

## ATHENS AND THE HELLENISTIC KINGS (338–261 B.C.): THE LANGUAGE OF THE DECREES<sup>1</sup>

It has been a widespread belief among historians of antiquity that Athens' importance on the political scene declined rapidly after 338, and especially after 322; Athens, so it is assumed, succumbed to the will of Alexander and, later on, of his Diadochoi. Of course, it cannot be denied that Athens found itself in a very precarious and sometimes impossible position. Yet the attitudes of Athens towards

<sup>1</sup> The paper has benefited greatly from the expert knowledge of Professor K. Buraselis. I am indebted to Professor M. H. Crawford for his continuous guidance; to Professor J. K. Davies (during the Classical Association Conference, St Andrews, April 1995), Professor P. J. Rhodes and Dr R. Thomas for their most valuable comments (during the oral examination of my Ph.D. thesis); to Professor S. V. Tracy and Mr A. J. Bayliss for saving me from errors; to Dr G. J. Oliver for our discussions; to Dr D. G. Shipley for his comments and encouragement; last, but not least, to the anonymous referee for his detailed criticism.

The following abbreviations are used:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Burstein, 'Bithys'                                   | S. M. Burstein, 'Bithys, son of Cleon from Lysimachia. A reconsideration of the date and significance of <i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 808</i> ', <i>CSCA</i> 12 (1979), 39–50. |
| Dinsmoor, <i>Archons</i>                             | W. B. Dinsmoor, <i>The Archons of Athens</i> (Cambridge, MA, 1931).  |
| Gauthier, <i>Bienfaiteurs</i>                        | P. Gauthier, <i>Les Cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs. BCH Suppl.</i> 12 (Athens, 1985).  |
| Habicht, <i>Gottmenschentum</i>                      | C. Habicht, <i>Gottmenschentum und griechische Stadt<sup>2</sup></i> (Munich, 1970).   |
| Habicht, <i>Untersuchungen</i>                       | <i>Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3 Jhd. v. Chr. Vestigia</i> 30 (Munich, 1979).  |
| Herman, 'Friends'                                    | G. Herman, 'The "friends" of the early Hellenistic rulers: servants or officials?', <i>Talanta</i> 12/13 (1980/81), 103–49.  |
| <i>FGrH</i>  | F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin and Leiden, 1923–57).  |
| Osborne  | M. J. Osborne, <i>Naturalization in Athens</i> , 4 vols (Brussels, 1981–3), see vol. I for inscriptions.   |
| Savalli-Lestrade, <i>Philoi</i>                      | I. Savalli-Lestrade, <i>Les Philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique</i> (Geneva, 1998).  |
| Shear, <i>Kallias</i>                                | T. L. Shear, <i>Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C. Hesp. Suppl.</i> 17 (Princeton, 1978).  |
| <i>Collections of inscriptions IG ii<sup>2</sup></i> | <i>Inscriptiones Graecae, Inscriptiones Atticae</i> , Editio Minor, II–III (Berlin, 1923–40).  |
| <i>SEG</i>   | <i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> (Leiden, 1923–).  |
| <i>ISE</i>   | L. Moretti, <i>Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche: testo, traduzione e commento</i> I. Biblioteca di studi superiori, 53 (Florence, 1967).                               |
| Schwenk  | C. Schwenk, <i>Athens in the Age of Alexander: The Dated Laws and Decrees of the 'Lykourgan Era' 338–322 B.C.</i> (Chicago, 1985).                                     |
| Tod  | M. N. Tod, <i>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions II</i> (Oxford, 1948).  |
| <i>Agora XVI</i>                                     | A. G. Woodhead, <i>The Athenian Agora</i> , vol. XVI: <i>Inscriptions: The Decrees</i> (Princeton, 1997).  |

All dates are B.C.

Scholars commonly prefer to take the end of the period to be 229, when the Athenians bribed the Macedonian garrison out of the Peiraieus, but I have taken the end of my examination to be 261, the end of the Chremonidean War, since it is after this war that Athens' status is defined as that of subject to Macedon; Athens' relationship with Antigonos Gonatas and the related evidence form a separate entity, demanding separate examination.

one king or the other, as well as its status, vary considerably until 261, the end of the Chremonidean War against Antigonos Gonatas, king of Macedon.<sup>2</sup>

Certain aspects of the Athenian relationship with the various monarchs are reflected in the decrees of the assembly, passed in honour of royal officials, as well as in the decrees conferring the highest honours (*proedria* of the games, *sitesis* in the *Prytaneion*, and a statue) upon Athenian citizens who belonged to a king's court. My purpose is to examine precisely the image that Athens projects through the above-mentioned decrees with regard to its relations with the various rulers and their officials; and these in relation to its perception of its own position on the military and political scene on different historical occasions. It will emerge that there was considerable development between one point of the period and the next.

In order to avoid unnecessary confusion, it is essential to lay down briefly the main events of Athenian history in the period 338–261. Generally speaking, Athens remained inactive until Alexander's death in 323; immediately afterwards it led the so-called Lamian War against the Macedonian regent Antipatros in which it was defeated.<sup>3</sup> As a result Antipatros installed a garrison on the Mounychia Hill and reduced the number of people entitled to citizenship rights. Antipatros' death in 319 was followed by a clash between his son Kassandros and Polyperchon, appointed regent by Antipatros, in which Athens got involved. In 317 Athens passed into Kassandros' hands, and he established Demetrios Phalereus as *ἐπιμελητής* (superintendent). In 307 Demetrios Poliorketes, son of Antigonos Monophthalmos, liberated Athens, and in the next four years they fought together against Kassandros. Nevertheless, in 301 Antigonos and Demetrios were defeated by the other Diadochoi at the battle of Ipsos, and the Athenians denied Demetrios access to Attika. Later on he took advantage of an internal conflict (the usurpation of power by the general Lachares)<sup>4</sup> and returned to Athens in 296/5; he installed a garrison and a government with oligarchic features (Plutarch, *Demetrios* 34). In the early summer of 287 Athens revolted with the aid of Ptolemy Soter, king of Egypt;<sup>5</sup> the *asty* was freed but Athens was in need of corn and money and consequently established regular contact especially with Egypt and also with Lysimachos. Athens, Sparta, and Ptolemy II Philadelphos formed an alliance in 268/7 and led the so-called Chremonidean War against Antigonos Gonatas (son of Demetrios Poliorketes), a war that resulted in the subjection of Athens in 261.

## 1. THE ATTITUDE AND THE ROLE OF THE KINGS

### *Philip and Alexander*

Literary testimonia inform us that Philip, Alexander, and the Diadochoi had been honoured by the Athenians but no honorific decrees for them have been preserved;

<sup>2</sup> The war broke out in 268/7 and ended in the spring of 261: H.-J. Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.: zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum Chremonideischen Krieg*. Hist. Einz. 20 (Wiesbaden, 1972), 95ff., 139–40, 180–9, 199–202.

<sup>3</sup> Diod. 17.111; 18.8–10, 14–17.

<sup>4</sup> *P.Oxy.* 17.2082; Pausanias 1.25.7. I follow Osborne's chronology of Lachares' regime; he dates its establishment before the death of Kassandros in 297 and its fall in Elaphebolion 295 (*Naturalization* II, 146–52).

<sup>5</sup> For the date of the revolt see M. J. Osborne, 'Kallias, Phaidros and the revolt of Athens in 287 B.C.', *ZPE* 35 (1979), 182–94.

thus, with regard to Athens' relations with the kings, we have to content ourselves with the impression we can gather from decrees for their officials (as well as from literary testimonia).<sup>6</sup>

After the battle of Chaironeia the Athenians awarded Philip citizenship as well as a statue.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, the decrees for people in his service are completely silent about the attitude of Philip towards Athens and vice versa.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, while literary evidence records that the Athenians gave Alexander citizenship (when he came to Athens to offer peace terms and to return the bones of the Athenian dead), little can be said about their attitude towards him (as reflected in the decrees);<sup>9</sup> whatever knowledge we have is derived from decrees dating long after Alexander's death.

It is interesting to compare the decree for Ainetos of Rhodes,<sup>10</sup> passed in 319/18, with the decree for Lykourgos, passed more than ten years later. In the first decree the fact that Ainetos fought nobly by the side of Alexander in Asia is one of the motivations for his honours, the other one being his previous relationship with Athens (lines 14–18). Osborne plausibly suggests that this decree must have been passed after the edict of Polyperchon had become known to Athens, proclaiming the restoration of the status quo, as it had been before 323;<sup>11</sup> furthermore, Ainetos would probably have fought by the side of Polyperchon in Asia. Thus the decree can be interpreted as a friendly gesture to the Macedonian regent, and the reference to Alexander's campaign becomes much more understandable. The implicitly favourable image of Alexander corresponds to the restoration of the constitution of the Greek cities, as it had been in his own and his father's time, and to the proclaimed re-establishment of peace.

