

ATTILA SEBŐK

University of Szeged

## Was Kos a member of the Second Athenian Naval Confederacy?

*After the defeat she suffered in the Peloponnesian War (431–404 BC), Athens worked on the restoration of her pre-war position in the diplomatic scenery of Hellas. One major portion of this process was the creation of the Second Athenian Confederacy. Possibly the most important conflict in the history of the Confederacy was the so-called Social War between 357 and 355 BC. In this conflict, some members of the Confederacy (namely Rhodes, Chios, Byzantium, and possibly Kos) waged war against Athens in order to leave the Confederacy. The participation of Kos as a rebel is argued against by Sherwin-White and some other scholars, assuming that only Rhodes, Chios, and Byzantium revolted, but there is the possibility that there could have been more rebels, supported by Buckler, who collected the names of twelve states and could have revolted. In my study, I present an examination of the question of Kos and possible other rebels.*

**Keywords:** Social War, Athens, Kos, Andros, Perinthus

In the following decades after Peloponnesian War (431–404 BC),<sup>1</sup> in which Athens and the Delian League suffered a decisive defeat from Sparta and its allies, Athens managed to more or less gain back its power and positions on the political field of Ancient Greece. Athens even managed to create a new alliance (since the Delian League was dismissed at the end of the Peloponnesian War) in 378/377: the so-called Second Athenian Confederacy.<sup>2</sup> Luck-

---

<sup>1</sup> All the following dates are BC.

<sup>2</sup> For the event before the creation of the second alliance see: BALCER (1974: 21–39); SEALEY (1976: 232–385); RHODES (2005: 14–195); HORNBLOWER (2011: 8–189); for the events surrounding the creation of the second alliance, see: CAWKWELL (1973: 47–60); KALLET-MARX (1985: 127–151); RHODES & OSBORNE (2004: 22); RHODES (2005: 195–196); HORNBLOWER (2011: 240).

ily for us, vital information was preserved about the Confederacy on the stele of Aristoteles.<sup>3</sup> This document was created after the establishment of the Confederacy, as the first version of it was completed in the spring of 377. The stele itself is a 1.93 meters high stone column, with text engraved on the front and upper left hand sides. The content of the stele is divided into two parts: the first part contains certain objectives and rules of the alliance with guarantees<sup>4</sup> from Athens for the allied states; and the other part of the stele gives a list of the members of the Confederacy. One of the problems related to the stele is that the stele itself is visibly fragmentary, smaller and larger pieces are missing in parts where, for example, there is the list of the names of the member states.<sup>5</sup> Another important question regarding the stele is how long the list was expanded by new members and how many different stonecutters could have engraved certain parts of the texts, based on which we can make assumptions on how many times and for how long the Confederacy could have been expanded.<sup>6</sup> With these problems presented, we cannot state for sure that the lack of a name in the stele means that the city in question was not part of the Confederacy.

---

<sup>3</sup> RHODES & OSBORNE (2004: 22).

<sup>4</sup> Athens had a rough history with the Delian League, becoming more aggressive and domineering towards the members of the League. To gain the trust of the potential members of the Second Confederacy, Athens promised some guarantees toward the members, which we can read on the stele of Aristoteles. These guarantees contain things like not sending garrison or governor to the land of the members or not forcing them to pay tribute – RHODES & OSBORNE (2004: 22). The modern literature usually agrees that Athens did not keep its promises – e. g.: CAWKWELL (1981: 40–55); BUCKLER (2003: 377); PARKER (2014: 275–279) – but Cargill had a more optimistic view on the Second Confederacy, although it also should be stated that Cargill was generally more criticized than praised, mostly because of his usually overly positive attitude towards Athens – reviews of Cargill HORNBLOWER (1982); SHERWIN-WHITE (1982); MARTIN (1984).

<sup>5</sup> For a picture of the stele see BARON (2006: 380).

<sup>6</sup> The latest date until which new members were added to the alliance is disputed, the two most likely being 375 and 373. However, it is accepted that these are the latest possible dates until a new member could have been added to the alliance. The sources we have regarding the expansion of the alliance, such as Diod. 15, 45, 2–4, or Xen. *Hell.* 6, 2, 2–3, are refer to the archonian year 374/373 as the very latest date. On the question see: SEALEY (1976: 418–419); CARGILL (1981: 45–47; 61–67); SEAGER (1994: 170); BUCKLER (2003: 268–269); RHODES (2005: 233–235); BARON (2006: 379–395). A more recent summary and examination of the question of how many stonecutters could have engraved the individual parts and city names on the stele, therefore how many times did the number of members of the alliance could have been expanded see: BARON (2006: 379–395).

