



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Athens from the revolt against Demetrios to the Chremonidean War

Citation for published version:

Canevaro, M, Iacoviello, A & Luraghi, N 2023, 'Athens from the revolt against Demetrios to the Chremonidean War: Aristeides of Lamptrai in I.Rhamnous 404', *Incidenza dell'Antico: Dialoghi di Storia Greca*, pp. 71-102.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Incidenza dell'Antico: Dialoghi di Storia Greca

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



INCIDENZA DELL'ANTICO

dialoghi di storia greca

anno 20, 2022



LUCIANOEDITORE

INCIDENZA DELL'ANTICO

dialoghi di storia greca

anno 20, 2022

Pubblicazione annuale

La Rivista è indicizzata in *Scopus* (*Elsevier*)

Classificazione ANVUR: A

Registrazione del Tribunale di Napoli n. 5337 del 14.10.2002

ISSN: 1971-2995

Abbreviazione assegnata da *l'Année Philologique*: IncidAntico

www.incidenzadellantico.it

Direzione

ALFONSO MELE (direttore responsabile), MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO

Comitato scientifico

CORINNE BONNET, LUISA BREGLIA, MIRKO CANEVARO, RENATA CANTILENA, RICCARDO DI DONATO, MICHELE FARAGUNA, MICHEL HUMM, MARIO LOMBARDO, CHRISTIAN MANN, MAURO MOGGI, MASSIMO OSANNA, NICOLA F. PARISE, PASCAL PAYEN, GABRIELLA PIRONTI, DOMINGO PLÁCIDO, ANGELA PONTRANDOLFO, PAOLO SCARPI, MAREK WĘCOWSKI, CESARE ZIZZA

Comitato editoriale

EDUARDO FEDERICO, MARCELLO LUPI, VITTORIO SALDUTTI, AMEDEO VISCONTI

Segreteria di redazione

SARA ADAMO, SERENA CUOPPOLO, MASSIMILIANO LANZILLO, GIUSEPPE PASCALE

Tutti i saggi e le note proposti per la pubblicazione su *Incidenza dell'Antico* sono soggetti a *peer review* obbligatoria. Per ogni contributo, almeno uno dei *referees* è esterno al comitato scientifico della rivista. Il referaggio è a doppio anonimato e i *referees* sono individuati, in stretta relazione agli specifici ambiti di studio, fra studiosi e cultori di riconosciuta competenza. *Incidenza dell'Antico* pubblicherà ogni due anni, anche sul proprio sito internet, una lista dei *referees* intervenuti, senza che sia esplicitato l'abbinamento con i contributi esaminati.

Per ogni informazione e comunicazione, nonché per l'invio di dattiloscritti e libri, si prega di far riferimento al seguente indirizzo: *Incidenza dell'Antico*, via Carlo Poerio 110, 80121 Napoli; email: incidenzadellantico@gmail.com.

Abbonamento 2022:

Privati:	volume singolo	€ 50,00
Enti:	volume singolo	€ 50,00
Eestero:	volume singolo	€ 55,00

Luciano Editore

via Padre Francesco Denza, 7 - 80138 Napoli
www.lucianoeditore.net

Sommario

5 Abstracts

Saggi

- 9 ALBERTO GANDINI, Diodoro e la Cheronea ‘ellenistica’: una sconfitta greca o il trionfo di Filippo?
- 43 MASSIMILIANO LANZILLO, *The name that matters*. La tradizione, le tradizioni sul nome del padre di Pittaco
- 71 MIRKO CANEVARO, ANTONIO IACOVIELLO, NINO LURAGHI, Athens from the revolt against Demetrios to the Chremonidean War: Aristeides of Lamprai in *I.Rhamnous* 404
- 103 MARTINA BONO, Il cosiddetto *SC de sacris Aegyptiis Iudaicisque pellendis* e la morte di Germanico (19 d.C.): in margine ad alcune fonti
- 123 SÉGOLÈNE MAUDET, Pithécusses et Cumes: retour sur les possibilités d’une analyse comparée des deux nécropoles grecques de Campanie (VIII^e-VII^e siècles)
- 149 ARMANDO TALIANO GRASSO, SALVATORE MEDAGLIA, La microceramica votiva della favissa di Stragolia Grande presso Torre Mordillo (Spezzano Albanese, CS)

Note

- 193 ALESSIA GONFLONI, Krinò e il *vota persolvere*. A proposito di SEG 57.758
- 205 LAVINIO DEL MONACO, Leggere un mosaico: iscrizioni musive greche dall’Italia centro-meridionale (III-I secolo a.C.)

Rassegne

- 221 SARA ADAMO, *Household economies, craft production*. Un posto per Omero?
- 235 MAURIZIO HARARI, ELEONORA ROCCONI, SILVIA ROMANI, Fu vero tuffo? A proposito di un volume recente sulla Tomba del Tuffatore

- 253 SILVIA EVANGELISTI, *Irpinia antica. Considerazioni in margine a un volume recente*

Recensioni

- 265 Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge, *Le Polythéisme grec à l'épreuve d'Hérodote* (Federica Zigarelli)
- 269 Marco Vespa, *Geloion mimēma. Studi sulla rappresentazione culturale della scimmia nei testi greci e greco-romani* (Ioannis M. Konstantakos)

Abstracts

ALBERTO GANDINI, Diodoros and Hellenistic Chaironeia. A Greek Defeat or the Triumph of Philip? [9-42]

This paper conducts an in-depth analysis of Diodoros Siculus's account of the Battle of Chaironeia, written ca. 300 years after the events it relates to. Drawing upon Early Hellenistic sources, the first-century Diodoros re-elaborates them according to his own historical and historiographical sensitivity, thus providing modern readers with a true 'Hellenistic' perspective on Chaironeia. In so doing, he offers a valuable alternative to the long-lasting Athenocentric paradigm, which has proved crucial in establishing both the ancient and modern views about one of the greatest historiographical myths of the Classical past.

Battle of Chaironeia – Classicism – Hellenistic historiography – Diodoros – Philip II

MASSIMILIANO LANZILLO, The name that matters. The tradition(s) about the name of Pittacus' father [43-69]

Pittacus of Mytilene is the only one of the Seven Sages for whom tradition is not exempt from problems about the father's name. This paper examines the two variants Hyrrhas and Hyrrhadios, with the related traditions and positions taken by more or less recent critics. As will be reiterated several times, the form to which value is preferred here is Hyrrhas, not so much for a datum of a quantitative order (greater number of occurrences) as for a qualitative one that counts in its favor: to know and accept this form it appears to be the Peripatus. Conversely, a patronymic function is recognized to the form Hyrrhadios (although not in the terms in which the sources do so); an explanation of its genesis is also proposed, making it equivalent to 'Υππαῖος, an Aeolic patronymic transmitted to us by an Alcaeus' poem.

Pittacus – Hyrrhas – Hyrrhadios – Seven Sages – Peripatus

MIRKO CANEVARO, ANTONIO IACOVIELLO, NINO LURAGHI, Athens from the revolt against Demetrios to the Chremonidean War: Aristeides of Lamprai in *IRhamnous* 404 [71-102]

This article examines the early Hellenistic honorific decree for the Athenian general Aristeides of Lamprai (*IRhamnous* 404). After discussing the decree's date and the external evidence about the honorand, the article provides a detailed analysis of Aristeides' meritorious deeds in the order in which they are recounted in the motivation clause of the decree. In particular, the article considers the ways in which this decree advances our understanding of the Athenian revolt against Demetrios Poliorketes in 287, of Athenian relations with the Antigonids in the late 280s and early 270s, and of the early phases of the Chremonidean War.

Aristeides of Lamprai – early Hellenistic Athens – Athenian chronology – Demetrios Poliorketes – Antigonos Gonatas – Chremonidean War

MARTINA BONO, Some notes concerning the *SC de sacris Aegyptiis Iudaicisque pellendis* and the death of Germanicus (19 AD) [103-122]

This paper aims at drawing attention to the apparent synchronism between Germanicus' death and the so-called *Senatus consultum de sacris Aegyptiis Iudaicisque pellendis* voted by the Tiberian senate in late 19 AD. Admittedly, our knowledge on the topic is scattered, and available sources are indeed at variance with each other. In order to trace back the intended purpose of the senatorial decree and who were the historical characters involved in this affair, we need to focus more on the connection between the ethnic and cultural identity of the *sacra peregrina* hit by the senatorial ban and the historiographical tradition about Germanicus' last days in the East.

Germanicus – Tiberian age – sacra peregrina – Jews in the Roman Empire – Magic

SÉGOLÈNE MAUDET, Pithekoussai and Cumae: limits and possibilities of a compared analysis of the cemeteries of the two Greek sites of Campania (8th-7th c. BC) [123-148]

In this paper, I present a compared analysis of the cemeteries of Cumae and Pithekoussai, the two Greek colonies established in Campania around the middle of the 8th c. BC. The identification of tumuli above inhumation graves is particularly studied, as it was used to demonstrate an indigenous origin of the Greek foundation. A comprehensive and serial analysis of the funerary evidence of both Pithekoussai and Cumae shows the limits of this conclusion. I finally present a reconstitution of the topography of the archaic Greek cemetery of Cumae, the Greek colony of Campania, allowing for a deeper comparison with Pithekoussai.

Greek colonial world – Pithekoussai – Cumae – funerary archaeology – archaeology of pre-Roman Italy

ARMANDO TALIANO GRASSO, SALVATORE MEDAGLIA, The miniature votive pottery of the favissa of Stragolìa Grande at Torre Mordillo (Spezzano Albanese, CS) [149–192]

This paper analyzes the miniature pottery recovered fortuitously, in an unspecified period, in the site of Stragolìa Grande near Torre Mordillo of Spezzano Albanese (CS) and currently preserved at the Melissa Palopoli Archaeological Museum in Torretta di Crucoli (KR). It consists of fifty-eight miniature finds from the Classical and Hellenistic periods found in association with a large group of terracotta statuettes and a bronze statuette of Heracles in repose datable to the same period that were part of a votive deposit to be referred to a cultic complex to be located outside the Hellenistic walls of the Brettian settlement of Torre Mordillo, not far from the probable west gate of access to the fortified citadel.

Miniature pottery – votive deposit – Bruttians – Sybaris – Magna Graecia

ALESSIA GONFLONI, Krino and *vota persolvere*. About SEG 57.758 [193–203]

This paper discusses the inscription of SEG 57.758, a metrical dedication of a statue by Krino of Paros to Artemis Delie, dated 4th century BC. The study analyzes the earlier scholars' interpretation and exegesis of the text to provide a new reading of the inscription. Taking into consideration several parallels attested in other Greek authors (metric position and meaning–context), it is possible to suggest a new reading of the text.

Greek epigraphy – CEG – metrical inscription – Paros – Artemis Delie

LAVINIO DEL MONACO, Reading a mosaic: Greek mosaic inscriptions from central and southern Italy (III-I century BC) [205–220]

From central and southern Italy, excluding Sicily, come six Greek inscriptions on mosaics datable between the 3rd and 1st centuries BC: these represent a small but significant dossier that allows you to monitor the phenomenon of Greek mosaic epigraphy in an era of transition from the Greek to the Roman age. The mosaics from Strongoli, Pompei, and Segni mention the names of the artists who created them, while the two documents from Palestrina, including the famous Nilotic mosaic, contain captions that explain the figurative context.

Mosaic – Epigraphy – Artist – Italy – Nilotic mosaic

Athens from the revolt against Demetrios to the Chremonidean War: Aristeides of Lamprai in *I.Rhamnous* 404*

MIRKO CANEVARO

University of Edinburgh
mirko.canevaro@ed.ac.uk

ANTONIO IACOVIELLO

EHESS Paris
antonio.iacoviello@ehess.fr

NINO LURAGHI

University of Oxford
nino.luraghi@classics.ox.ac.uk

1. Introduction: the text

The recent publication of the honorary decree for Aristeides, son of Mnesitheos, of Lamprai is arguably one of the most important events in recent years for students of early Hellenistic Athens. The discovery of the inscription (which had long been used as a tomb cover) in Skala Oropou was mentioned already in 2003 by V. Petrakos¹. The text, however, was published only in 2020, in the sixth volume of the results of the excavations in Rhamnous². In the intervening years, several scholars (including C. Habicht, K. Clinton, D. Knoepfler and A. Matthaïou) saw the inscription and/or learned about its contents³. In the first study of the inscription after

* We want to thank audiences in Edinburgh and Oxford for much valuable feedback, and particularly Peter Thonemann for his insightful comments on the wording of the decree, and Ilias Arnaoutoglou for early discussions on the context of the decree. We are also grateful to Edward Harris, Stephen Lambert, and Anna Magnetto for reading a draft of this article and helping us improve it in several ways, and to Stephen Lambert also for essential bibliographical assistance.

¹ Petrakos 2003, 15–16.

² Petrakos 2020.

