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ABSTRACT

The following sequence of events is urged in this thesis:

ca. 1400-1125 Samos is a Mykenaian outpost.
ca. 875 Colonization of Samos by Epidaurians.
ca. 705-700 Pheidon of Argos helps Aigina against Athens and Epidauros. Samians under Amphikrates raid Aigina.
704 (721?) Corinthian-Samian alliance against Aigina and Argos. Amelinckles builds biremes for Samos.
ca. 700 Defeat of Athens; fall of Epidauros.
ca. 680 Samos colonizes Amorgos.
675 Foundation of Prokonnesos by Samians.
ca. 675-670 Outbreak of war between Chalkis and Eretria over Lelantine Plain. Samos enters on side of Chalkis. Series of local wars.
ca. 670 Chalkis, with help from her northern colonies and Thessaly, defeats Eretria. Samos defeated in the East.
669/8 Pheidon defeats Spartans at Hysiai and controls Olympic games through Pisatans.
ca. 665 Outbreak of Messenian Revolt. Samos aids Sparta.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Phoibias holds office of <strong>aisymnetes</strong> in Samos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 655</td>
<td>Samos breaks with Chalkis in arbitration of Akanthian dispute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 650</td>
<td>Samos participates in the Melian War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Tyranny of Demoteles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Kolaios discovers Tartessos. Beginnings of Samian trade with Egypt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After ca. 625</td>
<td>Corinth deserts Samian alliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 601</td>
<td>Samos drops rivalry with Miletos, now ruled by Thrasyboulos. Samos and Miletos wage war against Priene. Regime of Demoteles overthrown by <strong>geomoroi</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Foundation of Perinthos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 600</td>
<td>Megarians raid Perinthos; Samos sends aid to Perinthians and Megara is defeated. Samians, after returning from Perinthos, overthrow <strong>geomoroi</strong> and establish popular government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 590</td>
<td>Syloson, son of Kalliteles, seizes tyranny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Birth of Pythagoras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 587</td>
<td>Samians seize 300 Kerkyraian boys sent by Periander to Alyattes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 575</td>
<td>Construction of the Heraion begun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 572</td>
<td>Accession of Polykrates I. Birth of Anakreon. <strong>Anaximander</strong> <strong>floruit</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Birth of Polykrates, son of Aiakes.

Arrival of Ibykos in Samos.

Anakreon becomes tutor to Polykrates II.

Samian pirates seize corselet sent by Amasis to Sparta.

Samian pirates seize krater sent by Sparta to Kroisos.

Fall of Sardis.

Battle of Pallene.

Persian raid on Samos; the Heraion burned. Ionians of the islands submit to Persia.Collapse of the regime of Polykrates I.

Pythagoras returns to Samos.

Coup d'état by Polykrates II and his brothers, Pantagnotos and Sylos.

Polykrates seizes full power; execution of Pantagnotos, banishment of Sylos. War with Persia; Persians successfully repulsed.

Polykrates forms alliance with Amasis of Egypt.

Death of Kyros; accession of Kambyse.

Second flight of Pythagoras, to Kroton.

Samos wages war against Miletos and Lesbos; several towns captured on mainland.

Capture of Phoenicia by Kambyse.
525 Polykrates furnishes troops for Persian expedition against Egypt.

525/4 Unsuccessful Spartan expedition against Samos. Lygdamis of Naxos deposed.

ca. 523 Capture of Rheneia and Delos; Polykrates institutes festival on Delos.

522 Polykrates assassinated by Oroites. Maiandrios seizes control of Samos.

521/0 Maiandrios expelled by Persians. Syloson installed as tyrant.

ca. 514 Syloson succeeded by his son, Aiakes.

499 Outbreak of Ionian Revolt; Aiakes flees Samos.

495 Aiakes restored as tyrant of Samos.

M. F. McGregor, Supervisor
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INTRODUCTION

This study had its origins in an investigation of the tyranny of Polykrates, and grew to include an examination of the history of Samos before the Persian Wars. Despite the importance of Samos in the Greek world, no recent study of the island's history in antiquity has been published. The only continuous historical works of recent scholarship were Stamatiades' Σαμιακά, ἢτοι Ἰστορία τῆς Νῆσου Σάμου (Athens, 1862), and Panofka's Res Samiorum (Berlin, 1822), and these are now unavailable. Much work has been done in specialized studies in recent years, however, and excavation of the Heraion by the German Institute has now reached the stage where some assessment of the archaeological evidence is possible. Thus it seemed that an investigation of the island's early history, embodying the conclusions of recent studies, might be of some value, at least as a compendium of information. I have put this thesis into the form of a continuous narrative, though I have not hesitated (particularly in Chapter Two) to discuss in detail, and at the expense of the continuity of the narrative, individual problems.

There is, for the history of Samos, no continuous extant ancient source. Our best source, especially for the tyranny of Polykrates, is Herodotos, who is particularly
authoritative when writing on Samian affairs because of his familiarity with the island and its history, gained during his residence in Samos. Herodotos provides us with our earliest and most detailed account of the rule of Polykrates. Herodotos' account is supplemented by valuable information preserved in the poetry of Anakreon and Ibykos, both of whom resided at the court of the Samian tyrants. Other references to early Samos are late, incidental, and scattered, and it is because of the inadequacy of these sources that there remain large gaps in our knowledge of the history of Samos. The sources have been supplemented, wherever possible, by archaeological and numismatic evidence.

I have tried to be consistent, for the most part, in the use of the Greek spelling of names. In a few cases, however, I have retained the more common Latin forms (e.g., Aegean, Rhodes, Sicily, Cyclades, Thucydides, Periander, Sardis).
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CHAPTER ONE
THE ISLAND AND ITS EARLY HISTORY

The island of Samos is favoured by an extraordinarily advantageous position, one that has allowed it to play an important rôle in the East Aegean. The most strategically located of that chain of islands that girdles the coast of Asia Minor, Samos has from the earliest times provided a necessary link between the Aegean and Asia Minor, serving as a meeting ground for the Greeks and the peoples of Anatolia. As the terminus for trans-Aegean routes and particularly for the great southerly route through the Cyclades, it was early used as a convenient port of call by Greek sailors who had discovered the advantages of employing this route from the mainland to the East by way of the islands.

Samos formed the natural centre for the maritime trade in the East Aegean, and was especially fortunate in the character of the routes leading from it, by which ready communication was permitted with every area of the Aegean. From Samos vessels could sail south, threading their way past the islands and peninsulas to Rhodes, and thence along the coast towards Cyprus or to Phoenicia. A direct

route lay open from Samos to Egypt by way of Karpathos. The westward passage through the Cyclades, under the shelter of Ikaros, Delos, and Naxos, led almost straight to the Saronic Gulf and the ports of mainland Greece. This was the route taken by the Persian fleet in 490, and it is much used at the present time. Northward-bound vessels could either keep close to the mainland or take the more exposed but perhaps less treacherous route that skirted the west coasts of Chios and Lesbos. Thus they arrived at the entrance to the Hellespont, whence they could turn west along the Thrakian coast or pass on into the Propontis and the Euxine.

As regards southern traffic, only Rhodes was as favourably situated; but Samos was in a better position for communication with the West and North. The island also provided ready access to nearby sites on the mainland: Ephesos, Miletos, Priene, and Myous. Samos was thus the pivot of navigation to western Asia Minor. In wartime the island was frequently used as a mustering point for fleets (e.g., by Datis and Artaphernes and by Xerxes);
indeed, Samos remained "the key point of Aegean naval strategy down to the Byzantine era." 8

If Samos' position at the end of the trans-Aegean route brought it into continual contact with the mainland Greeks, the island's proximity to the Ionian coast necessitated frequent intercourse with the coastal inhabitants. Samos is separated from Mykale by a strait only two and a half kilometres wide, and throughout antiquity she controlled some territory on the mainland. 9 As early as the seventh century we find her acquiring a peraila at the expense of Mella. 10

10. Samian participation in the division of land after the Melian War is reported by the Hellenistic historian Maiandrios of Miletos, who is quoted as evidence in a second-century dispute over boundaries between Samos and Priene (Inschriften von Priene, No. 37, lines 53-59). The war is dated to the period before the Kimmerian invasion under Lygdamis, ca. 650 B. C. (see Dittenberger, QG1, No. 13). For the latest discussion of the Melian War see Roebuck, CP 50 (1955) 32-33, whose views I accept. Samian claims on the peninsula of Mykale were asserted with varying success as late as the second century B. C., as
Trading contacts were established with the West in the late Bronze Age. Samos apparently lay within the Mykenaian koine in LH III, and was certainly known to the Attic trade in Protogeometric times. The island has produced a group of vases whose date indicates that men coming from somewhere west of Samos had settled there not long after 875 B.C. According to the literary tradition Samos was settled by Epidaurians in the eleventh century, but the archaeological evidence is not the evidence of Samos' long dispute with Priene reveals.

11. Maintained (correctly, I think) by Desborough, The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors 158; see also his review of Stubbings' Mycenaean Pottery From the Levant, JHS 73 (1953) 181. Hanfmann, HSCP 61 (1953) 4-5, 8-9, is skeptical about the presence of Mykenaian Greeks on Samos, however, and wishes to raise the date of the earliest Greek levels; he takes them to be Minoan and assigns them to Late Minoan IA (ca. 1550-1500 B.C.).


13. Ibid. 304.

14. Herodotos 1. 142; Strabo 10. 2; 14. 3 and 15; Pausanias 7. 3. 6. The traditional date for the founding of Samos is given by Eusebius as A. A. 981 (1036 B.C.) in the Armenian version. For a thorough discussion of both literary and archaeological evidence see Sakellariou, La Migration
There is considerable evidence for Samian overseas contact with the East at an early period. Trade flourished with the mainland during the period of Hittite rule. It was briefly interrupted by the invasion of barbarian tribes that poured across the Hellespont to put an end to Hittite hegemony over Asia Minor, but was soon established with the Phrygian invaders. Near-Eastern contacts increased rapidly in the eighth century, when we find Phoenician ivories and Assyrian bronzes in Samos. Objects from Cyprus appear frequently during this period, when Cypriot influence at Samos was considerable.

---

15. Sakellariou, op. cit. 341. In general, the evidence of archaeology tends to support the traditional picture of a Greek migration to Asia Minor in the eleventh century (see Roebuck, op. cit. 33-36, and Cook, op. cit. 15).
17. Roebuck, Ionian Trade and Colonization 45-46; Hanfmann, op. cit. 16.
6.

The rise of Samian sea-power began in the late eighth century, according to Thucydides, who tells us that Ameinokles of Corinth went to Samos where he built four ships for the Samians about three hundred years before the end of the Peloponnesian War (i.e., either 721, if Thucydides is referring only to the Archidamian War, or 704, if he means the whole twenty-seven years of the war). The passage, subject of much recent discussion, is of especial interest in that it gives us a specific date.

---

20. l. 13.2.

21. See especially Gomme, Commentary l 121-123; Davison, CQ 41 (1947) 18-24; Carpenter, AJA 52 (1948) 1-10; Kirk, BSA 44 (1949) 93-153; and Williams, JHS 78 (1958) 121-130, and JHS 80 (1960) 159-160.

22. Thucydides' date looks like a calculated figure (ten generations, reckoning a generation at thirty years), despite Gomme, who thinks that it was probably deduced from various traditions rather than calculated from given figures (Commentary l 122); and Jacoby, who thinks that Thucydides' date comes from a Samian χρονικόν (e.g., that of Euagon of Samos, if it was published before Thucydides wrote his preface)(Klio 9 [1909] 80-123). The date must not, I think, be pressed too hard.
for the introduction into Samos of a new type of ship, probably the bireme, which raised Samos to the first rank as a naval power, a position it was to enjoy for the next two centuries.

23. The ambiguity of Thucydides' language leaves us in doubt about the type of ship introduced by Ameinokles, and the passage has evoked much discussion. Thucydides says that the Corinthians were the first in Greece to build τριήρεις and that Ameinokles built four ναύς for the Samians. The word ναύς, according to Liddell and Scott (LSJ 1162, s.v. ναύς), is synonymous with τριήρεις in Greek literature; and after Thucydides' use of the word τριήρεις in the previous sentence it would be natural to take ναύς in the same sense. Thus the Corinthians built the first triremes in Greece and Ameinokles built four of them for the Samians at the end of the eighth century; and we are provided with a fairly reliable terminus ante quem for the introduction of the trireme into Greece and the beginning of Samian naval power. This is the conventional view, maintained, among others, by Gomme (Commentary i 122). Davison, however, has shown (CQ 41 [1947] 18-24) that the date conflicts not only with the other literary records, including Thucydides himself, but also with the archaeological evidence, which
That Corinth should aid Samos with a new shipbuilding technique, the sole knowledge of which would have given precludes such an early date for the introduction of the trireme. Davison concludes that triremes could not have been introduced into Greece before the third quarter of the sixth century, and that Thucydides was using ϑαυὖς of ships generally and refraining from specifying the class. From a consideration of the Phaeacian ships Davison suggests that the pentekonter was the ship introduced into Samos by Ameinokles. Carpenter (AJA 52 [1948] 1-10) differs from Davison in that he believes that Thucydides actually used ϑαυὖς to mean triremes in the disputed passage but was wrong. The ships Ameinokles built were pentekonters, which, he maintains, can be found on Dipylon vases. Williams, however, in a study of representations of ships on geometric vases between 775 and 700 B.C. (JHS 78 [1958] 121-130), finds no examples of pentekonters on Dipylon vases of this period; instead, he points out that, in the latter part of the period, ships of two levels (biromos) were being used by the Greeks, and suggests that Ameinokles introduced the bireme. Williams thinks it unlikely, moreover, that Thucydides wrote a sentence with such an anti-climax ("the Corinthians were the first in Greece to use the trireme and the Corinthian Ameinokles
Corinth an unrivaled superiority in the Aegean, at first appears strange. The reason for this aid is probably to be found in Samos' participation in a conflict between Athens and Aigina. Aigina had been subject to Epidauros; but the Aiginetans, having built a fleet, made themselves masters of the sea and revolted. Through their revolt they became embroiled with the Athenians, who at that time had close relations with Epidauros. At the suggestion of the Epidaurians, the Athenians sailed against Aigina. The Aiginetans appealed to Argos, which was at this time under the rule of Pheidon, and, with the help of an Argive made four ships of one sort or another for the Samians ca. 704 B.C.""). He suggests that what Thucydides wrote was ναῦς ὀδυρότους (biremes) and that this underlies the reading τέσσαρας καὶ ταῦτα (for δ' καὶ ταῦτα?) in Oxyrhynchus Papyri 13, No. 1620, much our oldest text of Thucydides l. 13.2. That Ameinokles introduced the bireme is likely. I am hesitant, however, about accepting Williams' emendation. It is probable that Thucydides used ναῦς to mean triremes, and was wrong.

24. Bradeen, TAPA 78 (1947) 236-237; see also Ure (The Origin of Tyranny 167), who places the war in the first half of the seventh century.

25. Herodotos 5. 83.

26. I accept the dating of Pheidon to the late eighth
force that crossed undetected from Epidauros, utterly defeated the Athenians in a land battle on the island. 

Samian participation in the war is attested by Douris of Samos, though the reason for her involvement is not clear. Corinthian hostility first seems to have been

---

century and the first half of the seventh as proposed by Ure, *op. cit.* 154-183, substantiated by Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3 761-762, and most recently set forth by Andrewes, *CO* 43 (1949) 70-78. Although Pheidon is not mentioned in the Herodotean narrative (5. 82-89), his connection with the conflict has been shown by Ure (*op. cit.* 164-178).

27. *Herodotos* 5. 86.

28. *FGrH* 2A, No. 76 F 24. Douris' account appears to be a garbled version of the Herodotean narrative. Samos' early hostility to Aigina (*Herodotos* 3. 59) makes it clear that she sided with Athens.

29. Bradeen (*op. cit.* 236-237) suggests that the reason for Samos' participation is to be found in her rivalry with Aigina in the trade with Egypt. But Greek commercial relations with Egypt are not attested by our sources before the reign of Psammetichos I (664-610); cf. *Herodotos* 2. 154; and the archaeological evidence is clear: no Greek sherd from Naukratis appears earlier than the last quarter of the seventh century (*Cook, JHS* 57 [1937] 227-237; cf. also Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas* 138-144). We have evidence
aroused by Argive support of the revolt of Megara from Corinth;\(^{30}\) then, when a struggle broke out between Aigina on the one side and Athens and Epidauros on the other, Pheidon came to the aid of Aigina. Samos sided with Athens and Epidauros and sent a naval expedition to raid Aigina.\(^{31}\) The fighting was indecisive, however, and Corinth, by this time frightened by the rise of Argos,\(^ {32}\) joined in and sent Ameinokles to help the Samians. The

of occasional contacts before this time: Herodotos (4. 152) records the story of the Samian Kolaios who was sailing to Egypt when blown off his course to Spain about 638 (the event is dated by its connection with the preliminaries of the foundation of Kyrene; see infra, p. 27, note 85). But it is at least a century later before we can begin to speak of a Samian-Aiginetan rivalry in the trade with Egypt.

