

ATHENION AND ARISTION OF ATHENS

GLENN RICHARD BUGH

IN BOOK 5 of his *Deipnosophistai*, Athenaios has his banqueter, Masurius, described as a jurist, poet, and musician, speak on the topic of *symposia*. After treating Homeric *symposia* at great length (186d–193c), Masurius directs our attention to the extravagant *symposia* and actions of Hellenistic kings, concentrating heavily on the Seleucids. On this dynasty, Athenaios can draw upon two very good and contemporary sources, Polybios of Megalopolis and Poseidonios of Apameia, probably the basis of his own history of the kings of Syria (211a). In the course of his speech, Masurius talks about Antiochos VII Sidetes, Antiochos IV Epiphanes—citing Poseidonios as his source (210d–f)—and Alexander Balas, son (?) of Antiochos Epiphanes (211a–c). Inserted into the discussion of Alexander's symposium is the incident of Diogenes the Epicurean philosopher, who Masurius claims (citing Athenaios' own work *On the Kings of Syria*) acted in an arrogant and abusive manner around the court. While Alexander tolerated this behavior on the part of Diogenes, his successor, Antiochos VI, did not and consequently had the philosopher executed.

This episode sets the stage for a long digression on so-called philosophers who seize political and military power and bring distress to their people. What follows is purportedly an extensive extract of Poseidonios of Apameia, the foremost philosopher of his day, on the career of one Athenion, son of Athenion, of Athens, a Peripatetic philosopher and sophist in the period of the First Mithridatic War (211d–215b). This extract can be conveniently divided into three sections:

(a) 211e–213f: the origins and early career of Athenion and his return to Athens in 88 B.C. as φίλος and ambassador of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontos. The arrival is dramatically cast, in a way reminiscent of Xenophon's account of the return to Athens of Alkibiades in 407 B.C. (*Hell.* 1.4.13–21) or Polybios' description of the arrival of Attalos I, King of

Certain works will be cited by abbreviation or author's name alone. Editions of Poseidonios: L. Edelstein and I. G. Kidd (eds.), *Posidonius 1: The Fragments*² (Cambridge 1989) = E-K (followed by line numbers), 2.1: *The Commentary* and 2.2: *Fragments 150–293* (Cambridge 1988) = Kidd (followed by page numbers); and W. Theiler, *Poseidonios 1: Die Fragmente, 2: Erläuterungen* (Berlin and New York 1982); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Athenion und Aristion," *SBPreuss* (1923) 39–50 = *Kleine Schriften* 6 (Amsterdam 1971); E. Badian, "Rome, Athens and Mithridates," *AJAH* 1 (1976) 105–128 = D. M. Pippidi (ed.), *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien: Travaux du VI^e Congrès International d'Études Classiques* (Bucharest and Paris 1976) 501–521.

Pergamon, in 200 B.C. (16.25.5–9). Athenion delivers an incendiary speech to his fellow Athenians highlighting Mithridates' successes over the Romans in Asia Minor and reminding them of their present hardships (e.g., indebtedness; the closure of sacred places, including Eleusis, together with the gymnasia, theater, and courts; the Pnyx in disuse; the schools of the philosophers without voice [τῶν φιλοσόφων τὰς διατριβὰς ἀφάνους],¹ and the anarchic state of affairs), all laid at the feet of the Romans (213d). The Athenians immediately elect him hoplite-general, the most important military position of the day, and they permit him to choose the other archons;

(b) 214a–d: Athenion assumes the position of tyrant, “after a few days,” and begins a purge of pro-Roman elements, though simply described as the “more sober-minded citizens” (τοὺς μὲν εὖ φρονούντας τῶν πολιτῶν);

(c) 214f–215b: Athenion sends Apellikon, a fellow Peripatetic, on an expedition to Delos, ostensibly to seize the treasury of Apollo there. This expedition ends in catastrophe when a certain Orobios (Orbius), a Roman commander guarding the region, soundly defeats Apellikon and his force. Apellikon escapes, but nothing more is heard of him or of Athenion in Athenaios' account. After recording the victory epitaph set up by Orbius, Athenaios (Masurius) adds a note on Lysias, an Epicurean philosopher who became tyrant of his native city of Tarsus (215b–c), but does not cite his source for this information.

At this precise point in the narrative, Athenaios recaps the preceding sections with the words, “Those are the sort of generals who have come from philosophy” (τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας στρατηγοί, 215c),² meaning Athenion, Apellikon, and Lysias. Without pausing Athenaios has Masurius continue his diatribe on the basic theme, now attacking the military record of Socrates the philosopher, quoting a line from Demochares that “you can't make a blameless soldier out of Socrates” (215c). From this point on in the narrative to the conclusion of his speech at 221a, Masurius questions the historical reliability of statements by philosophers, singling out Plato and his claims about Socrates. The Stoic context of this attack can be seen by the fact that only the Peripatetics, Epicureans, and Platonists are targeted.

The extract of Poseidonios embedded in Athenaios' account is arguably the most important historical fragment preserved from his *Histories*, a

¹Kidd (877) suggests that this meant “freedom of speech and criticism were banned.”

A full discussion of the veracity of these claims by Athenion is outside the scope of this paper; I will address them in a monograph on “Late Hellenistic Athens” (in preparation).

²At 213f Athenaios mentions a certain Hermippos, student of Kallimachos. Philodemus, the Epicurean philosopher, cites Hermippos as the author of a work entitled Περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας εἰς δυναστείας μεταστάντων (*Stoicorum Index Herculanensis*, col. XVI, p. 44, ed. D. Comparetti; an expanded title can be found in *Acad. Inc.*, col. XI, p. 29, ed. Mekler).

monumental work of 52 books covering the period from the end of Polybios' *Histories* in 146 B.C. to at least the destruction of Athens in 86 B.C. Poseidonios has been an appealing subject for some time, but in the last decade he has received renewed interest.³ While acknowledging the blatant anti-Athenian tone of this fragment (*FGrHist* 87 F 36; Theiler 1, no. 247; E-K, no. 253), most Poseidonios scholars hold to the view that he was a conscientious and reliable historian and that the loss of practically all of his *Histories* has handicapped our ability to reconstruct this transitional period in Hellenistic history.

