

XVIII.—The Lelantine War and Pheidon of Argos

DONALD W. BRADEEN

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE

The so-called Lelantine War between Chalcis and Eretria and their respective allies has long tantalized historians, but, despite much debate on the subject, there is as yet no substantial agreement. The war has been placed in various periods ranging from the eighth to the sixth centuries B.C., with the more recent authorities favoring a later date.¹ There has been a similar divergence of opinion concerning the war's extent and ramifications.² Such a diversity of views reflects the lack of precision and the paucity of our evidence. This study began as a review of that evidence, which is found to indicate that the struggle falls somewhere between the years 720 and 660 B.C. This leads to a detailed examination of the known history of that period, in which may be discerned two groups of Greek states which always appear hostile to one another. The best explanation for such an alignment is found in the career of Pheidon of Argos, and an analysis of his rise gives us a clue to the reasons for the extension of the Lelantine War and helps us to date it more precisely.

¹ The war is set in the late eighth century by G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, 1² (Gotha, 1893) 456-457; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, 2 (Stuttgart, 1884) 539-540; H. Dondorff, *De Rebus Chalcidensium* (Diss. Halle, 1855) 6-18; E. Curtius, "Studien zur Geschichte von Korinth," *Hermes* 10 (1876) 220. The first part of the seventh century is favored by A. R. Burn, "The So-called 'Trade Leagues' in Early Greek History and the Lelantine War," *JHS* 49 (1929) 14-37; M. Cary, *CAH* 3.622; F. Geyer, *Topographie und Geschichte der Insel Euböia*, 1 (Berlin, 1903) 24-27; E. L. Highbarger, *The History and Civilization of Ancient Megara* (Baltimore, 1927) 108-109; A. G. Dunham, *The History of Miletus* (London, 1915) 65-68. The end of the seventh and the early sixth century is supported by K. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, 1.1² (Strassburg, 1912) 338-339; A. A. Trever, "Economic and Political Conditions in Megara," *CPh* 20 (1925) 120-122; J. G. O'Neill, *Ancient Corinth*, 1 (Baltimore, 1930) 162-164 and 246-250; and W. Wallace, *The History of Eretria to 198 B.C.* (Unpubl. Diss. Johns Hopkins, 1936) 50-69. V. Costanzi, "La Guerra Lelantea," *Atene e Roma* 5 (1902) 768-790, dates the war more closely, putting it between 580 and 570 B.C.

² For the two extremes see Burn, *loc. cit.*, who believes that most of the Greek world was involved through trade relations, and P. Gardner, "A Numismatic Note on the Lelantine War," *CR* 34 (1920) 90-91, who considers it a "knightly combat" involving only the possession of the Lelantine Plain. K. F. Hermann, "Der Kampf zwischen Chalcis und Eretria um das Lelantische Gefilde," *RhM* 1 (1832) 84-97, suggested that the war was between oligarchies and democracies; he has been decisively refuted by Dondorff (*loc. cit.*).

There are only four ancient references which are universally accepted as pertaining to the war. First, Thucydides (1.15), after stating that land warfare among the early Greeks was carried on by individual cities without allies against their neighbors, makes the following exception to his statement: *μάλιστα δὲ ἐς τὸν πάλαι ποτὲ γενόμενον πόλεμον Χαλκιδέων καὶ Ἐρετριῶν καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἐκατέρων διέστη.*

Herodotus (5.99.1) gives as the reason for Eretria's aid to Miletus during the Ionian Revolt the help which the latter gave Eretria in the war with Chalcis, "when the Samians helped the Chalcidians against the Eretrians and the Milesians."

Plutarch³ tells a romantic story of the participation of Cleomachus the Pharsalian in the war. He was called in as an ally by the Chalcidians, who were hard pressed by the Eretrian cavalry, although they were superior in foot soldiers. With the aid of the Thessalian cavalry the Chalcidians won, but Cleomachus paid with his life and was buried in the agora of Chalcis. Plutarch adds, citing Aristotle, that the lover of Cleomachus was one of the Thracian Chalcidians, sent to aid Euboean Chalcis.

Finally, Strabo (10.1.11-12) says that Chalcis and Eretria lived peacefully for the most part, and when they fell out over the Lelantine Plain they set up conditions to govern the fighting. He cites as evidence of this a stele in Amarinthus which provided that missile weapons should not be used.

From these references we learn that the war started over possession of the Lelantine Plain, which lies between the two cities, and that it became what, in Thucydides' opinion, was the most extensive struggle of the period between the Trojan and Persian Wars. To warrant this estimate, the number of allies on each side must have been considerable,⁴ although we know only that Samos,

³ *Amatorius* 17 (*Moralia* 760E-761B).

⁴ That the allies involved were numerous seems certain when we compare the number of states active in the Messenian Revolt (Argos, Arcadia, the Pisatans, and Sicyon on the side of Messenia [Strabo 8.5.10; Paus. 4.15.7]; Samos and Corinth on the side of Sparta [Hdt. 3.47; Paus. *loc. cit.*]) and the Sacred War (Sicyon, Athens, Thessaly, and Argos against Cirrha [Paus. 10.37.6; sch. Pi. *P. Hypotheses* b, c, and d; Ath. 13.560c]), neither of which conflicts is mentioned by Thucydides. We must remember that in this section Thucydides is generalizing for the purpose of showing the unimportance of earlier wars; therefore we can not take literally his original statement about the lack of allies. By doing so the scholiast, *ad* 1.15.3, is led to comment: *διέστη· διεσπάσθη, ἀνεχώρησεν, οὐ συνεμάχησεν· οὐ γὰρ λέγει ὅτι ἐμερίσθη, ἀλλὰ μόνοι Χαλκιδεῖς μόνοις Ἐρετριεῦσιν ἐμάχοντο.* Yet this is in direct contradiction to the

Thessaly, and the northern Chalcidian colonies helped Chalcis, while Miletus aided Eretria. From the position of the reference in the narrative of Thucydides we may infer that the war was fought mainly on land. This is borne out in regard to the principals by the testimony of Aristotle and Strabo; it was natural for Chalcis and Eretria to meet one another on the Lelantine Plain. But there is nothing in the sources to show that fighting did not take place elsewhere; the mention of allies seems to show that it did. And although possession of the Plain was undoubtedly the immediate cause of the outbreak of the war, there is no evidence which forbids us to look for a broader and more far-reaching cause which would involve numerous allies.⁵

