

The Ancient History Bulletin

VOLUME THIRTY-FOUR: 2020
NUMBERS 3-4

Edited by:

Monica D'Agostini ✦ Edward Anson ✦ Catalina Balmaceda
Charlotte Dunn ✦ Andrea Gatzke ✦ Timothy Howe
Alex McAuley ✦ Sabine Müller ✦ Nanidni Pandey
John Vanderspoel ✦ Connor Whately ✦ Pat Wheatley



ISSN 0835-3638 ✦ eISSN 1700-3334

ANCIENT HISTORY BULLETIN

Volume 34 (2020) Numbers 3-4

Edited by:

Edward Anson, Catalina Balmaceda, Monica D'Agostini, Andrea Gatzke, Alex McAuley, Sabine Müller, Nadini Pandey, John Vanderspoel, Connor Whately, Pat Wheatley

Senior Editor: Timothy Howe

Assistant Editor: Charlotte Dunn

Editorial correspondents

Elizabeth Baynham, Hugh Bowden, Franca Landucci Gattinoni, Alexander Meeus, Kurt Raaflaub, P.J. Rhodes, Robert Rollinger, Victor Alonso Troncoso



Contents of volume thirty-four

Numbers 3-4

- 94 Thomas C. Rose, *The Life and Afterlife of a Hellenistic Flagship: The "Sixteen" of Demetrius Poliorcetes Revisited*
- 113 Marco Ferrario, *Uno, nessuno, centomila. L'Asia centrale achemenide e le sue fonti: alcune note di merito e di metodo*
- 138 Egidia Occhipinti, *The treaty of alliance between Athens and Carystus: Supplements for lines 2-3 and 4-6 and further historical considerations*
- 155 Chris Eckerman, *Review Article: Richard Neer and Leslie Kurke, Pindar, Song, and Space: Towards a Lyric Archaeology*

NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

The Ancient History Bulletin was founded in 1987 by Waldemar Heckel, Brian Lavelle, and John Vanderspoel. The board of editorial correspondents consists of Elizabeth Baynham (University of Newcastle), Hugh Bowden (Kings College, London), Franca Landucci Gattinoni (Università Cattolica, Milan), Alexander Meeus (University of Mannheim), Kurt Raaflaub (Brown University), P.J. Rhodes (Durham University), Robert Rollinger (Universität Innsbruck), Victor Alonso Troncoso (Universidade da Coruña)

AHB is currently edited by Timothy Howe (howe@stolaf.edu)

AHB promotes scholarly discussion in Ancient History and ancillary fields (such as epigraphy, papyrology, and numismatics) by publishing articles and notes on any aspect of the ancient world from the Near East to Late Antiquity. Submitted articles should normally be in English, but the journal will consider contributions in French, German, Italian or Spanish.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

AHB adheres to the usual North American editorial policies in the submission and acceptance of articles but imposes no House Style. Authors are, however, asked to use the abbreviations of *L'Année philologique* (APh) for journals, and of the *Thesaurus linguae latinae* (TLL) for Latin authors. Please send submissions to the editor most closely identified with your field of enquiry or, in case of doubt, to Timothy Howe (howe@stolaf.edu). Articles must be submitted in electronic format, preferably generated by MS Word. Greek font or other special characters must convert such to Unicode and should be accompanied by a PDF version. Authors will receive PDF offprints of their contributions. Copyright is retained by the author. Books for reviews and enquiries concerning book reviews should be directed to Joseph Roisman (jsroisma@colby.edu).

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The subscription rate for individual and institutional subscribers is USD 25.00. Detailed instructions about subscriptions and access to digital content can be found on the AHB website: <http://ancienthistorybulletin.org>

PAYMENT

Payment may be made via the subscription portal on the AHB website: <http://www.ancienthistorybulletin.org/subscribed-users-area/membership-levels/>

Cover image courtesy of The Nickle Arts Museum, University of Calgary

The treaty of alliance between Athens and Carystus: Supplements for lines 2-3 and 4-6 and further historical considerations

Egidia Occhipinti

Abstract: This paper discusses the content and background of the treaty of alliance signed by Athens and Carystus in 357 BC, giving a new reading of the connections that were established between Athens and Euboea during the first half of the fourth century BC. It suggests new supplements for lines 2-3 and 4-6 of that treaty, a time frame to date Carystus' admission to the Second Athenian league, as well as her re-admission in 357, after she had left the league in 371. Furthermore, this study hypothesises that in 357 bilateral treaties of alliance were signed between Athens and several Euboean cities, on the model of the alliance with Carystus.

Keywords: Carystus, Athens, treaty of alliance, Euboea, Second Athenian league, Demosthenes, Aeschines, Diodorus.

This paper offers a critical edition of the treaty of alliance signed by Athens and Carystus in 357 BC. It suggests new supplements for lines 2-3 and 4-6, and gives a fresh reading of the historical background pertaining to the inscription. Furthermore, a cross-comparison between this epigraphical document and the literary tradition on the period (Aeschines, Demosthenes and Diodorus) sheds further light on the history of Carystus and her relationship with Athens in the 370s and 350s BC. It also establishes a precise time frame to date Carystus' admission to the Second Athenian league.

1. *The text of the decree: new supplements*¹

The inscription, preserved in three fragments, forms the ending part of a decree containing, with all probability, the text of a bilateral alliance signed by Athens and Carystus.² The epigraph is made of three fragments of white Pentelic marble, a, b, c, which were set together by Koehler in 1877 (in MDAI(A) 2) to form lines 7-23 (*editio princeps*). The first 6 lines were later supplemented by Koehler himself (*IG II 5, 64*), who also modified the former text he had previously given.

* An Italian version of this paper, partly similar to the present, was published in *Axon* 4, 2020, 111-30.

¹ The study of the epigraph was based on the examination of photographs.

² According to Bengtson 1962, no. 304, followed by Harding 1985, 65, the decree would contain the text of an alliance signed between Athens and Eretria, Chalcis, Carystus, and Hestiaea. In contrast to Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* no. 48. Discussion below, at §5.

Fragment ‘a’ was discovered in August 1840 within the so-called Grotto of Pan, on the north-western slopes of the Acropolis, whereas the place of discovery of the other two fragments, ‘b’ and ‘c’, is unknown. Today the three fragments are held in the Epigraphical Museum of Athens (no. inv. a: EM 6963; b: EM 6961; c: EM 6962). Fragment ‘b’ (85x14.5x10 cm) forms the central part of the text; fragment ‘c’ (15x19x10 cm) gives the right part, fragment ‘a’ contains the left and low parts (21x29x10.8 cm), ll. 8-23. There are 23 lines in total, written in stoichedon style of 45 letters for each line. From line 18 this style is abandoned.

The prescript and the part relating to the terms of the alliance are missing, as well as the final lines of the decree. The text is written in Attic-Ionic, retaining ‘ε’ for ‘ει’ (l. 11) and ‘ο’ for ‘ου’ (ll. 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21). As for the content, the main information is as follows: the *demos* is called to choose the Athenian ambassadors who will receive the oaths at Carystus, and the Athenian authorities (*boule*, *strategoï*, *taxiarchoi*) are mentioned, who will swear in Athens in front of the Carystians. The expenses for the stele and the return journey of the Athenian envoys who went to Carystus, Eretria, Chalcis and Hestiaeae, are recorded. The names of the Athenian ambassadors who will swear at Carystus are listed. Some of them are very famous generals known from other sources as well, such as Chabrias, Chares,³ and Iphicrates⁴.

Let us consider the first 7 lines in detail:

]κλ[.....]

[.....]ν γραμ[.....]

[.....] εἰς τὴν [.....]

[.....] ἀναλ[ι]σκο[.....]

[.....]ι ἀποληψομ[.....] 5

[.....]ὕτοῖς τὸστρ[.....]

[.....]υλ[ή]ν· ἐπαινέσαι δὲ [.....]

