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INTRODUCTION

The chronology of events in the years between 478 and 431 B.C. in the Greek world present many problems for modern scholars. Our ancient sources for this interval are few in number and insufficient in accuracy, as these years, 478-431, represent the gap between the narratives of Herodotus and Thucydides. The early years of this period, the Pentekontaetia, are very important to our understanding of the Athenian Empire, but are extremely difficult to reconstruct. Our primary source for the Pentekontaetia is Thucydides' excursus on this age.\textsuperscript{1} Our lack of reliable contemporary sources to supplement Thucydides' narrative of the Pentekontaetia is the primary reason for this confusion. The problems of Thucydides' account are numerous, primarily the rapidity with which he describes events and his lack of an absolute chronology. Thucydides describes events as happening one after another, giving no indication of dates, only using a variety of particles to connect his narrative.\textsuperscript{2}

Besides Thucydides our reliable contemporary information concerning the formation of the Delian League and its development in the Pentekontaetia is scarce. The earlier historian, Herodotus, makes several

\textsuperscript{1}Thuc. 1.89-118.
\textsuperscript{2}This can be seen most clearly in 1.98, which will be discussed in Chapter Two. For a detailed discussion of Thucydides' use of particles in his Pentekontaetia see: A. W. Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1 (Oxford 1945), 361-2. See also: P. Stadter, "The Form and Content of Thucydides' Pentekontaetia (1.89-117)," GRBS 34 (1993), 71-2.
years of the League. Another valuable piece of information concerning this period is the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*. This treatise on the Athenian constitution was written in the late 4th century, probably by one of Aristotle's students. Although not contemporary with Thucydides, one can also glean a good deal of information from several of Plutarch's *Vitae*, which were written in the early 2nd century of the Christian era. Unfortunately, some of this information cannot be confirmed from other sources and must often be used cautiously. A full account of the Pentecontaetia can be found in the history of Diodorus Siculus, the Greek historian of the 1st century B.C. The problems with Diodorus' account are well known and his account also must be used very carefully. Fortunately some of Diodorus' information can be confirmed from several fragments of the 4th century B.C. historian Ephorus, who was probably Diodorus' primary source for the Pentecontaetia. There are also several other fragmentary sources that can be used to help in a reconstruction of the chronology of the Pentecontaetia. Among these are various *scholia* as well as fragments of some Atthidographers, who were compilers of Attic history. It is clear, however, that Thucydides is our best source for these years and any worthy examination of the period must begin with his account. This presents a number of immediate problems as

---

3In 7.107 Herodotus describes the siege of Eion and in 9.105 he refers to the war against Carystus.
5Diod. Sic. 11.39-12.28.
7For the fragments of Ephorus' History see: F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin 1923-30; Leiden 1940-58), Ephorus 70 F 1-238 (hereafter *FGrH*), for an introduction and commentary see *FGrH Vol. 2C* (Berlin 1926), 22-103.
we have seen. Therefore, to use Thucydides properly one must know how to go about reading this elusive source.

In addition to the primary literature this study will focus on the secondary literature concerning the early history of the Delian League. Over the past fifty years much of the history of the Pentecontaetia has been re-examined. This is primarily a result of two major studies in Thucydides and the Pentecontaetia. The first of these was the publication of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* by B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor. Work on this four volume history was begun in 1939. The third volume, published in 1950, presents the narrative history proposed by these three authors as a result of their earlier work. Shortly after work on *The Athenian Tribute Lists* was started another major study was published. This was the first volume of *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* by A. W. Gomme published in 1945. These two works revitalized the study of Athens in the fifth century, and all students of this period owe a great debt to these four scholars.

The primary contribution of these two works has been the new studies made as a result of their findings. Scholars have been able to re-interpret the evidence and this has changed the view of the fifth century. The first landmark study of the fifth century following the publications mentioned above was Russell Meiggs' *The Athenian Empire*, published in 1972. For the most part Meiggs followed the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* and Gomme, but his work did help to advance the study of the Pentecontaetia.

In the time since Meiggs' work was published many new important studies have been made that have changed the traditional views of the
Pentecontaetia and Thucydides. Philip Deane’s *Thucydides' Dates:* 465-431 B. C. paved the way for new interpretations to be made by challenging the methodologies of the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* and Gomme. Deane’s work, also published in 1972, challenged all proposed chronologies of the fifth century. His work has been well received and has led to many new and even more radical chronologies. Another recent work of note is Ernst Badian’s *From Plataea to Potidæa,* a collection of five of his previously published articles dealing with the Pentecontaetia and a new article dealing with the same period. Many of the ideas and views expressed in my work are a result of these two important studies. These new trends in the study of the Pentecontaetia will be examined closely. The conclusions I hope to reach here are consistent with the current methodologies of reading Thucydides and studying the Pentecontaetia.

In this thesis I will examine the primary literature dealing with the Delian League’s formation and the chronology of the League’s early activities. I will be using the military and political career of Cimon as the common thread by which to examine these events. Cimon is by far the dominant figure of the League’s first years and was also the dominant political figure in Athens until the time of his ostracism. Even in ostracism his influence on Athenian politics was felt, so much so that he was recalled to Athens. This thesis will cover the time period from the Delian League’s formation in 478/7 to the time of Cimon’s recall from ostracism and his final military success at the battle of Cyprian Salamis and his death at that battle in 451/0. This period, at least until 461, can certainly be classified as the Age of Cimon. After Cimon’s ostracism and

---

8All translations here are my own unless otherwise noted.
his death some ten years later the Delian League changed drastically. In 454/3 the League's Treasury was moved from Delos to Athens, thus marking a significant step on the road to imperialism. The League's objectives were also seriously challenged after Cimon's death when the Peace of Callias was signed between Athens and Persia in 449. For these reasons I have chosen to confine this study of the Delian League to the period before the League was transformed by the Athenians into the Empire. In Chapter One I will examine the Delian League's foundation and the League's Charter. Chapter Two will involve an examination of the League's military activities under Cimon's leadership and the chronology of these events.
CHAPTER I

After the defeat of the Persians at Plataea and Mycale in 479, the Greek poleis that had fought against the Persians were faced with a number of questions, foremost among these was how to carry out the war against the Persians. This group of poleis that had united against the Persians is known to modern historians as the Hellenic League. This League was made up of poleis from the Peloponnese, central Greece, Attica, and some Aegean islands. An inscribed list of these poleis is preserved on the Serpent Column and in a description of an inscription at Olympia recorded by Pausanias.¹ There is, however, some debate as to whether or not this list includes all the members of the Hellenic League.

The authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists believe that it is complete and that the inscription can be further broken down into three separate groups. These three groups include the hegemony of Sparta and two additional smaller hegemonies, that of Athens and of Corinth.² Another interpretation of the Serpent Column and the membership of the Hellenic League has been made by P. A. Brunt. In his article Brunt argues

¹For the Serpent Column see: R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B. C. (Oxford 1969), no. 27. Another inscription, this one was from Olympia, that records the poleis of the Hellenic League has been recorded by Pausanias, 5.23.1-2. See also: Hdt. 7.202-3.1, 8.1, 43-8, 82, 9.28. The total number of poleis inscribed on the column is thirty-one, while Pausanias names twenty-seven.

that the Hellenic League was much larger than the names on the Serpent Column alone. Brunt believes that many poleis from central Greece, including Thebes, were originally members of the Hellenic League, but were forced to submit to the Persians after the battle at Thermopylae, thus terminating their membership in the Hellenic League.\(^3\) It is not impossible to believe that these poleis were at one time members of the Hellenic League. This would help to explain the allies motivation in wanting to punish these poleis if they had not only medized, but also had betrayed the Hellenic League. These were a number of poleis throughout the Greek world that had helped the Persians in their war against the Greeks.

From its inception, control of the Hellenic League had been in the hands of the Spartans, the acknowledged military leaders of the Greek world.\(^4\) The fleet decided immediately following the battle of Mycale to destroy the bridge that had been built across the Hellespont, and in this way help to prevent another Persian invasion into Europe. When the fleet reached Abydus, where the bridge had been, they found that the bridge was already dismantled and that the cables had been moved.\(^5\) Despite their responsibilities to the Hellenic League, the Spartans and their Peloponnesian allies, led by their commander Leotychides, decided to leave for home after they had failed in capturing the cables.\(^6\) The Athenians, on the other hand, remained in the east with their Ionian and Hellespontine allies and continued the war against the Persians. The first

---

\(^3\) P. A. Brunt, "The Hellenic League Against Persia," *Historia* 2 (1953-4), 143.


\(^5\) Hdt. 9.114.1.

\(^6\) Thuc. 1.89.1-2; Hdt. 9.114.2; Diod. Sic. 11.37.4.
action taken by the Athenians at this time was the siege and capture of Sestus, and a small Persian garrison in the Chersonese. While the siege was in progress some Athenians went off in pursuit of the cables, which had been removed to Cardia. After taking the city early in the spring of 478 and retrieving the cables the Athenians and their allies also returned to their homes.

Perhaps the most important question facing the Hellenic League after the Persian Wars was how to handle the medizing poleis. This was a difficult question for the members of the Hellenic League to answer. While some form of punishment was needed any drastic measures could have upset the balance of the Greek world between the two strongest poleis, Sparta and Athens. In addition to upsetting the political balance in Greece, the number of poleis that had gone over to the Persians was so large that it would have created logistical problems for the Hellenic League. The Spartans proposed that all citizens of these cities be expelled from Greece. The most prominent city among the medizing poleis was Thebes. Therefore, the Hellenic League's army marched on Thebes after the battle of Plataea. After a siege of about twenty days the allies accepted the surrender of a few Theban citizens and ended the siege. The Greeks of the Hellenic League took these Thebans to Isthmia where they were executed.

In addition to the medizers on the mainland the Hellenic League was confronted with the question of what to do with the East Greeks in

---

7Thuc. 1.89.2; Hdt. 9.114.2-121; Diod. Sic. 11.37.4-5.
8Hdt. 9.115, 121.
9Herodotus provides us with a list of the medizing polies at 7.132.1.
10Hdt. 9.86-8.
Ionia and the Hellespont who had recently been liberated from the Persians. The Spartans proposed that the East Greeks be resettled in mainland Greece, specifically in the poleis of the expelled medizers.\textsuperscript{11} This plan was opposed by the Athenians, because of their kinship with the Ionians. Other motives can be attributed to the Athenians in their defense for keeping the Ionians in their native land. I believe that the Athenians by this time already were hoping to establish some sort of naval hegemony of their own, and this was one way of laying out the groundwork for such an endeavor.

Another well documented incident that set Athenian and Spartan interests apart at the close of the Persian Wars was the re-fortification of Athens. It was the Spartan position that no poleis outside of the Peloponnese should rebuild walls that had been destroyed by the Persians. By not re-fortifying areas outside of the Peloponnese, the Spartans argued, they would deprive the Persians of a fortified base if they invaded Greece again.\textsuperscript{12} This, of course, angered the Athenians who had already seen their city taken and sacked twice. Through the cleverness of Themistocles the Athenians were able to rebuild their walls.\textsuperscript{13} While this at first angered the Spartans they relented and allowed the Athenians to carry out their plans unopposed. The issue of Athens' walls is not important here, but, the incident does illustrate the fact that the Athenians were looking to the future, and possibly preparing for an inevitable conflict with either Persia or Sparta.

\textsuperscript{11}Hdt. 9.106.2-5; Diod. Sic. 11.37.1-3.
\textsuperscript{12}Thuc.1.90.1-2.
\textsuperscript{13}Thuc. 1.89.3-93.2; Lys. 12.63; [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 23.4; Diod. Sic. 11.39-40.4; Plut. Them. 19.1-3.
While administrative matters such as these were being discussed, the allies, in the name of the Hellenic League, returned to the military theater to take action against the Persians. At this time, 478/7, direct control of the Hellenic League's military forces was in the hands of Pausanias, the victorious Spartan general of the battle at Plataea. At the outset of the campaigning season, the Hellenic League took the offensive against the Persians. Pausanias first led a fleet to Cyprus, and then to Byzantium.\textsuperscript{14} Although no ancient evidence exists for any operations between Cyprus and Byzantium the authors of \textit{The Athenian Tribute Lists} believe that some cities along the way revolted from Persia.\textsuperscript{15} It is more likely that following the Persian defeat at Mycale the Persian forces withdrew from Ionia perhaps to an area between the sea and Sardis, as suggested by G. Cawkwell.\textsuperscript{16} This would explain why we hear of no operations between Cyprus and Byzantium.

