circumstances in which it was a matter of vital necessity for at least one of the parties.

First, a general date. The only event which the sources specify as a terminus post quem is the Kimmerian invasion of c.652. But Bias was involved. We know less of him than of the other three original 'Sages' (Pittakos, Solon, Thales): all that can be said is that his activities belong mainly to the first half of the sixth century.[1] Since Syloson was an enemy of Periander of Corinth, cheating him of his vengeance on the Kerkyraians, the alliance of Samos and Miletos can hardly have been made during the period of Thrasyboulos' friendship with Periander. Indeed, the Samian operations in the Propontis were a blow against Thrasyboulos as well as against Megara; and in her war against Lydia, which was ended by Periander's friendly arbitration, Miletos had no help but that of Chios.[2] The occasion which we seek, then, should postdate the death of Periander (586/5) or of Thrasyboulos (date unknown). But the disaster which Samos suffered six years previously should be earlier than the period of her greatest power under

---

1. For Bias, see Crusius in RE iii 383ff. He was apparently still active when Kyros reached Ionia c.541, Hdt. i 170. His just decisions were a byword to Hipponax (Fr. 73, Strabo 636), for whom see Gerhard in RE viii 1890f.

2. Hdt. i 18.

Polykrates I (c.570 onwards).

Within these limits, the obvious moment is the beginning of the *stasis* which tore Miletos for two generations some time before the tyranny of Histiaios.[1] The latter was already tyrant by the time of Dareios' Skythian campaign in 514;[2] and I conjecture that the beginning of the surviving list of annual *Aisymnetai* in 525/4 marks the constitutional settlement whereby Parian commissioners brought the *stasis* to an end.[3] If this is right, then the two generations began c.590-85. To patch up an alliance with perennially hostile neighbours was the almost instinctive reaction of one or other party to nearly every civil war. Of the two parties involved, the 'Ploutis' of the Aieinautai and the 'Cheiromacha' of the Gergithes, the latter prevailed for a time and the former took refuge on Leros. Phokylides and Demodokos exchanged insults across the water, and one of the latter's verses is a contemporary comment on the mediation of Bias, in which the Prienians, though beaten, had done so

---

1. *Id.* v 28; details in Plutarch, *Q.Gr.* 32 (*Mor.* 298C) cf. Athen. 524a: the party struggles followed the tyranny of Thoas and Damasenor (presumably Thrasyboulos' successors).

2. Hdt. iv 137; for the date, *v.inf.*, pp. 34 8ff.

3. A. Rehm, *Milet* I iii No.122.

well.[1]

What the Milesian Labour Party most needed to preserve them from the opposition on Leros was a naval ally in the islands - free of Lydia, yet close enough to send help urgently. Samos was the obvious choice: her recent successes in the North, contrasted with the failures of Mytilene, in any case made it necessary for Miletos to come to terms with her.

So, as an earnest of their good intentions - which Samos would be bound to view with reserve - and as the price of Samian naval guarantees against the aristocrats which both cities had reason to hate, the Milesians attacked Priene, and were successful in recovering Samos' possessions, at least for the present. The attack should be set early in the Milesian civil war, not later than 585, and not much earlier.

If this date is correct, we may see more significance in the 'Darkness by the Oak'. ἑκάτης seems to be used here

---

1. Demodokos Fr. 6, cf. Hipponax Fr. 73; for the insults, Id. Fr. 1, ap. Aristotle, Eth. Nic. 1151a (perhaps another comment on the same affair); Phokylides Fr. 1, ap. Strabo 487 (wrongly ascribed to Demod. by Anth. Pal. xi 325). For Leros as a Milesian refuge in time of stasis, cf. infra, p. 418.

in its normal early meaning of 'the darkness of death':[1] cf. Iliad v 47 στυγερὸς δ' ἄρα μιν σκότος εἶλεν , and similar formulae. But if such 'darkness' may be said to have any geographic connotation, it is below earth, in Tartaros: cf. Aischylos, Eumenides 72 σκότον νέμουσα Τάρταρόν τε; and Sophokles, Oedipus Coloneus 1701 τὸν θεὸν κατὰ γᾶς σκότον εἱμένος. The location of our 'Darkness' at the Oak is therefore a little difficult. It would be easier if literal darkness were involved besides. The general date which we have established suggests that the disaster may have been simultaneous with, or have been foretold by, Thales' eclipse on May 28th 585: to a Greek an eclipse was always the harbinger of doom, and would infallibly be connected with a calamity occurring at the same time or soon afterwards. The proverb, then, originally referred to the eclipse; but this part of its meaning was later forgotten.

Assuming the Prienians to have been defeated in 585, we can rebuild the chronology of the seventeen years since the foundation of Perinthos. Since Miletos defeated Priene

---

1. Other meanings not closely related are literal darkness, opposed to φῶς and ἠμέρα ; blindness and vertigo; obscurity and ignorance; pictorial shadows: see Liddell and Scott[9], s.v. σκότος never bears the metaphorical meaning 'disaster'. There seems to be no difference of meaning between the masculine and neuter forms; and in the present context Plutarch uses the former, Zenobios the latter.

ἑβδόμῳ ... ἔτει after the original Samian disaster, the latter must have occurred in 591. The Mytilenaian attack, and the generalship and subsequent accession to tyranny of Syloson, should then be placed in 590 or 589 - or both. Allow two years for reorganization, and Syloson's seizure of the Kerkyraian boys should be dated c.587 - at any rate earlier than Periander's death in the winter of 586/5. The success against Megara before Perinthos was the prelude to the rise of the democracy which Syloson succeeded. It should therefore also be earlier than the disaster of 591, and any date between 602 and 591 will be admissible. If it helped Solon to take Salamis, it will have been earlier than 594/3. And since it is likely that such an act as the foundation of Perinthos would be opposed as soon as done, a date c.600 is preferable.

Samos has recovered her peraia, and become subject to a tyrant. In the next chapter we must consider the duration of the tyranny.

Chapter Four

THE TYRANT DYNASTY

It has always been considered strange that the dynastic Samian tyranny arose at so late a date in a state not the least advanced in archaic Greece.[1] Yet the picture which Herodotos presents is apparently simple. A tyrant Polykrates, son of an otherwise unknown Aiakes, seized power in the island, where he enjoyed a reign more or less concurrent with that of Kambyses in Persia. His rule was distinguished for maritime supremacy over a wide area, and for the possession of many towns and islands on the Asiatic coast. He saw the Persian menace in time, and by his alliance with Egypt tried to avert it. His fleet was employed in piracy on a large scale - ἔφερε δὲ καὶ ἦγε πάντας διακρίνων οὐδένα - and the wealth thus gained he spent both on public works in Samos, and upon the magnificence of his court, which was a sort of Mecca for the intellectual elite of the time. Only the Syracusan tyrants were comparable - apparently not

---

1. I say 'dynastic' (Polykrates, brother Syloson, nephew Aiakes) to avoid confusion with Demoteles' short-lived monarchia (Plutarch, Q.Gr. 57 = Mor. 303E), probably in the late seventh century: see discussion, supra, pp.164ff. At any rate, the traditional view allows no tyrant for the first two thirds of the century.

the Peisistratids, we notice. Other writers add details to this outline, but none would change its shape.

Such prosperity, if the received account is accurate, should be reflected in the material evidence. The patience and energy of Professor Buschor and the German Institute have brought the excavation of the sanctuary of Hera to a stage where such an assessment of this evidence becomes possible. The surprising, but quite certain, fact is that votive offerings were comparatively rare during the last third of the sixth century. 'We should have expected many splendid Samian works of this prosperous epoch. Instead it is of just this period that the extensive excavations in Samos have yielded little sculpture.'[1] The same is true of the bronzes. The number of dedicatory inscriptions decreases in Samos, while elsewhere there is an increase in the practice of carving them. Yet from the previous generation we have the great inscribed group by Geneleos,[2] and no fewer than three dedications by Cheramyes.[3] And

---

1. G. M. A. Richter, Kouroi[2] (London, 1960) 114.

2. E. Buschor, Altsamische Standbilder, 26ff, Abb. 90-101.

3. Ibid. 25f, Abb. 86-9 (Hera, Louvre 686); ibid. 12, Abb. 17-18, cf. Id., Festschr. B. Schweitzer (1954) 97ff (kouros, Samos); ibid., standing woman, once in Berlin, now lost, hexameter inscr. on hem of veil (text unpublished). For Cheramyes, cf. infra. pp. 262f.

these do not stand alone.

There are indications that in the last third of this century large sums of money were comparatively rare in Samos. In the first half Samos circulated a considerable electrum coinage. Staters of Euboic standard (c.17.4 gm.), though not common, are by no means unique.[1] Between 530 and 520 the largest coin in circulation was the quarter (3.55 gm.) of the Lydo-Milesian stater in silver.[2] At this time, and in this part of the world, electrum was ten times more valuable than an equal weight of silver.[3] It follows from this that the largest coin in circulation during the first half of the century was worth almost fifty times as much as the largest coin of Polykrates. This at least indicates a rarity of large capital sums. Whatever we may think of the ματαιότερος λόγος that the tyrant bought off the Spartans with gilded lead,[4] such coins have survived, are

---

1. Traité II i nos. 355, 371, Pl. ix 2, 14, are staters; E. S. G. Robinson, 'Some Electrum and Gold Greek Coins', ANS Cent. Vol. 590, Pl. xxxix 8; BCH lxxxii (1958) 655, Pl. l 13. Cf. infra, pp. 299f, and PLATES XLII 1, XLIV 1.

2. Winged boar / lion's scalp: Traité II ii no.1782, Pl. cl 6, is of this date, though not all coins of these types are so. See PLATE XLIII 6.

3. A. R. Burns, Money and Monetary Policy in Ancient Times (London, 1927) 474.

4. Hdt. iii 56.2. So far as I know, none of the coins has appeared at Sparta.

certainly Samian - proved so by the local reverse device of the two parallel incuse rectangles, otherwise found almost only on Samian electrum - and certainly, on stylistic grounds, of this date.[1] But there is, as I have said, no genuine electrum coinage which can be given to Samos under Polykrates.

Herodotos gives an impression of Polykrateian prosperity and μεγαλοπρέπεια, then says that the three wonders of Samos are the reason for his having written of the island.[2] But he confines his account at large to Polykrates. In the light of this it is impossible not to associate the three great works mentioned by Herodotos with the ἔργα πολυκράτεια of Aristotle, quoted as an example of the way in which tyrants use public works as a means of keeping their subjects too busy for political meddling.[3] The only one of these works which has so far proved archaeologically datable is the Heraion with its τέμενος. In about 570 the τέμενος was extended to no less than twelve times its original area. Work soon started on a new temple of colossal proportions, designed by Rhoikos, a contemporary of Theodoros, the Samian

---

1. Published together by E. S. G. Robinson, op.cit. 591f and Pl. xxxix 9-12, p. 594 ad fin.; cf. an earlier example, from Samos, BCH lxxxii 655, Pl. 1 14. Cf. infra, pp. 325f, and PLATE XLII 5-6.

2. Hdt. iii 60.

3. Politica 1313b; cf. infra, pp. 23444.

responsible for the foundations of Kroisos' Artemision at Ephesos.[1] The Heraion was completed in fifteen years, and its roof-tiles survive. The construction of an imposing altar before the temple completed the design. About 540 this temple was destroyed by fire. Just before 530 new columns began to rise, largely over the same site, but a little further to the West in order to leave a space for the sacred games between the new temple and the old altar, which was retained. This temple was of design similar to

---

1. Herodotos iii 60, πρῶτος ἀρχιτέκτων. Diogenes Laert. ii 103: Theodoros advised on keeping the foundations of the Artemision dry by laying charcoal underneath. Cf. Pliny, *NH* xxxvi 14.95, *in solo id palustri fecere, ne terrae motus sentiret aut hiatus timeret, rursus ne in lubrico atque instabili fundamenta tantae molis locarentur, calcatis ea substrauere carbonibus, dein uelleribus lanae*. The excavators found plenty of charcoal beneath the temple (D. G. Hogarth, *Excavations at Ephesos*: *The Archaic Artemision* (London, 1908) *passim*.), but apparent remains of the fleeces proved illusory. But the date is now certain; for the objects in the foundation deposit 'are almost all of them of the seventh century B.C., a very few of them being later' (P. Jacobsthal, *JHS* lxxi (1951) 85), and so all laid down before c.580. The cornice of the Artemis altar had a work of Rhoikos (Paus. X xxxviii 6). Rhoikos worked with Theodoros and Smilis (a contemporary of Daidalos, *Id*. VII iv 4) on the 'Lemnian Labyrinth' (Pliny, *NH* xxxvi 90) - really Samian, since Pliny calls the architects *indigenae*: presumably his source had ἐν Λέμνῳ corruptly for ἐν λίμνῃ. If so, then surely the Heraion is meant. Diodoros i 98 makes Theodoros the son of Rhoikos, agreeing with Diogenes *loc.cit*. The mention of Smilis' name supports an early date for Rhoikos and Theodoros. The inscription Ροιϙος μ' ἀνέθηκε τῃ[φρ]οδιτῃι occurs on a double eye bowl of the first quarter of the sixth century from Naukratis (Petrie, *Naukratis* ii 66 no.778, Pl. 7; Prinz, *Funde aus Naukratis* 118).

that of its predecessor, whose column-drums helped to make its foundations; but it was slightly bigger. Work proceeded until just after 520 - a little more than a decade - and was then alternately stopped and resumed until c.470, when it was abandoned altogether until Hellenistic times. Sixty-five years had passed since work began, and building had proceeded in about thirty-five of those years. By that time a single row of colums stood all round, and two rows in front. No roof, no entablature: merely columns. The earlier builders had completed three times as much work in less than half the time.

The other works are not datable archaeologically. But it seems clear that if the tunnel was complete during some part of Polykrates' reign, work must have been begun before his accession. This has been argued by Miss Mary White on the ground of the engineering work involved, and we should agree with her conclusion, especially when we consider the slow speed at which work on the temple progressed in Polykrates' time.[1] The enlargement of the harbour must

1. M. White, JHS lxxiv (1954) 41. The general validity of her argument is not destroyed by the apparent slight inaccuracy due to calculation from Herodotos' measurements for the tunnel, which are incorrect. See Fabricius' account of the tunnel, Ath. Mitt. ix (1884) 165ff. Miss White is wrong in equating this with Maiandrios' escape-tunnel, for the latter, Hdt. iii 146, led to the sea, and is still to be seen on the southern side of Metamorphosis headland.

surely be contemporary with the first real need for it, and should therefore belong to the beginning of any considerable Samian sea-power.

Herodotos was told that Samian pirates stole a corselet which Amasis had sent as a gift to Sparta, and a year later spirited away a bowl which Sparta sent to Kroisos.[1] 'At the same time' they rescued three hundred Kerkyraian boys whom Periander had consigned to Alyattes.[2] The carriers of the bowl heard of the fall of Sardeis while they were near Samos. Sardeis fell in 541: Periander was

---

1. Herodotos iii 47, i 70. I cannot accept Mr. T. J. Cadoux's suggestion (JHS lxxvi (1956) 106) that this piracy was the work of the Herodotean Polykrates. Cf. infra, pp. 287ff.

2. Hdt. iii 48: supra, pp. 179ff.

dead by c.585.[1]

Whatever the exact dates of these acts of piracy, it is clear that they all belong to the first half of the century, and a little later. The Spartan bowl was taken by warships, whose use here marks a public venture as surely as their use by the Phokaians in the West argues that this too was a matter of state policy.[2] Such piracy on a national scale, and against foreign rulers, presupposes a

---

1. Abicht suggested that the offending synchronism, Hdt. iii 48.1 κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον τοῦ περιήκοντος ἀρπαγῆ γενομένου, should be expelled as a gloss. This is favoured by the assonance γενόμενον ... γενομένου, besides the ugly change of tense. A rough synchronism is further implied in the phrase γενεῇ πρότερον i.e. 525+c.33 = c.558. Two remedies are suggested: γενεῇ πρότερον τοῦ στρατεύματος τούτου may be considered a part of Abicht's gloss; or else emended, following Panofka, Res Samiorum (Berlin, 1822) 31f, to ⟨τρίτῃ⟩ γενεῇ πρότερον (palaeographically unexceptionable, by haplography from γ' γενεῇ), on the ground that this appears to have been the reading of the text which Plutarch used. For in a passage in which he is finding every possible fault with Herodotos' account (de Hdt. Mal. xxii 4 = Moralia 860A), he himself says that the Spartan attack on Samos occurred μετὰ τρεῖς γενεάς after the Kerkyraian incident (he is, it is true, no longer quoting Herodotos verbatim), yet does not comment on Herodotos' supposed chronological error. On the whole I am inclined to accept Panofka's ⟨τρίτῃ⟩, and at the same time to follow Abicht in deleting κατὰ ... γενομένου. But for our present purpose the significance is in the actual dates of the events recorded, not in Herodotos' judgment of their temporal interrelation. (Acceptance of the proposed 'late date' for the Corinthian tyranny creates more difficulties than it solves.)

2. Herodotos i 163.2.

high degree of confidence in naval supremacy. Clearly it was thought that the victims would hesitate to indulge in reprisals. And by the middle of the century Samos had a considerable history of power at sea. Even apart from the merchant fleet whose enormous success is attested by the special privileges taken by the Samians at Naukratis and by Kolaios' enterprise in opening the route to the Atlantic coast,[1] there was much purely naval activity.

Shortly after the foundation of Perinthos in 602, the Samian navy defeated the Megarian off Perinthos.[2] Since the Megarian prisoners, transported to Samos, helped the democrats in the island to seize power, it is unlikely that a tactless memorial to the victory at Perinthos would have been set up at the Heraion. The two surviving naval dedications of this period, then, will relate to other victories. The one survives in the foundations for a whole ship dedicated no later than c.600, when another building was erected over the spot; the other in a primitive relief of a ship with an inscription, fragmentary and largely illegible, of about the same date.[3]

---

1. Id. ii 178.3; iv 152. Herodotos makes Kolaios' journey an accident: Miss S. C. le M. Hinchliff assures me that this is nautically impossible.

2. Plutarch, Q.Gr. 57 = Moralia 303E-304C: supra, pp. 173f.

3. Ship-base, Arch. Anz. 1935, 238; 1937, 204: relief at the Heraion, PLATES X-XI.

What of Polykrates' own much vaunted thalassocracy?[1] Herodotos says that he had a fleet of a hundred pentekonters,[2] and that forty 'triremes' formed but a part of his whole force in 525.[3] Only one naval dedication of the period survives, recording a victory of Amphidemos over an unknown enemy - and even this may not belong to Polykrates' reign, but be earlier.[4] But in 525 Polykrates was unable to master his own political opponents at sea in the forty ships. Not until they landed did he defeat them, and then only by the threat of reprisals.[5] When the Spartan expedition arrived, again a landing was forced, and the invaders were only repelled after considerable street-fighting.[6] Herodotos indeed mentions that earlier in his reign Polykrates defeated Miletos and Lesbos.[7] But we shall surely find it hard to

---

1. Id. iii 39, 122.2; Thuk. i 13.6; Strabo 637; etc.

2. Hdt. iii 39.3: cf. infra, p.309.

3. Id. iii 44.2. These 'triremes' were in fact biremes: vide pp.310ff.

4. Unpublished: Vathy, No. B423, PLATE XII 1-2.

5. Hdt. iii 45.2, 4: the naval defeat was not unnoticed, 3, εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ λέγουσι τοὺς ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου νικῆσαι Πολυκράτεα - as they did, at first. Cf. infra, p. 323.

6. Ibid. 54ff.

7. Ibid. 39, ἐνδὲ δὴ καὶ Λεσβίους ὑστερέῃ βοηθέοντας Μιλησίοισι ναυμαχίῃ κρατήσας ἐδε, and made them help build his fortifications. Cf. infra, p. 313ff.

credit that the Samian tyrant 'had taken several of the islands and many towns of the mainland,' as he asserts, after the Persian reduction of Ionia.[1] Oroites was at Magnesia; and at the time of his offer to Polykrates, the latter was 'in high hope of gaining control of Ionia and the islands.'[2] He did not, therefore, already hold any considerable number of them. This conclusion is supported numismatically: Samos was quite cut off from the source of electrum, in which she had coined during the first half of the century.

If one considers solely those events which must belong within the period c.533-522, there is nothing to suggest an outstanding increase of Samian sea-power.[3] The picture has

---

1. Ibid., συχνὰς μὲν δὴ τῶν νήσων ἀραιρήκεε, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἠπείρου ἄστεα, repeated by Thuk. i 13.6, naming Rhenaia, for which see Suidas s.v. ταῦτά σοι καὶ Πύθια καὶ Δήλια, and H.W. Parke, 'Polykrates and Delos', CQ xl (1946) 105-8. Cf. infra, pp.278ff.

2. Hdt. iii 122.1, 2, ἐλπίδας πολλὰς ἔχων Ἰωνίης τε καὶ νήσων ἄρξειν.

3. It has been suggested that the use of triremes in Greece became regular during the latter part of the century, and that Polykrates was responsible for introducing them (J. A. Davison, 'The First Greek Triremes', CQ xli (1947) 18ff). But the suggestion is made in the light of Polykrates' 'known' thalassocracy - for which, therefore, it may not be used as evidence. The forty 'triremes' upon which the argument largely depends were in fact biremes (vide pp.309ff), and so weaken, rather than strengthen Professor Davison's case.

become exaggerated because Polykrates was the only ruler who retained any sea-power at all in the area, at a time when the task of halting the Persian menace could be shouldered only by Egypt and Free Ionia. In the second quarter of the century Lydia and Babylon had still stood, and the need for the Samian fleet had not yet arisen. But its international importance under Polykrates does not prove that it was then larger. Reistance was still possible until Persia learned to use the Phoinikian fleet; and now that the Ionian coast was in Persian hands, only an island power was of use. Samos alone had a fleet of any considerable size. Hence Samos' appearance at this point in the Eusebian Thalassocracy List, rather than earlier - when her fleet, though probably larger, was yet eclipsed by that of Phokaia.

I would submit that the only conclusion to be drawn from the evidence which I have adduced is that, as one would expect, the most outstanding μεγαλοπρέπεια of Samos preceded the Persian conquest of Ionia. The evidence, in fact, convicts Herodotos of curious distortion, a severely wrong emphasis. It suggests above all that the policies pursued by Polykrates were a continuation, and on a smaller scale, of those in force during the previous generation. Continuity of policy in two periods is not a <u>proof</u> that the same

government held power in both. But this is nevertheless the most obvious hypothesis. So some scholars have assumed, and Miss White recently sought to prove, that Aiakes, whom Herodotos names as the father of Polykrates, preceded him as tyrant.[1] Miss White argues that this is the conclusion to be drawn from certain literary references, with which I shall deal in a moment: it remains true that in every case the name Aiakes has to be produced by supplement, emendation, and even misinterpretation.

The most attractive evidence is provided by the famous Aiakes inscription.[2] A headless seated statue of indeterminate sex bears the following inscription on the left side of the throne:

Αεάκης ἀνέθηκεν | ὁ Βρυχώνος : ὃς τῆι | Ἥρηι τὴν
σύλην : ἐ|πράξεν: κατὰ τὴν | ἐπιστασίην

Aeakes the son of Brychon dedicated (this), who exacted the plunder for Hera during his superintendence.

The date and character of this work are vital for the

---

1. Mary White, JHS lxxiv (1954) 36ff; cf. E. Babelon, Traité II i col. 203.

2. PLATE XIII: E. Buschor, Altsam. Stand. 40ff, Abb. 141-3; bibliography in L. H. Jeffery, Local Scripts of Archaic Greece 342 no.13.

present question. Internal evidence of the inscription alone would point to a date close to 500 B.C. or a little earlier: A not A, and Θ not Φ, in an almost wholly stoichedon setting, with no trace of working over.[1] But the statue is not easy to date so closely, though Dr. Richter assigns it on purely stylistic grounds to the last third of the sixth century.[2]

> The manner in which the legs are carved to show through the clinging drapery recalls the latest of the seated figures from Miletos and the Athena perhaps by Endoios from the Athenian Akropolis. The stacked folds between the legs resemble those on the sculptures of the Siphnian treasury and on a late sixth-century terracotta statuette from Sicily.

This last also provides a parallel for Aiakes' hair-style, so far as it survives. Reviewing Dr. Richter's book, the late T. J. Dunbabin praised her 'proper scepticism about the person of the Aeaces who dedicated a seated statue to Hera of Samos,' and would reject the identification of him with Polykrates' father, whose activity should fill a period

---

1. Dr. Jeffery, op.cit. 330, dates the inscription c.525-520, identifying the dedicator with Polykrates' father. But she admits that the closest parallel for the letter-forms is the round altar from Miletos (Berlin Mus. 668: Rehm, Milet I iii 153f, 275f, no.129, figs. 41, 71), dated c.494 on the ground of its mouldings.

2. G. M. A. Richter, Archaic Greek Art, 168, cf. 139, and plates of the parallels she adduces. See PLATES XXIX-XXXII.

earlier than that of the statue.[1] Professor Buschor, indeed, would date both statue and inscription to c.540.[2] But the argument for such a date is based largely on the identification of the dedicator with Polykrates' father, and will therefore lead to circularity.

Let it not be said that the prosopographical argument for the date of this dedication outweighs the stylistic. It depends upon two assumptions, both alike false. Professor Page, for instance, says that 'no other Aeaces is known to us at any time in any place.'[3] But Polykrates' nephew, the latest of his dynasty, bore the name also;[4] and the least that this proves is that it was a family name, equally capable of descent in a collateral branch. The second assumption is related to the facts that the dedicator professionally looked after the σύλη, and that Herodotos' Aiakes I had a son Συλοσῶν:[5] Miss White states that 'this brother of Polykrates is ... the only person known to have borne the name.'[6] But another Syloson, the son of

---

1. JHS lxxi (1951) 266.
2. loc.cit.
3. D. L. Page, 'Ibycus' Poem in Honour of Polycrates', Aegyptus xxxi (1951) 170.
4. Hdt. vi 13.2: ὁ δὲ Αἰάκης ... πρῶτος μὲν ἦν Συλοσῶντος τοῦ Αἰάκεος.
5. Ibid.
6. Op.cit. 38 n.23.

Kalliteles, as we have seen, occurs in Polyainos; and there are no external grounds for assuming him to be a confused repetition of Polykrates' brother, and not, as he appears to be, an earlier tyrant.[1] If he was the latter, then the name was already known - again a family name - and the occurrence of σύλη in the inscription ceases to point to a connection with the father of the second Syloson.

To sum up, the statue is most unlikely to have been made before the accession of Polykrates: the inscription should be dated c.500, may be as early as 510, is unlikely to be as early as 520. We conclude that the dedication was made towards the end of the century by a relative of the tyrants, whose duty it may have been to see that Hera received her official share of booty - as Queen Elizabeth received hers from Drake.

II

However, in our attempt to find some evidence for Samian politics in the period before Polykrates, we meet with another tradition which quite contradicts the evidence of Herodotos. Superficially, of course, it appears less trustworthy: it is contained almost exclusively in late

---

1. Polyainos, Strat. vi 45; cf. discussion, supra, pp. 178f.

authors of little historical repute. I hope to show that its authority may well be superior, and that the material evidence is in its favour.

The twenty-ninth Oration of Himerios of Prusa consists of the opening part of a declamation written for the tutor to the son of the proconsul of Asia, P. Ampelius, about the middle of the fourth century A.D. It contains the story of the meeting between Solon and Anacharsis, followed by an account of the appointment of Anakreon as tutor to a young man called Polykrates. The whole is continuously covered by codex R, in which, however, about half of every line is missing, the page having been mutilated. But for two passages the entire text is preserved in a manuscript in Naples (N), which contains among excerpts from other writers three series of selections from Himerios (Na, Nb, Nc). That part of the speech which concerns us is as follows [Or. (xxx) xxxix, ed. A. Colonna, Rome 1951, lines 19ff. The sign | indicates the end of a line in R; a single square bracket] encloses words found only in Nc.]:

|...35... π]ρὸς πρόσθεν πολλάκις ἐπὶ τὴν ποίησιν, ἵνα καὶ Ἀνάχαρσις
|...35...]μιῶν, καί τινας ἄλλους λόγους εἰπεῖν, οἷς μάλιστ' ἂν
τις τὸ τοῦδε |..... ἦν Πολυκράτης ἔφηβος, ὁ δὲ Πολυκράτης
οὗτος οὐ βα]σιλείας Σάμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς
5 ἁπάσης θαλάσσης, | ἀφ' ἧς γένος ὁρίζεται. ὁ δὴ γοῦν τῆς
Ῥόδου Πολυκράτης ἥρμ]οττε μουσικῆς καὶ ῥητόρων, καὶ τὸν

πατέρα ἔπειθε συμπράξαι αὐτῷ πρὸς / τὸν τῆς μουσικῆς
ἔρωτα, ὁ δὲ Ἀνακρέοντα τὸν μελοποιὸν μετα]πεμψάμενος
δίδωσι τῷ παιδὶ τοῦτον τῆς ἐπιθυμίας διδάσκαλον, / ὑφ' ᾧ
10 τὴν βασιλικὴν ἄσκησιν ὁ παῖς διὰ τῆς λύρας πόνων
τὴν Ὁμηρι]κὴν ἐμέλλε πληρώσειν εὐχὴν τῷ πατρὶ Πολυκράτει,
πάντα / κρείττων ἐσόμενος.

