

PHILIP II, ALEXANDER, AND THE TWO TYRANNIES AT ERESOS OF IG XII.2.526

J. BERT LOTT

THE SO-CALLED DOSSIER of inscriptions from Eresos concerning two tyrannies associated with the reigns of Philip II and Alexander has naturally been of great interest to scholars.¹ The tyrannies date from ca 338–332 B.C., when Parmenion led an expedition to Asia Minor, Philip died, and Alexander began his conquest of the Persian empire. Thus they offer evidence (where other evidence is slim) for a crucial period in the history of Macedon's relations with the Greeks of Asia and the islands off its coast.² Moreover, the dossier, together with a passage of ps.-Demosthenes 17, provides insight into the continued workings of the Common Peace of 338 and Alexander's (supposed) zeal for legalism.³ However, the general circumstances surrounding the tyrannies themselves remain controversial, and the chronology especially has been a point of dissent.⁴ The most recent full edition of the dossier with an historical commentary is that of A. J. Heisserer, who (generally following H. Pistorius) proposes a series of three tyrannies at Eresos each broken by the establishment of a democracy by Philip or Alexander.⁵ But some of the basic tenets of Heisserer's and Pistorius' reconstruction are now questioned, most notably by A. B. Bosworth.⁶ Bosworth doubts particularly the likelihood *a priori* that Philip would have established a democracy at Eresos. However, Bosworth's own revised chronology is problematic, and N. G. L. Hammond rejects it in favor of the original chronology suggested by Pistorius. This paper will suggest that this confusion is largely the result of the modern belief (espoused by Pistorius, Heisserer, Bosworth, and Hammond) that there were three tyrannies at Eresos. There is in fact ancient evidence for only two; scholars have concocted the third in order to make Philip a champion of democracy in Asia Minor alongside his

I am obliged to Prof. A. John Graham for his aid.

¹ IG XII.2.526 = IG XII supp. pp. 65 ff. = OGIS 8 = IJG 2.27 = Tod 191. For plates see Heisserer 1980. For an English translation see Harding 1985: 112.

² There are several good historical and chronological discussions of events in the Aegean and Asia during the years in question. See Atkinson 1980: 457–458; Brunt 1976: 453–456; Heisserer 1980: 58–59. Cf. in general Badian 1966: 37–69; Hammond 1989: 209–217.

³ For an overview of the continued existence of the Common Peace of 338 see Hammond and Walbank 1988: 571–579.

⁴ Note especially the variant (if sometimes only slightly) chronologies in Pistorius 1913: 60–66, esp. 65, 71–75, 86–89, 120–123; Tod 191; Heisserer 1980; Griffith in Hammond and Griffith 1979: 720; Bosworth 1980: 179; Hammond in Hammond and Walbank 1988: 74.

⁵ Heisserer 1980: 27–78 with prior bibliography. Before Heisserer, see especially Pistorius 1913: 60–66, esp. 65, 71–75, 86–89, 120–123. For an extensive review of Heisserer, see Rosen 1982: 353–362, esp. 356–358.

⁶ Bosworth 1988: 192, n. 8; Bosworth 1980: 179. Cf. Hammond 1989: 215.

son Alexander. I will question (following Bosworth) the likelihood of this and offer a new chronology involving only the two securely attested tyrannies. The starting point of any discussion of the tyrannies at Eresos must be our two direct testimonia, the dossier itself and chapter 7 of speech 17 in the Demosthenic corpus. Historical analysis of these sources will provide the basis of my argument.

I. IG 12.2.526

In its present state the dossier consists of seven documents on two stelae.⁷ The first stele is inscribed only on the right lateral, the second on the obverse, right lateral and reverse.⁸ The contents of the collection are revealed in the final document on the second stone which is a decree of the *demos* of Eresos (lines 122–158):⁹ the dossier is a compilation of the actions taken at Eresos concerning tyrants and their descendants. The decree also provides a valuable chronological summary which notes some of the circumstances surrounding the various actions listed on the stelae.

We learn first that King Alexander ordered the Eresians to try the tyrants Eurysilaos and Agonippos themselves. This explains the first two documents on the stelae, which record the two trials. The proceedings against Eurysilaos (lines 44–75) accuse him, among other things, of seizing the citizens' arms, confining their daughters and wives on the Acropolis, plundering and burning the city, its temples, and the dead, and exacting 2300 staters from the survivors.¹⁰ The trial of Agonippos and the charges against him (the second document in the dossier, lines 1–31) closely parallel those against Eurysilaos but include the further accusations that Agonippos destroyed altars erected to Zeus Philippios, made war on Alexander and the Greeks, and slandered the citizens of Eresos to Alexander.¹¹

⁷ It was originally thought that the two stones were the broken halves of one large stele, i.e., that the first stone fit on top of the second. Heisserer (1980: 31–33) proposes two separate stelae on the bases of his own measurements and historical reasoning. I am unable to speak to the accuracy of Heisserer's measurements or those in *IG*, but Heisserer does present a convincing case on historical grounds. Heisserer is followed by Harding (1985: 112), but cf. the critical remarks of Rosen (1982: 357).

⁸ The editors of *IG* thought that the remaining three sides of the first stone were never inscribed but Heisserer (1980: 28–29) claims to have discerned "occasional letters" on the obverse. In support of this, the text of the first stone, which closely matches the obverse of the second, picks up in the middle of that text. This suggests that the missing portion was carved on the obverse of the first stone.

⁹ All line numbers refer to M. N. Tod's edition no. 191 since I believe his text to be the most readily available. It should be noted that Tod does not present the inscriptions in the correct order (see above, n. 8).

