

IG II² 1 and the Athenian Kleruchy on Samos

Jack Cargill

IN THE FIFTH CENTURY the Athenians generally supported factions on Samos labeled ‘democratic’ against factions described as ‘oligarchic’ (or in terms with similar meanings). Even with Athenian support the Samian ‘democrats’ were hard put to overcome their ‘oligarchic’ rivals, whether because the label generally assigned the pro-Athenian faction is deceptive (as some scholars believe), or because ‘oligarchs’ had other advantages—prestige, wealth, hired mercenaries, support from Persian satraps or other external powers—which could offset genuine numerical inferiority. Xenophon tells us that every ally except the Samians abandoned Athens after the destruction of most of the Athenian fleet at Aigospotamoi by Lysander in 405. The Samians, he says, made a slaughter of the aristocrats (*τῶν γνωρίμων*) and took control (*Hell.* 2.2.6). Whether this decisive act against the oligarchic friends of Sparta came before or after the battle itself, it committed the Samian *demos* to the Athenian side for better or worse. It also apparently occasioned the granting of Athenian citizenship to these Samians *en masse*.

Lysander blockaded the Samians until they finally agreed to terms: free men departed with one cloak each, while Lysander gave everything to “the former citizens” (*τοῖς ἀρχαίοις πολίταις*), *i.e.* the oligarchs, and appointed a ten-man ruling council (*δέκα ἄρχοντας*).¹ Isolated passages in both Xenophon and Diodoros indicate that the Samian government was still friendly toward Sparta not long after Konon’s defeat of the Spartan fleet at Knidos in 394.² Since Samos was not mentioned as an exception to the terms of the King’s Peace of 386, it presumably was classified at this time among the Greek states guaranteed ‘autonomy’ by the King.³ Samos virtually disappears from the sources until it is besieged and captured by the Athenian

¹ Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.6f. The more general discussion of Diod. 14.10.1 and 13.1 may include actions on Samos, though the island is not specifically named.

² Xen. *Hell.* 4.8 *passim*, esp. 4.8.23; Diod. 14.79.4–7, 84.3f, 93.2–4, 97.1–4, 99.4f, esp. 97.3f.

³ Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31, Diod. 14.110.3.

general Timotheos in 366 B.C.⁴ An Athenian kleruchy was sent out to the island in the following year (according to the dating accepted by most scholars).

The decree awarding Athenian citizenship to the loyal Samians in 405 B.C. was presumably inscribed at the time of its passage; a provision of the decree itself (38–40) provided for erecting inscribed copies in both Athens and Samos. If so, the original was probably destroyed by the Thirty when they took control in 404. When the Athenian democracy was restored in 403, the original decree was reinscribed, along with two additional decrees of the latter year, on an ornate stele topped with a relief showing Athena and Hera, the tutelary goddesses of Athens and Samos, clasping hands.⁵ Although some scholars believe that the original decree applied to *all* Samians, and that they had to take up residence in Attica to activate a citizenship that was only ‘potential’, the phrasing of the decree seems rather to indicate that loyal Samian democrats at the time of the crisis of 405 B.C. (and, implicitly, no other Samians) were made henceforth Athenian citizens, wherever they happened to live after that time.⁶ A resolution that “Samians are to be Athenians, governing themselves

⁴ Dem. 15.9, Isoc. 15.111, Nep. *Timoth.* 1.2, IG II² 108.

⁵ IG II² 1; photograph in O. Kern, *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Bonn 1913) 19. For commentary see W. Gawantka, *Isopolitie* (Munich 1975) 178–97 (earlier bibliography at 179f n.32); cf. Philippe Gauthier, “Épigraphie et institutions grecques,” *AEHE* 110 (1977–78) 373–77.