5 ἀφ' ἧς Castiglioni: ἐφ' ἧς Nc: ἐφ' ὅσον αὐτῷ Elter: ὑφ' ἧς H. Schenkl 5-6 τῆς Ῥόδου suspexit H. Schenkl 11 ἐμέλλε R: ἤμελλε Nc Πολυκράτει R: Πολυκράτης Nc 12 πάντα R: πάντων Nc (at cf. Hom. Il. vi 479 πατρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων)

This passage has already been interpreted by Sir M. Bowra and by Professor Page to refer to a son of the Herodotean Polykrates, himself of the same name, set by his father to rule over Rhodes.[1] But they both relied on the Naples excerpt, which begins at our line 3. When this is set in the rest of the speech as given by R, it becomes apparent that, whatever the historical truth, this interpretation cannot have been intended by Himerios. Anakreon's pupil is clearly the ἔφηβος (3), for the sole alternative would be to suppose the ἔφηβος to be the pupil's father. The only real question at issue is whether the ἔφηβος is, or is not, identical with the Polykrates who is 'king not only of Samos, but of the whole Greek sea.' In other words, should the

---

1. C. M. Bowra, 'Polycrates of Rhodes', Classical Journal xxix (1934) 375-380; Id., Greek Lyric Poetry (Oxford, 1936) 260; D. L. Page, op.cit. 171.

phrase ὁ δὲ Πολυκράτης οὗτος be translated 'and this Polykrates' or 'but this Polykrates'? If the former, then the ἕτερος is also (later) king of Samos; if the latter, then he is not so. But the latter translation can only be correct if the other man, who was in fact king, has already been mentioned. A glance at the text before the excerpt begins shows that this is impossible: a very brief gap, of perhaps two words, is preceded by a half line which might belong to this story or to that of Solon and Anacharsis. Before this, half a line missing, and then the story of Anacharsis not yet complete. It is inconceivable that this missing half line could have concluded the story of Anacharsis and introduced the Samian tyrant besides. Further, the next half line, preserved, appears to be the conclusion of the former narrative: 'this remark, and others which he made, provide a mirror to his character,' or something of the kind. And if it be thought odd that ὁ δὲ... οὗτος should have no other force than that of connection, a parallel may be adduced from the beginning of the same speech: 'Desire for the Eleusinian fire brought even Anacharsis the Skythian to the Mysteries. σόφος δὲ ἦν οὗτος Ἀνάχαρσις καὶ ἁρπαστὴς ἐρῶν ...' I agree that ἦν Πολυκράτης ἕτερος is, for Himerios, an unusually abrupt opening; but I see no alternative.

Two difficulties remain. Bowra and Page took lines

5-6 to mean 'Polykrates of Rhodes was fond of music.' It is doubtful whether ὁ τῆς Ῥόδου Πολυκράτης is Greek for 'Polykrates of Rhodes' in any case, and certainly impossible in the present context, since we have already demonstrated that this Polykrates is the ἔφηβος, and also identical with the tyrant of Samos. I follow Colonna, and Schenkl before him, in taking the sentence to mean 'Polykrates was fond of the music of Rhodes', despite the frankly difficult word-order.[1] Fragment 15 of Anakreon,

οὗτος δ' Ἰηλυσίους
τίλλει τοὺς κυανάσπιδας

- I agree with Bowra that the last word, here uniquely, is not a stock epithet - shows the poet's acquaintance with one branch of Rhodian art, the decoration of metal with blue enamel, of which we have remains, and so may be slight evidence of his having had a greater knowledge of Rhodes than has hitherto been supposed.

What was this 'Rhodian music', that it aroused the young Polykrates' enthusiasm? Within the past century the island's reputation for verse had been high. Peisander of

1. Colonna's note on line 24 of his ed. of the speech, 'de Rhodia musica ...'; H. Schenkl, Hermes xlvi (1911) 422 n.7, 'die Beziehung auf die rhodische Musik ist gänzlich unklar.'

Kameiros first fixed the canon of twelve Labours of Herakles, probably in the last third of the seventh century.[1] Alexandrian critics thought so highly of him that he was canonized among the great epic poets.[2] He had a predecessor, Peisanos of Lindos, to whom Clement of Alexandria ascribed the Heraklean canon.[3] In the first half of the sixth century the Sage Kleoboulos, who ruled over Lindos, wrote the famous 'Swallow-song' which Athenaios preserves:[4] his government was short of money, and he wrote the poem in the style of a beggar-song such as the κορωνισταί sang. This type of ἀγερμός at least was not uncommon. Kleoboulos survived at least until c.560, for according to Diogenes he offered Solon political asylum after the rise of Peisistratos. Diogenes also says that he wrote three thousand lines of songs and riddles; and those quoted are of a moralistic tone.[5]

---

1. AP ix 598, there ascribed to Theokritos. Suidas (s.v.) gives Peisander's date as Ol.33 (648-4 B.C.), though this is questioned in RE xix col. 144.

2. Quintilian, Inst. Or. x 1.56; Proclus, Chrestom. O. C. T. Homer vol. v 96, line 30.

3. Strom. VI ii 25.

4. Deipn. 360c-d. For Kleoboulos as ruler, vide Plut., Mor. 385E ὁ Λινδίων τύραννος ; cf. Clem. Alex. Strom. IV xix 123 Λινδίων μοναρχοῦντος

5. Diog. Laert. i 93, a spurious letter (Lindos is said to be δημοκρατουμένην) composed in the light of tradition; 89 ἐποίησεν ᾄσματα καὶ γρίφους εἰς ἔπη τρισχίλια; for their titles, 91ff.

His cousin, Antheas of Lindos, with his phallophoric songs, and cult of Dionysos, may be considered the father of comedy.[1] Perhaps it is he who 'makes fun of the men of Ialysos with their blue shields.' Anakreon may have visited Rhodes when the influence of Kleoboulos was still strong, and so have been qualified to bring to Samos learning both of songs and of βασιλικὴν ἀρετήν.

The other difficulty is that in line 11 Nc reads Πολυκράτης, and if this reading were right it would rob us of the father's name; though it would not, of course, affect the identity of the pupil. The subject of the sentence is ὁ παῖς (10), and if he were named again it would be odd for the name, in apposition, to be postponed until the whole sentence had passed. On the other hand, the father has not otherwise been given a name, and so it might be appropriate to do so here, particularly in consideration of the 'Homeric prayer' presumably referred to: πατρός θ' ὅς περ πολλῶν ἁμείνων .[2] It is apparently impossible to form a general principle as to the relative reliability of the MSS; but there is no reason to reject the (historically) <u>difficilior lectio</u> τῷ πατρὶ Πολυκράτει R.

---

1. Athen. <u>Deipn</u>. 445a-b.

2. <u>Iliad</u> vi 476-481.

We may support our judgment of the internal evidence of the text: if Herodotos' Polykrates had a son ἔφηβος (aged 18 or so) when Anakreon came to Samos, we should expect the son to be of responsible age by the time of the tyrant's death. For Anakreon was clearly there for more than one or two years. Yet on his departure for Magnesia Polykrates left his comptroller Maiandrios, not a son, in charge at home.[1] Herodotos only knew of a daughter.[2] After Polykrates' death, his brother considered himself heir, and tradition told that the daughter went to Persia, perhaps to join in urging his claim with Dareios.[3]

It must be concluded that Himerios is speaking of the education of the Herodotean Polykrates. The context demands a great name for the pupil, as well as for the tutor. He contradicts Herodotos in that he apparently gives the name of the young man's father as Polykrates also. Maiandrios, son of Maiandrios, affords a parallel for such practice at Samos at this date.[4] He implies that the father ruled

---

1. Hdt. iii 141.1. Had Polykrates taken a son, to meet his own fate, this must have been mentioned.

2. Ibid. 124.

3. Ibid. 140.5; Lucian, de Saltatione 54. The alternative is to suppose that her μέχρι Μαιάνδριος πλέω was among Otanes' captives after the fall of Samos. But I cannot think that she would have stayed long enough with the usurper Maiandrios.

4. Hdt. iii 123.1.

Samos no less than did the son, for the object of the tuition was to instil βασιλικὴν ἀρετήν . The story also entails the presence of Anakreon in Samos in the earlier reign, and he was certainly there in the later:[1] how far this is consistent with what we otherwise know of the poet's career will be considered later. Such is the belief of Himerios, though his words are in themselves no guarantee of its accuracy.

In the light of this it would clearly be wrong to allow any emendation of the entry in Suidas, s.v.

> ... εἰς Σάμον ἦλθεν ὅτε αὐτῆς ἦρχεν ὁ Πολυκράτης τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ· χρόνος δὲ οὗτος ὁ ἐπὶ Κροίσου, ὀλυμπιὰς νδ' [01.54, 564-0 B.C.: the chronographers' date for the accession of Kroisos was 560.]
>
> 1 Πολυκράτους Schmid post ἦρχεν legit Edmonds Αἰάκης ὁ Πολυκράτους 2 ὁ ante τοῦ addidit Unsinn

This is in precise agreement with Himerios as to both rule and relationship. The synchronism with Kroisos guarantees the numerical accuracy of the text. The phrase 'Polykrates,

---

1. He was said to have been with Polykrates when Oroites' envoy came, i.e. in 522 B.C., Hdt. iii 121.

2. It will be noticed that such emendation only removes the earlier tyrant's name, not the alleged fact of continuity in hereditary tyranny.

the father of the tyrant' plainly implies a second ruler of the same name and greater note: greater, inasmuch as it was he who figured largely, nay all but exclusively, in historical literature. Eusebios' date for Ibykos is indeed Ol.61, 536-532 B.C.[1] But this is also his date for the accession of Polykrates,[2] and since he only knew one tyrant of that name, to regard his testimony as an obstacle would involve a petitio principii. Our evidence about Ibykos must be free from Polykratean contamination.

For clarity of argument, I shall henceforth speak of Polykrates I and Polykrates II as the earlier and later tyrants respectively, in Himerios and Suidas.

Not one of Anakreon's many references to Polykrates has survived. But this is not the case with Ibykos: a considerable part of a long poem, universally attributed to Ibykos on grounds of style and structure, metre and language, is preserved in an Oxyrrhynchos papyrus of the

---

1. Jerome's version, sub Ol.61.4.

2. The various versions and MSS of Eusebios disagree on the precise year. This is well explained by Miss White, op.cit. 36 n.5, as due to the fact that the entry occupied three lines, at least in the Bodleian MS. of Jerome. The first line is written above the line of Ol.62, which is the alternative. See her note.

first century B.C.[1] The poem is addressed to one Polykrates, apparently on the subject of beauty. It was the beauty of Helen over which the Trojan War was fought (5), in which so many heroes took part. But it is not the poet's purpose to sing of them (10) - though he does so (10-35+). No: he will tell only of him whom

]δ χρυϲεόϲτροφ[οϲ
Ὑλλὶϲ ἐγήνατο, τὸν δ' [ἄ]ρα Τρωίλωι
ὥϲει χρυϲὸν ὀρει-
χάλκωι τρὶϲ ἄπεφθο[ν] ἤδη
Τρῶεϲ Δ[α]ναοί τ' ἐρό[ε]ϲϲαν
μορφὰν μάλ' ἔιϲκον ὅμοιον·
τοῖϲ μὲν πέδα κάλλεοϲ αἰὲν
καὶ ϲύ, Πουλύκρατεϲ, κλέοϲ ἄφθιτον ἑξεῖϲ,
ὡϲ κατ' [ἀ]οιδὰν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέοϲ.

... gold-girt Hyllis bare, whom indeed Trojans and Danaoi compared to Troilos in loveliness of form, even as thrice-refined gold to brass. Among them for ever, Polykrates, you too shall have an undying name for beauty, so far as [my] song and my fame can win it.

I have followed Wilamowitz and Page in removing the

---

1. P.Oxy. xv 1790. C. M. Bowra, Class. Journ. xxix (1934) 375-380; Id., Greek Lyric Poetry 259-269; D. L. Page, Aegyptus xxxi (1951) 158-172. See also APPENDIX A.

colon which the papyrus has at the end of line 46.[1] So, the sense of the ode is explicit. If the colon is kept, we translate 'Beauty is theirs for ever; and you too, Polykrates, shall have glory undying ... ' In this case the sense is equally clear, though now implicit. First the son of Hyllis is praised for beauty (for his name, see APP. A); then he is said to outshine even Troilos by as much as fine gold outshines brass; finally, at the end of the epode, Polykrates is promised undying fame. Fame for what? We cannot doubt that this is the climax: Polykrates is lovelier even than Troilos and the son of Hyllis.

Troilos' literary reputation for beauty stood high, following his story told in the Kypria. Phrynichos wrote of him[2]

λάμπει δ' ἔτι πορφυρέαις παρῆσι φῶς ἔρωτος.

The comparison with Troilos may suggest, as Bowra and Page both suppose, that Polykrates too is a young prince at court. And if he is being praised for ἐρόεσσαν μορφάν, this must give an indication of age. It would be worse than inappropriate so to address a middle-aged tyrant.

---

1. D. L. Page, op.cit. 160, crit. note on line 46. In line 41 I emend τῶι...Τρωίλωι to τὸν...Τρωίλω, following a suggestion of Mr. Lobel.

2. Trag. Gr. Fr. Fr. 13, p. 720 Nauck (q. Page 169).

Accordingly they identify this Polykrates with the Rhodian viceroy whom they have conjured from Himerios. But we have already seen that Himerios' meaning is quite different, and recalled that the tradition is rather against the existence of a son of Herodotos' tyrant, while indeed no writer suggests that he had one. If we allow that the poem is by Ibykos, only one real possibility remains: the Polykrates addressed is the Samian tyrant in his youth, at his father's court. And Suidas stated that Ibykos came to this very court at the necessary date.

The remaining direct evidence for the non-Herodotean tradition consists of a few scattered references to a tyranny of Polykrates in the earlier part of the century. Diogenes, quoting Apollodoros, says that Anaximander died soon after reaching the age of sixty-four in the second year of the forty-eighth Olympiad (547 B.C.), ἀκμάσαντά πη μάλιστα κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον. The age of akme was normally taken to be forty, and we are therefore given a date c.571 for Polykrates.[1] Suidas informs us that Ἀνακρέων ... γέγονε κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον ὀλυμπιάδι νβ' (572-68), though others give the Olympiad as νε' (560-56).[2]

---

1. Diog. Laert. ii 1.2: cf. R. Bentley ad C. Boyle, de Aetate Pyth.

2. s.v. Ἀνακρέων

Iamblichos states that Pythagoras was eighteen when he saw the tyranny of Polykrates growing in strength. He went into exile for thirty-four years in Egypt and Babylon, returned at the age of fifty-six, quarrelled with Polykrates, and went to his final exile at Kroton in about 530.[1] Strabo tells the same story, though without indication of time.[2] This is sometimes considered a 'doubled' account; for Aristoxenos, according to Porphyry, took Pythagoras for the same motive, dissatisfaction with Polykrates' oppression, to Italy at the age of forty, for a first and only period of exile.[3] Since he died before the end of the century, and at a great age,[4] the single quarrel in Aristoxenos' account must have been with a Polykrates who was tyrant in the first half of the century. We may not, therefore, be called upon to choose between Aristoxenos and the vulgate tradition in Iamblichos: both apparently recall a tyrant

---

1. Iambl. de Vita Pyth. ii 11, iv 19, xviii 88; viii 35 (date). For Rostagni's chronology of the life of Pythagoras, which I accept in its essentials, see APPENDIX C.

2. 638.

3. Porph. Vita Pyth. 9.

4. In the time of Milo, c.510, Diog. Laert. viii 39f, cf. Diod. xii 9. Aged 80 (Herakleides, son of Sarapion, second century B.C.) or 90, Diog. Laert. viii 44.

Polykrates of early date.[1]

We are left with the above two chronographical references to Anakreon and Anaximander, which testify to a reign of Polykrates from c.572, together with the passage of Himerios, the life of Ibykos in Suidas, and the poet's ode to Polykrates, which all point to the same period. Such is the admittedly small extent of the tradition: what of its source? We may lay aside the reference to Anaximander. It cannot be traced back farther than Apollodoros, whose net was wide. But for the others a more obvious ancestry is presented. Professor Page has already affirmed that since Himerios reveals 'extensive first-hand knowledge' of the works of the lyrists, having certainly consulted in Athens books which had long passed out of circulation, 'there is a strong general presumption that statements about the early lyrical poets in Himerios are founded on his own reading of their texts. In this instance, the source was surely Anakreon.'[2] And this is most plausible, for Strabo tells

---

1. Unless Aristoxenos, unaware of the tradition of an earlier exile, or ignorant of Pythagoras' age, merely dates his departure for Kroton by the traditional age of ἀκμή , 40: cf. Diog. Laert. viii 45, ἤκμαζε about 01.60 (540-36). In this case Aristoxenos' opinion would have little value. The tradition of the journey to Egypt is at least as old as Isokrates, Busiris 28.

2. Op.cit. 171.

us that 'indeed the whole of his poetry is full of mentions of' Polykrates.[1] It is therefore not unreasonable to suggest that the alternative tradition stems from a reading of the verse of Anakreon and Ibykos - for he too wrote of Polykrates, as the Oxyrrhynchos fragment proved. We may ask, of course, why the tradition is not more widespread if this is the case. But then, the tradition itself would not occur in so many words in any poem - could not, indeed, for Ibykos, whose verses were probably all written before the younger tyrant seized power. Its preservation is rather the result of the systematic search of such sources for biographical material, in an encyclopaedic but uncritical age. That its inconsistency with Herodotos passed unnoticed is proved by its very occurrence, regardless of its veracity.

The alternative tradition may also have been preserved by the Pythagoreans: hence Iamblichos' testimony, and perhaps also Suidas' note of Anaximander.

What are the consequences for literary chronology? Anakreon is said to have died at the age of eighty-five in Teos during the early years of the fifth century.[2] He can

---

1. 638.

2. Val. Max. ix 8; cf. [Lucian], Macrob. 26 (age). Simonides, Epigr. 126 Diehl^2, gives him a tomb (not a cenotaph) at Teos.

hardly have survived the Persian Wars, so that 572 must in fact be about the date of his birth, whatever Suidas himself understood by γέγονε.[1] He was in Athens after the death of Polykrates II, brought thither by Hipparchos.[2] In Samos he had lived as a companion and amatory rival of the tyrant,[3] perhaps suggesting that the two men were of similar age. The only indication we have of the age of Polykrates II is that at his death he left a daughter not yet of marriageable age.[4] This is no evidence: Sokrates left a babe in arms. But it is consistent with Polykrates II having himself been born c.570 or a year or two later. When, therefore, Anakreon became his tutor, the young prince would be about eighteen (ἔφηβος),[5] and the poet in his early twenties. This does not preclude residence of one or two years' with Kleoboulos' school in Lindos. Strabo mentions that the people of Teos emigrated to Abdera in the time of Anakreon, οὐ φέροντες τὴν τῶν Περσῶν ὕβριν.[6] Suidas expands this by

---

1. Cf. E. Rohde, 'Γέγονε in den Biographica des Suidas', Rhein. Mus. xxxiii (1878) 161-220, esp. 190; Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry 285.

2. [Plato], Hipparchos 228c.

3. Hdt. iii 121, cf. Strabo 638 etc.; Aelian, Var. Hist. ix 4.

4. Hdt. iii 124.

5. This was the age in Athens, at least: Arist, Ἀθ. Πολ. xlii 1-2.

6. 644.

saying that Anakreon went with them, and then improbably dates the event to the time of the Ionian Revolt.[1] If he did go to Abdera at the time of Harpagos' reduction of Ionia - after the fall of Sardeis, so c.540 - this would fit the interregnum before the rise of Polykrates II. I take it that the fall of Polykrates I is marked by the overtures to Persia by the 'Ionians of the islands' after Sardeis fell.[2] After the overthrow of his employer Anakreon would presumably return home at once, and so be ready to go to Abdera. Later, when his pupil came to power, he could resume residence in Samos.

So much for Anakreon. The chronology of Ibykos is less certain. His work shows the influence of Stesichoros, and cannot therefore begin before the second quarter of the sixth century. The only two direct references to his date, we have seen, are in Eusebios and Suidas. The latter brings him to Samos c.560; the former says that Ibycus carminum scriptor agnoscitur in Ol.61 (536-2). But since this is the date of Eusebios' Polykrates, and since Ibykos came to Samos in the time of a tyrant of that name, to

---

1. s.v. Ἀνακρέων.

2. Hdt. i 169. The arguments for there having been such an interregnum will be found on pp. 299ff.

accept Eusebios against Suidas is to beg the whole question at issue, especially since the sources of both writers are unknown. It might be argued that Ibykos belongs to the latter part of the century on the following grounds: Suidas gives Phytios as one of the alternative names for the poet's father, and a Roman copy of a herm has survived with the inscription [Ι]βυκος]|φυτιου|Ρηγινος, making the identification almost certain.[1] The name Phytios occurs as that of a noted Rhegine lawgiver and follower of Pythagoras in the West,[2] and he has been identified with Ibykos' father, on no very good grounds. But Pythagoras did not go to Kroton until c.530.[3] Ibykos would thus belong to the last third of the century - or even run the risk of being post-Polykratean. But there is no reason whatever to suppose that Iamblichos' Phytios is Ibykos' father: he may have been a relative, and from the same important family. Even this is unsafe conjecture, and this line of investigation will produce no real evidence.

The only other possibly historical figure whom Ibykos names appears to survive in fragment 20 Diehl:

---

1. IG xiv 1167: cf. G. Vallet, Rhégion et Zancle (Paris 1958) 287 and n.2.
2. Iambl., de Vita Pyth. xxvii 130, xxxl72, xxxvi 267.
3. Iambl. viii 35, Ol.62 (532-28), cf. Clem. Alex. Str. I xiv 65; akme-dates in Ol.61, Diod. x 3, Ol.60, Diog. Laert. viii 45. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. ii 59.2, gives the date as 580-76.

οὐδὲ Κυάξαρις, ὁ Μηδείων στρατηγός.

The Etymologicon alternatively derives this name from Κυαξάρης or Κυάξαρ - which otherwise is not found.[1] While ancient philologists are no evidence for the truth of a supposed derivation, we may at this period, and in this context, entertain the notion that the poet refers to Kyaxares. I can see no ground for Bowra's assertion that this is 'almost impossible', and that we should think rather of Kyros - who was in any case not a Mede but a Persian, an important distinction at this date.[2] But the great Kyaxares was a great enough figure in Ionian eyes to be commemorated after his day, and this approach is no more promising than the last.[3]

---

1. Etym. Magn. 542.51; Etymn. Flor. 197 Mill, s.v. Κυάξης.

2. Op.cit. 277.

3. It is possible that the fragment names not the great Kyaxares, the father of Astyages, who was reconciled and tied by marriage to Alyattes of Lydia c.585 (Hdt. i 74, dated by Thales' eclipse), but his grandson of the same name, uncle of Kyros (Xenophon, Cyropaed. I v 2 etc., perhaps from a Persian source). The younger Kyaxares became king on Astyages' death - in name, at least, ἔσχε δ' ἦν Κῦρος βασιλεύς (Tzetzes, Chil. i 68, cf. iii 580ff - a clumsy attempt to reconcile this with the Herodotean story), notice in this connection that the Book of Daniel speaks of a king called Dareios (the conventional king-name) who reigned briefly before the accession of Kyros: v 31 'Darius the Mede received the kingdom'; vi 28 'So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian'; ix 1 'Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes'; RV. Kyros became king in 559, the next Olympiad after that which Suidas gives for Ibykos' arrival in Samos. We can only pray for further fragments.

My hypothesis would agree with literary history in leaving Ibykos as the bridge between Stesichoros and Anakreon, and with the chronographers on all important points; and any objections are easy to overcome. If it could be proved that the alternative tradition stems from the writings of Ibykos and Anakreon, there would be the end of the matter. For they are contemporary written authorities, and their testimony is therefore worth more than that of Herodotos, whose digression was composed a century later from oral information. There is no reason to suppose that he had consulted the works of either poet. Ibykos is mentioned not at all, and Anakreon once only, in dismissing a story that the poet was with Polykrates II when Oroites' envoy came:[1] the story's dismissal proves that Herodotos did not find it in Anakreon's verse. It does not suggest that he had read the poet's writings, nor prove that those who told the story may not have read it there. For if Herodotos had found his own story of this occasion in Anakreon, he must have said so.

How serious a matter is it to contradict Herodotos? He gives no consecutive history of Samos before Polykrates II, and makes no statement as to the identity of the government

---

1. Hdt. iii 121.

which preceded him.[1] He is therefore not mistaken on these matters. The hypothesis supposes that he was told of a tyrant Polykrates under whom Samos tried to retard the Persian advance, and that he was also told of the great prosperity - whose monuments he could still see - which the island had enjoyed while Polykrates ruled. What he did not understand was that the enemy of Persia was not always identical with the prosperous ruler: there was another, whose father's name was Aiakes. That is the whole extent of Herodotos' error. His information, therefore, was either wrong or incomplete, allowing wrong inference. Late tradition tells that he lived in Samos for some time,[2] and it is quite clear that he had at least visited the island; and that his sources for its history were oral. The earliest known Samian local historian was Euagon, whose date is uncertain. He was earlier than Thukydides, but there is no reason to think that he preceded Herodotos.[3] What would

---

1. Cf. Jacoby's comment, FGrHist III b Komm. p. 455, that it is quite clear that Herodotos' sources were oral, and that they did not reach back beyond the time of (his) Polykrates.

2. Cf. Suidas, s.v. Ἡρόδοτος. Douris (FGrHist 76 F 64) called him a Samian.

3. Dion. Hal., de Thuc. 5: F. Jacoby, FGrHist III B Komm. No.535 p. 457, 'Vorher haben ihn (Thukydides und?) Aristoteles (aber nicht Herodot) benutzt, sodass er gang wohl in das letzte drittel des 5. jhdts gehören kann.' Cf. APPENDIX F.

the oral tradition be worth by Herodotos' time? Only a century had passed since the period with which we are concerned, and we should expect accurate recollection. Only a century had passed since the murder of Hipparchos when Thukydides wrote his sixth Book, where he denied in detail the oral tradition of the tyrannicides, as we can still see it embodied in the mid-fifth century skolion which begins

ἐν μύρτου κλαδὶ τὸ ξίφος φορήσω,
ὥσπερ Ἁρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων,
ὅτ' τὸν τύραννον κτανέτην
ἰσονόμους τ' Ἀθήνας ἐποιησάτην.

Yet even if Hipparchos had been joint-tyrant, Hippias reigned on after his death.[1] Only a century: and Athens had not seen and suffered two extensive changes of population. Samos was thoroughly 'netted' by Otanes' Persians, and re-settled from abroad.[2] One might suppose that Herodotos exaggerates the thoroughness of this. But he himself is in doubt about it, and so can have met few Samians who claimed autochthony. Otanes' settlers soon tired of

---

1. Thuk. vi 54ff; Anth. Lyr. Gr. ed. Diehl^2 ii, Scolia Anonyma 12.

2. Hdt. iii 149.

Syloson's harshness and left - ἔκγτι Συλοσῶντος εὐρυχωρίη.[1] Later, more immigrants arrived; this time even foreign slaves were welcome.[2] There was clearly every opportunity for the true tradition to be lost, and telescopy is a disease to which traditions are notoriously prone.

III

The hypothesis that there were two tyrants named Polykrates is seen to be not without foundation. A dedication by the elder may survive. There is in Leningrad a bronze statuette, 13 cm. in height, formerly in the Pourtalès Collection.[3] On three sides of its foot-plinth it bears in Argive characters the inscription

Πολυκρατες | ανεθε|κε.

Of this pleasing, if slight, little piece Dr. Richter says,[4]

> A fine bronze statuette ... has an inscription 'Polykrates dedicated it' in Argive letters (note form of lambda). The style of the statuette is

---

1. Strabo 638, cf. Zenob. Prov. (vulg.) iii 90: from Aristotle, Fr. 574 Rose (1886). The paroemiographer's explanation, of course, may be wrong, and the proverb merely recall the στάσεις At any rate, Samos ἐλευθερίας.

2. Photios, s.v. Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος; from Aristotle, Fr. 575.

3. G. M. A. Richter, Kouroi[2] 71f No.54 (with bibliography), figs. 193-95; IG iv 565.

4. Op.cit. 61.

> earlier than the time of the tyrant Polykrates and the name Polykrates is a common one. The type, however, with its rounded forms is Eastern rather than Argive.

She assigns the miniature kouros to her Orchomenos-Thera Group, which she dates 590-570. The reign of the earlier Polykrates is first attested in Ol.52 (572-68 B.C.). There can be little doubt stylistically of the East Greek origin of the statuette, and Dr. Richter lists it, at No.54, between works from Samos and from Miletos, She warns us of the frequent occurrence of the name Polykrates.[1] But this is scarcely to the point. We know of no Polykrates, apart from the Samian tyrants, before the last years of the fifth century.[2] And if the name was commonly borne in later days, it is to be supposed that it was given for its historic associations.

To sum up: if the statuette is East Greek, then because of the name of the dedicator it is probably Samian. It may be an offering of Polykrates I, perhaps before he became tyrant, but not necessarily so. It is a small private gift, most likely to the Argive Heraion. But its historic

---

1. Op.cit. 71, citing the index of IG iv, p. 395. Here (the Argolid) most occurrences are very late indeed.

2. A die-engraver of Akragas, C. T. Seltman, Masterpieces of Greek Coinage (Oxford, 1949) 102ff; and ~~in~~ a comrade of Xenophon, Anab. IV v 24 etc.

value may be immense.

Our conclusion about the length of the Samian tyranny is this: probably in 590/89, certainly in the first quarter of the century, the popular admiral Syloson, the son of Kalliteles, made himself tyrant.[1] It was perhaps his nephew who succeeded him in the mid-seventies - Polykrates I, the son of Aiakes. Since two tyrants of the same name have been telescoped in the extant historical tradition, their deeds will have been confused also. It will be our task in the next two chapters to try to reassign the achievements of either Polykrates, and to reconstruct the history of the Samian tyranny.

---

1. Cf. supra, pp. 175f, 188.

Chapter Five

THE PRIDE AND THE FALL

The two tyrants who governed Samos during the half-century from c.575 to 522 reshaped the whole internal economy of the island with extraordinary foresight; and its greatest period of prosperity, say from 575 to 540, is reflected in the rich variety of offerings excavated at the Heraion and elsewhere.[1] Our sources ascribe everything to 'Polykrates'; and since the reforms are not in general of such a character as to be dated by historical events, we can do little in the way of separating the achievements of the father from those of the son. Where there are any indications to help, I shall record them: but it will be seldom.