¹⁰ Tod's text: (*Ige* Εὐρύσιλαος) [παρ]ήλετο τὰ ὅπλα καὶ | ἐξ]εκλάϊσε ἐκ τὰς [πό]λιος πανδάμι, ταῖς | δ]ὲ γόνακας καὶ τ[αῖς] | θ]υγάτερας συλλάβ[ων] | ἤρξε εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπο[λ]ιν καὶ εἰσέπραξε | διοχλίους καὶ τρι[α]κοσίους σάττηρα<ς>, τὰ[ν] | δὲ πόλιν καὶ τὰ ἱρα [δι]α[ρ]πάσας μετὰ τῶν | [λ]αῖσταν ἐνέπρησε | [κ]αὶ συγκατέκαυσε | σώματα τῶν πολ[ι]τ[ῶ]ν . . .

¹¹ (*Ige* Ἀγώνιππος) . . . [καὶ ἰ | τοῖς] Ἑλλανας ἐλαΐζε[το] καὶ τοῖς βῶμοις ἄ[νέ]σ[κα]ψε τῷ Δίῳ τῷ Φιλιππίῳ, καὶ πόλεμον ἐξε[νι]κ[ά]μενος πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλανας . . .

These additional charges were probably made against Eurysilaos also on one of the erased faces of the first stele. It is clear from the summary that the two tyrants Agonippos and Eurysilaos ruled Eresos together and were both tried at Eresos and executed and their kin exiled (lines 131–136).

Next the summary registers another edict of Alexander requiring the Eresians to judge whether the descendants of a trio of tyrants, Apollodoros, Hermon, and Heraios, should be allowed to return to Eresos (lines 136–140).¹² The third document in the dossier (lines 34–42) is the decree of the *demos* in answer to Alexander's edict. The summary tells us that the sentence of exile against the kin of these three was upheld.

The final two documents in the dossier preceding the summary pertain to dealings with Philip Arrhidaios (lines 98–101)¹³ and Antigonos Monophthalmos (lines 105–121) concerning later attempts by the exiled relatives of our tyrants to return home. Thus we have two sets of tyrants: first Apollodoros, Hermon, and Heraios and second Eurysilaos and Agonippos. The list of charges against Agonippos and Eurysilaos will be of great help in placing both their own tyranny and the one of Apollodoros *et al.* in the historical record. Note that we know of the tyrants Apollodoros, Hermon, and Heraios only through the actions of their descendants. The occasion of their removal is not recorded in the dossier. Since the summary purports to record all the actions taken against tyrants ([π]άντα [τὰ γράφοντα] κατὰ τῶν τυρ[άν]ων), we must suppose that the removal of Apollodoros *et al.* occurred before the chronological period covered by the dossier and thus before the tyranny of Agonippos and Eurysilaos.

II. PS.-DEMOSTHENES 17.7

Chapter 7 of the work which has come down to us as number 17 in the corpus of Demosthenes is our second datum. Ps.-Demosthenes 17 purports to be an oration urging the Athenians to rise up against Alexander on account of his violations of the Common Peace of 338. The date of its composition is somewhat disputed and cannot be more firmly fixed than between 335 and 331. A lengthy scholion to ps.-Demosthenes 17.1 places it prior to the destruction of Thebes.¹⁴ However, G. Cawkwell (1961: 74) has raised strong objections to so early a date and to the reliability of the scholiast of ps.-Demosthenes in general.¹⁵ Modern scholars (e.g., *CAH* 6¹. 444) have connected this speech with the revolt of Agis

¹²The editors of *IJG*, followed by Heisserer (1980: 62), connect Hermesidas' and Agesimenes' request with the Exiles Decree of 324: see Diod. 17.109.1, 18.8.2–7; Curtius 10.2.4–8; Justin 13.5.2. Diodorus excludes murderers from the amnesty, Curtius those who had killed their fellow citizens, and Justin those convicted of murder. Cf. Tod nos. 201, 202.

¹³This is perhaps to be associated with the Royal Rescript of 319 which restored those banished "from that time when Alexander crossed over into Asia"; Diod. 18.56.

¹⁴Dilts 1983: 195, no. 2.

¹⁵Note that the sections of Cawkwell's argument which depend upon his interpretation of chapter 7 are greatly weakened by his inexact understanding of the tyrants at Eresos.

in 331. A date as early as 335 does seem untenable since Alexander would have had little time to commit all the crimes listed in the speech before the destruction of Thebes. The passage in question is part of an argument that Alexander has broken the Peace (and his own agreements with the Greeks) by interfering in the internal affairs of member states in restoring the tyrants of Messene.¹⁶ Alexander's justification was evidently another tenet of the Peace which forbade member states to change their constitution from that in force when they joined the Peace (cf. chapter 9 of the same speech). Our author counters by pointing out that Alexander had removed tyrants from Eresos and Antissa who had been in power when those states joined the Peace:

ἀλλὰ γὰρ εἵποιεν ἂν οἱ τυραννίζοντες οὗτοι ὅτι πρὶν τὰς συνθήκας γενέσθαι ἐτυράνουν Μεσσήνης οἱ Φιλιάδου παῖδες· διὸ καὶ καταγαγεῖν τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον αὐτούς. ἀλλὰ καταγέλαστος ὁ λόγος, τοὺς μὲν ἐκ Λέσβου τυράννους, οἷον ἐξ Ἀντίσσης καὶ Ἐρέσου, ἐκβαλεῖν ὡς ἀδικήματος ὄντος τοῦ πολιτεύματος, τοὺς πρὸ τῶν ὁμολογιῶν τυραννήσαντας, ἐν δὲ Μεσσήνῃ μηδὲν οἶεσθαι διαφέρειν, τῆς αὐτῆς δυσχερείας ὑπαρχούσης.

But these champions of tyranny might urge that the sons of Philicides were tyrants of Messene before the compact [of the Common Peace] was made, and that that was why Alexander restored them. But it is a ridiculous principle to expel the Lesbian tyrants on the ground that their rule is an outrage—I mean the tyrants of Antissa and Eresos who established themselves before the agreement [of the Common Peace]—and yet to imagine that it is a matter of indifference at Messene, where the same harsh system prevails.