³ The decree is mentioned, for instance, in the latest edition of Habicht's general history of Hellenistic Athens: Habicht 2006, 443–445, nn. 68 and 78.

its publication, Clinton used the decree to challenge what he considers misguided assumptions about the chronology of the recoveries of the Mouseion and of the Peiraieus, thereby taking issue with the generally accepted historical reconstructions of the period by Habicht and Osborne⁴. Rose and Wallace have recently responded to Clinton, essentially bringing arguments in support of the *communis opinio*, while Denis Knoepfler has recently published a first historical analysis of the overall contents of the decree⁵. After providing a text and translation of *IRhannous* 404, the present article aims to offer a preliminary study of this important decree, and to explore some of the ways in which it advances our knowledge of the political and military history of Athens in the early third century. Since we could not examine the inscription or a squeeze, we print Clinton's text, with some modifications indicated in the *apparatus criticus*.

- θ [ε] ο ί
 Φανόστρατος Ἀναξικράτου Φηγούσιος ε[ῖ]π[ε]ν· ἐπειδὴ Ἀριστείδης ἐν
 τε τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις οἰκείαν παρει[ληφῶς παρ]ὰ τῶν προ[γόνων]
 τὴν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὔνοιαν, διετέλει χρήσιμον ἑαυτὸν παρασκευ-
 5 ἄζων καὶ φρουρουμένης [ἔτι] τῆς πόλεως μ[ετ] (ἀ) τοῦ ἀ(δ)ελφοῦ Μνη-
 σιδήμου καὶ τῶν μετασχόντων τῆς πράξεως [ἐπι]? - -c. 8- -]
 [...].ΟΤ.[...]Τ.Τ.....ΤΙ.[...]Ο..Ν../.Υ. καὶ κομίσασθαι [τὸ]
 φρούριον [τῶι δῆμωι] καὶ συνελθόντος τοῦ δήμου εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησί-
 10 [- -c. 6- - π]ρὸς τὴν [πολι]ορκίαν τοῦ Μουσείου ἀ[νθ'] ὧν αὐτοὺς ὁ δῆμος
 [χρυσοῖς στεφάνοις] ἐτ[ίμ]ησεν [κ]αὶ σιτήσει ἐν πρυτανείω· κα[ῖ]
 χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου πρεσβευτῆς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν πρὸς
 Ἀντίγονον καὶ διαλεχθεὶς μετὰ τῶν συμπρεσβευτῶν ἐκομίσατο
 τὴν Ἐλευσίνα καὶ Π[ρ]Η[ρ]ΔΙ τάλαντα ἀργυρίου· καὶ πάλιν χειροτονή-
 15 σαντος αὐτὸν τοῦ δήμου στρατηγὸν ἐπὶ Ἐλευσίνος ἐμβ(α)λόντος Ἀντι-
 γόνου εἰς τὴν Μεγαρικὴν καὶ καιρῶν δυσκόλων ἐπιγενομένων διετήρη-
 σεν ἀσφαλῶς τὸ φρούριον τῶι δῆμωι καὶ παρέδωκεν τῶι μεθ' ἑαυτὸν στρα-
 τηγῶι σῶιον καὶ δημοκρατούμενον· καὶ σύνοδρον χειροτονήσαντος αὐτὸν
 τοῦ δήμου ἐπὶ τῇ βοήθειαν τὴν Ἀρέως καὶ τῶν συμμάχων, ἐμβεβλη[ηκό]τος ἤ-

⁴ Clinton 2022.

⁵ Rose, Wallace 2022. Rose's and Wallace's article was published as we were finalising our own, so although we have attempted to take into account their results, our argument proceeds rather independently (at one point disagreeing with their reconstruction, see below, pp. 87-88). It has also proven extraordinarily difficult to secure a copy of Knoepfler 2022 (the volume was published at the end of 2022, but does not appear to be available for purchase), where he discusses *IRhannous* 404 at pp. 105-122. We owe a photocopy of the relevant pages to the kindness of Stephen Lambert. We could read Knoepfler's discussion only when our article was already completed, and about to go into production. Accordingly, we could take into account Knoepfler's arguments only summarily.

- 20 δη Ἀντιγόνου εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀπήρεν, οὐθένα πρό[ν]ον οὐδὲ κίνδυνον
 ὑποστει-
 λάμενος εἰς τὸ πρᾶξιαι τι τῶν τῆι πόλιι συμφερόντων καὶ παρεγένε[το] Λ.Λ
 τα συντελέσας τὰ συμφέροντα τῶι δήμωι· καὶ νῦν χειροτονήσαντος αὐτὸν τοῦ
 δήμου στρατηγὸν ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Μεγεκλέ-
 ουσ ἄρχοντος, πολέμου ὄντος διατετήρηκεν τὸ φρούριον ἀσφαλῶ[ς] τῶι
 δήμωι
- 25 ἐπιμελόμενος [τ]ῶν [εταγμένων τῶ]ν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν τῆι φυλακῆι
 καθεστηκότων
 ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, ἀποδεικνύμενος τὴν εὐνοίαν ἣν ἔχων διατελεῖ
 κοινεῖ καὶ ἰδίαι πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν πολιτῶν, τά τε ὁψώνια (δι)(δου)[ς]
 εὐτάκτως κατὰ μῆ-
 να τὸν σῆτον μετρήσας ὅλου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἴν' εὐσχημονοῦντες διαφυλάττω[σι]
 [τὸ φρούριον] τῶι δήμωι· ἐπεμελήθη δὲ καὶ [- -c. 5- -]ΟΙΙ τῶν πολιτῶν
 ὅπως ἂν [.]Υ[.4.]
- 30 [- - - - - c. 38 - - - - - τῆς] τοῦ φρουρίου
 οἰκοδομῆς
 [- - - - -]
 [- - - - - εἰ]ς τὸ φρούριον Λ[- - -c. 6- -]Λ[- - -c. 6- - -]
 [- - - - - τῶν πολιτῶ]ν τῶν καθεστηκότων ὑπὸ τῆς β[ου]-
 [λῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἐν τῆι φυλακῆι, ἀγαθῆι] τύχηι· δεδύχθαι τοῖς στρατεuo-
 35 [μένοις τῶν πολιτῶν ἐν Ῥαμοῦντι ἐπαινέσαι Ἀριστ]είδην Μνησιθέου
 Λαμπρέ[α]
 [ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας ἣν ἔχων διατελεῖ πρὸς τὸ]ν δήμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων I [.]
 [- - - - - καὶ στεφανῶσαι χρυσ]ῶι στεφάνωι κατὰ τὸ[ν]
 [νόμον· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τότε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλι καὶ στήσαι ἐ]ν τῶι τεμένει τοῦ
 [Διονύσου· λογισάσθωσαν δὲ οἱ αἰρεθέντες τοῖς στρατιώταις ὅ τι ἀ]νάλωμα γένη-
 40 [ται· οἶδε ἡρέθησαν - - - - -] *vacat*

Suppl. Petrakos || 6 ex. πράξεως [ἐπι?] Clinton || 10 π]ρὸς nos post Clinton, coll. *IG* II³ 1, 985.18 πρὸς τὴν πολιορκίαν – [τὰ ὅπλα π]ρὸς τὴν [πολι]ορκίαν Thonemann per litt. || 20 med.-21 in. legit Clinton | [φ]όβ[ον οὔτ]ε κίνδυν[ον ὑποστειλ]άμενος εἰ[ς ἃ ἔ]πραξαν Habicht coll. *IG* II² 1304.8-9 οὔτε κακοπαθίαν οὔτε κί[ν]δυνον ὑποστελλόμενος, *Syll.*³ 442.9-10 [οὐδένα οὔ]τε φόβον οὔτε κίνδυνον ὑποστελλόμενοι, sed vestigiis non convenit || 21 ex.-22 Λ.Δ/ΤΑ legerunt Petrakos, Clinton, unde fortasse ἀπαν]τα || 22 in. συντελέσας Thonemann per litt., coll. *IG* II³ 1, 911.21-22 παρεγένετο βοηθῶν, *IG* XI 4, 1299.4-5 παρεγένετο ἔξ Αἰγύπτου θεραπεύων | συντελέσαι Petrakos, Clinton || 29 in. [τὸ φρούριον] Petrakos | [τὴν εὐνοίαν] Clinton

Gods.

Phanostratos son of Anaxikrates of Phegai proposed: since Aristeides, having inherited from his ancestors their traditional goodwill towards the People, in earlier times continuously made himself useful. And when the city was still garrisoned, with his brother Mnesidemus and those who participated in the

enterprise [...] and the fort be recovered for the People, and, having been elected general in charge of equipment when the People met in the Assembly, he arranged [...] for the siege of the Mouseion, in return for which the People honoured them with golden crowns and free meals in the Prytaneion. And, having been elected by the People ambassador to Antigonos in Asia, he negotiated with him alongside his fellow ambassadors and recovered Eleusis and secured [661] silver talents. And when the People elected him again general in charge of Eleusis, while Antigonos was invading the Megarid, in difficult times⁶, he kept the fort safe for the People, and he handed it over, safe and democratically ruled, to the general after him⁷. And when the People elected him delegate in charge of the aid of Areus and the allies, and Antigonos had already invaded Attica, he set out, sparing no effort or risk, to accomplish something of use to the city, he arrived [...] to accomplish [anything that?] what was useful for the People.

And now, when the People elected him general of the coastal district for the year of the archonship of Menekles, in times of war⁸, he kept the fort safe for the People, taking care of the stationed citizens and of those stationed on guard duty⁹ by the Council and the Assembly, showing the goodwill which he continues to have for each of the citizens both collectively and individually, he regularly distributed monthly salaries and paid the allowance of food for the whole year, so that they would safeguard with dignity the fort for the People. He also took care [...] of the citizens, so that [...] the building of the fort [...] to the fort [...] of the citizens set on garrison duty by the Council and the Assembly.

For good fortune, the citizens deployed in Rhamnous shall decide: to praise Aristeides son of Mnesitheos of Lamptraï for the excellence and goodwill which he continues to have for the Athenian People [...] and to crown him with a gold crown according to the law; and to inscribe this decree on a stone stele and erect it in the precinct of Dionysos; and those chosen are to account to the soldiers for whatever expenditure there is. Those chosen are [...].

2. Date and contents

The awarding body of this honorific decree is constituted by the citizens among the contingent of soldiers in Rhamnous (lines 34–35)¹⁰, who

⁶ Cf. *IG* II³ 1, 985.33 (decree for Phaidros of Sphetto): περιστάτων τεῖ πόλει καιρῶν δυσκόλων. See also *OGIS* 339.54 (*IvK Sestos* 1, 133–120 BCE, decree for Menas), which may point to the influence of the language of Athenian honorary decrees.

⁷ Cf. *IG* II³ 1, 985.38–40: καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθέραν καὶ δημοκρατουμένην αὐτόνομον παρέδωκεν [...] τοῖς μεθ' ἑαυτόν.

⁸ Cf. *IRhamnous* 3.7: πολέμου ὄντος (269/8).

⁹ Cf. *IEleusis* 95.4 (with reference to the Athenian garrison in Eleusis).

¹⁰ On the awarding bodies of decrees in Rhamnous see *AIO* <https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/AIO/823>.

award a crown to Aristeides of Lamprai on the proposal of Phanostratos son of Anaxikrates of Phegai¹¹. The decree has been dated by Petrakos and Clinton, as well as now by Rose and Wallace, to the archonship of Menekles (line 23; 267/6 BCE)¹², yet it seems more likely that it should be dated to the archonship of Nikias Otryneos (266/5). The mention of the archonship of Menekles serves in the decree to date Aristeides' *strategia* of the coastal district, that office being clearly the main motivation which prompted the Rhamnousians to award him a crown (since the fortress of Rhamnous was central in the activities of a general of the *paralia*). However, it is unlikely that Aristeides was honoured while still in office, because the decree makes clear that his honours are linked directly to his performance in office. In the late fourth century, we find decrees for magistrates enacted while they were still in office only when the grounds for their honours are independent of their current service as magistrates, or have to do with very specific actions that have already come to a close. In the few instances in which a magistrate is honoured while in office for services that include his performance as magistrate, the decrees invariably include a statement to the effect that the honours should not be awarded until after the magistrate undergoes his examination after his term of office (ἐπειδὴν τὰς εὐθύνας δῶι). By 304/3 they seem to be always enacted after the end of the term of office, and they always (with only one exception: *IG II*³ 1, 884.35) include a mention that the honorand has already undergone his examination (εὐθύνας ἔδωκε/δεδώκασιν)¹³. What all this suggests is that *IRhamnous* 404, which honours Aristeides also for his performance as *strategos* in 267/6, is more likely to have been enacted, at the earliest, in the year following the archonship of Menekles. One may object that this is a decree of a garrison, and the relevant rules might have been looser in this case, but there is in fact evidence internal to the decree that confirms that the year of Menekles had elapsed by the time the honours were passed: despite the *vũv* of line 23 (which indicates that this *strategia* is recent and the latest of a long series of offices and benefactions), among the activities for which Aristeides is praised (all in the past) the decree lists that 'he regularly distributed monthly salaries and paid the allowance of food *for the whole year*' (our emphasis). ὅλου τοῦ

¹¹ Otherwise unknown. Knoepfler 2022, 108, tentatively suggests that he might be identified with the son of the archon for 307/6: Anaxikrates (*LGP*N II, 6).

