

STRATOKLES OF DIOMEIA AND PARTY POLITICS IN EARLY HELLENISTIC ATHENS*

By Nino Luraghi

Summary: This paper discusses the political activity of Stratokles of Diomeia, arguing that his frequent characterization as a democrat, or even a radical democrat, results from undue reliance on texts that largely derive from the comic stage, where Stratokles was lampooned as an unprincipled demagogue. In spite of this characterization, in terms of Athenian inner politics Stratokles' sympathies may have been somewhat conservative. This case study suggests general skepticism towards the use of labels such as 'democrat', 'radical democrat' and such like for individual politicians or political groupings in the period in question.

This study questions the way Athenian politics in the decades after the death of Alexander the Great is usually presented in modern scholarship. The political profile of Stratokles of Diomeia is taken as a test case in an attempt to show that the use of pre-conceived, and somewhat ill-defined, labels for individual politicians as well as for political factions – some would say parties – has sometimes prevented scholars from devoting real attention to the evidence for the actions of the politicians in question. The case of Stratokles is complicated, but also made much more interesting, by the nature of the lit-

* I wrote this article as a fellow of the Kulturwissenschaftliches Kolleg of Konstanz University in 2013/14. I wish to express my gratitude to the colleagues in Konstanz for inviting me, and to the staff of the Kolleg for making it such a congenial workplace. Mirko Canavaro (Edinburgh) and Stephen Tracy (IAS) read earlier versions of this study and offered precious criticism and suggestions. Stephen Lambert (Cardiff) commented with his matchless competence on various aspects of the deliberative procedures documented in Stratokles' decrees. I thankfully acknowledge their contribution.

tle literary evidence on him: here, it will be argued that consideration of generic conventions and ideological idioms could lead to a different and more convincing interpretation of the texts concerning this most elusive politician.¹ Accordingly, the present note will start with a few remarks on the party-politics approach to late fourth-century Athens and move from there to a brief scrutiny of the evidence on which the political characterization of Stratokles is based. Finally, the posthumous honorary decree for Lykourgos of Boutadai will be considered in its implications for Stratokles' political alignments, with a side-glance, so to speak, at the decree granting highest honours to Philippides of Paiania, Stratokles' last known political act. A concise conclusion will round off the whole. But first, a few words on Stratokles' biography and political activity are in order.

Hailing from the (probably small) city deme of Diomeia, Stratokles was born in all likelihood soon after 356. His father Euthydemos and his grandfather Stratokles are both known for having been trierarchs and syntrierarchs multiple times: obviously, the family was affluent, but there is no evidence of political prominence.² Stratokles made his first documented appearance on the Athenian political stage on the occasion of the trial of Demosthenes in relation to the Harpalos scandal, a trial that took place in March 323 or

1 For a sympathetic reassessment of Stratokles, see Bayliss 2011: 152-86; his focus and conclusions differ from, but are not incompatible with, what the reader will find in the present contribution, and his overview of scholarly opinion on Stratokles is illuminating. Embedded in Paschidis 2008: 78-106 is the most detailed reconstruction of Stratokles' career available to date.

2 For the epigraphic evidence on Stratokles' family, see Davies 1971: 494-95. Note Demosthenes' favorable remark on Euthydemos' performance as a trierarch, Dem. 21.165. The identification of Stratokles with the Athenian Stratokles who won the pentathlon of the *paidēs* at the Great Amphiaraia of Oropos (Petraikos *EOrop* 520, which supersedes *IG* VII 414 + *SEG* 1.126) is impossible in light of the date of 329/8 or thereafter for this document suggested by Knoepfler 1993, accepted by Petraikos (and see Knoepfler 2001a: 367-89 for a demonstration of Knoepfler's thesis that the Athenians were granted Oropos by Alexander in 335, not by Philip in 338, which is the basis for his revision of the chronology of our inscription; the new date seems to be on its way to becoming a *communis opinio*, see Habicht 2006: 291-92).

soon thereafter. Stratokles was the first to speak among the accusers, which is rather remarkable.³ The roster of the prosecutors included prominent anti-Macedonian politicians such as Hypereides and Himeraios, and accordingly, the presence of Stratokles on the panel may be an indication of his political sympathies.⁴ A rather suspicious anecdote that features Stratokles deceiving the Athenians about the outcome of the battle of Amorgos may imply that he supported the revolt against Macedon in 323.⁵ In the years that followed, Stratokles is conspicuous by his absence. As far as we know, he was not among the politicians who were persecuted when Athens capitulated in September 322, nor do we hear anything about him during the democratic interlude that followed the death of Antipatros, or during the *dekaetia* of Demetrios of Phaleron.

We meet Stratokles again after Demetrios Poliorketes ousted Demetrios of Phaleron from Athens and the garrison of Kassandros from Mounychia, in the early summer of 307. According to Plutarch and Diodoros, Stratokles

- 3 Din. 1.1 and 1.20-1 refer to Stratokles' speech as having been already delivered; from Phot. *Bibl. Cod.* 250, 447a (in the course of an extended report of book 5 of Agatharchides' *On the Red Sea*, from what looks like a digression on how to convey impressively the destruction of a city, taking as examples Olynthos and Thebes, see 445b), it can be inferred that Stratokles, like Deinarchos (1.18-27) and before them Aischines (3.240), blamed Demosthenes for the destruction of Thebes. On the participation of Stratokles in the trial, see Bayliss 2011: 154-55. For the likely date of the trial, see Badian 1961: 43.
- 4 On this, see below, keeping in mind Ernst Badian's word of caution on the difficulty of connecting together the group of the accusers, or for that matter, that of the accused, in this trial (Badian 1961: 32). It is difficult to resist the impression that personal competition among leading politicians played as important a role as agreement or disagreement on larger political issues.
- 5 Plut. *Dem.* 11.4-5 (briefly repeated in *Prae.ger.reip.* 799 F), which Bayliss 2011: 158-59 tries to rationalize with helpful *comparanda*, especially the case of Agesilaos concealing the news of the Spartan defeat at Knidos and offering instead sacrifices for the good tidings, in order to fire up his soldiers for the upcoming battle of Koroneia (see esp. Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.10-14, an eyewitness account); one wonders, though, if it is really plausible that Stratokles knew about the outcome of the battle of Amorgos two (or even three, in the version of the *Praecepta*) days before everybody else in Athens, as the anecdote requires. Since the terminology used in the story implies a decree proposed by Stratokles and passed by the assembly, one rather wonders if the Athenians may not have indeed received (false) advance notice of a victory and jumped the gun in deciding on the celebrations, only to be disappointed later (but hardly two or three days later) by the true report.

proposed a set of extravagant honors for Antigonos and Demetrios, as liberators of Athens. The honours included two golden crowns,⁶ the creation of two new tribes named after the two of them, which brought the membership of the council from 500 to 600, the weaving of their images on the peplos presented to Athena at the Panathenaia, the institution of a cult for Antigonos and Demetrios as theoi soteres, with a yearly festival including procession, competitions, and sacrifices; gilded statues of Antigonos and Demetrios on a chariot were also erected in the agora close to those of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, a location that was usually explicitly forbidden.⁷ The way that both Plutarch and, even more clearly, Diodoros (20.46.2) refer to these honours shows that they were comprised in a decree presented by Stratokles which may be dated either to the last month of 308/7 or, much more likely, to the beginning of 307/6.⁸

This very visible action is the prelude to years of intense presence of Stratokles in the Athenian epigraphic record. By a recent count, he is documented to have proposed 28 decrees, all, with one or two exceptions, between 307/6 and 301/0, to which one should of course add possibly four or five more, documented in Plutarch's *Life of Demetrios* and in Diodoros.⁹

6 On the crowns and their value, set by Diodoros at an incredible 200 talents each, see Mikalson 1998: 79-80.

7 The classic treatment of the honors granted to Antigonos and Demetrios is Habicht 1970: 44-55. See also Mikalson 1998: 79-85.

8 Philochoros 328 F 66 dates the destruction of Mounychia to the archonship of Anaxikrates, 307/6, while the Marmor Parium (*IG XII 5.444.121-6*) has the expulsion of Demetrios of Phaleron under the archon Kairimos (308/7) and the destruction of Mounychia under Anaxikrates. Plutarch *Dem.* 10.1 narrates the restitution of the *patrios politeia* by Demetrios and the corresponding honors by the Athenians after the destruction of Mounychia. Overall, it seems much likelier that Stratokles' decree belongs early in 307/6, especially since in that year Stratokles was a member of the boule, as shown by *IG II².456* (and also 455 + *SEG 21.327*, which however is heavily integrated). Prescripts of decrees show that 307/6 was a year of transition: two documents still refer to the council as having 500 members (*IG II².466*, line 45 and *IG II².456* frg. b line 16 with Wilhelm 1939: 348, dating to the sixth prytany of the year), but on the other hand, another document is dated to the seventh prytany of the Antigonis tribe (*IG II².458* as presented in Agora 16.171): unsurprisingly, the tribal reform took some months to be implemented. Concise discussion of the resulting calendric problems by G. Woodhead, *Agora* 16: 168-71 with references.

9 See Tracy 2000: 228 n. 15, updating the lists of Dinsmoor 1931: 13-14 and Habicht 1977: 39 n. 15. *IG II².470* should probably be added, see Wilhelm 1939: 349. None of the lists

Apart from testifying to his activism, and of course to his connection to Demetrios, not all of these documents shed any specific light on Stratokles' political sympathies. From this point of view, the most telling of them is probably the decree posthumously awarding the highest honors to Lykourgos of Boutadai, the famous politician of the previous generation. This document, together with another highest honors decree proposed by Stratokles in 293/2, will be discussed in more detail later. Of the remaining documents, no fewer than eleven are decrees honoring friends of Demetrios Poliorketes, in some cases upon request of the latter.¹⁰ Proposing honours for foreigners, it should be noted, could be an eminently profitable activity. Demosthenes was accused of taking bribes from the honorands, and surely this is the meaning of the famous dictum of Stratokles and Dromokleides,

includes the decrees documented in the literary sources; the list in Paschidis 2008: 80, which does, is marred by various mistakes that make it somewhat less helpful than it might have been (*IG* II².499 and 503 are not included, the date of *IG* II².640 is wrong, etc; cf. Paschidis 2008: 103 and n. 7, 103-4 n. 1 and n. 2 for the missing texts and correct dates).

