

ATHENS AND TENOS IN THE EARLY HELLENISTIC AGE

Some recent work on the history of Athens and Tenos in the third century B.C. has brought to light new evidence and new interpretations of old evidence for this notoriously shadowy period of Greek history. Reflection on this material has suggested to me solutions to a few minor puzzles (Sections IA, IB, III), a contribution to a long-standing problem in the history of Athens in the early third century (Section IB), and a new explanation for the entry of Rhodes into the war with Antiochos (Section II).¹

I. TENOS AND ATHENS

Tenos and Athens enjoyed close relations in the late fourth and early third centuries, attested by a pair of important inscriptions awarding Tenians access to Athenian courts and isoteleia to Tenian metics in Athens who met certain conditions (*IG* ii².446 and 660). The origin of these good relations, however, has not been adequately explained. The following two sections tackle this issue. In the first (IA) I argue that the

¹ All of these issues spring also in part from a reading of Roland Etienne's new and interesting study. The following abbreviations are used throughout:

Beloch iv² 2 = Julius Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, iv² (Berlin–Leipzig, 1927).

Billows = Richard A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Hellenistic Culture and Society, 4) (Berkeley, 1990).

'Bull. ép.' = 'Bulletin épigraphique'.

Buraselis = Kostas Buraselis, *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis. Forschungen zur Politik des Kassandros und der drei ersten Antigoniden (Antigonos Monophthalmos, Demetrios Poliorketes und Antigonos Gonatas) im Ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 73) (Munich, 1982).

Etienne = Roland Etienne, *Ténos II. Ténos et les Cyclades du milieu du IV^e siècle avant J.-C. au milieu du III^e siècle après J.-C.* (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 263 bis) (Paris, 1990).

Flacelière = Robert Flacelière, *Les Aitolien à Delphes* (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 143) (Paris, 1937).

Garland = Robert Garland, *The Piraeus from the Fifth to the First Century B.C.* (Ithaca, 1987).

Gauthier = Philippe Gauthier, 'La réunification d'Athènes en 281 et les deux archontes Nicias', *REG* 92 (1979), 348–99.

Habicht = Christian Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Vestigia 30) (Munich, 1979).

Hammond–Walbank = N. G. L. Hammond and F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia*, iii (Oxford, 1988).

Heinen = Heinz Heinen, rev. of Habicht, *GGA* 233 (1981), 175–207.

Knoepfler = Denis Knoepfler, *La vie de Ménédème d'Erétie de Diogène Laërce. Une contribution à l'histoire et à la critique du texte des Vies des philosophes* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 21) (Basel, 1991).

Osborne = Michael J. Osborne, 'Kallias, Phaidros and the Revolt of Athens in 287 B.C.', *ZPE* 35 (1979), 181–94.

Picard = Olivier Picard, *Chalcis et la confédération eubéenne. Etude de numismatique et d'histoire (IV^e – I^{er} siècle)* (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 234) (Paris, 1979).

Tarn = W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford, 1913).

Wallace = W. P. Wallace, *The Euboean League and its Coinage* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, 134) (New York, 1956).

Will i², ii² = Edouard Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)* i² (Nancy, 1979), ii² (Nancy, 1982).

Athenian award of a judicial agreement to the Tenians in 307 B.C. should be seen in light of the recovery that year of Athens by Demetrios Poliorketes, and I suggest that Tenians may have participated in the recovery either by serving as soldiers or by allowing Demetrios to use Tenos as a base for operations, much as Kallias used Andros in 288/287 B.C.

The second section (IB) follows through on Tenian–Athenian relations by exploring the reasons for renewal of privileges for Tenians in 281 B.C. I argue that recovery by the Athenians of the Peiraieus, which had been held by a Makedonian garrison since the liberation of Athens in 287, prompted the Tenians to send an ambassador to congratulate the Athenians and to seek renewal of the privileges of Tenian metics in Athens as an assurance that such privileges would continue. This position, however, implies treating the problem of whether the Makedonian garrison in fact departed in 281, or continued to hold the Peiraieus throughout the 270s and 260s. I review the arguments presented on each side by C. Habicht and P. Gauthier (as well as additional views put forward subsequently) and conclude that the evidence favours a recovery of the Peiraieus in 281.

(A) Tenians and the liberation of Athens in 307 B.C.

In 307/6 B.C. the Athenians granted Tenians a judicial agreement (*σύνβολα*) which permitted them access to Athenian courts. The existence of the agreement is known through a decree honouring two Tenian ambassadors, part of whose speech is apparently paraphrased in the badly mutilated beginning of the inscription.² The general political background is clear. In 307 B.C. Antigonos Monophthalmos had sent his son Demetrios from Ephesos across the Aegean to recover Greece. Demetrios' primary goal was Athens, since 317 B.C. under the control of Demetrios of Phaleron, an ally of Kassandros, Alexander's former general who controlled much of Greece. Demetrios entered Athens to great celebrations, expelled the garrison on the Mounykhia imposed by Kassandros, and was awarded extraordinary honours. It was during this heady period that the two Tenian ambassadors arrived.³ The Tenians were not the only city to send congratulations to the Athenians. Embassies arrived from Kolophon, Parion, Myrlea and an unidentified city; other cities dispatched crowns, including Miletos, Ephesos, Tenedos, Myrina and Peparethos.⁴

Given this outpouring of sentiment, it might appear that Tenos simply joined a raft of other cities in expressing its pleasure at Athens' newly found freedom. But in fact the issue is more complicated. Except for the islands Tenos and Peparethos, all of these cities were situated in Asia Minor on territory controlled by Antigonos Monophthalmos. Their interest in seeing Athens returned to the Antigonid fold is therefore clear. But what about Tenos?⁵ It was the only Cycladic city under Antigonid control to send an embassy to Athens, and apparently the only city to be granted the special privileges recorded in *IG* ii².446. Scholars have offered several

² *IG* ii².466.32–5, 5–18. Cf. Philippe Gauthier, *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (Annales de l'Est Mémoire, 42) (Nancy, 1972), pp. 101–2, 171. Although it is possible that the agreement antedated the inscription, in my view the wording of lines 32–5 virtually guarantees a new arrangement.

³ Buraselis, pp. 52–3 with n. 58. For the removal of the garrison, see *IG* xii.5.444.125–6; Diod. 20.46.1; Plut., *Dem.* 10.1; Philokhoros, *FGrHist* 328 F 167.

⁴ *IG* ii².456 and 470 (Kolophon), 573 (Parion; wrongly Paros in Billows 210–11), 703 with B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 5 (1936), 201–5 (Myrlea), 557 (unidentified city); *IG* ii².1485–6. On Kolophon see Adolph Wilhelm, 'Athen und Kolophon', in *Anatolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, ed. W. M. Calder and Josef Keil (Manchester, 1939), pp. 345–68.

⁵ For Peparethos we have no evidence besides the crown just mentioned.

explanations. W. W. Tarn supposed that the Tenians had come 'to congratulate [Athens] on being "liberated" by Demetrios'; Kostas Buraselis thought that the embassy merely reflected the re-establishment of Antigonid control over the Cyclades; and Roland Etienne wrote that it 'had the goal, among others, of establishing or renewing a judicial convention', and adduced in general the close Athenian-Tenian relations to explain this and other honours (especially the *ἰσοτέλεια* attested by *IG* ii².660, on which see below).⁶ None of these views is very satisfying. Tarn is certainly right as far as he goes, but his view says nothing about the specific case. It is difficult to see why Tenos, which was only one among many members of the Nesiotic League which Antigonos established to control the Cyclades and which had its own *synhedrion* to deal with outside powers, should alone among the islands have congratulated Athens;⁷ further, the inscription makes it clear that the Tenians were acting on their own behalf, not as representatives of the Nesiotic League. Finally, the desire on the part of the Tenians to obtain (or renew) a judicial agreement with the Athenians does not explain why the Athenians, who were chary of awarding block grants of privileges to outsiders,⁸ should grant the Tenian request. I think we can find a more specific explanation: that Demetrios had used Tenos as a base, and that Tenian forces participated with him in the liberation of Athens.

The Tenian embassy arrived in conjunction with the celebration of the most important event in Athenian history since the imposition of Demetrios of Phaleros' rule ten years earlier. Poliorketes and his father were recognised as true liberators, as the expansive honours voted in their favour prove.⁹ The Tenian ambassadors were perfectly aware of all this. The few phrases preserved of their remarks to the Athenians show that they knew about the importance of the Mounykhia (line 5), named Antigonos and Demetrios (line 7), referred to their benefactions to the Athenians and the other Greeks (lines 8–10), and discussed the removal of Kassandros' garrison (lines 13–14). But it was not only the Athenians who benefited from Antigonos' activities. The Tenians stressed Antigonid benefactions to the Athenians and to the other Greeks – [ἐὺ]ργ[ε]το[υ]ν τ[ῆ]ν τε πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλ[λ]η[ν]ας, lines 8–10 – language which strongly suggests that the Tenians counted themselves among those beneficiaries.