Several points can be deduced concerning Eresos: first, Alexander was himself responsible for removing a tyranny from Eresos; second, Eresos was a signatory of the Common Peace of 338 at the time;¹⁷ third, the tyrants Alexander removed were already in power when Eresos joined the Peace. It would be difficult to deny that this tyranny must be one of the two tyrannies mentioned in the dossier. We must then consider the date for Eresos' entry into the Peace and note some of the circumstances which may have surrounded that entry.

Some evidence may be found in the altars of Zeus Philippios destroyed by Agonippos and Eurysilaos (lines 5–6). The epithet Philippios clearly creates a close relationship between Philip and the altars of Zeus, so close that C. Habicht thought the epithet implied the deification and worship of Philip himself.¹⁸ However, although there is still some controversy over the extent of the religious honors Philip desired and accepted, E. Badian has shown fairly convincingly that

¹⁶ It seems clear that the ὁμολογίαι discussed in ps.-Dem. 17 are mainly those of the Common Peace of 338 (both among the signatories and between Philip and the Greeks), and not new agreements reached with the Greeks by Alexander in 336.

¹⁷ From the text there can be no doubt that Eresos was a signatory of the Common Peace of 338. Even V. Ehrenberg (1938: 16 ff., esp. 21) must admit this, though he denies it for the other island cities. *Pace* Hammond (Hammond and Walbank 1988: 74), who seems to suggest that Eresos was allied directly with Alexander and not a party to the Common Peace. Cf. Badian 1966: 50–52.

¹⁸ Habicht 1970: 14, n. 2.

Philip was never worshipped as a god himself.¹⁹ Nevertheless it is true that Philip received (and must have desired) several novel religious honors near the end of his life. Note that in 336 Philip had his statue carried alongside those of the gods in the procession of the festival in honor of his daughter Cleopatra's marriage.²⁰ He constructed a tholos to house statues of himself and his family within the precinct of Zeus at Olympia.²¹ Finally, the Ephesians placed a statue of Philip in their Artemision at Ephesos in 335 when Parmenion liberated the city.²² In the face of these examples, we might easily credit Philip with a policy of active religious innovation devised late in his life to honor himself and his dynasty. (In any event we should not be surprised to note that "Zeus Philippios" is the first attested instance of an eponymous divine epithet.)

There are only a few later examples of eponymous (and adjectival) divine epithets in the Hellenistic world: a temple of Aphrodite Stratonikis at Smyrna built before 242 B.C., which still existed under Roman rule,²³ a cult of Zeus Seleukios in Lydia attested in A.D. 228/9,²⁴ and an obscure cult of Apollo Pasparios.²⁵ Roman examples of Caesarian and Augustan date, however, are plentiful. In the last years of Caesar's life the Senate voted cults of Clementia Caesaris and Victoria Caesaris at Rome.²⁶ Numerous cults of so-called Augustan gods who bore the epithet *augustus* were founded in Rome, Italy, and the provinces during the reign of Augustus.²⁷ Cicero notes that in the late Republic

¹⁹ Badian 1981: 67–71. Pace Fredricksmeyer (1979: 39–61, 1981: 145–156, 1982: 85–98), who believes Philip did consciously pursue his own divinity; cf. in general Borza 1990: 249–250; Griffith in Hammond and Griffith 1979: 692, 720.

²⁰ Diod. 16.92.5. Philip's murder occurred at this festival.

²¹ Paus. 5.20.9–10.

²² Arr. *Anab.* 1.17.10–12 says that after Alexander liberated Ephesos in 334, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ὁ τῶν Ἐφεσίων ... τοὺς τὸ ἱερὸν συλῆσαντας τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τοὺς τὴν εἰκόνα τὴν Φιλίππου τὴν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καταβαλόντας ... ὥρμησαν ἀποκτεῖναι.

²³ *ISmyrna* nos. 573, 574, 578, 723 (with bibliography), 751; Tac. *Ann.* 3.63; Habicht 1970: 100–101; Magie 1950: 97–98, 933.

²⁴ Nock 1928: 42–43. The Seleucids controlled Lydia in the first half of the third century B.C. However, the connection of the epithet with the Seleucid dynasty is attenuated by the centuries between Seleucid rule and the date of the dedication.

²⁵ Habicht 1970: 14, n. 2; Hesychius s.v. Pasparios.

²⁶ On Clementia and Victoria Caesaris, see Weinstock 1971: 308 ff. Caesar's name appears in the genitive rather than as an adjective. However, this does not greatly weaken the parallel between Zeus Philippios and the Caesarian cults since a Latin adjective (especially one formed from a personal name) is often interchangeable with a genitive form: e.g., Forum Augusti/Forum Augustum. See Schultz 1904: 9 ff., 486 ff., 510, 535; Wackernagel 1957: 59 ff., 71, 73–75.

²⁷ E.g., Apollo Augustus (*CIL* 6.33), Pax Augusta (*Res Gestae* 12; *Insc. Ital.* 13.2 404–405), Venus Augusta (*AE* 1980 54), Diana Augusta (*CIL* 6.128, 129), Mars Augustus (*IRT* 301), Mercurius Augustus (*CIL* 6.34, 6.283 = *AE* 1980 54; *CIL* 13.1769 = *ILS* 3208), Volcanus Augustus (*CIL* 6.802 = *ILS* 3306), Ops Augusta (*Insc. Ital.* 13.2149, 191, 493), Stata Mater Augusta (*CIL* 6.802 = *ILS* 3306; *CIL* 6.764), and Aesculapius Augustus (*CIL* 6.12 = *ILS* 3837)—and this list is far from complete. I know of no secure example of Jupiter Augustus from the reigns of Augustus or Tiberius, but a glance through the indices of *ILS* shows numerous subsequent or undated cults of Jupiter Augustus

it was common for eastern provincials to establish cults of the virtues of their Roman governors.²⁸ One might find the inspiration for Cicero's cults in a cult such as that of Zeus Philippios on Eresos. And Cicero's cults seem a sure model for the Caesarian and Augustan ones. Likewise, Caesar's well-known imitation of Alexander may have brought the altars of Zeus Philippios to his attention.