⁶ So phrases such as “for the Samians, as many as were with the *demoi* of the Athenians” (Σαμίους ὅσοι μετὰ τὸ δῆμον τῷ Ἀθηναίων ἐγένοντο, 3f), “for those now inhabiting Samos” (τοῖς νῦν οἰκῶσιν Σάμον, 22), and “for the *demoi* of the Samians” (τῶν δῆμων τῶν Σα[μίων], 44). Gawantka (*supra* n.5) 196 is forced to explain away the apparent possession of Athenian citizenship by Eumachos (who is invited to *deipnon*, not *xenia*, 37)—a person who appears to be in Athens only briefly, as an ambassador, before returning to Samos (34f). The phrasing of 33f seems to indicate that the Samians who are to be immediately apportioned among the Attic tribes are recent arrivals (“Samians who have come,” [Σαμίων τοῖς ἤ]κοσιν)—whether or not they consist only of, or overlap with, the “other Samians, all those who came with Eumachos” ([ἄλλοις Σαμίους πᾶσι τοῖς μετὰ Εὐμάχο ἤ]κοσι, 36). Admittedly, a problem could arise from the fact that, in the third decree, Poses the Samian, his sons, and “those of the Samians who are visiting” (Σαμίων τὸς ἐπιδημόντας, 75) are invited to *xenia* rather than *deipnon* (63, 74). Yet careless phrasing seems more likely here than in the *deipnon* of 37, 51, and 54, where an important point about the status of the honorees is being made. This conclusion seems even more believable in light of the fact that the third decree includes a clause reaffirming everything earlier granted to the Samians (66), analogous to similar clauses in the second (43f, 52–54). Moreover, the very fact that all three decrees were inscribed on one stele would suggest that their content shows consistency or development, not a reversal of Athenian policy. Cf. S. G. Miller, *The Prytaneion* (Berkeley 1978) 4–11; M. J. Osborne, “Entertainment in the Prytaneion at Athens,” *ZPE* 41 (1981) 153–55, and *Naturalization in Athens II* (Brussels 1982) 25f.

however they wish" (Σαμῖος Ἀθηναῖος εἶναι, πολιτευόμενος ὅπως ἂν αὐτοὶ βόλωνται, 12f) is quite meaningless if a condition of accepting the proffered Athenian citizenship is the abandonment of their homeland, *i.e.*, ceasing to govern themselves and instead being absorbed into the population of Attica. Of course, since Athenian citizenship required registration in Attic demes, actual enrollment may not have been instantaneous. Apparently the Samians physically present with the ambassador Eumachos (33f) asked for immediate enrollment and got it. Other Samians could presumably come to Attica and do likewise, perhaps staying only long enough to go through the process. I see no reason, however, why the Samian magistrates might not simply send lists of names to the Athenian officials, for apportioning among the Attic tribes and demes.

In any case, it would seem reasonable to expect that substantial numbers of the Samian democrats—dispossessed, expelled from Samos, and recent recipients of Athenian citizenship—*would* go to Athens to take up residence. Nowhere else would appear more likely. Impoverished they might still be, wherever they settled. But everywhere else they would be resident aliens, lacking the political rights of citizens, and subject to more restrictions and taxes. In Athens, on the other hand, they would be full and equal citizens, in a better position for rebuilding their shattered fortunes. And in the defeated metropolis, its population diminished by three decades of war, their manpower might be welcome (*cf.* Andoc. 1.149). Certain enfranchised Samians, resident in fourth-century Attica, have long been known. A family grave monument in Attica, assigned to the period 390–365 B.C., bears the names of several members of the family of one Ἡραγόρας Ἡροδότου Σάμιος; his two sons and a grandson all have the demotic Kephisieus.⁷ Μόσχος Ὑβλησίου Κηφισιεύς was an Athenian citizen buried in Attica in the fourth century B.C. (*IG* II² 6431). In 1906 P. Jacobsthal described this Moschos as the son of a Samian enfranchised in 405/4, citing a fifth-century Samian epitaph of one Ἡγησαγόρης Ὑβλησίου. He went on to suggest that the ship-owner or captain (*naukleros*) Hyblesios, mentioned repeatedly in Ps.-Demosthenes 35 (the only Hyblesios in *PA* other than the father of

⁷ *IG* II² 6417. We should presumably infer that Heragoras' wife (name lost) was not a native of Attica but had come with him from Samos, for Lloyd B. Urdahl, *Foreigners in Athens: A Study of the Grave Monuments* (Diss.Chicago 1959) 118, observes: "No sepulchral inscription of the fourth century B.C. and only one of the third century B.C. reveals a marriage which was beyond doubt contracted between an Athenian citizen and a non-citizen."