The first four lines refer to the *grammateus*, the person responsible for cutting the text into the stone, and the expenses for the stele; the treasurer was responsible for the latter. The most recurrent formula referring to the *grammateus* is ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα,⁵ followed by the mention of the material upon which the text should be cut; when the latter is omitted, it is however implied, since there is evidence of the material through the mention (in the decree) of the place where the text will be displayed. For this reason, the following supplements for lines 2-3 are suggested: ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βολῆς ἐν ἀκροπόλει δῶναι τὸ ἀργύριον. The formula δῶναι τὸ ἀργύριον, which refers to the money that the treasurer will provide, is moreover consistent with Koehler’s previous supplements for lines 3-4 εἰς τὴν [στήλῃν τὸν ταμίαν ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψήφισματα] ἀναλ[ι]σκο[μένων].

³ Schmitz 1997a, 1080-1, and 1997b, 1097-8.

⁴ Beck 1998, 1098-99.

⁵ Cf., just to give a few examples, IG II² 365, 513, 646, 663, 665, 675, 690, 710, 712(16), 772, 786, 788.

As for line 5, Koehler's restoration of two future tenses, put in succession, ἥξουσ[ι] ἀπολησόμενοι, is uncertain. More recently Matthaiou (2017, 107) has suggested a different supplement, which overcomes that difficult reading: πρέσβεις δ' εἰς Κάρυστον πέμψα[ι] ἀπολησομένου τοὺς ὄρκους παρὰ Καρυστίων. He was inspired by Hicks-Hill's restoration, τῶι δήμῳ. πρέσβεις δὲ εἰς Εὐβοίαν πέμψα[ι] ἀπολησομένους τοὺς ὄρκους παρὰ τῶν Εὐβοίων (1901, 249-50). Indeed the presence of the aorist πέμψα[ι] at line 5 is convincing. However, the sending of ambassadors to Euboea (Hicks-Hill) seems unlikely, in consideration of the following arguments here, which will show that this decree contained the text of a bilateral alliance between Athens and the city of Carystus. Besides, Matthaiou's restoration, even if plausible, is not convincing since in lines 5-6 the reference to the Carystians would be redundant: 'send envoys to Carystus to receive the oaths from the Carystians'. In Attic decrees the formula ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλισκομένων is not necessarily completed with τῶι δήμῳ⁶. For these reasons lines 4-6 can be supplemented as follows: πρέσβεις δὲ ἐλέσθαι τὸν δῆμον καὶ πέμψα[ι] ἀπολησομένου τὸς ὄρκος⁷.

At line 6 Koehler's supplement, παρὰ τῶν Καρυστίων· ὁμόσαι δ' αὐτοῖς, is preferred to Knoepfler's παρὰ Καρυστίων; the article τῶν before Καρυστίων allows the line to reach the number of 45 letters.

At lines 6-7 Klaffenbach's restoration, τὸς τ[ε] στρατηγὸς τὸς Ἀθήνησι ὄντας καὶ τήν, is not necessary, since *boule*, *strategoï*, *taxiarchoi* (as well as *hipparchoi*), usually received the oaths and swore. Koehler's supplement τὸς τ[α]ξιάρχος κ[αὶ] τοὺς στρατηγούς καὶ τήν βολ[ήν],⁸ as well as that of Klaffenbach seem outdated by now, for Matthaiou, after his autoptic reading of the stele, suggests τὸστρ[ατηγούς κ[αὶ] τοὺς ταξιάρχους, with the assimilation of the sigma.

In the light of the discussion thus far, a critical edition of the text is offered here:

Pittakis 1840, no. 407 (fr. a); Rangabé, *Ant. hell.* 2 no. 392 (fr. a); *IG II.1* no. 64 (fr. a); Koehler 1877, 210-212 (frr. a, b, c); *IG II.5* no. 64 (Michel 1454); Hicks, Hill, *GHI*²; *IG II*².1.2 no. 124; SEG; *Syll.*³ I no. 190; Tod, *GHI II* no. 153; *Staatsverträge II* no. 304; Rhodes, Osborne *GHI* no. 48; Matthaiou 2017. Cf. Foucart 1878; Beloch 1884, 320; Klaffenbach 1947-1948; Harding 1985, no. 65; Knoepfler 1995; Brun 2005.

[- - - - -] κλ[.....]
 [...ἀναγράψαι δὲ τότε τὸ ψηφίσμα τὸ]ν γραμ[ματέα τῆς βολ]
 [ῆς ἐν ἀκροπόλει· δῶναι τὸ ἀργύριον] εἰς τήν [στήλην τὸν τα]
 [μίαν ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα] ἀναλ[ι]σκο[μένων· πρέσβ]
 [εἰς δὲ ἐλέσθαι τὸν δῆμον καὶ πέμψα]ι ἀπολησομένου τὸς ὄρ] 5
 [κος παρὰ τῶν Καρυστίων· ὁμόσαι δ' αὐτοῖς τὸστρ[ατηγούς κ]

⁶ Cf., for example, *IG II*² 111.

⁷ A similar formula is found in *IG I*³ 1453 B/G 7, even if it is restored: κήρυκας δὲ ἐλέσθαι τὸν δῆμον καὶ πέμψαι ἀπαγγελοῦντας.

⁸ Cf. *IG II*² 21, ll. 12-13; *IG II*² 34, ll. 27-28; *IG II*² 42, ll. 15-16; *IG II*² 96, ll. 16-17; *IG II*² 105, ll. 33-34.

[αὶ τοὺς ταξιάρχους καὶ τὴν βουλευτήν· ἐπαινεῖσαι δὲ τὸν δῆμον
 [ὄν τὸν Καρυστίων καὶ τοὺς πρέσβεις τῶν Καρυστίων [καὶ τ]
 [ὄν σὺν] ἔδρον καὶ καλέσ[αι αὐ]τὸς ἐπὶ ξένια εἰς τὸ πρυτανε[
 [ῖον] εἰς αὐρίον· ἐπαινεῖσαι δὲ καὶ Μένωνα τὸν στρατηγὸν κ] 10
 [αὶ] τὸς πρέσβεις τὸς πεμφθέντας εἰς Κάρυστον καὶ καλέσαι
 [αὐ]τὸς ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐς αὐρίον· ἀποδοῦναι δὲ αὐ]
 [τοῖς καὶ ἐφόδια τὸν ταμίαν τοῦ δήμου] ΔΔ δράχμας ἐκ τῶν [ε]
 [ῖς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλίσκομένων] τῶν δήμῳ· ἀποδοῦναι
 [αὐ]τὸν τὰ ταμίαν τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τοῖς πρέσβεσιν τοῖς πρεσβεύ 15
 [σ]ασι εἰς Ἐρέτριαν καὶ Χαλκίδα καὶ ἐς Ἑστίαιαν ΔΔ δραχμ
 ἄς ἐκάστω· ἀποδοῦναι δὲ καὶ τοῖς τὴν συμμαχίαν πρεσβεύ
 σασιν τὸν ταμίαν τῷ δήμῳ Δ δραχμὰς [ἐκάστω· ο]
 ἴδε ὤμοσαν· ἡ βουλή ἢ ἐπ' Ἀγαθοκλέους ἄρχοντος οἱ στρατηγοὶ
 [[Χα]βρίας [Αἰ]ξω(νεύς)], ν Χάρης Ἀγγελῆ(θεν), ν Ἴφικράτης] 20
 Ῥαμνό(σιος),
 Μένων Ποτά(μιος), ν Φιλοχάρης Ῥαμνό(σιος),
 Ἐξηκεστίδης Θεορίκι(ος), ν Ἀλκίμαχος Ἀναγυρ(άσιος),
 Διοκλῆς Ἀλωπεκῆθεν vacat
 vacat 0.12

