

УДК (UDC) 94 (38+392) "280/278"

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2024.1\(45\).694](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2024.1(45).694)

INSCRIPTION I. RHAMNOUS, VI, 404 IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WAR OF ANTIGONOS GONATAS VS ANTIOCHOS I

Andrii Zelinskyi

Institute of World History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

e-mail: z-al@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0214-4625>

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research paper is to analyze the evidence of the published 2020 honorific decree of Rhamnous garrison which was constituted in honor of its commander, Aristеides son of Mnesitheos, and told about the participation of the latter in the Athenian embassy to Asia to King Antigonos II Gonatas, as well as to date and determine the historical context of the specified diplomatic mission.

Scientific novelty. K. Clinton's preliminary assumption regarding the dating of the Athenian embassy to Antigonos Gonatas with the participation of Aristеides during the war of the mentioned king with the ruler of the Seleucid state, Antiochos I Soter (ca. 280-278 BCE) is developed, clarified, and properly argued. Based on the above-mentioned dating, a number of assumptions associated with the historical realities of the Early Hellenistic era are made.

Conclusions. The year when Antigonos Gonatas acquired royal status (284/283 BCE) is proposed as the terminus post quem for the Athenian embassy mentioned in the decree from Rhamnous. A hypothesis is put forward regarding the authenticity of Gonatas granting 661 silver talents to the Athenians as a price for preserving royal control over Piraeus. Assumption of R. Waterfield regarding the meeting of Gonatas with the Athenian ambassadors in the Carian Kaunos, dated by the above-mentioned researcher to the end of the 270s BCE, is refuted. The current state of the source base of the war between Antigonos Gonatas and Antiochos Soter is summarized. The involvement of Antigonos in the mentioned war is indicated as the reason for the latter's voluntary agreement to hand over the city of Eleusis to the Athenians in accordance with the demand of the embassy with the participation of Aristеides. An assumption is made regarding the connection between the arrangements of the Athenian embassy with Gonatas and the long break in the contacts of Hellenistic Athens with the Seleucid Royal House. Several arguments are offered in favor of preceding the embassy with the participation of Aristеides, to the Galatian invasion of Greece, which began in the fall of 279 BCE. Given K. Clinton's assumption according to which the nephew of Demosthenes Demochares participated in the aforementioned embassy, an additional clarification of the date of the said diplomatic mission is proposed, which most likely took place at the end of spring – the first half of the summer of 279 BCE. It is noted that the decree from Rhamnous belongs to the few sources that elucidate the events of the war between Antigonos Gonatas and Antiochos Soter.

Keywords: ancient Greece, Hellenistic period, Antigonos II Gonatas, Antiochos I Soter, Athens, Aristеides son of Mnesitheos, Galatian invasion

НАПИС I. RHAMNOUS, VI, 404 У КОНТЕКСТІ ВІЙНИ АНТІГОНА ГОНАТА З АНТІОХОМ I

Андрій Зелінський

Інститут всесвітньої історії Національної академії наук України (Київ, Україна)

e-mail: z-al@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0214-4625>

АНОТАЦІЯ

Мета статті – проаналізувати свідчення опублікованого у 2020 р. почесного декрету рамнунтської залоги на честь її командира, Арістіда сина Мнесітія, про участь останнього в афінському посольстві до царя Антігона II Гоната в Азію. Здійснити датування та визначити історичний контекст зазначеної дипломатичної місії.

Наукова новизна. Розвинено, уточнено і належним чином аргументовано побіжне припущення К. Клінтона стосовно віднесення афінського посольства до Антігона Гоната за участю Арістіда на час війни зазначеного царя з володарем держави Селевкідів, Антіохом I Сотером (бл. 280-278 рр. до Р.Х.). На підставі вищезгаданого датування зроблено низку припущень, пов'язаних з історичними реаліями ранньоелліністичної доби.