From the evidence so far examined, we cannot even be sure who won the war, although the passage from Plutarch implies that Chalcis had the better of the local fighting.⁶ Cleomachus is said to have conquered only in battle, but it sounds like a decisive battle, and we shall see that other evidence supports a Chalcidian victory.⁷

There is in these passages small indication of date, although it seems reasonable to suspect that a war which Thucydides describes as *τὸν πάλαι ποτὲ γεγόμενον* took place at least before the time of Solon. But we do have a definite *terminus post quem*, the founding of the Chalcidian colonies in Thrace which sent aid to Chalcis during the war. These colonies were dispatched in the eighth century, before 736,⁸ and probably we should allow an interval of

evidence of Herodotus and Aristotle. Neither can we claim, as does E. Harrison, *Studies in Theognis* (Cambridge, 1902) 292–293, that from the passage of Herodotus “the inference is obvious; Miletus and Samos were the only two cities of note which Herodotus knew to have taken part in the war.” For it is Eretria’s help to Miletus which brings up the subject in the narrative, and Samos, as the natural rival of Miletus, would be logically introduced to balance the sentence.

⁵ It should be noted that the term “Lelantine War” occurs nowhere in the sources. It is a modern name which tends to make one think that the war was localized to the plain itself; when using it we must remember that there is no such ancient implication.

⁶ There is little value in the evidence usually adduced for a Chalcidian victory — the possession of the Lelantine Plain by the Chalcidian Hippobotae in 506 (Hdt. 6.100; Ael. *VH* 6.1). Between the war and 506, the land could have changed hands several times in purely local quarrels for which we have no testimony.

⁷ These are the collaboration in colonization by Chalcis and Andros, which had been under Eretrian control (below, 226), and the oracle praising Chalcidian prowess (below, 238–239).

⁸ No traditional dates have been preserved for Chalcis’ northern colonies (except for joint Chalcidian-Andrian enterprises). The vagueness of the tradition and the proximity of the Chalcidice to Greece proper both indicate for these northern colonies

perhaps a generation after their founding, during which they could have become firmly established and powerful enough to send aid back to their mother city.

This is all the information about the war which we may glean from the four references which, without question, deal directly with it. Now we must introduce more controversial evidence, first to narrow the limits of time within which the war must have occurred, then to discover its wider implications and to fit it into its proper place among the events which we know took place during that period.

In the first place, it seems safe to set the *terminus post quem* forward to a time after the founding of the colonies of Chalcis in the West. For at the beginning of that colonization Chalcis and Eretria were apparently on good terms and sent out colonists jointly to Campanian Cumae.⁹ Although that city was founded earlier than most of the western colonies, it is proper to assume that such an outburst of colonization would not have taken place either during or immediately after a destructive war. Therefore, we may set as the *terminus post quem* ca. 720, the approximate date of the founding of Rhegium, the last Chalcidian colony in the West.¹⁰

The resumption of colonizing activity by Chalcis after a long period of inactivity suggests a *terminus ante quem* for the war. For Stageirus, Sane, and Acanthus were settled jointly by Chalcis and Andros about the middle of the seventh century or a little later.¹¹ The latter island had formerly been under Eretrian con-

an early settlement date, falling before the intensive Chalcidian colonizing of the West, which began with the founding of Naxos in 736. See J. L. Myres, *CAH* 3.650, and E. Oberhummer, *RE* s.v. "Chalkis."

⁹ Strabo 5.4.9; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.3.1.

¹⁰ We have no traditional date for Rhegium, but its founding may be placed between 736 and 720 by the presence of the Messenians who had been exiled as pro-Spartan in the First Messenian War (Strabo 6.1.6; Heracleid. Pont. fig. 25 [*FHG* 2]). This war can be placed with some precision between 736 and 720 from the Olympic victor lists, in which the last Messenian appears in Ol. 11 (736), the first Spartan in Ol. 15 (720) (J. Karst, *Eusebius Werke*, 5, *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen Übersetzt. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte*, 20 [Leipzig, 1911] 91). The date of Rhegium may also be moved down to a time after 729, since it was settled after Zancle (Strabo, *loc. cit.*; Heracleid. Pont., *loc. cit.*), which town was founded later than Leontini, six years after Syracuse (Thuc. 6.4); see Busolt. "Bemerkungen über die Gründungsdata der Griechischen Colonien in Sicilien und Unteritalien," *RhM* 40 (1885) 466-469.

¹¹ Plu. *Qu. Gr.* 30 (*Moralia* 298A-B). Eusebius dates the founding of Acanthus and Stageirus in Ol. 31.2 (655/4); however, the true date may be a few years later, since Eusebius' chronology seems to have been inflated through the use of the 40 year generation. See Burn, "Dates in Early Greek History," *JHS* 55 (1935) 130-146.

trol;¹² her friendly relations with Chalcis, which are implied in this joint endeavor, are best explained as a result of her having been freed in the Lelantine War.

Another passage which suggests a *terminus ante quem* is fragment 3 of Archilochus (ed. E. Diehl, *Anth. Lyr. Gr.* 1².3):

οὐ τοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται οὐδὲ θαμειαί
σφενδόνας, εὐτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγῃ
ἐν πεδίῳ· ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον·
ταύτης γὰρ κείνοι δαίμονες εἰσι μάχης
δεσπόται Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί.

These lines seem to be a contemporary allusion to the Lelantine War, as shown by the phrase ἐν πεδίῳ and the abstention from the use of bows and slings, which is almost certainly an echo of the convention which Strabo connects with the war.¹³ It is, of course, barely possible that this passage merely reflects the reputation of the Abantes of Euboea as αἰχμηταί, μεμαῶτες ὀρεκτῆσιν μελήσι θώρηκας ῥήξειν δητῶν ἀμφὶ στήθεσσιν.¹⁴ But the lines of Archilochus resemble the convention reported by Strabo so much more closely than they resemble the lines of the *Iliad* that all probability favors considering the passage a contemporary reference to the war. Although the exact dates of Archilochus are in doubt, he seems to have lived through most of the first half of the seventh century.¹⁵ Therefore this fragment gives us a *terminus ante quem* of ca. 660 B.C.

Dondorff¹⁶ suggests that the war, which was apparently fought on land by states which were strong on the sea, must have taken place before the introduction of naval fighting. This is a reasonable assumption in the light of the position of Thucydides' reference to the quarrel in a section which describes land warfare,¹⁷ although we cannot be sure that there was no fighting at sea merely because mention of it does not occur in our sources. But Dondorff, on

¹² Strabo 10.1.10.

