparta [Herodotos, III, 47; Pausanias, loc. cit.]) and the Sacred War (Sikyon, Athens, Thessaly and Argos against Kirrha [Pausanias, X, 37, 6; scholia to Pindar, Pythians, Hypoth. b, c, and d; Athenaios, XIII, 506c]), neither of which conflicts is mentioned by Thucydides. We must remember that in this section Thucydides is generalizing for the purpose of showing the unimportance of earlier wars; therefore, we can not take his statement literally. By doing so the scholiast, ad I, 15, 3, is led to comment: διέστη· διεσπάσθη, ἀνεχώρησεν, οὐ συν-εμάχησεν· οὐ γὰρ λέγει ὅτι ἐμερίσθη, ἀλλὰ μόνοι Χαλκι-δεῖς μόνοις Ἐρετρίευσιν ἐμάχοντο. Yet this is in direct contradiction to the evidence of Herodotos and Aristotle. Neither can we claim, as does E. Harrison, Studies in Theognis (Cambridge, 1902), pp. 292-293, that from the passage of Herodotos "the inference is obvious; Miletus and Samos were the only two cities of note which Herodotus knew to have taken part in the war." For it is Eretria's help to Miletos which brings up the subject in the narrative, and Samos, as the natural rival of

colonies helped Chalkis, while Miletos aided Eretria. From the position of the reference in the narrative of Thucydides we may infer that the war was fought mainly on land. This is borne out in regard to the principals by the testimony of Aristotle and Strabo; it was natural for Chalkis and Eretria to meet one another on the Lelantine Plain. But there is nothing in the sources to show that fighting did not take place elsewhere; the mention of allies seems to show that it did. And although the Plain was undoubtedly the immediate cause of the outbreak of war, there is no evidence which forbids us to look for a broader and more far-reaching cause which would involve numerous allies.⁸

From the evidence so far examined, we can not even be sure who won the war, although the passage from Plutarch⁹ implies that Chalkis had the better of the local fighting.

Miletos, would be logically introduced to balance the sentence.

8. It should be noted that the term "Lelantine War" occurs nowhere in the sources. It is a modern name which tends to make one think that the war was localized to the plain itself; when using it we must remember that there is no such ancient implication.
9. There is little value in the evidence usually adduced for a Chalkidic victory---the possession of the Lelan-

Kleomachos is said to have conquered only in battle, but it sounds like a decisive battle, and we shall see that other evidence corroborates a Chalkidic victory.¹⁰

There is in these passages small indication of date, although it seems reasonable to suspect that a war which Thucydides describes as τὸ πάλαι ποτὲ γυνόμενον took place at least before the time of Solon. We have, at least, a definite terminus post quem, the founding of the Chalkidic colonies in Thrace which sent aid to Chalkis during the war. We have seen that these colonies were despatched between 775 and 735,¹¹ and probably we should allow an interval of perhaps a generation after their founding, during which they could have become firmly established and powerful enough to send aid back to their mother city.

This is all the information about the war which we may glean from the four references which, without question,

tine Plain by the Hippobotai in 506 (Herodotos, VI, 100; Ailian, Var. Hist., VI, 1). Between the war and 506, the land could have changed hands several times in purely local quarrels for which we have no testimony.

10. See below, p. 93 (the joint colonization by Chalkis and Andros, which had been under Eretrian control) and pp. 119-120 (the oracle praising Chalkidian prowess).

11. See above, pp. 69-70.

deal directly with it. Now we must introduce more controversial evidence, first to narrow the limits of time in which the war must have occurred, then to discover its wider implications and to fit it into its proper place among the events which we know took place during that period.

In the first place, it seems safe to set the terminus post quem forward to a time after the founding of the colonies of Chalkis in the West. For at the beginning of that colonization Chalkis and Eretria were apparently on good terms and sent out colonists jointly to Campanian Kyme. Although that city was founded earlier than most of the western colonies, it is proper to assume that such an outburst of colonization would not have taken place either during or immediately after a destructive war. Therefore, we may set ca. 720¹² as the terminus post quem.

The resumption of colonizing activity by Chalkis after a long period of inactivity suggests a terminus ante quem for the war. For Stageiros, Sane, and Akanthos were settled jointly ca. 625¹³ by Chalkis and Andros. The latter island¹⁴ had formerly been under Eretrian control; her friendly rela-

12. Rhegion, the last of the western colonies, can be dated between 729 and 716; see above, pp. 79-80.

13. See above, pp. 82-85.

14. Strabo, X, 1, 10; cf. Wallace, op. cit., pp. 29-33.

tions with Chalkis, which are implied in this joint endeavor, are best explained as a result of her being freed in the Lelantine War.

Another passage which suggests a terminus ante quem is fragment 3 of Archilochos (ed. Diehl):

οὐ τοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα ταυύσσεται οὐδὲ θαμειαί
σφενδόναί, εὖτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγῃ
ἐν πεδίῳ· ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον·
τούτης γὰρ κεῖνοι δαίμονές εἰσι μάχης
δεσπόται Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί.

These lines seem to be a contemporary allusion to the Lelantine War, as shown by the phrase ἐν πεδίῳ and the abstention from the use of bows and slings, which almost certainly is an echo of the convention which Strabo connects with the

¹⁵ war. It is, of course, barely possible that this passage

merely reflects the reputation of the Abantes as αἰχμηταί, μεμαῶτες ὀρεκτῆσι μελίησι θώρηκας ῥήξειν δηῖων ἀμφὶ στή-

¹⁶ θεσσιν. But the lines of Archilochos resemble the convention reported by Strabo so much more closely than they resemble the lines of the Iliad that all probability favors considering

15. X, 1, 11: δηλοῖ...στήλη τις, φράζουσα μὴ χρῆσθαι
τραπεβάλοις.

16. Iliad, II, 543-544, as interpreted by Costanzi, op. cit., pp. 776-778.

the passage a contemporary reference to the war. The floruit of Archilochos is almost certainly to be placed a little¹⁷ before the middle of the seventh century. This gives us a terminus ante quem of ca. 660 B.C.

¹⁸
Dondorff suggests that the war, which was apparently fought on land by states which were strong on the sea, must have taken place before the introduction of naval fighting. This is a reasonable assumption in the light of the position of Thucydides' reference to the quarrel in a section¹⁹ which describes land warfare. Nevertheless, we can not be sure that there was no fighting at sea merely because mention of it does not occur in our sources. But Dondorff, on these grounds, places the war before 700, since in 704 the Corinthians sent their shipbuilder Ameinokles to build four triremes²⁰ for the Samians. However, the construction of triremes did

17. Burn, J.H.S., LV (1935), pp. 132-133; his dating is based on the mention of Gyges in the poems of Archilochos and in Assyrian annals.

18. Op. cit., p. 12.

19. I, 15; see above, pp. 87-88.

20. Thuc., I, 13, 2-3: πρώτοι δὲ Κορίνθιοι λέγονται ἐγγύτατα τοῦ νῦν τρόπου μεταχειρίσαι τὰ περὶ τὰς ναῦς, καὶ τριήρεις ἐν Κορίνθῳ πρώτον τῆς Ἑλλάδος ναυπηγηθῆναι. φαίνεται δὲ καὶ Σαμίους Ἀμεινοκλῆς Κορίνθιος ναυπηγὸς

not mean that sea fighting on an organized basis would break out at once; it was forty years later, in 664, before the first naval battle known to Thucydides took place.²¹ Here Thucydides must be referring to an organized battle between fleets; we can be sure that ships were used in war long before 664,²² although probably only for duels between single vessels. Therefore the tradition that the Lelantine War was a land war points to a date before 664 rather than 700. The argument is weak by itself, but gives support to the date implied in the passage of Archilochos.

There is one other passage which has often been introduced as evidence for the date of the war. Theognis (891-894) says:

οἷ μοι ἀναλκείης· ἀπὸ μὲν Κήρινθος ὄλωλεν,

ναῦς ποιήσας τέσσαρας· ἔτη δ' ἔστ' ἡ μάλιστα τριακόσια
 εἰς τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου ὅτε Ἀμεινοκλῆς Σαμί-
 οῖς ἦλθεν. For further implications in this passage
 see below, pp. 116-117.

21. I, 13, 4: ναυμαχία τε παλαιτάτη ὣν ἴσμεν γίγνεται
 Κορινθίων πρὸς Κερκυραίων· ἔτη δὲ μάλιστα καὶ ταύτη
 ἐξήκοντα καὶ διακόσιά ἐστι μέχρι τοῦ αὐτοῦ χρόνου.
22. This is clear from the naval conflicts depicted on the
 Dipylon vases; P. N. Ure, The Origin of Tyranny (Cam-
 bridge, 1922), pp. 321-326.

Αηλάντοῦ δ' ἀγαθὸν κείρεται οἰνόπεδον.
 οἱ δ' ἀγαθοὶ φεύγουσι, πόλιν δὲ κακοὶ διέπουσιν.
 ὣς δὴ Κυψελιδέων Ζεὺς ὀλέσειε γένος.

In the last line the manuscripts read κυψελίζων or κυψελ-
 λίζων, but these words are unmetrical and almost unintelli-
 gible, and Bergk's emendation to Κυψελιδέων is attractive.²³
 We know that Theognis himself visited Euboea;²⁴ it has there-
 fore been claimed that this passage is an eye-witness account
 of the end of the Lelantine War and so is more important than
 all of the other evidence which points to an earlier date.²⁵
 The most probable floruit for Theognis is the end of the
 seventh century and the early part of the sixth, although he
 may have lived much later.²⁶ If we do accept this passage as

23. Dondorff, op. cit., pp. 16-17, appears to take κυψελ-
 λίζων with γένος; here he follows Müller, qui non putet
ad Corinthios eam (sc. vocem κυψελλίζειν) referendam
esse, sed potius significare obturatum et surdum popu-
lum. Dondorff cites Suidas, s.v. κυψέλη. ... διαφέρει
 δὲ πρὸς τὴν κυψελίδα, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶ ῥύπος.
 This meaning is possible, but on metrical grounds both
 κυψελίζων and κυψελλίζων are impossible.
24. Line 784: ἦλθον δ' Εὐβοίης ἀμπελόεν πεδίου.
25. Costanzi, op. cit., passim; Wallace, op. cit., pp. 51-
 56; Trever, Class. Phil., XX (1925), pp. 120-122.
26. For the floruit about 600 see T. H. Williams, "Theognis

actually referring to the Lelantine War, then we must place that war roughly about 600 B.C. or a little later. This would not only force us to abandon all of the evidence which points to a date in the first half of the seventh century, but it also would contradict what we know from Herodotos of the allies on each side. For under such an interpretation the πόλις of the passage must be Eretria, and the Kypselids must be held responsible for its fall; therefore, we should have the Kypselids allied with Chalkis and Samos against Miletos and Eretria. But we know that under these tyrants the foreign policy of Korinth had changed and that Periandros was friendly with Thrasyboulos of Miletos and hostile to Samos.²⁷ Therefore we can not accept an interpretation of the passage which assumes that the Kypselids were friendly to Samos and hostile to Miletos about 600 B.C., especially when the acceptance involves rejecting the evidence of Archilochos and the best explanation of the joint Chalkidian-Andrian colonization.

and His Poems," J.H.S., XXIII (1903), pp. 1-33. The dating depends almost entirely on the internal evidence of the poems and one's view of how much of them is genuine. E. Harrison, op. cit., pp. 268-303, maintains that Theognis lived until the period of the Persian Wars.

27. Herodotos, V, 92, §; III, 48.

We can not date the Lelantine War on the basis of this questionable passage alone.²⁸ A different interpretation of these lines seems much preferable: that they refer to civil strife in Chalkis and the cities of Euboia. The contrast of ἀγαθοί and κακοί in line 893 suggests a political conflict, and γένος Κυψελιδέων²⁹ may refer to the race of tyrants in general.

-
28. Wallace, op. cit., pp. 62-63, suggests as supporting evidence for an early sixth century date the battle of Keressos, in which the Thebans defeated the Thessalians some time before 571 (more than two hundred years before Leuktra; Plutarch, Camillus, 19; Pausanias, IX, 14, 2-4). It is true that the Thessalians were involved in the Lelantine War; yet this battle might better be connected with the Sacred War. Theban aid would help explain the long resistance of Kirrha to the combined forces of Kleisthenes of Sikyon, Athens, Thessaly, and Argos. After the war we find Kleisthenes making overtures to Thebes (see M. F. McGregor, "Cleisthenes of Sikyon and the Panhellenic Festivals," T.A.P.A., LXXII [1941], pp. 260-287, especially pp. 270 and 282).
29. Geyer, op. cit., pp. 97-98, suggests that the lines refer to civil strife, instigated by Periandros of Korinth. Concerning tyranny in Chalkis see below, pp. 138-140.

With the elimination of Theognis as pertinent evidence for the date of the Lelantine War, we are left with the previously established termini, ca. 720 and 660 B.C. Our next step is to examine the history of this period and the years immediately preceding it, with particular attention to the friendships and enmities of the various Greek states. We shall find that during this time there may be distinguished two groups of states which are hostile to one another. On the one side are Chalkis, Samos, Korinth, Sparta, Erythrai, Paros, Andros, and Athens; on the other Eretria, Miletos, Chios, Megara, Argos, and Aigina. Thereafter we must try to explain these interstate relations and to fit the Lelantine War into its most logical place in the history of the age. We must find the time when it is most likely that the war would involve more allies than did any other conflict in early Greece.

From the examination of western colonization we have³⁰ already gained some knowledge of interstate relations. At the time of their joint founding of Kyme, Chalkis and Eretria were apparently on good terms; but later, about 735, we find Korinthians taking over an Eretrian colony at Kerkyra. The joint settlement of Chalkidians and Megarians at Leontinoi implies friendly relations between the mother cities, even though the colonists could not live peacefully together and

30. Cf. above, pp. 70-82.

the Megarians soon left to settle Megara Hyblaia. The latter's appearance in Sicily indicates that Megara was also friendly to Korinth; it is likely that, in this age, Megara was under Korinthian control.³¹ The presence of pro-Spartan Messenians in early Rhegion reflects amity between Chalkis and Sparta.³² And finally, we have the close cooperation of Chalkis and Korinth which resulted in their complete control of trade in the West.

During the period ca. 720-660 there are three events which may be dated definitely. The first of these is the construction of the triremes for Samos by Ameinokles of Korinth about 704.³³ There could be no better evidence than this for

-
31. This is indicated by the tradition of a Megarian revolt under Orsippos, the Olympic victor in 720; Pausanias, I, 44, 1.
32. Suidas, s.v. Χαλκίοικος, gives: ἡ Ἀθηναῖ ἐν Σπάρτῃ. ἡ ὅτι χαλκοῦν εἶχεν οἶκον· ἡ διὰ τὸ στερεὸν εἶναι· ἡ διὰ τὸ τοὺς Χαλκιδεῖς τοὺς ἐξ Εὐβοίας φυγάδας αὐτὸν κτίσαι. If there be any truth in the final explanation, it would also show close relations between Sparta and Chalkis at an early period. But we can put little credence in the story, which appears to have been based on an analogy of names.
33. Thuc., I, 13, 3, quoted above, p. 95, note 20.

an alliance between Korinth and Samos. Another certain date is that of the battle of Hysiai, in which the Argives defeated the Spartans in 669/8 B.C.³⁴ Third, we know that the revolt of Kerkyra from Korinth, which led to the first real naval battle,³⁵ occurred about 664.

There are several other events which fall roughly within this period or a little later and which throw much light on interstate relations. We hear of Samian raids on Aigina,³⁶ led by King Amphikrates. In Asia Minor Miletos and Chios³⁷ were allied and together attacked Erythrai. That Erythrai was on good terms with Paros is shown by their joint colonization of Parion, which must be dated about the middle of the seventh century.³⁸ Later in the century, the arbitration by

34. Ol. 27, 2; Pausanias, II, 24, 7.

35. Thuc., I, 13, 4, quoted above, p. 96, note 21.

36. Herodotos, III, 59, 4; there is no precise evidence of date, but the presence of the Samian king (i.e., monarchy had not yet disappeared) places the raid in an early age.

37. Herodotos, I, 18, 3. All we know of the date is that it occurred before the reign of Alyattes, which gives us as terminus ante quem the end of the seventh century.

38. Strabo, XIII, 1, 11; Pausanias, IX, 27, 1; the date is given as ca. 710 by Eusebios (Armenian version, ed.

Samos, Paros, and Erythrai of a dispute over colonization between Chalkis and Andros implies that all five of these states had previously been on friendly terms.³⁹ Finally, the list of allies in the Messenian revolt shows the alignment of the mainland states about the middle of the seventh century. We find Argos, Arkadia, the Pisatans, and Sikyon supporting the Messenians;⁴⁰ Samos and Korinth help Sparta.

Karst, op. cit., p. 183), but Burn (loc. cit.) has shown that this must be moved down to the middle of the seventh century along with the date of Archilochos.

39. See above, pp. 82-85.

40. Strabo, VIII, 5, 10; Herodotos, III, 47; Pausanias, IV, 14, 8; IV, 15, 7. In the last passage Pausanias includes the Eleians as allies of Messenia, but these must be the Pisatans, who are mentioned by name in Strabo. For the Pisatan "interlude" at Olympia see Wade-Gery, C.A.H., III, pp. 544-548, and McGregor, op. cit., pp. 272-273.

There is no room here for a full-scale discussion of the Messenian revolt, which is generally placed at the end of the seventh century and considered a private quarrel between Sparta and Messenia; the tradition of allies on each side is called a projection into the past of events from the fourth century (see, e.g., Wade-

During the period under discussion there remains to be considered one other event, or rather series of events, all

Gery, C.A.H., III, pp. 557-558). I shall state my views briefly. The best evidence of date is the statement of Tyrtaios, frag. 4, lines 1-8 (ed. Diehl), that the grandsons of those who fought the first war participated in the revolt. Now the first Messenian War can be placed by the Olympic victor lists almost certainly ca. 736-716 (see above, pp. 79-80); therefore the revolt, about 60 years later, falls sometime between 676 and 656; most probably it was a result of the Spartan defeat at Hysiai in 669/8, and was instigated by the victor in that battle, Pheidon of Argos. Even though some details of the fourth century revival of Messenia may have entered the tradition of the revolt, it is impossible on these grounds to eliminate the allies on each side; for it is Herodotos who tells us that the Samians were involved. Another objection to the tradition of numerous allies---that "during this half-century, when the tyrants were at the height of their power, it is hardly conceivable that all Peloponnese was divided for a protracted war into two camps, one led by Spartans, one by Messenians" (Wade-Gery, loc. cit.)---falls when we realize that the war broke out before the rise of the tyrants.

connected with the rise and career of Pheidon of Argos.⁴¹
 Although we learn from Ephoros⁴² that this monarch "completely
 recovered the heritage of Temenos," we know definitely of on-
 ly a few steps in this process. He sided with Aigina in a
 quarrel against Athens and Epidauros and succeeded in defeat-
 ing the Athenians and gaining control of Epidauros.⁴³ His

41. I accept the dating of Pheidon in the late eighth cen-
 tury and the first half of the seventh; the case is
 argued by Ure, op. cit., pp. 154-183, and substantiated
 by Wade-Gery, C.A.H., III, pp. 761-762.
42. Frag. 115 (Jacoby).
43. Herodotos, V, 82-89; although Pheidon is not mentioned
 by name in this narrative, his connection with the in-
 cident has been shown by Ure (op. cit., pp. 164-178),
 who, however, goes far beyond the evidence when he
 states (p. 168) in support of his argument that "both in
 Argos and Aegina there does appear to be an abrupt ces-
 sation of Attic imports early in the seventh century."
 Exports of Protoattic pottery were generally less than
 those of Geometric; yet examples of Protoattic have
 been found both at Aigina and Argos. In Aigina finds
 of all types from this period are few; J. M. Cook,
 "Protoattic Pottery," B.S.A., XXXV (1934-1935), p. 204.
 This error, nevertheless, does not invalidate Ure's
 general conclusions.

control of Aigina is also shown by the fact that he struck his coins there.⁴⁴ It is most likely that the hand of Pheidon may be seen in the revolt of Megara from Korinth and later in the settling of the Megarian colonies of Chalkedon (ca. 684) and Byzantion (ca. 658) in the north-east;⁴⁵ it should be noted that the area in which these colonies were planted was in the Milesian sphere of influence,⁴⁶ and their establishment indicates that Argos, Megara, and Miletos were on good terms. There are also indications that Pheidon extended his control over Sikyon.⁴⁷ Later in his career, his

44. Ephoros, frag. 176 (Jacoby).

45. Wade-Gery, op. cit., p. 451. For the dates see Hieronymos (ed. Fotheringham), pp. 163 and 165.

46. Dunham, op. cit., pp. 46-62.

47. Sikyon is linked with Argos during the Messenian revolt (Pausanias, IV, 15, 7; 17, 7), and the tyrants of Sikyon were pre-Dorian; their rise may be the reaction to Argive (i.e., Dorian) control. I can not accept Ure's proposal (op. cit., pp. 179-183) that a similar condition existed in Korinth---that the Bakchiads were pro-Argive and the rise of Kypselos was a manifestation of anti-Argive feeling. The only evidence for this is a confused story connecting Pheidon with Archias, the founder of Syracuse (Plutarch, Amat. Narrat., 2 [772C-

ambitions extended further west, and in the 28th Olympiad (668 B.C.) he controlled the Olympic Games through the Pisa-

773B]; scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios, Arg., IV, 1212), and a tradition that Pheidon died at Korinth, during civil strife (Nikolaos of Damaskos, frag. 35 [Jacoby]). More confusion is added by Aristotle's mention (Politica, II, 1265b) of a Korinthian Pheidon who was one of the earliest lawgivers. This suggests the possibility that a Korinthian has been confused with his more famous namesake in the tradition; a similar confusion can be seen in Herodotos' (VI, 127, 3) reference to Leokedes, one of the suitors of Agariste, as the son of Pheidon of Argos. McGregor, op. cit., pp. 275-276, has urged that Leokedes was in reality the son of a Pheidon of Kleonai who is mentioned in an early sixth century inscription found at Nemea; in any case, Pheidon of Kleonai is not Pheidon of Argos. The above indications of Argive control of Korinth are not so strong as those which testify to Korinthian (i.e., Bakchiad) opposition to Pheidon, namely, the appearance of Korinth and Samos fighting against Argos during the Messenian revolt and the Samians' opposition to Pheidon in Aigina about the time when Korinth was building triremes for Samos (see above, p. 103, and below, pp. 114-117).

tans, whom he had supported against the Eleians.⁴⁸ In the previous year the Argives had defeated the Spartans at Hysiai, a victory which must have made it possible for Pheidon to extend his influence westward. Probably we see further results of this victory in the revolt of Kerkyra from Korinth about⁴⁹ 664 and in the revolt of the Messenians from Sparta, which

48. Pausanias, VI, 22, 2; Strabo, VIII, 3, 30. The text of Pausanias reads Ὀλυμπιάδι μὲν τῇ ὀγδόῃ, but Strabo states that from the first to the twenty-sixth Olympiad the Eleians held the presidency; Eusebios (ed. Schöne, I, p. 198) says that the Pisatans took over in the twenty-eighth Olympiad when the Eleians were busy fighting the Dymaians, then gained control in the thirtieth and held the presidency for the twenty-two following Olympiads. Falconer has suggested emending the text of Pausanias to Ὀλυμπιάδι μὲν τῇ ὀγδόῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ (see J. H. Schubart, Pausaniae Descriptio Graeciae [Teubner, 1853], p. XXVI). The corruption would have been easy at the time when the numbers were represented by letters, but we can not be sure that the error was not that of Pausanias or his source. For the full argument supporting the later date see Ure, op. cit., pp. 159-160; Wade-Gery, op. cit., pp. 541 and 761.

49. See above, p. 102. Probably the original Eretrian

50

broke out shortly after the battle. This coincidence of the dates of Hysiai and the revolt supports the conjecture that Pheidon instigated, or at least supported, the uprising. The only information we have about Pheidon other than what has been cited is a hint that he died fighting the Corinthians.⁵¹

From the evidence presented above, we may distinguish two groups which, in our sources, always appear as hostile to one another. On the one side the most important states are Samos, Korinth, Sparta, Erythrai, Paros, Andros, and Athens; on the other Miletos, Chios, Megara, Argos, and Aigina. Since our examination has covered the whole period during which the Lelantine War could have fallen, this must be roughly the alignment of allies during that war; the former group, as shown by the presence of Samos, supported Chalkis, the others favored Eretria.⁵² It can not, of course, be claimed that this

population at Kerkyra was responsible for the enmity between that colony and its later metropolis.

50. See above, p. 103.
51. Nikolaos of Damaskos, frag. 35 (Jacoby). The story connects Pheidon with civil strife in Korinth; it is very likely that, at the height of his power, he would have a party which favored him in that city.
52. It has often been noted that there is a similarity between this list of Eretrian allies in the seventh cen-

list is exact; some of the states may have played no part in

tury and the nationalities of the suitors of Agariste of Sikyon about 575 (Herodotos, VI, 127; cf. A. Holm, History of Greece, I [London, 1899], p. 317, note 9; Wallace, op. cit., p. 62; McGregor, op. cit., pp. 270-271). The similarity is not too striking. Of the twelve cities represented by the suitors, Argos, Elis (i.e., the Pisatans; McGregor, loc. cit.), Eretria, and the two Arkadian towns, Trapezos and Paios, were on one side in the seventh century, Athens and Thessaly on the other; while the sympathies of the Molossioi, Aitolia, Epidamnos, Siris, and Sybaris are uncertain. From this we are justified in concluding that Kleisthenes of Sikyon in general favored those cities which formerly had fought against the masters of the West (as McGregor, loc. cit.), but we can not reverse the process and use the list to add members to the seventh century alliance (as Holm, loc. cit.). For foreign relations could change much during almost a century, especially in the age of the tyrants (cf. the rapprochement of Korinth and Miletos under Periandros and Thrasyboulos; see also McGregor, loc. cit., for the changes during the reign of one tyrant, Kleisthenes of Sikyon). Yet Holm, from the list, adds Sybaris and Epidamnos, which was not

the war. But it is clear that in each group the states were sympathetic to one another, and since we know that the number of allies on each side during the Lelantine War was considerable,⁵³ the majority of these states must have been involved.⁵⁴ Burn, in his account of the early trade-leagues,

founded until ca. 628 (Eusebios, ed. Schöne, I, p. 89), to the Eretrian alliance, and W. W. How and J. Wells go even further by stating (A Commentary on Herodotus, II [Oxford, 1912], p. 58) that in the Lelantine War Kroton was an ally of Samos. There is, however, no valid evidence for the extension of that war to Magna Graecia. The friendship of Miletos and Sybaris, mentioned by Herodotos (VI, 21), most probably began near the end of the seventh century, after western markets were opened to Miletos by the rapprochement with Korinth; Burn, op. cit., pp. 23-24. It is at this time that east Greek pottery begins to appear in greater quantities in the West (Blakeway, op. cit., p. 207).