1-2 κλ[..5.. τὸ δὲ ψηφίσμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει Koehler-Kirchhoff;
 προσαναγεῖν τοὺς πρέσβεις εἰς τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν Hicks-
 Hill || 2-4 γραμματεῖα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν· τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον δῶναι εἰς τὴν
 [στήλην τὸν ταμίαν] Koehler-Kirchhoff || 3-4 δῶναι δὲ τὸν ταμίαν εἰς τὴν
 [ἀναγραφὴν ν ΔΔ ν δραχμὰς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ Knoepfler || 4-5 ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ κατὰ
 ψηφίσματα] ἀναλίσκομένων· ἐλέσθαι δὲ πέντε ἄνδρας οἵτινες ἤξουσιν
 Koehler-Kirchhoff; τῶν δήμῳ· πρέσβεις δὲ εἰς Εὐβοίαν πέμψαι Hicks-Hill;
 ἀναλίσκομένων τῶν δήμῳ· πρέσβεις δὲ εἰς Κάρυστον πέμψαι Matthaiou ||
 5-6 ἀποληψόμενοι τὸς ὄρκους παρὰ τῶν Καρυστίων Koehler-Kirchhoff;
 ἀποληψόμενοι τὸς ὄρκους παρὰ τῶν Εὐβοίων Hicks-Hill; ἀποληψόμενοι
 τὸς ὄρκους παρὰ Καρυστίων Knoepfler; ἀποληψόμενος τοὺς ὄρκους παρὰ
 Καρυστίων Matthaiou || 6-7 οἰοῦσαι δ' αὐτοῖς τὸς ταξιάρχους καὶ τοὺς
 στρατηγούς καὶ τὴν βουλευτήν Koehler-Kirchhoff; τὸς στρατηγούς τὸς
 Ἀθήνησι ὄντας καὶ τὴν Klaffenbach; τὸς στρατηγούς καὶ τοὺς ταξιάρχους
 Matthaiou || 13 Δ Koehler; ν Δ Kirchner; [ΔΔ Koehler-Kirchhoff || 20
 στρατηγοὶ [[Χα]βρίας [Αἰ]ξω], ν Χάρης Ἀγγελῆ, ν Ἴφικράτης] Ῥαμνό
 Koehler-Kirchhoff; στρατηγοὶ: _ _ _ _ _· Χά _ _ _ _· Ῥαμνοῦ· Koehler || 21
 Μένων Ποτά· Φιλοχάρης Ῥαμνοῦ· _ _ _ _ _]ς Koehler; Μένων Ποτά, ν
 Φιλοχάρης Ῥαμνοῦ Koehler-Kirchhoff.

2. The persons mentioned in the decree

At line 20 the name of Chabrias was later erased, but readable traces remain: $\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\iota$ $[[\chi\alpha]\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma [A\acute{\iota}]\xi\omega(\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma)]$, ν $\chi\acute{\alpha}[\rho\eta\varsigma \text{'}\text{Αγγελῆ(θεν)}, \nu$ $\text{'}\text{Ἰφικράτης}]$ $\text{'}\text{Ραμνός(σιος)}$.

According to Kirchner (1903, 314), Execestides of Pallene, who was sent as envoy to Byzantium in 378/7,⁹ would be the same ambassador who supported, along with others, the alliance between Athens and Thessaly of 361/60 BC (*IG II² 116*). This is, however, uncertain. Execestides might be the eponym of a naval symmoria obtained between 356 and 340 BC (*IG II² 1617*; Davies 1971, 4718). Further identifications are uncertain for the high number of persons attested under this name. Alcimachus of Anagyris was general in Thrace in 364 BC (schol. Aeschin. 2.31, Dem. 2.14), and later will be at war against Philip (Harpocr. s.v. *Alcimachos* on Dem. 47.50, 78; Kirchner 1894, 1540). Diocles of Alopece is the eponym of a naval symmoria held between 356 and 340 BC (*IG II² 1615 and 1616*; Davies 1971, 3990)¹⁰.

3. The historical background

The decree can be dated to 357 BC thanks to the reference to Agathocles' archonship (357/6). The historical background it refers to can be reconstructed by means of comparison with the works of Diodorus, Aeschines, and Demosthenes.

After the battle of Leuctra (371 BC)¹¹ the Euboean cities which were members of the Second Athenian league passed from the Athenian control to the Theban-Boeotian one. Relationships between Euboean cities and Boeotia strengthened against Athens: for example, Oropus, an important town on the border between Attica and Boeotia, in 366 BC was conquered by the Thebans with the help of Themison, the tyrant of Eretria. This cooperation between Euboeans and Boeotians¹² has been explained by the development of Euboean federalism during these years, in that federalism would be supported by Boeotians (Bertoli 2013).¹³

⁹ *IG II² 41*, Occhipinti 2018, 117-25.

¹⁰ Cf. Kirchner 1905, coll. 793.

¹¹ In 370 the Euboeans sided with the Thebans on the occasion of the first expedition of Epaminondas against Peloponnese (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.23). Diodorus shows that Euboean contingents participated in the battle of Mantinea siding with Thebes in 362 (Diod. 15.85.2, 6; 15.87.3).

¹² Already in 446 there had been a close cooperation between Boeotians and Euboeans that led the latter to a rebellion. See below, note 27.

¹³ For Wallace 1956, 1-4 and Brunt 1969, 245-65, the confederation was built in 411 BC. For Cawkwell 1978, 42-67, it was built in 411 and dissolved through the peace of Antalcidas; it was later re-built in 341/0 BC. For Picard 1979, 233, followed by Bertoli 2013, 191-223, against Wallace 1956, 1-4, the confederation was first established between 371 and 357 BC.

Though the issue of Euboean federalism is controversial (and this is not the appropriate place to deal with it),¹⁴ the Euboean confederation is well attested in our sources with reference to the 340s BC (Aeschin. 3.89-105; schol. Aeschin. 3.103).

Carystus, like other Euboean cities, strengthened her relationships with Boeotians near the end of the 370s: an inscription, dated to 370 BC (IG XII 9, 7), shows that the city borrowed money from some Thebans and Hestiaeans, in accordance with a common practice in the fourth century which reinforced political and military ties among allied cities.

In 357 BC Euboea withdrew her support for the Theban-Boeotian alliance. Possibly Thebes' weakness following the battle of Mantinea (362 BC) favoured the rise of internal tensions within the island. According to Diodorus, the Euboeans were involved in a civil war and divided between pro-Athenian and pro-Theban. Some Euboeans turned to the Athenians; these, on Timotheus' initiative, sent an army to the island. After a brief combat the two sides signed a peace treaty:

οἱ τὴν Εὐβοίαν κατοικοῦντες **ἔστασίασαν** πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ τῶν μὲν τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς, τῶν δὲ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐπικαλεσαμένων συνέστη **πόλεμος** κατὰ τὴν Εὐβοίαν. γενομένων δὲ πλείονων συμπλοκῶν καὶ ἀκροβολισμῶν ὅτε μὲν οἱ Θηβαῖοι προετέρουν, ὅτε δ' οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν νίκην ἀπεφέροντο. μεγάλη μὲν οὖν παράταξις οὐδεμία συνετελέσθη· τῆς δὲ νήσου διὰ τὸν **ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον** καταφθαρέσις καὶ πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων παρ' ἀμφοτέρων διαφθαρέντων μόγις ταῖς συμφοραῖς νουθετηθέντες εἰς ὁμόνοιαν ἦλθον καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην συνέθεντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους.