The Roman evidence provides a further argument *a fortiori* that Zeus Philippios was not a deified Philip: neither Caesar or Augustus was considered an incarnation of the gods who bore their names. D. Fishwick (1991: 455) suggests that the Augustan gods might sometimes act as the *comites* and protectors of the emperor. While there is some evidence for this in the case of Victoria especially, it seems the reverse of the usual situation. Clementia Caesaris did not protect Caesar; rather, she brought mercy to those in need of it, Caesar's enemies. Pax Augusta effected peace for the citizens of Rome, not for Augustus himself (who was rarely at peace). Dedications in Rome to Stata Mater Augusta for stopping fires surely gave thanks to the goddess for her assistance; the favored were those whose houses were saved,²⁹ not Augustus. It was Augustus' and Caesar's role in delivering the blessings of the god that occasioned the epithet, not their receipt of blessings: Caesar provided pardon and Augustus created a fire watch. Likewise we may suppose that Zeus aided the Eresians through the intervention of Philip. We will find later that the action of Zeus through Philip which occasioned the altars was likely the establishment of the first tyranny at Eresos.

The eponymous epithet certainly suggests that Caesar, Augustus, and Philip were in a unique position as the emissaries of Clementia, Pax, and Zeus. This in turn must have given them a holy character as the only link between the gods who bore their names and mortals. If one accepts this comparative analysis and the probability that Philip himself gave the Eresians the idea for their new cult, then we find Philip again stopping just short of declaring his own divinity while still appropriating some of the trappings of cult to increase his own holiness and uniqueness. In the case of Clementia Caesaris we have good evidence that the cult statue was to be a group of Clementia Caesaris and Caesar shaking hands.³⁰ If we keep in mind that Philip's statue was carried in the *pompe* and placed in the Artemision at Ephesos, then it seems possible that the altars of Zeus Philippios at Eresos stood before a statue group of Zeus and Philip.

throughout the empire. On the Augustan gods in general see Fishwick 1991: 446–474; Nock 1925: 90–93; and now Lott 1995.

²⁸ *QFr* 1.1.31: *qua re quoniam in istis urbibus cum summo imperio et potestate versaris in quibus tuas virtutes consecratas et in deorum numero conlocatas vides . . .* Cicero is warning his brother, who is about to take up a governorship, about the practice.

²⁹ Stata Mater with and without the epithet Augusta was a favorite patron of compital societies who had charge of fire control in Rome for much of Augustus' reign. See *CIL* 6.76, 761, 763–765, 802.

³⁰ App. *BC* 2.106.443; Dio 44.6.4; Plut. *Caesar* 57.4.

Two chronological points can be made about the altars. First, they must have been built while Philip was still alive since Alexander did not honor his earthly father. Moreover, if the eponymous epithet notes that Zeus acted through Philip, then it would have little meaning if Philip were dead. Second, the altars must have been dedicated late in Philip's life. All of Philip's novel religious honors occur at the very end of his life. We may then with some certainty connect the altars with the tyrants of ps.-Demosthenes 17.7 who ruled Eresos when the cult of Zeus Philippios was evidently founded. Heisserer (1980: 33) offers the attractive suggestion that the altars were in fact erected upon the occasion of Eresos' entry into the Peace. One might connect the altars with Philip's statue placed in the Artemision at Ephesos when Parmenion captured that city and suggest, then, that Eresos joined Philip and the Peace in 336. However, there is no evidence for naval action in the Asian campaigns of 336–335, and thus no plain opportunity for Parmenion to have intervened at Eresos.

In any event, the tyrants at Eresos of ps.-Demosthenes 17.7 (who raised the altars of Zeus Philippios) were in power *πρὸ τῶν ὁμολογίων*. This may mean before the inception of the Peace in 338 (of which Eresos was a party) or before Eresos swore the oaths and joined the (pre-existent) Peace. The former must be correct since the author of ps.-Demosthenes 17 clearly recognizes the difference between the foundation of the the Peace (αἱ ὁμολογίαι, αἱ συνθήκαι) and the addition of further members at a later date (ὅτε τοὺς ὅρκους τοὺς περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης ὤμνυσαν). Thus *πρὸ τῶν ὁμολογίων* should mean before the inception of the Peace in 338, and therefore that Eresos was a charter member of the Peace and the tyrants of ps.-Demosthenes 17 came to power in or before 338.³¹ Thus they came to power during Philip's lifetime and remained in power until Alexander removed them.

III. HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Leaving the tyrants of ps.-Demosthenes 17.7 unnamed for the moment, we find that the chronology of the second group of tyrants from the dossier, Agonippos and Eurysilaos, who medized and opposed Alexander, poses no problem. In 333 Darius' admiral Memnon began a naval counter-offensive off Asia Minor during which he took control of Tenedos, Chios, and Lesbos, except for Mytilene, which he besieged.³² Diodorus tells us that the cities of Lesbos (except Mytilene) joined the Persians without a fight.³³ Memnon then established

³¹ *Pace* Badian 1966: 51; Ehrenberg 1938: 21.

³² *Arr. Anab.* 2.1.1: ἐκ δὲ τούτου Μένων τοῦ τε ναυτικοῦ παντὸς ἡγεμὼν ἐκ βασιλείας Δαρείου καθεστῆκώς καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀποστρέψων τὸν πόλεμον, Χίον μὲν λαμβάνει προδοσίᾳ ἐνδοθεῖσαν, ἔνθεν δὲ ἐπὶ Λέσβου πλεύσας, ὥς οὐ προσεῖχον αὐτῷ οἱ Μιτυληναῖοι, τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις τῆς Λέσβου προσηγάγετο. ταύτας δὲ παραστησάμενος καὶ προσχῶν τῇ Μιτυλήνῃ τὴν πόλιν ... ἐκράτει οὐ χαλεπῶς.

