ATHENS FROM ALEXANDER TO ANTONY

CHRISTIAN HABICHT

TRANSLATED BY
DEBORAH LUCAS SCHNEIDER

ATHENS FROM ALEXANDER TO ANTONY

Christian Habicht

TRANSLATED BY
DEBORAH LUCAS SCHNEIDER

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England

Copyright © 1997 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
Second printing, 1999

First Harvard University Press paperback edition, 1999

Originally published in 1995 as *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit,*
Verlag C. H. Beck, Munich

Publication of this volume was assisted by a grant from Inter Nationes.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Habicht, Christian.
[Athen. English]
Athens from Alexander to Antony / Christian Habicht ; translated
by Deborah Lucas Schneider.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-674-05111-4 (cloth)
ISBN 0-674-05112-2 (pbk.)
1. Athens (Greece)—History. 2. Hellenism. I. Title.
DF285.H313 1997
938′.5—dc21 97-5180

PREFACE

This book is a synthesis of the author's earlier and more specialized studies. It was written with the aim of making those studies accessible to a wider audience without compromising scholarly standards. Since the surviving narrative sources for the Hellenistic era are quite inadequate, no coherent account of events can be presented. On the other hand, the evidence from inscriptions and coins is much richer than for earlier periods and illuminates important developments and areas of public life in unprecedented ways. With Athens as its model, the book aims to show how, after the death of Alexander the Great, the Greek cities strugggled to keep their own in a world drastically changed by the appearance of major powers. Successes and setbacks followed one another, as did times of independence and times of foreign domination. Some cities, such as Corinth, were razed by one of the great powers, while others, Athens among them, succeeded in surviving as vital social organisms, despite considerable loss of political clout. The epigraph from Horace expresses what Athens meant to the best of her conquerors.

The book contains only minor changes from the German edition of 1995; most noteworthy of these are revisions of calendar dates provided by Professor John D. Morgan of the University of Delaware, to whom I am grateful. More importantly, his work on the Athenian calendar and on the chronology of archons of the period will result in numerous changes of accepted archon-years. Dr. Morgan kept me informed and even authorized me to make his findings known. But since he has not yet published his study, I find that difficult to do. A short note in the *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996) 395 reveals his most important result, in accordance with the rule mentioned by Plato, *Laws* 767C, that the new year began with the new moon after the summer solstice, there was a nineteen-year cycle of twelve ordinary and seven intercalary years, following each other in fixed order. If rigorously observed (as seems to have been the case), the character of every single year, whether ordinary or intercalary, is determined a priori. This, in turn, requires the shift of a number of accepted archon dates, for instance, downdating most of the archons from around 240 to 200 by one year. As a consequence, a number of dates in this book will have to be revised, and while these revisions will rarely seriously affect the sequence of events as told, I would have preferred, had circumstances allowed, to have made full use of Dr. Morgan's work.

I am very grateful to Julia Bernheim, who typed and proofread the manuscript and contributed much to the final version. I am also deeply obliged to Deborah Lucas Schneider, who ably translated the book from the German and made me aware of a number of errors. To work with both was always pleasant and stimulating. Harvard University Press did everything in its power to make this book conform to its high standards. I am also grateful to all the people, too numerous to mention here, who have helped this project along in many discussions and by sending me copies of their own work. Any imperfections that remain are my responsibility alone.

试读结束：需要全本请在线购买： www.ertongbook.com

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

1. In the Shadow of Macedonian Expansion (338–323) 6
    1. Political Leaders 2. Endangered Peace 3. The Age of Lycurgus 4. The Crisis
2. Under Foreign Rule (323–307) 36
    1. The Hellenic War 2. Unsettled Postwar Years 3. Demetrius of Phalerum
3. Between Freedom and Dependency (307–287) 67
    1. Democracy without Full Freedom 2. Tyranny 3. King Demetrius
4. Culture in Public Life 98
    1. Drama 2. The Schools of the Philosophers 3. The Fine Arts 4. Prose: Historiography and the *Characters* of Theophrastus
5. The Independent City (287–262) 124
    1. Policy amid Competing Forces 2. Life in the City 3. The Chremonidean War
6. Renewed Subjugation (262–229) 150
    1. The Royal Governor 2. A Satellite of Macedonia 3. Official Religion and the Royal House 4. Hellenistic Athens as Seen by a Contemporary
7. Freedom and Neutrality (229–200) 173
    1. Precarious Freedom 2. The 220s 3. Athens as a Neutral Power
8. Alliance with Rome (200–167) 194
    1. Against Philip 2. Against Antiochus 3. Against Perseus
9. Times of Peace (before and after 167) 220
    1. Contacts with Kings 2. Contacts with Independent States 3. Conditions at Home

