

EPHORUS AND THE PROHIBITION OF MISSILES

EVERETT L. WHEELER

Duke University

In memoriam

Fordyce W. Mitchel

The alleged treaty banning missile weapons in a war between archaic Chalcis and Eretria is one of the most frequently cited events in Greek history.¹ A formal agreement to prohibit a specific type of weapon stands unique in the history of ancient international relations and, if historical, would constitute the first example for arms limitation in history. Indeed before the second half of the nineteenth century, when the humanitarian trend to ameliorate the laws and practices of war began to gain the influence it still exercises, only the Second Lateran Council's ban in 1139 on the use of bows and crossbows against Christians (permitted against infidels and heretics) offers a parallel.²

¹ The following abbreviations appear in the footnotes: Aly = Wolfgang Aly, *Strabon von Amasia*, Antiquitas 1.5 (Bonn 1957); Bakhuizen = S. C. Bakhuizen, *Chalcis-in-Euboea, Iron and Chalcidians Abroad*, Chalcidian Studies III (Leiden 1976); Coldstream = J. N. Coldstream, *Geometric Greece* (New York 1977); Donlan = Walter Donlan, "Archilochus, Strabo and the Lelantine War," *TAPA* 101 (1970) 131–42; Eretria = Paul Auberson/Claude Bérard/Clemens Krause et al., *Eretria, Fouilles et Recherches*, I–VI (Bern 1968–78); Forrest = W. G. Forrest, "Colonization and the Rise of Delphi," *Historia* 6 (1957) 160–75; Greenhalgh = P. A. L. Greenhalgh, *Early Greek Warfare, Horsemen and Chariots in the Homeric and Archaic Ages* (Cambridge 1973); Jeffrey I = L. H. Jeffrey, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961), Jeffrey II = *Archaic Greece: the City-States c. 700–500 B.C.* (New York 1976); Lefkandi = M. R. Popham/L. H. Sackett/P. G. Themelis, ed., *Lefkandi, I: the Iron Age*, BSA Supp. 11 (Oxford 1980); Murray = Oswyn Murray, *Early Greece* (Atlantic Heights 1980); Podlecki I = A. J. Podlecki, "Three Greek Soldier-Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Solon," *CW* 63 (1969) 73–81, Podlecki II = *The Early Greek Poets and Their Times* (Vancouver 1984); Pritchett, *GSAW* = W. Kendrick Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, I–IV (Berkeley 1971–85); Snodgrass, *EGAW* = A. M. Snodgrass, *Early Greek Armour and Weapons* (Edinburgh 1964), Snodgrass, *AAG* = *Arms and Armour of the Greeks* (Ithaca 1967), Snodgrass, *AG* = *Archaic Greece: the Age of Experiment* (London 1980); von Scala I = Rudolf von Scala, *Die Studien des Polybios* (Stuttgart 1890), von Scala II = *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums* (Leipzig 1898); Walbank, *HCP* = F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, I–III (Oxford 1957–79). With a few obvious exceptions, all dates are B.C.

² Second Lateran Council, Canon 29 = *Decretales Gregorii IX* 5.15 (Emil Friedberg, ed., *Corpus Iuris Canonis* [Graz 1955] II): "Artem autem illam mortiferam et [Deo] odibilem ballistariorum et sagittariorum adversus Christianos et catholicos exerceri de cetero sub anathemate prohibemus." Cf. Frederick H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1975)

The very uniqueness of such a pact, especially viewed from a larger historical perspective, arouses suspicion about its historicity. Only Polybius³ and Strabo⁴ mention the agreement, both rather late sources for the Archaic period, although some find an indirect reference in Archilochus.⁵

Nevertheless, the treaty's historicity has been widely accepted.⁶ Strabo's apparent quotation of an inscription convinces some and Archilochus fr.3 West adds other supporters.⁷ The treaty supposedly suits the chivalry of

156–58; James Turner Johnson, *Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War* (Princeton 1981) 128–29; Philippe Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, trans. Michael Jones (Oxford 1984) 71–72, 274–75. On the modern humanitarian trend see Geoffrey Best, *Humanity in Warfare* (New York 1980).

³ Plb. 13.3.2–4: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι πολὺ τι τοῦ τοιούτου μέρους ἐκτός ἦσαν· τοσοῦτο γὰρ ἀπηλλοτριώοντο τοῦ κακομηχανεῖν περὶ τοὺς φίλους χάριν τοῦ τῷ τοιούτῳ συναύξειν τὰς σφετέρως δυναστείας, ὥστ' οὐδὲ τοὺς πολεμίους 3 ἡροῦντο δι' ἀπάτης νικᾶν, ὑπολαμβάνοντες «οὐδὲν» οὔτε λαμπρὸν οὐδὲ μὴν βέβαιον εἶναι τῶν κατορ. θωμάτων, ἂν μὴ τις ἐκ τοῦ προφανοῦς μαχόμενος 4 ἡττήσῃ ταῖς ψυχαῖς τοὺς ἀντιταττομένους. διὸ καὶ συνετίθεντο πρὸς σφᾶς μήτ' ἀδύλοισι βέλεσι μήθ' ἐκηβόλοις χρήσασθαι κατ' ἀλλήλων, μόνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ χειρὸς καὶ συστάδην γινομένην μάχην ἀληθινὴν ὑπελάμβανον εἶναι κρίσιν πραγμάτων.

⁴ Strabo 10.1.12: Τὸ μὲν οὖν πλεον ὠμολόγουν ἀλλήλαις αἱ πόλεις αὐταί, περὶ δὲ Ἀηλάντου διενεχθεῖσαι οὐδ' οὕτω τελέως ἐπαύσαντο, ὥστε τῷ πολέμῳ κατὰ αὐθάδειαν δρᾶν ἕκαστα, ἀλλὰ συνέθεντο, ἐφ' οἷς συστήσονται τὸν ἀγῶνα. Ἀηλοὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ Ἀμαρυνθίῳ στηλῇ τις, φράζουσα μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις. Καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ τῶν πολεμικῶν ἐθῶν καὶ τῶν ὀπλισμῶν οὐθὲν οὐτ' ἐστὶν οὐτ' ἦν ἔθος· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τηλεβόλοις χρῶνται, καθάπερ οἱ τοξόται καὶ οἱ σφενδονῆται καὶ ἀκοντισταί, οἱ δ' ἀγχεμάχοις, καθάπερ οἱ ξίφει καὶ δόρατι τῷ ὀρεκτῷ χρώμενοι· διττὴ γὰρ ἡ τῶν δοράτων χρῆσις, ἡ μὲν ἐκ χειρὸς, ἡ δ' ὡς παλτοῖς, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ κοντὸς ἀμφοτέρως τὰς χρείας ἀποδίδωσι· καὶ γὰρ συστάδην καὶ κοντοβολούντων, ὅπερ καὶ ἡ σάρισσα δύναται καὶ ὁ ὑσσός.

⁵ Archilochus fr.3 West = Plut. *Thes.* 5.2–3:

οἱ δ' Ἄβαντες ἐκείραντο πρῶτον τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον . . . ὄντες πολεμικοὶ καὶ ἀγχεμάχοι καὶ μάλιστα διὰ πάντων εἰς χεῖρας ὠθείσθαι τοῖς ἐναντίοις μεμαθηκότες, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ἐν τούτοις· οὗτοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξῳ τανύσσεται, οὐδὲ θαμναι σφενδόναι, εὐτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγῃ ἐν πεδίῳ· ξιφῶν δὲ πολύστονον ἔσεται ἔργον· ταύτης γὰρ κείνοι δάμονές εἰσι μάχης 5 δεσπόται Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί.

⁶ E.g., von Scala I, 308 n.1 and II, 16–17 (Nr.19); H. L. Lorimer, “The Hoplite Phalanx,” *BSA* 42 (1947) 118; J. A. O. Larsen, review of A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, I in *CP* 44 (1949) 258–59; Johannes Volkmann, “Die Waffentechnik in ihrem Einfluss auf das soziale Leben der Antike,” in Leopold von Wiese, ed., *Die Entwicklung der Kriegswaffe und ihr Zusammenhang mit der Sozialordnung* (Cologne 1953) 71; John Boardman, “Early Euboean Pottery and History,” *BSA* 52 (1957) 24, 29; Aly 354–60; Jeffrey I, 82 and II, 46, 65–66 but cf. 70 n.4; Angelo Brelich, *Guerra, agoni e culti nella Grecia arcaica*, *Antiquitas* 1.7 (Bonn 1961) 9–21; Snodgrass, *EGAW*, 180; Walbank, *HCP* II, 416; J. K. Anderson, *Military Theory and Practice in the Age of Xenophon* (Berkeley 1970) 1–2; Krause, *Eretria* IV, 21 with n.10; Greenhalgh 91–92; Pritchett, *GSAW* II, 173, 251–52, IV, 16 n.52; Yvon Garlon, *War in the Ancient World*, trans. Janet Lloyd (New York 1975) 29, 128; Virgilio Ilari, *Guerra e diritto nel mondo antica*, Parte Prima, Università di Roma, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano e dei Diritti del' Oriente Mediterraneo 56 (Milan 1980) 53; Murray 78; Peter Karavites, *Capitulations and Greek Interstate Relations*, *Hypomnemata* 71 (Göttingen 1982) 23; Anne Pippin Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (Cambridge, Mass. 1983) 40 n.21.

⁷ Inscription: Lorimer, Aly, Jeffrey I, Greenhalgh, Burnett; Archilochus: Jeffrey II, Murray. For this note and nn. 8–10 below specific citations appear in note 6 above.

agonistic warfare in the Archaic period: missiles were un-heroic and too deadly for either men or horses, not to mention the treaty's coincidence with the civilizing/humanitarian mission of the Amphictyonic League.⁸ Besides, Polybius believed in the pact's historicity, and missile weapons would be ineffective in the new style of warfare employing the hoplite phalanx.⁹ A limitation on means of battle also would conform to a religiously sanctioned ritualistic war to initiate youth into the adult warrior community.¹⁰

Yet dissenters and skeptics can also be found: some believe that later Eretrians contrived the tale of a ban on missiles and even inscribed a fictitious treaty as a patriotic gesture to boast of their connection with Archilochus.¹¹ Furthermore, the new hoplite style of warfare made such an agreement on missiles unnecessary, and Strabo could not have read an archaic inscription even if he saw one.¹²

Ephorus has long been posited as the common source of Polybius and Strabo,¹³ although the implications of Ephorus as *Urquelle* have not been appreciated. All arguments hitherto presented for and against the historicity of the treaty can be shown fallacious. A ban on missiles does not fit either the archaeological context of archaic Eretria or the military context of the eighth and seventh centuries. Strabo did not see an inscribed treaty in Eretria, and he struggled to explain the meaning of the treaty found in his source. The key to understanding this alleged prohibition of missiles lies with Ephorus, the panhellenist propaganda he preached, and a contemporary military development of the fourth century.