Moschos), was also a Samian. It is now generally agreed that Hyblesios was a specifically Samian name, and one very well attested in Samian sources.⁸

A few additions may be tentatively suggested. Demosthenes' Samian connections, according to Demetrios of Magnesia, included his wife (Plut. *Dem.* 15.3). This assertion is generally rejected, or explained away by describing the woman as the daughter of an Athenian kleruch on Samos. But the distinction need not be material, if her family could have held Athenian citizenship in either case. It is similarly unnecessary to deny the legitimacy (*i.e.*, proper citizen parentage) of the two sons given to Demosthenes by another source (Ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 847c)—if one in fact accepts their existence. Whether she bore him sons or not, Demosthenes' wife must have been of citizen stock: both Aischines and Deinarchos, who insult Demosthenes by saying (Aesch. 2.149) or implying (Din. 1.71) that his wife bore children putatively his but actually sired by another man, would surely be expected to add her lack of citizen status to the insult, if there were truth or even plausibility in it.⁹

'Taureas' is a personal name derivable from the name of a Samian month, and several Samians called Taureas are known, whereas the name appears only twice in *PA*. An Attic inscription mentions an ephebe of 324/3, Ταυρέας Αἰσίμου Σκαμβονίδης.¹⁰ Someone named Aisimos appears in sources relating to Athenian politics and diplomacy at the very end of the fifth century. No Athenian is known to have borne this name earlier, and nothing is known about Aisimos' background or family; yet Lysias depicts him in a leadership rôle in the return of the Athenian democrats from Peiraeus at the time of the expulsion of the Thirty in 403—acting with particular zeal to put one upstart in his place who was accused of (among other vices)

⁸ Jacobsthal, "Hybla," *AthMitt* 31 (1906) 419f. Commonness in Samos: Chr. Habicht, "Samische Volksbeschlüsse der hellenistischen Zeit," *AthMitt* 72 (1957) 188 and n.46; J. and L. Robert, *Bull.épigr.* 1960, 318; G. Dunst, "Archaische Inschriften und Dokumente der Pentakontaetie aus Samos," *AthMitt* 87 (1972) 156–58, suggesting an addition to the sixteen examples already known to him. Osborne, *Naturalization II* (*supra* n.6) 25 n.61, cites *IG II²* 6431 with a question mark, referring to Habicht and the Roberts.

⁹ See J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971) 138f for discussion, sources, and literature; and note Urdahl's statement (*supra* n.7).

¹⁰ Habicht (*supra* n.8) 215; it is not suggested that the name was uniquely Samian; other Ionian cities had a month Taureon, *e.g.* Miletos (*Staatsvertr.* III 537.19), but the Attic calendar had no such month. Samian attestations: J. P. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* (London 1966) 104, 110 and n.6; J. Pouilloux, *Choix* 34.B58; *SEG XXII* 483.2 (? : Samian provenance restored). Ephebe: O. W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 14 [1971]) no. 15.ii.12.

falsely passing himself off as an Athenian citizen (Lys. 13.80–82). By the late 390's Aisimos' peculiarity of gait and/or propensity for drink were familiar enough for Aristophanes to refer to the state "reeling like Aisimos" (*Eccl.* 208). Perhaps he was only showing his sea-legs, since he later sailed out on two missions which were important in the organizational phase of the Second Athenian League. When a defensive alliance was made with Chios in 384, Aisimos was one of five Athenian ambassadors (his demotic has unfortunately been lost from the stone) whose names were inscribed below the text of the treaty (*IG II²* 34.36, *Staatsvertr.* II 248.40). A few years later, when Methymna on Lesbos joined the League, Aisimos and "the *synedroi* on the ships" were charged with administering the oaths of the new ally's magistrates (*IG II²* 42.19f, *Staatsvertr.* 258). His association with these members of the League council apparently causes some scholars to differentiate between two men named Aisimos, an Athenian (perhaps even a general, some believe) of the other sources and a representative of some unspecified allied state in the Methymna treaty. I see no reason, however, to doubt that all these sources refer to the same person, an Athenian citizen, for whom no office other than ambassador is indicated. Taureas Skambonides, ephebe in 324/3, might perhaps have been his grandson (which would necessitate a son Aisimos between them). The connection would make sense, because Aisimos, like Taureas, is a name not only rare in Attica but also attested on Samos.¹¹ Everything we know about Aisimos is in fact consistent with his being an enfranchised Samian: the rarity of the name, his appearance on the scene in a politically important rôle at this particular time, his zeal for the Athenian democracy, and his diplomatic connections with Chios and Lesbos—lands traditionally linked with Samos in Athenian policy.