10. Athenian Delos 246
1. The Cleruchy 2. The Limits of Athenian Sovereignty 3. Center of Trade
11. Roman Hegemony 264
1. Athens and Oropus 2. Rome Acquires a Foothold on the Balkan Peninsula 3. Athens and Delphi
12. The Close of the Second Century 280
1. Foreign Relations 2. Conditions at Home
13. Athens and Mithridates 297
1. The Break with Rome 2. War and Its Consequences
14. After the War 315
1. The Constitution 2. Ruling Circles 3. A Difficult New Beginning
15. Subjection 338
1. Clodius' Plebiscite 2. Romans in Athens 3. In the Civil Wars
Epilogue 366
Abbreviations and Short Titles 370
Select Bibliography 373
Index 391

Introduction

More than eighty years have passed since William Scott Ferguson published the last account of Athens in the postclassical period, in his excellent book *Hellenistic Athens.* Since then many new sources have been discovered and new insights gained, creating the need for a new account. The reasons why such a history has nonetheless remained lacking are not difficult to discover, however. The interest of scholars has always been drawn first and foremost to the events of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., the period when Athenian power and civilization were at their height: the city's defense against Persian attack, the creation of an Athenian empire, competition with Sparta for hegemony over the rest of Greece, the blossoming of Athenian culture in the age of Pericles, and the rise of democracy. In studying the period after the catastrophe of 404, historians have been fascinated by Athens' resurgence, the founding of the second Naval Confederacy, the further development of democracy, and finally the struggle against domination by King Philip of Macedon.

The second reason for the neglect of the postclassical era lies in the nature of the source material: it is not only much scantier than for the classical age, but also so fragmented that it is extremely difficult to gain an overview of the entire corpus of texts. Longer texts by individual authors are lacking almost entirely; the available sources tend to be limited to inscriptions in varying states of preservation. Fortunately far more of them have survived from the postclassical period than from earlier epochs, but their publication has been scattered in countless different works. Such inscriptions also require scholars to take a different approach; they cannot be read and interpreted in the same way as the complete, coherent text of an ancient historian who intended his work for future generations as well as his own. A student of the postclassical period must spend years acquiring familiarity with the sources, and the learning process is never complete: new inscriptions are discovered almost daily, requiring us constantly to round out and adjust our picture of the age.

The gaps in the sources and the fortuitous nature of their preservation make it impossible to frame a connected narrative history of Athens in the 300 years from Alexander the Great to Antony and Octavian, even in bare outline. Yet the inscriptions that have survived can often provide detailed insights into the workings of the state. Many aspects of public life in which every adult male citizen actively participated are better documented than for earlier times, such as the membership and actions of the Council and its committees, the celebration of great festivals with their literary and athletic contests, the activities of the ephebes, or life in Attic garrisons. The most lasting impression produced by a study of the inscriptions is that of a community regulating its affairs in exemplary fashion. Even if Athens was not always a sovereign power, and often had to follow the dictates of Macedonia, and later Rome, in foreign policy, the Athenians never relinquished control of their own internal affairs. They kept them in admirably good order, and the institutional framework within which they did so remained remarkably stable. Thus, for example, the very detailed records of resolutions passed by each Assembly looked in Augustus' time precisely as they had 300 years earlier; only the names and dates varied.[1] Such continuity over a period that, in American terms, would reach far back into colonial times is no mere matter of form; it reflects a general will to preserve procedural norms that had proven effective, such as the daily rotation of the president of the Assembly, the monthly rotation of the executive committee of the Council, the annual rotation of the secretary, the responsibility of the introducer of a motion for his bill, and the responsibility of the nine *proedroi* (presiding officers) for the motions they brought to a vote.