- 10 The decrees are *SEG* 31.80 (307/6, for Philippos and Iolaos, former guards of Alexander; the date results from the fact that Antigonos and Demetrios appear without the royal title, on which see Habicht 2006: 426 n. 31, and the decree is probouleumatic and must therefore belong to a year in which Stratokles was a member of the boule), *IG* II².471 (306/5, 10th prytany, for the *oikeioi* of Lykiskos), *IG* II².469 (306/5, for an officer of Demetrios whose name ended in *-otimos*), *IG* II².559+568 (date uncertain but non ante 306/5, if the emendations in line 9 are correct, for Philippos, son of Menelaos, Macedonian; for the name, see *SEG* 32.101b), *IG* II².486 (304/3, last assembly of the 12th prytany, for Eupolis, motivated by a message from Demetrios), *SEG* 36.164 (same day and same text as the previous one, for Sotimos of Kyrene; note that the very fragmentary decree published in Pritchett 1972: 170 could have an identical text, too – except presumably for the name of the honorand), *SEG* 16.58 (same day as the preceding, but different text; only three letters of the name of the beneficiary are preserved), Bielman 2004: no. 13 (303/2, for Apollonides of Kyzikos), *IG* II².495 (303/2, last day of the year, for Alkaios of Ainos), *IG* II².496+507 (same day and same text as the previous one, for Solon of Bargyilia; Agora XVI.117, whose text overlaps with lines 23 ff of the decree for Alkaios, is probably a third document of the same nature, passed on the same day), *IG* II².560 (uncertain date, between 306/5 and 302/1). Add to the list Dow 1933: 416 (306/5, possibly passed on the same day as *IG* II².471), if Habicht 1977 is right in supposing that Stratokles was the proponent. The decree moved by Stratokles conferring citizenship on a Troizenian, mentioned retrospectively in *IG* II².971 (best consulted as Osborne D 102, with a very helpful commentary), probably belongs to the years after 303; nothing can be said about the motives, but see Muccioli 2008: 129-31.

who called the orator's tribune 'the golden harvest'.¹¹ Documents of a more clearly political interest include decrees honoring the Kolophonians and their ambassadors to Athens (fifth prytany of 307/6) and ambassadors from Priene respectively – in at least one of these cases, the diplomatic exchange had concrete political consequences in the form of support for Athens in the war against Kassandros the following year.¹² Of six decrees we have only the very first lines, so we can date them and attribute them to Stratokles, but have no idea what their content was.¹³

The literary sources have preserved the memory of four (or possibly five) further decrees of Stratokles. Apart from the first decree, already mentioned, which granted a comprehensive package of honours to Antigonos and Demetrios, Stratokles is said by Plutarch to have moved, probably during the fall or winter of 304/3, that any wish of Demetrios be considered religiously unobjectionable and lawful.¹⁴ During the spring of 303, one or two decrees renamed the month of Mounychion first as Anthesterion and then as Boëdromion so that Demetrios could undergo the Eleusinian initiation without having to wait for the normal dates of the religious calendar.¹⁵ Fi-

- 11 Demosthenes bribed for proposing honorific decrees: Din. 1.41 and Hyper. 1.xxv. Golden harvest: Plut. *Prae.ger.reip.* 798 E.
- 12 These measures fit into a broader picture of renewed relations between Athens and the *poleis* of Asia Minor and the islanders in conjunction with Demetrios' arrival in Greece, see Reger 1992: 366-68 and Habicht 2006: 87. The two decrees proposed by Stratokles are *IG* II².456 (Kolophonians, prelude to support provided by the Kolophonians in the war against Kassandros and recorded in *IG* II².470, dating to the 7th prytany of 306/5; on the whole dossier see Wilhelm 1939: 345-52) and *SEG* 3.86 (ambassadors from Priene, 10th prytany of 307/6; see also *IG* II².566 and Wilhelm 1942: 166-75). The very fragmentary decree *IG* II².455 (307/6, second prytany, the earliest of Stratokles' decrees preserved on stone; Stratokles' name however is entirely restored, cf. Rhodes 1985: 270) could be of a similar nature, to judge by the few words that have survived; see Paschidis 2008: 82 and n. 2. In *IG* II².460 (307/6, 10th or 12th prytany, cf. *SEG* 21.331), the motivation clause refers to people (honorands?) in the plural.
- 13 Dow 1933: 412 (306/5), Broneer 1932: 45 (302/1, 2nd prytany), *Agora* XVI.110 (date uncertain). Of *IG* II².455, 460 (see above, n. 12), and 640 (301/0, 2nd prytany, the latest of Stratokles' decrees before the isolated one of 293/2), all that can be said is that they may not be honorary decrees for individuals.
- 14 Plut. *Dem.* 24.9-10 with the comments of Bayliss 2011: 167-72.
- 15 Plut. *Dem.* 26; Diod. 20.110.1 does not mention Stratokles as the mover of the decree. See Habicht 1997: 79 and Bayliss 2011: 176-79. For epigraphic evidence of the renaming of the month, see Woodhead 1989: 298-300. The chronology is by and large sorted out

nally, at an unspecified date, Stratokles moved that ambassadors sent to Antigonos and Demetrios be named *theoroi*, like the members of sacred embassies.¹⁶

Some clear patterns emerge from this evidence. In chronological terms, Stratokles' decrees fall into two groups with distinct characteristics, separated by a phase of silence between the summer of 305 and the summer or fall of 304. As Paschidis pointed out, honorary decrees proposed by Stratokles before 305 regularly provide specific information on the benefactions being rewarded. After 304, the honours tend to be motivated by general references to the engagement for freedom and democracy of the honoree, often based on communications to that effect from Demetrios himself.¹⁷ During this second period, honorary decrees were often put before the assembly by Stratokles in one of the last meetings of the year, three or more at a time in the same meeting, partly with identical formulations except of course for the name of the honoree. The assembly – one has the impression – merely rubber-stamped them.¹⁸ As far as we can tell, the end-of-the-year decrees of 304/3 and 303/2 honoured friends of Demetrios with golden crowns and

by Paschidis 2008: 92-93, whose date is here followed. Note however that Paschidis appears to believe that Stratokles' decree changed the name of Mounychion to Anthesterion and that of Thargelion to Boëdromion, whereas Plutarch, followed by Woodhead, says quite clearly that the same month, Mounychion, changed name twice (which may, but does not have to, suggest two successive decrees). Aspects of this rearrangement of the ritual calendar remain obscure: if the Lesser Mysteries really fell on the 20th of the month (references in Parker 2005: 344 n. 72), it would not have been possible to accommodate the Great Mysteries, which started in mid-month, within the same month as the Lesser Mysteries without changing their date. This may be the (unstated, so far as I can see) reason for Paschidis' theory that Boëdromion was in fact put in place of Thargelion.

¹⁶ Plut. *Dem.* 11.1, on which see Bayliss 2011: 162.

¹⁷ See Paschidis 2008: 98-102.

¹⁸ Hansen 1984: 129-30, pointing to a case on the 19 of Elaphebolion of 332/1, suggests that such cases of multiple non-probouleumatic honorific decrees point to the council putting to the assembly an open *probouleuma* to the effect that anybody who wanted to propose honors for extraordinarily deserving foreigners should do so. Note also Hansen 1991: 130, suggesting that grants of citizenship (as most of the honorary decrees for friends of Demetrios proposed by Stratokles appear to have been) were voted on a single meeting, once per prytany. For more specific (and somewhat speculative) thoughts on the meaning of this pattern in the chronology of Stratokles' decrees, see Thonemann 2005: 77-78.

Athenian citizenship. Stratokles acted almost as an Athenian alter ego of the king, making sure that requests the king had addressed to the council were duly approved by the assembly. The closeness of his ties to Poliorketes emphasized by the literary sources, which interpret it in terms of flattery, is proved by his disappearance from the record as soon as Athens deserted Demetrios after Ipsos and by his brief reappearance under Demetrios' new regime, in 293/2, Olympiodoros' second archontal year.¹⁹ Likewise, his phase of silence between 305 and 304 coincides with the high point of Kassandros' pressure on Athens, when the city came under siege while Demetrios was far away earning his nickname around the walls of Rhodes. In these months, his supporters in Athens may well have become somewhat less popular, or at any rate less vocal.²⁰

The lack of evidence for the years before 307 makes it impossible to tell whether Stratokles owed his influence in Athens to his connection with Demetrios or, the other way around, Demetrios chose Stratokles as his go-to Athenian politician because he was aware of the latter's (pre-existing) influence with the Athenians. The first scenario seems more easily reconcilable with the evidence, especially considering the total silence of the sources on Stratokles between 322 and 307, but it has to be said that, on the one hand, we know extremely little on any Athenian politician during the ten years in which Demetrios of Phaleron was in charge of Athens, and that on the other, in the light of the decrees, by 306/5 the association of Stratokles and Demetrios had become so conspicuous that the second scenario would have morphed into the first anyway.

Overall, the epigraphic record taken alone does not allow a very clear picture of Stratokles as an Athenian politician to emerge. Freedom and democracy, typically in association, appear often in the texts of honorific decrees proposed by him, but this does not tell us much about his politics. At least in one case, the words actually belong to the message sent by Demetrios ask-

19 In this year, Stratokles proposed to decree the highest honours for Philippides of Paiania discussed below. It is open to question how prominent Stratokles really was under Demetrios' second regime; see Bayliss 2011: 183-85. The characterization of Stratokles as a flatterer of Demetrios is likely to go back to the work of Demochares, politician, historian, and political enemy of Stratokles, see *FGrH* 75 F 1.

20 This was the time when Athens lost Phyle, Panakton and Salamis, and finally Kassandros' forces breached the very walls of Athens; see Habicht 2006: 92-94 and Paschidis 2008: 90.

ing for the honors to be granted; the two cases where Stratokles himself uses the terms appear to refer to actual participation in the campaigns that brought about the liberation of Athens. In any case, being supporters of freedom and democracy was the formulaic presupposition for being granted honours by the Athenian assembly.²¹ The decrees documented in Plutarch and Diodoros provide the most striking evidence for his connection to Demetrios, and offer a framework in which to interpret the honours for Demetrios' men preserved on stone. The decree for Lykourgos, which might be taken to position Stratokles in relation to known entities of Athenian politics, is not usually discussed in these terms.²² Stratokles' only actions in internal politics that have caught the attention of scholars are the exile of Demochares, probably around 303, allegedly caused by Demochares' too open opposition to Stratokles' flattery of Demetrios, and a possible accusation of subversion leveled at the comic poet Philippides of Kephale, who had attacked Stratokles in a comedy (or just possibly in more than one).²³ By and large, however, Stratokles' characterization as a radical democrat is

21 *SEG* 31.80: Philippos and Iolaos fight for freedom and democracy; *IG* 11².559, 568, Menelaos fights for freedom and democracy (same words, but in both cases largely integrated); 36.164: as per Demetrios' letter, Sotimos of Kyrene is favorably inclined to the freedom of the *demos* and participates in the fight for democracy (*IG* 11².486 appears to have the same text but breaks off before the possible mention of freedom and democracy).