Nevertheless, a different attitude of Athens towards Alexander is reflected in the decree for Lykourgos dating to 307/6, preserved in both a manuscript and an epigraphical version.<sup>12</sup> According to the manuscript Alexander aimed at ruling over all

<sup>6</sup> It is possible that the Athenians did not inscribe their decisions on stone but simply informed the kings of them.

<sup>7</sup> Plut. *Demosthenes* 22.3; Demades, *On the Twelve Years* 9; Pausanias 1.9.4 (statue). The erection of a statue for Philip marks a significant development in Athenian practice: only once in the past had a foreign king been awarded a statue (Evagoras of Salamis; see D. M. Lewis and R. S. Stroud, 'Athens honors King Evagoras of Salamis', *Hesp.* 48 [1979], 180–93).

<sup>8</sup> Decrees for people in the service of Philip and Alexander (proposed by Demades): Tod 180; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 240 + *SEG* 31.77; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 353; Osborne I, 21; for Euthykrates see Suidas, s.v. *Δημάδης*, and Hypereides, fr. 76 (*Against Demades for Illegal Proposals*). In addition, literary evidence records citizenship for Harpalos (treasurer of Alexander; Athenaios 586b) and probably for Antipatros as well (Hypereides, fr. 77); (probably) heroic honours for Hephaistion (Hypereides, *Funeral Speech* 21–2).

<sup>9</sup> Schol. Aristeides, *Panathenaikos* 178.16 (Dindorf); Justin 9.4.5. It is highly disputable whether the Athenians deified Alexander in 324/3; see Habicht, *Gottmenschen*, pp. 28–36; E. Badian, 'The deification of Alexander the Great', in H. J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honour of C. F. Edson* (Thessalonike, 1981), 27–71; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, 'The divinity of Alexander', in G. T. Griffith (ed.), *Alexander the Great: The Main Problems* (Cambridge, 1966), 179–204; G. L. Cawkwell, 'The deification of Alexander the Great', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History* (Oxford, 1994), 293–306.

<sup>10</sup> Osborne I, 29.

<sup>11</sup> Osborne II, 97.

<sup>12</sup> M. J. Osborne has associated *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 513 with *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 457 in 'Lykourgos again?', *ZPE* 42 (1981), 172–4. As a whole the manuscript version of the decree ([Plut.], *X. Orat. Vit.* 851f–852e) is more informative than the epigraphical version, but as regards Lykourgos' attitude towards Alexander, the latter is more detailed. The tradition represented by [Plutarch] has been doubted: A. N. Oikonomides argues that there are traces of a 'supra lineam' note ('The epigraphical tradition of the decree of Stratokles honoring "post mortem" the orator Lykourgos. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 457 and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 513', *AncW* 9 [1986], 51–4, at 54). However, these are minor interventions; where the manuscript

the Greeks after having established his authority over the whole of Asia ([Plut.] *X. Orat. Vit.* 852c–d). The epigraphical tradition lays additional emphasis on the fear felt by the Greeks and the threat imposed upon them (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 457.b.9–11).

The decree presents a rather unfavourable aspect of Athenian relations with Alexander on a specific historical occasion, namely the demand of Alexander to surrender certain orators, Lykourgos being one of them, whom he thought responsible for igniting the revolt of Thebes in 336/5; the Athenians refused to succumb to his demand. The stone presents their refusal as a result of their appreciation of Lykourgos' moral integrity and his continuous commitment to the salvation of the Greeks and to Athens' freedom (lines b.13–19). As Rosen has observed, these lines are indicative of the new relationship established between state/community and sovereign: it is obvious that Alexander has forcefully invaded Athenian political life.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, the author of the decree (Stratokles) takes pride in the fact that the Athenians steadfastly resisted Alexander's demand. The implications of such a statement are far-reaching: since Alexander's demand was part of his plan to rule over the Greeks, the refusal of the Athenians was translated into resisting this plan.<sup>14</sup>

The language of the Lykourgos decree is quite understandable in the context of Athens' liberation from Macedonian rule and the restoration of the democracy in 307. Macedonian plans were once again hindered, this time by the Antigonids; the Athenians felt free to take pride in their own resistance.

Even more than Alexander, it was Antipatros and what he did to Athens and to Greece as a whole that provoked bitter feelings. The reaffirmation of honours for Euphron of Sikyon in 318<sup>15</sup> is commonly viewed as a means for the (briefly) restored democracy to express its strong disapproval of the regime established by Antipatros. The defeat of Athens and its allies in the Lamian War is described by the phrase *συνέβη τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀτυχ[σ]ά[σθαι]* (line 53); its result was the enslavement of 'Ἑλλάς, not just of Athens (line 57). In the decree for Timosthenes of Karystos<sup>16</sup> the Lamian War is defined as a war undertaken by Athens against Antipatros, for the sake of Greek freedom (line 7; the name of Antipatros is restored but the stoichedon style of the decree renders the restoration fairly certain). We also note the preference for attack on a personal level rather than on a 'national' one.

Similar feelings against Antipatros are echoed in the decree for Demosthenes, passed in 280/79, a time of independence and democracy for Athens ([Plut.] *X. Orat. Vit.* 850f–851c); it is not so much that Demochares (the proposer of the decree) employs pejorative phraseology as that he places Demosthenes' death in the context of the manhunt that Antipatros had unleashed (851c). It is underlined that Demosthenes died, thus remaining in the *εὐνοία* of the people; he did not succumb to the will of the

tradition can be checked it can be shown to be in general agreement with the inscription (note also that a considerable part of *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 457 is lost).

<sup>13</sup> K. Rosen, 'Ehrendekrete, Biographie und Geschichtsschreibung. Zum Wandel der griechischen Polis im frühen Hellenismus', *Chiron* 17 (1987), 277–92, at 292.

<sup>14</sup> W. Will (*Athen und Alexander: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Stadt von 338 bis 322 v. Chr.* [Munich, 1983], 98–9) dismisses the decree of Stratokles as a late fourth-century forgery, aiming at creating a tradition of hostility towards Macedon. However, he offers no proof for this view; rather he discards this evidence because the image of Lykourgos resisting Alexander's plans does not fit the main (highly disputable) thesis of his book, according to which the whole programme of Lykourgos aimed at getting Athens into the new world empire created by Alexander.

<sup>15</sup> Osborne I, 38.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

enemies and did not behave in a manner unworthy of the *demos*; this time the emphasis is on the threat imposed upon the Athenian *demos* and not the Greeks as a whole.<sup>17</sup>

### *The Antigonids*

Antigonos Monophthalmos and his son Demetrios Poliorketes were treated in a unique manner by the Athenian *demos*. In return for the liberation of Athens in 307, the restoration of the democracy, and the repulse of Kassandros' siege in 304 a series of extravagant honours, including divine ones, was voted for them.<sup>18</sup>

As we shall see in more detail below, Antigonos, and even more so Demetrios, are ever present in the decrees passed for their officials. The motivation for the latter's honours is, most frequently, their connection with the kings and their favourable disposition towards them. On the rare occasions that we get more information the kings are presented as the saviours of Athens and the champions of Greek liberty or even of democracy, which is to a certain extent the result of Antigonos' propaganda for the restoration of freedom and autonomy to the Greek cities (Diod. 19.61). On the other hand, the Athenians of the time, given that Demetrios had liberated them from Kassandros and had restored democracy, would have viewed the proclamation of Antigonos as acceptable.

A decree unique in the phraseology employed for Demetrios is the one passed by the *ἐθελονταὶ ἐπίλεκτοι* (selected volunteer corps), probably in 303/2 (*ISE* 7.2), where the king is called *Μέγας*. The *ἐπίλεκτοι* urge the other Greek states to honour Demetrios with altars and stipulate that those responsible for the sacrifices on behalf of the king should also sacrifice to Demetrios the Saviour. The same decree provides us with far more details about Demetrios' campaign of liberation of the Greeks than any other decree (lines 2–11). There emerges the image of a glorious king who endures every danger, liberator and saviour of the Athenians as well as the Greeks: . . . ἐλευθέρωσε τὴν] χώραν τὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πλείστον Ἑλλήνων . . . κίνδυνον καὶ πόλιν αὐτὸς μὲν πάντα ὑπομένων (lines 3–7).

