

Herausgegeben von:

Thomas Corsten

Fritz Mitthof

Bernhard Palme

Hans Taeuber

TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

HOLZHAUSEN
DER VERLAG

Band 31, 2016



Hermann Harrauer

zum 75. Geburtstag

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Norman G. A s h t o n – Gregory H. R. H o r s l e y: A rediscovered <i>arkhisynagogos</i> inscription from Thessaloniki, and an intriguing Iulia Prokla (Taf. 1–6)	1
John B a u s c h a t z: Lochos and Ariston (Taf. 7–16)	25
Christer B r u n: A Dedication in 173 CE at Roman Ostia, carried out on the Emperor Antoninus Pius’ <i>dies natalis</i> (Taf. 17)	47
Emanuele C a s t e l l i: <i>Titulus</i> . Un contributo alla storia della parola nel mondo romano	51
Sara C h i a r i n i: Ἐγὼ εἶμι Ἑρμῆς. Eine dramaturgische Facette der antiken Zaubersprache	75
Maurizio C o l o m b o: La campagna estiva del 357 in <i>Germania I</i> , la spedizione del <i>magister peditum praesentalis</i> Barbatio contro gli Alamanni Iuthungi in <i>Raetia II</i> e le manipolazioni narrative di Ammiano Marcellino	103
Dan D a n a – Florian M a t e i - P o p e s c u: Quatre diplômes militaires fragmentaires (Taf. 18)	127
Michael F l e x s e n h a r I I I: Marcia, Commodus’ ‘Christian’ Concubine and CIL X 5918 (Taf. 19)	135
Regula F r e i - S t o l b a – Benjamin H a r t m a n n – Cédric R o m s: <i>Vadimonium Nertae</i> . Zum römischen Privatrecht in den gallischen Provinzen (Taf. 20)	149
Marco F r e s s u r a: Un frammento di “glossario virgiliano” in P.Vindob. L 102 f (Verg. <i>Aen.</i> I 707–708, 714–715, con traduzione greca) (Taf. 21)	157
Chrysi K o t s i f o u: Prayers and petitions for justice. Despair and the ‘crossing of boundaries’ between religion and law	167
Peter v a n M i n n e n: A Receipt for Tax Arrears from Hermopolis (Taf. 22)	201
Fritz M i t t h o f – Konrad S t a u n e r: Zwei Kassen in der römischen Armee und die Rolle der <i>signiferi</i> . Ein neues Papyruszeugnis: P.Hamb. inv. 445 (Taf. 23)	205
Bülent Ö z t ü r k: New Inscriptions from Karadeniz Ereğli Museum III (Herakleia Pontike and Tieion/Tios) (Taf. 24–27)	227
Amphilochios P a p a t h o m a s: Die Enttäuschung des belesenen Severus. Eine Anspielung auf Herodot I 44, 2 im Brief P.Oslo II 50	235
Shane W a l l a c e: The Rescript of Philip III Arrhidaios and the Two Tyrannies at Eresos (Taf. 28)	239
Ekkehard W e b e r: Scaurianus (Taf. 29)	259

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Bemerkungen zu Papyri XXIX (<Korr. Tyche> 820–831)	269
Adnotationes epigraphicae VII (<Adn. Tyche> 57–60) (Taf. 30–31)	285
Buchbesprechungen	291
<p>Charikleia A r m o n i, <i>Das Archiv der Taricheuten Amenneus und Onnophris aus Tanis (P.Tarich)</i>, Paderborn 2013 (A. Papatomas: 291) — Roger S. B a g n a l l, James G. K e e n a n, Leslie S. B. M a c C o u l l, <i>A Sixth-Century Tax Register from the Hermopolite Nome</i>, Durham 2011 (A. Papatomas: 293) — Peter F u n k e, Matthias H a a k e (Hrsg.), <i>Greek Federal States and Their Sanctuaries. Identity and Integration, Proceedings of an International Conference of the Cluster of Excellence "Religion and Politics" held in Münster, 17.06.–19.06.2010</i>, Stuttgart 2013 (J. Piccinini: 295) — Alisdair G. G. G i b s o n (Hrsg.), <i>The Julio-Claudian Succession. Reality and Perception of the 'Augustan Model'</i>, Leiden 2013 (R. Wolters: 297) — Volker G r i e b, Clemens K o e h n (Hrsg.), <i>Polybios und seine Historien</i>, Stuttgart 2013 (É. Foulon: 299) — Felix K. M a i e r, "Überall mit dem Unerwarteten rechnen": <i>Die Kontingenz historischer Prozesse bei Polybios</i>, München Beck 2012 (F. Russo: 301) — Mischa M e i e r, Steffen P a t z o l d (Hrsg.), <i>Chlodwigs Welt. Organisation von Herrschaft um 500</i>, Stuttgart 2014 (R. Whelan: 304) — Theresa N e s s e l r a t h, <i>Kaiser Julian und die Repaganisierung des Reiches. Konzept und Vorbilder</i>, Münster 2013 (H. Förster: 307) — Julietta S t e i n h a u e r, <i>Religious Associations in the Post-Classical Polis</i>, Stuttgart 2014 (I. N. Arnaoutoglou: 309) — Claudio V a c a n t i, <i>Guerra per la Sicilia e guerra della Sicilia. Il ruolo delle città siciliane nel primo conflitto romano-punico</i>, Napoli 2012 (L. Cappelletti: 317).</p>	
Indices	321
Eingelange Bücher	327

Tafeln 1–31

Die *Annona Epigraphica Austriaca* erscheint auf der Homepage des Instituts für Alte Geschichte der Universität Wien (<http://altegeschichte.univie.ac.at/forschung/aea/>) und wie bisher auch in der Zeitschrift *Römisches Österreich*.

SHANE WALLACE

The Rescript of Philip III Arrhidaios and the Two Tyrannies at Eresos*

Plate 28

Introduction

The remarkable Tyrants Dossier from the small Lesbian *polis* of Eresos has enjoyed continuous scholarly interest ever since its discovery in the mid-19th century. The Dossier preserves a series of six documents — four civic decrees and two royal letters — concerning the prosecution, exile, and non-restoration of two groups of tyrants and their descendents during the years 338 to 332 and thereafter.¹ The Dossier provides unique and important evidence for the local impact of Philip's and Alexander's campaigns in western Asia Minor. The chronology of the events it relates and the number of tyrannies it describes are not immediately clear. Andrew Heisserer has argued for three tyrannies and alternate changes each year from pro-Persian tyranny (in 337, 335, and 333) to pro-Macedonian democracy (in 336, 334, and 332). This has become the *communis opinio*.²

* I would like to thank Charles Crowther of the Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, University of Oxford, for permission to study Charles Newton's 1852 squeezes of the Tyrants Dossier. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Classical Association Conference in Nottingham in 2014. Brian McGing and Elisabetta Poddighe read and commented on earlier drafts. I am grateful to them for their invaluable comments, even if I have not always followed their suggestions. Translations, unless noted, are my own. All dates are BC.

¹ The major and most easily accessible editions are: *IG XII 2*, 526; *OGIS* 8; M. N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1948, 253–263, num. 191; C. Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques*, Brussels 1900, num. 358; A. J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks: The Epigraphic Evidence*, Oklahoma 1980, 27–78 [new edition from autopsy]; P. J. Rhodes, R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 B.C.*, Oxford, 2003, 406–419 num. 83 (henceforth *GHI* 83); A. Bencivenni, *Progetti di riforme costituzionali nelle epigrafi greche dei secoli IV–II a.C.*, Bologna 2003, 55–77; A. Ellis-Evans, *The Tyrants Dossier from Eresos*, *Chiron* 42 (2012) 183–212 [new edition from autopsy]. I follow Ellis-Evans' referencing system but for convenience I have also included the more widely accessible *GHI*, e.g. **A3**, ll.1–32 (*GHI* 83 §ii).

² Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 58–78; G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Lyon 1996, 23–42; C. Koch, *Prozesse gegen die Tyrannis: Die Vorgänge in Eresos in der 2. Hälfte des 4. Jh. v. Chr.*, *Dike* 4 (2001) 169–217; Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 406–419; Bencivenni, *Progetti* (n. 1) 55–77; Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1); D. A. Teegarden, *Death to Tyrants! Ancient Greek Democracy and the Struggle against Tyranny*, Princeton 2013, 115–141.

Recently, Gustav Adolf Lehmann has suggested that two separate tyrannies ruled Eresos from 337/336–334 and in 333.³ However, apparently unbeknownst to Lehmann, this reconstruction had already been proposed twenty years earlier by J. Bert Lott.⁴ Lott's article, which was more detailed and included arguments missed by Lehmann, has had very little impact on modern scholarship, and the chronology that he proposed has never been followed or critically examined.⁵ Furthermore, both Bosworth and Lott have pointed out numerous errors in Heisserer's chronology.⁶ It is time for a thorough reassessment of the evidence and arguments. This article focuses on the evidence offered by a single document, the rescript of Philip III to Eresos. The rescript, which was issued in 319/318, was inscribed as part of the Tyrants Dossier but it has been overlooked or underappreciated by Lott and others. It is absent from C. B. Welles' *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (even though Welles included Antigonos' letter to Eresos from the same stele) and was recently mistranslated by Peter Rhodes and Robin Osborne in their *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, an error copied by David Teegarden.⁷ Nonetheless, as this paper argues, the rescript is an important document for the history of Eresos under Alexander and his successors for three reasons. First, the rescript confirms Lott's chronology of two, not three, tyrannies at Eresos and elucidates the city's internal politics during these turbulent years (§3). Second, a different chronology means a different interpretation of events. A close reading of the rescript, which refers to an earlier decision of Alexander the Great, offers new insights into Alexander's actions as ἡγεμῶν of the League of Corinth in 334 (§4). Third, issued in 319/318, the rescript provides insight into Polyperchon's relations with the Greek cities during the period of his regency of the kings Philip III and Alexander IV (§5). In order to contextualise my arguments in support of Lott and the importance of the

³ G. A. Lehmann, *Zu den Tyrannis-Herrschaften in Eresos (Lesbos) während der Alexander-Ära*, ZPE 194 (2015) 36–46.