³³ *Diod.* 17.29.1–2: ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων Δαρείος χρημάτων πλῆθος ἐξέπεμψε τῷ Μένωνι καὶ τοῦ πολέμου παντὸς ἀπέδειξε στρατηγόν. ὁ δὲ μισθοφόρων πλῆθος ἀθροίσας καὶ τριακοσίας ναῦς πληρώσας

oligarchies and tyrannies in the cities which he had captured. Arrian notes by name Aristonikos at Methymna and Diogenes at Mytilene.³⁴ If Agonippos and Eurysilaos betrayed the city to Memnon in 333 and were then given forces to hold the city (as was done at Chios), it would match the charges from the stelae that they made war on Alexander and the Greeks and disarmed and robbed their own populace. Memnon died during or soon after the siege of Mytilene and Alexander sent Hegelochos and Amphoteros to regain the lost islands. In 332 Lesbos, Tenedos, and Chios returned to Macedonian control. Again, the cities of Lesbos except for Mytilene switched sides without a fight.³⁵ Hegelochos brought his prisoners from Lesbos and Chios, including specifically the tyrants of Methymna and Chios, to Alexander in Egypt. Alexander then returned all the tyrants ἐς τὰς πόλεις χρήσασθαι ὅπως [αἱ πόλεις] ἐθέλοιεν. This parallels the summary which tells us that Alexander commanded the Eresians to try Agonippos and Eurysilaos themselves (lines 127–130). Eurysilaos' presence in Egypt is confirmed if we emend Curtius, who says that Alexander returned Aristonicus and Ersilaus (*sic*) of Methymna to their own cities for trial, to read "Eurysilaus."³⁶ Furthermore, Agonippos was charged with slandering the *demos* of Eresos to Alexander. A meeting in Egypt would have provided an opportunity for this. The fact that Eresos changed sides so easily can be taken as evidence of factional strife within the city between those who supported Persia (led by Agonippos and Eurysilaos) and those who supported Macedon (in this case, the democrats).

The sequence of events prior to 333 is much less secure. The reconstructions of Heisserer and Pistorius both accept that Philip and Alexander each replaced a tyranny at Eresos with a democracy prior to Memnon's capture of the city in 333. This of course requires that there *be* two tyrannies prior to that of Agonippos and Eurysilaos. Thus Pistorius (followed very closely by Hammond) and Heisserer suggest a second, unattested tyranny for either Apollodoros *et al.* or Agonippos and Eurysilaos.³⁷ (For various reasons Pistorius prefers Agonippos and Eurysilaos, Heisserer Apollodoros, Hermon, and Heraios.) Parmenion's retreat and Memnon's counter-offensive in 335 provide the occasion for the fall of the democracy established by Philip. Memnon must have taken the island

ἐνεργῶς διώκει τὰ κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον. Χίον μὲν οὖν προσηγάγετο· πλεῦσας δ' ἐπὶ Λέσβον Ἀντισσαν μὲν καὶ Μήθυμναν καὶ Πύρραν καὶ Ἐρεσσὸν ῥαδίως ἐχειρώσατο, τὴν δὲ Μιτυλήνην μεγάλην οὖσαν ... εἶλε κατὰ κράτος.

³⁴ 2.1.5, 3.2.4. Cf. Curtius 4.5.19.

³⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 3.2.3–7: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ Ἡγέλοχος κατέπλευσεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἀπαγγέλλει Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Τενεδίους τε ἀποστάντας Περωσῶν σφίσι προσθέσθαι, καὶ Χίων ὅτι δὴ δῆμος ἐπηγάγετο σφᾶς βία τῶν κατεχόντων ... καὶ Μιτυλήνην δὲ Χάρητα ἔχοντα ὅτι ἀφείλετο καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς ἐν Λέσβῳ πόλεις καὶ αὐτάς ὁμολογίᾳ προσηγάγετο ... καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ὅσοι αἰχμάλωτοι ἦγον Ἡγέλοχος, Φαρνάβαζος δὲ ἀπέδρα ἐν Κῷ λαθὼν τοὺς φύλακας. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ τοὺς τυράννους μὲν τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ἐς τὰς πόλεις πέμψει χρήσασθαι ὅπως ἐθέλοιεν Cf. Curtius 4.5.14.

³⁶ 4.8.11. Cf. the helpful comments of Atkinson 1980: 371–372.

³⁷ See above, n. 3.

and replaced the democracy with a pro-Persian tyranny. Thus the chronology of Pistorius and Heisserer (and Hammond) is as follows:

1. Tyranny at Eresos removed by Philip and a democracy established. Pistorius dates the removal to ca 343. Heisserer prefers 336 during Parmenion's expedition to Asia Minor.
2. Memnon establishes a second tyranny in 335 during his offensive against Parmenion. The tyrants are either Agonippos and Eurysilaos or Hermon, Heraios, and Apollodoros.
3. Alexander removes this second tyranny, probably in 334 after the battle of the Granicus and the fall of Ephesos.
4. Memnon establishes the tyranny of Agonippos and Eurysilaos in 333 when he recaptures Tenedos, Lesbos, and Chios.
5. Hegelochos retakes the lost islands and Alexander orders the *demos* of Eresos to try Agonippos and Eurysilaos in 332.

There are, however, several problems with this reconstruction. First, it seems unnecessarily complex. Second, there is no hint at all in the dossier of a second tyranny for either group of tyrants. (It seems unlikely that the dossier omits a third group of tyrants since the summary document, which is intact, was clearly intended to be comprehensive [lines 123–127].) Third, Memnon's campaign in 335 appears to have been conducted solely on land.³⁸ Memnon does not appear as Darius' admiral until Alexander disbands his fleet after the fall of Miletus.³⁹ So a Persian capture of Eresos in 335, necessary to Heisserer's and Pistorius' reconstructions, is also unlikely. Fourth, if the tyrants of ps.-Demosthenes 17.7 had medized in 335 before their removal by Alexander, the argument of ps.-Demosthenes would have no force (see below, 36). Finally, Bosworth suggests that it is *a priori* improbable that Philip would have established a democracy at Eresos between 343 and 335.⁴⁰ This point is important enough to be examined fully.