¹² Petrakos 2020, 21; Clinton 2022, 7; Rose, Wallace 2022, 167; cf. Knoepfler 2022, 207, who mentions the date only in connection with the office, and not with the decree itself. See Osborne 2009, 89, for the dating of these archonships.

¹³ For these rules and provisions see Harris 2017.

ἐνιαυτοῦ of line 28 indicates that he had performed those tasks for the year in its entirety, and therefore that the year had elapsed. The decree must therefore have been enacted soon after 267/6, probably in 266/5.

This is therefore an Attic decree dating from the Chremonidean War as well as one of the very few documents which explicitly allude to the conflict (cf. line 24: πολέμιου ὄντος)¹⁴. The decree is composed for almost its entirety of a long and detailed motivation clause (listing the offices that Aristeides held in the course of ca. twenty years), followed by details about publication – as is typical of early Hellenistic ‘biographical’ decrees¹⁵. Unlike most contemporary ‘biographical’ decrees, however, this is not a decree of the Athenian Assembly, nor a decree granting a full set of honours (statue, *prohedria*, *sitiesis*)¹⁶. It is a decree enacted by the Athenian soldiers of the garrison at Rhamnous¹⁷, by virtue of which Aristeides is awarded only a golden crown and a honorific stele in the *temenos* of Dionysos (cf. lines 37–38). As far as degree of comprehensiveness is concerned, *IRhamnous* 404 stands out among early Hellenistic decrees bestowing lesser honours and enacted by smaller groups and units (such as garrisons and demes). For instance, the honours for the general Epichares (*IRhamnous* 403: see below), while being equally detailed in describing the honorand’s military endeavours, cover a time span no longer than roughly five years (from 272/1 to ca. 267); the motivation clause of the honours for Aristeides, on the other hand, encompasses a far longer period, from the recovery of the Mouseion down to the archonship of Menekles (267/6) – comparable to, e.g., the *megistai timai* decree for Phaidros of Sphettos (*IG II³ 1, 985*), arguably the most comprehensive of early Hellenistic biographical decrees. However, the fact that honours enacted by demes/garrisons were supposed to be equally exhaustive is suggested by the honorific decree for Xenokles of Sphettos (*IEleusis* 95, 321/0 or 318/7), enacted by both the deme of Eleusis and the garrison stationed therein. The decree explicitly refers to a law whereby the merits of the honorand ought to be comprehensively recorded on

¹⁴ The other two are: a decree for *epheboi* and their trainers, *IG II³ 1, 917* (cf. line 8: πο[λέμι]ο[ν] κα[τέ]χοντος τὴν πόλιν); and the naturalisation decree for the metic Strombichos, *IG II³ 1, 918–919*, who also fought to recover the Mouseion; on the latter, see Rose, Wallace 2022, 173–174.

¹⁵ On biographical decrees from early Hellenistic Athens, see Rosen 1987 and Errington 2005.

¹⁶ On Athenian *megistai timai* decrees, see Luraghi 2022, 216–217, with further references.

¹⁷ In fact, the quasi totality of deme decrees of the third century were passed by the garrison–demes of Rhamnous, Eleusis, and Sounion: see Oliver 2007, 100–102.

the stele (lines 7–10: [ἐ]πει[δὴ] ὁ [νό]μ[ος κ]ελεύει[ι] πρ[οσγ]ιλ[ρ]άφειν ἐν [τῶι ψ]ηφίσι[ματι τὸν λ]ιλ[α]μ[β]άνοντα δ[ω]ρεᾶν ὅ[τι] ε[ὐ]εργέ[ι]ιλ[τ]ηκεν τὴν π[ό]λι[ν]¹⁸. Accordingly, *IEleusis* 95 goes on to describe Xenokles' benefactions in his capacity as *epimeletes* of the Eleusinians mysteries, his past and present financial offices, and his merits in funding the construction of a bridge. *IRhannous* 404, therefore, advances our knowledge of how decrees of smaller bodies reflected on the city's recent past much like those passed by the Athenian *demos*.

This decree is by far the most informative piece of evidence about Aristeides, son of Mnesitheos, of Lamprai (*LGPN* II, 66). His father Mnesitheos was active as a decree proposer at the end of the fourth century¹⁹, if we accept Habicht's proposed restoration of his name in a decree honouring a certain Physkion: *IG* II² 592 + *SEG* 32.104 + *SEG* 45.97²⁰. As for Aristeides himself, a summary of what we knew (before the publication of *IRhannous* 404) was provided by Habicht in 1976, on the basis of three inscriptions (Aristeides is never mentioned in the literary sources)²¹. These come from Athens (*IG* II³ 4, 7 = *ISE* 12), Orchomenos (*BCH* 38, 451–454 = *ISE* 53), and Oropos (*IOropos* 26). Their combined evidence, however scattered, provides a coherent portrait of a prominent individual active in the early third century, particularly during the 'democracy of all the Athenians' from the 280s to the early 260s²².

Let us start with the decrees from outside Athens. *IOropos* 26 is a proxeny decree, and Aristeides is the honorand. The name is accompanied by the patronymic but not by the demotic; the identification (first proposed by Habicht) is universally accepted²³. Aristeides is one of the few *proxenoi* of Oropos with actual political clout, and for whom external evidence (besides proxeny decrees from Oropos) survives²⁴. Equally if not more

¹⁸ Luraghi 2022, 215 n. 34. On Xenokles (who had been an important associate of Lykourgos), see Ampolo 1976.

¹⁹ Tracy 1995, 156, tentatively suggested that this decree may date from the regime of Demetrios of Phaleron. Bayliss 2011, 230, noted that the redating of *IG* II² 2797 by Byrne 2006–2007, 170–175, from 290/89 to 280/79, by downdating by a decade Aristeides political activity, makes Tracy's suggestion less likely. *IRhannous* 404 now shows that Aristeides was already politically active at the latest in 288/7, and already elected to a generalship in 287/6 (see below, pp. 82–85), thus Tracy's suggestion becomes once again a concrete possibility.

²⁰ Habicht 1982, 200–201 (nr. 5). See also Knoepfler 2022, 109.

²¹ Habicht 1976. Cf. Humphreys 2018, 1.845. See now also Knoepfler 2022, 106–107.

²² Cf. *IG* II³ 1, 911.82: τεῖ δημοκ[ρατί]αι τεῖ ἐξ ἀπάντων Ἀθηναίων; Habicht 2006, 154–158; Osborne 2012, 43–50.

²³ Oliver 2007, 161; Wilding 2021, 152.

²⁴ On *proxenoi* at Oropos, see Wilding 2015.

important is the decree from Orchomenos in Arkadia which confers proxeny on three Athenian ambassadors. This document sheds light on the otherwise obscure decision-making processes of Orchomenos, its institutions, and the kinds of honours the city granted to foreigners²⁵. Crucially, it also bears witness to an Athenian embassy to Orchomenos, composed of three prominent Athenians from the early Hellenistic period: Kallippos of Eleusis, general of the Greek forces against the Gauls in the battle of Thermopylai of 279 BCE (Paus. 1.3.5) and delegate when the treaty between Athens and Sparta was stipulated in 269/8 (cf. *IG II*³ 1, 912.69–70)²⁶; Glaukon of Aithalidai, brother of Chremonides and, after the Chremonidean War, recipient of honours from the *koinon synedrion* of the Greeks in Plataia for his benefactions towards the cult of Zeus Eleutherios and Homonoia²⁷; and Aristeides of Lamptrai. The most plausible interpretation of the background of this document is that the embassy took place on the eve of the Chremonidean War, and perhaps as late as in its first year (269/8, archonship of Peithidemos)²⁸.

Until now, and on the basis of these inscriptions from outside Athens, Aristeides was thought to have been prominent especially in the years immediately preceding the Chremonidean War, yet *IG II*³ 4, 7 (from Athens) mentions him – his name added at the end of a dedication in honour of three Councillors – as *strategos* already in the archonship of Telokles (280/79)²⁹. The newly published decree from Rhamnous bears witness to a far longer and more prestigious public career than previously supposed. The decree informs us that Aristeides' presence on the Athenian political, diplomatic, and military stage went as far back as the recovery of the Mouseion from the Macedonian garrison stationed there in 287 (this is the first deed mentioned in the new text).

The motivation clause of *IRhamnous* 404 goes through five main offices (with the relevant deeds), all held by Aristeides at critical junctures in the history of early Hellenistic Athens:

²⁵ Moretti 1967, 135; Kralli 2017, 484 n. 235, on this decree as an example of *proxenia* merged with *epinomia* (right of pasture).

²⁶ Paschidis 2008, 164; Bayliss 2011, 187–210.

²⁷ Humphreys 2007, 70–72; Paschidis 2008, 162–170; Rosamilia 2018; on the decree of Plataia, see Wallace 2010.

²⁸ Habicht 2006, 162, draws a parallel with Demosthenes' activity in securing similar alliances on the eve of the Lamian War. Orchomenos was one of the allies of Sparta mentioned in Chremonides' decree, *IG II*³ 1, 912.24 and 39. This embassy might coincide with Aristeides' perilous journey in the first year of the war, see below, § 5.

²⁹ See below, pp. 88–89, for Clinton's use of this inscription to date the capture of the Mouseion. On the chronology of Telokles, we follow Byrne 2006–2007, 169–172; see also Knoepfler 2022, 106.

- i. *strategos* of the equipment (ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευήν)³⁰ at the time of the recovery of the Mouseion;
- ii. ambassador to Asia to secure funds from Antigonos and the recovery of Eleusis;
- iii. *strategos* in Eleusis at the time of Antigonos Gonatas' attack on Megara;
- iv. *synedros* at the outbreak of the Chremonidean War (cf. IG II³ 1, 912.48-52);
- v. *strategos* of the coastal district (ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν) in the archonship of Menekles (267/6; cf. l. 22 καὶ νῦν χειροτονήσαντος αὐτὸν τοῦ δήμου).

As it goes through (some of?) Aristeides' offices at key moments of the history of Athens in the early Hellenistic period, the decree sheds new light on events that have long been the focus of scholarly attention.

3. Aristeides' *strategia* in charge of the equipment and the recovery of the Mouseion

The first deed dealt with in the decree is the famous recovery of the Mouseion Hill, and therefore the recovery of democracy which marked the end of the second regime of Demetrios Poliorketes in Athens. Demetrios had gained control of Athens after starving the Athenians into surrender in the spring of 295. At that time, a decree proposed by Dromokleides had handed over to the king the Peiraieus and Mounychia. Demetrios proceeded to install a garrison there (as Antipatros had done in the wake of the Lamian War) and also in the more central stronghold of the Mouseion Hill³¹. Although Demetrios spent little time in Athens over the following years, his second regime was marked by more tangible interference in the workings of Athens' democratic institutions compared to his previous one (307-301), e.g. with Olympiodoros' double archonship by appointment (see below) and with the substitution of the *grammateis* of the Council with the

³⁰ On the categories of *strategoi* active in the early third century, attested for the most part by the decree for Phaidros (e.g. ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα, 'hoplite general'; ἐπὶ τοὺς Ξένους, 'in command of the mercenaries'; ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν παραλίαν, 'of the coastal district'; and, after the recovery of Eleusis, a general ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπ' Ἐλευσίνος) see Habicht 2006, 156; Osborne 2012, 96-97.

³¹ See Plut. *Demetr.* 35 and Thonemann 2005. Plutarch's narrative appears to omit Demetrios' dealing with an Athenian faction that was at that point in control of the Peiraieus, see Polyainos 4.7.5 and Bayliss 2003, 139-140.

anagraphēis (as in the years 322–318)³². Such interventions (as well as, arguably, the desire to recover the Peiraeus) stirred popular discontent³³, and paved the way for rebellion. The recapture of the Mouseion, in the context of Athens' revolt against Demetrios, is known from several other sources, yet there is much uncertainty about its dating, which the narrative of Aristeides' decree can help overcome.

The most important evidence about these events, so far, has come from the decree awarding *prohedria* and a statue to Kallias of Sphettos (*IG II³ 1, 911: 270/69*)³⁴. In a detailed narrative, the decree's motivation clause dwells extensively on the revolt and the role of Kallias within it: Kallias arrived in Athens from Andros³⁵ with a thousand Ptolemaic mercenaries under his command at a moment when the Macedonians had already been expelled from the *asty*, but the Mouseion was still in their hands (line 15); furthermore, the Macedonian troops that held the Peiraeus were bringing war to the Athenian countryside and Demetrios was on his way from the Peloponnese with his army in order to attack the city. Kallias immediately led his troops outside the walls in order to protect the transport of the harvest into the city. Afterwards, when Demetrios began the siege of Athens, Kallias led a sally and was wounded in action. Finally, when the Ptolemaic envoy Sostratos summoned him to the Peiraeus, he acted as representative of the Athenians in the peace negotiations with Demetrios brokered by Sostratos himself.