Nevertheless, the extract as it is preserved in Athenaios cannot really represent what Poseidonios originally wrote, despite the introductory words by Athenaios that he is quoting the author at length and in detail (211d). Not only are there omissions of detail⁴ and an entire section made confusing and disjointed by the possible presence of doublets (214a-d),⁵ but the very historicity of Athenion has been called into question. Only Poseidonios (and, of course, Athenaios) names Athenion as a tyrant of Athens in 88 B.C.; all other ancient sources refer only to a certain Aristion and there is no question that *he*, not Athenion, was a mint magistrate of the so-called Athenian New Style Silver coinage, together with his patron Mithridates, in 87/6 B.C., and it was certainly Aristion who was ruling as tyrant of Athens when the city fell to Sulla in 86 B.C.⁶ Since Niese published his seminal

³Theiler; E-K; Kidd; J. Malitz, *Die Historien des Poseidonios* (Munich 1983, *Zetemata* 79); D. E. Hahm, "Posidonius's Theory of Historical Causation," *ANRW* II 36.3 (1989) 1325-63.

⁴For example, an altar set up by the Roman commander Orbius contained an epigram which specifically commemorated men who had died fighting around Delos "on the sea" (ἐν πλάγῃ, 215b, E-K 177-178), but in the Apellikon account as we have it there is no mention of such a sea battle; in fact, all the action is described as occurring on land, on Delos itself. Poseidonios' original account must have supplied more information. See Wilamowitz 209.

⁵F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* Poseidonios 87 F 36, commentary, pp. 184-188; Wilamowitz 209-210, 217; Hahm (above, n. 3) 1327-28, n. 7; K. Reinhardt, s.v. Poseidonios, *RE* 22.1 (1953) col. 637; and J. Touloumakos, "Zu Poseidonios, Fr. 36 (= Athenaios 5, 214 a-b)," *Philologus* 110 (1966) 138-142, at 140: all these accept the presence of doublets in the account. On the other hand, Theiler (2.127) and Kidd (879-882) do not.

⁶For primary sources, see Strabo 9.1.20; Paus. 1.20.5-7; App. *Mith.* 28, 30-39 (with Teubner subdivisions, e.g., 28.110); Plut. *Sulla* 12-14, 23, *Luc.* 19.6, *Numa* 9, *Mor.* 558c, 809e; Oros. 6.2; Eutrop. 5.6.1 (see R. J. Penella, "Eutropius 5.6.1: Athenae, Civitas Achaiae," *AJP* 101 [1980] 447-448). On the numismatic evidence of New Style Silver coinage, M. Thompson, *The New Style Silver Coinage of Athens*, 2 vols. (New York 1961) 1.364-368, 409-420, had argued that the Aristion-Mithridates issue (and the preceding Apellikon-Gorgias issue) were to be dated to 121/0 B.C., in other words a full generation earlier than the First Mithridatic War, the Mithridates attested being Mithridates V Euergetes, not Mithridates VI Eupator. This argument brought immediate response from D. M. Lewis, "The Chronology of the Athenian New Style Coinage," *NC*, 7th ser., 2 (1962) 275-300, who argued for what would be called the "low chronology,"

article on the question of Athenion and Aristion just over a hundred years ago,⁷ arguing that they were two different tyrants, the debate has been periodically rejoined, usually footnoted to discussions of Hellenistic Athens or the Mithridatic Wars or Roman imperialism. A consensus still eludes scholars, but it would be fair to say that the "Separatist," as opposed to the "Identity," thesis seems to be winning the day.⁸

that is, that Thompson's dates needed to be lowered by 32 years. In subsequent discussion on the problem, the "low chronology" prevailed: H. B. Mattingly, "Some Third Magistrates in the Athenian New Style Coinage," *JHS* 91 (1971) 85-93 and his "Some Problems in Second Century Attic Prosopography," *Historia* 20 (1971) 26-46; Badian 105-128; C. Habicht, "Zur Geschichte Athens in der Zeit Mithridates' VI," *Chiron* 6 (1976) 127-142; S. V. Tracy, "Athens in 100 B.C.," *HSCP* 83 (1979) 213-235, at 231, n. 68. O. Mørkholm, "The Chronology of the New Style Coinage of Athens," *ANSMN* 29 (1984) 29-42, argued for the "low chronology" in the period after 145 B.C., but for fluctuations in the earlier issues, the New Style silver coinage beginning in the 180s, not 196 (Thompson) or ca 164 (Lewis, and most recently, M. J. Price, "The Larissa, 1968 Hoard," in *Kraay-Mørkholm Essays: Numismatic Studies in Memory of C. M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm*, ed. G. Le Rider, et al. (Louvain-la-Neuve 1989) 238-239—"a date in the 160's"). An editor's note to Mørkholm's article by M. Thompson herself (p. 29) reveals that she has now accepted the "low chronology": "the author's (i.e., Mørkholm) conclusions seem to me so valid that I hope the controversy can now be considered at an end." In addition, according to Mørkholm (32) the Aristion-Philon issue (no. 68), dated to 97/6 B.C., must refer to our Aristion—his choice of the Pegasos symbol for his coinage reveals his pro-Pontic sympathies a decade before his tyranny. B. C. McGing, *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator King of Pontus* (Leiden 1986, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 89) 84-85, n. 68, rightly cautions, "The presence of a Pontic symbol should not be taken to indicate that Athens was already split into pro-Mithridatic and pro-Roman 'parties'. Mithridates and his family had enjoyed Athenian favour for a long time." Moreover, the mint magistrate of 97/6 B.C. may not be our Aristion at all: Christian Habicht informs me that the name Aristion is attested in at least 18 demes.

⁷B. Niese, "Die letzten Tyrannen Athens," *RhM* 42 (1887) 574-81.