22 Symptomatically, see the guarded statement of Bayliss 2011: 156, to the effect that the decree for Lykourgos 'might indicate where his [i.e. Stratokles'] sympathies lay', all the more significant because it comes from a very detailed and sympathetic treatment of Stratokles.

23 The exile of Demochares is mentioned in Plut. *Dem.* 24.10-11; Bayliss 2011: 172-76 is probably right to stress that Plutarch does not make Stratokles responsible for it (the decree request for Demochares in Ps.-Plut. *Vitae decem oratorum* 851 E is no counterargument: attributing actions motivated by foreign dominators to domestic enemies was standard practice in Athenian decrees of this period), and Demochares' joke – an example of his famous *parrhesia* – was directed at Demetrios, not Stratokles: to say that Stratokles would have been mad not to behave madly is tantamount to saying that one had to do crazy things in order to please Demetrios. Demochares' words may allude to the famous saying of Themistokles (Plut. *Them.* 29.7 and *De exil.* 602 A), which makes one wonder if they may not have been thought out *a posteriori* and inserted in Demochares' own narrative of his exile. On Stratokles and Philippides, see below.

based essentially on the literary evidence of Plutarch.²⁴ Before turning to his text, a few observations on the meaning of such a label are in order.

STRATOKLES AND ATHENIAN POLITICAL PARTIES

The definition ‘radical democrat’ usually applied to Stratokles is a specific case of a more general approach to Athenian party politics in the fourth century that runs through most of modern scholarship on the topic. The roots of such an approach reach back deep into the nineteenth century, and one of their cornerstones is the work of Julius Beloch on Attic politics in the age of Demosthenes and Philip.²⁵ In his footsteps, scholars routinely speak of ‘democrats’, ‘radical democrats’, ‘conservatives’, ‘oligarchs’, and in reference to the late fourth century even of ‘nationalists’. Needless to say, even scholars who use this terminology would not describe such parties along the lines of the political parties of the twentieth century, but the terminology itself implies, at the very least, the existence of political groupings held together by shared views of key political issues of foreign and domestic politics and shared ideological allegiances. Leading politicians are seen as the leaders of such groupings, which are implicitly assumed to have included also citizens who were not personally active in politics.²⁶

24 Muccioli 2008: 123 points to the dominant influence of Plutarch on modern views of Stratokles.

25 See Beloch 1884: 232–50. Influential continuators of Beloch’s approach include Ferguson 1911: 7–14 and especially Tarn 1927: 440 and *passim*.

26 Both Stephen Tracy and the reviewer for the *C&M* have expressed some skepticism as to the accuracy of my characterization of the scholarship on this topic. I would prefer to be persuaded that they are right. The terminology whose use I would like to question appears prominently in the most authoritative recent work on Hellenistic Athens, Habicht 2006; see e.g. 106–7 (oligarchic party), 107 and 158 (radical democrats), 159 (nationalism) and the characterization of Demochares, Phaidros of Sphettos, and Olympiodoros in Habicht 1979: 58–59. Athenian nationalists are omnipresent in Shear 1978, as an electronic word-search easily shows; in Shear 1978: 49 we also meet ‘Stratokles and his party of extreme pro-Demetrian democrats.’ For a recent study that explicitly uses the concept of political party in reference to early Hellenistic Athens, see Landucci Gattinoni 2008: 240–49. As far as I can tell, Sartori 1963: 121 is one of the few scholars who have expressed skepticism towards the use of the word ‘party’ in the framework of Athenian Hellenistic (as opposed to Late Classical) politics.

The validity of this approach for to the fourth century down to Alexander has long since been challenged, and it seems fair to say that nowadays a majority of scholars reject the ‘party approach’ to the political world of Demosthenes, Aischines, Hypereides and contemporaries. Already in 1955, discussing Athenian politics and politicians after the Social War, Raphael Sealey wrote:

In some modern states one may sometimes see election-posters which state the name of the candidate and that of his political party. Such party-names are often such as to indicate very general differences of opinion between the parties. Do those who use very general designations for the parties they discover in ancient Athens suppose that elections there were similar, and that politicians professed allegiance to parties defined by the general principles they allegedly acknowledged, so that (for example) a man seeking election as general might describe himself as ‘the extreme democratic candidate in the tribe Aeantis’?²⁷

This *reductio ad absurdum* brings to light the almost inevitable risk of anachronism implied in using party terminology in reference to ancient Athens: even though presumably no scholar would subscribe to the paradoxical picture envisioned by Sealey, the simple use of the term carries with itself implications that clearly do not apply to this historical context. Sealey’s article announced a revision of the whole idea of political parties in Athens, based partly on the lack of evidence for their existence and partly on the fact that the practice of the Athenian democracy did not allow for the emergence of this kind of political configuration – most crucially, what did not exist in ancient Athens was the party-member, the intermediary between the active politician and the passive voter.²⁸ In the words of Moses Finley, Athenian politicians

27 Sealey 1955: 80.

28 On this point, see especially Hansen 1987: 81-83 and the comprehensive discussion in Hansen 1991: 277-87. Among the earlier bibliography, see also Perlman 1963, a very influential study that continued Sealey’s approach, and Sealey 1956. Mitchel 1970: 10-27 extends this kind of approach to the years after Chaironeia, when Athenian politics was dominated by Lykourgos.

...walked alone. They had their lieutenants, of course, and politicians made alliances with each other. But these were fundamentally personal links, shifting frequently, useful in helping to carry through a particular measure or even a group of measures, but lacking that quality of support, that buttressing or cushioning effect, which is provided by a bureaucracy and political party...²⁹

Alliances between political leaders pivoting around key issues, such as the attitude to Sparta, Thebes, or Macedon, did not as a rule prevent the same leaders from attacking each other when the occasion presented itself: the paths taken by several Athenian politicians in the Harpalos scandal are extremely instructive.³⁰

The revision that has affected the Athens of Demosthenes, however, scarcely extends to the years after his death. For early Hellenistic Athens, the work of Beloch's pupil Gaetano De Sanctis and of his own pupils, especially Piero Treves and to a lesser extent Arnaldo Momigliano, consolidated the party-based approach. De Sanctis' early work conceptualized Athenian politics with references to 'democratic', 'republican', and 'oligarchic' parties, while Treves in *Demostene e la libertà greca*, an intensely political book, made use, probably consciously and intentionally, of terms such as 'right', 'left' and 'extreme left'.³¹ The epigraphic turn in the history of early Hellenistic Athens, associated especially with the work of Christian Habicht, has had the effect of focusing scholarly attention towards issues of a different nature, allowing this view of politics in Athens after Alexander to stand unchallenged and continue by inertia, as it were. The results are even more paradoxical, if possible, than those generated by a party-approach to the Athens of Demosthenes. A clear product of the embarrassment generated by this approach is the creation of an Athenian 'nationalist' party, used especially to explain the trajectory of politicians such as Olympiodoros and Phaidros, who went from being supporters of Demetrios Poliorketes to leading the revolt against him. The problems generated by a consistent application of this way of viewing Athenian politics come to the surface when

²⁹ Finley 1962: 15.

³⁰ See Badian 1961: 32-36.

³¹ For examples of this terminology, see De Sanctis 1970: 251, 258, 266-68, 273 (from De Sanctis' dissertation, originally published in 1893) and Treves 1933: 126, 136, 160-61.

scholars have to explain alliances between politicians who used to belong to different parties. Treves' reconstruction of the trajectory of Philippides of Paiania, which ends with the reconciliation between the moderate oligarchic party and the radical democratic party after 295, is a particularly striking example: scholarship has to create complex scenarios to solve problems generated by its own categories.³² The alternative would be to recognize that now, just as in the age of Demosthenes, politicians acted in an essentially opportunistic and context-driven way, ideological allegiances being a rather poor predictor of their actions and consistency functioning as a standard only in a very broad sense. Such an approach clearly fits the evidence with much less effort, and is accordingly preferable.

The definition of Stratokles as a 'radical democrat' or an 'extreme democrat' is a case in point. Apart from reflecting the rhetoric of Plutarch, such definitions address the problem of differentiating Stratokles from Demochares, whose democratic credentials are attested beyond doubt by the text of the proposal of decree in his honor submitted by his son Laches.³³ Since Stratokles had caused Demochares to be exiled, they could not belong to the same party and/or share the same political views, and since Athens' entering the sphere of Antigonos and Demetrios involved the return of the democratic constitution, Stratokles, Demetrios' most prominent partisan, could only be located further to the left than Demochares, as it were – the demagogic portrait provided by Plutarch of course confirmed the conclusion.³⁴ This classification, in turn, made it necessary to envision a political crossover in order to explain why Stratokles had moved the decree in honor of Philippides of Paiania.

In other words, Stratokles the leader of the radical democrats is a combination of the *a priori* assumption that such a party existed and of Plutarch's characterization of Stratokles as a Kleon-like demagogue. It is to this characterization that we now need to turn.

32 Treves 1938: 2204; for a concise presentation of the evidence on Philippides, see below.

33 The text of the proposal is preserved in Ps.-Plut., *Vitae decem oratorum* 851 D-F.

34 Stratokles' clash with Philippides of Kephale, whose democratic credentials are established based on the highest honors decree for him passed in 283/2 (*IG II².657*), is usually interpreted along the same lines. Note that occasionally the problem of explaining the opposition of Stratokles and Demochares has been solved by placing Demochares to the left of Stratokles, as in Paschidis 2008: 97.

**PHILIPPIDES, STRATOKLES AND KLEON:
POLITICS AND THE COMIC STAGE**

After mentioning the honours for Demetrios and Antigonos proposed by Stratokles, Plutarch dwells on him for a few more paragraphs in order to introduce him to his readers.³⁵ A thoroughly despicable fellow, Stratokles, according to Plutarch, appeared to be imitating old Kleon in his dealings with the Athenian people. A couple of anecdotes are then offered in order to substantiate this characterization, one of which includes an iambic trimeter, while the second is the strange story of Stratokles announcing a victory in the battle of Amorgos. Poorly substantiated as it is, Plutarch's statement is the cornerstone of the modern view of Stratokles as a demagogue and/or a radical democrat. And yet, a closer look at the passage shows that there is quite a bit more to it than meets the eye at first, and a straightforward political interpretation fails to catch much of its meaning.