After reaching Byzantium, Pausanias and the Greek forces laid siege to the city and remained there for the winter. The city was finally taken in late winter or early spring. During his stay in Byzantium, Pausanias himself was suspected of medism.\textsuperscript{17} Based on these reports the Spartans believed that there was sufficient evidence to recall Pausanias to Sparta for an inquiry into these charges. The date of Pausanias' recall has traditionally been placed in the fall or winter of 478. However it has recently been argued by W. Loomis that the recall must be placed in the spring of 477. Loomis believes that the siege of Byzantium must have

\textsuperscript{14}Thuc. 1.94, 128.5; Diod. Sic. 11.44.1-3.
\textsuperscript{15}Meritt, et al., \textit{The Athenian Tribute Lists. Vol. 3}, 191.
\textsuperscript{16}G. Cawkwell, "The Power of Persia," \textit{Arepo} 1 (1968), 1-5.
\textsuperscript{17}Thuc. 1.95.1-5, 128.3; Hdt. 5.32; Diod. Sic. 11.44.3-6, 54.2-4, 55.8; Nepos Paus. 2.2-6; Plut. Cim. 6.2-3.
taken the entire winter, just as the siege of Sestus in the previous winter. Loomis' arguments for dating the recall of Pausanias and the subsequent formation of the Delian League are strong. During the period of time that Pausanias was away from Byzantium the East Greeks approached the Athenians--specifically Aristeides and Cimon, and, according to Thucydides, asked them to take control of the League:

"..."  

With this one (Pausanias) being violent, the other Greeks were hating him, not least of all the Ionians and the ones recently freed from the King. Frequenting the Athenians, they considered them worthy to become their leaders based on their kinship and so they would not have to leave this matter to Pausanias, who was acting violently there. The Athenians received these requests and took up the opinion that they should not overlook the others and to establish things in a way that appeared best to them.

While these events were taking place the Spartans sent out another commander, Dorcis, with a small force to assume control of the Hellenic League's operations. Upon his arrival at Byzantium, the allies refused to recognize Dorcis as their commander. Therefore, he left and returned to Sparta, where the Spartans decided not to send out further commanders. The Spartans feared that their commanders would become corrupted.

---

19 Thuc. 1.95.1-2. For the transference of League control to the Athenians see also Diod. Sic. 11.46.5; Plut. Arist. 23, Cim. 6.3.
while away from Sparta, just as had happened with Pausanias. The Athenians now controlled the fleet in the east, unopposed by the Spartans.²⁰

How the Athenians established their control of the fleet is a question of extreme importance. By accepting the East Greeks’ offer, the Athenians agreed to carry out the war against Persia with any of the East Greeks who would join them. Such an undertaking was a difficult one and would require many ships as well as a large amount of money. To help in this area and to solidify their acceptance of this role, the Athenians sent out invitations to various Greek cities and invited them to meet on Delos to discuss these problems. The Athenians chose Delos for a number of reasons. The first of these reasons was the religious significance of Delos to Athens and the Ionians. Another factor in Delos’ selection was its central location in the Aegean.²¹

It was at this meeting on Delos that a new league was formed, one that was completely independent from the Hellenic League. At this meeting on Delos there was no doubt who was in charge. The East Greeks had approached the Athenians several months earlier to take control of the war against Persia. The Athenians accepted this offer and they sent Aristeides to represent them. The states that had assembled there with the Athenians swore an eternal oath to remain loyal to one another, as we are told in the Athenaios Politeia:

²⁰Thuc. 1.95.7; [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 23.2; Diod. Sic. 11.50; Plut. Arist. 23.7.
καὶ τοὺς ὅρκους ὥμοιον τοῖς ἵωσι ὅστε τὸν αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν ἔλειμα καὶ φίλον, ἐφ' ὅς καὶ τοὺς μυστέρους ἐν τῷ πελάγει καθεῖσαν.  

and he (Aristeides) swore oaths to the Ionians that they would have the same enemies and friends, in addition to this they placed iron bars into the sea.

This oath was to last until the iron bars floated to the top of the sea, thus indicating a permanent alliance. After swearing this oath the details of the League's organization must have been worked out. The makeup of this charter presents a number of problems to be resolved.

Modern debate about the organization of the Delian League has focused on several major points, each of which will be examined here. The most puzzling of the questions surrounding the Delian League is its original membership; specifically, what cities joined the League in 478/7 and how many of them there were. Another problem closely related to the original size of the League is the amount of the first tribute raised by the League. According to Thucydides the amount of this first tribute was 460 talents. Based on later evidence from the tribute quota lists, the inscribed stelai recording the allies' tribute, it seems certain that this figure is too large. Various suggestions explaining the number have been made and will be looked at later. The organization of the League's synod and the relationship of Athens' vote to the allies' votes is one more problem that needs explanation. Another issue surrounding the original charter is the office of the Hellenotamiae. These were the Treasurers of the Greeks, who were responsible for the collection of the tribute. How these officials

---

22[Arist.] Ath. Pol. 23.5; see also Plut. Arist. 25.1.
23According to Herodotus, who describes a similar oath 1.165, the oath was to remain intact until the iron bars floated to the top of the sea.
24Thuc. 1.96.2.
were chosen and where they were from has been often debated. The final issue that will be discussed here is the Delian League's original intent and purpose.

Before examining these questions our sources for the Delian League's formation need to be discussed briefly. Our evidence for the Delian League's formation, just like our sources for the Pentecontaetia, is extremely scarce. Our most reliable information comes from Thucydides, who gives a very brief outline of the Delian League's organization in book 1.96-97.1. Despite the obvious values of Thucydides' account his narrative cannot be used alone. As we shall see some of Thucydides' information about the first years of the Delian League is erroneous and often biased. Because of these problems additional evidence must always be sought to confirm or reject Thucydides' narrative. Of course, this is not always possible so in these situations one cannot rely too heavily on Thucydides alone.

Other information concerning the formation of the Delian League can be found in Herodotus who provides us with a considerable amount of information concerning the Hellenic League and the events immediately following the battle of Mycale. This evidence from Herodotus is extremely important to our understanding of the Delian League's origins. Additional information about the Delian League's first meeting and the oaths of the allies are recorded in the Aristotelian Athenaión Politeía. In addition to these sources most of our other literary information concerning the Delian League's charter is found in Plutarch's Lives of Aristeides and Cimon. Another account of the early
development of the Delian League is given in the narrative of the historian, Diodorus Siculus.

Throughout all of our sources we hear that it was the arrogance and medism of Pausanias that drove the Ionian allies to appeal to the Athenians, and that the Athenians, only then, accepted this invitation. It cannot be doubted, however, that the Athenians had their eyes on control of the fleet at an earlier time. The Athenians attempted to wrest control of the fleet from the Spartans perhaps as far back as 479 when they remained in the east after the Spartans and their allies had returned home. Prior to this event, the Athenians had also opposed the Spartan plan to relocate the Ionians in central Greece.25 There is also another story that might be used as evidence for possible Athenian ambitions. Plutarch attributes to Themistocles a plan to burn all of the ships of the Greek fleet, and to make Athens the unquestioned masters of the sea.26 If this account is true, and it is possible that it is not, then it is only one more piece of evidence to support the claim that the Athenians desired the most powerful fleet in Greece.

While Pausanias' arrogance and medism are mentioned in all of our sources, many of these same sources tell us that the Athenians did not lack the initiative in this matter. According to Herodotus the Athenians:

\[
\text{πρόφασιν τὴν Παυσανίεω δέβριν προοιχόμενοι}
\]
\[
\text{ἀπείλοντο τὴν ἡγεμονίην τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους.}^{27}
\]

putting forward the arrogance of Pausanias as a pretense, took the hegemony from the Lacedaimonians.

---

27 Hdt. 8.3.2.
We are told a similar story in the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*. Here the author says that:

επὶ δὲ τὴν ἀπόστασιν τὴν τῶν Ἰωνίων ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων συμμαχίας Ἀριστείδης ἦν ὁ προτέφας, τηρήσας τοὺς Λάκωνας διαβεβλημένους διὰ Παυσανίαν.

Aristeides was the one who persuaded the revolt of the Ionians from the alliance of the Lacedaimonians, having observed that the Lacedaimonians had been misrepresented slanderously on account of Pausanias.

While the two stories do have some differences they remain basically the same. Athens was actively pursuing control of the fleet. To support the theory that the Athenians gained control of the fleet and established the Delian League by their own initiative we must look at the Spartan reaction to these events.

The first source in which we hear any mention of Spartan anger at the Athenian acceptance of the Ionian requests is in the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*. The writer of this treatise on the Athenian Constitution tells us that the Athenians τὴν τῆς ἄλλαττης ἡγεμονίαν λαβεῖν ἀκόντων τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων (took the leadership of the sea with the Lacedaimonians being unwilling). This mention of Spartan resentment over the Athenian control of the sea is found nowhere in Thucydides' narrative. A more detailed description of

---

29[Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 23.2. This passage has been interpreted in a variety of ways. Gomme has translated the key words as follows, "with the Spartans being unwilling to keep the leadership." *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1*, 272. This reading has also been accepted by the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists. Vol. 3*, 192. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaeion Politeia*, 291-2, believes that the translation that I have given above is correct, but he also believes that "Athens and Sparta remained on good terms."
the Spartan reaction to the Athenians is provided by Diodorus Siculus. According to Diodorus the Spartans were so angered by the Athenians' actions that a debate was held in the Gerousia about whether they should go to war with the Athenians over the issue. Diodorus tells us that the Athenians themselves even expected a war from the Spartans and that they began to build new triremes for this purpose. The only explanation for Thucydides' omission of these details can be that he was attempting to place great importance on the allies pleas to the Athenians. Through such a portrayal the allies would have no justification for being opposed to Athenian control of the Delian League, which by the time Thucydides was writing had already become the Athenian Empire. Thucydides believed strongly that Athens was just in her actions and his description of the foundation of the Delian League is one way that he sought to sanction the Empire's existence.

In order to understand the intricacies of the Delian League's charter it is first necessary to determine the original members of the League. This ambitious task was attempted by the authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists, who came up with a list of poleis that they believe were the League's original members. This, of course, is purely speculative and any further attempt to do the same here would be foolish. Therefore, the best method of approaching the problem is to try to determine if the original Delian League was either small or large. Before attempting to determine this there are a number of poleis that can be excluded from original membership in the Delian League. By eliminating these poleis we can get

---

30Diod. Sic. 11.50.1-7.
31Diod. Sic. 11.50.8.
a better picture of the size of the Delian League's charter members. Of course, all members of the Peloponnesian League must be excluded, for Sparta would have never allowed membership in both her League and the Delian League. The poleis of Caria and Lycia must also be excluded since Diodorus Siculus tells us that Cimon won them over to the Delian League prior to the battle of the Eurymedon in 465.\textsuperscript{32} It is also certain that the only polis on mainland Greece that was a Delian League member at this time was Athens. Therefore, we are left with the Aegean islands north of Thera and Melos, Ionia, the Hellespont, and the Thracian area as potential members. This would provide a fairly significant number of League members in 478/7.\textsuperscript{33}

With the Athenians now controlling the fleet as they wanted, the details of the League's organization had to be established. The first problem concerning the Delian League's organization is to determine the nature of the allies in relationship to Athens. Modern debate has focused on whether or not the League was unicameral or bicameral in nature. More specifically we would like to determine whether the vote of the Athenians in the allied synod was equal to the vote of all the other allies combined or if it was on an equal level with each one of the allies individually.

Most modern scholars believe that the Athenians held a vote that was equal with each individual allied member. Nevertheless, this view has been contested. Our primary piece of evidence for understanding the

\textsuperscript{32}Diod. Sic. 11.60.4-5. The date of the battle of the Eurymedon will be discussed in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{33}The authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists Vol. 3, 194-224, believe that the total number of original members was 142. I believe that a number approximating this one is correct.
League member's votes is the speech of the Mytilenians in Thucydides 3.9-14. In this speech the Mytilenians are explaining to the Spartans the reasons why they had revolted from the Athenians in 428. Several phrases used by the Mytilenians have been cited to explain the League's voting procedures. First the Mytilenians explain that καὶ μὲχρι μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱσοῦ ἡγοῦντο (Up till that time they [the Athenians] led from an equal position). Another most tantalizing phrase is used by the Mytilenians who are trying to explain how the Athenians have subjugated all of the allies. The Mytilenians explain that the allies are helpless because the Athenians have control over them διὰ πολυψηφίαν (on account of their many votes). The Mytilenians later in the speech say that they have τοὺς γε ἱσοψηφορος (an equal vote) with the Athenians. These three passages are essential to reaching an understanding of the League's synod. Interpretation of the phrases, however, is a difficult matter.