⁸Some of those who believe that Athenion and Aristion are one and the same, in spite of Niese's arguments: Th. Reinach, *Mithridates Eupator, König von Pontos*, translated by A. Goetz from the 1890 French edition with revisions by the author (Leipzig 1895) 133-134, n. 2; F. Geyer, s.v. Mithridates, *RE* 15.2 (1932) col. 2171; K. Reinhardt, *Poseidonios* (Munich 1921) 33, n. 1; P. Roussel, *Délos colonie athénienne* (Paris 1916; now reissued with updated bibliography and concordances by P. Bruneau, M.-T. Couilloud-Ledinhahet, and R. Étienne, Paris 1987, *BEFAR* 111) 319-327; M. Laffranque, *Poseidonios d'Apamée: Essai de mise au point* (Paris 1964) 142-144; C. Nicolet, *Rome et la conquête du monde méditerranéen 264-227 avant J.-C.*, 2 vols. (Paris 1978) 2.794-796; and most recently M.-F. Baslez, "Délos durant la première guerre de Mithridate," *Delo e l'Italia* (Rome 1982) 57. Representing the Separatist position are Wilamowitz; Jacoby (above, n. 5) 185-186; W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911) 444-451; J. Deininger, *Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland 217-86 v. Chr.* (Berlin 1971) 248-261; E. Candiloro, "Politica e cultura in Atene da Pidna alla guerra mitridatica," *Studi classici e orientali* 14 (1965) 134-176, at 145-157; Touloumakos (above, n. 5) 142, n. 2; Habicht (above, n. 6) 127-142; Badian 114-115 ("incline to"); Theiler 2.126; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East 168 B.C. to A.D. 1* (Norman, Okla. 1984) 135-138; Kidd 884-887; J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et*

All subsequent literature on the subject, whether *pro* or *con*, has had to address the arguments first articulated by Niese: (1) Athenion is repeatedly identified by Poseidonios (and Athenaios) as a Peripatetic philosopher (211d–e; 213e; 214a, e), while Aristion is called an Epicurean (App. *Mith.* 28.110–112); (2) the names Athenion and Aristion are not orthographically subject to scribal error, and in any case, it seems unlikely, considering the number of times that Athenion is cited in the text, that this sort of error could keep recurring; (3) the careers of Athenion and Aristion do not overlap, but are successive—this is probably Niese’s most compelling argument, which rests upon the chronological juxtaposition of the Delos expedition under Apellikon (214d–215b) and the first appearance of Aristion detailed by Appian (*Mith.* 28.108–109). The Poseidonios extract ends with the failure of Apellikon to hold Delos and his consequent inability to seize the treasury for which he had been sent. Appian, on the other hand, picks up the story with Archelaos, Mithridates’ general, sailing to Delos, conquering it along with other strongholds of the Athenians, and returning them to Athenian control. Archelaos also dispatched the treasury of Delos to Athens accompanied by Aristion and guarded by a Pontic force of 2,000 soldiers. With these troops, Appian relates, Aristion made himself tyrant over the land. Niese reasoned that these two episodes were chronologically distinct and successive: Delos is lost in the first, regained in the second; Athenion/Apellikon appears in the first, Aristion in the second; Athenion arrives in Athens as an unescorted ambassador from Mithridates, Aristion arrives with a significant Pontic escort; Athenion seeks to win the Athenians over to Mithridates’ cause, Aristion returns with an alliance already secured with Mithridates. And finally (4) Strabo (9.1.20) says that Mithridates established “tyrants” (τυράννους), not just one tyrant, over the Athenians.

In addition, there is simply too much precise information contained in the Poseidonios fragment⁹ for us to dismiss it as rhetorical fiction; the anti-Athenian hostility and pro-Roman partisanship is obvious enough to be pruned away. Poseidonios was too highly regarded in the ancient world

impérialisme: Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate (Rome and Paris 1988, BE-FAR 271) 477–479; P. MacKendrick, *The Athenian Aristocracy 399 to 31 B.C.* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969, Martin Classical Lectures 23) 61–62 (where Aristion is identified as a Stoic—surely a slip); McGing (above, n. 6) 118–121; T. Sarikakis, *The Hoplite General in Athens: A Prosopography* (Chicago 1976; a reprint of his doctoral dissertation, Princeton 1951, supplemented by his article, “οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι στρατηγοὶ τῶν ἑλληνιστικῶν χρόνων,” *Athena* 57 [1953] 242–304) 44, 120, n. 1.

⁹For example, the reception by the guild of Dionysian Artists (212d–e) and the hospitality provided to Athenion at the house of Dies, rich merchant from Delos (212d, E–K 51–52; for emendation of the text and identification of this man, see S. Dow, “A Leader of the Anti-Roman Party in Athens in 88 B.C.,” *CP* 37 [1942] 311–314).

to have been derelict of his historical responsibilities; after all, he chose to continue Polybios, an author who often railed against the inaccuracies of his fellow historians, and like Polybios, he was a contemporary of, and at times eye-witness to, many of the events he described. All things taken into account, I view the Separatist position as the stronger, but I cannot accept the Poseidonios extract as referring only to Athenion. A little noticed technical detail embedded in Athenaios 213f-214d (E-K 111-145) may provide a clue to what does not belong to Athenion. First we need to examine the whole passage for context.

Athenion has just been elected hoplite-general and has secured the other magistracies for his supporters. "Not many days later," Athenaios continues, "this philosopher made himself a tyrant" (E-K 111-112) and so began a campaign of terror (E-K 117-145). This passage is fraught with problems. As I have noted above, it is hard to imagine that Poseidonios wrote this piece as it stands, although Theiler was willing to argue so (2.126-127). Kidd, too, defends the basic text as Poseidonian, but concedes that there is strong evidence for interpolation by Athenaios in places, for example, in the digression on the Pythagoreans, Athenion's disregard for Peripatetic principles, and the proverb on the dangers of giving a knife to a child (E-K 112-119).¹⁰ Jacoby and Wilamowitz, on the other hand, thought that the contamination was much more extensive.¹¹

Jacoby believed that two, perhaps three, excerpts had been clumsily integrated. The first doublet occurs at lines 128-130 where Athenion apparently closes the city gates (the causative verb is missing, but most agree that this was the sense) and posts thirty guards at each to prevent entry or exit. It continues with lines 132-138, describing the dispatch of men into the countryside who were to act like bandits (ὁδοιδίκους), seize escapees from the city, and return them to Athens to suffer torture and then death without due process. Others Athenion accused of treason, as ones who conspired to bring back the exiles. Some of these fled before their trial, other less fortunate ones were condemned in the courts under Athenion's personal supervision. According to Jacoby, this repeats the information recorded at lines 119-128, where Athenion begins an attack on "the more sober-minded citizens" and places guards at the city gates, forcing many Athenians to escape by letting themselves down from the walls by ropes. Athenion sends cavalry in pursuit; this "specially armed" bodyguard kills some of those who flee and brings others back to Athens as prisoners. The tyrant convoked many meetings of the Assembly to denounce pro-Roman sympathizers who had been caught¹² and brought accusations against those who were said

¹⁰Kidd 879-880; cf. Ferrary (above, n. 8) 476, n. 134.

¹¹Wilamowitz; Jacoby (above, n. 5); cf. also Hahm (above, n. 5) 1327-28, n. 7.

¹²Touloumakos (above, n. 5) 138-142 supplies <τοὺς ληφθέντας> after προσεποιεῖτο to fill the lacuna in the text. Although contested by P. van Beneden, "Poseidonios von

to be plotting with the exiles to overthrow the government. These he had killed. A possible third doublet could be detected at lines 140–144 where Athenion now sends out a force of hoplites to pursue and capture those who were fleeing to safety. Those who were caught were flogged to death, some even dying under torture before they were flogged.

To be sure, these passages do appear to be repeating essentially the same information. Kidd, however, is not persuaded (879–882). He argues that these can just as easily represent different episodes in a reign of terror, that is to say, the guards first posted at the city gates relate to the initial flight and pursuit of refugees; the second reference is to the hardening of travel restrictions with the posting of a permanent guard of thirty men, the ὀδοιδόκοι acting as a sort of secret police; and thirdly the hoplites are sent as “official military patrols . . . on the hunt either for returned patriots who had sneaked back into the territory . . . or for any Athenian trying to cross the border.” He concludes, “What we have is not a confusion of doublets but a rhetorical *variatio*, deliberately filling out a reign of terror. This whole section from 112 is Posidonius’ picture of what happened, the result of Athenion’s tyranny.”

A dilemma then. One person’s doublets are another’s rhetorical *variatio*. But even Kidd acknowledged that this section in Athenaios may be not only interpolated, but contaminated as well. For instance, the reference to food rationing at 138–140 and also at 214f (E-K 159–161) “seems more suitable for the siege of Athens when Aristion was in power . . .” (885). Malitz had made much of this point in his defence of the Identity thesis ([above, note 3] 343). Wilamowitz, an advocate of the Separatist position, also worried about this point, as well as the closure of the city gates and the night curfew dictated by Athenion at lines 144–145. His solution was to suggest that here Athenaios may have attributed to Athenion certain actions which Poseidonios had only recounted for Aristion (210).¹³ I am convinced Wilamowitz was correct.

Let us return to one of Athenion’s reported tyrannical acts. At E-K 122–125, it is reported that Athenion dispatched horsemen (ἵππεις) to pursue those who were fleeing the city; some they killed, others they led back to Athens. Athenaios then reports, “for he (Athenion) had a great number of bodyguards of those who are called cataphracts (τῶν καταφρακτικῶν καλουμένων).” This represents an emendation by Kaibel in his 1887 Teubner

Apamea, Fr. 36,” *Philologus* 113 (1969) 151–156, this emendation has been accepted by Kidd and Theiler in their text editions.

¹³Cf. Touloumakos (above, n. 5) 142, n. 2. Ferguson (above, n. 8) 447, n. 1, argues from the other direction: “Appian, it is true, contaminates his sources and gives to Aristion the experiences of Athenion as well as his own, but Appian is not of equal value with Poseidonios as an authority.”

edition of Athenaios. The oldest manuscript reads τῶν ἀφρακτικῶν (A = Venetus Marcianus, tenth century), a later one τῶν φρακτικῶν (C = Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 841, fifteenth-sixteenth century). Kaibel was justly puzzled by this reading and suggested τῶν καταφρακτικῶν, the famous "fully armed" cavalry in which both rider and mount are protected by armor: *catafracti autem equites dicuntur, qui et ipsi ferro muniti sunt, et equos similiter munitos habent* (Servius ad Aen. 11.770, citing Sallust as his source). On this emendation the scholars of the text differ. Kidd accepts Kaibel's suggestion, Theiler opts for φρακτικῶν, and Jacoby for ἀφρακτικῶν with a question mark.

First of all, I think it unlikely that ἀφρακτικῶν was what Poseidonios wrote because it is conjoined with the participle καλουμένων, a word with which you would expect a proper name or precise nomenclature to be linked, for example, τῶν καλουμένων ψιλῶν, "of the so-called light-armed infantry," or τῶν καλουμένων ἀκροβολιστῶν, "the so-called skirmishers" (Asklep. *Tact.* 1.2, 3). Secondly, to "call" (καλέω) Athenion's hippic bodyguard "un-armored" (ἀφρακτικῶν) really makes sense only if we suppose that Poseidonios meant to distinguish between "fully armored with respect to man and horse" (καταφρακτός) and "more lightly armored with respect to man and/or horse" (ἀφρακτός or even ἀκαταφρακτός),¹⁴ as does appear in certain military treatises.¹⁵ But usually there are further divisions under ἀφρακτός, e.g., δορατοφόροι and ἀκροβολισταί, which in turn are further subdivided into δορατοφόροι proper and θυρεοφόροι in the former and the famous light-armed cavalry τάξεις known as Tarentines and the ἵπποτοξόται in the latter (Arr. *Tact.* 4.2-6; cf. Ael. *Tact.* 2.11-13 = Köchly-Rüstow 2.1 [Leipzig 1855] 256-263). If Poseidonios is referring to Athenian cavalry here and intended the reader to understand a

¹⁴For this variant, see the anonymous *Lexicon Hermeneia* (= *Definitiones*) in H. Köchly and W. Rüstow, *Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller* 2.2 (Leipzig 1855) 224, n. 25; for bibliography, see A. Dain and J.-A. de Foucault, "Les Stratégistes byzantins," *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967) 332.

