



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

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

Sarah Bolmarcich The Athenian Regulations for Samos (IG I3 48) Again

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **39 • 2009**

Seite / Page **45–64**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/395/5003> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2009-39-p45-64-v5003.3

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

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

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

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

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

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

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

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

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

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

SARAH BOLMARCICH

The Athenian Regulations for Samos (IG I³ 48) Again*

In 1931 and 1932 H. T. WADE-GERY and B. D. MERITT published what have become the definitive restorations of the Athenian treaty with Samos after the latter's revolt from and defeat by Athens in 440/39.¹ In the intervening 75-plus years, their restorations, published by ATL and IG I³, have occasionally been questioned, largely on the basis of the number of letter-spaces per line (35) that WADE-GERY assigned to the inscription; new or disputed readings that would alter their restorations significantly have also been suggested.² From the viewpoint of Athenian imperial studies, however, WADE-GERY and MERITT's restorations are unsatisfactory on historical as well as epigraphic grounds: their restorations have the Samians and the Athenians swearing reciprocal oaths to one another, a situation unparalleled in any other Athenian imperial decree,³ and the usual oaths sworn between Athens and a defeated ally are severely truncated by their restorations. This paper considers the current restorations, examines some problematic readings on the stone and offers some tentative restorations based on a longer line-length, which in turn provides a context that adheres more closely to the typical Athenian treatment of a defeated ally.

First, I shall examine briefly the fragments of the inscription and the two IG restorations of fragment *c* of the regulations for Samos, then consider several key problems with the text preserved on the stone. Then I shall turn to the question of line-length, before concluding with a consideration of the decree's place in the history of the Athenian Empire.

* The Epigraphical Museum at Athens permitted me to view the fragments of this decree on three separate occasions (spring 2003, fall 2004, spring 2005), and the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin granted me access to the Meritt Collection there in summer 2007. I would also like to thank an audience at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, especially R. STROUD, in the fall of 2004. E. MEYER and R. STROUD read and commented on drafts, and P. PERLMAN and S. V. TRACY provided advice and feedback. None of these is responsible for any errors in the final product, of course.

¹ WADE-GERY 1931; MERITT 1932, 48–56.

² Questioned by FORNARA 1979; WANKEL 1974. Alternative readings of problematic lines have been raised by BRESLIN 1980; BRIDGES 1980; HENRY 1977.

³ By this term I mean those regulations imposed by Athens and decreed by the Council and the People on allies who had revolted or been intransigent: Miletos, Samos, Erythrai, Kolophon, Eretria, Chalcis. The Athenians and the Chalcidians exchange oaths, but they are not reciprocal; see below.

The Fragments of the Decree

Currently four fragments are assigned to the decree.⁴ This paper is largely concerned with IG fragment *c*, which contains the oaths of the Samians and the Athenians. It preserves ten lines of one to thirteen legible letters from the right-hand edge of the stone. Fragment *b*, assigned to the top of the stone, is so fragmentary that no attempt has been made to restore it: clear are references to Lemnos (line 4), the Peloponnesians (line 7), and Athens or the Athenians (line 11), all of which relate to Thucydides' account of the Samian War (1.115–118); this fragment is not under consideration here.⁵ Fragments *d* and *a* give a list of generals, some of whom were involved in the Samian War, and will be discussed below.

The fragments have been linked since the publication of IG I², which placed *a*, *b*, and *c* together, although in no particular order, as no. 50.⁶ In 1931 WADE-GERY published fragment *d*, following A. WILHELM in linking it with the other three fragments because of the subject matter, shared with fragment *a*.⁷ The fragments have similar lettering and margins, as well as, on the backs of fragments *c* and *a*, a large groove flanked by two shallower ones.⁸ Only C. W. FORNARA has attempted to dissociate fragments *a*

⁴ FORNARA associated a fifth fragment, IG I³ 145 (the «Chromon Decree») with the Samian regulations, on the grounds of similar lettering and style (FORNARA 1979, 17), but see D. M. LEWIS 1979, 18–19, and BRIDGES 1980, 188, for serious objections.

Another fragment with similar lettering and spacing, as well as the same measurements for the right lateral margin, is IG I³ 185, which STROUD 1971, 147–148, restored to a 28-letter line based on the formulaic nature of the prescript. This fragment preserves three lines of a prescript of four to seven letters from the right-hand edge of the stone, with the same lateral margin as the other fragments on the right side. The fragment has a gray streak through its text that may be related to gray streaks found in fragments *c* and *a* (see discussion below), although the streak is less clear here than in the other fragments. The gray streak is visible in STROUD's photograph; autopsy indicates its distance from the right-hand edge of the stone is identical to that of the gray streak in fragment *c*, which may suggest a close link between the two fragments if they are indeed from the same stone. The only serious objection to the association of this fragment with the decree is that its line-length must be 28 letters, shorter even than WADE-GERY's line. I believe that the fragment is linked to this decree in some way; perhaps, as with IG I³ 34 and IG II² 2496, the first lines of the decree were inscribed on a narrower line-length than the rest of the decree to allow for a decoration (painting or relief) in the upper-left corner of the stele? Another possibility is that our stone actually contained a continuous series of decrees, of which fr. *b* represents a decree involving Lemnos and the Peloponnesians, fr. *c* and perhaps STROUD's fragment the Athenian settlement with the Samians, and perhaps fr. *a* and *d* part of that decree or another decree (see discussion of those fragments below).

⁵ It is hard for me to imagine that this fragment could be reconstructed on something as short as a 35-letter line; the references to Lemnos and the Peloponnesians suggest a fairly complex text.

⁶ Fr. *c* was also printed on its own as a different inscription as no. 102, with different readings.

⁷ WILHELM 1898, 472; WADE-GERY 1931.

⁸ These are originally the observations of Homer THOMPSON, cited by WADE-GERY 1931, 311–312. BRIDGES 1980, 185–186, also discusses the evidence of the back of the stone, and points to a shared fractural pattern in fragments *c* and *a*; see his excellent photographs. Autopsy

and *d* from *c* on the basis of letter-forms, punctuation, and the fact that the back of the stele is not original.⁹ Autopsy of the stone confirms that the fragments should be associated; although letter-shapes may occasionally differ, they never do so drastically, and letter-size is overall consistent throughout the four fragments, as is the size of the *stoichoi*.¹⁰ I now turn to fragment *c*, my focus here; the fragments of the strategic list will be discussed at the end of this paper.

MERITT'S restorations (ATL II D 18, IG I³ 48, M-L 56; cf. Staatsverträge II 159):

Στοιχ. 35 [-----δρ]- 15
 [άσο και ἐρῶ και βολεύσο τῶι δέμοι τῶι Ἀθена]-
 [ιον ἡό τι ἄν δύνομαι καλόν κ]αὶ ἀγαθόν, [οὐδὲ ἀ]-
 [ποστέσομαι ἀπὸ τῶ δέμο τῶ Ἀ]θенаίον οὔτε λ[ό]-
 [γοι οὔτε ἔργοι οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῶν] χουμάχον τῶν Ἀ-
 [θенаίον, και ἔσομαι πιστὸς τ]ῶι δέμοι τῶι Ἀθ- 20
 [енаίον· Ἀθенаίος δ' ὁμόσαι· δρ]άσο και ἐρῶ και
 [βολεύσο καλόν τῶι δέμοι τῶι] Σαμίον ἡό τι ἄν
 [δύνομαι και ἐπιμελέσομαι Σα]μίον κατὰ ἡὰ[ἡ]-
 [ομολόγησαν ἡοι στρατεγοὶ ἡοι] Ἀθенаίον [κα]-
 [ι ἡοι ἄρχοντες ἡοι Σαμίον· Καλλι]κράτε[ς εἶπ]- 25
 [ε (IG I³ 48.15–26)

Lines 15–17: The *δύνομαι* clause is not strictly parallel with the corresponding reciprocal clause in the second oath (21–23), as usual in reciprocal oaths (see below). Given the state of our text, the normal parallel clauses of reciprocal oaths are possible, but the restorations must be changed and the line lengthened, if this is to be achieved.