Further evidence is provided by Pausanias' lengthy excursus on early Hellenistic Athens, starting from the Lamian War (1.25.3–26.3). There, he relates that Olympiodoros of Konthyle was also a leader of the revolt (although he had had an active role in Demetrios' regime which preceded it, having been eponymous archon twice in 294/3 and 293/2)³⁶, routing the Macedonians in battle, forcing them to repair to the fort on the Mouseion Hill, and eventually capturing the fort with troops including only the young and the old.

IG II³ 1, 918–919, a decree in honour of Strombichos of 266/5 (the same year when Aristeides was also probably honoured), provides us with

³² Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 396–397. Probably at the same time, Adeimantos was installed by Demetrios as *strategos* ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν for two years: cf. *IRhamnous* 401.10–12.

³³ Note, however, that Demochares (*FGrHist* 75 F 8 and 9) blames the Athenians, rather than Demetrios, for their flattery during the latter's second regime.

³⁴ Shear 1978; Habicht 1979, 45–79; Osborne 1979.

³⁵ On Kallias' exile, see *IG II³ 1, 911.80–81* with Luraghi 2019, 281–282.

³⁶ Habicht 1985, 90–92; Oliver 2007, 55–63; Paschidis 2008, 133–139; Iacoviello 2022 with further bibliography.

some additional information: Strombichos defected from Demetrios with his men and joined the Athenians in the siege of the Mouseion³⁷.

None of this evidence provides precise information about the date of the capture of the Mouseion, nor about the surrounding events. The decree for Kallias, despite providing a narrative arranged chronologically, has no dates. There is in fact uncertainty even about the beginning of the revolt against Demetrios. Ever since the publication of the decree for Kallias, scholars have been debating the precise date of the revolt. Neither the literary nor the documentary evidence provides an archon date for it. The most informative piece of evidence is the decree for Phaidros of Sphettos (*IG II³ 1, 985*), which contains archon dates for several of the achievements of the honorand, but is heavily marred by erasures related to the memory sanctions against the Antigonids³⁸ – it so happens that Phaidros had managed to patch up his relations with the dynasty, and the decree in his honour was passed when Athens was controlled by Gonatas, after the Chremonidean War. Accordingly, scholars have been trying to map undated events, such as Olympiodoros' attack on the Mouseion and Kallias' actions, onto a chronological backbone provided mostly (although not exclusively) by the decree for Phaidros³⁹, which looks as follows:

- Kimon, 288/7: as *strategos* ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα, Phaidros preserved peace in the countryside when 'difficult times beset the city' (line 33: καὶ περιστάντων τεῖ πόλει καιρῶν δυσκόλων)⁴⁰; he saw to the transport of the crops into the city; the decree originally mentioned other activities carried out by Phaidros during that archonship, later erased.
- Xenophon, 287/6: Phaidros was elected again ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα, probably the first *strategos* elected for that year (lines 44–47); during the year, he consistently acted according to the laws and decrees of the Assembly and of the Council.

³⁷ See e.g. Shear 1978, 91; Hammond, Walbank 1988, 230; Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 402.

³⁸ Shear 2020; on the Antigonid *damnatio memoriae* of 200 BCE, see Byrne 2010.

³⁹ Earlier scholarship about the revolt is discussed and summarised in Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 393–405, with abundant references. T.L. Shear Jr. (1978) and J.L. Shear (2010, 2020) have dated the beginning of the revolt to 286 (archonship of Xenophon), yet most scholars now agree with Habicht 1979, 45–67; 1999, 95–97; 2006, 11–13; and Osborne 1979; 1982, 155–167; 2012, 36–43; 2015; 2016, that it started in 287 (archonship of Kimon): e.g. Oliver 2007, 54–68; Knoepfler 2014, 435–436; Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 395–396; Rose, Wallace 2022, 166–167; Knoepfler 2022, 109. We are also convinced that the earlier date is the correct one.

⁴⁰ Note the very similar formula in *IRhannous* 404.33.

- Diokles, 286/5: in the first prytany of the year, the Athenians honoured Zenon, a naval commander of Ptolemy's fleet, because he saw to the transport of grain, thereby contributing to the safety of the Athenians (*IG II³ 1, 863.16*: συναγωνιζόμενος τῇ τοῦ δήμου σωτηρίᾳ). In the same year, probably rather early in the archon year, Demochares of Leukonoion also returned to Athens ([Plut.] *X. Orat.* 851e)⁴¹.

Should the capture of the Mouseion Hill be set within this timeline, and, if so, when exactly? *LRhamnous* 404, by referring explicitly to the capture of the Mouseion, can help situate that event within this wider chronology. The key evidence, in this respect, is at lines 5–8. There, we learn that Aristeides took part in a *praxis* alongside his brother Mnesidemus and other participants. The context suggests that *praxis* stands here for some kind of military undertaking, although the term is not normally used to indicate military operations in Athenian documentary language⁴². It should probably be understood as a generic reference to a performance – to an endeavour. The second half of line 6 and line 7 are almost entirely lost but, where it continues, the inscription suggests that this *praxis* had to do with recovering a fort for the *demos*⁴³. Thereafter (lines 8–11), the decree goes on to mention Aristeides' election, by the Assembly, as στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευὴν⁴⁴. It is in this capacity that he provided (παρεσκεύασεν) for the siege of the Mouseion (τὴν [πολι] ορκίαν τοῦ Μουσείου). For his role in this enterprise he was honoured by the Athenian *demos* with golden crowns and *sitesis*⁴⁵. As far as the role

⁴¹ On Demochares' exile see Bayliss 2011, 172–176, and on the context and chronology of his return Osborne 1979, 191–192. For the precise date of Zenon's actions, see below, pp. 90–91.

⁴² See e.g. *IG II³ 1, 1292 = ISE 33* (honours for Kephisodoros), line 25, in which it stands for the 'effectiveness' of Kephisodoros' measures towards the city. Clinton 2022, 9 n. 7, points to Polyb. 2.9.2–3, 9.25.6, 4.25.4, 4.57.2 as parallels for such a usage.

⁴³ Petrakos reads here καὶ κομίσας [τὸ] φρούριον [τῷ δήμῳ], which would imply that the *phourion* was recovered before Aristeides' election to *strategos*, but Clinton sees traces of more letters at the end of line 7 and reads καὶ κομίσασθαι [τὸ] φρούριον [τῷ δήμῳ]. The infinitive allows for the possibility that the recovery of the *phourion* was the aim of the *praxis*, yet this was not yet achieved when Aristeides was elected *strategos*.

⁴⁴ Matthaïou, in Clinton 2022, 9 n. 8, points out that this expression to indicate an Assembly meeting occurs here for the first time, and points to Plut. *Alc.* 33.2 and *Nic.* 10.6 as parallels.

⁴⁵ The allusion in *LRhamnous* 404 to these past honours (granted, in that case, by the Athenian *demos*) is inevitably concise. Note, however, that decrees from 314/3 to 196/5 always grant *sitesis* together with *prohedria* and statue (whilst, on the other hand, a statue was not always accompanied by *sitesis*); see Osborne 1981, 167. Olympiodoros of Konthyle was probably granted a full set in the 280s for expelling the Macedonian gar-

of Aristeides is concerned, then, *I.Rhamnous* 404 attests to two phases in the revolt, in two successive Attic years. In the first year Aristeides, his brother Mnesidemus, and his comrades were involved in a *praxis* for the purpose of capturing the fort (lines 5–8), and at the end of that same year he was elected general in charge of the equipment for the following year⁴⁶. In the second year, once he had come into office, he (with no mention, this time, of his brother or others) proceeded, in this capacity, to provide (equipment) for the recovery of the Mouseion⁴⁷.

The context and details of the first deed, including which ‘fort’ lines 7–8 are talking about, are hard to pin down because of the very fragmentary state of line 7. Clinton believes that the fort mentioned at line 8 must already be the Mouseion⁴⁸. If this is so, it is likely that the activities for which Aristeides is praised (with his brother Mnesidemus) in that context were in preparation of the assault on the fort, all the more so as he was apparently not a *strategos* in that year but was elected only for the following year. Alternatively, Knoepfler connects the activities of the first year to a military action against the Macedonians (only allusively

risson from the Mouseion: Iacoviello 2022, 41–44. It is possible that Aristeides was also awarded a full set of honours on that occasion. On the other hand, *megistai timai* tended to come late in a politician’s career, after one had performed several actions worthy of praise. For Olympiodoros, the capture of the Mouseion represented the culmination of a career that included other deeds, like the defence of Eleusis and his involvement at the Peiraieus. If both Aristeides and Olympiodoros were awarded the highest honours for their involvement in the recovery of the Mouseion, that would put into stark relief just how important that recovery was for the Athenians. For similar considerations, cf. also Knoepfler 2022, 111 and n. 253; note, however, that the extant evidence does not indicate that *sitesis* could be awarded without a statue; cf. also Henry 1983, 306 n. 26.

⁴⁶ Formulas which include expressions such as *χειροτονηθεῖς*... (‘having been elected’ to a given office), in honorary decrees, are standard to indicate that the actions for which one was honoured occurred in the performance of a given office (as also, here, at lines 12, 14–15, 18, 22) – they are not meant to indicate that they occurred immediately after the election (and therefore before one entered into office).

⁴⁷ Two phases appear also in the decree for Strombichos, a mercenary of Demetrios who had joined the revolt (*IG II³ 1, 918*): in a first phase, Macedonian soldiers in the city were invited to join the revolt, which Strombichos did (lines 10–13); in a second phase, he participated in the siege of the Mouseion (lines 14–15). The same two phases are clearly demarcated also in the decree for Kallias (*IG II² 1, 911.12–15*). Cf. also Knoepfler 2022, 109–110, for the two phases.

⁴⁸ Clinton 2022, 10. In any event, *προϋρουμένης [ἔτι] τῆς πόλεως* of line 5, together with the evidence of the decree of Kallias, strongly suggests that most Athenian activities in the early stage of the revolt involved the city itself (i.e. freeing the *asty*, preparing for the siege, and recovering the Mouseion) and defending the harvest and its transport to the city (endangered by the garrison from the Peiraieus). It is unlikely that the Athenians at this stage were preparing, and making, attempts on *phouria* in the *khora* (such as Rhamnous).

mentioned at Paus. 1.26.1: ἐπεξελθόντας δὲ τοὺς Μακεδόνας μάχη τε ἐκράτησε καὶ φυγόντων ἐς τὸ Μουσεῖον τὸ χωρίον εἶλεν) in the *asty* that occurred before the assault on the Mouseion – Aristeides and Mnesidemus would have led that action, and Aristeides would have later been elected *strategos* because of that preliminary success. In this case, however, one wonders to which specific other *phrourion* in the *asty* the inscription refers⁴⁹. The very wording of the text seems to suggest that the whole section (lines 5–11) is in fact to do with the recovery of the Mouseion, and therefore that the *phrourion* of line 8 is, with Clinton, already the Mouseion. Key here is the αὐτούς of line 10. The plural strongly suggests that Aristeides and Mnesidemus were both honoured, together and for the same reason: they received crowns and *sitiesis* in exchange for (ἀ[νθ'] ὧν αὐτούς ὁ δῆμος [χρυσοῖς στεφάνοι]ς ἐτ[ίμ]ησεν [κ]αὶ σιτήσει ἐν πρυτανείῳ) the preparations that they carried out which led to the siege of the Mouseion (παρεσκεύασεν καὶ [- -c. 6- - π]ρὸς τὴν [πολι]ορκίαν τοῦ Μουσεῖου). Yet note that only Aristeides had been elected *strategos* and Mnesidemus is, strictly speaking, only mentioned as relevant to the actions before Aristeides' *strategia* (at lines 5–8). The plural αὐτούς, then, as the object of ἐτ[ίμ]ησεν, shows that the honours in question were awarded to both in connection with a series of actions which, albeit performed by them across two archon years and in different capacities, were envisaged as part of one coherent endeavour towards one aim: the recovery of the Mouseion⁵⁰.

These lines tell us plenty about the recovery of the Mouseion which we did not know (or did not know for sure). First, that the operations involved two stages, spanning two successive Athenian years; second, that Aristeides was involved at both stages; third, that he took part in the final stage – the actual recovery of the Mouseion – as *strategos* of the equipment, presumably aiding Olympiodoros, who was also, accord-

⁴⁹ Knoepfler 2022, 109–110. If we read κομίσας (with Petrakos) in line 7, then Knoepfler's interpretation becomes more likely. If we read κομίσασθαι with Clinton, then it is more likely that the *praxis* has to do with preparations for the recovery of the Mouseion. See above, n. 43.

⁵⁰ Matthaiou (in Clinton 2022, 9 n. 8) notes that the expression συνελθόντος τοῦ δήμου εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν χειροτονηθεῖς appears in this inscription for the first time (see also above, n. 44): χειροτονηθεῖς *vel sim.* normally occurs alone, to mark the transition to a new office and to the actions performed in that office, as here at lines 12, 14–15, 18, 22. The longer expression at lines 8–9 is perhaps due to the very fact that χειροτονηθεῖς here does not mark (as at lines 12, 14–15, 18, 22) the transition to a new deed and new honours, but rather is internal to one deed (the actions towards the recovery of the Mouseion), rewarded with one set of honours. It marks, that is, the articulation of this one deed in 'before' and 'after' (as in, before and after Aristeides became *strategos*).

ing to Pausanias (1.26.1–2), directly involved in the capture. The text does not give us any dates for these events, yet it provides us with a key chronological clue for their dating: the mention of the involvement of Aristeides' brother Mnesidemus in the first stage of these events, when the two brothers worked together towards the recovery of 'the fort for the people'. This mention can be combined with an important passage in Polyainos (5.17.1) to provide a *terminus ante quem* for the collaboration of the two brothers and the capture of the Mouseion⁵¹. In Polyainos, we find a Mnesidemus leading, as *strategos*, an Athenian contingent in a failed surprise attack on a Macedonian garrison in Athens:

Δημήτριος Ἡρακλείδην φύλακα τῶν Ἀθηνῶν συντάξας αὐτὸς μὲν ἦν περὶ τὴν Λυδίαν. οἱ δὲ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ βουλευσάμενοι τὸν ξεναγὸν Ἱεροκλέα, Κάρρα τῷ γένει, ἔπεισαν νυκτὸς ἀνοῖξαι τὰς πύλας καὶ δέξασθαι στρατιώτας Ἀττικοὺς, οἱ κτενοῦσιν Ἡρακλείδην. ταῦτα μὲν διη συνέθεντο παρὰ τὸν Ἴλισσον, οὗ τὸν καθαρμὸν τελοῦσι τοῖς ἐλάττοσι μυστηρίοις, Ἱππάρχου καὶ Μνησιδήμου στρατηγῶν ὄρκια δόντων καὶ λαβόντων. Ἱεροκλῆς δὲ πιστὸς Ἡρακλείδῃ γενόμενος ἐμήνυσε τὴν πράξιν. ὁ δὲ συνέπραττε νύκτωρ αὐτοὺς εἰσδέξασθαι ἀνοίξαντές τι μέρος τῶν πυλῶν. καὶ διη νυκτὸς εἰσδέξαντο τετρακοσίου καὶ εἴκοσι ἄνδρας, ὧν ἡγοῦντο Μνησιδήμος, Πολυκλῆς, Καλλισθένης, Θεόπομπος, Σάτυρος, Ὀνητορίδης, Σθενοκράτης, Πυθίων· Ἡρακλείδης δὲ στρατιώτας δισχιλίους ὠπλισμένους ἐπαφῆκεν, οἱ πάντας αὐτοὺς εἰσελθόντας ἐφόνευσαν.

When Demetrios was in Lydia, he left Herakleides in charge of Athens in his absence. The Athenian generals negotiated in secret with the mercenary officer Hierokles, a Karian. They persuaded him to open the gates by night and admit Athenian troops to murder Herakleides. This conspiracy was formed on the banks of the Ilissos, where the Athenians celebrate the purification for the Lesser Mysteries, and the generals Hipparchos and Mnesidemus exchanged oaths with Hierokles. But Hierokles remained faithful to Herakleides and revealed the plot to him. Herakleides arranged for the Athenians to be admitted by opening a certain part of the gates. Accordingly, four hundred and twenty men were let in during the night, under the leadership of Mnesidemus, Polykles, Kallisthenes, Theopompos, Satyros, Onetorides, Sthenokrates and Pythion. As soon as they had entered, Herakleides attacked them with two thousand soldiers and killed them all (Trans. modified from Rose).

⁵¹ This was missed by Clinton 2022 (see below, n. 68), but is correctly noted by Rose, Wallace 2022, whose chronology, however, differs from ours in one key respect.

The failed attempt to which this passage alludes must have occurred between the beginning of the revolt in 288/7 and the death of Demetrios in 283, but the reference at the beginning of the passage to his presence in Lydia is more easily taken to indicate the first phase of his last campaign, before he crossed into Cilicia in the autumn of 286. This of course would refer to the chronological starting point of Polyainos' narrative: the final stage might have occurred a bit later⁵². It has been read by scholars in conjunction with a series of decrees from the second half of the 280s which refer to (and wish for) a future recovery of the Peiraieus⁵³. Thus, the failed attack described by Polyainos is universally believed by scholars to be on the Peiraieus, and connected to a *polyandrion* mentioned in Pausanias' description of the Kerameikos cemetery⁵⁴. Polyainos mentions Mnesidemos as the *strategos* in charge of the enterprise, who died in that context with the entire contingent. The identification of Aristeides' brother with the general mentioned by Polyainos is likely⁵⁵. The name Mnesidemos is very rare, with only three occurrences overall, including that in Polyainos (cf. *LGPN* II, 316). Of the other two occurrences, one is the eponymous archon for 298/7, possibly a homonym of our Mnesidemos⁵⁶; the other is Mnesidemos of Lamptrai (born around 336/5)⁵⁷, who is in fact likely to be the uncle of our Aristeides and Mnesidemos sons of Mnesitheos. Now, the chances of two different characters, both named Mnesidemos and both engaged in military command and high-level military activities in Athens at roughly the same time, in the 280s, are very slim. Mnesidemos' involvement in the preparations to recover 'the fort for the Athenians', following which his brother Aristeides was elected *strategos*, make it virtually certain that the Mnesidemos that we find as *strategos* in Polyainos

⁵² See Weathley, Dunn 2020, 407 ff.; they put the attack on the Peiraieus in 286 (*ibid.*, 407 n. 1).

⁵³ See Taylor 1998 and the discussion here below.

⁵⁴ Paus. 1.29.10: 'There are buried also those who attempted a surprise attack on the Peiraieus when it was garrisoned by the Macedonians, but were betrayed by their accomplices before they could carry out their deed and slaughtered'. It is also believed that the funerary epigram for Chairippos of Aphidna, *IG* II² 5227a + *Hesperia* 39 (1970), 45 (= Moretti, *ISE* I 13), who perished 'at the walls of Mounychia' (line 5), might be connected to this failed attempt. See e.g. Shear 1978, 83; Oliver 2007, 122; Infusino 2017; Worthington 2021, 101. The Peiraieus had been garrisoned since the end of the Lamian War (with a possible interruption in the years 307-295): see Iacoviello 2022, 44-46, with references.

⁵⁵ Knoepfler 2012, 446-447 (with advance knowledge of *IRhannous* 404) already identified this Mnesidemos with Aristeides' brother.

⁵⁶ *IG* II² 1270; cf. Dion. Hal. *Din.* 9.

⁵⁷ *IG* II² 1514.62; 1516.38; 1518.80; *SEG* 19.174, l. 11.

is in fact the same man⁵⁸. If this is so, then the attack on the Peiraieus mentioned by Polyainos – if it can be dated – is a firm *terminus ante quem* for the events mentioned at lines 5–8 of *IRhannous* 404, because it tells us that Mnesidemos died in the context of the attack.

As it happens, Polyainos provides in the passage several details which allow us to date this attack with some precision. It tells us that the attack happened after Demetrios had left Athens for Lydia, when he was occupied with his Asian campaign. He does not tell us how soon after he left the Athenians attacked the Peiraieus, but it informs us that the pretended betrayal of Hierokles (a subordinate of Herakleides, left by Demetrios in charge of the fort)⁵⁹ was agreed on the banks of the Ilissos, where the Athenians celebrate the purification for the Lesser Mysteries. Τελοῦσι is here in the present, so this could theoretically refer only to the location of the meeting, but it is more likely that in the source that Polyainos was using the reference to the purification for the Lesser Mysteries provided the context for the meeting of Hierokles and the Athenian generals, which accordingly had occurred at the time of the Lesser Mysteries, in Anthesterion (February/March)⁶⁰. Scholars agree that Demetrios left Athens and sailed for Asia Minor in early 286. He had laid siege to Athens in the summer 287, and negotiations towards a resolution had started probably in the autumn or winter of 287 – Kallias' decree informs us that Sostratos, a prominent member of Ptolemy's court, arrived in Athens at this stage to start off the negotiations, and Kallias was himself involved as the leader of a delegation of citizens in the discussions at a later stage (*IG* II³ 1, 985.30–32)⁶¹. Rose and Wallace imagine that the Lesser Mysteries at which Hierokles agreed his pretended betrayal must have been those of 286 (February/March)⁶², yet the timeline seems to us too compressed.

⁵⁸ Thus also Rose, Wallace 2022, 169, who also consider the possibility that the same man may be mentioned also in *IG* II² 2354.21.

⁵⁹ This Hierokles might have still been serving in the Antigonid garrison in the 260s, see Diog. Laert. 2.127, with Reger 1992, 373–377; Paschidis 2008, 178 n. 1.; Rose, Wallace 2022, 170 n. 10.

⁶⁰ Thus also Rose, Wallace 2022, 170–171.

⁶¹ Shear 1978, 22; Habicht 1979, 63; Dreyer 1999, 219–221; Paschidis 2008, 147; Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 404. On Sostratos' career see Meeus 2015. Plut. *Demetr.* 46.3–4 speaks also of the involvement of the philosopher Krates, sent by the Athenians to negotiate with Demetrios (this Krates has often been identified with Krates son of Antigenes of Thria, e.g. by Ferguson 1911, 149, and Shear 1978, 77 n. 212; Paschidis 2008, 150–152, and Rose 2015, 320, identify him instead with Krates son of Askondas, a Theban cynic philosopher).

⁶² Rose, Wallace 2022, 170–171; Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 407, also date the events to 286. Scholars have long oscillated between 286 and 285: cf. Moretti 1967, 26–27; Shear 1978, 82–83; Gauthier 1979, 356, 366; Habicht 1979, 98; Hammond, Walbank

Although Plutarch (*Demetr.* 46.1–2; *Pyrrh.* 12.4–5) seems to suggest that Demetrios left quickly once the negotiations started, Kallias' decree suggests more protracted negotiations, in multiple stages (first involving only Sostratos, then also Kallias). It is also likely, as argued by Wheatley and Dunn, that Pyrrhos entered the scene only after these negotiations, and Demetrios and Pyrrhos carried out then further negotiations of their own⁶³. Imagining Hierokles' pretended betrayal, followed by the attempt on the Peiraeus, in spring 286 involves believing, first, that negotiations proceeded extremely fast, and Demetrios sailed for Asia Minor in the depths of winter; second, that the Athenians violated the peace treaty with Demetrios immediately after it had been laboriously agreed. Note also that the very possibility of a meeting involving an officer of the Macedonian garrison at a festival implies a context of peace – already solidified – and it is less likely during tense negotiations or immediately after they had been concluded⁶⁴. Conversely, imagining that the meeting on the Illisos occurred at the Lesser Mysteries of 285 gives us a more believable time-frame: we have a wider time window for Demetrios' departure for Asia, and can imagine him sailing e.g. in April/May rather than in the depths of winter⁶⁵. In the year after Demetrios left, things settled down⁶⁶, yet in the winter 286/5 news must have reached Athens of Demetrios' deteriorating position, first with Pyrrhos' attack on Thessaly, and then with Demetrios bottled up by Seleukos⁶⁷. Demetrios' new weakness can account for the decision of the Athenians to renew hostilities and make an attempt on the Peiraeus, which is therefore best dated to the spring of 285, in the archonship of Diokles. Despite their failure, the Athenians still believed that a recovery of the Peiraeus was a strong possibility at least until 282/1 (as is clear from *IG II*³ 1, 881.30–31), yet mentions of the Peiraeus disappear afterwards, possibly as a result of better relations with the Antigonids from 279 at the latest (as *IRhannous* 404 reveals: see below, § 4, for the events and the chronology of that period).

1988, 237 n. 3; Cuniberti 2006, 72 n. 219 (generically before 283); Oliver 2007, 58–60; Knoepfler 2012, 446–447; Clinton 2022, 10. Osborne 1979, 192–194; 1982, 161; 2012, 45–47, originally dated the failed attack to 281 (followed by Worthington 2021, 100–101), but has more recently opted for 285 (Osborne 2016, 93 n. 36).

⁶³ Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 403–405. Cf. also Dreyer 1999, 219; Paschidis 2008, 138, 148.

⁶⁴ See Chaniotis 2002, 108–110, for contact and exchange between royal garrisons and local populations in festival settings.

⁶⁵ Recently, Osborne 2016, 93 n. 36, and Clinton 2022, 10, have also preferred 285.

⁶⁶ Demochares' return and his quick reintegration in the Athenian political elite is evidence of this, as noted also by Osborne 1979, 183.

⁶⁷ We refer to Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 412–422.

This approximate chronology provides us with a solid *terminus ante quem* for Aristeides' preparations, together with his brother Mnesidemus: they must be dated before spring 285 (or possibly, although less likely, before spring 286), when Mnesidemus was killed in the attack on the Peiraieus. It therefore dispenses, as noted also by Rose and Wallace, with Clinton's theory that the capture of the Mouseion must be dated to the archonship of Telokles (280/79), when we know that Aristeides was *strategos* (IG II³ 4, 7 = ISE 1.12)⁶⁸. Such a dating becomes moreover very unlikely if we consider that Antigonos granted the Athenians a very sizeable sum of money as well as control of Eleusis in the same general period, possibly in the very same year 280/79 (see below, § 4). It is hard to believe that a botched attempt by the Athenians on the Peiraieus (controlled by an Antigonid garrison), to be dated in the spring (after the Lesser Mysteries), could be made at around the same time as, or even in the general vicinity of, an embassy that achieved such momentous concessions from Antigonos.