¹⁵The best examples of the distinction between καταφρακτός and ἀφρακτός is Arr. *Tact.* 4.1-6; Aelian uses the negative, τῶν δὲ μὴ καταφρακτῶν (Köchly-Rüstow 2.1 [Leipzig 1855] 258). This basic division, with variations (see, e.g., Asklep. *Tact.* 1.3, who seems to be fascinated by groups of three), reappears in Byzantine military treatises. For example, see text of the Byzantine emperor, Leo the Sage, cited in A. Dain, *Histoire du Texte d'Élien le Tacticien* (Paris 1946) 137-138 and the *Sylloge Tacticorum*, ed. A. Dain (Paris 1938) 50-53, 61-62. For a brief discussion of each of these texts, see Dain-Foucault (above, n. 14) 354-358. For an informative treatise on cavalry tactics in the early Byzantine period, see the *Strategikon* of Maurice; Greek text in H. Mihăescu, *Mauricii Strategikon* (Bucharest 1970, *Scriptores Byzantini* 6), and English translation in G. T. Dennis, *Maurice's Strategikon: Handbook of Byzantine Military Strategy* (Philadelphia 1984) from his German edition in *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 17 (Vienna 1981).

special—as *καλουμένων* would imply—more lightly-armed force, then he would have identified them by their proper title, “Tarentines.” For we know from exact epigraphical evidence from this period that the Athenian cavalry had Tarentines in its corps and even Tarantinarchs to command them.¹⁶

As for the later variant reading, *φρακτικῶν*, could Poseidonios have bonded such a generic term to *καλουμένων*? Of course, the hippic bodyguard was “armed,” hardly requiring special comment. However, inasmuch as the form *καταφρακτικῶν* is attested only here (Ibycus word search)—and as an emendation—instead of the common form *καταφρακτῶν*, we must at least consider the possibility that Poseidonios wrote *φρακτικῶν*. In which case he may still have meant cataphracts if we accept the suggestion by Stephanus (s.v. *καταφρακτός*, *TGL* 4, pp. 1293–94), from Eustathius’ commentary to *Iliad* 13.130 (ed. M. van der Valk, 1979, p. 3.450), that *φρακτικός* could be identified as *kataphraktos*. But even if this is correct, the main point remains—Poseidonios should be referring to cataphracts.

It might be objected that Poseidonios was unfamiliar with military terminology or that he had no close acquaintance with the organization of the Athenian cavalry—either one of which could explain his imprecision. This would be wrong. First of all, Poseidonios studied in Athens under Panaitios, scholarch of the Stoic school, and would have had ample occasion to see the Athenian cavalry at festivals and games, notably at the Panathenaia and the Theseia.¹⁷

Secondly, Poseidonios, like his predecessor Polybios, authored a military manual. In fact, Poseidonios’ manual ultimately stands behind the military treatises of his pupil Asklepiodotos, as well as those of Aelian and Arrian.¹⁸ Therefore, he had complete mastery of military terminology and we have every reason to expect him to be precise on this point. It is my contention that Poseidonios meant to alert his readers to a point of detail about the bodyguard of Athenion. Otherwise, it serves no obvious purpose to draw our attention to it.

¹⁶IG II² 958.1.57–59 (Theseia of 153/2 B.C.); *Fouilles de Delphes* III.2, nos. 24, 35, 46 (Pythais of 128/7 B.C.); III.2, nos. 28, 37.3 (Pythais of 106/5 B.C.); for discussion, see G. R. Bugh, *The Horsemen of Athens* (Princeton 1988) 197–198, and generally, M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, 2 vols. (Paris 1949–50) 1.601–604.

¹⁷For the Theseia, see IG II² 956–965 and discussion, G. R. Bugh, “The Theseia in Late Hellenistic Athens,” *ZPE* 83 (1990) 20–37. For the Panathenaia in this period, see IG II² 2313–17 and the new study by S. V. Tracy and C. Habicht, “New and Old Panathenaic Victor Lists,” *Hesperia* 60 (1991) 189–236.

¹⁸See Ael. *Tact.* 1.2; Arr. *Tact.* 1.1; for the manuscript tradition of these three authors, see Theiler 2.410; P. Stadter, “The *Ars Tactica* of Arrian: Tradition and Originality,” *CP* 73 (1978) 117–128; and E. Wheeler, “The Occasion of Arrian’s *Tactica*,” *GRBS* 19 (1978) 351–365, at 353, n. 9.

Therefore, Kaibel was correct, I believe, in proposing the emendation of τῶν καταφρακτικῶν. This was the special cavalry force of fully-armored men and horses, the famous cataphracts.¹⁹

It is not irrelevant to point out that among the Hellenistic armies these are only associated with the Seleucids and that Poseidonios himself was a native of Apameia in the heart of the Seleucid realm. He knows cataphracts. In any case, they certainly do not belong to the native Athenian cavalry of regular horsemen and Tarentines.

It is also very unlikely that the Athenians had established such a corps in the period immediately prior to the First Mithridatic War. This corps requires access to a specially-bred horse, often called Nisaeon, a large powerful creature—attested in our sources from Armenia and Persia/Parthia²⁰—in order to carry the weight of the added armor, much as in the case of the knights of the Middle Ages. Nothing of this sort was bred in Attika, undistinguished in hippotrophic land, nor in Greece proper for that matter, nor would there have been any military reason for the Athenians to organize such corps at the time. Furthermore, we know that Medeios had held without precedent the archonship of Athens for three consecutive years, 91–88 B.C., and as a friend of Rome would have had absolutely no reason to adopt a military arm aboriginal to the East, and certainly not at a time when Athens apparently found itself in severe financial straits—if we may believe Athenion's claims (212a–b, 213c–d).