⁴ J. B. Lott, *Philip II, Alexander, and the two tyrannies at Eresos of IG XII.2.526*, Phoenix 50 (1996) 26–40. Lehmann's article shows little to no knowledge of scholarship on the Dossier subsequent to Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1). Lehmann overlooks Lott, *Eresos*; Labarre, *Lesbos* (n. 2) 25–33; Koch, *Tyrannis* (n. 2); Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 406–419 (*GHI* 83); Teegarden, *Tyrants* (n. 2) 115–141 and the new edition, commentary, and translation of the Dossier provided by Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1), which is based on autopsy of the stones in Eresos and study of squeezes in both Berlin and Oxford.

⁵ Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) is unmentioned by Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1); G. A. Lehmann, *Alexander der Große und die "Freiheit der Hellenen": Studien zu der antiken historiographischen Überlieferung und den Inschriften der Alexander-Ära*, Berlin 2015, 84–87. It is referenced but not followed in Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 406–419 (*GHI* 83); Koch, *Tyrannis* (n. 2); Teegarden, *Tyrants* (n. 2) 115–141.

⁶ A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander I*, Oxford 1980, 179–184; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4). S. Dmitriev, *Alexander's Exiles Decree*, Klio 86 (2004) 348–381 argues, unconvincingly, that the tyrants Agonippos and Eurysilaos ruled Eresos until 324. He also claims (355) that Heisserer argues for two sets of tyrannies, when in fact he argues for three.

⁷ Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 413; Teegarden, *Tyrants* (n. 2) 131, translating κατέγνω φυγήν as “condemned to death” rather than “condemned to exile”.

rescript, I begin by summarising the evidence for the history of Eresos in the 330s (§1) and outlining the different chronologies proposed for the Eresian tyrants (§2).

1. Evidence for Tyrannies at Eresos

Each reconstruction of the history of Eresos in the 330s has drawn on the same six items of evidence, each of which tells us something important about the tyrannies at Eresos. No reconstruction has satisfactorily explained each item of evidence, though Lott's comes closest.

First, the evidence from the Tyrants Dossier itself. Originally a free-standing epigraphic stele over 1.3 metres high, the stele now survives as two non-joining blocks. It preserves six documents: four decrees of the *demos* of Eresos from 334, 323, and c.306–301 concerning the prosecution, exile, and non-restoration of two groups of tyrants and their descendents as well as one letter each from Philip III (319/318) and Antigonos Monophthalmos (306–301). A *diagraphe* (334) and letter (324) from Alexander the Great are cited but not preserved. The exact chronology of the events described in these documents is confusing — about 50% of the text of the inscription has been lost and the documents do not appear to have been inscribed in chronological order⁸ — but the basic outline is reasonably clear. Eresos sided with Alexander in 334 and was ruled by a pro-Macedonian democracy. In 333, however, this was overthrown and the pro-Persian tyrants Agonippos and Eurysilaos waged war on “Alexander and the Greeks” (i.e. the League of Corinth), tore down altars to Zeus Philippios, and terrorised the citizens, before they were captured and returned by Alexander to Eresos where they were tried and executed in 332 (A1, ll.1–18 [*GHI* 83 §v–vi], A3, ll.1–32 [*GHI* 83 §ii], B4 [*GHI* 83 §i]).⁹ Literary sources record similar events during the years 334–332 at Tenedos, Mytilene, Chios, and Kos (below §4). Sometime earlier — the precise chronology is uncertain — a dynasty of Old Tyrants (the brothers Apollodoros, Hermon, and Heraios) had been expelled from Eresos, but the circumstances are not clear. In 324/323 the descendents of the Old Tyrants, Heroidas son of Thetikon son of Heraios and Agesimenes son of Hermesidas, asked to be allowed to return to Eresos

⁸ Text survives on the obverse, reverse, and right lateral of Block A but only on the right lateral of Block B; the letters on the other four sides had been deliberately ground away by the mid-19th century, a not unusual occurrence with marble inscriptions, see C. Newton, *Travels and Discoveries in the Levant I*, London 1865, 94–95; W. G. Forrest, *Epigraphy in Chios: Cyriac of Ancona to Stephanou*, in: J. Boardman, C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios*, Oxford 1986, 136–137.

⁹ For the date, see A3, ll.1–15 (*GHI* 83 §ii) with Arr. *Anab.* 3.2.3–7; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 60–62; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 32–36; Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 417. Curt. 4.8.11 refers to *Methymnaeorum Aristonicum et Ersilaum* as two of the tyrants brought to Alexander in 332. The text should probably be emended to *Methymnaeorum Aristonicum <et Eresiorum Agonippum> et Erysilaum* or better *Methymnaeorum Aristonicum et Er<esiorum Eury>silauum*, see J. E. Atkinson, *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni, Books 3–4*, Amsterdam 1980, 371–372; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 72 n. 48; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 33 with n. 35; Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1) 193 n. 49.

under the terms of Alexander's Exiles Decree. Alexander deferred judgement to Eresos, which refused to readmit them (A3, ll.33–41 [*GHI* 83 §iii], A1, ll.18–28 [*GHI* 83 §vi]). In 319/318 the descendents of a nameless group of tyrants, most likely the Old Tyrants, requested readmission, but Philip III reconfirmed Alexander's earlier ruling (A4, ll.21–28 [*GHI* 83 §iv]).¹⁰ Finally, in 306–301, under Antigonos Monophthalmos, the descendents of Agonippos and Eurysilaos asked to return. Judgement was once more given to Eresos and the city again refused (A4, ll.29–43 [*GHI* 83 §v]). This is the last event recorded and it was likely the stimulus for the publication of the entire dossier.¹¹

Second, the altars to Zeus Philippios. The Tyrants Dossier records that when Agonippos and Eurysilaos took control of Eresos in 333 Agonippos "tore down the altars to Zeus Philippios".¹² These altars must have been erected during Philip's lifetime in thanks for some exceptional intervention in, or benefaction to, the state. Eresos' entry into the League of Corinth in 337/336 seems most likely.¹³ The consequences of this, however, have not been properly appreciated. If the altars were erected under Philip in 337/336 and stood until 333, then there must have been no violent change in government from Eresos' entry into the League under Philip in c.337/336 until the imposition of Agonippos' and Eurysilaos' rule in 333. This does not preclude a change in the government during the years 337/336–334/333, but it does mean that any change would have been non-violent and would not have altered either Eresos' membership of the League or its alliance with Macedon. Otherwise it is likely that the altars would have been destroyed, as the statue of Philip in the Artemision in Ephesos was in 335 (Arr. *Anab.* 1.17.11), the stelai bearing copies of the treaties with Alexander and the Greeks were on Mytilene and Tenedos in 333,¹⁴ and the altars themselves later were in 333 (A3, ll.3–6 [*GHI* 83 §ii]).

Third, a passage from Ps.-Demosthenes' speech *On the Treaty with Alexander*. This speech, for which both author and date are debated,¹⁵ criticises Alexander for having

¹⁰ R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier, Th. Reinach (eds.), *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques*, deuxième série, Paris 1898, 175–176; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 61–66; Labarre, *Lesbos* (n. 2) 29; Lehmann, *Alexander* (n. 5) 86–87.

¹¹ On the creation of the Tyrants Dossier, see Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1) 189–201.

¹² A3, ll.4–5 (*GHI* 83 §ii): καὶ τοῖς βόμοις ἄ[νέ]σ[θη]κε τῷ Δίῳ τῷ Φιλιππίῳ.

¹³ Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 30, 67–70; Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 179; A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Oxford 1988, 192; Labarre, *Lesbos* (n. 2) 25–33; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 29–32, 37–38; Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 417; Teegarden, *Tyrants* (n. 2) 124; Lehmann, *Eresos* (n. 3) 41–42 with ns. 23 and 25.

¹⁴ Arr. *Anab.* 2.1.4, 2.2–3; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 68–70, 131–134; Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 181–184; cf. n. 29 below.