I

Consideration of the Lelantine War, Archilochus fr.3 West, and Plb. 13.3.4 need not obscure focus on the real issues. Proper interpretation of the alleged ban on missile weapons does not depend upon solving the problems of the Lelantine War, if that is the proper term for the war between archaic Chalcis and Eretria, which Thucydides said divided all Greek powers into one camp or the other.¹⁴ Strabo is the earliest source to specify where the

⁸ Chivalry: Walbank and sources cited in Brelich (above, note 6) 16 and in Donlan 133 n.5; too deadly: Greenhalgh, Jeffrey II cf. Brelich, Anderson; Amphictyonic League: Walbank, Pritchett.

⁹ Polybius: Snodgrass; ineffectiveness: Anderson cf. Forrest 163.

¹⁰ Brelich, Garlon.

¹¹ Forrest 163–64; Bakhuizen 35. *Contra*, Donlan 140.

¹² Unnecessary: Forrest 163; Donlan 140; Strabo as epigrapher: Forrest 163; other skeptics: Podlecki I, 75 and II, 45–46; Hermann Bengston, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*, II² (Munich 1962) Nr. 102.

¹³ Von Scala in note 6 above; Walbank, *HCP* II, 416; Josef Forderer, *Ephoros und Strabon* (Diss. Tübingen 1913) 41, 43.

¹⁴ Thuc. I.15.3 cf. Hdt. 5.99.1; Bakhuizen 34–36.

Lelantine plain is, although he states that the war's focus was Lelanton (without explicit reference to the plain), which could also indicate a city of that name.¹⁵ For whatever reason the war occurred, a scholarly consensus now exists for dating the war *ca* 700¹⁶ and some archaeological evidence, as I shall note below, could support this date.¹⁷ Some go so far as to reject any connection between the treaty banning missiles and the Lelantine War.¹⁸ Certainly this hypercritical view has some justification: Strabo's quotation of the inscription does not mention the Lelantine War, but the context of the inscription in Strabo is the Lelantine War. So Strabo (or his source) made this connection, whether or not the war was the inscription's original context. Finally, both Herodotus and Thucydides viewed the Lelantine War as a single event. Since the two earliest sources for the war stress this point, then only an uncritical methodology permits standing this evidence on its head, in the belief that all sources for the war are equally valid, and constructing from this confused and contradictory mass of material the theory of a ritualistically repeated war with limited means for the initiation of youth.¹⁹ For this paper's purposes a war between Chalcis and Eretria occurred *ca* 700. Strabo believed the war concerned Lelanton (either the plain or perhaps a city) and involved a treaty prohibiting missile weapons in the conflict.

The reference of Archilochus fr.3 West to fighting on a plain involving the lords of Euboea and his contrast of missile weapons with swords and

¹⁵ Strabo 10.1.9 and 12 cf. Plut., *Mor.* 153F, fr.84 = schol. *ad* Hes., *Erga* 654–62; Popham, *Lefkandi* I, 425–26. Whatever the historical accuracy of the term “Lelantine War,” I shall use it for the sake of convenience as a conventional term.

¹⁶ Forrest 160–65; Jeffrey II, 65–67; Murray 76–78; Bérard, *Eretria* III, 68 with n.27; Krause, *Eretria* IV, 20–21 with n.58; Coldstream 200; Karavites (above, note 6) 23 with n.8; Donlan 135 n.8. These references include citation of earlier literature. Pritchett has recently exploited a new fragment of Tyrtaeus (*POxy.* 3316) as a basis for the rehabilitation of Pausanias' accuracy on the Messenian wars. If an isolated reference to Argives in the new fragment is indeed a confirmation of Argive support of Messenia in the wars (and this “if” is considerable), the degree of Greek sophistication in coalition warfare in the Archaic period should be upgraded in scholarly views, and Thucydides' assertion in 1.15.3 about major coalitions in the Lelantine War gains plausibility. See W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography*, V, CPCS 31 (Berkeley 1985) 1–68. Pritchett curiously omits reference to Lionel Pearson, “The Pseudo-History of Messenia and its Authors,” *Historia* 11 (1962) 397–426.

¹⁷ Theognis 891–94 refers to destruction of Cerinthos in extreme northeastern Euboea and of the Lelantine plain (two geographically distant areas) in conjunction with a curse on the Cypselids. This enigmatic passage, which mentions neither Chalcis nor Eretria, could be used to argue continuation of the dispute over the Lelantine plain at a later date, although Burn rejects these lines as historically “useless.” Figueria would date this conflict after 600, arguing from literary references to various alliances associated with the Lelantine War and not from Euboean archaeological evidence. See A. R. Burn, “The So-Called ‘Trade-Leagues’ in Early Greek History and the Lelantine War,” *JHS* 49 (1929) 34; Thomas J. Figueria/Gregory Nagy, ed., *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* (Baltimore 1985) 288–91 cf. 123–24, 271.

¹⁸ Snodgrass, *EGAW*, 180; Bérard, *Eretria* III, 69 n.48.

¹⁹ Hdt. 5.99.1; Thuc. 1.15.3; Brelich (above, note 6) 9–21; Garlon (above, note 6) 29, 128. Cf. A. Andrewes, review of Brelich, *JHS* 82 (1962) 192–93.

spears lead some to a connection with the ban on missiles in Strabo 10.1.12 and the Lelantine War.²⁰ Jacoby's date of 680–40 for Archilochus, now *opinio communis*, places the soldier-poet at least a generation after the Lelantine War, and Jacoby wisely noted that neither could the Lelantine War be used to date Archilochus nor Archilochus the Lelantine War.²¹ Furthermore, Archilochus' use of the future tense in fr.3 West indicates an approaching or even an hypothetical event, which cannot be the Lelantine War, and the "plain" in question need not be the Lelantine: the context of the fragment in Plutarch (*Thes.* 5.2–3) is a discussion of the Abantes in Homer (Il. 2.542–44), so the plain could easily be the Trojan. Nor is Homer's stylized description of the Abantes necessarily an historical reference to the realities of Euboean warfare.²² Besides, Archilochus does not refer to a prohibition of missile weapons but only to their relative scarcity: οὐ τοι πόλλ' . . . οὐδὲ θαμειαί. Strabo had read Archilochus and no doubt could have cited him, if he really had relevant information.²³ Archilochus fr.3 West neither proves nor supports the historicity of a ban on missiles in the late eighth or seventh centuries.

Polybius' account of the alleged treaty (13.3.4: text in note 3 above) in comparison to Strabo's (10.1.12) is vague and practically useless, except for its role in leading scholars to posit a common source for the two accounts.²⁴ The assumption that one source about two centuries earlier than another should convey more accurate information about an archaic event proves false in this case. Polybius fixes the setting of the treaty neither chronologically nor geographically. He states only that "the ancients" made an agreement not to use unseen or missile weapons against each other and to let close combat decide the issue of battles.

Besides using a different word for missile weapons (discussed below), Polybius also adds "unseen" (ἀδῆλοις), which Strabo lacks. The reason is clear. Polybius' glorification of ancient practices in 13.3 precedes his account in 13.4 of Philip V's deceitful intrigues against Rhodes in 204, which involved the duplicity and sabotage of Heracleides of Tarentum, Philip's "unseen" weapon. The passage actually belongs to a series of polemics against Philip scattered throughout Polybius' work. His praise of the Romans (13.3.7–8), paralleled with equal propagandistic intent elsewhere, serves to blacken further the picture of Philip.²⁵ For Polybius an alleged treaty banning missile weapons

²⁰ Text in note 5 above; Jeffrey II, 65; Murray 78; Donlan 131–33, 135–36; Greenhalgh 92.

²¹ Felix Jacoby, "The Date of Archilochus," *CQ* 35 (1941) 97–109; Burnett (above, note 6) 26; Podlecki II, 31–32, 46. Donlan believes that Archilochus was concerned with or at least knew of an actual or potential conflict between Chalcis and Eretria: 135–36.

²² Forrest 163–64; Burnett (above, note 6) 40; Podlecki II, 45; Greenhalgh 91. *Contra*, Donlan 136 n.1; Murray 78, who thinks that Archilochus' future tense somehow indicates a remembrance on an earlier generation.

²³ Donlan 132, 133 n.2, 134.

²⁴ Polybius' account is ignored by Forrest 163–64; Bakhuizen 35; and others.

²⁵ For Heracleides' activities see F. W. Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon* (Cambridge 1940)

provides an ancient exemplum useful for his anti-Macedonian/pro-Roman propaganda. His vague reference to the pact proves neither his own belief in the treaty nor its historicity. Specious “facts” make excellent propaganda. Furthermore, omission of specific details precludes use of the passage to confirm the account in Strabo. Only Polybius and Strabo, however, refer to this treaty and a common source is most probable.

II

If the Lelantine War, Archilochus, and even Polybius’ parallel account offer nothing fruitful, what can be derived from Strabo, the most detailed source for the treaty? The whole of 10.1 is devoted to Euboea. After various geographical details and brief digressions on the early traditions about the island (10.1.1–9), Strabo (10.1.10) turns to Eretria, to which he says the *komē* Amarynthus located seven stades away belongs. He notes an “Old Eretria” razed by the Persians in 490 and the “new” Eretria founded on the same site. Eretria’s might is attested by a stele in the temple of Artemis Amarynthia, upon which were inscribed details of a festal procession of 3000 hoplites, 600 cavalry, and 60 chariots, and by Eretria’s rule at some unspecified date over Andros, Teos, Ceos, and other islands. Strabo can fix neither the age of Eretrian power nor the date of the inscription with more precision than *ποτέ*, and the statement about an Eretrian thalassocracy does not belong to the inscription.

In 10.1.11 Strabo mentions Chalcis and Eretria as the leading cities of Euboea, noting that their esteem included not only war but also peace, as seen in Aristotle’s residence in Chalcis at his death and the school of Menedemus (*ca* 339–*ca* 265) at Eretria. The theme of peace and philosophers thus introduces the alleged treaty on the prohibition of missiles in 10.1.12.

Strabo states that Chalcis and Eretria generally maintained friendly relations, which did not cease in their dispute over Lelanton. Instead of waging a war with self-willed stubbornness dictating the hostilities, they agreed to a conflict limited by definite rules. Strabo contrasts a πόλεμος κατὰ αὐθάδειαν with an ἄγων.²⁶ Strabo adds that a stele in the Amarynthium illustrates the point, for it bore an inscription prohibiting missile weapons. The rest of 10.1.12 is a digression on missiles and hand-to-hand weapons,²⁷ which continues in 10.1.13 with special attention to Euboeans as close-combat fighters in Homer.

108–111. Cf. the gloss on Plb. 13.3–4 in Schweighauser’s edition (1789): “facile intelligitur de dolo illo agi, quo in subornando adversus Rhodios Heracleide usus Philippus est.” Polybius’ polemics: e.g., 5.11–12.4, 110.1–9; 18.3, 33.6; Roman propaganda: Liv. 42.47.4–9 with Walbank, *HCP* III, 299 on the Polybian origin of the passage.