So where do these cataphracts come from? From Mithridates, I would suggest, most likely from one or the other of his allies, the Sarmatians or the Armenians. According to Appian, Mithridates had a force of 10,000 horsemen from Armenia Minor; the number of Sarmatians is not recorded (*Mith.* 15, 17, 57). None are described as cataphracts, but we know that in the Third Mithridatic War Tigranes, king of Armenia, had at his disposal 17,000 cataphracts to use against Lucullus (Plut. *Luc.* 26.6; Eutrop. 6.9 =

¹⁹Polybios provides our earliest testimony to the use of cataphracts in the Hellenistic armies, where a force of these special horsemen were under the command of Antiochos, son of Antiochos III "The Great" at the Battle of Panion in 200 B.C. (16.18.6: as to whether this was the younger Antiochos [later IV Epiphanes] or more likely his homonymous elder brother, see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols. [Oxford 1957–79] 2.524 and 3.787). They are also mentioned in his army at the Battle of Magnesia in 189 (Livy 37.40.11) and subsequently at the Games at Daphne in 166 B.C. in the service of Antiochos IV Epiphanes (Polyb. 30.25.9 = Ath. 5.194). Only the Seleucids, adopting the eastern style, made extensive use of them. For general discussion of cataphracts, see W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments* (Cambridge 1930) 73–83 and Launey (above, n. 16) 1.569, 582. Incredibly, our best description of cataphracts comes from Heliodoros' Greek novel, *Aethiopika* 9.15 (Budé).

²⁰For the stud farms of the Nisaeon breed in Media/Persia/Parthia and Armenia, see Polyb. 5.44.1, 10.27.2; Strabo 11.13.7 and 11.14.9.

7,500 cataphracts). And the Sarmatians were famous for their cataphracts, at least in the imperial period (Tac. *Hist.* 1.79). It is more than likely, then, that Mithridates had a certain number of cataphracts among his forces in the First Mithridatic War.²¹ Furthermore, in Poseidonios' account M.' Aquillius is dragged along in chains by a mounted Bastarnian (213b, E-K 79–82), the Bastarnians being closely connected with the Scythians and Sarmatians in the area north of the Black Sea (Strabo 7.2.4, 7.3.9, 7.3.13; cf. Hdt. 4.116–117).

Even if we agree that Poseidonios is reporting the presence of cataphracts in Athens in 88 B.C., for whose benefit were they intended? Certainly, Athenion is named as the one who made use of these cataphracts (214a, E-K 122). We must assume, then, that at some unrecorded point in Athenion's usurpation of power from hoplite-general to tyrant, Mithridates dispatched this special force to him. He certainly did not return to Athens with such a force, as the narrative of Athenion's arrival makes abundantly clear. Many of those whom he targeted for attack came from the upper class, i.e., "the more sober-minded citizens" (E-K 117)—those most likely to be associated with, or even members of, the Athenian cavalry, like Medeios, son of Medeios of Peiraeus, for example.²² From this it could be argued that Athenion worried about the loyalty of the remaining Athenian horsemen and took the precaution of requesting foreign assistance from his ally Mithridates. There is nothing impossible in this reconstruction, but I think a better explanation is at hand.

The cataphracts belonged to Aristion, not Athenion. We have already noted above that in Appian's account Archelaos sailed with a fleet to Delos, recaptured the island which had revolted from the Athenians, and turned it and other neighboring islands over to the Athenians. He also sent the treasury of Apollo to Athens escorted by Aristion and a force of 2,000 Pontic troops. With these soldiers, Appian reports precisely, Aristion made himself tyrant over the land (οἷς ὁ Ἀριστίων συγχράμενος ἐτυράννησε τῆς πατρίδος), put to death Roman sympathizers, and sent others to Mithridates (*Mith.* 28.109).²³ It makes perfect sense to suppose that among these

²¹On the military forces of Mithridates, see App. *Mith.* 17; Memnon 22.6 (*FGrHist* 434); Just. 38.3.6. For discussion, see M. Janke, *Historische Untersuchungen zu Memnon von Herakleia* (Würzburg 1963) 139–144; Sherwin-White (above, n. 8) 128–129, n. 112; and McGing (above, n. 6) 85, n. 72.

²²For Medeios' cavalry career, see Bugh (above, n. 16) 119, 201, 256, n. 156; for full prosopography, see S. V. Tracy, *IG II² 2336. Contributors of First Fruits for the Pythais* (Meisenheim am Glan 1982) 210.

²³Is it possible that obscured in Plutarch's account of a group of Athenians who fled the tyranny of Aristion to take refuge in Amisos on the south shore of the Black Sea (*Luc.* 19.5–6) is this incident about Aristion sending some of his enemies to Mithridates (but cf. App. *Mith.* 83.373)? After all, Amisos, apparently a former colony of Athens situated within the territory of Pontos, should have been in the hands of Mithridates. If these refugees wanted to "escape" Aristion and his patron Mithridates, why did they

Pontic troops was a force of cataphracts who were to act as Aristion's private bodyguard. The reasons suggested above as to why they might be important to Athenion can apply just as well, if not better, to Aristion. A force of 2,000 troops, including a sizeable number of cataphracts, would accurately fit Poseidonios' reference to "a large bodyguard of fully-armed horsemen" (E-K 124-125).

Moreover, Badian has shown that the archons for 88/7, clearly identified as Athenion's men, are not members of the rabble, contrary to what Poseidonios would have us believe, but rather "most of them demonstrably (and in fact no doubt all of them) belong to good families, distinguished by priesthoods and high offices" (112). One could even argue that "the more sober-minded citizens" are more easily equated with victims from among the upper classes under the tyranny of Aristion, when his cause and that of Mithridates became desperate, than under Athenion well before the arrival of Sulla.²⁴ Otherwise, Athenion will have assumed the tyranny and initiated a purge of his own people without proper cause. Admittedly, this appears to be what Athenaios (Poseidonios?) has in mind, but the point remains, *historically*, which tyrant fits the evidence better?