The so-called Social War (ca. 357–355)<sup>7</sup> was a crucial event for the later history of the Confederacy as a conflict between Athens and some members of the Confederacy.<sup>8</sup> One major issue with this war is that we do not know exactly how many states did revolt, and we also do not know exactly which states did revolt. Going through the important literature, we can find works mentioning the cities of Byzantion, Rhodes, Chios and Kos as revolting states,<sup>9</sup> but there are also works where we can only find the names of Byzantion, Rhodes and Chios.<sup>10</sup> This presents the question: what was the situation with Kos regarding the war and the Confederacy? The sources stating that Kos did in fact revolt from Athens are Diod. 16, 7, 3 and 16, 21, 1. In the former for example, we can read that „the Athenians, who had suffered the revolt (ἀποστάσεων) of Chios, Rhodes, and Cos and, moreover, of Byzantium“.<sup>11</sup> This strongly suggests that Kos was a member of the Confederacy and did revolt against Athens with the other three states. But Sherwin-White presented an argument against the membership of Kos: despite the lack of information regarding the history of Kos between the 390s and the 360s, she thinks that Kos was not a member of the Confederacy, because in the

<sup>7</sup> Although the dating of the war is not relevant for the subject of the current study, it is an important question about the Social War. The exact dating of the war is debated, which debate is rooted in Diod. 16, 7, 2 and 16, 22, 1. In the first part, Diodorus gives the archonian year 358/57 (the archonian year began in the middle of summer, for this see SAMUEL [1972: 64]) and writes that the war lasted three years, based on which the war ended in the year archonian of 356/355. However in the second part he writes that the war lasted for four years and ended in the archonian year 356/355, based on which the war have to be started in the year 359/358. In addition, we can also read in another source (Lys. 2, 12. 7.) that the war spanned only two archonian years. Modern literatures usually give the calendar years of 357–355 or the archonian years of 357/56–356/55.

<sup>8</sup> The reason for the revolt could have been the fear of the possibility that Athens would be tyrannical against the allies again, for which there was a precedent in the form of the events that happened to the island of Samos in 365, see e.g.: SHERWIN-WHITE (1978: 67); RUZICKA (1998: 60–69); BUCKLER (2003: 377–379); contra CARGILL (1981: 129–188). About the events of the war see e.g.: BUCKLER (2003: 380–383).

<sup>9</sup> E.g. BUCKLER (2003: 377); PARKER (2014: 275); WORTHINGTON (2014: 10) – the latter does not include Byzantion as a rebel; the case of Byzantion is debated, since it seems possible that Byzantion did left the Confederacy before the Social War, see: e.g. SEALEY (1976: 434; 439); RUZICKA (1998: 60–69); WORTHINGTON (2014: 10); the detailed examination of the case of Byzantion is going to be the subject of my next study.

<sup>10</sup> E. g. BEAN-COOK (1957: 142); SHERWIN-WHITE (1978: 40–43); RUZICKA (1998: 60).

<sup>11</sup> ἀποστάσεων ~ ἀφίστημι = stand apart, revolt from – c.f. LSJ. s.v. ἀφίστημι.

works of contemporary sources Demosthenes and Isocrates only Byzantium, Rhodes and Chios are mentioned as states who revolted against Athens and Kos is omitted.<sup>12</sup> Based on that she concludes that only the three states that are mentioned by Demosthenes and Isocrates were the ‘real’ rebels, implicitly stating that Demosthenes and Isocrates provides a full list of the states who revolted in the Social War, therefore the status of Kos was different: Kos was only an ally of the rebel states but not a ‘real’ rebel. She even mentions Diod. 16, 21. where he refers to the revolting states as Chios, Rhodes, Byzantium and allies (μέτα τῶν συμμάχων), but in my opinion this paragraph does not mean that Diodorus himself disregard Kos as a revolting state, firstly because Diodorus mentions Kos as well as the others in the previous paragraph (Diod. 16, 21, 1). Secondly and more importantly, we cannot state that either Demosthenes or Isocrates or even Diodorus provides a full list of revolting states – something that Sherwin-White does implicitly say regarding Demosthenes and Isocrates. In fact, Diodorus mentioning *allies* should be an indication that there could have been more revolting states – of course it could also mean states that were allies of the rebels; at the end of the day the main issue is that we cannot state that either Demosthenes or Isocrates or even Diodorus provides a full list of the rebel states. This argument by Sherwin-White was later adopted by Hornblower and Ruzicka, but it was presented prior to her by Bean and Cook and overall can be traced back to Fraser, who was the first to create it.<sup>13</sup>