²⁶ Cf. Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 9.17.4 for *authadeia* as the “arbitrariness” of L. Aemilius Mamercus’ treaty with Veii (traditionally, 478: *MRR* I, 25–26), made without consulting the Senate about the terms.

Comparison of Strabo's account with Polybius' reveals both similarities and differences. Polybius' attribution of the treaty to "the ancients," lack of geographical identification, and his propagandistic addition of "unseen" weapons for application of the exemplum against Philip V have been noted. In both sources references to close combat immediately follow mention of the ban on missiles, a logical sequence permitting little argument about a common source, and the phrase ἐκ χειρὸς καὶ συστάδην is common to both, although in Strabo the order is reversed. The arguments that verbal similarity indicates a common source is mitigated somewhat by Polybius' use of this phrase elsewhere.²⁷ Yet verbal similarity with the *Urquelle* is probably not to be expected in Polybius, who has quite obviously in 13.3.4 reworked the source considerably for his own purposes.

More puzzling is the difference in words used for missile weapons: ἐκηβόλοις in Polybius and τηλεβόλοις in Strabo. Ἐκηβόλος, Apollo's epithet in Homer, appears in Hellenistic authors, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Onasander, Plutarch, Aelianus Tacticus, and Arrian, in historical and military contexts for missile weapons. In contrast, τηλεβόλος is relatively rare and not attested in epic—first occurring in Pindar (*Pyth.* 3.49). An argument that τηλεβόλος is a more specific term signifying only arrows and slings but not throwing spears and javelins is refuted by Strabo: in 10.1.12 *akontistai* are listed as users of τηλεβόλοις, and in 4.4.3 the comparative degree of the adjective describes a Gallic javelin similar to the *grosphos* (*hasta velitaris*) of the Roman *velites*.²⁸ If, as I argue, Polybius has considerably revised his source for the treaty stylistically, and his ἐκηβόλοις for missiles conforms with usage in other Hellenistic authors, then Strabo should be credited not only with the more detailed account of the treaty but also with probably a more faithful reproduction of the *Urquelle*. This argument (although not one to be pressed too far) would suggest that Strabo's τηλεβόλοις indicates a source that does not antedate the fifth century, and therefore that the inscription (at least as quoted in Strabo) also cannot be earlier than that date.³⁰

It is likewise peculiar that according to Strabo Chalcis and Eretria agreed to wage their *agon* by several rules (συνέθεντο, ἐφ' οἷς συστήσονται τὸν ἀγῶνα), but he can cite only one clause from presumably many in the treaty to justify his case. Any inscribed public document would have included all stipulations of an agreement. Several avenues of escape from this difficulty lie open: first, the inscription of 10.1.12 could be identified with the processional

²⁷ Some earlier editors viewed this digression as an interpolation, although its authenticity is accepted in the latest edition of Strabo, Book X by François Lasserre (Budé: Paris 1971).

²⁸ Von Scala I, 308 n.1; Walbank, *HCP* II, 416.

²⁹ *LSJ*⁹ s.vv. ἐκηβόλος, τηλεβόλος; Arr., *Tact.* 15.1; *grosphos*: Plb. 6.22.1, 4; Bérard, *Eretria* III, 69 n.48; Lasserre (above, note 27) 120 (n.3 *ad* p.29).

³⁰ We cannot, of course, argue either that Pindar invented the word or that it occurred before him on this evidence.

inscription of 10.1.10, also from the Amarynthium and also reporting military details. But a treaty and the description of a religious procession are two very different kinds of documents. This solution does not explain Strabo's reporting only one clause of the treaty, even if two inscriptions on the same stele are posited. Besides, Strabo in no way connects the two inscriptions and many cult inscriptions from Amarynthus are known (see below).

Second, Polybius' rules of "the ancients" could be used to supplement Strabo's single clause: mandatory declaration of war, advanced notice of time and place of battle, i.e., battles by appointment only, and renunciation of stratagems.³¹ Polybius' extensive revision of his source for the treaty renders any attempt to supplement Strabo with Polybius highly questionable, and in Strabo's account any requirement of a declaration of war is superfluous: Chalcis and Eretria have already declared war; the problem concerns only the rules of waging it. Finally, Strabo's mention of only one clause from the treaty could represent historical selection: he knew more clauses, but only chose to give one. As noted above, however, the quotation of the inscription contains no reference to the Lelantine War (see note 18 above). The connection between the war and the inscription as well as the assumption of a multi-clause treaty is merely the inference of Strabo (or his source) to explain the inscription. An inscription recording a treaty with a single known clause and associated with the Lelantine War begins to appear even more incredible.

III

Since literary sources fail to confirm the historicity of a ban on missiles, perhaps archaeological material can be more enlightening. Does a treaty prohibiting missiles fit the archaeological and military context of archaic Eretria? Two sites from Strabo 10.1.10–12 demand consideration—his Old Eretria said to have been razed by the Persians in 490, upon which a new Eretria was founded, and Amarynthus, the site of the sanctuary to Artemis, the patron goddess of Eretria, said to be seven stades from the city.

Among other geographical mistakes about Euboea, Strabo (10.1.10) errs in stating that Eretria was destroyed and that the Persians used their "netting" tactics in its capture. The town actually fell by betrayal; only the temples were destroyed, to which recent excavations now add damage to the city's West Gate.³² No literary text attests Persian destruction of the Amarynthium out-

³¹ Ilari (above, note 6) 53. On battles by appointment see Pritchett, *GSAW* II, 147–55 cf. 173–76; A. M. Eckstein, "Perils of Poetry: the Roman 'Poetic Tradition' on the Outbreak of the First Punic War," *AJAH* 5 (1980) 175–78, 188 n. 19, who erroneously equates challenges to battle with battles by appointment. I hope to treat such battles in a Roman context elsewhere.

³² Hdt. 6.101.2–3 cf. 6.119.2–4; netting: Hdt. 6.31.2; Lasserre (above, note 27) 119 n. 8 cf. Steven W. Hirsch, "Cyrus' Parable of the Fish: Sea Power in the Early Relations of Greece and Persia," *CJ* 81 (1986) 222–29; Krause, *Eretria* IV, 49; Fritz Geyer, *Topographie und Geschichte der Insel Euböia*, Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie 6 (Berlin 1903) 56–57.

side the city and the site of Amarynthus (discussed below) remains uncertain, although it would be quite peculiar if the Persians omitted destruction of the chief Eretrian sanctuary, given that their motive was revenge for Eretrian damage to Persian religious sites at Sardis. If the Persians destroyed the Amarynthium, the survival of a stele displaying an archaic treaty on missiles seems unlikely, but the opportunity for a later forgery of such a treaty appears inviting. Furthermore, the status of Eretria in the first half of the fifth century is practically unknown. Herodotus records Persian enslavement of the Eretrian population and its resettlement at Ardericca, 210 stades from Susa, but this can hardly mean the entire population: Eretria furnished seven ships to the Greek allied navy in 480 and 600 hoplites from Eretria and Styra served at Plataea the following year.³³

Strabo's picture of an Old Eretria replaced by a new city after 490 is entirely false—only one of his several misconceptions about Euboea.³⁴ Many scholars wish to identify Old Eretria with Amarynthus, a site whose name betrays a pre-Greek origin but whose location is in doubt.³⁵ Wherever Amarynthus may be, its festival of Artemis Amarysia, well attested by Hellenistic inscriptions, became a pan-Euboean event.³⁶ The occurrence of pyrrhic dancing at the festival in Hellenistic times leads some to see a connection with the military procession described in the inscription of Strabo 10.1.10 and to posit both a military flavor for the festival passed down from archaic times and an obscure association with the treaty banning missiles: a periodically repeated and religiously sanctioned ritual for the initiation of youth.³⁷ In such

³³ Hdt. 6.101.3, 119.2–4; 8.1.2, 46.2; 9.28.5; on Eretria, apparently prosperous, in the mid-fifth century see Russell Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 568–69.

³⁴ For other geographical errors in Strabo 10.1 see Geyer (above, note 32) 56–57; Popham, *Lefkandi* I, 426 n.3; Bakhuizen 82–84. In general on the archaeology of Eretria see Philippon, "Eretria I," *RE* 6 (1907) 422–25; T. W. Jacobsen, "Eretria," *PECS* (1976) 315–17.

³⁵ Some place Amarynthus near modern Kato Batheia and Ano Batheia, five or six miles east of Eretria at the foot of Mt. Kotylaion, a mountain sacred to Artemis. Numerous Hellenistic inscriptions including dedications to Artemis, Apollo, and Leto and fragments of victor lists from festive games have been found there. Material as early as the sixth century also occurs. *IG* XII.9 139–86; Irene C. Ringwood, "Local Festivals of Euboea," *AJA* 33 (1929) 386; William Wallace, "The Demes of Eretria," *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 134; Boardman (above, note 6) 23; Geyer (above, note 32) 57. On the -nthos combination as a pre-Greek place name see Carl Blegan/J. B. Haley, "The Coming of the Greeks," *AJA* 32 (1928) 141–54; Emily Vermeule, *Greece in the Bronze Age* (Chicago 1964) 60–64. In preference to this inland site, some place Amarynthus at Palaioacastri, a prehistoric coastal site. See Bakhuizen 78–79; Popham, *Lefkandi* I, 423, 426 note 4. Cf. Boardman (above, note 6) 24.

³⁶ Jessen, "Amarysia," *RE* I (1984) 1743; Denis Knoepfler, "Carystos et les Artémisia d'Amorynthos," *BCH* 96 (1972) 283–301. Knoepfler promises a monograph on Amarynthus and inscriptions of the cult which has not appeared, unless this be his "La cité de Ménédème. Études et documents sur l'histoire d'Érétia à la haute époque hellénistique" (Thèse Sorbonne 1984): *non vidi*.

³⁷ *IG* XII.9 236, 237, *IG* XII Suppl. 553 (a copy of XII.9 236); Liv. 35.38.3; Brelich (above, note 6) 18–20; Ringwood (above, note 35) 386–87. Cf. note 19 above.

cases continuity of practice is always easy to postulate and rather difficult to prove. First, as already noted, Strabo in no way associates the inscriptions of 10.1.10 and 10.1.12. Second, whatever its military connection in the fifth century and earlier, pyrrhic dancing in the Hellenistic period did not constitute military training nor have a military connection.³⁸ Third, Strabo gives no indication that the power of Eretria seen in the inscription dates to the Archaic period. To Strabo, writing under Augustus, the Eretrians' former power (τὴν δὲ δύναμιν . . . ἣν ἔσχον ποτέ) (10.1.10), could indicate the period of Eretria's leadership in an anti-Athenian coalition 411–394/3 or merely Strabo's (or his source's) inference from the size of the procession in the Amarysia. The use of chariots in the procession does not dictate an archaic date for the inscription or Eretrian military conservatism on the battlefield. Chariots were a regular part of the Panatheneia and no one draws similar conclusions from these Athenian chariots.³⁹

Strabo's geographical errors about Euboea, his false belief in destruction of Eretria in 490, and his general chronological vagueness do not inspire confidence in his accuracy about a supposed archaic treaty banning missiles. Evidence for the Amarysia dates to the fourth century and the Hellenistic period, from which time the bulk of Eretrian inscriptions derive.⁴⁰ On the basis of probability alone an inscribed treaty, even if existing and not the product of a propagandist's imagination, would seem to fit the fourth century at earliest.