Furthermore, if we closely examine the narratives of Poseidonios and Appian, there are some striking similarities which I cannot accept as coincidental. Most obvious is the fact that immediately after Athenion assumes the tyranny, the narrative in Athenaios is interrupted by a digression containing some unsavory remarks about the Pythagoreans and accusations about Athenion's violation of the Peripatetic principles of Aristotle and Theophrastos (E-K 111-119); in Appian, immediately following Aristion's assumption of the tyranny, the author mentions Aristion's Epicurean training and then interrupts his narrative with a caustic digression on Kritias and his fellow philosopher-tyrants in Athens, on the Pythagoreans, and on the so-called Seven Wise Men, and generally about the theme of the hypocrisy of those philosophers who adopt a posture of poverty and worldly disdain, while in fact envying the rich and famous. Appian concludes the digression by naming Aristion again (*Mith.* 28.110-112). This, as we recall, is the theme of Masurius' diatribe in Athenaios. I cannot easily accept Appian's digression as a mere *topos* on philosopher-tyrants; rather he seems to be borrowing directly or indirectly from Poseidonios' *original* account.

Now I think we can understand why Appian mentioned Kritias in his philosophical digression, but not Athenion, who should have been a logical entry at this point. It is precisely because Athenion was no tyrant in the

choose to place themselves in such danger? After Lucullus took the city (ca 71 B.C.) in the Third Mithridatic War, he apparently sent the survivors back to Athens with a gift of 200 drachmas each (cf. App. *Mith.* 83.373-374; *FGrHist* 434 Memnon 45).

²⁴On the issue of upper-class support for Mithridates, see McGing (above, n. 8) 113-131.

way that Kritias and Aristion were. This is exactly how we can interpret Strabo's observation that Aristion was the strongest and most oppressive of the tyrants at the time of the First Mithridatic War (τὸν δ' ἰσχύσαντα μάλιστα, τὸν Ἀριστίωνα, καὶ ταύτην βιασάμενον τὴν πόλιν, 9.1.20). And this would also explain why Athenion has disappeared so completely from the records—*comparatively*, his so-called tyranny was not tyrannical.²⁵ Kidd suggested that "Athenion enjoyed an ephemeral tyranny of a few weeks, soon forgotten because superseded by more important events" (886). It is likely, then, that most, if not all, of the acts ascribed to Athenion really belong to Aristion. Aristion has intruded into the narrative, perhaps as early as E-K 111, following the election of Athenion and his supporters.

I believe that Athenaios knew that there had been two tyrants in Athens in his period and purposely conflated the two careers. It was certainly easy enough to adjoin the career of Aristion to that of Athenion, so colorfully detailed by Poseidonios up to 213f. Athenaios' prefatory note to the quotation, that what follows concerns the career of Athenion, condemns Athenaios in this matter.²⁶ Now we know why he never mentioned Aristion in his account—he had already integrated Aristion into the Athenion narrative. Thus, he concluded his philosopher-tyrant section with a notice on Lysias, Epicurean tyrant of Tarsus, not Aristion, Epicurean tyrant of Athens. And it was Athenaios who named Athenion at E-K 122 and charged him with a series of tyrannical acts. Why should this sort of distortion surprise us? We recall that this is the same writer who devotes a lengthy excursus to Plato and Socrates, whose only aim appears to be to discredit the military reputation of the latter and to question the credibility of the former. And despite P. A. Brunt's assessment of Athenaios as accurate and "fairly reliable" with his historical citations²⁷ A. Tronson has detected a good bit of adaptation or distortion:

The preliminary results of a separate study of Athenaeus' citations of extant prose authors indicates that he is more inclined to adapt and paraphrase his sources, than to quote them *verbatim*. This applies particularly to extensive passages, when he alters the wording of the original to suit the requirements of his context, omits (to him) the irrelevant data and even distorts the meaning of his source in order to support his own arguments.²⁸

This is very likely what has occurred in our passage.

²⁵See H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, 2 vols. (Munich 1967) 1.414; but cf. Badian 113: "We need not carry distrust of Posidonius so far as to deny that Athenion wanted tyranny"

²⁶See Candiloro (above, n. 8) 149.

²⁷P. A. Brunt, "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes," *CQ* NS 30 (1980) 477–494, at 480–481.

²⁸A. Tronson, "Satyrus the Peripatetic and the Marriages of Philip II," *JHS* 104 (1984) 124–125, and n. 54. For other evidence of Athenaios' deliberate altering of his

That still leaves the Apellikon-Delos episode, which immediately follows. According to Athenaios, Athenion was the one who dispatched Apellikon to the island and the author emphasizes the Peripatetic *sympatheia* between the two men as the primary reason for Apellikon's acquisition of military power, perhaps as one of the *archontes* mentioned earlier (213f, E-K 110-111). But if we were to suppose that Aristion is really meant here, it would explain Strabo's reference to ὁ ἀποστήσας τύραννος αὐτὴν inasmuch as it would mean that Aristion, not Athenion, had caused Delos to revolt from Athens (cf. App. *Mith.* 28.110), and that Aristion, not Athenion, had sent Apellikon to subdue the island. Furthermore, it is obvious that the failure at Delos did not have a lasting effect on Apellikon's fortunes at Athens since we know that he continued to serve as first mint magistrate to the end of the civil year 88/7,²⁹ and, more importantly, that he remained in office at a time when all scholars agree that Aristion was now in power. If one's philosophical affiliation really counted for anything, why would an Epicurean like Aristion allow a Peripatetic like Apellikon to stay on, using his name and symbol on official Athenian coinage? For that matter, why would Aristion have allowed the rest of Athenion's friends to retain office for 88/7, as *IG II*² 1714 would lead us to believe?³⁰

sources, see R. W. Sharples and D. W. Minter, "Theophrastus on Fungi. Inaccurate Citations in Athenaeus," *JHS* 103 (1983) 154-156.

²⁹Thompson (above, n. 6) 611, who shows that amphora letters, the signs for monthly coin production, are unattested for only three months (5, 6, 8) of 88/7. H. B. Mattingly, "Some Third Magistrates in the Athenian New Style Coinage," *JHS* 91 (1971) 85-93, wanted to push the Apellikon-Gorgias issue back to 89/8 in the belief *inter alia* that Apellikon should not still be issuing coins after the debacle on Delos which falls some time in 88/7 B.C. This argument has not proved persuasive; for discussion of the question of Apellikon's continued activity in Athens even after his defeat on Delos, see Badian (109, 117-119), who emphasizes that this defeat may not have been as disgraceful as Poseidonios' patently hostile account records.