The evidence of Polyainos, then, provides us with a firm *terminus ante quem*: Aristeides' (and Mnesidemus') *praxis* towards the capture of the Mouseion must have happened before spring 285, and must be dated therefore in the context of the revolt that started in 287⁶⁹. Once we establish this, *IRhamnous* 404 can help us reconstruct the events of 288/7 and 287/6 with more precision than was previously possible. We know that at first, when the city was still garrisoned, Phaidros and Kallias protected the harvest and made sure that as much food as possible was carried into the city. This happened in the spring of 287 (archonship of Kimon), while Demetrios was approaching, but had not yet reached, Athens. Aristeides' preparations (*praxis*), together with his brother Mnesidemus and others, for the recovery of the *phrourion* (*IRhamnous* 404.5–8) must have occurred in the same context, i.e. in the first year – and in the very early stages – of the revolt⁷⁰. Oliver has

⁶⁸ Clinton 2022, 10, esp. n. 11, assumes that *IRhamnous* 404 must cite all of Aristeides' *strategiai*. Because IG II³ 4, 7 = ISE 1.12, a dedication of the Council in honour of three councillors, has Aristeides' mentioned as *strategos* (in a different hand, possibly as a chronological indication: στρατηγούντος [Ἀρισ]τείδου Λαμπτρέως), alongside the archonship of Telokles (280/79), Clinton downdates the capture of the Mouseion to 280/79. But quite apart from the fact that Mnesidemus at that point was long dead, there is no reason to assume that *IRhamnous* 404 must cite all of Aristeides' *strategiai*, rather than the most remarkable ones and/or those the most relevant to the garrison that was honouring him: see Rose, Wallace 2022, 169–171 and *passim* for more discussion.

⁶⁹ See above, pp. 80–82 and n. 39, for this dating of the start of the revolt, on which most scholars now agree.

⁷⁰ Or, if we follow Knoepfler 2022, 109–110, the initial military actions against the Macedonians in the *asty*, see above, pp. 83–84.

insightfully observed that, because Olympiodoros is said by Pausanias (1.25.3–26.3)⁷¹ to have captured the Mouseion leading citizens from the younger and older age classes, this means that the bulk of the Athenian army was at the time otherwise engaged. In his reconstruction, it was engaged in protecting the harvest under the command of Phaidros (as detailed in *IG II³ 1*, 985) – thus, he believes, the Mouseion was captured by Olympiodoros in the spring or early summer of 287, before the arrival of Demetrios⁷². The evidence of *IRhannous* 404 forces us to modify this reconstruction⁷³. Lines 5–11 mention, as we have seen (pp. 82–84), two stages in two successive years: a first stage when Aristeides was engaged with his brother and others in a *praxis* towards the recovery of the *phourion* (i.e. probably in preparation for its recovery); and a second stage, after he had been elected *strategos* ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευὴν (probably in the same context in which Phaidros had been elected again ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα) for the year of Xenophon, when the Mouseion was effectively captured (and he was in charge, as *strategos*, of the provisions for the relevant attack). This means that the capture of the Mouseion cannot have happened in 288/7 (archonship of Kimon, when Aristeides was elected to the archonship for the following year), but must have happened in the following year, 287/6 (archonship of Xenophon), when Demetrios was already laying siege to the city⁷⁴ – perhaps in the very late summer or very early autumn. Olympiodoros (aided – we now know – not only by Strombichos but also by Aristeides) was leading only the young and the old because the bulk of army, rather than being occupied in securing the harvest (as suggested by Oliver), was in all likelihood busy defending the walls of the city, at that point under siege by Demetrios (Kallias was wounded during a sally, at around the same time, in the context of the siege).

This makes the capture of the Mouseion all the more impressive, because it must have happened during, and not before, the siege. It might also help explain why Demetrios became so willing to start negotiations and decided to make concessions and lift the siege – the siege was lifted, and a peace was concluded, between the winter and the spring of 286. The Athenians had proven quite successful in their endeavours, and

⁷¹ Pausanias' description of Olympiodoros' exploits may itself be ultimately based on an honorific decree from the 280s: see Habicht 1985, 90–92.

⁷² Oliver 2007, 122–123, followed e.g. by Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 402.

⁷³ Pace Rose, Wallace 2022, 14, who believe that it confirms Oliver's dating.

⁷⁴ The siege probably started in the summer. For a good synthesis of the events see now Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 402–403.

the prospect of a quick resolution must have seemed – with the loss of the Mouseion – increasingly unlikely to Demetrios. Kallias remained in Athens until the situation had become quiet (and represented the Athenians in the negotiations between Demetrios and Ptolemy’s envoy Sostratos). But the siege must have lasted at least well into the autumn of 287 – long enough to hinder Athenian efforts at sowing time, and therefore compromising the harvest of spring 286. Indirect evidence of this are the honours granted in 286/5 to Zenon, a Ptolemaic naval commander, who helped with the grain supply for the city (*IG II*³ 1, 863). As noted by Oliver, it is likely that Zenon was in charge of protecting the cargo ships transporting grain (possibly sent by Ptolemy), meant to alleviate the grain shortage in Athens – *IG XII* 5, 1004, a decree from Ios, describes Zenon scrutinizing the crews. Zenon was honoured for his help in a decree of the first prytany of the archonship of Diokles, in the early summer of 286, so it is likely that his actions should be dated to the previous spring⁷⁵. Shipments of grain were particularly necessary in spring 286 because the harvest had been compromised by the siege of autumn 287, which had prevented effective sowing.

Zenon is, then, one of three Ptolemaic officials (with Kallias and Sostratos) prominently involved with helping the Athenians in 287/6. By the time he was honoured, in the first prytany of 286/5, Demetrios had sailed – probably in April/May 286 – for Asia Minor, and the situation in Athens must have been stable enough. It is in this context – also early in the year – that Demochares finally returned to Athens ([Plut.] *X. Orat.* 851e)⁷⁶. The situation must have remained fairly quiet for a few months but, with the winter, the Athenians started to receive news of Demetrios’ difficulties (with Pyrrhos’ attack on Thessaly and Seleucos’ success against Demetrios himself), so in the spring of 285 – spurred by the pretended betrayal of Hierokles – they made their failed attempt on the Peiraieus, as narrated by Polyainos, which effectively renewed hostilities with the Antigonids.

⁷⁵ See Oliver 2007, 123–124, who correctly connects Zenon’s activities to the protection of cargo ships (although he notes that we do not have direct evidence of grain donations for 287/6, as the gift of 2,000 *medimnoi* of wheat from Ptolemy II must be dated to a later point in time: see also Shear 1978, 3). Zenon’s activities were already connected with the need of importing grain by Ferguson 1911, 142, 147; Tarn 1911, 253; 1913, 92, 419; Volkmann 1959, 1627; Bagnall 1976, 147. Shear 1978, 20–21 with n. 37, believes instead that Zenon was involved in the same operations, in Attica, which saw the involvement also of Kallias. Wheatley, Dunn 2020, 400–401, seem to date Zenon’s activities to 287. For Zenon in general, see Merker 1970, 143, 150

⁷⁶ See Osborne 1979, 191, and Bayliss 2011, 172–176.

4. The recovery of Eleusis, the *phrouria*, and the problem of the Peiraieus

At a later stage, but we are not told exactly when, the Athenians decided to send an embassy to Antigonos Gonatas, who was at that point in Asia, and elected Aristeides among the ambassadors. The embassy, rather surprisingly, was successful, and managed not only to recover Eleusis, but also to bring back a (very significant) sum of money⁷⁷. Of all that we learn from *IRhannous* 404, this piece of information is the most striking. It provides the first relatively clear evidence for a reconciliation between the Athenians and the Antigonids between the insurrection against Demetrios and the Chremonidean War.

Other documents from the late eighties confirm that the Athenians had not recovered complete control over their territory with the peace brokered by Sostratos. We have references to their aspiration to recover the Peiraieus (*IG II³* 1, 871.32–34, decree for Audoleon king of the Paionians, last prytany of 285/4; *IG II³* 1, 881.30–31, decree for Euthios, seventh prytany of 282/1) or the Peiraieus and the *phrouria* (*IG II³* 1, 877.35–36, decree for Philippides of Kephale, third prytany of 283/2)⁷⁸. Among the *phrouria* must have been Rhamnous and Eleusis. The former, fallen into the hands of Demetrios during his invasion of 295 along with Eleusis (Plut. *Demetr.* 33.5)⁷⁹, was once again under Athenian control at the outbreak of the Chremonidean War, in 269/8⁸⁰, as shown by the honorific decree for the *strategos* Epichares (*IRhannous* 403), who is praised, among other things, for arranging shelters for the soldiers of the Ptolemaic general Patroklos and for protecting the harvest in the area surrounding the fortress⁸¹.

We do not know when and how exactly Rhamnous was recovered, but we have now more information about the recovery of Eleusis, which *IRhannous* 404 tells us was achieved through an embassy sent to Antig-

⁷⁷ Petrakos 2020, 23–24, presents the (remarkably large) figure of 661 talents as certain; see also Knoepfler 2022, 113.

⁷⁸ Iacoviello 2021, 622–623.

⁷⁹ Rhamnous was under Athenian control in the year 304/3, archonship of Pherekles, as shown by *IRhannous* 462, documenting honours for the *strategos* Kephisophon of Konthyle; see Oliver 2007, 117–118, and note that the decree for Adeimantos, now *IRhannous* 401, more likely dates to the year 293/2 or immediately thereafter.

⁸⁰ The most detailed discussion of the recovery of the *phrouria* is offered by Oliver 2007, 125–127. On the chronology of Peithidemos, we follow Byrne 2006–2007.

⁸¹ On the honours for Epichares, see Oliver 2001; Habicht 2006, 163; Oliver 2007, 139–140.

onos, at the time in Asia. In his first edition of *IRhannous* 404, Petrakos reported the opinions of Clinton and Habicht for the dating of Aristeides' embassy to Antigonos and the recovery of Eleusis⁸². Clinton dates it to the early 270s, and more precisely to 279/8, in the context of Antigonos' campaign against Antiochos I⁸³. Habicht, on the other hand, tentatively suggested, as a possible alternative, that there might have been a second Asiatic expedition by Antigonos, pointing to a (now) recently published decree from Kaunos which might attest to Antigonos' presence in Asia Minor in 269/8⁸⁴. This second option seems very unlikely: in the application for a decree in honour of Demochares of Leukonoion presented by his son Laches during the archonship of Pytharatos (271/0 BCE), at the end of a list of praiseworthy actions arranged chronologically we find the statement that πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον πρεσβεύσαντι καὶ λαβόντι εἴκοσι τάλαντα ἀργυρίου καὶ Ἐλευσίνα κομισαμένων τῷ δήμῳ ([Plut.] *Vit. X Or.* 851d-f). This is evidence that the recovery of Eleusis (and therefore Aristeides' embassy to Antigonos) must have occurred before 271/0, when the honours for Demochares were enacted. The date in the early 270s, in the context of Antigonos' campaign against Antiochos I, is the most likely – to say nothing of the fact that, as we learn from the decree for Aristeides, in 269/8 Gonatas was invading Attica, so he can scarcely have been in Asia Minor⁸⁵.

As the honours for Demochares help us date Aristeides' embassy to Antigonos, so, in turn, *IRhannous* 404 allows us to clarify certain aspects of Laches' application for a decree in honour of Demochares. Laches' *aiteisis* mentions the recovery of Eleusis right after an embassy (in which Demochares took part) to Antipatros. Scholars have not always treated these two deeds – the embassy to Antipatros and the recovery of Eleusis – as connected: occasionally the latter has been taken as an indication that Demochares could boast of strictly military achievements, too⁸⁶. This interpretation partly depended on the fact that the only possible identification for the Antipatros that shows up here appeared to be Antipatros Etesias, king of Macedon for 45 days in the late spring of 279, after the death of Ptolemy Keraunos and the

⁸² Petrakos 2020, 24.

⁸³ Cf. Clinton 2008, 180, and also Sarrazanas 2021, 104–105.

⁸⁴ Habicht 2006, 443 n. 68, referring to an inscription from Kaunos now published and extensively discussed by Marek 2006, 133–136 (nr. 4).

⁸⁵ See below, § 5.

⁸⁶ So Habicht 1979, 25 and 78; 2006, 148 (with the new chronology of *IG II² 1682* = *IEleusis* 141). On Demochares' embassies and the recovery of Eleusis, see Shear 1978, 80–82, and Marasco 1984, 69–74.

deposition of Ptolemy's brother Meleager⁸⁷. Obviously, Antipatros might conceivably have given money to the Athenians – although, considering the circumstances of his kingdom, this already sounds rather surprising – but he certainly did not have control over Eleusis⁸⁸. Accordingly, the two last benefactions of Demochares needed to be kept separate. Unless the sequence of events in Laches' application has been disrupted in the textual transmission, and nothing particularly indicates that it has, the recovery of Eleusis would have to be dated after the spring of 279. The decree for Aristeides, mentioning a recovery of Eleusis which must have occurred, as we have seen, in the same general period, shows that even the last of Demochares' feats was of a diplomatic, not military nature, and generates the strong suspicion that the 'Antipatros' of the decree may have crept in in the place of an 'Antigonos'⁸⁹, and that Demochares' embassy to [Antipatros] may in fact be the same as Aristeides' embassy to Antigonos⁹⁰.