30. Pausanias 1. 44.1. The revolt occurred shortly after 720 under Orsippos, the Olympic victor in that year.

31. Herodotos 3. 59.4. Although we cannot date the Samian raid on Aigina precisely, the mention of a Samian king places it in an early age, and the war between Athens and Aigina provides the most likely context.

32. Corinth seems to have constituted part of the heritage of Temenos (Apollodoros 2. 8.4). A late tradition records that Pheidon tried to annex Corinth while the pro-Argive Bakchiads held power; but the fall of the Bakchiads and
outcome of the war was, nevertheless, unfavourable for Samos: the Athenians were defeated and Pheidon gained control of Epidauros and Aigina.

The Athenian-Aiginetan conflict was but a prelude to a much larger conflict, the Lelantine War, which Thucydides regarded as the most extensive war of the period between the Trojan and Persian Wars. After stating that land

the rise of Kypselos brought an end to Argive influence at Corinth (Plutarch, *Amat. Narr.* B [Moralia 772]; Schol. Apollonios Rhodios, *Arg.* 4. 1212). The fall of the Bakchiads is made contemporary with the foundation of Syracuse (734 B.C.), but this is not sufficient reason to reject the story.

33. There is much controversy concerning the date of the Lelantine War, for our sources give no chronological indication beyond Thucydides' "long ago" (1. 15.3), and the inference from Aristotle's information (in Plutarch, *Moralia* 761A) that it is to be placed after the colonization of Chalkidike. The war has been variously dated from the eighth to the sixth centuries B.C. Forrest (*Historia* 6 [1957] 160-175) and Huxley (*BCH* 82 [1958] 588-601) assign the war to the late eighth century; Burn (*JHS* 49 [1929] 14-37) and Cary (*CAH* 3 622) to the first part of the seventh; and Will (*Korinthiaka* 391-404) to the sixth century. Boardman (*BSA* 52 [1957] 27-29) suggests that the
13.

warfare among the early Greeks was carried on by individual cities without allies against their neighbours, Thucydides says that the nearest approach to a coalition of states took place in the war between Chalkis and Eretria, "a quarrel in which the rest of the Hellenes took sides with one or the other." Further information is given by Herodotus, who says that the Samians helped the Chalkidians against the Eretrians and the Milesians. Plutarch tells us that Thessalians and Chalkidians from the colonies in Thrace helped Chalkis to victory. Finally, Strabo says that Chalkis and Eretria lived peacefully for the most part, and that when they fell out over the Leontine plain they set up conditions to govern the 

war lasted, with intervals, from 700 to ca. 550. The problem is well discussed by Bradeen (op. cit. 223-241), whose dates I accept. He concludes that the war should be placed between 720 and 660 as outside dates, and specifically between 675 and 670.

34. Thucydides 1. 15.3.
35. 5. 99.1. Close relations between Samos and Chalkis at this time are substantiated by similarities in Samian and Chalkidian coin types. See Babelon, RevNum 12 (1894) 253-285, plate x.
fighting. He cites as evidence a stele in Amarinthos that provided that missiles should not be used.

From these references we learn that the war started over possession of the Lelantine Plain, but spread to include much of Greece. Our sources give us the names of the leading states on each side: Samos, Thessaly, and the northern Chalkidian colonies were allied with Chalkis against Miletos and Eretria. But Thucydides makes it clear that there were others, and we can reconstruct at least a partial list from a consideration of interstate relations existing at this time.

We get some idea of Samian political relations in the late eighth and early seventh century from scattered references to Samian activity in this period. We have already noted that Samos was allied with Corinth at least as early as 704 B.C. Samian hostilities with Aigina in the latter's war with Athens will have left a breach that cannot have been healed soon; and her support of Athens in that conflict will have left Athens indebted to her. In the seventh century we find Samos, together with Paros and Erythrai, arbitrating a dispute over colonization between Chalkis and Andros, which implies that all five

37. Strabo 10. 1.11-12.
38. Plutarch, qu. Gr. 30 (Moralia 298A-B).
had been on friendly terms previously. We find Samos aiding Sparta in the Messenian revolt, \(^{39}\) which followed the Lelantine War so closely that good relations between the two can be inferred for that war. Samos' hostility to Aigina dated to the Athenian-Aiginetan War, as did her enmity with Argos, which, as we have seen, supported Aigina. Samos' traditional rivalry with Miletos existed at this time, \(^{40}\) and it is likely that Megara, whose colonial activities in the seventh century corresponded closely with those of Miletos, \(^{41}\) will have been allied with Samos' enemies. Chios, traditionally Miletos' closest ally, \(^{42}\) is usually found opposing Samian interests.

When we look at evidence for Chalkis and Eretria, we find some indirect signs of conflict between them even in the eighth century. Towards the middle of the century

---

41. Megara's early colonizing activities included the establishment in the Propontis of Astakos (712 B.C.), Byzantion (660), and Chalkedon (676).
42. See Herodotos 1. 18, where Chios aids Miletos when attacked by Alyattes; 1. 160, where Chians betray Paktyas, the Lydian patriot; and 1. 165, where Chians refuse to help the Phokaian die-hards.
they co-operated in the foundation of Ischia and Kyme, but at some later date there was stasis in Ischia. In 735 the Corinthian expedition to Kerkyra expelled Eretrian settlers already established there. Only a few years later the Chalkidians of Leontinoi drove out the Megarians who had originally shared the colony with them. The relevance of these last two facts becomes clear when we add them to the tradition of Megara's revolt from Corinth which occurred sometime after 720. Corinth and Chalkis worked closely in the West, and by 690 they held a virtual monopoly on trade in that area. Friendship between Chalkis and Sparta is suggested by the presence of pro-Spartan Messenians at Rhegion. Spartan hostility toward Argos had existed for some time before the Battle of Hyssiai in 669/8.

43. Strabo 5. 4.4, p. 247; Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Ant. Rom. 7. 3.
44. Strabo 5. 4.9; Plutarch, Qu. Gr. 11 (Moralia 293A-B); Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Ant. Rom. 7. 3.1.
45. Thucydides 6. 4.1.
46. Blakeway, BSA 33 (1932-1933) 170-208; for the numismatic evidence see Head, Historia Nummorum 334-335.
47. Strabo 6. 1.6; Herakleides Pontikos, FHG 2, p. 197, fr. 25.
By linking these rivalries and friendships we find two groups of states hostile to one another. On the one side are Chalkis, Samos, Corinth, Thessaly, Sparta, Erythrai, Paros, Andros, and Athens; on the other, Eretria, Miletos, Chios, Megara, Argos, and Aigina. Although not all are mentioned as participating in the Lelantine War, it is probable that most were involved in some way; nor are we certain that the list of belligerents is complete. 49

The Lelantine War has often been viewed as a struggle between two rival commercial leagues, largely arising from colonial rivalries. 50 That the origins of the rivalry can be traced to colonizing activity is possible; but it

49. Burn, loc. cit. (note 33), who thinks that most of the Greek world was involved in the war through trade-relations, employs evidence for interstate relations down into the sixth century; consequently, his list of allies on each side is much longer than that suggested above. It is, however, bad method to add powers to either side on the strength of evidence not actually relevant to the period of the war. Alliances and enmities were not always of long duration. As early as 655 Samos broke with Chalkis when she voted against her former ally in the Akanthian dispute (Plutarch, Qu. Gr. 30 [Moralia 298A-B]).

50. E.g., by How and Wells, Commentary on Herodotos 2 58.
is clearly going beyond the evidence to view the war as one arising out of colonial rivalries between two rival "trade leagues." Rather the evidence suggests a series of local conflicts between traditional rivals: Chalkis and Eretria, Samos and Miletos, Athens and Aigina, Chios and Erythrai, Corinth and Megara. Allies will have helped each other only as they found opportunity in the course of their normal trading activity. The economic aspects of the war, too, have been unduly stressed; the conflict

51. It is difficult to see what Thessaly could have had to do with colonies. Moreover, we can hardly speak of "trade leagues" organized for commercial purposes in seventh-century Greece. It is likely that there were ties of friendship of a quasi-political nature between the states mentioned. These may have afforded security for their ships in each others' harbours, as well as immunity from piracy, probably as frequent as trade at this period. But these connections must have been tenuous and often short-lived.

52. Thus Bradeen (op. cit. 236-237) finds as the reason for hostilities between Samos and Aigina their rivalry in the trade with Egypt. But, as we have seen (supra, p. 10, note 29), the Egyptian trade cannot be dated before the first quarter of the sixth century. Bradeen also suggests that the tradition that Pheidon struck coins at Aigina
seems to have consisted largely of local struggles between old enemies over longstanding issues. The enlargement of the war, originally confined to the Lelantine Plain, should probably be attributed to Pheidon, who was willing to interfere in local disputes in his desire to regain the lot of Temenos.

Thus the war broke out sometime after 704, and probably ca. 675, between Chalkis and Eretria over the Lelantine Plain. Argos, pursuing expansionist policies under Pheidon, supported Eretria. The reason for Samian and Corinthian involvement is not clear; it might relate to Pheidon's interference in the war and Corinthian fear of Argive designs (especially in view of Pheidon's recent seizure of Sikyon\(^53\)). Perhaps Samos aided Corinth in payment of an old debt, the help given by Ameinokles several years before. Miletos perhaps saw an opportunity to seize

---

proves the tyrant's interest in trade and commerce. But the tradition of Pheidon's introduction of coinage, always seriously questioned (see, e.g., Head, \textit{op. cit.} xliv, 394-395; and Hill, \textit{Historical Greek Coins} 4), has now been decisively refuted (see Brown, \textit{Numchron [Sixth series]} 10 (1950) 177-204).

\(^53\) Sikyon acted in close co-operation with Argos during the Second Messenian War (Pausanias 4. 15.7; 4. 17.7), and apparently came under Argive control shortly before.
land from Samos on the traditionally disputed peninsula of Mykale, and, hopeful of aid from Megara and Chios, entered the war. In any event, the rivalry between Miletos and Samos had always been keen enough to lead the one to side with the enemies of the other. Chios, traditionally Miletos' closest ally, became involved; perhaps their attack on Erythrai\(^{54}\) can be dated to this war. It was probably on this occasion, too, that Andros and the other Eretrian dependencies in the Aegean revolted.\(^{55}\)

The Chalkidians, although possessing superior infantry, were having trouble with the Eretrian cavalry. Chalkis' allies, busy in local struggles, could furnish no aid, but reinforcements finally arrived from her northern colonies and from Thessaly under Kleomachos of Pharsalos.\(^{56}\) With the additional cavalry Chalkis defeated the Eretrians and so gained possession of the plain. The western colonies of Eretria disappeared, and nothing remained to her west of the Malean Cape with the possible exception of Orikos on the Epeirote coast.\(^{57}\)

\(^{54}\) Herodotos 1. 18.3.

\(^{55}\) Andros is found planting colonies in Chalkidike \textit{ca.} 655.

\(^{56}\) Plutarch, \textit{Amat. Narr.} 17 (\textit{Moria} \textit{760E-761B}).

\(^{57}\) Burn, \textit{op. cit.} (p. 12, note 33) 36. Boardman (\textit{BSA} 47 [1952] 1-48), in a study of Eretrian pottery, finds that
In the East Chalkis' allies seem to have fared badly. Although we know little of actual events in the East during the war, the success of Miletos and her allies is shown by the changes in the Hellespont and Propontis. Up to this time the area had been colonized by Paros, Erythrai, Kolophon, Phokala, and Samos. After the war, however, we find Miletos taking over Parion, a possession of Paros and Erythrai, and Lampsakos, originally colonized by Phokalians. The Megarians now joined hands with the Milesians to prevent hostile interests from gaining admittance to the Propontis. Thus a colony that Archias of Thasos led to Archion, situated on the Bosporos, was dislodged by the Megarians of Chalkedon. Samos, active in the Propontis before the Lelantine War, is excluded from the area after the war. Prokonnesos, founded by the Samians ca. 675 B.C., seems to have come under Milesian control. After its

the Chalkidian victory diverted Eretria's interests rather than damaged her prosperity.

60. Dionysios of Byzantion, fr. 30.
defeat by Miletos, the island suffered an eclipse, and we hear of no further colonial activity in this region for half a century. Samos' defeat in the East, despite the victory of Chalkis and her allies in the West, is explicable only on the assumption that the Lelantine War consisted of a series of essentially local struggles.  

Although the war proper was over, its repercussions lingered on. In 669 an Argive army defeated the Spartans near Hysiai after an invasion by the Spartans. The Argive victory was decisive; in the next year Pheidon marched across the Peloponnese, seized Olympia from the Eleians, and, with the Pisatans, celebrated the festival under his own presidency. For Sparta the consequences

Strabo makes the colony's foundation roughly contemporary with that of Abydos (675 B.C.).

62. For a similar view see Forrest, op. cit. 161-163.
63. Pausanias 2. 24.7.
64. Herodotos 6. 127.3; Pausanias 6. 22.2; Strabo 8. 3.30. The text of Pausanias reads 'Ολυμπιάδι μὲν τὴν ὄμοσην, but Strabo says that the Eleians held the presidency for the first twenty-six Olympiads. Eusebios says that the Pisatans took over in the twenty-eighth Olympiad. The suggestion that the text of Pausanias should be emended to 'Ολυμπιάδι μὲν τὴν ὄμοσην καὶ εἰκοστῇ is attractive; the corruption would have been easy at a time when the numbers were
were disastrous. Morale was shaken and discipline weakened; and the Messenians, subdued sixty years earlier, were given their long-awaited chance to revolt.

The chronology of the Second Messenian War is uncertain, but the revolt probably followed closely on the defeat of Sparta at Hysiai. The Messenians were assisted by the Pisatans, Argives, Eleians, Sikyonians, and Arkadians. Samos and Corinth, allies of Sparta in the Ielantine War, continued to aid their ally. Samian connections with Sparta had been established early; much Lakonian pottery dating from the eighth century has been found in Samos. Close political ties are indicated, moreover, by the number of Spartan dedications in the Heraion at this time. It appears likely that by represented by letters. For a full discussion see Ure, op. cit. 159-160.

65. For the dates of the First Messenian War see Huxley, Early Sparta 34.

66. See Huxley, op. cit. 56-57, for a discussion of the problems involved.

67. Apollodoros (FGrH 244 F 344) quoted by Strabo 8. 362; Pausanias 4. 15.7.

68. Herodotos 3. 47.1; Pausanias 4. 15.8.

69. Roebuck, op. cit. (p. 5, note 17) 82.

70. Ibid. 82.
Sparta had won back much of Messenia, for in that year the Lakedaimonians took Phigaleia.\textsuperscript{71} The capture of Hira in 657 gave Spartan arms another success.\textsuperscript{72} But, if we are to believe Plutarch, Messenian resistance was not finally broken until about 600 B.C.\textsuperscript{73}

Samos, as we have seen, apparently fared badly in the Lelantine War, although her ally in the West defeated Eretria on the Lelantine Plain. We hear little of Samian activity during the next half-century, when Miletos and Megara held the upper hand in the East; Samos appears to have been reduced to the rank of a second-rate power. Miletos, victorious in the East, had secured for herself the northeast passage, and continued unabated her colonizing activities on the Black Sea and its approaches.\textsuperscript{74} Megara, too, had profited by the outcome of the war, and the latter half of the seventh century witnessed her greatest period of activity. The sudden rise of Megara

\textsuperscript{71.} Pausanias 8. 39.3-5.
\textsuperscript{72.} Pausanias 4. 27.9.
\textsuperscript{73.} Moralia 194B. Epameinondas is recorded as saying that he gave Messenia her freedom after two hundred and thirty years. Cf. also Aelian, VH 13. 42, who confirms the figure.
\textsuperscript{74.} Milesian colonies during this period include Tyras (656), Istros (656), Olbia (644), Kios (628), Pantikapaion
to prominence, supported perhaps by the entry of her name in the Eusebian "List of Thalassocracies," is seen in the establishment of important colonies at Chalkedon, Selymbria, and Byzantion, in what was previously a Milesian reserve. The Megarian thalassocracy probably reached its height under the demagogue Theagenes, who made himself tyrant in the third quarter of the seventh century.

Samian attempts at colonization were few. There is some literary evidence to indicate that Samos colonized (600), Theodosia (600), and Mileson Teichos (late seventh century).

75. Burn (JHS 47 [1927] 165-177) suggests that the troublesome ΚΑΠΕΣ be emended to read ΜΕΤΑΠΕΣ as ruler of the Aegean between 660 and 599 B.C. This area of the text is badly corrupted and the emendation is attractive and certainly more convincing than the solution proposed by Myres (JHS 26 [1906] 84-130, esp. 107-109), who excises the entry altogether from its position in the list and inserts it at the top of the list, where he supposes it to have dropped out. For the value of the Eusebian list see infra, pp. 72-77, esp. p. 77.