According to Gomme the phrase διὰ πολυψηφίαν is best explained in that the many weaker members of the League had no other choice but to vote with the Athenians. Without Athens to protect them, these smaller poleis would be at the mercy of their larger neighbors. The authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists believe, based on the passages of Thucydides cited above, that the Athenians held a single vote in the League's synod. It is not difficult to understand how the Athenians would have been able to manipulate a unicameral League with so many

34 Thuc. 3.10.5.
35 Thuc. 3.11.4.
small members. These poleis would have been dependent on Athens' protection and thus forced to vote with Athens at the League's synod.

Also crucial to our understanding of the League as a unicameral institution is another passage of Thucydides: ἡγοῦμενοι δὲ αὐτονόμων τὸ πρῶτον τῶν ἔμμαχων καὶ ἀπὸ κοινῆν ἕνωσαν βουλευόντων (They were the leaders of allies at first autonomous and making plans out of common synods). Diodorus Siculus, in his description of the Delian League's first meeting, describes this event in similar language to Thucydides: ὁ μὲν Ἀριστείδης ουνεβούλευεν τοῖς συμμάχοις ἀπασὶ κοινὴν ἁγοσὶν σύνοδον (Aristeides advised all the allies to hold a common synod). All of this evidence indicates that, at least from its outset, all of the members of the Delian League met in one body and each held a single vote.

Many scholars recently have argued for a bicameral League in which the allies all had an equal vote in their synod and the Athenian vote was equal to the synod's vote. This issue has been re-examined by Phyllis Culham who has cited the works of N. G. L. Hammond and G. E. M. de Ste. Croix as the two most convincing arguments in favor of a bicameral League. According to Hammond the League must certainly have been bicameral because the Athenians would not have placed themselves in a position of weakness in taking control of the League. The evidence proposed by de Ste. Croix is a comparison of the Delian

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{38}Thuc. 1.97.1.
\textsuperscript{39}Diod. Sic. 11.47.1.
\textsuperscript{40}P. Culham, "The Delian League: Bicameral or Unicameral?," AJAH 3 (1978), 27-31.
\textsuperscript{41}N. G. L. Hammond, "The Origins and the Nature of the Athenian Alliance of 478/7 B. C.," JHS 87 (1967), 49-52.
League to the Second Athenian League of 378/7 B.C., which was certainly a bicameral organization.\textsuperscript{42} According to de Ste. Croix the allies, who wanted to prevent Athens from again attaining an empire from a league, would not have agreed to a bicameral league if the Delian League had been unicameral.\textsuperscript{43} Culham, however, has questioned the understanding that the Delian League was bicameral and she has clearly demonstrated that further attempts to argue for a bicameral League would be fruitless. She has demonstrated this by an examination of Thucydides 1.141.6-7, where Pericles is comparing the Delian League to the Peloponnesian League. Culham has shown that this comparison supports the view that the Delian League had a unicameral structure.\textsuperscript{44}

It is now widely accepted that there were two types of allied members in the Delian League. The two types of allied members can be divided into two separate groups, ones who provided ships and subjugated ones who paid cash. It appears that the allies who were contributing ships held a more prominent status than the tribute paying allies. How many members were contributing ships from the League's outset is unknown. According to Thucydides the last three members who were contributing ships were Samos, Chios, and Lesbos, and by 439 only Lesbos and Chios still supplied ships. These three members, and others who contributed ships from the start were used by the Athenians to weaken the position of the tribute paying allies and then later each

\textsuperscript{42} For the organization of the Second Athenian League see: J. Cargill, \textit{The Second Athenian League} (Berkeley 1981), 115-128.


\textsuperscript{44} Culham, "The Delian League: Bicameral or Unicameral?," \textit{AJAH} 3 (1978), 29-30.
other.\textsuperscript{45} It seems certain, according to the author of the \textit{Athenaion Politeia}, that these three ship providing allies enjoyed privileges that the cash paying allies did not:
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\[\text{τοῖς συμμάχοις δεσποτικωτέρως ἐρχόμενο, πλὴν Χίων καὶ Λεσβίων καὶ Σαμίων (τούτους δὲ φύλακας ἔχον τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἔντες τὰς τέκνα πολιτείας παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἄρχειν ὑπὸ ἐτυχὸν ἀρχοντες).}\textsuperscript{46}

[The Athenians] were more inclined to despotism towards the allies, save Chios, Lesbos, and Samos. (They held these ones as guards of the Empire, allowing them their own constitution and to rule the ones who they happened to be ruling).

One of the reasons for the Delian League’s formation was to continue vigorously the war against the Persians and to protect the Greek cities. For the Athenians and their allies to carry out this task large sums of money in addition to a large number of ships were needed. The Athenians, therefore, instituted a system of contributions known as \textit{φόρος} (tribute) to help with the League’s expenses. At first, this was primarily done with the contributions of either ships or men. It was decided by Aристeides which of the allies were to contribute ships and cash.\textsuperscript{47} Later almost all of the cities in the Empire were paying with cash. However, even in the first year of the Delian League some cities were already contributing money. Thucydides gives the amount of this first tribute as 460 talents.\textsuperscript{48} This figure, for numerous reasons, seems to be too high. After the League treasury was moved to Athens in 454/3 the Athenians began to inscribe quota lists recording the tribute paid by the
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\textsuperscript{46}[Arist.] \textit{Ath. Pol.} 24.1-2; see also: Arist. Pol. 1284a38.
\textsuperscript{47}Thuc. 1.96.1; Diod. Sic. 11.47.1; Plut. \textit{Arist.} 24.
\textsuperscript{48}Thuc. 1.96.2. It should also be noted that Diodorus who is apparently using Ephorus gives a figure of 560 talents: 11.47.1.
allies. According to our information from these restored inscriptions the
tribute paid in 454/3 was approximately 490 talents.\textsuperscript{49} This list includes
many poleis who could not have been members of the League in 478/7.
Therefore, an increase of only 30 talents over a period of twenty-four years
seems highly unlikely. In addition to this most of the allies who were
contributing ships in 478/7 had converted to cash payments by 454/3.\textsuperscript{50}
Numerous suggestions have been made to account for Thucydides' statement.

The problem of such a high figure at this early date in the League's
history has been explained by the authors of the \textit{Athenian Tribute Lists} as
a figure representing a total of both money and ships combined. The
authors of the \textit{Athenian Tribute Lists} believe that a conversion of manned
ships into a monetary sum existed and that the 460 talents reported by
Thucydides represents this figure added to the amount of money
contributed.\textsuperscript{51} When discussing the allied contributions to the League it
cannot be forgotten that the Athenians also made significant
contributions. The Athenian fleet, the largest in the Greek world, was at
the disposal of the League. In addition to this the Athenians had all the
responsibilities of managing the League.\textsuperscript{52} This conversion of ships into a
monetary amount in order to explain the figure is also accepted by A. W.
Gomme in his \textit{Historical Commentary on Thucydides}.\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[50] According to Thucydides, 1.99.3, the allies converted to cash payments because
they no longer wished to leave their homes and serve in the fleet.
\item[53] Gomme, \textit{A Historical Commentary on Thucydides}. Vol. 1, 284.
\end{footnotes}
Since the arguments of the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* and Gomme were made they have often been challenged. The first serious challenge to this theory was made by Mortimer Chambers.\textsuperscript{54} Through an analysis of the word φορος in the text of Thucydides and the responsibilities of the Hellenotamiae, Chambers concluded that there is a distinct difference in Thucydides between the contribution of cash and ships. Having proved that the φορος meant cash payments only Chambers questioned the figure of 460 as given by Thucydides. Chambers concluded that the figure can only be explained as an error on Thucydides' part. The figure of 460 talents has not been explained adequately since Chambers' article. However, his arguments about φορος meaning cash payments alone have been widely accepted and recently strengthened. One recent challenge to Chambers' findings has been made by S. K. Eddy.\textsuperscript{55} Here, Eddy claims that φορος can indeed include the contribution of ships. He cites as his evidence various authors other than Thucydides to illustrate this theory. Furthermore, Eddy even claims to have figured out that the conversion ratio was one ship to one talent.\textsuperscript{56} Russell Meiggs in *The Athenian Empire* has more recently rejected the conversion explanation of the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* and states that:

If this figure is impossible it is better to attribute a mistake to Thucydides than to force his words into a meaning that would never have been suggested unless the historical sense seemed to demand it.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{55}S. K. Eddy, "Four Hundred and Sixty Talents Once More," *CP* 63 (1968), 184-95.
\textsuperscript{56}Ibid., 189-95.
\textsuperscript{57}Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, 64.
Meiggs, however, does offer some possible explanations to account for the sum of 460 talents. The first of these is there were many cities that were members of the League in 478 and were not members later, most notably the cities of Cyprus. He also believes that the original assessment of Aristeides might have taken up to several years to complete, thus explaining the high number. Both of these suggestions are plausible, however, they will remain unproved and for that reason cannot be accepted. Noel Robertson has also supported Chambers' theory arguing persuasively that no monetary value can be placed on a trireme because the costs of construction and maintenance would have varied so widely throughout the Aegean.

It is difficult to dismiss Thucydides' 460 talents simply as an error on the part of the historian. The only way of accepting the number is to admit that we do not thoroughly understand the nature of the tribute as understood by Thucydides. We also learn from Thucydides, that in 431/0, right before the start of the Peloponnesian War Athens was collecting about 600 talents. From our knowledge of the quota lists this number also appears to be erroneous. The quota lists suggest a total of somewhat less than 400 talents. It is possible that this figure does not represent tribute alone, but other sources of income that Athens would not have been collecting in 478/7. An interesting suggestion has been made by Ron K. Unz to explain Thucydides' tribute figures. Unz believes that our understanding of Thucydides is incorrect and that his figures must be

---

58 Ibid., 58-60.
60 Thuc. 2.13.3.
61 Meiggs, The Athenian Empire, 252-3.
believed. The figures are explained by Unz, who argues that they represent the quota paid on the surplus of each years tribute. The wide range of interpretations discussed above underscore the problems that still remain in understanding the basic function of the quota lists and the \( \phi\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\) in general. Without a thorough re-examination of these lists Thucydides' numbers must remain unexplained.

To understand the collection of the tribute better one must first understand the function of the Treasurers of the Greeks, the Hellenotamiai. The debate concerning the Hellenotamiai surrounds a single sentence of Thucydides: \( \kappa\alpha\lambda\ \'\varepsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\nu\tau\alpha\mu\mbox{\textae}\ \tau\omicron\tau\varepsilon\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu\ \'\Atheta\nu\alpha\omicron\omicron\varepsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\varepsilon\sigma\tau\eta\ \alpha\rho\chi\eta,\ \omicron\ \varepsilon\delta\varepsilon\chi\nu\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \phi\omicron\rho\omicron\nu\) (The Hellenotamiai were then first set up as an office for Athenians, and they received the tribute). The standard work on the Hellenotamiai remains that of A. G. Woodhead, who has clearly demonstrated that the office of the Hellenotamiai was established for the Athenians. The translation I have given here is the one proposed by Woodhead in the article cited above. This translation, however, is not universally accepted. A variant translation has been proposed by Meiggs, who translates as follows, "Hellenotamiai were then first instituted as an Athenian office and they received the phoros." The confusion rests in the word \( '\Atheta\nu\alpha\omicron\omicron\varepsilon '\) and the function of the dative case. According to Woodhead the office was held by Athenians, although they had to be elected at the League's synod. Meiggs' interpretation means that the Hellenotamiai were always chosen

---

63Thuc. 1.96.2.
65Meiggs, The Athenian Empire, 44. This translation is also accepted by S. Hornblower, A Commentary on Thucydides (Oxford 1991), 145.
by the Athenians alone and that the allies had no say in the matter. By comparison with the Hellenic and Peloponnesian Leagues Woodhead has shown that the Hellenotamiae were Athenians chosen at Athens, but that their selection required ratification before the League's synod. This means that during the early years of the League the Hellenotamiae were not an Athenian magistracy, as Meiggs believes. Woodhead also believes that this is how the generals who controlled the League's fleet were chosen. Woodhead's interpretation of this difficult passage seems to be correct. It is not likely that the Athenians would have ostensibly taken away the freedom of the allied members to choose the League's officers this early.

The final issue concerning the Delian League is its intent and purpose. Investigation into this question must begin with Thucydides' account at 1.96.1, where he states what he thought the object of the League was: πρόσχημα γὰρ ἢν ἀμύνεσθαι ὥν ἔπαθον δῆμοντας τὴν βασιλείας χώραν (this was a pretext to avenge themselves of the things they suffered by ravaging the King's land). What this passage means exactly is far from clear; the numerous different interpretations are testimony to this.

