

Tekmeria

Vol 14 (2018)

(2017-2018)

γεγενῆσθαι. μνηύεται οὖν ἀπὸ μετοίκων τέ τινων καὶ ἀκο-
 λούθων περὶ μὲν τῶν Ἑρμῶν οὐδέν, ἄλλων δὲ ἀγαλμάτων
 περικοπαί τινες πρότερον ὑπὸ νεωτέρων μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ
 οἴνου γεγενῆσθαι. ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ · ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
 ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION · INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH
 SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY ὡς ποιεῖται ἐν
 οἰκίαις ἐφ' ἑρμῆ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγάλματι. καὶ
 αὐτὰ ὑπολαμβάνοντες οἱ μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι
 ἐμποδῶν ὄντι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι,
 καὶ νομισάντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξέλασειαν, πρῶτοι ἂν εἶναι, ἐμεγά-
 λυνον καὶ ἐβόωντο ἐπὶ τὸν δήμον καταλύσει τὰ τε μυστικὰ καὶ
 ἢ τῶν Ἑρμῶν περικοπαί γεγενῆσθαι οὐδὲν εἴη αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ
 μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ
 ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. ὁ δ' ἔν τε
 τῷ παρόντι πρὸς τὸν δήμον καὶ ἐτοίμος ἦν
 πρὶν ἐκπλεῖν κρινεσθαι. ΣΥΜΒΟΛΑΙΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΟΥ
 ΚΟΣΜΟΥ · CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK
 AND ROMAN WORLD · CONTRIBUTIONS A L'HISTOIRE DU
 MONDE GREC ET ROMAIN · BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE
 DER GRIECHISCHEN UND RÖMISCHEN WELT · CONTRIBUTI
 PER LA STORIA DEL MONDO GRECO E ROMANO γὰρ καὶ τὰ τῆς παρανομίας ἐπεπερισσώθη, καὶ εἰ μὲν τούτων
 τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχει. καὶ
 ἐπεμαρτύρητο μὴ ἀπόντος περὶ αὐτοῦ διαβολὸς ἀποδέχεσθαι,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη ἀποκτείνειν, εἰ ἀδίκως καὶ ὅτι σωφρονέστερον εἴη
 μὴ μετὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, πρὶν διαγνωθῆναι, πέμπει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ
 τοσοῦτφ στρατεύματι. οἱ δ' ἐχθροὶ δεδιότες τὸ τε στρατεύμα
 μὴ εὖνουν ἔχρη, ἦν ἤδη ἀγωνίζηται, ὃ τε δῆμος μὴ μαλα-
 κίζηται θεραπεύων ὅτι δι' ἐκείνου οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι ξυνεστράτεον
 καὶ τῶν Μαντινέων τινές, ἀπέτρεπον καὶ ἀπέσπευδον, ἄλλους
 ῥήτορας ἐνιέντες οἱ ἔλεγον νῦν μὲν πλείν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ
 κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀναγωγὴν κρίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέραις
 ῥηταῖς, βουλόμενοι ἐκ μείζονος διαβολῆς, ἦν ἔμελλον ῥῆον
 αὐτοῦ ἀπόντος ποιεῖν, μετάπεμπτον κομισθέντα αὐτὸν ἀγω-
 νίσασθαι. καὶ ἔδοξε πλείν τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην.
 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρουσ μεσοῦντος ἤδη ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐγίνετο

Τεκμήρια

A Note on the history of Hellenistic Megara: The date of the Antigonid garrison in Aegosthena

Charalampos Chrysafis

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.11953](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.11953)

Copyright © 2019, Charalampos Chrysafis



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Chrysafis, C. (2019). A Note on the history of Hellenistic Megara: The date of the Antigonid garrison in Aegosthena. *Tekmeria*, 14, 181–202. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.11953>

A Note on the History of Hellenistic Megara: The Date of the Antigonid Garrison in Aigosthena¹

Introduction

For many Hellenistic cities, foreign garrisons were part of everyday life. In their contest for supremacy, Ptolemies, Seleucids, Antigonids and later the Attalids, all imposed garrisons as a means of control over a city (φρουρά) or to provide protection (παραφυλακή).² Literary and epigraphic sources allow us to explore the wide-ranging socio-economic ramifications of this phenomenon. But some details are worth revisiting.

1. Versions of this paper were presented at the Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des DAI in Munich in July 2015, at the University of Münster Ancient History seminar in July 2015 and at the University of Halle Ancient History seminar in December 2015. I wish to thank the audiences for their useful comments. I would like to thank Prof. Kostas Buraselis for his criticism and helpful remarks on this subject. He has saved this article from many imperfections; those that remain are my own responsibility. I am also grateful to Dr. Paul Vadan for his revision of my English text. My thanks go also to Ms Panagiota Avgerinou for her help to get the permission to study the inscriptions of the Museum of Megara and to the two anonymous referees for their insightful comments and suggestions.

2. The views that garrisons brought slavery or protection depend on whose opinion is consulted. For example, a typical “conservative” Achaian answer would be: Polyb. 2.41.9-10 [9] κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ὑστέρους μὲν τῶν κατ’ Ἀλέξανδρον καιρῶν, προτέρους δὲ τῆς ἄρτι ῥηθείσης ὀλυμπιάδος, εἰς τοιαύτην διαφορὰν καὶ καχεζίαν (the cities of Achaia) ἐνέπεσον, καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τῶν ἐκ Μακεδονίας βασιλέων, ἐν ᾗ συνέβη πάσας τὰς πόλεις χωρισθείσας ἀφ’ αὐτῶν ἐναντίως τὸ συμφέρον ἄγειν ἀλλήλαις. [10] ἐξ οὗ συνέπεσε τὰς μὲν ἐμφρούρους αὐτῶν γενέσθαι διὰ τε Δημητρίου καὶ Κασσάνδρου καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα δι’ Ἀντιγόνου τοῦ Γονατᾶ, τὰς δὲ καὶ τυραννεῖσθαι: πλείστους γὰρ δὴ μονάρχους οὕτως ἐμφυτεῦσαι δοκεῖ τοῖς Ἕλλησι· but when Philip V was asked, he responded: Polyb. 18.4.5-6: «ἐρωτᾶς με» φησὶν «Ἀλέξανδρε, διὰ τί Λυσιμάχειαν προσέλαβον; [6] ἵνα μὴ διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν ὀλιγωρίαν ἀνάστατος ὑπὸ Θρακῶν γένηται, καθάπερ νῦν γέγονεν ἡμῶν ἀπαγαγόντων τοὺς στρατιώτας διὰ τοῦτον τὸν πόλεμον, οὐ τοὺς φρουροῦντας αὐτήν, ὡς σὺ φῆς, ἀλλὰ τοὺς παραφυλάττοντας». About the term παραφυλάσσειν, cf. Buraselis 2000, 152-153.

As part of my research on the Antigonid garrisons, I sought to compile a catalogue of these instalments with all the necessary information: sources, prosopography, importance, typology and date; the latter is very problematic to pinpoint with certainty. One such case is the honorary decree of Megara for Zoilos, son of Kelainos of Boiotia, commander of a garrison in Aigosthena, a small port near the former city. This document is indicative of the potential problems encountered when attempting to correctly interpret these inscriptions, and the information they have to offer:

IG VII 1

ἐπὶ βασιλέος Ἀπολλοδώρου τοῦ Εὐφρονίου, γραμματεὺς βουλᾶς
καὶ δάμου Δαμέας Δαμοτέλεος, ἐστρατάγουν Δαμοτέλης
Δαμέα, Φωκίνος Εὐάλκου, Ἀριστότιμος Μενεκράτες, Θέδωρος
Παγχάρεος, Πρόθυμος Ζεύξιος, Τίμων Ἀγάθωνος.