The literature about the topic usually does not mention the possibility that there could have been more rebel states. However Buckler brought this possibility up in his very useful and detailed work about the history of Hellas in the fourth century, in which he takes a note where he mentions twelve cities which were involved in the Social War (without any detailed explanations, commentary or argument, solely presenting names and corresponding sources).<sup>14</sup> This list in itself could be a decisive asset in the question, but

<sup>12</sup> Dem. 15, 3; Isoc. 15, 63–64.

<sup>13</sup> FRASER (1921: 43–44, n. 25); BEAN–COOK (1957: 142 and n. 353); SHERWIN-WHITE (1978: 42–43 and n. 73); HORNBLOWER (1982: 133 and n. 228); RUCIZKA (1998: 60–61 and n. 6).

<sup>14</sup> BUCKLER (2003: 377, n. 24).

the main problem with it is that Buckler does not provide any further notes on the referred sources. However, if we take a more detailed examination on these sources, they can present several problems, and some of the sources can be heavily questioned in regards to whether or not they truly prove the involvement of the cities Buckler mentions. In the following I present a detailed examination of two states from the Buckler-list to illustrate two important facts: one of them being the case of Andros, with the importance to show that there can be several problems with the sources and names provided on the list, meaning that a detailed examination is definitely required on the other names and sources,<sup>15</sup> and the case of Perinthus, which indicates that there was at least one more revolting state (and could have been others as well), despite not even being mentioned anywhere in the above cited modern literatures – except in the work of Buckler.

### **Andros**

For the involvement of Andros, Buckler provides us Aeschines 1. 107, where we can read the following about the cases of corruption of Timarchus: „He was magistrate (ἄρχων) at Andros, an office he bought for thirty minas, money he borrowed at a rate of eighteen percent, using your allies as a means of funding his vile habits. And he displayed appetite on a scale never before seen from anyone in his treatment of the wives of free men.”<sup>16</sup> – stating that Timarchus gained his office in Andros in a non legal way. This raises two questions: what office did Timarchus held in Andros, and when did he held it?

For the first question, it seems generally accepted, that Athens send a governor-like magistrate to the island of Andros, and there was also an Athenian garrison there, at least during the time of the Social War.<sup>17</sup> Without

---

<sup>15</sup> I intend to do the examination of the other names and sources in the future, Byzantion being the next in line because of the importance of the problems and questions I mentioned in n. 9.

<sup>16</sup> Translation by CAREY (2000).

<sup>17</sup> TOD (1946: 156); CARGILL (1981: 155–156); CAWKWELL (1981: 51–52); CAREY (2000: 60); FISCHER (2001: 244).

going into the question of governors and garrisons in the Second Confederacy too much, it should be stated that Athens clearly had some intention not to make the same mistakes it did with the Delian League, which mistakes included the sending Athenian garrisons and governors to allied states and island, forcing them to remain loyal to Athens.<sup>18</sup> For the second question, there is not a firm answer. The main problem is that we do not have other sources about Timarchus holding the office in Andros, and Aeschines does not give us clear date in his speech about this activity of Timarchus. But there are other offices Aeschines mentions, and we have a date for them: he says that Timarchus was member of the boule in the archonship of Nicophemus in 361/0;<sup>19</sup> he also mentions that Timarchus was sent as auditor at Eretria, which presumably occurred in the year 348/347.<sup>20</sup> We also cannot be sure whether the list provided by Aeschines about the offices Timarchus held is in a chronological order or not. The importance of the date is the fact that if there is a governor (and a garrison) in the territory of an allied state during a conflict between the Second Confederacy and someone else, then there is the possibility that the reasons for said governor and garrison being there are mostly for defensive purposes rather than repression.<sup>21</sup> But if this is not the case, and Athens did keep governors and presumably garrisons in the territory of an allied state while there were no conflicts maybe because of preventing an attack, then it can be presumed that Athens broke its promises about the governors and garrisons, and decided that it should repress the allies as it did in the fifth century. If the list provided by Aeschines about the offices Timarchus held during his career is in chronological order, then