There is no doubt that the Delian League was established to "ravage" the King's land. Some scholars, however, have interpreted the phrase differently. According to Hammond, League activity was to be aimed against the Persians, which would be a highly profitable endeavor.66 This theory has been taken even further by Raphael Sealey who has argued that the Delian League was a purely piratical organization

---

formed to collect booty.\textsuperscript{67} This view is certainly plausible but there were other motives. This has best been explained by A.H. Jackson who has written in response to Sealey's article. Jackson, through a word study of \(\delta\eta\omega\nu\) (to ravage) in Thucydides, has conclusively proven that the word can only mean ravaging by causing destruction.\textsuperscript{68} Of course, as Jackson admits, if the opportunity for booty presented itself the League members would have taken advantage of it. Jackson's study is very convincing and should be accepted. The Delian League's purpose was to bring the war to the Persians as a means of preventing another attack against the Greeks.

A clear picture of the Delian League has now emerged. It seems from the evidence discussed above that contrary to Thucydides' account, the Athenians for some time had designs on acquiring a naval hegemony. They were able to accomplish this with great ease. Through Pausanias' mismanagement of the Hellenic League while at Byzantium, the Ionians and other allies approached the Athenians and asked them to lead the offensive against the Persians. Once the Athenians accepted this offer a new league, independent from the Hellenic League, was formed.

The first meeting of this League was held on the island of Delos in 478/7 with Aristeides representing Athens at the head of the League. At this first meeting on Delos the members swore an oath to have the same friends and enemies. A League synod was established that would meet, probably annually, on Delos. At these meetings all of the members,

\textsuperscript{67}R. Sealey, "The Origin of the Delian League," in \textit{Ancient Society and Institutions, Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday.} (New York 1967), 253. See also: K. Raafflaub, Beute, Vergeltung, Freiheit? Zur Zeitsetzung des Delisch-Attischen Seebundes," \textit{Chiron} 9 (1979), 1-22, who stresses the importance of acquiring booty, but also believes that retaliation was also a primary objective of the Delian League.

including Athens, would have one equal vote in deciding League policy. Because the allies had approached Athens to take control of the fleet Athens became the League's hegemon. Athens was responsible for a large share of the League's fleet and she provided the commanders to lead the fleet. Athens, as the League's hegemon, did enjoy some special privileges. The League officers known as the Hellenotamiae were to be Athenians, although their installation required ratification before the League's synod. The same procedure was used for electing the League's generals. The function of the Hellenotamiae was to collect the tribute of the allies, this meant cash contributions only. The allied members who decided against contributing ships provided cash payments to help with the cost of carrying out the League's operations. At first many states contributed ships, but in time almost all of the allies had converted their obligation into the payment of cash. According to Thucydides the total amount of the first tribute was 460 talents. This number seems to be too high for the period, but we must admit that we probably do not understand the meaning of φόρος in Thucydides. A large number of ships would have been needed to carry out the League's operations as described by Thucydides. This would imply that the original membership in the League must have been fairly large to support these operations. The Delian League's original purpose was to use these ships to bring the war to the King's territory and to ravage his land. Of course, this often meant the capture of booty that was possibly a crucial part of funding for the League's fleet. In time the intent of the League changed as the Athenians began to make war against Greek poleis that Athens attempted to force into the League. The Athenians also used the League's fleet to suppress several
revolts of League members. These are the events that will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER II

Now that the Delian League’s organization has been established we shall begin to examine the chronology of the League’s early campaigns. The chronology of these events is a very problematic issue, primarily on account of Thucydides’ narrative of these events. How one decides to go about reading the excursus on the Pentecontaetia can affect one’s proposed chronology of these years. Therefore the various methodologies for reading Thucydides must be explored before beginning the examination of Thucydides’ excursus and the chronology of the Pentecontaetia.

Methodology for reading Thucydides’ excursus on the Pentecontaetia is diverse, and certain apparent problems with the Thucydidean text itself further complicate the situation. To illustrate the difficulty it is necessary to examine the methodology for reading Thucydides of some modern historians if we are to understand better the Pentecontaetia and Cimon’s role in the events of these years. The first major study of the Pentecontaetia that we shall examine is The Athenian Tribute Lists. In their discussion of the Pentecontaetia, the authors firmly believe that Thucydides wrote his narrative of events in the order that they occurred. "His improvement [over Hellanicus] is to set events in proper order. It is our belief that in his excursus Thucydides has done this without any deviation whatsoever."¹ The authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists base their

¹Meritt, et al., The Athenian Tribute Lists. Vol. 3., 162.
argument on 1.97.2, where Thucydides criticizes Hellanicus for his lack of chronology:

οὕτων δὲ δοσιν καὶ ἥψατο ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἔργῳ ἡ Ἑλληνικός, βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη.

Hellanicus is the one who touched upon these things in his Atthis, he makes mention of these things both briefly and without accuracy in respect to the chronology.

The authors believe that giving the reader a relative chronology was Thucydides' means of improving on Hellanicus.² A. W. Gomme in his Historical Commentary on Thucydides had also arrived at the same conclusion.³

Not enough of Hellenicus' Atthis survives to determine the structure and content of his treatment of the Pentecontaetia. Without this information it is impossible to interpret how Thucydides intended to improve on Hellanicus' account or if his account of the Pentecontaetia is, indeed, an improvement over Hellanicus. What we do know is that Hellanicus used at least two methods of dating in his work: the Athenian archon list and the list of the Priestesses of Hera. Thucydides, later in his History criticizes these methods of dating.⁴

Thucydides' improvement is a system of dating based on summers and winters. By using this method, Thucydides does not have to split up events over two archon years, but can place them in one campaigning season, namely a summer.⁵

No modern historian would question the value of Hellenicus' account and its archon dates had it survived. This brief summary only illustrates the difficulties

³Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1, 361.
⁴Thuc. 5.20.
⁵The archon year ended in the month of July, in the middle of the summer and at the height of the campaigning season.
in forced interpretation of Thucydides to support one's own understanding of 5th century chronology.

The next major study of the Pententacteta published was Russell Meiggs' *The Athenian Empire*. In this study Meiggs adopted a similar methodology in his interpretation of Thucydides' excursus. In Meiggs' own words, echoing the statements of the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, he states, "since [Thucydides] insists so strongly on the importance of chronological accuracy we should accept his order of events unless he can be proved wrong." Such a strict reading of Thucydides remained in fashion for some time and was not seriously challenged until the publication of *Thucydides' Dates: 465-431*, by Philip Deane. In this publication Deane not only questioned accepted readings of Thucydides, but he also challenged the widely accepted chronologies of modern scholars. Deane refuted the notion that events must occur in a year to year sequence, as he states:

I shall try to show that the historian breaks up an episode not out of concern for sequentialism but when, by so doing, he can best bring out the importance of each stage of the episode in the development of the theme. The historian often follows chronological sequence since, usually, the best way to bring out the development of the theme of the growth of Athenian power will be to recount events in the order of their occurrence. The historian breaks up an episode not out of concern for sequentialism but when, by so doing, he can best bring out the importance of each stage of the episode in the development of the theme. The historian often follows chronological sequence since, usually, the best way to bring out the development of the theme of the growth of Athenian power will be to recount events in the order of their occurrence.

As we shall see shortly, Deane's methodology has led to new interpretations of Thucydides, and has greatly influenced many new chronologies of the Pententacteta. Most notable amongst these new interpretations is the chronology proposed by Ernst Badian, in his *From Plataea to Potidaea*.8

---

Up to this point I have tried to outline the development of some modern studies of the Pentecontaetia. For now I have avoided any discussion concerning emendation of the Thucydidean text, in particular at 1.103.1, which I shall discuss when the problem is looked at more fully. With this in mind I shall try to show here that the fundamentalist readings of Thucydides that have been proposed by the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, A. W. Gomme, and Meiggs are no longer adequate for studying Thucydides and the Pentecontaetia. The new interpretations, such as those of Deane and Badian, are now the best methods for studying this time period. I have chosen to follow such an interpretation here. I will begin examining Thucydides’ excursus with 1.98.

With my methodology established the text of Thucydides must now be closely examined. Thucydides begins his description, in rapid fashion, of the campaigns carried out by the allies under Cimon’s leadership. Thucydides’ narrative begins:

πρῶτον μὲν Ἰόνα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι Μῆδων ἔχοντον
πολιορκία έλλον καὶ ἡδραπόδιον, Κύμωνος τοῦ
Μιλτιάδου στρατηγοῦντος. ἔπειτα Σκύρον τὴν ἐν τῷ
Αἰγαίῳ νῆσον, ἣν ὄκουν Δόλοπες, ἡδραπόδιον καὶ
ὕκοσαν αὐτοῖ. πρὸς δὲ Καρυστίους αὐτοῖς ἄνευ τῶν
ἄλλων Εὔβοιῶν πόλεως ἐγένετο, καὶ χρόνῳ ἐξινέβησαν καθ’
ὑμνογίαν. Ναξιός δὲ ἀποστάσει μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπολέμησαν
καὶ πολιορκία παρεστάσαντο, πρώτη τε αὕτη πόλις
ἐπιμαχεῖσα παρὰ τὸ καθεστῆτος ἐδουλώθη, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τῶν
ἄλλων ὡς ἐκάστη ἐξινέβη.\(^9\)

First, with Cimon the son of Miltiades being the general, they took Eion on the Strymon by siege with the Medes holding it and they enslaved the people. Then they sold the inhabitants of Scyrus into slavery, the island in the Aegean which the Dolopians inhabited and they themselves settled it. Then a war was made against Carystus by the Athenians themselves without the other Euboeans and in time they agreed upon a surrender.

\(^9\)Thuc. 1.98.
After these events, they made a war against the Naxians who had revolted and they brought them to terms by a siege. Naxos was the first allied polis to loose its freedom contrary to the established charter. Afterwards this happened to each of the others.

The first attack Thucydides mentions here is the capture of Thracian Eion on the Strymon river. As one can see from the text above, Thucydides tells us very few details, and gives no indication for the date of the attack. Our other primary source, Herodotus, gives a slightly more detailed account of the capture. Herodotus describes how the Persian governor of Eion, Boges, refused to leave the city when Cimon gave him the opportunity to do so. Nevertheless, neither Herodotus nor Thucydides provides us with a date for the attack on Eion. Fortunately, however, we can establish a secure date. We have a scholiast's note to Aischines 2.31 that dates the attack on Eion to the archonship of Phaidon. The archon year of Phaidon was 476/5. In their discussion of Eion the authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists date the affair at Byzantium and Pausanias' first recall from the city, as discussed above, as well as the beginning of the siege of Eion to 477. This marks the first activity undertaken by the new League. They believe that the siege of Eion lasted through the winter and into the summer of 476, when the fort was finally taken.

---

10I have translated τὸ κατοφθος as "the established charter (of the Delian League)" as suggested by Meritt, et al., The Athenian Tribute Lists. Vol. 3, 156-7, who translate the phrase as "in breach of the constitution of the League." Hornblower, A Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1, 151 disagrees with this suggestion and translates the phrase in question as "contrary to custom." Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1, 282 believes that either interpretation is equally possible based on a scholia explaining the phrase.

11Hdt. 7.107.


13For all archon dates I have used G. F. Hüll, Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, rev. R. Meiggs and A. Andrewes (Oxford 1951), 397-401.

14In Diod. Sic. 11.60.2 we are told that after leaving Byzantium Cimon took the fleet to Eion that was then taken from the Persians by siege.
Thucydides next tells us that the Athenians attacked the island of Scyrus. Here Thucydides is once again vague. Most of our details concerning this attack are supplied by Plutarch. It was on this occasion, according to Plutarch, that Cimon found, in accordance with an oracle, the bones of the Athenian hero Theseus. Plutarch gives us two dates surrounding this event. In his *Life of Theseus* Plutarch says that the oracle to retrieve the bones was given in the archonship of Phaidon (476/5). In his *Life of Cimon*, describing the same events, Plutarch states that the bones were found in the archonship of Apsephon (469/8). It seems certain that Plutarch has given us two separate dates for two separate events. Based on Plutarch's dating of the oracle to the archonship of Phaidon the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* also date the capture of Scyrus to the autumn of 476 or the spring of 475. The authors of the *Athenian Tribute Lists* believe that the archon date of 469/8 supplied by Plutarch can be ignored because of a fragment of Ephorus that states that the Athenians led by Cimon sailed from Byzantium with their allies and took both Eion and Scyrus.