Quite apart from its implications for the decree application for Demochares, the decree for Aristeides casts a new light on the recovery of the Athenian *phrouria* under Macedonian control. After the failed attempt on the Peiraeus, the decrees from the late eighties give the impression that the Athenians were mostly hoping for resources, rather than military help, to recover their lost forts. Especially eloquent is the decree for Philippides of Kephale, where the recovery of the Peiraeus and the *phrouria* is presented as a potential consequence of further (financial) support by Lysimachos. Such hopes must have been dashed by Lysimachos' death at Koroupedion in February 281 – note the rather hopeful tone of the decree for the archon Euthios, passed on the 9th of Gamelion of that same year, immediately before the battle. The Athenians promptly turned to the winner: in 281, Komeas of Lamprai persuaded Seleukos to return Lemnos to the Athenians⁹¹. For the Peiraeus and the other fortresses, however, they had to try a different approach.

⁸⁷ For the chronology of 279, see Nachtergaele 1977, 174–175. For the scholarly discussion on the identity of this Antipatros cf. e.g. Roisman, Worthington 2015, 274 n. 17.

⁸⁸ It is somewhat surprising that the Athenians would turn to him at all, as pointed out by Marasco 1984, 73–74.

⁸⁹ Thus also Clinton 2008, 245; 2022, 12–13. As an alternative to postulating an error in the text of the *aitesis*, Rose, Wallace 2022, 167–168 n. 5, point to a letter of Epikouros (Erbi F 15) dating to 280–277 which mentions an Antipatros who appears to be an Antigonid official.

⁹⁰ Thus also Knoepfler 2022, 113–114.

⁹¹ *IG II³* 1, 884, on which see Byrne 2006–2007, 174–175.

Antigonos Gonatas had been left by Demetrios in command of the latter's remaining possessions in Greece. Soon after Ptolemy Keraunos assassinated Seleukos (September 281), Antigonos had made an attempt on Macedon, but his fleet had been defeated by that of Lysimachos, now at the orders of Keraunos, in the late fall of 281. Antigonos returned to Boeotia⁹². His next documented step, most likely in 280, probably rather early in the year, was to attack the possessions of Antiochos Soter, Seleukos' successor, in Asia Minor⁹³. The details and chronology of the war are utterly uncertain. Since Photios' abridgment of Memnon of Herakleia says that Antiochos and Antigonos fought for a long time, and since we find Antigonos back in Europe at the latest in the spring of 277, when he ambushed a band of Galatian warriors at Lysimacheia⁹⁴, some scholars maintain that the famous peace between Antigonos and Antiochos celebrated by Aratos must be dated as late as possible before the spring of 277⁹⁵. However, this chronology encounters several obstacles. In the fall of 279, both kings sent small contingents of mercenaries to join the Greek army that intercepted the Galatians at Thermopylai, which seems to indicate that they were no longer at war at that point⁹⁶. The time available for Antigonos' presence in Asia needs to be reconciled also with a fragmentary papyrus (*PHerc.* 339, col. 6, lines 2-7) from a lost work of Philodemos dealing with the chronology of Zenon, which seems to indicate that Antigonos' final appropriation of the Macedonian throne after Lysimacheia was actually a second attempt, and a previous one had ended with him retreating to Asia⁹⁷.

⁹² Memn., *FGrHist* 434 F 1.8.4-6; on this, see Hammond, Walbank 1988, 244-245. For the chronology of Ptolemy Keraunos' reign, we follow Heckel 2022.

⁹³ A date of 280 for Antigonos' invasion of Asia Minor is supported indirectly by the campaign of Areus against Aitolia (Iust. 24.1.2-6): the Spartan king would have hardly dared bring his troops into Phokis if Gonatas' army had still been in Boeotia. Other references to *poleis* of mainland Greece expelling Antigonos' garrisons around this time (Polyb. 2.41.10-15, at the time when Pyrrhos crossed into Italy, 280 BCE) also support the notion that Gonatas was not in Greece at this point.

⁹⁴ The precise date of the battle of Lysimacheia is uncertain: scholars put it late in 278 or early in 277 BCE; see Nachtergaele 1977, 167-168. The later date would be almost inevitable in light of the apparent first attempt by Antigonos, see here below.

⁹⁵ Buraselis 1982, 111. On the peace between Antigonos and Antiochos, see Kosmin 2014, 87-89.

⁹⁶ Paus. 10.20.5 with Knoepfler 2022, 112-113.

⁹⁷ See Lane Fox 2011, 499-500, following Hammond, Walbank 1988, 584-586; the edition of the papyrus by Dorandi 1982, 99, gives a rather more conservative text, but the reference to Antigonos' first failed attempt to occupy Macedonia from Asia is confirmed. We cannot find any reference to this text in Buraselis 1982.

All things considered, one is tempted to suggest that the war between Antiochos and Antigonos may have lasted rather less than Photios/Memnon seems to suggest, that Keraunos' death in February 279 may have been a cause for reconciliation between the two kings, and their two contingents sent in support of the Athenian-led coalition may indicate that the reconciliation had taken place, according to the scenario outlined by Mario Segre in 1930⁹⁸. In this case, it would be easy to date Aristeides' embassy in 280/79 or maybe, but somewhat less likely, in 279/8⁹⁹, at a moment when Antigonos was under heavy pressure from multiple sides and may well have thought that appeasing the Athenians was not a bad idea. At any rate, he appears to have been flush with money by the time he defeated the Galatians at Lysimacheia¹⁰⁰. The earlier date would coincide with Aristeides' tenure of the *strategia*, and one might wonder whether the wording of the inscription would be compatible with that scenario. In fact, the literary evidence suggests that an individual could be appointed both as a *strategos* and as an envoy within the same year¹⁰¹; in addition, the decree for Phaidros of Sphettos shows him embarking on an embassy to Ptolemy Soter in a year in which he must have been *strategos*¹⁰². A reason for perplexity might be the fact that the decree fails to mention that Aristeides had also been elected as *strategos* in the year of the embassy – but then again, as far as we know 280/79 had not been a year of war, and the embassy may have been Aristeides' only important achievement in that year.

⁹⁸ For this chronology, see Segre 1930, based especially on *OGIS* 748 (= Bringmann-von Steuben 241), from Kyzikos, where a state of war is recorded in the third year before the crossing of the Gauls into Asia (which took place in 278/7, archon Demokles, according to Paus. 10.23.14). A similar chronology is favoured also by Knoepfler 2022, 112–113. On the chronological implications of *OGIS* 748, see also Launey 1944, and Wörle 1975, 64 and n. 18, who speculates that the years in the inscriptions might not be consecutive (but the presence of the Gauls sets in any case a *terminus ante quem*).

⁹⁹ Clinton 2008, 180, and Sarrazanas 2021, 104–105, date it to 279/8; Knoepfler 2022, 111–112, like us, favours 280/79.

¹⁰⁰ See *Iust.* 25.1.4–5.

¹⁰¹ Nikias was concomitantly *strategos* – *Plut. Nic.* 10.3 with Fornara 1971, 62 – and *presbeutes* (*Thuc.* 5.19.2) in 421. The case of Phokion is less straightforward: while he was *strategos* in 323/2 along with Leosthenes (*Plut. Phoc.* 24.1), he served as envoy to Antipatros only after the battle of Crannon (*Plut. Phoc.* 26.1); see, however, Kienast 1973, 528, who believes that this all pertains to one year.

¹⁰² *IG* II³ 1, 985.21–30: between the archonship of Nikias (295/4) and the archonship of Kimon (288/7) Phaidros had been once *strategos* ἐπὶ τὴν παρασκευὴν, three times ἐπὶ τοὺς ξένους and 'many times' (i.e. at least four times) ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν, which means that he had been elected every single year, and accordingly was *strategos* when he went on an embassy to Ptolemy Soter.

5. The Chremonidean War

The last important cluster of information provided by this very rich decree sheds light on several aspects of the outbreak and early phases of the Chremonidean War¹⁰³. Considering how poor our understanding of the war is, it will probably take a few years before scholars will have worked out all the implications of this new document. In the following, we focus on a few points that appear quite obvious, and formulate a modicum of further thoughts and speculations.

Aristeides was elected *strategos* for Eleusis when Antigonos invaded the Megarid. In that difficult moment, Aristeides saw to the safety of the Athenian border fort (lines 14–18). This invasion probably corresponds to the siege of Megara by Antigonos mentioned by Polyainos (4.6.3) and Aelian (*NA* 11.14 and 16.36)¹⁰⁴. We cannot tell for sure how long before the alliance between Athens and Sparta this campaign took place – in theory, it could go back to the war between Gonatas and Pyrrhos in 272, or even before. The impression of proximity between the invasion of the Megarid by Antigonos and the election of Aristeides to *synedros* may result from the fact that the decree concentrates exclusively on his deeds. Still, considering that both the decree for Epichares and the decree for Aristeides show that Antigonos invaded Attica soon in the Attic year 269/8, that is, in the late summer of 269, he may well have been present in the area with his army already in 270/69. In any case, we are now certain that the siege of Megara does not belong in the years of the Chremonidean War, as some scholars have thought¹⁰⁵. The revolt of Antigonos' Galatian mercenaries in Megara indicates that the king had conquered the city previously¹⁰⁶.

In the late summer of 269, the Athenian assembly voted in favour of the proposal of Chremonides to join an alliance composed of Sparta

¹⁰³ O'Neil 2008; Luraghi 2018, 30–36.

¹⁰⁴ The story in Ael. *NA* 11.14 shows that also Phylarchos (*FGrHist* 81 F 36) referred to the siege of Megara by Antigonos.

¹⁰⁵ For instance, O'Neil 2008, 80–82; Heinen 1972, 171–172, thought instead of the years between 277 and 274. That Aristeides may have been *strategos* for Eleusis in the same year in which he was elected *synedros*, as Knoepfler 2022, 116–117, suggests, seems quite unlikely: Chremonides' decree, *IG* II³ 1, 912, was voted in the second prytany of the year – surely the Athenians would not have sent the *strategos* for Eleusis on a mission to the Peloponnese less than two months into his tenure of the office, with Antigonos' army immediately nearby in the Megarid (to say nothing of the fact that the description of Aristeides' activity in Eleusis, lines 15–18, clearly implies that he had been there during the year).

¹⁰⁶ *Iust.* 26.2.1–6 with Trogus, *Prolog.* 26, with Heinen 1972, 170–172, and O'Neil 2008, 80.

and several Peloponnesian and Cretan *poleis*. Two Athenians were elected as *synedroi* to participate in the leadership of the alliance. The text of the decree includes the name of Kallippos of Eleusis, who had led the Athenian contingent and most likely the whole Greek coalition at Thermopylai in 279. The other *synedros*, as we now know, was Aristeides. Antigonos' army immediately invaded Attica, as we knew from the decree for Epichares of Ikarion, *strategos* of the *paralia* in the year of Peithidemos (*IRhamnous* 403, 269/8). In spite of the danger, Aristeides managed to travel to the Peloponnese. The Athenians were in desperate need of help, as the decree makes clear – note that the alliance with the king of Sparta is called 'the rescue expedition of Areus'. One wonders whether the proxeny of Orchomenos may go back to this same trip, in which case we would have to conclude that Kallippos and Aristeides were accompanied on their mission by Glaukon of Aithalidai, Chremonides' brother. All things considered, one should not exclude a slightly earlier occasion, in preparation for the alliance between Areus and the Athenians.

Finally, Aristeides was *strategos* of the *paralia* in the year of Menekles (267/6 BCE), a year of war as we know from another document (*IG II*³ 1, 917). Aristeides' activities appear to have consisted mostly of seeing to the provisioning of the garrison: unlike the decree for Epichares from two years before, we have no details that might point to military operations in the immediate vicinities of Rhamnous. We may perhaps infer that in this year Antigonos was operating principally in the vicinity of Athens and in the Northern Peloponnese, against king Areus of Sparta, or that in this year the main operations of the war were taking place outside of Attica altogether¹⁰⁷. Let it be noted that, by establishing a certain sequence between the year of Menekles and the year of Peithidemos, the decree for Aristeides finally disproves Meritt's thesis, followed more recently by Dreyer, that the latter had come after the former, rather than before¹⁰⁸. Clearly, the decree for Aristeides could provide the starting point to a detailed re-examination of the first years of the Chremonidean War – but this is a task for another contribution.

¹⁰⁷ From the year of Menekles, see also *IEleusis* 181 = *IG II*³ 1, 915, decree for the *epimeletai* of the mysteries, showing that in that year the Athenians had been able to hold not only the Lesser Mysteries in Agrai by the Ilissos, immediately to the South-East of the city walls, but apparently even the Great Mysteries in Eleusis in Boedromion, i.e. in the late fall of 267; and *IEleusis* 182, decree of the Athenians deployed in Eleusis for Dion, secretary of the ταμίας τῶν σιτωνικῶν.