Polykrates I succeeded to the throne about twenty years after the archonship of Solon at Athens. That is the length of time required for an olive tree to come into production. By c.570, therefore, the success of Solon's

---

1. Particularly in the form of marble statues and bronzes, for which see especially E. Buschor, Altsamische Standbilder i-iii (Berlin, 1934), iv (1960: pagination consecutive with i-iii).

rationalization of Athenian agriculture - as indeed of all his economic measures - could be assessed. The Samian tyrant, whose state was in close and continual commercial contact with Athens,[1] set himself to perform a like service for his people.

Like Solon, he saw the virtue of concentrating on a very few crops of the highest quality, from the sale of which an increased amount of foreign produce could be purchased. The two main crops selected were olives and grapes. The former were famous by the time that Aischylos' Persai was performed in 472 B.C., and so must have been grown for some considerable time previously.[2] They are mentioned by the court poet Anakreon;[3] and Antiphanes or Alexis recalled that (in the fourth century) Samian oil was the palest in colour - and so the purest - of all.[4]

---

1. V.infra, pp. 259 ff.

2. Aisch., Pers. 882.

3. Anakreon Fr. 92, <ἐμ> Μελαμφύλλῳ δάφνῃ χλωρῇ τ' ἐλαίῃ τανταλίζει. For this name of Samos, cf. Strabo 637; Pliny, NH v 135, citing Aristokritos; Hesychios, s.v. Μελάμφυλλος.

4. Cited by Athen. 66f.

In spite of Strabo's odd dissent,[1] the excellence of Samian wine was as famous in the ancient as in the modern world. The only story preserved about the first legendary king Ankaios tells how he planted a vineyard, but did not live to enjoy the vintage.[2] The story is at least as old as the poet Asios;[3] and Ankaios is perhaps represented in his vineyard on a Samian 'Little Master' cup of Polykrates' reign.[4] The importance of the crop is further reflected in the name Ampelos, given both to the central mountain range and to a cape at the western end of the island.[5]

One of the tyrants was anxious to improve the standard of animal husbandry. He brought sheep from Miletos and

---

1. Strabo 637, emphasizing the contrast with good vineyards on neighbouring islands and mainland. There must have been a temporary decline in the first century B.C. The island had recovered by the second century A.D., cf. Apuleius, Florida 15, the account of an eye-witness.

2. Aristotle, Fr. 571: supra, p. 15 and n.1.

3. Cited by Paus. VII iv 1, for Ankaios' genealogy. Asios is usually taken to have been a sixth-century poet (cf. Jacoby, FGrHist III b Komm. 455f, and n.8 for references to earlier discussion); but Bowra has recently sought to place him in the later fifth century as an archaizing romantic: Hermes lxxxv (1957) 391-401.

4. Louvre F 68: CVA Fasc. 8 (France Fasc. 12) III He Pl. lxxxviii 3, 5, 8; Ath. Mitt. lix (1934) Beil. viii 1-2.

5. Strabo 637. He adds (488, secl. Meineke) that the hill behind Tigani (mod. Spiliani) was called Ampelos in antiquity. For vines, cf. also Hesychios, s.v. Σάμια· εἶδός τι ἀμπέλου.

Attika, goats from Skyros and Naxos, pigs from Sicily.[1] These animals were most suitable to the country, hilly and well forested: it is to be noticed that cattle are nowhere mentioned as kept in Samos, despite the patronage of the ox-eyed goddess.

At the same time the breed of hunting dogs was improved by the import of Lakonian and Molossian hounds.[2] We may suspect that the Lakonian hounds arrived during the period of friendship with Sparta: then the policy of producing better livestock may be credited to Polykrates I rather than to his son.

The reorganization of farming made it necessary to provide employment for the many citizens who had become

---

1. Klytos (FGrHist 490 F 2) and Alexis (ibid. 539 F 2) quoted by Athen. 540c-d. For yarn from Javan at this time, cf. Ezekiel xxvii 18: more specifically Milesian, but later, Aristoph., Frogs 542 and schol.; Lysistr. 729. For testimonia of Milesian wool at all periods into Roman imperial times, see A. S. F. Gow, Theocritus[2] (Cambridge, 1952) ad xv 125f. For the ancient wool trade in all its aspects, see R. J. Forbes, Studies in Ancient Technology iv (Leiden, 1956). The goats of Skyros are mentioned by Pindar, Fr. 98 Bowra.

2. Klytos and Alexis, locc.citt. Or were they war dogs? For the use of these in Ionia, cf. the Klazomenian sarcophagus in the British Museum (Pfuhl, Mal. u. Zeich. iii Abb. 139); Pollux, Onom. v 46 ὁ Μάγνης κύων ; Polyain. vii 1; Aelian, Var. Hist. xiv 46. (R.M.Cook denies their existence: Festschr.A.Rumpf (Krefeld, 1952) 38-42.)

redundant. It is the practice of tyrants, says Aristotle, to keep their subjects poor; for then they will be too busy earning their daily bread to engage in political plots. That, he affirms, was the purpose of the Egyptian pyramids, of the Peisistratids' building of the Olympieion at Athens, and of the Polykrateian works in Samos: to fill the subjects' time and to empty their pockets.[1] When we take away the antityrannous prejudices and preconceptions, what remains is a statement that the Samian tyrants had a policy of full employment, and that they engaged in public works on a considerable scale to implement it. These works must include the three which impressed Herodotos, namely the Heraion, the aqueduct of Eupalinos, and the mole of the Great Harbour.[2] To them we may add the encircling wall of the city, some three miles in length and up to fourteen feet thick (two Samian fathoms),[3] a dockyard,[4] and the Laura, a huge covered bazaar which rivalled even its model in Sardeis, the

---

1. Arist., Pol. 1313b.
2. Hdt. iii 60.
3. Ibid. 39.4, cf. 54.
4. Ibid. 45.4.

Ankon.[1] Great quantities of stone were required for all these enterprises, and quarrymen would be needed in great numbers, as well as builders.

So far only the Heraion and its subsidiary buildings have proved datable by archaeology. Professor Buschor believes that the temenos was extended to its present limits c.570, twelve times its previous size. That is, the extension of the sanctuary was among Polykrates I's earliest acts, and his programme of public works dates from the beginning of his reign.

The temple was between ten and fifteen years in building, and complete by c.560-555, together with the imposing altar which stood before it.[2] It was the earliest of the four colossal temples of the century - the others were the Ephesian Artemision, Temple G at Selinous, and the

---

1. Klearchos ap. Athen. 540e-f: στενωπή τις ἦν γυναικῶν δημιουργῶν, καὶ τῶν πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν καὶ ἀκρασίαν πάντων βρωμάτων ὄντως ἐνέπλησε τὴν Ἑλλάδα. Cf. [Plut.], Prov. Cent. i 61. This 'export market' was perhaps the distribution point for Lydian myrrh in Samian pots (infra, pp.274ff). Athen. adds that there was a Laura Eudaimonōn at Alexandria in his own day, of similar character (541a). (Ure connects the word λαύρα with λαβύρινθος, Origin of Tyranny 76f; whatever the etymological truth, it is clear that the Samian 'labyrinth' of Theodoros was in fact the Heraion: see p.193 n.1). There was also at Samos an establishment known as the Σαμίων ἄνθη (Athen. and [Plut.], locc.citt.), evidently a sort of night club: but not to be included in a list of public works.

2. E. Buschor, Ath. Mitt. lv (1930) 49ff, 72ff; lviii (1933) 17ff; lxxii (1957) 1ff; private communication. Cf. W. B. Dinsmoor, The Architecture of Ancient Greece³ (London, 1950) 124f; A. W. Lawrence, Greek Architecture (London, 1957) 132ff. For the altar, H. Schlieff, Ath. Mitt. lviii 174ff.

Olympieion at Athens - and the plan of its building shows strong Egyptian influence. The temple was dipteral, probably with rows of twenty-one columns at the sides, of eight in front, and of nine or ten at the rear. When finished, this labyrinthos must have seemed a veritable forest, like the Egyptian labyrinthos at which Herodotos marvelled.[1] In front the columns were not equidistant, but spaced so as to give a better view of the inner sanctuary - again an Egyptian device.[2] The design is said to have been the work of Rhoikos and Theodoros,[3] whose Egyptian training we have already noticed.[4] Pliny credits Theodoros with the invention of the lathe and with its use for this temple, and its marks may be seen on the surviving column-drums.[5] This is as good a piece of circumstantial evidence for Theodoros'

---

1. Hdt. ii 148, where he compares the temples at Ephesos and Samos. Theodoros' temple was called labyrinthos: cf. Pliny, NH xxxiv 83, xxxvi 90 (on the mistaken siting in Lemnos, cf. supra, p. 193 and n. 1). I take it that labyrinthos was the local Samian word for the temple (perhaps Theodoros' own word), and that it entered Herodotos' vocabulary during his residence there.

2. Lawrence, op.cit. 133.

3. Hdt. iii 60.4, Rhoikos was Ῥοῖκος ὁ Φιλέω ; Pliny, locc. citt.; cf. Vitruvius, de Architect. VII i 12.

4. Supra, p. 161.

5. Pliny, NH vii 198, xxxvi 90; cf. H. Johannes, Ath. Mitt. lxii (1937) 13ff, Taf. viiff; Buschor, op.cit. 84ff.

participation as was the discovery under the Epesian Artemision of the charcoal which he was said to have laid there.[1] The walls were rubble-filled for speed of construction, and there was little in the way of time-consuming plastic decoration, except for some elegant channelling of the column-bases.[2] The simple severity of the style is in sharp contrast with the superfluity of ornament attached to the Artemision at Ephesos and to the Heraion of Polykrates II. But by their time other architects had arisen. The first great temple was burned to the ground c.540, and Polykrates II began to build a replacement immediately upon his accession.[3] Work continued throughout his reign, but progress was slow.

To the same period as the first dipteron and the altar belong other constructions nearby, notably the 'South Building'.[4]

The Laura, presumably, was situated in the town, and no traces of it have been recognized. It will have been built by Polykrates I, when (as the Heraion dedications prove)

---

1. Cf. supra, p.163 and n.1.
2. For the bases, Johannes, loc.cit.
3. Cf. infra, pp.294f.
4. See Buschor, Ath. Mitt. lv (1930) 49ff, esp. 59ff; O.Ziegenaus, Ath.Mitt.lxxii (1957) 65-76.

there was still enough wealth in general circulation to ensure the success of such a concern, and when the imitation of Lydia could still be fashionable.

There remain the naval and military works, among which I include the tunnelled aqueduct, the purpose of which must have been to secure a protected water-supply within the walls in case of siege: otherwise a surface pipeline could have been led around the side of the hill.[1] It follows that the tunnel is not of earlier date than the walls, though the walls may antedate the tunnel. An engineer, F. R. Bichowsky, has estimated the time taken for the construction of the latter at fifteen years.[2] But his calculations seem to have been based on Herodotos' measurements of the tunnel, which are exaggerated, and a slight increase in the daily rate of progress - he suggests six inches - would cut years off the total time. The tunnel must have been in use during the Spartan siege of 525/4,

---

1. E. Fabricius, 'Die Wasserleitung des Eupalinos', Ath. Mitt. ix (1884) 163-92. A new study of the aqueduct is in progress. For interest in water-supplies shown by other tyrants, cf. Ure, op.cit. 76. A comparable tunnel had been made for King Hezekiah at Jerusalem: R. J. Forbes, Studies in Ancient Technology i (Leiden, 1955) 160; cf. II Kings xviii 17, xx 20; II Chron. xxxii 30; Isaiah vii 3, xxxvi 2. See also A. W. van Buren, RE 'Wasserleitungen'.

2. 'Eupalinos - First Civil Engineer', Compressed Air Magazine xlviii-xlix (1943-4) 7068-90. I have not seen this study, and am compelled to rely on the account of it given by M. White, JHS lxxiv (1954) 41 and n.39. Cf. supra, p.144 and n.1.

but we cannot quite rule out the possibility that it was dug during the preceding eight years. Probability, however, demands a longer period.[1] The oligarchs who ruled from 539 to 533 could have built no defence works, since they had bought power by submission to Persia, against whom alone, as the only likely invader, any defences would have been constructed. The tunnel, therefore, may well have been both begun and completed under Polykrates I.

A pipeline led from the spring at Aghiades by a tortuous route to the tunnel entrance, and from the other end of the tunnel to the so far undiscovered city fountain-house. The cutting itself passes through the solid limestone for about 1100 yards, and was started from both ends at once. Expert surveying brought the two sections within about five feet of one another where they met. Bichowsky suggests that Thales and Anaximander were hired as consultant surveyors; but the necessary instruments were not beyond the ingenuity of Theodoros, and it was perhaps he who advised the engineer in charge, Eupalinos the Megarian.[2]

---

1. Miss White, loc.cit., suggests that other technical experts regard Bichowsky's estimate of the time needed as conservative.

2. The triangulation would be performed with simple dioptra, consisting of a water-horizon (invented by Theodoros: Pliny, NH vii 198, libellam) mounted with sights on a circle divided into 360 degrees. See Heron, Dioptra 15-16; Forbes, loc.cit.

If the tunnel was commissioned by Polykrates I, then the city-walls which protected it were no later; and the style of the part which survives at the western end of Spiliani (Kastro), supported by finds of pottery nearby, agrees well with a date in his reign. Balancing the extension of the sanctuary of Hera, the city area became four times its previous size. The old limit had followed the brook which runs between the hills Spiliani and Kastelli and down to the sea a little to the West of the Church of the Metamorphosis. The new walls enclosed the whole length of Spiliani, and ran almost due South from its summit to the sea.[1]

The date of the harbour is a yet more difficult question. I incline to ascribe this also to Polykrates I, on the ground that its construction should be set in a period of prosperity contemporary with the first real need for it.[2] Polykrates' defiance first of the Quadruple Alliance and then of Persia presupposes that he commanded a great fleet.[3]

---

1. See PLATES V-VII. Cf. Arch. Anz. 1931, 286ff, Abb. 36f; ibid. 1933, 255ff; JHS liii (1933) 288. The height of the wall is not known: its Hellenistic successor still stood 20 feet high when seen by Robert Wood in September 1750 (JHS xlvii (1927) 114f). The wall was used in 525/4: Hdt. iii 54.2.

2. Cf. M. White, op.cit. 40.

3. V.infra, pp. 287-96.

The dockyard must go with the harbour.

All this constructional activity was Polykrates' answer to the employment problem. It was a problem which was to face his son also. Of his solution to it, we have fewer remains: he must have had to carry out extensive repairs to the fortifications; he built a fleet of newly invented Samainai;[1] and he enlisted citizens both in his army and in his navy.[2]

The programme of public works initiated by Polykrates I called for the commissioning of the best master-craftsmen available in the whole of Greece. Samos was fortunate in herself possessing the greatest practical genius of his time in Theodoros son of Telekles.[3] This master of all trades had spent some time in Egypt, and from his early experience there was able to visualize on a grand scale the fulfilment of the tyrant's dreams of splendour. He probably held a general superintendence over all the works. But when it came to digging the tunnel through Spiliani, a specialist from Megara was called in, Eupalinos son of Naustrophos; for Megarians were the acknowledged leaders in this field,

---

1. V.infra, pp. 310ff.
2. V.infra, pp. 313, 321ff.
3. Cf. Lippold, RE 'Theodoros' No.195.

having built the famous tunnel and fountain of Theagenes.[1] Nor was Eupalinos the only foreigner to be so employed. According to Alexis, Polykrates sought a number of craftsmen abroad, offering them higher wages than they could obtain elsewhere.[2]

The question arises whether the public works programme was directly controlled by the tyrant himself as employer, or whether contracts were leased to private firms. Certainty is impossible; but it is tempting to guess that at least some of the rich dedications received at the Heraion, and the costly monuments erected in the Nekropolis, were paid for out of private profits made in the public service.

There was besides all this public enterprise a certain amount of light industry. Among the most important was metalwork, at which Samian craftsmen had excelled ever since c.650. Local bronze-founding took on a new lease of life

---

1. Paus. I xl 1, cf. xli 2; Ure, op.cit. 76. Eupalinos may have owed his commission to the Megarian element in Samos' population (supra, p. 175).

2. FGrHist 539 F 2 (Athen. 540d). Similarly, Polykrates II retained the physician Demokedes of Kroton, offering him two talents a year, a greater sum than he had received in either of his previous appointments: Hdt. iii 131. Ure wrongly supposed that Alexis refers merely to labourers, and argued thence that Polykrates did not use slaves (op.cit. 77).

when Rhoikos and Theodoros introduced the sand-casting technique, enabling large statues to be cast hollow.[1] Gryphon-bowls continued to be produced as suitable objects for dedication.[2] They retained their popularity at home; but the demand was much reduced abroad, where the West was the only substantial market.[3] Smaller offerings were now fashionable, and there were no more of the old 'monumental' gryphons. Miniature kouroi in bronze were produced for the less wealthy dedicator who could not afford the large weight of metal required for a bowl or a full-size statue.[4] But the main product of the bronze-foundry must have been armour, for which the demand was as high as ever.

Theodoros was a fashionable goldsmith, patronized by Kroisos of Lydia.[5] But there is no evidence to tell whether he was leader of a flourishing craft or not. He worked also as a gem-engraver, and carved a lyre on the emerald so

---

1. Paus. VIII xiv 8; cf. IX xli 1, X xxxviii 5; Diodoros i 98. S. Casson, The Technique of Early Greek Sculpture (Oxford, 1933) 154ff.

2. See U. Jantzen, Griechische Greifenkessel Nos. 143ff.

3. Cf. ibid., Nos. 183ff. See also evidence of imitation of engraved bronze disks between Samos and Etruria: W. L. Brown, The Etruscan Lion (Oxford, 1960) 76f, Pl. xxvii a, b.

4. Buschor, Altsam. Standbilder i-iii Abb. 29-40; iv Abb. 275-7.

5. V. infra, pp. 272f.

prized by Polykrates II.[1] Pythagoras' father Mnesarchos followed the same craft.[2]

Stone sculpture was in great demand, and a thriving school of artists found employment in its production. The great majority of the statues found in Samos belong to the time of Polykrates I.[3] Hardly any are earlier, and later works are conspicuous by their rarity. The demand was not only for statues to be dedicated at home. Some were even sent to Athens.[4] Others, perhaps, were commissioned on the mainland of Asia.[5]

The excavations at the Heraion have disclosed the existence of an extremely lively group of ivory and wood carvers in Samos at this time. The workmanship is of all standards, some excellent.[6]

---

1. Hdt. iii 41; Clemens Alex., Paedag. III xi 59.2.

2. Diog. Laert. viii 1.

3. Buschor, op.cit., passim.

4. Infra, pp. 262ff.

5. R. M. Cook and A. G. Woodhead suggest that the inscription on the statue of Chares from Didyma is by the same hand as the signature of Geneleos at the Heraion: BSA xlvii (1952) 163 n.26a. See also Karo, Greek Personality 213.

6. For the best of all, Buschor, op.cit. iv 62ff, Abb. 238-48. D. Ohly, Ath. Mitt. lxviii (1953) 77ff, Beil. xiiiff, publishes some earlier wood-carvings.

Samian vase-painting reached its highest peak under this tyrant. Besides rough pottery for everyday use, a remarkable series of small and delicately thin black-figure kylikes came on to the market.[1] Made probably of imported Attic clay, they may be compared - but not confused - with Attic 'Little Master' cups of the time. The other influence they show is Lakonian. Like the gryphon-bowls, they found favour with Italian buyers,[2] and they were also sold at Naukratis.[3]

But works of art can never have represented more than a very small fraction of total production. For every sculptor there were a thousand stonemasons; and the lumpy vessels of undecorated ware turned out by the potteries for everyday use far outnumbered the frail kylikes painted by the Samian Little Masters. The textile industry flourished, helped by Polykrates' improvement of the local breed of sheep. Native and imported wools were used, and linen from abroad. Mines may have been worked.[4] Shipwrights were never

---

1. E. Kunze, 'Ionische Kleinmeister', Ath. Mitt. lix (1934) 81-122; cf. infra, pp.260f.

2. Ibid. 101ff.

3. Ibid. 91ff; cf. infra, p.252.

4. What was the date of Mandrobolos and his γεωφάνιον ? (See Aelian de Nat. Anim. xii 40, citing Aristotle (Fr. 572); cf. Suidas, s.v. ἐπὶ τὰ Μανδρ.βόλου ; and A. S. Gow and A. F. Scholfield, Nicander: Alexipharmaca (Cambridge, 1953) 192f, comm. on lines 148ff and Schol.)

unemployed, and the forests supplied timber for their use.

Amid such prosperity on every hand the tyrant's court kept up a becoming level of magnificence, unequalled, says Herodotos, except in the hey-day of the Syracusan tyranny.[1] Polykrates himself owned a library,[2] and scholars and poets sought his patronage. Ibykos came to him from Sikyon, perhaps when Kleisthenes died;[3] Anakreon was hired as tutor to the Crown Prince.[4] Only politicians were unwelcome; and Pythagoras spent the whole reign in exile.[5]

II

From the internal policies of Samos in this period we pass to consider the external. Herodotos makes much of the alliance between Polykrates II and the Egyptian Pharaoh Amasis, who was besides closely tied to Samos' traditional friend Kyrene.[6] But we have already seen that Samian

---

1. Hdt. iii 125.2. The ruins of the Palace fired the Emperor Caligula with a desire to restore it: Suetonius, Cal. xxi.

2. Athen. 3a.

3. See APPENDIX A; C. M. Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry 255ff; Suidas, s.v. Ἄγλωσσος.

4. Himerios, Orat. (xxx) xxix (ed. A. Colonna), quoted supra, pp. 205f.

5. Strabo 638; Iamblichos, de Vita Pyth. ii 11, iv 19.

6. Hdt. iii 39-43; ii 181-2: cf. infra, pp. 316ff.

interest in Egypt began in the mid-seventh century with mercenary soldiers, and continued with a share in Naukratis in the early sixth.[1] The policy of Polykrates II, then, was no novelty; but had it been first pursued by his father?

Amasis secured the throne of Upper and Lower Egypt in 569, having come to power at the head of a nationalist reaction against his predecessor's philhellenism.[2] Under Apries Egypt had seemed overrun by foreigners, no fewer than thirty thousand of whom served in his army.[3] Amasis himself eventually came to depend upon Greek mercenaries as much as had Apries; and there was no denying that the existence of Greek traders was a great blessing to the Egyptians. Amasis resolved the political dilemma, surely at the beginning of his reign, by restricting the entry of Greek merchants, allowing them access to Naukratis alone.[4] The words in

---

1. Supra, pp. 148ff.

2. Hdt. ii 161.4-163, 169; cf. G. Daressy, 'Stèle de l'An III d'Amasis', Recueil de Travaux ... égypt. et assyr. xxii (1900) 1-9. Amasis' own philhellenism (Hdt. ii 178.1) was a later development in the face of danger from Persia: R. M. Cook, JHS lvii (1937) 232. (Cook's misdating of Samian piracy against Sparta 'not ... much earlier than 526' - for the true date, infra pp.267f - does not affect the argument.)

3. Hdt. ii 163.1 - Ionians and Karians. Cf. Daressy, op. cit. 3.

4. Hdt. ii 179, taking τὸ παλαιόν to refer to the time of Amasis' regulations (cf. How and Wells, ad loc.). There is no reason to think that the restriction applied to any but merchants.

which Herodotos describes Amasis' reorganization of Naukratis have been used - as has the archaeological evidence from the site itself - to support a number of mutally contradictory theories as to its nature.[1] Amasis

> granted those who came to Egypt the city of Naukratis to live in;[2] and to those of them who had no desire to settle, but voyaged there, he granted lands in which to establish altars and sanctuaries for the gods. Their greatest and most famous and well-frequented sanctuary, the Hellenion, was founded by the following cities jointly: from Ionia, Chios, Teos, Phokaia, and Klazomenai; from Doris, Rhodes, Knidos, Halikarnassos, and Phaselis; from Aiolis, Mytilene alone. To them this santuary belongs, and these are the cities who provide governors of the

---

1. Hdt. ii 178: a proof that the foundation preceded Amasis' reign, according to W. M. F. Petrie, Naukratis i 4, cf. E. A. Gardner, ibid. ii 70ff; a proof to the contrary, according to Hirschfeld, Rhein. Mus. xlii (1887) 200ff, cf. D. G. Hogarth, BSA v (1898-9) 46.

2. Ἔδωκε Ναύκρατιν πόλιν ἐνοικῆσαι. The alternative translation 'allowed them to live in the city of Naukratis' (for the acc., cf. Thuk. i 18.1) is made impossible by the parallel ἔδωκε χώρους ἐνιδρύσασθαι βωμούς which follows. πόλιν is direct object of ἔδωκε not predicative after ἐνοικῆσαι, cf. 154.1 δίδωσι χώρους ἐνοικῆσαι, where no proper name allows ambiguity (Cook, loc.cit.). The natural inference, pace Cook, is that Naukratis already existed. The Greeks may not have thought it Amasis' to give; but in the context of his present general policy they could do little to protest.

trading-station.[1] All other cities who claim this right do so without justification. The Aiginetans on their own founded a separate sanctuary of Zeus, the Samians one of Hera, and the Milesians one of Apollo.[2]

---

1. προστάτας τοῦ ἐμπορίου. How and Wells, ad loc., make the prostatai consuls, trade-representatives. This meaning seems to be a development of the fourth century: at any rate, Herodotos uses it always of political leaders (cf. Roebuck, Class. Phil. xlvi (1951) 215 and n.23). The word may or may not be a formal title, cf. Liddell and Scott[9] s.v. : if not, then they may have been identical with the timouchoi mentioned by Hermeias ap. Athenaios 149f. The latter title belonged to magistrates in at least one of the founding cities of the Hellenion, namely Teos (SIG[3] 38.29, of the fifth century; cf. ibid. 578.60, second century); perhaps also in Phokaia, since it was used for the oligarchic council at Massilia (Strabo 179). It was fairly general in the East Greek region; for Liddell and Scott record further examples from Priene, Lebedos, Miletos and her colony Sinope, Pergamon, and Methymna. On the other hand, if prostates was a formal title, we may guess at a system of government by a board of nine with the guidance of a council of ninety, one and ten respectively elected by each city. For the terminology, compare again the constitution of Phokaian Messilia (Strabo, loc.cit.), where there was a synod of 600 timouchoi, πεντακόσιοι δ' εἰσὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου προεστῶτες. The ratio 9:90 may be paralleled in the constitution of Corinth after the end of the tyranny, where there were eight probouloi and a council of eighty (Nik. Dam., FGrHist 90 F 60; Suidas, s.v. πάντα ἀκριβῶς).

2. The whole account seems close to a passage from an Egyptian chronicle of Amasis' reign, usually taken to refer to the establishment of a mercenary-post (E. Revillout, Rev. Egyptol. i (1880) 59f; cf. Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. xiv (1891-2) 251ff): 'Let the Ouinin (?) be given place of habitation in the lands of the Nome of Sais; let them take to their use ships and firewood. Let them bring their gods.'

Herodotos surely thought that all the temene mentioned were founded at the time of Amasis' interference. His words have been taken to indicate that Aigina, Samos, and Miletos were the main trading powers interested in Naukratis, and that they accordingly had separate temples, while lesser cities had to make do with a single common sanctuary between them.[1] Such a simple view is entirely unfounded in fact; and it can be shown that the difference is one not of importance but of date.[2] Archaeologically, the Hellenion was founded c.570, the presumed date of Amasis' reorganization.[3] The inclusion of such cities as Teos, Phokaia, and Klazomenai, but not Athens, among those with a legal claim to provide προστάτας τοῦ ἐμπορίου shows that that function too originated earlier than c.540, and so almost certainly at the time of the reorganization. Why then, if their trade was really so preponderant, did Miletos and the others not demand and obtain the right to this crucial appointment? The

---

1. See for instance H. Prinz, 'Funde aus Naukratis', Klio, Beiheft vii (1908) 5f, 115f, suggesting that the three cities with separate sanctuaries also enjoyed separate emporia. This is impossible; for Hdt. ii 179 shows that the emporion of which the nine cities provided prostatai was Naukratis itself, not a wharf belonging to the Hellenion: ἦν δὲ τὸ πάλαι μοῦνη Ναύκρατις ἐμπόριον καὶ ἄλλο οὐδὲν Αἰγύπτου.

2. For what follows, cf. C. Roebuck, 'The Organization of Naukratis', Class. Phil. xlvi (1951) 212-220.

3. D. G. Hogarth, JHS xxv (1905) 136; cf. E. R. Price, JHS xliv (1924) 192, 204.

excavators missed the Aiginetan sanctuary, and the Samian was found to have been destroyed.[1] But they unearthed the Milesian temple of Apollo, and a sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos smaller, but no less well patronized, than that of Apollo. Both contained enough material to show that their establishment was earlier than that of the Hellenion. The key to what happened c.570 lies in the discovery that the separate temenos of Aphrodite was maintained by Chiotes.[2] Though they already owned one of the separate sanctuaries - albeit one not mentioned by Herodotos - and continued to use it; and though, as their pottery shows, they still held a preeminent place among the cities trading at Naukratis, they nevertheless received a place in the Hellenion, and the right to join in nominating prostatai. This proves that, as we should certainly have concluded without the false clue of the three separate sanctuaries, inclusion in the Hellenion carried the highest, not lowest, grade of membership of the trading community at Naukratis. If Aigina,

---

1. V.sup., pp. 156f.

2. Naukratis ii 33f; R. M. Cook, op.cit. 228f, 235; Roebuck, Class Phil. xlv (1950) 242; ibid. xlvi 217, suggesting that the Chiote use of both the Aphrodite ion and the Hellenion is evidence that the reorganization is historical. (There was, however, no notable cult of Aphrodite in Chios itself.)

Miletos, and Samos were left out, then their influence at Naukratis had declined to be less now than that of their rivals who were included. There is nothing in the extant remains to refute this conclusion.