The next event in Thucydides' narrative is the war with Carystus, a small polis in southern Euboea that had earlier surrendered to the Persians. After the Persian Wars the city of Carystus did not choose to join the Delian League. As punishment for their assistance to the Persians, the Athenians decided to make Carystus join the League. This war cannot be dated with certainty. The

---

16Meritt, et al., *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. Vol. 3, 160. In their discussion of these passages of Plutarch the authors believe that Plutarch is incorrect in associating the naming of Cimon and his colleagues as judges with the recovery of Theseus' bones. As we shall see later they associate this event with the battle at the Eurymedon.
17Meritt, et al., *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. Vol. 3, 159. *FGrH* Ephorus 70 F191, states the the Athenians led by Cimon sailed from Byzantium with their allies and took Eion and Scyrus. This fragment seems to be the source of Diod. *Sic.* 11.60.2, cited above.
18For the surrender of Carystus to the Persians see: Hdt. 6.99.2. For a reference to the war by Herodotus see: 9.105.2.
authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* date the event anywhere between 475-470, which seems to be the best possible guess.\(^\text{19}\)

These three campaigns cannot be dated with greater certainty than described above. In general the chronology for these three events proposed by the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* has been followed by recent scholars. Some attempts have been made to down date the chronology of these events. J. D. Smart has argued for dating the capture of Eion in 470/69 and the capture of Scyrus in the following year.\(^\text{20}\) This chronology cannot be supported because it seems impossible that Thucydides would not record any League events between 478/7-470/69. The chronology of these early events has also been challenged by A. J. Podlecki who believes that Plutarch's reference to the archonship of Phaidon (476/5) gives us the date only for the oracle surrounding Theseus' bones. Podlecki would like to place the date of Scyrus to 474/3 or even as late as 470.\(^\text{21}\) Another attempt to change the orthodox dating has been made by Michael Stienbrecher, who has offered a new date for the war against Carystus.

Stienbrecher has argued that the campaign took place in 470/69, in association with Cimon's selection as judge at the city Dionysia.\(^\text{22}\) As we have seen above, the dating of this event by Pluatrch has created many problems. On account of this it does not prove conclusively that the war against Carystus occurred in this year. The chronology of the League's early campaigns will remain problematic, on account of the difficulties in the archon names and our lack of other reliable sources to date these events. For this reason the evidence that we have supports the orthodox dating as proposed by the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists*.

---

\(^{20}\) J. D. Smart, "Kimon's Capture of Eion," *JHS* 87 (1967), 136-8.  
\(^{22}\) M. Steinbrecher, *Der Delisch-Attische Seebund und die Athenisch-Spartanischen Beziehungen in der Kimonischen Ära (ca. 478/7-462/1)* (Stuttgart 1985), 40-2.
The first major problem with the chronology of the Pentecontaetia is the siege of Naxos and its relationship to the battle at the Eurymedon. The order of events as described by Thucydides is the revolt of the Naxians, followed by the sea and land battles at the Eurymedon river. This presentation of events has left little doubt that this is, indeed, the sequence in which the events took place. As we have seen, it is the fundamentalist position of the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* along with Gomme and Meiggs that Thucydides presented events in a strict chronological order in response to his criticism of Hellanicus. Based on this reading of Thucydides the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* tentatively placed the siege of Naxos in 470, and the battle at the Eurymedon in 469. This date for the battle of the Eurymedon in 469 is based on Plutarch's statement that Cimon and his fellow strategoi were chosen as judges at the city Dionysia in the archonship of Apsephion (469/8). The authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* believe that only a victory of the significance of the Eurymedon could have constituted such an honor.

Following *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, Russell Meiggs in *The Athenian Empire* also adopted this sequence of events. While Meiggs agreed with *The Athenian Tribute Lists*’ order of the events he did not agree with their dating. Meiggs chose not to associate the Eurymedon with Cimon’s selection as judge at the Dionysia. Meiggs dismissed this association believing that the generals were chosen solely to keep events from getting out of hand in some unspecified year. It is Meiggs’ view that the battle at the Eurymedon took place at a later date, specifically 466,

---

23Thuc. 1.98.4, 1.100.1.
24Thuc. 1.97.2.
26Plut. *Cim*. 8.7-9. Plutarch, however, associates the Cimon’s selection as a judge with the Athenian capture of Scyrus and the recovery of Theseus’ bones.
27Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, 82.
with the siege of Naxos taking place in the previous year.\textsuperscript{28} To support his thesis, Meiggs places great influence on the anonymous letter of Themistocles\textsuperscript{29} and Thucydides' statement at 1.137.2 where he says that Themistocles passed the Athenian fleet besieging Naxos.

While Meiggs is certainly correct in placing the influence he does on Thucydides' statement concerning Themistocles' flight, he places far too much influence on the letter of Themistocles. Although these letters are surely based on some historical fact, it cannot be forgotten that they were written near the end of the 1st century of the Christian era.\textsuperscript{30} One other central clue to the date of Themistocles' flight and the siege of Naxos is the fact that it was Artaxerxes I to whom Themistocles wrote upon his arrival in Ionia.\textsuperscript{31} It seems that the fifth century authors, Thucydides and Charon of Lampsacus, mentioned by Plutarch would have had better information concerning Themistocles than the historians of the fourth century. Primarily, we can trust Charon, who was born in a polis that was very close to Magnesia, the territory that was given to Themistocles by Artaxerxes I. We can date with certainty Artaxerxes' accession to August 465 based on contemporary Near Eastern documents.\textsuperscript{32}

The sequence of events argued by the authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists, Gomme, and Meiggs, as well as others, was believed to be as close to an accurate chronology as could be achieved until a new thesis was put forth by Philip

\textsuperscript{28}[Ibid., 81.}
\textsuperscript{30}Doenges, The Letters of Themistokles, 60-3.
\textsuperscript{31}See Plut. Them. 27.1, where we are told that both Thucydides and Charon of Lampsacus (FGrH 687b F6) reported that Themistocles met with Artaxerxes, however we are also told that Ephorus (FGrH 70 F190), Dinon (FGrH 690 F 13), Clitarchus (FGrH 137 F 33), Heracleides (FGrH 689 F 6), and still many others report that he met with Xerxes. The version of Thucydides and Charon must be accepted on the grounds that they were writing in the fifth century while that others belong to the fourth.
Deane. We have already looked at Deane's innovations in the methodology of reading Thucydides' excursus on the Pentecontaetia and its impact. It is Deane's argument that it is possible for more than one event to take place in a single campaigning season. While this sounds absurdly simple, as a principle it has been largely ignored by most earlier chronologies. The single year in which Deane placed both the siege and the battle is 465. This is significantly later than either the authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists or Meiggs would allow, for they both firmly believed that the Athenian siege of Thasos took place in 465, and that Naxos and the Eurymedon had to take place earlier than this date. Although Deane placed both events in the same season, he chose to follow Thucydides' treatment of the two events, placing the siege before the battle. It was after the Athenians had completed the siege of Naxos that they set out for the campaign to the Eurymedon.

With the major chronologies challenged by Deane, new theories about the order of events were proposed. Perhaps the most radical recent chronology has been proposed by Ron K. Unz, who challenged the order of even Thucydides' account. In his proposed chronology, Unz argued that the battle at the Eurymedon preceded the siege of Naxos at some point in either 466 or 465. The order of Thucydides' narrative is explained by Unz as "anticipation" by the historian, who, preceeding his mention of Naxos, had described a series of suppressions of various cities by the Athenians. Wishing to keep the series of suppressions and revolts together, Thucydides, according to Unz, did not keep to a strict chronological arrangement. Another argument refuted by Unz in favor of placing Naxos before the Eurymedon is that the Naxians no longer believed that

34Thuc. 1.98.
the Delian League was necessary. Unz believes that this is highly unlikely because such a major Persian offensive was launched so soon after the revolt of Naxos.\textsuperscript{35}

Despite Unz's arguments the trend once again seems to be to place the siege of Naxos before the Eurymedon. This is the sequence proposed by Ernst Badian in a recently republished article, in which he argues that it was difficult even for Thucydides to learn the precise chronology of the two events. Two points are used by Badian to support this thesis. The first of these is similar to the theory of Deane; namely that a siege can take place over a period of time while a battle is a specific point in time.\textsuperscript{36} The second argument is that the battle of the Eurymedon quickly became part of Athenian legend and was even later confused with Cimon's Cyprus campaign.\textsuperscript{37}

It is difficult to argue, as Unz has, that the battle of the Eurymedon took place before the siege of Naxos was completed. Thucydides' account is the most important piece of evidence for this, and it is impossible to disregard unless one interprets Thucydides' presentation of events in the Pentecontaetia as Unz alone has. By continuing to look at the these two events, and others in the Pentecontaetia, as Deane and Badian have, one can get a better understanding of these difficult years. To fit all of the major events that we know about in a short period of time it has become necessary to place events like Naxos and the Eurymedon occurring in close proximity to each other if not simultaneously. No longer is it necessary to place every known event in its own year.

\textsuperscript{36}Badian, "Towards a Chronology of the Pentecontaetia," From Plataea to Potidaea, 76-7.
\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., 77. For an example of the confusion see Diod. Sic. 11.60.5-62. The battle of the Eurymedon is also confused by Nepos Cim. 2.2, who calls this battle Mycale.
A possible scenario with both the revolt and the battle happening simultaneously is plausible if we consider the position of Naxos. If Naxos had grown displeased with Athenian control of the League throughout the 470s, as seems certain because they did revolt, one must look for an explanation for their actions.\textsuperscript{38} One such reason can be found in Thucydides 1.99, where Thucydides tells us a number of reasons why the allies became displeased with the Athenians and revolted:

\[\text{αλτίαι δὲ ἄλλαι τε ἡσαν τῶν ἀποστάσεων καὶ μέγισται αἱ τῶν φόρων καὶ νεῶν ἐκδειαὶ καὶ λιποστράτιον ἐῖ τῷ ἐγένετο.}\]

The other greatest reasons for revolts were the shortfalls in the collection of tribute and ships and desertion.

Athenian successes throughout the 470s did not paralyze the Persian Empire, and the allies must have known that the Persian forces were preparing before the battle at the Euryomedon.\textsuperscript{39} To understand the relationship of these two events better the nature of the Persian expedition must be examined. If this was a defensive force then it would be difficult to explain any serious alarm in the Aegean. However, if the expedition was offensive in nature then the entire Aegean world would have had cause for concern. Our evidence for the purpose of this Persian expedition is not good, in fact it is nearly non existent. We have one piece of evidence relating to the Persian forces that might shed some light on the matter. According to Plato the Persians were planning an offensive attack against the Greeks: \[\text{αὐτὸς δὲ ἡγέλετο βασιλεὺς διανοεῖοθαι ὡς}\]

\textsuperscript{38}For a detailed discussion of Thuc. 1.99, and the reasons for allied revolts, see Meritt, et al., \textit{The Athenian Tribute Lists}. Vol. 3, 244-52.

\textsuperscript{39}Athenian advances into Asia Minor before the battle of the Euryomedon must have had some negative effect on the Persian Empire. It is not impossible to imagine that the Persians sent ambassadors to Naxos to encourage a revolt so that the Athenians might relax in their aggression against Persia. For a parallel Persian mission to Sparta during the revolt of Inaros see Thuc. 1.109.2.
ἐπιχειρήσων πάλιν ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἐλλήνας (It was reported that the King himself intended to make an attempt upon the Greeks again). If we can accept Plato’s statement then we must look to the behavior of the cities in Asia Minor before the battle of the Eurymedon occurred. According to Diodorus, a large number of cities were won over to the Athenians at this time and joined the League, suggesting that they needed the protection of the strong Athenian fleet or that they were expecting a Persian advance.

Recalling the treatment of Naxos by the Persians during the Persian Wars, it is possible to argue that the Naxians revolted in anticipation of a Persian invasion. Based on the importance of Naxos’ position and its past relationship with Persia, "it could be reasonably claimed that the League could not afford to let Naxos go." This would give us a sequence of events that fits into Thucydides’ narrative, with the revolt of Naxos occurring first, probably breaking out in 466, followed by the Athenian victory under Cimon at the Eurymedon in 465. If this was, indeed, how the events unfolded we would have a scenario with the Athenian fleet under Cimon gaining control of the situation at Naxos by capturing their fleet. At that point it would have been possible for Cimon to have left a small besieging force at Naxos while he proceeded with the fleet to engage the Persians who were gathering at the Eurymedon.