¹³ 10.1.12: δηλοῖ . . . στήλη τις, φράζουσα μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις.

¹⁴ *Il.* 2.543–544, as interpreted by Costanzi, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 776–778.

¹⁵ Burn, *op. cit.* (above, note 11) 132–133, dates Archilochus and the founding of Thasos "about 670 or 660," basing his argument on the mention of Gyges by the poet and in Assyrian annals. A. Blakeway, "The Date of Archilochus," *Greek Poetry and Life (Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray)* (Oxford, 1936) 34–55, after a consideration of the literary evidence, retains a late eighth-century date for Thasos and dates the poet from 740–730 B.C. to "before c. 670 – c. 660 B.C."

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 12.

¹⁷ 1.15; see above, 224.

these grounds, places the war before 700, since in 704 the Corinthians sent their shipbuilder Ameinocles to build four triremes for the Samians.¹⁸ However, the construction of triremes did not mean that sea fighting on an organized basis would break out at once; it was forty years later, in 664, that the first naval battle known to Thucydides took place (1.13.4). Here Thucydides must be referring to an organized battle between fleets; we can be sure that ships were used in war long before 664, although probably only for duels between single vessels.¹⁹ Therefore the tradition that the Lelantine War was a land war points to a date before 664 rather than 700. The argument is weak by itself, but gives support to the date implied in the passage of Archilochus.

There are two other passages which have often been used as evidence for the date of the war. The first is the story told by Plutarch²⁰ of the death of Amphidamas, king of Chalcis, who was killed fighting at sea with the Eretrians. However, this event cannot be connected with the Lelantine War, which we have seen took place after the founding of the Chalcidian colonies in Thrace. For these colonies were sent out after the downfall of the kings at Chalcis, when the oligarchic Hippobotae ruled the city.²¹

The second passage is from Theognis, who says (891-894):

οἷ μοι ἀναλκείης· ἀπὸ μὲν Κήρινθος ὄλωλεν,
 Ληλάντου δ' ἀγαθὸν κείρεται οἰνόπεδον·
 οἱ δ' ἀγαθοὶ φεύγουσι, πόλιν δὲ κακοὶ διέπουσιν.
 ὧς δὴ Κυψελιδέων Ζεὺς ὀλέσειε γένος.

In the last line the manuscripts read *κυψελίζων* or *κυψελλίζον*, but these words are unmetrical and almost unintelligible, and Bergk's emendation to *Κυψελιδέων* is attractive.²² We know that Theognis himself

¹⁸ Thuc. 1.13.2-3.

¹⁹ This is clear from the naval conflicts depicted on the Dipylon vases; see P. N. Ure, *The Origin of Tyranny* (Cambridge, 1922) 321-326.

²⁰ In *Hes.* 62 (*Moralia*, ed. Bernardakis, 7.82): *ναυμαχοῦντα πρὸς Ἐρετριέας ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ληλάντου ἀποθανεῖν*. Hermann, *op. cit.* (above, note 2) 91-92, emends *ναυμαχοῦντα* to *μονομαχοῦντα* because Thucydides (1.13.4) states that the first sea battle did not take place until 664. But the reference here could be to a duel between single ships or to a sea-borne raid, and so the emendation is unwarranted.

²¹ Arist. *fg.* 603, Rose.

²² Dondorff, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 16-17, appears to take *κυψελλίζον* with *γένος*; here he follows Müller, "qui non putet ad Corinthios eam (sc. vocem *κυψελλίζειν*) referendam esse, sed potius significare obturatum et surdum populum." Dondorff cites Suidas, s.v. *κυψέλη*: "... διαφέρει δὲ πρὸς τὴν *κυψελίδα*, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὡσί ρύπος. This meaning is possible, but on metrical grounds both *κυψελίζων* and *κυψελλίζον* are unsatisfactory.

visited Euboea;²³ it has therefore been claimed that this passage is an eye-witness account of the end of the Lelantine War and so is more important than all of the other evidence which points to an earlier date.²⁴ The most probable *floruit* for Theognis is the end of the seventh century and the early part of the sixth, although he may have lived much later.²⁵ If we do accept this passage as actually referring to the Lelantine War, then we must place that war roughly about 600 B.C. or a little later. This would not only force us to abandon all of the evidence which points to a date in the first half of the seventh century, but it would also contradict what we know from Herodotus of the allies on each side. For under such an interpretation the πόλιν of the passage must be Eretria, and the Cypselids must be held responsible for its fall; therefore, we should have the Cypselids allied with Chalcis and Samos against Miletus and Eretria. But we know that under these tyrants the foreign policy of Corinth changed and that Periander was friendly with Thrasybulus of Miletus and hostile to Samos.²⁶ Therefore we cannot accept an interpretation of the passage which assumes that the Cypselids were friendly to Samos and hostile to Miletus about 600 B.C., especially when the acceptance involves rejecting the evidence of Archilochus and the best explanation of the joint Chalcidian-Andrian colonization. We cannot date the Lelantine War on the basis of this questionable passage alone.²⁷ A different interpretation of these lines seems much preferable: that they refer to civil strife in Chalcis and the cities of Euboea. The contrast

²³ Line 784: ἤλθον δ' Εὐβοίης ἀμπελόμεν πεδίον.

²⁴ Costanzi, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) *passim*; Wallace, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 51-56; Trever, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 120-122.

²⁵ For the *floruit* about 600 see T. H. Williams, "Theognis and His Poems," *JHS* 23 (1903) 1-33. The dating depends almost entirely on the internal evidence of the poems and one's view of how much of them is genuine. Harrison, *op. cit.* (above, note 4) 268-303, maintains that Theognis lived until the period of the Persian Wars.

²⁶ Hdt. 5.92.ῥ; 3.48.

