

# ATHENS, CRETE AND THE AEGEAN AFTER 366/5 B.C.\*

S. DUŠANIĆ

BEOGRAD

This article is centred around an Athenian fourth-century comic fragment, the political allusions of which, though important, have not been understood by modern historians. The fragment runs:<sup>1</sup>

τούτω δ' ὄπόταν ναέται χώρας  
ἰχθύν τω' ἔλωσ' οὐχ ἡμέριων,  
τῆς περικλύστου δ' ἀλίας Κρήτης  
μείζω μεγέθει, λοπάς ἐστ' αὐτῷ  
5 δυνατὴ τούτους χωρεῖν ἑκατόν.  
καὶ περιοίκους εἶναι ταύτη  
Σιδούς, Λυκίους, Μυγδονιώτας,  
Κραναούς, Παφίους. τούτους δ' ὕλην  
κόπτειν, ὄπόταν βασιλεὺς ἔψῃ  
10 τὸν μέγαν ίχθύν, καὶ προσάγοντας,  
καθ' ὅσον πόλεως ἔστηκεν ὄρος,  
τοὺς δ' ὑποκαίειν, λίμνην δ' ἐπάγειν  
ὑδατος μεστὴν εἰς τὴν ἄλμην,  
τοὺς δ' ἄλας αὐτῷ ζεύγη προσάγειν  
15 μηνῶν ὄκτω συνεχῶς ἑκατόν.  
περιπλεῖν δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄμβωσιν ἄνω

\* This paper is part of a lecture delivered at the Institut F. Courby (Lyon), in April, 1980.

1. Athen. 8,346f = Meineke III 323-325, no. I = Kock II 252f. no. 5 = J.M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, II, Leiden 1959, 158f. (less reliable). My text follows those of Kock (*CAF*) and Kaibel (the Teubner *Athenaeus*), which are reasonably conservative and almost identical, a warning against too much scepticism or freedom in dealing with the textual problems involved; the only major point of the two editors' disagreement may be settled, it seems, if we accept the manuscript reading (v. 19-20, see below). The selective *apparatus criticus* given here is based on Kock's, which should be consulted, together with Kaibel's and Edmonds', for more details. Note that the *variae lectiones* of Kock ad v. 5,8 and 18 are found in his commentary, not his text, and carry little weight.

πέντε κέλητας πεντασκάλμούς,  
περιαγγέλλει τε κούχ ὑποκαίει·  
‘Λυκίων πρυτάνεις, ψυχρὸν τουτί·  
20 παύον φυσῶν, Μακεδὼν ἄρχων·  
σβέννυ, Κέλθ’, ὡς μὴ προσκαύσῃς’.

1 *τούτω* (i.e. Γηρυόνη): *ταύτης* (... χώρας) Edmonds. 5 *τούτους*: Κυωσοὺς Herwerden; *πόντους* Kock; “what ‘these’ refers to is not known, but probably some gesture of the actor made the reference clear” Gulick (the Loeb Athenaeus), cf. *infra*, n. 115. “Propter miram rectae orationis in obliquam conversionem ante v. 6 nonnihil excidisse suspicatur Meinekius” Kock (the suggestion has not been adopted by later editors). 6-7 *ταύτη ἐσώδοντις ἵδοντις Α,* *ἵδοντις (nihil amplius)* C: corr. Schweighäuser; *ἵδοντις* Meineke; Σωτοὺς Droysen, Edmonds. 8 Κραναούς: Κρονίους Kock. Παφίους: Παρίους Meineke (Edmonds *dubitante*); Ταφίους Kock. “V. 11 fortasse post v. 8 conlocandus: utique corruptus est” Kock (similarly Edmonds). 18-19 *τε κούχ ὑποκαίει Λυκ.* *πρυτάνεις Α: περιαγγέλλει θ’ ὑποκάνοντα* Kock; *τ’ οὐχ ὑποκαίεις, Λυκίων πρύτανι* Wilamowitz et alii (Webster’s *ὑποκαίεις* is contradicted by his own translation “You are not firing enough, chiefs of Lycia” [the plural!]). The transmitted text (with the *πρυτάνεις* in the vocative, like *Μακεδὼν ἄρχων* [which is, to be exact, a nominative in the vocative function] and *Κέλτ[ε]* in v. 20f.; for the adversative *καὶ* [Geryon’s galley “give orders but, themselves, they do not fire”, i.e. fight] cf. e.g. W. Pape’s *Handwörterbuch*, s.v., A.1.a) suits the historical situation of the late 360’s very well (see *infra*, on Pericles of Limyra and Timotheus). 21 Κελτούς *μὴ Α:* corr. Wilamowitz (*Κελτούς, μὴ* Schweighäuser, Kock; *σβέννυ, Κελτούς μὴ προσκαύσ.* Meineke).

The verses quoted originate from the (lost) play “Geryones”<sup>2</sup> written by Ephippus, a minor figure of Middle Comedy; according to Athenaeus, they were reused by the same poet in his “Peltast”, with the following addition:<sup>3</sup>

τοιαῦθ’ ὑθλῶν δειπνεῖ καὶ ξῆ  
θαυμαζόμενος μετὰ μειρακίων,  
οὐ γωώσκων ψήφων ἀριθμούς,  
25 σεμνὸς σεμνῶς χλανίδ’ ἔλκων.

Despite the difficulties of the language, the general meaning of the fragment is clear.<sup>4</sup> The chorus<sup>5</sup> or a character (Heracles?)<sup>6</sup> of the

2. Two more fragments (Kock’s nos. 3 and 4) are preserved from that comedy, but they have no direct interest for our subject (however, see below, n. 76).

3. Athen. 8,347b = Kock II 261, no. 19. There are no *variae lectiones*.

4. Two English translations may be consulted (C.B. Gulick; J.M. Edmonds).

play "describes how an enormous fish bigger than Crete is prepared for Geryon in a dish (which is the Mediterranean). The people on the coasts cut wood and fire it to boil the King's great fish ... On the top of the water five boats sail to take messages to the rims".<sup>7</sup> There can be no doubt that the "Geryones" was a political rather than a mythological production. This is shown by the mention of the actual states in v. 7-8, 19-21, as well as by the four lines appended in the "Peltast", which obviously refer to a contemporary δημαγωγός under Geryon's disguise.<sup>8</sup> Besides, Ephippus was fond of (the Athenian) political themes – among other plays, his *Navagós*<sup>9</sup> and *"Ομοιοι"*<sup>10</sup> are illustrative. The date and the historical context of the "Geryones" have remained, however, controversial. A. Meineke identified the Μακεδῶν ἄρχων (v. 20) with Alexander the Great and

For the reader's convenience, the former is reproduced here, with modifications (lines 18-19, 22; however, Gulick's punctuation has been generally retained) required by the following analysis: 'Whosoever the dwellers in that country catch a fish – not one of every-day size, but bigger in bulk than Crete, which the sea-waters wash all around – they give him a dish which can hold a hundred of these. And the neighbours about it are Sindians, Lycians, Mygdoniots, Cranaans, Paphians. These hew the wood whenever the king cooks that mighty fish; and they haul so much of it that it fills the circuit of the city as it stands, while others light the fire underneath. To make the pickle they draw off a lake full of water, and it takes a hundred ox-teams, for eight continuous months, to bring up the salt for it. On the top of the rim of that dish there sail five fast galleys, each with five oars on a side, which give orders but, themselves, do not fire: "You chiefs of Lycia, it's not hot enough! Now stop the bellows, you Macedonian ruler! Put out the fire, you Celt, if you don't want to scorch it." (Athen. 8,346f-347b). "Babbling this kind of nonsense, he dines and lives in the company of schoolboys who look up to him with admiration, although he couldn't do a sum with counters, and, proud in mien, proudly swishes his foppish coat." (ib., 347c).

5. Thus Edmonds, *op. cit.*, 158.

6. Thus T.B.L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, Manchester 1953 (1970<sup>2</sup>), 40.

7. *Ib.*, 40-43. Kock's interpretation, on Schweighäuser's reading of 20-21, "(Alexandrum regem) poeta iocose adhortatur, ne contra ingens Persarum regnum quicquam molliatur, sed Gallicum periculum avertat, quo tota Graecia possit inflammari", misses – among other things – the evident reference of the οβέννυ and προσκαύσης to the *ἰχθύς*.

8. A method common to the Old and the Middle Comedies (see e.g. Theopompus' *Theseus*, Kock I 737, no. 17, with comm.; S. Dušanić, *REG* 92, 1979, 346, note 167). Cf. Kock's remark concerning fragment 19 of Ephippus: "eundem Macedonum ducem (above, n. 7) dici atque in fr. 5 Meinekii est opinio, quae mihi quidem prorsus incredibilis videtur. sed nullam habeo probabiliorem".