Thucydides next mentions the revolt of the island of Thasos in the northern Aegean. It was this revolt, in all probability, that kept Cimon in the

---

40Pl. Menex. 241d.
41Diod. Sic. 11.60.4-5.
42For an appeal of the Naxian oligarchs to Persia see Hdt. 5.30., and for the Persian treatment of Naxos during the Persian Wars see Hdt. 6.95.2-96. Meiggs, The Athenian Empire, 71, touches upon this possibility very cautiously. According to Meiggs "we cannot exclude the possibility that party politics had taken a dangerous turn and that one party, perhaps oligarchs, had once again as in 500 thought of looking to Sardis." This theory is also suggested by Robertson, "The True Nature of the 'Delian League' 478-461 B. C.," AJAH 5 (1980), 110.
Aegean and denied the Athenians the opportunity to follow up their victory at the Eurymedon. According to Thucydides the reason for the revolt was a dispute concerning the mainland of Thrace, in particular the markets and control of the mines that were held by the Thasians. These mines were a source of great wealth and Athenian encroachment into the area was possibly the reason for the Thasian revolt. In this description Thucydides also tells us that the Athenians sent out a colony of 10,000 settlers who founded the colony of Ennea Hodoi, which was located on the mainland of Thrace near Eion. After arriving at Ennea Hodoi, the colonists went forth into the interior of Thrace where they were ambushed and slaughtered by a force of native Edonians and Thasians. The site of this disaster according to Thucydides was at Drabescus. Once again Thucydides provides us with no date, and the sequence of events is also unclear. The situation becomes more complicated when one tries to determine when the Thasians appealed to the Spartans for aid. This will then lead us into a discussion of the events surrounding the Spartan earthquake.

As mentioned above, both the authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists and Meiggs place the revolt of Thasos in the autumn of 465. The evidence for this date is involved and one must examine it closely. To determine the date of the revolt one needs to look to the colony at Ennea Hodoi and the subsequent disaster at Drabescus. Thucydides tells us that these two events took place ἰπὸ

---

44 Meiggs, The Athenian Empire, 82, who believes that a "large scale offensive" would have been the next step for the Athenians after the Eurymedon.
45 Thuc. 1.100.2. See also Diod. Sic. 11.70.1.
46 According to Herodotus 5.17.2 the mines gave a talent of silver a day.
47 Meiggs, The Athenian Empire, 83.
48 Thuc. 1.100.3. See also Hdt. 9.75 who places the disaster ἰν Δάρτη (in Datus); Diod. Sic. 11.70.5.
τοὺς αὐτοῖς χρόνους (at the same time). Therefore, if we can determine the date of one of these two events we will be able to determine the date of the other. Fortunately, we can date with a degree of certainty the disaster at Drabescus. Thucydides mentions the colony at Ennea Hodoi on one other occasion. In a brief description of the history of the site of Amphipolis, which was founded on the same site as Ennea Hodoi, Thucydides presents us with a rare opportunity to date an event. According to Thucydides the site was originally settled by Aristagoras of Miletus, and thirty-two years after that the colony of Ennea Hodoi was founded. Thucydides next tells us that twenty-nine years after the attempt to settle Ennea Hodoi, the Athenians once again colonized the site under Hagnon.

Once again we are indebted to a scholiast of Aischines, who gives the archon for the year when Amphipolis was settled; this archon was Euthymenes (437/6). Thus, counting backwards twenty-nine years from 437 we arrive at the year 465/4. This is one date in the Pentecontaetia that has been widely accepted as secure and one from which opinions do not vary widely. However, the date has been recently challenged by Deane, who argues for a date of spring 464. Deane believes that the colony could not have been founded in the autumn. Citing the difficulties of founding a colony and the severity of the Thracian climate in fall and winter, he proposes a date for the colony of spring 464. This date for the colony has recently been accepted by Badian.

---

50 Thuc. 1.100.3. A similar description is given by Diod. Sic. 11.70.5.
51 Thuc. 4.102.2. For a description of Aristagoras' flight from Miletus and his fate in Thrace see Hdt. 5.124-126.
52 Thuc. 4.102.3.
53 Schol. Aisch. 2.31; see also Diod. Sic. 12.32.1 who gives the same archon name for this year.
also been much debate concerning the disaster at Drabescus. There are many unanswered questions concerning this expedition. One would like to know how long the colonists remained in Ennea Hodoi before proceeding inland and if all or some of the colonists were killed. In his recent article Badian has attempted to answer these questions. The central issue to the debate here is the name of the archon supplied by the scholiast at Aischines 2.31. According to the scholia, the archons's name was Lysikrates, who was archon for the year 453/2. This archon name has been emended to read Lysitheus, archon for the year 465/4. This emendation is rejected by Badian, who places the date for the disaster to 453/2, some twelve years after the founding of the colony.\textsuperscript{56}

There has also been significant debate as to the number killed at Drabescus. The authors of \textit{The Athenian Tribute Lists} argue that only a small military escort was killed;\textsuperscript{57} while others believe that all the settlers were killed\textsuperscript{58} With so little evidence, an understanding the events surrounding the colony cannot be explained adequately. The most plausible reconstruction remains that the colony lasted for a relatively short time and that most of the settlers were killed. This, of course, requires emendation of the archon name Lysikrates to Lysitheus. While I am opposed, in principle, to textual emendation for the purpose of creating a plausible chronology, I must here accept the reading of Lysitheus and place the disaster in 464. There is, however, good reason to accept the emendation. As mentioned above, Thucydides places both the colony and the disaster "at the same time." Thucydides was certainly familiar with the area around Amphipolis and Thasos; he was one of the two generals who lost

\textsuperscript{56}\textit{Ibid.}, 81-6.
\textsuperscript{57}Meritt, et al., \textit{The Athenian Tribute Lists. Vol. 3}, 106-10.
\textsuperscript{58}Hornblower, \textit{A Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1}, 155-6.
the city to the Spartan general Brasidas in 424. On account of his apparent familiarity with the area, I do not think there is a firm basis for questioning Thucydides' account here.

With the date of the revolt of Thasos established as the spring of 464, and with a better understanding of the events surrounding the colony of Ennea Hodoi, the relationship of these events to the earthquake at Sparta needs to be established. Thucydides tells us that during the siege the Thasians appealed to the Spartans to invade Attica and that the Spartans promised assistance. The Spartans were unable to fulfill their promise to the Thasians on account of an earthquake in Sparta and a subsequent uprising of the Helots. These events have been debated endlessly by modern scholars. The central issue one must examine here is when the earthquake occurred in relation to the promise of aid to Thasos. We must also discuss the Athenian expeditions to Sparta under Cimon, the end of the Helots' revolt, and Thucydides 1.103.1.

If one follows a strict fundamentalist reading of Thucydides the sequence of events is not in doubt. The earthquake occurred after the Spartans had promised the Thasians that they would invade Attica. This, however, has recently been challenged by Badian, who has proposed that the earthquake actually happened prior to the Spartan promise to the Thasians. Before looking closer at Badian's suggestion it is necessary to understand Thucydides' account. After mentioning the earthquake Thucydides states that the siege of Naxos ended in it's third year. In the next chapter we are told by Thucydides that the Spartans were having difficulties in their war against the rebels who had fortified themselves on Mt. Ithome in Messenia and that it was necessary for the Spartans

---

59 Thuc. 4.104.1-107.1.  
60 Thuc. 1.100.1.  
61 Thuc. 1.101.3.
to appeal to the Athenians for assistance.\textsuperscript{62} We next learn from Thucydides that the Athenians sent a force of hoplites under Cimon's leadership to help the Spartans. The Spartans then grew afraid of the Athenians and dismissed them from the operation.\textsuperscript{63} Thucydides' narrative is deficient and leaves the reader asking many questions. One would like to know how long the Athenians were at Mt. Ithome before they were dismissed by the Spartans, and what was the reason for their dismissal. According to Thucydides the Spartans feared:

\begin{quote}
τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸ τολμήρον καὶ τὴν νεωτεροποιέαν, καὶ ἄλλοφυλος ἄμα ἡγομένους, μὴ τι, ἦν παραμείνοισιν, ὕπο τῶν ἐν Ἰθώμῃ πεισθέντες νεωτερίσωσι, μόνοις τῶν ἐμμάχων ἀπέπεμψαν.\textsuperscript{64}
\end{quote}

the daring and the innovation of the Athenians and they were considering them to be foreign, lest should they remain they would incite revolution being persuaded by the ones on Ithome, they sent the Athenians, alone of all the allies, away.

This does not answer our questions, but only raises others.

For instance, the length of the revolt on Mt. Ithome has for a long time been a difficult problem. Thucydides says that the revolt ended \( \text{ἐν ἐκάτω} \) \( \text{ἐτεῖ} \) (in the tenth year).\textsuperscript{65} Many who believe that the revolt could not have lasted so long have tried to emend the text to read the \( \text{ἐν τετάρτῳ} \) \( \text{ἐτεῖ} \) (in the fourth year).\textsuperscript{66} The controversy is how Thucydides wrote the number. If Thucydides was employing the acrophonic system of numerals he would have written a \( \Delta \) which would be equal to ten. On the other hand, if he did not use

\textsuperscript{62}Thuc. 1.102.1. For the Spartan appeal to the Athenians see also Diod. Sic. 11.64.2; [Arist.] \textit{Ath. Pol.} 3.11; Ar. Lys. 1137-1144; Paus. 1.29.8, 4.24.6.

\textsuperscript{63}Thuc. 1.102.1-4.

\textsuperscript{64}Thuc. 1.102.3. A similar account is given by Plut. \textit{Cim.} 17.3 and Paus. 4.24.6.

\textsuperscript{65}Thuc. 1.103.1.

\textsuperscript{66}A detailed history of the various emendations can be found in Meritt, et al., \textit{The Athenian Tribute Lists.} Vol. 3, 162-5, who accept the emendation: \( \text{ἐν τετάρτῳ} \) \( \text{ἐτεῖ} \) (in the fourth year).
this system of numerals the Δ, the fourth letter of the Greek alphabet, would then be equal to four. Supporters of emendation to τετάρτῳ believe that an early copyist read the delta as an acrophonic numeral and copied δέκατῳ into the text. It is also believed that this emendation occurred at an early date since Diodorus, who was apparently using Ephorus as his source, states that the revolt lasted to the tenth year. Just as we have seen that the strict chronological reading of Thucydides can no longer be used, this is also true of the emendation of 1.103.1. The two most convincing arguments in favor of retaining δέκατῳ are the works of Deane and Badian that we have already discussed. Emendation of the Thucydidean text has also been abandoned recently by D. M. Lewis in second edition of *The Cambridge Ancient History*.

Many other questions remain unanswered concerning Cimon's expedition to Sparta. Indeed, one would like to know how many expeditions the Athenians sent to Sparta. In Plutarch alone we hear of two Athenian expeditions to the Peloponnese. The first of these was a successful mission to help with the immediate emergency at Sparta itself. The second expedition occurred some time later when the Spartans needed Athenian assistance with the siege of Mt. Ithome. In Plutarch's description of the first expedition, he tells us that the Spartan ambassador who came to Athens to request assistance was Pericleidas. We also know of this ambassador from Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, where he is

---

67Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. Vol. 1, 403-4. Gomme prefers to emend the text to read ΗΕΚΤΟΙ (sixth year), an archaic spelling for ἕκτῳ.

68Diod. Sic. 11.64.4: ητί δε ἐτη δέκα.

69Deane's argument is also accepted by Unz, "The Chronology of the Pentecontaetia," *CQ* n.s. 36 (1986), 74 n.30. Stadter, "The Form and Content of Thucydides' Pentecontaetia (1.89-117)," *GRBS* 34 (1993), 54 n.70 also rejects emendation. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*. Vol. 1, 16 is unsure whether the reading should be tenth or fifth.


mentioned by name.\textsuperscript{72} The story of two expeditions as told by Plutarch has been
dismissed on account of Plutarch's unreliability. Nevertheless, several scholars
have supported Plutarch's account. Recently, Badian has taken up the argument
again.

Badian's argument concerning the Athenian expeditions to Sparta is often
convincing, but at times parts of his reconstruction seem improbable.
Thucydides' silence concerning an earlier expedition to Sparta is easily explained
by Badian and should be accepted. Simply, the first expedition did not
contribute to Thucydides' theme and, therefore, was not needed in the
excursus.\textsuperscript{73} Badian chooses to date the earthquake to 469/8, the date given by
Diodorus Siculus.\textsuperscript{74} A date previous to the outbreak of the Thasian revolt, and
seemingly contrary to Thucydides' narrative has been proposed by Raphael
Sealey and accepted by Badian.\textsuperscript{75} Sealey has proposed that Thucydides'
statement at 1.101.2, \textit{ὅποδ τοῦ γενομένου σεισμοῦ}, must be translated as "by
the earthquake, which had happened." It must now be accepted that this is what
the text says.\textsuperscript{76} Further evidence for an earlier expedition to Sparta by Cimon is
given in a scholiast's note to the Aristophanes passage discussed above (\textit{Lys.}
1138-1144). According to the scholiast Cimon went to Sparta and saved the city
after the earthquake and the beginning of the revolt in the twelfth year after the
battle of Plataea in the archonship of Theagenides.\textsuperscript{77} This year is dated to 468/7.