²⁷ Wallace, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 62-63, suggests as supporting evidence for an early sixth century date the battle of Cereusus, in which the Thebans defeated the Thessalians some time before 571 (more than two hundred years before Leuctra; Plu. *Cam.* 19; Paus. 9.14.2-4). It is true that the Thessalians were involved in the Lelantine War; yet this battle might better be connected with the Sacred War. Theban aid would help explain the long resistance of Cirrha to the combined forces of Cleisthenes of Sicyon, Athens, Thessaly, and Argos. After the war we find Cleisthenes making overtures to Thebes (see M. F. McGregor, "Cleisthenes of Sicyon and the Panhellenic Festivals," *TAPhA* 72 [1941] 266-287, especially 270 and 282).

of ἀγαθοί and κακοί in line 893 suggests a political conflict, and γένος Κυπριδίων may refer to the race of tyrants in general.²⁸

With the elimination of Theognis as pertinent evidence for the date of the Lelantine War, we are left with the previously established *termini*, ca. 720 and 660 B.C. Our next step is to examine the history of this period and the years immediately preceding it, with particular attention to the friendships and enmities of the various Greek states. We shall find that during this time there may be distinguished two groups of states which are hostile to one another. On the one side are Chalcis, Samos, Corinth, Sparta, Erythrae, Paros, Andros, and Athens; on the other Eretria, Miletus, Chios, Megara, Argos, and Aegina. Thereafter we must try to explain these interstate relations and to fit the Lelantine War into its most logical place in the history of the age. We must find the time when it is most likely that the war would involve more allies than did any other conflict in early Greece.

From an examination of western colonization we may gain some knowledge of interstate relations. At the time of their joint founding of Cumae, Chalcis and Eretria were apparently on good terms; later, about 735, we find Corinthians taking over an Eretrian colony at Corcyra.²⁹ The joint settlement of Chalcidians and Megarians at Leontini implies friendly relations between the mother cities, even though the colonists could not live peacefully together and the Megarians soon left to settle Megara Hyblaea.³⁰ The latter's appearance in Sicily also indicates that Megara was friendly with Corinth; it is likely that, in this age, Megara was under Corinthian control.³¹ The presence of pro-Spartan Messenians in early Rhegium reflects amity between Chalcis and Sparta.³² And finally, we know that Corinth and Chalcis worked together so closely in the West that by 690 they held a virtual monopoly of the trade in that area.³³

²⁸ Geyer, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 97-98, suggests that the lines refer to civil strife, instigated by Periander of Corinth. For tyranny at Chalcis see Arist. *Pol.* 1304A; 1316A.

²⁹ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.3.1; Strabo 5.4.9; Plu. *Qu. Gr.* 11 (*Moralia* 293A-B).

³⁰ Thuc. 6.4.1.

³¹ This is indicated by the tradition of a Megarian revolt under Orsippus, the Olympic victor in 720; Paus. 1.44.1.

³² Strabo 6.1.6; Heracleid. Pont. fg. 25 (*FHG* 2).

³³ A. Blakeway, "Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Commerce with Italy, Sicily and France in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.," *ABSA* 33 (1932-1933) 170-208; "Demaratus," *JRS* 25 (1935) 129-149.

During the period 720–660 there are three events which may be dated definitely. The first of these is the construction of the triremes for Samos by Ameinocles of Corinth about 704.³⁴ There could be no better evidence than this for an alliance between Corinth and Samos. Another certain date is that of the battle of Hysiae, in which the Argives defeated the Spartans in 669/8 B.C.³⁵ Third, we know that the revolt of Corcyra from Corinth, which led to the first real naval battle, occurred about 664.³⁶

There are several other events which fall roughly within this period or a little later and which throw much light on interstate relations. We hear of Samian raids on Aegina, led by King Amphicrates.³⁷ In Asia Minor, Miletus and Chios were allied and together attacked Erythrae.³⁸ That Erythrae was on good terms with Paros is shown by their joint colonization of Parium.³⁹ Later in the seventh century, the arbitration by Samos, Paros, and Erythrae of a dispute over colonization between Chalcis and Andros implies that all five of these states had previously been on friendly terms.⁴⁰ Finally, the list of allies in the Messenian Revolt shows the alignment of the mainland states about the middle of the seventh century. We find Argos, Arcadia, the Pisatans, and Sicyon supporting the Messenians; Samos and Corinth help Sparta.⁴¹

³⁴ Thuc. 1.13.3. J. A. Davison, "The First Greek Triremes," *CQ* 41 (1947) 18–24, casts doubt on the use of triremes by the Greeks before the time of Polycrates of Samos. Even if he is right, the passage is still important for our purposes, since Ameinocles must have been helping the Samians with some new shipbuilding technique.

³⁵ Ol. 27.2; Paus. 2.24.7.

³⁶ Thuc. 1.13.4.

³⁷ Hdt. 3.59.4; there is no precise evidence of date, but the presence of the Samian king (i.e., monarchy had not yet disappeared) places the raid in an early age.

³⁸ Hdt. 1.18.3; all we know of the date is that it occurred before the reign of Alyattes, which gives us as *terminus ante quem* the end of the seventh century.

³⁹ Strabo 13.1.14; Paus. 9.27.1; the former also mentions Milesians among the founders, but this element "probably annexed the place by force" (Burn, *op. cit.* [above, note 11] 132, note 7). The date of Parium is given as ca. 710 by Eusebius (Armenian version, ed. Karst, *op. cit.* [above, note 10] 183), but Burn (*op. cit.* 132) maintains that this must be moved down toward the middle of the seventh century along with the date of Archilochus.

⁴⁰ Plu. *Qu. Gr.* 30 (*Moralia* 298A–B).

⁴¹ Strabo 8.5.10; Hdt. 3.47; Paus. 4.14.8; 4.15.7. In the last passage Pausanias includes the Eleians as allies of Messenia, but these must be the Pisatans, who are mentioned by name in Strabo. For the Pisatan "interlude" at Olympia see Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.544–548, and McGregor, *op. cit.* (above, note 27) 272–273. There is no room here for a full-scale discussion of the Messenian Revolt, which is generally placed at the end of the seventh century and considered a private quarrel between Sparta and Messenia; the tradition of allies on each side is called a projection into the past of events from the fourth century (see, e.g., Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.557–558). I shall state