There is no question that Philip meddled in the affairs of other states and supported factions loyal to himself.⁴¹ Pausanias tells us that he supplied money to the oligarchs at Elis to help them in their struggle against the democrats. This was evidently successful since Demosthenes reports the overthrow of the democracy there in 343 accompanied by a massacre.⁴² In the same year Demosthenes accuses a certain Megarian oligarch, Perillos, of twice visiting Philip in Macedon and of

³⁸ Note his march across Mt. Ida to attack Kyzikos. Further Diodorus, who mentions the forces given Memnon, makes no mention of ships or crews.

³⁹ Arr. *Anab.* 1.20, 2.1; Diod. 17.29.1: ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων (333/332) Δαρείος χρημάτων πλῆθος ἐξέπεμψε τῷ Μέμνονι καὶ τοῦ πολέμου παντὸς ἀπέδειξε στρατηγόν.

⁴⁰ Bosworth 1988: 192, n. 8.

⁴¹ Griffith in Hammond and Griffith 1979: 496.

⁴² Paus. 4.28.4; Dem. 19.260, 19.294. This oligarchy was still in power and supporting Philip two years later: Dem. 9.27.

returning from his second trip with aid to help his party gain control of Megara.⁴³ In this case Philip was thwarted by the Athenian strategos Phokion who came to the democrats' defense.⁴⁴ Moreover, Philip intervened militarily in Euboea no less than three times between 343 and 340. At Eretria Philip overthrew the democracy and installed the tyrants Hipparchos, Automedon, and Kleitarchos. Twice more troops were required to keep these tyrants in power, and on the second occasion Parmenion toppled the democracy at Oreos and installed a small oligarchy there as well.⁴⁵ Finally, after Chaeronea, when Philip controlled all of Greece, oligarchies replaced democracies in Akarnania, Ambrakia, and Thebes, and probably in Troezen as well. This was certainly done with Philip's blessing if not his active help.⁴⁶

Finally, it is inferred from ps.-Demosthenes 17 that the Common Peace of 338 forbade tyrannies in member states.⁴⁷ This is a complex point which cannot be fully discussed here, and which a better understanding of the Eresian tyrannies will help to clarify. However, a few examples from ps.-Demosthenes 17 show that the Peace of 338 did not categorically forbid tyrannies. There were tyrannies in the member states of Messene and Antissa.⁴⁸ The author of ps.-Demosthenes 17 does not accuse Alexander of restoring tyrants *per se* but of meddling in the internal affairs of a signatory of the Peace, and worse, of effecting a change in its constitution.⁴⁹

Given the pattern, without explicit evidence we should not expect that Philip would establish a democracy at Eresos. (It is true, however, that Parmenion restored the democracy at Ephesos in 336. I can only suggest that here Parmenion [and Philip] were obliged to the democrats for betraying the city.)⁵⁰ E. Badian (1966: 44-46) points out that it is in fact only under Alexander that we hear of the wholesale restoration of democracies in Asia or the Aegean by the Macedonians. Bosworth notes that there is no reason to suppose that the two attested tyrannies were separated by a period of democratic rule at all. In order to remove the unattested second tyranny of Agonippos and Eurysilaos or of Hermon, Heraios,

⁴³ Dem. 19.295.

⁴⁴ Plut. *Phokion* 15.

⁴⁵ Dem. 9.57-58; 19.87-89.

⁴⁶ Akarnania and Ambrakia: Diod. 17.3.3; Troezen: Lykourgos *In Leocr.* 42; Hyperides 3.29-35. Cf. Hammond and Griffith 1979: 613; Roebuck 1948.

⁴⁷ Ryder 1965: 151. Heisserer (1980: 69) states, "participation in the League [of Corinth] entailed the banishment of all [tyrants and oligarchs] and the establishment of a pro-Macedonian democratic regime." Cf. also Griffith in Hammond and Griffith 1979: 623 ff.; Hammond in Hammond and Walbank 1988: 571-579; Dobesch 1975.

⁴⁸ Ps.-Dem. 17.4-7; Dem. *De Cor.* 295; cf. Polyb. 17.14.

⁴⁹ Ps.-Dem. 17.10: ἐπ' ἄλλο δὲ δίκαιον ἔρχομαι τῶν κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας. ἐστὶ γὰρ γεγραμμένον, ἐάν τινες τὰς πολιτείας τὰς παρ' ἐκάστοις οὖσας, ὅτε τοὺς ὄρκους τοὺς περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης ὤμνυσαν, καταλύσῃσι πολεμίους εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς τῆς εἰρήνης μετέχουσιν.

⁵⁰ Perhaps it was the continued loyalty in the face of a Persian garrison which in 334 suggested to Alexander his policy of restoring the democracies of Asia Minor.

and Apollodoros, yet keep the evidence of ps.-Demosthenes that Alexander removed a tyranny which had been in power under Philip, Bosworth suggests a single long tyranny for Agonippos and Eurysilaos lasting from ca 338 until 333.⁵¹ Thus Agonippos and Eurysilaos would have directly succeeded Hermon, Heraios, and Apollodoros—a change in dynasty, not a change in constitution. Agonippos and Eurysilaos supported Philip, joined the Peace, and raised the altars to Zeus Philippios. Then when Memnon captured the island in 333, they medized, oppressed the citizenry, and threw down the altars which they themselves had constructed. Then they were captured by Hegelochos in 332, sent to Egypt, and returned to Eresos for trial by Alexander.