But the real question is whether archaeological material from archaic Eretria will support the historicity of a ban on missiles. Only Eretria comes into consideration, since archaic Chalcis most probably lies beneath the modern city of Chalcis and no major excavations in that area have yet been conducted.⁴¹

³⁸ See Everett L. Wheeler, "Hoplomachia and Greek Dances in Arms," *GRBS* 23 (1982) 223–33, esp. 233 with note 54. Cf. J. Delorme, *Gymnasium* (Paris 1960) 469–74 and S. C. Humphreys, "The Nothoi of Kynosarges," *JHS* 94 (1974) 90–91.

³⁹ Archaic date of inscription in Strabo 10.1.10: Geyer (above, note 32) 63; Ringwood (above, note 35) 386; Snodgrass, *AAG* 71; Jeffrey I, 82; Coldstream 199 cites an abundance of Eretrian pottery on Andros to argue Eretrian control of the island in the late eighth and seventh centuries, but trade need not mean political control. 411–394/3: Bakhuizen 29. Panatheneia: L. Ziehen, "Panathenaia," *RE* 18 (1949) 468 cf. Lorimer (above, note 6) 118. A thesis of Greenhalgh's book is that chariots in Geometric vase painting do not indicate battlefield use, but are a heroicizing substitution for cavalry.

⁴⁰ Cf. notes 35, 37 above. The numerous funerary stelai found in the West Gate area date predominantly to the fourth and third centuries: Christine Dunant, *Eretria* VI, 22, 26.

⁴¹ Bakhuizen's book, in which he attempts to belittle archaic Eretria and to magnify the role of Chalcis, argues that Chalcis' prominence occurred from an early development of iron technology and exploitation of local iron resources. While his critical approach to the sources should be justly appreciated, his speculative arguments remain unproven, especially given the lack of archaeological support. See the reviews of M. M. Austin, *CR* 28 (1978) 377 and Denis Knoepfler, *MH* 32 (1980) 190–91.

Eretria was a relatively new city to be engaged in a war with Chalcis *ca* 700. Its foundation can be dated *ca* 800–750 on the basis of ceramic evidence, burials, and some building activity.⁴² Although the city's original extent is disputed (the acropolis may not have been initially included), Eretria was remarkable for its size (at least one square kilometer), its wealth (gold diadems, numerous bronze cauldrons), and its overseas contacts.⁴³ In fact the bulk of the city walls (or in another view an expansion of the city) and the West Gate belong to the seventh century—a troublesome problem for historians of the Lelantine War, although one excavator is willing to juggle the archaeological evidence to fit nearly any date for the war.⁴⁴

The earliest history of Eretria, however, can no longer be considered without reference to the British excavations of Xeropolis at modern Lefkandi. The ancient name of Xeropolis, located on the coast of the Lelantine plain halfway between Chalcis and Eretria, is unknown. The excavators suggest Lelanton.⁴⁵ The site experienced continuous occupation from the tenth century to *ca* 700 and has yielded numerous oriental imports of good quality, iron implements, and the presence of a foundry in the ninth century. *Ca* 825 a “disturbance” at Xeropolis occasioned the abandonment of some cemeteries and a general reduction of the inhabited area. Complete abandonment of the site came *ca* 700 possibly after a sack of the town. There is speculation that the decline of Xeropolis is connected with the rise of Eretria and that Xeropolis' evacuation marks an incident in the Lelantine War.⁴⁶

A connection with the Lelantine War becomes even more intriguing from an additional item of evidence from Eretria. A group of six warrior cremations, dated 720–680 and distinct from the city's major Geometric cemetery, was discovered just south of the West Gate within the city walls. Iron swords and spearheads occur in the grave goods. Tomb Six, the oldest and richest burial, perhaps that of a “prince,” forms the center of a semi-circle around which the other cremation burials were arranged. In brief, the site became a heroon, surrounded by a peribole and including a triangular monument—its *sêma*. Evidence of numerous sacrifices and offerings in the seventh century occur, although continuation of the cult after the sixth century cannot be substantiated.⁴⁷

⁴² Auberson, *Eretria* I, 24, Bérard, *Eretria* VI, 94 with n.93; Boardman (above, note 6) 14; Popham, *Lefkandi* I, 424; Coldstream 88, 199.

⁴³ Bérard, *Eretria* VI, 89–95; Coldstream 199.

⁴⁴ Krause, *Eretria* IV, 20–21 cf. Bérard in note 43 above.

⁴⁵ Popham, *Lefkandi* I, 424–26. Bakhuizen 8–13 argues that Xeropolis is Old Chalcis, i.e., a city called Euboea known only from a murky tradition and thought to have been submerged by a tidal wave (Strabo 10.1.9); Coldstream 90 argues for Strabo's Old Eretria.

⁴⁶ Popham/Sackett, *Lefkandi* I, 365–66, 368–69, 424; Murray 75–76; Coldstream 200. Also see P. G. Themelis, “Die Nekropolen von Lefkandi-Nord auf Euboea,” *SBVienna* 418 (1983) 145–60.

⁴⁷ Bérard, *Eretria* III, passim, *Eretria* VI, 89–95, and “Le sceptre du prince,” *MH* 29 (1972) 218–27, where he argues that the bronze spearhead found in Tomb Six and possibly an heirloom

Abandonment of Xeropolis *ca* 700 and warriors of 720–680 venerated as heroes at Eretria certainly coincide with a date of *ca* 700 derived from literary sources for the Lelantine War, although the lack of any archaeological evidence from Chalcis still casts a shadow over an identification of this apparent struggle between Xeropolis and Eretria with the great war of coalitions in Thucydides (1.15.3). Since the new city of Eretria was at war *ca* 700, can an inscribed treaty banning missiles have been part of this struggle? What is the epigraphical evidence from archaic Eretria?

As Forrest noted, inscriptions of the seventh century are few and Eretrian inscriptions are extremely rare. Jeffrey, who in 1961 accepted an archaic date for the inscriptions in Strabo 10.1.10 and 12, has difficulty finding parallel evidence. Her earliest Eretrian inscription (no.22) does not come from Eretria: a potter's signature on an Early Protocorinthian aryballos of unknown provenance possibly from the second half of the seventh century. Her next earliest is a brief $\theta\epsilon\alpha$ painted on an amphora from the Eretrian necropolis and dated *ca* 600. The only archaic Eretrian inscriptions of any political substance, i.e., not ceramic or funerary inscriptions, are three legal texts of *ca* 550–25 on blocks rebuilt in the city gate.⁴⁸ The epigraphical poverty of Eretria supports rejection rather than confirmation of an inscribed stele banning missiles *ca* 700.

Plutarch, however, records a tale that Cleomachus of Pharsalus brought Thessalian cavalry to the aid of Chalcis in the Lelantine War. He died in battle and the Chalcidians erected a column (bearing an inscription?) to him in their agora. At first glance the story seems to offer Chalcidian support for an Eretrian inscribed stele of the Lelantine War. Yet column monuments do not appear before the sixth century.⁴⁹ If the earliest extant inscribed Greek treaties are taken into consideration, the earliest, the alliance of Elis and Heraea *ca* 550 (*ca* 500: Jeffrey), appears on a bronze tablet, and Bengtson's earliest treaty on stone is the Athenian decree on Erythrae after 465.⁵⁰ An inscribed Greek treaty on stone dating before the sixth century would be an anomaly in the present state of the evidence.⁵¹ Even Jeffrey after several

in an age of iron indicates the royal power of the occupant; Popham/Sackett, *Lefkandi* 1, 369; Murray 78; Coldstream 196–97, 350 and "Hero-cults in the Age of Homer," *JHS* 96 (1976) 15.

⁴⁸ Forrest 163; Jeffrey 1, 82–86 cf. 71–81.

⁴⁹ Plut. *Mor.* 760E–61B; Bakhuizen 35–36 with note 143 cf. his "Ὁ μέγας κίων, the Monument for Cleomachos at Chalcis-in-Euboea," in *Festoen opgedragen aan A. N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta*, Scripta Archaeologica Groningana 6 (Groningen/Bussum 1976) 43–47.

⁵⁰ Bengtson, *Staatsvertr.*² Nr.102 cf. Jeffrey 1, 219 nr.6, *Staatsvertr.*² Nr.134 cf. Russell Meiggs/David Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford 1969) nr.40, who date it 453–52 and therefore later than the Athenian alliance with Egesta (nr. 37 = *Staatsvertr.*² Nr.139), which they date 458–57, although others say 418–17. This is not the place to debate the problems of fifth-century epigraphy.

⁵¹ A sixth-century Spartan treaty with Tegea mentioned by Aristotle and generally regarded as historical was inscribed on a stele: Arist. fr.592 Rose = Plut., *Mor.* 292B; *Staatsvertr.*² Nr.112; Felix Jacoby, *CQ* 38 (1944) 15–16; Paul Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia* (London 1979) 138–39.

flip-flops on the issue still believes in the historicity of Strabo's ban on missiles, but now (1976) dates it to the fifth century or later,⁵² although this concession to epigraphic reality removes the treaty from any meaningful contemporary context and invites an argument for forgery.

Much of the credibility of Strabo's ban on missiles derives from the assumed accuracy of the Homeric fame of the Euboeans, i.e., the Abantes, as experts in close combat, an appeal to which Strabo also resorts in attempting to explain the ban's meaning, and the archaic Chalcidians did have a reputation for the manufacture of swords.⁵³ In addition, *opinio communis* sees Greek warfare of the Dark Age and Geometric period as an era of combat predominantly between small groups of aristocrats relying on missile weapons and swords. The various components of the hoplite panoply began to appear in the late eighth and early seventh centuries, which began a transitional period of tactical experimentation eventually producing the hoplite phalanx of massed infantry about the middle of the seventh century or a little later.⁵⁴ Does a prohibition of missiles make sense in the military context of archaic Eretria?

Surprisingly, no one has noticed that the chief divinities of Eretria were archers: Artemis, Apollo, and even Heracles.⁵⁵ Although the mythological attributes of divinities in no way dictate the tactical practices of their worshipers, there is a certain contradiction in the idea of setting up an inscription banning missiles in the sanctuary of Artemis. Indeed a Euboean tradition in missile weapons can be demonstrated to offset the Homeric association of Euboea with close combat.