9. Frg. 14 Kock, cf. *REG* 92, 1979, 329 with n. 74.

10. Frg. 16 Kock, cf. Webster, *op. cit.* (cf. note 6) 30 and 40.

the ethnic from v. 21 with those Celts who had sent an embassy to Alexander in 335 B.C.<sup>11</sup> consequently, Meineke put the "Geryones" to about 334 B.C.<sup>12</sup> His suggestions have been accepted, with slight variation, by Kock, Edmonds and others.<sup>13</sup> Webster opposed, citing some good reasons: Ephippus' literary career fell, or culminated, in the 370's and 360's,<sup>14</sup> which almost excludes such a late dating of the play in question; the fragment's replica in the "Peltast" makes — if the title of the latter comedy really alludes to Iphicrates<sup>15</sup> — the year of the general's death, 353 B.C., a probable *terminus ante quem* for the original; the active role of the Lycians, postulated by verses 7 and 19, does not seem compatible with the international position of that tribe after the end of the Satraps' revolt in 359 B.C. Equally important, the English scholar has eliminated the strongest of the arguments propounded in favour of dating the "Geryones" in the 330's; that formulated by Kock's words "scripta est fabula OI. 111,2 vel 3, eo tempore quo Gallorum legatis in Macedoniam missis illius gentis nomen primum ad Graecorum aures pervenerat". For, as Webster notes, the Celts must have become rather well-known in the Greek mainland as early as 369 B.C., when Dionysius of Syracuse sent Celtic mercenaries to support Sparta.<sup>16</sup> Starting from the hypothesis — the only possible one — that Ephippus' fragment ridicules an Athenian multilateral alliance,<sup>17</sup> Webster places it in the early sixties of the fourth century, and deciphers the constituents of the bloc (*Σωδοί* "are the subjects of the Bosporan rulers", *Μυγδονιῶται* "may here be a metrically more convenient name for the Macedonians", *Κραναιοί* = the Athenians, *Κέλτος* "is a scorn-

11. Arrian. 1,4,6; Strab. 7,3,8 = *FGrHist* 138 F 2.

12. *FCG* I 351f. Similarly J.G. Droysen in 1836 (see *FCG* III 324f.).

13. Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 44, 1909, 456f.) was inclined to follow Meineke in dating the fragment to Alexander the Great's time but did not exclude the possibility of its being slightly earlier and alluding (v. 21) to the Celts in the hinterland of Massalia.

14. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2325 III, col. III, 1.145; Kock II 250, no. 1 (certainly referring to Alexander the Pheraeans). Also *Ναυαγός*, "*Ομοιοί* and *Πελταστής* must have predated the 350's.

15. Kock II 260: "Titulus fortasse ad inventum illud Iphicratidis referendus est, de quo cf. Diodor. 15,44 ..."

16. Xen. *Hell.* 7,1,20.31; Diod. 15,70,1. Cf. below, notes 21-22, and K.F. Stroheker, *Dionysius I*, Wiesbaden 1958, 126.155.242 n. 71.

17. It has been appropriately noted that "the ships, which bring them (the *περίουκοι*, v. 6) instructions, remind us inevitably and perhaps intentionally of the Salaminia in Aristophanes' Birds (146), which may pop up by any seabord city bringing a summons" (Webster, *op. cit.*, 41).

ful name for Dionysius himself, who used the Celts"). His conclusions, though, have not received the attention they deserve. Edmonds did not mention them, and the students of Athens' fourth-century foreign affairs ignore the fragment and Webster's comments likewise.<sup>18</sup> It is especially regrettable that the "Geryones" has not been entered in the collections of the *Staatsverträge* edited by R. v. Scala and H. Bengtson - H.H. Schmitt. The purpose of the present paper is to modify some of Webster's results (the date of the play, the identification of the "Celt" and the Mygdoniota), complete the others (notably as to the actual personages of Heracles and Geryon, the aim and enemies of the alliance) and examine the fragment's manifold implications bearing on the Greek history of the 360's, implications which, naturally, did not directly interest the author of the literary "Studies in Later Greek Comedy".

At this juncture, it may be useful to anticipate one of the conclusions of our research and state that Geryon's complex alliance was directed, mainly if not exclusively, against Persia. This is a rather obvious inference from the participation of Lycia<sup>19</sup> and Paphos in the coalition. In its turn, the anti-Persian attitude of Geryon suggests a date after 366/5 B.C., when Athenian foreign policy took a new, energetic line, under the pressure of the Oropian failure and Artaxerxes' option for the aggressive Boeotia (the peace conferences at Susa and Thebes).<sup>20</sup> Webster's "high" chronology of the fragment was determined, primarily it seems, by his conviction that the "Celt" of v. 21 must be Dionysius I, who had lent the Spartans his barbarian troops on two occasions (369, 368 B.C.); but there was also the third dispatch of the relief forces from Syracuse to the Peloponnese, in 365 (Dionysius II),<sup>21</sup> and that contingent must have included, like the previous two, some Celtic soldiers.<sup>22</sup> Our identification of the "Celt"

18. In a footnote to the article on "The Political Context of Plato's *Phaedrus*" (*Riv. stor. Ant.* 10, 1980, 15f. n. 76), I have dealt briefly with the "Geryones" to endorse the essence of Webster's interpretation and show that there was, toward 366/5 B.C., an Attico-Syracusan rapprochement initiated by Plato and Timotheus (cf. *infra*, text to nn. 86-88).

19. Which provoked the same observation in Webster, *op. cit.*, 42, too.

20. See e.g. T.T.B. Ryder, *Koine Eirene*, Oxford 1965, 80ff., 137ff.; Dušanić, *Chiron* 10 (1980) 111ff.

21. Xen. *Hell.* 7,4,12; below, n. 80. For the chronological and political context of the three expeditions see Dušanić, *The Arcadian League of the Fourth Century* (in Serbian with English summary), Belgrade 1970, 64-76, 122-126, 294f. n. 36, 296f. with n. 56, 302 n. 99.

22. Though Xenophon specifies neither the status nor the nationality of Dionysius II's troops in 365, we may safely assume that mercenaries (cf. G.

with Dionysius the Younger, as well as our dating of Geryon's alliance to 365-364 B.C., tend to be corroborated by the following analysis, itemized after the names of the Giant's *περίουκοι*.<sup>23</sup>

**Σωδοί:** the manuscript tradition of v. 7 hardly leaves place for a different reading of the ethnic; Droysen's and Edmonds' emendation *Σωτούς*, unattractive from the palaeographical or historical point of view, was evidently inspired by the scholars' wish to bring the fragment near to Alexander the Great's epoch and homeland.<sup>24</sup> As the largest of the tribes forming the Bosporan realm,<sup>25</sup> the Sindi are likely to represent here the kingdom together with its ruler, Leucon I.<sup>26</sup> Thus Ephippus provides a welcome support to an epigraphical testimony from 284 B.C., so far questioned<sup>27</sup> or inadequately interpreted,<sup>28</sup> according to which the Athenians and the

Glotz, *Histoire grecque*, III, Paris 1941, 172) were in question, roughly the same who had operated in the Peloponnese in 369 and 368 (cf. Plat. *Ep.* 7,348a: *μισθοφόροι οἱ πρεοψύτεροι*). Furthermore, the Syracuse court insisted upon the genealogical affinity between Sicily and the Celts (*FGrHist* 566 F 69, with comm.), which may have served Ephippus as an additional, and chronologically less precise, motive for creating the couple *Γηρυόνης* – *Κέλτος* (= the Syracusean tyrant), with its politico-mythological aspects.

23. Strictly speaking, the "Celt" does not count among the "perioeci", who were only five, with the *Κραναιοί* included (v.7-8); thence the *πέντε κέλητας* in v. 17. He was presumably described by Ephippus as a neighbour of Geryon (an Iberian giant according to the myth: Heracles marches through the Celtic lands on his way back from Geryon's Spain), one whose position vis-à-vis the monstrous King was less inferior than that of the "perioeci".

24. "Sintians are probably Macedonians" Edmonds, *op. cit.*, 158f n. b. On the Thraco-Macedonian Sinti see e.g. F. Papazoglou, *Les cités macédoniennes à l'époque romaine* (in Serbian with French summary), Skopje 1957, 273-279, and *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II 7/1, Berlin-New York 1979, 334. Exclusively continental, they could not have been reached by Geryon's sailors.

25. K. Kretschmer, *RE* 3 A (1927) 226-228.

26. Leucon's royal title is immediately associated with the name of the Sindi in the documents Tod, *GHI* II 115B (Λεύκωνος ἄρχοντος Βοσπόρου καὶ Θεοδοσίης καὶ βασιλεύοντος Σωδῶν, Τορετέων, Δανδαρίων, Ψησσῶν) and *IPE* II 7 (Λεύκωνος ... βασιλεύοντος Σωδῶ [ν ---]).

27. H.H. Schmitt, *Staatsverträge*, III, no. 401 (p. 1: "Nicht ausgeschlossen ist, dass Athen einen solchen Beschluss erfunden hat, um in der Bedrängnis der 80er Jahre den König [Spartokos III] zu veranlassen, [βοηθ]εῖν τῷ δῆμῳ καθότι ἀν δύνηται [Z. 48].")