Indeed, Demetrios' expedition of 307 B.C. had an important impact in the islands as well as in Athens. In the previous year Ptolemaios I Soter had dispatched a naval force through the Aegean which, among other things, removed a garrison from Andros.¹⁰ Buraselis has argued convincingly that this expedition interrupted the Antigonid hegemony over the Cyclades that had begun in 314 B.C.¹¹ Demetrios' actions recovered the islands for his father and himself. His 'liberation' of Delos resulted in the establishment there of a new festival, the Demetrieia, which was celebrated on an equal level with the Antigoneia founded in 314 B.C. to commemorate Antigonos' liberation of Delos from Athens.¹²

The normal sea route from Delos to Athens passes along the south coast of Tenos;¹³ Demetrios and his fleet must have sailed directly past the polis, which in antiquity as today was situated on the coast near the southeastern tip of the island.

⁶ Tarn, p. 418, Buraselis, p. 52, Etienne, pp. 176, 177–8.

⁷ On the League see most recently Billows, pp. 220–5.

⁸ Cf. the examples adduced by Mogens Herman Hansen, *Demography and Democracy. The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Herning, 1985), p. 90 n. 12.

⁹ Plut., *Dem.* 8–14.

¹⁰ Diod. 20.37.

¹¹ Buraselis, pp. 45–6.

¹² *IG* xi.4.1036 (= F. Durrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos* [Paris, 1921–2], no. 13); Buraselis, pp. 41–4; Billows, pp. 220–5, following Buraselis, pp. 41–3, 60–7, both with further references.

¹³ Cf. below p. 380.

The site includes a protected harbour. For launching attacks on Athens, a base in the nearer islands often proved useful. Before passing on to the mainland the year before (308), Ptolemaios had secured Andros by expelling the existing, presumably Antigonid, garrison. Andros served Kallias of Sphettos as a base for his capture of Athens in 287 B.C.; during the Khremonidean War the Ptolemaic general Patroklos operated from Keos and the little island near Sounion which bore his name; and in the 250s Antigonos Gonatas held Andros, surely as a means of securing control of the entrance of the Saronic Gulf.¹⁴ Demetrios and his fleet would have needed a similar base from which to launch his recapture of Athens. But Andros was unavailable, since it had been taken by Ptolemaios the year before; no doubt the Egyptian king had seen to the installation of his supporters in the Andrian government. Under these circumstances Demetrios needed to look elsewhere for his headquarters for the attempt on Athens: Tenos, the next closest island to the mainland after Andros, would have made a good choice. Once Demetrios' forces were stationed there and Tenos reincorporated into the Nesiotic League, participation in Demetrios' expedition by Tenian troops would have followed naturally.

This hypothesis explains both the Tenian interest in and presence during the celebrations in Athens, and the Athenian generosity to the Tenians in awarding symbola. Indeed, it is possible that Athenian generosity extended well beyond the award of symbola. Another inscription recounts an Athenian grant of *ισοτέλεια* to the Tenians (*IG* ii².660.6). Block grants of privileges like *isoteleia* or citizenship were rare in the fourth century.¹⁵ The full award included not only *isoteleia* for Tenians living in Athens but also the right to own a house 'for those who fight and pay contributions with the Athenians' [οἰκίων ἔγκτησιν στρ]ατε[υόμενοις καὶ τελοῦσιν τὰς εἰσφορὰς μετ' Ἀθηναίων] (*IG* ii².660.7–9, cf. line 39). The specification of Tenians who fight with Athenians could therefore reflect Tenian participation in the liberation of 307, especially as (Section B below), *isoteleia* was renewed in 281/280 B.C. probably in the context of another important 'liberation', though this one was evidently peaceful. Unfortunately, *IG* ii².660 lacks an *arkhon* or other indicator of date¹⁶ so that it is impossible to offer a date independent of the historical circumstances.

(B) Tenians and the recovery of the Peiraeus in 281 B.C.

A Tenian ambassador arrived in Athens in Thargelion 281/280 B.C. His business was to obtain confirmation of the *isoteleia* awarded in the fourth century to Tenians living in Athens (*IG* ii².660.25–46, cf. esp. 37–8).¹⁷ The Athenians granted the confirmation and, in a portion of the stone where a crucial part of the text is lost, repeated the phrase about Tenians *στρατευόμενοις καὶ τε[λοῦσι τὰς εἰσφορὰς μετ' Ἀθηναίων]*, 'fighting along with and paying taxes with Athenians', line 39 (cf. lines 6–8); perhaps the decree included a confirmation of the right to own property (*ektesis*) for Tenians

¹⁴ T. Leslie Shear, Jr., *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 17) (Princeton, 1978), p. 20, line 20; Louis Robert, 'Sur un décret des Korésiens au Musée de Smyrne', *Hellenica* 11–12 (1960), 132–76 and Heinz Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (*Historia Einzelschrift* 20) (Wiesbaden, 1972), pp. 149–50, cf. also John F. Cherry and Jack L. Davis, 'The Ptolemaic Base at Koreos on Keos', *BSA* 86 (1991), 9–28; Paus. 1.1.1; Plut., *Arat.* 12.2–3. I hope to treat this issue in another context soon.

¹⁵ Cf. n. 8.

¹⁶ *IG* ii², p. 261 indicates merely 'post med. s. IV.', presumably on the basis of the lettering.

¹⁷ For the date of the *arkhon* Ourias (line 25), see B. D. Meritt, 'Athenian Archons 347/6–48/7 B.C.', *Historia* 26 (1977), 173.

meeting these qualifications. In turn the Athenians praised the Tenians and awarded them a gold crown 'for their excellence and the benevolence (*εὐνοία*) which they continue to have toward the demos of the Athenians' (lines 34–7, restorations sure). The Tenian ambassador, also praised, received an olive crown and dinner in the Prytaneion (lines 40–3).

(1) *Reasons for the Athenian confirmation of Tenian privileges*

It would be interesting to have an occasion for this Tenian embassy and renewal of isoteleia for Tenians living in Athens. Greek cities often sought renewals of pre-existing privileges when they petitioned grantors for new or expanded privileges; for example, the Parians renewed their mutual friendship and benevolence with the Allarians on Krete prior to requesting asyilia and isopoliteia.¹⁸ In this case, nothing indicates that the Tenians wanted anything more than confirmation of the pre-existing isoteleia. They must then have worried for some reason that this privilege had lapsed, or was about to lapse, or that some Tenians might not be covered by it. Such concerns might have been prompted by political changes at Athens: is there any evidence that such changes had occurred?

There may be. Some years ago Philippe Gauthier argued that the Athenians recovered control of the Peiraieus in Elaphebolion 281 B.C.¹⁹ A foreign garrison had controlled the Peiraieus since 322 B.C., and after Demetrios Poliorketes' departure from Athens in 287 B.C. the presence of Makedonian troops effectively severed the city from its port, now in hostile hands. The desire to recover the Peiraieus forms an important theme in epigraphic documents of the 280s.²⁰ An attempt to seize the Peiraieus by force sometime in those years failed miserably, leading to the death of 420 men.²¹ Recovery of the Peiraieus might account for the Tenians' decision to seek reconfirmation of the privileges of their fellows at Athens. In the first place, recovery of the Peiraieus would surely have been for the Athenians an event as great as their liberation in 307. That occasion drew embassies from many states, come to congratulate the Athenians. There would be nothing surprising if the Tenians dispatched an ambassador to offer congratulations on the recovery of the Athenian port, and incidentally to seek reconfirmation of isoteleia.

Deeper political reasons might also have played a role. The original grant (as I have argued) occurred in the aftermath of Demetrios' liberation of Athens in 307 B.C. It was therefore granted by a government loyal to Demetrios, under whose suzerainty Tenos fell too as a member of the Nesiotic League. All that had changed in 288–287, when Athens escaped Demetrios' control and the Nesiotic League came under Ptolemaic control; but a Makedonian presence persisted in the Peiraieus in the form of Demetrios' garrison, leaving the transition unfinished there. The successful reintegration of the Peiraieus into Athens in 281 could then have prompted the Tenians to obtain a reconfirmation of privileges originally awarded under very different circumstances.

In Gauthier's interpretation (to which we shall return) the reunification of the asty and the Peiraieus involved the reconstitution of the Athenian government. 'Immediately, and quite logically, while the Ekklesia was reformed anew with all those who had been excluded previously [*sc.* citizens resident in the Peiraieus], a new

¹⁸ *I.Cret.* ii Allaria 2.

¹⁹ Gauthier; for the date 392–3.

²⁰ *IG* ii².654 + Add. p. 662, 655, 657 + Add. p. 662; *Hesperia* 7 (1938), 100 no. 18 (= *ISE* I.14, *SEG* 25.89). Cf. also B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 30 (1961), 211 no. 6 (= *SEG* 21.358) with Habicht, p. 100.

²¹ Polyain. 5.17. Pausanias saw their tombs (1.29.10). Osborne associates the epitaph of Khairippos with this event (193 n. 36).

Boule was put in place in which the whole civic population could be represented.²² Even though there was no reason to suppose that earlier decrees lost force because of this change, it might have looked prudent to outsiders like the Tenians to reassure themselves of the continuing validity of their privileges by seeking a renewal.

Finally, yet another possible explanation may reside in the persons affected by the original grant. The emphasis was on Tenians who lived in Athens and 'served in the military and paid war taxes (*εἰσφοράς*) with the Athenians'. This stress on the military aspect of their role in civic life may be intended to recall some specific, recent contribution to the commonweal. The most recent military event would seem to be the failed attempt to recapture the Peiraieus which fell between 286 and 281 B.C. Neither Polyainos nor Pausanias specifies that the 420 casualties were all Athenian citizens. We know that metics participated in the recapture of the Peiraieus and Athens from the Thirty, fighting in the battle around Mounykhia; the democratic leaders Arkhinos and Thrasyboulos awarded to some citizenship, and to others isoteleia, in 401/400.²³ The large metic population of the Peiraieus certainly meant that foreigners would have taken a special interest in its fate.²⁴ Thus the Tenians may have wanted to ensure their fellow citizens living in Athens full exercise of their privileges. But there is yet another way in which the emphasis on Tenian metics serving in the military and paying taxes may be understood.²⁵ Before 281, the many metics who lived in the Peiraieus did not fall under Athenian suzerainty. With the recovery of the Peiraieus, the status of these persons became unclear; in particular, would they enjoy the privileges which their native states had negotiated with the Athenian government? The Tenians may have sent their ambassador to renew isoteleia for Tenians living in Athens to assure the continuation of these privileges for Tenians domiciled in the Peiraieus.

The timing of the Tenian ambassador can be easily accounted for if we accept recovery of the Peiraieus in Elaphebolion 281 B.C. Unfortunately, however, Gauthier's views are far from universally held. Indeed, in the very same year as his article appeared, Christian Habicht published his detailed study of Athenian history in the third century, in which he argued powerfully that a Makedonian garrison remained in the Peiraieus continuously from 287 B.C. through the Khremonidean War.²⁶ In addition, Gauthier's views about the identity of the archon designated Nikias ὁ ὕστερος have been challenged.²⁷ Before we can accept the explanation I have offered for the Tenians' actions, therefore, it will be necessary to consider the objections raised by Habicht and others. This will entail a rather long digression into the history of Athens in the 280s and 270s, in which I shall argue that the evidence Habicht presents to show a Makedonian garrison in the Peiraieus from 281 to the end of the Khremonidean War does not in fact support this view, so that we may still accept a recovery of the Peiraieus by Athens in 281.

²² Gauthier 392–393.

²³ Xenoph. *Hell.* 2.4.25 (isoteleia); [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 40.2 (citizenship); Plut. *Mor.* 835f–836a; *IG* ii².10 (with both) = Marcus N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, ii (Oxford, 1948), pp. 8–13, no. 100, with Tod's commentary.

²⁴ Garland, pp. 58–72.

²⁵ A possible Tenian mercenary (?) at *IG* ii².1957.9, beg. III B.C.

²⁶ Habicht, pp. 96–107. Cf. also Heinen 175–207, J. and L. Robert, 'Bull. ép.', *REG* 94 (1981), 238, pp. 401–2. Garland, pp. 51–2 accepts Habicht and Osborne's position, without, however, adducing new evidence. Osborne's paper confined itself to showing that the garrison at the Peiraieus persisted beyond 287 B.C., and to suggesting that the unsuccessful attempt to regain it reported in Polyainos 5.17 occurred in 281 B.C. (Osborne 192–4).

²⁷ M. J. Osborne, 'The Archonship of Nikias Hysteros and the Secretary Cycles in the Third Century B.C.', *ZPE* 58 (1985), 275–95, cf. P. Gauthier, 'Bull. ép.', *REG* 100 (1987), 251, pp. 320–1; J. Tréheux, 'Bull. ép.', *REG* 103 (1990), 399, pp. 511–12.

(2) *The recovery of the Peiraeus*

The debate about whether the Athenians recovered the Peiraeus in the late 280s revolves around two different sets of evidence. There are three matters that bear directly on the question of recovery: the archonship of Nikias II of 282/281, who Gauthier argues was in office when the recovery occurred; an incident in the career of Olympiodoros which seems to speak directly to the recovery of the Peiraeus, though Habicht has recently cast doubt on this; and an inscription of Gamelion 281 which promises additional honours for the arkhon of the previous year 'when the Peiraeus and the asty are reunited'. Another set of evidence has been interpreted to show the existence of a Makedonian garrison in the Peiraeus after 281 but before 268 B.C. In the following sections we shall explore this evidence and argue, first, that the doubts that have been raised about the first set of evidence are not justified, and, second, that the evidence for a garrison in 281–268 does not in fact support this conclusion.

(a) Evidence bearing directly on the recovery of the Peiraeus

(i) *The arkhon Nikias*. Three inscriptions are dated to the arkhonship of Nikias ὕστερος.²⁸ The word ὕστερος has generally been understood to reflect a break in Nikias' arkhonship during his year of office, a break which occurred because of a change in government. Two Nikiiai served as arkhon early in the third century, Nikias (I) in 296/295 and Nikias (II) in 282/281.²⁹ Gauthier and many others have argued that Nikias ὕστερος was Nikias (II), and so the break in government fell in 282/281, associated thus with the recovery of the Peiraeus and the reconstitution of the Athenian government.³⁰ Now Jacques Tréheux has suggested a completely different solution. Pointing out that ὁ ὕστερος should denote not 'the second part of the year' of Nikias' arkhonship but rather an arkhon 'homonymous with and distinct from the first', he has argued that Nikias ὁ ὕστερος must be Nikias (II) and that no inferences about changes in government can be inferred from this usage.³¹ Thus one of Gauthier's arguments in favour of recovery of the Peiraeus in 281 apparently collapses.

Tréheux's view, however, cannot be accepted. In the first place, Nikias is not referred to as ὁ ὕστερος (so Tréheux), but simply as ὕστερος (*IG* ii².644, line 1, 645, line 1).³² The absence of the definite article weakens the case somewhat. Decisive however is the fact that Nikias is not always designated ὕστερος. In *Hesperia* 7 (1938), 100–9 (= *ISE* I.14) he is simply Νικίας ἄρχων. (This decree was passed in Gamelion [cf. lines 4–5], before Gauthier's change of government.) If ὕστερος were an official designation, as Tréheux argues, it would have to appear each time Nikias was mentioned, just as whenever an intercalary Panemos is added it is always called

²⁸ *IG* ii².644, 645, *Hesperia* 11 (1942), 281 no. 54; cf. Gauthier 380–1.

²⁹ Cf. Gauthier 378–9; I. Kirchener apud *IG* ii².644, commentary; B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 11 (1942), 281. The third Nikias, of 267/6 or 266/5, is irrelevant for our purposes.

³⁰ M. J. Osborne, *ZPE* 58 (1985), 275–95, has argued on the basis of a reexamination of *IG* ii².644 that Nikias ὕστερος here could only be Nikias (I), but his case, which depends on notoriously difficult arguments about the tribal cycle, is not decisive: cf. P. Gauthier, 'Bull. ép.', *REG* 100 (1987), 251, pp. 320–1.

³¹ J. Tréheux, 'Bull. ép.', *REG* 103 (1990), 399, pp. 511–12.

³² In *Hesperia* 11 (1942), 281 no. 54, line 1, Meritt restored 'Ἐπὶ Νικίου ἀρχοντος τοῦ ὕστερου ἐπὶ τῆς], assuming a stoichedon line of 33 letters. Meritt remarked on the presence here of τοῦ and suggested some other possibilities in his n. 15.

ῥστερος. The decisive instance, it seems to me, comes in *IG* ii².682, the famous decree recounting the accomplishments of Phaidros of Sphettos. Phaidros was general ἐπὶ Νικίου μὲν ἀρχοντος (lines 21–2) in 296/295 B.C. and agonothetes in 282/281 ἐπὶ Νικίου ἀρχοντος (lines 53–4). If Nikias ῥστερος were the official designation of Nikias (II), we should expect it here if anywhere. Its absence, however, is easily explained under Gauthier's view: Phaidros was elected agonothetes at the beginning of Nikias' year, along with all the other officials; Nikias' archonship ῥστερος fell only from Elaphebolion to the end of the year.

(ii) *Honours for Euthios*. In February 281 B.C., under the arkhonship of Nikias (II), a decree passed in favour of Euthios, the arkhon of the previous year, promised him further honours 'when the Peiraeus and the asty are reunited' (ὅταν ὁ Πειραιεὺς καὶ τὸ ἄστυ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένηται).³³ From this language Gauthier has argued very persuasively that the Athenians knew in Gamelion that they would be recovering the Peiraeus soon; public announcement of this in a decree further must mean that they were not planning a military assault (cf. iii below) but expected recovery as a result of negotiations.³⁴ In combination with the doubled arkhonship of Nikias (II), this text strongly supports the view that the Athenians did indeed get their port back in 281.

(iii) *The career of Olympiodoros*. Reviewing the career of the Athenian general and statesman Olympiodoros, Pausanias writes that his defeat of the Makedonians and recovery of the Mouseion (in 287 B.C.) was the greatest feat of his career 'except for those things which he did recovering (ἀνασωσάμενος) the Peiraeus and the Mounykhia'.³⁵ This report has often been taken as explicit evidence for the recovery of the Peiraeus.³⁶ Habicht however argued that ἀνασωσάμενος here meant not 'recover' but 'save, preserve', and that the phrase following, 'When the Makedonians made an attack on Eleusis he rallied the Eleusinians and beat the Makedonians', should be taken as explanatory: Olympiodoros' capture of the Mouseion was the greatest feat of his career 'except for those things which he did preserving (ἀνασωσάμενος) the Peiraeus and the Mounykhia, for when the Makedonians made an attack on Eleusis he rallied the Eleusinians and beat the Makedonians.' Habicht associates these events with an attack on Athens by Kassandros in 305 B.C. However, U. Bultrighini, in a careful study of Pausanias' language, has shown that Pausanias never uses ἀνασώζω as 'preserve' but always as 'recover', and that the two actions – recovery of the Peiraeus and the defeat of the Makedonians at Eleusis – can in fact be treated as separate events.³⁷

There remains a difficulty. Gauthier has argued that the recovery of the Peiraeus was achieved through negotiation, not force; the disaster of some years earlier had blocked the military route. But Olympiodoros' activities in recovering the Peiraeus have always been taken as military: clearly it is impossible that the Peiraeus was regained both by military and diplomatic means! The solution is to reject the assumption that Pausanias meant a military recovery of the Peiraeus. His account of Olympiodoros' life includes among his signal successes the negotiation of an alliance

³³ *Hesperia* 7 (1938), 100 no. 18, lines 28–30 (= *SEG* 25.89, *ISE* 1.14).

³⁴ Gauthier 349–66, 371–4; cf. J. and L. Robert, 'Bull. ép.', *REG* 94 (1981), 239, p. 403: 'the decree for Euthios attests to advanced negotiations' for the recovery of the Peiraeus, but adding (following Habicht) that these negotiations were ultimately abortive.

³⁵ Paus. 1.26.3. Cf. Habicht, pp. 102–7.

³⁶ Cf. e.g. T. Leslie Shear, Jr., *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 17) (Princeton 1978), pp. 82–3.

³⁷ Umberto Bultrighini, 'Pausania 1, 26, 3 e la liberazione del Pireo', *RFIC* 112 (1984), 54–62.

with the Aitolians that prevented a war with Kassandros (1.26.3); there is no reason why Olympiodoros' accomplishments in recovering the Peiraieus should not also have been owed to his diplomatic, and not his military, skills.

Three separate pieces of evidence all point in the same direction, toward a recovery of the Peiraieus in the spring of 281 B.C.; none of the objections offered to this interpretation withstands careful probing. But there is also evidence which has been interpreted to show a Makedonian garrison persisting in the Peiraieus through the 270s; if this evidence has been correctly understood, it would be necessary to reconsider the texts just treated. In fact, however, as we shall see, this material stands up no better on close inspection.

(b) Evidence for a Makedonian garrison in the Peiraieus after 281 B.C.

There are three pieces of such evidence: (i) a letter of the philosopher Epikouros which shows that Mithres, finance minister of Lysimakhos, was held in the Peiraieus while Epikouros negotiated for his release; (ii) a passage in Diogenes Laertios which has been taken to indicate that one Hierokles was ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς in 273 or 272 B.C.; and (iii) Pausanias' and Apollodoros' reports of the terms of the Athenian capitulation in 261 B.C., which are silent about the introduction of a garrison into the Peiraieus, whereas they explicitly mention the new garrison in the Mouseion.³⁸ The quality of these texts varies, and we will consider each in turn.

(i) *The letter of Epikouros*. The case for dating the events of this letter to 280–277 B.C. was made by Gaetano de Sanctis, whom Habicht follows.³⁹ Gauthier, stressing the many uncertainties that plague this interpretation, has shown that the letter and the events it describes cannot be dated more closely than between 285/284 (the death of Demetrios Poliorketes) and the death of Epikouros' friend Metrodoros, who was involved in the negotiations for Mithres' release, in 277 B.C.⁴⁰ Indeed, Gauthier points out that, like Harpalos, Mithres would have appealed more to his captors if he still had some official relation to Lysimakhos than if he was taken only after Kouroupedion. And even if Mithres' flight, capture, and ransom are put after Lysimakhos' death, there would still be plenty of time between Kouroupedion (February 281) and Gauthier's date for the return of the Peiraieus to the Athenians (April 281) for the events of Epikouros' letter to have unfolded.⁴¹ By itself, then, Epikouros' letter is not sufficient to prove Makedonian control of the Peiraieus after April 281 B.C. More important is the evidence about the career of one Hierokles, to which we turn next.

(ii) *Hierokles ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς*.⁴² Diogenes Laertios' biography of the philosopher Menedemos of Eretria reports an interesting encounter between Menedemos and his

³⁸ Carlo Diano, *Lettere di Epicuro e dei suoi nuovamente o per la prima volta edite* (Florence, 1946), pp. 19–20, no. 14; Diog. Laer. 2.127; Paus. 3.6.6, Apollodoros, *FGrHist* 244 F 44. Cf. Habicht, pp. 99–100.

³⁹ Gaetano de Sanctis, 'Il dominio macedonico nel Pireo', *RFIC* 55 (1927), 480–500 at 491–500. Habicht, p. 99 with n. 28.

⁴⁰ Plut., *Mor.* 1097b and 1126e; Diog. Laer. 10.23 (death).

⁴¹ Gauthier 374–8, cf. Heinen 200.

⁴² The 'Hierokles the Karian' of Polyain. 5.17 who engineered the annihilation of an Athenian force that tried to retake the Mounykhia (certainly 287–281) has often been identified with the later Hierokles whom I treat here; cf. K. von Fritz, *RE* 15 (1932) Menedemos 9, 789–90; Osborne 193. For the relevance of Diogenes Laertios' biography of Arkesilaos to Hierokles' date, see the Appendix.

friend Hierokles, described as ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς. Evidently Menedemos had been visiting Athens, and when he left to go to the Amphiaraiion at Oropos, Hierokles accompanied him. Conversation turned to a plan to capture Eretria, Menedemos' home town, but instead of being enthusiastic the philosopher asked by way of reply why Hierokles let Antigonos bugger him (εἰς τί αὐτὸν [sc. Hierokles] Ἀντίγονος περαίνει).⁴³

This story makes it clear that Hierokles was in charge of the Peiraeus at the time on behalf of Antigonos Gonatas. The rest might have remained rather obscure but for another passage in Diogenes' life of Menedemos. On the authority of Hermippos, Diogenes relates that Menedemos was suspected of betraying Eretria to Antigonos Gonatas and exiled. He spent his exile in the Amphiaraiion until some golden vessels vanished; suspected again, he was expelled by common decree of the Boiotians. Sneaking back into his home town, he retrieved his wife and daughters and fled to Antigonos' court.⁴⁴ This information explains why Menedemos was going to the Amphiaraiion and why Hierokles would have expected Menedemos to be pleased at his report of Antigonos' plans to capture Eretria. Further, the combination of these two incidents in Menedemos' life provides a crucial piece of evidence for continued Antigonid control of the Peiraeus after 281 B.C.: Menedemos' exile has been generally dated to 273 B.C., so that his encounter with Hierokles, Antigonos' commander ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς, occurred in the late 270s.

Julius Beloch made the case for dating Menedemos' exile to 273 B.C. or a little later; his argument has been generally accepted.⁴⁵ Menedemos served as Eretrian hieromnemon to the Delphic Amphiktyonia in 274 B.C.; the following year one Aiskhylos occupied the office. Since Aiskhylos was one of Menedemos' political opponents, Beloch argued that a political 'revolution' at Eretria ousted the pro-Antigonid Menedemos. Hierokles' visit then must have occurred in the late 270s, presumably before Eretria came back under Makedonian influence (dated by W. W. Tarn to 270 B.C.).⁴⁶ Despite the general scholarly acceptance of Beloch's reconstruction of events, it is in fact subject to a number of objections, some of them fatal. Indeed, a more coherent interpretation of all the evidence removes this testimony for Antigonid control of the Peiraeus entirely by putting Menedemos' exile in the context of the Khremonidean War.⁴⁷

⁴³ Diog. Laer. 2.127. The text is now to be consulted in the new edition of Knoepfler. There has been some debate on the interpretation of the expression I have paraphrased as 'a plan to capture Eretria', Ἱεροκλέους δὲ [τοῦ] ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς συνανακάμπτοντος αὐτῷ (sc. Μενεδήμῳ) ἐν Ἀμφιαράου καὶ πολλὰ λέγοντος περὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως τῆς Ἐρετρίας. Tarn, p. 287 with n. 30 there interpreted it as 'an account of how Antigonos had taken the town' (cf. also Wallace, p. 34 n. 71); I follow instead Knoepfler, p. 175 n. 15, Habicht, pp. 99–100, G. de Sanctis, *RFIC* 55 (1927), 495, and Beloch, *RFIC* 54 (1926), 334–335.

⁴⁴ Diog. Laer. 2.142.

⁴⁵ Beloch iv² 2.464, 608, cf. *RFIC* 54 (1926), 334–5. G. de Sanctis, 'Il dominio macedonico nel Pireo', *RFIC* 55 (1927), 495; Flacelière, p. 193; Wallace, pp. 31–2; Picard, pp. 269–70; Habicht, pp. 99–100; Walbank in Hammond–Wallbank, pp. 270–1.

⁴⁶ *Corpus Inscr. de Delphes* ii.124.3 (274 B.C.) for Menedemos as hieromnemon; *FD* iii.2.205, line 5 (= *SIG*³ 416), *SEG* 32.856 for Aiskhylos (273 B.C.). Beloch, *RFIC* 54 (1926), 334–5. Tarn, pp. 286–7. On Aiskhylos son of Antandrides, see D. Knoepfler, *Gnomon* 60 (1988), 234; cf. Knoepfler, p. 197 n. 72.

⁴⁷ In all this I have been greatly helped by the new edition of Diogenes' life of Menedemos by Denis Knoepfler, *La vie de Ménédème d'Érétrie de Diogène Laërce. Une contribution à l'histoire et à la critique du texte des Vies des philosophes* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 21) (Basel, 1991). I had arrived at my views before I saw Knoepfler's book, and was gratified to find that we generally agree (though he does not usually present his arguments for his views here).

(α) Beloch tacitly assumed that, as political opponents, Menedemos and Aiskhylos could not have co-existed at Eretria. This is patently false. Aiskhylos and Menedemos certainly participated in Eretrian politics simultaneously for many years. Inscriptions dating from the late fourth or early third century down to 273 document Aiskhylos' career, and Menedemos served his home town throughout many of the same years.⁴⁸ Thus there is no reason to suppose that Aiskhylos' appointment as Eretrian hieromemnon to Delphi had necessarily entailed Menedemos' exile.

(β) Beloch's argument hides a vicious circle. The explanation for Menedemos' exile is a revolution in Eretria against Antigonos. (Pyrrhos' invasion and conquest of Makedon is said to have provided the occasion.) But Menedemos' exile in turn becomes the evidence for the revolution. Unlike at Khalkis, where Picard has been able to adduce some numismatic evidence for a temporary revolt around 277–273 B.C., no corroborating evidence exists for Eretria.⁴⁹

(γ) Arguing against a view that made Eretria an adherent of the Boiotian League in 287–275 B.C., Maurice Holleaux long ago pointed out the folly of Menedemos' seeking refuge at an Oropos under Boiotian control if Eretria belonged to the Boiotian league.⁵⁰ These arguments have similar force in 274/273 B.C. In Holleaux's words, Menedemos 'had been suspected of treason; to have come then to Oropos, a confederate territory, to seek refuge, he would have to have lost his mind.' Oropos in 274/273 was no longer 'confederate territory', but Eretria participated actively with the Boiotians in the Amphiktyonia governing Delphi. It is hard to believe that Menedemos would have been welcome in Boiotian territory, or, if he did settle there, that Eretria would not have lodged a protest against his residence. Yet Diogenes' text makes it quite clear that Menedemos' expulsion from Boiotia resulted from criminal, not political, suspicions.

(δ) The argument in (γ) implies further that Menedemos' residence in exile at Oropos ought to have fallen during a period when Eretria was no longer participating in the Amphiktyonia. There are two pieces of relevant evidence. The Delphic Amphiktyonic lists, though still incomplete and insecurely dated, show the Euboian seat in the hands of an Eretrian representative from the spring of 277 to the autumn of 272 B.C.⁵¹ In autumn 271 the seat fell to Amphikrates of Khalkis. Some confusion follows (see below), then in the spring of 268 Hektorides 'of the Euboians' held the position. After a lacuna in the evidence of four years, Histiaians suddenly appear. They hold the seat with only one vacant year from 264 to 255 B.C.⁵²

The Delphic lists do not give an ethnic for Hektorides,⁵³ but it seems to me certain that he should be identified with one of the Eretrians of the same name who appear in two contemporary Eretrian inscriptions.⁵⁴ The name, which is in general very rare,

⁴⁸ For Aiskhylos, see *IG* xii.9.192, line 2, *IG* Suppl. xii.550, line 1 and 555, line 54, *Arch. Delt.* 17 (1961–2) Mel., pp. 211–14, recently republished, cf. *SEG* 32.856, *FD* iii.2.205, lines 4–5; cf. Maurice Holleaux, *Etudes d'histoire et de philologie grecques*, i (Paris, 1968), pp. 44–6, and the studies of Knoepfler cited at n. 46. For Menedemos, *Diog. Laer.* 2.140–1.

⁴⁹ Picard, pp. 270–1.

⁵⁰ Maurice Holleaux, *Etudes d'histoire et de philologie grecques*, i (Paris, 1968), pp. 59–60.

⁵¹ On Eperastos, see below n. 55.

⁵² Picard, pp. 222–3.

⁵³ That *Ἐκτορίδου* and not *Ἐκτου* is the correct reading for *FD* iii.1.475.3 can no longer be doubted; cf. Picard, p. 223 n. 2. R. Flacelière's date for this inscription, autumn 267 B.C., is mistaken (p. 391 no. 12).

⁵⁴ Suggested by Beloch iv² 2.463 on the basis of *IG* xii.9.249B32 and the arguments of H. Pomtow, *Klio* 14 (1915), 294 and 17 (1921), 202. The other inscription is *IG* xii.9.245A159; see *LGPN* i (Oxford, 1987), s.v. *Ἐκτορίδης*. Since the name appears in one case as H. son of Hippostratos and in the other as H. father of Mnesias, these two Hektoridai may themselves be one man.

occurs nowhere else on Euboia. Its presence in Eretria strongly suggests that the Euboian representative in the Amphiktyonia for the spring of 268 B.C. was in fact an Eretrian too.⁵⁵

We now have Eretrians in the Delphic Amphiktyonia from 277 to 268. There is, however, a troubling discontinuity. The current versions of the lists assign Prokles of Histiaia to the spring of 269 B.C.⁵⁶ This date is not sure. It rests on the assignment of the undated list containing Prokles' name to the Delphic arkhon Thessalos, whom Georges Daux placed in 270/269 (?) B.C. Though both Flacelière and J. Bousquet favoured this association, there is no evidence for it.⁵⁷ As Denis Knoepfler has observed,⁵⁸ the lists make better sense if Prokles is assigned to some sitting between autumn 268 and autumn 265 B.C.

Regardless of the final disposition of Prokles, Eretria clearly continued to control the Euboian seat on the Amphiktyonia through autumn 272, and again in the spring of 268. If Menedemos was exiled in 274/273 as a result of a political defeat at the hands of his enemy Aiskhylos, who successfully accused him of plotting treason, it strains credibility to suppose either that that same Aiskhylos, now holding the Eretrian seat in the Amphiktyonia, would have tolerated Menedemos' residence at Oropos, or that Menedemos would have sought refuge there. Menedemos' friendly reception strongly suggests that, by the date of his exile, Eretria was no longer involved in the Amphiktyonia.

A second piece of evidence points in the same direction. Another Delphic document mentions Menedemos again at Delphi in 268/267 B.C. with his fellow citizen Theokritos. J. Bousquet has suggested that they acted, as former hieromnemones, as judges charged with deciding cases on behalf of the Amphiktyonia. Theokritos had been Eretrian hieromnemon in autumn 277 B.C.⁵⁹ It seems very unlikely that the Amphiktyonia would have appointed an exile accused of treason to a post of such responsibility, especially as Eretria was still participating in the Amphiktyonia. The same year saw the passage of an important Delphic decree honouring Menedemos in dignified terms.⁶⁰ Again, such honours would seem inappropriate for an infamous exile. The evidence suggests, then, that Menedemos was exiled not in 274/273 but after 268 B.C. We must admit that we do not know the exact circumstances, but it is possible to offer a plausible reconstruction.

Most scholars accept a general revolt of Greek cities from Antigonos as a result of Pyrrhos' invasion in 274 B.C. As already mentioned, Khalkis' coinage can be interpreted to show a break in 273 B.C. which has been taken as evidence of such a revolt.⁶¹ The sudden appearance of a Khalkidian hieromnemon at Delphi in 272 has also been cited as evidence for a break with Makedon.⁶² Recently F. W. Walbank has

⁵⁵ Flacelière, p. 193 n. 2 pronounced Beloch's view 'peu probable', but it is certainly no less 'probable' than the identification of the Eperastos called only *Εὐβοιέων* in *FD* iii.1.298, line 4, 473, line 6; 3.185, line 3, and 203, line 4 with the Eperastos son of Amphias *Ἐπερτειὺς* of *FD* 5.93 I.16, which Flacelière accepts without demur. *LGPN* i (Oxford, 1987), s.v. *Ἐπέρραστος*. Wallace, p. 30 n. 65 tried to argue this away as a 'mistake', but this is not convincing.

⁵⁶ Picard, p. 223. For autumn of the same year there was no Euboian representative at all.

⁵⁷ Georges Daux, *Chronologie Delphique* (Paris, 1943), p. 35, G10; Flacelière, p. 415; J. Bousquet, 'Nouvelles inscriptions de Delphes', *BCH* 62 (1938), 358–62.

⁵⁸ Apud Picard, p. 223 n. 1.

⁵⁹ *Corpus Inscr. de Delphes* ii.129B3. J. Bousquet, 'L'inscription sténographique de Delphes', *BCH* 80 (1956), 25 n. 2. This inscription had appeared already in 1920 as H. Pomtow, *Klio* 17 (1921), 190 no. 79a. Theokritos, *FD* iii.1.8, line 4 (= *SIG*³ 406).

⁶⁰ J. Bousquet, 'L'inscription sténographique de Delphes', *BCH* 80 (1956), 20–32.

⁶¹ Picard, pp. 174–5, 270; Walbank in Hammond–Walbank, pp. 267–76, esp. 270–2 on Euboia; generally, Will i².209–19.

⁶² Beloch iv².2.463–4; Wallace, pp. 22–4.

reiterated the point in a general way: 'after 277 states under Macedonian control, which were entitled to send *hieromnemes* to Delphi, did not normally do so'.⁶³ Picard has argued the opposite, that the dispatch of a hieromnemon did not necessarily mark a break with Makedon.⁶⁴

It is a mistake to impose a rigid rule. Khalkis and Eretria had different experiences with Makedon. Khalkis was garrisoned, and so under much tighter scrutiny than Eretria. That situation alone explains the absence of any Khalkidian hieromnemon between 277 and 272 B.C. As a defiance after a revolt in 273, the Khalkidians may have briefly reclaimed their right to provide a hieromnemon.⁶⁵ Suppression of the revolt would have terminated the claim.

Eretria had no garrison. Indeed, in Menedemos the city had a prominent figure who promoted a pro-Makedonian line; it seems likely that Eretria would have benefited from his long-standing friendship with the Antigonids. The city enjoyed considerable freedom of action, including the right to fill the Euboian seat in the Amphiktyonia. The decree Menedemos moved for Antigonos Gonatas after his victory over the Gauls clearly indicates that Eretria acted as an independent polity; Knoepfler is quite right to remark that it 'remained independent for more than another decade', i.e. from 278/277 to c. 265.⁶⁶ Khalkis and Eretria had long been rivals; is it too much to suppose that Antigonos exploited that rivalry by favouring the Eretrians?

Given these conditions, Eretria is more likely to have remained loyal to Antigonos than to have 'revolted' in 274/273. Circumstances changed within the next few years, however. Antigonos suppressed Khalkis and imposed tyrants in many Greek cities.⁶⁷ Perhaps Eretria came to fear similar treatment. There is a lacuna in Amphiktyonic lists for autumn 269, and for the spring if Prokles is moved down. The Eretrians returned in the spring of 268 (if Hektorides is correctly identified as an Eretrian), then silence. The next year saw the outbreak of the Khremonidean War. A recently published inscription attests to a cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos at Eretria; Knoepfler puts this document in the early years of the Khremonidean War, showing Eretrian adherence to the Ptolemies early in that conflict. Moreover, an unpublished decree of c. 260 B.C. reported by Knoepfler confirms the return of democracy to Eretria, and therefore strongly supports a recapture of Eretria by Gonatas c. 265 B.C.⁶⁸ This makes sense; if Eretria had revolted c. 268 B.C., Antigonos would surely have wanted his rear and lines of communication secure once the Khremonidean War began. Hierokles' remarks to Menedemos about plans to recapture the city will then have occurred between roughly 268 and 265, in the midst of the Khremonidean War, and Hierokles' tenure ἐπὶ τοῦ Περραιῶς need not have begun before the early years of that war.⁶⁹

(iii) *The conditions of Athenian capitulation in 261 B.C.* Two sources, Pausanias and Apollodoros, give terms under which the Athenians capitulated to Antigonos at the end of the Khremonidean War. Since neither mentions the imposition of a garrison

⁶³ Walbank in Hammond-Walbank, pp. 270–1. ⁶⁴ Picard, pp. 267–9, cf. 221–5.

⁶⁵ In the second century the Khalkidians sued before the Amphiktyonia for the right to fill the Euboian seat during Pythian years, cf. Picard, p. 224.

⁶⁶ Diog. Laer. 2.142; Knoepfler, p. 199 n. 79.

⁶⁷ Walbank in Hammond-Walbank, pp. 272–6.

⁶⁸ Karl Reber, *Antike Kunst* 33 (1990), 113–14; Knoepfler, p. 203 n. 90, cf. 175 n. 15.

⁶⁹ Picard, p. 270 declares it impossible to associate an Eretrian revolt with the war; but he refers for this to Heinz Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Historia Einzelschrift 20) (Wiesbaden, 1972), p. 132 n. 161, who in turn refers to Flacelière, p. 193, who bases his argument on the date of Menedemos' exile!

in the Peiraieus – which in fact persisted there until the 220s – Habicht has inferred that ‘the garrison in the Peiraieus last attested in 273 or 272 was still there in 262’.⁷⁰ But these two sources are of unequal weight. Pausanias was interested in Antigonos’ willing removal of the garrison in the Mouseion some years later; since the Peiraiean garrison certainly remained until the 220s, mention of it would have had no point in Pausanias’ narrative. Indeed, Pausanias says nothing about the other conditions. Apollodoros’ account is more complete, since he also reports the abolition of elective office and the concentration of bouleutic powers in one hand. But as we have only a fragment of Apollodoros’ text, it is difficult to evaluate his silence. We must bear in mind how pathetically little we actually know about the course of the Khremonidean War. I have already suggested that the recapture of Khalkis and Eretria by Antigonos occurred in the early phases of the war. A recapture of the Peiraieus would fit well in this context, and would certainly have been a preliminary to the siege of Athens.⁷¹ In that case, there would have been no need to impose a garrison in the Peiraieus at the end of the war, since it was already there, and no reason for Apollodoros to mention it.

None of the evidence for continued Makedonian control of the Peiraieus between 281 and 267 B.C. can withstand critical probing. The capture and ransoming of Mithres can, and probably does, belong before the spring of 281 B.C. Menedemos’ exile certainly fell after 268 B.C.; Hierokles’ tenure ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς, during which he met with Menedemos, therefore also belongs after 268 B.C. No strong case remains for continuous Makedonian presence in the Peiraieus in 281–268 B.C. While Gauthier’s thesis cannot be said thus to have been proven – as Heinz Heinen has shown, it too requires certain undemonstrated assumptions⁷² – the arguments he presents carry new weight in the absence of contrary evidence. Especially strong is his argument – plausible, not certain – that the Athenians would have been unlikely to promise the ex-arkhon Euthios additional honours ‘whenever the Peiraieus and the *asty* should be reunited’ unless they anticipated the event soon. The disappearance of such language, and of references generally to the recovery of the Peiraieus, after 281 B.C. strongly presupposes that this concern had ceased to pre-occupy the Athenians after that date. Despite Tréheux’s explanation for Nikias ὁ ὕστερος, Gauthier’s point still remains that the Athenians would have had to reconstitute the government after the recovery of the Peiraieus to accommodate the participation of citizens of Peiraiean demes.⁷³ I would therefore tentatively conclude that Gauthier is right: in April 281 B.C., by agreement with Antigonos’ representatives – perhaps the Antipatros mentioned in Epikouros’ letter who has sometimes been identified as the

⁷⁰ Paus. 3.6.6; Apollodoros, *FGrHist* 244 F 44. Habicht, p. 100.

⁷¹ Habicht’s view (pp. 108–12) that the Khremonidean War was caused in part by the Athenians’ desire to recover the Peiraieus depends on his argument that Antigonos held it continuously from 281 to 267 (see also Garland, pp. 51–2). That Patroklos, the Ptolemaic admiral, operated from bases near Sounion instead of the Peiraieus may have resulted from the fact that the Athenian port was in hostile hands when he arrived (cf. already Tarn, p. 298), but hardly proves that the Peiraieus had been continually under Makedonian control before the war. Cf. also the views of G. de Sanctis, *RFIC* 55 (1927), 497–8, who thinks that other considerations may have decided Patroklos to use bases outside Athens.

⁷² Cf. the review by Heinen 198–205 of Gauthier’s whole case.