With the exception of Crete the Dark Age saw the disappearance of archery on the Greek mainland: finds of arrowheads, frequent in the My-

⁵² Jeffrey II, 46, 65–66, 69 n.3, 70 n.4.

⁵³ II. 2.542–44; Strabo 10.1.13; Chalcidian sword: references collected in Robert Renehan, "The Early Greek Poets: Some Interpretations," *HSCP* (1983) 2.

⁵⁴ The basic article remains A. N. Snodgrass, "Hoplite Reform and History," *JHS* 85 (1965) 110–22 cf. his *AAG* 35–88, *EGAW* passim, and *AG* 104–106. John Salmon would push back the introduction of the phalanx to ca 675: "Political Hoplitest?" *JHS* 97 (1977) 84–101. Also see Greenhalgh 70–74, 146 and passim. Snodgrass has recently been challenged by Pritchett (*GSAG* IV, 1–93), who discounts the significance of changes in Greek armor and argues continuity of the Greek phalanx from Homer on. Despite the poet's emphasis on heroic duels, Pritchett believes he has proved that battles of massed infantry organized in definite, disciplined units and forming phalanges fought on the plain of Troy. Pritchett curiously pretends that he is arguing with Lorimer (above, note 6) instead of Snodgrass, who had already refuted Lorimer on many points, and Snodgrass' 1965 article is not mentioned. Needless to say, the argument does not convince. On the other hand, Pritchett has admirably collected the evidence for hoplite combat in the Classical period. His discussion of *ôthismos* (65–68, 71–73, 91–92) is more than adequate to refute the questionable attempt of Peter Krentz to argue that *ôthismos* is a myth and that the phalanx was an open and not a closed formation: "The Nature of Hoplite Battle," *ClAnt* 4 (1985) 50–61.

⁵⁵ On the cult of Heracles at Eretria: *IG* XII.9 234; Ringwood (above, note 35) 388.

cenaeon period, practically vanish until the eighth century; archery is common in the seventh.⁵⁶ Euboea may now be added to those few places where Dark Age archery was known. A hydria of Middle Protogeometric date (i.e., ca 900) showing archers was found at Xeropolis. Although a unique find and probably an import, the vase shows at least an Euboean awareness of archery, which finds subsequent confirmation.⁵⁷ About a half-century later in Late Protogeometric burials at Xeropolis one tomb contained ten arrowheads and an iron sword (Toumba Cemetery, Tomb 26) and another the possible remains of a composite bow (Palia Perivolia/ East Cemeteries, T Pyre I). Iron spearheads also occur in burials of this period.⁵⁸

It should also be noted that until the introduction of the closed massed formation of the phalanx, spears were generally missile rather than thrusting weapons. Just as in the heroic duels in the *Iliad*, spears were thrown before closing for sword combat. From about 900, multiple spearheads in burials became common—not an indication of wealth as in Mycenaean graves, but of the use of spears as javelins. In Geometric and Protocorinthian vases warriors often appear carrying two spears, at least one of which would be thrown and the other left for close combat.⁵⁹

Eretrian evidence conforms to this interpretation. A Late Geometric amphora of local manufacture dated ca 700 shows warriors carrying two spears and possibly a hoplite shield—the only evidence so far of hoplite equipment from the Archaic period at Eretria. The fragment of a crater from the Eretrian heroon depicts a warrior (apparently part of a file of warriors) also carrying two spears and a Dipylon shield. Furthermore, the warrior burials of the Eretrian heroon contained numerous swords and elongated spearheads—javelin heads, not thrusting spears.⁶⁰ Since Strabo's *τηλεβόλοις* denotes javelins as well as slings and arrows, as shown above (note 29), the archaeological evidence appears decisive: Eretrians ca 700 did not observe a ban on missiles and a treaty to this effect cannot have been part of the Lelantine War.

Several specific arguments for the treaty's historicity can now be readily dispatched. The notion cannot stand that a ban on missiles conforms to an

⁵⁶ Snodgrass, *EGAW* 151–56, *AAG* 39, 47. Cf. Donlan 137 n.7 and G. Ahlberg, *Fighting on Land and Sea in Greek Geometric Art*, Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, Series in 4°, 16 (Stockholm 1971) 53–54.

⁵⁷ V. R. d'A. Desborough, *Lefkandi* I, 348, 357, II, Pl. 210c, Pl. 270d. Of course oral traditions about the Mycenaean period which eventually became part of the Homeric corpus probably perpetuated the memory of archery.

⁵⁸ *Lefkandi*, I, 160–61, 175–76, 182–83, 192–93, 358–59, 361.

⁵⁹ Snodgrass, *AAG* 38–39, 57, *EGAW* 138; Greenhalgh 41, 59, 63.

⁶⁰ Amphora: Boardman (above, note 6) 29 and "Pottery from Euboea," *BSA* 47 (1952) 7 with Pl. IIIA; Greenhalgh 91, 92; Lilly Kahil, "Céramique géométrique et subgéométrique d'Érétrie," *AntK* 11 (1968) 100 with Pl. 27.4; heroon: Bérard, *Eretria* III, 17 (Tomb 6—five javelin heads), 18 (Tomb 8—one javelin head), 19–20 (Tomb 9—three javelin heads).

archaic Greek code of chivalry in which archery was shunned as un-heroic and rules of *monomachia* permitted only close combat (cf. note 8 above). Strabo's τηλεβόλοις includes both spears and arrows. Homeric heroes threw their spears, and the eighth and seventh centuries saw a revival of archery and an emphasis on missiles, to which Eretria *ca* 700 does not offer an exception. The cowardice of archers asserted in Homer, Euripides, and Dio Chrysostom, and echoed in Homeric scholia, need not represent the true Greek attitude toward the bow used with approval by both gods and heroes.⁶¹

Von Scala and Walbank wish to associate the ban on missiles with the practice of *monomachia*, a duel of champions, and cite a fragment of Ephorus in Strabo, relating that *monomachia* is an ἔθος τι παλαιὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων.⁶² Ephorus' fragment is an unfortunate selection of evidence, since both duelists use missile weapons: one a bow, the other a sling. Besides, the rules of *monomachia* did not prohibit missile weapons: Menelaus throws his spear in his duel with Paris; both Hector and Ajax throw spears in their duel; and Pausanias and Polyaeus tell essentially the same story as Ephorus of a *monomachia* involving missile weapons. Strabo (10.1.13) even claims it a regular practice in *monomachia* to throw spears before closing for sword play.⁶³

The ineffectiveness of missiles against the new tactics of the hoplite phalanx is an argument used both for and against the historicity of a ban on missiles (see note 9 above), and is equally invalid for both sides of the issue. A treaty of *ca* 700 would antedate the appearance of the phalanx by at least a half-century.⁶⁴ The revival of archery on the mainland coincides with the development of hoplite armor, as seen in the reappearance of greaves *ca* 675, if taken as anti-missile protection rather than a social distinction. Besides, hoplite armor scarcely comes into question for Eretria *ca* 700, where the only evidence for it is a possible hoplite shield in a vase painting.⁶⁵ Furthermore, a

⁶¹ Il. 11.379–95; Eur. *HF* 157–64, 188–203; D. Chr. 58.1–4; schol. Ven. *ad* Il. 2.543 and Eust. 282 (*ad* Il. 2.543), cited by Pritchett, *GSAW* IV, 31 n.94. For an argument that the bow is not a cowardly weapon in Homer see André Arnaud, "Quelques aspects des rapports de ruse et de la guerre dans le monde grec du VIII^e au V^e siècle" (Thèse de 3^e Cycle: Paris 1971) 26–27. A literary analysis of Euripides' debate on archery in Richard Hamilton, "Slings and Arrows: the Debate with Lycus in the *Heracles*," *TAPA* 115 (1985) 19–25. Eustathius 1030 (*ad* Il. 15.540–43) defends an archer's shooting an enemy in the back.

⁶² Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 115 = Strabo 8.3.33; von Scala and Walbank in note 6 above. On *monomachia* see Wheeler (above, note 38) 224 with n.9 and Pritchett, *GSAW* IV, 15–21, who provides a catalogue of such duels. For Roman *monomachia* see S. P. Oakley, "Single Combat in the Roman Republic," *CQ* 35 (1985) 392–410. An alleged *monomachia* in the Lelantine War rests on emending the text of Plut. fr.84 from ναυμαχοῦντα to μονομαχοῦντα.

⁶³ Il. 3.355–56, 7.244–50; Paus. 5.4.2; Polyaeus 5.48 (= *Exc. Polyaei* 11.2); Strabo 10.1.13.

⁶⁴ Snodgrass, *EGAW* 180.

⁶⁵ On archery see note 56 above; Eretrian vase with shield: Boardman (above, note 60) cf. Coldstream 192 and Snodgrass, *AG* 108; greaves: Alcaeus *Z* 34 *PLF*; Snodgrass, *EGAW* 183, *AAG* 52–53. The function of greaves is not clear. Snodgrass is hardly convincing that greaves, worn in Mycenaean times but abandoned in the Dark Age, were revived because of epic references

belief that missiles are ineffective against hoplites and other heavily armored infantry in mass formation ignores Demosthenes' misfortune in Aetolia, not to mention the Parthian victory at Carrhae.⁶⁶ A larger target is easier to hit (cf. Arr., *Tact.* 15.4).

The opposite side of the coin also fails to convince: Forrest's argument that a ban was unnecessary because missiles were obsolete is based on Lorimer's early date for the introduction of the phalanx. But Snodgrass has refuted Lorimer's view. Analogy with modern practice indicates that Forrest's argument (contrary to his intention) would actually advocate such a treaty's historicity: except for arms banned for humanitarian reasons, only ineffective weapons tend to be prohibited.⁶⁷

Still another argument for historicity of the pact connects the alleged treaty with the civilizing/humanitarian mission of the Delphic Amphictyony.⁶⁸ The argument rests upon the Amphictyonic oath, which attempts to limit warfare between Amphictyonic members by forbidding the destruction of a member city, its starvation, or its deprivation of running water by another member. For some the oath must date at least to the early sixth century because of its supposed connection with the First Sacred War of ca 590. Unfortunately, some see the oath (known only from sources of the fourth century) as a forgery, and the historicity of the First Sacred War, not mentioned in any source before Isocrates (14.31), is also under attack.⁶⁹ These controversies cannot be treated here, but tying the historicity of a ban on missiles ca 700 to an oath whose archaic date can only be argued rather than

to them: AG 104. Delbrück, in discussing the phalanx of the earliest Roman army, suggests that in an age when each man bore the expense of arming himself, greaves were a social distinction emphasizing the wealth of the men who could afford them. The view has some merit, since in the early Imperial army only centurions, other officers, and members of elite units, e.g., urban cohorts, wore greaves. See Hans Delbrück, *The History of the Art of War within the Framework of Political History*, trans. Walter J. Renfroe, Jr., I (Westport 1975) 265; Paul Couissin, *Les armes romaines* (Paris 1926) 350, 467.