28. S.M. Burstein (*Historia* 27, 1978, 428-436) thinks of a single treaty signed c. 327 B.C. However, the plural [*προγόνων*]ν in 1.18 (an unavoidable restoration) shows that there was, under Spartocles III's ancestors Pairisades I, Leucon I and others (?; Schmitt and Burstein are justified in not considering, in this connection, the joint reigns of 310/309-304/3 and 349/8-344/3), more than one

Spartocids were traditionally linked by the treaty of a defensive alliance.<sup>29</sup> Though the testimony refers, probably, to the long period of close Attico-Bosporan relations in the fourth (even fifth?) century, certain facts tend to underline the importance of the ἐπιμαχία in the events of the late 360's. With regard to the anti-Persian tendency of Geryon's action, we are led to the supposition that the common enemies of himself and the Sindi were the oligarchs of Heraclea Pontica, whose loyalty to Susa<sup>30</sup> and hostile attitude to the Spartocids<sup>31</sup> seem to have been constant. The Athenian statesman Timotheus was active around Heraclea during the second half of 365, when he declined to support the Heraclean aristocrats *adversus plebem*.<sup>32</sup> A year later he helped his friend Clearchus in taking the city.<sup>33</sup> Both the decisions and the alliance with Leucon<sup>34</sup> must have been dictated by Athens' interests, both strategic<sup>35</sup> and economic.<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, Leucon may have had, in addition to Heraclea, some more points of conflict with Artaxerxes, e.g. on the common frontier of the two states, along the Caucasus.<sup>37</sup>

Λύκιοι: the tribe's hostility toward Persia was no secret,<sup>38</sup> and

epimachy concluded between Athens and the Bosporan kingdom. Burstein's *terminus post quem* (*e silentio*) for these treaties, Demosthenes' speech *In Leptinem* (XX, of 355 B.C.), 29-41, which mentions no Attico-Bosporan alliance, is valueless in Geryon's case: obviously, the Persophile opportunism of Demosthenes (cf. 20,60.68) made him pass over the alliance of 365-364 in silence. On the other hand, Geryon's coalition constituted a precedent for the decree of 284 from the point of view of international relations too, given the latter document's bearing on the Anatolian policy of Demetrios Poliorcetes.

29. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 653 (cf. Burnstein, *loc. cit.*, 429 n. 6a), 1.17-20: (δ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναῖων) [διέθε]το ἔαν τις βαδίζε[ι] ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τ[ὴν τῶν προγόνων] αὐτοῦ ή τὴν Σπα[ρ]τόκου, βοηθ[εῖν πατρὶ οθένε]ι κτλ. See also Schmitt's commentary, *Staatsverträge III*, no. 401.

30. Iust. 16,3,9; Memnon, frg. 1,5 = *FHG III* 527 (Clearchus' medism began with his estrangement from Athens, Plato's Academy and the rebel satraps: *Chiron* 10, 1980, 130-131).

31. Ps.-Arist. *Oec.* 2,2,8; Polyaen. 5,23; 6,9,3,4.

32. Iust. 16,4,3f.

33. Cf. Demosth. 20,84 (*Chiron* 10, 1980, 130 n. 126).

34. There may have been a personal link between Leucon and Timotheus, via Isocrates (cf. Isocr. 17,10 and *passim*; Dušanić, *Živa Antika* 29, 1979, 59f.).

35. *Chiron* 10, 1980, 130 with n. 124.

36. Heraclea being an important station on the Athenian corn-route.

37. The struggles related by Tacitus, *Ann.* 6,39ff. (the role of the Sarmatae!), might be taken as a parallel; cf. V.F. Gaidukevič, *The Bosporan Kingdom* (in Russian), Moscow-Leningrad 1949, 543 n. 46. On the south-eastern frontier of Leucon's state see Gaidukevič, *op. cit.*, 220-222.

38. Isocr. 4,161.

Lycia took part in the Satraps' revolt.<sup>39</sup> In the South-West of Asia Minor such an orientation also implied the hostility toward Mausolus, whose imperialism — notwithstanding all the Hecatomnid's faithlessness and centrifugal ambitions — must have been approved by Artaxerxes Mnemon as contributing in the last consequence to the power of the Persians.<sup>40</sup> This fact explains the attitude of Pericles of Limyra, an opponent to the Great King<sup>41</sup> and the King's loyal subjects such as Autophradates<sup>42</sup> and Mausolus<sup>43</sup> at the same time. Addressing the *Λυκίων πρυτάνεις*<sup>44</sup> in the plural, Ephippus' verse 19 probably shows that Pericles was dead or removed from his almost monarchical position by 365-364 B.C.,<sup>45</sup> his absence may have resulted in the Lycians' inactivity, travestied through the *ψυχρὸν τοντί*. A piece of evidence, interesting but difficult to interpret, tends to throw some light on the international aspects of the policy of the South-west Anatolians in the 360's: Tachos, the son and co-ruler of the pharaoh Nectanebos, sent the Athenians c. 365 B.C.<sup>46</sup> an embassy composed of three men (Pigres, Apollodorus, Zopyrus).<sup>47</sup> Though the mutilated inscription recording that occasion has preserved no further information, the ambassadors' names — especially the first one — indicate that Tachos' *πρέσβεις* were Anatolians, not Egyptians.<sup>48</sup> Tachos, together with Mausolus, was fighting the rebellious Ariobarzanes at Assus and Sestus in the

39. Diod. 15,90,3.

40. An analogous "tolerance" on the Great King's part rendered possible the famous events concerning Naxos and Aristagoras in 499 (Hdt. 5,30-35), Samos and Tigranes in 366 (Demosth. 15,9), and Rhodes and Artemisia c. 350 B.C. (*ib.* 11 and *passim*).

41. Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, V, Stuttgart-Berlin 1902, 316f.

42. M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 8, 1978, 246 n. 234.

43. Polyaen. 5,42 (cf. F. Miltner, *RE* 19, 1938, 1878).

44. The word refers to actual officials (like the two *ἀρχοντες Λυκίας* of the trilingual stele from Xanthus) or, untechnically, to all the leading men of the country?

45. Up to now, we had no precise *terminus ante quem* for his end (cf. H. Metzger, *CRAI* 1974, 88).

46. Cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* p. 658 Add.; Ed. Meyer, *RE* 4 A (1932) 1991.

47. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 119.

48. On the anthroponym Pigres see L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personen-namen*, Prag 1964, s.n. Mechanically, H. Pope labels our man Πίγρης Αἴγυπτος (*Non-Athenians in Attic Inscriptions*, New York 1935, 195) but, of course, Pigres may have been in the diplomatic service of a foreign sovereign like (e.g.) Philiscus of Abydus in that of Ariobarzanes and/or the Great King slightly earlier (*Xen. Hell.* 7,1,27; Diod. 15,70,2; cf. Ryder, *op. cit.*, 80).

spring-summer (?) of 365, when he decided to interrupt the siege<sup>49</sup> and return to his country. Immediately after, Timotheus intervened against Cotys and Autophradates to save Ariobarzanes and received Sestus from the satrap, in token of the satrap's 'gratitude'.<sup>50</sup> It is tempting to conjecture that the three envoys, starting from Lycia and/or an anti-Hecatomnid city of Caria,<sup>51</sup> were sent by Tachos on his voyage from the Troad to Egypt, which naturally led via Caria-Lycia. Both the alignment of the potentates operating around Sestus and the subsequent anti-Persian activity of Tachos<sup>52</sup> suggest that Pigres' embassy had something to do with the coalition confronting, so to say, Timotheus' allies with the Epaminondas-Mausolus-Artaxerxes axis. If the role of Mausolus in the events of 365 is not quite clear,<sup>53</sup> several circumstances recommend the thesis that the Greeks and Anatolians in the neighbourhood of his principality had every reason to fear his ambitions and equate them with those of the Great King.<sup>54</sup> Generally speaking, the passivity of Athenian foreign

49. Xen. *Ages.* 2,27.

50. *Ib.* 2,26; Isocr. 15,108.112; Corn. Nep. 13,1,3.

51. If it is not too idle to speculate about the domiciles of three men of unknown identity, we may note, at Caunus, a family distinguished because of its diplomatic connections with Egypt and using the name of Zopyrus (*Pap. Cairo Zen.*, 59045), and, at Xanthus (H. Metzger - E. Laroche - A. Dupont-Sommer, *Fouilles de Xanthos*, VI: *La stèle trilingue du Létoon*, Paris 1979; 32, 34, 54, 138, 165f.; the date of the inscription – 358 or 337 B.C. – remains uncertain), a Pigres whose domain may have been confiscated and given to a divinity of (?) politically characteristic origin (cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1974, 553 [p. 292]; 1980, 486), Βασιλεὺς Καΐνιος, for (?) political reasons (cf. e.g. the "sacral" confiscations recorded by *Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 46). For a Hecatomnid Pigres, enemy of (Mausolus and) Artemisia, W. Aly, *RE* 20 (1950) 1313-1316.