The inhabitants of Euboea fell into strife among themselves, and when one party summoned the Boeotians to its assistance and the other the Athenians, war broke out over all Euboea. A good many close combats and skirmishes occurred in which sometimes the Thebans were superior and sometimes the Athenians carried off the victory. Although no important pitched battle was fought to a finish, yet when the island had been devastated by the intestinal warfare and many men had been slain on both sides, at long last admonished by the disasters, the parties came to an agreement and made peace with one another¹⁵ (Diod. 16.7.2).¹⁶

That the island at the beginning of the 350s was under the influence of Athens again is glimpsed in Diodorus and explicitly stated by Aeschines and Demosthenes. According to the latter the truce following the civil war was due to Diocles (21.174), the general mentioned in our inscription. Furthermore, Timotheus is considered the liberator of Euboea (8.74).¹⁷

¹⁴ The character of this confederation is also controversial. Cf. Knoepfler 2015, 158-78.

¹⁵ In the paper the translations are from Perseus.

¹⁶ Diodorus dates the episode to 358/7 BC, but Bengtson 1962, 274-5 places it in 357 BC in consideration of other sources relating to the same event (Dem. 8.74; Aeschin. 3.85).

¹⁷ Cf. Dem. 21 [Contra Mid.] 174: καὶ τῆς μὲν Παράλου ταμιεῦων τότε, ὅτε τὴν ἐπὶ Θηβαίους ἔξοδον εἰς Εὐβοίαν ἐποιεῖσθ' ὑμεῖς, δώδεκα τῆς πόλεως τάλαντ' ἀναλίσκειν ταχθεῖς, ἀξιούντων ὑμῶν πλεῖν καὶ παραπέμπειν τοὺς στρατιώτας οὐκ ἐβοήθησεν, ἀλλ' ἤδη τῶν σπονδῶν γεγονυιῶν, ἃς Διοκλῆς ἐσπέισατο

Aeschines' report is more detailed, and connects the rebellion with the Euboean federal and independentist policy:

ὕμεις γάρ, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἠδικημένοι ὑπὸ Μνησάρχου τοῦ Χαλκιδέως, τοῦ Καλλίου καὶ Ταυροσθένους πατρός ... καὶ πάλιν ὑπὸ Θεμίσωνος τοῦ Ἐρετριέως, ὃς ἡμῶν εἰρήνης οὔσης Ὀρωπὸν ἀφείλετο, τούτων ἐκόντες ἐπιλαθόμενοι, ἐπειδὴ διέβησαν εἰς Εὐβοίαν Θηβαῖοι καταδουλώσασθαι τὰς πόλεις πειρώμενοι, ἐν πέντε ἡμέραις ἐβοηθήσατε αὐτοῖς καὶ ναυσὶ καὶ πεζῇ δυνάμει, καὶ πρὶν τριάκονθ' ἡμέρας διελθεῖν ὑποσπόνδους Θηβαίους ἀφήκατε, κύριοι τῆς Εὐβοίας γενόμενοι, καὶ τὰς τε πόλεις αὐτὰς καὶ τὰς πολιτείας ἀπέδοτε ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως τοῖς παρακαταθεμένοις...

You, fellow citizens, had suffered many serious injuries at the hands of Mnesarchus of Chalcis, father of Callias and Taurosthenes¹⁸ [...] and again at the hands of Themison of Eretria, who in time of peace robbed us of Oropus,¹⁹ but you were willing to overlook these wrongs, and when the Thebans had crossed over into Euboea in an attempt to enslave its cities, in five days you went to their rescue with fleet and troops, and before thirty days had passed you brought the Thebans to terms and sent them home; and being now yourselves in complete control of Euboea, you righteously and justly restored the cities themselves and their constitutions to those who had entrusted them to you ... (Aeschin. 3 [*Contra Ctesiph.*] 85)²⁰

According to scholars, the decree of alliance between Athens and Carystus, examined here, would refer to this historical background, and would prove the entrance of Carystus into the Second Athenian league again. In fact the decree's reference to the synedrion of the allies, which is praised along with the Athenian *demos* and the envoys from Carystus, is very telling. According to Accame, it was possible to admit new members without consulting the synedrion: a deliberation of the Athenian *demos* was sufficient.²¹ Differently,

Θηβαίοις, ἦκεν... “When he was steward of the Paralus at the time of your expedition to Euboea against the Thebans, though he was authorised to expend twelve talents of public money and was instructed by you to sail and convoy the troops, he rendered them no assistance and did not arrive until Diocles had already concluded his truce with the Thebans...” Dem. 8 [*De Cherson.*] 74: ἴστε γὰρ δήπου τοῦθ' ὅτι Τιμόθεός ποτ' ἐκεῖνος ἐν ὑμῖν ἐδημηγόρησεν ὡς δεῖ βοηθεῖν καὶ τοὺς Εὐβοέας σῶζειν, ὅτε Θηβαῖοι καταδουλοῦντ' αὐτούς... “For you know, of course, that the famous Timotheus once harangued you to the effect that you ought to send an expedition to save the Euboeans, when the Thebans were trying to enslave them...”

¹⁸ The two brothers aimed to make Chalcis independent from Athens; in the 340s they were among the proponents of the Euboean confederation's project. Fiehn 1934, 69.

¹⁹ In 366 BC.

²⁰ Diodorus mentions the Boeotians, while Aeschines and Demosthenes remember the Thebans only.

²¹ Other treaties have been taken into account to support this view: *IG II² 42* (alliance of Athens with Metymneans, in 377 BC), *IG II² 96* (alliance with Corcyraeans, Acarnanians, Cephallenians in 375), *IG II² 97* (alliance with Corcyraeans); Accame 1941, 126, 128. Later the same documents have been studied by Cargill 1981, 102-6, and 119-21, who, differently from Accame, maintains that the Athenian council too produced, in parallel, similar resolutions, even though there is no epigraphical proof. As for Corcyra, he even doubts that the island entered the league. Metymna was going to change her bilateral alliance with Athens into her

for Cargill (1981, 101-5) this was not the regular procedure. Before the *demos* deliberated (our inscription), the Carystian envoys had supposedly dealt with the *boule* and the *synedrion*. In other words, the scholar maintains that deliberations of the *synedrion* and the Athenian *boule* had been produced, even though they are not extant today.

It is odd that the literary sources just examined do not mention Euboea's entrance to the Second Athenian league for the second time. In particular, Aeschines, 3.85, who clearly shows a partisan perspective, pro-Athenian, focuses on Euboean internal affairs. He states that Athens suffered from Eretria's hostility in 366 BC, when the latter conquered Oropus and delivered it to the Boeotians. Furthermore, Athens faced Carystus' enmity. Despite all that in 357 she intervened in defence of the Euboeans against the Thebans and, at the end of that war, freed the Euboean cities giving to them their constitutions. Bertoli (2013, 216) wonders whether with the expression "[the Athenians] restored their constitutions" means that the Euboean confederation was dissolved, or simply that Euboean tyrannies, supported from abroad, were broken down.

Yet the language of the orator might be stereotyped, and express Athens' usual practice to install democracies in her allied cities:²² the cities that returned to their alliance with Athens might have returned to their previous constitutions too, those they had in the early 370s, when they entered the Second Athenian league. In other words, this does not imply that the Euboean confederation was dissolved.

Diodorus' text, already examined (16.7.2), wrongly dates the Athenian war in Euboea to the archonship of Cephisodotus (358/7 BC), while our decree was produced under the archonship of Agathocles (357/6 BC). Besides, the prosopography of the decree can help us to establish more precisely the moment when Carystus sided with Athens, and was admitted to the membership of the Athenian league again. The decree mentions the Athenian general Chabrias. In the 360s, along with the king Agesilaus, he served under the Egyptian king Tachos; after Tachos' fall he went back to Athens, and died soon after at Chios as trierarch, in 357. It is therefore certain that the alliance between the Athenians and Carystians is to be dated between July (the archon year started in July) and December 357. This alliance was signed at the end of the war which broke out for the control of Euboea between Athens and the Theban-Boeotian coalition, as is testified by the literary sources just examined.²³

4. Entrance of Carystus and other Euboean cities into the Second Athenian league

Now it is necessary to go back through time, in order to establish the precise moment when Carystus entered the Second Athenian league for the first time. This allows us to broaden the historical picture of the relationships that Athens built with the Euboean cities during the fourth century BC.

membership of the league, and all other member states were involved in this process; the *synedrion* took part in the oaths.