More conjectural possibilities may be mentioned also. *Ῥοῖκος Φιλίνο* appears on an early-fourth-century Athenian liturgical list (*IG II²* 1928.15)—the only Rhoikos in *PA*, and a name attested among Samians.¹² *PA* lists three Athenians called Saurias, another name attested early on Samos. One of the Attic examples (*PA* 12611) is almost certainly illusory.¹³ Textual difficulties also beset the restora-

¹¹ *SEG* I 355.3. Perhaps it should be mentioned that Pape-Benseler *s.v.* posited *five* Athenians named Taureas, from the same sources from which *PA* infers only two; the rarity or commonness of the name Taureas in Athenian literary sources may, then, be somewhat doubtful, though no one disputes the rarity of Aisimos.

¹² A Rhoikos is supposed to have built the earliest Heraion: Jacobsthal (*supra* n.8) 420 n.1.

¹³ Autopsy, my own squeeze, and consultation with C. Karapa of the Epigraphical Museum (21 July 1983) convince me that the text of *IG II²* 1491.22 is correct in read-

tion of Saurias as the name of an *epimeletes* among the Athenian kleruchs on Lemnos in *IG XII.8* 5.6, not listed among *PA*'s examples. The remaining two examples are both mentioned in fourth-century sources. If these names were new in Attica, perhaps they came in with the new Samian-Athenian citizens.

The circumstances of Timotheos' siege and capture of Samos in 366 B.C. are obscure. Demosthenes tells us that Samos was at that time garrisoned by Kyprothemis, who had been stationed there by Tigranes, viceroy (*ὑπαρχος*) of the Persian King; he says Timotheos freed (*ἠλευθέρωσε*) the island (15.9). If a Samian element was present within the population of Attica in the first half of the fourth century, nothing would seem to preclude the possibility of a Samian element among the Athenian kleruchs sent to Samos *ca* 365. Would not many of the enfranchised Samian exiles (or, more likely, their sons or grandsons) be among the 'Athenians' most eager to participate in the kleruchy? Most other Athenians might, conversely, be quite reluctant. Samos was just off the Asian coast, and the King was not friendly; it could be a dangerous place in which to settle. Furthermore, the new Samian citizens (and their offspring) might still mostly be numbered among the least wealthy classes of Athenians, since many of them would have begun their stay in Attica with literally nothing but the clothes on their backs. Such classes were perhaps the most likely citizens to participate in kleruchies. This economic premise requires further investigation, but if it should be valid, and if the kleruchs constituted in any sense a random sample of lower-class Athenians, the enfranchised Samians might well be disproportionately represented.

Epigraphic evidence relating to the Samian kleruchy is not altogether lacking. The names of about sixty apparent kleruchs are known, approximately two-thirds of the total from a very valuable document of 346/5 B.C. discovered in the excavations at the temple of Hera, which includes lists of treasurers of Hera and of *proedroi*, with demotics.¹⁴ Φόρυς Μελι(τεύς) (11) was a member of an Athenian navy board (*symmory*) sometime between 356 and 340 B.C. (*IG*

ing [Ι]σχυρίας rather than Σαυρίας, *i.e.* that the traces require χ, not α. In *IG II*² 1492.114 the emendation necessary to read Saurias would leave an empty letter-space (autopsy also). Samian attestation: see G. Lippold, *RE* 2A (1921) 261 *s.v.* "Saurias."

¹⁴ Michel 832; slightly revised text by Dieter Ohly, "Die Göttin und ihre Basis," *AthMitt* 68 (1953) 25–50. The traditional association of certain other inscriptions with the Samian kleruchy is highly doubtful: G. L. Cawkwell, "The Date of I.G. II² 1609 Again," *Historia* 22 (1973) 759–61, establishes that the inscription is most reasonably dated to 370/369 B.C., *i.e.*, well before the sending of any kleruchs to Samos. *IG II*² 1952 mentions several kleruchs, but no basis exists for asserting that they were kleruchs sent to *Samos*.