The *ἐπίλεκτοι*, who had fought by the side of Demetrios, were linked to him by a special bond and had actually become his *φίλοι*: τοὺς δὲ μετ' αὐ]τοῦ τιμῶν [Demetrios] καὶ περὶ πλείστον ποιούμενος τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν (lines 7–9). They were probably instrumental in the maintenance of his authority in Athens; this would go a long way towards justifying the laudatory phraseology. Our existing evidence indicates that after 304 Demetrios interfered openly and extensively in Athenian life, with the help of certain Athenian politicians.<sup>19</sup> It seems conceivable that, apart from their support, Demetrios would have also employed military help from within the Athenian citizen body.

Certain decrees passed long after Athens had been freed from Demetrios, naturally present significant differences from the decrees passed while he was in control: the Athenians drop altogether the title of the king in the decree for Philippides of Kephale (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 657.16–18), in the Kallias decree,<sup>20</sup> as well as in the decree for Strombichos,<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> The decree is quite vague as to the actual way in which Demosthenes died. In fact, the information provided by Plutarch in *Demosthenes* 30 is equally vague; he reports that Demochares, contrary to what other historians said, attributed his uncle's death to divine providence and not to poison.

<sup>18</sup> Plut. *Demetrios* 10.3–4, 12.1–2, 26.1; Diod. 20.46, 110.3.

<sup>19</sup> Actually, those who opposed Demetrios were driven into exile: Plut. *Demetrios* 24.

<sup>20</sup> Shear, *Kallias*, 16–17.

<sup>21</sup> Osborne I, 78.8.

in order to express the quarrel with Demetrios and his house. A different example of *deminutio maiestatis* is offered by the decree for Phaidros (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 682), although this occurred quite late, in 200; all lines referring to Demetrios were deliberately erased when the Antigonid descendant, Philip V, king of Macedon, invaded Attica; this was but one manifestation of a general measure against the Antigonids (*Livy* 31.44.4–6).<sup>22</sup>

### *Lysimachos and the Ptolemies*

The revolt of Athens in 287 took place within the wider framework of the hostilities between Ptolemy, Lysimachos, and Seleukos on the one hand, and Demetrios Poliorketes on the other.<sup>23</sup> Ptolemy Soter's military help during the revolt had been a major factor in Athens' liberation; his own contribution, as well as that of his son and successor Ptolemy II Philadelphos, in corn and money after the revolt was essential to the maintenance of Athens' freedom, as emerges from the Kallias decree. Lysimachos also provided Athens with corn and money after 287 ([*Plut.*] *X. Orat. Vit.* 851e). However, in sharp contrast to the extravagant honours voted for the Antigonids, the Athenians demonstrated a much more reserved and balanced attitude towards the other kings already after 301 and even more so after 287; the greatest honour offered to a king was a statue.<sup>24</sup>

Athenian attitudes of the 280s should be interpreted against the perspective of Athens' changed position on the international scene. The Athenians came into contact with all the Diadochoi and, above all, they shared a common goal: the annihilation of the Antigonid power. After the revolt, Athens' relationship with the kings was based on mutual need: it needed protection from Antigonos Gonatas (son and successor of Demetrios Poliorketes) and to recover the forts and the Peiraieus, while Lysimachos needed allies in Greece to prevent Antigonos Gonatas from supporting Pyrrhos, king of Epeiros, against him.<sup>25</sup> The bond with the Ptolemies was even stronger; their support for Athens should be seen in the light of their struggle against Antigonos Gonatas for domination over the Aegean.<sup>26</sup> More significantly, after 287 none of the Diadochoi was directly or deeply involved in Athenian civic affairs (as Demetrios had been) and no one was ever interested in making Athens his capital (as Demetrios had done). Athens emerged from the revolt of 287 free of external control, although the forts and the Peiraieus remained to be recovered.<sup>27</sup> The kings could now be regarded as combatants, even as allies, and as a source of corn and money.

<sup>22</sup> According to M. J. Osborne, an additional example might be provided by the decree for Neaios (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 553): Osborne II, 118–19 and 'The damnation of Neaios', *ZPE* 19 (1975), 143–58.

<sup>23</sup> The accession of Demetrios to the throne of Macedon and his ambitions in the Aegean and in Asia Minor alarmed the other Diadochoi and coalitions were formed against him; see *Plut. Demetrios* 44, *Pyrrhos* 11; Pausanias 1.10.2; Polyainos 4.12.2; Justin 16.2.1–2.

<sup>24</sup> After the battle of Ipsos Lysimachos offered Athens 10,000 medimnoi of wheat (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 657) and was honoured with an *aristeion* crown: see S. M. Burstein, '*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1485A and Athenian relations with Lysimachos', *ZPE* 31 (1978), 181–5. For Lysimachos' statue, see Pausanias 1.9.4; statues for Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II: 1.8.6; for Pyrrhos: 1.11.1; for Seleukos: 1.16.1.

<sup>25</sup> See Burstein, 'Bithys', 41, 47, n. 13; also C. Franco, 'Lisimaco e Atene', in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi ellenistici* (Pisa, 1990), 113–34; on Athens' relations with the Ptolemies, see Habicht, *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit* (Munich, 1994), 140–63.

<sup>26</sup> For the ambitions of the Antigonids and the Ptolemies in the Aegean and the long struggle between them, see K. 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* (Munich, 1982).

<sup>27</sup> It remains a crux whether Athens ever regained control of the Peiraieus and, if so, for how

The decrees dating after 287 reflect the significant role played by Lysimachos and the first two Ptolemies in Athenian life and their contribution to the survival of the polis as well as the change in Athens' attitude towards the kings and the different perception of their role in Athenian affairs. The authors of these decrees are interested in describing in more or less detail the actual circumstances of the benefaction. The kings assume importance because they offer substantial gifts and services; particularly in the decrees for 'officials' who were also Athenian citizens, the demos and the honorands attract a greater share of attention.

Lysimachos is a powerful presence in the decree for the Athenian poet Philippiades of Kephale (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 657) who spent quite a few years in the king's court and was able to provide considerable help to his polis. Lysimachos' word was the ultimate authority on which the people relied to honour Philippiades—he notified the Athenian ambassadors of Philippiades' deeds (lines 36–8). This, however, did not result in direct intervention in Athenian civic affairs, in the way Polyperchon's and Demetrios' letters asking for honours for their officials had done (see below).

The author of the decree persistently lays emphasis on Philippiades' soliciting gifts from Lysimachos (lines 10–28, 31–5). Thus, the demos does not fail to take pride in the achievements of a distinguished Athenian; of course, lurking behind Philippiades' activities is Lysimachos' benevolence.

It is noteworthy that the Athenians make no mention of Lysimachos' motives for his donations to Athens. In contrast, the decree for Kallias of Sphettos, who was an Athenian citizen and an official of Ptolemy, refers to the *εὐνοία* of Ptolemy I, in compliance with which Kallias acted during the Athenian revolt (lines 22–3). One has to bear in mind that the Kallias decree was voted in 270/69, shortly before the outbreak of the Chremonidean War, and after a long period of almost continuous contact between Athens and Egypt. Ptolemy I Soter and his son Ptolemy II Philadelphos are commonly referred to as the object of or in connection with various missions undertaken by Kallias, the results of which were important material benefits for Athens. The importance the Ptolemies had assumed in Athenian life is also indicated by the prolonged reference to the celebration of the Ptolemaia in honour of Ptolemy I and Kallias' participation in it (lines 55–62).

As to Kallias' role, it is worth underlining that the author of the decree describes at length the initial stages of Kallias' campaign in Attika, but we have to get to lines 22–3 to be informed that he was acting in compliance with Ptolemy's *εὐνοία* towards the demos. In this manner the proposer of the decree depicts the precarious situation in Attika at the time and, above all, Kallias' valour. Quite frequently Kallias' activities are associated with the best interests of Athens alone, for example during the peace negotiations of 286 (lines 32–9) or when he facilitated the efforts of the Athenian embassies at Halikarnassos (lines 71–4).

The decrees for Philippiades and Kallias illustrate the tension within the career of someone who was simultaneously an Athenian citizen and a *φίλος* of a king. On the one hand Philippiades and Kallias were attributed a central role in the events and were praised for their remarkable achievements for the sake of the polis; on the other, it was impossible to hide the fact that it was through their relationship with a foreign ruler that they benefited Athens and, moreover, that they also served the interests of the king. However, the fact remains that these decrees present the kings, especially the

long: Habicht believes that she did not (*Untersuchungen*, 98–107); *contra* G. Reger, 'Athens and Tenos in the early Hellenistic age', *CQ* n.s. 42 (1992), 365–83.