There is scant evidence of Samian commerce at Naukratis in the time of Polykrates I. It was not altogether at a standstill, however; for Samian 'Little Master' cups were sold there near the middle of the century,[1] and in one instance re-exported to Aigina.[2] Lakonian ware, which had first arrived c.590, at the same time as it first achieved popularity in Samos,[3] continued to be imported in reduced quantity until the Samians ceased to bring it c.550: no fragment is later than Lakonian II.[4] But the volume of traffic was little enough.[5] Perhaps the Chiotes saw to

---

1. E. Kunze, Ath. Mitt. lix (1934) 91ff, Taf vii (Alexandria) Beil. vii 1-3 (British Museum). The Ashmolean Museum has some fragments: CVA Fasc. 2 (Gt. Britain Fasc. 9) IID Pl. i 28-31.

2. Kunze, op.cit. 97f, Beil. vii 5. Direct trade is unlikely.

3. V.inf., pp.266f.

4. E. A. Lane, BSA xxxiv (1933-4) 180, who remarks on the especial frequency of fragments of the Hephaistos Painter group.

5. Cf. Roebuck, Class. Phil. xlv 239.

that.[1]

What is the explanation of the decline in importance of the three old masters of Naukratis? The general level of their prosperity continued at present undiminished; and we cannot see their fortunes at Naukratis paralleled elsewhere. Probably the arrival of the new powers of the Hellenion, bringing increased competition for Egyptian corn, drove the price up to the point where it became more economic for Miletos and Samos to concentrate on the Pontic supply, for the control of which they and others had been fighting since the latter years of the seventh century.[2] We first hear of Pontic corn early in the fifth century;[3] but Miletos' survival in the face of persistent Lydian attack more than a century before argues that the import of corn

---

1. Historic rivals of Samos (cf. supra, p.104), they kept up close commercial relations with Samos' enemy Aigina, the only site outside Chios and Naukratis to have among its abundant Chiote pottery examples with painted inscriptions (J. Boardman, BSA li (1956) 59). No Chiote pots so far found even at Naukratis have painted dedications to Hera (R. M. Cook and A. G. Woodhead, BSA xlvii (1952) 161 n.14). Samos received no more than casual souvenirs of Chiote ware (Cook, BSA xliv (1949) 159, 161). The decline of Chiote pottery at Naukratis about the middle of the century should not be traced to 'any Samos-Egypt agreement hostile to the now Persian Chios' (cf. Boardman, op.cit. 62): there is no reason to think that Samos now made a recovery at Chios' expense in Naukratite trade.

2. Cf. sup., pp. 168ff.

3. Hdt. vii 147.

from her colonies had already begun.[1]

Perinthos, Bisanthe, and Heraion Teichos were all fortresses designed to secure Samos a share in the good things of the North. Besides corn, there were other foodstuffs to be obtained, notably fish. The Propontis was a splendid fishing-ground, rivalled only by the Euxine itself; and a plentiful supply of salt tunny was available when the giant variety caught locally was not in season.[2] There were raw materials too - metals, ship-timber, wool from nomadic native tribes. One could prolong the catalogue; but Samos is not specifically mentioned as an importer, and we cannot be sure to what extent a judicious combination of trade and piracy brought the island the same luxuries as Miletos received from her dependencies.[3]

The northern slave-trade, however, is comparatively well documented. Herodotos notes that the Thrakians sold their children for export;[4] and certainly under the tyranny all

---

1. Id. i 17-22.

2. Propontis, Strabo 320 (παλαμύς 'yearling tunny', Arist., Hist. Anim. 571a), cf. coins of Kyzikos; Samos, Archestratos ap. Athen. 301f (ὄρκυς).

3. Cf. A. G. Dunham, History of Miletus (London, 1915) ch. ii; C. Roebuck, Ionian Trade and Colonization chaps. vii-viii.

4. Hdt. v 6.1.

the Samian slaves of whose origin we are aware came from Thrake. The most famous was Aesop, who served Iadmon son of Hephaistopolis.[1] Herodotos says nothing of his origin; and late writers call him Phrygian.[2] But this is nothing more than popular etymology - Αἴσωπος from Ἄεσωπος or Αἰσηπος - combined with superficial knowledge of perhaps the most common source of slaves.[3] The authority of Euagon, however, is not less than that of Herodotos; and he is quite explicit: Aesop was a Thrakian from Mesembria.[4]

The date of Aesop's slavery must be settled by reference to Herodotos' statement that Iadmon owned the Thrakian courtesan Rhodopis at the same time.[5] It was probably c.580 that she was brought to Samos; for by her next master Xanthes she was taken to Naukratis, then bought and freed

---

1. Id. ii 134.3.

2. Vide Hausrath, RE 'Fabel', 1707f.

3. For the archaic period, cf. Alkman Fr. 97; Hipponax Fr. 43.

4. FGrHist 535 F 4 (Suidas, s.v. Αἴσωπος, where the name is given as Eugeiton: see Jacoby ad loc.); Euagon, of course was a fifth-century Samian, with access to the same local tradition on which Herodotos drew, and must be considered a primary source. See also Arist. Fr. 611.33.

5. Hdt. ii 134-5. There is other, less reliable, evidence: Suidas places Aesop's murder at Delphoi in 564; but he was there on behalf of Kroisos (cf. Plut., Mor. 556F), and this necessitates a date at least nine years later (cf. Marmor Parium, FGrHist 239 A 41).

by Charaxos of Mytilene, achieving a dubious immortality in the verse of his sister Sappho.[1]

Herodotos has a curious story (picked up, he says, in the North) to the effect that Salmoxis, god of the Thrakian Getai, once lived in Samos as a slave to Pythagoras the philosopher.[2] The story, as Herodotos himself points out, is not without chronological difficulties. But if it sprang from any factual basis whatever, it may be that Pythagoras did indeed have a Getic slave whom, in however poor taste, he nicknamed Salmoxis. Again the chronology is recoverable: since Pythagoras left Samos twice as a political refugee, first at the age of eighteen when Polykrates I became tyrant and again on the accession of Polykrates II, spending the duration of each tyranny in exile, his only slave-owning (i.e. adult) years in Samos must fall between the death of the former tyrant and the rise of the latter, between c.539 and c.532.[3]

Lastly we have Anakreon's darling Smerdies, whose lovely head Polykrates II shaved in a fit of jealousy: according to an epigram of Dioskorides, he too was a

---

1. For detailed discussion of the chronological data, v. sup., p.160 and n.1.

2. Hdt. iv 95.

3. Vide infra, p.301f.

Thrakian slave.[1]

There is no direct evidence of the purpose for which most slaves were imported. Thukydides noticed more slaves in Chios at the end of the fifth century than anywhere else in Greece except Sparta.[2] The Chiot economy had much in common with the Samian, being largely based on the production of wine and oil for export, together (in the sixth century) with some light industry such as pottery and metalwork. These activities, then, presumably provided employment for slaves at Chios; and so probably at Samos also, where the tyrants' programme of public works would likewise call for a great amount of unskilled labour.

It appears that the prevailing policy towards slaves was generous: the state of servitude was not irrevocable. For we learn that Pythagoras' Salmoxis regained his liberty, perhaps by purchase;[3] and Aesop, set free by Iadmon, was able to appear as an advocate in court.[4] It would seem that when, after the end of the tyranny, the franchise was

---

1. Anth. Pal. vii 31; Anakreon, Frr. 9, 46-7; cf. Maximus of Tyre, Philosoph. xx 1. Was the girl Anakreon addresses as πῶλε Θρηικίη (Fr. 88) a slave also?

2. Thuk. viii 40.2.

3. Hdt. iv 95.2, emphasizing Salmoxis' wealth.

4. Aristotle, Fr. 611.33; cf. Rhet. 1393b.

offered to slaves on payment of five staters, this was no more than an extension, by abating the fee, of what had been common practice hitherto.[1]

It cannot actually be proved that Samos' colonies participated in her northern trade. But we do have evidence that close ties were preserved between the mother city and at least one of her daughters on the European shore of Propontis. An inscription set up at the Heraion, now dated c.525 by Dr. Jeffery, records a gift from Perinthos:[2]

..νικος Ξ[εν|ο]δοκο Δημι[ς| Π]υθοκλεος
ο[ι]κηι{ηι}οι Περ[ι]||νθιοι τηι Ηρ|ηι ανεθεσαν |
δεκατην ερ|δοντες γοε|γυρεην χρυση||ν
σειρηνα αργ|υρεον φιαλη|ν αργυρεην λυ|κνιην
χαλκη|ν ονονημενα || συνπαντα δ|[ι]ηκοσιων
δυ|ωδεκων στατ|ηρων Σαμιω|ν συν τωι λιθω[ι].

That these Perinthians should have felt obliged to send a tithe-offering to the Heraion at all is significant. Even more so is the emphasis of their status as οικηιοι , most probably to be rendered 'kindred':[3] that is, they felt

---

1. Vide infra, p. 385.

2. Published by G. Klaffenbach, Mitt. des deutschen arch. Inst. vi (1953) 15-20; cf. L. H. Jeffery, Local Scripts of Archaic Greece 365. For discussion, see APP. B. PLATE XII 3.

3. Suggested by L. Robert in a letter to Klaffenbach.

themselves still to 'belong' to Samos after nearly three generations, and they thought of the island with much the same affection as an Australian feels for the 'Old Country' today. Such affection can only survive in continuity.[1]

The early years of Polykrates I saw the beginning of sustained close relations with Athens. We can trace activity in both directions.

Attic black-figure pottery, which had already reached Naukratis but was still only very rarely exported beyond its native shores,[2] began to reach the Samian Heraion c.580. Fragments have been found there which are the work of the KX Painter, leader of the Komast Group,[3] together with others belonging to the Polos Group.[4] The C Painter is

---

1. Further evidence of continued Samian interest in the North c.525 may be suspected in the anxiety to destroy Polykrates II felt by Mitrobates, satrap of Daskyleion: Hdt. iii 120.

2. Cf. B. L. Bailey, JHS lx (1940) 60ff.

3. ABV 23ff: No.10, lidded lekanis (Ath. Mitt. liv (1929) Beil. xxi 2); No.18, hydria (Beazley, Development of Attic Black-figure (Berkeley, Calif., 1951) 21 Pl. vii 1); No.27, cup (Samos 1184: Ath. Mitt. liv Taf. iv; ib. lxii Taf. lvii 1; Beazley, Dev. 20); No.28, further fragments (Ath. Mitt. lxii 135 Nos. 2-4). Ibid. liv Beil. xxi 2 is of similar date.

4. Ath. Mitt. liv 38 No.3, Beil. xxii 1-2.

represented,[1] while the Amasis Painter[2] and 'Elbows Out'[3] carry the series down into the third quarter of the century. In general the shapes found indicate that the pottery was imported for its artistic interest rather than for what it contained.

This conclusion is borne out by a study of Athenian influence on contemporary Samian vase-painting. It seems probable that figure-painting in Samos during the sixth century was confined to decoration of cups of the so-called Ionian Little Master style, which were made for no more than a couple of decades or so between c.570 and 540.[4]

---

1. ABV 52 No.8, a cup (Ath. Mitt. liv Beil. xxiv 1).

2. ABV 151 Nos. 17-18, amphoras (No.18 is Ath. Mitt. lvi Taf. iii; Beazley, Dev. 60f, Pl. xxvi 1; S. Karouzou, The Amasis Painter (Oxford, 1956) Pl. xxx 2-3).

3. ABV 250 No.18, a small stand (Ath. Mitt. liv Beil. xix 5); No.24, a band-cup (Boehlau, Aus ion. u. ital. Nekr. Taf. x 11).

4. See E. Kunze, 'Ionische Kleinmeister', Ath. Mitt. lix (1934) 81-122. Black-figure 'Fikellura' pottery is sometimes assigned to Samos, in whole or in part: cf. R. M. Cook, BSA xxxiv (1933-4) 90ff. With the Ionian Little Masters it shares the technique of reservation instead of incision for detail; otherwise the stylistic resemblances are not nearly so great as has been maintained. I take it that 'Fikellura' belongs to Rhodes, where much of it has been found, and which would otherwise lack a figure style at this period. A degree of community between the pottery-styles of Rhodes and Samos is nothing new (cf. supra, pp.108f).

The name given to these cups emphasizes their connexion with the better known Attic Little Masters;[1] and it is not much more than thirty years since the two fabrics began fully to be distinguished. The Samian potters and painters borrowed many motifs from Sparta, but many too from Athens. A particularly cogent example is the tondo-border of a scene painted on the inside of a Samian cup in Vienna, which is virtually identical with the corresponding feature of a piece in Athens by the C Painter, who, we saw, did in fact paint for the Samian market.[2]

The clay of which these Samian cups are made is utterly unlike the rough micaceous fabric of other Samian ware. Instead, it is indistinguishable from Attic clay. The natural conclusion is that it was actually imported from Athens.[3] If so, then it surely follows that contact between the two cities was direct, not maintained through middlemen.

In return for her vases and potting clay, Samos supplied

---

1. For these, see J. D. Beazley, JHS lii (1932) 168-204.

2. Vienna, Mus. für Kunst u. Industrie 279 (Kunze, op.cit. 104ff, Taf. viii 1, Beil. ix 1-2); Athens, Nat. Mus. 531 (Kunze, ibid. Taf. viii 2; ABV 55 No. 92).

3. Cf. Kunze, op.cit. 122. (Differences of glaze show that the cups were not made by Ionians in Athens.)

Athens with cosmetics from Lydia, some packed in rough Lydian containers, some in the more gentle painted ware of Samos herself.[1]

Between c.580 and 560 Samian statues were sent for dedication on the Athenian Akropolis. Besides a number of smaller fragments, two large pieces survive.[2] The first is a headless kore (Akropolis Mus. No.619), preserved from shoulder-level almost to the ground, which immediately recalls both the Hera of Cheramyes in the Louvre[3] and the standing member of Geneleos' group in Vathy,[4] alike in style and technique.[5] The second (No.677) is part of another kore, from the head to the waist, of similar technique and style, perhaps rather later.

Archaeologists have been loath to commit themselves to a final judgment as to whether this group of works is of Samian or Naxian art. On the one hand, the kore No.677 is facially quite similar to the sphinx dedicated by the Naxians

---

1. Cf. infra, p.275 and n.1,2; p.276 and n.3.

2. E. Langlotz, ap. H. Schrader, Die archaischen Marmorbildwerke der Akropolis (Frankfurt a.M., 1939) 63ff, Taf. xxxiiif; H. Payne and G. M.-Young, Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis[2] (London, 1950) 12f, Pl. 11. xviii-xx; Buschor, Altsamische Standbilder 24f, Abb. 76, 78-83.

3. Buschor, op.cit. 25f, Abb. 86-89, 107.

4. Ibid. 26ff, Abb. 90-101: PLATES XXII-XXV.

5. S. Casson, The Technique of Early Greek Sculpture 98-103.

at Delphoi;[1] while the marble of the sphinx, of the two Akropolis statues, and of Cheramyes' Hera, has always been described as Naxian. On the other, the Hera and the Geneleos group came from the Samian Heraion, as did yet other examples of this individual style,[2] and no similar statue has yet turned up in Naxos. The stylistic argument convinced Langlotz that the Akropolis korai were Samian, and sent to Athens ready-made.[3] In support of this conviction it may be urged that Geneleos, the only named artist involved, was surely Samian, for his works are signed and inscribed in Samian script,[4] and there is no ethnic following his name. Further Cheramyes, who brought Naxian marble to Samos, was surely a Samian: the name is West Asiatic in form,[5] no ethnic is given, and the dedicator made other gifts to the Heraion on different occasions.[6] Add to this the fact

---

1. Fouilles de Delphes iv, Texte (1909) 41ff, Planches (1927) v-vi.

2. For instance Buschor, op.cit. 29ff, later developments.

3. Loc.cit.

4. Cf. L. H. Jeffery, Local Scripts of Archaic Greece 329.

5. Cf. the Lydian Paktyes, Hdt. i 153ff; Thales' father Hexamyes, Diog. Laert.i 29; and J. Sundwall, 'Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier', Klio, Beiheft xi (1913) 96, 161.

6. Buschor, Altsamische Standbilder iv (Berlin, 1960) 67.

that Attic pottery of the first half of the century is present in Samos, and popular enough to be imitated, but absent from Naxos, and it appears that Samos' close connexion with Athens at the relevant time was not shared by Naxos.

There is little to be gained by guessing what individual may have sent these expensive dedications to Athens. Langlotz, it seems, would like to think of Polykrates here, but chronology prevents him. We are not so prevented: it is possible that the statues were indeed the gift of Polykrates I - we have already found him making a small dedication at Argos.[1] An alternative is Cheramyes himself, with his known love of the additional extravagance of Naxian marble. He was obviously a great magnate; and the origin of his name suggests the conjecture that he was a naturalized Samian, a Lydian immigré, founder and owner of the Samian branch of the Lydian cosmetic trade which flourished in his lifetime.[2]

It seems likely that the friendship between Samos and Athens lapsed upon the death of Polykrates I, and was not revived by his son, whose catholic piracy would not appeal

---

1. Supra, pp. 227f.

2. Infra, pp. 274ff.

to the trading ambitions of Peisistratos.[1] The links between Samos and Naxos, however, were unbroken. The two states had found themselves on the same side in the Lelantine War; the earliest full-size marble statue from the Heraion is a daedalic import from Naxos of c.630;[2] Naxian marble was a luxurious 'extra' for statues in the time of Polykrates I, and the abrasive technique of its carving came originally from Naxos;[3] finally, Peisistratos' ally Lygdamis used his Naxian power to set Polykrates II upon his father's throne.[4]

III

One of the surprising features of Samian policy in the first half of the sixth century is the close connexion maintained with Sparta - all the more remarkable in the face of that city's later tradition of enmity for tyrants. The two states had first come into contact at the time of the

---

1. Infra, p.282 and n.1; D. M. Leahy, JHS lxxvii (1957) 274.

2. PLATE XXI; Buschor; op.cit. 23f, Abb. 72, 73, 75. Closely similar is the dedication of Naxian Nikandre to Delian Artemis: G. M. A. Richter, The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks[3] (Yale, 1950) fig. 263.

3. Casson, loc.cit.

4. Polyainos, Strat. i 23.

Lelantine War, when Samos had sent a naval squadron to aid the Spartans in their first struggle to win Messenia.[1] There is no direct evidence that the alliance was preserved after the war;[2] but in c.638 we find the Samian merchant-captain Kolaios lending help to Sparta's colony of Thera in the foundation of an offshoot at Kyrene.[3] By the same date Lakonian I pottery had begun to reach the Heraion. There are, however, only a very few fragments of seventh-century Lakonian ware from Samos.[4] The accession of Syloson I in 590/89 coincides (as precisely as we can judge) with the evolution at Sparta of the Lakonian III style of pottery. From this moment Samos began to receive Spartan ware in quantity: the work of the earliest artist of this period, the Hephaistos Painter, is represented; and to his group and to their close successors belong the majority of the pieces which have been found. No foreign state imported nearly so many Lakonian vases as did Samos, where they continued to arrive right up to the time of the Spartan

---

1. Hdt. iii 47: v.supra, p. 93.

2. But v.supra, pp. 113f and n. 2 on p. 114, for possible archaeological evidence.

3. Hdt. iv 152: v.supra, pp. 130ff.

4. E. A. Lane, 'Laconian Vase-painting', BSA xxxiv (1933-4) 179, 184.

expedition against Polykrates in 524, and where those found in excavation far outnumber the products of Corinth, elsewhere so much commoner and more widely distributed.[1] It seems, too, that the traffic was not all in one direction: while the Samians borrowed certain decorative motives from Sparta for their own 'Little Master' cups,[2] the Spartans in turn adopted the high foot of the Ionian cup; and in view of the predominance of their ware in Samos in contrast with its extreme rarity on other Ionian sites it is reasonable to suppose that this adoption was in fact made from Samos.[3]

Samian imports from Sparta in this period were not confined to pottery. The early sixth-century levels at the Heraion disclosed some carved ivories certainly of Peloponnesian style, and most closely related to the material from the temple of Artemis Orthia at Sparta. There is a plaque of Medousa dispatched by a most Lakonian Perseus with firmly arched eyebrows, short nose, and straight mouth - serious, but not stern - while Athene stands behind him, her right

---

1. Ibid. 178f. See PLATE XL 3-4.
2. Cf. esp. E. Kunze, Ath. Mitt. lix (1934) 99ff.
3. Lane, op.cit. 131, 185.

hand raised against the monster.[1] A second, and more fragmentary, plaque shows the head of Medousa, with a tiny Chrysaor at her side.[2] A small figure of a youth was found in the dried-up bed of the Imbrasos, South of the temple: he wears high boots and a short kilt, and holds two winged horses.[3] Dr. Barnett admits the affinity of this figurine to Spartan work, but would prefer to ascribe it to an independent Samian school.[4] It is true that the rather Semitic nose and eyes and the spinterish parting of the hair do not at first sight seem Peloponnesian. But these features may be paralleled in terracottas from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia, which themselves echo the motive of a human figure between horses;[5] and it is safer to suppose that the figurine is Spartan after all.

---

1. R. D. Barnett, JHS lxviii (1948) 15, fig. 13; cf. Hampe, Ath. Mitt. lx-lxi (1935-6) 288 No.5, Taf. xcix 2. For similar style at Sparta, R. M. Dawkins, Artemis Orthia (JHS suppl. V: London, 1929) Pl. clxxiii 5.

2. Barnett, loc.cit. fig. 14; cf. Artemis Orthia Pl. cii 1.

3. Arch. Anz. 1939, 266 and Abb. 18 (p. 262).

4. Barnett, op.cit. 16, comparing a bronze from Urartu in the British Museum, his Pl. v c.

5. Artemis Orthia 149, Pl. xxxii 4-5 (not noted by Barnett). Ivory examples of this motive were found at Sparta (ibid. 241, Pl. clxxii 1, clxxiii 3), but only with Lakonian I pottery. It is however represented in terracottas of Lakonian periods I, II, III, and IV. See also M. S. Thompson, JHS xxix (1909) 286-307.

Finally, a few Spartan bronzes have been found in the excavations at the Heraion. There is a hoplite on the march, with helmet and shield.[1] Small statuettes of this type have been found on other foreign sites, and were perhaps a favourite souvenir of tourists.[2] More useful was a bronze mirror, whose support only has survived: it is in the form of a warrior in breastplate and kilt.[3] Both objects belong the the second quarter of the sixth century.

But all the objects which we have mentioned so far - pottery, ivory, or bronze - could have been brought home by Samian travellers, tourists or merchants. There is proof, however, that at least one Spartan visited Samos, and he a member of the inner aristocracy of the Spartiatai. The Heraion received a small lion couchant, to be dated

---

1. JHS liii (1933) 289, fig. 15.

2. The group is well known. J. D. Beazley, BSA xl (1939-40) 83f, figs. 1-2, publishes an almost identical example from South Arabia, and lists others from Lakonia, Arkadia, Messenia, Olympia (2), Dodona (2), and Thessaly. B. Segall suggests the statuettes were circulated as tokens of Spartan military strength: AJA lix (1955) 315-8. The rarity of warriors depicted on pottery makes a striking contrast.

3. Buschor, Altsamische Standbilder 32f, Abb. 115-7 (published as Samian); E. Kunze, Ath. Mitt. lix (1934) 99 n.2; R. J. H. Jenkins, BSA xxxiii (1932-3) 77.

stylistically about the middle of the sixth century.[1] This agrees with the date of the retrograde inscription which encircles its mane in front: Ευμναστος ται hερα⟨ι⟩ Σπαρτιατας.

It has been suggested in the light of Sparta's aid to the Samian opposition party in 525/4 that it was with the oligarchic Geomoroi that the close ties between Samos and Sparta had grown up in the first half of the century.[2] Had the Geomoroi been in power at that time, as was thought, this would seem plausible. But in fact the opposition in 525/4 was democratic, and tyrants governed Samos for most of the earlier period; and the beginning of close association with Sparta dates from the accession of the first tyrant. It is therefore no surprise to find the tyrants themselves having dealings with Sparta. Polykrates I imported hunting dogs from Lakonia.[3] Theodoros built a rotunda for the Spartan assembly, in which its members still met in Pausanias' day.[4] This Skias was a public building,

---

1. PLATE XL 1-2; Arch. Anz. 1926, 436. For the style of the head, cf. a lion in Munich, ibid. 1938, 438, Abb. 14.

2. Cf. Lane, op.cit. 179, who recalls the honours paid to the dead Archias after he had fought against Polykrates in 524 (Hdt. iii 55); M. White JHS lxxiv (1954) 37.

3. Athenaios 540c (Alexis): see discussion supra p. 233.

4. Paus. III xii 10.

and constructed by the state-architect to Polykrates I. It seems likely that the tyrant secured him the commission: at the very least he can hardly have disapproved of it, as he must have done if the Spartans' friendship was confined to his own political enemies. The Spartan alliance was an important element in the foreign policy of the first two tyrants.[1]

When Theodoros was commissioned to build the Ephesian Artemision Alyattes still sat upon the throne of Lydia.[2] But most of the constructional work was done in the reign of Kroisos. Ephesos had been drawn to play some considerable part in the struggle for the Lydian succession (c.555), in virtue of the marriage alliance made between Alyattes and the Ephesian ruling house: the tyrant Melas married Alyattes' daughter,[3] and Alyattes himself took an Ionian wife.[4] To

---

1. This is not, of course, to deny that friendly relations existed between Sparta and the Geomoroi as well. A Samian follower of the oligarch Pythagoras at Kroton bore the name Lakon (Iambl., de Vita Pyth. xxxvi 267); cf. Sambs, son of the Spartan Archias (Hdt. iii 55).

2. Theodoros was responsible for the temple's foundation: Diogenes Laert. ii 103, cf. Pliny, NH xxxvi 95. For the date of this, P. Jacobsthal, JHS lxxi (1951) 85ff; E. S. G. Robinson, ibid. 156ff. Cf. p.193 n.1.

3. Baton of Sinope, FGrHist 268 F 3 (Suidas, s.v. Πυθαγόρας Ἐφέσιος). According to Athenaios (289c), he devoted a volume to the Ephesian tyrants.

4. Hdt. i 92.3.

the latter union was born Pantaleon, who sought to wrest the Lydian throne from Kroisos. By this time Melas had been succeeded at Ephesos by his son Pindaros. It seems that Pindaros supported the claims of his half-Ionian cousin at Sardeis, while Kroisos' eventual triumph was largely due to a loan from another Ephesian, Pamphaes, son of Theocharides.[1] As soon as his position was secure, therefore, Kroisos declared war upon Pindaros. The war ended immediately upon Pindaros' abdication and retirement to the Peloponnese, and a new government was installed more acceptable to Kroisos, who not only repaid his debt to Pamphaes personally, but added to the glory of his city besides, by making a large contribution towards the cost of completing the Artemision.[2]

The architect was not slow to impress Kroisos with his skill, and the king soon discovered that Theodoros was no less proficient as a goldsmith. He made the silver bowl

---

1. The evidence for these events is contained in Hdt. i 26, 92, and Baton, loc.cit., with Aelian, Var. Hist. iii 26, iv 27, and Polyainos, Strat. vi 50. Cf. P. N. Ure, Origin of Tyranny 271-3.

2. Hdt. i 92. Fragments of the dedicatory inscriptions Βασιλεὺς Κροῖσος ἀνέθηκεν were found on surviving pieces of the columns: Tod, GHI i^2 No.6, with bibliography. The cost was met, Hdt. says, from the fortune of one of Pantaleon's supporters (Sadyattes by name, according to Nik. Dam., FGrHist 90 F 65: probably a kinsman, since this was also the name of Alyattes' father). If Pantaleon's 'Ionian' mother was in fact Ephesian, it would be natural for Kroisos so to placate her patron goddess.

which Kroisos sent to Delphoi;[1] and it must also have been for Kroisos that he made the golden vine hung with bunches of emeralds for grapes, and the tiny plane-tree which would not have given shade to a grasshopper,[2] with both of which heirlooms Kroisos' grandson Pythios was able to buy the friendship of Dareios.[3] The Persian kings also owned a golden bowl by Theodoros, perhaps obtained from the same source.[4]

Theodoros' only recorded foreign works were at Sparta and Ephesos and for the Lydian king.[5] As at Sparta, so in Lydia his employment is a mark of Polykrates' goodwill towards Kroisos. The king had rested content with the domination of mainland Ionia, and had not tried to conquer the

---

1. Hdt. i 51. The Lydian kings had already employed outstanding Ionian craftsmen: Hdt. i 25.2 (Alyattes and Glaukos of Chios), cf. Paus. X xvi 1, Athen. 210c.

2. Chares of Mytilene and Amyntas, ap. Athen. 514f; Phylarchos, ap. Athen. 539d; Xenophon, Hell. VII i 38.

3. Hdt. vii 27. Pythios' descent from Kroisos is an inference from the fact that the latter had a son Atys (Id. i 34) and that Pythios' father was named Atys, together with Pythios' own evident position of wealth and influence under the Persians. (His name will have been a recognition of Kroisos' close regard for Delphoi.) See How and Wells on Hdt. vii 27.

4. Athen. 514f.

5. Not at Lemnos (so Pliny, NH xxxvi 90): see p. 193 n.1.

islands.[1] Instead he made them his friends, and the Lydian alliance became another anchor of Samian foreign policy.[2]

Its influence is observable in Samian commerce of the period.[3] Among the objects from Boehlau's investigations is a lekythos of actual Lydian manufacture which, like another from a grave in the Athenian Agora, is identical with an example excavated at Sardeis.[4]

Samos now became interested in the Lydian cosmetic trade, in the bakkaris[5] and brenthon[6] which found their way about the Greek world packed in the characteristically shaped lydion. The surviving lydia enable us to see that the export of these foundation creams lasted from the second quarter of the sixth century until some time quite early in

---

1. Hdt. i 27.

2. If the tradition that Aesop undertook an unpopular embassy to Delphoi on Kroisos' behalf is true (Plut., Mor. 556F; cf. Hdt. ii 134.3-4), then this may be another testimony to Polykrates' goodwill. For Aesop, once a slave in Samos (Hdt., loc.cit.), practised there as an advocate after receiving his freedom (cf. supra, p.257 and n.4).