II² 1616.75), a fact which led Davies (*APF* 557) to conclude that he must have gone to Samos with a late group of kleruchs. If he was already a person of some affluence (as the performance of this liturgy would indicate) before participating in the kleruchy, presumably he was not driven to join it by economic hardship. Was his motivation a desire to go 'home'? Ἡδύλος Διογ[— — —] Ἀλαεύς appears on the gravestone of an apparent Athenian kleruch buried on Samos. Ernst Fabricius long ago suggested that he was the grandfather of the poet Hedylos, described by Athenaios (297A) as "Hedylos the Samian or Athenian"—a description which makes sense, Fabricius continued, if the poet came from an Athenian kleruchic family and was born on Samos. The interpretation makes even better sense if ancestral Samians were among those present on the island during the kleruchy. Hedylos the poet was a member of the historian Douris' literary circle on Samos after the withdrawal of the kleruchs.¹⁵ Neokles was archon on Samos in 334/3, when "the *demos* of the Athenians in Samos" dedicated a golden crown to Apollo at Delphi.¹⁶ It seems clear that he is to be identified with Neokles Gargettios (*PA* 10640), father of the philosopher Epikouros; the family's connection with the kleruchy is attested by numerous sources. A recent biographer of Douris of Samos suggests that Epikouros was a fellow student of Douris and his brother Lynkeus, in Athens, after the expulsion of the kleruchy. Although *PA* lists several persons with the name of both father (10) and son (6), Epikouros is also a name well attested on Samos, while Neokles' name itself is not unknown there.¹⁷ Perhaps the Athenian kleruch Neokles named his son for a Samian relative. Many other names of the known Athenian kleruchs are names also attested in Samian sources, although the commonness of most of these names makes Samian origin in each particular case unprovable.¹⁸

¹⁵ Fabricius, "Alterthümer auf der Insel Samos," *AthMitt* 9 (1884) 260f no. 4a; R. B. Kebric, *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos* (*Historia Einzelschr.* 29 [1977]) 20. Fritz Heichelheim, *Die auswärtige Bevölkerung im Ptolemäerreich* (*Klio Beih.* 18 [1925]), lists Hedylos in his Ptolemaic prosopography under both Athenians (84) and Samians (107).

¹⁶ *Syll.*³ 276A.5 (*SEG* XVIII 200).

¹⁷ Epikouros: Kebric (*supra* n.15) 27; Michel 366.2; M. Schede, "Mitteilungen aus Samos," *AthMitt* 37 (1912) 216 no. 17.3; Habicht (*supra* n.8) 177 no. 11.1f; Pouilloux, *Choix* 34B.8f; A. Maiuri, *Nuova Silloge Epigrafica di Rodi e Cos* (Florence 1925) 1.3; V. Theophanidis, "Epigraphai Samou," *Deltion* 9 (1924–25) no. IV.4; two unpublished inscriptions cited in files at the Institute for Advanced Study. Neokles: Theophanidis no. I.2.

¹⁸ Samian attestations exist (they are too numerous to cite on a tangential point, but I have verified them in each case) for the following names in Michel 832 (line num-

For most modern commentators, when the Athenian kleruchs came in, all the Samians were expelled; when the kleruchs were finally expelled in 322 or 321 B.C., all the Samians came back. A considerably more subtle position is taken by G. T. Griffith:

In the long siege which won Samos the Athenians were overcoming virtually a Persian or pro-Persian garrison and a government of oligarchs (a tyrant and his circle); they were not fighting the Samian *demos* . . . There is no need to doubt that the Samian *demos* may perhaps have welcomed an Athenian 'presence' now which got their own upper class off their backs. The lands for the cleruchs will have been found from the estates of these newly-exiled and unpopular Samians. All good democrats, Samians, Athenians, and Athenian cleruchs at Samos, shared a common interest in continuing always to make absolutely sure that not one of those exiles ever came back.¹⁹