Ptolemies, as showing a great interest in Athens' fate. In effect Athens presents itself as an ally of Lysimachos and the Ptolemies against the Antigonids. This was an illusion, but nonetheless it is important that this is how Athens perceived its role.

In the decree of Chremonides (the decree of the Athenian alliance with Sparta which led to the Chremonidean War; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 687.17–19) Ptolemy II Philadelphos assumes the role of the liberator of the Greeks: *φανερὸς ἐστὶν σπουδάζων ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς τ[ῶν] Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας*. Fifteen lines of the text (14–28; almost half of it) describe Ptolemy's *προαίρεσις*, where he is presented as the moving force behind a series of alliances; their ultimate purpose is to achieve *ὁμόνοια* (lines 31–2).<sup>28</sup> The same role of liberator is applied retrospectively to Ptolemy's ancestors, i.e. to his father Ptolemy Soter. Indeed, as far as Athens was concerned, Ptolemy Soter had been a liberator (in 287/6).

### FROM *εὐνοια* TO ACTION: THE DEVELOPMENT IN THE ROLE OF OFFICIALS

#### *Eὐνοια towards the demos*

The decrees in honour of officials of Philip and Alexander are extremely brief, owing largely to the very nature of the services offered. The honorands had demonstrated their favourable disposition towards Athenians who arrived at the Macedonian court. We are in the dark as to the precise objectives of these missions, but it is plausible to suppose that they aimed at securing Macedon's goodwill; in other words, the help provided by these officials was diplomatic in character. Details of diplomatic overtures, by their very nature, would not be easy to write on stone.

The decrees confer upon the honorands either proxeny or citizenship; it would appear that the latter corresponded to the officials' rank in the court.<sup>29</sup> Both citizenship and proxeny had been traditional steps in the formation of Athenian foreign relations; a *proxenos*, however, more than an honorary citizen, was supposed to promote in his own city the interests of the polis or state that honoured him. By awarding proxeny to certain officials of Philip and Alexander the Athenians continued to employ an old political device, this time for a new objective: the security of Athens *vis-à-vis* the Macedonian monarchy. Apart from being a sign of the operation of tradition, the award of proxeny also indicates that the Athenians *preferred* to view these officials as first and foremost providing services to Athens; in other words, they

<sup>28</sup> A. Erskine has observed the influence of Stoic ideals on Chremonides' decree (*The Hellenistic Stoa. Political Thought and Action* [London, 1990], 92–5); there is also a fragment of the comic poet Alexis' *Hypobolimaos* where Ptolemy II, his wife Arsinoe, and *ὁμόνοια* are grouped together (T. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* III [Leipzig, 1880], fr. 244).

<sup>29</sup> Citizenship was given to Amyntor (Osborne I, 21), who in all probability was Hephaisstion's father (Osborne II, 86–7). Furthermore, Hypereides states that *Ἀντίπατρον καὶ Ἀλκίμαχον προξένους καὶ πολίτας ἐποιησάμεθα* (Hypereides, fr. 77 = Harpokration, s.v. *Ἀλκίμαχος*); the obvious difficulty with this passage is that no one was ever honoured by the Athenian demos simultaneously with both proxeny and citizenship. There have also been preserved the first clauses of a decree for Alkimachos, which offer no illuminating information as to the nature of the honours (Tod 180). Osborne offers two interpretations with a preference for the second one: either Hypereides is speaking loosely or the two honorands were first made *proxenoi* and subsequently citizens (Osborne III, 70–1). In any case, the attribution of citizenship to Antipatros would correspond to his high rank in the Macedonian court.



put them on the same level as people who had promoted their interests in the past. This attitude, if combined with the intensive military preparations between 338 and 323 could be taken to indicate that Athens had not accepted Macedonian supremacy as a definite fact.<sup>30</sup>

The common motivation for the honours is *εὐνοία* towards the Athenian demos, as had been the case with honorific decrees antedating 338; nothing is as yet said about *εὐνοία* towards the king (which becomes quite common later on). The demos still demonstrates a narrow political spectrum or even 'selfishness', one could say, and envisages the actions of the Macedonians solely from the perspective of its own benefit. Yet, there is evidence that things were not quite as the Athenians wanted to present them. Hypereides in his speech *Against Philippides* (5 col. 4) states that there was a necessity for the demos to vote honours for certain Macedonians, a necessity that he does not seem to question (he does challenge the proposal of Philippides to crown the *πρόεδροι* of the assembly who had proposed the honours). The same necessity is again recorded in Hypereides' *Funeral Speech* (21–2): *τοῖς τούτων οἰκέταις ὥσπερ ἥρωας τιμᾶν ἡμᾶς ἀναγκαζομένους*; Hypereides is hinting at the posthumous heroic honours conferred upon Hephaistion. Consequently, the factor of pressure or at least encouragement on the Macedonian part should also be taken into account, although it is impossible to establish the extent to which it was overt and the degree to which it determined Athenian policy. In this perspective the decrees could be seen as concealing reality, namely that the honours attributed might not be solely the result of Athenian initiative.

At the same time there is no visible sign of a servile attitude in the language of the decrees preserved. Nor is their number extraordinary: of the existing ten proxeny or citizenship decrees proposed by Demades (the main proposer of decrees for Macedonians), only four can be reasonably ascertained to concern people in the service of Macedon.<sup>31</sup>

After their defeat at the battle of Krannon in 322/1, and probably in the weeks immediately following it, the Athenians resolved to honour as many 'friends' of the king and Antipatros as possible, in an effort to secure their benevolence.<sup>32</sup> The speaker, Archedikos of Lamptraí, is thought to have been on good terms with Antipatros since he was *ἀναγραφεύς* in 320/19 (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 380–4), but this does not allow us to draw any conclusions as to whether Antipatros had ordered the attribution of honours to Macedonians or if Archedikos had inferred his wish. In any case, the Athenian resolution should be seen as the product of fear and as an effort to placate Antipatros' wrath.

See Gauthier, *Bienfaiteurs* 44, for the correspondence between status and honours: statue for the king, citizenship for the son and high-ranking officials, proxeny for the lesser officials.

<sup>30</sup> Lykourgos was elected to take charge of the preparations for war (probably a civic and not a military office); his other great programme concerned the reorganization of the *ephebeia*. From 332/1 to 326/5 Demades was concerned with the maintenance and improvement of the Athenian navy; see F. W. Mitchel, 'Lykourgan Athens', *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple* II (Cincinnati, 1973), 165–214; id., 'Demades of Paiania and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1493, 1494 and 1495', *TAPA* 93 (1962), 213–29.

<sup>31</sup> See above n. 8.

<sup>32</sup> S. V. Tracy, 'De Antipatro et Archedico Lamptrensi. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 402 + Agora I 4990', *Hesp.* 62 (1993), 249–51. For the date and the identification of the king with Philip Arridaios, see A. B. Bosworth, 'Perdiccas and the kings', *CQ* n.s. 43 (1993), 420–7; also E. Badian, 'A reply to Professor Hammond's article', *ZPE* 100 (1994), 388–90.

*Eὐνοια towards the Antigonids*

The period between 307 and 301 witnessed a unique proliferation of decrees (more than twenty-five) for Antigonid officials, proposed, for the most part, by Stratokles of Diomeia.<sup>33</sup> Their number and even their nature directly correspond to the extravagant honours conferred upon the Antigonids: quite a few Antigonid officials were given citizenship, three of them—Adeimantos, Oxythemis, and Vourichos—received cult honours;<sup>34</sup> another two received the highest honours (crown, *proedria*, *sitesis*, statue, and citizenship).<sup>35</sup>

Osborne rightly associates the high number of beneficiaries with actual Athenian gratitude for the liberation of Athens and the restoration of the democracy; given the fact of the ongoing struggle against Kassandros and Demetrios' continuous help, it should not be surprising that all these people were honoured by the demos.<sup>36</sup> One should add Stratokles' political will to establish as many connections as possible with Demetrios' court. Setting aside Stratokles' personal motives, the Athenian people must have fully acknowledged the importance of these 'middlemen' in their diplomatic relations. On the other hand, and especially for the period after 304, we could add factors such as the pressure on Demetrios' part, since this period also witnesses a deterioration in his relations with the polis and even his control over Athenian politics. That Demetrios had an acute interest in establishing his own officials in the framework of Athens as its citizens is amply demonstrated by the fact that he recommended two of his officials (Sotimos and Eupolis) by means of a letter to the assembly; as a result the Athenians awarded them citizenship (both decrees were passed on the same day).<sup>37</sup> Either Demetrios had directly requested citizenship for his officials or the Athenians inferred his wish (probably the former).