⁶⁶ Demosthenes: Thuc. 3.97–98; Carrhae: Plut. *Crass.* 23–29; Dio 40.14–24; Snodgrass, *EGAW* 156; Greenhalgh 91.

⁶⁷ Forrest 163 cf. note 54 above; Antonio Cassese, "Means of Warfare: the Traditional and the New Law of War," in Antonio Cassese, ed., *The New Humanitarian Law of Armed Conflict* (Naples 1979) I, 166–67 cf. 196–97.

⁶⁸ See note 8 above; J. A. O. Larsen, "Federation for Peace in Ancient Greece," *CP* 39 (1944) 145–62; F. W. Walbank, "The Problem of Greek Nationality," *Phoenix* 5 (1951) 53–54; Franz Kiechle, "Zur Humanität in der Kriegführung der griechischen Staaten," *Historia* 7 (1958) 134–35.

⁶⁹ Amphictyonic oath: Aeschin. 2.115; *Staatsvertr.*² Nr. 104 cf. Louis Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris 1938) 314–15; Georges Daux, "Serments amphictioniques et serment de Platées," in *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson* (St. Louis 1953) II, 779; Peter Siewert, *Die Eid von Plataiai*, *Vestigia* 16 (Munich 1972) 78–79 and passim; First Sacred War: N. Robertson, "The Myth of the First Sacred War," *CQ* 28 (1978) 38–73; G. A. Lehmann, "Der 'erste Heilige Krieg'—Eine Fiction?" *Historia* 29 (1980) 242–46.

proved is to build a very shaky house of cards. Besides, even if the archaic date of the Amphictyonic oath is accepted, the treaty banning missiles would still antedate it by a century.

Finally, the question must be raised: *cui bono*? What purpose would a ban on missiles *ca* 700 serve? The arguments based on chivalry, humanitarianism, and practical military concerns have all been shown fallacious.⁷⁰ If comparison is permitted between Strabo's alleged treaty and the only other prohibition of a specific weapon before the nineteenth century, a social answer appears at least possible. Many scholars think that the Second Lateran Council's prohibition in 1139 of the crossbow and other forms of archery was intended to limit warfare to the knightly class, i.e., an attempt to exclude mercenaries and other non-nobles.⁷¹ Murray makes a similar claim for Strabo's treaty, although without citing the Second Lateran Council's ban as parallel: the pact excluded arrows and stones of the lower classes. In this view only Eretrian and Chalcidian aristocrats would participate in the war.

The argument fails, however, for two reasons: first, Strabo's *télebolois* includes spears; and second, archery in the early Archaic period was not the specialized skill of a lower class. The presence of iron swords and arrowheads side by side in Protogeometric tombs found at Lefkandi and Athens indicates that aristocrats, too, could be archers, and a mounted heavily armored archer appears on a "Chalcidian" vase.⁷² Indeed many common notions of what constituted the rules of the aristocratic warrior code in the Archaic period stand in need of some revision, as a recent study of ῥίψασπία has shown.⁷³ A treaty banning missiles does not belong to events of the Lelantine War, nor does it fit the archaeological, epigraphical, and military context of archaic Eretria. The treaty's meaning and its proper context must be sought in Strabo or his source.

⁷⁰ For the sake of completeness Greenhalgh's explanation of the treaty should be noted: the pact's intent was protection of the aristocratic warriors' horses. See Greenhalgh 92, 136–37. A treaty to protect horses but not men finds no parallel in the annals of chivalry. Surely if the treaty applied to horses, Polybius or Strabo would have specified such.

⁷¹ Russell (above, note 2) 156; Johnson (above, note 2) 128–29; Contamine (above, note 2) 71–72, 274–75; Paul Fournier, "La prohibition par le II^e Concile de Latran d'armes jugée trop meurtrières (1139)," *Revue Générale de Droit International Public* 33 (1916) 471–79. Cf. A. T. Hatto, "Archery and Chivalry: a Noble Prejudice," *Modern Language Review* 35 (1940) 40–54. This view is not universal. One scholar finds a more immediate cause of the ban: only two years before the Lateran Council many pilgrims were injured at the siege of Praeneste by archers from the army of Lothar III, the (Holy) Roman Emperor. See Ernst-Dieter Hehl, *Kirche und Krieg im 12. Jahrhundert: Studien zu kanonischem Recht und politischer Wirklichkeit*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 19 (Stuttgart 1980) 45–48.

⁷² Murray 78; H. W. and E. Catling, *Lefkandi* I, 256–57; Greenhalgh 139–41 with fig. 76.

⁷³ See Thomas Schwertfeger, "Der Shield des Archilochos," *Chiron* 12 (1982) 253–80.

IV

Many believe that Strabo actually visited Eretria and reports the treaty banning missiles from autopsy. Forrest, a skeptic of the treaty, carries the view further: Strabo was not a good enough epigrapher to read a seventh-century inscription and what he saw was a later Eretrian forgery.⁷⁴ Despite Strabo's boasts of great journeys of discovery in imitation of Polybius and Poseidonius, the indications of autopsy in Strabo belong to his sources. In 10.1.12 Strabo does not say he saw the inscription himself, nor can it be proved that Strabo ever visited Eretria or Euboea. His own autopsy of the area might have corrected the errors of his sources.⁷⁵

Strabo not only knew the treaty on missiles exclusively from his source, but the structure of 10.1.11–13 suggests that he did not understand the meaning of the inscription. As noted above, references to peace and Chalcis and Eretria as seats of philosophers in 10.1.11 introduce discussion of the Lelantine War and the alleged treaty, but any connection between philosophers and the treaty is a chronological absurdity. Aristotle died at Chalcis in 322 and Menedemus' Eretrian school flourished *ca* 300–273.⁷⁶ Immediately after mention of the treaty Strabo begins a muddled digression on close-combat vs missile weapons and the types of spears suitable for both. He even asserts that a sixteen-foot sarissa can be hurled. The effort to make sense of the treaty continues in 10.1.13 with commentary on Euboeans as close-combat fighters in Homer. Strabo's appeal to Homer, whom he considered the founder of geography, is not unusual, and his commentary probably owes much to Apollodorus of Athens' twelve-book study of the Catalogue of Ships.⁷⁷ In brief, Strabo's source presented him with a peculiar treaty banning missiles, which he did not know how to interpret. So he did his best to explain it by situating the treaty between anachronistic references to philosophers and an otherwise unnecessary digression on close vs distant combat.

Interpretation of the treaty thus is reduced to a common source for Strabo 10.1.12 and Polybius 13.3.4. Strabo's sources for Euboea include the geographers and Homeric commentators Apollodorus of Athens (b. *ca* 180), Artemidorus of Ephesus (fl. 100), and Demetrius of Scepsis (b. *ca* 214)⁷⁸; the

⁷⁴ Boardman (above, note 6) 29; Greenhalgh 91; Ilari (above, note 6) 53 n.34; Podlecki II, 45; Forrest 163. Burnett (above, note 6) apparently thinks that a stone bearing the inscription is extant and was published by Forrest in 1957: 40 n.21.

⁷⁵ Strabo 2.5.11; E. Honigmann, *RE*, Reihe 2, 4A (1931) 81–85; Lasserre (above, note 27) 14; Strabo's errors: note 34 above.

⁷⁶ On Menedemus see D. L. 2.125–44 (numerous errors); K. von Fritz, "Menedemos 9," *RE* 15 (1931) 788–94; Lasserre (above, note 27) 28 n.5 cf. Knoepfler's thesis (above, note 36).

⁷⁷ Strabo and Homer: Honigmann (above, note 75) 144–47; 10.1.13 = Apollodorus: E. Schwartz, *RE* 1 (1894) 2867–68; Lasserre (above, note 27) 10.

⁷⁸ Apollodorus: Schwartz (above, note 77) 2856–86, esp. 2868; *FGH* 244 F 201–204 (use in Strabo 10.2); Lasserre (above, note 27) 10; Artemidorus: Berger, *RE* 2 (1895) 1329–30; R. Stiehle,

local Euboean historians, Aristotle of Chalcis (probably 4th c.) and Archemachus (3rd c. at latest)⁷⁹ and the major fourth-century figures, Aristotle and Ephorus. Scholars have further reduced the problem of a common source to Aristotle (or at least an Aristotelian *politeia*) or Ephorus, although some insist on Apollodorus as Strabo's *Zwischenquelle* for either Aristotle or Ephorus and some say Ephorus through Artemidorus.⁸⁰

Sure footing is rarely found in the slippery business of *Quellenforschung*, but the stronger case lies with Ephorus. Aly, who believes Strabo 10.1.12 preserves a genuine seventh-century document, champions Aristotle. He assumes, however, that the Aristotle of Strabo 10.1.3, 8 can only be the philosopher without even mentioning Aristotle of Chalcis, and from this assumption he derives his whole argument for Aristotle as Strabo's *Urquelle* for Euboean geography through Apollodorus. Eleven references to Strabo in Rose's collection of Aristotelian fragments supposedly bolsters the case, as does schol. ad Il. 2.543 on the Abantes (ἤν δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς αἰσχρὸν τὸ τοξεύειν), which he connects both with Strabo's ban on missiles and with the Homeric commentary of Apollodorus. Polybius' defense of Aristotle's account of the foundation of Locri against the slanders of Timaeus allegedly proves that Polybius would not have used Ephorus in 13.3.4.⁸¹ To Aly's arguments may be added Aristotle's authorship of an Eretrian *Politeia*, and Aristotle's view of a pacifistic Lycurgus at Sparta could be used to argue at least a favorable *Tendenz* to a ban on missiles.⁸²

Yet Aly's arguments have glaring weaknesses—one assumption leading to another. The Aristotle of Strabo 10.1.3, 8 need not be the philosopher, and even if it is, that would not prove Aristotle the source for Strabo 10.1.12. In comparison to Strabo as a minor source for Aristotle's fragments, Strabo is a major source for Ephorus' fragments. Likewise, the conjectured assignment of schol. ad Il. 2.543 to Apollodorus proves nothing and even presents difficulties: first, Ephorus was a major source for Apollodorus, and Strabo in 10.2 extensively uses Ephorus through Apollodorus; second, if the association of Apol-

"Der Geograph Artemidoros von Ephesus," *Philologus* 11 (1856) 193–244; Lasserre (above, note 27) 8, 120 n.2; Demetrius: Schwartz, *RE* 4 (1901) 2807–13; Lasserre (above, note 27) 8, 11.

⁷⁹ Aristotle: *FGrH* 423 with comm.: Jacoby states (without argument) that the Aristotle cited in Strabo 10.1.3, 8 must be the Stagirite; Archemachus: *FGrH* 424 F 9 = Strabo 10.3.6. In this fragment Archemachus has the Curetes of Chalcis fighting for the Lelantine plain but without reference to a ban on missiles. The story is an *aition* to explain the name "Curetes" from their peculiar haircut: see Bakhuizen 34–35 cf. 22; Aly 354–55.

⁸⁰ Aristotle: Aly 354–60; Ephorus through Apollodorus: von Scala and Walbank in note 6 above; Ephorus through Artemidorus: Lasserre (above, note 27) 8, 120 n.2; Aristotle or Ephorus through Apollodorus: Bakhuizen 35.

⁸¹ Aly 347–60; Plb 12.5–8.

⁸² Heracl. Lemb., *Exc. Polit.* 40 Dilts = Arist. fr.611.40 Rose; cf. 10 Dilts, 611.10 Rose, Arist. *Pol.* 5. 1306a 31–32; Everett L. Wheeler, "The *Hoplomachoi* and Vegetius' Spartan Drillmasters," *Chiron* 13 (1983) 16 with nn.81–82.

Iodorus with the scholion is accepted, Strabo can be charged with imprecise language: he has obviously changed a specific word for archery (*toxoein*) to a general term for any missile (*télebolos*).⁸³ Finally, Polybius' defense of Aristotle in Book XII does not prove that he did not consult Ephorus for Book XIII. Polybius also defends Ephorus against Timaeus in Book XII, which is the only part of Polybius' work where Aristotle is cited at length, and Polybius shows no familiarity with the *Politics* and several other major Aristotelian works.⁸⁴

Ephorus is indeed the more likely candidate. Both Polybius and Strabo sing his praises, and Strabo even couples Ephorus and Polybius on occasion. Some argue that Strabo used Ephorus directly as well as indirectly. Furthermore, Ephorus is known to have cited inscriptions.⁸⁵

Recognition of Ephorus as the *Urquelle* of Strabo and Polybius (whether Strabo's use occurred through Apollodorus or Artemidorus does not affect the argument) does not mean acceptance of all of the arguments of von Scala and Walbank. As noted above, the attempt to find verbal similarity between Polybius and Strabo is inconclusive. Certainly Ephorus was interested in the ancient customs of the Greeks, particularly as they concerned amelioration of warfare between Greeks, but the rules of *monomachia* in no way excluded missile weapons. Therefore von Scala's acceptance of the emendation of Plut. fr.84 to arrive at a direct reference to *monomachia* in the context of the Lelantine War is based on a false assumption.⁸⁶

Fixing the context of Ephorus' treatment of an Eretrian-Chalcidian treaty banning missiles is not easy given the fragmentary survival of Ephorus' work, and assignment of the treaty to a specific book would be meaningless conjecture. Retention of the manuscript reading of ναυμαχοῦντα in Plut. fr.84, however, a reference to the death of King Amphidamas of Chalcis in a naval battle during the Lelantine War, suggests at least a plausible argument. Hesiod participated in games at Chalcis sponsored by Amphidamas, which Plutarch (from Ephorus?) says were funerary and occurred during the Lelantine War.⁸⁷ The historicity of Plutarch's report is of no concern here.⁸⁸ Ephorus from Aeolic Cyeme was well aware that Hesiod's father was a native of the same

⁸³ Ephorus in Strabo: *FGrH* 70, passim; Ephorus in Apollodorus: Schwartz (above, note 76) 2870–71; *FGrH* 244 F 201–204 (use in Strabo 10.2).

⁸⁴ Plb. 12.28.8–12 and passim; F. W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley 1972) 32 n.3.

⁸⁵ Praises: e.g., Plb. 5.33.2, 6.45.1, 9.1.4, 12.28.10; Strabo 9.3.11, 10.3.2–5; *FGrH* 70, passim; Polybius and Ephorus: Strabo 1.1.1, 8.1.1; direct use: Honigsmann (above, note 75) 141–42; Fordeur (above, note 13) 45–50; inscriptions: *FGrH* 70 F 122, 199.

⁸⁶ See note 62 above and von Scala II, Nr.19.

⁸⁷ Hes., *Erga* 654–55; Plut., *Mor.* 153F, fr.84. Aly, 359–60, argues that Plutarch's source is an Aristotelian *Politeia* of the Chalcidians, but the fragments of this work indicate the Chalcidians of the Chalcidice: Heracl. Lemb. *Exc. Polit.* 62–63 Dilts.

⁸⁸ Historical: Jeffrey II, 65; rejected: K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* IV (Oxford 1970) 216; Bakhuizen 34.

city, and he even claimed Homer as Cymeian. Ephorus as Plutarch's source is a distinct possibility.⁸⁹

The reference to a naval battle in Plut. fr.84 may also be of significance. Polybius notes that Ephorus' ability to treat naval battles offset his deficiencies as a military historian. Ephorus had some interest in Eretria's naval power and quotes an inscription from Torone on the loss of an Eretrian fleet in 411.⁹⁰ Strabo's reference (10.1.10) to Eretrian control over several Cycladic islands, implying naval power, comes immediately after the inscription on the festal procession. Citing inscriptions and discussing naval power would well indicate Ephorus.⁹¹ Furthermore, if the Eretrian inscription of Strabo 10.1.10 belongs to Ephorus, then the inscription of Strabo 10.1.12 in all likelihood is also his. A fourth-century inscription on the festival of Artemis Amarysia encounters no epigraphical, archaeological, and historical objections. Citing a real inscription would increase the credibility of a forgery.

Another piece of evidence should also be considered. Eusebius' *Chronicon* preserves a fragment of Diodorus (7.11) giving a list of thalassocracies in the Aegean between the Trojan War and Xerxes' invasion of Greece. An Eretrian thalassocracy, said to have lasted fifteen years, appears under the year 506. Diodorus' immediate source was Castor of Rhodes, writing in the first half of the first century, but Castor used Apollodorus of Athens, who in turn most probably drew from Ephorus. Apollodorus and Ephorus are explicitly cited for the date of Homer.⁹² Although Diodorus' seventh book exists only in fragments and placement of those fragments is, at least to some extent, based on an editor's imagination, it is nevertheless interesting that the list of thalassocracies in 7.11 is followed by an Ephorus fragment (7.12.3) and most probably preceded by one: 7.10 on the tyrant Malacus at Cyme must certainly be from Ephorus.⁹³

The accuracy of 506 as the date of an Eretrian thalassocracy matters not. It would appear that Ephorus discussed Eretrian sea power, not surprising for a city which was an early leader in Greek colonization, and if Plut. *Mor.* 153F and fr.84 derive from Ephorus, he also treated the Lelantine War. Indeed if Plut. *Mor.* 760E–61A on Cleomachus of Thessaly and the monument

⁸⁹ Hes. *Erga* 635–36; Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 1, 101–102. On the role of Ephorus' Cymeian patriotism in his work see Deborah Hobson Samuel, "Cyme and the Veracity of Ephorus," *TAPA* 99 (1968) 375–88.

⁹⁰ Plb. 12.25f = *FGrH* 70 T 20, F 199 = Diod. 13.41.1–3.

⁹¹ Von Scala I, 308 n.1.

⁹² *FGrH* 70 F 102: "in Latina Historia haec ad verbum scripta repperimus Agrippa apud Latinos regnante Homerus poeta in Graecia claruit, ut testantur Apollodorus grammaticus et Euforbus historicus; ante urbem Romam conditam ann. CXXIV et, ut ait Cornelius Nepos, ante olympiadem primam ann. Ć." Castor: *FGrH* 250; Wolfgang Aly, "Kastor als Quelle Diodors im 7. Buch," *RhM* 66 (1911) 584–606; Kubitschek, *RE* 10 (1919) 2350–51.

⁹³ Diod. 7.12.3 cf. Strabo 10.4.16–20 = Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 149; Schwartz, "Diodorus," *RE* 5 (1905) 678.

erected to him in Chalcis for his aid in the Lelantine War is also from Ephorus, it would offer a parallel to the inscribed stele of Strabo 10.1.12.⁹⁴ But this argument should not be pressed.

V

A treaty between Chalcis and Eretria, of which only one clause is known—that banning missiles, first occurs in Ephorus and was associated with the Lelantine War. Such a treaty does not fit the archaeological, epigraphical, and military context of Eretria *ca* 700. Did an inscribed stele purporting to be an archaic treaty really exist in fourth-century Eretria, or is it Ephorus' invention? What was the motive for the forgery?

The forgery of archaic documents by later Greeks is a fact and includes the inscription of such documents on stone, although some scholars will always argue for authenticity. As examples may be cited the inscribed romance of the foundation of Magnesia on the Maeander from Thessalian Magnesia, the oath of Cyrene, and the much debated Themistocles decree.⁹⁵ Forrest argues that Strabo's treaty was a forgery set up by later Eretrians, ignorant of the change in tactics produced by the phalanx, to explain the contrast of missiles and close combat in Archilochus fr.3 West. Donlan rejects Forrest's argument, although agreeing that the inscription cannot date to the seventh century. In his view two rationalistic explanations are possible: first, the inscription gave details on reorganization of the Eretrian army, in which hoplites replaced slingers and archers; second, the inscription was a casualty list or epitaph, specifying close combat and omission of missiles. Bakhuizen believes the inscription a chronicle of Eretrian history, which mentioned the Lelantine War and also Archilochus. This chronicler, a later historian, or perhaps even Strabo distorted the original information into a treaty banning missiles.⁹⁶

None of these explanations are convincing and all three scholars omit consideration of Plb. 13.3.4. The inscription, if it really existed, cannot be traced back earlier than Ephorus, who could invent a treaty banning missiles in the Lelantine War from Archilochus fr.3 West just as easily as some ingenious Eretrian. Persian destruction of Eretrian temples in 490 surely indicates that any archaic stele from a sanctuary did not survive. That Ephorus garbled a legitimate inscription into a ban on missiles is not likely given his explicit quotation of such documents (e.g., *FGrH* 70 F 122, 199). There can never be certainty about whether Eretrians erected a forged inscription or Ephorus invented one. Any argument about a forgery must address not only

⁹⁴ Plutarch *Mor.* 761A–B, balances the account of 760F–61A with a different version from an Aristotle, who could be either the philosopher or Aristotle of Chalcis.

⁹⁵ See Forrest 163 with n.5, 166 with n.9. Cf. Meiggs/Lewis (above, note 50) nos.5, 23.

⁹⁶ Forrest 163–64; Donlan 140; Bakhuizen 35.

the problem of the document itself but also the motive for the forgery. Although local Eretrian patriotism desiring to establish a firm link with famous lines from Archilochus cannot be totally discounted, Ephorus had a better and more contemporary motive for forgery.

