

DOI: 10.31857/S0321039125010056

SALAMIS: AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE ATHENIAN CLERUCHIC SYSTEM

Alain Bresson

The University of Chicago, Chicago (IL), the United States of America

E-mail: abresson@uchicago.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-6622-2533

Through an investigation on the creation of the Athenian cleruchy in Salamis at the end of the Archaic period, this article provides an ‘archaeology’ of the cleruchic system. It starts from an analysis of the late Archaic inscription that stipulates the regulations applying to the holders of cleruchic land. Then, after a short reanalysis of the war between Athens and Megara over the possession of Salamis, it moves on to the question of the origin of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*, for which it provides a new solution that is linked to the circumstances of the creation of the cleruchic settlement in Salamis. The article concludes by examining the structural and defining conditions of the creation of a cleruchy.

Keywords: cleruch, cleruchy, Athens, Megara, Salamis, Solon, Peisistratus, *genos* of the *Salaminioi*

САЛАМИН: АРХЕОЛОГИЯ АФИНСКОЙ СИСТЕМЫ КЛЕРУХИЙ

А. Брессон

Чикагский университет, Чикаго (Иллинойс), США

E-mail: abresson@uchicago.edu

Данная статья путем исследования процесса создания афинской клерухии на о. Саламин в конце архаического периода демонстрирует «археологию» системы клерухий. Обзор начинается с анализа позднеархаической надписи, которая устанавливает правила, применяющиеся к владельцам наделов в клерухиях. Затем, после краткого

The author. Alain Bresson – Professor emeritus in the Departments of Classics and History, in the Oriental Institute and in the College at the University of Chicago.

I wish to extend my thanks to David Pritchard for his help in the preparation of the manuscript of this article. Any remaining errors are my own.

Epigraphic abbreviations follow those recommended by the AIEGL (URL: <https://www.aiegl.org/grepiabbr.html>; accessed on: 01.12.2024).

анализа войны между Афинами и Мегарой за обладание Саламином, рассматривается вопрос о происхождении рода Саламиниев и предлагается новое решение, связанное с обстоятельствами создания клерухий на Саламине. Статья завершается рассмотрением структурных и определяющих условий для создания клерухии.

Ключевые слова: клерух, клерухия, Афины, Мегара, Саламин, Солон, Писистрат, род Саламиниев

With the case of the creation of the Athenian settlement in the island of Salamis in the late Archaic period, this study offers an ‘archaeology’ of the cleruchic system, thus helping to define the logic of the creation of such a settlement in ancient times. Our first direct source of information on the Athenian cleruchy at Salamis is an inscription from the end of the sixth century or early fifth century, which already reveals the fundamental characteristics of the cleruchic system. But ancient literary sources also help to understand why, after conquering the island, the Athenians resorted to the legal and organizational system of the cleruchy. In the second half of the Archaic period, the island of Salamis was disputed between Athens and Megara. It was in the specific circumstances that followed this conflict that the cleruchy was planted. The same circumstances provide the best explanation for the origin of the famous *genos* of the *Salaminiotai* in Athens.

THE SETTLEMENT FOR SALAMIS

The control of Athens over Salamis materialized in the form of a settlement of Athenians in the island, known to us through an inscription found on the Athenian acropolis¹.

1 ἔδοχσεν τῷ δέμοι· τ[ὸς ἐ Σ]αλαμ[ῖνι κ]λερούχ[ος]
 2 οἰκῆν ἑᾶ Σαλαμῖνι [. . .⁵ .]λεν [. . .⁷ . . . Ἀθέ]νε-
 3 σι τελέων καὶ στρατ[εύεσθ]αι : τ[ὰ δ' ἐ Σαλαμῖνι] μ-
 4 ἐ μισθ[ῶν], ἐὰ μὲ οἰκ[. . .⁷ . . .]ο[. μισθόμενο . : ἐ]ἄ-
 5 ν δὲ μισθῶι, ἀποτ[ί]νεν τὸ μισθόμενον καὶ τὸ μ-
 6 ισθῶντα *hekátete*[ρον.¹⁹]
 7 ἐς δεμόσιο[ν : ἐσπράτεν δὲ τὸν ἄ]-
 8 ρχο[ν]τα, ἐὰν [δὲ μέ, εὐθ]ύ[νεσθαι: τ]-
 9 ἄ δὲ [h]όπλα πα[ρέχου]θα[ι αὐτὸς: τ]-
 10 ριά[κ]οντα: δρο[χμῶν :] *hoplisméno*-
 11 ν δὲ [τ]ὸν ἄρχοντ[α τὰ *hópla kárin*]-
 12 εν: [ἐπ]ὶ τῆς β[ο]λέ[ς^{c.11}]

Resolved by the people.

1. [Those in S]alamis who are cleruch[s] shall be allowed to dwell in Salamis [---] at Athens to pay taxes and provide military service.
2. [But their property in Salamis] shall not be leased (by them) unless [a kinsman? leases it.] If a man leases it, there shall be a penalty paid [by the lessee and by the] lessor, each of them [---] into the public treasury. [It shall be exacted by the] archon. If [not, he will be taken to co]u[rt].
3. Their arms [they shall furnish themselves at the cost of] thirty drachmas.

¹ *IG I³ 1 + Add.* p. 935. See lemma, bibliography, translation, and comment by Attic Inscriptions Online *AIO* 1672. The text used here is that of the Telota databank (URL: <http://telota.bbaw.de/ig/digitale-edition/inschrift/IG%20I%C2%B3%201>; accessed on: 01.12.2024).

4. [When they are armed], the archon [shall pass their arms under review].

5. In the year of [---], the council [---].

(Tr. Fornara 1983, 45–46, no. 44, modified; the numbers correspond to those of the clauses commented upon below)

The text is unfortunately badly mutilated. A new fragment published by A. Matthaiou in 1990–1991 shows that the settlers were probably defined as cleruchs, although at the end of line 1 of the plural accusative [κληρόχ]ος is a restoration. An alternative restoration would be [ἈθENAÍ]ος, but it is less likely in the context².

Indeed, despite this remaining uncertainty on the restoration of this word, the status of cleruchs for the Athenians in Salamis at least from the end of the sixth century is beyond doubt. An inscription of the fourth century, *Agora XVI* 41, fr. 3 l. 33–34, likely establishing the Athenian cleruchy at Lemnos in 387/386, directly refers to the status of Salamis as a cleruchy (--- καθάπερ τοῖς ἐς Σαλαμῖνα ---). Whether this text referred directly to *IG I*³ 1 or to a later re-elaboration of the statute of the Athenian cleruchs at Salamis may remain an object of debate. But the close similarity between the statutes of the establishments at Salamis and Lemnos inevitably supposes a close connection between the two, whether direct or indirect. Given that *Agora XVI* 41, l. 13, 20, 22, 33, 42, 47, explicitly mentions cleruchs, the restoration [κληρόχ]ος at the end of line 1 of *IG I*³ 1 is by far the most attractive. Thus, there is no reason to doubt that Salamis was a cleruchy³. The Salamis statute *IG I*³ 1 defines the conditions at which the cleruchs would dwell in the island. It established at least four series of regulations (we have only the upper part of the stele).

The first clause, l. 1–3, provides that the cleruchs would reside at Salamis under a proviso whose beginning is lost, the sentence ending with ‘pay taxes at Athens and perform military service’ (there is little doubt that [ἈΘÉ]νε[σ]ι, l. 3–4, must be linked with τελεῖν, and mean ‘pay taxes at Athens’). Obviously, the injunction was positive: the cleruchs should pay taxes and perform their military duty for the city. The meaning of the end of the clause might be to stress that in any case the Athenian cleruchs remained full citizens of Athens, with all their fiscal and military duties.

Given the mutilation of the text, the nature of the tax obligations of the cleruchs cannot be precisely defined. It has been envisaged that they corresponded to a form of tax on capital, later known as *eisphora*⁴. Taxes on trade have also been envisaged⁵. The long lacuna of l. 2 [...5...]λεν[...7...] might also refer to payment of taxes (τελεῖν?). Should we also think of specific forms of tax payments? The Attic law of 374/373 BC implicitly provided that the Athenian cleruchic-type settlements of Lemnos, Imbros and Skyros were

² See below for a justification of this statement. At least, it is certain that any of the other hypotheses of restoration that had been proposed before the discovery of the new fragment can now be excluded (see Igelbrink 2015, 154).

³ Pace Taylor 1997, 63–74, where curiously every argument against this status in fact speaks in its favor. According to an ancient *scholion* to Nem. 2.19 (*Scholia Vetera* Drachmann), the Athenian Timodemos of Acharnai for whom Pindar composed this ode was one of τῶν τὴν Σαλαμῖνα κατακληρουχησάντων Ἀθηναίων, “one of those who had received a *klēros* at Salamis”.

⁴ See van Wees 2013, 92.

⁵ See commentary ad *AIO* 1672.

to pay a tax in grain to the motherland⁶. However, Salamis was not a known to be a massive grain producing territory and standard forms of payment must probably be preferred.

The second clause (l. 3–8) provides that the property of the cleruchs cannot be leased, and that, if it is, both the lessor and the lessee will be fined. The fine had to be paid to the public treasury and was exacted by the archon (mentioned l. 7–8 and 11). Interestingly, this is the first mention of an archon, who is not the (eponymous) archon of Athens, but a special magistrate appointed to perform the role of magistrate of the cleruchy. This archon is known from other sources. He is referred to as the ἄρχων εἰς Σαλαμῖνα by the Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens*, where it is specified that he is appointed by lot (54. 8) and paid (62. 2) by the Athenians⁷. Other epigraphic sources of the Classical and Hellenistic period also may make mention of the ἄρχων ἐν Σαλαμῖνι⁸.

The third (l. 8–10) and fourth (l. 10–12) clauses refer to the military duties of the cleruchs. First (clause no. 3), they had to provide their own weapons for a value of thirty drachmas (this rules out them doing so with cheap, low-quality weapons). Then (clause no. 4), the already mentioned archon of the cleruchy had to inspect the weapons, obviously to make sure that they would fit with the regulation on their quality.

The same interrogation as for the tax duties applies to the military duties. If the cleruchs were mobilized on the spot and depended on specific military officers sent by Athens, this seems to imply that they did not have to respond to normal tribal mobilization calls. In other words, while they were away from Athens, it is likely that their ordinary tribal military responsibilities in Athens were suspended, to be replaced by their duties for Athens on the spot, which does not necessarily mean a suspension of the tribal organization – we know that in the fourth century the tribal system was still operational for the Athenian cleruchs in Samos⁹.

To sum up, a cleruchic property was not an ordinary estate. The *klēros*, the property that the Athenian settlers received in Salamis, implied for its holder a series of specific military duties and limitations of the use of this estate. These constraints were defined by the city of Athens according to its own needs, as illustrated by the settlement for Salamis. Whether it was a new creation aiming at clarifying a statute that until then had remained vague and unprecise, or whether it was only a reenactment of an older statute within the framework of the new Cleisthenic institutions cannot be determined.

THE CONFLICT OVER SALAMIS AND THE WARS BETWEEN ATHENS AND MEGARA

There remains to examine why the Athenians created this type of military settlement in the island facing their territory. The key is to be found in the conflict between Athens and its neighbor Megara. For this conflict, Plutarch's *Solon*, 8–10 and 12, is our main source, although not the only one. Plutarch's first reference to it (*Sol.* 8–9) is made as an

⁶ Stroud 1998 ; Rhodes-Osborne *GHI* 26.

⁷ According to Taylor 1997, 160, the archon of Salamis was chosen from among the cleruchs. For the role of the archon of Salamis, see in detail Taylor 1997, 159–192, and Lambert 1997, 98 and n. 34–35.

⁸ For a discussion on archons in Salamis in the fifth, fourth and third centuries, see Taylor 1997, 160–178. For the later period, see explicitly *IG II²* 1227, l. 1 (131/130 BC), and 1008, l. 75 and 80 (118/117 BC).

⁹ Hallof, Habicht 1995, with *IG XII.6* 262 (*bouleutai* of the cleruchy).

introduction to an anecdote meant to illustrate one of Solon's great achievements. As the Athenians were in despair following their defeat after a long war with Megara over the control of Salamis, a law had been made forbidding under pain of death the reopening of the case of Salamis. Solon defied the ban and recited a poem of his own composition urging the Athenians to resume fighting. The law was repealed, and Solon was placed at the head of a new expedition aimed at reconquering the island.

Plutarch gives two versions of the expedition, both based on the use of trickery. In the first one, Solon, in association with Peisistratus, lures the Megarians by making them believe that they would be able to capture Athenian women practicing the rituals of Demeter. In the second one, Solon recruits five hundred volunteers, captures a Megarian ship that he mans with his best soldiers, and then, while he engages the Megarians in open battle, has the ship now manned by Athenians come back to Salamis and conquer the city¹⁰. The existence of a ritual involving a ship commemorating the conquest of the island makes Plutarch prefer this second version. However, the war went on, until it was settled by a Lacedaemonian arbitration that awarded the island to the Athenians (*Sol.* 10)¹¹.

In his presentation of the unrest that occurred in Athens following the execution of the supporters of Cylon, Plutarch then briefly returns to the conflict with Megara (*Sol.* 12. 3). He notes that Megara took advantage of these troubles. The Athenians lost Nisaia (the port of Megara) and were again (αὔθις) driven out from Salamis.

Plutarch's narrative translates stories about Solon already circulating in the Classical period, as proven by the harsh criticism already made of them by the *Constitution of the Athenians* (17. 2), where the association between Solon and Peisistratus is rejected based on its chronological impossibility. If many gray areas remain, despite differences of appreciation in the detail modern research has set out the broad outlines of the conflict between Megara and Athens¹². A short summary of the events will suffice here.

The conflict started probably no earlier than the seventh century BC. In the first phase of the conflict, the Megarians were victorious and apparently inflicted heavy losses on the Athenians, who were unable to establish a lasting control over Salamis. This is when Solon first intervened. After him, however, Salamis was lost for the Athenians a second time, and Peisistratus had once again to reconquer it. Part of the anecdotes told by Plutarch over the military role of Solon in the conquest of Salamis must in fact certainly be connected to Peisistratus. Aeneas Tacticus (4. 8–11) details Peisistratus' defense of Eleusis and attack against Megara in terms close to those of Plutarch's first version of the alleged Solonian conquest. The Classical period made of Solon the founding hero of democracy, and, by contrast, darkened the action of the tyrant Peisistratus, which probably

¹⁰ In the debate on the forms of organization of the Athenian army in the Archaic period, G. Anderson (2003, 147–157) follows the view of those who consider that Athens did not have a regularly organized army in this period. For him, military expeditions were manned by volunteers following the leaders of aristocratic clans. By contrast, H. van Wees (2018) believes that, at least from Solon onwards, there already existed strict military obligations in pre-Cleisthenic Athens, although they applied only to the leisured elites. For him, for the reconquest of Salamis and for the occupation of the Chersonese c. 550 the Athenian campaigns relied on volunteers because in both cases the troops were aimed at becoming settlers in conquered territory (*ibid.*, 132).

¹¹ Still in the fourth century, the Megarians objected to the result of this arbitration: see the Megarian author Dieuchidas, Diog. Laert. 1. 57 = *FGrHist* 485 F6.

¹² French 1957; Legon 1981, 123–140; Figueira 1985; Robu 2004–2005.

explains the confusion between the roles of the two men¹³. For this reason, T.J. Figueira assumes that only Plutarch's second version corresponds to Solon's actual conquest of Salamis¹⁴. In any case, a second reconquest of Salamis under Peisistratus is most likely.

According to Figueira, the chronology of the conflict would be the following¹⁵:

- Before 600: Megarians occupy Salamis;
- Before 600: Exile of Dorykleians from Megara;
- C. 600–595: Athenians recapture Salamis;
- 590–570: Megarians reoccupy Salamis during Athenian *stasis*;
- 570–565: Peisistratid capture of Nisaia and Salamis (?);
- C. 510 Sparta awards Salamis to Athens (but see below).

The conflict ended only with the Lacedemonian arbitration (in favor of Athens). Among the five Lacedemonian arbitrators mentioned by Plutarch (*Sol.* 10. 4), Cleomenes has the best chance to be the famous Spartan King, who reigned at the end of the sixth and beginning of the fifth century (he died c. 490), and Amompharetos one of the Spartan commanders at Plataia (479 BC), who died during the battle¹⁶. Herodotus (IX. 85. 1–2) adds that Amompharetos, who had commanded the *lochos* battalion of Pitane, presumably an elite unit, was buried with the men of his age, the ἱρένες, if this reading must be accepted¹⁷. If indeed Amompharetos is the same character and not an earlier homonym, he was not over thirty years old in 479, and only nineteen in 490, which makes a participation in the arbitration process highly suspicious. Another solution would be that Amompharetos was buried with the fallen men he had commanded, and that he was not himself an *eiren* in 479. Herodotus would thus have made a shortcut in his presentation of the burying of the ἱρένες. If this solution is correct, it remains besides that there is no reason to date the arbitration c. 510. One should rather leave the date of the arbitration open, between 510 and 490.

THE ORIGIN OF THE *GENOS* OF THE *SALAMINIOI*: HISTORY OF A DEBATE

The religious association bearing the name of ‘*genos* of the *Salaminioi*’, was long known only by an honorific decree of the late fourth century BC (*IG* II² 1232). This decree provided for the dedication of stelae in two sanctuaries whose management was under the control of the association: the Eurysakeion at Melite, and that of Athena Skiras at Phaleron.

¹³ See the discussion of Iriarte 2022, but who in the end believes that only Peisistratus conquered Salamis, which is unlikely.

¹⁴ Figueira 1985, n. I, with also Hdt. I. 59. 4: πρότερον εὐδοκιμήσας ἐν τῇ πρὸς Μεγαρέας γενομένη στρατηγίῃ, Νίσειαν τε ἐλὼν καὶ ἄλλα ἀποδεξάμενος μεγάλα ἔργα, “had won a reputation in his command of the army against the Megarians, when he had taken Nisaia and performed other great exploits” (tr. Loeb). The conquest of Salamis might well be one of these μεγάλα ἔργα.

¹⁵ Figueira 1985.

¹⁶ On Amompharetos, see in detail Lupi 2006 and briefly 2018, 281–282, and convincingly Makres 2009 for the reading ἱρένας, -ες, not ἱρέας/ες, in Hdt. IX. 85. 1–2. But neither of them discusses the participation of Amompharetos to the Spartan arbitration mentioned by Plutarch and the chronological question it raises.

¹⁷ See Robu 2004–2005, 165, with the dossier of ancient sources and modern debates.

In 1938, W.S. Ferguson published two long inscriptions, for which a new and improved edition has been provided by S. Lambert in 1997, who also conveniently gives the other pieces of the dossier and a detailed commentary¹⁸. The first text, dated to 363/362 BC, is an arbitration between the two branches into which the association happened to be divided, the *Salaminioi* from the Seven Tribes and the *Salaminioi* from Sounion, which were in conflict about the management of the many cults and properties under the control of the association¹⁹. About a century later, the exact date remaining uncertain, a new settlement was necessary to arbitrate the conflict between the two branches, actually now appearing as two separates *genē*²⁰.

The establishment of the cults of Salaminian heroes at the heart of their public space highlights the significance of Salamis for the Athenians²¹. This was the case especially with the creation of the Eurysakeion, the sanctuary in honor of the Salaminian hero Eurysakes, the son of Ajax, on Kolonos Agoraios, south of the Hephastieion, at the very heart of the Athenian city. This was also the case for the cult of Heracles at Porthmos, near Sounion, and for that of Athena Skiras in Phaleron. The *genos* of the *Salaminioi* was in charge of those cults, as well as others that were among Athens's most sacred cults, namely those of Aglauros, Pandrosos and Ge Kourotrophos. The fact that it was originally one single *genos* that was in charge of the two series of cults, those coming from Salamis and those that were traditional Athenian ones, symbolized the new and inseparable link between Athens and Salamis established following the Athenian takeover of Salamis. However, the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* was divided into two geographically distinct groups, one based in Sounion, with the other said to be 'of the Seven Tribes'. Owing to this geographical separation, the two groups argued with one another over the management of the group's cults and properties. In 363/362, they managed to reach a compromise, but in the third century they finally broke into two different *genē*.

Since Ferguson's publication, the origin of the *Salaminioi* (οἱ Σαλαμίνιοι) has raised much debate and has given rise to a series of very different hypotheses, which can be only briefly summarized here²². One group of scholars disputes the idea that the *genos* had a Salaminian origin, another group accepts it, and a third group prefers a mixed solution.

Anticipating in some way the theories of Roussel and Bourriot on the artificial character of the *genos*, Ferguson, the first editor of the decrees, proposed the radical view that the *genos* was a purely Athenian group, artificially created apparently to justify the annexation of Salamis²³.

¹⁸ Ferguson 1938; Lambert 1997. The first of the two inscriptions is reproduced in Rhodes-Osborne *GHI* 37.

¹⁹ Ferguson 1938.

²⁰ The date depends on that of the archon Phanomachos. Lambert 1997, 89 with n. 3, hesitatingly retained 265/264. For more recent investigations, see Papazarkadas 2011, 296–298 (for him, the Athenian archon Phanomachos, who dates the inscription, is unlikely to have been in office during the Chremonidean War), and the suggestion of Osborne 2009, 97, to date the archon to 242/241 (discussed by Papazarkadas 2011, 298, n. 13).

²¹ Garland 1992, 37–38; Parker 1996, 308–316 (detailed analysis of the cult and sacrificial calendar).

²² See the reviews of Lambert 1997; Giuffrida 2004, 254, n. 4; L'Homme–Wéry 2000; Valdés Guía 2005, 57–60.

²³ Ferguson 1938. For the theories on the *genos*, see Roussel 1976 and Bourriot 1976, with the updating by Lambert 1999.

By contrast, as early as 1938, M.P. Nilsson supposed the existence of a ‘population exchange’ that would have taken place when the Athenians conquered the islands and established their cleruchs. As a sort of compensation, the Salaminians would have been authorized to settle in Athens and would have received the privileges that we know to have been those of the members of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*²⁴.

In 1948, M. Guarducci thought that the *Salaminioi* were the descendants of Athenians who had formerly been ejected from Salamis before Solon’s campaign²⁵.

Based on archaeology, R. Osborne suggested in 1994 that a migration from Salamis at the end of the sub-Mycenaean period might be the best explanation for the later creation of the *genos*²⁶.

In 1997, Taylor adopted Ferguson’s skepticism on the origin of the *Salaminioi* and stressed the absence of link between the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* and the Salaminians known through many inscriptions of the Classical and Hellenistic period²⁷.

In 1997 also, S.D. Lambert took a direction directly opposite to that of Taylor²⁸. Considering that Ferguson can hardly be followed in his view of a purely artificial link between the island of Salamis and an Athenian family group, he suggested a link between the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* and the Salaminians whom we see in the island in the Classical and Hellenistic periods²⁹. In his reasoning, although with due care, he gave some weight to the decree *IG II*² 1260, of 307–304 BC, voted at Sounion probably (the inscription is mutilated), as is found commonly elsewhere, by the soldiers of the garrison, by the members of the deme of Sounion, or by both acting together³⁰. In l. 14–20, the decree mentions among others the role of the honorand (whose name he lost) when he was a *stratēgos* in charge of the defense of Salamis. He thus suspects that the members of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* might one way or other have been behind the decision to vote for the decree. This would establish a link between the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* and the Salaminians we see active as a group in the island in a series of documents³¹.

However, this track cannot be followed. The man in question had been in charge of various regional defense sectors, at Piraeus, then at Salamis. Then, when he was *stratēgos* of the territory (l. 21–22, στρατηγ[ὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χῶρον]), he took a special interest in the defense of Sounion, Rhamnous, and other coastal regions (l. 22–23). His actions are similar to those that were to be those of the *stratēgos* of Piraeus and neighboring regions honored in 250 BC in the decree of the Salaminians *IG II*² 1225³². The link between the two documents is to be found in the active role of the two *stratēgoi* in the protection of the community of the Salaminians. There is no reason to see any specific involvement of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* in the vote of the decree *IG II*² 1260. Besides, it should be added

²⁴ Nilsson 1938.

²⁵ Guarducci 1948.

²⁶ Osborne 1994.

²⁷ Taylor 1997, 59–63.

²⁸ Lambert 1999, 94–103.

²⁹ In our sources, the Salaminians of the island are of course also *Salaminioi*. It is only for the sake of convenience that we define here as *Salaminioi* the members of the *genos*, while we speak of Salaminians for the *Salaminioi* of the island.

³⁰ See discussion in Lambert 1997, 100, and n. 41.

³¹ Taylor 1997, 233–256, and below *IG II*² 1225.

³² On this decree, see Taylor 1997, 250–256.

that it is difficult to see any evidence of a link between the community of the Salaminians and the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*. Thus, for instance, the members of the deme of Sounion do not seem to play any specific role, or even any role at all in the community of the Salaminians. Finally, it should be observed that the split in the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* cannot find any correspondence in the community of the Salaminians of Salamis throughout the Hellenistic period. For all these reasons, the hypothesis of a link between the historical Salaminians of the island and the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*, as a group, cannot be validated.

In 2000, L'Homme-Wéry showed convincingly that an exchange of population of the type suggested by Nilsson is far from convincing, for it would be a strange mix of punishment and reward. She herself thinks that a migration of Salaminians to Attica rather corresponded to an offer made by Cleisthenes. Some Salaminians would have accepted the exchange, and this would be the origin of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*. Others would have refused and would have stayed in the island, and this would be the origin of the residual non-citizen Salaminians whom one would still observe in the Classical period. In fact, as already proven by Taylor, the existence of remnant local Salaminians can no longer be admitted³³. Besides, it would be very strange that some Salaminians only would have been granted citizenship – those who would have accepted to live on the continent, while those who would have accepted to stay on their island would forever have been condemned to live a marginal life on the fringes of the citizen body. Again, there is a contradiction that cannot be solved.

L'Homme-Wéry adds, however, an interesting point to Nilsson's view. She notes that Plutarch (*Sol.* 10. 2) points to the migration to Athens, coming from Salamis (and perhaps beyond from Aigina) of the prestigious family of the Philaids. We thus have a first hint of a real migration of Salaminians to Athens in the Archaic period, although this is not directly related to the creation of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*. Besides, again according to Plutarch (*Sol.* 10. 2), Philaios and Eurysakes, the two sons of Ajax, would have settled in Attica, the former at Brauron, the latter at Melite, which is of course an etiological legend, but that might also echo some actual migration.

In 2004, M. Giuffrida thought that an actual transfer of part of the population of Salamis to Attica would have been impossible³⁴. Following M. Moggi and N. Salomon, she accepted the view that the members of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* would be the descendants of the 500 volunteers who fought alongside Solon, although one wonders why the creation of such a religious association would have seemed necessary³⁵. However, she also hypothesizes that the family of the Philaids (a Salaminian family, but from Aiginetan descent) would have made the choice of Athens and transferred to the continent, to become a leading Athenian family. As already underscored, this transfer of the Philaid family fits well with the hypothesis of a transfer of Salaminian population to the continent, which she nonetheless denies.

In 2005, M. Valdés Guía proposed that the Salaminians were a rich Athenian family in contact with the sea and having interests in Salamis³⁶.

³³ Taylor 1997, 82–95.

³⁴ Giuffrida 2004, 254, n. 4.

³⁵ Moggi 1979, 11, 29, n. 11; Salomon 1997, 192.

³⁶ Valdés Guía 2005, 58–60.

In 2015, C. Igelbrink has proposed a mixed approach³⁷. While accepting Ferguson's view that the *genos* was an artificial creation aiming at justifying the links between Athens and Salamis, he believes, against Ferguson and Taylor, but partly in line with Lambert, that the *genos* had developed links with the island. A proof of it would be to be found in an inscribed stele found in the island depicting the Salaminian hero Ajax with his son Eurysakes³⁸. L. 2 of the document mentions an archon, who indeed has a good chance to be the archon of Salamis centrally nominated at Athens³⁹. The text is unfortunately badly mutilated, and the name of the authority at its initiative remains unknown. In the present state of our knowledge however, nothing forces us to link it with the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*, and the community of the Salaminians is a far better candidate for its authorship.

This survey shows that, since Ferguson's publication, no new document has been added on the question of the origin of the Salaminians and that our evidence is still only the name of the association and the Salaminian character of the cults of Eurysakes and Athena Skiras. The diversity of opinions that have been expressed on the origin of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* seems to discourage adding a new one. Yet, one track has not been explored, which is directly linked to the nature of the cleruchic settlement in Salamis.

THE *GENOS* OF THE *SALAMINIOI* AND THE CREATION OF THE ATHENIAN CLERUCHY AT SALAMIS

Given that one of the branches of the *genos* is said to be 'from the Seven Tribes' and that the demes of the identified members of the *genos* are very diverse, everyone agrees that the creation of the *genos* dates back to pre-Classical times, with most scholars arguing for a date in the sixth century (and some even arguing for a much earlier date). The starting point of the reasoning is the war between Athens and Megara and the conditions under which the Athenian cleruchy was created.

Why did it seem necessary to plant cleruchs, i. e., as we have seen, settler soldiers, in Salamis? The constant threat of Megara might appear to have justified the reinforcing of the Athenian control through the creation of a settlement with full military vocation, which in itself could be a sufficient argument if the notion of cleruchy did not have specific territorial and population requirements⁴⁰. But the island was very close to Attica and its annexation into Athenian territory would also have been perfectly logical. Yet this was not done. Why was it so? In a more distant past, the territory of Marathon and the *tetrapolis*, to the north-east of Attica, had been incorporated into Attic territory. This had been the case even more recently with Eleusis, whose territory was so close to Salamis, perhaps in the eighth century, although it has been argued by L'Homme-Wéry that the incorporation of Eleusis was more recent and the work of Solon⁴¹.

Would it be possible that the fact it was an island added some foreign character to Salamis, which made of it a territory that it was desirable to annex, but not to incorporate into the Athenian territory? M. Giuffrida has insisted on the fact that for the Athenians Salamis was a territory beyond the sea, which might be paralleled by the situation of

³⁷ Igelbrink 2015, 158–162, 173.

³⁸ Lawton, Harris 1990.

³⁹ See above, § 1, on the archon of Salamis.

⁴⁰ On the defense argument, see Igelbrink 2015, 171, with previous literature.

⁴¹ L'Homme-Wéry 1996.

cities located on islands that had *peraiiai*, continental territories beyond the sea⁴². The argument has some weight, and the physical separation introduced by the existence of a channel between the continent island and the island territory certainly played a role in the decision to give to this territory a specific status. However, the existence of a channel and the (more significant) distance for instance between the island-city of Rhodes and the Carian Chersonese did not prevent the Rhodians from incorporating the Chersonesians into their own territory at the end of the fourth century⁴³. Thus we must identify another factor to explain the difference of treatment between Salamis and the territory of Eleusis. However, another and certainly more important difference is that not only Salamis was conquered by the Athenians, but that its territory was seized from its former occupants, with Athenian settlers replacing them.

Although, as we have observed, there remains much uncertainty on the respective roles of Solon and Peisistratus, details from the narratives of ancient authors provide useful hints on the origin of the Athenian presence in Salamis. Plutarch (*Sol.* 9. 2) refers to the Megarians occupying the island as τούς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι Μεγαρεῖς, ‘the Megarians in Salamis’. Is it a retrospective illusion that leads Plutarch to imagine a contingent of Megarian settlers in Salamis similar to the later contingent of Athenian settlers in the island? One might be tempted to think so if another source did not also refer to a contingent of Megarians in Salamis. In fact, Pausanias (I. 40. 5) even directly refers to Megarian cleruchs on the island. He first mentions the previous Athenian defeat before the Megarians, then he comes to the role of Solon and to the Athenian victory. Unlike Plutarch’s story, the Athenians would have been victorious thanks to a betrayal taking place on the Megarian side: Μεγαρεῖς δὲ παρὰ σφῶν λέγουσιν ἄνδρας φυγάδας, οὓς Δορυκλείους ὀνομάζουσιν, ἀφικομένους παρὰ τοὺς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι κληρούχους προδοῦναι Σαλαμῖνα Ἀθηναίους “But the Megarians say that exiles from themselves, whom they call Dorycleans, reached the cleruchs in Salamis and betrayed the island to the Athenians”⁴⁴.

Thus, it is certain that when the Athenians fought against the Megarians over Salamis, there were already Megarian settlers on the island. If we can trust Pausanias, this would be our first reference to cleruchs in any city or kingdom. Whether or not we should accept this definition, Pausanias’ account fits well with the image provided by Plutarch of a Megarian occupation by military settlers. On the Athenian side this time, we also find a contingent of military settlers. After a decree of the city, Solon could promise the volunteers who would follow him in the conquest of the island (Plut. *Sol.* 9. 2) that they would be in control of the settlement if they managed to take it: εἴτα παρὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐθελοντὰς λαβεῖν πεντακοσίους, δόγματος γενομένου τούτους, ἂν κατασχῶσι τὴν νῆσον, κυρίους εἶναι τοῦ πολιτεύματος “Then he took five hundred Athenian volunteers, a decree having been made that these should be in possession of the settlement in the island if they took it”⁴⁵.

⁴² Giuffrida 2000.

⁴³ On the question of the incorporation of the Chersonesos, the ‘integrated *Peraia*’, and the special status of the territories north of the Ceramic gulf, the so-called ‘subject *Peraia*’, see Bresson 2003, and for the date Badoud 2011.

⁴⁴ Tr. Loeb, modified (‘cleruchs’ instead of ‘colonists’). See Bultrighini 2011 for hypotheses on the possible settlement of the *Dorykleioi* in Attica.

⁴⁵ Tr. Loeb, modified.

It is clear that the formula *κυρίους εἶναι τοῦ πολιτεύματος* would fit perfectly well with a body of cleruchs who would settle in the island and who from then on would become the ruling power in the island. In that case, we have every reason to believe that the lands given to them would be those previously occupied by the Megarian settlers. Pausanias' definition of the Megarian settlers as 'cleruchs' might be an anachronism, but even this is uncertain as we have no independent source for such settlers at the end of the seventh century and beginning of sixth century. In any case, the installation of Athenian military colonist settlers in replacement of Megarian ones makes perfect sense. The Athenian cleruchy would thus date back to the beginning of the sixth century (in the Figueira chronology).

This chain of events deserves further comment. The Athenians settlers supplanted previous Megarian settlers, not 'authentic Salaminians' inhabiting the island. It is thus necessary to admit that at some earlier date the Megarians expelled the local Salaminian inhabitants. Although no source can be produced to support this hypothesis, they might well have been Athenian sympathizers, who for this reason represented a threat for the Megarians. Their replacement by Megarian cleruchs reinforced the state of preparedness of the Megarians to fight the Athenians. This eviction must have taken place in the late seventh century BC.

Where did the expelled Salaminians go? The best hypothesis is that they took refuge in Attica, where they were accepted because of their friendly attitude towards Athens. Although so far this hypothesis does not seem to have been proposed, it provides the most straightforward and economic solution to the riddle of the origin of the *Salaminioi*. A large group of Salaminians must have been settled in the region of Sounion, and a second, more fluid one was formed by the Salaminians scattered over the various regions of Attica, justifying the name of 'of the seven tribes' after the creation of the new Cleisthenic tribes. Population transfers such as that proposed for the Salaminians find several parallels.

For Athens, Herodotus explains how, in the Archaic period, the group of the Gephyraeans came to Athens, who, according to him, were not people coming from Eretria, as they themselves claimed, but Phoenician companions of Cadmos who had settled in Boeotia at Tanagra and later had been expelled from this place by the Boeotians⁴⁶. He underscores that in Attica these Gephyraeans were in charge of certain cults of which the other Athenians could take no part⁴⁷. The cults linked to the Gephyraeans provide a striking parallel with the case of the *Salaminioi* and their active cultic involvement, although with the nuance that for the *Salaminioi* our sources do not mention exclusive cults. In an inscription of 37/36 BC, the Gephyraeans advertise themselves as a *genos*⁴⁸. Despite current skepticism, given the very ancient cult investment of the Gephyraeans, it is perfectly admissible that at a much earlier date the Gephyraeans had already organized and designated themselves as a *genos*, like the *Salaminioi*⁴⁹. It should be emphasized that

⁴⁶ Hdt. V. 57. 1–2; 58. 1; 61. 2 and 62. 1. This version was criticized by Plutarch (*Mor. (de Herodoti Malignitate)* 860e–f), supposedly as being an attack on Greekness.

⁴⁷ Hdt. V. 61. 2.

⁴⁸ *SEG* 30 85, l. 2–3 and 15–16.

⁴⁹ Ismard 2010, 77, for the skepticism (and the inscription is not of the Imperial period). On the Gephyraeans and their cults, see Parker 1996, 288–289. A *horos* inscription of the second half of the

we owe our knowledge about the *Salaminioi* only to the fact that the two branches of the group were in conflict during a long period, before they finally separated into two *genē*. Without this conflict and without the two inscriptions referred to above dating back respectively to the fourth and third century, we would not know that the *Salaminioi* called themselves a *genos* in the Classical and early Hellenistic period and we would have been unable to detail their organization.

Other later cases are worth mentioning. Twice expelled from their city, the Plataeans took refuge in Athens and kept a special status of ‘Plataeans’⁵⁰. The Aiginetans were expelled from their island in 431. They took refuge by their Spartan ally, on the southeastern coast of the Peloponnese in Thyrea, in the Kynouria (the parallel with the Salaminians in Sounion is interesting), where they were nevertheless attacked by the Athenians⁵¹. The remnant Aiginetans had to wait the Athenian collapse of 405 to be able to come back to their city⁵². The most striking parallel, as it concerns directly Athens, is provided by the case of the Aiginetan democrats under the leadership of Nikodromos, who around or in 490 revolted against their government with the help of the Athenians. When their coup failed, the survivors took refuge in Athens, where they were settled at Sounion⁵³. The striking parallel with the *Salaminioi* has not escaped Figueira⁵⁴. Beyond the case of Athens, the Delians expelled from their island in 167 took refuge in Achaia and according to Polybius became citizens there⁵⁵. Besides, three other arguments reinforce the hypothesis of the integration of expelled Salaminians into the Athenian citizen body.

The first one concerns chronology. If, as suggested here, the initial transfer of population took place in the late seventh century, this was a period in which the frontiers of the citizen bodies were more fluid than they were later in the Classical or Hellenistic period, although even in the Hellenistic period the expelled Delians did become citizens in Achaia.

fourth century, *Hesp. Suppl.* 9 (1951) 30 (Finley 1985, no. 147), l. 8, mentions them as the beneficiaries of a mortgage for the excess value of a land for a dowry; for a parallel, see *IG II² 2670* (Finley 1985, no. 146), ca. 370–360 BC, where this time the *Kekropidai* and *Lykomidai* (two other well-known cultic organizations) and the deme of the Phleians are the beneficiaries of a mortgage in similar conditions (see Harris 2013, 140, for the analysis of these *horoi*, and Lambert 2015 on *genē* as descent group organizations providing priests and priestesses in Athens, with table 188–194 for a list of these *genē*).

⁵⁰ See Osborne 1981–1983, I, 28, decree D1; II, 11–16; III–IV, 161–162 and 173–176 (but the decree awarding citizenship to the Plataeans included in the Demosthenic speech *Against Neaira* ([Dem.] 59. 104 is not authentic: see Canevaro 2010).

⁵¹ Thuc. II. 27. 1–2; IV. 56. 2–57. 1–5; on the Aiginetans in exile in Thyrea and their fate (they are attacked by the Athenians in 424; their town was captured by storm, and after being brought back to Athens they were put to death): see in detail Figueira 1993, 293–310.

⁵² Xen. *Hell.* II. 2. 9.

⁵³ Hdt. VI. 88–91 for the revolt and its fate, and VI. 90 for the installation at Sounion: τοῖσι Ἀθηναῖοι Σούνιον οἰκῆσαι ἔδοσαν. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ οὗτοι ὀρμώμενοι ἔφερόν τε καὶ ἦγον τοὺς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Αἰγινητάς “to them the Athenians gave Sounion to dwell in, which they used as a starting point to assault and plunder the Aeginetans of the island”. The justification of the installation at Sounion is thus the ability for the exiled Aiginetans to harass their opponents in the island. See Figueira 1993, 113–49, with discussion of the various chronological hypotheses, in the 490s or 480s, although he prefers the date of 490, see his table p. 144.

⁵⁴ Figueira 1991, 83–84.

⁵⁵ Plb. XXX. 20. 1–9 and XXXII. 7(17). 1–5.

The second one is Solon's law reported by Plutarch (*Sol.* 24. 2), which provides for the integration of some categories of foreigners only: "But the law about naturalization is a matter of debate. It gives the possibility to become citizens only to those who were permanently exiled from their own country (πλὴν τοῖς φεύγουσιν ἀειφυγία τὴν ἑαυτῶν), or who moved to Athens with their entire families to practice a technical occupation. It seems that the law did not so much aim to turn away other foreigners as to incite these emigrants to come to Athens by offering them the guarantee of obtaining local citizenship. He also thought that one could trust those who had been forced to leave their home country or had left it with a well-defined project." Needless to say, Solon's law on naturalization would perfectly fit with the integration of the expelled Salaminians.

The third one is about the link with Cleisthenes' reforms. The Salaminians had been present in Attica for a century or more when they took place. As underscored by the Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens* (21. 2), this was the opportunity of massive inclusion of populations of previously dubious status and of a new 'mix' of the Athenian population. If indeed, as can be strongly suspected based on Solon's law, this had not occurred before, it was in any case in 508/507 that the Salaminians became full citizens of Athens. The demotic identity of the individual members of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi* thus gives a snapshot of their dispersion in Attic territory at the date of the reform.

Finally, there remains to explain why the Athenians did not simply re-send the Salaminians back to their island when they re-conquered it over the Megarians. On this point, two answers may be offered. The first one is directly based on our sources. Plutarch (*Sol.* 9. 2) explains us that, to be able to levy volunteers for the conquest of Salamis, Solon made sure that the city promised those who would accept to fight the *κυρία τοῦ πολιτεύματος*, the right to rule the settlement. The promise of the creation of an Athenian military settlement had been linchpin in the war against Megara, and the city could not rescind the concession. There was no place for a reinstallation of the original Salaminians, who had been resettled in Attica and must have been satisfied with their new lives there. The second answer is that the necessity to maintain a military presence in the island to prevent the Megarians to make their comeback, making sure that the 'property rights' of the Athenians over the island would be maintained. This explains well the necessity to plant and maintain a military presence in an island of increasing strategic significance, as at that time the Athenian city and economy turned more and more towards the sea.

Now although successfully integrated into the Athenian citizen body, the former inhabitants of Salamis kept the memory of their origin in the form of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*, which in Athens performed both the cults of traditional Salaminian heroes and prestigious traditional Attic deities, which showed the esteem of the Athenians for the Salaminians formerly expelled from their island and illustrates their integration into Athenian social and cultic life. Besides, the life of the association was not static. It underwent many changes over time, as incidentally proven by the conflicts developing within the association⁵⁶.

The new solution proposed here is the most economic one to make sense of the origin of the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*. It also explains the difference between the integration of the territories of the *tetrapolis* of Marathon or of Eleusis and of that of Salamis. The first

⁵⁶ Ismard 2010, 224–239.

two territories, admittedly at an earlier period, were absorbed *en bloc* and their inhabitants were incorporated into the Athenian citizen body (in the form it had in the Archaic period). Salamis was a different case. It was the product of the common conquest of the Athenians. The new territory was void of its previous inhabitants, the Megarian settler soldiers. It was Athens, as a state, which was its owner, which implied to establish a type of legal property that could not be that of ordinary property within the borders of the Athenian state. In the other Athenian cleruchies, starting with Chalcis in 507/506 BC, the scenario was the same: expulsion of former inhabitants and planting of settler soldiers, ensuring the permanence of Athenian control over the new territories⁵⁷. A common feature between the circumstances of the integration of Eleusis and of the Salaminians previously expelled by the Megarians was, however, the role of the prestigious priest-hoods, those of the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis, and those managed by the *genos* of the *Salaminioi*, which attached the elites to their new city and integrated them into the common Athenian imaginary.

CONCLUSION

The case of Salamis shows that a cleruchic settlement corresponded to specific political conditions and legal definitions. The cleruchus were settled in lands obtained by conquest, from which their former owners had been expelled. The *klēroi* holders owned their estates in exchange of precisely defined military duties, with also limits to their use in accordance with their military role. The logic of the Athenian cleruchic system directly announces what can be observed in the territories conquered by the kingdom of Macedonia in northern Greece and later in the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms.

References

- Anderson, G. 2003: *The Athenian Experiment: Building an Imagined Political Community in Ancient Attica, 508–490 B.C.* Ann Arbor.
- Badoud, N. 2011: L'intégration de la Pérée au territoire de Rhodes. In: N. Badoud (éd.), *Philologos Dionysios. Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler*. Geneva, 533–566.
- Bourriot, F. 1976: *Recherches sur la nature du génos: étude d'histoire sociale athénienne - périodes archaïque et classique*. Lille.
- Bresson, A. 2003: Les intérêts rhodiens en Carie à l'époque hellénistique jusqu'en 167 a.C. In: F. Prost (éd.), *L'Orient méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée. Cités et royaumes à l'époque hellénistique*. Rennes, 169–192.
- Bultrighini, I. 2011: "Dorykleion, Dorykleioi" e "Dorieis". *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 53/1, 99–106.
- Canevaro, M. 2010: The Decree Awarding Citizenship to the Plataeans ([Dem.] 59.104). *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 50, 337–369.
- Cargill, J. 1995: *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* Leiden.
- Ferguson, W.S. 1938: The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion. *Hesperia* 7/1, 1–74.
- Figueira, T.J. 1985: Chronological Table: Archaic Megara, 800–500 B.C. In: T.J. Figueira, G. Nagy (eds.), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*. Baltimore, 261–303.
- Figueira, T.J. 1991: *Athens and Aigina in the Age of Imperial Colonization*. Baltimore.
- Figueira, T.J. 1993: *Excursions in Epichoric History: Aeginetan Essays*. Lanham.
- Finley, M.I. 1985: *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500–200 B.C. The Horos Inscriptions*. 2nd ed. New Brunswick–Oxford.

⁵⁷ For Chalcis, Igelbrink 2015, 175–184 (the cleruchic settlement followed the Athenian victory over the Boeotians and Chalcidians, Hdt. VII. 77). For an overview on the Athenian cleruchic settlements, see Igelbrink 2015 for the fifth century and Cargill 1995, 1–58 for the later periods.

- Fornara, C.W. 1983: *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War*. Cambridge.
- French, A. 1957: Solon and the Megarian Question. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 77/2, 238–246.
- Garland, R. 1992: *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*. Ithaca.
- Giuffrida, M. 2000: Dall'esperienza omerica della peraia alla cleruchia di Salamina. *Hormos* 2, 43–60.
- Giuffrida, M. 2004: I Filaidi e l'annessione di Salamina ad Atene. In: G. Vanotti, C. Perassi (éd.), *In limine. Ricerche su marginalità e periferia nel mondo greco*. Milano, 253–268.
- Guarducci, M. 1948: L'origine e le vicende del genos attico dei Salamini. *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 26, 223–243.
- Hallof, K., Habicht, C. 1995: Buleuten und Beamte der athenischen Kleruchie in Samos. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 110, 273–304.
- Harris, E.M. 2013: Finley's Studies in Land and Credit Sixty Years Later. *Dike* 16, 123–146.
- Igelbrink, C. 2015: *Die Kleruchien und Apoikien Athens im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Rechtsformen und politische Funktionen der athenischen Gründungen*. Berlin–München–Boston.
- Iriarte, U. 2022: Peisistratus on Salamis: Who Captured the Island? *Acta Classica* 65, 238–245.
- Ismard, P. 2010: *La cité des réseaux. Athènes et ses associations, VI^e-I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.* Paris.
- L'Homme-Wéry, L.-M. 1996: *La perspective éleusinienne dans la politique de Solon*. Genève.
- L'Homme-Wéry, L.-M. 2000: Les héros de Salamine en Attique. Cultes, mythes et intégration politique. In: V. Pirenne-Delforge, E. Suárez de la Torre (éd.), *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs. Actes du colloque organisé à l'Université de Valladolid, du 26 au 29 mai 1999*. (Kernos Supplement, 10). Liège, 333–349.
- Lambert, S.D. 1997: The Attic genos *Salamini* and the Island of Salamis. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 119, 85–106.
- Lambert, S.D. 1999: The Attic Genos. *Classical Quarterly* 49/2, 484–489.
- Lambert, S.D. 2015: Aristocracy and the Attic Genos: A Mythological Perspective. In: N. Fisher, H. van Wees (eds.), *'Aristocracy' in Antiquity. Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*. Swansea, 169–202.
- Lawton, C., Harris, D. 1990: Aias and Eurysakes on a Fourth-Century Honorary Decree from Salamis. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 80, 109–115.
- Legon, R.P. 1981: *Megara. The Political History of a City-State to 336 B.C.* Ithaca–London–New York.
- Lupi, M. 2006: Amompharetos, the *lochos* of Pitane and the Spartan System of Villages. In: S. Hopkinson, A. Powell (eds.), *Sparta at War*. Swansea, 185–218.
- Lupi, M. 2018: Sparta and the Persian Wars, 499–478. In: A. Powell (ed.), *A Companion to Sparta*. Vol. I. Hoboken, 271–290.
- Makres, A. 2009: On the Spartan *eirenes* (Herodotus 9. 85): Ἰρέες or Ἰρένες? In: W.G. Cavanagh, C. Gallou, M. Georgiadis (eds.), *Sparta and Laconia: From Prehistory to Pre-Modern*. (British School at Athens Studies, 16). London, 187–194.
- Matthaiou, A. 1990–1991: Ἐπιγραφὴς Ἀκροπόλεως. *Horos* 8–9, 9–14.
- Moggi, M. 1979: L'esisphorà dei coloni ateniesi a Potidea ([Aristot.] "Oec." 2,2,5 [1347a]). *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 30/1, 137–142.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1938: The New Inscription of *Salamini*. *American Journal of Philology* 59/4, 385–393.
- Osborne, M.J. 1981–1983: *Naturalization in Athens*. Vol. I–IV. Brussels.
- Osborne, M.J. 2009: The Archons of Athens 300/299–228/7. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 171, 83–99.
- Osborne, R. 1994: Archaeology, the *Salamini* and the Politics of Sacred Space in Archaic Attica. In: S.E. Alcock, R. Osborne (eds.), *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford, 143–160.
- Papazarkadas, N. 2011: *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 1996: *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford.
- Robu, A. 2004–2005: L'affaire de Salamine. *Dacia* 48–49, 161–172.
- Roussel, D. 1976: *Tribu et cité*. Paris.
- Salomon, N. 1997: *Le cleruchie di Atene: Caratteri e funzione*. Pisa.
- Stroud, R.S. 1998: *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C.* (Hesperia Supplement, 29). Princeton.
- Taylor, M.C. 1997: *Salamis and the Salamini: The History of an Unofficial Athenian Demos*. Amsterdam.
- Valdés Guía, M. 2005: The Cult of Aglauros (and Aphrodite) in Athens and in Salamis of Cyprus: Reflections on the Origin of the Genos of the *Salamini*. *Ancient West and East* 4/1, 57–76.
- Van Wees, H. 2013: *Ships and Silver. Taxes and Tribute: A Fiscal History of Archaic Athens*. London–New York.
- Van Wees, H. 2018: Citizens and Soldiers in Archaic Athens. In: A. Duploux, R.W. Brock (eds.) *Defining Citizenship in Archaic Greece*. Oxford–New York, 103–144.