3. For commercial links between Lydia and Ionia in general, see Roebuck, Ionian Trade 50-60.

4. Boehlau, Aus. ion. u. ital. Nekr. 35f, Grave 7, Taf. vii 5; R. S. Young, Hesperia xx (1951) 92, No. 10-4, Pl. 41a; H. C. Butler, Sardis i (Leiden, 1922) 80, fig. 75b fourth from left in upper row.

5. Hesychios, s.v.; Semonides of Amorgos, Fr. 16.2; Hipponax, Fr. 19.

6. Hesychios, s.v.; Sappho, Fr. 94.LP. 18f.

the fifth.[1] Genuine Sardian examples have come to light at Athens, both in the Agora[2] and in the Kerameikos,[3] at Corinth,[4] and at Aigina,[5] apart from numerous finds in Phrygia and in Lydia itself.[6] But the majority of lydia are East Greek imitations, recovered mainly from Italy (where local copies were also made), but from sites in Greece as well.[7] The factories have not been conclusively identified: more have been found in Samos than elsewhere,

---

1. A. Rumpf, Ath. Mitt. xlv (1920) 163-170; Roebuck, op. cit. 56 and n.70, is weak but adds recent bibliography.

2. Young, op.cit. 88f, No.5-1, Pl. 39a.

3. Cf. G. Karo, An Attic Cemetery (Philadelphia, 1943) 21.

4. T. L. Shear, AJA xxxiv (1930) 422, fig. 15.

5. G. Welter, Arch. Anz. 1938, 496, 508 Abb. 24: described as a Samian imitation; but clearly the same as the Corinthian find and many from Sardeis.

6. See especially Butler, AJA xviii (1914) 433f, fig. 6, with description of clay and paint; Shear, AJA xxvi (1922) Pl. vi and 396ff, figs. 7-8; Sardis i 150, fig. 168 left. For a fuller bibliography, see Young, op. cit. 89.

7. There are in the first place literal copies of the Sardian shape, with its peculiar foot in the form of a truncated cone: cf. J. Sieveking and R. Hackl, Die könig. Vasensammlung (Munich, 1912) Taf. xix 538, 539, 542 (plain), and 540, 541 (banded painting); Rumpf, op.cit., Taf. v 3 (Italian copy, with palmette ornament). Secondly there are those, rather later, which adopt the high foot of the Ionian cup: Sieveking and Hackl, op. cit., Taf. xix 533-537, 543; Röm. Mitt. xxxviii (1923) 75, No.6, Abb. 2; Rumpf, op.cit., Taf. v 4 (Italian, with 'Wild Goat' procession of animals).

but this may be due to the accident of excavation. The best, however, seem close in fabric to the Ionian Little Master cups, which are most plausibly assigned to Samos, and it seems likely that some at least of the lydia were made there also,[1] and sold in the Laura.[2]

Export was probably in the hands of the Samians and Phokaians, importing the myrrh in bulk and packing it in these wide-mouthed pots which were the guarantee of its origin. The Agora grave already noticed, which contained the Lydian lekythos, also held three Greek lydia whose closest parallels are in Samos, one of them from the same burial as a second lekythos from Lydia which we have already compared with the Agora example.[3] Two more East Greek copies turned up at the Phokaian colony of Emporion (Ampurias) in Spain,[4] and the extensive traffic to Italy was perhaps

---

1. I class here the following: A. Greifenhagen, Arch. Anz. 1936, 382f, Abb. 36 (Bonn); E. Langlotz, Griechische Vasen (Munich, 1932) Taf. xviii 134 (Würzburg: better photo. in AM xlv, Taf. v 2); Langlotz adds Sieveking and Hackl, op.cit., Taf. xix 532, and the amphora, ibid. Taf. xvii 467.

2. Cf. supra, p.235 n.1.

3. Young, op.cit. 92, Nos. 10-5, -6, -7, Pl. 41a; cf. respectively Boehlau, op.cit., Taf. viii 13, 10 from Grave 7, 5. Young considers his No.10-5 possibly Attic.

4. A. García y Bellido, Hispania Graeca i 151, No.16, Lam. lxvii (a peculiar example with an exaggeratedly high foot); a simpler example, ibid., No.17, Lam. lxviii, now in Barcelona, dated c.500 by García.

likewise a largely Phokaian enterprise.[1]

The other great witness to Samian commercial relations with Lydia is her coinage. This appears to have been struck wholly in electrum before the fall of Sardeis, after it wholly in silver.[2] Mount Sipylos and the River Paktolos were the source of virtually all natural electrum, and it is clear that this source was open during the period of Samian friendship with Lydia and closed after the advent of the Persian conqueror whom Samos defied.[3]

For most of his reign Polykrates concentrated on advancing the material prosperity of his country. He encouraged trade in the North and, to less effect, with Egypt and Italy. He became closely associated with Lydia, Sparta, and Athens. But as time went on he aspired to a voice in international affairs. And that was his downfall.

---

1. Cf. Hdt. i 163.1. For Phokaia as a port of Lydia, cf. Sappho, Fr. 101LP; C. Theander, Eranos xli (1943) 150ff.

2. See pp. 214f.

3. In this connexion we must also notice the voluminous electrum currency of Phokaia in her hey-day: see B. V. Head, Historia Numorum[2] (Oxford, 1911) 287f. For Lydia as Greece's source of gold, cf. Hdt. i 69.4 (Sparta), vi 125 (Alkmeon). For Paktolos, Id. i 93, v 101, cf. Strabo 625; Sipylos, ibid. 680. Cf. Kroisos and Atarneus, [Arist.] de Mir. Ausc. 52 (834a); Strabo, loc.cit.

IV

I propose to assign to Polykrates I in the fifties and forties of this century the empire on the mainland of Ionia and among the islands which Herodotos mentions and which so impressed Thukydides. We must again recall that the only Polykrates known to these authorities was the second tyrant of that name, who reigned from 533 to 522; that the recorded deeds of either tyrant will have been ascribed to the second; and that any indication of date which the historians may give is therefore quite valueless unless it can be shown to have a circumstantial basis.

Herodotos refers to the empire in the following words:[1] συχνὰς μὲν δὴ τῶν νήσων ἀραιρήκεε, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἠπείρου ἄστεα. This statement has already been contrasted with Herodotos' later characterization of Polykrates in 522 (a circumstantial date) as ἐλπίδας πολλὰς ἔχων Ἰωνίης τε καὶ νήσων ἄρξειν .[2] If, at the end of his reign, rule over Ionia and the islands was still a dream, then he had not ruled any great part of them during the length of his tyranny. The clue lies in the last part of the former passage quoted. No independent

---

1. Hdt. iii 39.4.

2. Ibid. 122.2: cf. supra, pp. 198f.

tyrant could have gained or kept control of 'many mainland towns' at any time after the reduction of Ionia by Harpagos. There is therefore a prima facie case for dating the empire earlier than the fall of Sardeis in 541,[1] and so not in the time of Polykrates II but in the reign of his father. There is then no inconsistency between the two passages, and indeed in 522 Polykrates II was however unrealistically dreaming that he might recover what his father had held.

The argument may be developed further. Polykrates, says Thukydides, ἄλλας τε τῶν νήσων ἐπικούρους ἐποιήσατο καὶ Ῥήνειαν ἑλὼν ἀνέθηκε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δηλίῳ.[2] Later, he repeats the statement: τῶν δὲ ἄλλων νήσων ἦρξε καὶ τὴν Ῥήνειαν ἑλὼν ἀνέθηκε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δηλίῳ δήσας πρὸς τὴν Δῆλον.[3] The capture of Rheneia is given as an instance of Polykrates' island conquests, and since there can be no doubt that Herodotos and Thukydides are writing of the same island empire, we must add to it Herodotos' 'mainland towns'. The date of the whole empire, then, depends upon that of the dedication of Rheneia, and there is a prima facie reason for placing it before 541.

---

1. For the date, v.infra, p. 285 n.1.

2. Thuk. i 13.6.

3. Id. iii 104.2.

It was an obvious suggestion that Thukydides' account of the gift of Rheneia to Delos should be connected with a story which is preserved by Photios and Suidas.[1] Polykrates instituted a festival on Delos, then sent to ask the Delphic priestess whether he should call it Delia or Pythia. She replied Ταῦτά σοι καὶ Πύθια καὶ Δήλια,[2] meaning that his death was near. The prophecy was fulfilled.

So among his islands, and shortly before his death, Polykrates controlled both Rheneia and Delos. How does this fit what we otherwise know of Delian history?[3] To judge from dedications, Delos was under the especial influence of Naxos from c.650 until the beginning of the sixth century, after which East Greek interests became more strong. But the only historical evidence for the present period relates to Peisistratos of Athens. At the Battle of Pallene, which inaugurated his third tyranny at an uncertain date, Peisistratos had the help of the Naxian Lygdamis. Gaining control of Athens, Peisistratos took hostages from his opponents and put them on Naxos, which he had conquered

---

1. S.v. Πύθια καὶ Δήλια ; H. W. Parke, 'Polykrates and Delos', CQ xl (1946) 105-8.

2. Ταῦτά seems to me an obvious emendation for the meaningless τάδε τα of the received text.

3. See W. A. Laidlaw, A History of Delos (Oxford, 1933) 57ff.

and made a tyranny for Lygdamis. He had also - surely at the same time - purified Delos, digging up all graves in sight of the sanctuary and moving their occupants elsewhere.[1] Control of Delos is the symbol of control of the Kykladic archipelago, and no one else could hold Delos or Rheneia while Peisistratos and Lygdamis were in power. Since Lygdamis as tyrant helped Polykrates II to his throne,[2] the Samian's accession was later than Peisistratos' seizure of Naxos and Delos, which itself preceded Lygdamis' tyranny. Consequently, as Professor Parke saw,[3] any interference in Delos by Polykrates II must be later than 525/4, when the Spartans deposed Lygdamis,[4] but before his death three years later.

But was it possible then? By that time Polykrates II was navally weaker - his own political opponents could defeat him though they had only forty ships[5] - and he was forced to seek shelter under the Persian umbrella.[6] It is not likely that either Sparta or Athens would allow their enemy a

---

1. Hdt. i 61.4, 64; Thuk. iii 104.1.
2. Polyainos i 23; cf. p. 304.
3. Loc.cit.
4. Cf. infra, p. 324.
5. Hdt. iii 45.2: infra, pp. 322 f.
6. Hdt. iii 44.

Kykladic empire at this time.[1]

If, on the other hand, we take up again the prima facie argument already made, that the Samian island empire should be dated earlier than the fall of Sardeis, then quite a different picture emerges. The apprehensions of the larger cities of Asia Minor were occupied by Kroisos, who, upon his accession in 556/5, initiated a policy of imperial expansion in every direction.[2] Now was the moment, when all were concerned with a greater threat, for an enterprising islander to seize a number of small towns on the sea-coast for his own. It is probable that they consisted mainly of the places which were catalogued as Samian in later days,

---

1. For Polykrates II and Sparta, infra, pp. 323ff. That Polykrates and Peisistratos were mutually hostile has been suggested by D. M. Leahy, JHS lxxvii (1957) 274. (For scholars who have maintained the contrary, seeing Lygdamis as a friendly link between the two other tyrants whom he helped to power, and adducing common enmity for Lesbos, see ibid. nn. 26, 28.) Leahy's argument is from Samian hostility to Miletos (Hdt. iii 39.4), 'the traditional friend of Eretria' (Id. v 99.1) who supported Peisistratos (Arist., Ath. Resp. xv 2; cf. Hdt. i 61.2, 62.1. Cf. also Id. v 99.1, where it is explicitly noted that Eretria joined the Ionian Revolt - after the fall of the tyrants - for a reason other than friendship for Athens.)

2. Hdt. i 28. For the date of Kroisos' accession, v. infra, p. 285 and n.1.

on the Ionian paralia between Ephesos and Priene,[1] and that Polykrates held them with the agreement of Kroisos who was, as we have seen, his ally and his friend.[2]

The death of Polykrates I occurred soon after the fall of Sardeis.[3] A fulfilled prophecy that it would not be long delayed, therefore, should belong to the later forties. The available evidence is in conflict at certain points; but Peisistratos' final return at Pallene should be dated not earlier than 546.[4] His seizure of Naxos and Delos was subsequent to this. Some time previously Naxos had evidently been torn by civil war; for Lygdamis, who had been a leader, προστάτης, of the oligarchic party,[5] was looking for a chance to make himself tyrant - now, presumably, a political exile. The chain of events may best be reconstructed as follows:

---

1. Cf. ATL i 515 Μελάθριοι, 543 Πυγελῆς; Strabo 639; Pliny, NH v 113-4; J. Keil, 'Zur Topographie der ionischen Küste südlich von Ephesos', Jahresh. des öst. arch. Inst. xi (1908) Beiblatt 135-168.

2. V. supra, pp. 272ff.

3. V. infra, p. 296.

4. Cf. F. Schachermeyr, RE 'Peisistratos'; infra, p. 305 and n. 2.

5. Arist., Pol., 1305a.

556/5 Accession of Kroisos.

c.555-50 Ionian defences face East: Polykrates I seizes certain coastal towns with Kroisos' permission.

c.550-40 Stasis in Naxos.

c.545 Polykrates seises Delos, Rheneia, and other islands; dedicates Rheneia to Apollo, and institutes festival at Delos.

541/0 Fall of Sardeis.

c.540 Death of Polykrates: Samos submits to Persia.

Third tyranny of Peisistratos, who takes over Naxos and Delos, giving the former to Lygdamis.

With no more evidence than this it is profitless to venture a reconstruction of the list of Samian dependencies at this time; though a measure of influence over the whole group of Kyklades is implied, with control of the chief shipping route from Asia to the West.

Polykrates had meant his dedication and festival at Delos - another instance of his μεγαλοπρέπεια - to be the crown of his achievement. The Pythia warned him that he would not live long to enjoy it. Her prophecy was fulfilled, thanks to the arrival of a new barbarian invader who upset all Polykrates' nicely balanced policies.

V

Death found even that wily old Lydian Alyattes unprepared. The throne fell into dispute between two sons. After a

struggle Kroisos succeeded in 556/5.[1]

In 549 Kyros, king of Persia for ten years past, overthrew the empire of the Medes at Pasargadai. The emperor Astyages was Kroisos' brother-in-law, and Lydia had had no fear of Median encroachment since the end of war between the two states thirty-six years previously.[2] But a new wave of apprehension followed Kyros' coup, and Kroisos felt himself bound at last to avenge Astyages' fall. He therefore changed his policy towards the Ionians from active oppression to friendly alliance, and took steps to secure the cooperation of Persia's other enemies Amasis of Egypt and Nabonidus of Babylon. All three powers had long depended

---

1. Cf. supra, pp.274. I accept the dates for Kroisos' reign inferred from the Marmor Parium (FGrHist 239 A 41, 42, and comm.: probably following Xanthos). The alternative system of Apollodoros put the fall of Sardeis in 546/5, and is often associated with a note in the Nabonidus Chronicle of Kyros' defeat and execution of a king of Lu... in 547. (For the 'death' of Kroisos, cf. Bakchylides iii 23-62.) The earlier dates have been reargued recently by H. Kaletsch, Historia vii (1958) 1-47, esp. 39-47: Kroisos' reign ended in autumn 547/6. But Herodotos' account that Kroisos was spared (i 86ff) is confirmed by the circumstantial detail preserved by Ktesias that Kyros gave Kroisos Barene near Ekbatana (Persica 29.4). We may therefore deny the relevance of the Nabonidus Chronicle, and accept the later dates so as to avoid creating an unexplained gap in Kyros' career between the fall of Sardeis and his quite brief war against Babylon, whose own records guarantee that city's fall in 539.

2. Hdt. i 74: May 28th 585 B.C.

upon Greek mercenaries for a considerable part of their land forces, and it seemed logical now (probably 542) to offer membership of the alliance to the strongest state of the Greek mainland - Sparta, recently risen to lead a Peloponnesian league.[1] Thus the Quadruple Alliance prepared to meet the challenge of the new Persian empire.

The Lydian king's own army contained some battalions of his Ionian allies:[2] their cities were the base-line of his strength and the last centres of loyal but hopeless resistance when he was beaten.

By 541 it was clear that Kyros could not be trusted to honour the frontier agreed between Kyaxares and Alyattes in 585. Accordingly Kroisos advanced over the Halys into Kappadokia, to try his strength in battle at Pteria.[3] Though not conclusive,[4] the result was sufficiently disquieting for Kroisos to decide upon withdrawal until the following spring, meanwhile summoning his allies to be present four months hence. But the onset of winter did not deter

---

1. Id. i 69-70, 77, whence it is clear that the Egyptian and Babylonian alliances were made earlier than that with Sparta, which was itself made only a little while before Kroisos crossed the Halys.

2. Cf. Hdt. i 76.3.

3. Perhaps Boghazköy (see W. M. Ramsay, Historical Geography Asia Minor (London, 1890) 33; How and Wells ad Hdt. i 76.1): but the geography is quite uncertain (cf. D. G. Hogarth, Ionia and the East (Oxford, 1909) 6).

4. So Herodotos; but late writers suppose that Kroisos was now defeated (Polyainos vii 8; Just. i 7).

Kyros. He pursued at a cautious distance, and was nearly upon Sardeis before Kroisos became aware of his approach. The Lydian king had improvidently dismissed all the Ionians and mercenaries, and was left with none but his own subjects to oppose the Persian host. He summoned his allies to his immediate and urgent rescue. But before they could even assemble a force Kroisos was defeated in battle and Sardeis taken, after a siege lasting only a fortnight.[1]

The only member of the Quadruple Alliance geographically in a position to send forces at such notice was Sparta. And she, not for the last time in her history, was prevented by trouble at home, on this occasion by a border dispute with Argos. However, she set to work to gather a fleet, and meanwhile, as an earnest of her goodwill, sent Kroisos a bronze krater, which Polykrates' corsairs were quick to intercept and carry off to Samos. This was the second signal act of piracy directed by Polykrates against the Quadruple Alliance. For in the previous year he had carried off the friendly gift of a linen corselet sent by

---

1. Hdt. i 76-84 for the whole campaign.

Amasis to the Spartans.[1]

The alliance of these great powers, Lydia and Sparta, had been cultivated by Polykrates, as by his predecessor Syloson, until this moment. What lies behind so sudden a change of policy?

The two kingdoms had been courted in the first place for commercial reasons, and it is natural to suppose that their rejection had a similar motive. The growth of Samian prosperity during the past century had been largely a gift of geography. Rivals on the mainland, though blessed with superior natural resources, had been subject to repeated depradation both by the Kimmerians and by the Lydian kings whenever the attention of the latter had not been distracted by foreign warfare.[2] Safe in their island the Samians could amass riches without interruption. At first their wealthiest competitors across the Strait had been the

---

1. Hdt. iii 47; for the krater, Id. i 70 also. That the krater was sent as late as this - and so for the purpose I suggest - seems assured by the Samian allegation (presumably an argument for the defence in 525/4) that its carriers heard of the fall of Sardeis on their way, and so sold it in Samos. The Samians added that ἰδιώτας ἀνδρας bought it to dedicate in the Heraion, and perhaps they were able to show the inscription as evidence. This, however, is no answer to the charge of piracy: stolen goods are not without commercial value.

2. I include here not merely Miletos and Phokaia, but all the continental members of the Hellenion at Naukratis (Hdt. ii 178; cf. supra, pp. 248ff).

Milesians. Miletos was now firmly committed to Kroisos, though she was to withdraw in time to secure a favourable agreement with Persia. But she was passing through a period of comparative decline: the two generations of stasis which disrupted her economy between the end of Thrasyboulos' tyranny and the Parian arbitration before the rise of Histiaios must on any reckoning include the middle years of the century.[1] A more effective competitor at the present time was Phokaia, now at the peak of her naval and commercial supremacy.[2] She, more than any Greek city, had linked her own fortunes with those of the Lydian kingdom. She lay near the mouth of the River Hermos, which flows past Sardeis: hence the Lydians found her a convenient port. Her plentiful coinage was of Lydian electrum;[3] with Samos she was the greatest exporter of Lydian myrrh;[4] she was closely associated with Paktyes' Lydian revolt after the conquest;

---

1. Hdt. v 28: Histiaios was tyrant before the Skythian expedition of 514 (Id. iv 137, cf. infra, pp. 347ff). The two generations perhaps covered the sixty years from 585 (end of the Milesian thalassocracy, see pp.485f) to 525/4, when the list of annual Aisymnetai begins (Milet I iii No.122): cf. supra, pp. 185ff.

2. According to the received list she now enjoyed 44 years of thalassocracy: see p.486.

3. See Head, Hist. Num.[2] 287f.

4. Supra, pp.276f.

and when the revolt failed and her inhabitants were the first to be attacked by Harpagos, they could see no future for themselves remaining in Asia, but preferred even to sail away to find a new living in the uncertain West.[1] The activities of Phokaia had been a hindrance to Samian commerce ever since she took advantage of the political unrest in the island which preceded the rise of Syloson to capture the Spanish silver trade from Samos, to guard the route with warships, and hedge it about with colonies.[2] More recently, Phokaia had found a place in the Hellenion at Naukratis,[3] and had also prevented a Samian monopoly in the sale of Lydian cosmetics.[4]

This reconstruction, proposing the political hostility of Samos for Phokaia as a result of commercial rivalry, runs counter to the modern tendency to discount the possibility of such motives.[5] But Herodotos says that on this occasion the Chians refused to sell the islands of Oinoussai

---

1. Hdt. i 152.1; 163ff.
2. Cf. supra, pp. 147f.
3. Hdt. ii 178.2.
4. Supra, pp. 276f.
5. Cf. supra, pp. 100f.

to Phokaia διαμαίνοντες μὴ σφι μέν ἐμπόριον γένωνται, ἡ δὲ σφῶν νῆσος ἀποκλησθῇ τούτου εἵνεκα .[1] There can be no more direct evidence that political action against Phokaia at this time proceeded from economic considerations.

Polykrates will have argued that the victory of Kyros, now clearly inevitable, would bring the economic ruin, if not the physical destruction, of Kroisos' mainland allies. The fall of Miletos would remove a greedy buyer of Egyptian and Pontic produce; that of Phokaia would besides reopen the far West to Samos[2] - the Carthaginian barrier was not yet impenetrable - and leave her with the only substantial free war-fleet in the East. As so often when islanders find themselves in a position to play off one continental power against another, the temptation was irresistible - especially since Samos herself would be impregnable behind her moat: Kyros was without a navy.

So in 542 Polykrates marked his rejection of the Four Allies by intercepting Amasis' gift to Sparta. This interference was unexpected; for had he known of Polykrates' hostility Amasis could have sent his ship by the alternative

---

1. Hdt. i 165.1.

2. For Polykrates' interest in the West, compare his introduction of Sicilian pigs: Klytos ap. Athen. 540c (supra, p.233).

route past friendly Kyrene and Krete.[1] A year later, Polykrates prevented the news of Sparta's naval preparations from reaching Kroisos, and so perhaps hastened his willingness to surrender.

Sardeis fell during the winter. Immediately upon the news of this a series of Ionian and Aiolian embassies approached Kyros, offering their cities to become his vassals under the same conditions which they had formerly received from Kroisos. Early in his campaign Kyros had made an offer to the Greeks on these very lines. Now nothing less than their complete subjugation would content him. The embassies withdrew to Panionion: the old religius league for the first time took on political significance.[2] Here all except the Milesians (to whom alone Kyros had granted terms) discussed what they should do next. They decided on resistance, strengthened their fortifications, and sent to Sparta for help. The legation, headed by Pythermos of Phokaia, failed to fire the Spartans, who, however, bestirred themselves to the extent of sending a single ship

---

1. The route which Nikias closed to the Spartans by his seizure of Kythera in 424: Thuk. iv 53.3.

2. Hdt. i 141. There is no evidence of joint resistance to Lydia: indeed, we read specifically in the case of Miletos that she was aided only by Chios (Id. i 18.3). Thales had recently proposed an Ionian union, but in vain (Ibid. 170.3).

to watch the outcome and at the same time to order Kyros not to proceed against Ionia.[1] This was in spring 540.

If Polykrates the pirate was still in power, the Samians can hardly have been concerned in these plans and negotiations. And indeed Herodotos implies that neither Chios nor Samos was involved, saying that the islanders were not afraid of Kyros, who as yet had no fleet.[2]

Kyros left the reduction of the Greeks to his lieutenants, then marched to Ekbatana to devise the downfall of his remaining enemies in Babylon and Egypt.[3] As soon as his back was turned, Paktyes, whom he had left as puppet Treasurer of Sardeis, attempted to lead a Lydian revolt. He was put down, it appears with no great effort. Then, one by one, and after heavy fighting, the Greek cities of the coast fell to Harpagos, the most trusted of Kyros' henchmen.[4]

VI

'So, a second time, Ionia was enslaved. And when Harpagos had conquered the continental Ionians, the islanders were in terror and surrendered themselves to Kyros.'[5]

1. Hdt. i 152-3.
2. Ibid. 143.1.
3. Ibid. 153.3, 4.
4. Ibid. 154-170.
5. Ibid. 169.2.

The phrase οἱ τὰς νήσους ἔχοντες Ἴωνες cannot but include Chios and Samos: indeed, it is hard to see who else could be meant. Both islands had probably hoped to remain neutral. Chios at least had refused to grant asylum to Paktyes, and had handed him back to the Persians. But she had done this for gold, not under any compulsion.[1] The islanders, we learn, had no fear of subjection to Persia; for she had no fleet until the conquest of Phoinikia a decade later.[2] They had already contemplated the defeat of mainland Ionia and Aiolis, and had not found the prospect fearful to themselves. What, then, lies behind their changed policy? What new terror could Harpagos instil?

The literary authorities offer no answer to this question; only Pausanias records that on an unspecified occasion the Persians burned the Heraion.[3] Here archaeology comes to our assistance, the evidence recently interpreted by Mr. Boardman.[4] The first dipteron (the 'Rhoikos temple')

---

1. Ibid. 160.3, 4.

2. Ibid. 143.1.

3. Paus. VII v 4, also stating that the Persians burned the temple of Athena at Phokaia - presumably when that city fell to Harpagos. It does not necessarily follow from the context that the two temples were destroyed at the same time.

4. J. Boardman, Antiquaries Journal xxxix (1959) 199ff.

was built in the second quarter of the sixth century, and was destroyed by fire.[1] It was replaced by a second temple of similar design, built largely over the same site and partly of the same materials, which, though never completed, was never burned. There is no stratigraphical evidence available; but historically the second temple can hardly have been started after the reign of Polykrates II, and stylistically its earliest mouldings seem to belong to the third quarter of the century.[2] This then, is the admittedly vague terminus ante quem for the destruction of Rhoikos' temple.

The same altar served for both temples, and did not suffer the fate of the first dipteron.[3] This circumstance would argue that the temple perished by accident, not malice, and that Pausanias records a lying tradition, were it not for the evidence of the West Nekropolis. Here the stelai were broken down and subsequently reused in later graves.

---

1. Buschor proposed 560-550 as the building period: Ath. Mitt. lv (1930) 50f. Dinsmoor preferred a date c.575, so that Samos might have inspired the dipteral temples of Selinous and Syracuse: The Architecture of Ancient Greece[3] 75, 124. Buschor is now prepared to accept a date c.570 for the beginning of work: Ath. Mitt. lxxii (1957) 1ff; private communication. On the destruction, see Buschor, Ath. Mitt. lv 95f; O. Reuther, Der Heratempel von Samos (Berlin, 1957) 63f.

2. Boardman, op.cit. 200, and references there cited.

3. Cf. H. Schlief, Ath. Mitt. lviii (1933) 174ff.

Boehlau (followed by Buschor) supposed that the destruction took place during the Spartan attack of 525/4, on the ground of pottery from the later burials, which he dated to the last quarter of the century.[1] But this pottery was in fact misdated: there is nothing that need belong to the last quarter, little that can be even as late as the third.[2] To judge from the pottery, then, the desecration took place about the middle of the century. The style of the stelai agrees with this conclusion: 'we find their characteristic feature of alternate shallow convex and concave palmette leaves according well with the flutes on the column bases of the first dipteron, their contemporaries.'[3] These stelai were called Polykrateian by Buschor, since he accepted Boehlau's date for their destruction.[4] The effect of raising their date by a quarter-century will be to re-assign Buschor's post-Polykrateian stelai to the reign of Polykrates II.[5] These have shallow concave palmette leaves, and would be altogether more suitably grouped with the column

---

1. Aus ionischen und italischen Nekropolen 30-32. For Buschor's study of the stelai, Ath. Mitt. lviii (1933) 22ff.

2. Boardman, op.cit. 202 and n.3.

3. Ibid.202. Boardman well compares the alternate red and black leaves of palmettes in vase-painting.

4. Ath. Mitt. lviii 31-4, Group IV, Beil. xi-xiii 1.

5. Ibid. 34-6, Group V, Beil. xiii 2-xiv.

bases of the second dipteron, which precisely echo this form. Finally, one of the latter group of stelai was found in this very Nekropolis, and not apparently among those reused, so helping the meagre pottery to show renewed use of the Nekropolis in the third quarter of the century.[1]

The burning of the temple may be accidental; but few accidents will destroy a cemetery.[2] Nor, pace Boehlau and Buschor, is it conceivable that Greeks would commit such desecration - least of all Greeks who were merely intervening in civil war. The evidence of the nekropolis, therefore, shows that it was destroyed by non-Greeks close to the time of the conflagration which ruined the temple. Pausanias makes the Persians guilty of the latter disaster, and we may confidently hold them responsible for both.[3]

How did this happen? Polykrates had not allowed for the possibility of a Milesian treaty with Kyros on the same terms as with Kroisos. The terms included the obligation to provide forces when required.[4] I suppose that Harpagos made a surprise attack in Milesian - or, for that matter,

---

1. Boehlau, op.cit. Taf. i 1.

2. An earthquake, perhaps: but there are no traces of one.

3. Parallel is their desecration of the Kerameikos at Athens: cf. G. Karo, An Attic Cemetery 23.

4. Cf. Hdt. i 22.4 (the treaty with Alyattes: συμμάχους); Diog. Laert. i 25.

any captured Ionian - ships, landed for long enough to fire the temple and desecrate the cemetery, and made off before the Samians were properly aware of what had happened. He could not, of course, venture a battle or impose a blockade. But his objectives were chosen with a sound grasp of Greek psychology.