Most of the decrees proposed by Stratokles and others for officials of Demetrios are in a deplorably fragmentary state; in quite a few cases only the first or the final clauses have been preserved, which prevents us from acquiring precise knowledge of these men's services. However, some of the honorands had provided military aid during the Four Years' War against Kassandros, while it appears that a considerable number of them had offered diplomatic services.

In any case, the officials' *eὐνοια* towards Demetrios (and nearly always towards his father Antigonos) is almost invariably strongly emphasized, which marks a significant departure from the language employed for officials of Philip and Alexander. Various factors contributed to this change, apart from a tendency to flatter Demetrios: these honorands played a major part in the application of Demetrios' policies and they were infiltrating Athenian life, playing a very energetic role.

The favourable disposition of the officials towards Antigonos and Demetrios is usually mentioned before their goodwill towards Athens. The latter is often presented as a result of their being close (*διατρίβοντες*) to the kings.<sup>38</sup> The Athenians, then, were aware that the officials' benevolence towards them depended on Demetrios' benevo-

<sup>33</sup> See Appendix for a list of Antigonid officials honoured by the Athenians.

<sup>34</sup> Demochares, *FGrH* 75, F1.

<sup>35</sup> Asklepiades of Byzantion (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 555); Aristonikos of Karystos (Osborne I, 49); Herodoros (Osborne I, 68); the unknown honorand of *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 648 also received the highest honours.

<sup>36</sup> Osborne IV, 207.

<sup>37</sup> Eupolis: *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 486; Sotimos: *SEG* 36.164. Fifteen years earlier Sonikos and Eu- had most probably been awarded citizenship (Osborne I, 35) on the request, or rather order, of Polyperchon (again by means of a letter).

<sup>38</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 471.14–15, 492.17–19, 495.11–13, 498.11–14, 560.7–9, 562.3–5; Osborne I, 51.2.

lence. There emerges the image of an Athens continuously dependent on Demetrios' and his officials' goodwill.

'Being close' to Demetrios suggests that the officials accompanied him in his campaigns, in other words they were in Attica whenever he was, and quite a few of the decrees were passed at times when Demetrios was actually in Athens. Indeed, that they were in a position to provide diplomatic, let alone military aid, in most of our cases, presupposes their presence in Attica. It is noteworthy that quite a high number of the decrees was voted in 303/2, after Demetrios' return from his campaign to the Peloponnese and during the preparations for the re-establishment of the League of Corinth.

It is fairly certain that the honorands who provided military help to Athens commanded their own troops, which suggests that foreign troops were present in Attica for long periods of time. I do not claim that these forces were employed directly to intimidate the Athenians; actually, they were instrumental in Athens' salvation from Kassandros. Their mere presence, though, suggests control of Attica by Demetrios, however indirect. A recently discovered inscription from Rhamnous,<sup>39</sup> referring to an Adeimantos (an Athenian?, of Lampsakos?), appointed general of the countryside by Demetrios, supports the notion of Demetrios' controlling Attica.

The commonest form describing the status and the activities of the Antigonid officials is *διατρέβων λέγων καὶ πράττων τὰ ἄριστα*;<sup>40</sup> in most of our cases no specific services are recorded. We cannot tell whether the Athenians anticipated help not yet provided by the honorands or whether they had offered diplomatic services, which by their very delicate and intricate nature could not be expressed with precision.

However, the decrees for officials tend to be much more detailed when they concern people who offered substantial *military* help to Athens;<sup>41</sup> apparently, the Athenians employed detailed description of one's activities as a means of expressing their gratitude but also when there was something tangible to be recorded. These decrees concern occasions when Athens' existence was the issue and, furthermore, Athenian soldiers presumably had an active role on these occasions. Therefore, the *demos'* interests are more strongly felt.

The military help provided to Athens by the officials is usually set in the wider context of the liberation of the Greeks from Kassandros. Furthermore, on a couple of occasions *ἐλευθερία* is coupled with *δημοκρατία*, but it is not specifically the *δημοκρατία* of the Athenians.<sup>42</sup> Employing compound words starting with the preposition *σύν*, the authors of the decrees stress that the struggle for the democracy was a cause shared by the Athenians, the Antigonids, and their officials; the Antigonid propaganda of freedom and autonomy for the Greeks is echoed here.

### *From proxeny to citizenship*

Although quite a few of the preserved decrees for Demetrios' officials are either incomplete or heavily mutilated, thus preventing us from knowing the kind of

<sup>39</sup> *Ergon* 40 (1993), 7 (*non vidī*).

<sup>40</sup> On the regular use of the *διατρέβων* form see Savalli-Lestrade, *Philoi*, 260.

<sup>41</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 492, 498, 553, 555, 558; 559 + 568 + add. p. 662.7–10; Osborne I, 51; *SEG* 16.58; *ISE* 9.

<sup>42</sup> *SEG* 36.164: εὐνοῦν εἰς τὰ τῶν βασιλέων πράγματα καὶ τὴν τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ἐλευθερίαν καὶ [συναγ]ωνιστὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς δημοκρατίας (lines 12–15). Osborne I, 51.4: τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς δη[μοκ]ρατίας συστ[ρα]τευομένων; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 559 + 568 + add. 662.8–10: συνηγωνίζετο ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ τῆς δημοκρατίας; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 561.12–14 + *SEG* 31.80.

honours attributed, I believe it is not accidental that none of them rewards the officials with proxeny; instead we find citizenship, a higher honour.<sup>43</sup>

Attribution of citizenship corresponds to the pre-eminence of the king and his officials in the life of the polis. Furthermore, their 'being close' to the king suggests that these officials were of high rank; attribution of citizenship then corresponds to their status as well. It is not easy to establish the extent to which bestowal of citizenship was a choice of the polis or whether it was a result of the king's wishes and initiative. I believe that the truth lies somewhere in the middle. It was a situation that suited both sides. On the one hand, Demetrios had an acute interest in establishing his officials in the framework of the polis; the way in which honours were conferred upon Eupolis and Sotimos testify to this. On a theoretical level citizenship for royal officials created an image of integration. On a practical level these honorary Athenian citizens were present in Athens either occasionally or for longer periods of time, and thus could take advantage of the practical aspects of citizenship, like the right of access to the assembly;<sup>44</sup> thus, they would transmit Demetrios' will to the demos, even when he was away from Athens. On the other hand, it was in Athens' interest to acquire as many connections in the king's court as possible; and the way to do this was to award citizenship, thus pleasing or even flattering the officials more.

A *proxenos* was supposed to promote the interests of the polis that had awarded him the title in his own state. But most, if not all, of these officials had ceased to be active citizens of their own state; they were moving around promoting Demetrios' interests. Their place of birth was no longer important (but it did matter in the cases of Kallias and Philippides who were Athenian citizens as well as members of a king's entourage); it was *who* they were that mattered. Secondly, what were the odds that the officials of Demetrios, or any other king, would promote Athenian interests unless they coincided with those of the king? The Athenians, then, became aware of the fact that these officials were interested in Athens' fate only as long as it was linked to that of their king and that proxeny would not serve their purposes. Instead, they opted for an honour that was highly valued by the honorands themselves, thus expressing, indirectly, their favourable disposition towards Demetrios as well. In this manner they established the right connections that would help them transmit their problems to Demetrios and even contribute to their solution.

#### *The pragmatic character of the decrees in the 280s*

In the 280s the number of the honorific decrees voted for royal officials was drastically reduced, which is in itself quite illuminating; all in all, four decrees have been preserved, three of them conferring citizenship upon royal officials.<sup>45</sup> The significance of this small number is twofold: on the one hand it indicates that the number of royal officials contacting Athens was considerably smaller than before, but it also

<sup>43</sup> Osborne (IV, 208) observes that 'from ca. 321/0 onwards there are almost no attested cases of the proxy being granted without the accompaniment of some further privilege(s)'. The policy of the Athenian demos in this period has to be distinguished from the general trend in the Hellenistic world towards a massive increase in the number of *proxenoi*; for the political function of proxeny, see C. Marek, *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt, Bern, and New York, 1984), 333–57, 387.