- 5 ἐπεὶ δὲ τοὶ Αἰγιστενίται[ι] ἀνάγγελον Ζωίλογ Κελαίνου Βοιωτίου,
τὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις τοῖς ἐν Αἰγιστένοις τεταγμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ
βασιλέος Δαματρίου, αὐτόν τε εὐτακτον εἶμεν καὶ τοὺς στρατιώ-
τας παρέχειν εὐτάκτους, καὶ τᾶλλα ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καλῶς καὶ εὐ-
νόως, καὶ ἀξίου αὐτόν διὰ ταῦτα τιμαθῆμεν ὑπὸ τᾶς πόλιος,
10 ἀγαθᾶι τύχαι, δεδόχθαι τᾶι βουλᾶι καὶ τῶι δάμωι, στεφανῶσαι
Ζωίλογ Κελαίνου Βοιωτίου χρυσέωι στεφάνωι καὶ εἶμεν αὐτόμ πο-
λίταν τᾶς πόλιος τᾶς Μεγαρέωγ καὶ ἐκγόνους αὐτοῦ· εἶμεν δὲ
αὐτῶι καὶ προεδρίαν ἐμ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγῶσι οἷς ἂ πόλις τίθητι. Ἀγγράψαι
15 καὶ ἀνθέμεν εἰς τὸ Ὀλυμπιεῖον, ὅπως εἰδῶντι πάντες ὅτι ὁ δᾶμος
Μεγαρέων τιμῆ τοὺς ἀγαθόν τι πράσσοντας ἢ λόγωι ἢ ἔργωι
ὑπὲρ τᾶς πόλιος ἢ ὑπὲρ τᾶγ κωμᾶν.³

“In the ‘kingship’ of Apollodoros, son of Euphronios; the secretary of the Council / and the Assembly, Dameas, son of Damoteles; Damoteles, / son of Dameas, Phokinios, son of Eualkos, Aristotimos, son of Menekrates, Theodoros, / son of Pancharos, Prothymos, son of Zeuxis, Timon, son of Agathon were generals. 5 Since the Aigosthenitans report that the Boeotian Zoilos, son of Kelainos, / whom the King Demetrios named at the head of the soldiers posted at Aigosthena, / has been well-disciplined and maintained the discipline of the

3. Text as noted in Robu, 2014a, 110-111.

soldiers, / and he has taken care rightly and kindly of everything else, / and he deserves, for these things, to be honoured by the city; 10 with good fortune; be it resolved by the council and the people: to crown / the Boeotian Zoilos, son of Kelainos, with a golden crown; and he shall be / a citizen of the city of the Megarians, and his descendants too; and / he shall have the right to sit in the front rows at all the competitions which the city organizes; / the secretary of the Assembly shall write the decree on a stele of marble 15 and place it in the shrine of Zeus Olympios; so that everyone may see that the people / of the Megarians honours anyone doing good by word or by deed / on behalf of the city or the villages.” (transl. Robu 2014a, slightly modified).

Possible dates and the tendencies in the modern research

The essential question we must answer concerns the dating of the decree. In the literary sources there is no mention of a Macedonian garrison in this small city on the edge of Megaris between Attica and Boiotia.⁴ The Megarians dated

4. Another interesting subject is the status of Aigosthena itself as a dependency of Megara. In the decree for Zoilos the Megarians mentioned (or treated) Aigosthena as one of their *kôme* (primarily IG VII 1, l.17). The Aigosthenitans were dependent on the city of Megara and could only report the benefactions of Zoilos in the assembly. There, they could proceed to honour him. Aigosthena may indeed be viewed as a case of a dependent *polis*, cf. Hansen 1995, 74-75; Mack 2015, 216-218. Throughout the decree, the desire of the Megarians to stress the subordinate status of the Aigosthenitans is obvious, which means that Aigosthena looked very much like a *polis*. Later, Aigosthena managed to obtain *polis*-status inside the federal states of Achaia and Boiotia. Interestingly, in 194 BC Philopoimen also offered autonomous membership in the Achaian Koinon to former Megalopolitan *kômai*, Plut. *Phil.* 13.5; cf. Lehmann 1967, 253-254; Errington 1969, 90-91; Warren 2007, 150-51. Decrees of the Aigosthenitans as autonomous member of the Boiotian Koinon (IG VII 207-222) and the Achaian Koinon (IG VII 223 nowadays lost) have been discovered. Cf. Robu 2011, 90-96. It is also known that Pagai, another old *kôme* of Megara, also became an autonomous member of the Achaian Koinon before 224 BC and remained so until its dissolution by the Romans in 146 BC, with the exception of its Boiotian phase of the years 224-205 or 192 BC. For a decree of *proxenia* for a Pagaian in the Boiotian city of Thisbe, cf. Étienne, Knoepfler 1976, 329-330 n. 242; Fossey, Darmezin 2014, 12-14, 81. Pagai (but as far as we know not Aigosthena) also minted bronze Achaian federal coins, cf. Warren 2007, 31-32, 120. Pagai and Aigosthena are also attested in a

the years according to their *eponymous basileus* office, though this detail is not helpful in the present circumstance because of the scarce nature of our data.⁵ The only datable evidence is the mention of a King Demetrios (l. 7). There have been two Macedonian kings with that name, Demetrios Poliorketes (307-283 BC) –from now on high date– and Demetrios II (239-229 BC) –from now on low date–, and their respective reigns are therefore the only two possible answers.

There is no consensus in modern scholarship as to which Demetrios the inscription refers to. Initially, there was unanimity that this was Poliorketes⁶, though the suggestion was first contested by Feyel in 1942 on account of prosopographical references, the form of letters and his interpretation of I. Eleusis 196 on the status of the forts of Attica⁷. Since then, most scholars follow and enrich Feyel's interpretation despite the many objections primarily expressed by Urban in 1979 and Habicht in 1989.⁸ A re-evaluation of the sources and a critical approach of the scholarship on this topic is needed. My intention in this paper is to show that the old and recent arguments which have been put forward by the proponents of the low date do not justify the almost unanimous modern rejection of the high date.

catalogue of *theorodokoi* in Delphoi, cf. Plassart 1921, 1-85. Both Aigosthena and Pagai evolved from dependant *kôme* of Megara, to independent *poleis* within the Achaian and the Boiotian Koinon. However, even after the reintergration of Megara and Pagai to the Achaian Koinon in 205 or 192 BC, Aigosthena remained Boiotian. It is very dubious whether Aigosthena ever became Achaian again and the absence of a federal bronze coinage is an indication to the opposite, cf. Warren 2007, 119-120. Nevertheless, some researchers have tentatively suggested that the IG VII 223, belonging to Aigosthena's Achaian phase, should be dated after a supposed re-entry of the city in 171 BC, when the Boiotian Koinon was dissolved by the Romans, cf. Robu 2011, 91-94. See also Warren 2007, 163.

5. Cf. Smith 2008, 109-110; Robu 2014b, 367-375.

6. Cf. Korolkow 1883, 186; IG VII 2; Reinach 1900, 161; Heath 1912, 85-88. See also Robu 2012, 88 n. 9. for full bibliography.