\textsuperscript{72}Ar. Lys. 1138-9.
\textsuperscript{73}For another detailed analysis of Thucydides' omission of an earlier expedition see: G.
P. Papantoniou, "Once or Twice?," \textit{AJP} 72 (1951), 180. Papantoniou also accepts Plutarch's
account of two expeditions to the Peloponnese.
\textsuperscript{74}Diod. Sic. 11.63.1-4.
\textsuperscript{75}Badian, "Towards a Chronology of the Pentecontaetia," \textit{From Plataea to Potidaea,} 92-3,
\textsuperscript{76}Hornblower, \textit{A Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1}, 157 agrees that "there is no doubt
that the translation is correct." However he believes that the interval between the earthquake
and the revolt of Thasos is shorter than Badian would have it.
\textsuperscript{77}Schol. Ar. Lys. 1138-1144. See also: Philochorus\textit{FGrH} 328 F 117.
The scholiast here is using as his source Philochorus, the Attidographer of the 4th and 3rd Century B. C., a known reliable source.\textsuperscript{78} It seems certain that there was an earlier Athenian expedition to Sparta. We cannot use Thucydides' silence on this issue to dismiss what our other sources tell us. The fact that all of our primary sources supporting an earlier expedition are roughly contemporary to Thucydides except Plutarch, who may be using an earlier source, seems to indicate that there is some truth to the story of an earlier Athenian expedition to Sparta.\textsuperscript{79}

If then the earthquake happened before the revolt of Thasos we must determine the date of the earthquake. Several possibilities exist. Among these are 469/8 and 464/3 and probably any year in-between. If one retains δεκατω, which I am doing here, the apparent date for the earthquake according to Thucydides is somewhere between 465-463, probably 464. According to Diodorus the earthquake is dated to 469/8 and that the revolt lasted ten years.\textsuperscript{80} However, Diodorus' number must be called into question, for he later tells us that the revolt ended in 456/5.\textsuperscript{81} Apparently Diodorus has confused two traditions, one that the earthquake occurred in 469/8 and the other that it occurred in 466/5. Another possibility in dating the earthquake is from Plutarch who tells us that the earthquake happened in the fourth year of the office of

\textsuperscript{78}Philochorus \textit{FGrH} 328: F 97-160. See also \textit{FGrH 3b (Suppl.) Vol. 2}, 365-71, for commentary on F 117.


\textsuperscript{80}Diod. Sic. 11.63.1. Diodorus here gives the archon's name as Φαίων, when in fact it is Άφείων.

\textsuperscript{81}Diod. Sic. 11.84.7-8.
Basileus Archidamus. Once again we run into problems, for the date of Archidamus' accession is not known. Diodorus tells us that Archidamus became Basileus in 476/5 and died in 434/3, when he was in fact alive at a later date. Another source for the date of the earthquake is Pausanias, who gives a date by the Olympic year and the Athenian archon. Pausanias' date for the earthquake is 464/3.

If the earthquake occurred before the revolt of Thasos and the Athenians sent two expeditions to Sparta then the earthquake must be dated to sometime earlier than 466/5. It would be impossible to have the earthquake in 466/5 or later because this would crowd events too much: placing the revolt of Naxos, the battle at the Eurymedon, and an expedition to Sparta all in the same year. We know that Diodorus has the revolt last ten years, therefore making 466/5 as viable a candidate as 469/8 for the date of the earthquake. However, it is extremely difficult to support this dating for the earthquake. I do not believe that the helot revolt could have lasted as late as 456/5, because the revolt must have been over by the time of the battle of Tanagra in 458/7. Therefore, 469/8 is a much more likely date for the earthquake. The case for this date is further strengthened if we consider the scholiast's note to Lysistrata 1138-1144. According to this source, probably Philochorus, the first Athenian expedition to Sparta was dated to the archonship of Theagenides (468/7). Events would be dangerously crowded if we are to place an expedition to Sparta shortly before the campaign against Naxos and the Eurymedon.

82Plut. Cim. 16.4.
83For Archidamus' accession, 11.48.2, and for his death 12.35.4. Diodorus mentions Archidamus on three separate occasions after reporting his death.
84Paus. 4.24.5-6.
The question of what caused the Spartans to dismiss the Athenians has also been addressed by Badian. According to Badian "Thucydides' explanation for the dismissal is pure fiction." It is Badian's view that the Athenians were unable to perform their duties successfully at Mt. Ithome. The task required of the Athenians by the Spartans was to take the fortifications by siege. When the Athenians failed in their attempt they were no longer needed by the Spartans, who had other allies present. While the explanation is a practical one, and likely partially true, all of our other sources tell us otherwise and we must continue to believe that the Spartans did fear the Athenians for some reason. Another shortcoming of Badian's theory is that it fails to take into account the Athenian's outrage at the dismissal. It has also been argued that the Athenian's dismissal was a result of a fear of the Spartans that the Athenians would help the helots in their revolt. As an explanation for this theory Deane conjectures that the Athenians possibly learned of the Spartan promise to the Thasians to invade Attica.

After his dismissal from Sparta, Cimon returned to Athens in disgrace. At some point while Cimon was in the Peloponnese, or shortly after his return to Athens, his policies were challenged by Ephialtes. It was Ephialtes who brought forth legislation that overturned the powers of the Areopagus. When this happened is extremely important as is the timing of Cimon's ostracism from Athens. These events are nearly impossible to reconstruct because there is no

---

85 Badian, "Towards a Chronology of the Pentecontaetia," From Plataea to Potidaea, 95.
86 Thuc. 1.102.2 states that the primary reason the Spartans requested Athenian aid was their expertise in siege warfare. See also Hdt. 9.70.1-2.
87 This is the exact reason Badian gives for rejecting the argument that the Athenians left Ithome willingly upon hearing of Ephialtes' reforms. Badian, "Toward a Chronology of the Pentecontaetia," From Plataea to Potidaea, 95.
89 Plut. Cim. 17.3.
90 Plut. Cim. 15.2; [Arist.] Ath. Pol. 25.
mention of either Ephialtes' reforms or of Cimon's ostracism in Thucydides' excurssus. For the reconstruction of these events we must rely primarily on the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* and Plutarch.

According to Plutarch Ephialtes' reforms were carried out while Cimon was in Messenia.\(^{91}\) Modern debate is, however, divided on this point. One must decide whether the reforms took place while Cimon was in Messenia, in Athens, or after his ostracism. A strong argument can be made that the reforms occurred while Cimon was still in Messenia. This is the view of P. J. Rhodes, who believes that it was the reforms of Ephialtes, a known enemy of Sparta, that led the Spartans to dismiss the Athenians.\(^{92}\) There must be some connection between the two events. Perhaps Ephialtes and his faction had made an attempt to reverse the powers of the Areopagus while Cimon was still in Messenia. This certainly would have been reason enough for Cimon to wish to return to Athens quickly. The Spartans also would want Cimon to be at Athens to challenge Ephialtes' attacks.\(^{93}\) Having left Sparta accomplishing nothing, Cimon would have been open to criticism and then ostracized. With Ephialtes' faction in power, and Cimon ostracized, the failed mission to Ithome could then have become a propaganda piece used to tarnish the image of Cimon and his faction. If this is indeed how the events surrounding Cimon's ostracism unfolded all that remains is to determine a date for this event. Once again we must rely upon the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*. According to this source the reforms of Ephialtes were carried out in the archonship of Conon (462/1).\(^{94}\) Based on this date

\(^{91}\) Plut. Cim. 15.2.
\(^{93}\) The Spartans had many reasons to dislike Ephialtes. It was he who opposed Cimon when he was trying to get a force together to assist the Spartans. See Plut. Cim. 16.9-10.
Cimon’s ostracism, which took place after the reforms were passed, can be securely dated to 461.

With Cimon’s ostracism we have the end of his age and the rise of the age of Pericles. Following Cimon’s ostracism Athens and Sparta began to fight openly against each other, in what is known as the First Peloponnesian War. These events are too detailed to treat adequately here. However, a brief outline of some of the major events must be given. Among the more important incidents of these years are the Athenian alliances with Argos and Thessaly that were concluded sometime shortly after the Athenian dismissal from Ithome. Following the Athenian dismissal the Spartans were forced to allow the Messenians to leave Ithome unharmed. The Athenians took advantage of this situation and settled the Messenians at Naupactus. Also of great importance are the Athenian expeditions to Egypt to help the revolt of Inarus against Persia. During the First Peloponnesian War Athens attacked and took by siege the island of Aegina. From this short list of events it should be clear that the Athenians at this time were active on many fronts throughout the Greek and Mediterranean worlds. This alarmed the Spartans and they did not remain inactive for long. It was the Spartan expedition to Doris that set the scene for the battle of Tanagra. After a number of other Athenian successes and setbacks, the two met in battle at Tanagra in Boeotia. It was on this occasion that Cimon made a brief appearance on the battlefield.

---

95Thuc. 1.102.4, 2.22.5; Paus. 1.29.9, 4.24.7.
96Thuc. 1.103.3; Diod. Sic. 11.84.7-8; Paus. 4.24.7.
97Thuc. 1.104, 109-110; Hdt. 3.12.4, 15.3, 160.2. 7.7; Ctesias FGrH 688 F 14; Diod. Sic. 11.71.3-6, 74-5, 77.1-5.
98Thuc. 1.105.2-4, 108.4; Diod. Sic. 11.70.2-3, 78.3-4.
The battle of Tanagra was fought in the year 458/7, after the Spartans had been cut off from the Peloponnese by the Athenians. With no other choice, the Spartans prepared to fight. The Athenians did the same. While the Athenians were preparing, Cimon, before the end of his ostracism, arrived at the Athenian camp asking to be allowed to fight for Athens. This alarmed many of the Athenians present, who feared that Cimon and his faction might betray Athens to the Spartans. After a brief discussion the Boule, according to Plutarch, dismissed Cimon from the battlefield. In the ensuing battle the members of Cimon's faction fought bravely and were killed nearly to a man.

The date of the battle of Tanagra is one of the most difficult events in the Pentecontaetia to date accurately. Our only literary evidence for the date is provided by Diodorus Siculus who tells us that the battle occurred in the archonship of Bion, 458/7. On account of Diodorus' statement Tanagra has been dated to this year by almost all modern historians, although some other opinions do exist. The one widely accepted fact about Tanagra is that it must have been fought after the end of the helot's revolt, which I believe was in 459/8. The authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists have dated Tanagra to 459/8, while most other modern historians place the battle in 458/7.

Sometime after the battle of Tanagra Cimon was recalled from exile. According to most of our sources Cimon was recalled in the fifth year of his ostracism in order to negotiate a peace with the Spartans and because the

---

99Thuc. 1.107.2-4.
100The Athenians had reason to fear a betrayal, since there had been some form of an oligarchic plot at the time: Thuc. 1.107.4, 6; Plut. Cim. 17.4-7, Per. 10.1-3.
101Plut. Cim. 17.4-5.
102Diod. Sic. 11.79-80.
103This was first demonstrated by Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 1, 402 n.3. Gomme dates the battle to 458/7.
Athenians feared a Spartan invasion after the battle of Tanagra. Not surprisingly, controversy surrounds nearly all of these events. While most of our sources tell us of Cimon's early return from ostracism, the issue is still in doubt. I believe, on account of the overwhelming literary evidence in support of the fact, that Cimon was recalled early. Also, it was not many years earlier that Aristeides was recalled early from ostracism before the battle of Salamis. This certainly shows that there was precedence for recalling an important citizen if an emergency required it. If this is the case then, a date for the recall must be determined. The literary evidence points to a return in the fifth year of his ostracism, namely 457. This date would be consistent with the date I have supported for the battle of Tanagra, if Cimon was recalled on account of the Athenian losses at Tanagra and to negotiate a peace with Sparta. The date for Cimon's legal return to Athens after his ten years of exile would have been 451.

The problem of Cimon's activities after his recall is not easy to resolve. Only two of his actions upon returning to Athens are recorded. After Cimon's recall, the Five Years Truce was then established between Athens and Sparta, in 451. The only other mention of Cimon after his return from ostracism was his expedition to Cyprus. Both of these events occurred after Cimon would have legally returned from ostracism. This has cast doubts on Cimon's recall and led others to believe that he was recalled later than 457, and perhaps as late as 452.

Perhaps our primary source for Cimon's recall in the fifth year of his ostracism is a fragment of Theopompus, an historian of the 4th century B.C.