Evidence of this orderly administration of affairs, which the citizenry of Athens took pains to preserve, has survived in a variety of forms. Among them are lists, chiseled in stone, of the 500 councillors of a given year[2] and lists containing the names of all 50 councillors of the tribe that took its turn as the Council's executive committee for a month every year.[3] Evidence exists in the form of hundreds of inscribed lead tablets from the Council's annual inspection of the cavalry corps and valuation of individual horses.[4] For a span of 120 years we possess the whole series of "new style" silver coins issued annually, inscribed with the symbol of the year, the names of the two magistrates in charge of the mint, and the month of issue.[5] Further signs of this continuity can be found in the fact that for more than 150 years the office of public herald was filled by members of one family,[6] and that the two highest priesthoods of the Eleusinian Mysteries, the *hierophantes* and the *daduchos*, remained within two clans for centuries (the Eumolpidae and the Kerykes respectively).[7] Whereas foreign states frequently called upon Athenian citizens to act as judges or arbitrators, the Athenian judicial system itself never needed outsiders to guarantee impartial decisions; in this respect Athens and Rhodes, the other large republic with an exemplary administration, contrasted favorably with almost all the remaining Greek states.[8] These two states were sufficiently confident of their own power to be able to dispense with asking important Romans to advance their interests in the Senate and the higher ranks of Roman society.[9]

---

[1] The wording of the prescript of *IG* VII.4253, from 331, corresponds exactly to that of *SEG* 30.93, from 20 B.C.

But as competently as the city may have regulated its internal affairs, its position in the larger world was usually precarious. With his superior military forces, Philip II of Macedon subdued the majority of Greek states and deprived them of their independence. When new monarchies arose to replace Alexander's former empire, the situation did not fundamentally change, except that occasionally, under favorable circumstances, some states were able to play the rival empires against one another and regain their freedom. Athens managed it in 287 and again in 229. The only Greek states to remain permanently independent after Alexander's death, however, were Rhodes and the Aetolian League. Athens repeatedly received support from the Ptolemaic empire until the closing years of the third century, but this was not always sufficient to guarantee the city's independence from Macedonia.

---

[2] For the roster of the year 336/5 (*Agora* XV.42), almost all 250 names of the 5 tribes that have been preserved are still legible, and for other lists, extensive portions of all 10 tribes (or all 12 from the year 307 on; *Agora* XV.43, 61, 62, 72).

[3] They are *Agora* XV.44, 85, 86, 89, 130, 137, 194, 206, 212, 214.

[4] See Chapter 6 at note 41.

[5] See Chapter 9 following note 79.

[6] B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *Agora* XV.14–15 (where certain data are now in need of correction).

[7] Clinton, *Officials.*

[8] L. Robert, "Xenion," *Festschrift P. I. Zepos* (Athens 1973) 778 (= *OMS* 5.140).

[9] J.-L. Ferrary, *Rapports préliminaires (10th International Conference on Greek and Latin Epigraphy)* (Nîmes 1992) 80.

The decline of the Ptolemaic dynasty's power and a renewed threat from Macedonia led Athens to call upon Rome for help in the year 200. This was a fateful step, for even though the Senate had already decided to go to war against Macedonia for its own separate reasons and the Romans did not send their army to Greece on Athens' account, they could later point out that the Athenians had invited them. In the following period Athens adopted Rome's political line so readily that the city was soon allied with Rome against other Greeks.[10]

Thus from the late third century on Athens' policies were opportunistic and based entirely upon self-interest. Not long before, sometime between 270 and 260, the city had led a coalition in a war against the Macedonian king Antigonus, thereby serving the interests of other Greek states as well as its own. The unfavorable outcome of this war made a change of policy seem advisable. Thirty years later, when the liberation of 229 made an independent policy possible once again, its adherence to pure self-interest became obvious and was deplored by Polybius.[11]

Such a course may have brought little recognition to the citizens of Athens, but it was realistic, and furthered peace both at home and abroad. Avoidance of major wars lengthened the life expectancy of citizens and improved the quality of life for the entire population of Attica.