¹⁵ The author is unknown, but both Hyperides (D. Whitehead, *Hyperides, The Forensic Speeches: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford 2000, 7 n. 26) and Demochares (E. Culasso Gastaldi, *Sul trattato con Alessandro (polis, monarchia macedone e memoria Demostenica)*, Padua 1984, 159–183) have been suggested. The speech has been variously dated to 336/335 (Labarre, *Lesbos* [n. 2] 28–29; P. Debord, *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle. Pouvoirs et jeux politiques (412–323 a.C.)*, Bordeaux 1999, 469), 335/334 (G. Squillace, *Alessandro 'tyrannos' nella propaganda antimacedone: per una nuova proposta di datazione dell'orazione 'Sui Patti con Alessandro'*, *Miscellanea di Studi Storici* 10 [1995–1997] 33–43), 333 (W. Will,

violated the terms of the League of Corinth by removing from power in Eresos tyrants who had ruled the city since “before the articles of the treaty [i.e. the League of Corinth] were made”.¹⁶ This, as we learn elsewhere in the speech, was forbidden: “Should any parties overthrow the governments (τὰς πολιτείας) that were in place in each city at the time when they swore the oaths concerning the peace (τοὺς ὄρκους περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης ὤμνυσαν), those persons are to be treated as enemies by all members of the peace” (Ps.-Dem. 17.10). Ps.-Demosthenes accuses Alexander of hypocrisy, criticising him for removing the tyrants of Eresos, even though they had been in power when it joined the League, but restoring the tyrants of Messene, because they had been in power when it joined the League (Ps.-Dem. 17.7):¹⁷

ἀλλὰ γὰρ εἴποιεν ἂν οἱ τυραννίζοντες οὗτοι, ὅτι πρὶν τὰς συνθήκας γενέσθαι ἐτυράνουν Μεσσηνίων 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 οἶσθαι διαφέρειν, τῆς αὐτῆς δυσχερείας ὑπαρχούσης.

“But those who side with the tyrants might say that the sons of Philiades were ruling the Messenians as tyrants before the articles of the treaty [i.e. the League of Corinth] were made, hence why Alexander restored them. But it is a laughable principle to expel the tyrants of Lesbos, those from Antissa and Eresos, as if their rule were unjust, even though they had ruled as tyrants since before the agreements, but to think it not worth disputing at Messene, where the same awful system is in place.”

Ps.-Demosthenes’ charge of hypocrisy only works if the unnamed tyrants that Alexander removed from Eresos had, like the sons of Philiades in Messene, been in power before Eresos joined the League, in which case they should have been confirmed in power by Alexander, not removed from it.¹⁸ Accordingly, Alexander must have restored to power in Messene but removed from power in Eresos tyrannies that had

Zur Datierung der Rede Ps.-Demosthenes XVII, RhM 125 [1982] 202–203; M. Sordi, *L’orazione pseudodemostenica ‘Sui patti con Alessandro’ e l’atteggiamento dei Greci prima di Isso*, in: M. Sordi [ed.], *Alessandro Magno tra storia e mito*, Milan 1984, 23–30), 331 (G. L. Cawkwell, *A Note on Demosthenes 17.20*, Phoenix 15 [1961] 74–78; A. B. Bosworth, *Alexander the Great parts 1 & 2*, in: D. M. Lewis et al. [eds.], *The Cambridge Ancient History VI*, Cambridge 21994, 847; C. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Anthony*, Harvard 1997, 21; P. Brun, *L’Orateur Démade. Essai d’histoire et d’historiographie*, Paris 2000, 78 n. 29), or even in the early 3rd century (Culasso Gastaldi, *Alessandro* [see this note, above] 159–183).

¹⁶ Some take this to mean that the tyrants ruled before the League was founded, so Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 70–71; Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 416 n. 1, others that they were in power when Eresos joined the League, so Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 179; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 32; Lehmann, *Eresos* (n. 3).

¹⁷ On this passage, see Culasso Gastaldi, *Alessandro* (n. 15) 41–47.

¹⁸ The descendants of Philiades remained prominent in Messene throughout the 3rd century (P. Fröhlich, *Les tombeaux de la ville de Messène et les grandes familles de la cite à l’époque*

joined the League of Corinth under Philip. Since the altars of Zeus Philippios remained standing in Eresos from 337/336 to 333, which suggests no violent change in government during those years, it is possible that one set of pro-Macedonian tyrants ruled Eresos uninterrupted from at least 337/336, when the city joined the League of Corinth, until 334, when the tyrants were expelled non-violently by Alexander but the city remained a member of the League.

Fourth, the rescript of Philip III to Eresos. Dating from late 319 or early 318,¹⁹ this eight line, twenty-three word letter survives as part the famous Tyrants Dossier (A4, ll.21–28 [*GHI* 83 §iv]; see Pl. 28):²⁰

Φιλίππῳ
αἱ μὲν κατὰ τῶν φυγά-
δων κρίσεις αἱ κριθε[ῖ]-
σαι ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου
25 κύριαι ἔστωσαν καὶ
[ῶ]ν κατέγνω φυγὴν φε[υ]-
[γ]έτωσαμ μὲν, ἀγώγιμο[ι]
δὲ μὴ ἔστωσαν.

“From Philip. The judgements against the exiles judged by Alexander, let them be valid, and of those who have been condemned to exile, let them remain exiled, but let them not be liable to seizure.” Trans. Ellis-Evans 2012 (n. 1).

The rescript reveals two important points. First, it confirms that those exiled by Alexander are to remain exiles. Second, it modifies the terms of Alexander’s decision by ordering that those exiled were no longer to be ἀγώγιοι (liable to seizure). I shall return to the rescript in greater detail below (§3), but for the moment it is worth noting the term ἀγώγιοι, which also appears in Alexander’s Letter to Chios of 334,²¹ wherein Alexander orders that Chios’ pro-Persian fugitives “shall be exiled (φεόγειν) from all the cities sharing in the peace, and shall be liable to seizure (ἀγωγίμους) in accordance with the resolution (δόγμα) of the Greeks” (*GHI* 84a, ll.11–13; further below §3). It would seem that in 334 Alexander, in his official capacity as ἡγεμὼν of the League of Corinth, exiled tyrants from Eresos and Chios and made them ἀγώγιοι in accordance with a League δόγμα. We can therefore confirm that at Eresos one group of tyrants was

hellénistique, in: C. Granjean [ed.], *Le Péloponnèse d’Épaminondas à Hadrien*, Ausonius 2008, 204–208; *SEG* XLI 362).

¹⁹ On the date, see Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 62–63; Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 417; Bencivenni, *Progetti* (n. 1) 64–66; Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1) 189. Tod, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 262 suggests 323, Teegarden, *Tyrants* (n. 2) 115 opts for c.317.

²⁰ P. Usteri, *Ächtung und Verbannung im griechischen Recht*, Berlin 1903, 47–52.

²¹ Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 83–95; Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 422–423. Lehmann, *Eresos* (n. 3) 43–44 does not make the connection. K. Rosen, Review of A. J. Heisserer *Alexander the Great and the Greeks: The Epigraphic Evidence*, *Gnomon* 54 [1982] 328, 358–359) doubts its significance and argues that Chios might not have been a League member.

exiled in 334. Taken together with the survival of the altars of Zeus Philippios and the passage from Ps.-Demosthenes, this suggests that one group of pro-Macedonian tyrants held power in Eresos from its entry into the League in 337/336 until their expulsion by Alexander as ἡγεμόν in 334, a year before Agonippos' destruction of the altars to Zeus Philippios.

Fifth, two anecdotes from Plutarch's *Moralia* claiming that Theophrastos of Eresos twice liberated Eresos from tyrants.²² These anecdotes cannot be dated and so provide little in the way of positive evidence. Theophrastos was connected with both Philip and Alexander and he survived Polyperchon, Philip III, and Antigonos, dying sometime in the early 280s.²³ Plutarch's anecdotes could, therefore, refer to any of the exiles or refusals of readmission seen under Alexander (334, 332, and 323), Philip III (319), or Antigonos Monophthalmos (306–301), though an earlier date is perhaps more likely.²⁴

Sixth, and finally, comparative material from other cities of the Aegean and western Asia Minor that, like Eresos, saw changes in government from pro-Macedonian democracies to pro-Persian tyrannies throughout the late 330s. This can be seen most clearly at Ephesos and Chios.

When Alexander arrived at Ephesus in early summer 334 he found the city in the midst of a violent political upheaval (Arr. *Anab.* 1.17.10–18.2).²⁵ In 336 one Heropythes had expelled a pro-Persian regime and installed a democracy, which Philip's general Parmenion supported. In recognition of Macedonian support, a statue of Philip was erected in the temple of Artemis; Heropythes 'the liberator' died and was buried in the *agora* with heroic honours.²⁶ In 335, in the chaos following Philip's death, a counter-attack under Memnon, commander of the Persian forces, pushed the Macedonians back to the Troad. The pro-Macedonian democracy in Ephesus was overthrown and Syrophax was installed as tyrant. Heropythes' tomb was dug up and the statue of Philip in the temple of Artemis was torn down. In 334 Alexander restored the pro-Macedonian

²² Plut. *Mor.* 1097b: τίνας δὲ Θεοφράστου καὶ Φαινίου τοὺς τῆς πατρίδος ἐκκοψάντων τυράννους; *Mor.* 1126f: Θεοφράστῳ δὲ δις ἐλευθερώσαι τυραννομένην. For Theophrastos' connection with Phantias of Eresos, see Diog. Laert. 5.45, 50; schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.972.

²³ On Theophrastos' life, see J. Diggle, *Theophrastus: Characters*, Cambridge 2004, 1–3.

²⁴ Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 73–77 (with a clever reinterpretation of Diog. Laert. 5.37); Bencivenni, *Progetti* (n. 1) 64–65.

²⁵ On events in Ephesus between 337–334, see E. Badian, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia*, in: E. Badian (ed.), *Ancient Society and Institutions. Essays in Honour of Victor Ehrenberg*, London 1966, 40–45; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 58–59; P. J. Stylianou, *The Pax Macedonica and the Freedom of the Greeks of Asia (with an appendix on the chronology of the years 323–301)*, *Ἐπετηρίς* — Annual of the Cyprus Reserch Centre 20 (1994) 27–29; B. Dreyer, *Heroes, Cults, and Divinity*, in: W. Heckel, L. A. Tritle (eds.), *Alexander the Great: A New History*, Oxford 2009, 225–226; S. Wallace, *Alexander the Great and Democracy in the Hellenistic World*, in: M. Canavaro, B. Gray (eds.), *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Politics and Political Thought*, Oxford Forthcoming, §2.

²⁶ Arr. *Anab.* 1.17.11: Ἡροπύθου τοῦ ἐλευθερώσαντος; cf. Polyaeus *Strat.* 7.23.2. An unprovenanced squeeze, probably from his funerary monument, confirms his heroic honours (P. Foucart, *Un heros Ephésien*, RPh 42 [1918] 60–62: Ἡρῶι Ἡροπίθῳ).

democrats who had been exiled the previous year while a popular uprising led to the death of Syrphax, his son Pelagon, and his brothers.

Alexander's Letter to Chios from summer 334 reveals a similar series of annual shifts between pro-Macedonian democracies and pro-Persian oligarchies (*GHI* 84a).²⁷ A democratic revolt in 336 seems to have brought Chios to Philip's side and the city likely gained membership of the League of Corinth. In 335 it was betrayed to Memnon by pro-Persian partisans. In 334 it returned once more to Macedonian control, when Alexander re-installed a democracy and re-enrolled the city in the League of Corinth. The cycle of pro-Macedonian and pro-Persian regimes continued until 332. On the mainland, Ephesos remained democratic from 334 onwards; in the Aegean, Chios, Tenedos, Kos, Mytilene, and the cities of Lesbos sided with Macedon in 334 and (re-)joined the League of Corinth as democracies.²⁸ Pro-Persian tyrants were (re-)installed in 333 (*Arr. Anab.* 2.2.1–3; *Diod.* 17.29.2) before democracy was finally restored in 332.²⁹

Based on the apparent annual changes in government seen at Ephesos and Chios — pro-Macedonian democracies in 336, 334, and 332; pro-Persian tyrannies in 335 and 333 — scholars have reconstructed a similar sequence of events at Eresos. However, the situations are not exactly parallel. The campaigns undertaken by Parmenion in 336 and Memnon in 335 were both land-based. There is no evidence for either general or their respective powers, Macedon or Persia, mobilising their fleets in these years. Annual changes from pro-Macedonian democracies to pro-Persian tyrannies are well-attested for the years 334–332, but we should be careful not to assume that what appears to have happened at Chios in 336–334 — and events there are not absolutely certain (see §4 below) — must have happened elsewhere.

2. Reconstructing the Tyrannies at Eresos

Reconstruction via parallel is dangerous, yet what happened at Ephesos and Chios has influenced the way scholars have reconstructed the tyrannies at Eresos. Debate focuses primarily on the number of tyrannies. Heisserer has argued for three, Lott for two.

²⁷ Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 418–425. On the date and context, see also Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 178, 266–269; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 79–95; N. G. L. Hammond, F. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia III*, Oxford 1988, 73–74.

²⁸ Tenedos: *Arr. Anab.* 2.2.1–3; Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 183–184 suggests that it had originally joined the League in 338/337. Cos: *Arr. Anab.* 3.2.6–7. Mytilene: *GHI* 85a–b; *Arr. Anab.* 2.1.1–5, 3.2.6; *Curt.* 4.8.13; *cf. IG XII* 2, 6 and 8 with A. J. Heisserer, R. Hodot, *The Mytilenean Decree on Concord*, *ZPE* 63 (1986) 115 n. 9. For debates concerning Mytilene's membership of the League of Corinth, see Badian, *Alexander* (n. 25) 50; P. A. Brunt, *Arrian I*, Cambridge, Mass. 1976, 124 n. 2; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 131–134; Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 181; Hammond, Walbank, *Macedonia* (n. 27) 73. For the cities of Lesbos, see H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, Munich 1967, 337–339; P. Brun, *Les exilés politiques en Grèce: l'exemple de Lesbos*, *Ktéma* 13 (1988) 253–261; Labarre, *Lesbos* (n. 2) 23–42.

²⁹ *Arr. Anab.* 2.1.1–2, 3.2.3–7; *Curt.* 4.5.14–28; *Diod.* 17.29.2, 31.3.

Heisserer's reconstruction, which adapts that of Kirchoff,³⁰ posits a double tyranny by the Old Tyrants pre-336 and in 335 with a third tyranny by Agonippos and Eurysilaos in 333. This has been followed in almost all subsequent scholarship. Following the outline of events at Ephesos and Chios, Heisserer suggests that Philip oversaw the replacement of the Old Tyrants with a pro-Macedonian democracy in 336, at which point Eresos joined the League of Corinth and erected the altars to Zeus Philippios. The Old Tyrants were reinstated by Memnon in 335 before Alexander expelled them for a second time in 334 and reinstated the democracy. Agonippos and Eurysilaos were then installed by Memnon in 333. They destroyed the altars to Zeus Philippios and waged war on "Alexander and the Greeks", only to be removed by Alexander in 332, when democracy was finally confirmed.

Numerous scholars have highlighted the many flaws in Heisserer's reconstruction. First, as Bosworth has pointed out, there is no evidence for a series of expulsions and restorations of any one group of tyrants earlier than 334.³¹ There is no reason to assume that either the Old Tyrants or Agonippos and Eurysilaos held power more than once. It is not impossible, but it is an unnecessary complication introduced to bring Eresos in line with known events at Ephesos and Chios. Second, as Rosen emphasised, there is no evidence for naval activities under either Parmenion in 336 or Memnon in 335 making the Macedonian and Persian interventions posited by Heisserer in these years unlikely.³² Third, would Philip have supported a democracy in Eresos when he favoured oligarchy almost everywhere else?³³ Fourth, as Lott has highlighted, Ps.-Demosthenes shows that the tyrants of Eresos expelled by Alexander had been in power when the city joined the League of Corinth;³⁴ Heisserer argues that Eresos entered the League as a democracy. Fifth, the fact that the altars of Zeus Philippios stood from 337/336 until

³⁰ A. Kirchoff (in J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus II*, Gotha 1878, 363–373) similarly suggested three tyrannies: the Old Tyrants ruling until c.343, when a pro-Macedonian democracy was installed, and Agonippos and Eurysilaos ruling twice in 335 and 333. This restoration was followed by E. L. Hicks, G. F. Hill, *A Manuel of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1901, 294–301, num. 157; A. Baumbach, *Kleinasien unter Alexander dem Großen*, Jena 1911, 76–77; H. Pistorius, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Lesbos im vierten Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Bonn 1913, 60–76, 86–89, 121–123; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, Munich 1926, nums. 19, 325; Tod, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 253–263, num. 191; C. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*, Munich 1970, 14–16; cf. Griffith in: N. G. L. Hammond, G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II*, Oxford 1979, 720–721; Hammond in: Hammond, Walbank, *Macedonia* (n. 27) 74.

³¹ Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 178–180; *Conquest* (n. 13) 192–193; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 34.

³² Rosen, *Review* (n. 21) 355–356; Hammond in: Hammond, Walbank, *Macedonia* (n. 27) 69–72; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 33–34; E. Poddighe, *Alexander and the Greeks: The Corinthian League*, in: W. Heckel, L. Tritle (eds.), *Alexander the Great. A New History*, Blackwell 2009, 110–112. Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 77 suggests that Parmenion actually visited Lesbos: "when Philip's generals Parmenion and Attalos arrived on Lesbos in 336."

³³ Badian, *Alexander* (n. 25) 44–46; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 34–35; Wallace, *Alexander* (n. 25) §1. The pro-Macedonian democracies at Ephesos and Chios were probably spontaneous uprisings recognised by Parmenion in 336, as they later were by Alexander in 334.

³⁴ Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 34–36.

333 suggests that there was no violent change in government in Eresos during these years; Heisserer argues for violent changes in government in 336, 335, 334, and 333.

Highlighting just these weaknesses, Bosworth has argued for two tyrannies at Eresos. He suggested that the Old Tyrants were replaced in 337/336 with Agonippos and Eurysilaos, who oversaw Eresos' entry into the League of Corinth and erected the altars to Zeus Philippios.³⁵ They remained loyal to Macedon in spite of Memnon's victories in 335, were reconfirmed in power by Alexander in 334, but then defected to Memnon in 333, when they destroyed the altars. They were finally overthrown by Alexander in 332. Bosworth's reconstruction may take into account the survival of the altars until 333, but it is unsustainable for a number of reasons. First, as Lott has pointed out, it contradicts Ps.-Demosthenes' claim that Alexander acted unjustly in removing the tyrants of Eresos.³⁶ Ps.-Demosthenes' argument would fall flat if, as Bosworth suggests, the tyrants had actually medised in 334; it only works if Alexander's actions can be represented as hypocritical, confirming in power the Messenian tyrants but removing from power the Eresian tyrants, despite the fact that both had been members of the League of Corinth. Second, it is unlikely that Memnon would have kept in place in 333 a government that had previously supported Macedon.³⁷ The most conclusive refutation of Bosworth's reconstruction, unnoticed by Lott, comes from the rescript of Philip III which shows that in 334 Alexander exiled and made liable to seizure (ἀγώγμοι) the Old Tyrants of Eresos. This is incompatible with Bosworth's suggestion of a continuous tyranny from 337/336–332.

3. The Rescript of Philip III Arrhidaios

Bert Lott's reconstruction of events is the most plausible and is supported by the rescript of Philip III. Lott argued that the Old Tyrants were installed by Philip in 338,³⁸ oversaw Eresos' entry into the League of Corinth, and erected the altars to Zeus Philippios. They ruled Eresos continually and were loyal to Macedon until Alexander replaced them with a democracy in 334. Agonippos and Eurysilaos were installed by Memnon in 333, destroyed the altars of Zeus Philippios, but were then removed by Alexander in 332. Lott's reconstruction is the only one to explain the existence of the altars from 337/336 to 333 and account for the evidence from Ps.-Demosthenes. The rescript supports this reconstruction. The appearance of the term ἀγώγμοι is particularly important.

Ἀγώγμος means 'liable to seizure' (*LSJ* s.v. ἀγώγμος II) and was applicable to murderers and debtors. A debtor and his property could be made ἀγώγμος if he did not repay his loans or fulfil the terms of a contract, in which case he and his property were

³⁵ Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 178–180.

³⁶ Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 35–36.

³⁷ Labarre, *Lesbos* (n. 2) 30–31; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 35–36. Memnon changed regimes at Mytilene (Arr. *Anab.* 2.1.5), Methymna (Arr. *Anab.* 3.2.4; Curt. 4.5.19), and Chios (Arr. *Anab.* 3.2.3–5).

³⁸ Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 67 and Rhodes, Osborne, *Inscriptions* (n. 1) 417 have, perhaps more plausibly, suggested that they had been in power since the Social War of the 350s.

liable to detention or seizure in lieu of payment or until restitution was made.³⁹ However, just as ἀγώγιμος could be used internally within the state, so could it be used externally within international relations, in treaties or alliances between multiple states.⁴⁰ In such cases, the person who broke a particular law or committed a crime in one member state was liable to seizure (ἀγώγιμος), himself and his property, from all member states. This is how the term was used in the Second Athenian Confederacy,⁴¹ the Aitolian League,⁴² and the Delphic Amphictyony, which frequently stipulated that a person or monies would be ἀγώγιμος from everywhere (πανταχόθεν), if the individual's guilt was proven,⁴³ or not from anywhere (μηδοπόθεν), if he was judged innocent.⁴⁴

Ἀγώγιμος is often connected with some form of the verb φεύγω, which can mean either to flee or to be exiled. Those who were φυγάδες, who had either fled a city or already been exiled from it, could then be made ἀγώγιμος *in absentia* from the wider, hegemonic alliance. In 404/403 the Spartans ordered that the Athenian exiles (τοὺς Ἀθηναίων φυγάδας) were to be ἀγώγιμοι from all of Greece;⁴⁵ Xenophon claims that an individual exiled from one city of the Theban hegemony was ἀγώγιμος from all other member states;⁴⁶ and Diodorus records that after the destruction of Thebes in 335 the

³⁹ Plut. *Solon* 13; Dem. 53.11; Men. *Sic.* 138; Dion.Hal. 5.69.1; *IG IX* 1² (3) 639.9, ll.12–14 (Naupactus, 2nd century BC); *SGDI* 1878, ll.12–13 (Delphi, c.170–157/156); *IG IX* (1) 189, ll.151516 (Tithora, 2nd century AD); cf. *IG XII* (9) 207, ll.41–45 (Eretria, c.294–288). See also A. Lintott, *Violence, Civil Strife and Revolution in the Classical City*, London 1982, 26–28; A. J. Podlecki, *The Early Greek Poets and Their Times*, Vancouver 1984, 135–136; R. Lonis, *Extradition et prise de corps des réfugiés politiques en Grèce*, in: R. Lonis (ed.), *L'étranger dans le monde grec*, Nancy 1988, 80–82.

⁴⁰ Th. Thalheim, *ἀγώγιμος*, RE 1 (1894) 1835; Usteri, *Verbannung* (n. 20) 17–19, 59.

⁴¹ *IG II³* 1, 399, ll.15–16 [II² 125] (348 or 343): καὶ εἰν[αι τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ] | ἀγώγιμα ἐξ ἅπασων τῶν πόλεω[ν τῶν συμμαχίδων]; *IG II²* 179, frag. C, l.8 (353/352): [ἀ]γώγιμους εἶναι. It appears twenty-four times in Demosthenes' *Against Aristokrates* (Usteri, *Verbannung* [n. 20] 19–23), see in particular 23.16: ἀγώγιμον ἐκ τῶν συμμάχων εἶναι; 23.35: ἀγώγιμον ἐκ τῆς συμμαχίδος πάσης; 23.109: ἐκ τῶν ἑαυτῶν συμμάχων ἀγώγιμον εἶναι; 23.142: ἀγώγιμον αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν συμμάχων εἶναι; 23.52: ὁ δὲ 'ἀγώγιμος ἔστω' γέγραφεν κἀντεῦθεν, ὅποι φεύγειν οὐδεὶς κωλύει νόμος.

⁴² *IG IX* 1², 1.171, ll.3–4 (c.266): [ε]ἴμεν ἀγώγιμους ἐκ τῶν πολίων τοῦ[τ]ους μηδοπόθεν; ll.6–7: τοῦ[τους δὲ πανταχόθεν [ἀ]γώγι[μους εἶ]μεν; *FD III* 4, 359, l.41 (late 3rd century): [ε]ἴμεν ἀγώγιμους ἐκ τῶν πολίων; ll.44–45: τοῦ[τους δὲ πανταχόθεν [ἀ]γώγι[μους εἶ]μεν; *IG IX* 1², 1.137, ll.17–18 (c.130–120): καὶ ἔστω ἀγώγιμος καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ.

⁴³ Diod. 16.60.1 (346/345); *CID IV* 71, ll.9–10 (229–222); *FD III* 1, 351, ll.37–39 (217–212); *SGDI* 1723, ll.12–13 (179–157/156).

⁴⁴ *CID IV* 12, ll.8–10 (279/278–278/277); *CID IV* 359, ll.41–45 (266?); *CID IV* 33, ll.41–45 (c.264/263); *CID IV* 116, B1, ll.1–3 (c.134–130); *FD III* 2, 68, ll.66–70 (130/129); note also *SGDI* 2506, ll.10–11 (277).

⁴⁵ Diod. 14.6.1: [Λακεδαιμόνιοι] γὰρ τοὺς Ἀθηναίων φυγάδας ἐξ ἅπασης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀγώγιμους τοῖς τριάκοντα εἶναι; Plut. *Lys.* 27.2: Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ δύναμιν καὶ φόβον αὐτοῖς προστιθέντες ἐψηφίσαντο τοὺς φεύγοντας ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν ἀγώγιμους εἶναι πανταχόθεν, ἐκσπόνδους δὲ τοὺς ἐνισταμένους τοῖς ἄγουσι.

⁴⁶ Xen. *Hell.* 7.3.11: ἐψηφίσασθε δήπου τοὺς φυγάδας ἀγώγιμους εἶναι ἐκ πασῶν τῶν συμμαχίδων; Usteri, *Verbannung* (n. 20) 30–32.

Theban exiles, or fugitives, were to be ἀγώγιοι from all the cities of the League of Corinth (17.14.3–4; §4 below). The description of Eresos' exiles as ἀγώγιοι must relate to a similar clause.⁴⁷ Bernard Haussoullier recognised this and drew a parallel with Alexander's Letter to Chios from 334 wherein Alexander, as ἡγεμών of the League of Corinth, ordered that the pro-Persian tyrants who had already fled Chios were to be exiled from all the cities of the League of Corinth and made ἀγώγιοι in accordance with a δόγμα of the League συνέδριον (*GHI* 84a ll.10–15):⁴⁸

10 τῶν δὲ προδόντων
 τοῖς βαρβάροις τὴν πόλιν, ὅσοι μὲν ἂν προεξέλθωσιν, φεόγειν
 αὐτοὺς ἐξ ἀπασῶν τῶν πόλεων τῶν τῆς εἰρήνης κοινωνου-
 σῶν, καὶ εἶναι ἀγώγιμους κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὅσο[ι]
 δ' ἂν ἐγκαταλειφθῶσιν, ἐπανάγεσθαι καὶ κρίνεσθαι ἐν τῷ τῶν Ἑλ-
 15 [λ]ήνων συνεδρίῳ.

“Of those who betrayed the city to the barbarians, those who have already left shall be exiled from all the cities sharing in the peace, and shall be liable to seizure (ἀγώγιοι) in accordance with the resolution of the Greeks; those who have been left inside shall be taken and tried by the council (*synedrion*) of the Greeks.”

Trans. Rhodes, Osborne 2003 (n. 1).