²² This phenomenon is, moreover, well documented in the fifth century BC (cf. Thucydides). Occhipinti 2010, 23-43; Sancho-Rocher 1990, 195-215.

²³ Bertoli 2013, 191-223.

The treaty which allowed Carystus and other Euboean cities to enter the Second Athenian league was signed after the foundation of the league's syndrion. In fact, there were two steps in the forming of that league: the institution of a syndrion of the allies, which is documented in Diodorus' Book 15, and a call for membership: the decree of Aristoteles (Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* nr. 22), dated to March-April 377, contains the formal invitation that Athens addressed to those Greek states that were not under Persian control, to make them join the Athenian league, which was already in place.

Diodorus' passage 15.28, referring to the building of the syndrion, reports:

The Athenians sent their most respected citizens as ambassadors to the cities which were subject to the Spartans, urging them to adhere to the common cause of liberty [...] The first to respond to the plea to secede were the peoples of Chios and Byzantium; they were followed by the peoples of Rhodes and Mytilene and certain others of the islanders [...] The democracy, elated by the loyalty of the cities, established a common council of all the allies and appointed representatives of each state. [4] It was agreed by common consent that, while the council should hold its sessions in Athens, every city great and small should be on an equal basis and enjoy but one vote, and that all should continue independent, accepting the Athenians as leaders.²⁴

Later, at 15.30.1, Diodorus states that several other cities sided with Athens; the first and most willing were the cities of Euboea:

Now many of the other cities for the aforesaid reason were prompted to fall away to Athens; and the first to join in the alliance and the most eager were the cities of Euboea excepting Hestiaea; for Hestiaea, having been treated most generously by the Spartans while she had suffered terribly in war with the Athenians, had very good reason for maintaining unabated her enmity to Athens and for continuing to observe inviolate her pledge to Sparta.²⁵

²⁴ 2. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πρέσβεις τοὺς ἀξιολογωτάτους τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐξέπεμψαν ἐπὶ τὰς ὑπὸ τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους τεταγμένας πόλεις, παρακαλοῦντες ἀντέχεσθαι τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας ... 3. πρῶτοι δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀπόστασιν ὑπήκουσαν Χῖοι καὶ Βυζάντιοι, καὶ μετὰ τούτους Ῥόδιοι καὶ Μυτιληναῖοι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τινὲς νησιωτῶν ... ὁ δὲ δῆμος μετεωρισθεὶς ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν πόλεων εὐνοίᾳ κοινὸν συνέδριον ἀπάντων τῶν συμμάχων συνεστήσαντο, καὶ συνέδρους ἀπέδειξαν ἐκάστης πόλεως. 4. ἐτάχθη δ' ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς γνώμης τὸ μὲν συνέδριον ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις συνεδρεῦειν, πόλιν δὲ ἐπ' ἴσης καὶ μεγάλην καὶ μικρὰν μιᾶς ψήφου κυρίαν εἶναι, πάσας δ' ὑπάρχειν αὐτονόμους, ἡγεμόσι χρωμένας Ἀθηναίοις. Plutarch too speaks of the league's birth (*Pelop.* 15.1): "After this [Sphodrias' raid], the Athenians with the greatest eagerness renewed their alliance with the Thebans, and began hostile operations against Sparta by sea, sailing about and inviting and receiving the allegiance of those Greeks who were inclined to revolt."

²⁵ 1. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων διὰ τὴν εἰρημένην αἰτίαν προεκλήθησαν πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀποκλίνειν, πρῶται δὲ καὶ προθυμότερα συνεμάχησαν αἱ κατὰ τὴν Εὐβοίαν οἰκοῦσαι χωρὶς Ἑστιαίας· αὕτη γὰρ εὐηργετημένη μὲν ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων μεγάλα, πεπολεμημένη δὲ δεινῶς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων, εὐλόγως πρὸς μὲν Ἀθηναίους ἀδιάλυτον ἐφύλαττε τὴν ἔχθραν, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας βεβαίαν τὴν πίστιν διεφύλαττεν.

Thus Hestiaea²⁶ remained under Spartan control, since she continued to enjoy Spartan benefits. Athens' military attack, mentioned in the passage, refers to Pericles' campaign of 446 BC against the island, following a massive rebellion.²⁷ Diodorus' source is probably Ephorus of Cyme, since Stephanus of Byzantium²⁸ testifies that Ephorus called Hestiaea the city that elsewhere was called Histiaea. This city will enter the Athenian league later, following Chabrias' military initiative.²⁹

Diodorus' narrative is problematic and shows several inconsistencies, both chronological and of content. So, for example, Diodorus' reference to the archon year of Callias, 377 BC, clashes with the Spring of 377 found in the decree of Aristoteles (Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* nr. 22): in fact the archon year which starts in July is later than the Spring of 377. As is well known, Ephorus, Diodorus' source here, does not follow any annalistic criterion, but reshapes his narrative while trying to harmonise chronographic and historiographic sources.

Moreover, Diodorus' statement that Hestiaea remained under Spartan influence was judged unreliable, for such a position would clash with the rules of the peace of Antalcidas (387; Accame 1941). But, truly, even though after the peace of Antalcidas there were no hegemonic states, at least officially, Sparta maintained a position of almost undisputed hegemony all over Greece (she controlled Olynthus, Mantinaea, Thebes; only in 379 she lost the Cadmeia). Furthermore, Greek cities, depending on the political direction of their governments, pro-Spartan or pro-Athenian, supported Sparta or Athens. Diodorus' Book 15 devotes particular attention to the issue of hegemonic developments in Greece.³⁰ This, on the one hand, mirrors the historian's *a posteriori* reflection; on the other hand, it shows Diodorus' tendency to give examples of hegemonic states that through military expansion reach the peak of their success, but later, because of the mistreatment of their allies and subjects, decline relentlessly. In the *Bibliothèque* this is described with reference to Athens, Sparta, Syracuse, and Rome.

According to Accame, Diodorus' statement about the Euboean cities' entrance into the Athenian league (above, 15.30.1) is confirmed by the epigraphical document *IG II² 155*.³¹ The inscription preserves the prescript only. This is identical to the prescript of a decree of bilateral alliance that Athens signed with the Chalcidians in 377, *IG II² 44*, through which Chalcis was admitted to the league.³² The prescript was signed under the archonship of

²⁶ According to literary sources, Hestiaea changed her name into Oreus, but continued to be called Hestiaea in coins and inscriptions; Rhodes/Osborne *GHI*, 103-4. Cf. Bertoli 2013, 199-200, and Lasagni 2010, 371-90.

²⁷ Thuc. 1.114.2, Plut. *Per.* 23.3, Diod. 12.7: in 446 Euboeans and Boeotians fought against Athens in a concerted action; Pericles campaigned against Euboea, conquering Hestiaea and moving her inhabitants elsewhere. Bearzot 2013, 118-23. Cf. Bertoli 2013, 199.

²⁸ Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἱστίαια (=FGrHist 70, F 232).

²⁹ The name of Hestiaea is inscribed in the lateral side of the decree of Aristoteles (Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* nr. 22) at line 114. Since the cities are listed according to the date of their admittance to the league, Hestiaea was one of the last to adhere. After the publication of the decree of Aristoteles, further names were added to the stele. Dion and Athenae Diades, near Hestiaea, north of Euboea, probably entered the league by the end of 377, being registered at lines 88 and 90 respectively. Cf. Bertoli 2013, 204. See below.