Nothing justifies the occasional claim that political participation by Athenian citizens declined in the Hellenistic age. The history of Athens did not end with its military defeats by the armies of Macedonia. Even after these defeats the administration of justice and official cults, the provision of food supplies, the regulation of finances and all the other areas of government administration remained the exclusive responsibility of the citizens of Athens. When in times of independence foreign affairs were added to these tasks, there was certainly enough business

---

[10] Nabis of Sparta, the Aetolian League, the Greek allies of King Perseus, the Achaean League.

[11] Polybius 5.106.6–8.

试读结束：需要全本请在线购买： www.ertongbook.com

at hand to require that the citizenry continue to participate actively in the running of the state. The Assembly met at least thirty-six times a year, and the Council met daily except on important holidays. The list of jurymen, revised annually, continued to carry the names of 6,000 citizens; from this list juries were chosen by lot for duty in the various courts, as needed for each trial, and sometimes consisted of more than 1,500 members. For the Assembly to pass certain resolutions, such as the relatively frequent grants of Athenian citizenship to foreigners, the law required 6,000 voting members to be present, and the evidence makes it virtually certain that this quorum was reached without difficulty at most sessions. The number 6,000 symbolizes the entire body of citizens. When the case demanded a quorum, it was not settled by the usual show of hands, but by secret balloting in which citizens recorded their votes on potsherds.[12]

Throughout the three centuries of the Hellenistic age the city retained its role as a leader in intellectual life and the arts. There was only one area in which Athenian achievements were surpassed by the community of scholars assembled at the Museum in Alexandria by the Ptolemaic rulers of Egypt: the Alexandrians dominated the new field of philology—the study, criticism, and interpretation of classical texts—until the king banished all intellectuals from Egypt in 145 B.C. After the two schools of Epicurus and Zeno, both founded toward the end of the fourth century, began to rival the older schools of Plato and Aristotle, Athenian cultivation of philosophy was unparalleled in the ancient world, in both its attainments and its scope.

---

[12] P. Gauthier, *Cahiers du Centre Glotz* 1 (1990) 77–84.

ONE

In the Shadow of Macedonian Expansion

(338–323)

1. Political Leaders

The defeat which Philip II of Macedonia, through his effective generalship and strong Macedonian phalanx, inflicted on the Athenians and their Theban allies in the summer of 338 at Chaeronea in Boeotia left both Greek powers severely weakened and in a state of shock. Their ensuing fate, however, was quite different. Only a few years later the Thebans reacted with a spontaneous uprising to the false news that Alexander, the young Macedonian king, had died; they attempted to shake off the foreign occupation that had been imposed on them, and paid a terrible price when their city was sacked and utterly destroyed in the late summer of 335. The leading politicians in Athens, by contrast, managed to reconcile their differences and agree on a more prudent policy. They refrained—if only by the slimmest of margins—from joining the Thebans in their rash venture, and abstained as well from the rebellion led four years later by Agis of Sparta, which collapsed when Agis was defeated at Megalopolis in Arcadia in the spring of 330 by Antipater, Alexander's viceroy in Europe.

Athens also profited during these fifteen years from the fact that even during Philip's lifetime the focus of political and military activity began to shift away from the Greek mainland, first to Asia Minor in 336 and then further eastward beginning in 332. After the catastrophe of Thebes, Greece entered a period of relative calm that lasted until Alexander's return from India in 324. Alexander's sudden death in June 323 only fanned the flames of renewed conflict.