---

<sup>18</sup> It is stated on the stele of Aristoteles, that: „If any of the Greeks or of the barbarians living in Europe or of the islanders, [...]wishes to be an ally of the Athenians and their allies, he may be [...] neither receiving a garrison nor submitting to a governor nor paying tribute...” – RHODES & OSBORNE (2004: 22), line 15–22. For the Delian League, see e. g.: BALCER (1974: 21–39); SEALEY (1976: 232–385); RHODES (2005: 14–195); HORNBLLOWER (2011: 8–189). For a more optimistic view on the treatment of the allies in the Second Confederacy see: CARGILL (1981: 129–188).

<sup>19</sup> Aisch. 1, 107; DEVELIN (1989: 262; 264).

<sup>20</sup> Aisch. 1, 113; DEVELIN (1989: 317).

<sup>21</sup> For a more optimistic view on the question of garrisons in the Second Confederacy see: CARGILL (1981: 142–160).

it can be presumed that Timarchus held his office in Andros before the Social War, therefore we can presume that Andros might have been revolted against Athens because of this. As we can see, there are hypotheses behind hypotheses with many 'if's and 'presume's in the literatures. Scholars are mostly arguing for the latter: Carey states that Athens sent magistrates for Andros, but he provides no further notes or references for this;<sup>22</sup> Cawkwell does not exclude the possibility that the Athenian garrison in Andros was only there for providing defense for the island, even mentioning Tod 156, which states that there was a garrison in Andros during the Social War for defensive purposes, but he presumes, that even though the date is uncertain, Timarchus held his office sometimes in the 360s, therefore giving a reason for Andros to rebel;<sup>23</sup> Develin also positions the offices Timarchus held on the potential that Aeschines lists the offices in chronological order, giving the date 363/362 for Timarchus's time on Andros but clearly stating that the dates about this are uncertain.<sup>24</sup> But there are also scholars, who are more cautious about the question: Fisher states that the date is uncertain, and there is either the possibility that the list is in chronological order, but also saying that this could might not be the case;<sup>25</sup> Bajnok in his commentary also states that we cannot specify the date in question, because it cannot be proven or disproven whether the list is in chronological order.<sup>26</sup> And there is also Cargill, who generally argues toward Athens keeping its word, and the governors and garrisons sent by Athens to the territory of allied states are not evidence for Athenian oppression, which is also the scenario in the case of Andros.<sup>27</sup> There is one more thing to add to the question: both Bajnok and the note of Tod 156 refer to IG II<sup>2</sup> 1441 which talks about a crown given to the Athenian people by the Andrians in 348/347; it could indicate that Andros remained a member of the confederacy at least until 348/347.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> CAREY, (2000: 60, n. 117).

<sup>23</sup> CAWKWELL (1981: 51–52).

<sup>24</sup> DEVELIN (1989: 262; 264).

<sup>25</sup> FISCHER (2001: 244).

<sup>26</sup> BAJNOK (2017: 183).

<sup>27</sup> CARGILL (1981: 146–160).

<sup>28</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1441; TOD (1946: 156); BAJNOK (2017: 183).

In summary the question of the governorship of Timarchus in Andros is an important one, because the case of Athenian oppression against Andros could give Andros a reason to revolt against Athens, therefore providing evidence for Athenian oppression and imperialism which could have led to the outbreak of the Social War. But there is one problem with the assumption that Aeschines 1, 107 is an evidence for Andros revolting against Athens in the Social War: the source itself only states that there could have been a reason for Andros to revolt against Athens, not stating that they did revolt. In fact, since we have Tod 156 about an Athenian garrison in Andros during the Social War, which could have been for the safety of Andros,<sup>29</sup> and also IG II<sup>2</sup> 1441 about Andros gave a gift to Athens after the Social War<sup>30</sup> it seems more likely that Andros did not revolt against Athens, and because Buckler does not give any note on Andros and Aeschines 1, 107, we can say it is not likely that Andros have taken part in the Social War against Athens.