7. See below p. 196 on the rejection of Feyel's view on the status of Eleusis.

8. Cf. Feyel 1942, 31-32, 85-100; Kaloyéropoulou 1974; Robu 2012, Robu 2014a; contra Urban 1979, 66-70; Habicht 1989, 321-322. See Robu 2012, 88-89 nn. 10, 12 for full bibliography. The tendency nowadays is to identify with caution the named king as Demetrios II, cf. Smith 2008, 109-110, 112; Paschidis, 2008, 295-302; Liddel 2009, 411-436.

The evidence from the institutional changes in Hellenistic Megara

The aforementioned decree belongs to a corpus of eighteen decrees of Megara which, with the exception of one at the Artemision temple, were all inscribed on the *peribolos* wall of the Olympieion temple (IG VII 1, 1. 14-15). The decrees belong to a period of, at least, nine years since they refer to nine *eponymous basileis*, although we cannot be certain whether these nine years were consecutive or not. Unfortunately, almost all these decrees are now lost and all we can conclude is that they form two distinct groups: a) decrees recording five annually and only once elected generals (Heath 1912, nos. I-II, IG VII 8-14, Kaloyéropoulou 1974) and b) decrees recording six generals who remained in power for at least four years (Heath 1912, no. III, IG VII 1-7).⁹ Heath has proven that at least one set of five *strategoï* of group A, that held their post while Pasidoros was *basileus* (Heath 1912, nos. I-II), pre-dated those of group B.¹⁰ The disposition of the decrees on the building block published by Heath shows that the decree recording six generals is inscribed to the right, and therefore exactly after the two decrees recording the same five annual generals serving in the year of Pasidoros. The other sets of five generals may either pre-date or post-date Group B.¹¹ The Kaloyéropoulou 1974 decree inscribed on the Artemision is possibly the last in the chronological order.¹²

This institutional change was most probably imposed by the Macedonian King, either directly or indirectly¹³. Among the recipients of the *proxenia* during the tenure of the six generals, three (or possibly four) royal officials or agents of King Demetrios are explicitly mentioned: Zoilos, son of Kelainos of Boiotia (IG VII 1), Kleon and Philon, sons of Kleon of Erythrai (IG VII 5 and 6) and possibly Mys, son of Proteas of Eresos (IG VII 4).¹⁴ All the honourands are otherwise unknown. Their provenance may convene better to the reign of Poliorketes,

9. Cf. Paschidis 2008, 295 n. 1.

10. Cf. Heath 1912, 82-88.

11. Cf. Robu 2014a, 102.

12. Cf. Paschidis 2008, 298 n. 6.

13. Cf. Paschidis 2008, 296; Robu 2012, 96. About the college of *strategoï* in Megara, cf. Smith 2008, 112-113; Robu 2014b, 391-401; Robu 2012, 85-115.

14. Cf. Paschidis 2008, 300 n. 2. There is no other clear case of another Antigonid agent when collegia of five generals governed Megara.

but it does not exclude the period of Demetrios II.¹⁵ In other words, the college originally consisted of five generals elected annually and for only one mandate. The Macedonian intervention led to a constitutional change with the establishment of a permanent college of six generals who retained their office for at least four years.

Recently, Robu expressed the view that these institutional changes may provide further information or clues regarding the date of the decrees. He suggested that the introduction of the college of five generals postdated the participation of Megara in the Achaian League in 243 BC, and that the original college of magistrates consisted of six and not five annually elected generals (two for each *phyle*) until 243 BC, when this number dropped to five under Achaian influence¹⁶. He consequently stated that, when Demetrios II managed to reconquer Megara, he re-established the college of the six generals, who then retained their office as long as the city remained in the Macedonian camp. This presents us with a conundrum, however: during the Boiotian phase (224-205 or 192 BC) the college of five *strategoï* was replaced by that of the five

15. Cf. Urban 1979, 69-70 n. 330-331, who notes that if we accept that the named king is Demetrios II, then we have the strange case of a man from a pro-Achaian city honoured in Macedonian-controlled Megara (*IG VII 7*: Hermonax, son of Hermogenes from Troezen, Achaian from c. 243 BC, *Plut. Arat.* 24.3) and others from cities with bad relations with the Achaian League honoured in the Achaian Megara (*IG VII 10*: Telesias, son of Taurion and Peithanoridas, son of Nikaithos from Phleious under Argive and therefore Macedonian influence until 228, *Plut. Arat.* 35.3 and 39.4; *IG VII 11*: Menandros, son of Kallikrates from Megalopolis whose ruler Lydiadas was not in good terms with the Achaians until c. 235, *Plut. Arat.* 30). But see Paschidis 2008, 298 n. 3 for a continuation of the above argument.

16. Cf. Robu 2012, 99-104; Robu 2014b, 392-94. Robu (2012, 101-102) also added the following argument that the reduction was also a result of the loss of the former Megarian *kômai* Aigosthena and Pagai which became independent member of the Achaian Koinon. Robu was not the first to think that the original college of magistrates consisted of six and not five generals. That was the thought of Dittenberger (editor of *IG VII* in p. 2), when he cautiously considered all the decrees with five generals to be later than these with six generals, but he was only followed by Busolt 1920, 257-258. But afterwards, the most common interpretation in the research was that the original college was composed by five *strategoï*, cf. Paschidis 2008, 295 n. 1.

polemarchoi, not three as was the norm in the Boiotian cities.¹⁷ If the five high magistrates were a recent institutional reform less than twenty years old with a break of four or more years –seven according to Robu– and not an internal component of the Megarian administration, then this number should also have been changed during their Boiotian membership. Therefore, this hypothesis could not be considered strong enough to determine the identification of the King Demetrios. Five high magistrates were probably the traditional number of this college and not an Achaian influence.

On the contrary, it seems more probable that the attested replacement of the five *strategoï* with five *damiorgoi* took place during the first Achaian period of Megara (c. 243-224 BC), and not only during the second period (c. 205 or 192-146).¹⁸ If this is correct then the five *strategoï* were first replaced by the five *damiorgoi* and later by the five *polemarchoi*, during the time of their membership in the respective *Koina*.¹⁹ This interpretation has not been accepted by most researchers, but still remains a valid alternative.²⁰ Moreover, if future

17. The Boiotian cities had normally a college of three *polemarchoi*. The eponymous *basileus* is also replaced by the Boiotian *archon* in Onchestos. Similar adoption of Boiotian civic magistrates by new members of the koinon is also noted in Eretria (IG XII 9, 192), cf. Giannakopoulos 2012, 248-249, 264-266, 325. *Polemarchoi* are mentioned in two ephebic catalogues from Megara (IG VII 27-28) and three decrees of *proxenia* from Aigosthena (IG VII 207-208 and 213), cf. Liddel 2009, 426-27; Robu 2011, 88-90; Robu 2014b, 402 n. 356. The Aigosthenitan decrees do not report the number of these magistrates.

18. Attested cases of *damiorgoi* for Megara: IG VII 41: a dedication of five *damiorgoi* and their secretary to Aphrodite, cf. Wallensten 2003, 34. For Aigosthena: IG VII 223 with no information on the number of the magistrates, cf. Liddel 2009, 427; Robu 2011, 79-101.