³⁰ At ch. 23 it is told that in 380 BC, after Spartan victory over Olynthus, the Spartans appear as very powerful (*hegemones*) all over Greece, κατὰ γῆν ἅμα καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν.

³¹ Accame 1941, 72.

³² The content of *IG II² 44* recalls the text of the decree of Aristoteles, Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* nr. 22. Yet, despite the reference to the dogma of the allies in *IG II² 44*, it seems that that treaty was signed between

Nausinicus, during Leontis' prytany; the secretary was Aristoteles, the son of Euphiletus, from the deme of Acharnae. While Schweigert judged the text of *IG II² 155* a copy of the treaty of alliance between Athens and Chalcis (*IG II² 44*),³³ for Accame that document would refer to the alliance between Athens and a few Euboean populations, such as Eretrians, Arethusians, Carystians, and Icians.³⁴ Their names were later cut on the stone of the decree of Aristoteles (Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* nr. 22) by the same stone-cutter who wrote the name of the Chalcidians.³⁵ Still the issue whether the epigraph *IG II² 155* is a copy of the decree of alliance between Athens and Chalcis of 377 remains open.

As is known, the registration of the member states' names on the stele of Nausinicus (Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* nr. 22) was made by different stone-cutters. The first, probably the same who cut the decree's text, also cut the first five names of the left column (Chians, Mytileneans, Metymneans, Rhodians, Byzantines, ll. 79-83), as well as the name of the Thebans at the beginning of the right column. The following names belong to different handwriting. Since the name of the Chalcidians was cut when the first members had been registered (Chians, Mytileneans, Metymneans, Rhodians, Byzantines, Thebans), the Chalcidians along with other Euboeans (Eretrians, Arethusians, Carystians, and Icians ll. 80-84 right col.) entered the league after March 377, that is, the date of the decree of Aristoteles. Moreover, Diodorus mentions the Euboean cities at ch. 15.30.1, that is, after reporting the first states that were admitted to the league, such as Chians, Byzantines, Rhodians, Mytileneans, (15.28.2). This is a clue that the Euboean cities obtained their membership in a second step, after the synedrion was in place.

As for the Arethusians, according to Accame,³⁶ followed by other scholars,³⁷ they would be inhabitants of a city of the Chalcidian Peninsula, of Euboean origin. This identification is uncertain for several reasons. The nomenclature of Arethusa belongs to Euboean toponomastic (other than to several other toponomastics),³⁸ being a source near

Chalcis and Athens only: it looks like a kind of bilateral alliance which recognises the existence of the league. Cargill 1981, 102-6 e 119-21 explains this oddity with the fact that Chalcis started her relationships with Athens in a period when this meant to become a member of the league; presumably for this reason the mention of the synedrion was omitted from the treaty (it was considered unnecessary).

³³ Schweigert 1938b, 626.

³⁴ The Icians lived in the most eastern of the three islands that are offshore from the Peninsula of Magnesia.

³⁵ Accame 1941, 76 recognised three stone-cutters.

³⁶ The Arethusians, who in the stele are mentioned between Eretrians and Carystians, according to Accame 1941, 72-3, might not be connected to Arethusa in Euboea, but to a Macedonian city on the border with Thrace: by mistake Stephanus of Byzantium would consider as city the source Arethusa in Carystus.

³⁷ Knoepfler 1971, 239. Flensted-Jensen, Hansen, Raaflaub 2000. Cf. Strabo 7.331.

³⁸ The ancient tradition records many sources under the name of Arethusa (Euboea, Boeotia, Argos, Smyrna, Cephalenia, Ithaca, Elis, Syracuse, Squillace), as well as several cities (in Macedon, Euboea, Syria). Hirschfeld 1895, 679-80. Euboea: Eur. *Iph.* 170, Dicaearch. *Hellen.* 26, Strabo 1.58, 10.449; Athen. 7.278c, 8.331e, Suda s.v. Ἀρέθουσα. Boeotia: Plin. *HN.* 4.25, according to Solino 12 near Thebes. Argos, Peloponnese: schol. Hom. *Od.* 13, vv. 406-408. Smyrna, Asia Minor: Didym., Eust. and schol. Hom. cit. A possible source for Cephalenia: schol. Theocr. 1.117. Ithaca: *Od.* 13, vv. 406-408. Elis: schol. Pind. *Nem.* 1.1; Ovid. *Met.* 5.573 ff.; Paus. 5.7.2; Serv. *Aen.* 3.694. Hülsen 1895, 680-1. Syracuse: Ibycus in schol. Theocr. 1.117; Pind. *Nem.* 1.1; Polyb. 12.4; Strabo 6.270; Plin. *HN.* 2.225 and 31.55; Sen. *N.Q.* 3.26 and 6.8; Paus. 5.7.3; Mela 2.117; Luc. 3.177. Squillace: Cassiod. *Var.* 8.32. Hirschfeld 1895, 679-80. City in Macedon: Strab. 7.331 fr. 36; Scylax 66; Scymn, 635. City in Euboea: Rangabé 1855, nr. 381 b, Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* nr. 22. Benzinger 1895, 680. City in Syria: Strabo 16.753, Plin. *HN.* 5.82, Itin. Ant. 188, 194; Tab. Peut. Geogr. Rav. 2.15, Plut. *Ant.* 37, Jos. *Ant. Iud.* 14.75; *bell. Iud.* 1.7.7; App. *Syr.* 57; Zosim. 1.52.

Chalcis, mentioned by Euripides (*Iph. Aul.* 170), and Strabo (449 10.1, 13). Stephanus of Byzantium defines Ἀρέθουσα as a “city in Syria, Thrace, Euboea, and source in Sicily. It is also a source in Ithaca.” Yet, aside from these different geographical traditions, the mention of Arethusa within a group of Euboean cities in the stele of Nausinicus offers a good reason to believe that that has an independent status of *polis* in Euboea: in fact Arethusa is listed among the Athenian allies. Furthermore, it must be recalled that states were registered in the stele of Nausinicus according to a geographical criterion, depending on the military acquisitions made by Athenian generals. And the geographical closeness between Eretrians, Arethusians, Carystians, and Icians supports the view that the Arethusa of the decree of Aristoteles (Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* nr. 22) was indeed an Euboean city. There are further clues showing diplomatic relationships between Athenians and Arethusians in this period: a fragment of a decree dated to 377 honours the people from Arethusa (Ἀρεθουσίους ε) (l. 7).³⁹ There could be some connection between the *Arethousioi* honoured by the Athenians in this decree and the *Arethousioi* who donated a crown; these latter are mentioned in an inventory of Athena’s treasury dating to 350 BC (*IG II²* 1437). It seems reasonable that the same population is in question. However, it is not possible to say whether Arethusa was still a member of the Athenian league, or not. In fact, between 354 and 345 BC Athens conferred awards (crowns) to both member states and non-members.⁴⁰

It is possible to further specify the time frame for the admittance of the Euboeans to the Second Athenian league, that is, the period between March 377 (the date of the decree of Aristoteles, Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* no. 22) and the time preceding Chabrias’ departure to Euboea. The Athenians, annoyed by a Spartan garrison at Hestiaea, sent an army to the island. The *terminus ante quem* is given by this enterprise led by Chabrias. According to Diodorus, the Athenians sent Chabrias to Euboea in order to protect ‘their allies’ (Diod. 15.30, 2). This presupposes that the Euboean cities had already adhered to the Athenian league.⁴¹ Chabrias’ departure to Euboea cannot be dated before June-July 377, since before that time the general was involved in a military campaign against Agesilaus in Boeotia (Diod. 15.32)⁴². After Chabrias’ Euboean expedition Hestiaea was admitted to the Athenian league, one of the last cities to adhere to it.

5. The decree, or the bilateral alliance between Athens and Carystus

This last section discusses the typology of alliance established by our decree, in consideration of the reflections thus far.