We should notice first of all that comparing a politician of the late fourth century to Kleon was hardly a way of commenting on the former's political agenda. Kleon had the misfortune of being utterly disliked by two very influential contemporaries, a hugely talented historian and a hugely talented comic poet – Thucydides and Aristophanes.³⁶ Even though a case could be made for Thucydides' portrait of Kleon already playing on the characterization of the latter on the comic stage, it was only later that the comic image of Kleon merged with, and essentially transmogrified, his characterization as an Athenian politician. A decisive role in this process was probably played by the famous excursus on Athenian demagogues in Book 10 of Theopompos' *Philippika*.³⁷ The result of the process is the caricature of Kleon as an orator found in the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians*, a work that was the product of an intellectual milieu with clear political sympathies, one

35 Plut. *Dem.* 11.

36 Whether the reasons for their attitudes were personal or political or a mixture of the two, is immaterial for our purposes. On Thucydides and Kleon, Woodhead 1960 still seems overall convincing to me, in spite of the objections of Spence 1995. On Aristophanes and Kleon, Edmunds 1987 provides an excellent introduction.

37 On the excursus on Athenian demagogues, Connor 1968 is a classic. On Theopompos and Kleon, see now Saldutti 2009.

that was highly influential in Athens right at the time of Stratokles.³⁸ The impression, conveyed by the passage of the *Constitution of the Athenians*, that the debate on Athenian demagogues, and on Kleon in particular, was still very much alive in Stratokles' times is confirmed by another work that appears to have been highly polemical in tone, and strongly inspired by Theopompos, namely *The demagogues of Athens* by the Epicurean Idomeneus of Lampsakos, a work that is all the more noteworthy from our point of view for being one of the sources Plutarch drew upon when he had occasion to discuss Kleon in his biographies of fifth-century Athenians.³⁹

As we try to press Plutarch's analogy between Stratokles and Kleon, we are faced with a spectrum of options ranging between two poles: the analogy could be taken to reflect either the views of the historical audience, as it were, that is, of (some of) Stratokles' fellow-citizens, or those of more specialized observers, i.e. writers of some sort, contemporary or not, including of course Plutarch himself. To be sure, that Plutarch is responsible for the artistry of our passage, which is inseparable from its politics, is beyond doubt, as we shall see in more detail in a moment. The opposite end of the spectrum, that Plutarch is really saying that the Athenians were reminded of Kleon, may seem the less promising one, for it may be taken to imply the existence of a surprisingly detailed memory of the late fifth century among Athenians living a century later. In fact, however, we do not necessarily need any such assumption in order for Stratokles' contemporaries to have an image of Kleon – a rather lively image at that. In the late fourth century, old comedies were regularly re-performed at the Great Dionysia, and it is entire-

38 See *Ath.pol.* 28.3 with the remarks of Favreau-Linder 2010: 42. More serious, and potentially more damaging for Stratokles, was the notion that Kleon had promoted the moral decadence of the Athenian *demos*. Situating the *Constitution of the Athenians* in the political context of Athens after the Hellenic War is an urgent desideratum; see for a promising start van Wees 2011.

39 Plutarch mentions Idomeneus as a source for Kleon's accusation to Perikles in 430 (*Per.* 35.2 = *FGrH* 338 F 9). On Idomeneus and Kleon, see Saldutti 2013. A pupil of Epikouros during the latter's stay in Lampsakos between 310 and 307/6, and the author of two works of erudition, on the Socratics and on the Athenian demagogues respectively (both very likely with a political agenda), Idomeneus may have had an important political role in his city, possibly as a representative of Lysimachos (see the careful discussion of Franco 1993: 131-33). His profile reminds in many ways of Douris of Samos, on whom see below, n. 45. Angeli 1981 tried to dissociate Idomeneus the Epicurean from Idomeneus the erudite, but without conclusive arguments, see Cooper 1997: 455-58 with n. 10.

ly conceivable that an Athenian audience would be reminded of Kleon by this practice.⁴⁰ It has to be said, to be sure, that there is no specific evidence for the re-performance of Aristophanes' Kleon-related comedies.⁴¹ Moreover, for Plutarch to say what he says it seems almost inevitable to admit that some previous author had already put the two characters together, either focalizing the resemblance from the point of view of the Athenians or, less likely in view of Plutarch's words, from his own personal one.

The vocabulary employed by Plutarch in characterizing the resemblance between Stratokles and Kleon, whose force is easily attenuated by anodyne translations, is highly relevant to this issue. Stratokles supposedly imitated Kleon's εὐχέρεια, or 'amoral recklessness' in dealing with the Athenian *demōs*, with his own βωμολογία and βδελυρία, something like 'disgusting ribaldry'. In a passage in the *Life of Nikias*, Plutarch described Kleon's oratory with exactly the same words used in the *Life of Demetrios*.⁴² There can be no doubt that the Kleon who is being evoked in this passage as a model for Stratokles is the Kleon of comedy, all the less surprisingly in light of what has been observed above regarding the development of the image of Kleon. As we zoom out from the vocabulary to the context, it is easy to see that comedy is present all over Plutarch's Stratokles. The anecdote of the courtesan Phylakion, Stratokles' beloved, who brings brains and necks home from the market and is told by Stratokles that those are what politicians play ball with in the assembly would make for a rather weak stand-alone joke, but it would work perfectly well as a scene in a comedy, and in fact, Stratokles' *bon mot* has been long since recognized as a line from comedy because of its metrical structure.⁴³ And finally, for absent-minded readers who have not understood which literary codes need to be activated in reading these passages, Plutarch inserts a quote from Aristophanes, a choral line from *Knights* that, in its original context, comments on an exchange between the Paphla-

40 On the reperformance of old comedies at the Great Dionysia, which started in 340/39, see Nervegna 2007: 15 and *IG* II².2318, frs. g-h in Millis and Olson 2012.

41 General familiarity with Aristophanic themes among the audience of the New Comedy seems however a fairly safe assumption; see e.g., the comments of Marasco 1984: 45 n. 22 on Alexis *PCG* fr. 99 and its imitation of Aristophanes' *Clouds*.

42 Plut. *Nic.* 3.1; on Plutarch's characterization of Kleon, see Favreau-Linder 2010: 41-44.

43 See Frantz 1900. Stratokles' dealings with whores seem to have been a popular topic; see Matron fr. 1.121-22 Olson-Sens, Machon fr. 16.311-18 Gow, and Athen. 13.596 F (a quote from Gorgias' work on courtesans).

gonian, that is, Kleon, and the sausage-seller.⁴⁴ Later, after a description of the manifestations of divine displeasure at the excessive honours granted Demetrios, Plutarch introduces the comic poet Philippides of Kephale, who attacked Stratokles in his comedies and whose upright personality is contrasted with Stratokles', not without a touch of paradox.⁴⁵

The appearance of Philippides has been a cue for many scholars to attribute the whole Kleonization of Stratokles to Philippides' comedies.⁴⁶ To be sure, Plutarch may not have read Philippides' comedies himself, and the anecdotes on the poet's role at the court of Lysimachos, which Plutarch uses in order to characterize Philippides' personality, confirm the impression. Among the historians who wrote on early Hellenistic Athens and whose works Plutarch had access to and made use of, at least one, Douris of Samos, can be shown to have included quotes from contemporary poetry and is, for this reason and more in general, a good candidate for Plutarch's direct source as regards Philippides.⁴⁷ From our point of view, however, it is not crucial to figure out who was Plutarch's direct source, nor whether Philippides himself explicitly played Aristophanes to Stratokles' Kleon, or simply styled Stratokles as a new Kleon, leaving it up to, e.g., Douris to draw the final connection between the two poets, or whether he attacked Stratokles and made fun of him in a way that evoked, in the mind of a cultivated observer like Douris (or whomever else, including Plutarch himself), the memory of Kleon. What matters for the purpose of the present investigation

44 Aristoph. *Eq.* 382.

45 I take the words at the end of Plut. *Dem.* 12.9 to mean that, although the contrary would be expected, Philippides, the man from the comic stage, was more earnest and upright than Stratokles the politician; the latter was the true buffoon. On Philippides see especially Philipp 1973 and more recently Major 1997: 47-48 and Luraghi 2012: 360-66. On the satire of Stratokles and the comparison with Kleon, see also Mastrocinque 1979: 267 and Marasco 1981: 63 (but the analogy drawn by Marasco between the anecdote on Stratokles in Plut. *Dem.* 11.4-5 and that on Kleon in Plut. *Nic.* 7.7 and Theop. *FGrH* 115 F 92 seems rather loose).

46 See most recently O'Sullivan 2009: 73-74.

47 Marasco 1981: 63-64, and see 56 n. 112 for a list of numerous references to poetry in Douris' fragments. On Douris, see especially Landucci Gattinoni 1997 and Knoepfler 2001b. It would be all the less surprising that Douris sympathized with Philippides if Knoepfler (2001b: 28-29) is right to think that Douris was Lysimachos' man. On Lysimachos, Samos and Douris see also Franco 1993: 160-4. On Philippides and Lysimachos, see Franco 1990: 113-21.

is that Plutarch's characterization of Stratokles and the equation with Kleon is not based on the nature of Stratokles' political activity, but rather amounts to a poet's attempt at undermining a politician's public standing by showing him up as an unprincipled demagogue and a man without dignity. To what extent the parallel with Kleon was integral to this operation and whether the lambasting of Stratokles on the comic stage involved activating the Kleon subtext, while interesting in itself, is a question of secondary importance for the present purpose.⁴⁸ The key point is that this satirical rendering of Stratokles' character cannot be taken as evidence for the latter's political alignment, even less than Aristophanes' attacks on Kleon.

STRATOKLES AND LYKOURGOS: POLITICAL HERITAGE AND/OR POLITICAL SELF-FASHIONING

Two of Stratokles' thirty-something decrees involve prominent Athenian politicians, Lykourgos and Philippides. It is fair to say that neither one of these documents plays any real role in the characterization of Stratokles' political alignments in modern scholarship. This can perhaps seem justified in the case of the decree for Philippides. Dating to 292, almost a decade apart from the last decree proposed by Stratokles before Ipsos, it can easily be bracketed as an outlier. Whether this is really inevitable, it remains to be discussed. In any case, the decree for Lykourgos, one of the earliest among those proposed by Stratokles, cannot be marginalized on any grounds. On the contrary, precisely its peculiar aspects – first and foremost, the fact that it was posthumous – point to its importance as a characterizing political act.