The surrender of Samos soon followed. Since it is clear that Polykrates II and his brothers had to seize power from a republican government,[1] Polykrates I must have been deprived of his power some time previously. This is the natural occasion. What became of the tyrant, we do not know. But the Persians were not in the habit of executing conquered kings; and it was probably his own oligarchs who murdered Polykrates as a prelude to their capitulation. These final events are to be dated in 540 or 539.

So ended, if we may judge from the material remains, the brightest epoch of Samian history. Fortune had for the island another decade of importance in store. But the unroofed second temple was to stand as a monument to the unreality of Polykrates II's vision of a Samos as free and powerful as in his father's day.

---

1. Infra, pp.299ff.

Chapter Six

THE FINAL STAND

The oligarchs disposed of the tyrant and made their peace with Harpagos. But there is no indication that he sent an occupation force.

Three pieces of evidence support the hypothesis that there was a short but significant interval in the tyranny at this time. The first is numismatic. The electrum coinage of Polykrates I had as its obverse type the scalp of a lion.[1] It was struck on a slightly heavier variant of the Euboic standard, the stater weighing c.17.40 gm. The silver coinage of Polykrates II, of which only fractions have been found, is of Lydo-Milesian weight (stater c.14.20 gm.), but shows the lion's scalp as the type of the first one-sided hektai[2] and as the reverse type of the later quarters or drachms.[3] There is, however, a rare issue

---

1. E. Babelon, Traité des Monnaies grecques et romaines II i (Paris, 1907) 201ff: staters illustrated, Nos. 355, 371; half-staters, Nos. 356, 373, 387; hekte, No. 379; hemiekton, No. 381. The type is not always easy to discern.

2. Traité Pl. xi 19 (2.53 gm.).

3. Cf. ibid., Pl. cl 6 (3.46 gm.); not Pl. cl 4-5, which are of Samian standard and belong to the Ionian Revolt. See pp. 566ff.

represented by a half-stater in the British Museum, stylistically later than the electrum coinage, one-sided with the forepart of an ox as its type. It weighs 8.74 gm., and was perhaps accompanied by a hemidrachm of 2.12 gm., and an obol, 0.62 gm.[1] These weights (at least the first two) are unmistakably accurate divisions of the heavy Euboic stater. The coins must therefore fall between the Euboic electrum and the Lydo-Milesian silver, that is, before the reign of Polykrates II, but after the flow of electrum from Lydia had been stopped. The interruption of the normal type, I suggest, carries a reflection of the changed government.

Secondly, the only surviving fragment of Erxias' Kolophoniaka tells how the Samians built a gymnasium to Eros and called his feast 'Eleutheria'.[2] Athenaios comments that the Athenians too found eleutheria through Eros - a reference to Harmodios and Aristogeiton - and that the Peisistratids hated the god accordingly. This suggests that the gymnasium at Samos in fact celebrated delivery from a tyrant. From which tyrant? Athenaios, I believe, himself

---

1. Traité II i 279, Nos. 446-8, Pl. xi 21-2.

2. FGrHist 449 F 1, ap. Athen. 561f-562a.

provides the answer:[1] tyrants were everywhere keen to root out τοὺς παιδικοὺς ἔρωτας, for such friendships were dangerous to them; εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ τὰς παλαίστρας ὥσπερ ἐπιτειχίσματα τῆς ἰδίας ἀκροπόλεως ἐνεπίμπρασάν τε καὶ κατέσκαψαν· ὡς ἔπαινος Πολυκράτης ὁ Σαμίων τύραννος. The two passages taken together suggest that the gymnasium of Eros was built (and the Eleutheria founded) after the death of Polykrates I; and that his son removed the insult upon his accession.[2]

Thirdly, we have the late evidence of Iamblichos who drew upon what remained of the Pythagorean tradition of the Master's life. Pythagoras fled from Polykrates I, and spent the first part of his long exile in Egypt by his own choice, the second in Babylon as a prisoner. But he escaped thence, for he was once again in Samos when Polykrates II seized power.[3] When Pythagoras reached Samos he was recognized by a few of the older men; and, παρακαλούσης δὲ τὸν δημοσίᾳ τῆς πατρίδος ὠφελεῖν ἅπαντας, he seems to have

1. Athen. 602d.

2. 'The palaestra may exist without a gymnasium, but no gymnasium can exist without a palaestra. Moreover, in a gymnasium the necessary buildings are naturally centred round the palaestra. Hence ... the two terms are in practice often used synonymously': E. N. Gardiner, Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals (London, 1910) 467f; cf. K. Schneider, RE xviii (1942) s.v. παλαίστρα; Daremberg and Saglio, Dict. des Ant. s.v. Gymnasium.

3. Iambl., de Vita Pyth. ii 11, iv 19, xviii 88; cf. summary account of Strabo 638; and APPENDIX C.

taken a great part in politics.[1] Such an official appeal would be most unlikely if the tyrant were still in power; and indeed the phrasing suggests that such was not the case. Pythagoras, we know from his career in Italy, was an oligarch; and it was by the oligarchs that he was called to re-enter Samian public life, until exile was once again forced upon him by the old tyrant's son.[2]

For the rest, the history of these years is lost.

II

While the oligarchs were in power, the young Polykrates had supported himself by hiring out tankards and priceless coverlets for weddings and the larger receptions.[3] The tankards are called ποτήρια, and so were of metal and perhaps from Theodoros' workshop; the coverlets, στρωμνά, were of wool, probably from the Milesian and Attic sheep with which Polykrates I had improved his flocks.[4] It is likely that all this finery had been rescued from the Palace during the

---

1. Iambl., op.cit. v 20, vi 28.

2. Chorikios of Gaza (6th cent. A.D.), Miltiades 77, says Polykrates overthrew the democracy. It is hard to see what could have been his authority for this, and it may safely be dismissed.

3. Alexis, FGrHist 539 F 2, ap. Athen. 540d-e.

4. Cf. supra, pp. 23-24.

revolution; and, if so, the fact that it could be openly displayed without fear of confiscation indicates the respect in which the family was held even when out of office. This is not surprising, for Polykrates I must have owed his reign of more than thirty years to a measure of collaboration with his oligarchs.[1]

The same conclusion about the popularity of Polykrates II - though not necessarily with the oligarchs - is to be drawn from the organization of the coup which brought him to power; for if we cannot seriously believe that only fifteen hoplites took part,[2] nevertheless the number cannot have been great.

It was time for an armed procession to be made to the Heraion. Polykrates told off his brothers Syloson and Pantagnotos to join it with a band of conspirators; then, before the sacrifice, when all should have laid aside their arms by the altars, to take a man each from among the prominent oligarchs and kill him. This they did. Meanwhile Polykrates himself seized the strategic points of the city, and barricaded himself within the walls of the akropolis,

---

1. Notice that Lygdamis of Naxos, ally of Polykrates II, had been an oligarchic leader before he became tyrant: Aristotle, Pol. 1305a.

2. Cf. Hdt. iii 120, Mitrobates' taunt to Oroites.

with the aid of some troops which he had requested from Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos.[1]

What was the secret of Polykrates' success? He overthrew oligarchs; then his appeal was to the demos. The universal left-wing platform of the ancient world was γῆς ἀναδασμός and χρεῶν ἀποκοπή.[2] There is some indication that Polykrates promised the former, good evidence that he both promised and fulfilled the latter. He coined in silver on the Lydo-Milesian standard (stater of 14.20 gm.). Hitherto all Samian coins had been of Euboic weight (stater of 17.30 gm.) - silver under the oligarchs, electrum under the preceding tyranny.[3] As Condurachi has recently pointed out, this is a devaluation of precisely the same kind as that which, according to Aristotle, Solon made at Athens.[4]

---

1. Polyainos, Strat. i 23; cf. Hdt. iii 39. The name Pantagnotos occurs again in Samos in the Hellenistic period: Ἀρχ. Δελτ. ix (1927) 100.

2. Cf. for instance Demosth. xvii 15.

3. For detailed references, v.supra, pp.249f.

4. Aristotle, Resp. Athen. x 2; cf. Plut., Solon xv. In the light of C. M. Kraay's study of the chronology of the early Athenian coinage (Num. Chron. 1956, 43-68), it is clear that Solon did not so manipulate Athenian currency in 594/3. Alternative remedies are to lower the date of Solon; to divorce the currency reform from his name; or to suppose that he made Athens use Corinthian coins instead of Aiginetan in 594/3. For Samos, Em. Condurachi, 'La Réforme monétaire de Polycrate', Athenaeum NS xxxvi (1958) 238-247. His argument is not at all invalidated by his use of the wrong light-weight coins, nor by his incorrect statement that the minting of electrum was continued for use abroad.

This is the χρεῶν ἀποκοπή: debts contracted in heavy drachmai could be paid in the new lighter coins. I go beyond Condurachi in suggesting that this was one of Polykrates' 'election promises'. With it should go γῆς ἀναδασμός. I believe that he promised that too, but, like his father before him, found that he had to compromise with the powerful Geomoroi in the interests of security. The democrats waited for five or six years. But then we hear them grumbling over the promise that was not fulfilled, and see them following Arkesilas to Kyrene for a similar hope.[1] They gave Polykrates his power; and when he disappointed them they destroyed him.

For the accession of Polykrates the date given by Eusebios is 533 B.C., and there is no reason not to accept this as substantially correct.[2]

---

1. Hdt. iv 163.1: v.infra, pp. 317, 320.

2. Polyainos' reference to Lygdamis as tyrant of Naxos (if reliable: he could help Peisistratos without being tyrant) gives the only terminus post quem, governed by the date of Peisistratos' third tyranny in Athens (cf. Hdt. i 64.1-2). But no reconstructed chronology of Peisistratos' successive periods of tyranny and exile accounts for all the evidence (cf. F. Schachermeyr, RE 'Peisistratos', coll. 164ff; C. Hignett, A History of the Athenian Constitution (Oxford, 1952) 328f), and it is unsafe to build further on such shaky foundations, except to say that the third tyranny began not earlier than 546. Busolt asserted that Lygdamis was already tyrant of Naxos at the time of the battle of Pallene (Gr. Gesch.^{2} ii 508 n.3). Otherwise we have only Thuk. i 13.6, who equates the reign of Polykrates with that of Kambyses in Persia (529-522).

At first, Polykrates and his brothers ruled Samos as a triumvirate. But before long they quarrelled: Pantagnotos was assassinated, Syloson driven into exile.[1] It may be that they had been more anxious than Polykrates to collaborate with the oligarchic party, recalling that their father's long rule had been made possible by just such collaboration.[2] This conclusion as to the nature of the quarrel should perhaps be drawn from the fact that Pythagoras was evidently exiled about the same time. The chronographers agree in placing the latter event in the sixty-second Olympiad (532-528).[3]

A considerable number of Samians were involved in these disturbances, and not all of them were content to join the Pythagorean colony at Kroton. Jerome records under the year 531 Samii Dicaearchiam condiderunt quam nunc Puteolos vocant: the name gives the reason for the foundation. The place was never more than a subsidiary port of Cumae until Roman times, and never struck an independent coinage. Little is known of its history.[4] But Mr. M. W. Frederiksen

---

1. Hdt. iii 39.2.

2. Supra, p. 303 and n.1.

3. Cf. Eusebios, 01.62.3 (Jer.); APPENDIX C.

4. Beloch, Campanien (Berlin, 1879) 88ff; RE 'Dikaiarcheia', 'Puteoli'. Mommsen rejected the tradition of Samian foundation: CIL x p. 182.

informs me that the akropolis is said to carry remains of six-century walls.

III

Polykrates' easy success in regaining the tyranny suggests that his people were ready for a return to the policy of independence of the mainland empire which his father had pursued. They had surrendered quickly in 539, after Harpagos' raid, but when no occupation followed, they had second thoughts.

It has already been remarked that the μεγαλοπρέπεια of Polykrates I's reign contrasts sharply with the austerity of the present period.[1] Few offerings of any size were dedicated at the Heraion, and work on the new temple itself proceeded at a snail's pace. Yet, inasmuch as Samian wealth was largely the reward of enterprise in areas not yet in Persian hands - Egypt, Kypros, Thrake, mainland Greece, and the West - there is no obvious reason why the island should have become suddenly poor. Rather it would seem that a considerable amount of money still flowed in to Samos, but that it was being spent in other ways: that private citizens were less affluent because of heavier

1. Supra, pp. 190ff; cf. G. M. A. Richter, Kouroi^2 114.

taxes, and that the increased state revenue was dispersed directly to men employed on national projects.

This is reflected in the coinage. The largest coin in circulation in the reign of Polykrates I was the Euboic electrum stater of 17.40 gm. The largest coin minted by his son was a Lydo-Milesian silver drachm of 3.55 gm.[1] The ratio of the value of equal weights of gold and silver was 13 1/3:1 in the sixth century, and of electrum and silver 10:1.[2] The largest coin of Polykrates I, therefore, was forty-nine times the value of the largest coin of Polykrates II. But the latter pieces are sufficiently common for us to be sure that no inconsiderable total sum of purchasing power was in circulation in the later period. Electrum staters represent capital savings, and now there were none, only current wages.

From our literary authorities it is clear that the purpose of the national projects on which virtually all revenue was being expended was in fact defence.

In this expenditure the naval estimates undoubtedly formed the greatest single item. Ancient writers are unanimous in assigning the Samian thalassocracy to this

---

1. V. supra, pp. 299f.

2. A. R. Burns, Money and Monetary Policy 474f.

period.[1] This is not necessarily to say that Samian sea-power was greater now than it had ever been, but that it was greater than that of any other contemporary maritime state. The size of the fleet is given by Herodotos as one hundred 'pentekonters',[2] and he tells us later that in 525 the desperate oligarchs, returning from Egypt in forty 'triremes', were able to defeat the home fleet.[3] The total is not remarkable: Samos could man sixty ships for the battle of Lade in 495, Miletos eighty, and Chios a hundred - and this only four years after throwing off the Persian yoke.[4]

It is dangerous to press Herodotos' naval terminology, as some have done, arguing that Polykrates inherited a hundred single-level pentekonters, and that by 525 he was in the process of replacing them with triremes, of which

---

1. Hdt. iii 39.3-4, 122.2 πρῶτος ὃς θαλασσοκρατέειν ἐπενοήθη; Thuk. i 13.6, with date ἐπὶ Καμβύσου; Strabo 637; Eusebios, ed. Schoene, i p. 225 (Chronographia), ii p. 98 (Arm. vers. of Chron. Can.). Cf. J. L. Myres, JHS xxvi (1906) 84-130; J. A. Davison, CQ xli (1947) 18-24; APPENDIX D.

2. Hdt. iii 39.3.

3. Ibid. 44-45; perhaps tacitly contradicted by Thuk. i 14, who says that pentekonters were normal until the fifth century, when triremes replaced them. Note that Polykrates cast his ring from a pentekonter, Hdt. iii 41 (implied date c.525?); and that he sailed to his death upon one in 522, ibid. 124.2: How and Wells ad ibid. 44.2.

4. Id. vi 8; infra, p. 367.

he had so far built forty.[1] Yet it is clear that Polykrates did in fact introduce a new type of warship, and that those sailed by the rebel oligarchs in 525 were of the new design.

This ship was known in antiquity as the Samaina. It is described by Plutarch in his Perikles:[2] ἡ δὲ Σάμαινα νῆός ἐστιν ὑόπεως μὲν τὸ σίμωμα, κοιλοτέρα δὲ καὶ μετεωροειδής, ὥστε καὶ φορτοφορεῖν καὶ τάχυναυτεῖν. οὕτω δ' ὠνομάσθη διὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἐν Σάμῳ φανῆναι, Πολυκράτους τυράννου κατασκευάσαντος. (It is implied that other states adopted the design.) Photios and Suidas add that the Samaina was πλοῖον δίκροτον, a bireme,[3] Hesychios that it was decked for its whole length and that it was distinguished from other types of vessel by its boar's head ram as well as by its greater breadth.[4] All this adds up to a remarkably full description, and we are able to identify

---

1. Cf. Davison, op.cit. 20f. As a warning of the danger involved, see Hdt. v 85.1, where a trireme is used in the war between Athens and Aigina c.700 (for which v.sup., pp. 93ff).

2. Plut., Per. xxvi.

3. S.v. Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος, citing Lysimachos' Nostoi, FGrHist 382 F 7: for the meaning, R. T. Williams, JHS lxxviii (1958) 126. Cf. also Phot.-Suid. s.vv. Σάμαινα and Σαμικὸν τρόπον, quoting Choirilochos (? Choirilos of Samos, FGrHist II B p. 515; RE iii 2359ff).

4. S.v. Σαμικὸς τρόπος, from Didymos. Triremes were not fully decked until after Salamis (Thuk. i 14.3), and the innovation appears to have been made by Kimon before the Eurymedon: Plut., Kim. xii 2 - note that in so doing he made the ships πλατύτερας, cf. μετεωροειδής of the Samaina.

the Samaina's prow on the tetradrachms which the Samian refugees struck at Zankle after the Ionian Revolt.[1] More important, there are two examples of Samainai to be recognized from the last quarter of the sixth century. The first is in Herodotos. After their final defeat in 525/4, the Samian democrats sailed away in Polykrates' ships and eventually settled at Kydonia in Krete. Five years later they were attacked and defeated by the Aiginetans, who τῶν νεῶν κατείους ἐχουσέων τὰς πρῴρας ἠκροτηρίδεσν, καὶ ἀνέθεσαν ἐς τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς Ἀθηναίης ἐν Αἰγίνῃ.[2] The second example is visual: an Attic black-figure cup in the British Museum, dating from early in the last quarter of the century, shows two stages in the seizure of a merchantman by pirates.[3] In the first scene, the holkos is travelling under shortened sail, while the pirate galley, a bireme with boar's head ram, pursues under full power of

---

1. Infra, p.379 ; cf. Phot.-Suid., s.v. Ἑκαταῖος ὁ λογοποιός ... οἱ δὲ τὴν Σάμαιναν νόμισμα εἶναι.

2. Hdt. iii 59. Cf. How and Wells, ad.loc.

3. Brit. Mus., B 436; L. Casson, 'Hemiolia and Trihemiolia', JHS lxxviii (1958) 14ff, citing earlier publications; R. T. Williams, ibid. 126f. Mr. B. B. Shefton tells me that the shape of the cup makes it almost certainly a work of the last quarter, though Casson and Davison (op.cit. 24 and n.5, quoting T. B. L. Webster) put it c.540. PLATE XLI.

wind and oars. In the second scene the merchant captain has become aware of his peril and is crowding on sail; but too late, for the pirates of the upper bank have already left their oars and now prepare to haul down their sails for the attack.[1] The pursuing vessel corresponds with the literary description of the Samaina, and the scenes were painted at the end of Polykrates' reign. Their subject - intentionally or not - is a reminder of Polykrates' notoriety as a pirate.

The navy was very much the 'senior service'. But the army was not neglected: in 525/4 it succeeded first in routing the native rebels and then in withstanding the Spartan expeditionary force; for both had evaded the fleet

---

1. In the first scene the warship has both banks of oars complete. In the second, only the lower bank is complete; the fore half-bank is shown above, but without rowers, while the after half is omitted altogether. Casson concludes (loc.cit.) that this is a hemiolia, of one and a half banks, with ancient descriptions of which it accords well. But his interpretation of the two scenes, which I follow in the text above, presupposes that they represent two stages in the same action. That is, the same warship is shown twice (as Casson says, op.cit. 15). It is therefore a bireme, with some oars removed before close combat; and its resemblance in this state to a hemiolia cannot logically be more than coincidental.

and made a landing.[1] The army was partly composed of citizen soldiers (including a regiment of a thousand archers) and partly of mercenaries.[2]

With the mainland conquered by Persia, self-exiled mercenaries would be more than usually easy to find. Citizens, on the other hand, are notoriously hard to recruit. So, apart from their wages, Polykrates offered an insurance policy in addition. Douris recorded that Polykrates gathered together the mothers of those who had fallen in 'the war', and entrusted them to the care of the wealthiest citizens, saying to each Μητέρα σοι τάνδρ' δίδωμι.[3] There is no clue as to which was 'the war'.

The first foreign challenge which Polykrates had to meet is recorded by Herodotos. The Milesians, aided by the Lesbians πανστρατιῇ, were defeated at sea.[4] They were,

---

1. Hdt. iii 45.2; 54.

2. Ibid. 39.3, 45.3 ἐπίκουροί τε μισθωτοὶ καὶ τοξόται οἰκήιοι; cf. 54.2; also Douris, cited in next note.

3. Douris, FGrHist 76 F 63 (Zenobios, Cent. v 64).

4. Hdt. iii 39.4. This was perhaps the occasion of Anakreon's comment πόλλα τοι' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι (Fr. 86), later quoted by the oracle of Branchidai to the Karians at the time of the Ionian Revolt (Zenob., Cent. v 80; infra, p. 360 n. 1). The scholiast on Aristoph., Plut. 999ff, makes the oracle so reply to Polykrates seeking Milesian allies: I take this to be a mistake induced by a little knowledge of Anakreon's life. Bekker dismisses it (ad loc) in favour of Zenobios. See also Athen. 523f, citing Aristotle Fr. 509; Hesychios, s.v. πόλλα ...; Diod. x 25.2; Synes., Ep. 81, p. 228e.

of course, both subject to Persia at this time,[1] and Herodotos' words disguise a Persian attack similar to that which an Ionian fleet launched against Naxos on Persia's behalf in 499.[2] If so, then Thukydides may be thinking of the same battle when, in the sentence immediately preceding his notice of Polykrates, he says that the Ionians had many ships in the time of Kyros and Kambyses, ἧς τε καθ' ἑαυτοὺς θαλάσσης Κύρῳ πολεμοῦντες ἐκράτησάν τινα χρόνον.[3] This would date the battle between Polykrates' accession in 533 and Kyros' death in 529. It is likely that Malalas' and Kedrenos' authority had the same engagement in mind: their account sets the war of the Samians against Kyros later than the capture of Sardeis and in the course of the thalassocracy, and makes Kyros' death fall soon afterwards - that is, the battle was fought c.530.[4]

The Lesbians were taken prisoner, and Polykrates set them to strengthen his defences by cutting a ditch along the

---

1. Miletos, Hdt. i 141.1. The Mytilenaian navy served Kambyses on his Egyptian expedition, Id. iii 13.1.

2. Hdt. v 30ff; infra, pp. 356f.

3. Thuk. i 13.6.

4. Joh. Malalas, Chronogr. vi 201; Geo. Kedrenos, Hist. Compend. ed. Niebuhr (Bonn, 1837) i p. 243 (138c). The primary source is given as Pythagoras of Samos!

outside of the city wall.[1] We cannot say what was the original length of the ditch: today it is possible to trace only a section cut from the solid rock, running northwards at the western end of the great hill Spiliani.[2] It is 7'7" wide (6½ Samian feet) and 7' deep (a Samian fathom), at a distance of 26'6" from the wall.

Polykrates had demonstrated that his power was not a mere shadow, and he enjoyed security for four or five years more. His defeat of the Persian attempt confirmed his lasting reputation as a thalassocrat, and he grew bolder. Ἔφερε καὶ ἦγε πάντας δικαίων οὐδένα, Herodotos asserts, to the obvious motive of material profit adding that his purpose was to secure the gratitude and love of his friends, whose property he was good enough to return.[3] As Ure has pointed out, behind this picturesque tale is concealed a policy of total blockade of the Asian coast, pursued in great earnest.[4]

---

1. Hdt. iii 39.4.
2. PLATE V.
3. Hdt. iii 39.4; cf. Polyain. i 23.
4. Ure, Origin of Tyranny 71.

IV

Political unrest compelled King Battos III of Kyrene to appoint a foreign commissioner, Demonax the Mantineian, to prepare a new constitution. Among other reforms, Demonax abolished all but the ceremonial duties of the king. Battos' son and successor Arkesilas III revolted against the reduced role of a constitutional monarch and tried to take back the regal power. Civil war ensued. Arkesilas sought allies. He sent his mother Pheretime to Kypros, to ask Evelthon of Salamis for an army.[1] In this he probably had the encouragement of his friend Amasis of Egypt,[2] now overlord of Kypros,[3] whose wife Ladike was a Kyrenaian and perhaps Arkesilas' own sister.[4] Pheretime was given no army. But Arkesilas himself was more fortunate: he went to another of Amasis' Greek allies, Samos, with whom Kyrene had a tradition of friendship going back to her own foundation

---

1. Hdt. iv 161ff, for the whole sequence of events.

2. Cf. Id. ii 181f. Amasis here, as so often, reacted against the policy of his predecessor Apries: cf. Id. ii 161.4, iv 159.

3. Id. ii 182.2.

4. Ibid. 181.2: daughter either of Battos or of one Kritoboulos. It is uncertain whether Battos II or Battos III is meant, and so (if this alternative tradition is right) whether she was sister or great aunt of Arkesilas III. Ladike survived Amasis, and Kambyses returned her to Kyrene: ibid. 182.5.

a century before.[1] Here Arkesilas made the usual revolutionary promises of land-distribution, and managed to raise a considerable force.[2] His success was commemorated by Kyrenaian coins of the time, on which the native silphion is joined by a lion's head for Samos.[3]

The counter-revolution was successful. But Arkesilas' policy of vengeful repression brought him no peace, and he was first compelled to seek protection in vassalage to Kambyses,[4] and then assassinated together with his cousin the king of Barka.[5] What became of his Samians we do not know.

The reconstruction outlined above assumes a date earlier than 525, when Polykrates' alliance with Egypt was finally broken. Herodotos gives us only two clues to the chronology of Arkesilas III: that he already reigned in the time of Kambyses, to whom he submitted between 525 and 522;[6] and

---

1. Cf. Id. iv 152.

2. It is interesting that Polykrates sent his politically discontented subjects on this expedition: cf. his aid to Kambyses, infra, p. 322.

3. BMC Cyrenaica Pl. iii 4.

4. Hdt. iii 13.3-4; iv 165.2.

5. Id. iv 164.

6. Supra, n. 4.

that his death was avenged by his mother in the time of Dareios.[1] It is not possible that Arkesilas could obtain an army from Samos by promising grants of land later than the reign of Maiandrios,[2] and unlikely that he could do so after the death of Polykrates. The latter event, then, gives us a fairly strong terminus ante quem in 522 B.C. Formally, it is possible that the counter-revolution took place later than 525, with Kambyses in the liaison position I have assigned to Amasis. Two arguments may be advanced against this. First, Polykrates would be unwilling to help a royal house of Spartan descent, in what was only a civil dispute, in or after 525; whereas the fact that he had some time previously helped Sparta's friends would not deter her from attacking him when she saw him changing sides and espousing the Persian cause. Secondly, Pheretime's journey to Evelthon of Salamis and his refusal of aid can only be understood if he had previously either promised or been ordered to provide an army. So far as we know Kyrene had no historic ties with Salamis such as she enjoyed with

---

1. Hdt. iv 165-167, esp. at end. Since this was during Aryandes' governorship of Egypt, and he had been appointed by Kambyses (ibid. 166.1), the interval between Arkesilas' submission and his death may have been quite short.

2. "Εκητι ξυλοσσύτος εὐετηρίη, Strabo 638 (cf. inf., p. 345): no shortage then.

Samos; and the Kypriotes were not notorious mercenaries, as were the Ionians. The natural occasion for Evelthon to break his promise or to disobey an order would be quite soon before the revolt of Kypros from Egypt to Persia, which occurred in time for the Kypriotes to join Kambyses expedition - that is, by 525.[1]

Arkesilas' counter-revolution, then, most probably belongs to the year 526 or 527. For Polykrates, the most sinister development was the refusal of Evelthon to help an ally of his master Amasis. Samian interests had always been deeply involved in Kypros and in the route which Kypros controlled. But they were no less deeply involved in Egypt. Polykrates knew - as who did not? - that Kambyses of Persia was planning the conquest of Egypt. Here, Pharaoh Amasis had found that he could not rely on his own people for security, and had transferred the Greek mercenary veterans from Boubastis to Memphis for this very reason.[2] Weighing all this, and remembering the speed of Lydia's reduction, who would not have felt that Egypt's defeat was inevitable, and that the Kypriotes had decided aright?

---

1. Hdt. iii 19.3, cf. ii 182.2. A reversal of policy is of course possible during the chaos which followed the death of Kambyses. But Polykrates was then dead.

2. Id. ii 154.3. Cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ Καρικόν· τόποι ἐν Μέμφει κτλ. and s.v. Καρικόν. Cf. also Polyainos vii 3.

But there was another powerful influence urging Polykrates in the same direction. This was the very real danger from a revival of the democratic party at home.

The storm signals had first appeared during Arkesilas' visit, when the promise of γῆς ἀναδασμός had been enough to collect an army for Kyrene. The best Samian land was - and was to remain - in the hands of the Geomoroi, in collaboration with whom the tyrants had secured their power, except during the unbalanced revolutionary period culminating in the expulsion of Syloson and Pythagoras in 531. Polykrates' defence policy was expensive, and in the archaic period the most favoured means of taxation were customs and excise duties. These provide for no 'earned income allowance', and while impoverishing the millionaire may actually destroy the livelihood of the small merchant or farmer. Hence the agitation.

Anakreon complained to his friend Megistes:[1]

μυθίηται δ' ἀνὰ νῆσον, ὦ Μεγίστη,
διέπουσιν ἱρὸν ὕστυ.

The fragment is quoted by the scholiast on Odyssey xxi 71,

---

1. Anakreon Fr. 25 Diehl, whom see for testimonia. For the precise use of διέπουσιν, cf. Theognis 893.

who first explains μύθου· νῦν τῆς στάσεως, ὅθεν καὶ Ἀνακρέων τοὺς ἐν Σάμῳ ἁλιεῖς ὄντας στασιάσαντας φησίν. Anakreon, then, has a contemporary notice of the political unrest of a group of halieis, and Antigonos of Karystos identifies their leader as one Herostratos.[1] Their name can mean 'fishermen' in Greek of all periods. In early Ionic it also means 'seamen' in general,[2] and it is this meaning that I would propose here: Anakreon complains that the city is being run by mutinous sailors.