Висновки. Запропоновано як *terminus post quem* для афінського посольства, згаданого у Рамнунтському декреті, рік набуття Антігоном Гонатом царського статусу (284/283 р. до Р.Х.). Висунуто гіпотезу стосовно достовірності надання Гонатом афінянам 661 срібного таланта як ціни збереження царського контролю над Піреєм. Спростовано припущення Р. Уотерфільда щодо зустрічі Гоната з афінськими послами у карійському Кавні, віднесеної вищезгаданим дослідником на кін. 270-х рр. до Р.Х. Підсумовано сучасний стан джерельної бази війни Антігона Гоната з Антіохом Сотером. Вказано на зайнятість Антігона у зазначеній війні як на причину добровільної згоди останнього передати афінянам місто Елевсін згідно з вимогою посольства за участю Арістіда. Зроблено припущення щодо зв'язку між домовленостями афінського посольства з Гонатом і тривалою перервою у контактах елліністичних Афін з царським домом Селевкідів. Запропоновано низку аргументів на користь передування посольства за участю Арістіда галатському нашестю на Грецію, котре почалося восени 279 р. до Р.Х. З огляду на припущення К. Клінтона, згідно з яким у вищезгаданому посольстві брав участь племінник Демосфена Демохар, запропоновано додаткове уточнення дати зазначеної дипломатичної місії, котра скоріш за все припала на кінець весни – першу половину літа 279 р. до Р.Х. Відзначено належність Рамнунтського декрету до нечисленних джерел, які проливають світло на події війни Антігона Гоната й Антіоха Сотера.

Ключові слова: стародавня Греція, елліністичний період, Антігон II Гонат, Антіох I Сотер, Афіни, Арістід син Мнесітія, галатське нашестя

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, the Greek epigraphist V. Petrakos announced the introduction into scientific circulation of the honorific decree from Rhamnous, which is rich in historical content and was constituted in honor of the Athenian military and political figure of the 1st half of the 3rd century (hereafter – BCE) Aristeides, son of Mnesitheos of Lamptraí¹. However, for reasons unknown to us, this document was published only

¹ Cf. *Oliver G. War, Food, and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

17 years after its announcement². As mentioned above, the central figure in the decree is Aristeides, the son of Mnesitheos, who was elected military strategos of Athens at least twice and served as a diplomatic envoy on behalf of his polis several times. Among his merits to Athens, the authors of the decree (troops stationed in the town of Rhamnous) indicate the following: involvement in the recovery of the occupied by the Antigonids (cf. below) fortification on the Mouseion Hill (lines 5-11), playing a key role in the recovery of the Athenian polis of Eleusis and obtaining a significant sum of money for Athens from King Antigonos Gonatas (lines 12-14), successful command of the Eleusis garrison before the Chremonidean War³ (lines 14-18), participation in the embassy to the Spartan king Areus within the framework of the formation of the anti-Macedonian coalition (lines 18-22), skillful discharge of military and civilian powers in the conditions of war in the position of strategos of the Rhamnous garrison in the year of constituting of the decree (lines 22-34)⁴.

THE EMBASSY TO ANTIGONOS GONATAS

The author of this research is mostly interested in the fragment of the decree from Rhamnous related to the embassy with the participation of Aristeides, son of Mnesitheos, to the Hellenistic basileus of the Antigonid dynasty – Antigonos Gonatas (284/283-239)⁵. According to the text of the decree: "...being elected by the demos by

P. 161; *Paschidis P.* Between city and King. Prosopographical Studies on the Intermediaries Between the Cities of the Greek Mainland and the Aegean and the Royal Courts in the Hellenistic Period (322-190 BC). Athens: Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity – Diffusion de Bocard, 2008. P. 164, not. 5; *Clinton K.* The Reunion of the Athenian Asty with the Piraeus, 280-279 B.C. // *Grammateion.* 2022. Vol. 11. P. 7.

² I. Rhamnous, VI, 404; also, see: *Clinton K.* Op. cit. P. 7-8; *Rose Th., Wallace Sh.* The Athenian Revolt from Demetrios Poliorketes: New Evidence from Rhamnous (IRhamnous 404). *Ancient history bulletin.* 2022. № 3-4. P. 175.

³ On Chremonidean War (ca. 268-262/261) see – *Heinen H.* Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum Chremonideinischen Krieg. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1972. S. 95-213; *Dreyer B.* Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen (322 – ca. 230 v. Chr.). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999. S. 308-376; *O'Neil J.* A re-examination of the Chremonidian war Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World / ed. *P. McKechnie, Ph. Guillaume.* Leiden; Boston: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2008. P. 65-90; *Зелінський А.* Від басилевсів-фараонів до фараонів-басилевсів: перші 100 років птолемейської монархії. Вінниця; Київ: «Твори», 2020. С. 100-102, 349-352, прим. 687-706; *Johstono P.* The Army of Ptolemaic Egypt 323 to 204 BC An Institutional and Operational History. Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2020. P. 123-128; *Waterfield R.* The making of a king: Antigonos Gonatas of Macedon and the Greeks. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2021. P. 159-173; *Worthington I.* Athens After Empire: a history from Alexander the great to the emperor Hadrian. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021. P. 117-124; *Grainger J.* The Ptolemies, Rise of a Dynasty: Ptolemaic Egypt 330-246 BC. Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2022. P. 203-222.

At the same time, the evidence of the Rhamnous decree is extremely interesting. According to it, contrary to established opinion (exception – *Hammond N., Walbank F.* A History of Macedonia: vol. III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988. P. 270), the invasion of Antigonos Gonatas to Megarid began earlier, and not during the aforementioned conflict – I. Rhamnous, VI, 404, 14-16; see also note 10.

⁴ I. Rhamnous, VI, 404; *Clinton K.* Op. cit. P. 7-16; *Rose Th., Wallace Sh.* Op. cit. P. 166-178. About Aristeides, the son of Mnesitheos activity, see also – *Habicht Ch.* Aristeides, Sohn des Mnesitheos, aus Lamptraia. Ein athenischer Staatsmann aus der Zeit des Chremonideischen Krieges // *Chiron.* 1976. Bd. 6. S. 7-10; *Dreyer B.* Op. cit. S. 144-145, 241-242, 278; *Oliver G.* Op. cit. P. 161; *Paschidis P.* Op. cit. P. 164.

⁵ About him, see, for example: *Tarn W.* Antigonos Gonatas. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1913. 501 p; *Hammond N., Walbank F.* Op. cit. P. 259-316; *Gabbert J.* Antigonos II Gonatas. A political Biography. 2nd ed. London; New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2004. 88 p; *Waterfield R.* Op. cit.

a show of hands⁶ as an ambassador to Antigonos in Asia and honored [by the king – *author's note*] of the entire embassy he [Aristeides – *author's note*] recovered Eleusis and secured 661 (?) silver talents”⁷.

In the author's opinion, this fragment needs a few additional comments. First of all, we are considering a complex of nuances related to its previous dating. When taking into account the chronological sequence of the events presented in the decree⁸, the above passage is dated between 287/286 (the date of the recovery of the fortifications on the Mouseion⁹) and 270/269 (Aristeides' position of strategos in Eleusis¹⁰). At the same time, the terminus post quem can certainly be shifted, at least to 284/283¹¹ – the year Antigonos Gonatas¹² was given a royal title. If the assumption

⁶ Regarding the practice of open voting by a show of hands (χειροτονία) during the formation of the embassies in Greek poleis – see *Egetenmeier Ph. Zwischen zwei Welten. Die Königsfreunde im Dialog zwischen Städten und Monarchen vom Jahr der Könige bis zum Frieden von Apameia (306-188 v. Chr.)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2021. S. 29.

⁷ χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου πρεσβευτὴς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν πρὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ διαλεχθεὶς μετὰ τῶν συμπρεσβευτῶν ἐκομίσατο τὴν Ἐλευσίνα καὶ [...] τάλαντα ἀργυρίου – I. Rhamnous, VI, 404, 12-14; *Rose Th., Wallace Sh. Op. cit. P. 175*. The author is sincerely thankful to V. Staviuk, Dr. of Historical Science (Kyiv) for the invaluable assistance provided during the work with the foregoing fragment.

⁸ Cf. *Clinton K. Op. cit. P. 10*.