---

105Thuc. 1.112.1; Ar. Ach. 187-90; FGrH Theopompus 115 F 88; Diod. Sic. 11.86.1; Plut. Cim. 18.1, Per. 10.4; Nepos Cim. 3.3.
106Thuc. 1.112.2-4; Diod. Sic. 12.3-4.3; Plut. Cim. 18.19.2, Per. 10.5, 8, Them. 31.4; Nepos Cim. 3.4; Paus. 1.29.13.
According to the fragment, which has been preserved by a scholiast to the orator Aristides 46.3, Cimon was recalled in the fifth year of his exile:

οὖν δὲ πέντε ἔτην παρεληλυθότων πολέμου συμβάντος πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ὁ δὴμος μετεπέμψατο τὸν Κύμωνα, νομίζον διὰ τὴν προζενίαν ταχίστην ἀν αὐτὸν εἰρήνην ποιήσασθαι.\(^{108}\)

The demos recalled Cimon with not yet five years of the war against the Lacedaimonians having gone by, thinking that he would bring about peace quickly on account of his proxeny.

Additional literary evidence in support of Cimon's early recall from exile is provided by Plutarch, who also tells us that the losses at the battle of Tanagra compelled the Athenians to recall Cimon. More surprisingly, Plutarch also tells us that Cimon's recall was proposed by Pericles:


Theopomp. FGrH 115 F 88; for the difficulties with using this passage see: W. R. Connor, Theopompus and Fifth Century Athens (Washington 1968), 24-30.

\(^{109}\)Plut. Cim. 17.8. See also: Per. 10.4; Nepos Cim. 3.2-3.

\(^{110}\)Andoc. 3.3-4.

\(^{111}\)Meiggs, The Athenian Empire, 422-3.
possible that Cimon was recalled later than 457, although most of our evidence points to this date.

Other explanations for Cimon's recall have been made. Recently Unz has argued that the disaster in Egypt prompted the Athenians to recall Cimon.\textsuperscript{112} According to Unz, Cimon was recalled in spring 454, concluded the Five Years Truce with Sparta in the summer, and then quickly sailed off to Cyprus and fought at Citium. The arguments for this reconstruction are interesting, yet not convincing. As seen above the evidence that Cimon was recalled as a result of the battle of Tanagra seems conclusive. J. R. Cole has also presented an intriguing argument in support of Cimon's early recall. The recall of Cimon, according to Cole, was advocated by the Aeschylus in his \textit{Oresteia}, presented in 458.\textsuperscript{113} Aeschylus was calling for Cimon's recall in addition to military resistance to Persia as well as an end to factionalism at Athens. Cole has noticed many similarities in the characters of Agamemnon and Orestes with Cimon. Cole's article is certainly interesting, however it is both difficult and dangerous to attempt to recreate historical events through tragedy.

The Five Years Truce with Sparta was negotiated by Cimon in 451. Diodorus Siculus dates the Five Years Truce to 454/3.\textsuperscript{114} However, Thucydides provides us with a more reliable date. Uncharacteristically, Thucydides tells us that the Five Years Truce was concluded three years after Pericles' campaign of 454/3 in the Corinthian Gulf.\textsuperscript{115} This allows us to date securely the Five Years Truce to 451.

\textsuperscript{112}Unz, "The Chronology of the Pentekontaetia," CQ n.s. 36 (1986), 76-82. 
\textsuperscript{114}Diod. Sic. 11.86.1. 
\textsuperscript{115}Thuc. 1.112.1.
The only other mention of Cimon after his return from ostracism was his expedition to Cyprus. Here Cimon fought his final battle against the Persians at Citium, where he died. The battle of Cyprian Salamis, fought by Cimon's forces after his death, was a brilliant victory for the Delian League. This victory marked the end of open hostilities between the Delian League and the Persian Empire, as well as Cimon's death. The precise date of this expedition is unknown from our sources, although it can be dated between 451-0, or possibly as late as 449. The expedition is placed by Thucydides right after the completion of the Five Years Truce of 451.116 Most modern historians have argued that the campaign and Cimon's death took place in 450.117 Meiggs, however, has dated the campaign to 451.118 Badian, too, has argued for a date not consistent with the orthodox view, placing the campaign in 450, but Cimon's death in 449.119 It would appear that 451 is not a possible date for the campaign. After concluding the Truce with the Spartans, Cimon would hardly have had enough time to equip a fleet, sail to Cyprus, and lay siege to Citium before he died. This would make the spring of 450 the logical date for the start of the expedition. When exactly Cimon died, is also disputable although summer 450 appears most probable.

Cimon's dominance in Athenian politics ended in 461 with his ostracism. Despite this his faction and influence still remained intact. This is perhaps the primary reason that he was able to be recalled from ostracism. His final actions on behalf of Athens and the Delian League made possible the Peace of Callias and the end of hostilities with the Persians. This, however, led to further Athenian imperialism and fighting with the Peloponnesians. Cimon certainly

116 Thuc. 1.112.2-4.
would have been opposed to these activities, and would undoubtedly have pushed for peace with Sparta. This would have been impossible; the wheels of Athenian imperialism were already in motion and Cimon, knowingly or not, played a major role in this transformation.
CONCLUSION

In chapter one I have presented an analysis of the Delian League's foundation and its charter. I have argued for a large League, composed primarily of poleis from the Aegean islands north of Melos and Thera, Ionia, the Hellespont, some Thracian poleis, and Athens from the mainland. These poleis met on the island of Delos in a common synod where each polis held an equal vote. Each of the members was assessed, by Aristeides, an amount of either money or ships which they were to contribute to the League. According to Thucydides, the League's first assessment was 460 talents. The term used by Thucydides here, φορος, certainly means cash only. This presents problems, for we do not fully understand how Thucydides added up his figure. The officials responsible for collecting the tribute were the Hellenotamiae, the Treasurers of the Greeks. These officials were Athenians from the League's outset, although their appointment originally required ratification before the League's synod.

The League's original purpose was to ravage the King's land. If at any time the opportunity for booty presented itself, the League fleet would certainly have taken advantage of the situation. In time, however, the League's purpose changed as Athens moved closer to making the Delian League into their Empire.
Once the League's charter was established the fleet began its operations at once. Command of the League's fleet was given to Cimon, while Aristeides took care of administrative matters. The reconstruction of the chronology of the League's early campaigns has presented numerous problems for scholars studying this period. Much of this debate was changed with the publication of The Athenian Tribute Lists Vols. 1-3 between the years 1939-50. The publication of A Historical Commentary on Thucydides Vol. 1 by A. W. Gomme in 1945 also contributed the development of this change in the study of the Pentecontaetia.

While they did help to rewrite the history of the Pentecontaetia, their findings did not remain unchallenged for long. The most important improvement on these two works is in the reading of Thucydides' excursus on the Pentecontaetia. The authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists and Gomme believed that Thucydides wrote his excursus in a strict chronological order. According to them, this was Thucydides' method of improving on Hellenicus' chronologically inaccurate account of these years.

This conclusion can no longer be maintained. It has been sufficiently proven by both Deane and Badian, as well as others, that for a variety of reasons Thucydides often does not present his narrative of events in a strict chronological order. Other improvements in the works of the authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists and Gomme include the abandonment of textual emendation at 1.103.1. I have argued here that the helot's revolt did last for ten years, beginning in 469/8. After the earthquake, the Spartans requested Athenian assistance and Cimon led a force of Athenians to Sparta in 468/7. Cimon would again lead another
expedition to Messenia in 462/1. It was on this mission that the Spartans, for various reasons feared the Athenian’s presence and dismissed them.

During the years between 468/7 and 462/1 the Athenians and Cimon were involved in several other campaigns. The suppression of the revolt on Naxos, the battle at the Eurymedon, and the revolt of Thasos. I have proposed that both the revolt of Naxos and the battle at the Eurymedon can be dated to 465. This is later than most proposed chronologies, but I believe that it is supported by Thucydides’ report that Themistocles passed the Athenian fleet besieging Naxos before he reached Ephesus. After reaching Ephesus Thucydides tells us that Themistocles wrote a letter Artaxerxes I, who had just come to the throne. Artaxerxes I became king in 465. After the victory at the Eurymedon the fleet returned to the Aegean. The revolt of Thasos began in the spring of 464, after the establishment of the colony at Ennea Hodoi.

In 462/1 Cimon and the Athenians were dismissed from Ithome by the Spartans. This action was taken, possibly as a reaction to Ephialtes’ attempted overthrow of the Areopagus. When Cimon had returned to Athens, he was ostracized in 461 and the powers of the Areopagus were overturned.

As Cimon went into exile, the Athenians and the Spartans began fighting the First Peloponnesian War. During this war an important battle was fought at Tanagra, in 458/7. Sometime after this battle, possibly 457, Cimon was recalled from ostracism by a special decree proposed by Pericles. We have no record of Cimon in Athens until 451, when he negotiated the Five Years Truce between Athens and Sparta. After this Cimon set out on an expedition to Cyprus, where he died while besieging
Citium. After his death the League fleet won a major victory at Cyprian Salamis. It was this victory that opened the door for the Peace of Callias, which effectively ended the existence of the Delian League.
Appendix A

Proposed Chronology

Siege and capture of Sestus       aut. 479-spr. 478
Expeditions to Cyprus and Byz.    spr. 478-aut. 478
Recall of Pausanias               spr. 477
Meeting on Delos                   early sum. 477
Capture of Eion                    476/5
Capture of Scyrus                  476/5
War against Carystus               475-470?
Earthquake at Sparta               469/8
1st Athenian expedition to the Pel. 468/7
Revolt of Naxos                    466/5
Battle at the Eurymedon            465
Colony to Ennea Hodoi              spr. 464
Revolt of Thasos                   464
Disaster at Drabescus              464
2nd Athenian expedition to the Pel. 462
Spartan dismissal of the Athenians 462/1
Reforms of Ephialtes               462/1
Ostracism of Cimon                 spr. 461
End of the helot's revolt          459
Battle of Tanagra                  458/7
Recall of Cimon from ostracism     457 possibly later?
Five Years Truce with Sparta       451
Campaign to Cyprus                 spr. 450
Death of Cimon                     450
### Appendix B

#### Other Proposed Chronologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>ATL</th>
<th>Deane</th>
<th>Badian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siege and capture of Sestus</td>
<td>479/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expeditions to Cyprus and Byz.</td>
<td>spr. 478</td>
<td></td>
<td>478-477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall of Pausanias</td>
<td>sum. 478</td>
<td></td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on Delos</td>
<td>sum. 478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Eion</td>
<td>477/6-475</td>
<td></td>
<td>477/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Scyrus</td>
<td>476/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>476/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War against Carystus</td>
<td>475-70?</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake at Sparta</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>469/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Athenian expedition to the Pel.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>spr. 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolt of Naxos</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>467/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle at the Eurymedon</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony to Ennea Hodoi</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>spr. 464</td>
<td>465/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolt of Thasos</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>465/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster at Drabescus</td>
<td>465/4</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>453/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Athenian expedition to the Pel.</td>
<td>462/1</td>
<td>462/1</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartan dismissal of the Athenians</td>
<td>462/1</td>
<td>462/1</td>
<td>462/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforms of Ephialtes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>462/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostracism of Cimon</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>spr. 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the helot's revolt</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>455/4</td>
<td>458/7?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Tanagra</td>
<td>459/8</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall of Cimon from ostracism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Years Truce with Sparta</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign to Cyprus</td>
<td>spr. 450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Cimon</td>
<td>sum. 450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Steinbrecher</td>
<td>CAH vol. 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siege and capture of Sestus</td>
<td></td>
<td>479 (winter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expeditions to Cyprus and Byz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall of Pausanias</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>478 (winter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on Delos</td>
<td>478/7</td>
<td>478 (winter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Eion</td>
<td>476/5</td>
<td>476-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Scyrus</td>
<td>476/5</td>
<td>476-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War against Carystus</td>
<td>470-69?</td>
<td>475-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake at Sparta</td>
<td></td>
<td>465-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Athenian Expedition to the Pel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolt of Naxos</td>
<td>467/6</td>
<td>475-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle at the Eurymedon</td>
<td>466/5</td>
<td>469-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony to Ennea Hodoi</td>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolt of Thasos</td>
<td>465/4</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster at Drabescus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Athenian expedition to the Pel.</td>
<td>463/2</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartan dismissal of the Athenians</td>
<td>462/1</td>
<td>462?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforms of Ephialtes</td>
<td>462/1</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostracism of Cimon</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the helot's revolt</td>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Tanagra</td>
<td></td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall of Cimon from ostracism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Years Truce with Sparta</td>
<td></td>
<td>451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign to Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td>450?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Cimon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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