As we have already seen, the appearance of the term ἀγώγιοι in both Alexander's Letter to Chios and Philip III's rescript to Eresos shows that in 334, as ἡγεμών of the League of Corinth, Alexander expelled the tyrants from both Chios and Eresos in accordance with a δόγμα of the League of Corinth, the terms of which exiled fugitives and made them ἀγώγιοι from all member states. This supports Lott's chronology on two points. First, it elucidates the evidence of Ps.-Demosthenes. Exiled and made ἀγώγιοι by Alexander as ἡγεμών according to a League δόγμα in 334, the tyrants mentioned in the rescript must be the same as the tyrants that Ps.-Demosthenes claimed had ruled Eresos when it joined the League and had been unjustly removed by Alexander (Ps.-Dem. 17.7).⁴⁹ There is no evidence that they had medised, yet they were

⁴⁷ The property of Agonippos and Eurysilaos was confiscated and sold according to the law (**A1**, ll.17–18 [*GHI* 83 §vi]). No mention is made of the property of the Old Tyrants, though it was likely also confiscated as part of their being made ἀγώγιοι, whether by the League of Corinth or the state of Eresos itself. There would have been little incentive for those who had profited from the sale of a tyrant's property to vote for his re-enfranchisement, see Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1) 198.

⁴⁸ B. Haussoullier, *Un Rescrit d'Alexandre le Grand*, RPh 17 (1893) 190; Dareste, *inscriptions* (n. 10) 175–176, num. 27; later followed by Usteri, *Verbannung* (n. 20) 46–49; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 62–64 (without reference to previous scholarship). Lonis, *Extradition* (n. 39) 83–84 comments on ἀγώγιοι in Alexander's Letter to Chios, but does not connect it with the rescript. Rosen, *Review* (n. 21) 357 criticises Heisserer's “verwickelte Argumentation” in connecting Alexander's Letter to Chios with Philip III's rescript to Eresos.

⁴⁹ If the Old Tyrants had been the rulers of Eresos when it entered the League and had maintained the state's loyalty to Macedon from 337/336–334, this might explain why they were

exiled, unjustly according to Pseudo-Demosthenes. It seems likely that Alexander must have relied on the League δόγμα and his authority as ἡγεμών in order to justify their removal in 334. His actions were, strictly speaking, unlawful as the tyrants of Eresos had been loyal members of the League, and he was accused of hypocrisy by Ps.-Demosthenes. But, as ἡγεμών, Alexander could interpret the δόγμα on medism as he wished. Indeed, he elsewhere applied the δόγμα as it suited his interests, using it to punish the Greek mercenaries who fought at the battle of Granikos (Arr. *Anab.* 1.16.6) but absolve those who fought at the battle of Gaugamela (Arr. *Anab.* 3.23.8, 24.5). The δόγμα on medism afforded a suitable legal pretext for removing inconvenient regimes. Second, it explains why the altars of Zeus Philippios survived from 337/336 until 333: they were erected by pro-Macedonian tyrants and survived their expulsion in 334 because the democracy that replaced them remained a loyal member of the League of Corinth. The altars, naturally, survived a non-violent change in government from pro-Macedonian tyranny to pro-Macedonian democracy. It was only with the imposition of the pro-Persian tyranny of Agonippos and Eurysilaos in 333 that the altars were destroyed.

4. Alexander the Great and the League of Corinth

The consequences of this reconstruction have significance for Alexander's treatment of the Greek states and his role as ἡγεμών of the League of Corinth. Paul Usteri long ago noticed that ἀγωγήμος appears in a third document relating to Alexander the Great and the League of Corinth, Diodorus' description of the judgment of Thebes in late 335 (17.14.1–4):⁵⁰

Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς...τοὺς δὲ συνέδρους τῶν Ἑλλήνων συναγαγὼν ἐπέτρεψε τῷ κοινῷ συνεδρίῳ πῶς χρηστέον τῇ πόλει τῶν Θηβαίων...ἐψηφίσαντο τὴν μὲν πόλιν κατασκάψαι, τοὺς δ' αἰχμαλώτους ἀποδόσθαι, τοὺς δὲ φυγάδας τῶν Θηβαίων ἀγωγίμους ὑπάρχειν ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ μηδένα τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑποδέχεσθαι Θηβαίων. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀκολούθως τῇ τοῦ συνεδρίου γνώμῃ τὴν μὲν πόλιν κατασκάψας...

“The king...calling together the *synedroi* of the Greeks turned over to the common *synedrion* the question of what was to be done with the city of the Thebans...they voted to destroy the city, sell off the survivors, make the Theban exiles⁵¹ liable to seizure (ἀγωγήμοι) from all of Greece, and forbid any Greek to receive a Theban. The king destroyed the city, in pursuance of the *synedrion*'s decision...”

willing to stand trial in Eresos in 324/323 (A3, ll.33–41 [*GHI* 83 §iii]) and sought to return in 319/318 (A4, ll.21–28 [*GHI* 83 §iv]). Their rule could have been benevolent and well-supported; they were confident of a fair trial, see Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1) 197.

⁵⁰ Usteri, *Verbannung* (n. 20) 45–52; Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 93 (without reference).

⁵¹ Or, ‘the Thebans who had fled’.

According to Diodorus, after the capture of Thebes, Alexander passed judgment to the συνέδριον of the League which voted to raze the city, sell the captives into slavery, make the Thebans exiles ἀγώγμοι from all the cities of the League, and forbid anyone from giving them shelter.⁵² Besides a passing reference in Heisserer, the appearance of ἀγώγμοι in documents pertaining to Alexander and the League's actions at Thebes, Eresos, and Chios in 335/334 has received scant attention, but it is important for Alexander's relationship with the League of Corinth.⁵³

The δόγμα on medism, to which Diodorus refers, was likely resolved by the συνέδριον when the war against Persia was announced.⁵⁴ It was cited by Alexander throughout his Asian campaign and gave him wide-ranging powers as ἡγεμών to punish as a traitor any individual, group, or city that he felt assisted the Persians. Fugitives and exiles were made ἀγώγμοι from all member states. In 334 Alexander punished the Greek mercenaries who fought with the Persians at battle of Granikos because they had fought "contrary to the resolutions made in common (τὰ κοινῇ δόξαντα) by the Greeks" and in 330 he threatened to punish Darius' Greek mercenaries because "they fought against Greece with the barbarians contrary to the resolutions (δόγματα) of the Greeks" (Arr. *Anab.* 1.16.6, 3.23.8, 24.5).⁵⁵ In contrast, he released an embassy that Sinope had sent to Darius since "the Sinopeans were not members of the Greek league (τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων) and since they were subject to the Persians they did not seem to act unreasonably by sending ambassadors to their own king" (Arr. *Anab.* 3.24.4).⁵⁶

Alexander used this δόγμα to remove from Eresos a government that had been recognised by Philip, had been loyal to Macedon from 336–334, and was a member of the League of Corinth. This was, as Ps.-Demosthenes pointed out, unconstitutional, but Alexander's actions need to be interpreted in the wider context of his promotion of democracy in Asia Minor. After the democratic uprising in Ephesus in 334 Alexander sent a 'Liberation Decree' to the cities of Ionia and Aiolis promoting democracy as pro-Macedonian and demonising oligarchy/tyranny as pro-Persian (Arr. *Anab.* 1.18.1–2).⁵⁷

⁵² Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 89–90 does not think that this was a meeting of the League συνέδριον — Arrian (*Anab.* 1.9.9) says that Alexander passed judgement to τοῖς δὲ μετασχούσι τοῦ ἔργου ξυμμάχοις; cf. J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus I*, Gotha 1877, 140 n. 1.

⁵³ Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 93. Haussoullier, *Rescrit* (n. 48) 188 and Lehmann, *Eresos* (n. 3) 43–44, citing A1, ll.35–38 (*GHI* 83 §vi), argued that the decision to make the exiles ἀγώγμοι was Eresos' own.

⁵⁴ J. Kaerst, *Der Korinthische Bund*, RhM 52 (1897) 523 n. 1; Stylianou, *Pax Macedonica* (n. 25) 9. Haussoullier, *Rescrit* (n. 48) 188 connected the δόγμα with the clause cited at Ps.-Dem. 17.10.

⁵⁵ The trials ἐπὶ βαρβαρισμῶι on Chios in 334 were state-run but were similarly motivated, see Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 106–111; *GHI* 84b. Alexander also threatened to punish Lampsakos (Paus. 6.18.2–4; cf. Val. Max. 7.3 ext. 4; Bosworth, *Commentary* [n. 6] 107–108) and Zeleia (Arr. *Anab.* 1.17.2; Bosworth, *Commentary* [n. 6] 127–128) for having sided with the Persians but there is no evidence that he invoked the δόγμα on medism.

⁵⁶ For discussion, see Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 353.

⁵⁷ Badian, *Alexander* (n. 25) 45–46; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 37–38.

Ἀλκίμαχον δὲ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέους ἐπὶ τὰς Αἰολίδας τε πόλεις ζὺν δυνάμει οὐκ ἔλάττονι ἐξέπεμψε καὶ ὅσαι Ἴωνικαὶ 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.

“Alexander sent Alkimachos, son of Agathokles, with no less a force to the Aiolic cities and however many of the Ionian cities remained under Persian control. He ordered that the oligarchies everywhere should be overthrown, democracies established and cities restored to the own laws, and remit however much of the tribute (*phoros*) they paid to the Persians.”

Alexander and Philip supported whichever regime was most loyal to Macedon. In Greece that was oligarchy, in Asia Minor it was democracy.⁵⁸ Both regions could be treated differently. The cities of mainland Greece were members of the League of Corinth and Alexander was their ἡγεμών, the cities of Asia Minor were not members of the League and Alexander was their liberator and ruler.

The situation in the Aegean was trickier. Unlike the cities of mainland Greece, the Aegean islands were the front line of the war against Persia during the years 334–332. They were members of the League of Corinth, but they experienced the close hand of wartime control unfelt on the mainland. Furthermore, they were also subject to Alexander’s Liberation Decree of 334, a unilateral declaration made by Alexander as king, not ἡγεμών. This is where the events at Eresos fit in. Eresos had joined the League under the Old Tyrants in 337/336 and they had remained loyal to Macedon from 337 to 334. Were Alexander to expel the tyrants he would be acting consistent with his promise to remove tyrannies and install democracies in Ionia and Aiolis, but illegally in regards his commitment to a League member. Were he to support the tyrants, he would be fulfilling his obligations as ἡγεμών of the League, but acting inconsistently in imposing democracies in some cities but leaving existing tyrannies in charge of others. In the end, motivated by the massive public support for democracy seen in Ephesos, Chios, and elsewhere, the tyrants of Eresos had to go, despite their earlier loyalty to Macedon.

Scholarship has tended to focus on the extent rather than the practice of League membership, particularly the question of whether or not the cities of Asia Minor were members of the League.⁵⁹ The islands of the eastern Aegean, however, present a more

⁵⁸ Ps.-Dem. 17 *passim*; E. Poddighe, *Una possibile identificazione del paidotriba di Sicione: Ps. Dem. XVII, 16*, QS 59 (2004) 183–196; Wallace, *Alexander* (n. 25) §1–2.

⁵⁹ Members: Badian, *Alexander* (n. 25) 51–53; Stylianou, *Pax Macedonica* (n. 25). Not Members: V. Ehrenberg, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks*, Oxford 1938, 13–16 (Ehrenberg argues unconvincingly that the islands were not members of the League); S. M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Archives: The Edict of Alexander to Priene: A Reappraisal*, JHS 105 (1985) 84–85; Hammond in Hammond, Walbank, *Macedonia* (n. 27) 75–76; Bosworth, *Conquest* (n. 13) 251, 255–256. For discussion, see J. Seibert, *Alexander der Große*, Darmstadt 1972, 85–90; most recently, M. Kholod, *Arr. Ind. 18. 3–8 and the Question of the Enrolment of the Greek Cities of Asia Minor in the Corinthian League*, in: M. Kholod, A. A. Sinityn (eds.), *KOINON ΔΩΠΟΝ*:

interesting problem. They were members of the League of Corinth but they were also subject to Alexander's unilateral Freedom Decree in 334. This was, in theory, incompatible with their status as members of the League of Corinth but, in practice, the tyrants of Eresos and Chios were expelled according to the terms of the League δόγμα on medism. When dealing with the Aegean cities, Alexander's roles as ἡγεμών and βασιλεύς overlapped.

The rescript shows the power that the ἡγεμών could exercise. The founding charter of the League of Corinth does not survive so little is known about the degree of Alexander's authority as ἡγεμών.⁶⁰ It is a safe assumption that he had broadly defined and wide-ranging on-the-spot powers — it would simply not have been practical to refer to the συνέδριον continually during wartime.⁶¹ The examples of Chios and Eresos show that Alexander was able to deal with League members directly as ἡγεμών and implement the terms of League δόγματα; the συνέδριον was only used as the instrument of punishment.⁶² At Eresos Alexander imposed democracy on a League member in 334 and used — one might say abused — the δόγμα on medism and the office of ἡγεμών to justify this. This is in contrast with his actions in 332 when tyrants such as Agonippos and Eurysilaos of Eresos were returned to their native cities for prosecution. Exiling the Old Tyrants in 334 ensured the consistent application of his Freedom Decree in Asia Minor, authorising this through the League δόγμα on medism maintained the ostensible legality of the situation. Only with League members such as Eresos and Chios did Alexander need to invoke the δόγμα on medism; elsewhere he could simply install democracies as king and conqueror. However, Alexander left himself open to the charge of hypocrisy, and Ps.-Demosthenes criticised him for supporting tyrants in Greece but expelling them from Eresos.

Lott's chronology of the two tyrannies at Eresos, coupled with the evidence of the rescript of Philip III, calls for a reconsideration of the events of the years 336–334 in the Aegean. Based on the evidence from Ephesos it has been widely assumed that pro-Macedonian democracies were installed in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands in 336 and that the years 336–334 saw the same annual cycle of pro-Macedonian democracies and pro-Persian tyrannies as the years 334–332. Numerous scholars have cautioned against this assumption; spontaneous democratic revolts like that seen in Ephesos might

Studies and Essays in Honour of Valery P. Nikonorov on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday, St. Petersburg 2013, 479–482.

⁶⁰ The surviving portions of the charter of Antigonos and Demetrios' Hellenic League of 302 do not refer to the office of ἡγεμών (*IG IV*², 1 68). C. C. Patsavos, *A Comparison of the Hellenic Leagues of Philip II and Demetrius I of Macedonia*, Ann Arbor 1983, compares the offices and institutions of the League of Corinth of 336–323 and the Hellenic League of 302/301.

⁶¹ Badian, *Alexander* (n. 25) 38–39; Stylianou, *Pax Macedonica* (n. 25) 36; Poddighe, *Alexander* (n. 32) 103 with n. 17. On the institutions of the League, see Griffith in: Hammond, *Macedonia* (n. 30) 634–646; Stylianou, *Pax Macedonica* (n. 25) 1–20, 33–48.

⁶² Bosworth, *Conquest* (n. 13) 193–194.

not have been all that common in 334.⁶³ Alexander dispatched Alkimachos with military support after the revolt in Ephesos, implying that democracies would be forcibly installed if needs be. The quick shift to pro-Persian tyrannies in 333 suggests that the Aegean islands were divided and that many tyrants enjoyed wide support.

If Eresos was under the control of pro-Macedonian tyrants from 337/336–334 then it is very possible that other Aegean cities were too. We first read of Mytilene and Tenedos in the literary sources when they were betrayed to Memnon in 333 (they had been democratic members of the League of Corinth in 334).⁶⁴ These democracies were probably installed by Alexander in 334 as part of his Freedom Decree, but there is nothing against the possibility that, like Eresos, both cities had been governed since 337/336 by pro-Macedonian tyrannies recognised by the League of Corinth. Kos first appears in the literary sources in 332 (it had been under the control of a pro-Persian tyranny in 333) but we do not know what types of regimes were in control from 337/336–333.⁶⁵ A series of annual changes between pro-Macedonian democracies and pro-Persian oligarchies should not simply be assumed. Chios first appears in literary sources when it came over to the Macedonian side through treachery in 334 (Arr. *Anab.* 2.1.1), but Alexander's Letter to Chios shows that pro-Persian partisans had also betrayed the city to Persia in 335 (*GHI* 84a). It is generally assumed that the pro-Macedonian government overthrown in 335 was a democracy, but Bosworth has suggested that an existing oligarchy could have sided with Philip in c.340 and then joined the League of Corinth.⁶⁶ The example of Eresos could be used to support this theory. We cannot know for certain what happened in cities for which we have little or no evidence for the years 336–334, but an annual cycle between pro-Macedonian democracies and pro-Persian tyrannies from 336–334 should not simply be assumed. Considering Parmenion's and Memnon's lack of naval power in 336 and 335, as well as Philip's clear preference for oligarchy over democracy, it is very possible that Aegean cities other than Eresos were enrolled in the League under pro-Macedonian tyrannies in 336, some of which, like Eresos, may have lasted until their removal by Alexander as part of his Freedom Decree in 334. Variation in the political organisation of the islands under Philip and Alexander is possible.

5. Polyperchon and Greece

The rescript of Philip III to Eresos also elucidates Polyperchon's actions in Greece in the years 319–317, in particular the Edict of Philip III.⁶⁷ When Antipatros passed

⁶³ Badian, *Alexander* (n. 25) 40; Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 178–179; *Conquest* (n. 13) 192; Rosen, *Review* (n. 21) 355–356; Lott, *Eresos* (n. 4) 34–35; Poddighe, *Alexander* (n. 32) 110–112.

⁶⁴ Arr. *Anab.* 2.1.1–5, 2.1–3, 3.2.6; Curt. 4.8.13.

⁶⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 3.2.6–7.

⁶⁶ Bosworth, *Commentary* (n. 6) 178; *Conquest* (n. 13) 192.

⁶⁷ On the Edict, see most recently E. Poddighe, *Propaganda Strategies and Political Documents. Philip III's Diagramma and the Greeks in 319 B.C.*, in: V. Alonso Troncoso, E. Anson (eds.), *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi (323–281 B.C.)*, Oxford 2013, 225–240.

control of the regency of Philip III and Alexander IV to Polyperchon in autumn 319, his overlooked son Kassandros made war on Polyperchon. Hoping to undermine Kassandros' position, Polyperchon dispatched a royal edict to the Greek cities in autumn 319 nullifying the changes made by Antipater during his governorship of Europe and restoring Macedon's relationship with the Greek cities to what it had been under Philip and Alexander. By "providing for you peace and the governments that were in place under Philip and Alexander", the Edict commanded the Greeks "to act in other matters according to the edicts earlier issued by them" (Diod. 18.56.3). This reconstituted the political situation that had existed under the League of Corinth without recreating the συνέδριον itself.⁶⁸ Polyperchon hoped to motivate the democratic factions in the Greek cities to overthrow the oligarchies and garrisons that had been installed by Antipater and on which Kassandros now relied. A general amnesty was also granted to all those exiled by Antipater "from the time when Alexander crossed over into Asia" (Diod. 18.56.4). The problem of contradictory decrees by Philip and Alexander was provided for (Diod. 18.56.6):

εἰ δέ τινα τῶν πολιτευμάτων Φίλιππος ἢ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀπέδειξαν ἑαυτοῖς ὑπεναντία, παραγινέσθωσαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα διορθωσάμενοι τὰ συμφέροντα καὶ ἡμῖν καὶ ταῖς πόλεσι πράττωσιν.

"If either Philip or Alexander produced regulations that contradicted each other, let them be brought before us, in order that having reconciled them they shall be advantageous to both us and the cities."

Eresos was just such a case. Philip enrolled the Old Tyrants into the League in 337/336, Alexander expelled them in 334. The Old Tyrants were treated different by successive ἡγεμόνες so their descendants sought clarification from Philip III in 319/318. They were not eligible for restoration under the terms of the edict, however, which only offered restoration to "those banished or exiled from the cities by our generals from the time when Alexander crossed over into Asia" (Diod. 18.56.4).⁶⁹ Nonetheless, as with Alexander's Exiles Decree of 324, a case could be made. In spring 318 the Athenians sent two embassies to the royal court at Pharygai in Phokis to discuss the implementation of the terms of the Edict (Plut. *Phoc.* 33). An embassy from Eresos

⁶⁸ For discussion and debate on whether this constituted a full renewal of the League of Corinth, see J. A. O. Larsen, *Representative Government in the pan-Hellenic Leagues II*, CPh 21 (1926) 65–66; Ehrenberg, *Alexander* (n. 59) 42–43; K. Rosen, *Political Documents in Hieronymus of Cardia (323–302 BC)*, AClass 10 (1967) 64–68; Stylianou, *Pax Macedonica* (n. 25) 49–50; E. Poddighe, *Il diagramma di Poliperconte e la politica in Grecia nell'anno 319/8 a.C. Il contributo delle iscrizioni*, Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Cagliari 16 [53] (1998) [1999] 37–39; *Nel Segno di Antipatro. L'eclissi della Democrazia ateniese dal 323/2 al 319/8 a.C.*, Roma 2002, 171–190; *Propaganda* (n. 67) 233; M. D. Dixon, *Corinth, Greek Freedom, and the Diadochoi*, in: W. Heckel, L. Tritle, P. V. Wheatley (eds.), *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, California 2007, 159–161.

⁶⁹ Bosworth, *Conquest* (n. 13) 224.

is also possible, the result of which might be the rescript.⁷⁰ The descendents of the Old Tyrants will have cited their membership of the League under Philip, the *demos* will have cited Alexander's expulsion of the Old Tyrants. As with Athens' control of Samos (Diod. 18.56.7), Philip III showed a willingness to review and renegotiate Philip's and Alexander's decisions. Philip III modified Alexander's earlier decision, rejecting both the *demos*' request to make the exiled tyrants ἀγώγμοι and the tyrants' request to return. A middle ground was found: the tyrants were to remain exiles but they were no longer to be ἀγώγμοι.

The rescript also reveals the afterlife of the League of Corinth. In particular, it shows that the League δόγμα on medism survived the end of the League itself. We do not know how the League of Corinth came to an end, but it is assumed that it simply petered out during the course of Alexander's life.⁷¹ Nonetheless, its δόγματα still had some force after his death and Philip III felt it necessary to invalidate officially the δόγμα that made the Old Tyrants of Eresos and their descendents ἀγώγμοι. It is doubtful that they were still ἀγώγμοι in any real sense by 319/318 — how could they when the League and its συνέδριον had ceased to exist? — but Eresos evidently called for the terms of their exile to be enforced. The δόγμα still had enough weight in 319/318 that official cancellation of the ἀγώγμοι clause was necessary and to some degree meaningful. The rescript mentions neither the League nor the δόγμα on medism. Perhaps what Alexander had ordered as ἡγεμών in 334 had by 319/318 been ascribed to Alexander as βασιλεύς, in which case the descendents of the Old Tyrants remained ἀγώγμοι until 319/318 because they had been made so by Alexander, not the now defunct League. We might posit a shift, conscious or otherwise, in the perception of authority over time whereby decisions originally taken by Alexander as ἡγεμών, based on the authority of the League, became reattributed to Alexander as βασιλεύς and were imbued with the same legitimacy as other Argead royal edicts. The League died, but the decisions of its ἡγεμών lived on.

The rescript also shows that Philip III acted unilaterally in his dealings with Eresos. This is not unusual in and of itself, but it is out of place within the Tyrants Dossier. Alexander twice deferred authority to Eresos regarding Agonippos and Eurysilaos in

⁷⁰ Agonippos' request to return in 324 was a chance at reinstatement and Eresos sent an embassy to counter his charges before Alexander (A. Cassayre, *La justice dans les cités grecques: de la formation des royaumes hellénistiques au legs d'Attale*, Rennes 2010, 484–487). The situation must have been the same in 319/318 under Philip III and in 306–301 under Antigonos, see Ellis-Evans, *Dossier* (n. 1) 193–196.

⁷¹ Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 226–229. There are few references to the League after 332. It awarded Alexander a crown after the battle of Issus (Diod. 17.48.6); it tried the Spartans after the revolt of Agis III in 331 (Curt. 6.1.19–20, 7.4.32; Diod. 17.73.5–6; Aesch. 3.133); its troops were disbanded in 330 (Arr. *Anab.* 3.19.6); membership was still of concern to Alexander in 330 (Arr. *Anab.* 3.24.4–5); Kallisthenes was apparently to be tried ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ...παρόντος Ἀριστοτέλους in 327 (Plut. *Alex.* 55.5). Heisserer, *Alexander* (n. 1) 73–75 suggests that Diog. Laert. 5.37 refers to the difficulties in convening meeting of the συνέδριον in 324. The arbitration between Kimolos and Melos (*IG XII* (3) 1259, ll.3–5 [*GHI* 82]), κατὰ τὸ δόκημα τοῦ συνεδρίου τῶν Ἑλλάνων, is undated.

334 and the descendents of the Old Tyrants in 324. Antigonos Monophthalmos did the same in 306–301 with the sons of Agonippos. The rescript of Philip III displays a degree of centralised royal authority that Alexander and Antigonos had apparently been unwilling to exercise.⁷²

Conclusion

This article has argued for the importance of a single word in an obscure letter in a large epigraphic dossier, but the argument has wide-ranging implications. The presence of the term ἀγώγιμοι in the rescript of Philip III to Eresos is important for a number of reasons. First, it shows that Bert Lott's chronology of two tyrannies at Eresos is correct. It is the only reconstruction to integrate and explain all the available evidence. Heisserer's reconstruction, which is the *communis opinio*, must be rejected. This calls for a reassessment of the events of the years 337/336–334/333.

Second, the rescript shows how Alexander balanced his roles as βασιλεύς and ἡγεμών. The Aegean islands were where these roles overlapped; states such as Eresos were members of the League of Corinth but they were also subject to the Freedom Decree of 334. By expelling the Old Tyrants in 334 in accordance with the Freedom Decree, Alexander was practicing regime change, forcing a loyal League member to change its government to fit with his wishes. The appearance of the term ἀγώγιμοι in the rescript of Philip III shows that Alexander exiled the Old Tyrants of Eresos according to the terms of the League δόγμα on medism; Eresos is an important case study of Alexander's authority as ἡγεμών and the wartime operation of the League. Further, we should not assume that all cities saw the same cycle of pro-Macedonian democracies and pro-Persian tyrannies that Heisserer has argued for. States such as Tenedos, Mytilene, Chios, and Kos may also have joined the League in 337/336 under pro-Macedonian tyrannies.

Third, the rescript provides insight into Polyperchon's actions in Greece in 319/318 and how the terms of the Edict of Philip III were put into practice. Philip III's decision not to treat the descendents of the Old Tyrants as ἀγώγιμοι reveals the continued importance of Alexander's decisions after his death and Philip III's (Polyperchon's?) willingness to reassess them.

The Letter of Philip-Arrhidaios is an important document for early Hellenistic history and it merits greater attention than it has hitherto received.

Department of Classics
Trinity College Dublin
Dublin 2, Ireland
SWALLACE@tcd.ie

Shane Wallace

⁷² Koch, *Tyrannis* (n. 2) 211–212.



Zu S. Wallace, S. 244

Ellis-Evans A4, ll.21–28 (*GHI* 83 §iv). Squeeze of Charles Newton (1852)
(digitised by the Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, University of Oxford)