In the meantime, however, despite occasional tensions with Alexander, Antipater, or the queen mother, Olympias, Athens experienced a respite of peace in which most of its energies could go toward rebuilding the city and restoring morale. As luck would have it, four exceptionally capable men, all at the height of their powers, chose to devote themselves to this task. All born between 390 and 385, they were about fifty years old at the time of the battle of Chaeronea. Besides participating actively in politics, Lycurgus, Demosthenes, Demades, and Hypereides were also gifted orators. And despite their differences in character, temperament, and political views, they were all first and foremost Athenian citizens, patriots with their city's best interests at heart. No matter how much their opinions might diverge on important political questions, no matter how hard they fought one another to win a majority in the Assembly, they were still capable of close cooperation until 324, when Alexander's threats from his army headquarters, the flight of his treasurer Harpalus, and the death of Lycurgus brought this period of relative peace and harmony among the four leaders to an abrupt end. Of the four, only Lycurgus died a natural death; the others became victims of politics. On Antipater's demand, Demades pushed a death sentence against Demosthenes and Hypereides through the Assembly in 322. In turn Demades was condemned to death by Antipater three years later, for although he owed his control of Athens to Antipater, Demades had conspired against his protector.

Demosthenes, the best known of the four men, is famous both as the implacable enemy of King Philip and as the greatest Greek orator in the view of ancient and modern critics alike. Several times in his political career he sought the support of the distant king of Persia against Athens' powerful neighbor Macedonia, and Persian gold, intended to finance Greek resistance to the Macedonians, passed through his hands more than once. Some of it went into his own pocket. It was Demosthenes who at the last minute persuaded Athens' longtime enemy Thebes to join the alliance against Philip in 338, a venture for which he also risked his own life at the battle of Chaeronea. Even after the Athenians' defeat there, the citizens remained loyal and chose him—over considerable opposition—to deliver the funeral oration for the fallen.[1] The remaining critics of his policies were silenced eight years later, when Demosthenes defended himself vehemently in his speech

---

[1] N. Loraux emphasizes the pessimistic tone of the speech that has been preserved, noting that it offers no hopeful perspective for the future; *The Invention of Athens*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Cambridge, Mass., 1981) 125–127. Whether the speech is actually Demosthenes' is a matter of controversy.

On the Crown. Demosthenes not only won the case against Aeschines, his accuser, but also humiliated him so that Aeschines was forced to go into exile. After Chaeronea Demosthenes continued to be held in high esteem but no longer played the leading role that had enabled him to forge the coalition against Philip. He had to cede part of his influence to Demades, who had earned credit for achieving peace with the Macedonian king. Demosthenes' chief successor, however, was Lycurgus. The latter rose to such preeminence that the period from 338 to 324 has been called "the Age of Lycurgus."

Lycurgus was a conservative, deeply religious man from a prominent family who had married into the wealthy family of Callias of Bate.[2] Not long after the battle of Chaeronea he was placed in charge of the public treasury, a position he held for twelve years, most likely from 336 to 324 (rather than from 338 to 326). He oversaw the finances of the city directly for a term of four years; after that, since an additional term was not allowed, he placed front men in office and exerted indirect control. Lycurgus was an administrative and financial genius. He increased state revenues many times over and determined their use, spending one-third on improvement of the city's defenses on land and sea, one-third on imposing architecture to improve its appearance, and saving one-third to build up its monetary reserves. He envisioned a state strong enough economically, militarily, and morally to break the bonds restricting its independence. He prosecuted relentlessly all those who failed to meet his standards, including profiteers, defeatists, and those with unpaid debts to the state, and confiscated their property if they were found guilty. As a politician he acquired a reputation for inflexibility and harshness but also for complete integrity. During these years he created the conditions that would make it possible, after Alexander's death, for Athens to challenge Macedonia's military might with some prospect of success.

In a number of fundamental respects Demades was Lycurgus' polar opposite. Though from a poor family, Demades possessed such gifts as an orator that he was able to acquire considerable wealth as an attorney and, later, influence in politics. He understood better than anyone, including Demosthenes, how to turn such influence into material profit; he maintained his own racing stable and sent a winning team of horses to the games at Olympia. Because Demades always delivered his speeches extemporaneously, no written versions have survived, but he may well have been the most talented of the famous orators; in any case he was the most flexible. His conscience allowed him a wider field of activity than Lycurgus' or Hypereides' did, and Demades was never at a loss when rapid adjustment to a new situation was called for. No one could equal him in summing up an unexpected turn of events in pithy, accurate language that at the same time conveyed a powerful image. Demades has been severely criticized by earlier scholars, who could discern few if any virtues in him. Yet even if he deserves reproach more frequently than the others, his shortcomings should be weighed against his great achievements. He was no friend of the Macedonians, nor the opportunistic turncoat he has often been called. He was certainly more willing than the others to come to terms with and accept foreign domination when superior strength was on the other side, but he fought in the ranks at Chaeronea and as a politician always put Athenian interests first. More than once he helped bring peace to his country (in 338, as a prisoner of Philip, and again in 322) or preserved the peace (335 and 331). Demades acquired his bad reputation in part because he was the one to propose the (inevitable) motion to ostracize Demosthenes and Hypereides.