Polykrates was faced with the threat or the reality of mutiny in his navy, and the poorer civilian classes were agitating against the oppressive burden of taxation. The tyrant went in perpetual danger of assassination. This seemed a high price to pay for the privilege of delaying the tide of history by a year or two. Polykrates made his decision. Herodotos records the exchange of letters

---

1. FGrHist 544 F 1: Hist. Mir. 120, ὁ δὲ τοὺς Σαμιακοὺς †πλοῦς συγγενεσθῶς ἐπὶ τῶν πρώτων κληθέντων †μαθητῶν τῶν περὶ ἡρόστρατόν† φησι χελιδόνα λευκὴν φανῆναι. Schneidewin corrected to μυθητῶν. For the 'white swallow', Aristotle ap. Aelian, de Nat. Anim. xvii 20: it reputedly had the Hydra-like property of recovering its sight after being blinded. It was perhaps a warning to Polykrates that he could not guarantee his throne merely by sending his opponents to fight and die abroad: there would always be others to take their place (cf. infra, p. 328).

2. Cf. for instance Odyssey xvi 349, xxiv 419.

between Samos and Egypt which ended in the abrogation of the alliance between the two countries.[1] Samian tradition blamed Egypt for the betrayal: we do not have the Egyptian tradition.

In 526/5 Polykrates wrote secretly to Kambyses, saying that a request for military aid against Egypt would receive sympathetic consideration. Kambyses requested it, Polykrates manned forty Samainai and sent them to join the Persian fleet. The crews were specially chosen to include the mutineers, and Kambyses was asked to see that they never returned home alive. It must have been the crews, not the captains, who were disloyal: there were less costly means of disposing of a few men, without having to lose many times the number of loyalists. And since for the success of the strategem surprise was essential, the regular crews must have served. But the oligarchs, wealthy men, would not normally serve in ships' crews. The mutineers therefore were not oligarchs but democrats. It was not clear whether they turned back at Karpathos or whether they arrived in Egypt and made their escape subsequently: at any rate, the Persian king was left to complete his conquests without them, and the Samian tyrant to face a desperate attack at

---

1. Hdt. iii 40-43.

sea. The insurgents vanquished the home fleet and forced a landing, but were defeated after Polykrates had shut up the wives and children of his citizen troops in the docks, which he threatened to fire in case the mutiny spread.[1]

Polykrates was safe for the moment. His enemies got away to Sparta to implore help. Their case was founded on some involved historical argument, but military assistance was promised at last. The Samians pleaded their aid to Sparta in the First Messenian War two hundred years previously. The Spartans mused upon the acts of piracy directed against them by Polykrates' father at the time of the fall of Sardeis. The Corinthians were happy to join Sparta, recalling that the Samians had once frustrated their vengeance upon the perpetual enemy, Kerkyra.[2] But overshadowing all this, though unmentioned by Herodotos, was the Persian threat to the Greek mainland: with the continental Ionians in Persian hands, the Samian fleet was the last bastion of the outer defences. The leader of the Peloponnesian League must act.[3]

---

1. Ibid. 44-45.

2. Ibid. 46-48; cf. supra, pp. 179ff. 287f.

3. Sparta had long owned a responsibility in the matter: cf. Hdt. i 69-70; 152-3. Hence Maiandrios' later appeal, and hence its failure, infra, pp. 337f. Ure, op.cit. 72, quite misunderstands the situation, writing that the expedition 'shows simply that the neutrals to the west did not yet realize who was their real enemy.' They did: and Polykrates had gone over to him.

Late in 525 (or perhaps early in 524) the Spartans were ready. First, they sought the cooperation, or at least the neutrality, of Polykrates' friend Lygdamis of Naxos. Impatient at his indecision, they soon deposed him and sailed on.[1] They arrived with a great fleet and began to besiege Samos. We do not hear that Polykrates risked a naval engagement. The first attack was made in the προάστιον to the West,[2] where the city wall ran down to the sea, strengthened by a corner-tower as it turned to follow the coastline. The tower was seized, but the Spartans were compelled to withdraw in face of a heavy counter-attack led by the tyrant in person. Next, the mercenaries together with a considerable force of native Samians made a sally from the main tower on the western summit of Spiliani. The Spartans routed them, and pursued them back as far as the wall. Two Spartans, Archias and Lykopes, were even bolder and entered the city, where they were killed after a desperate fight. Herodotos tells us that he once met the grandson of this Archias in the Lakonian village of Pitana: it was probably from him that he had the Spartan

---

1. Plut., de Hdt. Mal. 21 (Mor. 859C-D). The date is disputed as between 525 and 515: for a recent discussion, see D. M. Leahy, JHS lxxvii (1957) 272-5.

2. For the locality, cf. Strabo 637.

version of the expedition.[1]

The Peloponnesian army carried on the siege for almost six weeks, then gave up and returned home. It was said that the commanders had been bribed by Polykrates, who struck a quantity of false coin in lead which he plated with gold. Such accusations of corruption were regularly made against the kings of Sparta, and Herodotos is sceptical.[2] But the coins have survived. Three obverse types are represented by three specimens, weighing 6.49 gm., 6.56 gm., and 8.37 gm. respectively.[3] That they were meant for staters, despite their weight, is shown by the reverse device of two oblong incuses in parallel, and by their dimensions.[4] It

---

1. <u>Ibid</u>. 54-55. For the Spartan version, <u>ibid</u>. 47.2, ὡς δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι. ~~; and the ματαιότερος λόγος of 56 (infra).~~ Archias was given a public funeral in Samos - presumably with a cenotaph, after the death of Polykrates. His son was renamed Samios, after his exploit; and his grandson, Herodotos' informant, Archias after himself.

2. <u>Ibid</u>. 56, ὡς δὲ ὁ ματαιότερος λόγος ὅρμηται λέγεσθαι...

3. Conveniently published together by E. S. G. Robinson, <u>Centennial Volume</u> of the Am. Num. Soc. (New York, 1959) 591ff, Pl. xxxix 10-12: the first two in Paris, the third in Boston (where they were found is not known). Robinson gives full references to earlier discussions. No traces of the plated metal now remain. An earlier example in the British Museum (<u>ibid</u>. No.9: 10.69 gm.) retains its electrum skin, but the core is copper. Another, found in Samos in 1957 (<u>BCH</u> lxxxii (1958) 655, Pl. 1 14), is of lead, and still has traces of electrum plate; but there is no discernible type, and the reverse punch is a single rectangle.

4. Robinson, <u>op.cit</u>. 591, discussing No.9 - though he hesitates to give the name of stater to such light pieces as Nos. 10-12.

was once suggested that one of these pieces was a lead proof for an electrum stater.[1] But, as Dr. Robinson says, 'It seems to stretch the limits of coincidence too far to assume that we have here leaden trial pieces of no less than three different issues of a series of which no normal electrum coins have survived.' The obverse style points to a date in the third quarter of the century, which is close enough to 525, and it is hard to see what more attractive support archaeology could bring to Herodotos' μετιόντες λόγος.

The Peloponnesians sailed home. Their disappointed Samian friends were left with no resources but their ships, and therefore turned to seek a living in piracy and 'protection'.[2] Their first quarry was Siphnos, whose gold and silver mines were then at the peak of their production.[3] The Samians demanded a 'loan' of ten talents. Meeting with a refusal, they attacked and besieged Siphnos until they could extract a hundred. So enriched, they sailed on to find a sea-faring - and so more vulnerable - victim. One was ready to hand in Aigina. First the Samians bought the island of Hydra from

---

1. W. Greenwell, Num. Chron. 1897, 282 No.5; A. B. Brett, Catalogue of the Greek Coins (Boston, 1955) No.2311.

2. Hdt. iii 57-59.

3. On Siphnian mines, see J. T. Bent, JHS vi (1885) 195ff.

Hermione: this would serve both as a permanent home and as a base for attacks on the trade route between Aigina and Krete, whose relations with one and other were close.[1] Even more daring, the Samians asked their kinsmen in Troizen to look after Hydra for them while they raided a Zakynthian settlement in Krete itself. Evidently they liked the look of the island, for what began as a raid turned into a serious settlement at Kydonia. They built temples and lived prosperously for five years. Such audacity was too much for their victims; and a joint expedition of Aiginetans and Kretans attacked and enslaved them, destroyed their ships, and dedicated the prows to Aiginetan Athena.[2] For security, Kydonia itself became an Aiginetan colony.[3]

V

Polykrates had survived the concerted onslaught on his power. But the omens were bad. The white swallow had

---

1. How and Wells, ad Hdt. iii 59, recall the proverb Κῆς πρὸς Αἰγινήτην.

2. A. Furtwängler, Aegina (Munich, 1906) 7, proposed to read Ἀφαίης for Ἀθηναίης here, on the ground that Pausanias does not mention a temple of Athena at Aigina although he made use of Herodotos as one of his sources (compare Hdt. v 82f with Paus. II xxx 4). The argument is not quite conclusive. But since Aphaia was the local name for Britomartis, whom the Samians worshipped as Diktynna at Kydonia, the dedication might well be a necessary appeasement (see Hdt. iii 59.2; Paus. II xxx 3).

3. Strabo 376.

been seen, the bird whose legendary property was the ability to regain its sight when its eyes had been put out: for every rebellious democrat killed or expelled another would arise.[1] And there was the affair of the ring.[2] The story is well known: to avert the Nemesis which ends a long run of good luck Polykrates had been advised to throw away the thing he valued most. This, he decided, was his signet ring, set with an emerald in which Theodoros had carved a lyre.[3] Theodoros was long dead, and the ring was irreplaceable. Polykrates dropped it into the sea. Later in the week a particularly big fish was caught and presented to the tyrant. When opened it was found to contain the ring. So it became clear that no man could be rescued from his impending fate.

As it stands, the story is incredible.[4] Then either Herodotos' ultimate source invented it, or else the return of the ring was faked - that is, unless by sleight of hand it never reached the sea, a replica of it had been prepared.

---

1. Cf. supra, p.321 n.1 (Aristotle).

2. Hdt. iii 40-43.

3. Cf. Clem. Alex., Paedag. III xi 59.2.

4. But see A. R. Burn, The Lyric Age of Greece 317, for an authenticated parallel.

Former writers have assumed that the story is no more than an old folk-tale, attached to Polykrates without apparent reason.[1] Their view may well be right. But for a moment let us pursue the alternative explanation, which must offer a motive for the forgery - for no one who knew why Polykrates threw away his ring could suppose that he would be glad to have it back.

Polykrates' prime importance, in the eyes of his contemporaries no less than in the light of history, was as a thalassocrat. He was, says Herodotos, the first Greek who consciously aimed (ἐπενοήθη) to rule the waves since King Minos of Knossos.[2] It is therefore the more remarkable a coincidence that the ends of both Minos and Polykrates were foreshadowed by a similar portent. Minos, not caring to believe that Theseus was the son of Poseidon who would destroy his sea-empire, threw his signet ring into the sea and commanded Theseus to prove his identity by retrieving it. Theseus dived in, and reappeared with the ring, and

---

1. Cf. J. G. Frazer, Pausanias (London, 1898) iv 237f, with references to earlier discussion; How and Wells, ad Hdt., l.c.

2. Hdt. iii 122.2.

a crown from Amphitrite. Minos recognized his match.[1]

Now suppose that Polykrates was a second Minos in his own eyes, as well as in those of Herodotos: his ambition to rule Ionia and the islands would be in character.[2] Then it would be a brilliant stroke for a political opponent to turn the ritual placation of Nemesis into a repetition of the omen which foretold the dissolution of Minos' thalassocracy. In the old story Theseus himself both brought back the ring and destroyed the empire. In Samos the opposition party of the time consisted of ἁλιεῖς, seamen. The return of the ring was so contrived that it could be a natural and unsuspicious act of ἀνὴρ ἁλιεύς, a fisherman. This slight ambiguity - so dear to the 'wooden wall' style of oracle then in vogue - made the omen even more certain and frightful.

So Polykrates had to guard against his sailors, and we have seen the methods which he used. But when the end came, it came as part of the chaos into which the Persian Empire fell when Kambyses was dying, and which lasted through the

---

1. First in Bakchylides xvii 57ff, composed only about half a century after Polykrates' death; cf. the wall-painting by Mikon, Paus. I xvii 3; and Frazer, ad loc; Hyginus, Astronom. ii 5. The story was particularly popular c.500-475, and was illustrated on vases by the Syriskos, Panaitios, Harrow, and Triptolemos Painters (ARV 195, 214, 179, 240 respectively). See further P. Jacobsthal, Theseus auf dem Meeresgrunde (Leipsig, 1911). A. B. Cook first compared this tale with that of Polykrates, Class. Rev. xvii (1903) 409; but he associated both with the Venetian Doge's mystical wedding to the Adriatic. See also, at greater length, S. Reinach, Rev. Arch. vi (1905) 9ff.

2. Cf. Hdt., loc.cit., with Thuk. i 4.

interregnum of the Magoi until Dareios seized the throne for himself. Herodotos dates the murder of Polykrates about the time of Kambyses' last illness.[1]

Certain wealthy Lydians had fled to Samos to take refuge from their Persian satrap Oroites. Polykrates granted them asylum. Oroites sent an ambassador to demand their surrender, but Polykrates refused to receive him, the poet Anakreon being a witness of the refusal. Oroites, meanwhile, had given way to pressure from his northern colleague, Mitrobates of Daskyleion, to take Samos and destroy Polykrates. His method was to exploit the tyrant's imperial ambitions, promising him all the money he needed to complete the conquest of Ionia and the islands, if only he would make Oroites his ally and partner in the attempt. Cannily, Polykrates first sent his comptroller Maiandrios to make sure that Oroites really had the money he promised. Maiandrios' report was favourable, and his master crossed to Magnesia to seal the bargain,[2] having already murdered the Lydian refugees and confiscated their fortunes. No sooner had he arrived than

---

1. Hdt. iii 120.1, cf. 122.3.

2. Magnesia was perhaps chosen because of friendship for Polykrates: Anakreon wrote a hymn to Artemis of Magnesia (Fr. 1, with Ioannes Sikeliotes, Rhet. Gr. vi 128W).

he was traitrously seized by the satrap and crucified. His young daughter had told her father of a dream she had had, in which she saw him washed by the rain of Zeus and anointed by the sun; but all her entreaties had not prevented his departure. Now on the cross at Magnesia the last of the three omens was fulfilled.[1]

With the death of Polykrates Greek independence in the eastern Aegean was at an end.

---

1. Ibid. 120-125; Diodoros x 16.4 (a separate tradition, perhaps from the same source as the ἑλάσσονες of Hdt. iii 121.1 - very likely the eye-witness Anakreon himself). Later tradition held Maiandrios to have been Oroites' accomplice in the murder: cf. Lucian, Charon 14; Chorikios, Miltiades 78; and infra p. 333. This too may descend from good authority.

Chapter Seven

EARTH AND WATER

On his departure for Magnesia, Polykrates had appointed his comptroller Maiandrios to be regent. When the news of the tyrant's death reached Samos the trusted servant acted curiously. He gave Polykrates' furniture and effects to Hera, and then consecrated in the προάστιον an altar and precinct of Zeus Eleutherios, which was still cultivated in Herodotos' day.[1] From this it is evident that Maiandrios, at the moment at least, did genuinely wish to put an end to the tyranny; and if, as Lucian believed,[2] he had helped to compass his master's death, he had been inspired by a liberal enough motive.

For the present Samos was free, and Maiandrios summoned an assembly πάντων τῶν ἀστῶν, before which he proposed the establishment of a new constitution, and the end of the tyranny. In return, he asked six talents of Polykrates' fortune, and the priesthood of Zeus Eleutherios for himself

---

1. Hdt. iii 142.

2. Lucian, Charon 14; cf. Chorikios, Miltiades 78: v.sup, p. 332 n.2.

and his descendants in perpetuity. A moderate request. But a prominent citizen by the name of Telesarchos stood up, and said that Maiandrios would be getting off lightly at that, and that he should be made to account for years of misspent revenue. And so, though Maiandrios 'wanted to become the most righteous of men, he was frustrated'; and, like so many, he saw that the tyrant can never afford to retire. But he made a fair answer. He called his most vocal inquisitors to the Akropolis singly to inspect his accounts - and then imprisoned them. They must have been very few or very credulous.

Having thus confirmed his position, a serious illness overtook Maiandrios. He never showed any resolution again: it was as if he saw the hand of the Erinyes in his malady. But his ambitious brother Lykaretos, whom the Persians later set to rule over Lemnos,[1] hoped to gain the throne and killed all the prisoners as a preliminary. All these events must have taken place soon after Maiandrios' accession, that is to say, in 522/1.[2]

So for a short time Maiandrios enjoyed his master's

---

1. Hdt. v 27.

2. Id. iii 142f, for the whole narrative.

fortune. The ancient writers tell us nothing of his reign save at its beginning and end, and archaeology has added little. It seems that prosperity continued. Professor Buschor believes that the first building-period of the Heraion lasted rather more than a decade, ending just after 520.[1] It is probable that the issue of quarter-staters of Lydo-Milesian weight continued, though their standard was progressively debased.[2] How much of Polykrates' fleet remained, we cannot say; but the tyrant may well have taken a considerable part of it with him when he went to Oroites.[3]

An ill wind was blowing from Sousa. When Syloson was exiled by his brother Polykrates, we do not know where he went at first.[4] But at some time between 525 and 522 he was in Egypt, perhaps to trade, perhaps as a sightseer.[5] In Memphis he happened to meet a young Persian nobleman called Dareios, who was in attendance on his cousin the King. The Persian had admired his cloak, and in an impulsive moment Syloson had given it to him. It was one of those impulses

---

1. See pp. 193f.
2. See pp. 500ff.
3. Hdt. is not specific about the numbers, beyond πολλοὺς τῶν ἑτέρων, iii 125.
4. Perhaps to Italy with Pythagoras: see p. 306.
5. Hdt. iii 139ff.

which the gods send: Dareios was now King of Persia, and here was Syloson's opportunity to regain his position in Samos. He went to Sousa and reminded Dareios of the incident in Memphis, and persuaded the King to conquer Samos and to hand it over to him without enslavement or bloodshed. Dareios agreed - χρύσεα χαλκείων, Aelian remarks.[1] But it was not such a bad bargain. Dareios had to conquer Samos sooner or later anyway; and if anything remained of Polykrates' fleet, he would be glad of it. As for Syloson's pretensions, it was in any case the Persian custom to set up native princelings as their client rulers.

Otanes, one of those whose support had made Dareios King, was sent with an army, and met little or no resistance - an indication that the Samians were not prepared to fight hard for their tyrant. Maiandrios admitted the Persians, and it was agreed that he and his court should be granted safe conduct out of the island.[2]

But Maiandrios had another brother Charilaos, who was at the moment confined ἐν γοργύρῃ.[3] He showed more spirit

---

1. Var. Hist. iv 5.

2. Hdt. iii 144.

3. Ibid. 145ff. For the meaning of γοργύρη, see APPENDIX B.

and begged his brother to release him to attack the Persians. Maiandrios agreed: why should Syloson enjoy his own kingdom intact? Then Maiandrios passed through his tunnel to the sea, and sailed away, leaving Samos to face the consequences of Charilaos' rashness.

Charilaos' surprise attack was immediately successful. But Herodotos calls him ὑπομαργότερος ; and so he must have been, if he thought that he could drive the Persians from the island for ever. Otanes rewarded his treachery by the slaughter of all prisoners, even those snatched from the temple sanctuaries. The island was 'netted': every Samian in sight was massacred, and the resulting wilderness given to Syloson for a kingdom. Later, Otanes brought in a new population, as the result of a certain divine premonition.[1]

Maiandrios, now regretting the incontinent haste of his departure, made his way to Sparta, and besought King Kleomenes to restore him to his throne.[2] He was quickly told to take his bribing gifts and be gone. At first sight it seems ridiculous that Maiandrios should have asked aid

---

1. Ibid. 149.

2. Ibid. 148. He may have appealed next to Athens (like Aristagoras later). I can think of nothing else likely to be behind Aelian's remark (Var. Hist. xii 53) that τὸν μὲν γὰρ Περσικὸν ἐκ τῆς Μαιανδρίου τοῦ Σαμίου πρὸς Ἀθηναίους διαφορὰς τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν φασί.

from the Spartans to reestablish the very tyranny which they had themselves but recently tried to destroy. But on both occasions strategic considerations were decisive. Polykrates, by an accident of geography, had been left to inherit the Lydian struggle against Persia in collaboration with Egypt. At first the allies had faced an empire invincible only on land. Between 529 and 525 Persia acquired the Phoinikian fleet; but Polykrates still held the balance between that and the Egyptian. When he crossed over, action had been necessary to try to recover Greek control of this balancing force. And that action had failed.[1] What Maiandrios now sought was a second attempt to retrieve Samos from the Persian camp, and the internal political aspect was of no significance. Kleomenes rejected his plea because the Samian navy was no longer important. For by the time of Polykrates' death, Persia had won the Egyptian fleet in addition to the immensely powerful Phoinikian. There was now no balance to hold, and the effort to recover Samos would have been strategically useless even if (which was impossible) it had succeeded. Nor was Kleomenes the man to grasp an ill-considered opportunity in haste.

That is the sum of our information about Maiandrios.

---

1. For the significance of Polykrates' thalassocracy, see pp. 315, 323.

Yet even from this little a distinctive personality emerges - more distinctive than that of either Polykrates, father or son. He was not a bad man, but a weak one, and small-minded. He had hoped for an end to the rule of tyrants, and had probably stooped to intrigue with Oroites to secure it. But in the end he yearned for his trappings, and sought a Spartan restoration. He reigned as the tool of his mal-adventurous brothers, allowing the one to murder his own prominent citizens, and treacherously permitting the other to instigate a suicidal attack on the Persians who had granted safe conduct to himself. Faint-hearted enough to abdicate at the first sign of danger, he meanly preferred to destroy the people he deserted rather than to leave them to serve his rival. The only apparent contradiction in this sorry tale is that Polykrates had seen fit to leave him in charge of the regency. But it was a logical decision: here, if anywhere, was a man unequal to the task of raising a rebellion in his absence.

We have to consider the duration of Maiandrios' reign. To judge from Herodotos alone, one would suppose that he held the island but a few months; and if this is not quite true, at least the evidence indicates that his rule was brief.

Since Maiandrios went to Kleomenes after his expulsion, and presumably without delay, the date of the Spartan king's

accession joins that of Polykrates' murder (522) as a terminus post quem for the fall of Samos. But we know no more than that Kleomenes was already king by 519 B.C.,[1] and it seems that Samian history may cast more light on Spartan than vice versa. A terminus ante quem is provided by the date of Dareios' expedition across the Danube, which we shall agree to have taken place in 514.[2] On this expedition Dareios was accompanied by his client tyrants, among them Aiakes of Samos; so that by 514 Samos must have fallen, and Syloson have reigned and been succeeded by his son. Syloson's name was a byword for harsh rule, and we must allow him two or three years of power in which to forge his reputation. A date not later than 517 for the fall of Samos is demanded.

There are two direct lines of argument. The first is from the notorious List of Thalassocracies.[3] Unhappily the entry concerning Samos is defective. But we seek only its terminal date, to be recovered from the succeeding entry.

---

1. In that year he advised Plataiai to make an alliance with Athens: Hdt. vi 108, with Thuk. iii 68.5 (Thuk.'s text has often been attacked; but see Gomme, ad loc., and J. Wells, JHS xxv (1905) 193-203).

2. Infra, pp. 346ff.

3. Cf. supra, p. 309 and n. 1; APPENDIX D.

The list ends in 481/80. Between that date and the end of the Samian period the Chronographia of Eusebios gives a total of thirty-seven years, back to 518/7 B.C. The Armenian Chronici Canones, before mutilation, agreed. Besides the duration, the Armenian version provides absolute dates, annis Abraham. Here the Samian thalassocracy lasts from 530 to 513; but since the last entry, that of Aigina, is five years too late, all must be raised by that length of time. Apart from these, we have the Greek version of Synkellos, who gives a total of thirty-nine years, bringing the Samian period to an end in 520/19. There is no quite satisfactory means of deciding between these variants - for that is all that they are. But we cannot err far if we say that the Thalassocracy List places the succession of Samos by Sparta in or close to 518. But is that the date of the fall of Samos or of the rise of Sparta?[1] Since we do not know with

---

1. Of both, according to G. Dickins, JHS xxxii (1912) 28, maintaining that the Spartan expedition against Polykrates cannot be dissociated from the listed transfer of power from Samos to Sparta, which Myres dated 'with great certainty' to 517-515. This implies 517 for the death of Polykrates, and 'about 515' (ibid. 27) for Maiandrios' flight. But Sparta failed against Polykrates; and we must anyway not reject a chronologically circumstantial account of Herodotos in favour of an hypothetical interpretation of a list in Eusebios.

what event the Spartan thalassocracy was associated,[1] it is impossible to be sure; for the List seems to follow no general principle in the matter.

The second, and more promising, line of argument derives from a combination of Herodotos with Persian documents. The death of Kambyses certainly took place in 522, at a date later than July 1st; for he committed suicide after the false Bardiya (really the Magian Gaumata) seized the empire on that day.[2] Dareios' vengeance was swift, and Gaumata was executed on September 29th.[3] That, then, is the date of Dareios' accession. Herodotos says that Otanes' conquest of Samos was one of the first events of the new reign, Dareios' first foreign conquest.[4] He also expressly

---

1. The expulsion of Lygdamis of Naxos? (So A. Andrewes, <u>The Greek Tyrants</u> 123; but see D. M. Leahy, <u>JHS</u> lxxvii (1957) 273; cf. <u>supra</u>, p. 324). Perhaps the exploits of Dorieus (Hdt. v 42ff) are meant, though Herodotos makes them 'unofficial'. See J. L. Myres, <u>JHS</u> xxvi (1906) 99f.

2. Hdt. iii 66; Behistun Inscription, xi: Parker and Dubberstein, <u>Bab. Chron</u>. 12. Gaumata had proclaimed himself Bardiya and rebelled on February 28th; and Kambyses seems not to have been regarded as King after the spring (<u>CAH</u> iv 174).

3. Beh. Inscr. xiii: Parker and Dubberstein, <u>loc.cit</u>. So ended the seven months' reign (Hdt. iii 67) of Gaumata, since February 28th, when he rebelled (see previous note).

4. Hdt. iii 139 ... Σάμον βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος αἱρέει, πολίων πασέων πρώτην Ἑλληνίδων καὶ βαρβάρων. We must, I think, take πρώτην here to mean 'first', not 'foremost', which would be manifestly untrue.

dates it before (and perhaps during) the revolt of Babylon.[1] According to the Behistun inscription there were two such revolts, with a short interval between. On or about October 3rd 522 Nidintu-Bel raised the flag of rebellion as Nebuchadnezzar III. Dareios defeated him at the Euphrates near Zuzannu on December 18th, and soon afterwards the pretender was taken and killed in Babylon.[2] Thereafter

> Darius I was recognized as ruler of Babylonia until the beginning of September, 521. Toward late August Nebuchadnezzar IV revolted and was recognized as King of Babylonia until late in November 521. The army sent by Darius achieved the defeat and capture of Nebuchadnezzar on November 27th, 521.[3]

Dareios was reaccepted at Borsippa by December 25th, at Sippar by January 8th 520, and at Babylon itself by January 25th.[4] We must suppose that it was the second revolt that

---

1. Ibid. 150, ἐπὶ δὲ ἐόντων στρατεύματος νεωτικοῦ οἰκομένου Βαβυλῶνος ἀπέστησαν.
2. Beh. Inscr. xix-xx: Parker and Dubberstein, op.cit. 13.
3. There is a difficulty here. Herodotos (iii 152-3) makes the siege last for a year and seven months. Seeming to confirm this, there exist tablets dated in the sixth and seventh months of Nebuchadnezzar IV's first (not accession) year. Gray suggested (CAH iv 180) that Nebuchadnezzar dated his reign as if in continuation of Nidintu-Bel's. And the year and seven months accurately measure the time that had elapsed since Gaumata usurped the power of Kambyses, July 1st 522, until Dareios' reacceptance at Babylon, January 25th 520.
4. Parker and Dubberstein, op.cit.14.

occurred while Otanes was at Samos, for there is not time for Syloson's journey and appeal, and for the mounting of the expedition, between Dareios' accession and the first Babylonian revolt.

The conquest of Samos, therefore, must have taken place in the autumn of 521; for we shall accept this date in preference to that given by the Eusebian Thalassocracy List. Maiandrios' appeal to Kleomenes will have been made during the ensuing winter 521/0, and Otanes' resettlement of Samos in the spring of 520.[1]

---

1. It is conceivable, though not likely, that all these dates should be lowered by one year. For the problem involved, see G. B. Gray, CAH iv 662f. For how long was Gaumata King? There are tablets dated in the second and third months of his accession year, and others dated in the first, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh months of his first year. In normal usage these would be two years, not one; and the days and months given would necessitate a reign of at least eighteen months. But Herodotos (iii 67) says that 'Smerdis' ruled for seven months; and this can only be true if accession year and first year are identical. In the latter case we should have tablets from all seven months; otherwise a gap of nine consecutive months with no tablets. Herodotos is supported by the Behistun Inscription: although dates are given by days and months, not years, Dareios claims that the events noted in the first four columns (including the wars of succession and the Babylonian revolts) happened hamahyāyā tharda, 'in the same year'. This must be a slight exaggeration, but favours the chronology which we follow. Herodotos' account of the duration of Dareios' reign is consistent. The king died in 486/5 (reckoning from Marathon, vii 1.2 τρίτα ἔτεα ; 1.3 τετάρτῳ Egypt revolted; 4 τῷ ἕκτῳ ἔτεϊ after this Dareios died), having reigned 36 years, i.e. since 522/1.