53. See above, p. 89, note 7.

54. J.H.S., XLIX (1929), pp. 14-37; he collected the evidence down into the sixth century, with the result that his list of allies on each side is much longer than that given above. He also distinguishes a third "trade league of the Southern Dorians," but, since this group

noted that the maritime cities of the pro-Eretrian group were those which seemed particularly interested in the northern region, while the other side was primarily interested in the West. It was, he thinks, trade rivalry between these two groups which led to the spread of the Lelantine War. He does not, however, state exactly where this rivalry lay; the discovery of the reason for it would shed much light on the whole war. The fact that a war caused by a border dispute spread to involve many allies can not be explained merely by the existence of two groups of trading powers, especially when they were primarily interested in different regions. The Lelantine Plain itself certainly was not important enough to cause a clash between the groups; there must have been some issue which was vital to all of the states involved.

In view of the monopoly clamped on the West by Chalkis and Korinth between 735 and 690, one's first inclination is to view the Lelantine War as an attempt to halt that policy. But upon closer examination, we find little evidence of a serious interest in the West by any states concerned in the war except Chalkis, Korinth, and, perhaps, Eretria. The Eretrians had been expelled from Kerkyra by Korinth, and, although they seem thereafter to have turned their energies

has no part in the Lelantine War, it need not concern us here.

toward control of part of the Kyklades, they would have had good reason to be eager to break their rivals' hold on the West. But the crux of the question lies in explaining the participation of Miletos and Samos in the quarrel; although these two states were natural rivals, particularly over trade in Egypt,⁵⁵ one of them, at least, must have had some strong common interest with one of the cities of Euboia, which made entry into the war seem desirable. Yet there is no evidence of any Milesian ambition in the West as early as the end of the eighth century.⁵⁶ It is possible that the Eretrians persuaded Miletos to help them break Chalkis' hold on the West, but this seems improbable when we realize that during this period Miletos was colonizing in the regions of the Propontis and the Hellespont.⁵⁷ It is unlikely that she would fight a war over the West while the North-east was not fully exploited. Again, it is difficult to explain why Samos should be fighting

55. See below, p. 115, note 66.

56. The friendship between Miletos and Sybaris (Herodotos, VI, 21) most probably began at the end of the seventh century, after western markets were opened to Miletos by the rapprochement with Korinth; see above, p. 111.

57. Dunham, op. cit., pp. 46-62; Abydos, Kyzikos, Trapezos, and Sinope were all Milesian foundations in the late eighth and early seventh centuries.

on the side of powers which controlled the West. We do not know of any Samian interest in that area except for the story⁵⁸ of Kolaïos, the Samian sea-captain who sailed to Tartessos. But, according to the report, he had set out to sail to Egypt, and even if the trip to the West was intended, it was the result of Samian friendship and cooperation with Korinth and Chalkis, rather than the cause of it.⁵⁹ Therefore, if the Lelantine War is considered an attempt to halt the monopoly of Chalkis and Korinth in the western trade and is placed during the period when this policy was being established, ca. 735-690 B.C., we are left with no satisfactory explanation of the participation of Samos and Miletos.

There seems to me, however, to be an explanation of the appearance of Samos on the side of Chalkis and Korinth which will provide the key to the whole problem of the Lelantine War. We know that Samos' primary interest in trade was with the South and East, particularly Egypt.⁶⁰ Her only colo-

58. Herodotos, IV, 152.

59. The date of the voyage of Kolaïos is uncertain; Ure, op. cit., dates it "about 620 B.C." (p. 68), "between 643 and 640 B.C." (p. 117), and "about 668 B.C." (p. 177).

60. Cf. Herodotos, IV, 152, where the Samian Kolaïos is said to have been sailing to Egypt when blown off his course to Spain.

nies were along that route, Amorgos,⁶¹ Kelenderis,⁶² and
⁶³ Nagidos. She was on friendly terms with Kyrene⁶⁴ and had
 an inland colony at an oasis in Egypt.⁶⁵ Her rivals for trade
⁶⁶ in this area were Miletos and Aigina. This rivalry would

61. Suidas, s.v. Σταμύλας.

62. Pomponius Mela, I, 13.

63. Arrian, Anabasis, I, 26; "Skylax," 102 (ed. Müller, G.G.M., I, p. 76). (For Skylax and "Skylax" see A.T.L., I, p. 461 and the references there cited.)

64. Herodotos, IV, 152.

65. Herodotos, III, 26, 1.

66. Herodotos, II, 178, records that, after Amasis gave Naukratis to the Greeks (ca. 570), all other states built a joint temple, but the Aiginetans, Samians, and Milesians had separate temples. The inference is that these three states were the most important and so probably had traded first with Egypt. Excavations at Naukratis have shown that the Greeks had traded there early in the seventh century (cf. Ure, op. cit., pp. 105-120). Most of the early pottery found is either "Rhodian" or "Fikellura" ware (H. Prinz, Funde aus Naukratis [Klio, Beiheft VII, 1908], pp. 14-63), which were probably products of Rhodes, Miletos, and Samos (R. M. Cook, "Fikellura Pottery," B.S.A., XXXIV [1933-

well explain the Samian-Aiginetan hostility which led to the Samian raids under King Amphikrates. It does not explain, however, why the Corinthians, then expanding in the West, should be so interested in this quarrel, which was concerned with Egyptian trade,⁶⁷ that they would build triremes for the Samians, the sole possession of which must have given Korinth control of the sea. Yet we know that they did send Ameinokles to help the Samians about 704 B.C. The Lelantine War has often been proffered as the reason for this aid;⁶⁸ but such an explanation leaves unanswered the question of Samian participation in the war. A better reason for a Corinthian-Samian alliance about 700 B.C. is the extension of Pheidon's influence over Aigina, and the help which he gave her against Athens and Epidauros.⁶⁹ Pheidon must have supported Aigina's

1934], pp. 90-93). However, some of the earliest Naukratite pottery has been found on Aigina (Prinz, op. cit., p. 88).

67. We may assume that Egyptian trade at this time meant little to Korinth from the fact that not a scrap of Proto-Korinthian pottery has been found at Naukratis (Payne, Necrocorinthia, p. 25).
68. First by Curtius, Hermes, X (1876), p. 220.
69. That the Samians were somehow involved in this Athenian-Aiginetan war is indicated by the fact that a

trade, as shown by his striking of coins there, and thus he would incur the enmity of Samos. In the face of the rising power of Pheidon, Korinth would have had good reason to support Samos against him in every manner, even to the extent of sharing her best naval weapon. Probably Pheidon, by supporting the revolt of Megara, had already incurred the hatred of Korinth.⁷⁰ Thus, in a joint enmity to Pheidon of Argos, we have the explanation of the otherwise strange alliance of Samos and Korinth.

If the interpretation offered above for the appearance of Samos on the side of Korinth is true, the Lelantine War must have taken place after ca. 704. For there is no logical reason for Samian help to Chalkis except their joint friendship with Korinth; according to our interpretation, that friendship only came into being after the threat of Pheidon brought Samos and Korinth together.

garbled version of Herodotos' account (V, 87) of the fate of the lone Athenian survivor appeared in Book II of the Horai of Douris of Samos (frag. 24 [Jacoby]). Samos undoubtedly helped Athens.

70. See above, p. 101, note 31; although there is no direct evidence connecting Pheidon with the revolt, its occurrence during the rise of Pheidon must be more than a coincidence.

We have located the Lelantine War between 704 and 660; this is roughly the reign of Pheidon, and if we look further into his activities, we can find a reason for the extension of the war. This reason lies in Pheidon's western campaigns. We know for certain only that he turned his attention to Elis after the consolidation of his position in the East. But in the light of his penchant for commerce, as shown by his introduction of coinage, it is likely that he viewed control of the Olympic Games and Elis as just a step toward control of the Korinthian Gulf and trade with the West; this was the strategy used nearly a century later by Kleis-⁷¹thenes of Sikyon. It is probable that, for the same reason, he supported, and perhaps instigated, the revolt of Kerkyra from Korinth a few years later. By aiding Eretria in the Lelantine War, Pheidon saw a chance to crush Chalkis and Korinth and break their hold on the West. But a war with these two would involve his old enemy, Samos, and then her rival, Miletos. At least he could expect to keep his enemies busy elsewhere while he seized control of Elis.

If the connection between Pheidon's western campaigns and the Lelantine War is legitimate, the war must have taken place toward the end of Pheidon's reign, probably after 675. There is one piece of evidence which indicates that the

71. McGregor, op. cit., pp. 276 and 285.

victory of Chalkis over Eretria occurred before the triumph of Argos at Hysiai in 669/8. There is preserved a response of the Delphic Oracle which Ion of Chios says was given to the people of the small Achaian town of Aigion, who, from pride in a minor victory over the Aitolians, asked where they stood among the Greeks. The reply was as follows:

Γαίης μὲν πάσης τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἄμεινον,
 Ἰλίου Θεσσαλικὴν, Λακεδαιμονίην τε γυναῖκα,
 ἄνδρες δ' οἱ πίνουσιν ὕδωρ καλῆς Ἀρεθούσης,
 ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ τοῦδ' εἰσὶν ἀμείνονες οὔτε μεταξὺ
 Τίρυνθος ναίουσι καὶ Ἀρκαδίας πολυμήλου,
 Ἄργεῖοι λινοθώρακες, κέντρα πτολέμοιο.
 Ὑμεῖς δ' Αἰγέες οὔτε τρίτοι, οὔτε τέταρτοι
 οὔτε δωδέκατοι, οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ, οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ.⁷²

-
72. Ion of Chios, frag. 17 (Müller). Kallimachos, Epigrammata, 27 (ed. O. Schneider [Teubner, 1870]), alludes to the next to last line as addressed to the Megarians, and in that form it is attributed to Theognis by Clement of Alexandria (Stromateis, VII, 110). The response seems to have been famous in antiquity, and perhaps Theognis changed it to fit his own purposes. Wade-Gery, C.A.H., III, p. 541, thinks that the original was addressed to the Megarians, but the authority of the fifth century Ion is against this.

This description of the Argives and the reference to the Lakedaimonian women is most fitting soon after the battle of Hysiai, and the mention of the Chalkidians, "the men who drink the water of fair Arethousa,"⁷³ as second may best be explained by their victory over Eretria. Perhaps the praise of ἔκγονοι Θεσσαλικῆν is in part a reference to the part played by Thessalian cavalry in that victory. The implication in the response is that the Argives replaced the Chalkidians as the best warriors in Greece, which would mean that the victory of Chalkis over Eretria came before Hysiai; as we read along, our assumption is that the Chalkidians are the best, until we come to ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ τοῦδ' εἰσὶν ἀμείνους in the fourth line. This is the most reasonable explanation of the wording of the oracle, although the possibility remains that the position of the two cities is based on the importance of their victories. At least we may infer from the oracle that the victories of Chalkis and Argos occurred fairly close to one another and that the victory of Chalkis may have been earlier.

We are now in a position to reconstruct, from the evidence and interpretations given above, an outline of the events leading up to, during, and after the Lelantine War.⁷⁴

73. For the identification see Strabo, X, 1, 13, and above, pp. 5-6.

74. In the following section I shall not repeat citations

In the period immediately after the colonization of the West, Chalkis and Korinth worked together in that area and built a trading monopoly. Meanwhile, Eretria was gaining control of the central Kyklades, Miletos was opening the North-east, Samos and Aigina were beginning to vie, along with Miletos, for the rich trade of Egypt. In the Peloponnese, Sparta had just conquered Messenia. Then, with the accession of Pheidon, ca. 710 B.C., Argos became a power to be reckoned with. Pheidon first extended his influence by supporting the revolt of Megara from Korinth; then, when a struggle broke out between Aigina on the one side, and Athens and Epidauros on the other, Pheidon came to the aid of Aigina. Samos sided with Athens and Epidauros against her rival and sent a naval expedition to raid Aigina. Korinth, angered by the revolt of Megara and frightened by the rise of Argive power, joined in and sent Ameinokles to help the Samians. Nevertheless, the Athenians were defeated and Pheidon gained control of Epidauros and Aigina. He fostered Aiginetan trade and struck there the first coinage in Greece. Through his enmity with Samos, he became friendly with Miletos; because of this friendship Megara was allowed to send her colonists to Chalkedon and then to Byzan-

given above. Appended to this chapter (pp. 125-126) is a chronological table with page references to the evidence already presented.

tion, in the Milesian sphere of influence. Then he extended his power over Sikyon. After a period of consolidation, Pheidon turned his attention to the West: Elis and the Olympic Games, control of the Korinthian Gulf, and finally trade with Italy and Sicily. At this time, perhaps about 675 B.C. (or a little later?), a war broke out between Chalkis and Eretria over the Lelantine Plain. By supporting Eretria Pheidon saw a chance to crush, or at least immobilize, one of the two western powers. But with the entrance of Pheidon, his old enemies Korinth and Samos became involved, and with the latter Pheidon's eastern allies. The war became a series of more or less local struggles. Miletos and Chios attacked Erythrai. The energies of Samos were probably expended in helping Erythrai and perhaps in again attacking Aigina. Megara and Korinth very likely kept each other involved, while Pheidon supported the Pisatans in Elis, thus bringing Sparta into the fight. There would have been little chance of much help reaching the original combatants, Chalkis and Eretria. Andros, and probably the other Eretrian dependencies in the Aigaian, revolted. Meanwhile, the Chalkidians, although they had superior infantry forces, were having trouble with the Eretrian cavalry. Finally reinforcements arrived from the northern colonies and from Thessaly, under Kleomachos of Pharsalos. With the additional cavalry, the Chalkidians defeated the Eretrians and so gained possession of the plain. The Lelantine War proper was over,

but its repercussions lingered on. Pheidon defeated the Spartans at Hysiai and gained control of the Olympic Games in 668 B.C. This led to the revolt of the Messenians, in which Corinth and Samos continued to help Sparta against the Messenians, Pheidon, Arkadia, Sikyon, and the Pisatans. The victory at Hysiai also brought on the revolt of Kerkyra from Corinth, probably managed by the Eretrians in Kerkyra at Pheidon's instigation. At last Pheidon was killed, probably in battle with the Corinthians, and Argive power collapsed.

I realize that much of the above account is reconstruction on the slimmest of evidence, but it seems to me that it is credible at least in its general outlines. It utilizes all the evidence we have for the period and offers the only logical explanation I can find for the appearance of Samos in the Lelantine War and the Messenian Revolt; it also resolves an apparent contradiction in our sources for the war, that it attracted more allies than any other ancient struggle, according to Thucydides, and yet seems from Strabo and Plutarch to have been fought mainly by Chalkis and Eretria on the plain itself. When we connect with it Pheidon's ambitions, his enemies and allies, the contradiction disappears. To the obvious objection that none of our ancient sources connects Pheidon with the war, I can only say that references to both are far too few to give this objection any weight.

Thus we conclude that the Lelantine War was the be-

ginning of a struggle that involved much of the Greek world. In itself the war was not of great scope. It was fought mainly by Chalkis and Eretria on the plain, while their allies were, for the most part, busy fighting one another. It was only an episode in the larger struggle, and although Chalkis won the plain, this had no effect on the course of the war in the Peloponnese, where the opposing side, represented by Pheidon of Argos, was victorious. We hear of no help given by Chalkis to her Peloponnesian allies. It is likely that she sent some aid during the Messenian Revolt, but, even so, the losses of the Lelantine War and the ever-present danger from Eretria must have prevented her from sending any large forces abroad.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE, 736-660 B.C.

- 736-720 Chalkidian colonies founded in the West (pp. 70-80).
- 735 Kerkyra taken from Eretrians by Korinth (p. 71).
Syracuse founded (pp. 74-75).
- ca. 736-716 First Messenian War (p. 79).
- ca. 710 Accession of Pheidon of Argos (pp. 104-105).
- ca. 710-705 Revolt of Megara, under Orsippos, from Korinth (p. 101).
- ca. 705-700 Pheidon helps Aigina against Athens and Epidaurous (p. 105).
Samians, under Amphikrates, raid Aigina (p. 102).
- 704 Korinthian-Samian alliance against Argos and Aigina; Ameinokles builds triremes for Samos (p. 95).
- ca. 700 Defeat of Athens; fall of Epidaurous (p. 105).
Pheidon controls Aigina, strikes coinage there; supports Aiginetan trade (p. 106).
- ca. 690 Korinthian-Chalkidian monopoly in West complete (pp. 80-82).
- 684 Founding of Megarian colony of Chalkedon, probably with Argive support (p. 106).
- ca. 680 Pheidon extends control to Sikyon (p. 106).

- ca. 675-670 Outbreak of war between Chalkis and Eretria over Lelantine Plain; Argos, Megara, Aigina, Miletos, and Chios support Eretria; Korinth, Samos, Sparta, Erythrai, Paros, Andros, Thessaly, and the northern Chalkidic colonies support Chalkis.
- Miletos and Chios attack Erythrai (p. 102).
- Andros revolts from Eretria (pp. 93-94).
- Series of local wars.
- ca. 670 Chalkis, with help from her northern colonies and Thessaly, defeats Eretria (pp. 91-92).
- 669/8 Pheidon defeats Spartans at Hysiai (p. 102).
- 668 Pheidon controls Olympic games through Pisatans (pp. 106-108).
- ca. 665 Outbreak of Messenian revolt, probably at instigation of Pheidon; Messenia, Argos, Arkadia, Sikyon, Pisatans, against Sparta, Korinth, and Samos (pp. 103-104).
- 664 Revolt of Kerkyra from Korinth.
- First naval battle (pp. 96 and 102).
- ca. 660 Death of Pheidon, while fighting Korinthians (p. 109).

CHAPTER IV

CHALKIS IN THE SIXTH CENTURY

After the Lelantine War we catch only glimpses of Chalkidian activity before the final decade of the sixth century. In the last half of the seventh century, probably about 630-625 B.C., she shared with Andros in the founding of Akanthos, Sane, and Stageiros in the Thracian Chalkidike and lost the ensuing dispute over the official possession of those cities.¹ In the arbitration of this dispute Samos and Erythrai sided with Andros, while Paros supported Chalkis. This split shows in part the dissolution of the alliance which had fought together in the Lelantine War.² Probably by this time the close friendship between Korinth and Chalkis had ended. The Hippobotai must have been distrustful of the Korinthian tyranny which overthrew the oligarchical Bakchiads about 657. We know little of the foreign policy of Kypselos, the first³ tyrant, but Periandros, who ruled from ca. 627 to ca. 587,

1. See above, pp. 82-84.

2. See above, p. 109.

3. The dates vary by a few years in our sources, but those given above are the most convincing; see Beloch, Gr. Gesch., I², 1, pp. 274-275; McGregor, T.A.P.A., LXXII (1941), p. 281.

was hostile to Samos and friendly to Thrasyboulos of Miletos,⁴
 a reversal of Bakchiad policy. Yet there seems to have been
 no corresponding change in Chalkidic policy towards a hostile
 Miletos. For when Milesian trade with the West began near
 the end of the seventh century,⁵ it was carried on through
 Sybaris, thus bypassing the Straits of Messene which were con-
 trolled by the Chalkidic colonies Rhegion and Zankle.⁶

It was probably in the last quarter of the seventh
 century that Chalkis struck her first coins. These are on
 the Euboic standard, with a wheel on the obverse and an in-
 cuse pattern on the reverse; they bear no legend. They are
 part of a group commonly called the Heraldic Types (Wappen-
 münzen), which have various obverses, but a common reverse,
 an incuse square with raised diagonal lines.⁷ Both the da-
 ting and the origin of these coins have been much disputed.
 They were assigned by Head⁸ to various cities of Euböia in

-
4. Herodotos, IV, 48-49; V, 92, [.
 5. See above, p. 111, note 52.
 6. Timaios, frag. 60 (Müller).
 7. See E. Babelon, Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines,
 II (Paris, 1907), plate XXXIII; C. T. Seltman, Athens,
 Its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion
 (Cambridge, 1924), plates I-IV.
 8. Hist. Num.², pp. 355-356.

the sixth century, by Babelon⁹ to Athens and other undetermined towns both before and during the time of Solon, by Svoronos¹⁰ to Athens before Solon, and by Seltman¹¹ to Athens during the sixth century; the last maintained that the various obverse designs represent the badges of Eupatrid houses which struck the coins before and between the periods of the tyranny of Peisistratos. It was Seltman who discovered that all the Wappenmünzen must have been issued at the same mint, since the same dies were used on the reverse of coins with different types on the obverse.¹² He built an attractive case for his

-
9. Op. cit., pp. 695-702 and 720-724. In the first of these passages Babelon attributes the coins generally to Athens because the finds are mostly from Attike, and because of their weight, style, fabric, and types. Yet in the second passage he admits that the coins bearing a wheel, a triskeles, or a beetle belong to other towns, and he definitely assigns those with a gorgoneion to Eretria (pp. 675-680). Thus he takes from Athens a large majority of the extant specimens; see below, pp. 132-133.
10. Les Monnaies d'Athènes (Munich, 1923), plate I.
11. Op. cit., pp. XVII-XIX.
12. Head, op. cit., p. 355, had proposed a single mint because of the general similarity of the reverse dies,

Eupatrid theory by comparison of shield designs on Athenian vases with the coin types, but he assumed, rather than proved, that Athens was the center of issue, and he cast aside lightly the claims of Euboea.¹³

Recently, however, J. G. Milne¹⁴ has shown, almost irrefutably, that the Wappenmünzen must be dated from about 625 B.C. His chronology is based on a coin on which a gorgoneion of the Heraldic type is overstruck by a Korinthian type which may be dated about 600.¹⁵ Since the gorgoneion

but he did not prove his thesis; Seltman, loc. cit., gives him no credit for the suggestion.

13. This may be seen from the following quotations: p. XVIII, "They [the 'heraldic' coins] all come from one and the same mint. That fact once established there can be no doubt that the mint is Athens, and that the heraldic coins are the money issued under the regime of the old Eupatrid families;" p. XIX, "As the heraldic coins are all Athenian, there are no early incuse coins of Euboea." It should be noted that Seltman had as supporting evidence the appearance of the heraldic coin types as shield devices on Athenian vases.
14. "Early Coinages of Athens and Euboea," Num. Chron., I, ser. 6 (1941), pp. 8-16.
15. The coin apparently has never been published. Milne,

comes late in the series, the Wappenmünzen may safely be dated from ca. 625 to ca. 585 B.C. Once this date is established, Seltman's theory, which places the coins from 594 to 508, falls; further, it is very questionable whether Athens could have produced such a variety of coins before the time of Solon, when its economy was mostly agricultural and was in the throes of a depression.¹⁶ It is far more probable that Chalkis, as Milne suggests, was the minting place of the coins.¹⁷ She was the natural trading center for Euboea¹⁸ and already had a metal-working industry. Through her northern colonies¹⁹ she was in touch with the silver mining districts of Thrace.

op. cit., p. 8, merely calls it "a coin in Basel sale 8, lot 302."

16. Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 2 and 5; Plutarch, Solon, 13. See also Milne, "The Economic Policy of Solon," Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 231-245. Seltman himself states, op. cit., p. 14: "Now Athenian commerce in the years before Solon's reform was of little account."
17. See above, p. 2.
18. See above, pp. 10-14.
19. Seltman, op. cit., pp. 128-129, states that there were four important silver mining districts accessible to the Greeks, Thrace, Epiros, Siphnos, and Laurion, which correspond to the four earliest Greek coinages, Asia

And the connection of Eubolia with a coin standard in ancient times points to an early coinage on that island.²⁰

The obverse types of the coins furnish even stronger evidence pointing to Chalkis as the mint. By means of the reverse die sequences, the Wappenmünzen may be divided into two chronological groups. In the earlier group there are eleven

Minor, Korinth, Aigina, and Athens. But Chalkidic contact with Thrace is as well established as that of Korinth with Epiros or Aigina with Siphnos. It is not certain to what extent the mines of Laurion were worked before Peisistratos (see Ure, Origin of Tyranny, pp. 46-47, and Seltman, op. cit., p. 129), but Chalkis could also have obtained some silver from them.

20. Herodotos, III, 89, 2: Εὐβοϊδὸς μνῆας; III, 95, 2: Εὐβοϊκὰ τάλαντα; cf. also Diodoros, V, 36, 2. The question of the origin and development of the Euboic standard need not be considered here, as it is still an object of speculation and controversy (cf. G. Hill, C.A.H., IV, pp. 130-131). And whatever its origin, even if it was a Mykenanian weight for bronze, as Seltman believes (op. cit., pp. 115-116), the use of the standard for a silver coinage in the fifth century points to an early silver coinage in Eubolia.

obverse types,²¹ although of the surviving examples more than half²² bear a wheel. To this device Chalkis has by far the best claim, since it occurs on all the coins which can be attributed with certainty to that city before 507.²³ In the second group of the Wappenmünzen, there are seven obverse types,²⁴ but the great majority of the surviving coins have either the wheel or a gorgoneion; the latter is probably the badge of Eretria.²⁵ Its appearance in the second group re-

-
21. They are, in order of frequency, a wheel with four spokes, the hindquarters of a horse, an amphora, a beetle, the forepart of a horse, a bridled horse, an astragalos, a cart wheel, a triskeles, an eye, and a bull.
 22. Of the 134 specimens of this group reported by Seltman (op. cit., pp. 153-158) 70 have the wheel with four spokes and three have the cart wheel.
 23. See Babelon, op. cit., pp. 667-672 and plate XXXI, nos. 1-6.
 24. The types and the number of specimens reported by Seltman, op. cit., pp. 162-167, are as follows: gorgoneion, 63; wheel, 39; owl, 13; apple, 13; bull's head, 10; frog, 4; and leaf, 1.
 25. The gorgoneion coins are attributed to that city by Head, op. cit., pp. 360-361, and Babelon, op. cit., pp.

presents, perhaps, another rapprochement between Chalkis and Eretria.