---

[2] The recently discovered grave mound of the family near the state cemetery *(demosion sema)* provides new inscriptions on the genealogy of the family; *Horos* 5 (1987) 31–44.

Hypereides, the son of a wealthy family, was a man of the world and devoted to all the good things in life. It was no accident that he acted as defense counsel for Phryne, the most famous courtesan of ancient times after Aspasia, when she faced the death penalty for alleged crimes of sacrilege. (It is said that he sealed the verdict of "not guilty" by granting the jury a glimpse of a part of her exquisitely beautiful body that was normally clothed; Greeks throughout the ages have regarded extraordinary beauty as a sign of divinity.) Although Hypereides was the equal in oratory of his three previously named contemporaries, he held virtually no public offices. In 338, however, he belonged to the Council and was therefore unable to take part in the battle of Chaeronea. But the citizens entrusted difficult diplomatic missions to him again and again, and his success always justified their confidence. His personal integrity matched that of Lycurgus. He once sued Demades for introducing a resolution to award honors to a man who had betrayed his city of Olynthus to Philip. Hypereides maintained close political and personal ties to Demosthenes for many years, until the scandal over Alexander's disloyal treasurer Harpalus shattered the friendship. Hypereides then acted as one of Demosthenes' accusers, charging that he had accepted twenty talents from Harpalus. Demosthenes was convicted and went into exile. The two were not reconciled until Alexander's death brought Demosthenes back to Athens. And just as Demosthenes had delivered the funeral oration for the dead after the battle of Chaeronea in 338, Hypereides was chosen by the people in 323 to speak the epitaph for the general Leosthenes and the soldiers who had fallen in the first months of the Lamian War. The major part of this speech, a swan song of Athenian greatness, has survived.

Another important figure half a generation older than these four men was Phocion, a man of conservative stamp who had been a pupil of Plato at the Academy. In contrast to the others, Phocion spent most of his long career as a military leader. He had learned his skills from Chabrias, one of the great *strategoi,* and the Athenians chose him as their commander no fewer than fifty times. As a general, Phocion tended toward caution and avoidance of losses whenever possible. He gained fame above all in three campaigns on the island of Euboea in the years 349, 348, and 341 and in defending Byzantium against Philip in 340. This successful military career gave him some influence in the political sphere, which, as his character would lead one to expect, he used to combat nationalist fervor and to further peace with the great power of Macedonia in particular. Thus he took Aeschines' side in the latter's debate with Demosthenes over the "false embassy" in 343/2. Alexander the Great held Phocion in high esteem, and Plutarch considered him worthy of a biography. Phocion was incorruptible, a man who never hesitated to speak the truth, however harsh, to his fellow citizens and to offer unwelcome advice. He was called to take charge of the government at the age of eighty, and soon afterward sealed his own doom by acting against the declared will of the people during the tumultuous period of the *diadochoi* (Successors).

2. Endangered Peace

As darkness fell that summer night in 338, 1,000 Athenians lay dead on the battlefield of Chaeronea.[3] Another 2,000 had fallen into Philip's hands as prisoners of war, heavy losses for a state whose total adult male population numbered at most 30,000, the old and unfit included. Yet

---

[3] They were buried in a single mass grave in the common burial-place *(polyandreion)* (Pausanias 1.29.13). A contemporary epigram written in their honor is partially preserved as an inscription (Peek, *GVI,* no. 27); the full text is in *AP* 7, no. 245. An epigram honoring an individual citizen killed at Chaeronea was discovered recently; *Horos* 3 (1985) 132–133.

试读结束：需要全本请在线购买： www.ertongbook.com