Before looking at the two decrees separately, there is one obvious common aspect that should be considered. The language used to describe the excellence of the two politicians who were granted the honours is similar, including key concepts of the highest honors decrees, such as the honours and generosity and his benevolence towards the *demos* – this may not be

48 Which is not to say that it is uninteresting or not important in itself. As a matter of fact, a comprehensive study of political satire in Early Hellenistic Athens, on the lines of Kurke 2002: 20–42, is an urgent desideratum; such a study should include at the least Lynkeus (Douris' brother!), Machon, Matron, Philippides and, last but not least, Theophrastos' highly enigmatic *Characters*.

particularly noteworthy, although considering the political trajectory of Philippides this language may not seem entirely obvious. More interestingly, though, a significant amount of space is devoted at the beginning of both decrees to the *progonoi* of the two politicians, a feature that recurs elsewhere only in the decree for Phaidros of Sphettos, of uncertain date but in any case later than the end of the Chremonidean War.⁴⁹ The choice of emphasizing the recent ancestors of the man receiving the honours, let it be noted, is not a simple reflection of the prominence of such ancestors: in the highest honours decree passed in 270/69 honoring Kallias, Phaidros' brother, there is no reference to them.⁵⁰ Insisting on the fact that the honorands loyalty, benevolence and generosity towards the *demos* continued a tradition set by his father and grandfather may be taken as a sign of a somewhat aristocratic understanding of democracy. We shall come back to this point later.

The decree for Lykourgos is famously preserved both in a very lacunose and fragmentary inscription and in the documentary appendix to the pseudo-Plutarchean *Lives of the ten orators*.⁵¹ In the latter text, Stratokles' decree is actually embedded in an application submitted by Lykourgos' son Lykophron asking for the honours granted to his father's descendants, namely the *sitesis* in the Prytaneion, to be extended to him.⁵² Honouring a politician who had been dead for over fifteen years must have been a very pointed political statement. Almost certainly, Stratokles was not the first to introduce this practice, and actually his proposal can be seen as a response to

49 The decree for Phaidros, *IG* II².682 lines 1-18, is much more detailed in outlining the deeds of Phaidros' father. Given the frequent changes of regime that affected Athens in the period covered by their activity, this choice is particularly striking: this time, evasiveness may have seen counterproductive, but one still wonders why the opposite was the case in 292. For the text of the decree for Phaidros, and especially for a reconstruction of the career of his father Thymochares, see now Bayliss 2006.

50 For the text of the decree see *SEG* 28.60.

51 Ps.-Plut. *Vitae decem oratorum* 852 and *IG* II².457. Faraguna 2003 provides a comprehensive discussion of the documents preserved in the *Lives of the ten orators*.

52 For the two texts and their editions, see Prauscello 1999 and the references in Culasso Gastaldi 2003: 68 n. 13. On the differences between the manuscript and the epigraphic version, see also Faraguna 2003: 487-91 and Culasso Gastaldi 2003: 69-73. Prauscello 1999, 58-67 provides abundant arguments against Michael Osborne's proposal to consider *IG* II².513 as belonging to a second copy of the decree. Wilhelm 1925: 3-6 recognized *IG* II².6207 as forming the lower part of *IG* II².457; I could find no further discussion of his proposal in later studies.

the only known precedent: Plutarch's words strongly suggest that Phokion, too, had been granted the highest honours posthumously, evidently during the *dekaetia*, the ten years when Demetrios of Phaleron controlled Athens on behalf of Kassandros.⁵³ In other words, the decree for Lykourgos was also an episode in a battle for memory waged against the oligarchs who had ruled the city on behalf of Antipatros and his son. Famously incorruptible, austere, and respectable, and at the same time an intransigent defender of Athenian freedom and democracy, Lykourgos was an ideal democratic antithesis to Phokion 'the good'.⁵⁴ The resemblances in the idealized portraits of the two politicians may have escaped attention because of the divergence in their political orientation, but they are nevertheless striking. Beyond the solid reputation for honesty and seriousness, both were said to dress very thriftily, not wearing warm clothes or shoes unless absolutely necessary.⁵⁵ Somewhat more intriguingly, both show signs of Laconizing sympathies.⁵⁶ In the light of this, however, it is hard not to think that Stratokles the demagogue is hardly the first Athenian politician one would put in a list of sympathizers of Lykourgos: if the labels used for Athenian politicians had any value, we would have expected Stratokles to propose honors for Hypereides instead.⁵⁷

As mentioned above, the decree begins by stating that for Lykourgos *eunoia* towards the *demos* was a family tradition, as witnessed by his grandfa-

53 Plut. *Phoc.* 38.1. See Kralli 1999: 138 n. 12 with references. On the timing of Phokion's rehabilitation, see Orsi 2002: 32-35 with further references. Plutarch is clear that the statue was erected after Phokion's death, which, short of jettisoning his testimony, makes it idle to look for an earlier date for Phokion's highest honours. Note that the decree of Meidias the Younger and the speech of Hypereides against such a decree mentioned in the short biography of Hypereides in Ps.-Plut. *Vitae decem oratorum* 850 B should be separated from the question of the posthumous honors for Phokion, as showed by Orsi 2002.

54 The legend of Phokion, enshrined in Plutarch's biography, has been investigated thoroughly, see Gehrke 1976: 180-98, Bearzot 1985: 250-55 and the recent discussion of Bayliss 2011: 129-51. On Lykourgos, whose memory was also becoming increasingly idealized after his death, see Culasso Gastaldi 2003: 88 with full references to the evidence.

55 Compare Plut. *Phoc.* 4.4 with Ps.-Plut. *Vitae decem oratorum* 842 C (as a matter of fact, neither of them was especially wealthy, see Davies 1971: 348 on Lykourgos and 559 on Phokion).

56 Plut. *Phoc.* and Lycurg. *Leocr.* 105-7 with Fisher 1994: 377-79.

57 This has been rightly pointed out by Orsi 2002: 36.

ther Lykourgos and his father Lykomedes, who both had received a public burial in the Kerameikos cemetery. Lykourgos himself is praised in general terms for the good laws he proposed, after which the decree becomes more specific as it starts listing his financial activity as an administrator of the *polis*, for which he was repeatedly crowned by the Athenians. He provided precious ornaments for the cult of Athena and saw to the preparation for the impending war, i.e. the Hellenic or Lamian War, in terms of weapons and ships. Then military and civilian buildings he built or completed are mentioned. Finally, the decree mentions that the Athenians, in spite of their fear of Alexander, stood their ground when the king of Macedon requested the extradition of Lykourgos.⁵⁸ The politician is praised for his incorruptibility and honors are decreed, and previous honorific decrees for him are proclaimed still (or again?) valid.⁵⁹

In this idealized profile of the late statesman, some scholars have thought that Lykourgos' opposition to Alexander and to the Macedonians in general may be overstated, although it is not clear that this suspicion is well founded. It is true that the decree almost imports the dead orator into the Hellenic War that broke out in 323, but we have reason to think that Lykourgos was indeed contemplating a renewed war against Macedon.⁶⁰ More to the

58 Here the manuscript text of the decree has a famous anachronism, speaking as though, at the time when he requested the handover of the politicians, Alexander had already conquered the Persian Empire; the anachronism is probably generated by a somewhat careless rendering of the inscription (fr. b lines 9-19), which does present Lykourgos' opposition to Alexander as an enduring feature continuing even after Alexander had conquered the Persian Empire, and then, after a summation of Lykourgos' engagement on behalf of freedom, refers, without a specific chronological link to the proceeding, to the fact that his political attitude had provoked Alexander's request for his delivery (see the explanation of Culasso Gastaldi 2003: 70). Whether or not this characterization of Lykourgos was correct is a separate question, see below.

59 As Lambert 2008: 77 n. 40 points out, the manuscript reading 'his decrees' makes no sense, and his proposal: Emending αὐτοῦ to περὶ αὐτοῦ or to αὐτῶ, solves the problem brilliantly. This may refer to the relevant inscriptions having been destroyed by one of the previous anti-democratic regimes, compare the case of the honors for Euphron of Sikyon in *IG II².448*.

60 On the decree evoking and connecting to the political climate of the Hellenic War, see Culasso Gastaldi 2003, 77-79. Whether Lykourgos really meant to prepare Athens for war against Macedon we may not be able to tell with certainty, but cf. the reference to support for a possible war in the honorary decree for Eudemos of Plataiai, *IG II³.352*, also in *RO 94*, proposed by Lykourgos in 330/29 (discussion in Faraguna 1992: 256-57, and

point, the text of the decree points to the importance of the memory of the Hellenic War at this point in time. In a somewhat paradoxical way, the Athenians appear to have seen Antigonos and Demetrios as taking the war against Macedon for the freedom of the Greeks up again, while at the same time conveniently forgetting the democratic interlude made possible by Polyperchon.⁶¹

In an attempt at explaining why it was Stratokles, of all people, who proposed a decree for Lykourgos, it has been pointed out that Lykourgos' son Habron was prominent in Athenian politics from 307/6, and the possibility has been suggested that Stratokles proposed the decree in honour of Habron's father in order to curry favor with him.⁶² If this were the case, though, it would be somewhat odd that, as Gauthier noticed, there is no sign that Habron or one of his brothers had presented the *aitesis* to the council, as was normal for these decrees.⁶³ As we will see more in detail in a moment, it is entirely possible that personal affiliations played a part in Stratokles' measure, but even if they did, the fact remains that honouring Lykourgos was indeed Stratokles' own political act, and it should be evaluated as such. One purpose of such an act could be easily surmised: various other documents show that, between 322 and 307, a war of memory was waged between anti-Macedonian democrats and their Athenian adversaries, a war that involved, among other things, the destruction and reconstruction of public documents.⁶⁴ In choosing Lykourgos, the scion of one of the most

see also 258-60; Faraguna seems to me not to give sufficient consideration to the fact that war was mentioned at all in the decree proposed by Lykourgos, all the more striking given the fact that the funds offered by Eudemos were then used for a different purpose). In any case, *pace* Wirth 1999: 45-49, in the light of the speeches against Lysikles and Leokrates it seems impossible to deny that Lykourgos was, as Stephen Lambert puts it, 'implicitly if not overtly hostile to Macedonia'; see Lambert 2011: 204.

61 See esp. Muccioli 2008: 125, and note that both Plut. *Dem.* 10.2 and Diod. 20.46.3 speak as though the Athenians had recovered their democracy now for the first time after its abolition in 322, fifteen years before.