19. This was also the opinion held by Urban 1979, 69.

20. Veligianni-Terzi 1977, 86-89 suggested that Megara did not adopt these magistracies from the Achaian League, but that the *damiorgoi* were another college of officials with unknown responsibilities that acted in parallel to that of the *strategoï*. Similar objections were expressed by Robu 2014b, 401-404 and all the other proponents of the low date; see also Smith 2008, 113-14; Paschidis 2008, 298 n. 2. The only confirmed detail is that Aigosthena (IG VII 223, see former n. 17) adopted these Achaian-style magistrates, but this is easily explained by the fact that they achieved the *polis*-status within the Achaian League. However, I am inclined to accept that Megara also changed the name of their magistrates from *strategoï* to *damiorgoi* as early as the first Achaian phase (243-

epigraphical discoveries confirm that the *damiorgoi* replaced the *strategoï* already in the 240s BC, this would be in favour of the high date for the inscriptions under discussion, where only the latter were mentioned.²¹

Evidence from the prosopographical and palaeographical analysis

More information can be obtained through the prosopographical analysis of the college of the generals and other magistrates (fifty-four persons). It seems that there are some family links between them. For instance, Timon, son of Agathon, one of the six generals (at *IG VII 1, l.4*), is possibly the father of Agathon, son of Timon, one of the five generals serving under *basileus* Damon (Kalyéropoulou 1974, p. 140, l.6). It is worth noting that the secretary (*grammateus*) in the decree of Zoilos is Dameas, son of Damoteles, and the leading general of the six is Damoteles, son of Dameas (*IG VII 1, l.2*).²² Another member of this

224 BC), and not only during the second period of their membership after 205 or 192 BC. The mention of *strategoï* in a Megarian decree from Kos (*IG XII 4.1, 216 IV ll.13-25*), that belongs to the corpus concerning the recognition of inviolability of the Asklepieia (*IG XII 4.1, 207-245*), does not contradict the above suggestion. The date of the corpus is based on the mention of the forty first year of Antigonos Gonatas in the decree of Amphipolis (*IG XII 4.1, 220 II ll. 18-34*), which is accepted to be 242 BC, cf. Chambers 1954, 385-394. Even if the date of 242 BC is correct, the Megarian decree could have been passed during the first year of the city's participation in the Achaian Koinon, or during the last year of the Macedonian dominion, when the institutional change had not yet been implemented. The fall of Corinth happened most probably around 243 BC, and Megara entered the Achaian Koinon sometime after. The Koan *theoroi* visited Megara in early spring 242 BC, and before reaching Amphipolis in the month *Gorpiaios* (July/August), they visited Thebai Phthiotikai, Gonnoi, Homolion in Magnesia, two to five other Thessalian cities, as well as Pella and Cassandria, (*IG XII 4.1, 169*). The evidence on the Megarian calendar is scarce and therefore we cannot calculate when the Megarian magistrates were taking office, cf. Paschidis 2008, 297 n. 2 with bibliography. Another point that needs to be added is that I strongly doubt whether the unanimously accepted date (242 BC) of the recognition of the inviolability of Asklepieia in Kos is as certain as it was thought. Evidence that I intend to present in another paper will show that these decrees were passed four years earlier.

21. The opposite will not offer anything on the discussion of the date of *IG VII 1*.

22. Dittenberger already assumed that both the secretary and the leading general for this year have a father-son relationship. It is very interesting that Damoteles is

family may also be Dameas, son of Matrokles, general of the college of the five during the reign of *basileus* Pasiadas (IG VII 8-11, 3473). The secretary Pasion, son of Mnasitheos, during the reign of *basileus* Pasidoros (Heath 1912, no. I-II) is also a relative (father or son) of Mnasitheos, son of Pasion, one of the five generals under *basileus* Pasiadas.²³ Two brothers, Pasiadas and Herodoros, sons of Dion, simultaneously became generals under *basileus* Apollonidas (IG VII 14). A family link may also be established between Pyrrhos, son of Diokleidas, one of the five generals under *basileus* Pasidoros (Heath 1912, nos. I-II) and Diokleidas, son of Pyrrhos from Megara, emissary of a King Antigonos (Gonatas or Doson) to Minoa of Amorgos (IG XII 7, 221b).²⁴ Other proposed family links are not so certain.²⁵ It is obvious that multiple members of few leading families could control most of the magistracies for many generations and therefore we can imagine an established oligarchic structure or, at least, a government with oligarchic tendencies.

leading general only during the year of *basileus* Apollodoros, under whom Dameas also served as secretary (IG VII 1-3). During the other years when *basileis* were Antiphilos, Euklias and Theomantos (IG VII 4-7, Heath 1912 no. I-II), Damoteles is mentioned after Phokinos, son of Eualkos, Aristotimos, son of Menekrates, and before Theodoros, son of Panchares, Prothymos, son of Zeuxis, and Timon, son of Agathon, cf. Dittenberger (ed.) 1892, 1-2; Paschidis 2008, 299-300. In my opinion, it is also possible that the secretary Dameas was the father and not the general Damoteles, contra Paschidis 2008, 301 n. 4. The new regime did not change the rule that a *grammateus* could only serve once for a year, and maybe the reason behind this was not that this office was insignificant. But on the contrary, this magistrate was prestigious and often prominent citizens were chosen to hold it, cf. Busolt 1920, 478-80 (oral advice from Prof. Buraselis to whom I am grateful).

23. There is also the possibility that the same year under Pasidoros when Pasion, son of Mnasitheos, served as secretary, his brother (?) Eupalinos, son of Mnasitheos, was general, cf. Robu 2014a, 103 n. 28.

24. For the importance of this link, cf. Paschidis 2008, 302 n. 3. There are three different possible versions to consider: 1) father Pyrrhos, general during 290s BC – son Diokleidas, royal emissary during 250s BC, 2) father Diokleidas, royal emissary during 250s BC – son Pyrrhos, general during 230s BC, 3) father Pyrrhos, general during 230s BC – son Diokleidas royal emissary during 220s BC.

25. For a complete catalogue of the possible family relations see: Robu 2014a, 103-106. See also Paschidis 2008, 299-302.

Evidence of these men has also been attested outside of Megara. The Megarians Timon, son of Agathon, (*FD III*, 1. 181)²⁶, Kallias, son of Hippias and Matrokles, son of Damoteles (*FD III*, 1. 169)²⁷, and perhaps Phokinos, son of Eualkos²⁸, were all honoured at Delphoi sometime between 290-280 BC. Concerning the first two individuals (as well as Phokinos, if the attribution is correct), scholars accept either that the honourands and the generals are one and the same person, or that they are a grandfather and his grandson, depending on which Demetrios the decrees refer to.²⁹ To sum up, the prosopographical evidence is abundant but inconclusive for the date of the decrees. A high date under Poliorketes is perhaps again preferable, since it is somewhat difficult, although not impossible, due to the oligarchic nature of the Megarian constitution, to accept that so many grandfathers in the 280s would simultaneously take honours at Delphoi and 50 years later their grandsons would again simultaneously become generals in their home city.

Most scholars date the letters in the decrees to the middle of 3rd century BC because of their form.³⁰ As Paschidis (2008, 298) has noted: “*Although dating by letter forms is notoriously unreliable, when you have to choose between two dates 70 years apart it may be helpful*”. Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to produce a detailed study of the Megarian palaeography because most stones are considered lost, while those that survive cannot be accurately dated. In his description of the letters on the surviving stones Paschidis noted that most alphas have a curved middle stroke, triangular letters have slanted strokes

26. For Timon, son of Agathon one of the six pro-macedonian generals, see above p. 188.

27. Kallias son of Hippias was one of the five generals together with Agathon, son of Timon, under *basileus* Damon, cf. Kaloyéropoulou 1974, 141. Matrokles is another member of the leading family of Damoteles, son of Dameas. Conflicting reconstructions of the family stemma in Urban 1979, 68 n. 324; Paschidis 2008, 301 n. 4.

28. Pomtow 1923, 270 no. 204. One Phokinos from Megara was honoured with other five Megarians *dikastai* in Delphi around 290 BC, and it was proposed he was the same person as the Megarian general Phokinos, son of Eualkos, cf. Reinach 1900, 161, 168 n. 1; Habicht 1989, 321-22.

29. Aitolians and Poliorketes managed to reach a compromise around 289 BC so that it wouldn't be strange for proantigonid officials to be honoured at Delphoi, cf. Lefèvre 1998, 109-141.

30. Cf. Paschidis 2008, 298-99; Robu 2012, 93-94.

with extensions above the letter, there are also pronounced serifs throughout, sigmas usually have parallel horizontal strokes and round letters are slightly smaller than the rest. I had the chance to examine the Heath 1912, nos. I-III and *IG VII 42* decrees at the Museum of Megara. In spite of the fact that I could verify the description of the letters by Paschidis, I was not convinced that these letters could not belong to the 280s BC. The palaeographical data from the nearby regions of Athens and Oropos seem to confirm a later date (260s-240s) for these letters, but letter forms vary considerably from one area to another, so changes in palaeography attested in one location are not necessarily reliable for dating inscriptions in another location.³¹

Megarian inscriptions that could be dated with approximate certitude are primarily the *IG VII 42*, engraved probably during the first Achaian Phase (242-224 BC), and the *IG VII 27-28* of the Boiotian Phase (224-205 or 192 BC).³² *IG VII 42* is a subscription for the temple of Apollon with thirty seven names of Megarian citizens.³³ Three (or possibly four) of them are attested in another list of 151 Megarian *dikastai* (*IG IV² 1. 71*) that arbitrated the frontier between Epidauros and Corinth under the Achaian general Aigialeus (his strategy may actually be assigned to any year between 244/3 BC and 236/5 BC when Aratos was not *strategos*, namely 244/3, 242/1, 240/39, 238/7 or 236/5 BC). It is also possible that two more people in the first list assumed a father-son relationship with persons in the latter. Consequently, the subscription of *IG VII 42* was probably engraved between 260 and 220 BC. But it is strange that from the 184 Megarian citizens mentioned in these two lists of the third quarter of the 3rd century BC, none can be securely connected with the fifty four *strategoí* and *grammateis* in the examined corpus (*IG VII 1-14*, Heath 1912, nos. I-III, Kaloyéropoulou 1974). If the decrees of this corpus were to be dated to the time of Demetrios II (239-229), some traceable overlap would be expected.³⁴

31. See the case of the neighbouring cities of Amyzon and Stratonikeia in Karia, cf. Robert - Robert 1983, 120-22.

32. Cf. Robu 2012, 94.

33. Robu 2012, 94 n. 29 argued that the letters of *IG VII 42* have a lot of common traits with these of Heath 1912, nos. I-III. However, this small resemblance could not be used as a solid proof that the named king is Demetrios II. Robu also provides (2012, 108-114) a series of high-quality photos of the letters of Heath 1912, nos. I-III and *IG VII 42*.

34. As far as I am concerned, this interesting fact has been somehow unnoticed until now in the bibliography on the subject. The only noticeable possible link between

Evidence from the literary sources: The allegiance of Hellenistic Megara (307-224 BC)

The study of the philological sources has proven far more helpful. The relations between the Antigonids and Megara started in the summer of 307 BC when Demetrios Poliorketes “liberated” the city from Kassandros’ occupation (Diod. Sic. 20.46.3).³⁵ After the fall of the city, the Antigonids proclaimed the *autonomia* of the *demos*. It is almost certain that no garrison was established in the city of Megara at that time.³⁶ It would indeed be very strange if this “liberation” was also combined with the imposition of a pro-Antigonid regime of six generals who remained in office for four or more years contrary to the constitutional norm. Demetrios received noteworthy honours from those whom he treated well, although the city was pillaged. Megara remained under Antigonid influence after the defeat of Antigonos Monophthalmos at Ipsos until sometime between 283 and 265 BC.³⁷ Gonatas reinstated Megara under his dominion, and the only explicit mention of a Macedonian garrison in the city, derives from the period of his rule.³⁸

these two groups is perhaps the case of Kleon, son of Philon (IG IV² 1. 71, l. 72) and the brothers Kleon and Philon, sons of Kleon (IG VII 5-6). But in this case the latter are not Megarians, but Erythreans who were honoured by the Megareis with *proxenia*, *ateleia* and *asylia* and, most importantly, not with *politeia*. On this group of 54 people in the examined corpus, we can add the seven of the nine known *theoroi* of IG VII, 39-40, since the other two of them may appear also as *strategoi*, IG VII 12-13 and Heath 1912, no. I-II, cf. Robu 2014a, 107. None of these 61 Megarians or their relatives are attested among the Megarian *dikastai* of 240s (IG IV² 1. 71) or in the *epidosis* for Apollo (IG VII 42).

35. See also Philochoros, FGH 328 F66; Plut. *Demetr.* 9.4-10 and *Mor.* 5f and 475c; Diog. Laert. 2.115. Cf. Liddel 2009, 411 n. 1.

36. Similar tactic was employed by Demetrios in almost all the Greek cities which he freed between 307 and 301 BC. The best known exception is Corinth, Diod. 20.103.3. Since 301 BC Demetrios discontinued this policy and used garrisons as a way to retain the cities under his influence, cf. Wehrli, 1968, 118-129.

37. Megara after Ipsos, Plut. *Demetr.* 30.3. Megara rebelled unsuccessfully against the Antigonid authority at least once during the Chremonideian War. It has been supposed that another temporarily successful attempt by Megara to become independent took place after the expulsion of Poliorketes from Macedonia (287 BC), and before the Galatian invasion of 280/79 BC, cf. Heinen 1972, 170-72.

38. Some *defectores Galli* used Megara as their base against Antigonos Gonatas, and

One unforeseen event changed the political and military landscape and brought the collapse of the Macedonian rule in the area. Namely, the sudden takeover of Corinth by the Achaians under Aratos around 243 BC. Polybios, our main and most detailed source for this period, mentions that Megara became part of the Achaian League immediately after this event and, more importantly, remained so until 224 BC when the city, with the consent of the Achaians, joined the Boiotian League.³⁹

Therefore, the philological sources present Megara as pro-Antigonid during Poliorketes', and throughout most of Gonatas' reign. We have confirmation that the latter had a garrison under his command in the city. On the other

they may have been installed by him as a garrison, Trog. *Prol.* 26; *Iust.* 26.2. On the use of Gallic mercenaries by the Macedonian kings, Plut. *Arat.* 38.3-4. See also Adam, Fichtl 2011, 117-128. A funerary inscription from Maroneia in Thrace may refer to one of these mercenaries cf. Welles 1970, 477-490; O'Neil 2008, 80-81, contra Loukopoulou et al. (eds.) 2005, 396. Teles (Περὶ Φυγῆς 23 [Hense]), a cynic philosopher from Megara mentions a certain Lykinos, a fugitive from Italy, who was appointed garrison-commander in Megara by Antigonos Gonatas around 250-240 BC. Finally, Plutarch (*Arat.* 24.3) makes a distinction between Megara on the one side and Troizena-Epidauros on the other. Both were on the promacedonian camp until 243 BC and they joined the Achaian *Koinon* immediately after the fall of Corinth, but Plutarch describes only the action of the former as a defection (ἀποστάντες), which probably means that only the Megarians expelled a garrison.