76. Thucydides 1. 126; Aristotle, Rhet. 1. 2; Pol. 7. 1305A; Pausanias 1. 28.1, 40.1, 41.2; Plutarch, Qu. Gr. 18 (Moralia 295).
Amorgos in the first half of the seventh century. The Samians were anticipated on the island by Naxians, but there is no evidence of discord between the two. The island provided a useful port of call on the regular route from southwest Asia Minor into the Cyclades and across the Aegean. Two colonies, Kelenderis and Nagidos, were founded on the Pamphilian coast. There is no evidence for the date of their foundation, but since Samian trade with Cyprus and the Near East flourished as early as the eighth century, an early date is likely. They doubtless provided good stopping points en route to Syria or Cyprus, and perhaps also lairs for the favourite Samian occupation of piracy. Samos early showed an interest in the Northeast; we find Samians founding Prokonnesos ca. 675.

77. The chronological evidence is slight. Stephanos of Byzantion (s.v. 'Αμοργός) states that the Samian poet Simonides took part in the colonization as hegemon and that he lived 490 years after the Trojan War.
78. Steph. Byz., s.v. 'Αμοργός.
79. Kelenderis: Mela 1. 77; Strabo 14. 670; Ps.-Skylax 102; Apollodoros 3. 14.3. Nagidos: Steph. Byz., s.v.; Ps.-Skylax 102; Mela 1. 77; Strabo 14. 670, 682; Herodian 2. 2.925, 7L.
80. See supra, p. 5.
81. See supra, p. 21, note 61.
Two other colonies in the Propontis, Bisanthe, and Heraion Teichos, both founded by Samians, may date to this period.

It is in the latter half of the seventh century that we find the beginnings of the Samian trade with Egypt. The first mention we have of Samian contact with Egypt is in the story of Kolaios recorded by Herodotos. Herodotos says that the Samian Kolaios was sailing for Egypt when he was forced to put in at the island of Platea. Anxious to reach Egypt, he again set sail in that direction, but was carried out of his course by an east wind that carried his ship past the Pillars of Herakles to Tartessos. Herodotos describes the port as "virgin" (ἀκηράγατον), suggesting that the market was a new one, or at least long unvisited. Kolaios came away with such a load of silver that he made, says Herodotos, a greater profit than any Greeks before him, save for an otherwise unknown Sostratos. Kolaios' voyage may be dated to about 638. The opening

82. Mela 11. 24; Steph. Byz., s.v.; Herodian 1. 312.16.
84. 4. 152.
85. Dunbabin, The Western Greeks 339, note 1. The date is seven years before the foundation of Kyrene, while the Theraians were still on the island of Platea. The Eusebian date for the foundation of Kyrene is 631 B.C.
of the Spanish silver mines was an event of great importance to Mediterranean trade, but the Samians seem not to have followed up Kolaios' successful voyage. Instead they left it to the Phokaians to develop a trade with the west, and the Phokaians long enjoyed friendly commercial relations with Tartessos.  

The Samians, however, maintained an interest in Kyrene and its founders, the Theraians, long after Kolaios' first contact with them.  

Kolaios' voyage cannot be taken as evidence of an established trade with Egypt at that time; indeed, that he should be so far off course as to land in Platea suggests that he was unfamiliar with the route to Egypt. Herodotos dates the earliest Greek trade with Egypt to the reign of Psammetichos I (660-610). This agrees with the ceramic finds that date the first Greeks at Naukratis to ca. 620. That Samians were beginning to make contact with Egypt before this time is indicated by Egyptian bronzes dating from the mid-seventh century that have been

---

86. Herodotos 1. 163. Dunbabin, op. cit. 339, note 2, suggests that the reign of eighty years ascribed to Arganthonios represents the period during which Tartessos was visited by the Phokaians (i.e., ca. 620-540).

87. Herodotos 4. 152.5.

88. 2. 154.

89. Boardman, op. cit. (note 29) 138.
found on Samos. Kolaios' voyage must have been among the first attempts at communication with the Egyptians.

Herodotos says that Amasis first granted the Greeks Naukratis as an emporium. The archaeological evidence clearly reveals, however, that Naukratis was founded long before Amasis' reign. The pottery, as we have seen, dates the earliest Greeks there to ca. 620 B.C. Naukratis was founded probably about 615-610. Samos maintained a separate temple there, a privilege enjoyed as well by Miletos and Aligina. These states, perhaps the first to establish a significant trade with Egypt, doubtless represented the most important Greek elements at Naukratis. The Samian temple to Hera was discovered by Ernest Gardner in 1886; it has not, unfortunately, been dated. It is unlikely, at any rate, that Samian trade of any significance much preceded the end of the seventh century.

90. Ibid. 130-131.
91. 2. 178.
93. Herodotos 2. 178.3.
94. Gardner, New Chapters in Greek History 206.
Political relations in this period underwent significant change. We find Corinth, under Periander, deserting her Samian alliance and acting in concert with Miletos under the tyrant Thrasyboulos. The reason for this abrupt volte-face is not hard to find. Periander's goodwill was doubtless attracted by the rule of a fellow tyrant at Miletos, and by a common hostility to Samos, which had supported the Corinthian aristocracy overthrown by the Kypselids. There was seldom any continuity in the foreign policy of a tyrant and the regime that he had replaced.

Even more remarkable is the change in Samian-Milesian relations that occurred at the end of the seventh century. There is evidence that Samos maintained a certain degree of friendly intercourse with Miletos in the latter part of the century: a number of Samian vases of the late seventh and early sixth century have been discovered at Miletos. Moreover, we find the two cities acting in concert against Priene for the possession of the estuary of the Maeander. It is just at this period that we find Thrasyboulos in power at Miletos, and it is likely

95. Herodotos 5. 92; Aristotle, Pol. 3. 1284A; 7. 1311A; Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Ant. Rom. 4. 56.
96. Dunham, The History of Miletus 66.
97. Plutarch, Qu. Gr. 20 (Moralia 296A-B).
that the Milesian tyrant, willing to forget (at least temporarily) traditional feuds, established a *modus vivendi* with Miletos' chief rival. Samos, with markets in the Northeast closed to her, and unable to maintain the trade she had opened up in the West, was willing to drop her rivalry with her now dominant neighbour in order to gain access to markets on the mainland.

Confirmation of the friendly relations that existed between Samos and Miletos at this time may be found in Samos' entry into the Propontis, for sixty years a Megarian and Milesian reserve. In the last years of the seventh century a war broke out between Athens and Megara over Salamis.\(^98\) The island, which changed hands repeatedly, seems originally to have been Megarian.\(^99\) Samos, previously excluded by Megara from the Propontis, now took advantage of Megara's occupation with the war to found Perinthos in 601 B.C.\(^100\) That Miletos made no attempt to check this new Samian intrusion into the propontis (a fact that has unnecessarily puzzled some\(^101\))

\(^{98}\) Plutarch, *Solon* 8-10.

\(^{99}\) Strabo 8. 395.

\(^{100}\) Plutarch, *Qu. Gr.* 57 (Moria* *303F*); Eusebios (Latin version) 1415; ps.-*Skymnos* 714; Strabo 7, fr. 56.

\(^{101}\) E.g., Burn, op. cit. (note 33) 24.
finds its likely explanation in the friendly relations then existing between Miletos and Samos. Megara, unwilling to permit Samian intrusion into her reserve, sent as many ships as she could spare from home waters and besieged Perinthos. Thrasyboulos, who tacitly supported Samos' venture in the Hellespont, left his erstwhile ally to fight and lose unaided. A relieving fleet arrived from Samos and in a pitched battle Megara was defeated. Six hundred prisoners were taken and Perinthos was saved.

Samos, forced for half a century to accept the position of a second-rate power, seemed about to regain her status in the Aegean as a power of the first rank. But her victory at Perinthos was followed at home by a period of stasis which vitiated her gain in the Propontis. Civil strife, although rendering Samos temporarily impotent, paved the way, however, for a vigorous tyranny which made the island, for a time, the greatest power in the East Aegean.

102. Plutarch, Qu. Gr. 57 (Moralia 303F).
103. Thrasyboulos' iesertion of Megara certainly cannot be traced to his lack of interest in the Pontic trade, as Burn suggests (op. cit. 24).
104. Plutarch, Qu. Gr. 57 (Moralia 303F).
CHAPTER TWO
THE EARLY TYRANNY

The Megarian expedition against Perinthos occurred, says Plutarch,\textsuperscript{1} "after the murder of Demoteles and the dissolution of his monarchic government, when the landowners (geomoroi) controlled the state." The Megarians had little doubt that they would overcome easily the newly-founded colony, for they brought with them fetters with which to bind their captives. When the geomoroi learned of the Megarian expedition, they dispatched thirty ships under nine generals to aid the Perinthians. Although two of the ships were destroyed by a thunderbolt while sailing out of the harbour, the rest of the fleet proceeded to Perinthos, where the Samians defeated the Megarians and took six hundred prisoners. The oarsmen conceived the project of overthrowing the oligarchy at home, and a convenient opportunity was provided them by the geomoroi, who sent word to the victorious generals to bring the captive Megarians to Samos bound in their own fetters. The Samians took their prisoners into their plot and set sail for Samos. When they had disembarked at Samos, the prisoners were paraded in triumph and led to

\textsuperscript{1} Qu. Gr. 57 (Moralia 303E-304C).
the council-chamber, where the geomoroi were awaiting the returning expedition; but the Megarians had had their fetters loosely fastened and daggers concealed under their clothing. According to plan, at a given signal the chains were shaken off, and the prisoners drew their concealed swords and slew the geomoroi. So fell the land-owning aristocracy of Samos. The democrats granted citizenship to as many of the Megarians as desired it, and the Megarians constructed a temple and dedicated their fetters to Hera.

Plutarch does not date the war with the Megarians, but, as we have seen, it must have followed closely the establishment of Perinthos by the Samians in 601 B.C., and most likely represented a Megarian attempt to prevent Samian influence in what Megara regarded as her reserve. The popular revolution is the earliest event in Samian political history of which we know; and Plutarch's connection of the event with the Perinthian expedition allows us to date the revolution securely.²

2. On the historical value of events related in the Moralia see Stadter, Plutarch's Historical Methods, esp. 125-140. Stadter shows that Plutarch derived his information for the Moralia from the general histories, which he supplemented by consulting numerous local historians. Stadter finds
Plutarch says that the Samian expedition to aid the Perinthians occurred "after the murder of Demoteles and the dissolution of his monarchic government" (μετὰ τὴν Δημοτέλους σφαγῆν καὶ τὴν κατάλυσιν τῆς ἐκείνου μοναρχίας). The identification of Demoteles has provoked some controversy. Ure suggested that he was a hereditary king of the period before the abolition of the monarchy. But Andrewes has shown that the ordinary usage of the word μοναρχία in non-philosophical prose is as a synonym for τυραννίς. Demoteles, then, was not the last of the hereditary kings, but rather a tyrant.

That tyranny should arise so early in Samos is not surprising. As one of the most advanced cities in Ionia, Samos doubtless experienced considerable political change early. We know that the hereditary monarchy still existed in Samos ca. 704, when the βασιλεύς Amphikrates led that Plutarch's information, particularly of the period before Herodotus, is generally correct. The amount of material on Samian affairs in the Quaestiones Graecae (see questions 54, 55, 56, 57) suggests that Plutarch consulted a Samian historian, perhaps Douris. On the Quaestiones Graecae see Halliday, The Greek Questions of Plutarch, esp. 204-212.

an expedition against Aigina. The hereditary monarchy was overthrown sometime in the seventh century, perhaps as a result of political strife brought about by Samos' defeat in the Lelantine War. If events in Samos followed the usual course of political evolution in Greek states, the monarchy was followed by oligarchic rule, that of the powerful geomoroi.

We know of another Samian tyrant who flourished in the seventh century. Theodoros Metochites preserves mention of a Samian aisympetes named Phoibias, who is listed together with Pittakos, Periander, and an otherwise unknown Chairemon in Apollonia, all holders of this extraordinary office in time of crisis. The reference to the Samian Phoibias with Pittakos and Periander, both of whom flourished in the latter half of the seventh century suggests that the Samian tyrant should be placed

7. According to Aristotle (Pol. 1285A), the aisympetes was a supreme ruler, appointed in times of internal crisis, for life, for a prescribed period, or until the completion of his task. Aristotle defines the office as an elective tyranny, Dionysios of Halikarnassos (Ant. Rom. 5. 73) compares it with the Roman dictatorship. Inscriptions
In that period, Phoibias' tyranny was followed by that of Demoteles; but by the turn of the century he had been overthrown by the geomoroi, who succeeded in regaining power.

After the war with Megara to which we have referred, the Samian sailors and their Megarian prisoners overthrew the geomoroi and established a popular government. The democracy was soon subverted, however, for we hear of the rise of another tyrant. Polyainos tells of one Sylosos, the son of Kalliteles, who had been elected to command against the Aiolians on account of his democratic leanings. Sylosos had promised to safeguard the sacred procession to the Heraion, which was threatened with cancellation in the event of an Aiolian raid. The Samians were enthusiastic in their praise for Sylosos' courage and piety. But while they were at the Heraion he sent for his sailors "from the triremes" and seized the akropolis in the night. In the morning the Samians awoke to find a tyrant in control.

The story has often been dismissed as a doublet of the rise of Polykrates, the Sylosos of Polyainos' account being taken for a confused recollection of the brother of

(SIG\(^2\) 38, 57, 272, 642, 955) show regular magistrates so-called in Miletos, Teos, Naxos, Megara, Selinos, and Chalkedon.

Polykrates.\textsuperscript{9} There are a number of objections to this view, however. Sylosos's father is given by Polyainos as Kalliteles; Polykrates' (and his brother Sylosos's) as Aiakes.\textsuperscript{10} The rise to power of Polykrates and his brothers, moreover, is related separately by Polyainos,\textsuperscript{11} and the detailed circumstances of the two revolutions are quite dissimilar. There is no reason to doubt that we have mention in Polyainos of a separate tyrant.

Can we date the tyranny of Sylosos? We know enough of Samian history between the death of Polykrates and the Persian Wars to exclude the possibility that the tyranny might date to that period.\textsuperscript{12} Two items in Polyainos' account, however, suggest the period in which we should place Sylosos's seizure of power. First, Sylosos was elected to command against the Aiolians because of his

\textsuperscript{9} E.g., by Ure, \textit{op. cit.} 69.

\textsuperscript{10} Herodotos 3. 39.1.

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Strategikon} 1. 23.

\textsuperscript{12} Polyainos' mention of triremes implies a date later than the reign of Polykrates, if we accept Davison's suggestion (\textit{Colloq} 1947. 18-24; see \textit{infra}, p. 84) that Polykrates was first to use the trireme on a large scale. But triremes are referred to anachronistically by other writers (e.g., Herodotos 5. 85), and we should not press the term in so late an author as Polyainos.
democratic leanings; this implies that the government at this time was a popular one. Secondly, his seizure of power occurred with the help of sailors; this recalls the overthrow of the geomoroi by Samian sailors who then set up a democracy. We may infer, I think, that Syloson's revolution followed closely upon the popular revolution. It is not surprising that the sailors who had earlier overthrown the geomoroi later helped to promote a tyrant.

The most significant fact about Syloson, however, is that his name suggests that he was related to Polykrates and his brother Syloson, who was tyrant after Polykrates' death. It is likely, then, that Polykrates, even though he seized power in a revolution, was not the first of his family to hold the position of tyrant. Rather, as will appear, he was the successor to at least two sixth-century tyrants, whose rule he continued.

Syloson, then, having overthrown the democracy set up ca. 600 B. C., established a tyranny. We cannot determine the precise dates of his tyranny, but, as we shall see, his successor seems to have come to power ca. 570. Syloson's rule may then be dated to the first quarter of the sixth century.

13. Herodotos 3. 139-149.
Although our literary sources name more than one tyrant who ruled in Samos in the sixth century, there is no reference to a tyranny lasting for several generations. Herodotos discusses only the tyranny of Polykrates, and his account of the ἐπανάστασις has been taken to imply that the tyranny of Polykrates was a new departure. But there is considerable archaeological evidence to show that there was, in fact, a vigorous tyranny flourishing in Samos in the generation preceding Polykrates. And, as we shall see, Herodotos, although his interest in the Samian tyranny is concentrated on the career of Polykrates, has provided us with enough information about Samian activities in the immediately preceding period to suggest that Polykrates was, in many cases, continuing policies initiated at least a generation before him.