52. Diod. 15, 90, 2; 91-91; below n. 140.

53. According to Xenophon, *Ages.* 2, 27 (transl. E.C. Marchant – G.W. Bowersock, the Loeb ed.), "Mausolus ... was induced, not indeed by fear, but by persuasion, to sail for home" (cf. also Xenophon's reference to Mausolus "old ties of hospitality with Agesilaus," *ibid.*). However, the sincerity of the satrap's motives is open to doubt: the balance of powers in 365 could not guarantee success to Artaxerxes' partisans and Athens' enemies. Mausolus' opportunism determined his inconsistent attitude to the Great Revolt (the same may be said of other actors in it, including Tachos after the defeat of the Egyptian forces). Obviously, he did not join Datames, Orontes and Ariobarzanes in its early phase; also, Mausolus' loyalty was officially recognized in 367/6 and 361/0 (though the latter recognition involves some chronological and political problems), Tod, *GHI* II 138, 1.1ff.17ff. After all, Agesilaus and Timotheus collaborated c. 365 against Persia and Thebes, but they were not at one in all the matters of external policy (e.g. not as to the Peloponnese: *MDAI[A]* 94, 1979, 135; *REG* 92, 1979, 325ff.)

54. Cf. *Chiron* 10, 1980, 131-134, on Cos and Cnidus. It is significant that

policy of the early 360's must have facilitated Mausolus' option for Thebes and Susa, — especially after the *κοινὴ εἰρήνη* of 367 and 366/5 — but that option conversely forwarded the formation of Geryon's multilateral alliance.<sup>55</sup>

*Μυγδονιῶται*: far from being a synonym for the Macedonians (Webster) or the Phrygians (Edmonds et alii),<sup>56</sup> they figure in the fragment on their own account. Their country Mygdonia, lying between Axios and Strymon,<sup>57</sup> had its political role and independence only during the years 366-359, under Pausanias, an unsuccessful pretender to the Macedonian throne.<sup>58</sup> It is that dynast, of the Argead blood,<sup>59</sup> who is called *Μακεδὼν ἄρχων* in v. 20.<sup>60</sup> Significantly enough, he fought together with the Athenians, Archelaus and Argaeus, against Philip, the future Philip II, in 359 B.C.<sup>61</sup> The anti-Philippic coalition of that year seems to have been prepared by Timotheus, who had operated around Amphipolis in 364-360 B.C.; according to a natural deduction, Pausanias and the Athenian general were co-belligerent as early as 364 B.C.<sup>62</sup> Of Timotheus' enemies and Amphipolis' allies (Cotys, Perdiccas [363-360], Olynthus), Pau-

one at least of the noble houses of Caria seems to have combined an anti-Achaemenid and anti-Hecatomnid attitude with the sympathy for Plato and the Pan-Athenian ideals common to both the philosopher and Timotheus (*REG* 92, 1979 340 with n. 134; on the career of Mithradates' son Orontopates see H. Berve, *RE* 18 [1939] 1167).

55. See below, on Crete. The mythological material concerning the Cretan-Anatolian affinities also reflects an anti-Hecatomnid tendency (cf. my note 76 and the work cited in n. 147).

56. The form of the ethnic *Μυγδονιῶται* does not seem to be attested elsewhere. Schweighäuser's correction *Μυγδονῖται* was not adopted by Pape-Benseler, who interpret the *Μυγδωνιῶται* (s.n.) “= *Μυγδόνες* in Phrygien od. Lykien.”

57. Thuc. 2, 99, 4. Cf. Papazoglou, *Les cités macédoniennes*, 136ff. Mygdonia possessed, on the Aegean coast, more than one harbour to receive Geryon's *κέλης* (v. 17); whether Calindoia itself (see the next note) was a maritime city is impossible to say, its site baffling so far a precise localization.

58. On him, Th. Lenschau, *RE* 18 (1949) 2398. Our fragment confirms Ptolemy's attribution of Calindoia (Pausanias' capital: *IG IV<sup>2</sup>* 1, no. 94, I, b, 13) to Mygdonia (Geogr. 3, 12, 33); doubts sporadically expressed (M. Zahrnt, *Olynth und die Chalkidier*, München 1971, 191 ff.) as to that attribution or to the identity of the Pausanias of the Epidaurian list, may be put aside now.

59. *Schol. Aesch.* 2, 26; *Diod.* 16, 2, 6.

60. The doublet *Μυγδονιῶται* (v. 7) — *Μακεδὼν ἄρχων* (v. 20) is paralleled by the doublet *Λύκιοι* (v. 7) — *Λυκίων πρυτάνεις* (v. 19).

61. *FGrHist* 115 F 29, cf. *Chrion* 10, 1980, 120f.

62. *Chiron, loc. cit.*

sanius must have opposed the Odrysian more fervently<sup>63</sup> than the others,<sup>64</sup> which well accords with Cotys' medism of the later 360's.<sup>65</sup>

*Párhoi*: there is no ground whatsoever for changing the transmitted text of the second name in v. 8 or treating it (with Edmonds)<sup>66</sup> as a *pars pro toto* for all the Cypriots. Obviously, Geryon needed Paphos at a moment when the other great (and rival) centre of the island, Salamis, was taking a Persophile line.<sup>67</sup> This was due to the Salaminian ruler Evagoras II;<sup>68</sup> Ephippus provides a reliable *terminus ante quem* (365-364 B.C.) for Evagoras II's accession, which used to be dated with too much variation.<sup>69</sup> The subsequent fate of Evagoras — whose medism caused him to lose the Salaminian throne c. 350 B.C. — is not uninformative from the point of view of the political polarization in the eastern Mediterranean. Namely, Artaxerxes III rewarded Evagoras' loyalty by granting him Sidon<sup>70</sup> — the grant was inspired, no doubt, by the Great King's wish to have a faithful governor at Sidon instead of a pro-Athenian of Strato's type.<sup>71</sup> Comparable to the Paphian-Salaminian relations of the 360's and 350's, local rivalry and political dissent characterize the positions of Sidon and Tyre in the events of the same epoch; Strato's friendship

63. Cf. v. 20: *παύον φυσῶν*. That advice may have reflected Timotheus' decision of the spring-summer 364 to attack the Amphipolitans before the Thracians (cf. Demosth. 23, 149 med.); for an analogous dilemma and decision in 363 see Demosth. 23, 150 init.

64. Hence Berisades' support to Pausanias in 359 (Diod. 16, 2, 6, cf. K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*,<sup>2</sup> III 1, Berlin-Leipzig 1922, 225 n.l.)?

65. See e.g. Xen. *Ages* 2, 26 (365 B.C.).

66. *Op. cit.*, 159, n.b. Cf., on Kock II 97f.no. 202, Webster, *op. cit.*, 39: "Salamis) substituted (by) the better-known Paphos."

67. Webster (*ib.*) may well be right in postulating, on Antiphanes' frg. 202 Kock, the presence of Timotheus' army in Cyprus c. 365/4, but its base must have been Paphos, not Salamis.

68. For whose political orientation see e.g. Diod. 16, 42, 7; 46, 1-3.

69. H. Swoboda, *RE* 6 (1907) 827f; cf. M. Chavane - M. Yon, *Salamine de Chypre*, X: *Testimonia Salaminia*, 1, Paris 1978, 129.138.

70. Head, *HN*<sup>2</sup> 796.

71. Tod, *GHI* II 139 ("Athens honours Strato, King of Sidon: about 367 B.C."), with comm. The decree, moved by an anti-Theban (Cephisodotus, 1.30, on whom see e.g. Tod, *GHI* II 137, with comm.), was probably occasioned by Strato's services to the Athenian envoys of 366-365 (envoys who had accomplished the revision of the anti-Athenian clauses of Pelopida's Common Peace, cf. Ryder, *op.cit.*, 138f; below, n.88), not of 368/7 or 362/1.

for Tachos<sup>72</sup> and the Carthaginian collaboration with Tyre<sup>73</sup> are indicative of that.

Kéλτος: the instruction “put out the fire, you Celt, if you don’t want to scorch the fish”<sup>74</sup> may have had a double point, to satirize both Dionysius II’s cruelty<sup>75</sup> and Geryon’s plan to have the “fish” equally well prepared from all sides.<sup>76</sup> At the beginning of his reign, the Syracusan was at war with the Carthaginians and the Lucanians;<sup>77</sup> these peoples were probably allied then, as on some previous occasions.<sup>78</sup> Among several factors which tended to bring him together with Athens,<sup>79</sup> the common hostility to Carthage-Thebes must have

72. Xen. *Ages.* 2, 30.

73. G. Glotz -- P. Roussel, *Histoire grecque*, IV 1, Paris 1945, 85 n.10, 87 n. 14. Regardless of the uncertainties which darken the political background of that collaboration in the fourth century B.C. (but see *infra*, text and n.77, 81, 83, 85-88), the traditional medism of Cathage’s metropolis and the traditionally anti-Persian feelings of the Sidonians, may be clearly observed in the events of 332 (Arr. *Anab.* 2, 15, 6, cf. Glotz – Roussel, *op. cit.*, 84ff; Eissfeldt, *RE* 7 A, 1948, 1893f.).