During the period under discussion there remains to be considered one other event, or rather series of events, all connected with the rise and career of Pheidon of Argos.⁴² Although we learn from Ephorus⁴³ that this monarch "completely recovered the heritage of Temenus," we know definitely of only a few steps in this process. He sided with Aegina in a quarrel against Athens and Epidaurus and succeeded in defeating the Athenians and gaining control of Epidaurus.⁴⁴ His control of Aegina is also shown by the fact that he struck his coins there.⁴⁵ It is most likely that the hand of Pheidon may be seen in the revolt of Megara from Corinth and later in the settling of the Megarian colonies of Chalcedon (ca. 684) and Byzantium (ca. 658) in the North-east;⁴⁶ it should be noted that the area in which these colonies were planted was in the Milesian sphere of influence,⁴⁷ and their establishment indicates that Argos, Megara, and Miletus were on good terms. There are also indications that Pheidon extended his control over Sicyon.⁴⁸

my views briefly. The best evidence of date is the statement of Tyrtaeus, *fg. 4*, lines 1-8 (ed. Diehl, *Anth. Lyr. Gr.* 1².1), that the grandsons of those who fought in the first war participated in the revolt. Now the first Messenian War can be placed by the Olympic victor lists almost certainly ca. 736-720 (see above, note 10); therefore the revolt, about 60 years later, falls somewhere between 676 and 656; most probably it was the result of the Spartan defeat at Hysiae in 669/8, and was instigated by the victor in that battle, Pheidon of Argos. Even though some details of the fourth century revival of Messenia may have entered the tradition of the revolt, it is impossible on these grounds to eliminate the allies on each side; for it is Herodotus who tells us that the Samians were involved. Another objection to the tradition of numerous allies — that "during this half-century, when the tyrants were at the height of their power, it is hardly conceivable that all the Peloponnese was divided for a protracted war into two camps, one led by Spartans, one by Messenians" (Wade-Gery, *loc. cit.*) — falls when we realize that the war broke out before the rise of the tyrants.

⁴² I accept the dating of Pheidon in the late eighth century and the first half of the seventh; the case is argued by Ure, *op. cit.* (above, note 19) 154-183, and substantiated by Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.761-762.

⁴³ *Fg. 115 (FGrH 2A, no. 70).*

⁴⁴ *Hdt. 5.82-89*; although Pheidon is not mentioned by name in this narrative, his connection with the incident has been shown by Ure, *op. cit.* (above, note 19) 164-178.

⁴⁵ Ephorus, *fg. 176 (FGrH 2A, no. 70).*

⁴⁶ Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.541. For the dates see Hieronymus, ed. J. K. Fotheringham, *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones* (London, 1923) 163-165.

⁴⁷ Dunham, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 46-62.

⁴⁸ Sicyon is linked with Argos during the Messenian Revolt (Paus. 4.15.7; 4.17.7), and the tyrants of Sicyon were pre-Dorian; their rise may be the reaction to Argive (i.e., Dorian) control. I cannot accept Ure's proposal (*op. cit.* [above, note 19] 179-183) that a similar condition existed in Corinth — that the Bacchiads were pro-Argive and the rise of Cypselus was a manifestation of anti-Argive feeling. The only evidence for this is a confused story connecting Pheidon with Archias, the founder of Syracuse

Later in his career, his ambitions extended farther west, and in the 28th Olympiad (668 B.C.) he controlled the Olympic games through the Pisatans, whom he had supported against the Eleians.⁴⁹ In the previous year the Argives had defeated the Spartans at Hysiae, a victory which must have made it possible for Pheidon to extend his influence westward. Probably we see further results of this victory in the revolt of Corcyra from Corinth about 664⁵⁰ and in the revolt of the Messenians from Sparta, which broke out shortly after the battle.⁵¹ This coincidence of the dates of Hysiae and the revolt supports the conjecture that Pheidon instigated, or at least supported, the uprising. The only information we have about Pheidon other than what has been cited is a hint that he died fighting the Corinthians.⁵²

From the evidence presented above, we may distinguish two groups which, in our sources, always appear as hostile to one an-

(Plu. *Amat. Narrat.* 2 [Moralia 772D-773B]; sch. Apollon. Rhod. *Arg.* 4.1212), and a tradition that Pheidon died at Corinth, during civil strife (Nic. Dam. fg. 35 [FGrH 2A, no. 90]). More confusion is added by Aristotle's mention (*Pol.* 1265B) of a Corinthian Pheidon who was one of the earliest lawgivers. This suggests the possibility that a Corinthian has been mistakenly identified with his more famous namesake in the tradition; a similar error can be seen in Herodotus' (6.127.3) reference to Leocedes, one of the suitors of Agariste, as the son of Pheidon of Argos. McGregor, *op. cit.* (above, note 27) 275-276, has urged that Leocedes was in reality the son of a Pheidon of Cleonae who is mentioned in an early sixth-century inscription found at Nemea; in any case, Pheidon of Cleonae is not Pheidon of Argos. The above indications of Argive control of Corinth are not so strong as those which testify to Corinthian (i.e., Bacchiad) opposition to Pheidon, namely, the appearance of Corinth and Samos fighting against Argos during the Messenian Revolt and the Samians' opposition to Pheidon in Aegina about the time when Corinth was building triremes for Samos (see above, note 41, and below, 236-239).

⁴⁹ Paus. 6.22.2; Strabo 8.3.30. The text of Pausanias reads 'Ὀλυμπιάδι μὲν τῇ ὀγδόῃ, but Strabo states that from the first to the twenty-sixth Olympiad the Eleians held the presidency; Eusebius (ed. A. Schoene, *Eusebii Chroniconum Libri Duo*, 1 [Berlin, 1875] 198) says that the Pisatans took over in the twenty-eighth Olympiad when the Eleians were busy fighting the Dymaeans, then gained control in the thirtieth and held the presidency for the twenty-two following Olympiads. Falconer has suggested emending the text of Pausanias to 'Ὀλυμπιάδι μὲν τῇ ὀγδόῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ (see J. H. Schubart, *Pausaniae Descriptio Graeciae* [Leipzig, 1853] xxvi). The corruption would have been easy at a time when the numbers were represented by letters, but we cannot be sure that the error was not that of Pausanias or his source. For the full argument supporting the later date see Ure, *op. cit.* (above, note 19) 159-160; Wade-Gery, *CAH* 3.541 and 761.

⁵⁰ Thuc. 1.13.4. Probably the original Eretrian population at Corcyra was responsible for the enmity between that colony and Corinth.

⁵¹ See above, note 41.

⁵² Nic. Dam. fg. 35 (FGrH 2A, no. 90). The story connects Pheidon with civil strife at Corinth; it is very likely that, at the height of his power, he would have a party which favored him in that city.

other. On the one side the most important states are Samos, Corinth, Sparta, Erythrae, Paros, Andros, and Athens; on the other Miletus, Chios, Megara, Argos, and Aegina. Since our examination has covered the whole period during which the Lelantine War could have fallen, this must be roughly the alignment of allies during that war; the former group, as shown by the presence of Samos, supported Chalcis, the other favored Eretria.⁵³ It cannot, of course, be claimed that this list is exact; some of the states may have played no part in the war. But it is clear that in each group the states were sympathetic to one another, and since we know that the number of allies on each side during the Lelantine War was considerable,⁵⁴ the majority of these states must have been involved.