Thus Griffith assumes (sensibly and correctly, I think) that at the time the kleruchy was established Samian 'democrats' remained on Samos alongside the newcomers from Attica. Certainly the Samian democrats had been exiled at least briefly, and certainly the island was for a time under the control of the oligarchs (Samians who, on my interpretation, had *not* been granted Athenian citizenship); these facts are evident from Xenophon's description of the activities of

bers in parentheses): Dionysios (2), Lysandros (2), Theophilos (3), Theokles (3, 5, 58), Aristomachos (4), Aristarchos (7, 59), Antiphon (7, 60), Kallimachos (8, 60), Diotimos (11), Theoxenos (11f), Demetrios (30[?], 62), Gorgias (44), Sokrates (44), Euboulides (61), Dionysodoros (61f). Kleruchs mentioned in sources other than Michel 832 whose names have Samian attestations: Timos[tratos?] *SEG* XVIII 201.2 (I could see no trace of the *sigma* in examining the stone on 2 July 1983); and (all on unpublished *Heraion* Inv. J 24) Theogenes, Androkles, Philippos, Ariston. Ariston Timos[tra]tou (Phalereus) Athenaios was a victor in comic poetry competition on Samos in the second century B.C. (Michel 901.10). His sons were named Timostratos and Poses (*IG II² 1714.10*). Poses' own son (*IG II² 1756.22*) was another Ariston (see *stemma* in *PA* 13824). Poses and Ariston continue to appear in pairs of names of Athenian fathers and sons in Boiotian victor lists of the first century B.C.: *IG VII 416.30*; 540.14 (*SEG* XIX 335). The name Poses, which appears only once in *PA*, was also borne by the Samian honored and crowned by the Athenian assembly in 403 B.C. (*IG II² 1.58* etc.). Philon of Michel 832.2 has, in Davies' words (*APF* 555), a "far from common name-root." Although I have not found this name itself in Samian sources, the root appears to have been proportionally more common. [Nik]omachos Hierokleious Athenaios, the comedian, is attested on Samos later than the period of the kleruchy (Habicht [*supra* n.8] 224–26 no. 58.3), but he too was an Athenian with a name known in Samian sources.

¹⁹ Griffith, "Athens in the Fourth Century," in P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker, ed., *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (Cambridge 1978) 139f; cf. Barron (*supra* n.10) 118; Kebric (*supra* n.15) 3; S. M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* (Hypomnemata 51 [1978]) 67.

Lysander. It makes sense to suppose that many of the democratic exiles would have returned home after the Spartans' dominance of the Aegean was broken in the late 390's. Whether they expelled the oligarchs associated with Lysander's *dekarchy*, or worked out some sort of *modus vivendi* with them, is unknown. It seems clear that an oligarchic faction friendly with Kyprothemis was in control at the time of Timotheos' expedition. Persian military support was apparently necessary for the maintenance of the 'tyranny'. It is natural to assume (with Griffith) that Samians implicated in this régime (those who did not perish in the fighting itself) would have fled into exile in consequence of Timotheos' successful siege. These persons would therefore have been absent during the period of the kleruchy, and presumably Griffith is also correct in supposing that their lands would have been confiscated. Numerous Samians in exile during this period are well attested, especially in the series of exile (*φυγή*) decrees passed by the returnees in the years after 322, giving praise, honors, and often Samian citizenship to individuals who had befriended them during their absence.²⁰

The kleruchs *were* the state on Samos during the period of their presence; this is clear enough from the fact that they provided the treasurers of Hera (Michel 832). If some Samians remained, at least initially, alongside the kleruchs, the question of these Samians' status is inescapable (though even Griffith does not appear to deal with it directly, as one might expect). Were they enslaved? Did they become 'resident aliens' in their own land? I believe that it is more likely, and that it would be more politically workable, for them to have been absorbed into the kleruchic state—on the basis of the Athenian citizenship granted to the Samian democrats in 405 and reaffirmed in 403. Samos was Athenian territory now. Why should not all the Athenian citizens present share in governing it? The remaining oligarchs, as mentioned above, will have fled when Timotheos captured the island. Whether and to what extent these Samian democrats shared in the lands appropriated from the exiled oligarchs is undeterminable.

Πελύσιος, whose name derives from the name of a Samian month, is described in Michel 832.39 as "the *ιέρως* of the goddess." Ulrich Koehler believed that Pelysios was a temple slave, taking the term as equivalent to *ιερόδουλος* and analogous to *δημόσιος* (public slave).