### Perinthus

In the case of Perinthus Buckler refers to Plutarch *Demosthenes* 17, 2, where we can read the following: „Secondly, he (sc. Demosthenes) gave aid to the Byzantians and Perinthians, who were under attack by the Macedonian (sc. Philip II), by convincing the people to put aside their enmity and the memory of the offences committed by each of the two cities in the War with the Allies.”<sup>31</sup> Although the source itself refers to the event when Philip II of Macedonia attacked Perinthus and Byzantium in 340<sup>32</sup> Plutarch clearly indicates that Perinthus took part in the Social War against Athens. Checking on the commentary for this does not indicate any problem with this paragraph, only talking about the involvement of Athens in this event.<sup>33</sup> The case of

<sup>29</sup> CARGILL (1981: 155–156).

<sup>30</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 1441; TOD (1946: 156) – commentary: BAJNOK (2017: 183).

<sup>31</sup> Translation by LINTOTT (2013).

<sup>32</sup> BUCKLER (2003: 478–488); ELLIS (1986: 168–180); ELLIS (1994: 773–781); ERRINGTON (1990: 54–56); GABRIEL (2010: 181–198); HORNBLOWER (2011: 285–286); MÜLLER (2010: 175–176); RHODES (2005: 316); WORTHINGTON (2014: 76–79).

<sup>33</sup> LINTOTT (2013: 63).



Perinthus seems clear, a case where Buckler does not have to provide any additional commentary, since both the referenced source and the surrounding notes and commentary, prove that Perinthus did in fact revolt against Athens during the Social War. In addition to this, we can find Perinthus on the stele of Aristoteles in line 84,<sup>34</sup> which proves that (at least at some point of time) Perinthus in fact was a member of the Second Athenian Confederacy. Overall, we have Perinthus as a state which is not mentioned by either Demosthenes or Isocrates, but we can prove that it was a member of the Confederacy and it revolted against Athens during the Social War.

In conclusion the argument against the membership of Kos by Sherwin-White and the other scholars is based upon the assumption that Demosthenes and Isocrates mentions every state which revolted in the Social War, implicitly stating that Demosthenes and Isocrates provides a full list of the rebels. Contrary to this we can find an opinion by Buckler that overall twelve states revolted against Athens during the war, presenting the possibility that more states could have revolted besides the three mentioned by Demosthenes and Isocrates. This list by Buckler does not have a detailed examination by him, which is definitely required because there can be several problems with the names and sources on the list, as we saw with the case of Andros. However, in the case of Perinthus we have a state of which we can prove that it was a member of the Confederacy and it revolted from Athens during the Social War and it is not mentioned by either Demosthenes or Isocrates. Based upon this we can safely state that neither Demosthenes nor Isocrates provides a full list of rebels, therefore the omission of Kos from their list does not mean that Kos was not a rebel and since Diodorus clearly indicates that Kos revolted in the war we do not have any reason to disregard Diodorus and can accept the likeliness that Kos was in fact a member of the Confederacy.

---

<sup>34</sup> RHODES & OSBORNE (2004: 22).

## Primary sources

- BAJNOK 2017 D. BAJNOK (trans.): *Magánélet az agorán. Aischinés vádbeszéde Timarchos ellen (Privacy on the Agora. Aeschines Against Timarchos)*. Budapest 2017.
- BROWNSON 1921 C. L. BROWNSON (trans.): *Xenophon Hellenica Volume II: Books 5–7*. Cambridge 1921.
- CAREY 2000 C. CAREY (trans.): *Aeschines*. Austin 2000.
- FISCHER 2001 N. FISCHER (trans.): *Aeschines Against Timarchos*. New York 2001.
- LINTOTT 2013 A. LINTOTT (trans.): *Plutarch: Demosthenes and Cicero*. Oxford 2013.
- NORLIN 1986 G. NORLIN (trans.): *Isocrates in three volumes. Volume II*. Cambridge 1968.
- RHODES & OSBORNE 2004 P. J. RHODES – R. OSBORNE: *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 BC*. New York 2004.
- SHERMAN 1952 C. L. SHERMAN (trans.): *Diodorus of Sicily. Volume VII: Books XV. 20 – XVI. 65*. Cambridge 1952.
- TREVETT 2011 J. TREVETT (trans.): *Demosthenes, speeches 1–17*. Austin 2011.
- TOD 1946 M. N. TOD (ed.): *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford 1946.
- USHER 1974 S. USHER (trans.): *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Volume I: Ancient Orators. Lysias. Isocrates. Isaeus. Demosthenes. Thucydides*. Cambridge 1974.

## Secondary sources

- BALCER 1974 J. M. BALCER: *Separatism and Anti-Separatism in the Athenian Empire (478–433 B.C.)*. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 23 (1974) 21–39.
- BARON 2006 C. A. BARON: *The Aristoteles Decree and the Expansion of the Second Athenian League*. *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*. 75 (2006) 379–395.
- BEAN–COOK 1957 G. E. BEAN – J. M. COOK: *The Carian Coast III*. *The Annual of the British School at Athens*. 52 (1957) 58–146.
- BUCKLER 2003 J. BUCKLER: *Aegean Greece in the Fourth Century BC*. Boston 2003.
- CARGILL 1981 J. CARGILL: *The Second Athenian League. Empire or Free Alliance?*. Berkeley 1981.
- CAWKWELL 1973 G. L. CAWKWELL: *The Foundation of the Second Athenian Confederacy*. *The Classical Quarterly* 23 (1973) 47–60.
- CAWKWELL 1981 G. L. CAWKWELL: *Notes on the Failure of the Second Athenian Confederacy*. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 101 (1981) 40–55.
- DEVELIN 2003 R. DEVELIN: *Athenian Officials 684–321 B. C.* Cambridge 2003.
- ELLIS 1986 J. R. ELLIS: *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism*. New Jersey 1986.

- ELLIS 1994 J. R. ELLIS: *Macedon and North-West Greece*. In D. M. Lewis – J. Boardman – S. Hornblower – M. Ostwald (ed.): *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume VI<sup>2</sup> The Fourth Century B.C.* Cambridge 1994, 723–760.
- ERRINGTON 1990 R. M. ERRINGTON: *A History of Macedonia*. Berkeley 1990.
- FRASER 1921 P. M. FRASER: *Studies in the History and Epigraphy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Oxford 1921.
- GABRIEL 2010 R. A. GABRIEL: *Philip II. of Macedonia. Greater than Alexander*. Washington D. C. 2010.
- HORNBLOWER 1982 S. HORNBLOWER: *Mausolus*. Oxford 1982.
- HORNBLOWER 1982 S. HORNBLOWER: *Review: The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance? by Jack Cargill*. *The Classical Review*. 32 (1982) 235-239.
- HORNBLOWER 2011 S. HORNBLOWER: *The Greek World 479-323 BC*. New York 2011.
- LSJ H. S. JONES – H. G. LIDDELL – R. SCOTT (ed.): *Greek-English Lexicon*. 9<sup>th</sup> edition Volume I. Oxford 1940.
- KALLET-MARX 1985 R. M. KALLET-MARX: *Athens, Thebes, and the Foundation of the Second Athenian League*. *Classical Antiquity* 4 (1985) 127–151.
- MARTIN 1984 T. R. MARTIN: *Review: The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance? by Jack Cargill*. *Classical Philology*. 1984. 79 (1984) 243-247.
- MÜLLER 2010 S. MÜLLER: *Philip II*. J. Roisman – I. Worthington (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*. New Jersey 2010.
- PARKER 2014 V. PARKER: *A History of Greece, 1300 to 30 BC*. Oxford 2014.
- RHODES 2005 P. J. RHODES: *A History of the Classical Greek World, 478 - 323 BC*. Oxford 2005.
- RUZICKA 1998 S. RUZICKA: *Epaminondas and the Genesis of the Social War*. *Classical Philology*. 93 (1998) 60-69.
- SAMUEL 1972 A. E. SAMUEL: *Greek and Roman Chronology. Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity*. München 1972.
- SEAGER 1994 R. SEAGER: *The King's Peace and the Second Athenian Confederacy*. In D. M. Lewis – J. Boardman – S. Hornblower – M. Ostwald (ed.): *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume VI<sup>2</sup> The Fourth Century B.C.* Cambridge 1994, 156–186.
- SEALEY 1976 R. SEALEY: *A History of the Greek City States, ca. 700-338 B.C.* Berkeley 1976.
- SHERWIN-WHITE 1978 S. M. SHERWIN-WHITE: *Ancient Cos. An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period*. Göttingen 1978.
- WORTHINGTON 2014 I. WORTHINGTON: *By The Spear. Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire*. Oxford 2014.