Burn, in his account of the early trade-leagues,⁵⁵ noted that the maritime cities of the pro-Eretrian group were those which seemed particularly interested in the northern region, while the other side

⁵³ It has often been noted that there is a similarity between this list of Eretrian allies in the seventh century and the nationalities of the suitors of Agariste of Sicyon about 575 (Hdt. 6.127; cf. A. Holm, *History of Greece*, 1 [London, 1899] 317, note 9; Wallace, *op. cit.* [above, note 1] 62; McGregor, *op. cit.* [above, note 27] 270–271). The similarity is not too striking. Of the twelve cities represented by the suitors, Argos, Elis (i.e., the Pisatans; McGregor, *loc. cit.*), Eretria, and the two Arcadian towns, Trapezus and Paeus, were on the one side in the seventh century, Athens and Thessaly on the other; while the sympathies of the Molossians, Aetolia, Epidamnus, Siris, and Sybaris are uncertain. From this we are justified in concluding that Cleisthenes of Sicyon in general favored those cities which formerly had fought against the masters of the West (as McGregor, *loc. cit.*), but we cannot reverse the process and use the list to add members to the seventh century alliance (as Holm, *loc. cit.*). For foreign relations could change much during almost a century, especially in the age of tyrants (cf. the rapprochement of Corinth and Miletus under Periander and Thrasybulus; see also McGregor, *loc. cit.*, for the changes during the reign of one tyrant, Cleisthenes of Sicyon). Yet Holm, from the list, adds Sybaris and Epidamnus, which was not founded until ca. 628 (Eusebius, ed. Schoene, *op. cit.* [above, note 49] 89), to the Eretrian alliance, and W. W. How and J. Wells go even further by stating (*A Commentary on Herodotus*, 2 [Oxford, 1912] 58) that in the Lelantine War Croton was an ally of Samos. There is, however, no valid evidence for the extension of the war to Magna Graecia. The friendship of Miletus and Sybaris, mentioned by Herodotus (6.21), most probably began near the end of the seventh century, after western markets were opened to Miletus by the rapprochement with Corinth; Burn, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 23–24. It is at this time that east Greek pottery begins to appear in greater quantities in the West (Blakeway, *ABSA* 33 [1932–1933] 207; see above, note 33).

⁵⁴ See above, note 4.

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.* (above, note 1) 14–37; he collected the evidence down into the sixth century, with the result that his list of allies on each side is much longer than that given above. He also distinguishes a third “trade league of the Southern Dorians,” but, since this group had no part in the Lelantine War, it need not concern us here.

was primarily interested in the West. It was, he thinks, trade rivalry between these two groups which led to the spread of the Lelantine War. He does not, however, state exactly where this rivalry lay; the discovery of the reason for it would shed much light on the whole war. The fact that a war caused by a border dispute spread to involve many allies cannot be explained merely by the existence of two groups of trading powers, especially when they were primarily interested in different regions. The Lelantine Plain itself certainly was not important enough to cause a clash between the groups; there must have been some issue which was vital to all the states involved.

In view of the monopoly clamped on the West by Chalcis and Corinth between 735 and 690, one's first inclination is to look at the Lelantine War as an attempt to halt that policy. But upon closer examination, we find little evidence of a serious interest in the West by any of the states concerned in the war except Chalcis, Corinth, and, perhaps, Eretria. The Eretrians had been expelled from Corcyra by Corinth, and, although they seem thereafter to have turned their energies toward control of part of the Cyclades, they would have had good reason to be eager to break their rivals' hold on the West. But the crux of the question lies in explaining the participation of Miletus and Samos in the quarrel; although these two states were natural rivals, particularly over trade in Egypt,⁵⁶ one of them, at least, must have had some strong common interest with one of the cities of Euboea, which made entry into the war seem desirable. Yet there is no evidence of any Milesian ambition in the West as early as the end of the eighth century.⁵⁷ It is possible that the Eretrians persuaded Miletus to help them break Chalcis' hold on the West, but this seems improbable when we realize that during this period Miletus was colonizing in the regions of the Propontis and the Hellespont.⁵⁸ It is unlikely that she would fight a war over the West while the North-east was not fully exploited. Again, it is difficult to explain why Samos should be fighting on the side of the powers which controlled the West. We do not know of any Samian interest in that area except for the story

⁵⁶ See below, note 64.

⁵⁷ The friendship between Miletus and Sybaris (Hdt. 6.21) most probably began at the end of the seventh century, after western markets were opened to Miletus by the rapprochement with Corinth; see above, note 53.

⁵⁸ Dunham, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 46-62; Abydus, Cyzicus, Trapezus, and Sinope were all Milesian foundations in the late eighth and early seventh centuries.

of Colaeus, the Samian sea-captain who sailed to Tartessus.⁵⁹ But, according to the report, he had set out to sail to Egypt, and even if the trip to the West was intended, it was the result of Samian friendship and cooperation with Corinth and Chalcis, rather than the cause of it.⁶⁰ Therefore, if the Lelantine War is considered an attempt to halt the monopoly of Chalcis and Corinth in the western trade and is placed during the period when this policy was being established, ca. 735–690 B.C., we are left with no satisfactory explanation of the participation of Samos and Miletus.

There seems to me, however, to be an explanation of the appearance of Samos on the side of Chalcis and Corinth which will provide the key to the whole problem of the Lelantine War. We know that Samos' primary interest in trade was with the South and East, particularly Egypt.⁶¹ Her only colonies were along that route, Amorgus, Celenderis, and Nagidus.⁶² She was on friendly terms with Cyrene and had an inland colony at an oasis in Egypt.⁶³ Her rivals for trade in this area were Miletus and Aegina.⁶⁴ This rivalry would well explain the Samian-Aeginetan hostility which led to the Samian raids under King Amphicrates. It does not explain, however, why the Corinthians, then expanding in the West, should be so interested in this quarrel, which was concerned with Egyptian trade,⁶⁵ that they would build for the Samians triremes, the sole possession of which must have given Corinth control of the sea.

⁵⁹ Hdt. 4.152.

⁶⁰ The date of the voyage of Colaeus is uncertain; Ure, *op. cit.* (above, note 19), dates it "about 620 B.C." (p. 68), "between 643 and 640 B.C." (p. 117), and "about 668 B.C." (p. 177).