A solution that has been put forward more than once is to suppose that Aiakes, whom Herodotos names as the father of Polykrates,16 was his predecessor in the tyranny.17

16. Herodotos 2. 182.2; 3. 39.1; 3. 139.1; 6. 13.1.
17. First proposed, so far as I can discover, by Babelon, RevNum 12 (1894) 253-285 (see esp. 269), and Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines 2, 1 col. 203, it has most recently been advocated by Homann-Wedeking, ArchEph 1953-1954 B' (1958) 185-191. This view has been most forcefully expounded by White, JHS 74 (1954) 36-43.
This theory claimed support from the superficially attractive evidence of a dedication made by Aeakes, who held the office of ἐπιστάτης in Samos, which had been thought to show that in the generation before Polykrates there was an Aiakes active in Samos. The dedication, a marble statue of a headless seated figure, was uncovered in 1905 in the Heraion. The figure, though of indeterminate sex, probably represents Hera. An inscription engraved on the left side of the chair on which the figure is seated reads:

Δέκατος άνέθηκεν | τὴν σύλην; Ἕρην
κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστάσιν

"Aeakes the son of Brychon (Bryson?) dedicated (this), who exacted (or sold) the plunder for Hera during his superintendence."

Until recently most authorities dated the statue (and inscription) to ca. 540 in the belief that the Aeakes mentioned in the inscription was the father of Polykrates.

19. Not the dedicator, as Ure suggested (op. cit. 82).
20. I follow Curtius (op. cit. 158-159) in taking ἐπρῆσεν as Ionic for ἐπρᾶσσεν in the common sense of "exacted" (πρᾶσσω), rather than the Ionic aorist of περάω, "sell."
21. Dittenberger, SIG³ 10; Austin, The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions 13-14; and Tod, GHI 7 and 258.
Both statue and inscription have lately received much attention, however, and it now appears that the dedication cannot be dated as early as the mid-sixth century. Pomtow, who was among the first to suggest that the dedication should be dated ca. 500-490, attributed it to an otherwise unknown cousin of Aiakes, son of Sylasos, or even to Aiakes himself.22

Internal evidence of the inscription alone points to a date close to 500 B.C.: Α not Α, and Θ not Θ, in an almost stoichedon setting (perhaps the earliest extant example of this style), with no trace of working over.23 On purely stylistic grounds Richter assigns the statue to the last third of the sixth century, comparing "the latest of the seated figures from Miletos and the Athena perhaps by Endelios from the Athenian Akropolis," together with the reliefs of the Siphnian treasury and a terracotta statuette from Sicily.24 In a review of Miss Richter's work, Dunbabin praised her "proper scepticism about the person of the Aeaces who dedicated a seated statue of Hera of Samos," and rejected the identification of him with Polykrates' father, "whose activity should be dated to a


24. Richter, Archaic Greek Art 168; cf. also 139.
period earlier than that of the statue." Miss Jeffery dates the inscription ca. 525-520, identifying the dedicator with Polykrates' father, largely on the testimony of Buschor, "whose authority in setting the date of the statue ca. 540 cannot be lightly dismissed," though she admits that the closest parallel for the letter forms is the round altar from Miletos dated ca. 494 on the style of its mouldings. Lewis, in a review of Miss Jeffery's book, criticises her "uneasy compromise between her better judgment (nearest epigraphic parallel 500-490) and Buschor's authority in setting the date of the statue c. 540," and asks, "how far was Buschor originally justified in his dating by the belief that Aiakes was Polykrates' father? And do the statue and the inscription have to be contemporary?"

Prosopographical arguments have been used to support the identification of the dedicator of the statue with Polykrates' father. Page, for example, suggests that it is likely that the two are the same since "no other Aiakes is known to us at any time in any place." But Polykrates'

---

25. Dunbabin, JHS 71 (1951) 266.  
27. Lewis, JHS 83 (1963) 176.  
nephew also bore the name. A second argument proceeds from the appearance of the word σύλη in the inscription (the only place it is found in the singular in all of Greek literature) and its supposed reappearance in the name of Polykrates' brother Sylosos. Miss White states that "this brother of Polykrates is, so far as I can discover, the only person known to have borne the name." We do, in fact, know of another person by that name, Sylosos the son of Kalliteles.

The statue most likely dates to the last third of the sixth century and the inscription should be dated ca. 500. The dedication cannot be used to support the view that Aiakes, the father of Polykrates, preceded his son as tyrant. That "the phrase ἀρὰ τὴν ἐπίστασιν indicates the position Aiakes held while he exercised what later generations called a tyranny" can no longer be upheld; and there is no other evidence, of an explicit or implicit nature, to connect Aiakes with the tyranny. On the other hand, the dedicator may have represented a collateral

30. LSJ 1671, s.v. σύλη.
31. White, op. cit. 38.
32. Ibid. 38, note 23.
33. Ibid. 38.
branch of the tyrants' family; this is suggested by the dedicator's name, which we know was a family name of the tyrants, and by the appearance of the word σύλη in the names of two members of the tyrants' family, perhaps a pun on a family occupation. The most logical conclusion, then, is that the dedication was made near the end of the century by an otherwise unknown relative of the tyrants, whose duty it was, as ἐπιστάτης, to see that Hera received her share of the "booty" collected by Samian pirates.

34. Bilabel's suggestion (NeueHeidJahrb 1934 133) that the word ἐπιστάτης denotes a political office rather than the position of a temple-guardian seemed probable when Aiakes could perhaps be associated with the tyranny. Thus Ehrenberg (JHS 57 [1937] 149, note 7) thought that Aiakes became a pirate officially "with the consent of the goddess and while still in the magistracy," and that it was his combination of personal power and enrichment from state-supported piracy that resulted in Polykrates' tyranny. This view, based on the dedication of Αιακες, now seems unlikely; but precisely what Αιακες' position was, whether that of a temple official or a political magistrate, we do not know.

35. Pomtow (Sig3 20), while dating the statue ca. 500-490, nevertheless tried to preserve its connection with Polykrates' father by suggesting that Aiakes, the son of
If we dismiss the dedication of Aeakes as evidence for an Aiakes who held an important political office in the mid-sixth century, the theory that Polykrates' father preceded him in the tyranny finds no support. There is evidence to show that there was a tyrant ruling in Samos in the generation before Polykrates, however, and that his name, too, was Polykrates; that there was not one tyrant of this name, but two; and that the first Polykrates ruled from ca. 572 to sometime before ca. 541. It is this evidence that we must now consider.

Diogenes Laertios, quoting Apollodoros, says that in the second year of the fifty-eighth Olympiad (547/6 B.C.) Anaximander was sixty-four and that he died not long afterward; then he adds that he flourished almost at the same time as Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos (ἀκμάσαντι πη μάλιστα κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον). Since the age of akme was usually taken to be forty, we

Sylosos, dedicated the statue in his grandfather's name. This view is, as Miss Jeffery states, "very lame." On Samian piracy see infra, pp. 87-89.

36. First proposed by Barron, CQ (New Series) 14 (1964) 210-229. Although I disagree on major points, my debt to Barron in the following discussion will be obvious.

37. Diogenes Laertios, Vit. Phil. 2. 1.2.
are given the date ca. 571 for Polykrates. But Polykrates' tyranny is made contemporary with the reign of Kambyse by Thucydides, whose chronology is supported by Eusebios. Thus Diels and Jacoby transfer this last phrase in Diogenes' account to the life of Pythagoras on the ground of chronological difficulty. The text offers no grounds for such violent emendation, however; it appears rather that we have here another chronological system in which Polykrates was dated a generation earlier than he was by Thucydides, and that this chronology was current in the second century B.C., when Apollodoros wrote.

There is preserved in the twenty-ninth Oration of Himerios, written about the middle of the fourth century after Christ, a 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 passage reads as follows:

---

38. 1. 13.6.

39. Eusebios dates Polykrates' accession to 532 B.C.


41. Jacoby, Forh 2 BD 727.

42. The most recent text is that of Colonna, 131-132; see
Bowra and Page took lines 3-4 to mean "Polykrates of Rhodes was fond of music," and suggested that the Herodotean tyrant, who συχνάς μὲν ἐν τῶν νήσων ἀραιοίμενος, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἑπείρου ἄστεα, sent his son, also named Polykrates, to rule Rhodes much as Periander had sent Lykophron to Kerkyra, and as Peisistratos established Hegesistratos in Sigeion. Further support for Samian rule of Rhodes, it was suggested, could be found in a fragment of Anakreon:

"He is plucking the beards of the blue-shielded men of Ialysos." Since we are told that here τίλλει means

also Anakreon fr. 146 in Page 228.

44. Page, op. cit. (p. 43, note 28) 170-172.
46. Herodotos 3. 53.
47. Herodotos 5. 94.1.
48. Diehl fr. 15 D; Page 178 fr. 349.
it follows that someone is deriding the people of Ialysos. Since Anakreon wrote for the tyrant Polykrates, it was suggested that he was here referring to the tyrant's son and praising his conduct in Rhodes.

The identification of 'Ρόδου Πολυκράτης as the son of the tyrant was based on the assumption that the Πολυκράτης Ἐφηβος (line 1) referred to the son of the Herodotean Polykrates. The work of Bowra and Page was based on an incomplete manuscript, however; we now possess the lines immediately preceding our narrative, and these reveal that the account of the meeting between Solon and Anacharsis almost certainly preceded our passage, and that Ἡν Πολυκράτης Ἐφηβος begins the account of Polykrates and Anakreon. Thus the Πολυκράτης Ἐφηβος and Πολυκράτης who was οὗ βασιλεὺς ζύμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἐπός θαλάσσης are one and the same person.

'Ρόδου Πολυκράτης remains a problem, however. A solution has been proposed by Labarbe, who notes that while the combination ἐν γοῦν (line 3) is unknown in the rest of Greek literature, ήγουν commonly introduced a gloss. Thus by redividing the words and restoring

&  ἡγοῦν ἡγοῦν τῆς Ῥώδου as a comment on the phrase τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀπάσης ἑθᾶς κτλ. The suggestion is an attractive one, and, if accepted, removes the difficult phrase. 52

That the person being addressed in the poem is Polykrates is further shown in lines 9-10, where reference is made to the πατρὶ Πολυκράτει (or Πολυκράτης). There is a divergence in the manuscripts here, and, while it is impossible to reach general conclusions on the reliability of the manuscripts, 53 Πολυκράτει seems to be the correct reading; for if we accept Πολυκράτης it robs us of the father's name. Moreover, the subject of the sentence is ὁ παῖς (line 8), and if he were named again we should not expect the name, in apposition, to be postponed emphatically to the end of the sentence.

It must be concluded that Ἰμερίος is speaking of the education of the Herodotean Polykrates. He implies that the father ruled Samos (the object of the instruction was to instil βασιλικῆν ἀρετῆν), and, if we accept the reading Πολυκράτει, his account contradicts that of Herodotos,

52. Colonna (note 1, line 25 of his edition) takes the phrase to mean "Polykrates was fond of the music of Rhodes," despite the unusual word order.

53. See Barron, op. cit. 221.
for he gives the name of the tyrant's father as Polykrates.

Himerios' account is valuable for its authority. Page and Bowra have affirmed that Himerios reveals a first-hand knowledge of the works of the Greek lyrist, and that he had access to books at Athens that had long passed out of general circulation. If the passage is based on Himerios' own reading of Anakreon, the narrative gives us trustworthy information about the sixth-century court at Samos.

Suidas' information regarding Anakreon is interesting in the light of the passage in Himerios. According to Suidas, Anakreon γέγονε κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον 'Ολυμπιάδι νή (i.e., 572-569 B.C.). Suidas records a variant, νε' (560-557 B.C.). Rohde emended νή to ξή on the assumption that γέγονε here means floruit.

---

54. Page, op. cit. (p. 43, note 28) 171; Bowra, op. cit. 375.
55. Labarbe, op. cit. 186, note 125, notes that γαία, a poetic form, occurs nowhere else in Himerios, who elsewhere employs the normal prose form, Ἡ; he thinks that the word is corrupt. Barron, op. cit. 222, suggests, however, that in the phrase, τῆς 'Ελληνικῆς ἀπάσης θεάσης ἐφ' ἦς γαία ὀρίζεται, we have a trace of an original poem from Anakreon. If a fragment of Anakreon's work survives here, Himerios' source cannot be doubted.
56. Suidas, s.v. 'Ἀνακρέων.
The emendation is unnecessary if we assume that the entry refers to a Polykrates who ruled in the second quarter of the sixth century. The poet is said to have died at the age of eighty-five in Teos during the early years of the fifth century; thus we may date his birth ca. 572 B.C. There is no reason, then, to assume a numerical error in Suidas' text; rather his source for Anakreon's life seems to have known of an earlier Polykrates.

The dates given for the poet Ibykos, who is also closely associated with the Samian tyranny, have presented chronological difficulties, I think, because of a confusion between the Herodotean Polykrates and his predecessor, and because of the belief that the Samian tyranny was confined to the years 532-522. Suidas says that the poet came to Samos ἐτε αὐτῆς ἦρχεν ὁ Πολυκράτης ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ. χρόνος δὲ ἦν οὗτος ἐπὶ Κροίσου Ὀλυμπίας νό (564-561). Eusebios' date for Ibykos is 01. 61 (536-533). The passage from Suidas has troubled Bowra, who rejects the entry on three grounds: that Eusebios gives another date, although Bowra admits that the two dates are not incompatible; that the father of Polykrates is called by the same name, whereas his name was really Aiakes; and that the father is made to rule Samos. He therefore accepts the emendation

58. Suidas, s.v. "Ἰβυκος."
of Schmid, who emended Πολυκράτης to Πολυκράτους, and thus removed the supposed difficulty. The passage then reads "when the father of the tyrant Polykrates ruled Samos" (or we might take ὁ Πολυκράτης to mean "the son of Polykrates" and translate "when the son of Polykrates, the father of the tyrant, ruled Samos"). But the emendation is unnecessary as it is unwarranted.

That the passage in Suidas mentions a Polykrates ruling earlier than the dates assigned to the Herodotean tyrant need not bother us if we accept the thesis that two tyrants by that name ruled Samos in the sixth century. The real problem lies in the relationship of the two tyrants. Suidas' entry for Ibykos speaks of the earlier tyrant as the father of the Herodotean Polykrates; and, as we have seen, the fragment of Himerios apparently makes the two father and son. But Herodotos repeatedly refers to Polykrates as the son of Aiakes. What are we to make of this contradiction in our sources?

One solution, as we have noted, is to accept the Herodotean genealogy, and to make Aiakes Polykrates' predecessor in the tyranny. This was proposed by Mary White, who, following Wilamowitz, emended Suidas' Πολυκράτης to Ἀιάκης. This violent emendation is wholly

60. Wilamowitz, pindaros 512
61. White, op. cit. 42.
without textual warrant, however. The association of Aiakes with the tyranny, moreover, was based largely on a dating of the dedication of Äeakes to the mid-sixth century, and the belief that an Aiakes held an important political office in the period before Polykrates' seizure of power. Since the statue most probably dates to ca. 500-490, there is no evidence to support the thesis that Aiakes was tyrant before Polykrates.

A suggestion that cannot be so readily dismissed is that of Barron, who proposes that the tradition that names Polykrates as the father of the tyrant should be accepted over that of Herodotos, who names Aiakes as his father. Barron argues that, since Himerios was apparently well-versed in the poetry of Anakreon and Ibykos, both of whom spent some time at the court of the tyrants, his narrative, which seems to make Polykrates the son of Polykrates, is more authoritative than the account of Herodotos, based on oral tradition gathered nearly a century after the tyrant's rule.

Barron's thesis is a superficially attractive one; nevertheless, it contains a number of difficulties that render it, I think, untenable. The first objection is that in Greece sons were seldom named after their fathers; this immediately militates against acceptance of Polykrates as

the patronymic. Secondly, boys were usually named after their grandfathers; and, in Herodotus' account, Polykrates' brother Syloson had a son named Aiakes. Finally, the authority of Herodotus in Samian affairs stands firmly in the way of this view. Suidas says that Herodotus took up residence in Samos because of Lygdamis' tyranny at Halikarnassos, and that while at Samos he became familiar with the Ionic dialect and wrote his history. The last two elements may be rejected; that he lived for some time in Samos is borne out by his special familiarity with the island and its history. This has been shown by Cole, who has established that (1) Herodotus' history of Samos indicates a direct influence from Samian monuments, the result of long association with the island; (2) Herodotus reveals an intimate knowledge of internal affairs explicable only by an extensive period of residence on the island; and (3) Samos was so much a part of Herodotus' mental equipment that it became the natural object of comparison in discussing other subjects, and may passages in Herodotus not on the surface derived from Samian sources reveal, nevertheless, indirect Samian origin.

64. Suidas, s.v. 'Ἡρόδωτος'.
65. How and Wells, Commentary on Herodotus 1 2, note 2.
Herodotos' narrative shows an extensive knowledge of Polykrates' immediate family; he mentions by name his two brothers, his father, and his nephew, all of whom, we assume, were well-known historical figures on Samos long after the period of the tyranny. Herodotos devotes considerable space in his narrative to a description of the events surrounding these personalities. If we accept the traditional date of Herodotos' birth (484 B.C.) as reasonably certain, and assume that his stay in Samos occurred in the early part of his life, probably before 450 (for he spent some time in Athens before taking part in the founding of Thourioi in 444/3), it is not improbable that he talked with some who lived under the tyranny of the Herodotean Polykrates, and certainly with many whose parents had witnessed the tyranny. In view of Herodotos' intimate knowledge of Samian affairs and his interest in Polykrates' family, it is difficult to reject what is, in fact, our earliest and only detailed account of the Samian tyranny.