So the greatest maritime power of Greece was reduced to nothing, with almost incredible speed, and became subject to Dareios. The final obstacle to his domination of all Greece seemed to have been removed with the collapse of Polykrates' house of cards.

II

Syloson II became tyrant in his brother's room before midwinter 521/0. Otanes supplied him with a people to rule;[1] but who the new inhabitants were, we cannot say. Syloson's government was harsh and unpopular, and Strabo took the proverb ἔκητι Συλοσῶντος ἐρευκωρίη to imply that Otanes' settlers soon left again.[2] He may be mistaken in this interpretation, for the proverb could equally well be a reference to Otanes' original depopulation of Samos during the conquest.

But there can be no doubt that this was a hard time for the islanders - everything in ruins, thanks to the crazy Charilaos, and no resources upon which to draw for the replacement of what was lost. Syloson struck no

---

1. Hdt. iii 149.

2. Strabo 638.

coins.[1] He added not a stone to the Heraion. He can have had no fleet, no army but the Persian garrison. Yet Strabo thought him powerful, and coupled his name with that of Polykrates as having presided over the affairs of Samos when the tyranny was most flourishing.[2] Here, apparently, is a misrepresentation yet more striking than that involved in Herodotos' estimate of Polykrates. Even the younger Aiakes could claim some degree of affluence. It is rather to be believed that Strabo's source, knowingly or not, drew on a tradition of the very real prosperity under Syloson I and Polykrates I.

Syloson governed for long enough to be remembered in proverb.[3] But the next event to be considered will be Dareios' expedition against the Skythians in 514; and by then Aiakes was tyrant. We shall not be greatly in error if we suppose that the succession had passed to him in 516 or 515. There is no other evidence.

Aiakes marked his advent to power by a small issue of

---

1. See p.569.

2. Strabo 637, οἱ μὲν οὖν τυραννίδες ἤκμασαν ἐπὶ Πολυκράτη μάλιστα καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Συλοσῶντα.

3. Strabo 638, quoted above; also ἡ Συλοσῶντος χλαμύς, Diog. Prov. v 14, cf. Apostol. xviii 27 - but this from Herodotos.

coinage. For the first time a half stater was struck in silver,[1] together with a quarter and a sixteenth. For the obverse type Polykrates' winged boar gave way to the canting badge of Hera βοῶπις - a signal of the renewed devotion to this goddess which was to be a feature of the new reign.

Once his Asiatic possessions were secure, Dareios turned his attention to Europe. In 514 he was present in person to command an expedition into Skythia, taking with him a number of his puppets, among them Histiaios, Aiakes, Miltiades, and Hippoklos the Lampsakene.[2] The host crossed the Bosporos at Chalkedon, on a pontoon-bridge constructed by the Samian engineer Mandrokles. For this service he claimed a princely fee, and spent a tithe of it on a grandiloquent mural for the Heraion:[3] the Bosporos bridged and the army marching over, with Dareios borne ahead on a litter; below it the legend

Βόσπορον ἰχθυόεντα γεφυρώσας ἀνέθηκε
Μανδροκλέης Ἥρῃ μνημόσυνον σχεδίης,
αὐτῷ μὲν στέφανον περιθείς, ἑλμίοισι δὲ κῦδος,
Δαρείου βασιλέος ἐκτελέσας κατὰ νοῦν.

---

1. I leave out of account the unique half stater BMC Ionia 350.8. For the present series, see pp. 503, 569 ; for the meaning of the type, pp. 584 ff.
2. Hdt. iv 137f.
3. Ibid. 88.

It is nothing to our purpose to give an acoount of Dareios' adventures:[1] only relevant to mention that when he crossed the Danube he left the Greek tyrants in charge of the bridge; and that Miltiades was all for cutting it adrift and leaving the King marooned among the vengeful Skythians. But he was overruled by the others, Aiakes included, when Histiaios of Miletos pointed out that the Asiatic tyrants were only tolerated by their subjects for fear of Dareios, and that the result of Miltiades' plan would be to encourage domestic revolution. So Dareios returned safe across the Danube, only to find Mandrokles' bridge destroyed at the Bosporos. The result of this, ironically enough, was that Dareios was forced to march South into Miltiades' own territory of Cheronesos, and to cross at Sestos.[2] Herodotos says that Miltiades was expelled by the Skythians. But it is far more likely that Dareios deposed him on his way home.[3]

This expedition is almost certainly to be dated in 514. As Professor Wade-Gery has said, it cannot have been

---

1. See Hdt. iv 83-98, 118-144; v 1-27: the only considerable authority. Cf. CAH iv 212ff.

2. Hdt. iv 136-43.

3. Id. vi 40: M. Cary, CAH iv 214, who, however, makes Megabazos responsible.

much earlier, for Dareios was too busy in the East; nor later, for it must precede Hippias' medizing alliance with Lampsakos.[1] The Persian evidence is consistent with this date. The inscribed foundation block of the Persepolis terrace includes Sakā, Skythians, among Dareios' subject peoples.[2] This inscription must be earlier than 511, for that is the date of the earliest 'Fortification Tablets', which prove that the terrace was already in use by this time. On the other hand, the Skythians must be virtually the most recent addition to the imperial list; for Putāyā, the Libyans, are absent from it, though Herodotos makes the annexation of Libya simultaneous with that of Skythia.[3] Further, uta dahyāva tyā para draya - 'lands which are across the sea' - are so entered, and not named individually as in later lists. All this goes to show that the overseas (i.e. European) possessions had been acquired only a very short time before the Persepolis terrace was built not much earlier than 511.

513/2 is the date given by the Chronicon Romanum (inscribed in A.D. 15/16), in the following words:[4]

---

1. JHS lxxi (1951) 215; v.inf. p.350.

2. R. G. Kent, 'Old Persian Texts IV', JNES ii (1943) 302 No. II. See Wade-Gery, loc.cit. and note 13.

3. Hdt. iv 145.1.

4. FGrHist 252 B 8: IG xiv 1297.

ἀφ' οὗ Ἀλκμάδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων Ἵππαρχον τὸν Πεισιστράτου υἱὸν [καὶ] Δαρεῖος ἐπὶ Σκύθας διέβη, ζεύξα[ς τὸν] Κιμμέριον (sic) Βόσπορον, ἔτη ϝκη. But Hipparchos was killed at the Panathenaia of 514, and it may be that the synchronism of the Chronicon is more reliable than the exact date it gives. That the synchronism is in fact correct may be shown from Thukydides. Hippias' immediate reaction to the murder of his brother was to give his daughter Archedike in marriage to Aiantides, son of Hippoklos of Lampsakos, ἀξιωθησόμενος αὐτοὺς μέγα παρὰ βασιλεῖ Δαρείῳ δύνασθαι.[1] The cause of Hippoklos' influence with Dareios was, of course, his loyalty against Miltiades at the Danube bridge. Lampsakos and Chersonesos were always at loggerheads, and Hippias' action meant a decisive break with Miltiades. Hippias' medism was the real reason why Sparta attacked him - not the hatred of tyranny which was her specious claim - and the first attack was by Anchimolios in 511. The marriage should be placed in 513, as a prompt reaction both to Miltiades' provocation of Persia and to the worsening position in Athens, manifest in the murder of Hipparchos; and both these events belong most naturally to 514.

---

1. Thuk. vi 59. For the argument which follows, see Wade-Gery, op.cit. 215f.

If Mandrokles was splendidly paid for bridging the Bosporos, we shall not think that Aiakes himself went unrewarded for his loyalty at the Danube. It appears that the public funds now began to grow again, and their growth is once more reflected in the remains from the Heraion. Professor Buschor believes that the second building period began in 510 or a little earlier, and lasted until c.500.[1] At the same time the scope of the coinage was enlarged. On his accession Aiakes had struck a small issue of reduced Lydo-Milesian weight, with the obverse type of the forepart of a cow. Now the weight was further reduced to what we know as the Samian standard, and the final types of classical Samos appeared - on the obverse a lion's scalp, while the cow retired to the reverse. Both are Heraic symbols:[2] the latter recalls the goddess in her Greek character; the former refers rather to her oriental aspect (which had been explicit ever since Smilis gave her the horned polos of Astarte[3]), bringing memories of the lions of the Mother, and the lion which Hera herself carries on painted vases to embody the lordship of Asia which she promised to

---

1. Private communication (May, 1958).

2. See pp. 575ff.

3. See p. 120 and nn. 1-2.

Paris.[1] The two types were used first on triobols; but in about 510 a full stater was at last struck, together with small fractions, and the issue continued regular but rare until the Revolt.[2] The widespread adoption of larger coins at this time was designed or demanded to attract trade with the Persians.

Trade, of course, is a private affair, and the harbour-dues it provided would but slowly replenish the treasury and the building fund. But quicker results were to be obtained by more direct means; and following precedent that was both ancient and honourable, Letters of Marque in Hera's name were issued to the tyrant's cousin Aiakes, the son of Brychon. So long as Persian ships were not molested the satrap would not object: mutual piracy was finally forbidden to the Ionians only in consequence of the Revolt.[3]

The evidence for this new privateering is, of course, the notorious inscribed statue which Aiakes dedicated in the Heraion. I have already dealt with the question of the date of this dedication, and shall not repeat the argument

---

1. Cf. ARV 772, Berlin 2536, photograph in Brunn-Bruckmann, text to Pl. 660, p. 6. Another (otherwise unpublished) recorded by Welcker, Alte Denkmäler v 388 no.22.

2. See pp. 504ff. 569.

3. Hdt. vi 42.

here, except to recall that a date c.510 would most conveniently suit sculptural and epigraphic style together.[1] But we must look more closely at the relative clause of the inscription, ος τηι | Ηρηι : την συλην : επρηξεν : κατα την | επιστασιν, which I translated 'who exacted the plunder for Hera during his superintendence.' It is most probable that επρηξεν represents the imperfect tense of πρήσσω: the single sigma raises no difficulty.[2] But the crucial word is σύλη. The singular form appears here only. By analogy with σῦλον, it could be abstract or concrete. The primary meaning of ξῦλον, σῦλα , and σῦλα is 'the right of seizing foreign cargo as reprisal.' ξῦλον and σῦλα (but not σῦλα) also refer to the cargo so seized.[3] It is not easy to choose between abstract and concrete for the meaning of σύλη here.

---

1. V.supra, pp. 201ff.

2. Cf. the kouros inscribed ... Απολωνι , Richter, Kouroi[2] 86f No.77 figs. 258-60 (Leukos, from precinct of Apollo near Glyphada).

3. See Liddell and Scott[9], s.v. σύλη , to show that 'privateering' was the sense of these words throughout the fifth and fourth centuries. Only the verbal form (συλάω , also rarely συλεύω) is as old as Homer, where the original and predominant sense is of stripping the armour from a slain enemy. But this is one of the rights of conquest. The idea of 'stealing by right', therefore, is not necessarily a late development in the meaning of the word.

But at least it is clear that the sense is of privateering, not merely piracy. Since τῇ Ἥρῃ stands inside the relative clause, it follows that the actual seizures were made on the goddess' behalf, and to her profit.

The process of reconstruction went on to the end of the century. But the time for tyranny was everywhere past; and Aiakes' sword was to turn in his hand.

III

By the end of the sixth century Dareios had advanced the frontiers of his Persian empire as far as was profitable into every nation except the Greek homeland. The Asiatic Greeks had suffered much from their subjection, both materially in the imposition of tribute upon themselves, together with the current decline of their trade with Egypt and the Levant, and psychologically in the loss of their autonomy to a foreign invader and in their continued subservience to tyrants. Some of those who had made it their business closely to observe the ebb and flow of Persian strength saw that now was the moment for the Ionians to rise and invite their liberation by the already apprehensive cities of mainland Greece, before Dareios should prepare his armada to enslave them too. The centre of this awareness was at Miletos.

Except for a few important details to be gleaned elsewhere, we depend upon Herodotos for our account of the Ionian Revolt.[1] His chief sources seem to have been two in number, the logographer Hekataios, and the oral tradition of Samos. It would be hard to decide which was the more full of prejudice and of the 'malignity' for which Herodotos himself was to be held responsible. Hekataios' account, rich in wisdom after the event, was composed later in self-justification, and it is almost certainly through him that Aristagoras appears in so unfavourable a light.[2] As to

---

1. Of modern accounts I have derived most help from M. Cary, CAH iv (1926) 214-228; G. de Sanctis, 'Aristagora di Mileto', Problemi di Storia Antica (Bari, 1932) 63-91 (= Riv. di Filol. Classica N.S. ix (1931) 48ff); G. B. Grundy, The Great Persian War (London, 1901) 79-144; and, for a recent study of the chronology, N. G. L. Hammond, Historia iv (1955) 382ff, whom I follow.

2. Hdt. v 36, the proposal to buy thalassocracy with the Branchidai treasure, is certainly serisapientia, presumably Hekataios' own, in the light of the Battle of Lade and the destruction of Branchidai. In fact such sacrilege would have ruined the chances of the Revolt anyway; and de Sanctis well compares the feeling against Phokis in the fourth century when she made use of the Delphian treasure (op.cit. 77ff). The proposal is most unlikely to have been made at all. To Hekataios' account belongs also v 124-6 and Diodoros x 25.14. De Sanctis remarks that Hekataios was at liberty to invent what tale he pleased; for Aristagoras was dead, and the other leaders present at strategic conferences were either dead or scattered.

Samian tradition, to which we owe at least part of the narrative of the campaign for Kypros,[1] together with the very full story of the Battle of Lade:[2] the Revolt had been predominantly a Milesian affair, and Herodotos was gathering his information at a time when feelings between Samos and Miletos were more than usually bitter. Further, Samos' own part in the Revolt had been so discreditable as to give her people every reason for concealment and misrepresentation; and, most dangerous of all, the discredit was a matter of party politics.[3]

The safest procedure, then, is to suppose that Herodotos' statements of fact may well be true so far as they go, but that all ascriptions of motive are likely to be false. Upon this basis, a plausible account may be reconstructed, at least in outline.

The leader of the insurrection was Aristagoras, son of Molpagoras, to whom as viceroy the tyranny of Miletos had been entrusted by his cousin and father-in-law Histiaios. Herodotos recounts how, after an appeal for his aid by the Naxian oligarchs, he persuaded Artaphrenes, satrap of Sardeis,

---

1. v 108-115; note especially 112.1, Σάμιοι ἠρίστευσαν. All references are to Hdt. unless otherwise specified.

2. vi 6-16.

3. Cf. vi 14.2-3.

to give him a fleet (with Dareios' permission), in order to take Naxos for the King as an advance base for the invasion of Greece. But the Naxian democrats were forewarned by Megabates the Persian admiral, and managed to survive a four-month siege undefeated.[1]

As it stands this story is both incomplete and unacceptable. Only two great powers were in a position to undertake the conquest of Naxos, Persia and Sparta. Of these, only the former would demand complete political subjection in return. The Naxians were well aware that Aristagoras could not help them without the knowledge and approval of Persia. They were prepared, then, to hand over the autonomy of their island as the price of partisan success. We must believe that an appeal had already been made to Sparta - who, indeed, had set these very oligarchs in power in place of the tyrant Lygdamis[2] - and that the appeal had been dismissed. So they turned instead to Persia, making use of their friend Aristagoras as intermediary.[3]

Was Aristagoras already planning another use for the fleet?[4]

---

1. v 30-34.

2. Supra, p. 324.

3. Cf. de Sanctis, op.cit. 65f.

4. As Grundy suggests, op.cit. 85f.

It is interesting to notice that the two hundred ships assembled at Chios, Miletos' firmest ally in the Revolt: Samos would have made a more convenient starting-point, but her tyrants were more closely associated with Persia, to whom they owed their throne. It is incredible that Megabates should have sent the warning message to Naxos. But did Aristagoras? The successful defence of the island is evidence of preparedness, in the face of so considerable an armament. If he was already plotting revolt, Aristagoras would not want Naxos to fall; for that would destroy his chances of aid from Old Greece.[1]

The readiness of Naxos made a siege inevitable. The island held out well, giving Aristagoras time to lay his plans and to train his crews. After four months the fleet retired to Myous, where it remained undispersed.[2]

This was autumn 499.[3] Consultations were now held at Miletos, Aristagoras (with real or pretended encouragement from Histiaios[4]) proposing open revolt while Hekataios

---

1. Cf. ibid. 86ff.

2. v 36.4.

3. Miletos is generally agreed to have fallen in 494/3: cf. vi 95. 1-2 (a minor inconsistency here to be corrected), 48.2, 46.1, 44.2-3, 43.1, 31.1, reckoning back from the year of Marathon. And it fell in the sixth year of the Revolt (vi 18).

4. v 53.2-4.

led the opposition - or so he claimed. The former prevailed. He sought to win the support of the other cities of East Greece by delivering them from their puppet tyrants, some of whom he gave up to execution by their subjects, while others escaped to join their Persian masters. At the same time he declared the Milesian tyranny at an end - that is, he deposed Histiaios.[1] But his own position was not left insecure, for his brother Daphnis was appointed to hold the chief office of Aisymnetes for 498/7, the next vacancy.[2]

Among the tyrants expelled was Aiakes of Samos, who made his escape to Sardeis.[3] It was probably in celebration of their deliverance that the Samians dispatched a bronze statue to Delphoi. The base has survived, with the

---

1. v. 36-38.

2. The list of Aisymnetai (Milet I iii No.122, col. i. 29) gives Δαφνις Μολπαγορεω for 498/7. Aristagoras' father was called Molpagoras (Hdt. v 30.2), and I infer the relationship.

3. vi 13.2.

inscription Σάμιοι | τωπολλωνι .[1]

This is the earliest surviving corporate dedication by the Samians. The time demanded a sense of unity, and it was made manifest too upon the coins issued during the Revolt. For the first time the silver staters bore an ethnic inscription ΣΑ. Besides these, there was a large issue of quarter-staters, uninscribed, for which Polykrates' types of winged boar and lion's scalp were revived to recall past independence. Both staters and quarters betray the emergency of their issue in the careless haste with which the dies were engraved.[2]

Miletos, on the other hand, produced a very striking ceremonial issue in electrum. Several obverse types were chosen in deference to Miletos' allies: a sphinx for Chios, the forepart of an ox for Samian Hera, a winged boar for

---

1. PLATE XIV; Delphoi, Mus. Inv. 1790: SIG^3 20; Pomtow, Klio xv (1918) 60f No.87; L. H. Jeffery, Local Scripts of Archaic Greece 330 No.17. The alternative date suggested is after the Battle of Mykale in 479; but the script suits 499/8 better, in particular the form Α, which never occurs in Samos in the fifth century either on stone or on coins. It is interesting that the Samians should feel it desirable to send an offering to Delphoi now: the oracle evidently opposed the Ionian Revolt, cf. Hdt. vi 19.2, 77 (infra, p.362 and n.1); and perhaps 27.2. But nothing more sinister need be implied than a belief in Dareios' invincibility: cf. vii 140. See further H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, The Delphic Oracle i 158. The oracle of Apollo at Branchidai seems equally to have lacked confidence in Miletos: Zenobios, Cent. v 80, v.sup., p. 313 and n. 4.

2. See pp. 568f.

Klazomenai, an eagle for Abydos, and so on. But it is clear from the uniformity of weight and fabric and from the similarity of reverse punches that all were issued from a single mint, and there are no other coins which can be assigned to Miletos at this date.[1]

Aristagoras spent the winter of 499/8 in Greece, seeking allies. It was imperative for him to secure the help of the Peloponnesian League, which could provide the powerful fleets of Corinth and Aigina to defend the coastal towns, and even send an army of Spartan hoplites to prevent the enemy land forces from reaching the coast at all.[2] According to Herodotos, King Kleomenes judged the odds to be weighted heavily in Dareios' favour, and declined to help.[3] In fact, domestic conditions in Greece would have made Spartan intervention impossible; and had Kleomenes wished to move, the opposition would have been led by Corinth and perhaps Aigina too, the very members whose aid was most needed.[4]

---

1. The types were studied by P. Gardner, Proc. Brit. Acad. iii (1907-8) 119-22, who thought that the coins were minted in the cities to which the types seemed to belong, all of which are recorded as having been involved in the Revolt. But several of the types are slightly odd: why does the Samian ox look back, for instance? Six suggested that they were all minted in Chios (Num. Chron. 1890, 215), and Babelon believed in a single mint for all (Traité II i 198). See also C. T. Seltman, Greek Coins^2 (London, 1955) 87f, Pl. xii 1-9.

2. Cf. de Sanctis, op.cit. 80.

3. v 38.2, 49-51.

4. For the Spartan position, see J. A. O. Larsen, 'Sparta and the Ionian Revolt', Class. Phil. xxvii (1932) 136-50.

Further, Kleomenes could not send the Spartan army abroad for fear of Argos. By the same token, Argos in turn refused to listen to Aristagoras' plea.[1]

At Athens, however, the Milesian met with more success.[2] His appeal, he said, was from a colony to its metropolis. A powerful argument; but probably more decisive was the fact that Athens was already at odds with Persia over the question of the tyrant Hippias, whose restoration had been demanded by Artaphrenes.[3] At any rate, the Athenians voted twenty ships for the Ionian Revolt, perhaps as many as could be spared from their modest fleet at this time.[4] And with them, when spring came, sailed five Eretrian vessels, a return for Milesian aid in the Lelantine War.

Aristagoras was faced with a cruel dilemma: to succeed in driving the Persians from Ionia he required a coalition of Greece with the native peoples of Anatolia, notably the Karians and the Lydians. But the latter showed no inclination

---

1. That he approached Argos was argued from the joint oracle to Argos and Miletos (Hdt. vi 19.2, 77.2) by J. B. Bury, Klio ii (1902) 14ff. Cf. Parke and Wormell, opcit. 158.

2. v 55, 97.

3. v 96.

4. For other views of the significance of the number, see E. M. Walker, CAH iv 168f; C. A. Robinson, jr., AJP (1939) 232; A. W. Gomme, AJP lxv (1944) 326. There is no evidence that Athens had a great fleet before Themistokles.

to move, and he could expect no more allies from mainland Greece except after a successful attack on Sardeis. This, however meant antagonizing the wealthy Lydians, whose property would suffer most. The coming of spring made the decision for him. The Persians, of course, had known of the Revolt since the beginning of winter, and as soon as the new campaigning season opened they mounted an attack on Miletos.[1] Aristagoras could not risk being pinned down in a purely defensive position, and decided to attack Sardeis forthwith.[2] The expedition was commanded by his brother Charopinos with one Hermophantos as his colleague. Aristagoras himself stayed behind to supervise resistance at home.

The Greek force landed near Ephesos, and marched straight for Sardeis. The whole city fell with little resistance, except for the akropolis which held out under the personal command of Artaphrenes. But eventually someone started a fire, and in the general conflagration the hallowed shrine of Kybebe was destroyed. Henceforth the Lydians were unambiguously on the Persian side, and the Greeks had to retire. Their attack on Sardeis had at least succeeded in drawing the Persian army back from Miletos. But the two forces now met near Ephesos, and the Greeks were heavily defeated.

---

1. Lysanias of Mallos, FGrHist 426 F 1, ap. Plut., de Herod. Mal. 24 (Mor. 861A-D). This accounts for Aristagoras' failure to lead the expedition to Sardeis in person, Hdt. v 99.2.

2. v 99-102.

More was involved than the immediate tactical reverse. The Athenians returned home and took no further part in the Revolt.[1] The Eretrians probably went with them. Not only had all hope of an understanding with Lydia perished in the fire, but Greece too had been disappointed of such a show of strength as would encourage the sending of more help from across the Aegean.

On the other hand, the Asiatic coastal towns were impressed, and by the end of the year almost all of them from Byzantion to Karia - where natives joined as well as Greeks - had been persuaded to range themselves on the Ionian side.[2] Even more important, the Greek cities of Kypros had risen in revolt, led by Onesilos of Salamis.[3] Aristagoras' venture was now at the peak of its success.

In 497 Dareios accepted Histiaios' offer of mediation, and sent him down to the coast. But Artaphrenes rejected him.[4] At the same time the Persians urgently assembled large forces to crush the Revolt by land and sea. The heaviest fighting of the year was in Kypros, where Onesilos had laid siege to the Phoinikian city of Amathous. The Ionians

---

1. v 103.1.
2. v 103.2.
3. v 104.
4. v 105-7, vi 1.

sailed to meet reinforcements, and defeated the Phoinikian fleet so decisively that it needed two years to recover. The Samians took part in this battle - and fought hardest, they told Herodotos. But on the plains of Salamis Onesilos was beaten, and his city surrendered at once. The rest were reduced one by one, Soloi only after a five-month siege which ended early in 496.[1]

Further West, a three-pronged Persian attack was made on the coastal towns. On the shores of the Hellespont and in the Troad the smaller places submitted easily. But Karia was the crucial region; for while it was in revolt Miletos was safe. Accordingly the successful northern army was relieved and sent to Karia, where at first its success was repeated. But eagerness in pursuit proved disastrous, and in a night surprise near Pedasos the whole Persian force and its commanders were cut to pieces.[2]

With their fleet crippled at Kypros and their best army destroyed in Karia, the Persians cannot have hoped for a speedy end to the insurrection. But their Ionian campaign of 496 resulted in the recovery of Klazomenai and Kyme.[3]

---

1. v 108-116.

2. v 116-122.

3. v 123.

More calamitous to the insurgents was the loss of Aristagoras himself, who fell fighting the natives in Thrake.[1] Herodotos' source (probably Hekataios) implied that he had deserted the cause and sailed to take refuge in Histiaios' old fort at Myrkinos. But there was no danger at all in Miletos - from the Persians, at least. The true explanation is rather that proposed by de Sanctis:[2] that Aristagoras did not enjoy the full confidence of his new democratic friends. 'In the leader or dictator of today they saw the tyrant of yesterday and feared the tyrant of tomorrow.' A quick and signal success would have assured his position; the prospect of a long hard struggle did not. So Aristagoras was compelled to leave the direction of the war, and seek safety in the North, whence he hoped to return should the political situation in Miletos become easier.

Also in the North, and equally rejected by the Milesians, was Histiaios, whose aim was to make a counter-attack against Persian advances in the Hellespont.[3]

---

1. v 124-6; one of the few events for which we have a certain date: Thuk. iv 102 with Schol. Aischin. ii 31.

2. Op.cit. 87ff. Cf. Hdt. vi 5.1, οἱ δὲ Μιλήσιοι ὕστερον ὑπὸλλοχθέντες καὶ Ἀρισταγόρεω.

3. vi 5.

During the winter the Persians pressed on with the preparation of a new Phoinikian fleet, and by midsummer 495 it was ready to assemble, including Kilikian and Egyptian contingents, and even ships from the recently reduced cities of Kypros.[1] Gradually the armada made for Ionia, only momentarily delayed by the resistance of Lindos.[2] At the same time Artaphrenes sent an army to besiege Miletos by land; but the geography of the place is such that a naval victory had to be gained first.[3] A conference held at Panionion decided that the Milesians should be left to man their defences alone, while their allies prepared to resist by sea. Chios provided a hundred ships and Miletos eighty; Lesbos seventy and Samos sixty. Smaller contingents from elsewhere brought the total to three hundred and fifty-three. Ephesos stood aloof: indeed, there is no evidence that she did anything but harm to the Ionian cause during the whole course of the Revolt.

The Persians considered the two fleets to be evenly

---

1. For this campaign, Hdt. vi 6-17; for a modern account which explains the difficult topography, Sir John Myres, 'The Battle of Lade, 494 B.C.', Greece and Rome 1954, 50ff.

2. See C. Blinkenberg, Die Lindische Tempelchronik (Bonn, 1915) 34-36; K. J. Beloch Griech. Gesch.^{2} II ii (Strassburg, 1916) 81-3.

3. Hence Alyattes' failure a century before this (Hdt. i 18).

matched; so of their six hundred ships perhaps as many as a third were merely transports. Anxious to avoid a repetition of the disaster off Kypros, they waited to see what intrigue could do. Aiakes and his fellow tyrants held secret meetings with their former subjects, promising favourable terms. At the same time the Greeks were fast tiring of the vigorous training methods of their admiral, Dionysios the Phokaian. As soon as Aiakes and his colleagues judged their conversations to have taken effect, the Persians advanced to the attack. They found the Greeks ready for them, drawn up in line and hidden from view by the island of Lade, just off Miletos towards the open sea.

Had the battle been fought to a conclusion it is more than likely that the Greeks would have won. But the Samians soon hoisted sail and deserted, except for eleven ships which remained and whose captains were commemorated by an honorific inscription in the Samian agora, presumably erected in 479. Seeing their flank thus laid bare, the Lesbian squadron followed suit and sailed for home. But Chios stood firm. At last the Persians were victorious. Some of the Chiote ships escaped, while the crews of their more disabled vessels managed to land at Mykale, and began to make their way homeward on foot. But they were taken for robbers and slain by the Ephesians, whose womenfolk were then celebrating the

Thesmophoria. If this festival was held in Ionia at the same time of year as at Athens, we have a means of dating the Battle of Lade towards the end of October 495.[1]

The Revolt had now been broken. Miletos fell during the summer of 494, and the inhabitants were punished with exemplary cruelty. Even the Athenians wept, and fined the playwright Phrynichos for making an entertainment of their grief.[2] Karia was restored to obedience, which done the Persians wintered at Miletos.[3] By the end of 493 all the Asiatic communities were back in Persian hands, including Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos,[4] despite a desperate campaign of resistance by Histiaios, who was at last captured harvesting the Mysian corn in June. He was given up to execution by Artaphrenes.[5]

---

1. Hammond, op.cit. 387. If the Battle took place near the end of October, then it must have been fought in 495, not 494 B.C.; for Miletos fell in the latter year (supra, p.356 n. 3), and Karia was reduced before the winter (vi 25.2, 31.1). We know that all this was later than Lade (vi 18); but it cannot be fitted in between the end of October and the winter respite.

2. vi 18-21.

3. Supra, n. 1.

4. vi 31ff.

5. vi 26-30: the whole narrative is given together, though it spans the winter noted in ch. 31. Cf. Hammond, op. cit. 387f.