62 Bayliss 2011: 156.

63 See Gauthier 1985: 89-90; on the *aitesis*, the request submitted by the would-be honorand himself, or by his descendant in the case of posthumous honours, see 83-88. On Habron's political career, see *IG II²*.463 line 36 and 1492 lines 123-24 with Merker 1986.

64 See Luraghi 2015.

blue-blooded families of Athens,⁶⁵ as the pillar on which to throw the bridge of democratic memory, Stratokles was sending a moderately conservative message, one that at the same time placed the allegiance to democratic values beyond question, but did not amount to a slap in the face of the partisans of Demetrios of Phaleron who had remained in the city after the latter fled. Stratokles' choice of Lykourgos as the symbol of the restored democracy would correspond, as it were, to the relative mildness of the democratic restoration, which, beyond unequivocal proclamations in favour of freedom and democracy, in fact was implemented largely without bloodshed – an attitude that appears to have corresponded to the Poliorketes' own approach.⁶⁶

This would inevitably tell us something about Stratokles himself and his political allegiances. Implications for his political biography cannot be more than speculative, tempting as the speculations might be. For all we know, it is entirely conceivable that Stratokles entered the panel of accusers of Demosthenes thanks to a preexisting connection to Lykourgos or to his close associates. In 307 at least two men who were closely connected to Lykourgos and had all but disappeared during the dekaetia of Demetrios of Phaleron came back prominently on the political stage. The first was Habron, Lykourgos' own son, who was appointed to an important financial post, the same one his father once had. The second was Xenokles of Sphettos, possibly the closest of Lykourgos' associates, the man who stepped in for Lykourgos as chief financial officer of the polis so that Lykourgos could continue running the public finances.⁶⁷ In 307, Xenokles was *agonothetes*, and the following year he was one of three Athenian ambassadors to Antigonos who brought back to the city a gift of grain, timber and money. That Habron, Xenokles and Stratokles all returned to prominence in 307 may mean

65 Famously, the hereditary priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheios was transmitted within the family; see Blok & Lambert 2009: 109-13. For a socio-political profile of Lykourgos, see Humphreys 1985.

66 See Plut. *Dem.* 9.3 on his protective treatment of Demetrios of Phaleron once the latter surrendered. On the fate of the other partisans of Demetrios of Phaleron, see Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 66 with Habicht 2006: 85-86: those who fled were condemned to death in absentia, those who remained in the city were acquitted.

67 Ampolo 1979 provides an exemplary study of this interesting politician; see also Habicht 1988 for fascinating speculation about his possible appearance in a decree honouring his grandson in the second half of the third century.

that they were already connected before, all the more so, since Stratokles appears associated with Xenokles in Matron of Pitane's *Dinner*, a satirical poem describing a gourmet dinner in the home of Xenokles – consistent with the image outlined by Philippides of Kephale, Stratokles pops in in the company of two whores.⁶⁸

The upshot of all this is clear: if scholars had not been persuaded by Plutarch, that is, ultimately by Philippides, that Stratokles was a demagogue, the consensus would probably be that in all likelihood he was a former associate of Lykourgos.

STRATOKLES, PHILIPPIDES, AND DEMETRIOS: POLITICAL REALIGNMENT IN CONTEXT

Philippides, the son of Philomelos, of the deme Paiania, was an old man when Stratokles proposed to grant him the highest honours in 292.⁶⁹ The political landscape of Athens had changed radically since the time of the decree for Lykourgos. After the defeat of Antigonos and Demetrios at the battle of Ipsos in the summer of 301, the Athenians somewhat less than elegantly, had turned their back on the Saviour-god. Demetrios Poliorketes, the liberator of 307, had re-conquered the city at the end of a siege in the spring of 295. After being starved into surrender, the Athenians were prepared for the worst, but Demetrios had refrained from retaliating, confining himself to mild reproach – and to placing garrisons in the Peiraieus and in the city itself, on the Mouseion Hill. The Athenians celebrated his clemency, but this time around there was no talk of democratic restoration; with good reason, as far as we can tell. The sheer fact that Olympiodoros, generally identified with the *strategos* who had distinguished himself at the time of the Four Years War, was now archon for two years in a row indicates the limits of this new incarnation of the Athenian democracy, and so does the ominous reap-

68 Matron of Pitane, known only through Athenaeus, wrote a poem in hexameters called *Attic Dinner-Party*. Olson & Sens 1999 provide a convenient introduction to this author with a commented edition of the fragments. Stratokles appears in fr. 1.122, at the end of an epic-parodic description of the meal.

69 The complete text of the decree for Philippides is found in Dinsmoor 1931: 7-8.

pearance of the *anagrapheus* at the beginning of decrees.⁷⁰ In spite of this, it should be pointed out that in Plutarch's description, the Athenian assembly was at this point dominated by demagogues bent on flattering Demetrios just as it had been in 307.⁷¹

A near-contemporary of Demosthenes, from a wealthy and prominent family, Philippides was not an obvious candidate for the limelight at this point. His last known political act was the proposal, in the second prytany of 299/8, of a decree honouring an Athenian who had spontaneously joined an embassy to 'king Kassandros' (sic).⁷² It is not unlikely that Philippides had himself participated in the embassy.⁷³ At that point, Philippides was already an elderly man. Born probably in the 380s, he makes his first appearance in the sources in Demosthenes' speech against Meidias in 348, in a list of wealthy trierarchs who are expected to step forward and speak on behalf of Meidias, men who are collectively characterized as overbearing and generally anti-popular in their attitudes.⁷⁴ In spite of Demosthenes' characterization, the group is a rather mixed bag, wealth being the only documented common denominator between its members: we know nothing beyond what Demosthenes says about the political sympathies of Mnesarchides,⁷⁵ but Diotimos of Euonymos,⁷⁶ who had a distinguished political and military career during the forties and thirties, was on the list of politicians whose extradition was demanded by Alexander in 335; as for Neoptolemos,⁷⁷ he was an associate of Lykourgos, and later Demosthenes himself acknowledged his civil merits.⁷⁸ In other words, strictly speaking, from Demosthenes we cannot infer anything except for Philippides' wealth and social standing.

70 On this whole set of events, see Habicht 2006: 102-7. Thonemann 2005 provides a vivid picture of the conquest of Athens by Demetrios and the following reconciliation (to be read alongside the remarks of Osborne 2006: 70-72).

71 Plut. *Dem.* 33.5-34.

72 *IG* II².641.

73 As suggested by Paschidis 2008: 115.

74 *Dem.* 21.208-9 and 215 with MacDowell 1990: 412-17.

75 *APF* 10242, 392-93.

76 *APF* 4386, Diotimos II, 163-64).

77 *APF* 10652, 399-400.

78 *Dem.* 18.114. On Neoptolemos, see Faraguna 1992: 220-21. Tellingly, Davies calls Philippides an *oligarchikos* (the designation does not occur in Demosthenes, so far as I can see) in the lemma devoted to his family, *APF* 549, but then, talking about Neoptolemos at

His political views would acquire a clearer profile if we were certain that he was indeed the man attacked by Hypereides in a speech delivered between the Peace of Demades and Philip's death, accusing of illegal proposal a Philippides who had proposed honours to the *proedroi* who had put one or more decrees honouring Macedonians or supporters of the Macedonians to the vote.⁷⁹ Philippides is characterized as an enemy of the people and a lackey of Philip, and we learn that he had been indicted for illegal proposals twice before.⁸⁰ Finally, a reference to his slender build transmitted by Athenaeus makes it possible to identify him with a Philippides targeted for the same reason by the comic poets Alexis, Aristophon and Menander, the latter in his first victorious comedy, *Anger*, staged in 322/1 or in 316/5.⁸¹ The identification of Philippides of Paiania with the accused had been doubted mainly because Hypereides was taken to say that Philippides had been a political Laconizer before the rise of Philip, and Philippides of Paiania was thought to be too young for that, since Spartan power had been fatally undermined by the Theban victories starting with Leuktra in 371. As David Whitehead rightly observed, however, what Hypereides is really saying is that people like Philippides, not Philippides himself, had passed from being Laconizers to being in favour of Philip because they really hated Athens, and it should not be forgotten that Hypereides is not providing a historical overview, but rather trying to blacken the character of his opponent, linking him to the

APF 400, by implication describes Philippides as a man 'of the conservative, but non-oligarchic, Right Wing.'

79 See Whitehead 2000: 30 on the date of the speech and 31-32 on the substance of the issue.

80 Hyp. 4.15b.10-11 with Whitehead 2000: 53.

81 On the chronology of Menander's *Anger*, see *PCG* Testimonia 3 and 49 and de Marcellus 1996: 70. Alexis mentioned Philippides in (at least) three different comedies: *Agonis* or *Hippiskos* (*PCG* fr. 2), *The Thesprotians* (*PCG* fr. 93) and *The Mandrakorizomene* (*PCG* fr. 148); none of them can be dated with any precision, although for the *Agonis* a date around 330 seems the most likely, see Arnott 1996, 54. Aristophon mentions Philippides in his *Platon* (*PCG* fr. 8) and in the *Pythagoristai* (*PCG* fr. 10), on which see the comments of Papachrysostomou 2007: 120-22 and 128-30 respectively; all we know of Aristophon's chronology is that he won his first Lenaian victory after Alexis (late 350s? Arnott 1996: 17) based on the list of Lenaian victors *IG* II².2325, to be consulted in Millis and Olson 2012: 183-92. If the thin Philippides is really the son of Philomelos of Paiania, there is more than a touch of irony in the fact that comic poets used as a byword for a walking corpse a man who lived to be over ninety years of age.

oligarchs of the late fifth century.⁸² Overall, in the text of the speech there seems no real obstacle to the identification of the pro-Macedonian Philippides with Philippides of Paiania.

Stratokles' decree is remarkably vague in praising Philippides.⁸³ His father and grandfather are said to have disbursed lavishly for all sorts of liturgies, including trierarchies and choregies, to have been elected as *strategoí* and to have performed successfully in such a role. Philippides continued the tradition of generosity, and the same checklist of liturgies is repeated; then his more special deeds are listed, including one naval *strategia*,⁸⁴ one *agonothesia* and the *basileia* – if by lottery or not, one hesitates to say.⁸⁵ Finally, there is a reference to Philippides having served as an ambassador more than once. Peculiarly, no date is provided for any of the magistracies or the embassies, which strongly suggests the suspicion that the most prestigious part of Philippides' political career may have taken place during times of which the Athenians, at this point, did not have a very positive memory.⁸⁶ The

82 Whitehead 2000: 28-29 and 45-46; a similar point already in Bartolini 1977: 77. See also the important comments of Fisher 1994: 394-95. In Hypereides' line of argument the late-fifth-century oligarchs associated with the Thirty Tyrants are equated with the Philippizers of his own times (Hyp. 4.15b.8); the point is not their political ideology, the point is that they are traitors to the fatherland. Note that the evocation of the Thirty Tyrants in relation to the present situation of Athens, with the same implicitly optimistic message implied by Hypereides, recurs in 330 in Lykourgos' speech against Leokrates (*Leoc.* 61).