Line 17, καλόν κ]αὶ ἀγαθόν: Unparalleled in fifth-century literature and inscriptions; it is to the best of our knowledge a fourth-century phrase.¹¹ H. WANKEL would prefer simply *ἀγαθόν* alone, but FORNARA argues that such an adverb is usually part of a list, and that a phrase like *δίκαιον και ἀγαθόν*, which would require two more letter spaces, would suit better.¹² ATL restores *καλόν* before *ἀγαθόν*, but *-αι ἀγαθόν* is not the end of a list: in all instances of *-αι ἀγαθόν* on stone, the *-αι* belongs to a verb, almost always a form of *δύνομαι*. *ἀγαθόν* is also always first in such a list of abstract qualities.

of the fragments in the Epigraphical Museum confirms the grooved back. BRIDGES 1980, 186, also points to «a greyish, sugary streak» common to fragments *c* and *a*, which I also note from autopsy.

⁹ FORNARA 1979, 17; but cf. WADE-GERY 1931, 312 n. 1; BRIDGES 1980, 185–186 for responses to FORNARA.

¹⁰ Cf. IG I³ 48 for exact measurements.

¹¹ WANKEL 1974, 250–251. The only other fifth-century instance of the phrase is also completely restored to the regulations for Kolophon (IG I³ 37.44).

¹² WANKEL 1974, 253; FORNARA 1979, 16.

Line 17: A. S. HENRY notes that in lines 17–18 the restoration [οὐδὲ ἄ][πιστέσομαι] is improper negative coordination; it should be *καὶ οὐκ ἀποστέσομαι*.¹³

Line 18: The lambda of λ[όγος] should be dotted. On the stone itself, I see in this *stoichos* a stroke sloping up from the bottom left of the *stoichos* to where the stone breaks on the right. The stroke crosses almost the full *stoichos*. On the right side of the *stoichos*, I see a faint mark sloping up from just outside the lower right corner of the *stoichos* to the middle of the *stoichos*, where it would be at the proper angle to intersect with the other stroke, although any intersection is not preserved on the stone.¹⁴ The possibility of a different reading may exist here. MERITT read *lambda*, which is epigraphically possible but hardly secure.

Line 20: AS FÖRNARA notes, we would expect the noun χσύμμαχος with ἔσομαι πιστός, which would require nine more letters.¹⁵ Otherwise, there is no referent for πιστός.

Line 21: FÖRNARA notes that the oath formula Ἀθηναῖος δ' ὁμόσαι should include a phrase like *κατὰ τάδε*, which would require eight more letters.¹⁶

Line 23: If the restoration [ἐπιμελέσομαι] is correct, it would be the only instance of the verb in an oath (all other extant occurrences of this verb are part of the decree proper).

HILLER's restorations (IG I² 50; cf. IG I² 102):

Στοιχ. 44 – – κατὰ τάδε Σαμῖος ὄμ]- 20
 [όσαι· δράσο και ἐρῶ και βολεύσο καιὼν και ἄ[γ]αθὸ[ν ἠό, τι ἄ]-
 [ν δύνομαι παντὶ σθένει τοῖ δέμοι τοῖ Α]θηναίων, οὐ[δ' ἀπο]-
 [στέσομαι τὸ δέμο τὸ Ἀθηναίον οὐδὲ τὸν] χσυμμάχων τὸν Α-
 [θηναίον, και χσύμμαχος ἔσομαι πιστὸς τ]οῖ δέμοι τοῖ Αθ-
 [εναίον. Ἀθηναῖος δὲ ὁμόσαι κατὰ τάδε· δρ]άσο και ἐρῶ και 25
 [βολεύσο καιὼν και ἀγαθὸν τοῖ δέμοι τοῖ] Σαμῖον ἠό, τι ἄν
 [δύνομαι παντὶ σθένει¹³..... Σα]μῖον κατὰ ἡα[.] (IG I² 50.20–27)

Lines 22, 27, παντὶ σθένει: παντὶ σθένει in the promise «I shall act and speak and give good counsel as best I can with all my might to the people of Athens» is unparalleled; παντὶ σθένει does occur in oaths, but only in promises of military assistance, and it is not epigraphically attested before the fourth century.¹⁷

¹³ HENRY 1977, 156. MERITT 1984, 131, dismisses HENRY's argument without discussion.

¹⁴ I also see this second sloping mark in three of the four squeezes of fragment *c* in the Meritt Collection at the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin. The squeezes at the Aleshire Center at Berkeley are ambiguous, as are the CSAD squeezes online (<http://www.csad.ox.ac.uk/CSAD/Images/200/Image216.html>). I thank R. STROUD for checking the Aleshire squeezes for me.

¹⁵ FÖRNARA 1979, 16.

¹⁶ FÖRNARA 1979, 16.

¹⁷ Cf. MEIGGS-LEWIS, Add. 62 bis 19 (I date this to the fourth century; see BOLMARCICH 2008 for discussion and bibliography); Staatsverträge II 223.6, 224.5, 8, 248.27–28, 29, 257.51,

The oath restored in the IG I² version is fuller and more satisfactory than that in the ATL/IG I³ edition. The clause of acting, speaking, and giving good counsel that is common to both oaths is reciprocal, unlike the same clause in ATL/IG I³ 48.15–17, 21–23 (see above), although the clause in IG I³ still does not follow the same order of clauses in both instances. Πιστός in line 24 has χσύμμαχος to modify, and the Athenians in line 25 are swearing to terms (κατὰ τάδε), not simply swearing. The IG I² version of the oath also incorporates more standard features of oaths in Athenian imperial decrees than the ATL restorations (see below).

Every note above on IG I³ 48, the first version of the text given, suggests that a longer line is desirable for grammatical reasons or on the basis of epigraphic practice. WADE-GERY believed that the line-length of the inscription as a whole could not be longer than 35 letters, because he thought this was the maximum space required for a list of ten generals in *fr. a* and *d* and their tribes (the generals are not identified by patronymic and/or demotic, as usual).¹⁸ Yet left to itself, fragment *c* suggests a line with a number of letters in the mid- to upper 40's, perhaps even longer: for instance, lines 22–24 of the text of IG I² 50, οὐ[δ' ἀπο]||[στέσομαι τὸ δέμο τὸ Ἀθηναίων οὐδὲ τὸν] χσύμμαχον τὸν Ἀ[[θηναίων, is a very natural restoration (based on other imperial decrees, see below) for what survives on the stone, and is 44 letters long. Likewise, lines 24–25 of IG I² 50, Ἀθ[[εναίων. Ἀθηναίος δὲ ὁμόσαι κατὰ τάδε· δρ]άσο και ἐρῶ και, is again a very natural restoration of 44 letters given what survives on the stone.

Yet on other grounds the oath-clauses are still not satisfactory as restored in any version. In both restorations, they are simply too short. The six-line Samian oath with a 35-letter line is significantly shorter than almost any other sworn by other Athenian subjects to Athens. The 32-letter line of the regulations for Chalcis has an oath of 12 lines (IG I³ 40.21–32), while the non-stoichedon regulations for Kolophon and Eretria have oaths of 14 and 7 lines, respectively, with the Kolophon inscription ranging from 37–41 letters per line and the Eretria inscription ranging from 33–36 letters per line; both inscriptions break off before the oath is complete (IG I³ 37.43–56, 39.6–12), so there is no way to determine the ultimate length of the oath. Only the oath in the second Erythrai Decree, at 4 lines long with 47 letter-spaces per line, is shorter than the Samian oath (IG I³ 15.39–42), but the non-stoichedon first Erythrai Decree had an oath of at least 12 lines (with 44–49 letters per line), sworn by the βουλή (IG I³ 14.21–32, possibly much longer) and this fact might have allowed the oath in the second decree to be shorter, as a subsequent oath,¹⁹ or as an oath perhaps of the Erythraian δῆμος.

263.4–5, 9–10, 280.17, [22], 23, 290. 28, 29, 34, 307.7–8, [13], 309.41, 322.16, 27. The phrase does occur in the reported fifth-century epigraphic record (Thuc. 5.23.3), but not on stone.

¹⁸ WADE-GERY 1931, 310–311. For the typical use of patronymics and demotics with strategic names, see, e.g., IG I³ 364.8–9 (with demotics) and 370.20–21 (with patronymics and demotics).

¹⁹ See discussion at MEIGGS – LEWIS no. 40, and HIGHBY 1936, 33–35.

These parallels all suggest that the line-length in the Samian inscription must be longer, since oaths in the imperial decrees tend to incorporate certain standard features and formulae. Altered or missing from the Samian oath as currently restored are several standard clauses in oaths for Athenian subjects. Such oaths (excluding the present inscription) tend to take the following form and order:

- 1) (if present) a clause promising good counsel to the Athenians, their allies, and the other party to the treaty, or a combination thereof (IG I³ 14.21–23, 37.43–44, 89.27);
- 2) a clause promising not to revolt from the Athenians and/or their allies (IG I³ 14.23–24, 15.40–41);
 - a. with the provision «neither in word nor in deed» (IG I³ 37.46–47)
 - b. with the provision «and not by any trick nor device at all, neither in word nor in deed» (IG I³ 39.7–9, 40.21–24)
- 3) a clause promising not to trust in anyone but the Athenians (IG I³ 14.24–25, 15.41–42), or not to trust in a rebel (IG I³ 37.47, 39.9–10, 40.24); and
- 4) other clauses specific to the situation in which Athens and the ally might find themselves.

There is no room for provision 2b in the current restorations, although it is not necessary; for provision 3, is «I shall be trustworthy to the Athenians» a sufficient replacement, especially without a noun for «trustworthy» to modify? Nor are there (apparently) any individualized clauses specific to the Samian situation, as in 4. Is it likely that all of these clauses have been left out? No. The Samian oath as restored is simply too short and truncated.

44–35–?:

Key to the line length is IG I³, line 21: Ἀθ[εναίων· Ἀθηναίος δ' ὁμόσαι· δρ]ἄσο καὶ ἐρῶ καὶ ... The final six letters of Ἀθηναίων must occupy the first six letters of the line; ἄσο καὶ ἐρῶ καὶ occupies the last twelve, with δρ- extending the phrase to the last fourteen letter-spaces. On the 35-letter line reconstruction, this leaves only fifteen letters to reconstruct who swore this oath. κατὰ τὰδε is almost certainly part of such a clause (or at the very least τὰδε).²⁰ Also necessary is a form of «to swear», and the shortest possible version would be ὁμόσαι. Δέ is also needed as a conjunction. These three words or phrases comprise sixteen letters – one more than WADE-GERY's 35-letter line will permit. (An elided δ' would fit the space exactly.) But this leaves no room for the subject of the clause, the swearers of the oath. This suggests that the line-length proposed by WADE-GERY is incorrect. Determining the correct length of line, then, may depend upon successfully identifying who swore the second oath in the document. There are several possibilities for this group: the most likely are the Athenians

²⁰ κατὰ τὰδε: IG I³ 39.[6], 40.3, 21, 53.12–13, 75.[6, 21], 76.16, IG II² 230.5. τὰδε: IG I³ 14.21, 15.39–40. IG I³ 89.27 does seem to introduce an oath clause with δέ alone, but the clause is incomplete.

or some subset of Samians, especially given the nature of democratic and oligarchic strife on Samos at this time.²¹ To include either of these groups as the swearers of the second oath, the line-length must be at least 44 letters long (TEN BOΛEN and AΘE-NAIOΣ are each eight letters long; TEN BOΛEN TEN ΣAMION or TEN BOΛEN TEN AΘENAION *vel sim.* would require even more space).

The oath «I shall act and I shall speak and I shall give counsel ...» is rare in the epigraphic and literary record, in both full and partial versions. It occurs in the regulations for Kolophon (IG I³ 37.43–44), where it is sworn by all Kolophonians to Athens; in the settlement with the rebellious Perdiccas I of Macedon (IG I³ 89.27), where context is impossible to determine but it may have been sworn by all Macedonians; in the Erythrai Decree (IG I³ 14.21–23), where it is sworn by the Erythraian βουλή to Athens; and at Arist. Pol. 1310a9–11, where it is presented in the negative as an oath sworn by oligarchs against the δῆμος. It is also part of the bouleutic oath of Athens.²² Based on these examples, either the oath is a group (Athenian) oath, or it is sworn by a subset of the Samian population to Athens. The Athenians seem unlikely to have sworn it, for several reasons, most thoroughly explored by FORNARA, who pointed out that «the Athenians swore» in the text of the document has had to be completely restored; he argues that this was not an Athenian oath but an oath sworn by the Samian βουλή, following an oath by the Samian δῆμος to Athens.²³ In place of MERITT's restoration Ἀθηναίος δ' ὁμόσαι, he offers ὁμόσαι δὲ τὴν βολὴν κατὰ τὰδε, based on the Erythrai Decree (IG I³ 14.21), which suits his argument for a return to the 44-letter line of IG I².²⁴

I concur that the second oath in the document is not one that the Athenians swore to the Samians. I would first add to FORNARA's arguments that the Athenian oath as currently restored is in an odd position in the document: it comes second, after the Samian oath. In almost no other fifth- or fourth-century Athenian treaty is it the case that the Athenian oath comes second,²⁵ and it is logical that the Athenian text of a treaty would put the Athenian oath first. The context of the oath has also long puzzled scholars; it is, simply put, unparalleled in the Athenian imperial decrees. Her gener-

²¹ See OSTWALD 1993. The question of the nature of the government on Samos at this time is much fraught; see OSTWALD 1993 for the most recent bibliography, and SHIPLEY 1987, 103–122 for a summary of the historical events.

²² RHODES 1972, 194.

²³ FORNARA 1979, 17–18, followed only by OSTWALD 1993.

²⁴ FORNARA 1979, 18.

²⁵ In the fifth century, Athenian oaths that are first in a treaty-text can be found at IG I³ 40.3–14, 53.10–16, 54.20–23, 76.11–16; Thuc. 5.23.1, 47.4. In the fourth century, cf. Staatsverträge II 223.4–7, 224.4–6, 248.26–30, 263.16–26, 293.16–26, 303.9–18. There are two fourth-century exceptions: Staatsverträge II 280.12–18, a treaty between Athens and Dionysius I of Syracuse, and 290.25–30, a treaty between Athens and the Arcadian League. The federal nature of the first treaty and the personal nature of the second (it was made to protect Dionysius and not Syracuse) may explain these aberrations.

osity in this oath – swearing things very similar to those the Samians swore – is inexplicable. Was it the consequence of a desire to protect the Samian democrats? Did it reflect a softening of imperial policy?²⁶ While it is true that Samos is thought to have had a «special relationship» with Athens in the fifth century,²⁷ it did not necessarily put her on an equal footing with Athens: «It did not matter how polite the diplomatic phraseology used. The fact remains that the surrender of Samos was complete and unconditional.»²⁸ In that case, why should Athens even swear anything to Samos? In the six imperial decrees imposing regulations on a rebellious and subsequently defeated subject, she swore only one oath to a conquered subject for certain:²⁹ that to the Chalcidians. I offer a translation here:

«I shall not exile Chalcidians from Chalcis nor shall I devastate the city nor shall I deprive any private citizen of his rights nor shall I punish him with exile nor shall I imprison him nor shall I kill him nor shall I take property from anyone without trial without the Athenian people [in agreement], nor shall I have a vote taken without summons to court against either the commonality [Chalcidians] or any private citizen whatsoever, and when an embassy comes I shall introduce it to the Council and the People within ten days when I hold the prytany, as best I can. I shall guarantee this to the Chalcidians who obey the Athenian people.» (IG I³ 40.4–16)

The difference between this oath and the purported Athenian oath to the Samians is striking. The Athenians guaranteed the Chalcidians some very basic rights, largely freedom from different kinds of harm, direct or indirect. The Samians, on the other hand, are guaranteed some of the same things that they guarantee to Athens. This puts the two states on a footing of equality, hardly feasible when one state has just expended at least nine months – and possibly as many as sixteen generals and 239 total ships, as well as an enormous amount of money³⁰ – to subdue the other (Thuc. 1.115.3, 116.1–2, 117.2–3). As FORNARA writes, «[the Athenian oath] is an act of allegiance confirmed by oath setting the interests of another government on the same level as those of Athens itself It is a great deal to attribute to the Athenians, especially on the basis of mere restoration.»³¹

²⁶ Cf. KAGAN 1969, 176; MEIGGS 1972, 194, both of whom note the possibility of but sound doubtful about such a softening of Athenian imperial policy.

²⁷ See QUINN 1981, 10–23, 50–56, for the history of this assumption and the argument that the «special relationship» only came into being after the Samian War; lack of solid proof for it at the time of the Samian War means that it cannot be assumed to be the reason for the Athenians swearing an oath to the Samians in this document.

²⁸ MERITT 1984, 132.

²⁹ Cf. IG I³ 39.1–3, for the restoration of the final clauses of the oath to the Chalcidians restored to the contemporary regulations for Eretria.

³⁰ IG I³ 363 records expenditures of at least 1276T on the Samian Revolt, and probably more; see SAMONS 2000, 43–49, for a review of interpretations of the decree.

³¹ FORNARA 1979, 17–18.

To demonstrate further the feasibility and preferability of a longer line, I propose below (like WADE-GERY's original 35-letter-line restorations, *exempli gratia*) a restoration of 44 letters per line. I have left the name of the swearer of the second oath blank; the eight-letter gap will suit both those who believe this to be an Athenian oath and those who follow FORNARA's suggestion of the Samian βουλή. I stress that these restorations are for the purpose of further demonstrating the problems of the 35-letter line length only; I do not propose that they be accepted as definitive. On current evidence, I do not believe a satisfactory restoration of the regulations for Samos is possible; while we have a number of parts of tantalizingly familiar clauses on the remains of the stone, we do not have enough of the stone to judge what particular form those clauses took, what other clauses might have supplemented them, or even the width of the stone itself.

| | |
|--|---|
| [..... ²² <i>hóti</i> ἄν δύνομαι ἀγαθὸν [καὶ δι]- | 1 |
| [καιὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀποστέσομαι τὸ δέμο τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ οὔτε λ[ό]- | |
| [γοὶ οὔτε ἔργοι τρόποι οὐδενὶ οὐδὲ τῶν] χυμμάχων τῶν Ἀ- | |
| [θηναίῳ καὶ χσύμμαχος ἔσομαι πιστὸς τ]οῖ δέμοι τῷ Ἀθ- | |
| [εναίῳ. ¹⁴ δὲ κατὰ τὰδε· δρ]άσο καὶ ἐρῶ καὶ | 5 |
| [βουλευσο τῶν Ἀθηναίῳ τῷ δέμοι καὶ τῶν] Σαμίῳ <i>hóti</i> ἄν | |
| [δύνομαι ἀγαθὸν καὶ δίκαιον ... ⁸ ... Σα]μίῳ κατὰ <i>hà</i> [.] | |

*Lines 1–2, 6–7, [.....²²..... *hóti* ἄν δύνομαι ἀγαθὸν [καὶ δι]||[καιὸν and *hóti* ἄν|[δύνομαι ἀγαθὸν καὶ δίκαιον:* For a parallel (another clause promising good counsel, but in the superlative), see IG I³ 14.21–22, ἄριστ[α κα]||[ι] δ[ι]κα[ιότα]τα. For a quasi-parallel (in the superlative, and describing the behavior of an ally) see IG I³ 40.28–29, ἄριστος καὶ δικαιοτάτος. Both of these parallels use the verb δύνομαι. Parallels in other types of classical inscriptions are IG I³ 164.20 and IG II² 1254.2 and 4, as well as SEG 46.163.4, all honorary inscriptions; cf. also Staatsverträge II 287.17, a non-Athenian treaty between Keos and Histiaea.

Line 3, τρόποι οὐδενί occurs in the negative sense in one classical non-Athenian treaty, IG XII 5.109, and on the Stele of Aristoteles, τρόπων μηθενί, IG II² 43.40–41. A similar phrase occurs in a positive sense in the reported epigraphic record at Thuc. 5.47.3 and 4, and has been restored at IG I³ 83.[9], [14], 118.[11]. It occurs as well in later diplomatic documents in the negative: with οὐδενί, IG II² 1135.c.13/IC 1.18.9.c.13, IG XII 6.1.22; with μηθενί, FD III 1.362+4.354, IG XII 3.330.47.

Line 6: On the parallel of the Erythrai Decree, IG I³ 14.22, Ἐρυθραίων τῷ πλέθει καὶ Ἀθηναίων.

Line 7: There are a number of possibilities after κατὰ *hà*[.]. After that, no certain restorations are possible. The eight-letter gap could be filled with a verb introducing the next clause, perhaps, depending on the identity of the swearer of the oath, something like καὶ ἄρξω, or perhaps begins the next clause by naming a group of Samian magistrates: *hαι* ἀρχαί, for instance.

These restorations are not definitive, and I do not propose that they represent completely accurately what the Samian decree actually said. I do believe that they illustrate

the feasibility and desirability of a line longer than 35 letters. I have based my line-length on lines 2, 4, and 6, which seem to my mind to be very natural restorations of the text preserved on the stone. A longer line, one of 47 letters,³² or in the 50's or 60's, might also be possible.

The List of Generals

The Samian decree also includes fragments *a* and *d*, a strategic list. Since these fragments are responsible for the proposal and adoption of the 35-letter line length, a few remarks on this list are necessary. The ATL text reads:

| | | |
|-----------|---|-------------|
| Στοιχ. 35 | [ἰ ἡοὶ ἄρχοντες ἡοὶ Σαμίον· Καλλι]κράτε[ς εἶπ]- | 25 |
| <i>c</i> | [ε· -----]λ[... ⁶ ...] | |
| | <i>lacuna (14 lines)</i> | |
| <i>d</i> | [στ]ρατεγ[οὶ ὄμνουν τὸν ἡόρκον· Σοκράτες Ἐρε]- | 41 |
| | χθείδος· Δεμ[οκλείδης Αἰγείδος· Φορμίον Πα]- | |
| | νδιονίδος· Χ[..... ¹⁰ ... Λεοντίδος· Περικλ]- | |
| | ἔς· Γλαύκον Ἀ[καμαντίδος· Καλλ]{[στρατος Οἰ]- | 45 <i>a</i> |
| | [ν]εΐδος· Χῤε[νοφῶν Κεκροπίδος]· Τλεμπ[όλεμος] | |
| | [Αἰαντίδος· ... Ἄντιοχίδος]· βολὲ ἔρχε Ἄθ[εν]- | |
| | [αίοις ἡεὶ ⁸ ... πρῶτ]ος ἐγραμμάτευε Ῥα- | |
| | [μνόσιος <i>vacat</i>] <i>vacat</i> | |

On the basis of [στ]ρατεγ[οὶ and the name Glaukon,³³ listed by Androtion (FGrHist 324 F 38) as a general serving against the Samians in 441/0,³⁴ the list has been taken to be entirely a list of generals. WADE-GERY made several assumptions before restoring this fragment of the inscription: 1) a list of generals could only be the board of one

³² A forty-seven letter line is also possible:

| | |
|--|---|
| [... ²² ... ἡότι ἄν δύνομ]αι ἀ[γ]αθὸν [καὶ δι]- | 1 |
| [καιον καὶ οὐκ ἀποστέσομαι ἀπὸ τὸ δέμο τὸ Ἀ]θναίων οὔτε λ[ό]- | |
| [γοι οὔτε ἔργοι τρόποι οὐδενὶ οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τὸν] χυμμάχον τὸν Ἀ- | |
| [θναίων καὶ χυμμάχος ἀεὶ ἔσομαι πιστὸς τ]οὶ δέμοι τῶι Ἀθ- | |
| [εναίων. [17] δὲ κατὰ τάδε· δρ]άσο καὶ ἐρῶ καὶ | 5 |
| [βουλευσο ... ²⁸ ... Σαμίον ἡότι ἄν | |
| [δύνομαι ἀγαθὸν καὶ δίκαιον .. ¹¹ .. Σα]μίον κατὰ ἡὰ[.] | |

4, ἀεὶ: Staatsverträge II 120.4–5, 159.20; cf. IG I³ 53.12 and 15, and 54.22 and 26. 7, *hoi* ἄρχοντες or *hai* ἀρχαὶ *hai* both fit the 11-letter gap.

³³ No other name on the list can be restored with absolute certainty as a general's name. -ἔς may well be Pericles; Χῤε- I cannot see on the stone at all, but it is clear in MERITT's squeeze in the Meritt Collection at the Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin. Δεμ- cannot be identified, and Τλεμπ-, while identified by Thucydides as one of the leaders of reinforcements to Samos in 440/39 (1.117.2), is not specifically identified by him as a general.

³⁴ There are a number of controversies with Androtion's list, primarily the fact that it names eleven generals, not ten. See HARDING 1994, 143–148 for a full discussion with bibliography.

year; 2) this board, since it does not accord with the names we have from the boards of 441/0 and 440/39, must be the board of 439/8; 3) this board swore the Athenian oath to the Samians; 4) the list, since a board of generals would list no more than ten generals,³⁵ could not have a line-length of more than 35 letters; and 5) the rest of the decree must then also have a 35-letter line. His 35-letter line only allows for nine tribes, however, meaning that one tribe had two generals in the year listed;³⁶ while this objection is answered in line 46, since the -ε̃ς before Glaukon's name must be the name of another general from the same tribe, the possibility of a longer line was not allowed for.

I note here several problems with the current restorations of the generals' list:

Line 45: According to LGPN, Kallisstratos with a double *sigma* is not known as an Attic name or variant spelling outside of this instance. The *sigma* was doubled in ATL II D 18 to avoid WADE-GERY's even less satisfactory initial suggestion in the same line of HOINEIΔΟΣ as an alternative spelling of the tribal name.³⁷ Another name is possible; Kallistratos was only added to the list on the strength of Androtion's testimony. The ι may be part of a personal name, a tribal name, or another word entirely. The editors of ATL created a link between fragments *a* and *d* on the basis of the ι: they linked line 1 of fragment *a* with the next-to-last line of fragment *d*, thus making the -ι part of Kallistratos of Oineis' name; since Tlempolemos is in line 2 of fragment *a* and must be the last or next-to-last name on the list, because the following line has a postscript, this more or less dictated that one tribe had to be left off the list. But the upright stroke in line 45 (either *tau*, *upsilon*, or *iota*)³⁸ does not have to be part of the name of Kallistratos of Oineis; if it is not, and if there is also no reason for the fragments to share this particular line, the position of fr. *a* could be moved down a line (or even further)³⁹ and the upright stroke could be part of the tribal name Kekrops or one of its generals, ensuring that this is a list of more than ten names, generals or otherwise.

Line 46: The ATL editors read -ος before Tlempolemos, instead of the -ες printed by IG I². LOLLING, the IG I copyist (suppl. 557), saw a horizontal stroke at the bottom of the *stoichos* before the *sigma* preceding Tlempolemos; HILLER in IG I² 50 accordingly

³⁵ See WADE-GERY 1931, 310, for the math here. This also led to his link of the next-to-last line of fragment *d* with the first line of fragment *a*, which itself led to further truncation of the list (the tribe Hippothontis had to be left out).

³⁶ There is debate over whether there was indeed one general per tribe, as [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 22.2 states; see FORNARA 1971, 19–27, RHODES 1981 *ad loc.*, and HAMEL 1998, 85–87.

³⁷ WADE-GERY 1931, 311.

³⁸ Or perhaps *pi*; the text of LOLLING in IG I suppl. 557 noted a second stroke in this line, and printed it as though it were a *pi*. Autopsy of the stone confirms the presence of the first upright stroke; the stone has suffered wear since LOLLING copied it, and any second stroke is no longer visible. A Π would fit Κεχρο]π[ιδος, and also a number of potential generals' names. Even *pi* or *iota* alone in these two spaces could be part of the genitive of Kekropis; there is nothing that says the upright letter must be a part of the name of the general from Oineis, unless like WADE-GERY one wishes to make this a ten-general list.

³⁹ Cf. also BRIDGES 1980, 187, on moving the «join» down a line.

printed a dotted *epsilon*. J. BRESLIN and BRIDGES both argue for a name ending in *-εσ* here, against WADE-GERY, who arbitrarily decreed the letter to be *omicron*.⁴⁰ I also see the beginnings of this horizontal stroke at the edge of the stone at the bottom of the *stoichos* before *sigma*, and absolutely nothing that indicates an *omicron*. In all the fragments of the decree in which ΟΣ occur together, the space between the outer curve of the *omicron* and the inner center angle of the *sigma* is consistently 1 cm; that measurement, applied here, shows only blank space. WADE-GERY's reading meant that the name before Tlempolemos was not that of another general but a tribe,⁴¹ and a tribal name was needed in order to preserve his argument for a single board of generals and a 35-letter line (otherwise there would have been double representation in two tribes).

Line 47: βολὲ ἔρχε is unparalleled in Greek inscriptions. Ἄθ[εν] is probably not correct: the marks are no longer visible on the stone, but WILHELM and LOLLING both saw the bottom of an upright stroke and a curved stroke; WILHELM printed ho, LOLLING the genitive τῶν or τοῦ. The lack of an article for βολέ is unusual.⁴² The meaning of the phrase is also elusive: the βουλή was in office? I wish to float the possibility that this βουλή may not have been the Athenian βουλή but the Samian βουλή.⁴³

There are a few general problems with the placement of the generals' list on the stone as well. BRIDGES argues strongly for the elimination of the 14-line lacuna between *c* and *d*, pointing out physical features of the stone (a gray streak in both fragments and the pattern of breakage) that suggest the two fragments were very closely related. His reconstruction is also satisfying in that the *-κρατε-* of line 25 becomes part of the name of the general for Erechtheis, Sokrates. It also means that there is no place for a list of Samian officials, which we might expect if this was a list of oath-swearers. While I appreciate the strength of BRIDGES's argument, especially the point that the 14-line lacuna of ATL may be unnecessary, the fragments may not join as closely as he posits: his pattern of breakage could extend a few lines further down than he has it, depending on the width of the stone, and it should be noted that the gray streaks in fragments *c* and *a* cannot possibly be directly linked, since the first is nearer the right lateral margin than the second, and it slants down to the right, while the second slants down to the left. Some space may need to be allowed between the fragments to accommodate the different gray streaks.

⁴⁰ BRESLIN 1980, 105–106; BRIDGES 1980, 185, 187, with photograph; WADE-GERY 1931, 310 (and cf. MERITT 1984, 124).

⁴¹ Or possibly another general's name ending in *-οσ*.

⁴² See WADE-GERY 1931, 313, on the phrase.

⁴³ LURIA 1927, 267–268, argues that the phrase indicates anti-aristocratic sentiments; I would think it indicated the opposite.

The question remains, what was this list? The evidence of Androtion (FGrHist 324 F 38), confused as it is, indicates that it cannot be the board of generals of 441/40. The evidence of Thucydides (1.117.2) suggests that it cannot be the board of 440/39 (the year we would also expect to be the natural date of this inscription).⁴⁴ ATL very specifically defined the list as the board of generals of 439/38 (for which there is no evidence outside of this inscription), who agreed to the pact with the Samians, and at the same time argued that – although it was not common for generals to swear treaty-oaths in Athenian treaties and unexpected for all ten generals to do so, unless all were in the field against Samos,⁴⁵ and it was even more unusual for generals swearing to a treaty to be named⁴⁶ – they swore the Athenian oath in the document, identified by them as the second oath in fragment c.

But other possibilities exist for the names on this list. BRIDGES names a few: «Our list may contain names both of generals and of other officers such as taxiarchs; perhaps there are separate lists together on the stone. The names could belong to generals of more than one year, incorporating both those who handled the Revolt from the beginning and those who succeeded them.»⁴⁷ More possibilities include a list of those swearing to the treaty-oaths (assuming an Athenian oath preceding the Samian oath). It is likely that this list has more than generals on it; the longer lines in the 40's that I propose above would lengthen the list to include probably 17–21 names total (the numbers depend on whether or not the «join» of ATL is pushed down by a line).

Strategic lists on stone are very rare, making this list even less likely to be such. The list could very well be divided into groups of officials who had fought against the Samians; different officials tend to be marked out on such lists (IG II² 102.17, 104.1), so on this interpretation somewhere in the list there would have to be such a division. Since we know that Glaucón was a general, and we do not know for certain that Tlempolemos was, the division might fall somewhere between those two names. Note that after Οἱ|[v]εῖδος (lines 44–45), we do not have any certain tribal names, unless Κεχρο]π[ιδος can be restored (see above). Tribes might have been given for the generals alone (whose list was then succeeded by a list of other officials), and given the confusion between the accounts of Androtion and Thucydides, we cannot be sure that any generals who served against the Samians were from tribes VII–X.⁴⁸ The generals whom we can place on Samos for certain independently of Androtion's evidence are

⁴⁴ On the dating, see FORNARA 1979, with summary of previous arguments, and the response of MERITT 1984.

⁴⁵ Also unlikely; the only known instance in Athenian history of all ten generals serving together is at Marathon. If all ten generals were at Samos, who would guard the frontiers of Attica, lead Athenian troops in suppressing the Byzantian revolt, or serve in any other trouble-spots that year?

⁴⁶ See MOSLEY 1961 on the identities of officials likely to swear treaties in classical Greece.

⁴⁷ BRIDGES 1980, 187.

⁴⁸ Nor do we know for certain if tribes I–VI were all included on the list: Leontios and Aigeios do not survive on the stone at all.

from tribes V (Pericles) and II (Sophocles),⁴⁹ although there were undoubtedly more. There might then, be a few generals' names, and then other types of officials. This would explain the presence of another personal name before Tlempolemos.

If our list holds seventeen names, that suggests that it may indeed be a list of those who swore to these treaty terms.⁵⁰ Although there was no fixed number of swearers, the Peace of Nicias and the Spartan-Athenian alliance of 421 both list 17 oath-swearers for each side (Thuc. 5.19.2, 24); the Athenian group includes three generals and two former generals, and our list might have similar representatives. These could be organized by tribe (Thuc. 5.19.2, 24.1).⁵¹ Those who swore might well include some, but not all, of the generals or other officials who had led the effort against the Samians. While I do not believe that the second oath in fragment *c* is an Athenian oath, I do believe that an Athenian oath might well have come before the text on fragment *c*, as Athenian oaths occur also in that position in the Chalcis Decree (IG I³ 40.4–16) and perhaps the Eretria Decree (IG I³ 39.1–3, heavily restored). There is no corresponding list of Samian oath-swearers, however, which might not be expected if indeed all Samians swore the oath. (The lists of names should follow the order of the oaths: Athenians first, Samians second, the swearers of the second oath on *c* third, if necessary.) This is impossible, given where the text on the stone ends, unless the βολέ of line 46 officially records that the Samian βουλή swore an oath.

The point here is that this list cannot on present evidence be satisfactorily restored. While it offers several lines that must seem to be a certain length, those lines only seem that way because of the assumptions made that the names on this list represent a single board of ten generals, which resulted in a shorter line length, appropriate for a list of ten names. Fragment *c* also has lines that must be a minimum length, and that minimum is 44 letters. We have no parallels for the strategic list, but we do have a number of parallels for the oaths sworn by defeated allies in imperial decrees. Fragment *c* clearly falls within the tradition of those oaths, and its needs in terms of restoration should have primacy over fragments *a* and *d* and the uncertain nature of the list they preserve.

⁴⁹ Sophocles' presence is not without controversy: see Hypoth. ad Ant. 1.15–17; Vita Sophoclis 9; Athen. 603f 1–2; EHRENBERG 1954, 117–119; KAGAN 1969, 175–176; R. G. LEWIS 1988; WOODBURY 1970.

⁵⁰ Not to be confused with the members of an embassy to the Samians, since embassies rarely had more than ten men; see MOSLEY 1965, 255–266, and 1973, 55–62. On Athenian commissions of seventeen, see OLIVER 1951, who argues that «[t]he curious number seventeen became, precisely at Athens, a traditional number for the representation of parties making peace or alliance.» This is probably going a little far (see the objections of ANDREWES – LEWIS 1957, 177), but OLIVER is correct that the number seventeen is known from three treaties: Thuc. 5.19.2, 5.24; IG II² 40.1; and cf. Plat. Leg. 761e.

⁵¹ On this, see HORNBLOWER *ad loc.*; ANDREWES – LEWIS 1957; OLIVER 1951.

Historical Reverberations

This document is key to Athenian imperial studies in several ways. The second oath, when it is assumed to be sworn by Athens, suggests both a close, «special» relationship between Athens and Samos, and the fact that the oath is taken to the Samian δῆμος suggests that Athens established a democracy at Samos in 440/39. The same oath also suggests that towards the end of the Pentecontaetia period, Athens was not treating her allies (or not all of them) with the previously heavy hand of the 440's.

If the Athenians did not swear the second oath, these three conclusions must all change. The nature of the «special relationship» between Athens and Samos has already been questioned by T. J. QUINN, who concludes that there is no evidence for such closeness until the Samians showed extreme loyalty to the Athenian cause after the disasters at Syracuse and Aegospotami.⁵² There would also have been no marked change in Athenian treatment of her allies if they did not swear a comparatively lenient oath to the Samians.

The second conclusion, that this oath supports the idea that Athens established a democracy at Samos, is also more dubious now; additionally, insofar as this document has been taken to indicate a widespread Athenian practice of establishing democracies in allied states, this must also be questioned. At the beginning of the revolt, Thucydides notes that some private citizens (ἄνδρες ἰδιῶται, 1.115.2) on Samos wished to change the government. The first Athenian expedition there resulted in the imposition of a democracy (δημοκρατίαν, Thuc. 1.115.3; cf. Plut. Per. 25), the only use of the word in the entire Samian account. This has been taken to mean that the private citizens wanted a democracy. The democracy was then overthrown (1.115.5), and neither Thucydides nor Plut. Per. 28 mention another change from oligarchy to democracy after the second Athenian expedition to Samos, although Diod. Sic. 12.28.4, a confused passage, does. At Thuc. 8.21, the δῆμος returns to power in Samos, replacing the δυνατοί. D. W. BRADEEN observes that all this, taken together, «would imply no change in the surrendering government, which was an oligarchy».⁵³ Yet there is much debate in the scholarship over whether the Athenians established democracy twice on Samos, and, if so, whether perhaps an oligarchy had been briefly established at Samos after the Sicilian disaster, and these are the δυνατοί referred to at Thuc. 8.21.⁵⁴ Thucydides pays little attention to terms like «democrat» and «oligarch» in

⁵² QUINN 1981, 10–23.

⁵³ BRADEEN 1960, 265 n. 48.

⁵⁴ For a democracy imposed on Samos after the revolt: ATL III.151–153; BARRON 1966, 80–93 (cf. KRAAY 1976, 332–334); GALLO 2005; KAGAN 1969, 176; MEIGGS 1972, 192–193; PRANDI 1978. Those who argue for the establishment of a democracy, which was then at some point before 412 supplanted by an oligarchy, include ANDREWES, HCT 5.45; CARTLEDGE 1982, 260–261; and LEGON 1972, 154. If this were true, I think Thucydides would have made this explicit, the better to draw comparisons with the affair of the 400 at Athens in 411. SCHULLER 1981 believes that the 412 affair was an internal conflict in the democracy; but cf. Thuc. 8.63.3, which

his Samian narrative, compared to their frequent use elsewhere in passages like the Corcyraean *στάσις*; this suggests that he did not view the identity of the government on Samos as worth noting, or that democracy vs. oligarchy was not the issue at hand. I believe BRADEEN is correct to take the simplest view of Thucydides' account possible.

If the Athenians do not swear the second oath to the Samian *δῆμος*, this would suggest a democracy was not established after the revolt.⁵⁵ I would note that the history of political struggle in Samos in the sixth and fifth centuries BC is not one of democracy against oligarchy, but of pro-Persians against anti-Persians, and of aristocratic factionalism;⁵⁶ democracy and oligarchy do not enter into it. Polycrates of Samos medized (Hdt. 3.44–46), creating a resistance to his rule among the Samian aristocracy (Hdt. 3.46–47, 54–57),⁵⁷ and was succeeded by the aristocrat Maeandrios (Hdt. 3.142–146, 148);⁵⁸ his successor Syloson was installed by Darius (Hdt. 3.146–149), and Syloson's son Aiakes, tyrant from 514–499 and ca. 493–ca.480, supported Persia (Hdt. 6.13–14). At the Battle of Lade there was a split among the aristocrats who served as ship-captains, many deserting to Persia and only eleven remaining loyal to the Ionian cause (Hdt. 6.13–14). After Aiakes' presumed death, the pro-Persian tyrant Theomestor was installed by the Persians (Hdt. 8.85.3, 9.90). Samos was then liberated by an aristocratic, presumably anti-Persian party under Hegesistratos (Hdt. 9.90.1). This is the government that joined the Delian League and became a staunch, non-tributary ally of Athens, inviting her to take on the hegemony of the Delian League (Thuc. 1.95.1; Plut. Ar. 23) and later to move the treasury from Delos to Athens (Plut. Ar. 25). There is no indication that this was ever a democratic government;⁵⁹ it was simply a pro-Athenian, anti-Persian government.⁶⁰ Samos had an obvious interest in belonging to the Delian League in its role as an anti-Persian instrument;⁶¹ the Samian oligarchs or aristocrats would not have found membership onerous, as aristocrats in other allied

refers to an uprising against a Samian oligarchy. Those who believe that Athens allowed Samos to remain oligarchic after the first, failed imposition of a democracy include BRADEEN – MCGREGOR 1973, 120–121; FORNARA 1979; OSTWALD 1993; SHIPLEY 1987, 119–122; and WILL 1969.

⁵⁵ See WELWEI 1986, 188, who thinks *δῆμος* here may mean simply the Samian populace, not a political body.

⁵⁶ Sometimes related to the question of medizing (SHIPLEY 1987, 103–109, and esp. 112), but also perhaps over relations with Sparta (CARTLEDGE 1982; SHIPLEY 1987, 55, 57, 86; and *fr.* b).

⁵⁷ See MITCHELL 1975.

⁵⁸ On Maeandrios's anti-Persian goals but aristocratic ideals, MITCHELL 1975, 86.

⁵⁹ But see BARRON 1966, 80–93 and KRAAY 1976, 333, both of whom on the basis of numismatic evidence see democratic-oligarchic changes at Samos throughout the fifth century. I find both their accounts difficult to verify on historical grounds.

⁶⁰ Cf. SHIPLEY 1987, 109.

⁶¹ Cf. CARTLEDGE 1982, 260–261.

states (who had to shoulder the burden of tribute payment)⁶² did, since Samos was non-tributary, and Athens would have benefited immensely from having a stable ally on almost her very frontiers with Persia.⁶³

A close reading of the accounts of the Samian Revolt suggests that the question of Persia, not oligarchy⁶⁴ or democracy, might have played a major role. We do not know the political persuasion of the private Samians who sought out Athenian aid to change the government; we only assume they were democrats because that is the government that was installed,⁶⁵ and that assumption may well be correct. What we do know is that «some of the Samians» (τῶν δὲ Σαμίων ... τινες, Thuc. 1.115.4) – whether they had been the government or not is unspecified – fled to the mainland, sought help from the Persian satrap Pissouthnes, receiving seven hundred mercenaries (Thuc. 1.115.4–5), and returned to Samos, overthrowing the new democracy while Pericles was absent because of concerns over a possible attack by the Phoenician fleet in the service of Persia (Thuc. 1.116.3). These were presumably the later Samians of Anaea (Thuc. 3.19.2, 32.2, 4.75.1), who had Persian ties and harassed the island Samians and the Athenians, and who may have minted a coin with the Persian name Batis, perhaps a Persian official under Pissouthnes.⁶⁶ Given all these links with Persia, it is possible that the government of Samos suffered a split between pro- and anti-Persian factions at the time of the Samian War. The Athenian goal, then, was to expel the pro-Persian faction, which they twice did, and leave a government as stable as possible in its place. Their first attempt, a democracy, proved unsuitable, and may have been ill-judged given the aristocratic traditions on Samos, and so they may have allowed the Samians to return to their former oligarchic government, setting up a βουλή (as at Erythrai) that swore an oath of loyalty to the Samian δῆμος, much as that δῆμος swore an oath to the Athenians. Such an oath might have helped ensure that Samos preserved the civic harmony needed for a state so close to Persia. FORNARA's suggestion of the second oath in this document as an oath of a Samian βουλή, then, may well be right.

It has become a truism in Athenian Empire scholarship that Athens set up democracies among her allies. The Athenians may also have set up democracies at Erythrai and Kolophon; the latter reference has been restored (IG I³ 37.49),⁶⁷ and in

⁶² RHODES 2007, 35.

⁶³ Cf. [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 24.2, which refers to Samos, Lesbos, and Chios as the guards of Athens's empire.

⁶⁴ I am using «oligarchy» for convenience's sake; I suspect the government of Samos would be better described as aristocratic (cf. Diod. 12.27.3) or plutocratic (cf. SHIPLEY 1987, 120, 122), as the term γεωμόροι (Thuc. 8.21; cf. SHIPLEY 1987, 39–41) suggests.

⁶⁵ The war itself is «about Priene», which may suggest land ownership in the Samian peraea may have been an issue; see SHIPLEY 1987, 119–120.

⁶⁶ BARRON 1966, 92.