From the variety of types it seems evident that Chalkis struck coins for all Euboea and probably for some towns of the mainland and islands of the Kyklades. It is impossible, however, to ascribe all the types to individual towns. Head has tentatively assigned the horse-types to Euboeic Kyme,²⁶ and Milne has suggested that the bull and bull's head represent all Euboea.²⁷ The owls may well be the first Athenian coinage,²⁸ struck at Chalkis. It is very likely that in pre-Solonian times the Wappenmünzen circulated interchangeably throughout a wide area, including Attike. This

675-680. The attribution is not absolutely certain, since there is no inscribed Eretrian coin bearing this device; it depends on later uninscribed coins with the same type of obverse and a bull's head or a panther on the reverse. The large percentage of gorgoneion coins in the extant examples of the group points to an important city like Eretria.

26. Op. cit., p. 360.

27. Num. Chron., I, ser. 6 (1941), pp. 11-12. Fourth century Eretrian coins struck for all Euboea had a bull or bull's head; Head, op. cit., p. 362.

28. Milne, op. cit., p. 12.

would account for the finds at Athens and Eleusis, on which²⁹
the early attribution of these coins to Athens mainly rested.

Before the middle of the sixth century, the issue
of Wappenmünzen seems to have ceased. The next Chalkidic
coins, over which there is no question of attribution, retain
the wheel, now transferred to the reverse, and have on the ob-
verse a flying hawk or eagle,³⁰ which sometimes is carrying a
snake in its beak. This type continues until ca. 507; the
later specimens in this series are inscribed VAL.³¹

To the first quarter of the sixth century are as-
signed the earliest examples of the excellent black-figured

29. See above, p. 129, note 9. For the provenience of all
known Wappenmünzen see Seltman, op. cit., pp. 146-148.
The majority of pieces were found in Attike, but others
come from Euboic Kyme, the Egyptian Delta, the Kyklades,
and Taras.

30. It has been suggested that this bird is the $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\iota\varsigma$ -
 $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\mu\iota\nu\delta\iota\varsigma$ mentioned in the Iliad, XIV, 291; F. Stud-
niczka, "Zum Hydragiebel," Jahrb. des Arch. Inst., I
(1886), p. 93. But that most likely was an owl; see J.
M. Boraston, "The Birds of Homer," J.H.S., XXXI (1911),
pp. 240-241, and D. W. Thompson, A Glossary of Greek
Birds (Oxford, 1936), p. 186.

31. Babelon, op. cit., pp. 667-672 and plate XXXI, nos. 1-6.

³² pottery called Chalkidic and generally attributed to Eu-
 boic Chalkis. The grounds for this attribution ³³ are: the
 use of the Chalkidic alphabet in the inscriptions on the vases;
 the frequent appearance of a flying hawk, similar to that on
 early Chalkidic coins, on the shields of warriors or as back-
 ground decoration; ³⁴ the supposition that ancient references
 to Χαλκιδικὰ ποτήρια imply a ceramic industry at Chalkis; ³⁵
 and the fact that the pottery has been found throughout Sicily
 and Italy, especially in Etruria and the Chalkidic colonies,
 the areas where we most expect to find traces of Chalkidic
 trade. ³⁶ Smith, however, has maintained, with great proba-
 bility, that this ware was the product of Chalkidic colonists

-
32. Published by A. Rumpf, Chalkidische Vasen (Berlin, 1927). A few examples missed by Rumpf are given by H. R. W. Smith, "The Origin of Chalcidian Ware," Univ. of California Publ. in Class. Arch., I (1929-1944), pp. 85-149.
33. See Rumpf, op. cit., pp. 40-53.
34. E.g., Rumpf, op. cit., plate VII. Similar designs appear also on Corinthian vases; cf. H. Payne, Necrocorinthia, plate 41, fig. 3.
35. See above, p. 11, note 36, where it is suggested that these refer to metal work, not pottery.
36. Loc. cit.

in the West, who were probably located at Caere in Etruria. His argument is threefold. First, he has published a Chalkidic sherd³⁷ which can only be from a type of stand of which all other examples are in Etruscan bucchero ware. It imitates even the plastic ornaments and incised decoration of the Etruscan type, and such close imitation points to the manufacture of Chalkidic ware in an area under Etruscan influence. Second, there is no example of Chalkidic pottery which can be proved to have been found anywhere but in Sicily or Italy. This is almost inexplicable if the ware was made in Euboea. Since the publication of Smith's article, this argument has been much strengthened by the absence of Chalkidic ware in the finds during the excavations at Olynthos.³⁸ Even though this town was not Chalkidic until 479,³⁹ it was near numerous colonies of Chalkis, and we should certainly expect to find there traces of any pottery made in Chalkis. Finally, Smith argues that Chalkidic pottery shows the influence of Corinthian and Attic wares, but exerts no influence on them. And the Ionic influence discernible in the later stages of Chalkidic ware seems to have come to it through Etruscan art. In view of these arguments and the lack of any other evidence

37. Op. cit., plates 9 and 10, fig. B.

38. See Robinson, Excavations at Olynthos, V, pp. VII-VIII.

39. See above, pp. 34-35.

of a ceramic industry at Chalkis, we can not assign to her this "Chalkidic" pottery.

At some time during the sixth century, probably during its first quarter, the government of Chalkis was apparently in the hands of a tyrant. Such is the best interpretation of the lines of Theognis which lament the destruction of Kerinthos and the ravaging of the Lelantine Plain, add that the ἀγαθοί flee and the κακοί hold the city, and end⁴⁰ with a curse on the Kypselids. The passage sounds like a contemporary allusion to the overthrow of the Hippobotai. They would be the ἀγαθοί to the oligarch Theognis, who used⁴¹ this word and κακοί in a political sense. The Lelantine Plain was the land of the Hippobotai,⁴² and might well have been ravaged during a revolution. The reference to Kerinthos may represent a concerted uprising there, or perhaps, as Geyer suggests,⁴³ the Hippobotai took refuge in that town before they

40. Lines 891-894. See above, pp. 96-99.

41. See lines 57-60 and T. H. Williams, "Theognis and his Poems," J.H.S., XXIII (1903), pp. 9-10.

42. Ailian, Var. Hist., VI, 1: 'Αθηναῖοι...κατεκληροῦχῃσαν τὴν Ἰκπόβοτον καλουμένην χώραν, τεμένην δὲ ἀνῆκαν τῇ 'Αθηναῖ ἐν τῷ Ληλάντῳ ὀνομαζομένῳ τόπῳ. The temenos, as Athene's share of the land seized and divided, would be in the same area as the other lots.

43. Topographie und Geschichte, pp. 97-98.

were defeated. In the cursing of the Kypselids, it is tempting to see the hand of Periandros, installing a sympathetic tyranny in place of hostile oligarchs in a city whose friendship had once been so profitable to Corinth. But the γένος Κυψελιδέων of the text may be only a general reference to tyrants as a group. Aristotle mentions a tyrant of Chalkis, Antileon, who was overthrown by an oligarchy.⁴⁴ Although the date of Antileon is not certain, the passage may refer to the restoration of the Hippobotai.⁴⁵ There is no evidence for the length of the tyranny; probably it was short and relatively

44. Politica, V, 1316a: ἀλλὰ μεταβάλλει καὶ εἰς τυραννίδα τυραννίς, ὥσπερ ἡ Σικυῶνος ἐκ τῆς Μύρωνος εἰς τὴν Κλεισθένους, καὶ εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν, ὥσπερ ἡ ἐν Χαλκίδι ἡ Ἀντιλέοντος, καὶ εἰς δημοκρατίαν, ὥσπερ ἡ τῶν Φέλωνος ἐν Συρακούσαις, καὶ εἰς ἀριστοκρατίαν, ὥσπερ ἡ Χαριλάου ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι.

45. There is little indication of the date of Antileon in the context of the passage. Aristotle is choosing examples without regard to chronology, as is shown by the variation in the dates of Kleisthenes (sixth century), Gelon (fifth century), and Charilaos (eighth century). At times he also uses fourth century tyrants as examples (e.g., Dionysios of Syracuse; cf. V, 1312a).

unimportant.⁴⁶ The most likely time for it is the first quarter of the sixth century, which is the best attested date for Theognis.⁴⁷ And in 575, at the time of the marriage of Agariste,⁴⁸ Eretria is called ἀνθεύση by Herodotos; this Eretrian prosperity may reflect the weakening of Chalkis through civil strife.

We hear nothing more of Chalkis until the last decade of the sixth century. Then the Hippobotai are in control and allied with Thebes and the Peloponnesians against Athens. The oligarchical government at Chalkis must have viewed with suspicion the growing prosperity of Athens, especially when that city was under a tyranny which was particularly friendly with Eretria.⁴⁹ After the expulsion of Hippias, that suspicion

46. Possibly there were two periods of tyranny in the sixth century. Aristotle, *Politica*, V, 1304a, states: καὶ ἐν Χαλκίδι φόβον τὸν τύραννον μετὰ τῶν γνωρίμων ὁ δῆμος ἀνελὼν εὐθὺς εἶχετο τῆς πολιτείας. However, it is more likely that Phoxas lived in the fourth century, although we lack the evidence necessary for certainty; see below, pp. 221-222.

47. Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-23. For a later date, however, see Harrison, *Studies in Theognis*, pp. 268-303.

48. VI, 127, 4.

49. Peisistratos had made Eretria his base of operations during his long exile; Herodotos, I, 61-62.

would be turned toward the new democracy and Kleisthenes.⁵⁰
 At this time, too, Chalkis enjoyed a close relationship with
⁵¹Thebes. ⁵²Therefore, about 506, she allied herself with

50. Kleisthenes had won the support of most of those who had favored the tyranny; McGregor, "The Pro-Persian Party at Athens from 510 to 480 B.C.," Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., Suppl. Vol. I (1940), pp. 74-75. The oligarchs in Chalkis, Thebes, and Sparta may well have considered him another prospective tyrant.
51. This is shown by the excavations at Mykalessos, which was on the route between Thebes and Chalkis. The town was very prosperous in the last half of the sixth century, but declined after the defeat of her two more important neighbors; R. M. Burrows and P. N. Ure, "Excavations at Rhitsona in Boeotia," B.S.A., XIV (1907-1908), pp. 241-242.
52. The date depends upon those adopted for the expulsion of Isagoras (and his ally Kleomenes) and the return of Kleisthenes from exile, which preceded Kleomenes' effort to restore the oligarchy through the campaign in question. But the date of Kleisthenes' return can not be determined with certainty, since the accounts in Herodotos (V, 66-73) and Aristotle (Ath. Pol., 20-21) of the events in Athens after the fall of Hippias do

the Boiotian city to support the attempt of Kleomenes of
Sparta to restore Isagoras and the oligarchy to Athens.⁵³

not agree in all details. Herodotos gives no dates, but Aristotle (op. cit., 21, 1) places Kleisthenes' return and his reforms ἔτει τετάρτῳ μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων κατάλυσιν ἐπὶ Ἰσαγόρου ἄρχοντος (508/7). If this date is correct, we still can not be sure of the year of Kleomenes' invasion. It most likely occurred in the spring following the expulsion of Isagoras. If the latter was driven out early in his archonship (i.e., 508), the invasion fell probably in the spring of 507; if he was expelled in the later months (507), the invasion may have been delayed until 506. On the whole 506 is more attractive, since it allows more time for the events in the archonship of Isagoras before his ejection: Kleisthenes' successful appeal to the people, Isagoras' summons of help from Kleomenes, the exile of the democrats, the defeat and withdrawal of the Spartans and Isagoras, and finally the return of the Alkmaionidai. Cf. Busolt, Gr. Gesch., II², pp. 402, note 6, and 442; U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Aristoteles und Athen (Berlin, 1893), II, pp. 77-78.

53. Herodotos, V, 74, 2. There are Chalkidic and Boiotian coins commemorating the alliance. They bear the usual

54

The campaign of the allies, as described by Herodotos, was well co-ordinated. The Peloponnesian army advanced to Eleusis, the Thebans seized Oinoe and Hysiai, while the Chalkidians also invaded Attike, undoubtedly in its north-west corner. But, after the Athenians had decided to face the Peloponnesians, the plan miscarried because the Corinthians suddenly withdrew their forces, probably fearing the extension of Spartan power beyond the Isthmus.⁵⁵ Since Demaratos, the other Spartan king, supported the Corinthians, the allied army broke up. Thereupon, the Athenians advanced against the Chalkidians, who had withdrawn to Euboia. But as the Boiotians marched toward the Euripos to aid the Chalkidians, the Athenians turned and met them first. The result was a complete victory for the Athenians, who took 700 prisoners. Then, on the same day according to Herodotos, they crossed into Euboia and decisively defeated the Chalkidians.

Herodotos' account of the campaign raises and leaves unanswered two questions: how did the Athenians

wheel on the reverse, but the obverse is a Boiotian shield. One, on the Euboic standard, is inscribed V; the others, on the Phoenician, have BOI or TA (for Tanagra); Seltman, op. cit., p. 93, fig. 57.

54. V, 74-77.

55. Cf. E. M. Walker, C.A.H., IV, pp. 159-160.

catch the Boiotians and Chalkidians separately, and how did they cross to Euboia? The answer which is implied in Herodotos' account is the extremely bad liaison between Chalkis and Boiotia and quick action on the part of the Athenians. The Chalkidians must have known that the Athenians were advancing against them if the Boiotians were aware of it in time to go to their aid, yet if they were so negligent that they let the Boiotians be caught alone, it is no surprise that they allowed the Athenians to cross to Euboia unopposed.

However, it has been suggested by J. L. Myres⁵⁶ that the answer lies rather in Eretrian aid to Athens, especially by sea. His argument is based on Eretria's reputation as ruler of the sea from 505 to 490 in the list of thalassocracies preserved by Eusebios,⁵⁷ which list, he maintains, is derived ultimately from a fifth century source.⁵⁸ Since, he

56. "On the 'List of Thalassocracies' in Eusebios," J.H.S., XXVI (1906), pp. 96-97.

57. Armenian version (ed. Karst), pp. 106-107.

58. Op. cit., pp. 84-89. Eusebios attributes the list to Diodoros, and the latter perhaps took it from Ephoros. But Myres' inference (from Thuc., I, 13) of a fifth century list is weak. Thucydides, in speaking of the rise of sea power, does mention Korinth, the Ionians, Samos, and Phokaia, but that is a far cry from a systematized

argues, the campaign "involved the cooperation of somebody's
⁵⁹ fleet for the passage of the Euripus," the most likely
 ships are those of Eretria. These arguments are far from con-
 clusive. Not only is the authority of the list of thalasso-
⁶⁰ cracies uncertain, but in it Naxian, not Chalkidic supremacy
 precedes Eretrian, so that naval victory over Chalkis alone
 would not give Eretria naval dominion.

We know very little of the sea power of Athens and
 Chalkis at the time, but there is nothing to suggest that the
 Athenians did not have a fleet of their own sufficient to take
⁶¹ them to Euboea or to face the Chalkidians. Several years

list going back to the Trojan War, such as that trans-
 mitted by Eusebios. The schematic form of Eusebios'
 list points to fourth century historians.

59. Op. cit., p. 97.

60. We should not trust too much a source which continues
 Eretrian thalassocracy for four years after the Persian
 victory at Lade.

61. Wilamowitz (op. cit., II, pp. 287-288) refers to the
 victory of 506 the dedication of the Athenian stoa at
 Delphoi (Dittenberger, Syll., I³, no. 29): 'Αθηναῖοι
 ἀνέθεσαν τὴν στοάν. καὶ τὰ ὀπλ[α κ]αὶ τ' ἀκρωτήρια ἐλόν-
 τες τῶν πολε[μίων]. The ships' beaks imply a naval en-
 gagement, yet the reference is more probably to the

later Athens seemed to be stronger at sea than Eretria, when she sent twenty ships to help the Ionians as compared with Eretria's five.⁶² If we also suppose Eretrian action by land, it would explain satisfactorily why the Chalkidians remained in Euboeia---to protect their territory. But the results of the campaign indicate a strictly Athenian victory, especially the settling of klerouchs on the Lelantine Plain and the pride of Athens in her accomplishment.⁶³ All in all, the hypothesis of Eretrian aid to Athens must be considered improbable. If there was any help from Eretria, it must have been late⁶⁴ and of little significance.

After the victory over the Chalkidians, the Athenian dead were buried near the Euripos, and over their funeral mound⁶⁵ was inscribed an epigram by Simonides. The Chalkidian

victory at Salamis; see H. Pomtow, P.W., R.E., Suppl.-bd. IV, s.v. Delphoi, cols. 1299-1300, and M. N. Tod, Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford, 1933), pp. 21-22.

62. Herodotos, V, 99, 1.

63. See below, pp. 147-149.

64. The fact that the Chalkidians invaded Attike early in the campaign shows that they had no fear of Eretria.

65. Diehl, Anthologia Lyrica Graeca, II (Leipzig, 1925), no. 87:

Δίφρωνος ἐδμήθημεν ὑπὸ πτυχί, σῆμα δ' ἐφ' ὅμῳ

prisoners, along with the 700 Boiotians, were kept in chains at Athens until a ransom of two minai was paid for each man. The chains were then exhibited as a memorial on the Acropolis, where Herodotos saw them still hanging on the walls which had been scorched in the fire set by the Persians. ⁶⁶ A life-sized

ἐγγύθεν Εὐρίπου δημοσίᾳ κέχυται,
οὐκ ἀδίκῳ ἔρατῃν γὰρ ἀπώλεσαμεν νεότητα
τρηχεῖαν πολέμου δεξάμενοι νεφέλην.

Cf. F. Jacoby, "Some Athenian Epigrams from the Persian Wars," *Hesperia*, XIV (1945), pp. 159-160. Another epigram from the Greek Anthology attributed to Simonides (Diehl, no. 117), which praises Athenian horsemen who died κλείστοις Ἑλλάνων ἀντία μαρνόμενοι, was formerly thought to refer to the campaign of 506 (Geyer, *op. cit.*, p. 47). However, *I.G.*, I², 946, which also bears a text of the epigram, was inscribed to commemorate either the battle of Tanagra (A. Wilhelm, "Simonideische Gedichte," *Jahreshefte des Öster. Arch. Inst.*, II [1899], pp. 221-227) or a cavalry skirmish in 431 (F. Hiller von Gärtringen, *I.G.*, I², p. 248). This casts doubt on the attribution to Simonides, although the possibility remains that the epigram was his originally and was later borrowed for the inscription.

66. V, 77, 3: κρεμάμεναι ἐκ τειχέων περιπεφλευσμένων πυρὶ

bronze chariot was dedicated to Athene as her share of the ransom money. It was probably placed on the Acropolis near the wall from which the chains were suspended. On its base, part of which still exists, was inscribed the following epigram:

[Δεσμῶι ἐν ἄχυνόεντι σιδερέοι ἔσβεσαν ἡβῆ]ριν
 παῖδε[ς Ἀθηναίων ἔργμασιν ἐν πολέμῳ]
 [ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμάσαντες·]
 τὸν ἥϊκος δ[εκάτεν Παλλὰδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν].⁶⁷

ὑπὸ τοῦ Μήδου, ἀντίον δὲ τοῦ μεγάρου τοῦ πρὸς ἐσπέρην τετραμμένον. The building referred to here was the old temple of Athene; G. P. Stevens, "The Periclean Entrance Court," *Hesperia*, V (1936), p. 506.

67. *I.G.*, I², 394, II. The text is restored from Herodotos, V, 77, 4, and Diodoros, X, 24, 3, where it is given with the first and third lines interchanged (and with ἄχλυόεντι as a variant reading for ἄχυνόεντι). Such was the order in which the epigram was reinscribed after the Persian invasion, probably to celebrate Perikles' victories in Euboea in 446. A fragment of this later inscription also survives; *I.G.*, I², 394, I. Herodotos (*loc. cit.*) describes the restoration as standing in front of the Kimonian Propylon. Its base has been found lying partially under the Propylaia of

From Chalkis Athens confiscated the land of the Hippobotai on the Lelantine Plain; there she marked off temene for Athene, and probably for the other gods, and settled a klerouchy.⁶⁸ Herodotos twice gives the number of

Mnesikles; Stevens, "Architectural Studies Concerning the Acropolis of Athens," Hesperia, XV (1946), pp. 81-82 and figs. 4 and 6. With the construction of the Propylaia, the chariot was probably moved inside to a spot near the Promachos, where there is a rock cutting appropriate for its base (Stevens, loc. cit.). It was there that Pausanias saw it (I, 28, 2). There is no archaeological evidence for the position of the original chariot, but it is likely that the first dedication, which gives prominence to the chains, was on the Acropolis near them; F.Hiller von Gärtringen, I.G., I², p. 190. The effect of the change in the order of the lines for the inscription which stood outside the Propylon is, on the other hand, to reduce the emphasis on δεσμοί.

68. Herodotos, V, 77, 2, and VI, 100, 1; Ailian, Var. Hist., VI, 1. Ailian apparently confuses events of 506 and of 446, and it is much disputed how much of the passage refers to the earlier period; see below, pp. 189-197. Kahrstedt, "Der Umfang des Athenischen Kolonialreiches,"

klerouchs as 4000, while Ailian has 2000, although there is a variant reading, τεσσαράκοντα, which throws some doubt on Ailian's figure, even though forty is not a reasonable number for a klerouchy.⁶⁹ Before discussing the relative credibility of these figures, we should note that they are most probably based on the total number of lots and that, since ten per cent of the land went to the gods, the actual number of klerouchs was 3600 or 1800. For, although the figures for settlers in other klerouchies are generally given in thousands or fractions thereof,⁷⁰ in the one case in which we have explicit information of the division of the land, on Lesbos in 427, we

Nachr. Ges. Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse (1931), p. 162, denies that a klerouchy was settled in 506 and calls the tradition "eine politische Erfindung, um die 446 wirklich und genau so vorgenommene Expropriierung des Adels von Chalkis mit einem alten Rechtstitel zu begründen." But this "expropriation" in 446 is purely hypothetical (see below, p. 187, note 80), and it is hardly necessary to add that the rejection of Herodotos' explicit statement on such grounds is unjustifiable.

69. See below, pp. 191-192.

70. E.g., 2000 to Hestiaia (Theopompos, frag. 450 [Jacoby]); 1000 to the Thracian Chersonese, 500 to Naxos, and 250 to Andros (Plutarch, Pericles, 11).

know that the gods received 300 lots of an original 3000,
 the klerouchs the remaining 2700.⁷¹ It is probable that the
 same system was followed in all klerouchies, and we reach an
 awkward and uneven figure for the gods' ten per cent of the
 whole if the actual count of settlers was an even thousand.⁷²
 The total number of lots, as a round number, could easily be-
 come in the tradition the figure for the settlers.

On the question of the number of klerouchs, we should
 naturally expect that the figure given by Herodotos, writing
 two generations after the settlement, would be more trustworthy
 than that of Ailian, who lived in the second and third cen-
 turies of our era. We do not know the ultimate source of either

71. Thuc., III, 50, 2.

72. E.g., 4444.44 lots are needed to allow 4000 settlers.

Of course it is possible that the tithe was not exact,
 but this is unlikely. To give too small an area to the
 gods would have been sacrilegious, and more than ten
 per cent might have been looked on with resentment by
 prospective klerouchs; cf. the decree concerning the
 colony at Brea, I.G., I², 45, 10-11: [τὰ δὲ τεμ]ένη τὰ
 ἐχσειρεμένα ἔαν καθά[περ ἐστί, καὶ ἅλ]λα μὲ τεμενί[ζεν].
 Although we are not told what percentage of the land
 the τεμένη cover, it is clear that the people did not
 intend that they should become too large.

figure, although Ailian's information seems to have come directly from either Favorinus (second century after Christ) or Pamphila (first century).⁷³ However, in spite of the questionable value of Ailian's authority and the variant reading for the figure in the manuscripts, his 2000 has often been accepted on the ground that the 4000 of Herodotos is "obviously too large" for 506.⁷⁴ It is true that this figure is the

73. Too much has been made of the fact that later in the same passage Ailian mentions stelai set up in the Agora; for Ailian's sources see below, pp. 190-194. Herodotos' figure is considered by J. A. Munro (C.A.H., IV, p. 237) "a calculation from the Periclean cleruchy or from the 20 triremes at Artemisium." But this statement is really based on an assumption that Herodotos must be wrong. The "Periclean cleruchy" is very doubtful (below, pp. 186-189), and, while a computation from the twenty ships lent Chalkis by Athens in 480 is possible, it is much more likely that Herodotos' information came ultimately from public records.

74. Busolt, Gr. Gesch., II², p. 444, note 1: "offenbar zu gross." Cf. also Munro, loc. cit., and F. Schulthess, P.W., R.E., XXI, s.v. κληροῦχοι, cols. 818-819. Kahrstedt, op. cit., pp. 161-162, argues against Herodotos on these grounds, although he rejects Ailian as well.

largest reported for any klerouchy; the nearest is the 2700⁷⁵ for the settlers on Lesbos in 427. But the case against Herodotos is based mainly on the assumption that only nine or ten thousand Athenians, including the klerouchs from Chalkis, fought at Marathon. If that assumption were true, it would be difficult to believe that almost one half the hoplite strength of Athens had been moved to Euboia. But there is no proof that the klerouchs were at Marathon;⁷⁶ further, the⁷⁷ authorities for the number of men at that battle are late, and the figure was probably obtained by a calculation of 1000⁷⁸ men to a tribe. Herodotos' statement that there were 30,000 Athenian citizens ca. 500 has a better claim to authority, even though it was, or became, the conventional figure for the enfranchised population of Athens.⁷⁹ Gomme,⁸⁰ working from other figures, arrives at 35,000 as a conservative estimate of citizens between the ages of 18 and 59 in 480. This

75. Thuc., III, 50, 2.

76. See below, pp. 157-159.

77. Justin, II, 9, 9; Cornelius Nepos, Miltiades, 4; Pausanias, IV, 25, 5 and X, 20, 2.

78. Cf. Munro, C.A.H., IV, p. 239.

79. V, 97, 2. Cf. A. W. Gomme, The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. (Oxford, 1933), p. 3.

80. Op. cit., pp. 25-26.

agrees well enough with Herodotos' 30,000 ca. 500 B.C., and out of a citizen body of 30,000 to 35,000 the sending of 3600 klerouchs is not improbable. For we must keep in mind that most of these men would be from the landless lower classes⁸¹ who could not afford the armor of a hoplite. In the days before the Athenian fleet became large, they were of little use in war, and it was to the advantage of the state to give land to as many as possible, thus increasing the hoplite force. The income from the land would raise the klerouchs to hoplitic census.