⁶¹ Cf. Hdt. 4.152, where the Samian Colaeus is said to have been sailing to Egypt when blown off his course to Spain.

⁶² Suidas, s.v. *Σαμίας*; Pomp. Mela 1.13; Arr. *An.* 1.26; "Scylax," 102 (*Geog. Gr. Min.* 1.76).

⁶³ Hdt. 3.26.1; 4.152.

⁶⁴ Herodotus (2.178) records that, after Amasis gave Naucratis to the Greeks (ca. 570), all other states built a joint temple, but the Aeginetans, Samians, and Milesians had separate temples. The inference is that these three states were the most important and so probably had traded first with Egypt. Excavations at Naucratis have shown that the Greeks had traded there early in the seventh century (cf. Ure, *op. cit.* [above, note 19] 105–120). Most of the early pottery found is either "Rhodian" or "Fikellura" ware (H. Prinz, *Funde aus Naukratis* [*Klio*, Beiheft 7, 1908] 14–63), which were probably products of Rhodes, Miletus, and Samos (R. M. Cook, "Fikellura Pottery," *ABSA* 34 [1933–1934] 90–93). However, some of the earliest Naucratic pottery has been found on Aegina (Prinz, *op. cit.* 88).

⁶⁵ We may assume that Egyptian trade at this time meant little to Corinth from the fact that not a scrap of Proto-Corinthian pottery has been found at Naucratis; see H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* (Oxford, 1931) 25.

Yet we know that they did send Ameinocles to help the Samians about 704 B.C. The Lelantine War has often been proffered as the reason for this aid;⁶⁶ but such an explanation leaves unanswered the question of Samian participation in the war. A better reason for a Corinthian-Samian alliance about 700 B.C. is the extension of Pheidon's influence over Aegina, and the help which he gave her against Athens and Epidaurus.⁶⁷ Pheidon must have supported Aegina's trade, as is shown by his striking of coins there, and thus he would incur the enmity of Samos. In the face of the rising power of Pheidon, Corinth would have had good reason to support Samos against him in every manner, even to the extent of sharing her best naval weapon. Probably Pheidon, by supporting the revolt of Megara, had already incurred the hatred of Corinth.⁶⁸ Thus, in a joint enmity to Pheidon of Argos, we have the explanation of the otherwise strange alliance of Samos and Corinth.

If the interpretation offered above for the appearance of Samos on the side of Corinth is true, the Lelantine War must have taken place after ca. 704. For there is no logical reason for Samian help to Chalcis except their joint friendship with Corinth; according to our interpretation, that friendship only came into being after the threat of Pheidon brought Samos and Corinth together.

We have located the Lelantine War between 704 and 660; this is roughly the reign of Pheidon, and if we look further into his activities, we can find a reason for the extension of the war. This reason lies in Pheidon's western campaigns. We know for certain only that he turned his attention to Elis after the consolidation of his position in the East. But in the light of his penchant for commerce, as shown by his introduction of coinage, it is likely that he viewed control of the Olympic games and Elis as just a step toward control of the Corinthian Gulf and trade with the West; this was the strategy used nearly a century later by Cleisthenes of Sicyon.⁶⁹ It is probable that, for the same reason, he supported, and perhaps

⁶⁶ First by Curtius, *Hermes* 10 (1876) 220.

⁶⁷ That the Samians were somehow involved in this Athenian-Aeginetan war is indicated by the fact that a garbled version of Herodotus' account (5.87) of the fate of the lone Athenian survivor appeared in Book 2 of the *Horae* of Duris of Samos (fig. 24 [FGrH 2A, no. 76]). Samos undoubtedly helped Athens.

⁶⁸ See above, note 31; although there is no direct evidence connecting Pheidon with the revolt, its occurrence during the rise of Pheidon must be more than a coincidence.

⁶⁹ McGregor, *op. cit.* (above, note 27) 276 and 285.

instigated, the revolt of Corcyra from Corinth a few years later. By aiding Eretria in the Lelantine War, Pheidon saw a chance to crush Chalcis and Corinth and break their hold on the West. But a war with these two would involve his old enemy, Samos, and then her rival, Miletus. At least he could expect to keep his enemies busy elsewhere while he seized control of Elis.

If the connection between Pheidon's western campaigns and the Lelantine War is legitimate, the war must have taken place toward the end of Pheidon's reign, probably after 675. There is one piece of evidence which indicates that the victory of Chalcis over Eretria occurred before the triumph of Argos at Hysiae in 669/8. There is preserved a response of the Delphic Oracle which Ion of Chios says was given to the people of the small Achaean town of Aegium, who, from pride in a minor victory over the Aetolians, asked where they stood among the Greeks. The reply was as follows:

Γαίης μὲν πάσης τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἄμεινον,
ἵππον Θεσσαλικήν, Λακεδαιμονίην τε γυναῖκα,
ἄνδρες δ' οἳ πίνουσιν ὕδωρ καλῆς Ἀρεθούσης,
ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ τοῦδ' εἰσὶν ἀμείνονες οἷτε μεταξὺ
Τίρυνθος ναίουσι καὶ Ἀρκαδίας πολυμήλου,
'Αργεῖοι λινοθώρακες, κέντρα πτολέμοιο.
'Υμεῖς δ' Αἰγίεες οὔτε τρίτοι, οὔτε τέταρτοι
οὔτε δυωδέκατοι, οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ, οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ.⁷⁰

This description of the Argives and the reference to the Lacedaemonian *women* is most fitting soon after the battle of Hysiae, and the mention of the Chalcidians, "the men who drink the water of fair Arethusa,"⁷¹ as second may best be explained by their victory over Eretria. Perhaps the praise of ἵππον Θεσσαλικήν is in part a reference to the part played in that victory by the Thessalian cavalry. The implication in the response is that the Argives replaced the Chalcidians as the best warriors in Greece, which would mean that the victory of Chalcis over Eretria came before Hysiae; as we read along, our assumption is that the Chalcidians are the

⁷⁰ Ion of Chios, *fg.* 17 (*FHG* 2). Callimachus, *Epigr.* 27, alludes to the next to last line as addressed to the Megarians, and in that form it is attributed to Theognis by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 7.110). The response seems to have been famous in antiquity, and perhaps Theognis changed it to fit his own purpose.