While this reconstruction is attractive in some respects (i.e., it does not posit a democracy established by Philip) it does present several, I believe insoluble, problems. First it is unlikely that Memnon would allow Agonippos and Eurysilaos in 333 to simply turn their coats, join the Persians, and remain in control of Eresos. Such an extreme change of loyalties would surely have been suspect. If Agonippos and Eurysilaos were in fact the tyrants of ps.-Demosthenes 17.7, then they had brought Eresos into the Common Peace of 338 and raised the altars to Zeus Philippios. Note that in the three instances where we know Memnon's settlements in 333 he replaced the existing government with new pro-Persian rulers.⁵² Moreover, one would expect treachery to be included in the list of the charges brought against Agonippos and Eurysilaos if they had betrayed the Greek cause. Second, if Agonippos and Eurysilaos were the tyrants of both ps.-Demosthenes 17.7 and 333, then the argument of ps.-Demosthenes would have no force. Surely the author could not object to Alexander removing tyrants who had medized and made war on the Greeks, whether they had been in power in 338 or not? Finally, it was the *demos* of Eresos who tried Agonippos and Eurysilaos, not Alexander, as ps.-Demosthenes implies about the tyrants of 17.7. It would be difficult to construe allowing a city to try and remove its own tyrants as a violation of the Peace.

Thus we must accept that Alexander removed a tyranny at Eresos separate from and prior to the tyranny of Agonippos and Eurysilaos and that the tyrants of this tyranny are those of ps.-Demosthenes 17.7, who joined the Peace and erected the altars of Zeus Philippios. Alexander in effect altered the constitution of a member state of the Peace and removed a regime which had been loyal to his father. The only attested candidates for this earlier tyranny are Hermon, Heraios, and Apollodoros. There is no chronological problem with this conclusion since the summary (lines 135–140, see also lines 34–42) implies that Hermon and Heraios were still alive in 324 when their grandsons asked to return home.

The removal of Apollodoros *et al.* must fall after Philip's death and before Memnon's counter-offensive in 333. It seems unlikely that Alexander would

⁵¹ Bosworth 1980: 179. Cf. Hammond in Hammond and Walbank 1988: 74, n. 2.

⁵² Diogenes at Mytilene, Aristonikos at Methymna, and Autophradates and Pharnabazos at Chios.

have acted so boldly before his position was secure, and thus not before the destruction of Thebes, and probably not before he had secured a foothold in Asia Minor. Arrian reports that following the victory at the Granikos and the recapture of Ephesos (where a democracy was re-established) in 334 Alexander sent Alkimachos from Ephesos to the cities of Aiolis and those under Persian control in Ionia, with instructions to destroy the oligarchies everywhere and establish democracies.⁵³ Alexander's stay at Ephesos perhaps provided the first opportunity for him to consider what was to be done with the Asiatic Greeks, and, as Badian (1966: 44-46) points out, this is when Alexander first exhibits any inclination towards democracy in Asia at all. The mention of Aiolian cities in particular strengthens the possibility that Eresos was included in Alkimachos' itinerary. Eresos does not exactly fit within Alkimachos' mission as defined by Arrian since it was already in Macedonian control. Nevertheless Alexander might well have decided to replace all Greek constitutions in Asia Minor with democracies as it became evident that democrats were more likely to support him against Persia.⁵⁴ In any event, Arrian's passage focusses on the institution of democracies and he might well be inexact as to the nature of the governments removed.

If we accept that the tyranny of ps.-Demosthenes 17.7 (i.e., Apollodoros, Hermon, and Heraios) lasted from at least ca 338 until 334, then we may again deny that Memnon captured Eresos in 335. In 333 Agonippos and Eurysilaos destroyed the altars to Zeus Philippios which were erected prior to Philip's death. Thus the altars remained in existence from their dedication until 333. Presumably, if Memnon had established pro-Persian tyrants at Eresos in 335, he would have ordered them and not, as actually happened, Agonippos and Eurysilaos to overthrow the altars.

One final question remains, when did the tyranny of Hermon, Heraios, and Apollodoros removed by Alexander come to power? Pistorius cites three possible times for Macedonian intervention at Eresos, all prior to 338:⁵⁵ during unspecified activities at sea in 350 or 343 and as part of the campaign waged against Perinthos and Byzantium in 340.⁵⁶ However, the connection between Apollodoros *et al.* and the altars of Zeus Philippios suggests that the date should be much later, ca 338. It is tempting to place the rise of Apollodoros *et al.*, Eresos' entry into the Peace, and the foundation of the altars in a single year. The eponymous epithet

⁵³ Arr. *Anab.* 1.18.1-2: 'Αλκίμαχον δὲ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέους ἐπὶ τὰς Αἰολίδας τε πόλεις ξὺν δυνάμει οὐκ ἐλάττονι ἐξέπεμψε καὶ ὅσαι Ἰωνικαὶ ὑπὸ τοῖς βαρβάροις ἔτι ἦσαν. καὶ τὰς μὲν ὀλιγαρχίας πανταχοῦ καταλύειν ἐκέλευσεν, δημοκρατίας δὲ [τε] ἐγκαθιστάναι καὶ τοὺς νόμους τοὺς σφῶν ἐκάστοις ἀποδοῦναι, καὶ τοὺς φόρους ἀνεῖναι ὅσους τοῖς βαρβάροις ἀπέφερον.

⁵⁴ Note Ephesos and probably the voluntary surrenders of Magnesia and Tralles in 334; Arr. *Anab.* 1.18.1: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ἐκ Μαγνησίας τε καὶ Τράλλεων παρ' αὐτὸν ἦγον ἐνδιδόντες τὰς πόλεις.

⁵⁵ Pistorius is of course thinking of the overthrow, not the establishment, of a tyranny.

⁵⁶ Dem. 4.34, 7.15. For various reasons Pistorius prefers 343; Hammond and Griffith (1979: appendix 6) accept Pistorius' possibilities but prefer 340.

suggests that Philip did something for the tyrants which could be construed as a blessing from Zeus. Most likely he helped the tyrants seize power (with money, soldiers, or threats) and then enrolled Eresos in the Peace. Out of gratitude the tyrants (probably with some direction from Philip himself) founded a cult of Zeus Philippios.