68. Given by Aulus Gellius, Noct. Att. 15. 23. The date, even if calculated, cannot be far wrong (see How and Wells, Commentary 1 2, note 1).
69. Suidas, s.v. Ἡρόδοτος. On the date of Thourioi see Gomme, Commentary 1 386 and 396.
It is true that Herodotos' account includes no mention of a tyranny before Polykrates, and his account of the ἐπανάστασις implies that the tyranny of Polykrates was a new departure. But the argument from silence is especially dangerous in the case of Herodotos, and should never be used to discredit other information he has collected. Herodotos' sources were oral, and oral tradition tends to gather about individuals, and often leaves gaps, even in the case of important persons and events. Herodotos has frequently been criticized for his tendency to digress from the subject of his narrative; but his narrative is, in fact, closely knit, and his "digressions" are often essential to the narrative. Herodotos' account is, in the case of Polykrates, concerned with the tyrant's relations with Amasis and Kambyses, and a digression at this point, tracing the history of the tyranny before Polykrates, would be inappropriate. A similar omission of information about other members of a tyrant's dynasty is found in Herodotos' account of the Sikyonian tyranny, where two detailed stories about Kleisthenes are told, while his genealogy contains the only mention of earlier members of the family. We know, however, that the tyranny lasted a hundred years.

---

70. Herodotos 5. 67-68; 6. 126-130.
71. Aristotle, Pol. 1315B.
and that Kleisthenes had several predecessors and at least one successor.72 To conclude from his silence about the Samian tyranny before Polykrates that Herodotos knew of no earlier tyrants of the same dynasty, then, is dangerous.

I accept as correct Herodotos' statements naming Aiakes as the father of Polykrates. But, as has been shown, we have good evidence for an earlier tyrant named Polykrates, who is called by Suidas ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ. I suggest that the earlier tyrant was, in fact, his grandfather, as we should expect from the similarity in names. Suidas evidently knew of an earlier tyrant named Polykrates who was followed by the more famous one; assumed that the two were father and son; and, in order to distinguish the Polykrates under whom Ibykos came to Samos from the Herodotean tyrant, spoke of him as "the father of the tyrant."73

73. The practice of identifying a little-known ruler by reference to a well-known one can be paralleled in Suidas in a note on another lyric poet, Alkman: ἦν ὁ Ἐκὶ τῆς Κύρης 'Ολυμπιίτος, βασιλεύοντος Λυκίων "Αρέους, τοῦ 'Αλκυότου πατρός. Barron (op. cit. 223, note 1) suggests that Suidas derived both notes (on Alkman and Ibykos) from a single source that favoured this means of identification. But Suidas makes
The fragment from Himerios offers greater difficulties. According to the account, Polykrates (whom we have identified as the Herodotean tyrant) loved music and urged his father to help him to indulge his love of music. His father sent for Anakreon, who was to serve as tutor to Polykrates. Under the poet's instruction, Himerios tell us, the lad "seemed likely to fulfil the prayer of which Homer speaks by surpassing his father Polykrates in all accomplishments" (Τὴν Ὄμηρικήν ἔμελλε πληρώσειν εὐχὴν τῷ πατρὶ Πολυκράτει, πάντα κρείσσων ἐσόμενος).

Whether or not the fragment speaks of Polykrates as the father of the Herodotean tyrant (depending on whether we read Πολυκράτει or Πολυκράτης), there is no doubt that Himerios makes Polykrates' father tyrant before him. How can we reconcile this with Herodotos' mention of Aiakes as Polykrates' father? We must assume, I think, that the young Polykrates was groomed to succeed his grandfather in the tyranny. Why Aiakes did not succeed his father we do not know. The most likely explanation is that he predeceased his father, the elder Polykrates. In any event, his son

precisely the same error here: he names Ardys as the father of Alyattes. In fact, Ardys was Alyattes' grandfather (Herodotos l. 18.2). If Barron is correct, Suidas' identification of Polykrates as ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ is suspect.
was brought up at the court of his grandfather and trained to succeed him in the tyranny. We must conclude, then, that Himerios is speaking of Polykrates' grandfather. Himerios evidently made the same error that Suidas made: he knew of two tyrants named Polykrates, one of whom was trained to succeed the other, and assumed quite naturally that the two were father and son.

A considerable part of a forty-eight line poem, attributed to Ibykos on grounds of style, structure, metre, and language, is preserved in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus of the first century B.C. The poem is addressed to the young Polykrates, apparently on the subject of beauty. It was Helen's beauty over which the Trojan War was fought (line 5), in which so many heroes took part. Employing the rhetorical device of praeteritio, Ibykos disclaims any intention of telling of them (line 10), though he does so for thirty-four lines; rather he will tell only of him whom

\[ \text{Ilykis}\] \text{gynato' ton } [\text{a}]\text{ra Irodilwi} \\
\text{dsi xryso' orei-} \\
\text{kalwi tri' apefso} [\text{n}] \text{Hd} \\
\text{Troes } [\text{a}]\text{gari } \text{e} [\text{e}]\text{son xan} \\
\text{moron } \text{mal, eismon } \text{bmoiog.} \\
\text{tois } \text{me } \text{ke } \text{kalleo } \text{gion} \\
\text{kai su, Polukratecs, kleos } \text{aphtov } \text{etexis} \\
\text{ws kat } [\text{a}]\text{oidan kai } \text{emon } \text{kleo}. \\

\[ \text{Ilykis}\] \text{gynato' ton } [\text{a}]\text{ra Irodilwi} \\
\text{dsi xryso' orei-} \\
\text{kalwi tri' apefso} [\text{n}] \text{Hd} \\
\text{Troes } [\text{a}]\text{gari } \text{e} [\text{e}]\text{son xan} \\
\text{moron } \text{mal, eismon } \text{bmoiog.} \\
\text{tois } \text{me } \text{ke } \text{kalleo } \text{gion} \\
\text{kai su, Polukratecs, kleos } \text{aphtov } \text{etexis} \\
\text{ws kat } [\text{a}]\text{oidan kai } \text{emon } \text{kleo}. \\

72. Grenfell and Hunt, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 15 fr. 1790, 73-84; Page fr. 282, 144-147; cf. also Page, op. cit. (p. 43, note 28) 158-172, and Bowra, "Early Lyric and Elegiac Poetry,"
Bowra has shown that Ibykos had a special interest in Sikyon, having spent some time there at the court of the tyrant Kleisthenes, perhaps immediately before his departure for Samos. The poet seems to have had a dispute of some kind with his patron, for in the above passage we see him hurling insults at the Sikyonian tyrant. Polykrates is compared to the son of Hyllis, whom Barron has shown to be Zeuxippos, the last king of Sikyon. The import of this barb is evident when we realize that Hyllis was an Argive nymph. This looks like a conscious attempt to embarrass Kleisthenes, who was then engaged in an anti-Dorian, anti-Argive campaign, the most famous part of which was the attachment of insulting new names to the three Dorian tribes, among them the Hylleis. It appears that we have in this poem a compliment to the ruling tyrant (or perhaps to his grandson; this would better fit the language) made by Ibykos who had only recently left the court of his former patron and was able to aim barbs freely at him while at a safe distance overseas. This agrees with the date given by Suidas for the arrival of Ibykos in New Chapters in Greek Literature, Third Series, ed. J. U. Powell, 30-36.

73. Bowra, op. cit. (p. 52, note 59) 246-247.
75. Steph. Byz., s.v. 'Yλλίς.
76. Herodotos 5. 68.
to Samos (fifty-fourth Olympiad, i.e., 564-561 B. C.). Kleisthenes was ruling Sikyon at this time; he was still tyrant in 575, at the time of the marriage of his daughter, Agariste, and must have been dead by 560/59, since he reigned thirty-one years and was already in power before the fall of Kirrha in 591/0 during the First Sacred War. The poem thus supports Suidas' information, and provides independent evidence dating from the sixth century for the rule of a tyrant in the second quarter of the sixth century.

One item remains to be dealt with: the biographical tradition of Pythagoras, long a thorny subject. The tradition surrounding the life of Pythagoras has been subjected to much detailed study, and source-criticism has traced most of the material back to Timaios. But difficulties begin as soon as one tries to reconstruct Timaios' chronology.

---

77. Herodotos 6. 126-130. For the date see McGregor, TAPA 72 (1941) 287.


79. The sources are collected by Diels and Kranz, Vorsokr, 1 96-113, 440-480. The best treatment of the subject remains that of von Fritz, Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy, who deals at length with the problem of source-criticism. For
Nearly all scholars, although differing in their results, have observed that there is essentially trustworthy material, derived from Timaios, in the account of Iamblichos with which to construct a chronology of the events in the life of Pythagoras.

The chronological information contained in the account of Iamblichos can be summarized as follows: (1) Pythagoras is 18 years of age when he leaves Samos for the first time in order to study with Thales, Anaximander, and others; (2) after this he spends 22 years in Egypt; (3) there follow 12 years in Babylonia; (4) then he returns to Samos at the age of 56. Since 18 + 22 + 12 is only 52, we must infer that Pythagoras spent four years studying under Thales and Anaximander.

Iamblichos later says that Pythagoras was head of the Pythagorean order for 39 years and that he died at an age of nearly 100. Since 56 + 39 is 95, there are four or five more years to be accounted for. Iamblichos says that an extensive discussion of the chronological problems see Labarbe, op. cit. 157-178. Valuable discussions can also be found in Minar, Early Pythagorean Politics in Practice and Theory; and Morrison, OQ (New series) 6 (1956) 135-156.

80. von Fritz, op. cit. 47.
after Pythagoras returned from Babylonia he spent a few years in Samos, undertaking at the same time brief trips to Crete, Sparta, and Delos. All the above material combines in a complete account of Pythagoras' life, which can be further supplemented by Justinus, who says that Pythagoras, after he had spent 20 years at Kroton, migrated to Metaponton. The 39 years during which he was head of the order in Italy, then, must be divided into 20 years spent in Kroton, and 19 in Metaponton.

Rostagni, starting with the assumption that Timaios dated the migration of Pythagoras to Italy in 529 B.C., attempted to convert the above information into an absolute chronology:

589 -- Birth of Pythagoras (529 + 4 + 56)
571 -- Pythagoras leaves Samos at age 18
571-567 -- Travels and studies with Thales, etc. (4 years)
567-545 -- Sojourn in Egypt (22 years)
545-533 -- Sojourn in Babylonia (12 years)
533-529 -- Second stay at Samos; visits Crete, Sparta, and Delos (4 years)

84. 20. 4.17 (Diels and Kranz, Vorsokr. 5 2, p. 102).
529-509 -- Pythagoras at Kroton (20 years)
509-490 -- Pythagoras at Metaponton (19 years)
490 -- Death of Pythagoras

There is a passage in Strabo on Pythagoras, which von Fritz attributes to Timaios. Strabo says, "ἐνὶ τούτου (i.e., under Polykrates) Pythagoras, seeing the tyranny developing (φυμένην), left the city and went off to Egypt and Babylon to satisfy his love of learning; when he returned and saw the tyranny still enduring (συμμένουσαν), he set sail for Italy and spent the rest of his life there." Strabo's remark is regarded as chronologically untenable by von Fritz, who observes that "...this would presuppose that Pythagoras already saw the tyranny approaching in 571." But von Fritz admits that Rostagni's chronology is highly convincing. There is, in fact, no problem in the report that Pythagoras saw the tyranny approaching in 571; evidence strongly suggests that there was a tyrant named Polykrates ruling at this time, and the independent testimony coming from Timaios on the life of Pythagoras confirms the tradition.

86. von Fritz, op. cit. 53-54.
87. Strabo 14. 1.16 (C636).
88. von Fritz, op. cit. 54
89. The theory that Pythagoras reached Kroton early enough
The literary evidence for an early tyranny on Samos receives remarkable confirmation from the archaeological evidence. Miss Richter has noted that the period between ca. 575 and 550, to judge from the results of excavations, was one of great artistic activity in Samos. No fewer than sixteen fine pieces of sculpture have been discovered from this period, including the great inscribed group by Ganeleos and three dedications from Cheramyes. These are supplemented by many other kouroi and korai. Of especial interest is a bronze statuette, now in the Hermitage in Leningrad, bearing the inscription

Πολύμορφος ἄνδρες

in Argive letters. Richter assigns the miniature kouros to be responsible for the extraordinary incuse coinages in the cities of South Italy, which some scholars believe were issued to exemplify his philosophy of opposites, is, I think, untenable. The coins cannot be dated much later than 550 B.C., but Pythagoras' arrival in Italy cannot much precede 529. The theory that these coins were Pythagoras' invention has been put forward many times, most recently by Seltman, NumChron (Sixth series) 9 (1949) 1-21.

90. Richter, op. cit. 102-107.
91. Richter, Kouroi, Archaic Greek Youths 60-61.
92. Ibid. 61, 71-72; Jeffery, op. cit. 156; IG 4 565.
to her Orchomenos-Thera Group, which she dates 590-570 B.C. She observes that the type, with its rounded forms, is Eastern rather than Argive. Barron thinks that the script too may be East Greek, noting that the letter forms are nearly identical with those of the Euphorbos plate in the British Museum that Jeffery assigns to the East Greek Doric region. He suggests that it represents a dedication by Polykrates I.93

Herodotos says that he has dwelt longer on the affairs of the Samians because three of the greatest works in all Greece were made by them: the tunnel, the engineer of which was the Megarian Eupalinos; the harbour mole; and the Heraion, the architect of which was Rhoikos.94 At least two of these were begun in the generation before the tyranny of the Herodotean Polykrates.

The only one of the works that has so far proved datable is the Heraion with its temenos. The date is determined by the stratification of levels. Buschor dated the temple, of which Rhoikos was the architect, to the middle or shortly before the middle of the sixth century.95 Dinsmoor dates the early temple to 575.96 It was at this

94. Herodotos 3. 60.3.
period that the greatest work was done on the temple; the temenos was first extended to no less than twelve times its original area, and construction on the temple itself began shortly thereafter. A great altar was begun in front of the temple ca. 575. 97

The construction of the tunnel of which Herodotos spoke was also begun in the period of the first Polykrates. The purpose of the tunnel was to bring water into the city of Samos from a spring on the north side of Mt. Ampelos. The tunnel has been studied at length by an engineer, F. R. Bichowsky. 98 Bichowsky estimates that the construction of the tunnel took at least fifteen years. This estimate is based on the time necessary for the cutting of the tunnel: ten years at the rate of six inches a day at each face in a bore eight feet high and eight feet wide; and five years for the remainder of the work. Bichowsky assumes (without discussing the question) that Aiakes was tyrant but was confused with Polykrates; he places the beginning of the construction within Aiakes' supposed reign. The tunnel was completed by the siege of 525/4, 99 and thus

97. Ibid. 124.
98. Bichowsky, Compressed Air Magazine 47 (1943) 7086-7090.
99. Herodotos 3. 56. This explains the ability of the Samians to hold out during the long Spartan siege.
must have been begun before the accession of Polykrates ca. 532 B.C.

Such, then, is the evidence for the existence of a Samian tyranny preceding that of the Herodotean Polykrates. As we have seen, tyranny arose early in Samos; in the seventh century Phoibias and Demoteles ruled as tyrants. The geomoroi succeeded in regaining power for a short time, but they were overthrown about 600 B.C. and a popular government was established. Sometime in the first quarter of the sixth century the democracy was subverted by Sylosos, who set himself up as tyrant, and he was succeeded about 572 by Polykrates I. We do not know what the relationship of these two tyrants was or if the tyranny continued uninterrupted; I suggest that the two represented different families united by marriage. Polykrates I was not succeeded by his son, Aiakes, who probably predeceased his father. Aiakes' son, Polykrates II, was brought up at the court of his grandfather, whom he was groomed to succeed. But the succession was not smooth; the tyranny was interrupted, and when Polykrates came to power it was through armed force.

100. The suggestion is based on the fact that the name Kalliteles (the father of Sylosos I) does not reappear among the names of the tyrants' family which we possess, as we should expect if the succession were direct in the same family.
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CHAPTER THREE

THE TYRANNY OF POLYKRATES

The rise to power of Polykrates is described briefly by Herodotos in the course of his narration of Kambyses' conquest of Egypt. According to Herodotos, Polykrates, son of Aiakes, made himself master of Samos by insurrection. At first he divided the state into three parts, sharing the rule with his brothers, Pantagnostos and Sylosos. Later, however, he killed Pantagnostos and banished Sylosos and assumed control over the whole island. Herodotos later tells us that Polykrates seized the island with the aid of fifteen hoplites. A more detailed account of the ἐπανάστασις is given by Polyainos, who relates that during the festival of Hera the three brothers disarmed the citizens and seized the citadel of Astypalaia, and that Lygdamis of Naxos later brought reinforcements by which the brothers secured their power.

The chronology of Polykrates' tyranny has been much debated. The tyrant's death can be determined with reasonable certainty. Herodotos prefaces his account of Croites' plot against Polykrates with the remark that

2. J. 120.3.
"these things occurred about the time of Kambyses' last illness," thus fixing Polykrates' death ca. 522 B.C.\(^3\)

The date for the beginning of the tyrant's rule is less easy to determine. His accession is dated by Eusebios in the first year of Ol. 62 (532 B.C.),\(^4\) and its closeness to the truth is guaranteed by Thucydides, who dates him to the reign of Kambyses (ἐν Καμψισοῦ), i.e., 530-522 B.C.\(^5\)

Further evidence for the chronology of Polykrates:

3. For the date of Kambyses see Parker and Dubberstein, Babylonian Chronology, 626 B.C.-A.D. 45 14.

4. Eusebios, Chronici Canones, Armenian version, ed. by J. Karst in Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Eusebius Werke, Band 5; Jerome's version, ed. by J. K. Fotheringham, Eusebi Pamphili Chronici Canones Latine vertit...S. Eusebius Hieronymus. In the Bodleian MS. of Jerome, where the notice, apud Samum tyrannidem exercent tres fratres Polycrates Sylus et Pantaognostus, takes three lines, the first line is above that on which LXII Olym. is written. Thus some editors date the event in the last year of Ol. 61 (533 B.C.), others in the first year of Ol. 62 (532 B.C.); see Fotheringham, op. cit. 185.

5. Thucydides 1. 13.6.
reign has been found by some in the "List of Thalassocracies" which appears in the Chronographia, one of the two books of Eusebios' Chronicon. Eusebios ascribes the list expressly to Diodoros. It was apparently given in the lost second volume of Diodoros, books six to ten; indeed, the existence of the list is presumed at the end of book five. Diodoros' source was probably his contemporary, Kastor of Rhodes, who is said by Suidas to have written on the thalassocracies in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The list purports to give in order the seventeen powers that ruled the sea from the Trojan to the Persian Wars together with the years of the duration of each power. Only the Armenian version of the list is preserved, and this is badly mutilated. The name is

6. For discussions of the list see Myres, JHS 26 (1906) 84-130, and JHS 27 (1907) 123-130; Fotheringham, JHS 27 (1907) 75-89; Myres, Herodotus Father of History 163, 193, 195, 198-199; Lenschau, PWRE 21 (1952) cols. 1727-1734, s.v. Polykrates; and White, JHS 74 (1954) 39-40.
7. See especially the end of 5. 84.
8. Myres, op. cit. (first item) 84-85; and Burn, The Lyric Age of Greece 58.
9. Suidas, s.v. Καστόρ 'Ρόδιος.
omitted in the tenth place, and the years of duration are missing in places VII-XI (Aegyptii, Milesii, [Megarii],\textsuperscript{10} Lesbii) and again in XIII (Samii). Myres thinks that there was an early lacuna in the list at its middle point that involved damage to the name-column.\textsuperscript{11} Working back from the end, where the years are preserved, we have the following: XVII Aiginetans (ten years), 490-480; XVI Eretrians (fifteen years) 505-490; XV Naxians (ten years) 515-505; XIV Lakedaimonians (two years) 517-515. The Samian thalassocracy (XIII) ends, then, according to the list, in 517, some years after the Persians captured Samos from Maiandrios, Polykrates' successor, and set up Sylosos as tyrant.\textsuperscript{12} No years of duration for Samos are provided by the list, nor is it possible, because of the lacuna in the middle, to calculate the length by working down from the earlier part. The Phokeians (XII) preceded the Samians with 44 years, but for the Lesbians (XI), Megarians (X), and the Milesians (IX) no years are preserved.

\textsuperscript{10} On this emendation see supra, p. 25, note 75.

\textsuperscript{11} Myres, op. cit. (first item) 144.

\textsuperscript{12} Herodotos 3. 149. The Persian capture of Samos should be dated about three years earlier (see infra, p. 117 and note 152).
The only information about the Samian thalassocracy in the list itself is, then, that the 44-year Phokaian sea-power (the dates of which are lost) was followed by the Samian, and the Samian by the Spartan in 517.

The lost numeral for Samos can, however, be restored approximately. The Phokaian sea-power was brought to an end by the Persian capture of the city at a date not exactly determinable, but soon after 547. We know that Phokaia was at the height of her power when Kyros destroyed the Lydian kingdom. After Kyros captured Sardis he left Ionia for the conquest of Babylon, putting Tabalos and Paktyes in charge of Lydia and Ionia. The revolt of Paktyes followed immediately. Mazares was sent to subdue Paktyes; later he took Priene and the plain of the Maeander, after which he died. Harpagos succeeded him and directed the first attack on Phokaia. The Persian capture occurred, therefore, within a year or two after the fall of Sardis. If we date the fall of Sardis late in 547, we may place the end of the Phokaian thalassocracy

15. Herodotos 1. 156.2-161.
about 544. This gives us a plausible date for the beginning of the Samian thalassocracy, which we may set

17. The precise date for the fall of Sardis is not known, and it has been variously placed between 547 and 540. The Ferian Marble dates the fall of Sardis to 541/0 (Hignett, A History of the Athenian Constitution 328). This has little authority, although it avoids the supposition, which the earlier date involves, that Kyros delayed for some years between the prosecution of the Lydian and Babylonian Wars. Herodotos places the fall of Sardis later than the Battle of Pallene, 547/6 (on the date of which see infra, p. 81, note 31); he assumed that Peisistratos was in control of Athens when Kroisos sent messengers to Greece to look for allies (1. 59.1). The Babylonian Chronicle makes Kyros march against a land late in 547 and kill its king (Nabu-naid Chronicle col. 2, lines 16-18). The name is broken, but almost certainly must be restored to Lydia (see Smith, Isaiah Chapters XL-LV, Literary Criticism and History, Schweich Lectures, 1940 33-36; and Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire 40). It is this date, I think, that has the most authority and is probably correct (for a different view see Summer, CQ [New series] 11 [1961] 43, note 4; and Wade-Gery, JHS 71 [1951] 219, note 38).
ca. 544-517. 18

Despite the considerable work done to restore the list, it seems to me that the very nature of the document precludes its acceptance as trustworthy evidence for determining the duration of Polykrates' rule. Such a document, in which one sea-power vanishes from the scene and another immediately replaces it, is at best chronologically vague, and cannot be pressed to yield exact chronological data. Thus the Samian thalassocracy ends in 517 according to the list, though the Persian capture of the island occurred some three years before. 19 It is impossible to determine whether the compiler of the list made the Samian entry begin in the year in which he thought Polykrates came to power. Most likely the Samian thalassocracy was made to begin in whatever year the Phokaian rule of the sea was thought to have ended, regardless of the date of Polykrates' accession. At any rate, we must conclude that the list provides no help in determining the chronology of Polykrates' rule.

It is best, then, since we lack explicit evidence

18. Lenschau, op. cit. cols. 1727-1734, terminates the Phokaian thalassocracy with the Battle of Alalia, ca. 538.
19. See supra, p. 74, note 12.
that puts Polykrates' rule earlier, to accept the
dates given by the chronographers for the tyrant --
ca. 532 for the beginning of his rule and ca. 522
for his death -- that is, as both Herodotos and
Thucydides indicate, a period roughly contemporary with
Kambyses.

We have seen that Samos was ruled by an earlier
Polykrates, the grandfather of the Herodotean tyrant,
who preceded his grandson in the tyranny. Yet Herodotos'
account of the ἐπαυδακτος of Polykrates and his two
brothers²⁰ implies that the tyranny was a new one.
Clearly the tyranny was interrupted; although the
younger Polykrates was groomed by his grandfather to
succeed him,²¹ it became necessary for him to seize power
through revolution. We are not told what events brought
about the interruption in the tyranny, but a clue is
provided by Pausanias, who says that the Samian Heraion
was burned by the Persians.²² The destruction of the
temple must be dated earlier than the Persian War,
for Herodotos says that the Samian sanctuaries were

²¹ Anakreon, fr. 146 in page 228; see supra, pp. 47-51.
²² Pausanias 7. 5.4.
left unharmed by Dareios. Nor is it likely that the destruction occurred about 520 B.C., when the Persian Otanes massacred the Samians "both within and outside the sanctuary," for Herodotos says nothing about a destruction of the Heraion on this occasion, which he otherwise records fully. Pausanias couples the destruction of the Heraion with that of the temple of Athena at Phokaia, which presumably was destroyed by Harpagos when the city fell in the late 540's. It is likely that Pausanias meant to imply that the Heraion suffered destruction at the same time. This is supported by the archaeological evidence. The second dipteron, begun shortly after the accession of Polykrates, about 530, although it remained unfinished, shows no sign of early damage. But the first dipteron, begun ca. 575, was destroyed by fire.

Herodotos says that after Harpagos had subjected the Ionian mainland the Ionians of the islands, fearing

24. Herodotos 3. 147.2.
27. Ibid. 176.
28. Ibid. loc. cit.
a similar fate, gave themselves up to Kyros. It generally has been thought that Samos succeeded in maintaining her independence during this period; but Herodotus makes no exceptions to his statement, and Pausanias' remark almost certainly refers to the destruction of the Heraion that occurred before the rule of Polykrates.

It appears, then, that Samos was attacked by Harpagos ca. 541, and in the course of the attack the Heraion was destroyed. It is probably to the Persian invasion of the island that we must attribute the fall of Polykrates I. The subjugation of the island must have followed, and we assume that the Samians remained under Persian control until Polykrates' revolution brought to Samos a decade of independence.

Thus Polykrates, intended successor to his grandfather, was forced to seize power in an anti-Persian coup. That he and his brothers were able to take control of the state with only fifteen hoplites suggests that Polykrates initially enjoyed the support of the Samians, as we might expect if the revolution was anti-Persian. His rule was secured through aid furnished by Lygdamis of Naxos,

29. Herodotus 1. 169.2.
30. See, e.g., How and Wells, Commentary on Herodotus 1.129.
who had assisted Peisistratos at the Battle of Pallene in 547/6, \(^{31}\) and had been rewarded by being installed as tyrant of Naxos. \(^{32}\) Lygdamis' aid probably represented not only support to insure the success of a fellow tyrant's revolution, but military aid against the eventuality of another Persian attack. At any rate, Persia was hardly able to offer an immediate threat to Samos' independence: Kyros and Harpagos were in the

\(^{31}\) Herodotos 1. 61.4. On the date of the Battle of Pallene, which is much disputed, see Adcock, *CQ* 18 (1924) 174-181; and, more recently, Sumner, *CQ* (New series) 11 (1961) 37-48. Sumner dates Pallene to 541 or 540, but this date does not take adequate note of Herodotos' synchronism of the fall of Kroisos with the final tyranny of Peisistratos. Herodotos assumed that Peisistratos was in control of Athens when Kroisos sent messengers to Greece to seek allies (1. 59) in 547/6. I agree with the view that Herodotos 5. 65.3 indicates a thirty-six year period of continuous rule before the expulsion of Hippias in the archonship of Harpaktides in 511/10 B. C.; this places the Battle of Pallene in 547/6.

\(^{32}\) Herodotos 1. 64.1-2.
the East and Persia did not possess a navy until after her conquest of Phoenicia. Nevertheless, Polykrates must have been well aware of Samos' insecure position.

Herodotos does not tell us how long Polykrates shared the rule of Samos with his brothers. We assume from the tone of his account that the period of joint rule was not long. He soon had Pantagnotos murdered and banished Sylosien, who took service with the Persians in Egypt.

Soon after Polykrates gained sole rule he made an alliance with Amasis of Egypt. The treaty must have been essentially a defensive alliance made by the Samian tyrant under threat of Persian invasion. With an invasion imminent, the island's proximity to the mainland

33. Herodotos 1. 171.1; 177.
34. Herodotos 1. 143.1. Xenophon says that Kyros received the submission of the Phoenicians (Cyr. 1. 1.4); but Herodotos implies that the Phoenicians were conquered by Kambyses (see 3. 34.4 where he makes the Persians say that Kambyses προσεκτήσας τὴν θάλασσαν). The fact that Persia did not obtain a navy before her conquest of Phoenicia probably explains in part why Egypt was not conquered until the fifth year of Kambyses' reign (How and Wells, Commentary 1. 262).
controlled by Persia rendered Samos' position precarious, and Polykrates must have realized the necessity of obtaining a powerful ally. The choice was a natural one: Samos had long enjoyed a privileged trading status with Egypt, and Polykrates may have had close relations with Amasis, for it was during his rule that Samos was granted a separate shrine at Naukratis. Moreover, Egypt was the only power that could be considered to be of real aid against Persia. The alliance probably dates to the year of Polykrates' accession or shortly thereafter.

The first concern of Polykrates must have been to

35. How and Wells, op. cit. 266, suggest that the initiative for the alliance came from Amasis, an important element of whose foreign policy was the formation of a league of maritime states that included Cyprus, Samos, and Phoenicia. Samian initiative seems more likely; although Egypt, too, had reason to fear Persia's rapidly expanding power, it is difficult to see what immediate advantage a weak Samos would have been to Egypt.

36. Herodotos 2. 178. See supra, p. 29 and note 92. If a friendship existed it must have been severely strained at times, e.g., when Samian pirates seized the corselet that Amasis sent as a gift to the Spartans (Herodotos 3. 47; see infra, p. 88).
build the defences of the island to guard against a Persian attack. Herodotos ascribes to Polykrates the possession of 100 pentekonters, but later says that when Kambyses was preparing for the invasion of Egypt Polykrates was able to dispatch forty triremes as a contribution to the expedition. The two passages appear to be inconsistent, but it has been suggested that in the interval between the two references (i.e., between Polykrates' accession and the naval expedition against Egypt) the tyrant succeeded in converting his navy to triremes. Herodotos' latest reference to pentekonters as capital ships is his mention of Polykrates' 100 pentekonters. Since the first large-scale use of triremes in battle occurred at Iade, it seems that their introduction into Greece must shortly precede that battle. This is explicitly affirmed by Thucydides, who describes the last quarter of the sixth century as a transitional period from the old

37. 3. 39.3.
38. 3. 44.2.
39. They are so viewed by How and Wells, Commentary 1268.
pentekonters to triremes. 42

Polykrates' interest in naval architecture is further revealed in a late tradition that makes him responsible for the introduction of a new type of ship, the Samaina ("so-called because it first appeared in Samos, where the tyrant Polykrates had some built"). 43 Suidas identifies the ship as a bireme (πλοῖον δικροτον), and Plutarch describes it as "a ship that is low and flat in the prow so as to look snub-nosed, but it is broader in the beam, more spacious and rounded, so that it can travel on the high seas and travel fast as well." 45 The ship was pictured on coins struck by the Samians at Zankle (the coins were actually called Σάμαινα, according to Suidas), the earliest of which date between 493 and 489 B.C. 46

It seems likely that Polykrates at his accession had a fleet of 100 pentekonters that had escaped destruction or capture by the Persians. He evidently introduced a new ship, the Samaina, to replace the old pentekonters, and

42. Thucydides 1. 14.
43. Plutarch, Pericles 26.
44. Suidas, s.v. Σάμαινα δ οίμος.
45. Plutarch, loc. cit.
later began to build triremes, recently introduced into Greece, and the latest word in Greek naval architecture. His success in acquiring a maritime empire may be the result of his use of the new type of ship that rendered the pentekonters virtually obsolete.

In addition to his fleet of 100 pentekonters, Polykrates is said to have possessed 1000 bowmen. Although

47. Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 1. 16. 76.7, reports a tradition that the Sidonians were the first to build τρίκορον ναῦ. This will have been before the destruction of Sidon by the Assyrians in 672 B.C. The Phoenicians were evidently far ahead of the Greeks in naval architecture (Davison, op. cit. 21, note 1). On the difficult passage in Thucydides 1. 13 see supra, pp. 6-7 and notes 22 and 23.

48. Davison (op. cit. 18, note 1) compares the introduction of the trireme to the introduction of the all-big-gun battleship into the British navy in 1907, which rendered all pre-dreadnought ships obsolete and reduced to the second rank those naval powers that did not build these battleships in sufficient numbers.

49. Herodotos 3. 39.3. Smith (Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, USA Fasc. 10, San Francisco Fasc. 1 25) takes this passage to prove that Polykrates introduced marine archers. This is
his bowmen were native Samians, he also had in his pay a large body of foreign mercenaries.50

Herodotos says that Polykrates "plundered everyone without distinction of friend or foe; for he argued that a friend was better pleased if you gave him back what you had taken from him than if you spared him at first."51 The piracy of Polykrates can be understood properly only in the context of a tradition of Samian plundering on the high seas going back several centuries. Piracy had long been a favourite occupation of the Samians. The strategic position of Samos provided an excellent base for plundering maritime trade in the East Aegean and we hear of raids on shipping at an early date. Plutarch relates that "in obedience to an oracle" the Samians changed their residence from Samos to Mykale and supported themselves

rejected by Davison (op. cit. 20, note 1), who argues e silentio Herodoti, who does not mention them in either of his references to naval battles fought by Polykrates, either against the Lesbians and Milesians (3. 39.4) or against the rebels (3. 45.2). The evidence is too slight to decide the question, however.