39. Polyb. 2.43.5-6: ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ τὴν τῶν Μεγαρέων πόλιν διαπραξάμενος προσέειπε τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς. ταῦτά τ' ἐγένετο τῷ πρότερον ἔπει τῆς Καρχηδονίων ἥττης, ἐν ᾗ καθόλου Σικελίας ἐκχωρήσαντες πρῶτον ὑπέμειναν τότε φόρους ἐνεγκεῖν Ῥωμαίοις.; Polyb. 20.6.7-10: [7] διὸ καὶ Μεγαρεῖς, μισήσαντες μὲν τὴν τοιαύτην κατάστασιν, μνησθέντες δὲ τῆς προγεγενημένης αὐτοῖς μετὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν συμπολιτείας, αὐτίς ἀπένευσαν πρὸς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς καὶ τὴν ἐκείνων αἴρεσιν. [8] Μεγαρεῖς γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν ἐπολιτεύοντο μετὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἀπὸ τῶν κατ' Ἀντίγονον τὸν Γονατῶν χρόνων: ὅτε δὲ Κλεομένης εἰς τὸν Ἴσθμὸν προεκάθισεν, διακλεισθέντες προσέθεντο τοῖς Βοιωτοῖς μετὰ τῆς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν γνώμης. [9] βραχὺ δὲ πρὸ τῶν νῦν λεγομένων καιρῶν δυσαρεστήσαντες τῇ πολιτείᾳ τῶν Βοιωτῶν αὐτίς ἀπένευσαν πρὸς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς. [10] οἱ δὲ Βοιωτοὶ διοργισθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ καταφρονεῖσθαι δοκεῖν ἐξῆλθον ἐπὶ τοὺς Μεγαρεῖς πανδημει σὺν τοῖς ὅπλοις.; Plut. *Arat.* 24.3: Μεγαρεῖς τε γὰρ ἀποστάντες Ἀντιγόμου τῷ Ἀράτῳ προσέθεντο, καὶ Τροιζήνιοι μετὰ Ἐπιδαυρίων συνετάχθησαν εἰς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς.

hand, Megara is explicitly mentioned to have been beyond Antigonid control during the time of Demetrios II and his successors.

Is Polybios lying?

In spite of these observations, the *opinio communis* is that Demetrios II managed to take over Megara sometime during his reign (239-229 BC), probably at the time of his Boiotian campaign of ca. 236/5 BC. After his death the city would have become Achaian again.⁴⁰ However, we are now in the very unpleasant position of not only doubting our literary sources, but also dismissing them as untrustworthy. If we accept the dating of the decrees under Demetrios II, then we must also explain why Polybios and Plutarch do not refer to any of the afore-mentioned events. It is highly improbable that the Achaian Polybios would have simply missed or forgot these episodes in Megarean and Achaian history. On the other hand, he explicitly mentions that in 243 or 242 BC Megara became Achaian and that in 224 BC, with the consent of the latter, the city entered the Boiotian Koinon⁴¹. It is impossible to consider that in his narration he would dismiss a Macedonian interval of at least four years as irrelevant.⁴² Other

40. The proponents of a later date for this Macedonian garrison explained the change of status of Aigosthena from an autonomous Achaian *polis*-member in 243 BC to a dependent Megarian *kôme* (or *polis*) under Macedonian influence as a gift of Demetrios II in order to ensure the loyalty of the Megarians. According to this hypothesis, Aigosthena returned to the *polis* status with its adhesion to the Boiotian Koinon in 224 BC. That is an entirely possible scenario, however, it remains only a complex hypothesis. On the status of Aigosthena as a *polis* or a Megarian *kôme*, see n. 4.

41. Polyb. 2.43.5-6, 20.6.7-10.

42. The important point is not that Polybios makes no mention of a Macedonian takeover of Megara in 230s BC, which could be easily explained as concealment, but rather that he does not leave the slightest doubt that a similar event happened during that specific time. Megara according to Polybios (20.6.8) was continuously member of the Achaian League from the time of Antigonos Gonatas to the Kleomenes' war, thus denying the possibility of a Macedonian intervention in the city during that period. Such an obvious omission would not pass unnoticed even by a 2nd century BC audience. In the 30s BC the Megarians could still show Marcus Antonius the *bouleuterion* (Plut. *Ant.* 23.3) situated between the temples of the *Olympieion* and the *Artemision* (where the decrees were inscribed in stone) and the shrine of Alkathoos (where the record office

cities also abandoned the Achaian Koinon and Polybios recorded this development: the Arcadian cities of Orchomenos, Mantinea and Tegea, for example, became Aitolian for approximately five years (234-229 BC) before their takeover by the Spartans.⁴³ In addition, in his narration of the Boiotian campaign of Demetrios II, the historian from Megalopolis does not mention Megara once, nor does he, or Plutarch, or Pausanias for that matter, report the city among the Macedonian-controlled territories (such as Athens, Peiraieus, Hermione and Aigina) who abandoned the Antigonids after the death of Demetrios II (229 BC).⁴⁴ Not to mention that, if Doson had inherited Megara from Demetrios II, there would be no reason for the adhesion of the city to the Boiotian Koinon against the danger of Kleomenes. The Macedonians would maintain their control, as their target was the re-conquest of Corinth, which they succeeded the following year (223 BC). Moreover, in his biography of Aratos Plutarch mentions no Macedonian intervention at Megara, although it would certainly be worth mentioning due to its implications regarding the capability of Aratos'

was located). We can easily suppose that their archives and the catalogue of kings and generals were still intact. Pausanias 1.43.4 confirms this while visiting Megara in the 160s AD. Consequently, even Plutarch, more than two centuries after the death of Polybios, was in a position to confirm the credibility of Polybios' information concerning the continuous Achaian membership by visiting the city archive. For a topography of Megara, cf. Smith 2008, 14-21.

43. Polyb. 2.46.2: τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς ... συμβουλευομένους δὲ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ φθονοῦντας τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὥστε Κλεομένους πεπραξικοπηκτός αὐτοὺς καὶ παρηρημένου Τεγέαν, Μαντίνειαν, Ὀρχομενόν, τὰς Αἰτωλοῖς οὐ μόνον συμμαχίδας ὑπαρχούσας, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπολιτευομένας τότε πόλεις. Defection of Mantinea, Polyb. 2.57.1 Μαντινεῖς τοίνυν τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐγκαταλιπόντες τὴν μετὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πολιτείαν ἐθελοντὴν Αἰτωλοῖς ἐνεχείρισαν αὐτοὺς καὶ τὴν πατρίδα, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Κλεομένει. Defection of Orchomenos, Polyb. 4.6.5 ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος Κόρινθον μὲν εἶχε κατὰ τὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν συγχώρημα διὰ τοὺς Κλεομενικοὺς καιροὺς, Ὀρχομενὸν δὲ κατὰ κράτος ἐλὼν οὐκ ἀποκατέστησε τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς.; IG V 2, 344, cf. Mackil 2013, 364. Other major cities who managed to secede from the League are Mantinea for second time in 226 BC (Polyb. 2.58.4, Plut. Arat. 45, *Kleom.* 14.1), Megara in 224 BC (Polyb. 20.6.8) and Corinth in 224 BC (Polyb. 2.51.6, Plut. Arat. 45.1), cf. Rizakis 2008, 280-282.

44. Polyb. 20.5.3; Plut. Arat. 34.3; Paus. 2.8.6.

incursions against Athens at that time.⁴⁵ Consequently, if we accept the proposition of a late date for these decrees, we must address the problem of why Polybios purposefully attempts to misinform us.⁴⁶ For this reason, I am inclined to accept the attribution of the Aigosthenitan garrison to Poliorketes rather than to Demetrios II.

Another argument in favour of the late date, has been that Demetrios II would never give Eleusis back to the Athenians in 235 BC, if he did not control Megaris. However, this argument is not as strong as Paschidis implies.⁴⁷ The reason is that the supposed return of the Eleusinian fort under Athenian jurisdiction is based on a problematic interpretation of the two decrees of I. Eleusis 196 concerning a certain Aristophanes, the Athenian general of Eleusis. First of all, Paschidis himself has shown that “there was probably no clear-cut change in the status of the forts and the generalship in 235 BC”. He pointed correctly that “the different rhetorical purposes of the two decrees (I. Eleusis 196) account for the difference in terminology”. Thus, we cannot deduce a clear change of procedure between the two generalships of Aristophanes in Eleusis and, therefore, there is no reason to retain the old hypothesis of Feyel that Demetrios II returned Eleusis to the Athenians.⁴⁸ Recently, Oetjen has argued convincingly that the Macedonians had returned the fort of Eleusis already from ca. 255 BC simultaneously with Rhamnous and he also postulated, that “für die Datierung des böotischen Koalitionswechsels spielt das Dekret

45. Cf. Urban 1979, 67. For the strategic value of Megaris regarding the military movements between Attica and the Peloponnese see de Ste Croix 1972, 187-196.

46. Indeed, this was the core of the hypothesis that Feyel 1942, 305 tried to prove. The bias of Polybios towards the Aitolians and the Boiotians is well known and he could avoid to mention facts that he considered unpleasant, however there would be no reason not only to hide, but also to refute such an event about Megara. Surely he did not think that no one other than him could write about the same events and could avoid the possible accusations like these that he addressed against Phylarchos, Polyb. 2.56-63, cf. Walbank 1962, 1-12. Concerning the credibility of Polybios, see also Lehmann 1967, 333-338; Haegemans, Kosmetatou 2005, 123-139.

47. Cf. Paschidis 2008, 297.

48. Cf. Paschidis 2008, 518-519. In that case the presence of over 50 mercenaries in Eleusis did not confirm the sense of security that the Athenians would feel if Boiotia and Megaris were under the control of Demetrios II.

für Aristophanes keine Rolle”.⁴⁹ Thus, the only historical argument in favour of an occupation of Megaris from Demetrios II is no more valid.

Conclusion

To sum up, the debate on the chronology of the decrees is still open, but the evidence, especially the literary sources and the prosopographical identifications, are more in favour of a high date under Demetrios Poliorketes between 301 and 287 BC. After their defeat at Ipsos, the Antigonids had a very difficult time preserving their dominion and frequently appointed garrisons in the cities they controlled. Indeed the Megarians, unlike the Athenians, may have remained faithful to Demetrios in the wake of Ipsos. The regime of six generals, imposed by the Macedonians at Megara, may be compared with two similar interventions of Poliorketes at Athens in 295 BC, where Olympiodoros was appointed *eponymos archon* for two consecutively mandates, and in the Boiotian Koinon, where Hieronymos of Kardìa was appointed as *epimeletes*.⁵⁰ Both the Athenians and the Boitians had their cities and border-forts, such as Rhamnous, garrisoned by soldiers of the Macedonian King.

The imposition of a garrison (or garrisons) at Aigosthena (and perhaps in other ports in the Megaris and even in Megara) should not only be seen as a way to ensure the loyalty of the Megarians. It was also a way for Demetrios to protect (*παραφυλάσσειν*) his faithful allies and their territories from enemy invasions, especially during the war with the Aitolians over the control of Delphoi.⁵¹ After the end of the war and the compromise between the belligerents,

49. Oetjen 2014, 56-62.

50. Cf. contra Robu 2012, 97. About Athens, cf. Osborne 2009, 125-138; About Boiotia, cf. Wehrli 1968, 173-176.

51. Aigosthena and its territory was vulnerable against an Aitolian incursion and the presence of soldiers was probably requested by the Megarians in order to confront this danger. The reference to Zoilos as leader of the soldiers in Aigosthena (“τὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις τοῖς ἐν Αἰγιστένοις τεταγμένον”, IG VII 1, l. 6) and not as commander of the region, as the Antigonid officers were usually called (see, for example, ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς, ἐπὶ τῆς Φωκίδος etc., cf. Juhel 2009, 59-76) may support the idea that his stay at Aigosthena was a temporary measure. On the other hand, we may assume that if there had been enemy incursions in the area they would have been mentioned in the decree (oral advice of Professor Stefan Pfeiffer to whom I am grateful). Another interesting aspect

the Megarian former or current magistrates could be honoured as *proxenoi* in Delphoi as mentioned earlier.

Charalampos I. Chrysafis
University of Augsburg
chares.chrysafis@gmail.com

Summary

This paper discusses the date of the Antigonid military presence in Aigosthena, a small fortified port on the Corinthian gulf, near Megara. The presence of a Macedonian garrison at Aigosthena is only known from a Megarian honorary decree for Zoilos, a Boiotian that served as commander of the garrison (*IG VII 1*). The decree mentions a King Demetrios that could either be identified with Demetrios Poliorketes (306-284 BC) or with his grandson, Demetrios II (239-229 BC). After having examined all the available philological, prosopographical and paleographical evidence, we have concluded that a date around 295-287 BC is probably preferable.

are the imposing fortifications of Aigosthena, which the Megarians could not be in the position to finance. It has been suggested that the fortification walls were constructed by the Athenians in 343 BC or even by Demetrios Poliorketes after 307 BC, cf. Benson 1895, 314-324; Smith 2008, 45-49; Amandry, Kremydi 2015, 99.

Bibliography

- Adam, A.M., Fichtl, S. 2011. “Les Celtes dans les guerres hellénistiques: le cas de la Méditerranée orientale”, in J.-Ch. Couvenhes, S. Crouzet, S. Pé-ré-Noguès, (eds.), *Pratiques et identités culturelles des armées hellénistiques du monde méditerranéen* (Hellenistic Warfare 3). Bordeaux, 117-128.
- Amandry, M., Kremydi, S. 2015, “Le monnayage d’époque sévérienne frappé à Aigosthènes en Mégaride”, in M. Amandry, U. Wartenberg (eds.), *KAIPOΣ: Contributions to Numismatics in Honor of Basil Demetriadi*, New York, 97-106.
- Benson, E.F. 1895. “Aegosthena” *JHS* 15, 314-324.
- Buraselis, K. 2000. *Kos between Hellenism and Rome: Studies on the Political, Institutional and Social History of Kos from ca. the Middle Second Century B.C. until Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia.
- Busolt, G. 1920. *Griechische Staatskunde: Allgemeine Darstellung des Griechischen Staates*. München.
- Chambers, M. 1954. “The First Regnal Year of Antigonus Gonatas”, *AJA* 75 (4), 385-394.
- Errington, R.M. 1969. *Philopoemen*. London.
- Étienne, R., Knoepfler, D. 1976. *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 avant J.-C.* (BCH Suppl. 3). Paris.
- Feyel, M. 1942. *Polybe et l’histoire de Béotie au IIIe siècle avant notre ère*. Paris.
- Fossey, J.M., Darmezin, L. 2014. *Further Studies on Boiotian Inscriptions* (Epigraphica Boeotica 2). Leiden-Boston.
- Giannakopoulos, N. 2012. *Θεσμοί και λειτουργία των πόλεων της Εύβοιας κατά τους ελληνιστικούς και τους αυτοκρατορικούς χρόνους* (Πηγές και Μελέτες Ιστορίας Ελληνικού και Ρωμαϊκού Δικαίου 7). Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Habicht, C. 1989. “Personenkundliches”, in N. Himmelmann, H.-U. Cain, H. Gabelmann, D. Salzmann (eds.) *Festschrift für Nikolaus Himmelmann: Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Hermeneutik* (Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher 47). Mainz am Rhein, 321-327.
- Haegemans, K., Kosmetatou, E. 2005. “Aratus and the Achaean Background of Polybius”, in G. Schepens, J. Bollansée (eds.), *The Shadow of Polybius: Intertextuality as a Research Tool in Greek Historiography: Proceedings of the International Colloquium*, Leuven, 21-22 September 2001, 123-139.
- Hansen, M.H. 1995. “Kome: A Study in How the Greeks Designated and Classified Settlements Which Were not Poleis”, in M. H. Hansen, K. Raaflaub (eds.) *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Stuttgart, 45-81.
- Harter-Uibopuu, K. 1998. *Das zwischenstaatliche Schiedsverfahren im achäischen Koinon: zur friedlichen Streitbeilegung nach den epigraphischen Quellen*