²⁰ See, e.g., Michel 366–69; Fabricius (*supra* n.15) 194; M. Schede, "Aus dem Heraion von Samos," *AthMitt* 44 (1919) 4–15; Habicht (*supra* n.8) 258f and "Hellenistische Inschriften aus dem Heraion von Samos," *AthMitt* 87 (1972) 196ff nos. 2 and 4.

Indeed, his very presence during the period of the kleruchy was one reason offered by Koehler for classifying him as a slave. Other scholars have described Pelysios as a ‘priest’ (equating the term with *ἱερεύς*), but it would seem rather suspicious to try to save his free status by a dubious translation. G. Dunst, however, even while denying this translation, cites a parallel which implies that *hieros* of itself cannot prove Pelysios to have been a slave. Perhaps he was, but he can as easily have been a Samian citizen; a magistrate with the same name is mentioned on Samian coins.²¹ If a Samian citizen, then he may also have been an Athenian citizen. His name bears no demotic in Michel 832, but its context is one in which a demotic would not be provided—just as one is not given for the names of the archons in Athens (lines 1, 5). The sources do not make it possible to differentiate, after 365, between ‘Samian-Athenians’ who came out as kleruchs and those already resident on Samos. Any of the names with demotics on Michel 832 could belong to either category, if both participated in the kleruchic state. This situation is of course not very satisfying. However, even an imprecise ‘feel’ about a Samian-Athenian presence on Samos may be viewed as a step forward, compared with the traditional confident, but possibly quite erroneous, assumption that there simply was no such presence.

If enfranchised Samians and their offspring constituted a numerous element within the fourth-century Athenian citizen body, if some of them participated in the kleruchy established on Samos *ca* 365, and if the kleruchs lived in harmony with Samians already present and already their fellow citizens, then conventional interpretations of the implications of the establishment of the kleruchy may well be called into question. The kleruchy becomes less obviously an example of a new and rapacious Athenian imperialism, or a provocation leading to the Social War, as many have suggested. Rather, it may have represented only a new phase in Athens’ traditional support of the Samian ‘democrats’ against their ‘oligarchic’ enemies, opportunely embodied in a stroke against the power of the Persians, who had recently become hostile to Athens, and whose occupation of Samos was itself in flagrant violation of the provisions of the King’s Peace. The Athenians’ occupation of the island would indicate their realization that only a large influx of settlers from Attica could secure it against

²¹ Name: Michel 368.2; W. Vischer, “Epigraphisches,” *RhM* 22 (1867) 317f; Habicht (*supra* n.8) 215. Status: U. Koehler, “Inscription der Kleruchen auf Samos,” *AthMitt* 7 (1882) 368–70; Barron (*supra* n.10) 134 and n.13; Kebric (*supra* n.15) 3 n.16; Dunst (*supra* n.8) 34 and n.69.

Persian/oligarchic recapture.²² The place of the Samian kleruchy within Athenian foreign relations—both with the allies and with the Persian Empire and its satraps—requires further investigation. But over-generalizations must be avoided. Athenian-Samian relations in the fourth-century constituted a decidedly special case, whose unique nature should not be ignored.

APPENDIX

The subsequent history of the Samian kleruchy is not within the scope of this discussion. Developments in changed circumstances may tell us little about the Athenians' motivations in the establishment of the kleruchy and during the early years of its operation. The picture of even the later years need not be as bleak as the interpretation, ultimately derived from G. Grote, *History of Greece* X (London 1869) 57 n.1, accepted by most commentators (including Griffith). The sources on which this interpretation is based may reasonably be described as suspect. That the Samian government which passed the *phyge* decrees (*supra* n.20) was democratic in form is obvious from the wording of the decrees themselves, but this need not be significant; a *demos* of all citizens eligible to vote may be limited to persons with a certain property qualification—in exactly the same way that the *demos* of Athens was sometimes restricted under Macedonian domination. Kebric (*supra* n.15) 6f is convinced that Samians of all classes had long been exiled; nonetheless, he recognizes that the *returnees* would have been mostly oligarchs. Schede (*supra* n.20) 14 comments that aristocratic names found on Samian coins tended also to appear in the returnees' *phyge* inscriptions; *cf.* Hornblower (*supra* n.22) 199 and n.132. Sherwin-White (*supra* n.19) 67 n.194 and 71 and Hornblower (199 and elsewhere) make much of the number of states whose citizens are mentioned in these decrees, but aristocratic exiles will always have individual friends in many places. It is noteworthy that the Samian *phyge* decrees honor specific persons, whereas *IG* II² 1.48f commends the Ephesians and Notians in general for receiving the pro-Athenian Samian exiles.