⁷³ On the uncertainties of the identification, see Heinen 178–80, 200. Gauthier considered a compromise view that ‘au minimum, le commandant du Pirée accepte de se replier à Mounychie; plus probablement, lui et ses troupes conviennent d’évacuer complètement le Pirée’ (392). This compromise – that the Athenians recovered the Peiraieus but the Mounykhia remained under ‘friendly’ control of the Makedonian garrison – is possible, but there is no evidence to decide one way or the other.

garrison commander, successor to Herakleides⁷⁴ – the Athenians recovered the Peiraeus and re-established their government to reflect the return to active citizenship of many persons who had been excluded from participation for many years.⁷⁵

II. TENOS AND THE WAR AGAINST ANTIOKHOS III

A text from Tenos known from the beginning of this century commemorates the activities of a public doctor, Apollonios son of Hierokles of Miletos. His honours, voted both by the demos of the Tenians and the Nesiotic League, were long thought to have been occasioned by his selfless service during a 'great plague' also known from other islands.⁷⁶ Though Apollonios did indeed practice gratis for six months at a period when 'many sick people were coming into our city' (lines 9–14), a recent re-examination of the stone has shown that it also refers to service during warfare: *καινού περιεστηκότος νῦν κινδύνου* instead of *[λοιμοῦ] καινού περιεστηκότος ἐπικινδύνου* (lines 15–16, with R. Etienne's demonstration that this phrase must refer to warfare), and *περιστάντων δὲ καὶ πολεμῶν κατὰ κοινὸν τοὺς Νησιώτας* instead of *περιστάντων δὲ παθῶν (ἐν)δήμων*, etc. (lines 39–40).⁷⁷

Etienne associated Apollonios' services with the Third Makedonian War.⁷⁸ Christian Habicht, however, showed recently that the eponymous Rhodian priest Autokrates, whose date of office is crucial to establishing the date of Apollonios' decree, cannot have served so late; *IG* xii.5.824 belongs rather in 190 or 189 B.C., immediately after the war with Antiokhos III.⁷⁹

With its improved readings and more precise date, the inscription sheds important new light on the war with Antiokhos. Antiokhos' stopover on Tenos during his retreat from Greece to Asia was already known from *Livy* 36.21.1: 'Antiochus sub adventum consulis a Chalcide profectus Tenum primo tenuit, inde Ephesum transmisit'.⁸⁰ *Livy's* language, however, gave no hint of resistance. The inscription now proves that in fact the Tenians did resist and suffered casualties.

⁷⁴ Diano (above, n. 38), pp. 19–20, no. 19, lines 8, 9–10. Cf. G. de Sanctis, *RFIC* 55 (1927), 493; Gauthier 377.

⁷⁵ One argument of Osborne's (189–90) also points toward the recovery of the Peiraeus in 281. He notes the frequent honours for importers of grain in the 280s, and suggests that grain import had been rendered difficult by hostile control of the Peiraeus (cf. also Gauthier 370). But these problems vanish after c. 280: does that not imply that the cause of the troubles was over?

Osborne's main conclusion (194) is that the failed attempt to retake the Peiraeus fell in 281 B.C. But his evidence for this view is all negative, and some very unpersuasive. He is troubled, for instance, that no decrees of the Athenians or for Athens by foreigners mention the disaster (193–4, 194 n. 41). But who would want to remind Athenians of a recent and shameful disaster?

⁷⁶ *IG* xii.5.824. For the plague, see A. K. Orlandos, 'Δάνειον τῆς Πάρου ἐκ Κρήτης κατὰ τοὺς ἐλληνιστικοὺς χρόνους', in *Πεπραγμένα τοῦ Διεθνούς Κρητολογικῆ Συνεδρίου* (Athens, 1973), i.199–205 at 204–5 and S. V. Spyridakis, 'Paros, Allaria and the Cretan Koinon', *Ariadne* 1 (1982), 9–26 at 18–19. The notion that the Parian loans which Orlandos publishes were occasioned by the 'great plague' has been rightly questioned by Léopold Migeotte, *L'Emprunt public dans les cités grecques* (Québec–Paris, 1984), pp. 215–18 no. 62, at 218. On public doctors, see still Louis Cohn-Haft, *The Public Physicians of Ancient Greece* (Smith College Studies in History, 42) (Northampton, Mass., 1956).

⁷⁷ Etienne, pp. 120–3.

⁷⁸ Etienne, pp. 122–3 and 'La date du prêtre éponyme de Rhodes, Autocrates', in *Recherches sur les amphores grecques*, ed. J.-Y. Empereur and Yvon Garlan (*BCH* Suppl. xiii) (Paris, 1986), pp. 45–7.

⁷⁹ Christian Habicht, 'Der rhodische Eponym Autokrates (*IG* xii.5, 824)', *Chiron* 19 (1989), 273–7.

⁸⁰ For the necessary textual correction to 'Tenum' (Tenedum: MSS.), cf. John Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXIV–XXXVII* (Oxford, 1981), p. 251. No mention of Tenos in *App. Syr.* 20.

This resistance must have had important political consequences. Antiokhos had left Greece in late April from Khalkis in Euboia. He may either have sailed down Euripos, rounding the southern end of Euboia and heading east, or returned north to pass down the eastern side of the island. In either case, his route took him first past Andros. Anchoring there was, however, out of the question, since Andros, which had been awarded to Attalos II as a reward for his participation in the Second Makedonian War, was hostile territory.⁸¹ Tenos was the next island on his route. As a consequence of Rhodian help during the war with Philip V, the Rhodians had been permitted to exert new political control in the Cyclades. They revitalised the Nesiotic League, founded by Antigonos Monophthalmos in 314 but moribund since about the mid-third century, as their instrument of control. The headquarters of the new League were set on Tenos, which enjoyed something of a local renaissance as a result. Inscriptions attest to the presence of Rhodian sailors and troops on the island.⁸²

Rhodos, as is well known, had kept an edgy neutrality in the war between Antiokhos and Rome.⁸³ It was not until the summer that the island committed 25 ships which met the Roman fleet before Ephesos (Livy 36.45.5, cf. 43.4, where the Rhodian ships are anticipated). In late April or early May Antiokhos had no reason to expect a hostile reception on territory under Rhodian influence. We now know, however, that the appearance of his fleet led instead to bloodshed.

We do not know the immediate cause of the fighting on Tenos, and it would be futile to speculate. Two important inferences are justified, however. First, the inscription states explicitly (lines 39–40) that the war involved the Nesiotai, and not just Tenos. This may mean that citizens of other Cycladic islands were present on Tenos – perfectly understandable given Tenos' role as the headquarters of the League – or that Antiokhos had met resistance on other islands as well.⁸⁴ It is virtually certain in addition that Rhodian troops, or at least mercenaries in Rhodian pay, had engaged Antiokhos' forces. These events must have weighed strongly in the Rhodian decision to cast their lot in with the Romans – who, under D. Livius Salinator, commander of the Roman fleet, were at least indirectly responsible for the subsequent liberation of Tenos.

Whether or not limited to Tenos, the fighting there provides for the first time a clear explanation for the timing of the Rhodian decision to join the war actively against Antiokhos. The standard account seems to follow Maurice Holleaux, who argued that the Rhodians joined the Romans and Pergamenes because, with Antiokhos' defeat at Thermopylai and again at sea – after his passage through the Cyclades –

⁸¹ Will ii².207 (date of departure); Theophil Sauciuc, *Andros. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Topographie der Insel* (Sonderschrift des österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien, 8) (Wien, 1914), pp. 84–7.

⁸² Cf. most recently Etienne, pp. 101–24, 116 for the inscriptions.

⁸³ For some accounts, cf. Richard M. Berthold, *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age* (Ithaca–London, 1984), pp. 150–1; Sheila L. Ager, 'Rhodes: the Rise and Fall of a Neutral Diplomat', *Historia* 40 (1991), 25–6. Despite Antiokhos' negotiations, Hatto Schmitt dismisses the possibility that the Rhodians might have supported him in the war; *Rom und Rhodos* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 40) (Munich, 1957), pp. 74–80.

⁸⁴ These other islands would be neighbouring Cyclades, members of the League, which lay on Antiokhos' path: perhaps Syros, across the channel from Tenos, or Mykonos. Another possibility is Keos. If Antiokhos sailed down the Euripos from Khalkis, he might have tried to put in at Koresia (Arsinoe) at the northwestern corner of the island. A Keian inscription of about the same date honours a public doctor at Ioulis (*IG* xii.5.600). A recent re-examination of this document, which is unfortunately very abraded, suggests that the published text is not entirely correct. I hope to treat this soon in another context.

they foresaw his ultimate defeat and were already nourishing territorial ambitions on the mainland.⁸⁵ With differing emphasis, Holleaux's explanation has been accepted by H. Schmitt, H. Rawlings, R. Berthold and E. Gruen.⁸⁶ Appeals to Rhodian foresight and territorial ambitions – real though both may have been – are no longer necessary. Antiokhos presented a direct threat to Rhodian interests in the Aegean; fighting had occurred on Tenos, territory subject to the Rhodians, and Tenian blood had been shed; indeed, if Rhodian sailors had been present, Rhodian citizens may have been personally involved. If factions in Rhodes had been arguing over the expediency of declaring war against Antiokhos, the incident at Tenos will certainly have given a powerful impetus to war.⁸⁷

III. TENOS AND ANDROS IN THE EARLY SECOND CENTURY

Roland Etienne has remarked on the rarity of proxenies awarded on Tenos for citizens of neighbouring islands.⁸⁸ For the first half of the second century – the period of the revitalised Nesiotic League and Rhodian dominance – proxenies are known only for two citizens of Ioulis on Keos and two Andrians.⁸⁹ One of the two Keians,

⁸⁵ Maurice Holleaux, *Etudes d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques*, v (Paris, 1957), pp. 407–8.