Ephorus, the student of Isocrates or at least a sympathizer with Isocratean views, has not fared well as a reliable historian in modern eyes.⁹⁷ Even in antiquity he received mixed reviews: Josephus rated him among the most accurate historians; Strabo knew Ephorus made mistakes, but still considered him better than others. Seneca was less generous: Ephorus had little credibility—often he was deceived and often he was the deceiver.⁹⁸ Ephorus' citation of inscriptions implies travel and autopsy, but apart from his journey from Cyme to Athens nothing is known of his travels, if indeed he made any. Polybius, who in Book XII often defends Ephorus against Timaeus, upbraids them both for a lack of autopsy and topographical study. Ephorus had not visited the battlefield of Leuctra. Even a "cut-and-paste" artist like Diodorus recognized that Ephorus had never been to Egypt.⁹⁹ A visit of Ephorus to Eretria cannot be proved, although given the scanty evidence on Ephorus' life this silence of the sources does not mean much. The connection of Ephorus with a ban on missiles lies with Ephorus the panhellenist, not the Ephorus the peripatetic.

The movement of panhellenism emerged in the late fifth and fourth centuries as a response to the numerous wars and political turmoil within the Greek world. Isocrates and his followers became its chief (though not only) proponents. The panhellenists preached to restore observance of the common laws of the Greeks, to limit and to ameliorate warfare between Greeks, and to direct hostilities against the common barbarian enemy Persia. In the Isocratean school panhellenist propaganda included glorification of the Greek past and even distortions of that past. Plato, a non-Isocratean panhellenist, proposed a new code of warfare in his *Republic* to try to insure that Greeks would wage only limited war between their cities and to prohibit acts engendering lasting resentment, such as enslavement of Greeks or hindering

⁹⁷ E. Schwartz, "Ephorus," *RE* 6 (1909) 1–16; E. A. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge 1935) 1–16. Schwartz denies and Barber defends a close relationship between Ephorus and Isocrates. For an attempted rehabilitation of Ephorus' reputation as an historian see Guido Schepens, "Historiographical Problems in Ephorus," in *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Louvain 1977) 95–118, esp. 98–99, 114 n.98, and 115 n.99 on older literature. Cf. (against Ephorus' accuracy) H. D. Westlake, "Agésilas in Diodorus," *GRBS* 27 (1986) 263–77. A new book-length study of Ephorus would be welcome.

⁹⁸ *FGrH* 70 T 14a = Jos., c. *AP.* 1.67, F 122 = Strabo 10.3.5 T 14b = Sen., *QNat.* 7.16.2: "Ephorus vero non religiosissimae fidei: saepe decipitur, saepe decipit." Ephorus also had a reputation for plagiarism: Porphyry in Euseb. *Prep. Evang.* 10.3.2, 12 cf. E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur* (Leipzig 1912) 47–48.

⁹⁹ Plb. 12.25e–g; Diod. 1.37.4, 39.7, 13; Schepens (above, note 97) 105 n.61.

their burial. War between Greeks should only be a *stasis* with *polemos* reserved for barbarians.¹⁰⁰

Ephorus' panhellenism is not in dispute.¹⁰¹ His *Histories* treated the κοινὰ πράξεις of Greeks and barbarians from the return of the Heracleidae to his own time—the first universal history in Polybius' view.¹⁰² He emphasized the common laws of the Greeks and posited a civilizing mission of the Delphic Oracle to guide Greek behavior. His equation of the common laws of the Greeks with the common laws of all men echoes Isocrates. Yet his panhellenism could induce invention: Ephorus created the myth of joint strategic planning between Persia and Carthage for the simultaneous invasions of Greece and Sicily in 480.¹⁰³

Of more significance for Ephorus' treatment of a treaty banning missiles is his concern for limitations on warfare. As noted above, he was interested in the chivalry seen in the old Greek custom of *monomachia*. His common laws of the Greeks included sparing the lives of prisoners of war and permitting only trophies of wood for victories over other Greeks, so that both such trophies and memories of these misfortunes would eventually be forgotten.¹⁰⁴ Strabo's treaty on missiles is in close accord with this aspect of Ephorus' thought. Chalcis and Eretria in the Lelantine War offered an example of how Greek states should manage an armed conflict. Once determined on war, they made an agreement to wage the struggle by definite rules and limited means. It would be a regulated contest, an *agôn*, rather than a *polemos* in which each side acted as it saw fit (*kata authadeian*).

But why a ban on missiles? Apart from the literary theme that missiles were cowardly and un-heroic, can this concern be associated with a fourth-century military development, of which Ephorus particularly disapproved? From the Peloponnesian War on light infantry, often mercenaries and especially Thracian peltasts, had become prominent in Greek warfare. The skirmishing

¹⁰⁰ For a survey of panhellenism and bibliography see Gerhard Dobesch, *Der "Philippos" des Isokrates* (Vienna 1968) 3–28 with n.52; common laws of the Greeks: Demetrius Wogastli, *Die Normen des altgriechischen Völkerrechts* (Diss. Freiburg 1895); Ilari (above, note 6) 357–68; idealization and invention of Greek history: Franz Hampl, "Römische Politik in republikanischer Zeit und das Problem des 'Sittenverfalls,'" *HZ* 188 (1959) 149–52; limitations on warfare: Pl. *Rep.* 5.469b–71b cf. *Menex.* 242d; Kiechle (above, note 68) 143–49; Ilari (above, note 6) 143–50, 192–201.

¹⁰¹ Barber (above, note 97) 79–83; L. Canfora, "Eforo contro Tuciddide (su Cimone e Pausania)," *Sileno* 3 (1977) 211–14. Schepens (above, note 97) accepts Ephorus' panhellenism and his pro-Athenian bias, but argues that Ephorus' work was apolitical: 116 and *passim*.

¹⁰² *FGrH* 70 T 7 (= Plb. 5.33.2), 8, 11.

¹⁰³ *FGrH* 70 F 31 = Strabo 9.3.11; Diod. 13.23.4 cf. Isoc. 18.27–28; Diod. 13.20–32 = Ephorus: Schwartz (above, note 93) 681; Walbank, *HCP* I, 264; H. W. Parke/D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* (Oxford 1966) I, 378; 480: *FGrH* 70 F 186 cf. Diod. 11.1.4–5, 20.1; Barber (above, note 97) 27; Klaus Meister, "Das persisch-karthagische Bündnis von 481 v. Chr.," *Historia* 19 (1970) 607–12.

¹⁰⁴ *FGrH* 70 F 115; Diod. 13.23.4, 24.5–6, 26.2.

tactics of such troops who refused to close for hand-to-hand combat, could be seen as unmanly conduct and were particularly troublesome to heavily armed hoplites.¹⁰⁵ But Strabo's *têlebolois* is a most obscure word, if Ephorus' objection is to mercenaries or peltasts. Catapults offer a better explanation.

Engineers of Dionysius I of Syracuse invented the non-torsion catapult in 399. Use of the weapon reached mainland Greece by 368 or 367 and Philip II's engineers developed torsion artillery in the period 353–341. Artillery made its first major impact on mainland Greek siegecraft in 340, Philip II's capture of Perinthus. Ephorus was writing his *Histories*, presumably at Athens, 360–330, and the siege of Perinthus marked the last event he described. Non-torsion artillery, however, might have been in Athenian hands since 371/0. In 340 Phocion expelled a pro-Macedonian faction from Eretria and transferred to Athens the Macedonian torsion artillery found there.¹⁰⁶

Ephorus was no doubt aware of the new weapon and bringing the first torsion artillery to Athens from Eretria might have been suggestive. The real significance of the catapult, however, is the effect that this new and no doubt terrifying weapon would have had upon a panhellenist urging limitations on warfare. For the first time in Greek warfare a man could be killed by a machine and not a warrior's prowess. Ephorus' reaction to the catapult probably resembled that of King Archidamus III of Sparta, when he first saw a demonstration of the new device in 368 or 367: ὦ 'Ηράκλες, ἀπόλωλεν ἀνδρὸς ἀρετή.¹⁰⁷ Archidamus' exclamation invites comparison with the reaction of another advocate of chivalry to the new artillery of a much later age. Don Quixote moans:

Blessed were the times which lacked the dreadful fury of those diabolical engines, the artillery, whose inventor I firmly believe is now receiving the reward for his devilish invention in hell; an invention which allows a base and cowardly hand to take the life of a brave knight, in such a way that, without his knowing how or why, when his valiant heart is fullest of furious courage, there comes some random shot—discharged perhaps by a man who fled in terror from the flash the accursed machine made in firing—and puts an end in a moment to the consciousness of one who deserved to enjoy life for many an age. And when I think of that, I am tempted to say that it grieves me to the heart to have adopted this profession of knight errantry in such a detestable age as we now live in. For although no danger frightens me, still it causes me misgivings to think that powder and lead may deprive me of the chance of winning fame and renown by the strength of my arm and the edge of my sword, over all the known earth.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Missiles = cowardice: see note 61 above; peltasts: J. G. P. Best, *Thracian Peltasts and their Influence on Greek Warfare* (Groningen 1969).

¹⁰⁶ E. W. Marsden, *Greek and Roman Artillery: Historical Development* (Oxford 1969) 48–67; Barber (above, note 97) 12–13.

¹⁰⁷ Plut. *Mor.* 191E = 219A; Marsden (above, note 106) 65.

¹⁰⁸ Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *The Adventures of Don Quixote*, trans. J. M. Cohen (Penguin: Harmondsworth 1950) 344–45 (Pt. I, Ch. 38).

If the introduction of artillery was seen as the end of military *arete*, the hallmark of the Homeric warrior code, then no doubt a proponent of limited warfare like Ephorus, who idealized the chivalrous agonal warfare of a distant past, would have disdained and feared a new ultimate weapon like the catapult. The obscure Lelantine War and Archilochus fr.3 West offered Ephorus the opportunity to create an exemplum of how war should be waged by definite rules and restraints, and to protest use of a new terrifying missile weapon, which in the hands of Phocian mercenaries and Philip II cast a foreboding shadow over the future of traditional Greek politics and values. Persian destruction of the archaic sanctuaries at Eretria in 490 facilitated Ephorus' pretense to cite such a treaty, of which the existence could no longer be verified.

A treaty banning missiles transferred to an archaic context to offer an ancient exemplum for imitation fits admirably the political, military, and intellectual context of the fourth century, but not at all that of archaic Eretria. Strabo knew Ephorus' treaty only through a *Zwischenquelle*, who seems to have sharply edited and trimmed Ephorus' text.¹⁰⁹ Strabo clearly did not understand the treaty's meaning, but did his best to explain what might be considered the first protest against missiles in history.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ Lasserre (above, note 27) believes that repetition of both the word *συστάδην* and the idea of close combat at the end of 10.1.12 and the beginning of 10.1.13 indicates Strabo's switch from Artemidorus in 10.1.12 to Apollodorus in 10.1.13: 29 n.4.

¹¹⁰ I wish to acknowledge that my research has been supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, and most recently the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation. Oral versions of this paper were delivered at the NYU Ancient Civilizations Group and at the APA meetings in San Antonio. My special thanks to Graeme Clarke and Kent Rigsby for beneficial criticisms.