<sup>44</sup> See Gauthier, *Bienfaiteurs*, 150–2 on the double value of citizenship (practical and/or honorific) as well as on the importance attached to it by the beneficiaries.

<sup>45</sup> One more was probably voted for Sostratos, the Ptolemaic representative in the peace negotiations of 286. It is disputable whether the decree and the statue in honour of Philokles were also voted in the immediate aftermath of the revolt or at the end of the 280s; see Shear, *Kallias*, 33–4 and n. 79.

implies that the Athenians had become very selective as to whom they would honour. As to the nature of the honours, it should be noted that they correspond to the high status of the honorands; actually the Ptolemaic official Philokles, who was also king of the Sidonians, was also awarded a statue (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 3425) (we do not know what kind of honours were bestowed upon the Ptolemaic official Zenon). In the case of these officials, citizenship is honorific in nature; there was no case of them taking practical advantage of it since they were living far away from Athens.

In the 280s the officials' relationship with a king gives prominence to what the officials actually did for Athens in very specific instances.<sup>46</sup> The decrees describe primarily specific services of the honorands, not vaguely and solely their 'being close' to the king. The honorands of the 280s did not infiltrate Athenian life in the way the officials of Demetrios had, in the sense that either they were present very briefly during the revolt of 287 and its aftermath, or they operated and exercised their influence far away from Athens, as in fact did their kings.

The first part of the decree in honour of Bithys of Lysimacheia (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 808) is lost to us; therefore we cannot know whether it contained any reference to his relationship with Lysimachos.<sup>47</sup> We are informed, though, of his favourable disposition towards the Athenians (lines 10–11). The most interesting information offered is that Bithys' last activity in Attica involved assignment of soldiers to squadrons, which actually forms the only evidence for Lysimachos' military help to Athens.<sup>48</sup>

In the decree for Artemidoros of Perinthos, instead of the *διατρίβων* term we find a more elaborate formula which emphasizes that he is a friend and in the confidence of Lysimachos: *ἐμπίσται καὶ φιλῖται ὧν* (*SEG* 16.62.6–7).<sup>49</sup> Artemidoros was sent as an ambassador to Athens, apparently more than once; after his return, he promoted the interests of the Athenian demos when Athenian embassies arrived at Lysimachos' court (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 663.3–13). No information is given, though, as to the precise objective of this series of missions. It is quite possible, however, that the issue at stake was the restoration of Lemnos and Imbros to Athens, which Lysimachos did not in the end grant.<sup>50</sup> Given the delicate nature of these transactions and that, apparently, they had not reached a conclusion, it is not surprising that they are recorded pretty vaguely.

The language of the decree for the Ptolemaic official Zenon is quite different. Nothing is mentioned about his relationship with Ptolemy, which is understandable if we bear in mind that confidence between the king and Artemidoros was instrumental for the negotiations concerning Lemnos and Imbros, whereas contact between Athens

<sup>46</sup> *Εὐνοία* towards the demos alone does appear in the decree for Philokles (Osborne I, 77), but the greatest part of the stone is lost and we cannot know whether there was any reference to his relationship with Ptolemy.

<sup>47</sup> For the identification of Bithys and the date of the decree, see Burstein, 'Bithys'; A. S. Henry, 'Bithys, son of Kleon of Lysimacheia: formal dating criteria and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 808', in E. M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens, Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford, 1990), 179–89; M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Une Donation du roi Lysimaque*. Meletemata 5 (Athens, 1988), 18–21, 38–9.

<sup>48</sup> Burstein, 'Bithys', 45–6.

<sup>49</sup> This formula is attested in the third and second centuries B.C. As regards Athenian decrees it is also attested in the decree for Herodoros, official of Demetrios Poliorketes (Osborne I, 68); see Savalli-Lestrade, *Philoi*, 261.

<sup>50</sup> Habicht, *Untersuchungen*, 80; cf. Osborne (II, 156–7) who has argued that the Athenian embassies referred to in the decree should be identified with those undertaken by Demochares. This seems possible, but it seems to me quite puzzling that the decree does not mention the outcome of these missions—the gifts of corn and money—while other decrees are quite explicit about this problem.

and Zenon was limited and a result of specific orders from Ptolemy. Zenon was honoured largely because he was responsible for the delivery of either imported or local grain and, on a secondary level, because of his help towards various Athenians he encountered.<sup>51</sup> We do find the formula *εὖνους ὦν*, but this concerns strictly Zenon's attitude towards the Athenian people (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 650.12). His efforts are directed towards Athens' best interest alone: *λέγων καὶ πράττων ἀγαθὰν ὃ, τι [δύναται ὑπὲρ τῆς] πόλεως* (lines 15–16).

When considering the differences in language between the two decrees examined above, one should also take into account the difference in rank between Artemidoros and Zenon: the former was a high-ranking official, whereas the latter was simply a commander of mercenary forces, subordinate of the nesiarch Bakhon, who in turn was a subordinate of Philokles.<sup>52</sup> A secondary official like Zenon could not be in the confidence of the king.

In contrast to the image presented in the decrees for officials of Demetrios, after 287 and as a result of pride at the restoration of freedom in 286, in the Zenon decree it is underlined that the *demos* had taken an active part in events, instead of being an object of benefaction. The means of expressing this participation is the use of a compound participle starting with the preposition *σύν*; it is thus stressed that foreign help and Athenian effort contributed to an equal degree to Athens' salvation: *συναγωνιζόμενος τῇ τοῦ δῆμου σωτηρίᾳ* (lines 16–17).<sup>53</sup>

#### *Attitudes towards the φίλοι*

The *φίλοι* of the kings formed an 'entité sociologique et institutionnelle' of which the Greek *poleis* were well aware, since it had been developing at least from the time of Philip II.<sup>54</sup> Consequently, with regard to officials who came into contact with them, the *poleis* were also aware of their specific offices. Yet, the vast majority of the decrees discussed above do not record the precise office held by a royal official, an omission scarcely accidental; instead, they persistently describe his status in terms of his personal relationship with the king. Savalli-Lestrade's analysis of titulature reveals the complex mentality hidden behind the employment of general terms such as *διατρίβων* or *φίλος* in Athenian (and other) decrees.<sup>55</sup> First of all, these vague terms were regularly employed in decrees of all the free Greek *poleis*, whereas specific titles were regularly employed in decrees of subject *poleis*.<sup>56</sup> The free Greek *poleis*, by emphasizing the personal relationship of the honorand with the king, enhanced the

<sup>51</sup> Shear, *Kallias*, 21, 63, 69; in lines 17–18 Shear restores *ἐπιμελεῖται δὲ [τῆς συνκομιδῆς τοῦ] σίτου τῷ δήμῳ ὅπως ἂν ἀσφαλέστατα εἰσκομίζεται*, whereas Habicht restores *διὰ* instead of *εἰς* in line 18 (*Untersuchungen*, 48–50).

<sup>52</sup> Shear, *Kallias*, 23, 67–9, 74 on Zenon. On the hierarchy of Ptolemaic officials, see I. L. Merker, 'The Ptolemaic officials and the League of the Islanders', *Historia* 19 (1970), 141–60, at 148–51. Many scholars believe that Philokles' title was 'nauarch'; contra H. Hauben, 'Philocles, King of the Sidonians and General of the Ptolemies', *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 22 (1987), 413–27.

<sup>53</sup> The collective character of the effort for Athens' salvation in 287 is again underlined in the decree for the mercenary leader Strombichos (Osborne I, 78) some twenty years after the revolt: Strombichos was *συναίτιος* and *συνεπολιόρκει* the Mouseion Hill (lines 13–14).

<sup>54</sup> Savalli-Lestrade, *Philoi*, 275; on the institution under the Argead dynasty, see *ibid.*, 291–307; on the *συνέδριον* of the *φίλοι*, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings I*, *Meletemata* 22 (Athens, 1996), 287–9, 323–36.

<sup>55</sup> Savalli-Lestrade, *Philoi*, 251–354.

<sup>56</sup> See above n. 40.

honorand's prestige instead of confining him to the limits of a particular office.<sup>57</sup> Another factor operating in the employment of terms of personal relationship was that *φιλία* had always been a 'key-notion' in the political life of the *poleis*; thus, by emphasizing the *φιλία* of an official with a king, the *poleis* assigned him to a recognizable political category.<sup>58</sup>

From a practical point of view, a *φίλος* could have all sorts of responsibilities; therefore, the authors of the decrees preferred to employ an all-encompassing terminology.<sup>59</sup> As we have seen, the officials occasionally provided military help, but in quite a few cases, their help was diplomatic in nature; in this case, in particular, specific office would not matter in the eyes of the Athenians, or rather it would matter less than their personal relationship with the king.