From lines 10-11 it is learned that the general Menon⁴³ and the Athenian envoys will be sent to Carystus to receive the oaths. This leads to hypothesise that the decree refers to a

³⁹ Cargill 1981 and Rhodes/Osborne *GHI*, 103. Woodhead 1997, no. 43.

⁴⁰ Rhodes 2010, 164.

⁴¹ For Plutarch, *Mor.* 350, the Euboeans were admitted to the league through Timotheus’ intervention.

⁴² On Chabrias’ campaign in Euboea cf. Plut. *De glor. Ath.* 8.350f; here Plutarch dates to the 370s Timotheus’ activity in Euboea aiming to liberate the island. This is to be correctly dated to 357; cf. Dem. 8.74; Diod. 16.7.2; Accame 1941, 71, note 2.

⁴³ Engels 1999, 1250.

bilateral alliance signed by Athens and Carystus; it is moreover possible that this alliance is the result of previous negotiations with the syndedrion of the allies.⁴⁴

It is striking that this kind of alliance was signed with Carystus only, and not with other Euboean cities too. In fact this is a time when Athens was damaged by the Theban-Boeotian expansion in Euboea, as well as by the Social War; therefore, she needed to maintain her control over a strategic area, geographically very close to Attica, as Euboea was. One might suppose that Carystus was one of the most important cities in Euboea from a geopolitical point of view; or this city alone was able to move alliances, changing balances of power; or—and this is what I suggest—the Athenian alliance with Carystus was part of a broader system of alliances that Athens had been building with several other Euboean cities.

That Carystus was a city with strategical importance may be plausible. From Herodotus 6.99 it is learned that the Persian fleet landed to Carystus in June 490 BC: clearly the city, because of her location, on the southern extremity of Euboea, halfway between Athens and Eretria, had a safe harbour. However, this does not mean that that city alone was able to change balances of power in Euboea: for example, just before the battle of Salamis, Carystus sided with the Persians, (Hdt. 8.66.2),⁴⁵ while Eretrians, Chalcidians and Styrians remained by Athens' side (Hdt. 8.46.2, 4).

Bengtson titled this decree “Bündnis Athens mit den Städten von Euböa: Eretria, Chalkis, Karystos, und Histiaia”, suggesting that the inscription contained references to a multiple alliance between Athens and various Euboean cities.⁴⁶ Differently, according to Cawkwell, this decree would imply that Athens had signed bilateral treaties with Carystus, Eretria, Chalcis and Hestiaea. The scholar maintains that “separate treaties were made”, but, unfortunately, he does not add further explanation to clarify the issue⁴⁷. Rhodes/Osborne *GHI* no. 48 title the inscription “Alliance between Athens and Carystus, 357”, but they do not discuss the relationship between Athens and the other Euboean cities that are mentioned in the decree.

It is possible to offer some support to Cawkwell's suggestion. Lines 15-16 mention envoys—they were certainly Athenian—⁴⁸ who had been to Eretria, Chalcis, and Hestiaea to carry out some diplomatic tasks, and have now returned. This leads us to believe that our decree was one of the treaties of alliance which Athens signed *separately* with several Euboean cities, in view of readmitting them into the league, even though, unfortunately, there is no epigraphic evidence for this. In favour of this idea, however, one may mention an Attic decree, *IG II²* 125, which offered formal guarantees to Eretria. It proves that in the early 350s Athens allied with various Euboean cities, other than with Carystus. In fact, Bengtson (1962, 275)⁴⁹ judged this decree coeval to Athens' treaty of alliance with Carystus, dating it to 357 BC (Tod, *GHI II* nr. 154). The text of *IG II²* 125 shows that Eretria had been attacked by member states of the Second Athenian league (ll. 6-7), and the Athenians

⁴⁴ Cf. above, §3.

⁴⁵ For this reason Carystus was heavily punished by Athens. The encounter is dated to 472 BC. Thuc. 1.98, Hdt. 9.105.

⁴⁶ Bengtson 1962, no. 304, followed by Harding 1985, 65.

⁴⁷ Cawkwell 1978, 45.

⁴⁸ Harris 1999, 127-8, clarifies that the language employed in decrees is very precise: the verb ἦκω indicates envoys from abroad, while the Athenians going abroad are referred to by the verb πέμπω.

⁴⁹ Followed by Bertoli 2013, 217.

decreed to punish those responsible in order to prevent similar cases in the future (ll. 9-14). The envoys from Carystus are described as supporters of the Eretrians, presumably along with the Chalcidians (βοηθήσ[αντ]ας Ἐ[ρ]ε[τριεῦσιν Χαλκιδέας καὶ Κα]ρυστίους [καὶ Καλλίαν Χαλκιδέα τὸν Εὐβοέων στρ[α]τηγόν, ll. 20-23). This implies that Euboean cities were in close relationship with Athens in that period. Despite this, however, Bengtson's date for the decree has been refused by Rhodes/Osborne (*GHI* nr. 69) and Lambert.⁵⁰ They date the epigraph to 343 BC, or, alternatively, to 348 BC.⁵¹ For Rhodes/Osborne such an attack against Eretria would be misplaced in 357, in that though they had rebelled (Social War; Diod. 16.21.2),⁵² Athenian former allies would avoid damaging a *polis*, such as Eretria, which was so close to Athens. Yet it seems hard to date the decree *IG II² 125* to 343 or 348, since in the 340s relationships between Athens and Eretria deteriorated, and Eretria was under Macedonian influence, along with Oreus. From Aeschines, 3.91-103, one learns, for example, that in 343 Chalcis obtained Athenian support on the occasion of an expedition that she led against Eretria⁵³. Furthermore, Diodorus' passage, examined above (16.7.2), shows the existence of Atheno-Euboean connections. In 357 during the Atheno-Boeotian war, the whole of Euboea was involved in a civil war (στασιάζω, ἐμφύλιος πόλεμος): some cities were pro-Athenian, other pro-Theban. All received external support, from Athens or Thebes. Therefore, after that war, Athens presumably allied, other than with Carystus, also with those cities which had pursued a pro-Athenian policy.

In consideration of the discussion thus far, and supposing the view that *IG II² 125* dates to 357 BC, one can infer that in the early 350s Athens forged political ties with several Euboean cities, and signed bilateral alliances with them, like that with Carystus, discussed in this paper.

To sum up, the city of Carystus, which, along with other Euboean cities, became a member state of the Second Athenian league between March and June 377, came under the Theban-Boeotian control in 371. She returned to Athenian alliance in 357, as the decree we have just examined shows. It is, moreover, highly plausible that in 357 Athens signed several bilateral treaties of alliance with other Euboean cities too, which, unfortunately, are not extant.

EGIDIA OCCHIPINTI

UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO

⁵⁰ Lambert 2012, 185-6.

⁵¹ Rhodes/Osborne *GHI*, 348. Knoepfler 1984, 152-61, dated the decree to 343 BC, while Dreher 1995, 156-80, to 348 BC. In 348 the Athenians attacked Eretrian territory with the consequent exit of Euboea from the Athenian league and influence (Plut. *Phoc.* 12-14; Dem. 21.132-135, 161-168, 197, e 5.5). Knoepfler dated the decree to 343, when its proponent Hegesippus, who was an influential politician at Athens, was trying to regain the island diplomatically. Aeschines (88-94) states that in 341 Callias of Chalcis persuaded the Athenians to enter into an agreement which was different from their past alliances: Chalcis became an ally of Athens, but remained a member of the Euboean league, and did not adhere to the Athenian league. Cf. Aeschin. 2.12 e 120; 3.86-88. Dem. 4.17 and 37; 5.10; 18.71, 79, 81, 87; 19.22.

⁵² Cawkwell 1962, 34-49; Peake 1994, 130-2.

⁵³ Cf. Cawkwell 1978, 42-67.