50. Herodotos 3. 54.2.
by piracy for ten years, after which they returned and
overcame their enemies (who are not named). Their exile
and plundering activities were commemorated in a festival
in honour of Hermes Charidotes during which theft was
made legal. The event cannot be dated, but it certainly
relates to an early period, probably shortly after the
colonization of the island.

Herodotos records two seizures made by the Samians
that later served as an excuse for the Spartan expedition
against Samos on behalf of the Samian oligarchs. The
first incident involved the seizure of the corselet sent
by Amasis to Sparta; this is dated by Herodotos a year
before the seizure of the krater sent by Sparta to Kroisos,
the second act of Samian piracy for which the Spartans
sought retribution. The krater was sent by Sparta to
Sardis on the occasion of Sparta's alliance with Kroisos.

52. Plutarch, Qu. Cr. 55 (Moralia 303D).
53. The story should probably be associated with the
expulsion of the Samians from their island by the Ephesians
shortly after the colonization of Samos by Prokles
(Pausanias 7. 4.1-7).
54. 3. 47-49.
55. 3. 49.2.
56. Herodotos 1. 70.
The Spartans claimed that the krater had been seized by the Samians, but the Samians stated that it had arrived too late to be sent to Kroisos before the fall of Sardis. The latter explanation is probably an excuse on the part of the Samians, but it must at any rate have been plausible. We may thus date the seizure of the krater to the year of the fall of Sardis (547) and the seizure of the corselet to 548.

Polykrates, then, inherited a long tradition of piracy. Various motives have been given for Polykrates' infamous plundering of foreign ships, none of them wholly satisfactory. The most likely reason, which has been overlooked, is to be found in the tyrant's need to raise money. Samos seems to have been in a state of economic depression at the time of Polykrates' accession. The numismatic evidence for this period shows that in the last third of the century large sums of money were

57. Thus Andrewes, The Greek Tyrants 119, suggests that Polykrates' piratical seizures are to be connected with the wars that he waged. Ure, op. cit. 71-72, finds the piracy of Polykrates "comprehensible" only if understood as a blockade directed against Persia. Ormerod, Piracy in the Ancient World 104, thinks that the tyrant might have been undertaking police action on the principle of
comparatively scarce. Ca. 600 Samos had circulated a considerable electrum coinage on the Samian-Euboic standard. Between 530 and 520, however, no electrum coins were struck, and the largest coin in circulation was the quarter of the Lydo-Milesian stater in silver, the "winged boar" drachm, worth only one-fiftieth as much as the electrum stater of the early part of the century. In the first half of Polykrates' reign coins were poor, rare, and even smaller. This indicates a rarity of large sums in Samos.

The shortage of funds that Polykrates faced is revealed in at least two incidents that occurred during the tyrant's reign. Diodoros notes that Polykrates "began oppressing" both his own subjects and foreigners the pasha of Rhodes, who built ships for the Turkish government and had a frigate that he used for piratical purposes of his own while he cleared the seas of all other pirates.

58. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* 7-8; cf. also Babelon, *Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines* 1, 2 nos. 353 ff., pl. IX; *BMC Ionia*, 13-15, pl. 11. 15-29; ibid. 348 no. 1, pl. 111. 20; Babelon, *ReVNum* 12 (1894) 149-163, pl. 111.

59. Barron, op. cit. 37, plates i-ii.
who put in at Samos, and assigns to this Amasis' break in relations with Polykrates. The tyrant was probably extorting money from both Samians and foreigners. Elsewhere Diodoros relates that some Lydians, fleeing from the satrap Oroites, came to Samos as suppliants, bringing with them their possessions. Polykrates is supposed to have received them kindly at first, but later killed the Lydians and confiscated their possessions. The picture given is clearly one of a tyrant hard-pressed for funds with which to carry out his programme, and obtaining them by whatever means he could.

If Polykrates on his accession was faced with a lack of funds and had no scruples about extorting money from citizens and foreigners alike, we should not be surprised that he resorted to piracy. The tyrant was forced to spend large sums in building the island's defences, hiring foreign mercenaries, and transforming his navy from one of pentekonters to triremes. In addition, we find him inaugurating a large public works programme. Since he required capital sums for these activities, he employed extraordinary measures, including piracy, to secure them.

60. Diodoros 1. 95.3.
61. Diodoros 10. 16.4.
A late tradition records that a war took place between Samos and Persia during the reign of Kyros and "while the Samians ruled the seas." According to the account, Kyros was defeated in a naval battle, after which he returned to his kingdom and died. The account is ascribed to Pythagoras, "who wrote a history of this war between Kyros and the Samians." Although the story is late, and contains obviously inaccurate information about the death of Kyros, the account need not be totally rejected. If the battle immediately preceded the death of Kyros, it should be placed ca. 530 B.C. The reference to the Persians' defeat sounds convincing, since Persia was at this time without an adequate navy.

---

63. Malalas in Migne, PG 97 260; Kedrenos, Synops. 243, ibid. 121 277.
64. Malalas, loc. cit.; Kedrenos, loc. cit.
65. Kyros died while fighting the Massagetai (Herodotos 1. 214).
66. Kyros died in June of 530 according to the Nabu-naid Chronicle (see Parker and Dubberstein, op. cit. 14). Kyros, who was at this time campaigning in the East against the Massagetai, cannot have conducted the campaign against Samos.
67. See supra, p. 82, note 34.
Another war attributed to the reign of Polykrates is that between the Samians and the Lesbians and Milesians. We are informed that the Samians overcame the Lesbians in a naval battle after the Lesbians had come to the aid of the Milesians. Polykrates made a number of the Lesbians prisoners, and they dug the moat that surrounded the tyrant's palace. The cause of the war is not given, but Samian piracy provides the most probable reason for hostilities. Milesian and Lesbian trade must have suffered because of frequent Samian raids on shipping.

Herodotos connects the capture of several towns on the mainland by the Samians with the war. Miletos alone of the Greek cities in Asia had concluded a treaty with Kyros by which she obtained the same terms she had enjoyed under Kroisos. As part of the favourable terms accorded her by the Persians, she might have been allowed to take possession of the Samian peraia on the peninsula of Mykale. In the course of Polykrates' war with Miletos the tyrant might have regained the Samian territory on the mainland and taken several towns in addition.

69. loc. cit.
70. Herodotos 1. 141.4.
71. Perhaps Klazomenai should be included among these; see
wonder under what circumstances Persia would allow Samian control of mainland cities. The most likely reason is that Harpagos, who was engaged in campaigns against the Karians, Kaunians, and Lykians,\(^72\) was forced for a time to tolerate Samian activity on the mainland.\(^73\)

Herodotos says that Polykrates controlled many islands;\(^74\) we cannot, with few exceptions, ascertain which islands these were. We know that toward the close of his rule the tyrant captured Rheneia and Delos.\(^75\) It is probable that Amorgos was under Samian control at this time; it belonged to Samos in the fifth century until the Samian revolt and appears separately on the Athenian quota-lists after 434/3.\(^76\) Kalymna, which lies fifty miles south of Samos, has been assigned to the Polykratean empire on the basis of its coin-types in this period, when it struck coins on the Samian standard.\(^77\)

\([^\text{infra, p. 95.}}\)]

\(^{72.}\) Herodotos 1. 171.1.

\(^{73.}\) As he was forced to tolerate Paktyes' revolt from Kyros (see Herodotos 1. 153-161).

\(^{74.}\) Herodotos 3. 39.4; cf. also Thucydides 3. 104.2.

\(^{75.}\) Thucydides 1. 13.6; Suidas, s.v. Πυθία καὶ Δήλια.

\(^{76.}\) ATL 1 228.

\(^{77.}\) Seltman, "The Ring of Polykrates," in The Centennial
The Samian obverse coin-type of a winged boar closely resembles in style the device employed at Klazomenai and Ialysos, suggesting that these cities, too, should be assigned to the empire of Polykrates. Numismatic evidence also indicates that Lykia was probably included among Polykrates' possessions. Staters were struck in Lykia with the forepart of a boar on the obverse and on the reverse a facing lion's mask within a border of dots. This combination of types is strongly suggestive of the Polykratean "winged boar" drachms, which likely served as a model for the Lykian coins.

It appears that at least up to the time when Polykrates furnished aid for Kambyses' expedition against Egypt Samos enjoyed friendly relations with Athens. Polykrates received aid from Lygdamis, who had been...

Publication of the American Numismatic Society 595-601.
78. BMC Ionia pl. vi. 1-2.
79. BMC Caria pl. xxxv. 1-5. For a possible reference to the Samian occupation of Rhodes see Anakreon, Diehl fr. 15 D; Page 178 fr. 349 (see supra, pp. 47-48).
81. For a different view (which I think is contrary to the archaeological evidence) see Leahy, JHS 77 (1957) 274.
installed as tyrant of Naxos by Peisistratos. Since tyrants were usually on good terms with one another and since Lygdamis enjoyed good relations with both Peisistratos and Polykrates, it is possible that cordial relations existed between Athens and Samos under their respective tyrannies. Samian connections with Athens under Peisistratos receive confirmation from the numismatic and archaeological evidence. Samos struck coins on the Euboeic standard at this time, indicating that the island lay within the Athenian trading area. Much Attic pottery from this period has been found in the Heraion, indicating considerable trade with Athens; and Athenian influence is seen in the production of the almost certainly Samian "Little Master" cups. The possession of a common enemy in Lesbos has been put forward as a sign of association between Athens and Samos at this time, but such evidence is at best tenuous.

Sometime before the death of Amasis in 526 the alliance between Egypt and Samos came to an end. According to the Herodotean account, Polykrates, successful in everything he undertook, was warned by Amasis that success

82. Barron, op. cit. (p. 90, note 58) 35.
83. Barron, op. cit. 35, note 54.
84. How and Wells, Commentary 1 267.
can be too complete and too continuous for safety; the Egyptian king advised him to get rid of that object the loss of which would most grieve him. Polykrates threw overboard his most precious possession, the ring made for him by Theodoros, the renowned Samian craftsman, but the ring returned to him, found in the belly of a large fish presented to the tyrant. Amasis, who believed that Polykrates was certain to come to grief, thereupon renounced his friendship with the Samian tyrant. The truth must be otherwise. A Persian invasion of Egypt was imminent and Amasis could not afford to lose his powerful naval ally. Polykrates must have been forced to break the alliance, realizing that Kambyses, now in control of the Phoenician navy, was too strong for Egypt and Samos. The island had heretofore successfully defied Persian domination, but as an ally of Amasis Polykrates could expect the

85. Herodotos 3. 40-43. The story of Polykrates’ ring is not impossible. A gruesome parallel to it is recorded in the Annual Register of 1787. According to the account, Ephraim Thompson of Whitechapel had returned to him a watch numbered 1369 by its maker, Henry Warson, that he had given to his son, who was lost overboard from his ship off Falmouth. The watch had been found in the belly of a sick shark caught in the Thames (Burn, op. cit. 317).
subjugation of Samos. Thus, when in 525 Kambyses commenced the collection of a force for the invasion of Egypt, Polykrates offered to furnish troops for the expedition. It was this overt act that broke the alliance with Egypt. In offering aid to Kambyses Polykrates acted as an independent ruler; apparently he did not agree to acknowledge the suzerainty of Persia, for we find him still recognized as an independent monarch by the Persians in 522. Kambyses was eager to accept Samian aid; doubtless he realized the advantage of employing Polykrates' famed navy to insure the success of his Egyptian expedition.

---

86. Herodotos 3. 44.1.
87. It is possible, however, that Amasis was responsible for breaking the alliance at an earlier date. Diodoros (1. 95.3) says that Polykrates' oppressive treatment of foreigners in Samos caused Amasis to break off relations with the Samian ruler. It must have been difficult for Polykrates to keep any friends while he indiscriminately plundered shipping and treated foreigners in Samos outrageously.
88. Herodotos 3. 120.3.
89. Herodotos 3. 44.2.
90. Polykrates' decision to throw in his lot with Persia is reflected in a change in Samian coin-standards from the
Polykrates used the expedition against Egypt as a means for ridding himself of his enemies. He selected those who he thought were most likely to revolt against him and sent them to Kambyses in forty triremes with instructions not to permit them to return home. We are not told what group the disaffected Samians represented, but their later appeal to the Spartans for aid on the ground of ancient ties of friendship suggests that they were members of the Samian aristocracy, the geomoroi.

Polykrates was not so easily rid of his enemies. The Samians got as far as Karpathos and resolved to go no further (though, according to another account, they actually reached Egypt, but, finding themselves under surveillance, deserted). The exiles sailed back to Samos where they were met by Polykrates, who sailed out with his fleet to meet them. Polykrates had underestimated the strength of the disaffected oligarchs, for in their forty triremes they defeated the tyrant at sea. A battle was fought on Samos and here the forces of Polykrates were victorious, thanks largely to the loyal mercenaries in the pay of the tyrant. The oligarchs left the island Euboic to the Lydo-Milesian standard. See Barron, op. cit. (page 90, note 58) 35.

91. Herodotos 3. 44.2.
and sailed to Sparta. By this time Polykrates' regime had clearly become unpopular. The tyrant was able to prevent his subjects from betraying him and joining the revolt only by shutting up their wives and children in sheds that had been built to shelter his ships and by threatening to set fire to the sheds if a revolt should break out.\(^{92}\)

Arriving at Sparta the Samian oligarchs asked for aid against Polykrates. But Sparta was hesitant about making an expedition against Samos. The temper and polity of the Spartans were ill-suited for distant enterprises, and two audiences with the magistrates were required before help was secured.\(^{93}\)

Herodotos relates that Sparta was willing to assist the Samian exiles for two reasons: first, "in return for a favour" (εὐεργεσίας ἑκτίνοντες), because the Samians

---

\(^{92}\) Herodotos 3. 45. Polykrates' hiring of foreign mercenaries seems to have occasioned a new coinage on the Lydo-Milesian weight-standard, struck primarily to pay his mercenaries (see Barron, op. cit. 35). The greatest volume of production begins ca. 525, which might indicate that growing discontent forced the tyrant to hire increasing numbers of mercenaries to protect his position.

\(^{93}\) Herodotos 3. 46.
had aided Sparta against the Messenians; and, secondly, out of revenge, because the Samians had stolen the krater that the Spartans had sent to Kroisos and the linen corselet that Amasis had sent to Sparta. Corinth likewise agreed to aid in the expedition against Polykrates because the Samians had seized the 300 Kerkyraian boys whom Periander had sent to Alyattes. These piratical seizures were committed by Polykrates I, for Sparta and Corinth could claim revenge for the seizures a generation earlier only if the regime of Polykrates was the one that had committed the seizures. The geomoroi were ruling Samos when it sent aid to Sparta during the Second Messenian War, and could thus claim ties of ancient friendship with the Spartans.

But the grievances mentioned by Herodotos can hardly

94. Herodotos 3. 47.
95. Herodotos 3. 48. Herodotos dates the seizure of the Kerkyraian boys "a generation earlier, about the time of the seizure of the wine krater." But his chronology here is clearly confused: Periander died ca. 587, and this date must serve as the terminus ante quem (see Cadoux, JHS 76 [1956] 105-106).
96. White, op. cit. 37.
97. See supra, p. 23.
be considered satisfactory reasons in themselves for the Spartan willingness to aid the Samian oligarchs; nor can considerations of friendship with Samians who had rendered aid against the Messenians a century before have been a major factor. Moreover, it is naive to suppose that the Spartans deposed Polykrates because of a doctrinaire hostility toward tyrants in general; indeed, it is not certain that such an attitude existed at this time. The Spartans had deposed Aischines of Sikyon, but Herodotos regarded the attack on Polykrates as owing not to a general anti-tyrannical policy, but to particular grievances. A clear indication that the Spartans were not as yet rigidly opposed to all tyrants is the fact that they were still on friendly terms with the Peisistratids, although by now probably with reservations.


99. Plutarch, De Mal. Her. 21 (Moralia 859D), however, assigns the Spartan expedition against Polykrates to the Spartans' proverbial dislike of tyrants.

100. Herodotos 5. 63.2; Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 19.4. The Spartan expulsion of Lygdamis of Naxos, a friend of the Peisistratids, indicates worsening relations (see infra, p. 103).
Sparta's decision to aid the Samian exiles probably stemmed primarily from her increasing interest in the fate of the Greeks of Asia Minor and her awareness of the peril of a rapidly expanding Persia. The Spartans had earlier, in response to an appeal from the Ionians and Aiolians, sent an embassy to Kyros at Sardis to warn him not to molest any city in Greece. This was an empty gesture, for Sparta could do nothing to stop him. It is significant, however, in that it committed Sparta to an anti-Persian policy. Since she was unable to prevent Persian control of the mainland of Asia Minor, it was all the more important that she guarantee that the passage across the Aegean should be secured. The Spartans must have viewed with alarm the prospect of Persia controlling Polykrates' maritime empire. Thus the Spartans dispatched their first trans-Aegean expedition.