83 The considerations in the motivation clause are 'aussi verbeux que vagues' (Gauthier 1985: 90).

84 The *strategos epi to nautikon* is attested for the first time immediately after the Lamian War, see *IG* II².682 line 5 with Bayliss 2006: 112-21, and then again in 315/14; in both cases, the incumbent was Thymochares of Sphettos, the father of Phaidros and Kallias. The designation of one *strategos* for the fleet may point to the reduced size of the Athenian fleet after the Lamian War. Given his age, Philippides is more likely to have served between 317 and 307 than after Ipsos.

85 Ever since Dinsmoor 1931: 15, who provided the first edition of the two halves of the inscription, the reference to the office of (*archon*) *basileus* in lines 25-30 has been taken to mean that Philippides held it in 293/2, but this is not what the text says: the use of the participle present in line 25-26 has only a relative, not an absolute meaning, and his activities as *basileus* are consistently referred to with the perfect tense (lines 27 and 29), just like his activities as *agonothetes* (line 30).

86 Not so much under the democracy *d'antan*, as Gauthier 1985: 90 suggests, but rather during the *dekaetia* of Demetrios of Phaleron and/or after Ipsos.

fact that such a level of vagueness was somewhat out of the ordinary seems to be confirmed by the unique clause, at the end of the decree, granting Philippides the right to add to the text of the inscription a detailed list of his and his ancestors' deeds, an option of which Philippides appears not to have taken advantage – at least not on the one stele that is preserved, although space had been provided on the stone.⁸⁷

If we accept that the thin Philippides of Hypereides was one and the same with Philippides of Paiania, his political profile can be outlined in a reasonably consistent fashion. For somebody who had been a Philippizer after Chaironeia it would not be strange to become a partisan of Kassandros after Ipsos, and it would be easy enough to connect the dots by assuming proximity to Antipatros and participation in the regime of Demetrios of Phaleron. How a man with such a personal record could be a plausible candidate for highest honours in 292, however, is rather less obvious. The honours proposed by Stratokles for Philippides are usually seen as the seal of a political alliance between the conservative right, or a part thereof, and democratic left, or a part thereof, in the framework of the new regime imposed by Demetrios Poliorketes on Athens.⁸⁸ One wonders however if we should not look at the scenario from a different angle, asking rather what would have happened to Kassandros' supporters in Athens after his death and the ousting of Lachares. The question needs to be addressed in a broader context.

In 294, Demetrios had become king of Macedon, after getting rid of Kassandros' two surviving sons. This new situation had a visible impact on his policies vis-à-vis the Greeks. In the light of this, the possibility that Stratokles' move was meant to show the new king of Macedon taking under his protection the political clients of his predecessor on the throne, or the ones among them who had not fled Athens, should at least be considered. After all, if there was something that Stratokles was, he was the most easily recog-

87 For the shape of the stele, see Dinsmoor 1931: 3-5; the bottom half of the front surface is empty. Note that the decree, lines 48-50, mandated that two stelai be inscribed, so in theory the catalogue of deeds could have been transcribed on only one of them (one would wonder why, though: did Philippides not survive the passing of the decree long enough?).

88 This view is criticized by Bayliss 2011: 184, who speculates that Stratokles and Philippides may have been personally on friendly terms, given also that they were not too far apart in age.

nizable of Demetrios' partisans in Athens: it stands to reason that, especially now, anything he did would be perceived as emanating from the king. Conspicuously honoring the octogenarian Philippides, while glossing over his political record, was a clear gesture of magnanimity and reconciliation towards a politically defeated adversary, a gesture that was going to be paralleled a year later, in 292/1, by the return, sanctioned by king Demetrios himself, of the partisans of Demetrios of Phaleron who had been in exile since 307.⁸⁹ The very fact that, on this occasion, Deinarchos could hope for Theophrastos interceding in his favor points to Demetrios inheriting the connections of the Antipatrids, especially if we remind ourselves by contrast that in earlier times the popular view, as expressed by Alexis in one of his comedies, had associated Demetrios with the bill of Sophokles of Sounion of 307/6, that had tried to curb the autonomy of the philosophical schools and provoked the temporary exile of Theophrastos.⁹⁰ Now, instead, Demetrios' right-hand-man for Greek affairs, Adeimantos of Lampsakos, appears to be the recipient of one of three copies of Theophrastos' last will when the latter died, in the early eighties.⁹¹ The other side of the coin, as it were, is Demetrios, king of Macedon, abandoning his previous attitude towards the freedom of the Greeks and behaving increasingly as a traditional Macedonian king in this respect.⁹²

Seen in this light, the decree in honor of Philippides of Paiania is rather unlikely to signal any convergence of political parties in Athens. As such, it tells us very little about Stratokles' views of Athenian politics or his ideological commitments. It rather shows an Athenian politician navigating the troubled waters of the new world of Hellenistic kingdoms.

89 Dion.Hal. *De Dinarcho* 2-3 (which includes Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F 67).

90 Theophrastos and Deinarchos: Dion.Hal. *De Dinarcho* 2. The fragment of Alexis is *PCG* fr. 99, from the *Hippeus*; see Arnott 1996: 259-65. On the bill of Sophokles, see Haake 2007: 16-43 and Canevaro 2011: 72-76. Of course, the bill can scarcely have been a simple implementation of Demetrios' wishes, or it would hardly have been withdrawn the following year. Demetrios' role was more likely along the lines envisioned by Canevaro 2011: 77-78. In any case, the fact remains that back then Theophrastos had had to flee from Athens, while now he could be counted upon to intercede with Demetrios in favor of former political enemies.

91 On the recipients of Theophrastos' last will, see Diog.Laert. 5.57. On Adeimantos, see Landucci Gattinoni 2001.

92 On this, see the acute observations of Buraselis 1982: 88.

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that, in the years from 307 to 301, the Athenians were putting a lot of energy into reactivating their democratic institutions. The disproportionately high number of decrees from these years, the renewal of the practice of honoring the best bouleutic contingent of the year, the insistent references to freedom and democracy in the texts of the resolutions of the assembly, all document this climate.⁹³ There was nothing particularly radical about all this, though – unless we think that there was anything radical about the Athenian democracy before the Lamian War, the democracy of Demosthenes and Lykourgos. Unless the decrees are misleading, for their high number is after all inflated by an overwhelming proportion of honorific decrees for Demetrios and his associates, Stratokles was the most prominent politician in Athens at this time. In any case, he was certainly Demetrios' man among the Athenians. The meager evidence makes it at least possible that he still preserved that position, perhaps alongside Dromokleides, after Demetrios reconquered Athens in 295/4. All this, however, tells us nothing about his political views as an Athenian citizen. Much more significant in this respect is his decision of promoting the memory of Lykourgos, a socially conservative democrat from the time before the Lamian War. How much preexisting personal affiliations may have weighed in this decision we cannot tell. On the other hand, it seems hard to deny that the decree for Lykourgos should be seen as by far the most important piece of evidence as to Stratokles' sympathies as an Athenian politician. Nobody would characterize Stratokles' political connections in Athens as radical. The fact that the comic poet Philippides depicted Stratokles as a Kleon-like demagogue does not tell us more about his political views than the fact that Demochares' son Laches retrospectively accused him of oligarchic subversion. In both cases, we have to do with political opponents attacking him with words, just as the orators of the age of Demosthenes used to do. Nobody would seriously think of reconstructing Demosthenes' political profile based only on Aischines' speeches. Stratokles should be granted the same benefit.

93 See Habicht 2006: 88-89. It should be noted, however, that for practical reasons the new democracy cannot have brought about a mere reconstitution of the status quo ante of fifteen years before, as pointed out by Canevaro 2011: 70.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ampolo, C. 1979. 'Un politico "evergete" del IV sec. A.C.: Xenokles figlio di Xeinis del demo di Sphettos' *PP* 34, 167-78.
- Angeli, A. 1981. 'L'opera "Sui demagoghi di Atene" di Idomeneo' *Vichiana* 10, 5-16.
- Arnott, W.G. 1996. *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Badian, E. 1961. 'Harpalus' *JHS* 81, 16-43.
- Bartolini, G. 1977. *Iperide: Rassegna di problemi e di studi* (-). Padova.
- Bayliss, A.J. 2006. 'Antigonos the One-Eyed's return to Asia in 322: A new restoration for a rasura in IG II² 682' *ZPE* 155, 108-26.
- Bayliss, A.J. 2011. *After Demosthenes: The Politics of Early Hellenistic Athens*. London & New York.
- Beloch, J. 1884. *Die attische Politik seit Perikles*. Leipzig.
- Bielman, A. 1994. *Retour à la liberté: libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne. Recueil d'inscriptions honorant des sauveteurs et analyse critique*. Lausanne.
- Blok, J.H. & Lambert, S.D. 2009. 'The appointment of priests in Attic gene' *ZPE* 169, 95-121.
- Broneer, O. 1932. 'Eros and Aphrodite on the North Slope of the Acropolis in Athens' *Hesperia* 1, 31-55.
- Buraselis, K. 1982. *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis: Forschungen zur Politik des Kassandros und der drei ersten Antigoniden (Antigonos Monophthalmos, Demetrios Poliorketes und Antigonos Gonatas) im Ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien*. Munich.
- Canevaro, M. 2011. 'The twilight of nomothesia: Legislation in Early Hellenistic Athens (322-301)' *Dike* 14, 55-85.
- Connor, W.R. 1968. *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*. Cambridge, MA.
- Cooper, C. 1997. 'Idomeneus of Lampsacus on the Athenian demagogues' *EMC* 41, 455-82.
- Culasso Gastaldi, E. 2003. 'Eroi della città: Eufrone di Sicione e Licurgo di Atene' in A. Barzanò et al. (eds.) *Modelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea*. Rome, 65-98.
- Culasso Gastaldi, E. 2007. 'Atene nella prima età ellenistica: la testimonianza dei decreti onorari' in P. Desideri et al. (eds.) *Costruzione e uso del*