⁷¹ For the identification see Strabo 10.1.13.

best, until we come to ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ τοῦδ' εἰσὶν ἀμείνωνες in the fourth line. This is the most reasonable explanation of the wording of the oracle, although the possibility remains that the position of the two cities is based on the relative importance of their victories. At least we may infer from the oracle that the victories of Chalcis and Argos occurred fairly close to one another and that the victory of Chalcis may have been earlier.

We are now in a position to reconstruct, from the evidence and interpretations given above, an outline of the events leading up to, during, and after the Lelantine War.⁷² In the period immediately after the colonization of the West, Chalcis and Corinth worked together in that area and built a trading monopoly. Meanwhile, Eretria was gaining control of the central Cyclades, Miletus was opening the North-east, Samos and Aegina were beginning to vie, along with Miletus, for the rich trade of Egypt. In the Peloponnese, Sparta had just conquered Messenia. Then, with the accession of Pheidon, ca. 710 B.C., Argos became a power to be reckoned with. Pheidon first extended his influence by supporting the revolt of Megara from Corinth; then, when a struggle broke out between Aegina on the one side and Athens and Epidaurus on the other, Pheidon came to the aid of Aegina. Samos sided with Athens and Epidaurus against her rival and sent a naval expedition to raid Aegina. Corinth, angered by the revolt of Megara and frightened by the rise of Argive power, joined in and sent Ameinocles to help the Samians. Nevertheless, the Athenians were defeated and Pheidon gained control of Epidaurus and Aegina. He fostered Aeginetan trade and struck there the first coinage in Greece. Through his enmity with Samos, he became friendly with Miletus; because of this friendship Megara was allowed to send her colonists to Chalcedon and then to Byzantium, in the Milesian sphere of influence. Then he extended his power over Sicyon. After a period of consolidation, Pheidon turned his attention to the West: Elis and the Olympic games, control of the Corinthian Gulf, and finally trade with Italy and Sicily. At this time, perhaps about 675 B.C., a war broke out between Chalcis and Eretria over the Lelantine Plain. By supporting Eretria, Pheidon saw a chance to crush, or at least immobilize, one of the two western powers. But, with the entrance of Pheidon, his old enemies Corinth and Samos became involved, and with the latter Pheidon's eastern allies. The

⁷² In the following section I shall not repeat citations given above.

war became a series of more or less local struggles. Miletus and Chios attacked Erythrae. The energies of Samos were probably expended in helping Erythrae and perhaps in again attacking Aegina. Megara and Corinth very likely kept each other involved, while Pheidon supported the Pisatans in Elis, thus bringing Sparta into the fight. There would have been little chance of much help reaching the original combatants, Chalcis and Eretria. Andros, and probably the other Eretrian dependencies in the Aegean, revolted. Meanwhile, the Chalcidians, although they had superior infantry forces, were having trouble with the Eretrian cavalry. Finally reinforcements arrived from the northern colonies and from Thessaly, under Cleomachus of Pharsalus. With the additional cavalry, the Chalcidians defeated the Eretrians and so gained possession of the plain. The Lelantine War proper was over, but its repercussion lingered on. Pheidon defeated the Spartans at Hysiae and gained control of the Olympic games in 668 B.C. This led to the revolt of the Messenians, in which Corinth and Samos continued to help Sparta against the Messenians, Pheidon, Arcadia, Sicyon, and the Pisatans. The victory at Hysiae also brought on the revolt of Corcyra from Corinth, probably managed by the Eretrians in Corcyra at Pheidon's instigation. At last Pheidon was killed, probably in a battle with the Corinthians, and Argive power collapsed.

I realize that much of the above account is reconstruction on, at times, the slimmest of evidence, but it seems to me that it is credible at least in its general outlines. It utilizes all the evidence we have for the period and offers the only logical explanation I can find for the appearance of Samos in the Lelantine War and the Messenian Revolt; it also resolves the apparent contradiction in our sources for the war, that it attracted more allies than any other struggle, according to Thucydides, and yet seems from Strabo and Plutarch to have been fought mainly by Chalcis and Eretria on the plain itself. When we connect it with Pheidon's ambitions, his enemies and allies, the contradiction disappears. To the obvious objection that none of our ancient sources connects Pheidon with the war, I can only say that references to both are far too few to give this objection any weight.

Thus we conclude that the Lelantine War was the beginning of a struggle that involved much of the Greek world. In itself the war was not of great scope. It was fought mainly by Chalcis and

Eretria on the plain, while their allies were, for the most part, busy fighting one another. It was only an episode in a larger struggle, and although Chalcis won the plain, this had no effect on the course of the war in the Peloponnese, where the opposing side, represented by Pheidon of Argos, was victorious.

APPENDIX

The following is an outline of the chronology urged above for the period 736-660 B.C.:

- 736-720 Chalcidian colonies founded in the West.
- 735 Syracuse founded. Corcyra taken from the Eretrians by Corinth.
- ca. 736-720 First Messenian War.
- ca. 710 Accession of Pheidon of Argos.
- ca. 710-705 Revolt of Megara, under Orsippus, from Corinth.
- ca. 705-700 Pheidon helps Aegina against Athens and Epidaurus. Samians, under Amphicrates, raid Aegina.
- 704 Corinthian-Samian alliance against Argos and Aegina; Ameinocles builds triremes for Samos.
- ca. 700 Defeat of Athens; fall of Epidaurus. Pheidon controls Aegina, strikes coinage there, supports Aeginetan trade.
- ca. 690 Corinthian-Chalcidian monopoly in West complete.
- 684 Founding of Megarian colony of Chalcedon, probably with Argive support.
- ca. 680 Pheidon extends control to Sicyon.
- ca. 675-670 Outbreak of war between Chalcis and Eretria over Lelantine Plain; Argos, Megara, Aegina, Miletus, and Chios support Eretria; Corinth, Samos, Sparta, Erythrae, Paros, Andros, Thessaly, and the northern Chalcidian colonies support Chalcis. Miletus and Chios attack Erythrae. Andros revolts from Eretria. Series of local wars.
- ca. 670 Chalcis, with help from her northern colonies and Thessaly, defeats Eretria.
- 669/8 Pheidon defeats Spartans at Hysiae.
- 668 Pheidon controls Olympic games through Pisatans.
- ca. 665 Outbreak of Messenian Revolt, probably at the instigation of Pheidon; Messenia, Argos, Arcadia, Sicyon, Pisatans, against Sparta, Corinth, and Samos.
- 664 Revolt of Corcyra from Corinth. First naval battle.
- ca. 660 Death of Pheidon, while fighting Corinthians.