74. Gulick’s translation.

75. Demonstrated in his later dealings with Locri (cf. e.g. *Plat. Leg.* 1, 638b) too. For his rashness in general, *Plat. Ep.* 7, 349a.

76. I.e. to acquire the whole of Crete, without exploiting the local rivalries on the island (Cnossus – Gortyn, etc.); cf. *infra*, for the metaphor “fish” = Crete. With regard to the politico-racial chain Syracuse – Tarentum – Sparta – the Lacedaemonian ἀποκοτ of the *Iovis insula* (cf. Diod. 16, 61, 4 – 16, 64, 3; Arist. *Pol.* 1271b – 1272b; Isocr. 6, 63.73; my notes 53, 78, 80, 111), even the possibility of a direct (and undiplomatic) intervention of Dionysius II in Cretan affairs (c. 365-364 B.C) should be allowed for. Ethnic affinities with Geryon’s meal may have contributed to the alignment of the other “perioeci” as well: of Sarpedon’s Lycians, Pausanias the Argead’s Mygdonians (ν Argos and Cnossus), Agapenor’s Paphians (ν the Arcadian/Cretan Tegea and Gortys), Athenians as the οὐγγεῖς of the Lyttians (*διὰ τὰς μητέρας*: Plut. *Mor.* 247f), and of the Milesian Bosphorans (ν Sarpedon and/or Minos’ grandson Milatos; whether the decree Tod, *GHI* II 115 A, honouring Leucon, should be attributed to the Cretan or Peloponnesian Ἀρκάδες is uncertain). Another fragment of the “Geryones” (3 Kock, 1.4: Amphidromia) presumably parodies the same themes of the οὐγγένεια and the birth of a nation (cf. e.g. Kock II 170, no. 15, and Webster, *op. cit.*, 85f., for the Auge story).

77. Diod. 16, 5, 2; cf. Plut. *Dion* 6f. 14, 4-7; *Plat. Ep.* 3, 317a and 7, 332d, 333a, 338a. See H. Berle, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, München 1967, I, 267f.; II, 659f.

78. Cf. Stroheker, *op. cit.*, 132: after 382 B.C. (for 216-215 B.C. see e.g. Liv. 22, 61). Archytas’ alignment with Dionysius (*Plat. Ep.* 13, 360b, cf. 7, 350a-b, 338c-d) probably favoured the Lucanian alignment with Carthage (cf. Diod. 16, 61-62).

79. Plato’s mediation between Timotheus and Dion-Dionysius II (cf. e.g.

been the strongest. Even the Syracusans' Celtic mercenaries, eponymous of Geryon's last-named ally, were used against the Theban followers in the Peloponnese, according to the Spartan qualification of the Arcadians.<sup>80</sup> The polarization of Ephippus' Mediterranean – Athens, Mygdonia, Leucon, Lycia, Paphos (Sidon, Egypt, Cyrene)<sup>81</sup> and Syracuse against Susa, the Odrysae, Heraclea Pontica, Mausolus, Salamis (Tyre), Thebes and Carthage (the Lucanians)<sup>82</sup> – coincides with Ephorus' contemporary invention of the famous parallel between the naval victories of the Western and Eastern Hellenes in 480 B.C.<sup>83</sup> The importance of the maritime forces for Geryon's coa-

*Ep.* 13, 363a); the symmachy Athens-Dionysius I of 367 B.C. (Tod, *GHI* II 136); the Attico-Syracusan alliance with Sparta and Corinth, bearing not only on the Theban and Carthaginian danger but also on some problems of interest for Syracusan home policy (the project of the recolonization and reorganization of Sicily [Plat. *Ep.* 7, 336d; Plut. *Dion.* 53; Diod. 16, 6, 5] in the first place).

80. Cf. Plut. *Dion.* 17, 8. The Athenians proposed in 368 that the δευτέρα βοήθεια should be engaged, against Thebes, in Thessaly and not in the Peloponnese (*Xen. Hell.* 7, 1, 28). Their wish, which was not granted, had evidently something to do with the Arcadian estrangement from Boeotia commencing about the same time (*Xen. Hell.* 7, 1, 24.32).

81. Together with Egypt, Cyrene collaborated with the Pan-Athenians – Chabrias (who seems to have i.a. won over Thera, Cyrene's metropolis, to the Second Maritime Confederacy in 376-375 B.C.: the lines B 1-2 of Bengtson, *Staatsverträge*, II<sup>2</sup>, no. 257 [cf. *Nachträge*, p. 343, *ad num.*], go together with the entries obviously reflecting Chabrias' operations after the victory off Naxos [B, lines 3ff.]), Timotheus' group – in the later 360's (Dušanić, *Riv. stor. Ant.* 10, 1980, 11-15 [on Plat. *Phaedr.* 274cff.; *Politic.* 257b; the special interest of the Academy in Ammon's sanctuary of Siwa and its political sympathies is attested also through Ps.-Plat. *Alc.* II 148eff.]); infra, n. 140. There are some indications that the Libyan Hellenes were in indirect conflict with Carthage then (A. Laronde, *Λιβυκαὶ ιστορίαι*, forthcoming). On the other side, the Cyrenean radical democracy – reformed, thanks to Plato and the Pan-Athenians, c. 363-362 B.C. (*Chiron* 8, 1978, 70, n. 100; 72 n. 113, 118.73.75 with n. 143) – may have been created through Epaminondas' intervention on his cruise of 364; the motive of the Theban's meddling there may have been to abolish an Atticophile (cf. C. Dobias-Lalou, A. Laronde, *REG* 90, 1977, 11) aristocracy, the régime typical of the rich capital of the Pentapolis. Was it this pro-Boeotian government of Cyrene (c. 364-363 B.C.) which welcomed some of the Samians expelled from their city by Timotheus in 366/5 B.C. (see S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, Göttingen 1978, 67 with n. 194)?

82. The bipartite list covers only the states whose activities are examined in the context of the "Geryones"; it certainly may be enlarged, cf. below, text and notes 96-99.

83. *FGrHist* 70 F 186: Ph. Gauthier, *Le parallèle Himère-Salamine au Ve et IVe siècle av. J.-C.*, *REA* 68, 1966, 5-52; Y. Garlan, *BCH* 94, 1970, 630-635. Cf. Isocr. *Ep.* 1, 8.

lition reaffirms,<sup>84</sup> in this context, G. Glotz' thesis that Carthaginian experts helped Epaminondas to build the fleet for his Aegean undertaking of 364.<sup>85</sup> Two documents, whose reading may now be definitively established, and interpretation improved, show that Athens' navy really supported Dionysius' operations of 366/5,<sup>86</sup> and suggest that Timotheus initiated the expedition *eis Σικελίαν*.<sup>87</sup> The co-belligerency had its bearing i.a. on Athenian relations with Artaxerxes, as "the Sicilian tyrant endorsed at Susa the Athenian claims to Amphipolis and the Chersonnese disregarded at the peace conference of 367".<sup>88</sup> This last circumstance illustrates the flexibility of methods

84. Against e.g. G.L. Cawkwell's scepticism (*Cl. Quart.* 66, 1972, 272).

85. *Mélanges Iorga*, Paris 1933, 331ff., on *IG VII* 2407 (the inscription dates from 362 [P. Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération Béotienne*, Paris 1965, 75-77] but its content is of course compatible with a slightly earlier beginning of the Theban-Carthaginian collaboration [which was bound to have lasted throughout the period of Boeotia's great foreign ambitions]); cf. J.M. Fossey, *Tieresias*, Suppl. 2, 1979, 9ff. The Boeotian decree for a citizen of Byzantium, *IG VII* 2408 (of 363 B.C.: Roesch, *loc. cit.*), may be politically eloquent too, given Epaminondas' interest in that strategic point (S. Accame, *La lega ateniese del secolo IV a.C.*, Roma 1941, 79f. with n. 3).

86. (A) *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1609 ("Traditio curatorum navalium", of 366/5 B.C. [J.K. Davies, *Historia* 18, 1969, 309ff.]), II, 1.81f.: Κρήτη, τριήρ. [Χαιρέστρατος Κηφι., Ἀριστομένης Πόρι. (Sundwall's restoration). (B) Isaeus, 6 (of 364/3 B.C., cf. para. 14), 1: ὅτε γὰρ εἰς Σικελίαν ἐξέπλει τριηραρχῶν Χαιρέστρατος, διὰ τὸ πρότερον αὐτὸς ἐκπεπλευκέναι προήδεων πάντας τοὺς ἑσομένους κυβόνους, ὅμως δὲ δεομένων τούτων καὶ συνεξέπλευσα καὶ συνεδυστόχησα καὶ ἐάλωμεν εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους (cf. S. del. Schoemann; Χαιρ.: Φανδόστρατος Reiske [thinking of the Sicilian enterprise of 415-413 B.C.]). Notwithstanding all the controversies – textual, chronological and historico-prosopographical, (A) + (B) clearly demonstrate that Chaerestratus and Aristomenes participated in a naval war (cf. *eis τοὺς πολεμίους*, Isaeus, *loc. cit.*) around Sicily (*eis Σικ.*), in the first half of 365 (between the end of the Samian siege and the beginning of the Samian cleruchy expedition, cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1609), and that Aristomenes figured as the speaker of Isaeus' work (cf. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford 1971, 564). It is, essentially, the moderns' *a priori* disbelief in the possibility of an Athenian military engagement in the West in 366/5 B.C. which has prevented the evident deductions from (A), (B) and the data cited in our notes 77, 79, 87 and 88.

87. Cf. above, n. 23 and 79. We are led to think that Chaerestratus chose to sail for Sicily (Isaeus, 6, 1, suggests a personal decision) because of his family connections with Timotheus (both his father and his adoptive father served in 366/5 under that general, see Isaeus, 6, 9 and 27; A. Raubitschek, *RE* 19, 1938, 2500 [for this latter]); on the name of his ship see *infra*, text and n. 138-140.

88. Dušanić, *Riv. stor. Ant.* 10, 1980, 14f., on Plat. *Ep.* 13, 363b-c (Above, n. 71). Unnecessary reserves in Berve, *op. cit.*, I, 268; II, 660.

and the diversity of the allies' positions within the whole of Geryon's action.

The foregoing discussion of verses 7-8 and 19-20 confirms, we hope, what has been said at the beginning of this article on the date of Ephippus' fragment. The mention of the Mygdoniotaes puts it within the years 366-359, and the case of the "Celt" excludes the later years of the period.<sup>89</sup> Moreover our conclusion that the "Geryones" was written c. 365-364 B.C is compatible — to say the least — with the then situation of the Sindi, Lycians and Paphians. Though we could claim even a less broad chronological context for the fragment, 365 B.C., the mythological subject of the play, as compared with the ethnics of 1.7-8, 19-20, suggests rather that the "Geryones" was composed c. 364 B.C., reflecting to a degree the circumstances of 365 too; a scrupulous precision, chronological or historical, is not to be expected on the part of a comic poet, who was certainly allowed to combine in his travesty topical events from more than one year. The comedy's heroes, Geryon and Heracles,<sup>90</sup> are likely to represent Timotheus and Epaminondas in their conflict centred on the Theban maritime expedition of 364, which sharpened the Attico-Boeotian enmity of 369-365. The Boeotian figure of Heracles undoubtedly had its political facet connected with Epaminondas' activity of 364-362.<sup>91</sup> On the other hand, we have already seen that Timotheus appears in, or must be surmised behind, the Athenian contacts with Geryon's "perioeci." A further analysis of Ephippus' verses and Timotheus' career of the 360's corroborates the identification of Geryon with Conon's son.<sup>92</sup> First, Timotheus' ability to organize international alliances and use foreign friends for political purposes was wide-

89. Dionysius II's wars of 367-365 obviously did not last long, cf. Diod. 16, 5,2 (Berve, *op. cit.*, I, 268: "um 364 zu einem Friedensschluss kam"). Behind the relative cooling of Plato's and Dionysius' friendship after c. 364 B.C. we have to look for political dissensions (the tyrant disapproved of Plato's plans concerning the unification of Sicily [Diog. Laert. III 21], plans which obviously contained pan-Athenian connotations [cf. Plat. *Ep.* VII 336d]), in addition to those of a private nature (Dion).

90. It is true, Heracles does not appear in the three preserved fragments, but the comedy must have treated his duel with Geryon; without Heracles, the literary attraction of Geryon's myth is too slim. Cf. Aristoph. *Acharn.* 1082; Weicker, *RE* 7 (1910) 1286ff.

91. Cf. the type of the alliance coins of 364 (Rhodes, Samos and six other cities under a pro-Theban, pro-Carian and pro-Persian régime: *Chiron* 10, 1980, 134f. n. 155); Xen. *Hell.* 7, 5, 20.

92. Webster, however, seems to have thought of Callistratus and Melanopus (*op. cit.*, 42).

ly known.<sup>93</sup> He was even reproached for not fighting himself but leaving others, and the Τύχη herself, to do his job,<sup>94</sup> which reminds us of the end of v.18.<sup>95</sup> During 366-359, he actually did lead an ambitious international action against Persia, Thebes, Mausolus and their allies, in Ionia,<sup>96</sup> the North (Thessaly, Macedonia, Thrace, the Marmara etc.), the South,<sup>97</sup> and around Cnidus.<sup>98</sup> That and Geryon's action form a coherent unity, which aimed at a broad expansion of the Second Maritime Confederacy; Ephippus — complying with the scenic and poetic conventions of Middle Comedy — was of course free to choose only some episodes of it for the “Geryones.”<sup>99</sup> Second, Timotheus' almost perpetual absence from Athens 366/5-359 B.C. explains the fact that the *Kραναοί* (= the Athenians)<sup>100</sup> figure in the fragment among the “perioeci,” whom Geryon sends his orders through his ships. The detail also contains a political sting typical of the age: the Athenian generals act with regard to their own interests, not the city's, as stateless *condottieri*.<sup>101</sup> Though, theoretically, Ephippus' use of the public attacks upon Timotheus need not have implied the poet's personal attitude<sup>102</sup> or represented Heracles in a better light than Geryon,<sup>103</sup> a certain feeling inimical toward Ti-

93. Isocr. 15, 117ff.; Demosth. 23, 198ff.

94. Plut. *Sulla* 6, 3f.

95. See supra, the *apparatus criticus ad loc.*

96. Samos (Isocr. 15, 111; Demosth. 15, 9); Erythrae (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 108).

97. Egypt, Cyrene (above, n. 81).

98. *Chiron* 10, 1980, 131ff.

99. Note, though, that the lost portion of the play is not likely to have referred to more than five (or six, with the “Celt”) allies of Geryon (*supra*, n. 23). The choice may have had something to do with the theme of the *οργγένεια* (*supra*, n. 76).

100. Despite Meineke's and Kock's reserve (“*Κραναοὺς* quos dicat obscurum est. Droysenus Athenienses intellegebat. Ii rectius dicerentur *Kραναῖοι*”), the equation is unavoidable; cf. Hdt. 8, 44; Strab. 9, 1, 18.

101. Cf. e.g. Lys. 19, 21f.; Demosth. 2, 28; 13, 22.

102. For the distinction between the comic personal satire presented “in anger” and that presented “without anger” see Plat. *Leg.* 11, 935dff. (cf. Webster, *op. cit.*, 37ff.).

103. Usually, an Athenian comic poet sympathizes with the eponymous hero of his play, but that was not always so (e.g. not, in all probability, with the lost comedy of Aristophanes Τρυφάλης = Alcibiades). On the other hand, the mythic victory of Heracles over the giant of threefold aspect (Geryon's three bodies may have symbolized in our case Timotheus' ambitions concerning the three continents [Europe, Asia, Africa, cf. Serv. *Aen.* 7, 662; *Myth. Vat.* 1, 68], though the prefix of the epithets like *τρισώματος* [cf. Aristophanes' Τρυφάλης just mentioned] was sometimes used to add emphasis only) may have been reversed in the comic poetry (cf. Webster, *op. cit.*, 57).

motheus seems discernible there.<sup>104</sup> The same might be said of the addition to the replica in the "Peltast." It presumably ridicules the strategus' social pretensions,<sup>105</sup> thirst for the soldier's glory and popularity,<sup>106</sup> – and the role he had in his trial ὑπὲρ χρέως of 362 B.C.<sup>107</sup> A date c. 362 for the "Peltast" would, in general, accord well with Ephippus' decision to repeat the verses published in the "Geryones" in 364. From the point of view of home policy, the important pact of Timotheus (Geryon) and Iphicrates ("Peltast"<sup>108</sup>), concluded in 362, raised many comments, not always favourable to Timotheus.<sup>109</sup> From the point of view of foreign policy, the contexts of the "Peltast" and the "Geryones" were roughly the same: Timotheus continued to pursue his Pan-Athenian line (it may be followed as far as the 350's) and, doubtless, to reckon on his allies of 365-364.<sup>110</sup> Some of Geryon's "perioeci" seem to have become topical again, thanks to Timotheus, in about 362 B.C.<sup>111</sup>

The last circumstance brings us back to v.2-4 and the problem of Geryon's immediate aims. Does the "fish bigger than Crete" represent a Gargantuan image only,<sup>112</sup> devoid of the political content so

104. Cf. Ephippus' criticism of Plato and the Pan-Athenian statesmen in the *Ναυαγός* (Kock II 257f. no. 14, cf. REG 92, 1979, 329 n. 74).

105. V. 25, cf. v. 6ff. of Ephippus' frg. 14 Kock (and Webster, *op. cit.*, 52). Timotheus really had certain aristocratic idiosyncrasies, Isocr. 15, 131ff.

106. V. 22-23 (judging from the formulation, the ξῆθαυμαζόμενος μετὰ μειρακίων is a consequence of the δειπνεῖ [ἰχθύν]; on the meaning of the "fish" see *infra*). The year 362/1 marks the climax of Timotheus' career (*Chiron* 10, 1980, 115f.).

107. V. 24 ("although he couldn't do a sum with counters"; Gulick's transl.) reminds us of the ironical comments of the plaintiff concerning Timotheus' defence in that matter (Ps. Demosth. 49, pass.). Timotheus' usual difficulties of a financial nature, originating from his political ambition, may also have been alluded to.

109. Ps. Demosth. 49, 66f.

110. *Chiron* 10, 1980, 120ff. 127f. (on the Thessalian events of 361, Macedonian and Thracian of 359). It is difficult to say whether the reference to the Argive Nicostratus (on him see e.g. Diod. 16, 44, 2-3 [note Nicostratus' identification with Heracles!]) in another fragment of the "Peltast" (Kock II 260f. no. 17) had a political meaning, the more so as we ignore the name of the fragment's speaker.

111. Dionysius II for instance, thanks to the preliminaries of Plato's Sicilian voyage of 361/0, which may have been intended to initiate a renewal of the Attico-Syracusan alliance and action of 366/5 (cf. Plat. *Ep.* 7, 339d: Plato, Tarentum, Dionysius II [above, n. 78]). On the contemporary anti-Persian operations of Tachos and the Lycians, Diod. 15, 90 (the Egyptians were supported on that occasion by Chabrias, a Pan-Athenian: Diod. 15, 92, 3).

112. Thus Gulick and Edmonds. Webster does not discuss it.

typical of the rest of the fragment? Several facts point to the contrary. Though the Gargantuan images are understandably not unknown in Greek comic passages dealing with culinary<sup>113</sup> and related matters, the poets' reference, in that connection, to a personal or geographical name always suggests an effect more concrete than purely literary. In other words, to eat a man of public distinction, or a state, or an entire country, means in the language of the comedy and the street to assimilate them politically.<sup>114</sup> Here, such an interpretation of Geryon's meal is recommended by the juxtaposition, in the verses 22-23, of the δειπνεῖ and the ξῆθαυμαξόμενος μετὰ μειρακίων, which reveals that Geryon's (civic) fame resulted from his swallowing Crete. We should prefer therefore to see in Crete an object — one of the objects, if not the chief<sup>115</sup> — of the alliance organized by Geryon-Timotheus. Ephippus sings, it is true, of a fish the size of which exceeds Crete, but this probably shows only that Geryon caught, in addition to Zeus' island, at some islands and lands which diplomatically or strategically depended on Crete, such as Thera, Egypt, Cyrene, Rhodes.<sup>116</sup> Of necessity, Geryon's (Timotheus') plans to propagate the Maritime Confederacy required him to secure Crete — with its advantages of favourable position, numerous cities and not insignificant economy —, especially at a moment when the expansion to the South was imminent.<sup>117</sup> That need must have been dramatically underlined by the attempts of Geryon's two great enemies, Epaminondas and Mausolus, to oppose Athens there and attract the island into their sphere. We have no direct information on Epaminondas' relations with the Cretans,<sup>118</sup> however, it is more than probable that the

113. See e.g. Kock II 81, no. 172.

114. *Ib.* 441f. no. 8 and 449, no. 3 (cf. Webster, *op. cit.*, 43); Plut. *Alc.* 15, 3 (the Athenians swallow Patras).

115. Crete may have been put to the fore by Ephippus because of its being suitable to the image, laughable as it is, of an enormous fish prepared in an enormous cooking pot. Besides, it figures in some stories on Geryon and Heracles as Heracles' base for the war against the Giant (Diodorus, 4, 17, 3): a tradition invented to endorse Epaminondas' Cretan policy of 364 B.C. (thence also the tradition on Rhadamanthys and Boeotia [Apollod. 3, 2, 3]?). Do verses 4-5 allude to the ἑκατόμπολις Κρήτη (τούτους may refer to the chorus constituted from the people of a polis, e.g. Thebes)?

116. All of these actually were engaged in the international conflicts of 364-362.

117. The Peloponnesian War provides a parallel, see R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford 1973, 217, on Thuc. 2, 85, 5 (cf. G. Daux, *CRAI* 1979, 89-103).

118. Cf. *supra*, n. 115.

Boeotarch tried, during his naval expedition of 364, to win over Crete as he won over some of the Cyclades.<sup>119</sup> As to Mausolus, things look clearer. The Hecatomnid ambition to spread to the West took an overt form in the Social War<sup>120</sup> and the subsequent occupation of Rhodes.<sup>121</sup> A decree by Mausolus and Artemisia, providing no chronologically precise indication, honours the Cnossians in a way which discloses Mausolus' wish to obtain Crete itself.<sup>122</sup> The inscription is usually dated to the last years of the joint reign, after 357 B.C.,<sup>123</sup> but it, or the wish at least, may have been earlier. The clause *ἐὰν δέ τις ἀδικῆι Κυωσίους κτλ* (1.8ff.) implies the possibility of a conflict involving Cnossus, and we are entitled to assume the Athens-Caria rivalry behind all that. The relevance of another document, fragmentarily preserved, to the same complex of international affairs has not been recognized.<sup>124</sup> It forms a judicial treaty,<sup>125</sup> palaeographically dated c.360 B.C.,<sup>126</sup> which was concluded between Athens and a Cretan state and formulated after a similar Attico-Cnossian convention.<sup>127</sup> According to 1.5 ([κ]ρίωντες Κυ[δωνιατ—(?)]),

119. Thera included (*JG* II<sup>2</sup> 179, 1, 9 and 11; cf. *Chiron* 8, 1976, 66 n. 80, 75f.). In 364, Epaminondas made common cause also with Rhodes (*Diod.* 15, 79, 1), which stood, racially and otherwise, near to the Cretans. We are entitled to assume a contribution of Argos, Thebes' faithful ally, to that alliance, given the well-known *οὐγγένεια* uniting the Argives with the Cnossians and the Rhodians. Cf. n. 81.

120. *Diod.* 16, 7, 3, etc.

121. *Demosth.* 15, 3, and *passim*.

122. J. Crampa, *Labraunda*, II 2: *The Greek Inscriptions*, II, Stockholm 1972, no. 40. Cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1973, 407. Sherwin-White glosses it "(Mausolus) opened up links further afield with Cnossus, a potential source of Cretan archers" (*op. cit.*, 68). Of course, the Carian economic interests were in play too (1, 6-8).

123. Crampa, Sherwin-White, *loc. citt.*

124. A.G. Woodhead, *Hesperia* 26, 1957, 229ff. no. 86 (Pl. 58) = *SEG* XVII 20 = Bengtson, *Staatsverträge* II<sup>2</sup> 296 = Ph. Gauthier, *Symbola*, Nancy 1972, 168. Unearthed in Athens, preserved in the Agora Museum (I 3055).

125. Cf. 1.7: [τῶ]ι δικαιοη[ρίωι]; 10: [τῶ]ν δικῶν; 14: [ἐν]εχέτω ἐν [τῇ] αὐτῇ ζημιαῖ], etc. Also the reference to the "nine archons" (1.3.,9) reflects the judicial character of the main part of the document; on the nature of the opening clause(s) see *infra*.

126. Woodhead, *Hesperia*, *loc. cit.* Bengtson and Gauthier prefer a dating somewhat more recent.

127. Cf. 1.8,10,12: *καθάπερ* (*τοῖς*) *Κυωσίους* or the like; 1.16: [παρόν]τος ἐγ *Κυ[δωνιατ]*. Woodhead appropriately remarks that, if the stele was opisthographic (which seems to have been the case), this latter may have been inscribed on the other surface of it.

Athens' partner was Cydonia — there is no other plausible restoration of the *Kv*[] in the context.<sup>128</sup> This conclusion enables us, in its turn, to establish the length of the line (the inscription is written *στοιχηδόν*); the evident restoration of 1.11-12 (*μετο[ικίο δὲ ἀτέλειαν τοῖς Κυδωνιάταις δίδοσθαι καθάπερ Κνωσ[ίοις—]*) postulates a line of 49 letters.<sup>129</sup> Now, the upper part of the fragmentary document, in which meagre traces of three lines are extant, has remained without an attempt at reading or interpretation:<sup>130</sup>

[——] MH [——]  
[——] ΩΛΛ [——]  
3 [—— ἐνν]έ' ἀρχο[ντ —]

Starting from the MH of 1.1 and the three characteristic letters of 1.2<sup>131</sup> — which are difficult to reconcile with a simple word or another name — we should propose, in the light of what has been said here on Geryon and Mausolus, to restore a formula not unparalleled in the series of judicial treaties:<sup>132</sup>

[ — 27 letters — ]· μὴ [ἐξεῖναι δὲ Κυδωνιάταις]  
[συμμαχίαν ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς Μαύσσωναλλον ἄνευ Ἀθηναίων ? καὶ  
3 το]  
[ῦ πλήθους τῶν συμμάχων. τοὺς δ' ἐνν]έ' ἀρχο[ντας κτλ.  
(13 1.)].<sup>133</sup>

128. Despite Bengtson's and Gauthier's reserves, the first editor's *Kv[δωνιατ — —]* should be retained.

129. Woodhead, *Hesperia* 26, 1957, 230, is inclined to posit a line of 46 *στοῖχοι*, on his reading of 1.7-8 ([τῷ] δικαιοτρίῳ · δὲ πολέμαρχος τῶν διαδικασιῶν ἐπιμελεῖσθω καθάπ[ερ τοῖς Κνωσίοις]), but the restoration δὲ πολέμαρχος κτλ. is admittedly quite uncertain (Woodhead himself adds a question-mark, while Bengtson and Gauthier omit it altogether in their texts [cf. Gauthier, *op. cit.*, 177f. 184f.]).

130. Woodhead justly notes (*Hesp.* 1957, 230 n. 12) that a restoration (1.2) [*τ]ῷλ Λ[υττίων]*] seems politically improbable (*Diod.* 16, 62f.); it also orthographically unattractive.

131. The *omega* (1.2) is engraved below the *mu* (1.1) and above the *epsilon* (1.3); the reading of all the ten letters extant in 1.1-3 is beyond doubt (cf. my note 133).

132. E.g. *Staatsverträge* III 470, 480, 511; cf. *Staatsv.* II 289 (Athens-Ceos, 362 B.C.), 1.71-73 vs. 73-79.

133. For the restoration (the line-division is arbitrary), whose wording is *exempli gratia* or almost of that type, cf. *Staatsverträge* II<sup>2</sup> 263 (Athens-Corcyra, 375 B.C.), 1.11-14; *ib.* 231 (Amyntas III - the Chalcidians, about

If our restoration is correct, this inscription completes the testimony of Ephippus on the Attico-Carian diplomatic struggles over Crete during the mid 360's.<sup>134</sup> Both the choice of Cydonia<sup>135</sup> and the background of the other Athenian documents belonging to the same genre and epoch<sup>136</sup> support the thesis that Athens' motive for approaching the two Cretan cities was imperialist rather than consular. Some at least of these inscriptions of the *συμβολαί* group may be connected with Pan-Athenian statesmen;<sup>137</sup> the document just quoted, we may specify, with Timotheus himself, whose interest in Crete is reflected not only in Ephippus' "Geryones" but also in the name of the ship *Κρήτη* constructed or baptized, it seems, by his partisans for his operations of 366/5.<sup>138</sup> The name *Κρήτη* sounds programmatically, like the names of many other Athenian vessels ('Ηγεμονία, Δημοκρατία etc.).<sup>139</sup> A close analogy is to be found in the name of the fortress *'Αρκαδία* erected by Timotheus to 393 B.C.), 1.18ff. Theoretically, other possibilities should also be allowed for, an "equal" formula (like e.g. *Staatsv.* II 231, 1.20f.), or even a clause favourable to Mausolus, presupposing the existence of an earlier Carian-Cretan symmachy (cf. e.g. *Staatsv.* II 280 [Athens - Dionysius I, 367 B.C.], 1.28f.). Thanks to the kindness of the authorities of the Agora Museum, my friend Dr. P. Petrović (of the Archaeological Institute, Belgrade) and I have been able to check the stone and consult two squeezes of it produced in the Museum (May, 1980). We believe we discerned, in the two places immediately preceding the omega of 1.2, traces of an *upsilon* and *sigma*, which would confirm the essence of the restoration printed here (the spelling *Μαύωλλος*, already attested [*Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 169, 1.3], implies a slight modification of our text, e.g. to read *ποιήσασθαι* instead of *ποιεῖσθαι*] in 1.2). But, the line being very worn – the two letters ( $\Upsilon$ ,  $\Sigma$ ) do not appear in the squeezes – I prefer to deal with the text as published in 1957.

134. They continued into the 350's, no doubt. Notwithstanding the gradual diminution of its foreign projects, Athens retained some interest in Crete during as late as the 340's, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1443, II, 1, 121f.

135. Woodhead (*Hesperia* 26, 1957, 230) refers, with good reason, to Thuc. 2,85,5 (cf. above, n. 117), and qualifies the *συμβολαί* in question as an Athenian attempt at finding in Cydonia a *point d'appui* for spreading its influence into Crete.

136. Woodhead, *loc. cit.*, 221ff. (nos. 84-85, 87), esp. 224f.; Gauthier, *op. cit.*, 167.

137. The treaty between Athens and Troizen (Gauthier, *op. cit.*, 166f. no. IX: of several datings proposed so far, Woodhead's seems the most probable) significantly coincides with the Pan-Athenian engagement in the Peloponnesian *στάσεις* spoken of in Diodorus, 15,40 (375/4 B.C., cf. *REG* 92, 1979, 320ff. 325ff.; *MDAI[A]* 94, 1979, 135 n. 82).

138. Above, n. 87. The ship does not occur in the earlier lists: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1604 (377/6 B.C.), 1606 (374/3), 1607-1608 (373/2), 1605 (370's or the beginning of the 360's; cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1610).

139. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1606 (1.59f.), 1609 (1.81, 94), etc.

gether with the Zacynthian democrats in their island a decade before (Diod. 15,45,3): the Zacynthian *'Αρκαδία* announced Timotheus' anti-Spartan engagement in the Peloponnese of 374 and 371 B.C.<sup>140</sup>

One last remark. Timotheus' foreign activity of 366-359 reveals that in many places he enjoyed the important support of the school led by his relative and political friend Plato; that help not only made Timotheus' diplomatic tasks easier but also inspired the topical facets of Plato's dialogues of the middle and late periods.<sup>141</sup> Crete may have been a similar case.<sup>142</sup> The collaboration between the general (or one of his younger associates) and the philosopher had already given Ephippus an opportunity for the satire in the *Ναυαγός*.<sup>143</sup> Webster has discovered the allusion to a Platonic image in our fragment of the "Geryones" itself.<sup>144</sup> All this opens up a perspective for an inquiry into the "political" aspect of the Cretan scene of Plato's *Laws*, which has received no satisfactory explanation.<sup>145</sup> The special interest of the Academy in Crete predates the

140. *REG* 92, 1979, 325f. (cf. above, n. 137). Many anthroponyms convey similar ideas, e.g. the names of Themistocles' daughters Italia, Sybaris and Asia (cf. Davies, *Ath. Propertied Families*, 217). Timotheus' own trireme in 366/5 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1609, 1.100: the cleruchy expedition to Samos of the summer, 365), *Ναύκρατις* (*τῶν καωδῶν*), also tells us that the strategus had the South on his mind then (not long after, the Panathenians [Chabrias] and Tachos collaborated at and around Naucratis, Ps.-Arist. *Oec.* 2,2,25 [cf. H. Kees, *RE* 16, 1935, 1960, *Chiron* 8, 1978, 76 n. 146]). The ship-name *Θήρα*, first attested (357/6 B.C.) in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1611, 1.216 (*τῷ μ πρώτων*), may also be signalled here (cf. *supra* notes 81 and 119).

141. *Chiron* 10, 1980, 117ff. (Macedonia, Heraclea Pontica, Thasos, Cnidus, Thessaly, Thrace). Cf. *supra*, n. 54, 79, 81 (Caria, Syracuse, Cyrene). As to Cyprus, Aristotle's *Eudemus* and *Protrepticus* seem significant, especially the former, with its manifold political implications (Pherae, Syracuse).

142. Plato seems to have had a pupil named Isus, presumably of Cnossian origin and identical with the father of the two Epidaurian proxenoi honoured in *IG* IV, 2, 96 l. 25 (R. Walzer, *Fragmenta graeca in litteris Arabicis*, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1939, 416f.).

143. *Supra*, n. 104.

144. *Op. cit.*, 41f. (finding in the "Phaedo", 109b, the source of Ephippus' comparison of the Mediterranean to a pond). On Plato's judgment on Heracles and Geryon, see the "Gorgias", 484b-c.

145. It is commonly believed that Plato's choice of Crete as the setting of the "Laws" had nothing to do with the international relations of the 360's - 350's, which, in the general opinion of the moderns, left Crete peaceful and isolated: U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Platon*, I<sup>2</sup>, Berlin 1920, 661ff.; H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe*, Paris 1948, 20ff.; G.R. Morrow, *Plato's Cretan City*, Princeton 1960, 17ff. Cf. M. Piéart, *Platon et la*

"Laws", judging from the Pseudo-Platonic "Minos":<sup>146</sup> it may well have coincided with Timotheus' coalition of 365-364 B.C.<sup>147</sup>

*Cité grecque*, Bruxelles 1973, 3f.

146. Which is obviously somewhat earlier than the "Laws" (Morrow, *op. cit.*, 37).

147. I am preparing a book on the problem, under the title "History and Politics in Plato's Laws".