If we consider the political situation at Athens in 506 we can find another reason for such a large number of klerouchs. Kleisthenes owed his support to the common people, many of whom were of impure descent and had been struck from the citizenship rolls after the expulsion of the tyrants.⁸² These Kleisthenes re-enrolled, and he undoubtedly added new

81. Cf. Libanios, hypothesis to Demosthenes, VIII: ἔθος δ' ἦν τοῦτο παλαιὸν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ὅσοι πένητες ἦσαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀκτήμονες οἴκοι, τούτους πέμπειν ἐποίκους εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις τὰς ἐαυτῶν. It is specified in I.G., I², 45, 40-42, that only thetes and Zeugitai should be sent to the colony at Brea.

82. Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 13, 5.

⁸³
citizens. There must have been a sudden increase in the number of poor citizens. The land in Chalkis would afford Kleisthenes a chance to acknowledge their support and gain their further gratitude, while he also increased the hoplite force of the city. The figure of 4000 given by Herodotos, therefore, seems reasonable in 506 and should not be rejected offhand as too large, even if, as suggested above, the actual number of settlers was only 3600.

Although the Hippobotai were dispossessed, there is no evidence that they were exiled or that the government was forcibly changed. There were still Hippobotai in Chalkis ⁸⁴ sixty years later, and it is likely that an oligarchy con- ⁸⁵tinued to rule the city until the second Persian invasion. At any rate, Chalkis was stripped of her power. Her fleet ⁸⁶ was taken away, and she seems to have struck no coins for

83. Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 21, 4, speaks of νεοπολίτας, by which he probably means both those who had been disenfranchised and those who became citizens for the first time.

84. Cf. below, pp. 175-177.

85. A democratic change in government in 481/0 best explains what we know of the activities of Chalkis at that time; see below, pp. 166-167.

86. She had no ships of her own at the time of the Persian Wars; see below, pp. 159-168.

more than a century after 506.

-
87. Cf. Head, op. cit., p. 358, and Babelon, op. cit., p. 674. Gåbler does attribute one fifth century coin to Chalkis, but it is probably Olynthiac; see above, p. 45. Seltman, op. cit., pp. 100-101, maintains that a group of Athenian coins, rougher in fabric than usual and having an ⲁ (with sloping bars), were struck at Chalkis for the klerouchs during the first decade of the fifth century. But that these coins form a group distinctly separate from other Athenian coinage is doubtful; see the review of Seltman's work by E. S. G. Robertson, Num. Chron., IV, ser. 5 (1924), p. 337.

CHAPTER V

CHALKIS IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

Throughout the fifth century the history of Chalkis is bound closely to that of Athens. But we know little of the relationship of the two cities during the first half of the century, and to reconstruct the history of Chalkis and the Athenian klerouchy there we must depend upon scattered references which are open to widely divergent interpretations.

We hear of the Athenian klerouchy only once after its founding, and thereafter it drops from sight. During the first Persian invasion the klerouchs were sent to the aid of Eretria, after an appeal from that city to Athens. When they arrived, however, they were warned by Aischines the Eretrian of the dissension among the citizens which made the fall of the city inevitable, so they left and crossed over to Oropos to save themselves. Thus the story is told by Herodotos,¹ who places it during the time when the Persians were still at Karystos. It is likely that in Herodotos' account the sending of help to Eretria, if not her appeal,² is dated too early among the events leading up to Marathon.

1. VI, 100.

2. Herodotos' account of this campaign is notoriously con-

For while the Persians remained at Karystos, it was uncertain whether they would next move on Athens or Eretria.

³ Munro has shown that most probably the Athenians waited until the Persians had committed themselves by sailing towards Eretria, then voted to go to the aid of that city, and were actually on their way when they were diverted by the Persian landing at Marathon. Under these conditions it is very unlikely that the klerouchs would leave Chalkis until the objective of the Persians was known. When it was clear that Eretria was to be attacked next, the klerouchs, we may conjecture, offered their help for a pitched battle, but, on learning that the Eretrians were not prepared to meet the Persians in the field, they withdrew to save themselves and their families. While the Persians were encamped around Eretria, the Lelantine Plain must have been at the mercy of their cavalry. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that the klerouchs took their families and movable possessions with them when they crossed to Oropos.⁴ We should expect that they would have

fused, especially in its chronology; see Munro, C.A.H., IV, pp. 235-236.

3. C.A.H., IV, pp. 237-238.

4. They may have had the help of the Athenian fleet in crossing. Munro, C.A.H., IV, p. 237, suggests that it had been stationed at Oropos or Chalkis to ferry the

then joined the Athenians at Marathon, for the battle did not take place until eight days after the Persian landing. They may have done so, but it is strange that the arrival of so large a reinforcement has left no trace in the tradition.⁵ Perhaps the transportation of families and goods to Oropos took too long.

We hear nothing of the Chalkidians proper at this time, although one would suspect that they would not be unhappy over the fall of Eretria and the temporary discomfiture of Athens.

After Marathon there is no more evidence concerning the klerouchs.⁶ But Herodotos states that in 480 the Athen-

Athenians to Euboia to help Eretria, or vice versa.

But we hear nothing of the fleet during the campaign, and possibly the Athenians refused to waste their strength manning ships which would be no match for the Persian fleet. For the relatively small size of the Athenian navy at this period see McGregor, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., Suppl. Vol. 1 (1940), pp. 80-82.

5. The Plataian contingent, which must have been much smaller, is noted (Herodotos, VI, 108, 1), but of course this is due to their being the only non-Athenians present.

6. VIII, 1, 2, and 46, 2.

ians furnished twenty ships in which the Chalkidians fought at Artemision and Salamis, and it has been claimed that these "Chalkidians" were the Athenian klerouchs on the ground that the complements of twenty ships would equal the number of the settlers, 4000.⁷ The similarity in the figures is striking, but it is clear that Herodotos believed the ships were manned by native Chalkidians; he says,⁸ in his description of the fleet at Salamis, μετὰ δὲ Αἰγινήτας Χαλκιδέες τὰς ἐκ' Ἀρ-
 τεμισίῳ εἴκοσι παρεχόμενοι καὶ Ἑρετριέες τὰς ἐκτά· οὗτοι δὲ
 Ἰωνεῖς εἰσι.⁹ Kius maintains that Herodotos made a natural mistake in calling the klerouchs Chalkidians; the error stems, he argues, from the practice of calling such settlers, in the fifth century, by the name of the city in which they

-
7. Böckh, Staatshaushaltung, I³, pp. 501-502 and 507; O. Kius, "Die Attische Kleruchie," Programm, Königliches Friedrichs-Gymnasium zu Cassel (Cassel, 1888), pp. 5-8; How and Wells, Commentary on Herodotus, II, p. 235; Munro, C.A.H., IV, p. 284. The last two authorities accept the equation without discussion. R. W. Macan, Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books, I, 2 (London, 1908), p. 358, suggests that only the epibatai were Athenians.
8. VIII, 46, 2.
9. Loc. cit.

lived. He cites two examples. Thucydides, enumerating the Athenian allies in Sicily, speaks of Lemnians, Imbrians,¹⁰ Aiginetans, and Hestiaiians as Athenian colonists. But Kius ignores the care with which Thucydides modifies the names and specifies that the people are ἑποικοί. On two¹¹ Athenian casualty lists, as Kius recalls, there appear Ἀθηναῖοι. But here their very presence in public lists in Athens makes their status as klerouchs evident, and furthermore they are inscribed according to Attic tribal affiliation. These two cases, then, do not prove that the Athenian klerouchs could have been called Χαλκιδεῖς without qualification. It becomes even more unlikely when we realize that the references to Chalkidians occur in the account of naval warfare for which Herodotos' main sources seem to have been Athenian.¹² Such sources would not have given credit to Chalkidians for fighting done by Athenians.¹³ But the most conclu-

10. VII, 57, 2: Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν αὐτοὶ Ἰῶνες ἐπὶ Δωριᾶς Συρακοσίου ἐκόντες ἦλθον, καὶ αὐτοῖς τῇ αὐτῇ φωνῇ καὶ νομίμοις ἔτι χρώμενοι Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Ἰμβριοι καὶ Αἰγινῆται, οἳ τότε Αἰγίναν εἶχον, καὶ ἔτι Ἑστιαίης οἱ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ Ἑστίασαν οἰκοῦντες ἑποικοὶ ὄντες συνεστράτευσαν.

11. I.G., I², 947 and 948.

12. Macan, op. cit., II (London, 1908), pp. 267-268.

13. It should be noted that the klerouchs were called

sive proof that the "Chalkidians" were not Athenians is the fact that they were stationed at Salamis next to the Aigine-¹⁴ tans,¹⁵ who were on the opposite wing from the Athenians. Klerouchs would certainly have fought alongside the Athenians.

The arguments adduced above against identifying the "Chalkidians" with klerouchs are based on the assumption that the latter were still Athenian citizens, and there remains the possibility that by 480 the settlers had become so intermingled with the Chalkidians that they were no longer considered Athenians. At this point it is necessary to observe that in 446 Chalkis, along with the rest of Euboia, revolted. This would hardly have been possible if the klerouchs had remained Athenian citizens, and the settlement after the surrender of Chalkis in 446/5 shows no signs of the presence of the klerouchy.¹⁶ Therefore, between 490 and 446 one of two things must have happened: the klerouchy was withdrawn or its members were so absorbed by the Chalkidians that they

Athenians when sent to help Eretria in 490; Herodotos, VI, 100.

14. Herodotos, VIII, 46, 2.

15. Diodoros, IX, 18, 2. Cf. Munro, C.A.H., IV, p. 311; W. W. Tarn, "The Fleet of Xerxes," J.H.S., XXVIII (1908), p. 224.

16. See below, pp. 175-197.

lost their identity and their Athenian sympathies. Böckh maintained that the second of these alternatives was true and that the calling of the klerouchs "Chalkidian" in 480 shows¹⁷ that the process had started earlier. But it seems certain now that klerouchs and their descendants remained Athenian citizens, owing military service to Athens, and that the city retained a legal claim to their land. P. Foucart proved that this obtained from the latter part of the fifth century on, and he suggested that such was the case for earlier klerouchies, including that at Chalkis.¹⁸

This suggestion has been proved right by recent interpretations of a fragmentary late-sixth century inscription concerning Salamis.¹⁹ We may safely believe that this decree

-
17. Op. cit., pp. 501-502. He even suggests that the Hipobotai in 446 might be descendants of the klerouchs. Cf. also Kius, op. cit., pp. 7-8.
18. "Mémoire sur les Colonies Athéniennes au Cinquième et au Quatrième Siècle," Mémoires Présentés...à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1^{re} Serie, IX, 1 (Paris, 1878), pp. 323-413. The conclusive proof for the fifth century is the appearance of Lemnian klerouchs on Athenian casualty lists; I.G., I², 947 and 948.
19. I.G., I², 1, with a new fragment published by E. Schweigert, "Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis," Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 264.

regulates the relationship of Athenians on Salamis with the
²⁰
 new Athenian democracy. Although in places definite restorations are impossible, the main clauses are established: the Athenians in Salamis are to retain possession of their land but must give military service and pay taxes as Athenians; the renting of their land is in some way limited, un-

-
20. Meritt, "Notes on Attic Decrees," Hesperia, X (1941), pp. 301-307; Wade-Gery, "The Sixth-Century Athenian Decree about Salamis," Class. Quart., XL (1946), pp. 101-104; Kahrstedt, Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen, I (Stuttgart-Berlin, 1934), pp. 358-362. It is maintained by Wilhelm, "Attische Urkunden, IV," Sitzb. Ak. Wien (1939), pp. 5-11, as reported by Meritt, loc. cit., that the decree concerns natives of Salamis. Yet the provisions of the law militate against this theory, especially the clause which specifies the arming of the people concerned. There were many earlier attempts at restoration, but they did not take into account the stoichedon form of the first six lines of the inscription, which was noted by R. P. Austin, The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions (London, 1938), pp. 8, 20-21, 45. Meritt has also observed "a certain plan and order" in the disposition of the last six lines (non-stoichedon).

doubtedly for the purpose of keeping Athenians in active possession;²¹ and they are to provide arms for themselves²² to the value of thirty drachmai,²³ under the supervision of an archon.

We can not say with conviction whether these Athenians at Salamis are recent klerouchs or settlers who had been there for some time.²³ In either case, their position in regard to the democracy would be the same. This decree is to be dated about the time of the sending of the klerouchy to

-
21. The restoration is not sure. Wade-Gery, op. cit., pp. 101-102, gives the possibilities and favors reading that the land could be rented only to relatives of the owner. Whatever the exact details, the purpose, at least, is clear---to retain Athenians on the land. Renting was further discouraged by a tax on both owner and renter, according to Wade-Gery's restoration, which seems better than earlier attempts to supplement the line.
22. Possibly the state was to pay for the arms, as Kahrstedt claims (op. cit., p. 360); but cf. Meritt, op. cit., p. 306.
23. Meritt, op. cit., pp. 302-303. M. P. Nilsson, "The New Inscription of the Salaminioi," A.J.P., LIX (1938), pp. 385-393, maintains that the Athenians had settled Salamis from the time of Solon.

Chalkis (506) and it is safe to assume that the settlers there were bound by regulations similar to those concerning Salamis. It is hardly possible that the klerouchs, under such conditions, while remaining Athenian citizens and owing military service to Athens, could have lost their identity and come to be considered Chalkidians in two generations. Nor could the land have reverted to Chalkidians through the depletion of the klerouchy in military operations or by the return of individuals to Attike, for the regulation on renting in Salamis shows that the state retained control of the land, at least to the extent of seeing that Athenians remained in possession.

Therefore, since the klerouchs could not have become "Chalkidians," we are left with the conclusion that the klerouchy in Chalkis was abandoned at some time between 490 and 446. If we connect this withdrawal closely with the appearance of Chalkidians fighting in Athenian ships in 480, the explanation of both of these rather surprising events becomes clearer. It has, however, commonly been maintained that the klerouchs did not return to Chalkis after they crossed²⁴ to Oropos in 490. The reasons given are that the Athenians

24. H. Swoboda, "Zur Geschichte der Attischen Kleruchien," Serta Harteliana (Vienna, 1896), pp. 30-31; Busolt, Gr. Gesch., III, 1, p. 431; Oberhummer, P.W., R.E., VI, col. 2082; Geyer, Topographie und Geschichte, p. 48.

would wish to keep their forces concentrated and that, by maintaining the klerouchy, they would drive the Chalkidians to aid Persia. These arguments seem to have little force when applied to 490, while the Athenians were fresh from their victory at Marathon; they would fit much better nine years later, when Xerxes was advancing on Greece. At that time the Athenians could not hope to hold Chalkis and they could expect the Hippobotai, who had been close to the Thebans a generation before, to follow Boiotia in joining the Persians. But by supporting a democracy at Chalkis and strengthening it with a withdrawal of the klerouchy, or, more likely, a promise to do so in return for assistance against Persia, Athens could obtain much needed allies²⁵ whom she could trust and who, incidentally, would favor defending Greece above the isthmus. She herself would supply the ships, as the government of Chalkis apparently had not been allowed to maintain vessels of war. This, I suggest, is what happened. The establishment of a Chalkidic democracy in 481/0 to insure help against Persia explains not only the Chalkidians fighting in Athenian ships but also the elimination of the klerouchy and the motive

25. That there were not enough Athenians to man the whole fleet and carry out the withdrawal to Salamis at the same time is shown by their use of the Plataians at Artemision; Herodotos, VIII, 1, 1.

26
behind it.

We have no details of the actual fighting done by the Chalkidians at Artemision. During the campaign Chalkis served as a secondary base for the Greek fleet. Herodotos²⁷ says that the whole Greek fleet retired to that city after the loss of two ships in an initial skirmish and remained there during the storm which destroyed part of the Persian fleet. If such a retreat did take place, it was undoubtedly²⁸ to seek protection from the storm. However, it is far more

26. According to Diodoros, XV, 29, 7, the Athenians in 377 gave up their klerouchies in order to impress the Greek world with their good faith and so to acquire allies for their Second Confederacy. If this were true, the case would be somewhat similar to the early withdrawal of the klerouchy at Chalkis. But Diodoros' remarks, in all probability, derive ultimately from I.G., II-III², 43, which specifies the cession of ἐγκτήματα, not klerouchies. There can hardly have been any regular klerouchs left in 377, since Lysandros had forced all of them to return to Athens in 405 (Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 22; Mem., II, 8, 1; Plutarch, Lysander, 13).

27. VII, 183, 1, and 189-192.

28. G. B. Grundy, "Artemisium," J.H.S., XVII (1897), pp. 217-218.

credible that Herodotos has applied to the whole fleet the movements of the fifty-three Athenian ships which were despatched to defend the Euripos against the Persian flanking movement around Euboia.²⁹ These ships, then, stayed at Chalkis during the storm, "mopped up" the Persian ships which had survived and rounded the southern tip of Euboia, and then returned to join the main Greek fleet.

After the battle at Artemision and the retreat of the Greek navy to Salamis, Chalkis must have fallen into the hands of the Persians, since Xerxes' fleet sailed through the Euripos.³⁰ Probably many Chalkidians, besides those in the fleet, escaped. Apparently the Euboians in general had been lax in planning a withdrawal;³¹ it was only after the arrival of the Persians that they bethought themselves of escape.³²

29. See Munro, C.A.H., IV, pp. 286-291.

30. Herodotos, VIII, 66, 1. Diodoros, XI, 14, 5, adds that the Persians devastated Euboia.

31. Herodotos, VIII, 20.

32. Herodotos, VIII, 4-5, states that the Euboians appealed to Eurybiades, and then bribed Themistokles with thirty talents, to keep the fleet at Artemision long enough to allow them to remove their families. The truth of the story of the bribery is not in point; even if false, it must have been based on the desire of the Euboians to withdraw to safety.

The Chalkidians were in the best position to cross to the mainland, and they would have had time to do so.³³ We should expect them to withdraw to the Peloponnesos along with the Plataians and Thespians,³⁴ or possibly to Salamis with the Athenians.

The Chalkidians fought again in the same twenty ships at Salamis, stationed next to the Aiginetans,³⁵ but nothing is told of their exploits. After Xerxes' retreat following the battle, the Chalkidians could return to their homes. With the Persian fleet gone and Mardonios in Thes-³⁶ sally, they would have little to fear, at least temporarily.

-
33. The Plataians left the fleet only when it passed Chalkis in its retreat (Herodotos, VIII, 44, 1) and had completely evacuated their city when the Persians arrived there (Herodotos, VIII, 50, 2).
34. Herodotos, VIII, 50, 2.
35. Herodotos, VIII, 46, 2.
36. The Athenians seem to have returned to Attike; at least Herodotos believed that they did (VIII, 140-144; IX, 3, 2). Munro, C.A.H., IV, p. 318, maintains that they did not, citing as evidence the Persian offer to give back their land and the Spartan condolences on the loss of two harvests. But it is hardly possible that the Athenians would stay on Salamis while Attike lay deserted.

There is no indication that the city was molested after Mardonios' invasion of Attike the following spring (479). We hear no more of the twenty ships, but it is likely that the Chalkidians kept them, rejoined the Greek fleet, and fought at Mykale. Athens, supporting a large land force,³⁷ would welcome help in manning her ships even more than she had a year before, and their naval responsibilities would explain the small number of Chalkidians at Plataia.

There were at Plataia 400 Chalkidian hoplites;³⁸
 we may posit about the same number of light armed troops.³⁹
 They may have been among those who joined the Greek army after it had encamped near Plataia.⁴⁰ They were drawn up on the left center with the other Euboic contingents, facing the

They would return even if they did not plant crops.

And the Persian offer would be technically correct in that the land was really in the power of Mardonios whenever he wished to advance on it.

37. According to Herodotos, IX, 28, 6, there were 8000 Athenian hoplites at Plataia.
38. Herodotos, IX, 28, 5.
39. Herodotos, IX, 29, 2, says that the light armed soldiers numbered about one to a hoplite, but does not divide them by nationalities.
40. Herodotos, IX, 38, 2.

Indians. The role of the troops in the Greek center is not clear. Herodotos⁴¹ accuses them of fleeing before the battle began, but this is undoubtedly a misinterpretation of a planned realignment of the Greek army, in which the center⁴² was to shift into position on the left wing. We do know that the Megarians and Phliasians, who were stationed on either side of the Euboic contingent, were attacked by the Theban cavalry while crossing the plain.⁴³ This means that the whole left center, including the Chalkidians, advanced to the aid of the Athenians and diverted the Theban cavalry from them.⁴⁴

For their share in the fighting against the Persians, the name of the Chalkidians was inscribed on the "Serpent Column" at Delphi⁴⁵ and on the monument at Olympia.⁴⁶

Chalkis was undoubtedly an original member of the Delian League, which was a reorganization of the naval arm of

41. IX, 52, and 85, 3.

42. See Munro, C.A.H., IV, pp. 333-336.

43. Herodotos, IX, 69.

44. See Munro, C.A.H., IV, p. 338; How and Wells, op. cit., II, pp. 393-395.

45. Tod, Gr. Hist. Inscr., 19.

46. Pausanias, V, 23, 2.

the Hellenic League,⁴⁷ to which she must have belonged as a combatant in the campaigns of 480 and 479. Probably she contributed ships and men until ca. 450, and money thereafter. Her debut in the tribute records is in List 7 (448/7), when she apparently paid five talents.⁴⁸ This comparatively late first appearance in the lists may, of course, be an accident, but West,⁴⁹ noting that none of the states which participated in the Persian campaigns of 480-479 occurs in the tribute lists until 450, has shown that the most likely explanation

47. See J. A. O. Larsen, "The Constitution and Original Purpose of the Delian League," Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., LI (1940), pp. 175-213; E. Maple, Confederacy and Empire, A Study of Athenian Foreign Policy (M. A. thesis, unpublished, University of Cincinnati, 1946), pp. 6-21.
48. The quota is not certain. It consisted of only one letter, which was restored as X by A. Kirchhoff (I.G., I, Suppl., 231) and as H by J. Kirchner (I.G., I², 196). But the break in the stone indicates that the lower right hand stroke of either of these letters should be visible; the restoration [H] is therefore preferable; see A.T.L., I, p. 36.
49. "The Tribute Lists and the Non-Tributary Members of the Delian League," Am. Hist. Rev., XXXV (1929-1930), pp. 267-275. See also Maple, op. cit., pp. 35-56.

for this phenomenon is that they contributed ships and men until the time of Kimon's last campaign in Kypros.⁵⁰ Gomme objects to the inclusion of Chalkis in such a category because she had no ships of her own in 480.⁵¹ But her lack of ships in that year must have been a result of conditions imposed by the Athenians, and there is no reason why Chalkis should not supply ships after the withdrawal of the klerouchy,

-
50. H. Nesselhauf, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Delische-Attischen Symmachie (Klio, Beiheft XXX, 1933), pp. 11-13, explains the absence of the island states from the early lists by disaffection caused by their losses in the Egyptian campaign. He is followed by R. Meiggs, "The Growth of Athenian Imperialism," J.H.S., LXIII (1943), pp. 30-31, who adds that the transferral of the league's treasury from Delos to Athens might have increased the disaffection. But the Egyptian expedition apparently was not so great a disaster as has been commonly thought; see Wallace, "The Egyptian Expedition and the Chronology of the Decade 460-450 B.C.," T.A.P.A., LXVII (1936), pp. 252-260. That Athens would have allowed defaulting by important states located near her is, on the face of it, difficult to believe.
51. A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, I (Oxford, 1945), p. 286. However, on p. 272 he says that Chalkis probably furnished ships in the first assessment (478/7).

especially as she had trained crews.

It is likely, then, that the Chalkidians contributed ships for the league campaigns until ca. 450. However, we have no specific references to Chalkis during this period except that she, with the rest of Euboeia, took no part in the reduction of Karystos.⁵²

In 446, probably early in the summer, Euboeia revolted from Athens.⁵³ At Chalkis the Hippobotai were the moving spirits of the uprising.⁵⁴ The discontent which must

52. Thuc., I, 98, 3: πρὸς δὲ Καρυστίους αὐτοῖς [sc. 'Αθηναίοις] ἄνευ τῶν ἄλλων Εὐβοέων πόλεμος ἐγένετο, καὶ χρόνῳ συνέβησαν καθ' ὁμολογίαν. The date is uncertain, but was perhaps about 474-472; cf. Gomme, Hist. Comm., I, p. 408.
53. Thuc., I, 114, 1: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα [sc. Koroneia] οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον Εὐβοία ἀπέστη ἀπὸ 'Αθηναίων. The revolt must have taken place after the Dionysia in March when the tribute was paid, as the Euboians are present in List 8; see A.T.L., I, pp. 134 and 176. [Χαλκιδεῖς] is a safe restoration on the basis of correspondences with List 7 (A.T.L., I, p. 133), and there is no doubt concerning the Hestiaiians (II, 36), Eretrians (II, 68), and Karystians (II, 56).
54. This follows from their exile after the failure of the revolt; Plutarch, Pericles, 23, 4, quoted below, p. 178.

have followed upon Athens' continued collection of the tribute after the Peace of Kallias would give them a grievance, and the defeat of the Athenians at Koroneia a short time before⁵⁵ would encourage them to act. There were Eubolian

K. Fuhr, Ausgewählte Biographien des Plutarch, erklärt von C. Sintenis, III⁴ (Berlin, 1880), p. 111, followed by Wallace, History of Eretria, p. 135, suggests that the mention of the Hippobotai here is only a confusion with Herodotos' description of the settlement of klerouchs on their land in 506 (V, 77, 2; see above, pp. 149-155). But the rest of Plutarch's account seems to be from a good source, which adds several details to what we learn from Thucydides, and there is no reason to reject the statement, especially since it is entirely believable that oligarchs would lead the revolt. And if Plutarch were carelessly combining sources here, we should expect him to say that klerouchs received the land of the Hippobotai, as Herodotos does for 506, and not that the latter were exiled, which is not in Herodotos.

55. The usual date given for Koroneia is 447; see, e.g., Busolt, Gr. Gesch., III, 1, p. 422; Gomme, Hist. Comm., I, p. 396, although on p. 409 he dates it "in the autumn or winter, 447-446." Meritt, however, in an unpublished manuscript, argues that the battle fell in the

56

exiles fighting on the side of the Boiotians at Koroneia; some of them were probably Hippobotai who had been expelled for previous anti-Athenian activities.

The revolt in Euboia was well coordinated with the Peloponnesians, for, as soon as Perikles advanced against the island, the Megarians seceded from their alliance and the Peloponnesians invaded Attike,⁵⁷ forcing the Athenians to return in haste from Euboia. But the Peloponnesians, who apparently were concerned only with the success of the Megarian rising, soon withdrew, after devastating the land around Eleusis and Thria. Then Perikles, in command of five thousand hoplites and fifty ships,⁵⁸ returned to Euboia and subdued the whole island. The Thebans offered no help in return for that given them at Koroneia, but left Euboia to its fate.

In the settlement after the revolt, the Chalkidians fared well, as compared with the Hestiaiians, who were ex-

spring of 446. This interpretation has the advantage of connecting the revolt of Euboia more closely with the Athenian defeat, and it is truer to Thucydides, who says (I, 114, 1) that the revolt was οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον than Koroneia.

56. Thuc., I, 113, 2.

57. Thuc., I, 114, 1.

58. Plutarch, Pericles, 23, 3.

pelled from their land, which was given to Athenian klerouchs. There is a fair amount of evidence on this settlement, especially for Chalkis, but it has been subjected to widely divergent interpretations. Of the ancient authors who speak of the settlement as a whole, Thucydides⁵⁹ says: καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι...τὴν μὲν ἑλλην [sc. Εὐβοίαν] ὁμολογία κατέστησαντο, Ἑστιάει⁶⁰ δὲ ἐξοικίσαντες αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν ἔσχον. Plutarch adds a few details: [Περικλῆς]...κατεστρέψατο τὰς πόλεις. καὶ Χαλκιδέων μὲν τοὺς ἱπποβότας λεγομένους πλοῦτῳ καὶ δόξῃ διαφέροντας ἐξέβαλεν, Ἑστιαεῖς δὲ πάντας ἀναστήσας ἐκ τῆς χώρας Ἀθηναίους κατώκισε, μόνοις τούτοις ἀπαραιτήτως χρησάμενος, ὅτι ναῦν Ἀττικὴν αἰχμάλωτον λαβόντες⁶¹ ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς ἄνδρας. And finally, Diodoros states: καὶ [sc. Περικλῆς] τὴν μὲν πόλιν τῶν Ἑστιάειων ἑλὼν κατὰ κράτος, ἐξώκισε τοὺς Ἑστιάει⁶¹ς ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος, τὰς δ' ἄλλας κατακληζάμενος ἠνάγκασε πάλιν πειθαρχεῖν Ἀθη-

59. I, 114, 3. Philochoros, frag. 89 (Müller), merely repeats the passage.

60. Pericles, 23, 3-4. A lacuna between καὶ and Χαλκιδέων was proposed by Fuhr, loc. cit., who suggested that there should be some indication that the affairs of the rest of the island were arranged by ὁμολογία. But the affairs of Chalkis were also so arranged, and the passage reads well enough as it stands.

61. XII, 7.

vaίois.

In all of these passages the contrast is between the treatment of Hestiaia and of the other cities. Despite the exile of the Hippobotai, only the Hestiaians could be said to have been treated harshly. The status of the others was settled by agreement, on terms that made them subject, to a degree, to Athens. Thucydides' ⁶²ὁμολογία and Diodoros' ⁶³πειθαρχεῖν are not contradictory; they reflect a difference of emphasis.

There has survived part of the agreement with Chalkis, consisting of three decrees of the Athenian people, all passed on the same day and inscribed consecutively on the same stele. ⁶³They do not represent the first stages of the

62. F. Hampl, "Poleis ohne Territorium," *Klio*, XXXII (1939), p. 9, maintains, in support of his argument that Athens appropriated all of the land of Chalkis, that ὁμολογία here equals deditio. But despite the fact that Athens may have had the power to seize the land, ὁμολογία emphasizes the fact that she did not do so except at Hestiaia, but made agreements with the other cities. In thus interpreting ὁμολογία Hampl has not felt the need to cite ancient support.

63. *I.G.*, I², 39. For the text and its interpretation see below, pp. 203-211.

settlement. We may assume from the text that previously a decree, or decrees, had been passed which specified that the Athenians and Chalkidians were to take oaths defining their relationship,⁶⁴ that Chalkidian hostages should be ceded,⁶⁵ and that certain legal cases should be referred from Chalkis⁶⁶ to Athenian courts. There were undoubtedly other stipulations,⁶⁷ one of which was the exile of the Hippobotai. The preserved decrees were apparently passed after an embassy⁶⁸ from Chalkis had asked for modification of the former terms. However, they fall early in the negotiations, for in them are given the texts of oaths which must have been agreed upon previously and provision for their administration. We should not expect a great delay in the swearing of the oaths, and it is⁶⁹ most satisfactory to date our decrees in 446/5.

64. Line 3: τὸν ῥόγκον.

65. Lines 47-52.

66. Lines 70-76.

67. See above, p. 175, note 54.

68. See line 47.

69. Hesychios, s.v. Ἐρετριάδος κατάλογος, gives: ἐπὶ Διφίλου ψήφισμα ἐγράφη ἐξ Ἐρετρίας καταλέξαι ὁμήρους τοὺς τῶν κλουσιωτῶν υἱούς. τοῦτο οὖν τὸ ψήφισμα ἔχει ἐπιγραφὴν Ἐρετριάδος κατάλογος. Diphilos was archon in 442/1, and if these Eretrian hostages were surren-

The first decree of I.G., I², 39 makes arrangements for the administration of oaths both to the Chalkidians and Athenians, and the texts of the oaths are given. The Athenian dikasts and Boule are to swear, first, not to remove the Chalkidians from Chalkis.⁷⁰ The prominence given this statement reflects the Chalkidians' fear of suffering the same fate as the Hestiaiians. Then the Athenians undertake not to inflict punishment on any Chalkidian without due process of law,⁷¹ as specified by the Athenian people, not to propose any legislation concerning Chalkis or any of her citizens without giving them a hearing, and to introduce Chalkidic embassies to the Boule and the demos within ten days of their arrival, if possible. These conditions are affirmed for as long as

dered in 446/5, this is evidence for a delay in the final settlement of Eubolia. We should then have to move the Chalkis decrees down at least to 442/1, for Eretrian affairs had apparently been decided already (cf. I.G., I², 39, 42-43). But these Eretrian hostages may well have been taken because of disaffection after the ὁμολογία of 446/5; see Wallace, History of Eretria, p. 145.

70. See below, pp. 207-208.

71. Lines 9-10: ἀκρίτε οὐδενὸς ἄνευ τοῦ δέμο τοῦ Ἀθηναίων.
See below, pp. 207-208.

the Chalkidians remain in allegiance to the Athenians. The oath of the Chalkidians is to be taken by all adult citizens, and it is specified that refusal to participate is punishable by loss of citizenship and confiscation of goods, which would revert to the public treasury (of Chalkis, apparently) except for one-tenth set aside for Zeus Olympios. The Chalkidians are to swear to remain loyal to Athens, to pay an unspecified amount of tribute, which is to be negotiated, to be allies of Athens, and to protect and obey the demos. There is no mention at all of the Delian League, which was now defunct; Chalkis' loyalty is to Athens alone.

The second decree, after insisting upon an early administration of the oaths, refuses a Chalkidic request for the release of hostages. There follows an obscure passage which seems to allow Chalkis to tax all foreigners living there, except those who already pay taxes to Athens or have received from the Athenians freedom from taxation.⁷² Then there are regulations for the publication of the decree in both Athens and Chalkis, and, finally, provision is made for sacrifices prescribed by oracles concerning Euboia.

The last decree modifies, or at least specifies, the legal jurisdiction of Athens over the Chalkidians. The latter are to conduct the audits of their magistrates except

72. For this interpretation see below, pp. 208-209.

in cases where exile, death, or loss of civil rights are involved. Such cases, which would be serious enough to affect the safety of Athens and the Empire, are to be tried at Athens.⁷³ The decree ends by ordering the generals to take care to guard Euboea.

The terms of the settlement, as preserved in these decrees, are exceedingly fair when applied to a state which had just revolted. The government at Chalkis was undoubtedly a democracy;⁷⁴ this is indicated by the exile of the Hippobotai

73. Cf. Gomme, Hist. Comm., I, p. 342, and below, pp. 209-211.

74. Kahrstedt, Nachr. Ges. Göttingen (1931), pp. 164-166, in support of his thesis that Athens seized all the land of Chalkis, maintains that the Chalkidians were reduced politically to an indefinite koinon, with the status of metics. This, however, is contrary to the whole tone of I.G., I², 39 and demands strange interpretations for many of its phrases, especially δεμόσια (line 34), εὐθύνας (line 71), and ἀτιμίαις (line 75). Furthermore, the continued payment of tribute by the Chalkidians and Thucydides' description (VII, 57, 4) of them as ὑπήκοοι καὶ φόρου ὑποτελεῖς disprove Kahrstedt's thesis. Cf. Gomme, "Euboea and Samos in the Delian Confederacy," Class. Rev., L (1936), pp. 6-9; and also below, p. 187, note 80.

and is implied in the terms which grant to the Chalkidians the right to conduct audits of their magistrates καθάρειν Ἀθηνεσιν Ἀθηναίους, except in cases involving heavy penalties.⁷⁵ These terms also show that Chalkis enjoyed a fair degree of autonomy. The granting of the right to negotiate the amount of tribute and the giving of confiscated property to the treasury of Chalkis both show unexpected consideration.

Another important piece of evidence for the settlement with Chalkis is the record of her tribute. In 443/2, her first appearance since the revolt, her payment has dropped unexpectedly from five to three talents, which she continues to pay until 425/4.⁷⁶ The only logical reason for this reduction is the confiscation of part of her land by the Athenians. The tribute of the other cities in Euboea remained the

75. Lines 71-73.

76. A.T.L., I, pp. 438-439. There is no evidence for her payments in the previous assessment period, 446/5 through 444/3. However, since, as we shall see, the explanation of the drop in her tribute is the confiscation of part of her land, and since this confiscation would have taken place in the settlement of 446/5, it is likely that Chalkis paid at the reduced rate of three talents from 446/5 through 444/3.

77

same after the revolt, and it is hardly possible that Chalkis would have received a reduction except under special circumstances. Furthermore, we know that the Athenians owned sacred land in Chalkis, from a fragmentary record, dating ca. 420 B.C., of the renting of temene in Chalkis as well as in Hestiaia, Eretria, and other towns, whose names cannot be

78

-
77. Except, of course, Hestiaia, which stopped payment altogether.
78. I.G., I², 376, as restored, with an additional fragment, by A. E. Raubitschek, "The Athenian Property on Euboea," Hesperia, XII (1943), pp. 28-33. The document can not be fully interpreted and it is impossible to determine to what divinity the land belonged. The heading (line 2), which was inscribed after the cutting of the rest of stone, reads [---]s τεμενε, with a space for a maximum of five letters at the beginning. We should expect a reference to Athene, as we know she had a temenos at Chalkis (I.G., XII, 9, 934). However, [Ἀθηναία]s will not fit, and the presence of this form in line 3 seems to preclude the use of [Ἀθηνῆ]s in the prescript. Since the heading was a later addition and in cutting it no attempt was made to space it so that it would reach the right margin of the stone, it is not necessary that the restoration should extend to the left edge. It is possible to read [Ἐ]s τεμενε, or

restored with confidence.

From the reduction of the tribute, the exile of
 the Hippobotai, and the temene in Chalkis,⁷⁹ we are led to

[ἐσ]ς τεμένε, which makes the heading general, referring to no particular divinity, but to receipts of the ἄρχων βασιλεύς, who had charge of the renting of all temene (Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 4, 4: εἰσφέρει δὲ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς μισθώσεις τῶν τεμνῶν ἀναγράφας ἐν γραμματείοις λελευκομένοις). This seems to be the best restoration, although it is not altogether satisfactory, as it appears from the photograph of a squeeze printed by Raubitschek (op. cit., p. 29) that the tip of the lower bar of a sigma should be visible. Raubitschek states that the preceding letter should be omicron. In this case [ὀδ]ς is possible, but there is no other evidence that the Athenians had temene of Zeus abroad, although I.G., I², 863, is a boundary stone of land sacred to him in Attike.

79. By itself, the existence of Athenian temene in a city does not prove a large scale confiscation, as there were temene in Aigina before the Athenian klerouchy was settled there in 431 (I.G., IV, 29 and 30), in Kolophon (I.G., I², 14), and in Kythnos in 408/7 (I.G., I², 313, line 147). However, the existence of Athenian land at Chalkis does support the other evidence.

the conclusion that part of the territory of the city was confiscated by the Athenians. That it was only a part of her land is evident from Chalkis' continued payment of tribute and from the contrast drawn by all of our ancient sources⁸⁰ between the treatment of Hestiaia and the rest of Eubolia.

80. See above, pp. 178-179. Kahrstedt, op. cit., pp. 164-166, maintains, however, that Athens confiscated all of the land of Chalkis. This thesis is grounded on Andokides, de Pace, 9: καὶ Χερρόνησόν τε εἶχομεν καὶ Νάξον καὶ Εὐβοίας πλεον ἢ τὰ δύο μέρη. This statement is from a section in which Andokides is exaggerating the benefits of the Peace of Nikias; it is full of errors (e.g., 8: ὅτι διὰ ταύτην τὴν εἰρήνην ἑπτακισχίλια μὲν τάλαντα νομίσματος εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀνηρέγκαμεν. Cf. also 3-4). It can scarcely stand as evidence against the continued payment of tribute, which proves Kahrstedt's theory wrong. See Gomme, Class. Rev., L (1936), pp. 6-8, and above, p. 183, note 74. Hampl, op. cit., pp. 7-13, upholding Kahrstedt's main thesis, attempts to explain the tribute payments on the ground that the Chalkidians were still organized as a polis, even though their land was all confiscated. But he admits that the Chalkidians did not have to pay to live on what he considers to have been Athenian land, which was left to

This contrast further implies that klerouchs were not settled in Chalkis in 446. But there is much stronger evidence against the settling of a klerouchy. Thucydides,⁸¹ enumerating the allies of Athens on the Sicilian expedition, makes a distinction between the ἄποικοι and the ὑπήκοοι καὶ φόρον ὑποτελεῖς. In the former group are the Hestiaiians, Imbrians, Lemnians, and Aiginetans, all klerouchs; in the latter class are the Chalkidians. Furthermore, when Euboia revolted in 411, only Oreos (i.e., Hestiaia)⁸² remained loyal to Athens.⁸³

them "als angabenfreien Bittbesitz" (p. 50). Such a situation seems impossible; and if it could exist, the "confiscation" would be legal only, with no effect on actual conditions.

81. VII, 57, 2-4.

82. Oreos was apparently a district of Hestiaia in which the Athenian klerouchs settled; Theopompos, frag. 387 (Jacoby): ...δισχιλίους δ' ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἐλθόντας τὸν Ὀρεὸν οἰκῆσαι, δῆμον ὄντα πρότερον τῶν Ἰστιαίων. However, the two names became synonymous (Strabo, X, 1, 3: οὕτω γὰρ [sc. Ὀρεῖται] ὠνομάσθησαν ὕστερον οἱ Ἰστιαεῖς, καὶ ἡ πόλις ἀντὶ Ἰστιαίας Ὀρεός), although the official designation at Athens remained Hestiaia (I.G., I², 40, 41, 42, 43). Cf. Geyer, op. cit., p. 86.

83. Thuc., VIII, 95, 7.

Chalkis could hardly have revolted if garrisoned by Athenian⁸⁴ klerouchs. These two pieces of evidence, taken together, make it almost certain that a klerouchy was not settled at Chalkis in 446.

However, it has been maintained, first by Swoboda,⁸⁵ that in 446 the Athenians settled 2000 klerouchs in Chalkis. This theory is based on an obscure passage in Ailian:⁸⁶

Ἀθηναῖοι κρατήσαντες Χαλκιδέων κατεκληρούχησαν αὐτῶν τὴν γῆν ἐς δισχιλίους [V.1. τεσσαράκοντα] κλήρους, τὴν Ἰκπόβοτον καλουμένην χώραν, τεμένη δὲ ἀνῆκαν τῇ Ἀθηναῖ ἐν τῷ Δηλάντῳ ὀνομαζομένῳ τόπῳ, τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν ἐμίσθωσαν κατὰ τὰς στήλας τὰς πρὸς τῇ βασιλείῳ στοᾷ ἐστηκυίας, αἵπερ οὖν τὰ τῶν μισθώσεων ὑπομνήματα εἶχον. τοὺς δὲ αἰχμαλώτους ἔδησαν, καὶ οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα ἔσβεσαν τὸν κατὰ Χαλκιδέων θυμόν. Swoboda's interpretation of these lines is that the Athenians divided

84. Swoboda, op. cit., p. 32, tries to explain the revolt of the Chalkidians in 411 by the destruction of the klerouchs in the Sicilian disaster. But this is contrary to Thucydides' description of the forces in Sicily, for a large number of klerouchs would have been listed with the ἄποικοι, not the ὑπήκοοι.

85. Op. cit., pp. 28-32; cf. also Geyer, op. cit., pp. 49-50; Oberhummer, P.W., R.E., VI, cols. 2082-2083.

86. Var. Hist., VI, 1. *Already discussed: cf. p. 149, note 68; pp. 150 ff.*

the confiscated land at Chalkis into 2000 lots, set aside a share of these for the goddess and gave the rest to Klerouchs, who remained at Chalkis as a garrison, renting the land to the Chalkidians. This is parallel to the arrangements in⁸⁷ Lesbos in 427. He maintains that the passage must refer to 446, not the klerouchy of 506, because the number of lots is different from the 4000 mentioned by Herodotos⁸⁸ for the earlier settlement.

But this passage from Ailian is neither clear enough nor of enough authority to prove any theory of a klerouchy at Chalkis in 446 in the face of the evidence against it. All that we may legitimately assume on the basis of these lines is that there was in the Agora a record of the renting of land in Chalkis and that accordingly Athens owned land there. We must realize, first, that the passage was not written primarily as history. Ailian included it as an example of *ὄψεις* on the part of the Athenians, and it is from a section in which such examples are not given in historical order. The examples were probably taken by Ailian from works of a similar nature by⁸⁹ Favorinus or Pamphila. Undoubtedly the story came originally

87. Thuc., III, 50, 2.

88. V, 77, 2.

89. F. Rudolph, "De fontibus quibus Aelianus in varia historia componenda usus sit," Leipz. Stud. zu Class.

from a historical work, but we do not know through how many stages it passed before reaching Ailian.⁹⁰ We must keep in mind the possibilities of error and confusion in such a process, and also that Ailian was interested in giving an example of ὁβρις, not in reporting the facts of a klerouchy in Chalkis.

Secondly, the value of the passage is lowered by the variant reading given for the number of the lots. It is common to ignore this variant, and the reason must be that it is omitted by the editor of the standard edition of Ailian, R. Hercher, who gives only a cursory discussion of the manuscripts.⁹¹ Τεσσαράκοντα was, however, the common reading un-

Phil., VII (1884), pp. 1-137, especially pp. 56-66 and 92-93. However, W. von Christ, Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur⁶, revised by W. Schmid and O. Stählin, II, 2 (Munich, 1924), pp. 787-790, considers the case for Favorinus as Ailian's main source not proved, although he states that Ailian, while sometimes using old sources, drew heavily on later Sammelschriften.

90. Gellius (XIV, 6) says that Favorinus used multae et variae et remotae lectiones. But these include philosophers and Alexandrine writers; see Rudolph, op. cit., pp. 104-108 and 126-134.

91. Aeliani...Varia Historia...(Paris, 1858), pp. I-II.

til J. Gronovius discovered the other figure (δισχιλίους) in
⁹²
 a Medicean codex. Without definite knowledge of the value
 of the manuscripts we can conclude only that the exact num-
 ber is unsure and the figure of a given text must be used
⁹³
 cautiously as evidence.

Finally, we can not identify precisely the ultimate
 source from which is derived the information about the divi-
 sion into lots. There are two recognizable possibilities.
 One is Herodotos' account of the Athenian victory over Chal-
 kis in 506, as is clear from Ailian's last sentence which
 mentions the binding of prisoners and the quenching of the
⁹⁴
 spirit of the Chalkidians. The other is the record of
 rents from Chalkis, inscribed on stelai in the Agora, as

His Teubner editions (1864, 1867) contain no considera-
 tion of manuscripts.

92. Thesaurus Graecarum Antiquitatum, IV (Leyden, 1599),
 "Praefatio," p. b3 (verso). Here Gronovius is comment-
 ing on the older reading (τεσσαράκοντα) used in the
 same volume by J. Meursius, "Ceramicus Geminus," col.
 966.
93. 2000 was accepted because it was much more credible for
 the number of lots than only 40. This very reason,
 however, introduces suspicion of a correction.
94. Cf. Herodotos, V, 77, 3-4.

cited by Ailian. This record conceivably could refer to the early klerouchy, but it is far more probable that inscriptions in the Agora, cited as evidence by a historian of the fourth century, or later,⁹⁵ would date after the Persian Wars. Very likely, then, we have a confusion of the story of 506 with the stelai which bore the official accounts of the rents for property in Chalkis at a much later time than 506 B.C. It is impossible to tell definitely whether the information concerning the division of the land and its name came from Herodotos or the stelai. There may be in the word 'Ἰκρόβοτον, used by Ailian as the name of the land, an indication that his ultimate source was an epigraphic text, not Herodotos. For the latter speaks of τῶν ἰκροβοτέων χώρα, and we should expect a corresponding genitive plural in Ailian if Herodotos was the source. In any case 'Ἰκρόβοτον, which is elsewhere a poetic word, seems strange as the official designation of the land. It could well have arisen from ΗΙΓΓΟΒΟΤΟΝ, which in an Attic inscription of the fifth century represented the genitive plural, 'Ἰκροβοτῶν. This, I believe, is what happened; and the error was made by Ailian's source.

95. The Stoa Basileios, by which the stelai are said to have stood, was built between 430 and 409 B.C.; H. A. Thompson, "Buildings on the West Side of the Agora," Hesperia, VI (1937), p. 73.

The information about the temene is not in Herodotus; it probably came ultimately from the inscriptions, although some other source is, of course, possible. But the implication in the location of the stelai has been overlooked. They were near the Stoa Basileios, which was so called because it was the headquarters of the ἄρχων βασιλεύς. This official had charge of the renting of temene.⁹⁶ We may assume then that the inscriptions mentioned in Ailian were the records of the rents of the temene, in which a temenos of Athens might well find a place. If we also take into account the likelihood that the number of lots and the name of the Hippobotai were also on the inscriptions, we may surmise that the land of these oligarchs was divided among the various divinities after its confiscation by the Athenians, and then was rented out by the ἄρχων βασιλεύς. Such a practice would be the equivalent of the land's being let by the state,⁹⁷ for the income thus derived would benefit the whole Athenian demos.

When we examine Swoboda's theory now we can see its weakness. His insistence on the importance of the number of lots is unjustified, and it is impossible to explain why there should be, at Athens, a public record of rents, if they

96. Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 47, 4; Pausanias, I, 3, 1.

97. There is, as far as I can discover, no evidence that the state rented out the land directly.

were paid to klerouchs in Chalkis. Ailian does not prove a klerouchy in 446, and, if we weigh the evidence against⁹⁸ there having been one,⁹⁹ the argument collapses.

There have been other interpretations of the passage of Ailian. Originally it was thought that klerouchs¹⁰⁰ themselves paid rent, but such a condition is unparalleled

98. See above, pp. 186-189.

99. L. R. Farnell, "An Unrecorded Attic Colony in Euboea?" (Class. Rev., XX [1906], pp. 27-31), considers I.G., I², 190, to be evidence for a klerouchy in Chalkis. This is a fragmentary Athenian inscription, dating, to judge from the hand, probably between 440 and 430; it deals with sacred affairs. It was found near Chalkis, a fact which supports Farnell's interpretation that the document concerns the religious institutions of a klerouchy. But Wilhelm, "Ἀττικὴ Ἐπιγραφὴ ἐκ Χαλμίδος," Eph. Arch. (1902), pp. 135-142, seems nearer the truth when he states that the stone originated in Attike and that it regulated the sacrifices and priesthoods of an Athenian trittys, for the word τριττύς appears in the text (line 7). Cf. Hiller von Gärtringen, I.G., I², p. 78.

100. E.g., Kirchhoff, Über der Tributpflichtigkeit der Attischen Kleruchen (Berlin, 1873), p. 18. Foucart, op. cit., p. 345, agrees, but hesitatingly.

and most unlikely.¹⁰¹ Others have seen in Ailian three classes of Chalkidic land: the lots, the temene, and τὴν λοιπὴν¹⁰² (which was rented). Thus τὴν λοιπὴν refers to all the Chalkidic territory except the lots and the τεμένη; that such an area was rented is impossible.¹⁰³ Busolt explains the passage as does Swoboda, except that he believes the Athenian citizens who drew the rent remained at Athens.¹⁰⁴ This is another unparalleled situation and would not explain the public stelai in the Agora.

An explanation which fits the passage of Ailian and the other evidence has been offered by Nesselhauf.¹⁰⁵ He thinks that the Athenians rented the land to Chalkidians as state domain. If we qualify this by adding that the state domain was first presented to various divinities and then

101. Cf. the Salamis decree, I.G., I², 1, and above, pp. 163-166.

102. B. Büchsenschütz, Besitz und Erwerb im Griechischen Alterthume (Halle, 1869), p. 62; U. Köhler, Ath. Mitt., IX (1884), p. 121.

103. See above, pp. 186-187.

104. Gr. Gesch., III, 1, pp. 431-432. But in II², p. 444, Busolt uses Ailian's 2000 for the klerouchy of 506.

105. Op. cit., pp. 137-138. Cf. Gomme, Hist. Comm., I, pp. 344-345.

rented, we have an explanation of the stelai in the Agora which is consistent with the other evidence of the settlement of 446. The land of the exiled Hippobotai was confiscated by Athens, broken up into lots, and rented to Chalkidians. This could not have been looked upon as a very harsh measure, especially in view of the reduction in tribute which accompanied the confiscation. The demos in Chalkis undoubtedly must have benefited by the breaking up of the large estates. Such a moderate settlement agrees well with the rather conciliatory terms of I.G., I², 39.

The agreement of 446 seems, then, to have been very fair to Chalkis both politically and financially. To what extent Athens later infringed upon the extensive autonomy implied in the treaty, we do not know. There is one example of Athenian encroachment which, although minor, must have been irritating to the Chalkidians. There is extant a decree of the Athenian people which sets the fares which can be charged for transportation between Chalkis and Oropos or Hestiaia.¹⁰⁶

Chalkis continued to pay a tribute of three talents until 425/4, when she was assessed ten. The size of this increase shows that she could not have been oppressed financially

106. I.G., I², 40, 19-29; cf. Hiller von Gärtringen, "Athenisches Gesetz über Hestiaia um 445 v. Chr.," Nachr. Ges. Göttingen (1921), pp. 65-66.

before. Yet she may have suffered from unofficial "contribu-
 107
 tions" to Athenian forces.

With the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, Eubolia increased in importance to the Athenians, for the island was

107. Polyainos, III, 4, 1, and Frontinus, Strategemata, III, 11, 1, relate, as an example of feigned retreat, that the Athenian general Phormio raided Chalkidic territory and withdrew to Skyros. When an embassy arrived from Chalkis he made restitution and deceived the ambassadors into believing that he was recalled to Athens immediately. After the Chalkidians, in that belief, had relaxed their guard, he returned to their land and carried off much booty. If there is a basis of truth in the story, it probably refers to the early years of the Peloponnesian War. But it may well be doubted if the connection of the Euboic Chalkidians with the incident is historical; it is difficult to explain why they should send an embassy to Phormio in Skyros rather than directly to Athens. In view of Phormio's command in the Thracian Chalkidike, where he ravaged the country (Thuc., I, 65, 2), I suspect that some strategem which he used there has been transferred to Euboic Chalkis by the writers on tactics, confused by the name Chalkidians.

safer than Attike itself. There they transferred much of¹⁰⁸
 their livestock when they withdrew behind their walls,
 and in the first years of the war they took precautions to¹⁰⁹
 defend the island against Lokrian pirates. Chalkis, we
 may deduce from the importance of her position, was an Athen-¹¹⁰
 ian naval and military base. After the fighting began and
 particularly after the rise of the demagogues, the treatment¹¹¹
 of Euboia undoubtedly became harsher. After the sharp in-

108. Thuc., II, 14, 1.

109. Thuc., II, 26; 32.

110. Thucydides, VII, 29, 2, says that some Thracian merce-
 naries serving Athens started from Chalkis to raid Boi-
 otia. They were not stationed there, however, but had
 stopped off on their way back to Thrace.

111. The fate of Euboia is expressly mentioned by Pagondas
 in encouraging the Thebans to fight at Delion in 424;
 Thuc., IV, 92, 4. Cf. Aristophanes, Nubes, 211-213:

MA. ἡ δὲ γ' Εὐβοίᾳ, ὥς ὀρᾷς,

ἡδὲ παρατέταται μακρὰ πόρρω πάνυ.

ΣΤ. οἶδ'· ὑπὸ γὰρ ὑμῶν παρετάθη καὶ Περικλέους.

The designs of the demagogues on Euboia may be seen in
 Aristophanes, Vespae, 715-717:

ἀλλ' ὅποταν μὲν δείσωσ' αὐτοί, τὴν Εὐβοίαν διδῶσιν
 ὑμῖν καὶ σῖτον ὑφίστανται κατὰ πεντήκοντα μεδίμνους

crease in tribute in the assessment of 425/4 discontent must have become so great as to lead to open rebellion, for in 424/3, the Athenians made an expedition to Euboia.¹¹² We know none of the details of the operations or the extent of the revolt, but the campaign must have been minor, to judge from Thucydides' silence, and we may assume that the Athenians were successful.

When next we hear of the Chalkidians, they are among the Athenian subject allies participating in the Sicilian expedition.¹¹³ Their presence must have been particularly desirable to the Athenians, who were in Sicily nominally in sup-

πορεύειν· ἔδοσαν δ' οὐ πώποτε σοι πλὴν πρῶην
πέντε μεδίμνους.

112. Philochoros, frag. 90 (Müller): πέρυσι γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἰσάρχου ἐστράτευσαν ἐκ' αὐτῆν [sc. Εὐβοίαν]. Raubitschek, *op. cit.*, p. 33, suggests that this campaign be placed in 426/5 and that it was made to protect and expand the sources of Athens' food supplies. But his only evidence is that Diodoros, XII, 65, 3-5, puts the Boiotian campaign of 426/5 under 424/3. This is hardly sufficient grounds for rejecting Philochoros' date, especially when the need for the expedition may be better explained after the assessment of 425/4.

113. Thuc., VII, 57, 4.

port of Chalkis' western colonies.

After the defeat of the Sicilian expedition, the Euboians were the first Athenian allies to ask Sparta to support their revolt. Since the Spartan occupation of Dekeleia had cut off the Athenians completely from Attike, Euboea had become even more important to Athens as a source of provisions, and in their preparations for defense after their defeat in Sicily, the Athenians looked first to the strengthening of their hold on Euboea.¹¹⁴ But in the winter of 413/12, Euboeian envoys approached King Agis of Sparta. He made preparations for supporting their revolt, but the men picked for this task were diverted to aid Lesbos.¹¹⁵ A year later, the Eretrians, after helping to betray Oropos to the Boiotians, made a similar appeal, but help was delayed this time by the situation at Chios.¹¹⁶ Finally, after the defeat of an Athenian naval squadron off Eretria in the summer of 411, all Euboea revolted except Oreos.¹¹⁷ The Chalkidians, to insure continued aid from the mainland, built with the help of the Boiotians a mole across the Euripos, leaving in the middle a passage flanked with towers and only wide enough for one ship

114. Thuc., VII, 28, 1; VIII, 1, 3; 95, 2.

115. Thuc., VIII, 5, 1-2.

116. Thuc., VIII, 60, 1-2.

117. Thuc., VIII, 95, 7.

to pass through.¹¹⁸ This proved effective, for Theramenes, after sailing up to the mole, withdrew, and Athens apparently made no attempt to recapture Chalkis.

The Chalkidians were now in a sense free. They were undoubtedly under an oligarchy,¹¹⁹ and they probably fought as allies of Sparta.¹²⁰ But they were soon to discover that their new allies were harder masters than the old.

118. Diodoros, XIII, 47, 3-8.

119. This is implied in Thuc., VIII, 95, 7, which states that the Peloponnesians, after causing Euboia to revolt, καὶ τὰλλα τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν καθίσταντο.

120. There is no direct evidence that Chalkidians fought actively for Sparta, but it is likely, since other Euboians did. Among the nauarchs honored by statues at Delphoi for their share in the victory at Aigospotamoi were Autonomos of Eretria and Aristokles of Karystos; Pausanias, X, 9, 10, and Dittenberger, Syll., I³, 115.

APPENDIX

I.G., I², 39: RELATIONS BETWEEN ATHENS AND CHALKIS

446/5 B.C.

ἔδοχσεν τῷ βολῇ καὶ τῷ δέμοι, Ἀντιοχίῃ ἑκπρυτ,
 ἀνευ, Δρακόν, τίδες ἐπεστάτε, Διόγνετος εἶπε.
 κατὰ τάδε τὸν ἡόρκον ὁμόσαι Ἀθηναίων τ CTOIX. 32
 ἐν βολῇ καὶ τὸς δικαστάς· οὐκ ἔχσελῶ Χα
 5 λκιδέας ἐχ Χαλκίδος οὐδὲ τὸν τόλιν ἀνά
 στατον ποέσο, οὐδὲ ἰδιότεν οὐδένα ἀτιμ
 ὅσο οὐδὲ φυγῇ ζεμιόσο οὐδὲ χουλλέφσο
 μαι οὐδὲ ἀποκτενῶ οὐδὲ χρέματα ἀφαιρέ
 σομαι ἀκρίτο οὐδενὸς ἀνευ τῷ δέμο τῷ Ἀθ
 10 εναίων, οὐδ' ἐπιψεφίῳ κατὰ ἀπροσκέτο
 οὔτε κατὰ τῷ κοινῷ οὔτε κατὰ ἰδιότο οὐδ
 ἐ ἐνός, καὶ πρεσβείαν ἐλθῶσαν προσάχσο
 πρὸς βολῇ καὶ δῆμον δέκα ἡμερῶν ἡόταν
 πρυτανεῦο κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. ταῦτα δὲ ἐμπ
 15 ρεδόσο Χαλκιδεῦσιν πειθομένοις τῷ δέ
 ρμοι τῷ Ἀθηναίων. ἡορκῶσαι δὲ πρεσβεία
 ρν, ἐλθῶσαν ἐχ Χαλκίδος μετὰ τὸν ἡορκοτῶ
 ν Ἀθηναίος καὶ ἀπογράφαι τὸς ὁμόσαντ
 ας. ἡόπος δ' ἂν ρόμῶσοσιν ἡάπαντες, ἐπιμελ

- 20 ὁσθον ῥοι στρ_ρατεγοί. vacat
κατὰ τὰδε Χαλκιδέας ὁμόσαι· οὐκ ἀπορ_ρσ_ρτέ
σομαι ἀπὸ τῷ ρ_ρδέμο τῷ Ἀθηναίου οὔτε τέ_ρχ_ρν
ει οὔτε μηχανῇ οὔδεμιᾷ οὐδ' ἔπει οὔδε
ἔργοι οὔδε τῷ ἀφισταμένοι πείσομαι, κ
25 αὶ ἐὰν ἀφιστῇ τις κατερῶ Ἀθηναίοισι, κ
αὶ τὸν φόρον ἠνποτελῶ Ἀθηναίοισιν, ἥδ_ρ
ἂν κείθο Ἀθηναίος, καὶ χσύμμαχος ἔσομα
ι ῥοῖος ἂν δύνομαι ἄριστος καὶ δικαιο_ρ
ατος καὶ τῷ δέμοι τῷ Ἀθηναίου βοεθέσ
30 ο καὶ ἀμυνῶ, ἐὰν τις ἀδικῇ τὸν δῆμον τὸν
Ἀθηναίου, καὶ πείσομαι τῷ δέμοι τῷ Ἀθ
εναίου. ὁμόσαι δὲ Χαλκιδέον τὸς ῥεβῶντ
ας ῥάπαντας· ῥῶς δ' ἄμ με ὁμόσει, ἄτιμον αὐτ
ὸν εἶναι καὶ τὰ χρέματα αὐτῷ δεμόσια καὶ
35 τῷ Διδ_ρς τῷ Ὀλυμπίῳ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον ῥιερῶ
ν ἔστο τῶν χρεμάτων. ῥορκῶσαι δὲ πρεσβε
ίαν Ἀθηναίου ἐλθῶσαν ἐς Χαλκίδα μετὰ τ
ὸν ῥορκοτῶν τῶν ἐν Χαλκίδι καὶ ἀπογράφ
σαι τὸς ὁμόσαντας Χαλκιδέον.

vacat

- 40 Ἀντικλῆς εἶπε· ἀγαθῇ τύχει τῇ Ἀθηναί
ου ποῆσθαι τὸν ῥόρκον Ἀθηναίος καὶ Χαλ
κιδέας, καθάπερ Ἐρετριεῦσι ἐψεφίσαν
ο ῥο δῆμος ῥο Ἀθηναίου· ῥόπος δ' ἂν τάχιστ

- α γίνεται, ἐπιμελῶσθον ῥοι στρατεγοί.
- 45 ῥοίτινες δὲ ἐχσορκῶσσι ἀφικόμενοι ἐ
 ε Χαλκίδα, ἐλέσθαι τὸν δῆμον πέντε ἄνδρ
 ας αὐτίκα μάλα. περὶ δὲ τῶν ῥομέρον ἀποκ
 ρίναςθαι Χαλκιδεῦσιν, ῥότι νῦν μὲν Ἀθε
 ναίοις δοκεῖ, ἔαν κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφισμένα· ῥ
- 50 ὅταν δὲ δοκῇ, βουλευσάμενοι ποέσσοι τὲ
 ν διαλλαγῆν, καθότι ἂν δοκῇ ἐπιτέδειο
 ν εἶναι Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Χαλκιδεῦσιν. τὸς δ
 ε χσένος τὸς ἐν Χαλκίδι, ῥόσοι οἰκῶντες
 μὲ τελῶσιν Ἀθῆναζε, καὶ εἴ τοι δέδοται ῥ
- 55 ὑπὸ τῷ δέμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίου ἀτέλεια· τὸς δὲ ἄ
 λλος τελῆν ἐς Χαλκίδα, καθάπερ ῥοι ἄλλο
 ι Χαλκιδέες. τὸ δὲ φσεφισμα τόδε καὶ τὸν
ῥόρκον ἀναγράφαι Ἀθῆνεσι μὲν τὸν γρα
 μμαγτέα τῆς βολῆς ἐστέλει λιθίνει καὶ κ
- 60 αταθῆναι ἐς πόλιν τέλεσι τοῖς Χαλκιδέ
 ον, ἐν δὲ Χαλκίδι ἐν τῷ ῥιερῷ τῷ Διὸς τῷ
 Ὀλυμπίῳ ῥε βολὲ Χαλκιδέον ἀναγράφας
 α καταθέτο. ταῦτα μὲν φσεφίσασθαι Χαλκ
 ιδεῦσιν. ν ν τὰ δὲ ῥιερὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν χρεσμ
- 65 ὦν ῥυπὲρ Εὐβοίας θῦσαι ὅς τάχιστα μετὰ
ῥιεροκλέος τρεῖς ἄνδρας, ῥὸς ἂν ἐλεται ῥ
 ε βολὲ σφῶν αὐτῶν· ῥόπος δ' ἂν τάχιστα τυθ
 εῖ, ῥοι στρατεγοὶ συνεπιμελῶσθον καὶ τ

ὁ ἀργύριον ἐς ταῦτα ἔπαραρχόντων. vacat
 70 Ἀρχέστρατος, εἶπε· τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ Ἀ
 ντικλῆς· τὰς δὲ εὐθύνας Χαλκιδεῦσι κατ
 ἅ σφον αὐτῶν ἔναι ἐν Χαλκίδι καθάπερ Ἀθ
 ἑνεσιν Ἀθηναίοις πλὴν φυγῆς καὶ θανάτ
 ο καὶ ἀτιμίας· περὶ δὲ τοῦτον ἔφεσιν ἔνα
 75 ἰ Ἀθέναζε ἐς τὴν ἐλῖαίαν τὴν τῶν θεσμοθ
 ετῶν κατὰ τὸ φσέφισμα τῷ δέμο· περὶ δὲ φυ
 λακῆς Εὐβοίας τὸς στρατηγὸς ἐπιμέλεις
 θαι ἥος ἂν δύνονται ἄριστα, ἥόπος ἂν ἔχε
 ἰ ἥος βέλτιστα Ἀθηναίοις.
 80 ἥόρκος.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dittenberger, Syll., I³, no. 64; E. L. Hicks and G. F. Hill,
A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions² (Oxford, 1901),
 no. 40; Tod, Historical Inscriptions, no. 42; Köhler, Ath.
Mitt., I (1876), pp. 184-197; Foucart, Rev. Arch., XXXIII
 (1877), pp. 242-262; Meyer, Forshungen zur Alten Geschichte,
 II (Halle, 1899), pp. 141-148; Kirchhoff, I.G., I, Suppl.,
 27a; Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen. (in Phil. Untersuchungen, I
 [Berlin, 1880]), pp. 87-96; W. Kolbe, Hermes, LI (1916), pp.
 479-480; E. von Stern, Hermes, LI (1916), pp. 630-632; C.F.
 Lehmann-Haupt, Hermes, LII (1917), pp. 520-535; and Klio,

XVI (1920), pp. 193-196; J. H. Lipsius, Hermes, LIII (1918), pp. 107-110; R. T. Bonner and G. Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle, II (Chicago, 1938), pp. 246-253; Gomme, Class. Rev., L (1936), pp. 6-8; and Hist. Comm., I, pp. 342-343.

COMMENTARY

There are three points of which the interpretation given above (pp. 179-184) needs further explanation. In the oath of the Athenians I consider the promise not to expel the Chalkidians to be without qualification, except for the condition expressed in lines 14-16, i.e., that the Chalkidians remain loyal; and I have taken ἔνευ τῷ δέμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων (lines 9-10) closely with the preceding phrase, ἀπρίτῳ οὐδενός, as modifying only those verbs which refer to the punishment of individual Chalkidians. Foucart and Meyer maintained that it also modified ἐχσελῶ and ποέσο (lines 4-5). This thesis was based on the belief that the various sections of the oath should be divided between the Boule and the dikasts; Foucart and Meyer assigned the first section to the Bouleutai, who thus swore not to expel any Chalkidians or make them leave their homes, unless this was approved by the demos. However, it is hardly possible to split the oath in this manner; as Dittenberger pointed out, the Bouleutai and the dikasts are

to swear for the whole Athenian people, both individually and as a state. Since this is the case, the modifying of the promises not to eject the Chalkidians by ἕνεκ τοῦ δέμου would render this whole section meaningless; the demos would, in reality, be swearing not to expel Chalkidians---unless it decided to do so. On the other hand, the phrase is explicable when taken closely with ἀπρίτω and so refers to the treatment of individual Chalkidians. In lines 6-10 (ἰδιόθεν... Ἀθηναίων) the Athenians promise not to punish or fine any Chalkidian unless he is given a trial before the demos, or under conditions specified by the demos. It is a safeguard against arbitrary action by Athenians serving in a public capacity (e.g., as generals or ἐπίσκοποι).

I take lines 52-57 to mean that any foreigners living in Chalkis, except those who pay taxes to Athens or have received ἀτέλεια from the Athenians, are subject to Chalkidic taxation. The passage is obscure, and it appears that we have here a decision, couched in general terms, on some particular problem advanced by the Chalkidian ambassadors who are mentioned in the same decree. Kirchhoff believed that the original text read τὸς δὲ χσένους τὸς ἐν Χαλκίδι οἰκῶντας, ἥοσοι μὲν τε λῶσιν Ἀθήναζε, καὶ εἴ τοι δέδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ δέμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίου ἀτέλεια, ἀτελεῖς εἶναι. But this supposition hardly seems necessary, since we retain a similar sense from the extant text by taking the negative

μὲ with εἴ τοι δέδοται as well as with τελῶσιν and consid-
 ering τὸς δὲ ἄλλος a resumption of the subject τὸς δὲ χσένος,
 made necessary by the anacoluthon. The sense is: τὸς δὲ
 χσένος τὸς ἐν Χαλκίδι ἥσοι οἰκῶντες μὲ τελῶσιν Ἀθηνάζε
 τελῶν ἐς Χαλκίδα εἰ μὲ τοι δέδοται ἥντὸ τῷ δέμῳ τὸ Ἀθηναίων
 ἀτέλεια. Kirchhoff believed that τὸς δὲ χσένος referred to
 Athenian klerouchs; disregarding the question of the pres-
 ence of klerouchs at Chalkis, we can hardly believe that
 they, as Athenian citizens, could be called χσένοι in an
 Attic decree. Lehmann-Haupt, following Kolbe, claims that
ἥσοι μὲ τελῶσιν Ἀθηνάζε refers specifically to Athenian
 metics who have been granted ἰσοτέλεια by Athens. This is
 based on an entry in I. Bekker, Anecdota Graeca, I (Berlin,
 1814), p. 267, 1: Ἰσοτελεῖς· μέτοικοι τὰ μὲν ξενικὰ τέλη
 μὴ τελοῦντες, τὰ δὲ ἴσα τοῖς ἰστοῖς τελοῦντες. However, the
 language of the decree can scarcely be considered specific
 enough to equal this description of ἰσοτελεῖς and so to re-
 fer only to this class; as it stands the phrase in the in-
 scription must mean any χσένοι who do not pay taxes to Athens.

Finally, I have, with Gomme, interpreted the last
 decree, that of Archestratos (lines 70-76), as referring spe-
 cifically to the audits of Chalkidian magistrates and specify-
 ing that only the more serious cases of this type are to be
 tried, for the first time, at Athens. That ἔφεσιν (line 74)
 must mean the original submission of a case to Athens, not an

appeal after a trial at Chalkis, seems certain (see Gomme, Hist. Comm., I, p. 342, note 2; Bonner and Smith, II, pp. 246-253). However, ἐθούνας has usually been interpreted here as meaning punishment in general, not in the technical Attic sense of the audit of a magistrate after his term of office. Yet we should expect the word to retain its technical sense when used, without any qualification, in an Attic decree; as far as I can discover, it always has this meaning in fifth century Athenian inscriptions. (Since Wilamowitz, it has been common to state that ἐθούνας can mean "punishments" on Athenian decrees; I can find no examples cited. The nearest to a parallel is the use of ἐθούνασθαί meaning "to be punished or fined;" I.G., I², 4, 15, and 188, 6.) Further, if ἐθούνας is taken generally, any trial of a Chalkidian which involves heavy penalties must take place at Athens. Yet, as Gomme asks, why should the Athenians be concerned with an ordinary murder case involving Chalkidians? The cases which the Athenians wished to try were political---those which threatened the safety of the empire. Serious charges against magistrates would come under this heading, and I think it is only with such cases that the decree in question deals. That is not to say that charges of this type only were to be heard at Athens. Other trials, for example those for treason, undoubtedly were also referred to Athens. But we must remember that the decree of Archestratos is only a small part of the settlement with Chalkis, prob-

ably modifying previous regulations. It is a mistake to look at it as containing the sum of the legal relationship between Athens and Chalkis.

CHAPTER VI

CHALKIS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY TO CHAIRONEIA

At the close of the Peloponnesian War Chalkis enjoyed a greater degree of autonomy than she had possessed for over a hundred years. Without doubt she was under oligarchic rule, but she seems to have escaped the establishment of a dekharchy and the imposition of a Spartan harmost and garrison,¹ the fate of many of Sparta's allies as well as enemies. The Chalkidian oligarchs were by tradition friendly to Thebes, and their policy was oriented by that of the Boiotians, not that of Sparta, for in 404/3 Chalkis, like Thebes, defied the Lak²edaimonians by giving refuge to Athenian exiles. Presumably it was the support of the Thebans which saved Chalkis from harsher treatment at the hands of the Spartans.

-
1. Plutarch, Lysander, 13, and Diodoros, XIV, 10, 1, speak in general terms of Lysandros setting up dekharchies in the allied cities. But in XIV, 13, 1, Diodoros qualifies this by saying that the Spartans controlled the cities by dekharchies or oligarchies. That Chalkis was in the latter group is clear from her independent action in 404/3 and in 394.
 2. Lysias, XXIV (ὕπὲρ τοῦ Ἀδυνάτου), 25.

It is likely too that Chalkis, soon after the revolt from Athens, had joined with the other Euboian cities in a loose federation, a forerunner of the Εὐβοϊκὸν συνέδριον³ of which we hear in 342. This earlier league seems to have lasted until the Theban supremacy, and its effects can be seen in the common foreign policy which the cities of Eubolia appear to have followed until that time. The only direct evidence for the league is a series of federal coins inscribed EYB and bearing on one side the head of a woman, probably the nymph Eubolia, on the other a bull or a bull's head.⁴ These federal issues were probably struck at Eretria, whereas the individual cities of Eubolia apparently had no coinage of their own.⁵ The earliest of these coins are on the Aiginetan standard, and undoubtedly were struck soon after the revolt from Athens, when Theban and Peloponnesian influence was at its strongest. Later coins of the series, how-

-
3. See below, pp. 229-231, and Wallace, History of Eretria, pp. 154-155.
 4. Babelon, Traité, III, 2^{me} partie, pp. 191-202 and plate CXCVIII; Head, Hist. Num.², pp. 362-363.
 5. Babelon, op. cit., pp. 175-191 and 203-207. Head, op. cit., pp. 355-365, agrees, except that he groups the coins of Karystos under 550-445 and 441-336 B.C. and makes no attempt to date them more closely.

ever, probably dating after 394, are on the regular Attic standard. We know nothing of the exact relationship among the members of the league, except that they were not prevented from making individual alliances.⁶ Apparently the Euboians, while in practice acting together for mutual protection, cherished their new-found autonomy too much to yield the right of acting legally as individual states.

In 394 the Chalkidians, along with the other Euboians, joined the coalition of Thebes, Athens, Corinth, and Argos against Sparta,⁷ and in that year her soldiers fought with the allied forces at Nemea⁸ and against Agesilaos at Koroneia.⁹

By the terms of the Peace of Antalkidas in 387/6, the Chalkidians must have abandoned their alliance with Thebes and Athens, and become allies of Sparta, subject to

-
6. Cf. I.G., II-III², 16 (treaty between Athens and Eretria, 394 B.C.); I.G., XII, 9, 180 (treaty between Eretria and Hestiaia, 411-390).
 7. Diodoros, XIV, 82, 3. I.G., II-III², 16 is a treaty of alliance between Eretria and Athens signed at this time.
 8. Xenophon, Hellenica, IV, 2, 17. He specifies that there were about 100 Chalkidian horsemen, but groups all the Euboian hoplites, to the number of 3000.
 9. Xenophon, Hellenica, IV, 3, 15; Agesilaus, 5, 6.

furnishing contingents on demand.¹⁰ We hear of no direct interference by Sparta in the affairs of Chalkis, but the installation of a Lakedaimonian garrison and harmost at Hestiaia¹¹ must have alarmed all the rest of Euboia.

When, in 377, the Athenians founded their new confederacy, the cities of Euboia, except Hestiaia, were the first and most eager to join.¹² We have a fragment of the treaty between Chalkis and Athens, concluded in 378/7.¹³

10. There is no specific reference to the Euboians as allies of Sparta, but Diodoros, XV, 5, 1-3, speaks in general terms of all the cities becoming subject to her. We also know that the cities of Boiotia, as allies, had to supply contingents to the Lakedaimonians (Plutarch, Pelopidas, 4; Pausanias, IX, 13, 1; Isokrates, XIV [Πλαταικός], 27).
11. Xenophon, Hellenica, V, 4, 57, tells of the expulsion of the harmost Alketas by the Thebans in 377. The garrison was probably instituted to hold the city against Jason of Pherai, who had previously installed a tyrant in Thebes; Diodoros, XV, 30, 3.
12. Diodoros, XV, 30, 1: πρῶται δὲ καὶ προθυμότατα συνεμάχισαν αἱ κατὰ τὴν Εὐβοίαν οἰκοῦσαι πόλεις Ἑστιαίας....
13. I.G., II-III², 44, of which I.G., II-III², 155 is a copy; see Schweigert, Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 627. Cf.

Its most striking features are the precautions taken to avoid repetition of the Athenian encroachments upon her allies in the Delian League. It is specified that ἔχε[ν τῇ]ν ἑαυτῶν Χαλκιδέ[ας ἐλευθέρ]ος ὄντα [s καὶ] αὐτονόμος καὶ αὐ[τοκράτορα]s μήτε φρορὰν ὑποδεχομένος [παρ' Ἀθηναίων μ]ήτε φόρον φέροντας μήτε [ἄρχοντα παραδ]εχομένος.¹⁴ The name of the Chalkidians was also inscribed on the list of allies appended to the Athenian decree which activated the confederacy. The document implies that they were enrolled at the

also S. Accame, La Lega Ateniese del Secolo IV A. C. (Rome, 1941), pp. 70-78. The treaty is dated in the archonship of Nausinikos (378/7) and falls soon after the decree setting up the confederacy (I.G., II-III², 43), which was passed in the seventh prytany of the same year.

14. Lines 21-25. For the restoration αὐ[τοκράτορα]s see Accame, op. cit., pp. 75-76. Other suggestions are [αὐτοσπόνδου]s (Wilhelm, in Hicks and Hill, Historical Inscriptions, 102), ἀ[φορολογήτο]s (Dittenberger, Syll., I³, 148), κα[θάπερ Ἀθηναίου]s (Hicks and Hill, op. cit., 102), αὐ[τογνώμονα]s (Hiller von Gärtringen, in I.G., II-III², p. 28). Only the last fits the physical requirements.

same time ¹⁵ as the Eretrians, Arethousioi, ¹⁶ and Karystians.

However, the Chalkidians did not long remain allies

15. I.G., II-III², 43. Χαλκιδῆς (II, 80) follows Θηβαῖοι (II, 79), which was cut by the hand which recorded the body of the decree. Χαλκιδῆς, however, is in a different (and later) hand, which then inscribed Ἐρετριῆς, Ἀρεθόσιοι, and Καρύστιοι in the lines immediately below (II, 81-83). The Euboic cities were manifestly entered as a group.

16. Accame, op. cit., pp. 72-73, thinks that these Arethousioi are the inhabitants of the town of Arethousa in the Thracian Chalkidike (see above, p. 84). If so, they were an exception, for all other towns on that peninsula were apparently enrolled in the confederacy as Chalkideis, probably in 375; see I.G., II-III², 44, face B, 5-6, and F. H. Marshall, The Second Athenian Confederacy (Cambridge, 1905), pp. 60-61. But the fact that the Arethousioi joined the League at the same time as the three known Euboic towns so soon after its founding indicates that they should be placed in Euboea, and connected with the fountain Arethousa, which lies south of Chalkis (above, p. 5). The inhabitants of Euboic Arethousa must have become independent of Chalkis, but when and how it is impossible to say.

of Athens. After 371, when Thebes emerged from the battle of Leuktra as the strongest power in Greece, all Euboia came under Boiotian control. Contingents from the cities of the island served under Epameinondas during his first campaign into the Peloponnese in 369¹⁷ and at Mantinea in 362.¹⁸ The Thebans apparently broke up the loose confederacy of the Euboic cities, for at this period Chalkis began once more to strike her own coinage.¹⁹ The Boiotians also imposed on Euboia governments favorable to them. The leader of the Boiotian faction in Chalkis seems to have been Mnesarchos,²⁰ who was perhaps maintained as a tyrant. At some time dur-

17. Xenophon, Hellenica, VI, 5, 23.

18. Xenophon, Hellenica, VII, 5, 4.

19. Babelon, op. cit., pp. 185-187 and plate CXCVIII. Karystos and Hestiaia also resumed the minting of coins. All of these issues were on a standard slightly lighter than the Attic. Eretria continued to strike coins marked EYB, but changed the standard to that employed by the other cities of the island.

20. Aischines, III (κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος), 85, calls Mnesarchos one who did Athens much harm, and links him with Themison, a pro-Theban tyrant at Eretria, who in 366 helped Thebes to seize Oropos from Athens; Diodoros, XV, 76, 1. Cf. Wallace, op. cit., pp. 158-159.

ing this period, a certain Phoxos may have held a similar
²¹
 position at Chalkis.

After Mantinea Theban control over Euboea was
 weakened and the Athenians fostered unrest. By 357 open
stasis broke out on the island and the opposing factions
²²
 called in the Thebans and the Athenians respectively.
²³
 Urged on by Timotheos, the Athenians sent help quickly---
²⁴ ²⁵
 Demosthenes says within three days, Aischines five. The

21. See below, pp. 221-222.

22. Diodoros, XVI, 7, 2 (the reference is vague: οἱ τὴν
 Εὐβοίαν κατοικοῦντες ἐστασίασαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους). He a-
 scribes these events to the archonship of Kephisodotos
 (358/7), and we can place them more precisely in the
 later part of this year, because I.G., II-III², 124,
 which deals with the settlement after the campaign, is
 dated in 357/6. Aischines, III, 85, and Demosthenes,
 VIII (περὶ τῶν ἐν Χερρονήσῳ), 74, give a biased view of
 the affair, stating that the Athenians went to save Eu-
 boia from enslavement by the Thebans.

23. Demosthenes, VIII, 74.

24. XXII (κατ' Ἀνδροτίωνος), 14. Demosthenes himself was
 a voluntary trierarch, in partnership with Philinos;
 XXI (κατὰ Μειδίον), 161; XVIII (περὶ τοῦ σπεφάνου), 99.

25. III, 85.

expedition was commanded first, perhaps, by Timotheos, then
²⁶
 by Diokles, and it included a body of mercenaries under
²⁷
 Chares. The campaign consisted of skirmishes and the
 ravaging of the country by both sides, with no pitched bat-
²⁸
 tle. But the Athenians emerged victorious in a relatively
 short time, although we may suspect Aischines of exaggera-
 tion when he states that the fighting lasted only thirty

26. Demosthenes, XXI, 174, states that Diokles concluded the truce with the Thebans, and his name appears among the generals in I.G., II-III², 124, 23. G. Grote, History of Greece, IX (London, 1888), p. 215, and Wallace, op. cit., p. 161, think that Timotheos was in charge, since he is credited with urging the expedition. If so, he was in command only during the early part of the campaign, for his name does not appear in the complete list of generals (for 357/6) on the inscription. Timotheos may have been a general for 358/7, in the latter part of which year the campaign began, and yet not have been reelected for 357/6 if the expedition set out after the election. Yet he may have urged the venture as a private citizen.

27. Aischines, I (κατὰ Τιμάρχου), 113; Demosthenes, XXIII (κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους), 173.

28. Diodoros, XVI, 7, 2.

29 days. The Thebans departed under truce and the Athenians, after setting up governments controlled by those Euboians who had asked their aid,³⁰ again enrolled the cities of the island in their confederacy.³¹ The yearly contributions assigned to Eretria and Hestiaia were five talents each,³² and probably Chalkis paid the same amount.

There are two undated references to the affairs of Chalkis which may well belong to the campaign of 357 or to the years of unrest immediately preceding. The first is the expulsion of the tyrant Phoxos, who is said by Aristotle³³ to

29. III, 85.

30. Aischines, III, 85: καὶ τὰς τε πόλεις αὐτὰς καὶ τὰς πολιτείας ἀπέδοτε ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως τοῖς παρακαταθεμένοις.

31. I.G., II-III², 124, deals specifically with an embassy to Karystos to make an alliance and speaks of (line 16) embassies to Chalkis, Eretria, and Hestiaia. I.G., II-III², 147, a very fragmentary inscription which concerns the Chalkidians, may refer to this settlement. I.G., II-III², 149, mentions an alliance of Athens and the Euboians (lines 5-6), while praising the Athenian ambassadors who concluded it and some Hestians who aided.

32. Aischines, III, 94, 100.

33. Politica, V, 1304a: καὶ ἐν Χαλκίδι φόβον τὸν τύραννον

have been ejected by the demos, with the aid of the γυῳρίμοι³⁴. Although this passage may refer to the sixth century, the fact that Phoxos was opposed by both the upper and lower classes suggests that he was supported by an outside power. If such was the case, it is most likely that the power was Thebes and that he was expelled about 357.

The second reference is by Aineias Taktikos, who, in a discussion of the value of signals, preserves a report of the seizure of Chalkis by soldiers who were admitted to the city secretly by an exile who had set out from Eretria.³⁵ This account has sometimes been connected with the Lelantine War,³⁶ but Aineias, when he does not date a story, is usually describing contemporary events and the detail in which this illustration is given points to his own generation.³⁷ Furthermore, the mention of the Chalkidian exile suggests the stasis of ca. 357, and this tale may well reflect an incident

μετὰ τῶν γυῳρίμων ὁ δῆμος ἀνελὼν εὐθὺς εἶχετο τῆς πολιτείας.

34. See above, pp. 138-140.

35. IV, 1-4.

36. E.g., Dondorff, De Rebus Chalcidiensium, pp. 17-18; Meyer, Gesch. des Altertums, II, p. 539.

37. L. W. Hunter, Αἰνείου Πολιορκητικά, revised by S. A. Handford (Oxford, 1927), pp. 113-115.

of that period.

The cities of Eubolia were not long to remain members of the Athenian Confederacy, for Philip of Makedon began intrigues among the Euboians soon after he gained control of the Pagasaian Gulf in 353/2.³⁸ Matters came to a head a few years later when he instigated at Eretria a democratic uprising under Kleitarchos against the pro-Athenian tyrant, Ploutarchos.³⁹ The latter appealed to Athens for help, which was granted, over the objections of Demosthenes,⁴⁰ through the influence of the party of Euboulos.⁴¹ So, in the early spring of 348,⁴²

-
38. Demosthenes, IV (κατὰ Φιλίππου, A), 37 (delivered in 351), presents letters written by Philip to certain Euboians as evidence of the king's insolence.
39. Plutarch, Phocion, 12, 1; scholia (ed. Dindorf [Oxford, 1851]) to Demosthenes, V (περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης), 5; Aischines, III, 86.
40. V, 5.
41. This is nowhere stated specifically, but the scholiast to Demosthenes, XIX (περὶ τῆς παραπρεσβείας), 290, tells us that Hegesileos, the cousin of Euboulos, was tried and condemned for helping Ploutarchos deceive the people. Demosthenes elsewhere (XXI, 110) notes that Ploutarchos was the γένος καὶ φίλος of Meidias, who was of the party of Euboulos (XXI, 206-207).
42. For the date see E. Radtge, Zur Zeitbestimmung des eu-

Phokion set out for Euboia with a small body of picked hoplites (ἐπίλεκτοι) and some cavalry, apparently in the expectation that he would receive support from the partisans of Athens on the island. But this help failed to materialize,⁴³ and soon Phokion was in a dangerous position.

böischen und olynthischen Kriegen (Giessen, 1908), pp. 19-46. The year depends on that of the outbreak of the Olynthian War, which started before the uprising in Euboia; this we know from Demosthenes, who says, XXI, 161, that voluntary trierarchies were instituted in the first campaign in Euboia (357), were asked a second time for Olynthos, a third time for the present campaign in Euboia. The Olynthian War began in 349/8 (archonship of Kallimachos), according to Philochoros (frag. 132 [Müller]), and since the Euboian campaign started in early spring, the year must be 348. We know the season from Demosthenes, XXXIX (πρὸς Βοιωτῶν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος), 16-17, where it is stated that the festival of the Choes and the Dionysia were celebrated during the campaign.

43. Plutarch, Phocion, 12-14, gives the only consecutive account of this campaign, and the information presented here comes from this source unless it is otherwise specified. In using the orators, we must keep in mind that

At this time Chalkis was under the control of Kallias (the son of Mnesarchos), who had previously been on good terms with the Athenians. But now he rallied the Euboians against them, called in help from Philip, and sent his brother, Taurosthenes, to hire mercenaries in Phokis. With these forces Kallias compelled Phokion and his ally, Ploutarchos of Eretria, to withdraw to Tamynai.⁴⁴ Phokion⁴⁵ sent an appeal to Athens for reinforcements, but before

Aischines places the blame for the Athenian difficulties on Kallias of Chalkis, who later became a strong supporter of Demosthenes's anti-Makedonian policy, and that Demosthenes accuses Ploutarchos of Eretria, the friend of the party of Euboulos.

44. Aischines, III, 86-87. Here, however, Aischines claims that Kallias did not collect the troops until after Phokion was at Tamynai. If this is true, it is difficult to explain the Athenians' withdrawal. Aischines apparently does not wish to give Kallias credit for his initial success, though he holds him responsible for the Euboian resistance.
45. Demosthenes, XXI, 162-163. The defendant is accused of having volunteered as a trierarch only after the Boule had presented a motion that the rest of the cavalry, to which he belonged, be sent to Tamynai. Then he learned

they were despatched the Euboians attacked. Although Phokion had given orders that his troops should not advance, Ploutarchos, as well as the Athenian cavalry, attacked and were defeated. Ploutarchos fled,⁴⁶ but Phokion and the ἐπίλεκτοι,⁴⁷ among whom was Aischines, finally won the day, aided by the rallying cavalry. After the victory Phokion received some reinforcements from Athens,⁴⁸ expelled Ploutarchos from Ere-

that the cavalry was not needed, so he did not command his ship personally.

46. Demosthenes, V, 5, and XXI, 110, implies that Ploutarchos acted with deliberate treachery. But had he wished to betray the Athenians, there were better ways to do this than by provoking a battle. More likely he was moved by over-eagerness to fight and considered Phokion's waiting tactics cowardly (Plutarch, Phocion, 13, 1).
47. II (περὶ τῆς παραπρεσβείας), 169. Aischines was crowned for bravery and took the military news to Athens.
48. The cavalry, of which Meidias was a member, went to Argoura, in the territory of Chalkis, and was stationed there until called into active duty by Phokion; Demosthenes, XXI, 132, 164. Demosthenes himself served as a hoplite; XXI, 133. H. W. Parke, "Athens and Euboea, 349-8 B.C.," J.H.S., XLIX (1929), pp. 246-252, magnifies these reinforcements into an expedition πανδημεί

tria, fortified Zaretra, and then returned to Athens before sailing to the Hellespont. Kallias of Chalkis probably withdrew temporarily to Makedonia.⁴⁹ But Phokion's successor,

sent immediately after Phokion's appeal. This theory he bases on: [Demosthenes], LIX (κατὰ Νεαίρας), 4 (μελλόντων στρατεύεσθαι ὑμῶν πανδημεὶ εἰς τε Εὐβοίαν καὶ Ὀλυνθον); Demosthenes, XXXIX, 16-17, where the defendant is said to have stayed at Athens during the Choes and Dionysia while οἱ ἄλλοι went to Tamynai; and Demosthenes, XXI, 162, where it is stated that the Boule proposed to send τοὺς ὑπολοίπους ἱππέας to aid Phokion. But the first passage is only rhetorical exaggeration, referring to the whole Euboian campaign; in the second, the charge of desertion against Boiotios may refer to the original expedition as well as to reinforcements; the third proves nothing, for in the next paragraph (163) Demosthenes goes on to say that the horsemen were not needed, with the result that Meidias, one of them, spent the Dionysia in Athens. In fact, this disproves Parke's thesis.

49. Aischines, III, 89, states that Kallias became one of the ἑταῖροι of Philip to obtain Makedonian help in strengthening Euboia against Athens, but he says that this happened after Kallias had been forgiven by the

50. Molossos, was incompetent and was finally captured, along with some of his soldiers, by Ploutarchos, who held them until a ransom of fifty talents was paid.⁵¹ In the summer of 348, shortly before the Olympic truce, ambassadors from Eubolia

Athenians. Yet, as Grote suggests (op. cit., IX, p. 333, note 2), this story of his being forgiven seems to be an attempt to make Kallias' conduct appear worse. His motive, as given by Aischines, fits 348, for there- after the Athenians did not have enough power in Eubolia to make Kallias leave and seek help.

50. Parke, op. cit., pp. 249-250, maintains that another general, Hegesileos, held the command between Phokion and Molossos. This he bases on a scholium to Demosthenes, XIX, 290: οὗτος [sc. 'Ηγησίλεως] εἰς Εὐβοίαν ἐπεστρατήγησεν, ὅτε τῷ Πλουτάρχῳ τὴν βοήθειαν ἐπεμψαν Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς εἶπεν ἐν Φιλιππικοῖς. ἐκρίθη δὲ ὡς συνεξαπατήσας τῷ Πλουτάρχῳ τὸν δῆμον. However, ἐπεστρατήγησεν certainly does not have to mean that Hegesileos was in supreme command. Possibly he was a general in the campaign and was responsible for the Athenian cavalry having attacked, along with Ploutarchos, against the orders of Phokion. This would explain his condemnation.

51. Scholia to Demosthenes, V, 5.

were in Athens to discuss peace.⁵² We do not know if terms were made, but it is clear that through this campaign Athens⁵³ lost control of all Euboia, except possibly Karystos.

We know little of the affairs of Chalkis for the next five years. A Chalkidian envoy, Kleochares, was present at the court of Philip in 346 at the time when the negotiations for the Peace of Philokrates were going on. He is represented by Aischines⁵⁴ as fearing a secret agreement between Philip and Athens, which apparently would have given Athens a free hand in Euboia. It is likely that the Chalkidians took the oaths as allies of Philip. After the peace, Euboia was full of intrigue, and Demosthenes charges that Philip was strengthening it as a base against Athens.⁵⁵ But Kallias of Chalkis had the ambition to reconstitute the Εὐβοϊκὸν συνέδριον,⁵⁶ with himself as leader. In this he ran contrary to

52. Aischines, II, 12.

53. Demosthenes, XIX, 22, speaks as if Philip controlled all Euboia, yet from [Demosthenes], VII (περὶ Ἀλουνήσου), 38, we learn that the Athenians had appealed to Philip on behalf of a Karystian. Possibly this means that Karystos remained friendly to Athens.

54. II, 120.

55. XIX, 326.

56. Aischines, III, 89. See above, pp. 213-214.

the policy of Philip, who instigated uprisings at Oreos and Eretria, presumably against governments which favored Kallias or Athens, and was supporting Philisteides and Kleitarchos respectively in those cities.⁵⁷ Therefore Kallias, perhaps⁵⁸ after first having sought help from Thebes, sent an embassy to Athens, and in 342/1 Chalkis concluded an alliance with the Athenians, not as a member of the confederacy, but as an independent power.⁵⁹ Henceforth Kallias was one of the

-
57. Demosthenes, IX (κατὰ Φιλίππου, Γ'), 33, 57-59, 66.
58. Aischines, III, 90. However, we can not be sure of Aischines' veracity here, for he is trying to discredit Kallias by showing that he allied himself with Athens as a last resort.
59. Didymos, I, 13-25, quoting Philochoros; Aischines, III, 91-92. (The latter's charges that Kallias bribed Demosthenes to obtain the alliance are absurd; Demosthenes was ready enough to accept any help against Philip.) We have part of an Athenian decree which may be concerned with this alliance. I.G., II-III², 258 and 617 have been joined by Schweigert, Hesperia, VI (1937), pp. 327-329, to form a single decree honoring certain Chalkidians; it is questionable whether these are Thracian or Euboic. Since the document can be dated epigraphically between 350 and 340, Schweigert suggests

staunchest supporters of Demosthenes' anti-Makedonian policy.

In the summer of 341 the Athenians crossed over to Euboia, taking with them some Megarian troops, and with the help of the Chalkidians took Oreos, killing the tyrant Philistides, and besieged and captured Eretria.⁶⁰ These cities were now enrolled in the Euboic League, and paid to its treasury the contributions of five talents which they formerly gave to the Athenian Confederacy.⁶¹ Kallias reconstituted the Εὐβοϊκὸν συνέδριον on the basis on which it had functioned earlier in the century, for the member states were granted⁶² full autonomy and made their treaties individually.

that it refers either to this alliance with Kallias or negotiations with Olynthos in 349/8.

60. Didymos, I, 13-25; Charax, frag 31 (Müller). The fall of Oreos is placed in the archonship of Kephisophon (342/1) and that of Eretria in the archonship of Nikomachos (341/0); they are nevertheless parts of a single campaign, in the summer of 341.
61. Aischines, III, 94, 100-105; the charges that the contributions were paid to Kallias, who had bribed Demosthenes, need no comment.
62. Athens and Eretria concluded a treaty at this time (I.G., II-III², 230). We also have an Eretrian decree (I.G., XII, 9, 189) which provides for a greater festival of

Kallias was active in support of Demosthenes' plans to assemble, in 340, a congress of Greek states to oppose Philip, and he himself went to the Peloponnese, returning with promises of aid from the Achaians and Megarians. This⁶³ he reported in person to the Athenian assembly. Even though the congress failed, the Chalkidians remained loyal allies of Athens and carried on the war actively against Philip, using, in part at least, borrowed Athenian triremes.⁶⁴ They took some of his cities on the Pagasaian Gulf and captured and sold Makedonian merchants as slaves, for which exploits Kallias was⁶⁵ given a vote of thanks by the Athenians.

Chalkis had now become more of a power in Greece than she had been since 506. But this situation soon came to

Artemis and boasts of the freedom of the city, which will last forever.

63. Aischines, III, 95.

64. Some of these ships were lost and the Athenians who had guaranteed them, among whom was Demosthenes, had to make restitution. In the records of the ἐπιμελητὰι τῶν νεωρίων for 334/3 there is a list of these guarantors (I.G., II-III², 1623, 161-199), and from 325/4 B.C. we possess a partial report of their payments (I.G., II-III², 1629, 516-543).

65. [Demosthenes], XII (Ἐπιστολὴ Φιλίππου), 5.

an end. In 338 the Chalkidians fought on the side of the
 Greeks at Chaironeia,⁶⁶ and with this battle they lost, to
 all intents and purposes, their freedom.⁶⁷ For the Makedoni-
 ans, recognizing the strategic importance of Chalkis, estab-
 lished there a garrison for the control of central Greece.

66. Demosthenes, XVIII, 306; Plutarch, Demosthenes, 17, 4.

67. Possibly Chalkis was not occupied by Philip. But by
 334 it was a Makedonian naval base (Arrian, Anabasis,
 II, 2, 4), and in the same year its fortifications were
 strengthened and extended (Strabo, X, 1, 8); this im-
 plies a garrison.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient Sources (Literary)

- Ailian, de Natura Animalium, Varia Historia, Epistulae et Fragmenta, ed. R. Hercher (Paris, 1858; and 2 vols., Teubner, 1864-1866); Varia Historia, ed. R. Hercher (Teubner, 1887)
- Aineias Taktikos, Poliiorcetica, ed. R. Schöne (Teubner, 1911); ed. L. W. Hunter, with introduction and commentary (Oxford, 1927)
- Aischines, Orationes, ed. F. Blass (2nd edition, Teubner, 1908)
- Aischylos, Fragmenta, ed. A. Nauck, Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (2nd edition, Leipzig, 1889)
- Alkaios, in E. Diehl, Anth. Lyr. Gr., I², 4, pp. 86-159
- Ammianus Marcellinus, Res Gestae, ed. V. Gardthausen (2 vols., Teubner, 1874-1875)
- Andokides, Orationes, ed. F. Blass and C. Fuhr (4th edition, Teubner, 1913)
- Apollodoros, Bibliotheca, ed. I. Bekker (Teubner, 1854)
- Apollonios Rhodios, Scholia, ed. C. Wendel (Berlin, 1935)
- Appian, Historia Romana, ed. L. Mendelssohn (Teubner, 1879)
- Archilochos, in E. Diehl, Anth. Lyr. Gr., I², 3, pp. 3-49

- Aristophanes, Comoediae, ed. F. W. Hall and W. M. Geldart (2 vols., Oxford, 1906); Scholia, ed. W. Dindorf (Oxford, 1835)
- Aristotle, Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, ed. H. Oppermann (Teubner, 1928)
- Aristotle, de Animalibus Historia, ed. L. Dittmeyer (Teubner, 1907)
- Aristotle, de Mirabilibus Auscultationibus, ed. O. Apelt (Teubner, 1888)
- Aristotle, de Partibus Animalium, ed. B. Langkavel (Teubner, 1868)
- Aristotle, Fragmenta, ed. V. Rose (Teubner, 1886)
- Aristotle, Politica, ed. O. Immisch (Teubner, 1909)
- Arrian, Anabasis, ed. A. G. Roos (Teubner, 1907)
- Arrian, Fragmenta, in F. Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., IIB, no. 156
- Athenaios, Dipnosophistae, ed. G. Kaibel (3 vols., Teubner, 1923-1925)
- Charax Pergamenos, in C. Müller, F.H.G., III, pp. 636-645
- Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, ed. W. Dindorf (2 vols., Oxford, 1859)
- Demosthenes, Orationes, ed. S. H. Butcher and W. Rennie (3 vols., Oxford, 1903-1931); Scholia, ed. W. Dindorf (2 vols., Oxford, 1851)

- Didymos, de Demosthene Commenta, ed. H. Diels and W. Schubart (Teubner, 1904)
- "Dikaiarchos," in C. Müller, G.G.M., I, pp. 97-110
- Diodoros, Bibliotheca Historica, ed. F. Vogel and C. Fischer (5 vols., Teubner, 1888-1906)
- Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Antiquitates Romanae, ed. C. Jacoby (4 vols., Teubner, 1885-1905)
- Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Opuscula, ed. H. Usener and L. Radermacher (2 vols., Teubner, 1904-1929)
- Douris of Samos, in F. Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., IIA, no. 76
- Ephoros, in F. Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., IIA, no. 70
- Euripides, Scholia, ed. W. Dindorf (4 vols., Oxford, 1863)
- Eusebios, Chronica, ed. A. Schöne (2 vols., Berlin, 1866-1875); Armenian version, ed. J. Karst, Eusebius Werke, V, Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen Übersetzt (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte, XX [Leipzig, 1911]); Latin version of Hieronymos, ed. J. K. Fotheringham (London, 1923), and R. Helm, Eusebius Werke, VII, Die Chronik des Hieronymus, Erster Teil (Die Gr. Christ. Schriftsteller, XXIV [Leipzig, 1913]); Zweiter Teil (Die Gr. Christ. Schriftsteller, XXXIV [Leipzig, 1926])

- Eustathios, Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem
(4 vols., Leipzig, 1827)
- Eustathios, Commentarii in Dionysium, in C. Müller,
G.G.M., II, pp. 201-407
- Frontinus, Strategemata, ed. G. Gundermann (Teubner,
1888)
- Gellius, Noctes Atticae, ed. C. Hosius (2 vols., Teub-
ner, 1903)
- Hekataios, in F. Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., I, no. 1
- Herakleides, in C. Müller, F.H.G., II, pp. 197-224
- Herodotos, Historiae, ed. C. Hude (2 vols., 3rd edition,
Oxford, 1927)
- Hesiod, Carmina, ed. A. Rzach (3rd edition, Teubner,
1913)
- Hesychios, Lexicon, ed. M. Schmidt (5 vols., Jena, 1858-
1868)
- Hieronimos, see Eusebios
- Homer, Opera, ed. D. B. Munro and T. W. Allen (5 vols.,
Vol. II in 3rd edition, Vols. I, III, and IV in 2nd
edition, Oxford, 1911-1920); Scholia in Iliadem,
ed. I. Bekker (2 vols., Berlin, 1825)
- Ion of Chios, in C. Müller, F.H.G., II, pp. 44-51
- Isokrates, Orationes, ed. F. Blass (2 vols., 2nd edition,
Teubner, 1888)
- Justin, Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi,
ed. O. Seel (Teubner, 1935)

- Kallimachos, Epigrammata, ed. O. Schneider (Leipzig, 1870)
- Klearchos, in C. Müller, F.H.G., II, pp. 302-327
- Livy, ab Urbe Condita, ed. W. Weissenborn and M. Müller (4 vols., 2nd edition, Teubner, 1926-1930)
- Lysias, Orationes, ed. T. Thalheim (2nd edition, Teubner, 1913)
- Nepos, Cornelius, Vitae, ed. A. Fleckeisen (Teubner, 1912)
- Nikolaos of Damaskos, in F. Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., IIA, no. 90
- Nonnos Panopolitanos, Dionysiaca, ed. A. Ludwig (2 vols., Teubner, 1909-1911)
- Pausanias, Graeciae Descriptio, ed. F. Spiro (3 vols., Teubner, 1903); ed. J. H. Schubert (2 vols., Teubner, 1853-1862)
- Philochoros, in C. Müller, F.H.G., I, pp. 384-417
- Pindar, Scholia, ed. A. B. Drachmann (3 vols., Teubner, 1903-1927)
- Pliny, Naturalis Historia, ed. L. Ian and C. Mayhoff (5 vols., Teubner, 1897-1906)
- Plutarch, Moralia, ed. C. Hubert, W. Nachstädt, W. R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sieveking, J. B. Titchener, I. Wegehaupt (Vols. I-IV, Teubner, from 1925); ed. G. N. Bernardakis (7 vols., Teubner, 1888-1896)

- Plutarch, Vitae Parallelae, ed. C. Lindskog and K. Ziegler (4 vols., Teubner, 1914-1939)
- Polyainos, Strategemata, ed. E. Wölfflin and I. Melber (2nd edition, Teubner, 1887)
- Polybios, Historiae, ed. T. Büttner-Wobst (4 vols., Teubner, 1882-1904)
- Pomponius Mela, de Chorographia, ed. C. Frick (Teubner, 1880)
- Simonides, in E. Diehl, Anth. Lyr. Gr., II, pp. 61-118.
- "Skylax," in C. Müller, G.G.M., I, pp. 15-96
- Skymnos, Periegesis, ed. A. Meineke (Berlin, 1846)
- Stephanos Byzantios, Ethnica, ed. A. Meineke (Berlin, 1849)
- Strabo, Geographica, ed. A. Meineke (3 vols., Teubner, 1913-1921)
- Suidas, Lexicon, ed. A. Adler (Lexicographi Graeci, I, Leipzig, 1928-1938)
- Theognis, in E. Diehl, Anth. Lyr. Gr., I², 2, pp. 3-87
- Theopompos, in F. Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., IIB, no. 115
- Thucydides, Historiae, ed. H. S. Jones (2 vols., Vol. II in 2nd edition, Oxford, 1898-1902); Scholια, ed. C. Hude (Teubner, 1927)
- Timaios, in C. Müller, F.H.G., I, pp. 193-233
- Tyrtaios, in E. Diehl, Anth. Lyr. Gr., I², 1, pp. 6-22
- Velleius Paterculus, Historia Romana, ed. C. Halm (Teubner, 1876)

Xenophon, Opera Omnia, ed. C. E. Marchant (5 vols.,
Vol. II in 2nd edition, Oxford, 1900-1910)

Ancient Sources (Epigraphic)

Dittenberger, W., Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum (4
vols., 3rd edition, Leipzig, 1915-1924)

Hicks, E. L., and Hill, G. F., A Manual of Greek His-
torical Inscriptions (2nd edition, Oxford, 1901)

Inscriptiones Graecae, I, Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis
anno vetustiores, ed. A. Kirchhoff (Berlin, 1873,
with supplements in 1877, 1886, and 1891)

Inscriptiones Graecae, I, Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis
anno vetustiores, ed. F. Hiller von Gärtringen
(editio minor, Berlin, 1924)

Inscriptiones Graecae, II-III, Inscriptiones Atticae
Euclidis anno posteriores, ed. J. Kirchner (editio
minor, Berlin, from 1913)

Inscriptiones Graecae, IV, Inscriptiones Argolidis, ed.
M. Fränkel (Berlin, 1902)

Inscriptiones Graecae, XII, Inscriptiones Insularum Mari
Aegaei praeter Delum, Fasc. 9, Inscriptiones Eu-
boeae insulae, ed. E. Ziebarth (Berlin, 1915)

Meritt, B. D., Wade-Gery, H. T., and McGregor, M. F.,
The Athenian Tribute Lists, I (Harvard University
Press, 1939)

Tod, M. N., A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1933)

Ancient Sources (Collections and Fragments)

Bekker, I., Anecdota Graeca (3 vols., Berlin, 1814-1821)

Diehl, E., Anthologia Lyrica Graeca (2 vols., Vol. I in 2nd edition, Teubner, 1925-1936)

Jacoby, F., Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (3 vols., Berlin and Leyden, from 1923)

Müller, C., Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum (5 vols., Paris, 1878-1885); Vol. V, Part 2, ed. V. Langlois; T. Müller joint editor of Vol. I

Müller, C., Geographi Graeci Minores (2 vols., Paris, 1855-1882)

Nauck, A., Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (2nd edition, Leipzig, 1889)

Modern Works

Accame, S., La Lega Ateniese del Secolo IV A.C. (Rome, 1941)

Allen, T. W., The Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Oxford, 1921)

Allen, T. W., "Lives of Homer," J.H.S., XXXIII (1913), pp. 19-26

Allen, T. W., "The Date of Hesiod," J.H.S., XXV (1915), pp. 85-99

- Allen, T. W., Halliday, W., and Sikes, E., The Homeric Hymns (2nd edition, Oxford, 1936)
- Atkinson, K. M. T., "Two Tomb-Groups from Selinus," P.B.S.R., XIV (1938), pp. 115-146
- Austin, R. P., The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions (London, 1938)
- Babelon, E., Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines (3 vols., Paris, 1901-1933)
- Barber, G. L., The Historian Ephorus (Cambridge, 1935)
- Beloch, K. J., Griechische Geschichte (4 vols., 2nd edition, Strassburg, Berlin, and Leipzig, 1912-1927)
- Bischoff, E., s.v. Kalender, in P.W., R.E., XX, cols. 1568-1602
- Blakeway, A., "Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Commerce with Italy, Sicily and France in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.," B.S.A., XXXIII (1932-1933), pp. 170-208
- Blakeway, A., "'Demaratus'," J.R.S., XXV (1935), pp. 129-149
- Blegen, C. W., "Athens and the Early Age of Greece," Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., Suppl. Vol. I (1940), pp. 1-9
- Blegen, C. W., "Pre-classical Greece," Studies in the Arts and Architecture (University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference, Philadelphia, 1941), pp. 9-11

- Böckh, A., Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener (2 vols., 3rd edition, revised by M. Fränkel, Berlin, 1886)
- Böhnecke, K., Demosthenes, Hypereides, Lykourgos (Berlin, 1864)
- Bonner, R. T., and Smith, G., The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle (2 vols., Chicago, 1930-1938)
- Boraston, J. M., "The Birds of Homer," J.H.S., XXXI (1911), pp. 216-250
- Büchschütz, B., Besitz und Erwerb im Griechischen Alterthume (Halle, 1869)
- Buck, C. D., Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects (2nd edition, Boston and New York, 1928)
- Burn, A. R., "The So-called 'Trade-Leagues' in Early Greek History and the Lelantine War," J.H.S., XLIX (1929), pp. 14-37
- Burn, A. R., "Dates in Early Greek History," J.H.S., LV (1935), pp. 130-146
- Burrows, R. M. and Ure, P. N., "Excavations at Rhitsona in Boeotia," B.S.A., XIV (1907-1908), pp. 226-318
- Bursian, C., Quaestionum Euboicarum Capita Selecta (Dissertation, Leipzig, 1856)
- Bursian, C., Geographie von Griechenland (2 vols., Leipzig, 1862-1872)
- Busolt, G., Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei

Chaeroneia (3 vols., Vols. I and II in 2nd edition,
Gotha, 1893-1904)

Busolt, G., "Bemerkungen über die Gründungsdata der
Griechischen Colonien in Sicilien und Unteritalien,"
Rhein. Mus., XL (1885), pp. 466-469

Byvanck, A. W., "Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der
Funde in Italien aus dem VIII und VII Vorchristlichen
Jahrhundert," Mnemosyne, IV, series 3 (1936-1937),
pp. 181-225

The Cambridge Ancient History, Vols. III-VI, ed. J. B.
Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock (Cambridge,
1926-1933)

Cary, M., in C.A.H., III, pp. 616-623

von Christ, W., Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur
(6th edition, revised by W. Schmid and O. Stählin,
in I. Müller, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft,
VII, Munich, 1920-1940)

Cook, J. M., "Protoattic Pottery," B.S.A., XXXV (1934-
1935), pp. 165-211

Cook, R. M., "Fikellura Pottery," B.S.A., XXXIV (1933-
1934), pp. 1-98

Costanzi, V., "La Guerra Lelantea," Atene e Roma, V
(1902), pp. 768-790

Curtius, E., "Studien zur Geschichte von Korinth,"
Hermes, X (1876), pp. 215-243

- Dondorff, H., De Rebus Chalcidiensium (Dissertation, Halle, 1855)
- Dondorff, H., Die Ionier auf Euböia (Berlin, 1860)
- Dunham, A. G., The History of Miletus (London, 1915)
- Fabricius, E., "Über die Abfassungszeit der Griechischen Städtebilder des Herakleides," Bonner Studien für R. Kekule (Berlin, 1890), pp. 58-66
- Farnell, L. R., "An Unrecorded Attic Colony in Euboea?" Class. Rev., XX (1906), pp. 27-31
- Foucart, P., "Mémoire sur les Colonies Athéniennes au Cinquième et au Quatrième Siècle," Mémoires Présentés par Divers Savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres de l'Institut de France, 1^{re} Serie, IX, 1 (Paris, 1878), pp. 323-413
- Foucart, P., "Décret des Athéniens Relatif à la Ville de Chalcis," Rev. Arch., XXXIII (1877), pp. 242-262
- Fuhr, K., Ausgewählte Biographien des Plutarch, erklärt von C. Sintenis (3 vols., 4th edition, Berlin, 1870-1882)
- Gäbler, H., Die Antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands, III, Makedonia und Paionia (2 vols., Berlin, 1906-1935)
- Gäbler, H., "Zur Münzkunde Makedoniens VI," Zeitschrift für Numismatik, XXXV (1925), pp. 201-212
- Gallavotti, C., "Generi e Tradizione Letteraria dell' Agone tra Omero ed Esiodo," Riv. di Fil., LVII (1929), pp. 31-59

- Gardner, P., "A Numismatic Note on the Lelantine War,"
Class. Rev., XXXIV (1920), pp. 90-91
- Geyer, F., Topographie und Geschichte der Insel Euböia,
 I (Berlin, 1903)
- Gisinger, F., Die Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos von
 Knidos (Berlin, 1921)
- Gomme, A. W., "Euboea and Samos in the Delian Confeder-
 acy," Class. Rev., I (1936), pp. 609
- Gomme, A. W., A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, I
 (Oxford, 1945)
- Gomme, A. W., The Population of Athens in the Fifth and
 Fourth Centuries B.C. (Oxford, 1933)
- Gounaropoulos, K. A., Ἱστορία τῆς Νήσου Εὐβοίας
 (Thessalonike, 1930)
- Gronovius, J., "Praefatio," Thesaurus Graecarum Antiqui-
 tatum, IV (Leyden, 1599)
- Grote, G., A History of Greece; from the Earliest Period
 to the Close of the Generation Contemporary with
 Alexander the Great (10 vols., London, 1888)
- Grundy, G. B., "Artemisium," J.H.S., XVII (1897), pp.
 212-229
- Gude, M., A History of Olynthus (Johns Hopkins Press,
 1933)
- Gwynn, A., "The Character of Greek Colonisation," J.H.S.,
 XXXVIII (1918), pp. 88-123

- Haley, J. B., and Blegen, C. W., "The Coming of the Greeks," A.J.A., XXXII (1928), pp. 141-154
- Halliday, W. R., The Greek Questions of Plutarch (Oxford, 1928)
- Hampl, F., "Poleis ohne Territorium," Klio, XXXII (1939), pp. 1-60
- Harrison, E., Studies in Theognis (Cambridge, 1902)
- Harrison, E., "Chalkidike," Class. Quart., VI (1912), pp. 93-103 and 165-178
- Head, B. V., Historia Numorum (2nd edition, Oxford, 1911)
- Head, B. V., Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum, Macedonia, Etc. (London, 1879)
- Heinze, H., De Rebus Eretriensium (Dissertation, Göttingen, 1869)
- Hermann, F., "Der Kampf zwischen Chalcis und Eretria um des Lelantische Gefilde," Rhein. Mus., I, (1832), pp. 84-97
- Highbarger, E. L., The History and Civilization of Ancient Megara (Baltimore, 1927)
- Hill, G., in C.A.H., IV, pp. 124-136
- Hiller von Gärtringen, F., "Athenisches Gesetz über Hestiaia um 445 v. Chr.," Nachr. Ges. Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse (1921), pp. 62-68
- Holm, A., History of Greece from its Commencement to the Close of the Independence of the Greek Nation (English translation, 4 vols., London, 1894-1898)

- Homolle, T., "Inventaires des Temples Deliens," B.C.H.,
X (1886), pp. 461-475
- How, W. W., and Wells, J., A Commentary on Herodotus
(2 vols., Oxford, 1912)
- Hunter, L. W., Αἰνείου Πολιορκητικῆς, Aeneas on Siege-
craft, revised by S. A. Handford (Oxford, 1927)
- Jacoby, F., "Some Athenian Epigrams from the Persian
Wars," Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 157-211
- Johansen, K., Les Vases Sicyoniens (Paris, 1923)
- Kahrstedt, U., Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in
Athen, (2 vols., Stuttgart-Berlin, 1934)
- Kahrstedt, U., "Der Umfang des Athenischen Kolonialreiches,"
Nachr. Ges. Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse (1931),
pp. 159-195
- Kahrstedt, U., "Chalcidic Studies," A.J.P., LVII (1936),
pp. 416-444
- Kalogeropoulos, D. P., Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν Βιβλιογραφίαν
τῆς Νήσου Εὐβοίας καὶ τῶν Θεσσαλικῶν Σποράδων,
1471-1937 (Athens, 1937)
- Kirchhoff, A., Über der Tributpflichtigkeit der Attischen
Kleruchen (Berlin, 1873)
- Kius, O., "Die Attische Kleruchie," Programm, Königliches
Friedrichs-Gymnasium zu Cassel (Cassel, 1888), pp.
1-26
- Köhler, U., "Über zwei athenische Vertragsurkunden," Ath.
Mitt., I (1876), pp. 184-205

- Köhler, U., "Attischer Volksbeschluss," Ath. Mitt., IX (1884), pp. 115-126
- Kolbe, W., "Zum Dekret über Chalkis," Hermes, LI (1916), pp. 479-480
- Lamb, W., Greek and Roman Bronzes (London, 1929)
- Larsen, J. A. O., "The Constitution and Original Purpose of the Delian League," Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., LI (1940), pp. 175-213
- Lehmann-Haupt, C. F., "Zum attischen Volksbeschluss über Chalkis," Hermes, LII (1917), pp. 520-535
- Lehmann-Haupt, C. F., "Καθ' ὅπερ οἱ ἄλλοι Χαλκιδέης," Klio, XVI (1920), pp. 193-196
- Lipsius, J. H., "Zum attischen Volksbeschluss über Chalkis," Hermes, LIII (1918), pp. 107-110
- Macan, R. W., Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books (2 vols., London, 1908)
- Maple, E. D. M., Confederacy and Empire, A Study of Athenian Foreign Policy (M.A. Thesis, unpublished, University of Cincinnati, 1946)
- Marshall, F.H., The Second Athenian Confederacy (Cambridge, 1905)
- Matsas, I., "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Εὐβοίας," Athena, XI (1899), pp. 265-300
- McGregor, M. F., "The Pro-Persian Party at Athens from 510 to 480 B.C.," Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., Suppl. Vol. I (1940), pp. 71-95

- McGregor, M. F., "Cleisthenes of Sicyon and the Panhellenic Festivals," T.A.P.A., LXXII (1941), pp. 266-287
- Meiggs, R., "The Growth of Athenian Imperialism," J.H.S., LXIII (1943), pp. 21-34
- Meritt, B. D., "Notes on Attic Decrees," Hesperia, X (1941), pp. 301-307
- Meursius, J., "Ceramicus Geminus," Thesaurus Graecarum Antiquitatum, IV (Leyden, 1599), cols. 961-1016
- Meyer, E., Geschichte des Altertums (5 vols., Stuttgart-Berlin, 1884-1902)
- Meyer, E., Forshungen zur Alten Geschichte (2 vols., Halle, 1892-1899)
- Milne, J. G., "Early Coinages of Athens and Euboea," Num. Chron., I, 6th series (1941), pp. 8-16
- Milne, J. G., "The Economic Policy of Solon," Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 231-245
- Munro, J. A., in C.A.H., IV, pp. 229-251 and 268-345
- Mylonas, G. E., "Pre-Persian Pottery," Excavations at Olynthus, V (Johns Hopkins Press, 1933), pp. 1-63
- Mylonas, G. E., "Excavations at Meczyberna 1934, 1938," A.J.A., XLVIII (1943), pp. 78-87
- Myres, J. L., "On the 'List of Thalassocracies' in Eusebius," J.H.S., XXVI (1906), pp. 84-130
- Nesselhauf, H., Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Delisch-Attischen Symmachie (Klio, Beiheft XXX,

Leipzig, 1933)

Neugebauer, K. A., "Reifarchais^che Bronzefasen mit
Zungenmuster," Röm. Mitt., XXXVIII-XXXIX (1923-
1924), pp. 341-440

Nilsson, M. P., "The New Inscription of the Salaminioi,"
A.J.P., LIX (1938), pp. 385-393

Oberhummer, E., s.v. Bottia, in P.W., R.E., V, cols.
794-795

Oberhummer, E., s.v. Chalkis, in P.W., R.E., VI, cols.
2078-2088

O'Neill, J. G., Ancient Corinth, I (Baltimore, 1930)

Papabasileiou, G., Περὶ τῶν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ Ἀρχαίων Τάφων
(Athens, 1910)

Papabasileiou, G., "Περὶ Ἐπιγραφῆς Ἀνευρεθείσης ἐν
Χαλκίδι," Athena, I (1889), pp. 311-313

Papabasileiou, G., "Περὶ τῆς ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ Πόλεως Χαλκίδος,"
Athena, III (1891), pp. 607-615

Parke, H. W., "Athens and Euboea, 349-8 B.C.," J.H.S.,
XLIX (1929), pp. 246-252

Payne, H., Necrocorinthia (Oxford, 1931)

Phousara, G. I., Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν Εὐβοϊκὴν Βιβλιογραφίαν
[1620-1936] (Athens, 1937)

Pomtow, H., s.v. Delphoi, in P.W., R.E., Suppl.-bd. IV,
cols. 1299-1300

Prinz, H., Funde aus Naukratis (Klio, Beiheft VII, Leip-
zig, 1908)

- Radtge, E., Zur Zeitbestimmung des euböischen und olynthischen Krieges (Giessen, 1908)
- Raubitschek, A. E., "The Athenian Property on Euböia," Hesperia, XII (1943), pp. 28-33
- de Ridder, A., Catalogue des Bronzes Trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes (Paris, 1896)
- de Ridder, A., "Un Bronze Chalcidien sur l'Acropole," B.C.H., XX (1896), pp. 401-422
- R[obertson], E. S. G., Review of C. T. Seltman, Athens, Its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion, Num. Chron., IV, 5th series (1924), pp. 335-337
- Robinson, D. M., Excavations at Olynthus (12 vols., Johns Hopkins Press, from 1928); Vol. I by G. E. Mylonas; J. W. Graham co-author of Vol. VIII; P. A. Clement co-author of Vol. IX
- Robinson, D. M., "A Deed of Sale at Olynthus," T.A.P.A., LIX (1928), pp. 225-232
- Robinson, D. M., "New Inscriptions from Olynthus and Environs," T.A.P.A., LXII (1931), pp. 40-56
- Robinson, D. M., "Inscriptions from Olynthus, 1934," T.A.P.A., LXV (1934), pp. 103-137
- Robinson, D. M., "Inscriptions from Macedonia, 1938," T.A.P.A., LXIX (1938), pp. 43-76
- Rudolph, F., "De fontibus quibus Aelianus in varia historia componenda usus sit," Leipz. Stud. zu

- Class. Phil., VII (1884), pp. 1-137
- Rumpf, A., Chalkidische Vasen (Berlin, 1927)
- Schulthess, F., s.v. κληροῦχοι, P.W., R.E., XXI, cols. 814-832
- Schweigert, E., "Inscriptions in the Epigraphical Museum," Hesperia, VI (1937), pp. 317-332
- Schweigert, E., "Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis," Hesperia, VII (1938), pp. 264-310
- Schweigert, E., "Epigraphic Notes," Hesperia, VII (1938), pp. 626-627
- Schweitzer, B., "Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte der Geometrische Stile in Griechenland," Ath. Mitt., XLIII (1918), pp. 1-152
- Seltman, C. T., Athens, Its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion (Cambridge, 1924)
- Smith, H. R. W., "The Origin of Chalcidian Ware," Univ. of California Publ. in Cl. Arch., I (1929-1944), pp. 85-149
- Smyth, H. W., The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects---Ionic (Oxford, 1894)
- von Stern, E., Geschichte der Spartanischen und Thebanischen Hegemonie (Dorpat, 1884)
- von Stern, E., "Zum Athenischen Volksbeschluss über Chalkis," Hermes, LI (1916), pp. 630-632
- Stevens, G. P., "The Periclean Entrance Court," Hesperia, V (1936), pp. 443-520

- Stevens, G. P., "Architectural Studies Concerning the Acropolis of Athens," Hesperia, XV (1946), pp. 73-106
- Studniczka, F., "Zum Hydragiebel," Jahrbuch. des Arch. Inst., I (1886), pp. 87-94
- Svoronos, I., Les Monnaies d'Athènes (Munich, 1923)
- Svoronos, I., "Numismatique de la Peonie et de la Macedonie," Journal Ingt. d'Arch. Num., XV (1913), pp. 193-280
- Swoboda, H., "Zur Geschichte der Attischen Kleruchien," Serta Harteliana (Vienna, 1896), pp. 28-32
- Tarn, W. W., "The Fleet of Xerxes," J.H.S., XXVIII (1908), pp. 202-233
- Thompson, D. W., A Glossary of Greek Birds (Oxford, 1936)
- Thompson, H. A., "Buildings on the West Side of the Agora," Hesperia, VI (1937), pp. 1-226
- Treuer, A. A., "Economic and Political Conditions in Megara," Class. Phil., XX (1925), pp. 115-132
- Ulrichs, H. N., Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland (2 vols., Berlin, 1863)
- Unger, G. F., "Herakleides Pontikos der Kritiker," Rhein. Mus., XXXVIII (1883), pp. 481-506
- Ure, P. N., The Origin of Tyranny (Cambridge, 1922)
- Wade-Gery, H. T., "The Sixth-Century Athenian Decree about Salamis," Class. Quart., XL (1946), pp. 101-104.

- Wade-Gery, H. T., in C.A.H., III, pp. 527-548
- Walker, E. M., in C.A.H., IV, pp. 157-163
- Wallace, W., The History of Eretria to 198 B.C. (Dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1936)
- Wallace, W., "The Egyptian Expedition and the Chronology of the Decade 460-450 B.C.," T.A.P.A., LXVII (1936), pp. 252-260
- West, A. B., The History of the Chalcidic League (Madison, 1918)
- West, A. B., "The Tribute Lists and the Non-Tributary Members of the Delian League," Am. Hist. Rev., XXXV (1929-1930), pp. 267-275
- West, A. B., "Thucydides V, 18, 5," A.J.P., LVIII (1937), pp. 157-165
- West, A. B., "Thucydides V, 18, 6," A.J.P., LVIII (1937), pp. 166-173
- von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U., Aus Kydathen. (in Phil. Untersuchungen, I Berlin, 1880)
- von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U., Aristoteles und Athen (2 vols., Berlin, 1893)
- Wilhelm, A., "Simonideische Gedichte," Jahreshefte des Öster. Arch. Inst., II (1899), pp. 221-227
- Wilhelm, A., "Ἀττικὴ Ἐπιγραφὴ ἐκ Χαλκίδος," Eph. Arch. (1902), pp. 135-142
- Wilhelm, A., "Εὐβοϊκά," Eph. Arch. (1904), pp. 88-110

Wilhelm, A., "Attische Urkunden, IV," Sitzb. Ak. Wien

(1939), pp. 5-11

Williams, T. H., "Theognis and His Poems," J.H.S., XXIII

(1903), pp. 1-33

Winter, J. G., "A New Fragment on the Life of Homer,"

T.A.P.A., LVI (1925), pp. 120-129