I would add another parameter: Herman has observed that the term *φίλος* can bear either a formal or an informal sense and it is not always easy to tell which sense is implied in each case. The first sense 'implies informality, symmetry and equality between the partners involved', whereas '*philos* as a rank or title implies an institutionalised, asymmetrical and therefore hierarchical relationship'; furthermore, *φίλοι* '... from the viewpoint of the Greek cities were a visible sign of monarchical rule'.<sup>60</sup> I would think that the Athenians were quite conscious of the hierarchical type of relationship and consequently were aware that the officials were acting on the king's orders, but they preferred to forget about it and emphasize the first sense of the word. By recording on the stone that someone 'was close to a king' or that he was his *φίλος*, the Athenians maintained an image of free benevolence towards Athens and kept hidden the fact that the officials were acting upon orders; in other words, that favourable disposition might not be the motivation. In this manner, it would also be easier for the Athenian demos to incorporate certain *φίλοι* in their citizen body.

Occasionally, the Athenians preferred to describe the official's activities in some detail but without referring to the actual capacity in which he acted. Savalli-Lestrade pointed out that decrees are consistently imprecise.<sup>61</sup> However, I would like to draw attention to the exceptional case of Adeimantos of Lampsakos. The decree in his honour, dating (probably) to 302/1, marks one of the very rare occasions on which the precise title of an official is recorded.<sup>62</sup> Adeimantos is explicitly referred to as appointed to some office or capacity in the *συνέδριον* of the League of Corinth, prob-

<sup>57</sup> Savalli-Lestrade, *Philoi*, 277–9; Savalli-Lestrade's argument is directed against the argument of G. Herman who thought that inscriptions systematically avoid recording precise offices because the Greek cities held a pejorative view of the officials' position ('Friends', 103–49).

<sup>58</sup> Savalli-Lestrade, *Philoi*, 336–44.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 263.

<sup>60</sup> Herman, 'Friends', 111, 117.

<sup>61</sup> According to Savalli-Lestrade, there is no marked change in the use of titulature after 280 (*Philoi*, 275), contrary to what Herman thought ('Friends', 124–6).

<sup>62</sup> In a recently discovered decree for a certain Medon and his father (dating to 304), A. P. Matthaiou restores in lines 14–15: *Μέδων στρατηγῶν* (*Horos* 4 [1986], 19–23); the '*στρατηγῶν*' is a description of the activities pertaining to an office, not the actual office. On the other hand, P. Gauthier (*REG* 101 [1988], 363–4, no. 430) restores *στρατευόμενος* which is equally or even more plausible, given the fact that it is not recorded below in which capacity Medon has been dispatched *now* (at least not in the preserved part of the stone).

In *SEG* 31.80 (dating from the same period) Philippos and Iolaos are referred to as *σωματοφύλακες* of Alexander. No evidence has survived, though, of the actual office they held at the time the decree was passed; on the identification of the 'Alexander' in the decree. see S. M. Burstein, '*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 561 and the court of Alexander IV', *ZPE* 24 (1977), 223–5; C. Habicht, 'Literarische und epigraphische Überlieferung zur Geschichte Alexanders und seiner ersten Nachfolger', in *Akten des VI. Intern. Kongr. für griech. und latein. Epigraphik* (Munich, 1973), 367–77; W. Heckel, '*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 561 and the status of Alexander IV', *ZPE* 40 (1980), 249–50.

ably that of *πρόεδρος* (*ISE* 9.7).<sup>63</sup> This office was, in every respect, a very honourable one: the leaders of the *συνέδριον* acted according to the best interest of the kings, the Athenians, and the other allies, and aimed at protecting Athens and the allies against aggression (lines 7–17).<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, scholars have long since recognized that Adeimantos was perhaps the most influential person in the League after Demetrios himself.

The second exception in the use of titulature by the Athenians is marked by the case of Zenon. It is clearly recorded in the decree (lines 11–12) that he was appointed *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀφράκτων*. Although descriptive, it is, nonetheless, a clear reference to Zenon's office. Various factors could have brought about this exception. One of them could be that through Zenon's agency (and others') Athens had been saved from starvation. On the other hand, it has to be observed that the Athenians were not consistent: the contemporary decree for the official of Lysimachos Artemidoros does not record his precise title or office. In my view, the inconsistency should be attributed to the context in which services were provided: that Zenon offered his help was a direct result of his specific appointment, whereas Artemidoros had provided help through his personal relationship with Lysimachos.<sup>65</sup> One should not forget that, later, Kallias' precise office was not recorded either, perhaps because he was regarded more as an Athenian citizen providing services to his polis than as an official of a king.

On the basis of the above, the various images of foreign relations, as they emerge from the decrees for royal officials, can be schematically arranged as follows: from 338 to 322, the Athenian demos is the central concern of the decrees, while the Macedonian kings are not mentioned. The situation changes dramatically in the period of Demetrios Poliorketes: the Antigonid kings are dominant while the demos' interests form part of, or are even subordinate to, the plans of the kings. Quite frequently, the motivation for the honours is first and foremost the officials' relationship to the kings. In response to the balanced distribution of honours to the various kings after 301, and especially after 287, the decrees employ a language which reflects the different status and attitude of Athens. The presence of the kings is always strongly felt but by now the demos' interests receive an equal or even greater share of attention; moreover, it is for very pragmatic reasons that the beneficiaries receive their honours.

### 3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We should not view the decrees as straightforwardly reflecting reality; rather they should be taken to demonstrate how the Athenians *viewed* their relations with the

<sup>63</sup> I. Calabi Limentani argued that Adeimantos' office was that of the *στρατηγός* of the League who was the second-in-command after Demetrios ('I proedroi nella lega di Corinto e la carica di Adimanto di Lampsaco', *Athenaeum* n.s. 28 [1950], 55–66, at 63–5). Objecting to this, G. Daux restores either *πρόεδρος* or, alternatively, *σύνεδρος* ('Adeimantos de Lampsaque et le renouvellement de la ligue de Corinthe par Démétrios Poliorcète', *AEph* [1953–4], I, 245–54). C. Habicht is also uncertain as to whether Adeimantos was a *στρατηγός* or *πρόεδρος* (*Gottmenschentum*, 56, n. 4).

For the importance of Adeimantos, see L. Robert, 'Adeimantos et la Ligue de Corinthe', *Hellenica* II (Paris, 1946), 15–33.

<sup>64</sup> On lines 15–17, see Moretti, *ISE* I, 20; also G. De Sanctis 'Un decreto del Sinedrio di Corinto', *RFIC*, 19 n.s. (1941), 194–7. The decree for Adeimantos should be read together with the foundation decree (*IG*<sup>2</sup> iv, 1.68) of the League.

<sup>65</sup> It is possible that the decree for Bithys recorded his office, given the military nature of his services.



kings. At the same time, what is inscribed on the stone should not prevent us from reading between the lines.

The passing of honorific decrees for foreigners or citizens had been a regular activity of the assembly. The decrees were usually quite brief and commonly referred to the *εὐνοία* of the honorands towards the Athenian demos as their motivation. In the early Hellenistic period, the language and the structure of the decrees underwent transformations in order to adapt to the new status quo and to the circumstances of the moment, as well as to the status of the recipients of the honours.

One should not imagine that the demos had from the start a fixed language tailored to suit officials or kings or citizens. Similarly, there is no fixed pattern of what should be included in an honorific decree and what would be insignificant. The contents, the language, and the length of a decree were dependent on the circumstances of the actual moment at which it was passed: the nature of the regime, but also Athens' needs of the moment. Additionally, the contents depended on the nature of the services, the persons, the relationship of Athens with them, and the perception Athens had of its role in the events. The lengthier the decree the more information we obtain about the honorand, but also about the needs and situation of the Athenians at the time, as well as their relations with the various rulers.

A most useful measure of comparison are the contemporary decrees for foreigners who did not belong to a king's entourage. The Athenians rewarded certain people who had co-operated with them in the days of Chaironeia or during the Lamian War; in this case the decrees are much more detailed than the decrees for officials.<sup>66</sup> Referring to the help the honorands provided was, for Athens, a means of describing its own role in events; in particular, voting honours for people who had contributed to the Lamian War was a means for Athens to take pride in its own glory as protector of the liberty of the Greeks.