Kebric (61), though expressing doubt, admits that the passages in Diodorus on Samos and Samians in this period could have been taken from Douris. If so, an oligarchic and anti-Athenian bias in them may be suspected. Griffith (140 and 313 n.40) cites Krateros *FGrHist* 342F21 as applying

²² S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (Oxford 1982) 135f, describes evidence for Mausolos' influence on Samos before the Persian occupation, speculating: "Was Samos an early try-out for the kind of Mausolan practices later carried through with greater success at Rhodes? For once, Athens beat Mausolus to it: after Timotheos' siege, the cleruchy on Samos kept Mausolus and Persia at bay." *Cf.* the casual acceptance of Kebric (*supra* n.15) 3: "While the terms of the [King's] Peace contained no specifics governing its disposal, proximity guaranteed the eventual absorption of Samos into the Persian Empire . . ."

to the fourth-century Samian kleruchy, and makes much of its implications. The passage, from Zenobios' explanation of Ἀττικὸς πάροιχος, he renders: "Krateros says it comes from the Athenian *epoikoi* who were sent to Samos. For the Athenians who reinforced those already there in Samos settled and pushed out the native Samians." But Jacoby *ad loc.* and Hornblower (198 n.127) argue against the connection, as all other known fragments of Krateros relate to the fifth century. Another major source of the conventional reconstruction is a passage in Herakleides Lembos (second century B.C.), excerpting Aristotle's lost *Constitution of the Samians* (M. R. Dilts, *Heracledis Lembi Excerpta Politiarum* [GRBM 5 (1971)] 24; Arist. fr.611.35 Rose): "Theogenes, a certain Samian, clever but profligate and knavish, being exiled from his country and living at Athens with Euripides, having made him an accomplice by corrupting his wife, persuaded the Athenians to dispatch 2000 (men?) to Samos; having arrived, they expelled everyone." Who is Theogenes and when is he welcome at Athens but not on Samos? How did he (through his Athenian dupe—with a suspiciously famous name, though its most famous bearer cannot fit the period of the kleruchy chronologically) persuade the assembly to send to Samos 2000 (kleruchs? troops?). This undated story, if credible at all, might just as easily fit the events of 440 B.C., when private Samians sought Athenian help, oligarchs were sent away to Lemnos, and an Athenian garrison was dispatched (Thuc. 1.115–17, Plut. *Per.* 26–28); or of 411, when large numbers of Samians were expelled in an action having Athenian support (Thuc. 8.21, 73). Details have to be coerced to fit *any* of these occasions, including the period of the kleruchy. Is the statement "they expelled everyone" more credible than anything else in this manifestly unreliable tale? It is true that Strabo 14.1.18 echoes the figure 2000, and calls them kleruchs, but his account is extremely condensed (mentioning the presence on Samos of Perikles, Sophokles, Neokles, and Epikouros all in the same sentence) and obviously derivative; it provides no independent support for Herakleides' story.²³

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

October, 1983

²³ This work was facilitated by a 1982 Summer Fellowship from Rutgers University. Versions were read at the APA/AIA convention in Philadelphia in December 1982 and at a Rutgers Social History Group colloquium in February 1983. Some material unavailable to me in the United States I consulted during two months in Greece in summer 1983 (while working on a different project, funded in part by a Rutgers Research Council grant). I am grateful for the use of the facilities and the help of the staffs at the American School, the British School, the Epigraphical Museum, the Agora Museum, the Delphi Museum, and the Heraion Excavation on Samos. For comment on earlier drafts I wish to thank readers whose names I do not know and Professors Christian Habicht, Fordyce Mitchel, Raphael Sealey, Stanley Burstein, Kent Rigsby, John Buckler, and too many of my colleagues in the Rutgers History Department to mention by name. I have of course disagreed on points with all of them.