- (Akten der Gesellschaft für Griechische und Hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte 12). Köln.
- Heath, R.M. 1912/1913. "Proxeny Decrees from Megara", *ABSA* 19, 82-88.
- Heinen, H. 1972. *Zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum Chremnideischen Krieg* (Historia Einzelschriften 20). Wiesbaden.
- Juhel, P. 2009. "{Ο ἐπί + substantif au génitif}, titre des fonctionnaires de l'administration hellénistique en général et des hauts fonctionnaires royaux de la Macédoine antigonide en particulier." *Tyche* 24, 59-76.
- IG VII. *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. VII. *Inscriptiones Megaridis et Boeotiae* (edited by W. Dittenberger) (Berlin 1892).
- IG XII 4.1. *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. XII. Fasc. 4, pars 1. *Inscriptiones Graecae insularum maris Aegaeie praetor Delum. Inscriptiones Coi insulae: decreta, epistulae, edicta, tituli sacri* (edited by D. Bosnakis, K. Hallof, K. Rigsby) (Berlin 2010).
- IG XII 7. *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. XII. Fasc. 7. *Inscriptiones Graecae insularum maris Aegaeie praetor Delum. Inscriptiones Amorgi et insularum vicinarum* (edited by Iulius Delamarre) (Berlin 1908).
- IG XII 9. *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. XII. Fasc. 9. *Inscriptiones Graecae insularum maris Aegaeie praetor Delum. Inscriptiones Euboeae insulae* (edited by Ericus Ziebarth) (Berlin 1915).
- Kaloyéropoulou, A.G. 1974. "Un nouveau décret de proxénie de Mégare", *AAA* 7, 138-147.
- Korolkow, D. 1883. "Megarische Inschriften", *MDAI(A)* 8, 181-191.
- Lefèvre, F. 1998. "Traité de paix entre Démétrios Poliorcète et la confédération étolienne (fin 289 ?)", *BCH* 122 (1), 109-141.
- Lehmann, G.A. 1967. *Untersuchungen zur historischen Glaubwürdigkeit des Polybios* (Fontes et Commentationes 5). Münster.
- Liddel, P. 2009. "The Decree Cultures of the Ancient Megarid" *CQ* 59 (2), 411-436.
- Loukopoulou, L.D., Zournatzi, A., Parisaki, M.-G., Psoma, S. 2005. *Ἐπιγραφές τῆς Θράκης τοῦ Αἰγαίου: μεταξύ τῶν ποταμῶν Νέστου καὶ Ἐβρου (Νομοὶ Ἐάνθης, Ροδόπης καὶ Ἐβρου)*. Athens.
- Mack, W. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford Studies in Ancient Documents). New York.
- Mackil, E.M. 2013. *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 55). Berkeley.
- Oetjen, R. 2014. *Athen im dritten Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Politik und Gesellschaft in den Garnisonsdemen auf der Grundlage der inschriftlichen Überlieferung* (Reihe Geschichte 5). Duisburg.

- O'Neil, J. 2008. "A Re-Examination of the Chremonidean War", in P. McKechnie, Ph. Guillaume (eds.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and His World* (Mnemosyne Supplements, History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity 300). Leiden-Boston, 65-90.
- Osborne, M.J. 2009. "The Athenian Decrees of the 290s BC", in Themis, A.A., Papazarkadas, N. (eds.), *Αττικά Επιγραφικά: Μελέτες προς τιμήν του Christian Habicht* (Ελληνική Επιγραφική Εταιρεία 10). Athens, 125-138.
- 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 BC)* (Μελετήματα 59). Athens.
- Plassart, A. 1921. "Inscriptions de Delphes, la liste des théorodotes", *BCH* 45 (1), 1-85.
- Pomtow, H. 1923. "Delphische Neufunde. VI", *Klio* 18, 259-308.
- Reinach, T. 1900. "Pierres qui roulent", *REG* 13, 158-178.
- Rizakis, A.D. 2008. "L'expérience de l'organisation inter-civique et supracivique dans la confédération achéenne", in M. Lombardo (ed.), *Forme sovrapoleiche e interpoleiche di organizzazione nel mondo greco antico: atti del convegno internazionale*, Lecce, 17-20 settembre 2008. Lecce, 274-292.
- Robert, J., Robert, L. 1983. *Fouilles d'Amizon en Carie, I: Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*. Paris.
- Robert, L. 1939. "Hellenica", *Op. Min.* II, 1250-1370.
- Robu, A. 2011. "Recherches sur l'épigraphie de la Mégaride: le décret d'Aigosthènes pour Apollodôros de Mégare (IG VII, 223)", in Badoud, N. (ed.), « *Philologos Dionysios* »: mélanges offerts au Professeur Denis Knoepfler. Neuchâtel, 79-101.
- Robu, A. 2012. "La cité de Mégare et les Antigonides: à propos d'une magistrature mégarienne extraordinaire (le collège des six stratèges)", in Ch. Feyel, J. Fournier, L. Graslin-Thomé, Fr. Kirbihler (eds.), *Communautés locales et pouvoir central dans l'orient hellénistique romain* (Études Anciennes 47). Nancy, 85-115.
- Robu, A. 2014a. "Between Macedon, Achaia and Boeotia: The Epigraphy of Hellenistic Megara Revisited", in N. Papazarkadas (ed.) *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia* (Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy 4). Leiden-Boston, 95-118.
- Robu, A. 2014b. *Mégare et les établissements mégariens de Sicile, de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin: histoire et institutions*. Pieterlen.
- Smith, P.J. 2008. *The Archaeology and Epigraphy of Hellenistic and Roman Megaris* (BAR International Series 1762). Oxford.
- de Ste Croix G.E.M. 1972. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London.

- Urban, R. 1979. *Wachstum und Krise des Achäischen Bundes: Quellenstudien zur Entwicklung des Bundes von 280 bis 222 v.Chr.* (Historia Einzelschriften 35). Wiesbaden.
- Veligianni-Terzi, C. 1977. "Damiurgen: Zur Entwicklung einer Magistratur" (diss. Univ. of Heidelberg).
- Walbank, F.W. 1962. "Polemic in Polybius", *JRS* 52, 1-12.
- Wallensten, J. 2003. *ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΑΡΞΑΣ: A Study of Dedications to Aphrodite from Greek Magistrates.* Lund.
- Warren, J.A.W. 2007. *The Bronze Coinage of the Achaian Koinon: The Currency of a Federal Ideal* (Royal Numismatic Society 42). London.
- Wehrli, C. 1968. *Antigone et Demetrios.* Genève.
- Welles, C.B. 1970. "Gallic Mercenaries in the Chremonidean War", *Klio* 52, 477-490.