Bibliography

- Agora XVI** = Woodhead, A.G. (1997). *The Athenian Agora*. Vol. XVI, *Inscriptions: The Decrees*. Princeton.
- Davies**, *APF* = Davies, J.K. (1971). *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.* Oxford.
- Hicks, Hill GHI2** = Hicks, E.L.; Hill, G.F. (1901). *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Second edition. Oxford.
- IALD* = Lambert, S.D. (2012). *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1 BC. Epigraphical Essays*. Leiden.
- IG II.1** = Koehler, U.; Kirchoff, A. (eds) (1877). *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. II, *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora Pars I, Decreta continens*. Berlin (nos. 1-641).
- IG II.5** = Koehler, U.; Kirchoff, A. (eds) (1895). *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. II, *Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora Pars 5, Supplementa*. Berlin.
- IG II.2.1.2** = Kirchner, J. (ed.) (1916). *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Voll. II et III, *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores, Pars I, Decreta continens*. Fasc. 2, *Decreta anno 229/8 a. Chr. posteriora. Accedunt leges sacrae*. Ed. altera. Berlin (nos. 1-1369 in fasc. 1 e 2).
- PA* = Kirchner, J. (1901). *Prosopographia Attica*. Berlin.
- PA II* = Kirchner, J. (1903). *Prosopographia Attica*. Berlin.
- Rangabé**, *Ant. hell.* 2 = Rangabé, A.R. (1855). *Antiquités helléniques*, vol. 2. Athens. <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008589029>.
- Rhodes, Osborne GHI** = Rhodes, P.J.; Osborne, R. (eds) (2003). *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 B.C.* Oxford.
- Staatsverträge II* = Bengtson, H. (ed.) (1962). *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*, Bd. II. München.
- Syll.3 I** = Dittenberger, W. (ed.) (1915). *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Bd. I, 3. Ausg. Leipzig.
- Tod**, *GHI II* = Tod, M.N. (ed.) (1948). *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Vol. II, *From 403 to 323 B.C.* Oxford.
- Accame, S. (1941). *La lega ateniese del sec. IV a.C.* Rome.
- Bearzot, C. (2013). “Da isolani a continentali. L’Eubea tra la fine del VI e la fine del V secolo a.C.” Bearzot, C.; Landucci Gattinoni, F. (eds), *Tra mare e continente: l’isola d’Eubea*. Milan, 105-35.
- Beck., H. (1998). s.v. “Iphikrates.” *NPau* 5, coll. 1098-99.
- Beloch, J. (1884). *Die attische Politik seit Perikles*. Leipzig.
- Benzinger, A. (1895). s.v. “Arethusa.” *RE* II.1, coll. 680.
- Bertoli, M. (2013). “L’Eubea nella prima metà del IV secolo a.C. tra aspirazione alla libertà e dipendenza da Atene.” Bearzot, C.; Landucci Gattinoni, F. (eds), *Tra mare e continente: l’isola d’Eubea*. Milan, 191-223.

- Brun, P. (2005). *Impérialisme et démocratie à Athènes: inscriptions de l'époque classique, c. 500-317 av. J.-C.* Paris.
- Brunt, P.A. (1969). "Euboea in the Time of Philip II." CQ, 19, 245-65.
- Cargill, J. (1981). *The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance?*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London.
- Cawkwell, G.L. (1962). "Notes on the Social War." C&M, 23, 34-49.
- Cawkwell, G.L. (1978). "Euboea in the Late 340s." Phoenix, 32, 42-67.
- Dreher, M. (1995). *Hegemon und Symmachoi: Untersuchungen zum Zweiten Athenischen Seebund.* Berlin; New York.
- Engels, J. (1999). s.v. "Menon." NPauLy 7, coll. 1250.
- Fiehn, K. (1934). s.v. "Taurosthenes." RE V A.1, coll. 69.
- Flensted-Jensen, P.; Hansen, M.H.; Raaflaub, K.A. (2000). *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis.* Stuttgart.
- Foucart, P. (1878). "Note sur la chronologie de l'archontat de Agathoclès." RA, 35, 227-32.
- Harding, P. (1985). *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus.* Cambridge.
- Harris, E.M. (1999). "IG I3 227 and the So-Called Peace of Epilykos." ZPE, 126, 123-8.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1895). s.v. "Arethusa." RE II.1, coll. 679-80.
- Hülsem, C. (1895). s.v. "Arethusa." RE II.1, coll. 680-1.
- Kahrstedt, U. (1954). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Thrakischen Chersones.* Baden-Baden.
- Kirchner, J. (1894). s.v. "Alkimachos." RE I.2, coll. 1540.
- Kirchner, J. (1905). s.v. "Diokles." RE V.1, coll. 793.
- Klaffenbach, G. (1947-48). "Review of A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions. Vol. II. From 403 to 323 B.C. Oxford. Clarendon Press 1948, Tod, M.N." DLZ, 66-9, coll. 498-503.
- Knoepfler, D. (1971). "La date de l'annexion de Styra par Erétrie." BCH, 95, 223-44.
- Knoepfler, D. (1984). "Le décret d'Hégésippe d'Athènes pour Erétrie." MH, 41, 152-61.
- Knoepfler, D. (1995). "Une paix de cent ans et un conflit en permanence: étude sur les relations diplomatiques d'Athènes avec Erétrie et les autres cités de l'Eubée au IV^e siècle av. J.-C." Frézouls, E.; Jacquemin, A. (eds), *Les relations internationales = Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (15-17 Juin 1993)*. Paris, 309-64.
- Knoepfler, D. (2015). "The Euboian League - An 'Irregular' Koinon?." Beck, H.; Funke, P. (eds), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge, 158-78.
- Koehler, U. (1877). "Attische Psephismen aus der ersten Hälfte des vierten Jahrhunderts." MDAI(A), 2, 210-12.
- Lasagni, C. (2010). "Histiaia-Oreos e l'insediamento ateniese." ASAA, 88, s. III, 10, 371-90.
- Matthaiou, A.P. (2017). "Παρατηρήσεις εις έκδεδομένα Ἀττικά ψηφίσματα." ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΙΟΝ, 6, 103-8.
- Occhipinti, E. (2010). "Political Conflicts in Chios Between the End of the 5th and the First Half of the 4th Century B.C." AHB, 24, 23-43.

- Occhipinti, E. (2018). "Trattato di alleanza tra Atene e Bisanzio." *Axon*, 2(1), 117-25. DOI <http://doi.org/10.30687/Axon/2532-6848/2018/01/010>.
- Occhipinti, E. (2020). "Trattato di alleanza tra Atene e Caristo." *Axon*, 4(1), 111-30. DOI <http://doi.org/10.30687/Axon/2532-6848/2020/01/006>.
- Peake, S. (1994). "A Note on the Dating of the Social War." *LCM*, 130-2.
- Picard, O. (1979). *Chalcis et la Confédération eubéenne. Étude de numismatique et d'histoire, IVe-Ier siècle av. J.-C.* Athènes. Paris.
- Pittakis, K.S. (1840). "n. 407." *AEph*, 19, 337-8.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2010). *A History of the Classical Greek World: 478-323 BC*. West Sussex.
- Sancho-Rocher, L. (1990). "El δῆμος y la στάσις en la obra de Tucídides." *Ktèma*, 15, 195-215.
- Schmitz, W. (1997a). s.v. "Chabrias." *NPauily* 2, coll. 1080-1.
- Schmitz, W. (1997b). s.v. "Chares." *NPauily* 2, coll. 1097-8.
- Schweigert, E. (1938a). "Inscriptions from the North Slope of the Acropolis." *Hesperia*, 7, 264-310.
- Schweigert, E. (1938b). "Epigraphic Notes." *Hesperia*, 7, 626-7.
- Schweigert, E. (1939). "Greek Inscriptions (1-13)." *Hesperia*, 8(1), 1-47.
- Wallace, W.P. (1956). *The Euboian League and Its Coinage*. New York.