³⁰On the matter of Athenion's magistrates, *IG II*² 1713.II.12 specifies the year 88/7 as *anarchia*, i.e., one without an eponymous archon; and *IG II*² 1714, dated to this same year by S. Dow ("The Lists of Athenian Archontes," *Hesperia* 3 [1934] 140-190, at 144-146, though Sherwin-White [above, n. 8] 136, n. 14 suggests that the date is not secure), though inscribed at a later date, lists the eight other archons, along with the Herald of the Areopagus, but not that of the eponymous archon. And, according to Dow's autopsy of the stone, one was never intended to be inscribed, there being insufficient space at the top of the stone for an entry. This omission has generated two hypotheses: Badian (112-114) suggested that Athenion picked some loyal but obscure associate for the archonship and that after the sack of Sulla the Athenians, out of special reverence for this "naming" office, removed both man and entry from the official list. Habicht (above, n. 6) 127-142, on the other hand, suggested that Mithridates himself had been chosen eponymous archon, an action analogous to the appearance of his name on New Style coinage and to similar honorific practices elsewhere, and that the omission later was an obvious case of *damnatio memoriae*. Kidd

Certainly, as tyrant he could have removed them at any time. Political accommodation, no doubt, but it raises questions about the date of the transfer of power from one tyrant to the other as well as the nature of Aristion's actions early in his tyranny. Perhaps even in the early days of Aristion's rule he struck a more moderate pose, and only later became oppressive? Appian is not much help in this regard, possibly telescoping the time which elapsed between Aristion's return to Athens and his use of Pontic troops to assume the tyranny. In any case, to return to the suggestion of seeing Aristion even in the Apellikon episode, we might note a reference to food rationing at 214f (E-K 159-161)—this could belong to Aristion, not Athenion, and it recalls the incident of food rationing back at 214c (E-K 138-140).

Nevertheless, there is so much attention directed at the Peripatetic background of Apellikon and its proximity to Athenion. This appears too authentic in its detail. At 214e-f (E-K 146-180) Athenaios could very well be paraphrasing an authentic moment in the career of Athenion. But why should this section annalistically follow 213f-214d? We cannot know how Poseidonios had originally cast these events in his *Histories*. The Delos expedition can mark a separate and distinct episode and in fact refer back to Athenion when he was hoplite-general, and in turn explain his fall from power.³¹ Tronson has observed that in places Athenaios "combines widely separated extracts from an author into a single 'quotation' to prove his point" ([above, note 28] 125, with note 57). Athenaios had constructed a list of self-styled non-Stoic philosophers who assumed political and military power, that is, Athenion, Apellikon, and Lysias. In this case, Athenaios, adopting the tone of Poseidonios' account, can record the consequences of such pretension by gloating over Apellikon's failings as a general. As for Athenion himself, he may not have incurred a personal setback as hoplite-general; so Apellikon had to serve Athenaios in his stead. Aristion, on the

(878) favored Habicht's ingenious solution, and of the two, it does appear to be the more persuasive. I might even suggest a third hypothesis: Aristion, despite his Epicurean affiliation, could have held the missing eponymous archonship or even an unrecorded position in the military, as did Apellikon. It would have been more than justifiable for the Athenians to apply the *damnatio memoriae* to Aristion particularly in light of what he later brought down upon Athens. Moreover, we know that Apellikon, an avowed Peripatetic, continued his mint magistracy for 88/7, at a time when Aristion, an Epicurean, was in power. Why can't the reverse be true? Lastly, if Aristion were already on numismatic record for his pro-Pontic sympathies (97/6, see earlier note), then in the sharing of political and military power for 88/7 one could argue that these sympathies and even more so his *pro-Mithridates* position—as his subsequent career makes abundantly clear—were more relevant to Athenion than any philosophical differences.

³¹See Ferguson (above, n. 8) 446 and J. Day, *An Economic History of Athens Under Roman Domination* (New York 1942) 116.

other hand, appears to have acquitted himself well in the field of battle (App. *Mith.* 29.114–115).

In summary, following Wilamowitz, it is my contention that the Poseidonios' extract found in Book 5 of Athenaios details not only something of the "tyrant" Athenion, but also of Aristion and that the latter has intruded into the narrative as early as 214a (E-K 122–125), where the catafracts make an appearance, and more than likely monopolizes the acts of tyranny from 214a to the conclusion of this section at 214d (E-K 145). This explains why Aristion is never mentioned in Athenaios' account—he has been absorbed into Athenion. Poseidonios began the portrait of one philosopher-tyrant, Athenaios finished it with another. After all, are not all philosopher-tyrants pretty much the same? Lest we forget, this was a diatribe, not critical history; why should Athenaios have hesitated to incorporate information about Aristion into his narrative about Athenion? As I have mentioned earlier, after reading Athenaios' account of Athenion's purported confiscations, rationing, restricted travel, murders, executions, and complete abrogation of justice, it is surprising to learn that Strabo considered Aristion the most oppressive of the tyrants at that time, never even mentioning Athenion by name. And when Plutarch profiles Aristion in most uncomplimentary terms, he remarks that his tyranny was devastating for a city that had survived previous countless wars, and many tyrannies and civil disturbances (πολλὰς δὲ τυραννίδας καὶ στάσεις, *Sulla* 13.2). There is no hint that he thought that some such thing had just occurred in Athens within the previous year. The reason, I have argued, is that these outrages, or at least the worst of them, belong to Aristion, not Athenion.

One final problem. What to do about Strabo 10.5.4 and the "tyrant who caused Delos to revolt"? Here we must decide either that Aristion, not Athenion, was already installed as tyrant at the time of Apellikon's expedition to Delos or that Strabo has made a mistake. The second possibility is preferred. Athenion, hoplite-general of Athens, had already slipped into the shadow cast by his successor, Aristion.³²

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND
STATE UNIVERSITY
BLACKSBURG, VA 24061-0117

³²This paper was made possible by a visiting membership at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1989–90. I am particularly indebted to Christian Habicht for his very helpful critique of an early draft. He has saved me many careless errors; those yet remaining are, of course, my responsibility. My thanks go also to the referees for their valuable suggestions.