- passato storico nella cultura antica: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze - settembre* . Alessandria, 115-38.
- Davies, J.K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families*, - B.C. Oxford.
- de Marcellus, H. 1996. 'IG XIV 1184 and the ephebic service of Menander' *ZPE* 110, 69-76.
- De Sanctis, G. 1970. *Studi minori*, 1. Rome 1970.
- Dinsmoor, W.B. 1931. *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge, MA.
- Dow, S. 1933. 'Notes on three decrees of B.C. 306/5' *AJA* 37, 412-16.
- Edmunds, L. 1987. *Cleon, Knights, and Aristophanes' Politics*. Lanham & New York.
- Faraguna, M. 1992. *Atene nell'età di Alessandro* (Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche, Memorie, Serie IX, Volume II, Fascicolo 2). Rome.
- Faraguna, M. 2003. 'I documenti nelle "Vite dei X oratori" dei *moralia* plutarchei' in A.M. Biraschi et al. (eds.) *L'uso dei documenti nella storiografia antica. Atti del convegno di Gubbio, - maggio* . Naples, 481-503.
- Favreau-Linder, A.M. 2010. 'La figure de Cléon à l'époque impériale' in P.-L. Malosse, M.-P. Noël & B. Schouler (eds.) *Clio sous le regard d'Hermès: L'utilisation de l'histoire dans la rhétorique ancienne de l'époque hellénistique à l'Antiquité tardive*. Alessandria, 35-46.
- Fisher, N.R.E. 1994. 'Sparta re(de)valued: some Athenian public attitudes to Sparta between Leuctra and the Lamian War' in A. Powell & S. Hodkinson (eds.) *The Shadow of Sparta*. London, 347-400.
- Franco, C. 1990. 'Lisimaco e Atene' in B. Virgilio (ed.) *Studi ellenistici* 3. Pisa, 113-34.
- Franco, C. 1993. *Il regno di Lisimaco. Strutture amministrative e rapporti con le città*. Pisa.
- Frantz, W. 1900. 'Ein Fragment des Komikers Philippides' *Hermes* 35, 671.
- Gauthier, P. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e-I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.)*. Contribution à l'histoire des institutions (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, Supplément 12). Paris.
- Haake, M. 2008. 'Das "Gesetz des Sophokles" und die Schließung der Philosophenschulen in Athen unter Demetrios Poliorketes' in H. Hugonard-Roche (ed.) *L'enseignement supérieur dans le mondes antiques et médiévaux*. Paris, 89-111.

- Habicht, C. 1970. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*. Second edition. Munich.
- Habicht, C. 1977. 'Athenisches Ehrendekret vom Jahre des Koroibos (306/5) für einen königlichen Offizier' *AJAH* 2, 37-39 (reprinted in C. Habicht, *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit*. Munich 1994, 337-38).
- Habicht, C. 1988. 'Die beiden Xenokles von Sphettos' *Hesperia* 57, 323-27 (reprinted in id. *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit*. Munich 1994, 323-27).
- Habicht, C. 2006. *Athènes hellénistique: Histoire de la cité d'Alexandre le Grand à Marc Antoine*. Second edition, revised and augmented. Paris.
- Hansen, M.H. 1984. 'The number of *rhetores* in the Athenian *ekklesia*, 355-322 B.C.' *GRBS* 25, 123-55.
- Hansen, M.H. 1987. *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes*. Oxford.
- Hansen, M.H. 1991. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structures, Principles, and Ideology*. Oxford.
- Humphreys, S. 1985. 'Lycurgus of Butadae: An Athenian aristocrat' in J.W. Eadie & J. Ober (eds.) *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*. Lanham, MD, 199-252.
- Knoepfler, D. 1993. 'Adolf Wilhelm et la pentètèris des Amphiaraiia: réexamen de A. P. LIV 7 à la lumière du catalogue IG VII 414 + SEG I, 126' in M. Piérart (ed.) *Aristote et Athènes*. Paris, 279-302.
- Knoepfler, D. 2001a. *Eretria : Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*. Lausanne 2001.
- Knoepfler, D. 2001b. 'Trois historiens hellénistiques: Douris de Samos, Hiéronymos de Cardia, Philochore d'Athènes' in J. Leclant (ed.) *Colloque 'Histoire et historiographie dans l'Antiquité': actes* (Cahiers de la Villa Kérylos, II) Paris, 25-44.
- Kralli, I. 1999-2000. 'Athens and her leading citizens in the Early Hellenistic Period (338-261 B.C.): the evidence of the decrees awarding the highest honors' *Archaiognosia* 10, 133-61.
- Kurke, L. 2002. 'Gender, politics and subversion in the *Chreiai* of Machon' *PCPhS* 48, 20-65.
- Lambert, S.D. 2011. 'What was the point of inscribed honorific decrees in classical Athens?' in S.D. Lambert (ed.) *Sociable man: essays on ancient Greek social behaviour in honour of Nick Fisher*. Swansea, 193-214.
- Lambert, S.D. 2012. *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 480 - 322 BC*. Leiden & Boston.

- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 1997. *Duride di Samo*. Rome
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 2001. 'Il ruolo di Adimanto di Lampsaco nella "basileia" di Demetrio Poliorcete' in M. Capasso & S. Pernigotti (eds.) *Studium atque urbanitas: miscellanea in onore di Sergio Daris*. Galatina, 211-25.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 2008. "'Partiti" e fazioni ad Atene e in Macedonia all'alba dell'Ellenismo' in C. Bearzot & F. Landucci Gattinoni (eds.) *'Partiti' e fazioni nell'esperienza politica greca*. Milan, 239-63.
- Luraghi, N. 2015. 'Memory and community in Early Hellenistic Athens' in V. Wieser (ed.) *Historiographies as Reflection about Community: Ancient and Christian Models*. Vienna.
- MacDowell, D.M. 1990. *Demosthenes, Oration against Meidias (Oration 19)*, edited with introduction, translation, and commentary. Oxford.
- Marasco, G. 1981. 'Introduzione alla biografia plutarca di Demetrio' *Sileno* 7, 35-70.
- Marasco, G. 1984. *Democare di Leuconoe. Politica e cultura in Atene fra IV e III sec. A.C.* Florence.
- Merker, I.L. 1986. 'Habron son of Lykourgos of Boutadai' *AncW* 14, 41-50.
- Mikalson, J.D. 1998. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Berkeley.
- Millins, B.W. & S.D. Olson 2012. *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens: IG II² - and Related Texts, Edited, with Introductions and Commentary*. Leiden & Boston.
- Mitchel, F.W. 1970. *Lykourgan Athens: -*. Cincinnati.
- Muccioli, F. 2008. 'Stratocle di Diomeia e la redazione trezenia del "Decreto di Temistocle"' in B. Virgilio (ed.) *Studi Ellenistici* 20. Pisa, 109-36.
- Nervegna, S. 2007. 'Staging scenes or plays? Theatrical revivals of "Old" Greek Drama in antiquity' *ZPE* 162, 14-42.
- Olson, S.D. & A. Sens 1999. *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Atlanta, GA.
- Orsi, D.P. 2002. 'Iperide e Glaucippo: uno o due discorsi contro Focione?' *AncSoc* 32, 29-41.
- Osborne, M.J. 2006. 'The eponymous archons of Athens from 300/299 to 286/5' *AncSoc* 36, 69-80.
- O'Sullivan, L. 2009. 'History from comic hypotheses: Stratocles, Lachares & POxy 1235' *GRBS* 49, 53-79.

- Papachrysostomou, A. 2007. *Six Comic Poets: A Commentary on Selected Fragments of Middle Comedy*. Tübingen.
- Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.
- 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 (- BC)*. Athens.
- Perlman, S. 1963. 'The politicians in the Athenian democracy of the fourth century B.C.' *Athenaeum* 41, 327-55.
- Prauscello, L. 1999. 'Il decreto per Licurgo IG II² 457, IG II² 513 e (Plut.) mor. 851F-852E: discontinuità della tradizione?' in B. Virgilio (ed.) *Studi ellenistici* 12. Pisa, 41-71.
- Pritchett, W.K. 1972. 'Lucubrationes epigraphicae' *CSCA* 5, 153-81.
- Reger, G. 1992. 'Athens and Tenos in the Early Hellenistic Age' *CQ* 42, 365-83.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1985. *The Athenian Boule*. Second edition. Oxford.
- Saldutti, V. 2009. 'Gli esordi politici di Cleone (Theop. *FGrHist* 115 FF 92-94)' *IncidAnt* 7, 194-208.
- Saldutti, V. 2013. 'Un frammento di Idomeneo di Lampsaco sul giovane Cleone' *QUCC* 103, 81-89.
- Sartori, F. 1963. 'Cremonide: un dissidio fra politica e filosofia' in *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni*. Torino, 118-51.
- Sealey, R. 1955. 'Athens after the Social War' *JHS* 75, 74-81.
- Sealey, R. 1956. 'Callistratos of Aphidna and his contemporaries' *Historia* 5, 178-203.
- Spence, I.G. 1995. 'Thucydides, Woodhead, and Kleon' *Mnemosyne* 48, 411-37.
- Tarn, W.W. 1927. 'Greece: 335 to 321 B.C.' in J.B. Bury, S.A. Cook & F.E. Adcock (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, VI, *Macedon, - B.C.* Cambridge, 438-60.
- Thonemann, P. 2005. 'The tragic king: Demetrios Poliorketes and the city of Athens' in O. Hekster & R. Fowler (eds.) *Imaginary Kings: Royal Images in the Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome*. Stuttgart, 63-86.
- Tracy, S.V. 2000. 'Athenian politicians and inscriptions of the years 307 to 302' *Hesperia* 69, 227-33.
- Treves, P. 1933. *Demostene e la libertà greca*. Bari.
- Treves, P. 1938. 'Philippides (6)' *RE* 19, 2201-4.

- van Wees, H. 2011. 'Demetrius and Draco: Athenian property classes in and before 317 BC' *JHS* 131, 95-114.
- Whitehead, D. 2000. *Hyperides: The forensic speeches, with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Wilhelm, A. 1925. *Attische Urkunden*, III. Vienna.
- Wilhelm, A. 1939. 'Athen und Kolophon' in W.M. Calder & J. Keil (eds.) *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler*. Manchester, 345-68.
- Wilhelm, A. 1942. *Attische Urkunden*, V. Vienna.
- Woodhead, A.G. 1960. 'Thucydides' portrait of Cleon' *Mnemosyne* 13, 289-317.
- Woodhead, A.G. 1989. 'The calendar of the year 304/3 B.C. in Athens' *Hesperia* 58, 297-301.