A late tradition records that Lygdamis of Naxos was expelled by Sparta. It is probable that this action took place during the Spartan expedition against Samos, for we know of no other instance in which a Spartan

101. Herodotos 1. 152.3.
102. Herodotos 3. 56.2. Not possessing a fleet of her own, Sparta must have employed Corinth's fleet.
103. Plutarch, De Mal. Her. 21 (Moralia 859D).
expedition traversed the Cyclades. 104 Doubtless the Spartans deposed Lygdamis for reasons of security. The Naxian tyrant was an ally of Polykrates, having helped him to secure his power, and the geographical situation of Naxos was such that a hostile power there might be a threat to the Spartan expedition against Samos. 105 The Spartans were anxious to prevent the intervention of Lygdamis, and, realizing that it was essential to secure communications along the way, attacked Naxos and expelled its tyrant.

The Spartans arrived at Samos with a considerable force and attacked the island both by sea and land. Laying siege to the town, they made several assaults, but despite a forty-day siege the Spartans were unable to take the town, and they raised the siege and returned to the Peloponnese. 106 The Samians' ability to withstand the long siege was probably due to the tunnel that brought water into the city from a spring on Mt. Ampelos. 107

The departure of the Spartans seems to have been hastened by a bribe. Polykrates is said to have struck

105. Leahy, op. cit. 274.
106. Herodotos 3. 54-56.
107. Herodotos 3. 60.1.
a quantity of coins in lead, which he coated with gold and paid to the Spartans, after which they left.\textsuperscript{108} Herodotos calls the account a ματαιότερος λόγος, but his scepticism is refuted by the survival of the coins. Five of them of unknown provenance are proved Samian by their reverses, on which appear the two parallel incuse rectangles that mark Samian coins of this period.\textsuperscript{109} The sixth was actually found on Samos, but it is typeless and has a different reverse technique.\textsuperscript{110} Forbidden to possess coinage, the Spartans minted no coins but continued to use iron spits until the end of the fourth century.\textsuperscript{111} Thus they might well have been deceived by Polykrates, who minted a special issue of coins with which to bribe the Spartans.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{108} Herodotos 3. 56.2.
\textsuperscript{109} Robinson, "Some Electrum and Gold Greek Coins," in The Centennial Volume of the American Numismatic Society 591-594, nos. 9-12, pl. xxx. 10-12; and 594, postscript, pl. xxix.
\textsuperscript{110} Daux, BCH 82 (1958) 655, pl. 1. 14.
\textsuperscript{111} Plutarch, Lycurgus 9.
\textsuperscript{112} Seltman, Greek Coins 33.
\textsuperscript{113} The coins were not a regular issue; the obverse types are different from both the earlier electrum coinage and
The Samian oligarchs left Samos and sailed to Siphnos where they defeated the Siphnians and forced them to give up 100 talents. Thereupon they bought the island of Hydrea from the Hermionians, which they left in trust to the Troizenians, while they went on to Crete, where they founded Kydonia. After five years there, they were attacked by the Aiginetans, who, with the aid of some Cretans, reduced the Samians to slavery.\textsuperscript{114}

The attack on Samos by the Spartans convinced Polykrates that it was necessary to strengthen his position against further attacks from the West. For this purpose the control of the Cyclades was of vital importance to him. Lygdamis had provided a safe buffer-state between Polykrates and mainland Greece. Now considerations of security led him to create a substitute. If he could establish a foothold on the other side of the Ikarian Sea, he could not immediately be invaded from that direction. So he intervened forcibly there.

There is preserved in Suidas a story about Polykrates and the island of Delos, offered as an explanation of the phrase ταῦτα σοι καὶ Πύθεια καὶ Δήλια.\textsuperscript{115} The phrase, the "winged boar" types of Polykrates (Robinson, \textit{op. cit.} 592; Barron, \textit{op. cit.} 17-18).

\textsuperscript{114} Herodotos 3. 57-59.

\textsuperscript{115} Suidas, \textit{s.v.} Πυθεια καὶ Δηλια.
when used colloquially, is said to have meant "it's all the same to you." According to Suidas, Polykrates had instituted a festival on Delos and asked the pythia whether to call it by one name or the other. The phrase was given in reply, and the death of the tyrant, which came soon after, was regarded as the fulfillment of the prophecy.

The passage from Suidas appears to provide a context for Thucydides' remark that "Polykrates, tyrant of Samos, having added Rheneia to his other island conquests during his period of naval ascendancy, dedicated it to the Delian Apollo by binding it to Delos with a chain." Suidas mentions only a festival at Delos, Thucydides only the dedication of Rheneia, but it is probable that these events should be placed together. Suidas states that Polykrates died shortly after he received the pythia's reply; since we have placed the death of Polykrates ca. 522 B.C., we may date the capture of Rheneia and its dedication to Apollo, as well as the establishment of a festival on Delos, to the year immediately preceding the tyrant's death, 523.

Delos, as the geographical and religious centre of

116. Thucydides 3. 104.2; see also 1. 13.6.
117. Parke, op. cit. 105-108.
the Cyclades, was an appropriate place for a demonstration of Polykrates' newly acquired influence. The tyrant chose this time to dedicate a new festival at Delos probably to celebrate his recent conquests in the Cyclades. Peisistratos had earlier intervened in Delos, having purified the island presumably a year or two after his final establishment as tyrant. But Athenian influence must have waned in Delos by this time, for we hear of no move by Athens to protect her interests on Delos.

Polykrates' action in 523 was sufficient to make his position secure in the West. In the next year we find him rashly crossing over to the Asiatic mainland to negotiate with the Persian satrap of Ionia, an endeavour

118. We cannot determine from Thucydides' account which were the other islands besides Rheneia that Polykrates seized. Some of the less important Cyclades such as Mykonos, Tenos, Syros, and Amorgos would have guaranteed him a secure hold on the passage through the Cyclades. On Amorgos see supra, p. 94.

119. Herodotos 1. 64.2.

120. Athens' only known action in connection with Samos about this time came after Polykrates' fall, when she sent a pentekonter to rescue Anakreon and bring him to Athens (Ps.-Plato, Hipparchos 228B).
in which he lost his life.

"I have dwelt longer on the affairs of the Samians," says Herodotos, "because three of the greatest works in all Greece were made by them." These works, the tunnel of Eupalinos, the mole in the harbour at Samos, and the Heraion, should probably be associated with the ἑργα ἔρωτατεια mentioned by Aristotle as an example of the way in which tyrants used public works as a means of keeping their subjects in poverty and without leisure. The Heraion, as we have seen, dates to the early part of the sixth century, having been begun by Polykrates or even by his predecessor, Syloson. In about 570 the temenos was extended to twelve times its original area. Work soon started on a new temple of colossal proportions designed by Bheikos, a contemporary of Thedoros, the Samian responsible for the foundations of the Artemision at Ephesos. The Heraion was completed in fifteen years, and its roof-tiles survive. This temple was destroyed

121. Herodotos 3. 60.1.
123. supra, pp. 67-68.
124. Diogenes Laertios 2. 103; Diodoros 1. 98; cf. also Pausanias 3. 14. On the date see Jacobsthal, JHS 71 (1951) 85.
in the course of a Persian attack about 541 B.C. Polykrates initiated the construction of the new temple immediately after his revolution in 532. The new temple, very similar in design to its predecessor, though slightly larger, was built a little further to the west of the old site, apparently in order to leave a space for the sacred games between the new temple and the old altar, which was retained.

Building proceeded slowly after 530, in contrast to the rapid construction of the temple in the years ca. 570-555, apparently because of a lack of funds. We have already noted that Samos experienced a lack of capital funds at this time, and this is confirmed in the remains of the Heraion: there is a striking contrast in the archaeological remains of the temple between the resources available for building in the early period and those available for the reconstruction by Polykrates. Work continued on the project at a slow pace until the Persian conquest and Malandrios' expulsion in 521/0. The interruption lasted throughout the reign of Sylosos. Work was begun again ca. 510, interrupted again for the

125. Pausanias 7. 5.4; Boardman, op. cit. (p. 79, note 26)
176; see supra 78-80.
126. Reuther, Der Heratempel von Samos 63-64.
five years of the Ionian Revolt, resumed ca. 494, and finally abandoned ca. 470, after which no further construction was undertaken until Hellenistic times. Even now the temple consisted of no more than a cella with a single row of columns all around. It was intended to be dipteral, with an additional row at front and rear, without entablature or permanent roof. 127

The tunnel was constructed to bring water into the city of Samos from a spring on the north side of Mt. Ampelos. An underground conduit led from the spring by a tortuous course following the contour of the mountain for nearly half a mile and then entered the tunnel to be carried through the mountain for a distance of about 3300 feet. The water emerged inside the wall of the city and was carried by another conduit to a fountain-house in the city. 128 The purpose of the tunnel was to safeguard the water-supply of the city in time of siege, and the fact that the Spartan siege of forty days failed in 525/4 indicates that the tunnel was already in use.

128. Bichowsky, Compressed Air Magazine 47 (1943) 7086-7090; Goodfield, Scientific American 210 (1964) No. 6 (June) 104-112.
The period of construction for the tunnel is estimated by an engineer at more than fifteen years.\textsuperscript{129} Since it was completed by 525/4, it must have been begun by Polykrates I and finished by the Herodotean tyrant.

The third monument that interested Herodotos was the great mole that went all around the harbour at Samos. It was nearly twenty fathoms deep and over 400 yards in length.\textsuperscript{130} If polykrates inherited his fleet of 100 pentekonters, the construction of the mole should perhaps be assigned to his predecessor.\textsuperscript{131} In view of the tyrant's interest in naval matters, however, we should probably attribute the construction of the mole to him.

Two other monuments may be ascribed to Polykrates. The palace of Polykrates was splendid even in ruins, and inspired Caligula to plan its restoration.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{129} Bichowsky, \textit{op. cit.} 7089; see supra, p. 68. Since the rock is a "hard, somewhat bedded limestone," the estimate is regarded as conservative by White (\textit{op. cit.} 41).

\textsuperscript{130} Herodotos 3. 60.3-4.

\textsuperscript{131} Suggested by White, \textit{op. cit.} 40, and Barron, \textit{CQ} (New series) 14 (1964) 214. The acts of Samian piracy against Sparta and Egypt under the regime of Polykrates I might support this view.

\textsuperscript{132} Suetonius, \textit{Caligula} 21.
The wall that encircles the city, three miles in length, represented a colossal undertaking. Neither has been dated, but the wall was used in 525/4, and must therefore antedate the tunnel that was designed to be brought within it, so that it was almost certainly begun before 532.

Polykrates was interested in securing a firm economic base for his rule. He imported, according to Alexis, a Samian historian, hounds from Molossos and Lakonia, goats from Skyros and Naxos, and sheep from Miletos and Attika. Klytos, a Milesian historian, adds that he obtained, in addition to these, swine from Sicily. He also encouraged, according to Alexis, the immigration of artisans by the offer of high wages. Among those attracted were Eupalinos of Megara, who built the tunnel to bring water from Mt. Ampelos. Other artists and craftsmen, already famous, were attracted to Samos, including Rhoikos, the architect of the Heraion, and Theodoros, who

---

133. Herodotos 3. 54.2.

134. This is supported by nearby ceramic finds; see Barron, op. cit. (p. 112, note 131) 215, note 1.

135. PHG 4, p. 299 in Athenaios, Deipnosophistae 12. 540D.

136. PHG 2, p. 333 in Athenaios, Deipnosophistae 12. 540D.

137. PHG 4, p. 299 in Athenaios, Deipnosophistae 12. 540D.
had worked for Kroisos and had made the silver bowl that Herodotos saw at Delphi. Through his programme of public works and an increase in Samian trade, Polykrates restored, at least to some extent, the Samian economy that had declined after the Persian conquest of the island. Herodotos was impressed with the μεγαλοπρέπεια of Polykrates, surpassed only by that of the tyrants of Syracuse. The tyrant succeeded in maintaining the most magnificent court of his time. His palace, even in ruins, impressed later generations. He is said to have collected a magnificent library. He brought to his court the famous physician, Demokedes of Kroton, by offering a higher retaining fee than the Athenians, who had previously enticed him away from Aigina. Anakreon and Ibykos, who had served as tutors to the young Polykrates, continued to sing his praises. He enjoyed

138. Herodotos 1. 51.3; 3. 41; 3. 60.4.
139. 3. 125.2.
140. Herodotos, loc. cit., where it is implied that he even surpassed the Peisistratidai.
142. Athenaios, Delphinosophistae 1. 3c.
143. Herodotos 3. 131.
144. Anakreon was with the tyrant when Oroites' messenger
the works of the artists and craftsmen whom he had
attracted to his court by offers of high salaries.  

As we have noted, about 523, after the Spartan
invasion of Samos, Polykrates succeeded in securing his
position in the West by the capture of Delos and Rheneia
and several other islands in the Cyclades. Encouraged
by his success in this area, the tyrant turned his thoughts
eastward. We are told that he not only desired to rule
the islands, but had designs on Ionia as well.

"About the time of Kambyses' last sickness" (i.e.,
ca. 522 B.C.), Croites, the Persian satrap of Sardis,
came to summon Polykrates to the mainland (Herodotos 3. 121).
After the fall of Polykrates, he went to Athens (see supra,
p. 108, note 120).

145. Important works of art from Samos in the third quarter
of the sixth century are few in number and mostly in a sad
state of mutilation. Miss Richter attributes this to the
introduction of hollow casting by Rhoikos and Theodoros
(the invention of which is attributed to them by Pausanias
[8. 14.8]). The use of bronze now became common, and the
bronze statues would long since have been melted down
(Richter, Archaic Greek Art 106; see also Byvanck, Mnemosyne

146. Herodotos 3. 122.2.
decided that the time had come to put an end to the independent power of Samos. Polykrates had furnished ships for Kambyses' expedition against Egypt, but he had not submitted himself to Persian control. The immediate occasion of Oroites' decision to deal with the Samian tyrant, according to Herodotos, was a taunt by the satrap of Daskyleion, Mitrobates, for having failed to bring an island as close to the mainland as Samos under Persian control, when its tyrant had managed to subdue it with only fifteen hoplites. 147

Oroites sent a Lydian, Myrsos, to Samos with a message that the Persian satrap was under suspicion and was threatened with death by Kambyses. He advised Polykrates to come to the mainland in order to rescue him and to transport his wealth to Samos. Oroites' inducement was his promise to share his treasure with Polykrates. 148

Polykrates, hard-pressed for capital with which to carry out his contemplated conquest of Ionia, seized the offer and agreed to the terms. In order to insure that the funds available were worth the risk, he sent his secretary, Maiandrios, to investigate. Oroites filled eight large chests with stones, then covered them with

147. Herodotos 3. 120.
gold. The deceit was successful, and Maiandrios returned to tell his master of the great wealth awaiting him.\(^{149}\)

Polykrates, ignoring the advice of his friends and the warnings of his daughter, who reported an ill-omened dream in which she saw her father hanging high in the air, washed by Zeus and anointed by the sun, set sail for the mainland. He is reported to have told his daughter that she would live to be an old maid if he came back. The tyrant, accompanied by his physician, Demokedes, among others, arrived at Magnesia on the Maeander, where Oroites resided. He was immediately put to death by the Persian satrap and hung upon a cross. Thus the dream of Polykrates' daughter was fulfilled, and the bad end that Amasis had predicted for Polykrates came to pass.\(^{150}\)

With the death of Polykrates the Samian empire collapsed and Persian domination of Samos quickly followed. Maiandrios, Polykrates' emissary in the negotiations with Oroites, now seized the throne, at first enjoying a measure of popular support.\(^{151}\) But in 521/0 (or, less probably, 520/19),\(^{152}\) Maiandrios was expelled by the new Persian

---

149. Herodotos 3. 123.
151. Herodotos 3. 142.
152. Herodotos 3. 139-141, 144-149, with indications of
emperor, Darelos, who installed Polykrates' exiled brother, Syloson, as tyrant. Many Samians were massacred by the Persian army, which introduced new settlers from elsewhere. Few of these remained because of the cruel government of Syloson, whose rule gave rise to the proverb, Ξυνί Συλοσώντος εὐρυκριή, "there's plenty of room, thanks to Syloson." By 514 Syloson had made way for his son, Aiakes, who ruled until 499 B.C., when he was forced to flee at the outset of the Ionian Revolt. As far as Samos was concerned, the revolt ended in 495 with the Persian victory at the Battle of Lade. Aiakes was restored to power and his Samian opponents fled into exile at Zankle.

date at 139.1 and 150.1.

153. For the date of Darelos' accession see Parker and Dubberstein, op. cit. 15-16.
154. Herodotos 3. 149.
155. Strabo 14. 1.17 (C 638).
156. Herodotos 4. 138; he was present on Darelos' expedition to Skythia, on the date of which see Wade-Gery, op. cit. 215-216.
158. Herodotos 6. 6-17.
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