IV. CONCLUSION

Thus the historical circumstances of the two tyrannies of the dossier are now much clearer. Hermon, Heraios, and Apollodoros came to power ca 338 with Philip's aid (or at least his blessing). They erected altars to Zeus Philippios and entered into the Common Peace of 338. In 334 Alexander removed these tyrants from power along with other oligarchs and tyrants. The later hostility of the Eresians towards the descendants of the three shows that their rule had not been pleasant, and thus Alexander's actions were perhaps calculated to endear himself to a people clearly torn by faction. Plutarch relates that Theophrastos, a native of Eresos, had twice convinced Alexander to rid his city of tyrants.⁵⁷ Plutarch must mean that Theophrastos spoke with Alexander on behalf of his patria. The removal of Hermon, Heraios, and Apollodoros must be the first of those instances. Alexander must have recognized the possibility that given a chance Eresos might join the Persians and tried to secure the city's loyalty by switching his support to the democrats (who it was becoming clear were to be his true allies in Asia Minor) at the urging of Theophrastos. It is not surprising that the cult of Zeus Philippios did not cease when Alexander removed its founders: the new democracy remained loyal to the son of Philip.

His efforts were in vain and Eresos did in fact join Memnon in 333 and receive a new set of tyrants. Agonippos and Eurysilaos threw down the altars and suppressed the pro-Macedonian democrats. However, in the end they were captured and given over to the loyal Eresians who sentenced them to death. While in Egypt Agonippos attempted (unsuccessfully) to implicate the *demos* of Eresos in his crimes. It is here that Theophrastos must have spoken against tyranny for the second time. Alexander surely needed no urging to remove the medizing Agonippos and Eurysilaos. Perhaps Theophrastos refuted Agonippos' charges against the *demos*.

Philip's support for a democracy at Eresos and Memnon's capture of the city in 335 are both modern fictions. Rather, Philip advanced a tyranny at Eresos to membership in the Common Peace and died with that tyranny still in place. The kin of the tyrants who had supported Philip later petitioned Alexander

⁵⁷ Plut. *Mor.* 1097B, 1126F. Phanias, also a native of Eresos, appears in the first passage as well. Heisserer (1980: 75) rightly dismisses Aelian *Var. Hist.* 4.19 which makes Theophrastos a friend of Philip, not Alexander; *pace* Pistorius 1913: 120–122. Also note Heisserer's (clever) reading of Diogenes' *Life of Theophrastos* 5.27.

(lines 34–42) and Philip Arrhidaios (lines 98–101) that they be allowed to return home.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
WICHITA, KS 67260
U.S.A.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atkinson, J. E. 1980. *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni*. Amsterdam.
- Badian, E. 1966. "Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia," in *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on His 75th Birthday*. Oxford. 37–69.
- 1981. "The Deification of Alexander the Great," in H. J. Dell (ed.), *Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*. Thessaloniki. 27–71.
- Borza, E. N. 1990. *In the Shadow of Olympus*. Princeton.
- Bosworth, A. B. 1980. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander the Great* 1. Oxford.
- Brunt, P. A. ed. 1976. *Arrian History of Alexander and Indica* 1. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge.
- 1988. *Conquest and Empire*. Cambridge.
- Cawkwell, G. 1961. "A Note on ps.-Demosthenes 17.20," *Phoenix* 15: 74–78.
- Dilts, M. R. 1983. *Scholia Demosthenica* 1. Leipzig.
- Dobesch, G. 1975. "Alexander der Grosse und der Korinthische Bund," *GrazBeitr* 3: 73–149.
- Ehrenberg, V. 1938. *Alexander and the Greeks*. Oxford.
- Fishwick, D. 1991. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* 2.1. Leiden.
- Fredricksmeyer, E. A. 1979. "Divine Honors for Philip II," *TAPA* 109: 39–61.
- 1981. "On the Background of the Ruler Cult," in H. J. Dell (ed.), *Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*. Thessaloniki. 145–156.
- 1982. "On the Final Aims of Philip II," in W. L. Adams and E. N. Borza (eds.), *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*. Washington, D.C. 85–98.
- Habicht, C. 1970. *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*². *Zetemata* 14. Munich.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1989. *The Macedonian State*. Oxford.
- and G. T. Griffith. 1979. *A History of Macedonia* 2. Oxford.
- and F. W. Walbank. 1988. *A History of Macedonia* 3. Oxford.
- Harding, P. 1985. *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome 2. Cambridge.
- Heisserer, A. J. 1980. *Alexander the Great and the Greeks: The Epigraphic Evidence*. Norman, Oklahoma.
- Lott, J. B. 1995. *The Earliest Use of the Divine Epithet Augustus*. Diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- Magie, D. 1950. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*. Princeton.

- Nock, A. D. 1925. "Studies in Graeco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire," *JHS* 45: 84–101 = Z. Stewart (ed.), *Essays on Religion in the Ancient World* (Oxford 1972) 33–48.
- 1928. "Notes on the Ruler Cult 1–4," *JHS* 48: 21–43 = Z. Stewart (ed.), *Essays on Religion in the Ancient World* (Oxford 1972) 134–157.
- Pistorius, H. 1913. *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Lesbos im 4. Jahrh. v. Chr.* Diss., Bonn.
- Roebuck, C. 1948. "The Settlements of Philip II with the Greek States in 338 B.C.," *CP* 43: 73–92.
- Rosen, K. 1982. A Review of Heisserer 1980, *Gnomon* 54: 353–362.
- Ryder, T. 1965. *Koine Eirene*. Oxford.
- Schultz, W. 1904. *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*. Berlin.
- Wackernagel, J. 1957. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*. Basel. (orig. pub. 1926).
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford.