Poseidippos escorted the ambassadors without being an official member of the embassy was that the ambassadors expected that he would prove useful to the mission—an expectation which was eventually met, as the decree informs us. And the most probable reason why Poseidippos was expected to prove useful is that he had prior contacts with the court of Kassandros. If this assumption is correct, the interesting conclusion is that Athens did not rely only on ambassadors realistically expected to be well received in the court of the king, like Philippides, but also recruited private individuals\(^1\) with the appropriate connections.

**A40. Philippides son of Philokles of Kephale**

— *PCG VII* 333-52 (testimonia and fragments)

The comedy-writer Philippides of Kephale was probably born in the mid-fourth century.\(^2\) He made his first known political appearance during Poliorketes’ first rule over Athens (307-301),\(^3\) when he appears to have been a prominent member of the democratic faction opposed to Stratokles and his subservient policy towards Poliorketes. Fragments of his work portray his vehement opposition to the extraordinary honours to Poliorketes, as well as his political and personal dislike for Stratokles.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) The phrase ἀποδεικνύμενον τὴν εὔνοιαν ἣν εἶχε πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τῶν Ἀθηναίων (ll. 17-19) might allow, at first glance, the assumption that Poseidippos was not an Athenian by birth but a naturalized citizen, in which case one would be tempted to associate him with the well-known Poseidippos son of Kyniskos of Kassandreia, who lived in Athens (*PCG VII* 561-81). Nonetheless, similar phrases are used in Attic decrees for Athenians as well: Philippides himself, proposer of the decree for Poseidippos, was described as ἀεὶ φιλοτιμούμενος περὶ τὸν δῆμον τῶν Ἀθηναίων (*SEG* 45 [1995] 101, ll. 8-9). There is therefore no reason to dispute Poseidippos’ Athenian origins or to assume any connection with the Macedonian comedy-writer.

\(^2\) The *Suda* places his *floruit* in the ρια΄ (111th) Olympiad (336-32), which would give us a birth date of ca. 375. This is obviously too high, which is why it is usually corrected to ρκα΄ (121st Olympiad, 296-92), which gives a birth date of ca. 334. Given that his first victory took place in the Dionysia of 312/11 (*IG* II\(^2\) 2323a, l. 43; we do not know the date of another recorded victory [*IG* II\(^2\) 2325, l. 164]), this, in turn, is somewhat low (cf. Davies 1971: 541). Moreover, Philippides must have been over sixty in 283, like all honourands receiving the highest honours in Athens (see p. 162 n. 4, below), which effects that he must have been born before 343. Bielman 1994: 77 n. 3 thinks the original reading of the *Suda* is correct, pointing out that Gell., *NA* 3.15.2 records that Philippides died very old, and that the date of the decree in his honour (283/2) is not incompatible with a date of birth ca. 365, for example. Nonetheless, such an assumption would imply: a) that his *floruit* came earlier than usual; b) that Philippides died immediately after his honouring, a plausible but unnecessary assumption; and c) that he won his first victory after the age of fifty, itself not very likely, even if possible.

\(^3\) His homonymous cousin was a member of the council in 305/4 (*Agora* 15.68, l. 62).

\(^4\) Philippides, *PCG VII* fr. 25 (Plut., *Demetr.* 12.9 and 26.5); 22 (Ath. 6.262a); 26 (Plut., *Mor.* 750E); 30 (Stob. 3.2.8); the passage recorded in Plut., *Demetr.* 11.3 is probably to be attributed to Philippides.
The chief source on Philippides' life is the ‘career decree’ proposed by his fellow demesman Nikeratos son of Phileas in the autumn of 283. The decree informs us that Philippides left Athens and sought refuge at the court of Lysimachos before the battle of Ipsos (cf. ll. 9-10, 16-17), probably in 303, when a short period of anti-Macedonian strife in Athens ended with the exile or self-exile of the opponents of Stratokles, including Demochares. Determining the time of his return to Athens is more difficult. Some believe that he returned immediately after Ipsos, their sole argument being that the period of 300-298 seems most appropriate for the production of his plays against Stratokles and Poliorketes. Nothing, however, obliges us to assume that Philippides was in Athens in person during the didaskalia of his plays, let alone that he had permanently resettled in Athens. In fact, most scholars have rightly pointed out that nothing in the decree suggests that Philippides had resettled in Athens before 287, and accordingly place his return soon after that date. Franco, however, rightly points out that the mediation of Philippides between Athens and Lysimachos after 287 is described in the decree in terms which point to his continuing presence at court, and, accordingly, concludes that Philippides returned only in 284/3, when he was elected agonothetes and financed the established contests, as well as a new contest, held in honour of Demeter and Kore. Another difficulty (which has been pointed out without scholars drawing the necessary conclusions) is that, at the time he was honoured (autumn 283), Philippides was again at the court of Lysimachos. Are we to assume that he settled in Athens in 284, only to return to the court a year later? It is more plausible to assume that, after his self-exile in 303, Philippides never

as well (cf. PCG VII p. 352). For the place of Philippides in the history of political comedy, see Philipp 1973.

1 IG II 657 (Syll 374; T. L. Shear 1978: 94-95, T11; Bielman 1994: 74-80 no 20; Bringmann / von Steuben 1995: no 6; PCG VII 333-35, T3); on ‘career decrees’ in general, see Gauthier 1985: 77-92; cf. p. 162 n. 4, below.

2 Plut., Demetr. 24.12; [Plut.], Mor. 851ε; cf. above, A19 (III). Fr. 25 of Philippides (ταῦτα καταλύει δῆμον, οὐ κωμῳδία) may point to a legal charge against him. A date in 303 or 302 for his exile is unanimously assumed (see, for example, Ferguson 1911: 144; Tarn 1911: 95 n. 12; Habicht 1970: 215; T. L. Shear 1978: 49; Mastrocinque 1979b: 263; Lund 1992: 86). It must be stressed, however, that there is no direct evidence on an official exile; Philippides may well have left on his own will (cf. Sonnabend 1996: 311; Kralli 2000: 151).

3 See the bibliography cited by Bielman 1994: 78 n. 17.


8 IG II 657, ll. 29-30: “... and he remains useful to the Athenians who happen to arrive [at court]” (καὶ τοῖς ἄει περιτυνχάνουσιν Ἀθηναίων χρήσιμος ὃν διατελεῖ).
actually resettled in his hometown. If this is correct, an important conclusion for the appraisal of his role as an intermediary can be drawn, namely that the poet was not an Athenian citizen who happened to offer his services to a king for a brief period of time, but a 'full-time' courtier of Lysimachos, who just happened to maintain his interest in his hometown.

I. 299/8: The donation of grain and a new interpretation for Lysimachos' donation of a peplos for the Panathenaia

The first intervention of Philippides on behalf of his hometown brought Athens 10,000 medimni of grain and a new spar and mast for Athena's peplos for the coming Panathenaia of 298. The approach of Lysimachos, the donation and the honours for the king which followed, are part of the official foreign policy after Ipsos, when, as we saw (A38, above), Athens followed a path of careful distances from Poliorketes, active neutrality, and pursued contacts with all his opponents.

1 The obvious objection is that, as an agonothetes, Philippides had to reside in Athens, not only in order to supervise the games, but also in order to pass through an euthyna after his term of office (IG II² 657, ll. 47-48). To counter that objection, a short digression on the agonothetai is necessary. As we saw (A31, above), the office was probably created by Demetrios of Phaleron or, at the latest, in 307. Already from the start, only very rich citizens were elected (Xenokles [A31], Philippides son of Philomelos [A38], our Philippides, Phaidros son of Thymochares [A46]); they were obviously expected to spend a lot of their own money to secure the proper conduct of the contests, which is why the office is explicitly described as a liturgy and not an arche (IG II² 682, ll. 53-63), and why it was an honorary appointment, proudly passed from father to son (for the agonothetai of the third century, cf. J. L. Shear 2001: 472-78). The people actually taking care of the procedural details of the Panathenaia in the third century (J. L. Shear 2001: 461), or even the second (Nagy 1978), were still the athlothetai. In other words, the only real obligation of Philippides as an agonothetes may have been to provide large sums of money for (some?) contests and not to be present throughout the year, supervising the preparations. He was probably present at some of the contests of 284/3, and may have passed the euthyna after his term had ended, but there is no need to assume that he was a resident of Athens.

2 For the high position of Philippides at Lysimachos' court, see Plut., Demetr. 12.8-9 (philos and confidant of the king) and below; cf. Franco 1990: 118 and Landucci Gattinoni 1992: 259.

3 IG II² 657, ll. 11-16. It should be stressed that 299/8 is the year when the grain and the peplos were delivered to Athens. The necessary discussions which must have preceded Lysimachos's decision, the latter's final decision to proceed with the donation and the announcement of this decision probably belong to the previous year, 300/299. It is highly unlikely that the donation of cereals was made much earlier and that it was only distributed to the Athenians in 300/299, as Zink and Hünerwadel have assumed (cf. Bielman 1994: 77 n. 3).

4 Lysimachos was honoured with a golden crown (IG II² 1485Α, ll. 28-29, with the comments of Burstein 1978 and Lund 1993: 66 for the date; cf., however, Lewis 1988: 303). The erection of the statue of Lysimachos in the agora (Paus. 1.9.4) probably belongs to the period after 285 (Franco 1990: 120 n. 39, with earlier bibliography).
The substantial donation of grain made 299/8 a year of sufficient food supplies, a fact that the new regime publicized effectively.¹

The donation of the spar and mast of Athena, that is, of the peplos and of the spar on which it was fixed for the procession of the Great Panathenaia every four years,² requires a more detailed examination. In 307, the Athenians had decided to have Antigonos and Demetrios portrayed on the peplos.³ Plutarch, explicitly quoting Philippides, has another story on that ‘Antigonid’ peplos: during the Panathenaia, the peplos was torn in half by a storm.⁴ It is accordingly unanimously assumed that the peplos donated by Lysimachos was meant to supplant the destroyed ‘Antigonid’ peplos.⁵

In my view, Plutarch’s anecdote is unhistorical. Firstly, it should be reminded that the decree for Philippides only speaks of a donation, not of a replacement of the peplos, as one would expect from a decree demonstrably favourable to Lysimachos and hostile to Poliorketes.⁶ Secondly, heed should be given to the narrative context of the anecdote. The destruction of the peplos is one of the divine omens which proved the sacrilegious nature of the honours voted for Poliorketes:⁷ conium gushed from the ground near the altars erected for Antigonos and Demetrios, a frost forced the Athenians to interrupt the procession of the Dionysia and blusted the vines, fig-trees and cereal crops. All these omens—including the destruction of the peplos—are drawn from Philippides’ comedy on Stratokles, the fragment of which (fr. 25) immediately follows.⁸ I see no reason why the story of the torn peplos should be invested with any greater historical value than the story of

---

¹ See Habicht 1979: 19. On the question of the frequency of the dedication of the peplos (annually or every four years) see mainly J. L. Shear 2001: 97-103 (annual peplos, attested from the late second century) and 173-86 (penteteric peplos), with the sources and earlier bibliography.
³ Diod. Sic. 20.46.2; Plut., Demetr. 10.4.
⁴ Plut., Demetr. 12.2. Plutarch places the event in 307, giving the impression that the Panathenaia in question are those of 306; had the peplos been destroyed in 306, it would have been replaced well before 298; it is therefore assumed (Mastrocinque 1979b: 262, with earlier bibliography) that the Panathenaia in question are those of 302, and that Plutarch, once more, got his dates wrong.
⁶ Lysimachos is described as the sole victor at Ipsos over Demetrios and Antigonos (IG II² 657, ll. 16-18), who do not bear the royal title (l. 18 and 28).
⁷ Plut., Demetr. 10.3-7.
⁸ The fragment refers to the destruction of the peplos and the frost, not to the incident with the conium, but surely Plutarch had no other source: all omens are preceded by the overall introduction ἐπεσήμην δὲ τοῖς πλείστοις τὸ θέναι. Plutarch perhaps used Philippides indirectly; his source may have been a historical work (Douris of Samos?) which included fragments of Philippides and their historical context (so Marasco 1981b: 63-64).
conium gushing from the earth. It should be added that further signs of divine displeasure were invented by the anti-Antigonid propaganda of the post-Ipsos period, as a reaction against the policy of Stratokles. As already noted, the comedy of Philippides, which exploits this prevailing climate of superstition, must have been staged sometime between 300 and 298. Is it a coincidence that our only source on the destruction of the ‘Antigonid’ peplos is a theatrical play by the same person who convinced Lysimachos to donate a peplos to Athens? I believe that a different interpretation is needed.

There is no reason to assume that the peplos had been destroyed in 302. The ‘Antigonid’ peplos, a relic of the old regime, could no longer be used after Ipsos in the festival which, more than any other festival, reflected and proclaimed the Athenians’ self-image. Philippides decisively contributed to its replacement in two ways: on the one hand, he advised Lysimachos to donate a new peplos; on the other hand, he simultaneously attacked Poliorketes and Stratokles’ faction through his theatrical work, thereby discrediting the old regime and its tangible testimonies, while at the same time facilitating the acceptance of the new peplos, free of the impiety interwoven with the old one. Lysimachos not only received Athens’ gratitude but, more importantly, managed an important symbolic blow against his main opponent’s promoted image. It is no accident that Ptolemy II followed his example in the Panathenaia of 278.

II. The prisoners of Ipsos and the ἐν τῇ Ἀσίαι εἱργμένοι

The second benefaction of Philippides revolves around the fate of the Athenians who were in Poliorketes’ army in 301. He made sure the dead were

---

1 Philochoros, FörHist 328 F 67: a dog managed to climb the Acropolis against the rules and a comet appeared in the sky (cf. Marmor Parium, FörHist 239 B 25 [303/2]); these signs, according to Philochoros, predicted the return of the exiles. The passage appears to be dated to 306/5, but this is not necessary (cf. Jacoby, FörHist II b Suppl. I, 345). The date offered by the Parian Chronicle for the appearance of the comet (corroborated by Chinese evidence: see Ramsey 2006: 71) allows us, I believe, to establish the (fictional) date of Philochoros’ incident in 303/2 as well; otherwise, the mention of the return of the exiles of 303 would make no sense. The exiles, in that case, were prominent anti-Macedonians, such as Demochares and Philippides (who, of course, returned much later), and less prominent ones, perhaps such as the ἐν τῇ Ἀσίαι εἱργμένοι ὑπὸ Δημητρίου καὶ Ἀντιγόνου mentioned in the decree for Philippides (IG II 657, l. 28; cf. section II, below); for a different view, see Mastrocinque 1979b: 262-63; Dreyer 1999: 144.

2 The wording of the decree (IG II 657, l. 11-15: διαλεχθεὶς ἐκόμισεν τῶι δήμωι... διελέχθη δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ κεραίας καὶ ἱστοῦ ὡς ἄν δοθεῖ does not allow the assumption that an Athenian petition had preceded the donation. The initiative probably belonged to Philippides and Lysimachos.

3 SEG 28 (1978) 60; for the date, see p. 149 n. 2, below.

4 This is not necessarily an official Athenian contingent (pace Franco 1990: 115; Lund 1993: 86; Bielman 1994: 79), although the existence of such a contingent is probable. Judging from the fact that Philippides sent the survivors “wherever each of them wanted” (IG II 657, l. 25: οὖ
buried properly, that the prisoners (at least those in the hands of Lysimachos) were released, that those who so wished joined ranks with Lysimachos, that the rest of them –more than 300– went wherever they desired, “and he also begged for the release of the citizens who were left in Asia, incarcerated by Antigonus and Demetrios” (IG II² 657, ll. 16-29: παρειτήσατο δὲ καὶ ὅπως ἀν ἀφεθῶσιν καὶ ὅσοι τῶν πολιτῶν κατελήφθησαν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ εἰργμένοι ὑπὸ Δημητρίου καὶ Ἀντιγόνου). The first four actions require no further comment, other than they bare testimony to Philippides’ high place at court and considerable wealth.¹

The reference to “those incarcerated in Asia”, however, is not clear. Who are they, and in what did they differ from the other prisoners mentioned in the same phrase? It is usually assumed that they were Athenian hostages taken by Polior- ketes, and/or anti-Macedonian politicians exiled to Asia.² Bielman³ aptly remarks that in the phrase εἱργμένοι ὑπὸ Δημητρίου καὶ Ἀντιγόνου the order in which the kings are mentioned is different from standard practice, including the order followed in the decree itself, just a few lines above; based on this anomaly she proceeds to construct an interesting albeit implausible theory: Antigonus is not Antigonos the One-Eyed but Antigonos Gonatas, the “prisoners in Asia” are Athenians who happened to be in the cities Lysimachos wrested from Poliorketes after Ipsos, and the mention of Gonatas, who had no connection to the post-Ipsos Asian campaign, is a testimony of Philippides’ hostility towards the Antigonids in general. Bielman’s theory is untenable for several reasons. Firstly, her argument that since the events date from the period after the battle of Ipsos Antigonus has to be Antigonos Gonatas is invalid, since there is no reason to suppose that the Athenians in question were imprisoned after Ipsos. Secondly, there is no reason why Lysimachos would have imprisoned Athenians who just happened to be in a city controlled by Poliorketes. Finally, the theory is disproven by the explicit mention of “Demetrios and Antigonus” as those responsible for the incarceration. We would, therefore, better abide by the traditional interpretation, explain the reversed order of the kings by the preeminent position of Poliorketes in Athenian matters, and assume that the εἱργμένοι are Athenians deposed by Stratokles and/or Poliorketes or perhaps taken hostage as an assurance of Athens’ continued good faith ἕκαστοι ἠβούλοντο), which means that many of them decided not to return to Athens, most of the Athenians mentioned in the decree were probably mercenaries.

¹ On the financial burden of Philippides’ action, see Bielman 1994: 79. Franco 1990: 116, n. 16 points out that if Lysimachos had accepted the release of the prisoners without ransom, this should be reported in the decree, and concludes that Philippides ransomed the prisoners, but his argument can be turned against him: had Philippides spent additional money to ransom the prisoners, this should be recorded in the decree; let us not forget that this is a decree in honour of Philippides, not Lysimachos.


towards the king. Their release and the return of some of them to Athens sheds new light on the political situation in post-Ipsos Athens; it particularly sheds new light on Philippides’ Athenian political agenda, the main objective of which was the restoration of democracy – a democracy which he fervently believed had been crippled in 307-301.

III. After 287: τὰ συμφέροντα τεί ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίας and the festivals of 284/3

If the interpretation of the “prisoners in Asia” proposed here is correct, there appears to have been a gap in the benefactions of Philippides between soon after 301 and 287. The gap is well explained; under the tyrannid of Lachares (297[?]–295), and the second rule of Poliorketes over Athens (295–287) neither Lysimachos nor Philippides had any reason to lavish any benefactions upon Athens nor did the Athenians in charge have any reason to ask for their help. It is therefore easy to understand why Philippides reappeared in Athenian affairs only after the revolt of 287 – the “liberation of the people” (κομισαμένου τοῦ δήμου τὴν ἐλευθερίαν) as the decree explicitly calls it. At that time he asked the king once more to send grain and money to Athens and, in general, did everything in his power “so that the people remain free and regain the Piraeus and the forts as soon as possible”.

This activity is part of the intense diplomacy of 287-285, that is, until Poliorketes’ final defeat by Seleukos in Asia, a period in which the main concern of Athenian statesmen was the military, diplomatic and financial protection of the city in view of a possible return of Poliorketes. Contacts with Lysimachos, Pyrrhos, Ptolemy, minor rulers such as Spartokos of Bosporos or Audoleon of Paionia, even contenders for the Macedonian royal title, such as Antipatros Etesias, were actively pursued in that period. Contacts with Lysimachos, in particular, appear to have been dense. Two more officers of the king were honoured with the Athenian citizenship in the same period: Artemidoros of Perinthos and Bithys of Lysimacheia. We also know of at least two embassies to Lysimachos – led by one

---

1 Cf. p. 120 n. 1, above.
2 IG II² 657, ll. 31-36.
3 Pyrrhos (in 287): Plut., Demetr. 46.1-4 and Pyrrh. 12.6-8; Paus. 1.11.1; cf. Kotsidu 2000: no 8, with bibliography; Ptolemy: IG II² 650 (Syll² 367; Bringmann / von Steuben 1995: no 14); IG II² 682 (Syll² 409; Bringmann / von Steuben 1995: no 15); SEG 28 (1978) 60 (Bringmann / von Steuben 1995: no 16); Osborne 1981: D77 (Kotsidu 2000: no 48; Agora 16.173); [Plut.], Mor. 851E; cf. Habicht 1992: 69-71 and A46-A50, below; Spartokos: Bringmann / von Steuben 1995: no 34 (IG II² 653; Syll² 370); Audoleon: Osborne 1981: D76 (IG II² 654; Syll² 371; Bringmann / von Steuben 1995: no 32 E1); Antipatros Etesias: [Plut.], Mor. 851E; for the date and context of that contact, see A49, below.
4 Cf. Franco 1990: 122-34.
5 Agora 16.172; cf. A51, below.
6 Osborne 1981: D87 (IG II² 808); the question whether the honourand should be identified with the general of Demetrios II in the 230’s (Plut., Arat. 34.1) or with the philos of Lysimachos (Aristodemos, FHG III 310 apud Ath. 6.246a-c; Phylarchos, fGrHist 81 F 12 apud Ath. 14.614e-615a)
of the leaders of the post-287 regime, Demochares, nephew of Demosthenes, which resulted in donations of 30 and 100 talents respectively; these 130 talents should either be identified with the χρήματα of the Philippides decree (l. 34) or as part of them. Finally, the statue of Lysimachos which the grateful Athenians erected in the agora probably also belongs to the same period.

Lysimachos’ benefactions appear to have come to an end in 285—and so did, correspondingly, the expression of Athenian gratitude. Habicht assumes that this is an indication of hostility between the two sides, triggered by the reluctance of Lysimachos to restore Lemnos to the Athenians, as well as by the significant increase of Lysimachos’ power and the extinction of the danger which Poliorketes signified for Athens. These two factors obviously took a toll on the relationship between the two sides, but can hardly have led to open hostility. As Franco aptly remarks, the decree for Philippides repeatedly mentions the benefactions of Lysimachos; in the subtext of Hellenistic diplomatic language, this clearly means not only that Athens remained an ally of the king, but also that it expected future benefactions by him, including, as the decree explicitly states, help for the recovery of the Piraeus and the Attic forts.

It is therefore in the context of this friendly, even if somewhat strained, relationship between Athens and Lysimachos that we should set the agonothesia of

is answered by SEG 38 (1988) 619 in favour of the latter option (cf., however, Gauthier, BullEpigr 1991, 176). On the latter Bithys, see mainly Ameling 1991: 113-15 and Franco 1990: 130-134, with earlier bibliography. It should be noted that the Athenian decree for Bithys should not be taken to imply that Lysimachos offered military assistance to Athens in 287, as Burstein 1980 had assumed, followed, among others, by Franco 1990: 130 and Lund 1992: 101. The phrase εἰς τάγμα καταχωρίζεται (l. 8; Kirchner’s unnecessary restoration of the rest of the phrase as εἰς τε ἡγεμονίας καθίστησιν probably gave rise to Burstein’s theory) has an exact parallel in the decree for Philippides (IG II 657, ll. 22-23: τοὺς βουλομένους στρατεύοντας διώκησεν ὅπως ἂν καταχωρισθῶσιν [ἐν ἡγεμονίᾳ]. Bithys was not involved in any military operation in Athens any more than Philippides was (cf. Ameling 1991: 115); the only thing both Bithys and Philippides did was to incorporate Athenians who so wished in Lysimachos’ army.

1 [Plut.], Mor. 851E; cf. A49, below.

Phylarchos, FrHist 81 F 29 (apud Ath. 6.255) records the hostility of the Athenians of Lemnos towards Lysimachos and informs us that Lemnos was only later restored to Athens by Seleukos I, immediately after the battle of Kouroupedion in 281; cf. Habicht 1970: 89-90 and Lund 1992: 203-204.

3 Franco 1990: 127-29. Dreyer 1999: 229 is also circumspect as regards Habicht’s theory.

Philippides in 284/3. Naturally, these lavishly organized contests were a benefaction of Philippides as an individual, but Athenians were well aware that he was not only a wealthy citizen but also a prominent courtier of Lysimachos, whose donations were the chief source of Philippides’ wealth.\(^1\) If this is true for the pre-existing contests, it is even truer for the new contest held at Eleusis in honour of Demeter and Kore, which Philippides financed; this contest was instituted as “a reminder of the people’s freedom”,\(^2\) but also in order to celebrate the recovery of Eleusis, for which Demochares was also honoured, and to which the donations of Lysimachos certainly contributed.\(^3\) Moreover, the lavish contests, old and new, come in significant contrast with the fiscal austerity of 286/5, on which Demochares prided himself, in typical Lykourgean language.\(^4\) It is true that two year later the danger of Poliorketes was extinct, but, nevertheless, these lavish festivities would not have been possible without the money of the citizen and courtier Philippides.

IV. An overview: Philippides between Athens and the court

If we were to draw a line connecting Athens and the court of Lysimachos, Philippides’ position on that line would appear rather peculiar. In a sense, he was a courtier honoured for his mediation between the two sides. In another sense, however, Philippides was a citizen benefactor. This is an interpretation conspicuously promoted by both ‘contracting parties’. If we focus on the, always significative, wording of the decree, the city appears to have honoured him because on every occasion Philippides proved his goodwill towards his hometown, helped his fellow citizens, promoted the city’s salvation by words and deeds, “voluntarily accepted the people’s nomination” of him as an agonothetes, successfully passed the euthyna “according to the laws”, and “never did anything contrary to the rule of the people by words or deeds”. The city honoured a worthy citizen, with terms befitting civic leaders,\(^5\) although the only official position Philippides ever held was that of an agonothetes, a costly liturgy rather than a real office.

But this point of view was also Philippides’ point of view. The decree, as all decrees leading to the greatest honours in Athens, drew on a sort of official

---

\(^1\) Philippides’ family was probably well-off (cf. Davies 1971: 541), but certainly not as wealthy as the families of other agonothetai like Xenokles and Phaidros.

\(^2\) IG II² 657, ll. 43-45: ὑπόμνημα τῆς τοῦ δήμου ἐλευθερίας.


\(^4\) [Plut.], Mor. 851E: συστείλαντι τὴν διοίκησιν πρώτῳ καὶ φεισαμένῳ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων...

\(^5\) Similar emphasis is put on democratic policy in the decrees for Lykourgos, Demochares ([Plut.], Mor. 851-852) and Kallias (SEG 28 [1978] 60).
This means that Philippides himself not only maintained an unfailing interest in Athenian affairs, manifested by the benefactions themselves, but was also interested in having his actions presented as those of a citizen benefactor.

At the same time, however, the wording of the decree points to a different direction: the decree makes it clear that even the benefactions of the king were largely attributable to Philippides—now the courtier and not the citizen. Moreover, Philippides strove for his actions to be advertised by the king himself: “... and to all these [sic. Philippides’ actions], the king has often testified to the Athenians sent on an embassy to him” (ll. 36-38; ... καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτων πάντως πολλάκις μεμαρτύρηκεν αὐτῶι ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς ἑαυτόν). Philippides knew the importance of his position παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ, knew that the Athenians were well aware of this importance and impressed it upon them on every occasion. The story of his career as presented in the decree begins with his position at the court of Lysimachos, the victor of Ipsos over the hated Poliorketes, and throughout the text the Athenians are discreetly reminded of how influential the honourand was at the king’s court.

In conclusion, regardless of how much Philippides loved his country, he was exactly in the middle of the road leading from the city to the king and vice versa; a fact of which he was well aware of and which he duly emphasized. He was a citizen and a courtier; as a citizen, he exploited his countrymen’s gratitude to consolidate his position at court; as a courtier, he exploited the royal favour to enhance his esteem with which he was invested back home.

A41. Lachares

— Paus. 1.25.7-8; Plut., Demetr. 33.7-8; other sources: FörHist 257a F 1-4 (P.Oxy. 2082); Plut., Mor. 379C and 1090C; Paus. 1.29.10 and 29.16; Polyainos 3.7.1-3; 4.7.5; 6.7.2; fr. 52.3; Demetrios, ΙΧΓ V 11 apud Ath. 9.405f; ΙΕ 23 (ΙΓ II2 774 + Add.) + ΣΕΓ 39 (1989) 131, ll. 29-32 (?)

It is indicative of the deplorable state of our sources for the third century that we know so little about Lachares, who, according to all available sources, became a tyrant in Athens in the first decade of the century. To begin with, we know nothing about his background, including his patronym and his deme of origin. Secondly, there is no consensus on the duration of his tyrannid or its precise date. Various dates have been proposed: 300-295, 295-294 (with a civil strife from 298/7 and/or with Lachares in power already after 301), 297-294 and 297-295 (the dating which I follow here).2

---

1 See IG II2 657, ll. 54-55 (... δὲν εξέλθωσιν αἱ ἕκ τοῦ νόμου ἡμέραι τῆς αἰτήσεως), with Gauthier 1985: 83-88.
2 Here I offer only a select bibliography, citing the main proponents of the various datings (for a more extensive bibliography, see especially Dreyer 1999: 17-76). 1) 300-295: Ferguson 1929; Habicht 1995: 90 and n. 58 (cf. [2006] 99-101, modifying his earlier views); 2) 295-294: Beloch