Similarly, it is not accidental that the decrees rewarding citizens with the highest honours are considerably more detailed than those for foreigners.<sup>67</sup> The abundance of information has to be seen in relation to the services offered to Athens—services aimed almost exclusively at the maintenance of the democracy—as well as the Athenian perception of the citizens' (major) role in events.

University of Crete

IOANNA KRALLI

jkralli@hol.gr

<sup>66</sup> Schwenk 1; Osborne I, 38; Osborne I, 43; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 505. We could add *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 456 for the Kolophonians and *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 566 + *SEG* 3.86 for the Prieniens; both record previous relationships with the Athenian demos.

<sup>67</sup> Athenian citizens rewarded with the highest honours: Demades: Dinarchus 1.101 (*post* 338 or 336). Phokion: *Plut. Phokion* 38.5; [*Plut.*] *X. Orat. Vit.* 850b (*ante* 322). Lykourgos: *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 457; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 513; [*Plut.*] *X. Orat. Vit.* 851f–2e (306). Philippides of Paiania: *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 649 + Dinsmoor, *Archons*, 7–8 (293/2). Philippides of Kephale: *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 657 (283/2). Demosthenes: [*Plut.*] *X. Orat. Vit.* 850f–1c (280/79). Demochares: *ibid.*, 851d–f (271/0). Kallias of Sphettos: Shear, *Kallias*, 2–5 (270/69). Phaidros of Sphettos: *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 682 (250s). Olympiodoros: Pausanias 1.26.1–3 (unknown date). Kephisodoros: *ISE* 33 (early second century B.C.). Most probably the fragmentary decree for Eurykleides (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 834) awarded him the highest honours as well (in 229 or slightly later).

APPENDIX: LIST OF HONORIFIC DECREES FOR ROYAL OFFICIALS<sup>68</sup>

Year	Proposer	Honorand	Honours	Text <sup>69</sup>
<i>Officials of Philip and Alexander</i> <sup>68</sup>				
337/6	Demades	Alkimachos of Pella	proxeny? (later, probably citizenship)	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 239; Tod 180; Schwenk 4
337/6	Demades	-ios son of Andromenes	proxeny	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 240; Tod 181; <i>SEG</i> 31.77; Schwenk 7;
329/8	Demades	Choiros Larisaïos	proxeny	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 353
334/3	Demades	Amyntor	praise citizenship	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 405 + <i>SEG</i> 21.275 = Osborne I, 21; Schwenk 24
<i>Officials of the Antigonids</i> <sup>70</sup>				
307/6	unknown	Aristodemos	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 459
306/5	unknown	Alkimos	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 773; C. Habicht, 'Athenisches Ehrendekret vom Jahre des Koroibos (306/5) für einen königlichen Offizier', <i>AJA</i> 2.1 (1977), 37–9
306/5	Stratokles	-otimos	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 469
306/5	Stratokles	oikeioi of Lykiskos	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 471
306/5	unknown	Lykiskos	praise crown	<i>SEG</i> 16.60
304/3?	unknown	Neaios	praise golden crown citizenship	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 553 = Osborne I, 44 <sup>71</sup>
304/3	Kajlaides	Medon and his father	unknown	A. P. Matthaiou, <i>Horos</i> 4 (1986), 19–20; <i>SEG</i> 36.165
304/3	Stratokles	Eupolis	citizenship	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 486 = Osborne I, 45; S. N. Koumanoudis, <i>Horos</i> 4 (1986), 13
304/3	Stratokles	Sotimos Dositheou Kyrenaios	praise golden crown citizenship	S. N. Koumanoudis, <i>Horos</i> 4 (1986), 11–12; <i>SEG</i> 36.164

<sup>68</sup> See n. 8 above for literary evidence testifying to more honours.

<sup>69</sup> Reference is made to various editions of the inscriptions; where editions are identical I employ the equation symbol (=), whereas where there are variations I employ the semicolon (;). Textual differences between editions do not normally affect the argument.

<sup>70</sup> A number of decrees proposed by Stratokles report only his name: *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 455, 460, 461 (307/6); 499, 503, (302/1); 640 (301/0); *Hesp.* 11 (1942), 241 no. 46 (307–301); *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 474 + S. Dow, *AJA* 37 (1933), 412–14 (306/5); a list of most of Stratokles' decrees is provided by Dinsmoor, *Archons*, 13–14. Additionally, there are numerous decrees, dating to the last decade of the fourth century and to c. 295, which record only the grant of citizenship; it is reasonable to assume that at least some of the honorands were Antigonid officials; for the texts see Osborne I, 48, 52–8, 62–5, 69–73; *Agora* XVI, 144 possibly records citizenship for an official of Demetrios.

For a prosopography of Antigonid officials and more details on their career, see R. A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Los Angeles and London 1990), appendix 3, nos. 1, 7, 8, 12, 16, 19, 23, 31, 40, 49, 57, 62, 68, 69, 82, 86, 93, 107, 110, 122, 125, 127, 130, 134.

<sup>71</sup> *Contra* Osborne, S. V. Tracy notes that an earlier date, such as 338 or 323/2, is more likely (though 'Osborne's dating is not impossible'): *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1995), 119.

Year	Proposer	Honorand	Honours	Text
304/3	Stratokles	Bianor (or Euanor or Theanor) and others	unknown	<i>SEG</i> 16.58; S. N. Koumanoudis, <i>Horos</i> 4 (1986), 14–17
303/2	Stratokles	Apollonides	(previously citizenship) praise golden crown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 492 <sup>72</sup>
303/2	Stratokles	Alkaïos of Ainos	praise golden crown citizenship	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 495 = <i>ISE</i> 6 = Osborne I, 60
303/2	Stratokles	Solon of Vargylia	praise golden crown citizenship	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 496 + 507 + add. p. 661 = Osborne I, 61
303/2	unknown	Oxythemis of Larisa	praise golden crown citizenship	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 558 = Osborne I, 47
303/2	Philostratos	Medeios of Larisa	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 498
303/2?	Stratokles	M]enel[au] Makedon	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 559 + 568 + add. p. 662
302/1?	unknown	Adeimantos of Lampsakos	praise golden crown	<i>SEG</i> 14.58; <i>ISE</i> 9
307–303	unknown	Asklepiades of Byzantion	praise golden crown <i>proedria</i> statue at Byzantion	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 555
307–302	unknown	unknown	praise golden crown citizenship	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 538 + add. p. 662 = Osborne I, 59
307–302	unknown	Aristonikos of Karystos	praise golden? crown citizenship <i>sitesis</i>	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 385b = Osborne I, 49; <i>SEG</i> 21.341
307–301	unknown	Zoes	golden crown citizenship	<i>SEG</i> 16.59 = Osborne I, 66
307–301	Stratokles	Dionysios and X	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 560
307–301	Stratokles	Philippos and Iolaos and X	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 561; <i>SEG</i> 31.80
307–301	unknown	unknown	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 562; cf. <i>SEG</i> 38.91
307–301	unknown	unknown	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 563
306–302	—o]u Thriasios	Nikomedes of Kos	praise golden crown citizenship	Osborne I, 51
295/4	unknown	Aristolas and Sostratos	citizenship	<i>SEG</i> 29.94; <sup>73</sup> Osborne I, 67; <i>Agora</i> XVI, 162
295/4	Gorgos Phr[y]ni[	Herodoros	praise golden crown citizenship <i>sitesis</i> <i>proedria</i> statue	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 646; <i>SEG</i> 29.95; Osborne I, 68

<sup>72</sup> Habicht suggests that Apollonides could be one of the honorands in *SEG* 16.58 (*Gottmenschentum*, 57, n. 9).

<sup>73</sup> For the date, see J. S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica. Hesp. Suppl.* 14 (Princeton, 1975), 129–32; Habicht, *Untersuchungen*, 1–2, 4, and n. 18.

Year	Proposer	Honorand	Honours	Text
<i>Officials of Lysimachos</i>				
286/5	-tos Aphidnaios	Artemidoros of Perinthos	golden crown citizenship	<i>SEG</i> 16.62 + <i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 663 + add. p. 663; Osborne I, 74; <i>SEG</i> 38.71; <i>Agora</i> XVI, 172
280s	unknown	Bithys of Lysimacheia	golden crown citizenship	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 808 = Osborne I, 87
<i>Officials of Ptolemy</i>				
286/5	Epicharmos	Zenon	unknown	<i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 650
c. 286	unknown	Philokles, king of the Sidonians	praise golden crown citizenship statue	<i>Hesp.</i> 9 (1940), 352ff. no. 48 = Osborne I, 77; <i>IG</i> ii <sup>2</sup> 3425 (statue base)