⁶⁷ An unlikely restoration, given that δημοκρατία in inscriptions is otherwise exclusively a fourth-century or Hellenistic word.

the Erythrai Decree there is an obvious effort to ensure that the government the decree establishes remains hostile to Persia (IG I³ 14.27). Parallels have been drawn previously between the language of the Samian and Erythraian decrees;⁶⁸ e.g., the two decrees are the only ones to involve oaths sworn not just to the Athenians but to the Athenians and their allies, suggesting a Delian League context for both: and what could be more characteristic of the Delian League than professed hostility to Persia?⁶⁹ Thuc. 1.19.1 presents an opposition between the Spartans, who established oligarchies in their allied states, and the Athenians who exacted tribute, both states acting to keep allies in line. This suggests that the Athenians did not make a habit of establishing democracies. Kolophon, the other possible democracy established by the Athenians was also troubled by internal division between medizers and non-medizers, as well as attacks by the Persians, as Samos and Erythrae may have been as well.

It is notable that the three states for which we have the best evidence for such a practice – Kolophon, Erythrai, and Samos – were all in Ionia, near Persia, and all had known problems with pro-Persian sympathizers. This decree does not suggest that the Athenians established a democracy at Samos from 439–412; it suggests that if they interfered in Samian affairs, they did so to establish a pro-Athenian and stable government, which may very well not have been a democracy. Nor did the Athenians give the Samians any special treatment in 440/39.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that: 1) the current restorations of the Athenian regulations for Samos are unsatisfactory on the grounds that they do not fit the larger pattern of allied oaths in Athenian decrees; 2) that, in particular, the length of line proposed by WADE-GERY and adopted by the editors of ATL and IG I³ is too short and truncated, since it depends on various assumptions made about fragments *a* and *d* of the decree and ignores the needs of fragment *c*; 3) that the minimum line-length of the decree is 44 letters and possibly much longer; and 4) that the current restorations and the assumptions that accompany them have caused several problems in Athenian imperial studies, among them the apparent leniency of the Athenians towards the Samians and whether Athens did or did not permit oligarchic governments among her allies. I suggest that Athens was not lenient towards the Samians, that they did not impose democracy a second time at Samos, and, indeed, that there was little Athenian predilection for imposing democracies among her allies in general; rather, they were more interested in supporting anti-Persian governments, whatever constitutional

⁶⁸ Cf. MEIGGS – LEWIS no. 56.

⁶⁹ The Peace of Callias has some bearing on the situation in Ionia; while I believe such a peace was in effect, it did not prevent the Persians from interfering in the internal affairs of Athenian allies in Ionia, as at Erythrai and Kolophon.

form they may have taken. The question of what the Athenian regulations for Samos actually said should be reopened.

The University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies
245 Nicholsen Hall
216 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
U.S.A.

Bibliography

- ANDREWES, A. – LEWIS, D. M. 1957. Note on the Peace of Nikias, *JHS* 77, 177–180.
- BARRON, J. 1966. The Silver Coins of Samos.
- BOLMARCICH, S. 2008. The Date of the «Oath of the Peloponnesian League», *Historia* 57, 65–79.
- BRADEEN, D. W. 1960. The Popularity of the Athenian Empire, *Historia* 9, 257–269.
- BRADEEN, D. W. – MCGREGOR, M. F. 1973. Studies in Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphy.
- BRESLIN, J. 1980. The Athenian Board of Generals in Samos 439/8 BC, *AncW* 3, 104–106.
- BRIDGES, A. P. 1980. The Athenian Treaty with Samos, *ML* 56, *JHS* 100, 185–188.
- CARTLEDGE, P. 1982. Sparta and Samos: A Special Relationship?, *CQ* n. s. 32, 243–265.
- EHRENBERG, V. 1954. Sophocles and Pericles.
- FORNARA, C. W. 1971. The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404.
- FORNARA, C. W. 1979. On the Chronology of the Samian War, *JHS* 99, 7–18.
- GALLO, L. 2005. Samo e Atene, in: L. BREGLIA – M. LUPI (eds.), *Da Elea a Samo: filosofi e politici di fronte all'Impero ateniese*, 247–258.
- HAMEL, D. 1998. Athenian Generals: Military Authority in the Classical Period.
- HARDING, P. 1994. Androtion and the Atthis.
- HENRY, A. S. 1977. Negative Co-ordination in Attic Decrees, *JHS* 97, 155–158.
- HIGHBY, L. I. 1936. The Erythrai Decree: Contributions to the Early History of the Delian League and the Peloponnesian Confederacy.
- HORNBLOWER, S. 1991–2003. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols.
- KAGAN, D. 1969. The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.
- KRAAY, C. M. 1976. Archaic and Classical Greek Coins.
- LEGON, R. P. 1972. Samos in the Delian League, *Historia* 21, 145–158.
- LEWIS, D. M. 1979. Additional Note to Fornara 1979, *JHS* 99, 18–19.
- LEWIS, R. G. 1988. An Alternative Date for Sophocles' *Antigone*, *GRBS* 29, 35–50.
- LURIA, S. 1927. Zur Geschichte der Präskripte in den attischen voreuklidischen Volksbeschlüssen, *Hermes* 62, 257–275.
- MEIGGS, R. 1972. The Athenian Empire.
- MEIGGS, R. – LEWIS, D. M. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*.
- MERRITT, B. D. 1932. Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century.
- MERRITT, B. D. 1984. The Samian Revolt from Athens in 440–39 BC, *PAPhS* 128, 123–133.
- MERRITT, B. D. – WADE-GERY, H. T. – MCGREGOR, M. F. 1939–53. The Athenian Tribute Lists, I–IV (ATL).
- MITCHELL, B. M. 1975. Herodotus and Samos, *JHS* 95, 75–91.
- MOSLEY, D. J. 1961. Who «Signed» Treaties in Ancient Greece? *PCPhS* n. s. 7, 59–63.

- MOSLEY, D. J. 1965. The Size of Embassies in Ancient Greek Diplomacy, *TAPhA* 96, 255–266.
- MOSLEY, D. J. 1973. Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece.
- OLIVER, J. H. 1951. Athenian Commissions of Seventeen, *Classical Weekly* 44, 203.
- OSTWALD, M. 1993. *Stasis* and *Autonomia* in Samos: A Comment on an Ideological Fallacy. *SCI* 12, 51–66.
- PRANDI, L. 1978. Il trattato fra Atene e Samo del 439/8 (IG I² 50) e il problema della democrazia nell'isola dopo l'intervento Ateniese, *Aevum* 52, 58–61.
- QUINN, T. J. 1981. Athens and Samos, Lesbos, and Chios 478–404 BC.
- RHODES, P. J. 1972. The Athenian Boule.
- RHODES, P. J. 1981. A Commentary on the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*.
- RHODES, P. J. 2007. Democracy and Empire, in: L. J. SAMONS II (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles*, 24–45.
- SAMONS II, L. J. 2000. Empire of the Owl: Athenian Imperial Finance.
- SCHULLER, W. 1981. Die Einführung der Demokratie auf Samos im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr., *Klio* 63, 281–288.
- SHIPLEY, G. 1987. A History of Samos 800–188 BC.
- STROUD, R. S. 1971. Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis, I, *Hesperia* 40, 146–204.
- WADE-GERY, H. T. 1931. Strategoi in the Samian War (with an Unpublished Inscription), *CPh* 26, 309–313.
- WANKE, H. 1974. Zu Eidesformeln in athenischen Urkunden des 5. Jh., *ZPE* 15, 249–254.
- WELWEI, K.-W. 1986. «Demos» und «Plethos» in athenischen Volksbeschlüssen um 450 v. Chr., *Historia* 35, 177–191.
- WILHELM, A. 1898. Altattische Schriftdenkmäler, *AM* 23, 466–492.
- WILL, E. 1969. Notes sur les régimes politiques de Samos au V^e siècle, *REA* 71, 305–319.
- WOODBURY, L. 1970. Sophocles among the Generals, *Phoenix* 24, 209–224.