⁸⁶ Hatto H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos*, p. 79, with however the qualification that there was never any doubt the Rhodians would choose Rome. Hunter R. Rawlings III, 'Antiochus the Great and Rhodes, 197–191 B.C.', *AJAH* 1 (1976), 21: 'It was not until the summer of 191 that Rhodes joined the Roman side... [a]fter Antiochus' ignominious defeat at Thermopylae and a naval defeat in Asia.' Berthold 151 (with further references at n. 12): 'It must now have seemed to Rhodes inevitable that the Romans would ultimately win, and rather than cling to a profitless neutrality, it determined to reap the various rewards available to a victorious participant.' Erich S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley, 1984), ii.545–6: 'Rhodes... beneficiary of the *modus vivendi* with Antiochus... would not automatically reckon him an enemy... Only after the battle of Thermopylae, when Antiochus retreated ignominiously from Greece, only after a Roman navy sailed into the Aegean, indeed after a victory at sea by Pergamene and Roman ships, did vessels sent by Rhodes join the allied forces against Antiochus.' Peter Green, *Alexander to Actium. The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Hellenistic Culture and Society, 1) (Berkeley, 1990), p. 420 and Sheila L. Ager, 'Rhodes: the Rise and Fall of a Neutral Diplomat', *Historia* 40 (1991), 25–6 sidestep the issue.

⁸⁷ This result also refutes Roland Etienne's contention (p. 119) that the Rhodians failed to respond to an attack on the islands; in fact, they acted with resolve and dispatch. The text of the decree of the Nesiotic League requires some correction. After a section praising Apollonios' skill and dedication (lines 34–6), it passes on to his activities during the war (lines 38–41). These activities are described in some detail in the following lines (lines 41–5). Everything from line 38 to line 45 refers to his behaviour during the war. The restorations at lines 44–5, which derive from Apollonios' treatment of the sick on Tenos, are not appropriate; instead, we should restore *τεθεράπευκε πολλοὺς τραυματίας* at line 44 and *περὶ πλέονος ποιούμενος τὴν [τῶν τραυματιῶν σωτηρίαν τοῦ ἰδίου συμφέροντος]* at line 45, expressions which are common in inscriptions honouring doctors for their services in war; cf. *AM* 72 (1957), 233, no. 64, lines 7–8, 29 (Samos); *I. Cret.* i Knossos 7.9, 16 (= J. Pouilloux, *Choix d'inscriptions grecques* [Paris, 1960] no. 14, 16).

⁸⁸ Etienne, pp. 182–3.

⁸⁹ *IG* xii.5.820, 825–6. Cf. Etienne, p. 179. The proxeny for Kharinos son of Kharinos (*IG* xii.5.821) can belong to the first half of the second century only on very specific conditions. Kharinos is explicitly called *Χαρίνου Χαρίνου Μινωήτην* (line 3). But Minoa was taken over by the Samians in the late third century; they controlled it down into the second century: cf. Georges Rougement, 'Amorgos colonie de Samos?', in *Les Cyclades. Matériaux pour une étude de géographie historique. Table ronde réunie à l'Université de Dijon les 11, 12 et 13 mars 1982*, Editions du Centre National de la Recherche scientifique (Paris, 1983), pp. 131–4, 236–9, with further references, and Louis Robert, 'Les Asklepieis de l'Archipel', *REG* 46 (1933), 423–42 at 437–42 (= *Op. Min. Sel.* i.549–68). The Naxians seem to have come to Arkesine in the second century, cf. *IG* xii.7.50. Thus if the decree really belongs to the second century, as the letter forms seems to suggest, then the Tenians are honouring an exile.

who were brothers, was similarly honoured as a doctor on Delos, and it is virtually certain, as Etienne remarks, that he and his brother were honoured in such a capacity on Tenos too.⁹⁰ The absence of other proxenies Etienne explains by supposing that 'ce genre de distinction [*sc.* proxenia] ne sanctionne pas essentiellement de pures relations de voisinage, et sert souvent des intérêts qui dépassent le cadre régionale'. For the Andrian proxenies it could be that 'political motivations had more weight than the desire to preserve good neighbourly relations'.⁹¹

Yet in the case of the Andrians, the explanation is perfectly clear. Andros had been awarded to Attalos II in 199 B.C. after its capture during the Second Makedonian War; Pergamon still held it in 133 B.C., when it was dealt with as part of the settlement of Attalos III's will.⁹² Thus Andros was really 'foreign territory' to the Tenians, who had to assure relations through the mechanism of the proxeny.⁹³

Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut

GARY REGER

APPENDIX: FURTHER EVIDENCE ON HIEROKLES ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς

The other evidence for Hierokles as commander of a garrison at the Peiraieus dates easily to the end of the Khremonidean War or afterwards. In Diogenes' biography of Arkesilaos the philosopher is described as φίλος τε ἦν μάλιστα Ἱεροκλεί τῷ τὴν Μουνυχίαν ἔχοντι καὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ· ἐν τε ταῖς ἐορταῖς κατῆι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκάστοτε (Diog. Laer. 4.39). The title 'Hierokles who has the Mounykhia and the Peiraieus' makes it very clear that Diogenes' source thought of him as in control of the Peiraieus as a whole, and not just of the fortress on the Mounykhia. In a second passage, Arkesilaos is said to have been 'friendly with Hierokles, for which he was blamed by some people' (οἰκείως πρὸς Ἱεροκλέα· ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ πρὸς τινων διεβάλλετο, 4.40). Their friendship must have persisted over some time, since Diogenes reports that Hierokles often tried, unsuccessfully, to persuade him to meet Antigonos.⁹⁴

Admittedly, Arkesilaos' activities in Athens are difficult to date. Since he died in 241/240 B.C., at the age of 75, and had come to Athens early enough to study with Theophrastos, who died in c. 288 B.C., these stories about his friendship with Hierokles could fit any time over a span of fifty years or more.⁹⁵ There is, however, one event apparently tied to Arkesilaos' relationship with Hierokles that may admit a closer dating. After Diogenes relates Hierokles' numerous unsuccessful attempts to get Arkesilaos to meet Antigonos, he adds: 'And after Antigonos' naval battle (ναυμαχίαν) he (*sc.* Arkesilaos) kept silent, though many people were going up to him (*sc.* Antigonos) and writing letters of request (ἐπιστόλια παρακλητικά).'⁹⁶ This naval battle must have been a victory for Antigonos, and only two such battles are likely:

⁹⁰ IG xi.4.693, cf. Etienne, pp. 179, 182.

⁹¹ Etienne, p. 182.

⁹² Theophil Sauciuc, *Andros. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Topographie der Insel* (Sonderschrift des österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien, 8) (Wien, 1914), pp. 84–8. Etienne notes this (p. 113) but fails to make the connection.

⁹³ I would like to thank the anonymous referee for this journal, whose comments materially improved this paper. Responsibility for any errors remaining rests of course with me.

⁹⁴ Cf. Diog. Laer. 4.39, Πολλῶν δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀντίγονον θεραπεύοντων καὶ ὁπότε (note especially) ἦκοι ἀπαντῶντων αὐτὸς (*sc.* Arkesilaos) ἡσύχαζε, μὴ βουλόμενος προεμπίπτειν εἰς γνῶσιν and καὶ δὴ καὶ πολλὰ ἐκείνου (*sc.* Hierakles) συμπεῖθοντος ὥστ' ἀσπᾶσθαι τὸν Ἀντίγονον, οὐκ ἐπείσθη, ἀλλ' ἕως πυλῶν ἐλθὼν ἀνέστρεψε.

⁹⁵ Diog. Laer. 4.45 (FGrHist 244 F 16 with Jacoby's comm.), 4.44; study with Theophrastos, Diog. Laer. 4.29. Cf. H. von Arnim, *RE* 2 (1896), s.v. Arkesilaos (19), 1164.

⁹⁶ Diog. Laer. 4.39.

those of Kos and Andros.⁹⁷ Kostas Buraselis has recently tried to argue that this naval battle should be identified as the battle of Kos and dated to 255 B.C.⁹⁸ While Buraselis' argument does not establish the date,⁹⁹ there can be no doubt that Kos is the battle referred to. In my view, Kos marked the end of the Khremonidean War. Antigonos' return to Athens must have followed that victory, and therefore the events narrated by Diogenes fall soon afterwards, say in 261 or 260 B.C. It is then to the years after the Khremonidean War, and not the 280s or 270s, that Arkesilaos' association (or rather refusal to associate) with Antigonos belongs.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ Cf. most recently Buraselis, pp. 119–51 for full discussion, sources, and earlier bibliography.

⁹⁸ Buraselis, pp. 149–51.

⁹⁹ Cf. G. Reger, 'The Date of the Battle of Kos', *AJAH*, forthcoming.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Denis Knoepfler, 'Tétradrachmes attiques et argent 'alexandrin' chez Diogène Laërce', *Mus. Hel.* 44 (1987), 241–2 n. 36, *contra* Habicht, p. 72. Arkesilaos incorporated Antigonos' naval victory into his lectures on mixtures (Plut. *Mor.* 1078c): *εἰ γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ κράσεις δι' ὅλων, τί κωλύει, τοῦ σκέλους ἀποκοπέντος καὶ κατασαπέντος καὶ ριφέντος εἰς τὴν θάλατταν καὶ διαχυθέντος, οὐ τὸν Ἀντιγόνοῦ μόνον στόλον διεκπλεῖν, ὥς ἔλεγεν Ἀρκεσίλαος*, etc.