¹⁰⁸ Dreyer 1999, 291–301.

Bibliography

- Ampolo C. (1979), *Un politico evergete del IV sec. a.C.: Xenocles figlio di Xeinis del demo di Sphettos*, «PP» 34, 167–178.
- Bagnall R.S. (1976), *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden.
- Bayliss A.J. (2003), *Curse-Tablets as Evidence: Identifying the Elusive “Peiraikei Soldiers”*, «ZPE» 144, 125–140.
- (2011), *After Demosthenes: The Politics of Early Hellenistic Athens*, London.
- Bringmann K., von Steuben H. (1995), *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer, I. Zeugnisse und Kommentare*, Berlin.
- Buraselis K. (1982), *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*, München.
- Byrne S. (2006–2007), *Four Athenian Archons of the Third Century B.C.*, «MedArch» 19–20, 169–179.
- (2010) *The Athenian damnatio memoriae of the Antigonids in 200 BC, in Philathenaios: Studies in Honour of Michael J. Osborne*, ed. by A. Tamis, C.J. Mackie, S.G. Byrne, Athens, 155–177.
- Chaniotis A. (2002), *Foreign Soldiers - Native Girls? Constructing and Crossing Boundaries in Hellenistic Cities with Foreign Garrisons, in Army and Power in the Ancient World*, ed. by A. Chaniotis, P. Ducrey, Stuttgart, 99–113.
- Clinton K. (2005), *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme, IA–B. Text, Plates*, Athens.
- (2008), *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme, II. Commentary*, Athens.
- (2022), *The Reunion of the Athenian Asty with the Piraeus, 280–279 B.C.*, «Grammateion» 11, 7–15.
- Cuniberti G. (2006), *La polis dimezzata. Immagini storiografiche di Atene ellenistica*, Alessandria.
- Dorandi T. (1982), *Filodemo, Gli stoici (PHerc. 155 e 339)*, «CronErc» 12, 91–133.
- Dreyer B. (1999), *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen (322–ca. 230 v. Chr.)*, Stuttgart.
- Errington R.M. (2005), *Biographie in hellenistischen Inschriften*, in *Biographie und Prosopographie. Internationales Kolloquium zum 65. Geburtstag von A. R. Birley*, hrsg. v. K. von Vössing, Düsseldorf, 14–28.
- Ferguson W.S. (1911), *Hellenistic Athens. An Historical Essay*, London.
- Fornara C.W. (1971), *The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404*, Wiesbaden.
- Gauthier P. (1979), *La réunification d’Athènes en 281 et les deux archontes Nicias*, «REG» 92, 348–399.
- Habicht C. (1976), *Aristeides, Sohn des Menistheos, aus Lamprai. Ein athenischer Staatsmann aus der Zeit des chremonideischen Krieges*, «Chiron» 6, 6–9.
- (1979), *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, München.
- (1982), *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen.
- (1985), *Pausanias’ Guide to Ancient Greece*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.

- (2006²), *Athènes hellénistique: histoire de la cité d'Alexandre le Grand à Marc Antoine*, Paris.
- (2014), *Kyzikos: The Epigraphic Evidence*, in *Cyzique, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique*, éd. par M. Sève, P. Schlosser, Metz, 167–177.
- Hammond N.G.L., Walbank F.W. (1988), *A History of Macedonia*, III. 336–167 BC, Oxford.
- Harris E.M. (2017), *Applying the Law on the Award of Crowns to Magistrates (Aeschin. 3.9–31; Dem. 18.113–17): Epigraphic Evidence for the Legal Arguments at the Trial of Ctesiphon*, «ZPE» 202, 105–117.
- Heckel W. (2022), *Storm Clouds over Three Hellenistic Courts: Observations on the Life and Death of Ptolemy Ceraunus*, in *The Courts of Philip II and Alexander the Great: Monarchy and Power in Ancient Macedonia*, ed. by F. Pownall, S.R. Asirvatham, S. Müller, Berlin - Boston, 33–54.
- Heinen H. (1972), *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum chremonideischen Krieg (Historia Einzelschrift 20)*, Wiesbaden.
- Henry A.S. (1983), *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees*, Hildesheim.
- Humphreys S.C. (2007), *Notes on Attic Prosopography*, «ZPE» 160, 65–85.
- (2018), *Kinship in Ancient Athens. An Anthropological Analysis*, I–II, Oxford.
- Iacoviello A. (2021), *Exemplarity and Politics of Memory. The Recovery of the Piraeus by Olympiodoros of Athens*, «CQ» 71, 617–623.
- (2022), *A Piraeus-Recovery Tale. (Again) on Paus. 1.26.3*, «Ricerche Ellenistiche» 3, 39–58.
- Infusino I. (2017), *Epigramma funerario per Carippo caduto a Munichia*, in *Inscrizioni Greche. Un'antologia*, a cura di C. Antonetti, S. De Vido, Roma, 242–244.
- Kienast D. (1973), *Presbeia*, in *RE Suppl. XIII*, 499–628.
- Knoepfler D. (2012), *Épigraphie et histoire des cités grecques: cours: Athènes hellénistique (2e partie): nouveaux développements sur l'histoire, les institutions et les cultes de la cité*, «ACF» 111, 435–459.
- (2014), *Épigraphie et histoire des cités grecques: cours: Athènes hellénistique (4e partie): nouveaux développements sur l'histoire, les institutions et les cultes de la cité*, «ACF» 113, 427–447.
- (2022), *Un trésor documentaire pour l'histoire d'Athènes à l'époque hellénistique. Le corpus des inscriptions de Rhamnonte (1999–2020) par Vassilios Pétrakos*, Paris.
- Kosmin P. (2014), *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*, Cambridge (MA).
- Kralli I. (2017), *The Hellenistic Peloponnese: Interstate Relations. A Narrative and Analytic History, from the Fourth Century to 146 BC*, Swansea.
- Lane Fox R. (2011) “Glorious servitude...”: *The reigns of Antigonos Gonatas and Demetrios II*, in *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC–300 AD*, ed. by R. Lane Fox, Leiden, 495–519.
- Launey M. (1944), *Études d'histoire hellénistique*, «REA» 46, 217–236.
- Luraghi N. (2018), *Stairway to Heaven. The Politics of Memory in Early Hellenistic Athens*, in *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought*, ed. by M. Canevaro, B. Gray, Oxford, 21–43.
- (2019), *Kallias of Sphettos Between Two Worlds*, in *La cité interconnectée dans le*

- monde gréco-romain. *Transferts et réseaux institutionnels, religieux et culturels aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, éd. par M. Dana, I. Savalli, Bordeaux, 273–286.
- (2022), *The Politics of the (Recent) Past. Early Hellenistic Athenian Decrees between Epigraphy and Literature*, in *Writing Contemporary History, from Thucydides to Ammianus Marcellinus* (Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt), éd. par V. Fromentin, Vandoeuvres, 201–239.
- Marasco G. (1984), *Democare di Leuconoe: politica e cultura in Atene tra IV e III sec. a.C.*, Firenze.
- Marek C. (2006), *Die Inschriften von Kaunos*, München.
- Meeus A. (2015), *The Career of Sostratos of Knidos: Politics, Diplomacy and the Alexandrian Building Program in the Early Hellenistic Period*, in *Greece, Macedon and Persia: Studies in Social, Political, and Military History*, ed. by E. Garvin, T. Howe, G. Wrihston, Oxford, 143–171.
- Merker I.L. (1970), *The Ptolemaic Officials and the League of the Islander*, «Historia» 19, 141–160.
- Moretta L. (1967), *Iscrizioni Storiche Ellenistiche, I. Attica, Peloponneso, Beozia*, Firenze.
- Nachtergaeel G. (1977), *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôteria de Delphé. Recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistiques*, Bruxelles.
- Oetjen R. (2014), *Athen im dritten Jahrhundert v. Chr. Politik und Gesellschaft in den Garnisonsdemen auf der Grundlage der inschriftlichen Überlieferung*, Düsseldorf.
- Oliver G.J. (2001), *Regions and Micro-Regions: Grain for Rhamnous*, in *Hellenistic Economies*, ed. by Ž. Archibald, J.K. Davies, V. Gabrielsen, G.J. Oliver, London - New York, 104–118.
- (2007), *War, Food, and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens*, Oxford.
- O'Neil J.L. (2008), *A Re-Examination of the Chremonidean War*, in *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and His World*, ed. by P. McKechnie, P. Guillaume, Leiden - Boston, 65–89.
- Osborne M.J. (1979), *Kallias, Phaedros and Revolt of Athens in 287 B.C.*, «ZPE» 35, 181–194.
- (1981), *Entertainment in the Prytaneion at Athens*, «ZPE» 41, 153–170.
- (1982), *Naturalization in Athens*, II, Brussels.
- (2009), *The Archons of Athens 300/299–228/7*, «ZPE» 171, 83–99.
- (2012), *Athens in the Third Century B.C.*, Athens.
- (2015), *The Athenian Decree for Kallias of Sphettos and the Panathenaia*, in *ΑΞΩΝ: Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*, ed. by A.P. Matthaiou and N. Papazarkadas, Athens, 59–76.
- (2016), *Panathenaic Fantasies*, «ZPE» 198, 88–96.
- Paschidis P. (2008), *Between City and King. Prosopographical Studies on the Intermediaries between the Cities of the Greek Mainland and the Aegean and the Royal Courts in the Hellenistic Period (322–190 B.C.)*, Athens.
- Petrakos V.C. (2003), *Ἀνασκαφές*, «Ergon» 50, 13–64.
- (2020), *Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος*, VI. *Οι επιγραφές, τα χαράγματα, τα σταθμια, οι μαρτυρίες*, Athenai.
- Reger G. (1992), *Athens and Tenos in the Early Hellenistic Age*, «CQ» 42, 365–383.
- Roisman J., Worthington I. (2015), *Lives of the Attic Orators: text from Pseudo-Plutarch, Photius and the Suda*, Oxford.

- Rosamilia E. (2018), *From Magas to Glaukon. The Long Life of Glaukon of Aithalidai and the Chronology of Ptolemaic Re-Annexation of Cyrene (ca. 250 BCE)*, «Chiron» 48, 263–300.
- Rose T. (2015), *A Historical Commentary on Plutarch's Life of Demetrius*, PhD Diss., Iowa City.
- Rose T., Wallace S. (2022), *The Athenian Revolt from Demetrios Poliorketes: New Evidence from Rhamnous (I.Rhamnous 404)*, «AHB» 36, 166–178.
- Rosen K. (1987), *Ehrendekrete, Biographie und Geschichtsschreibung. Zum Wandel der griechischen Polis im frühen Hellenismus*, «Chiron» 17, 277–292.
- Sarrazanas C. (2021), *La cité des spectacles permanents. Organisation et organisateurs des concours civiques dans l'Athènes hellénistique et impériale*, Bordeaux.
- Segre M. (1930), *Per la storia di Antioco I Sotere*, «Athenaeum» 8, 488–507.
- Shear J. (2010), *Demetrios Poliorketes, Kallias of Sphettos, and the Panathenaia*, in *Studies in Greek Epigraphy and History in Honor of Stephen V. Tracy*, ed. by G. Reger, F.X. Ryan, T.F. Winters, Bordeaux, 135–152.
- (2020), *An Inconvenient Past in Hellenistic Athens: The Case of Phaidros of Sphettos*, «Histos» Suppl. 11, 269–301.
- Shear T.L. (1978), *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 BC*, Princeton.
- Taylor M.C. (1998), *When the Peiraieus and the City Are Reunited*, «ZPE» 12, 207–212.
- Tarn W.W. (1913), *Antigonos Gonatas*, Oxford.
- Thonemann P. (2005), *The Tragic King: Demetrios Poliorketes and the City of Athens*, in *Imaginary Kings. Royal Images in the Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome*, ed. by Ö. Hekster, R. Fowler, Stuttgart, 63–86.
- Tracy S.V. (1995), *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 BC*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.
- Volkman H. (1959), *Ptolemaios I Soter*, in *RE XXIII*, 1603–1645.
- Wallace S. (2010), *The Significance of Plataia for Greek Eleutheria in the Early Hellenistic Period*, in *Creating a Hellenistic World*, ed. by A. Erskine, L. Llewellyn-Jones, Swansea, 147–176.
- Wheatley P., Dunn C. (2020), *Demetrius the Besieger*, Oxford.
- Wilding A. (2015), *Aspirations and Identities: Proxenai at Oropos during the Fourth to the Second Centuries BCE*, «BICS» 58, 55–81.
- (2021), *Reiventing the Amphiareion in Oropos*, Leiden – Boston.
- Wörle M. (1975), *Antiochos I, Achaïos der Ältere und die Galater. Eine neue Inschrift aus Denizli*, «Chiron» 5, 60–87.
- Worthington I. (2021), *Athens after Empire. A History from Alexander the Great to the Emperor Hadrian*, Oxford.