⁹ *Rose Th., Wallace Sh. Op. cit. P. 166-178*. Alternative less convincing dating of this event (280/279) was proposed by K. Clinton – *Clinton K. Op. cit. P. 1-16*.

¹⁰ Cf. *Ibid. P. 13* (otherwise – P. 9); *Rose Th., Wallace Sh. Op. cit. P. 168, 173*. The previous faulty dating of Eleusis strategia of Aristeides to 268/267. – *Oliver G. Op. cit. P. 161, 165*, occurred due to a lack of information about the participation of the latter at the diplomatic mission to Areus of Sparta dating to 269/268 (cf. note 3), mention of which can be found in the chronologically organized Rhamnous decree (see note 8) between references to Eleusis and Rhamnous strategie of the son of Mnesitheos – *Rose T., Wallace S. Op. cit. P. 168*.

¹¹ At the same time, it should be borne in mind that Antigonos Gonatas to whom Aristeides' embassy was sent, during 287-281, as far as we know, was engaged exclusively in European affairs (see notes 5, 18).

¹² A set of documents related to the international recognition of the inviolability of the temple of Asklepios on the island of Kos and the Panhellenic status of the Kos Games in honor of Asklepios now evidence in favor of 284/283 as the date when Gonatas was given a royal title. The matter concerns the decrees of the Macedonian cities of Amphipolis and Beroea, dated to the month of Gorpiaios (July/August) of the 41st year of Antigonos Gonatas – IG, XII, IV, 1, 220II; *Bosnakis D., Hallof K. Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos VI // Chiron. 2020. Bd. 50. S. 291-293, 298-300*, and about the letter of the Bithynian king Ziaelas, which is dating the corresponding large-scale campaign of the Kos theōriā to 243. – *Ibid. S. 294, 312*; *Зелінський А. Зовнішньополітичні орієнтири віфінського царя Зіела у світлі нових коських написів // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В.Н. Каразіна. Серія «Історія». 2021. Вип. 60. С. 30*.

Thus, since the 41st year of Antigonos' reign coincides with 244/243, the counting of the years of his reign should be started from 284/283 – *Bosnakis D., Hallof K. Op. cit. S. 318-319*; *Hatzopoulos M. Quatre nouveaux décrets macédoniens: géographie historique et institutions // Revue des études grecques. 2021. No. 1 (134), P. 206*; *Кузьмин Ю. «Новые» и «старые» декреты македонских полисов по поводу асилии святилища Асклепия на Косе // Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры. 2021. № 4. С. 216-217*; otherwise see *Coşkun A. The Chronology of the Asyilia Dossier from Kos Revisited in Light of Some Recent Epigraphic Discoveries // Philia. 2021. Vol. 7. P. 35-36*; *Coşkun A. The Regnal Years of Antigonos Gonatas // Karanos. 2021. Vol. 4. P. 49-58*; concerning previous proposals regarding the specified dating of the first year of Antigonos Gonatas' reign, see, for example: *Зелінський А. Від базилиевців-фараонів до фараонів-базилевців. С. 441, прим. 1277*. At the same time, it seems that Gonatas' father, Demetrios Poliorketes, while in captivity by Seleukos I Nicator – *Plut. Demetr. 50-52*; *Plut., Reg. et Imp. XXX, 1*; *Paus. I, X, 2*; *P. Trog. Prol. XVI*; *Just. XVI, 2*, just during his lifetime, passed the royal title to his son – *Plut. Demetr. 51*; *Plut., Reg. et Imp. XXX, 1*; *Wheatley P., Dunn Ch. Demetrius the Besieger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. P. 432-434*; *Waterfield R. Op. cit. P. 35-36*; *Romm J. Demetrius Sacker of Cities. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2022. P. 172*.

proposed by K. Clinton regarding the involvement of another Athenian statesman, Demochares¹³, the nephew of Demosthenes, in the procedure of regaining control over Eleusis is correct, the terminus ante quem of Aristeides' embassy can be shifted to 271/270 when a posthumous decree honoring the specified politician was constituted¹⁴.

Another complex of questions is associated with the financial donation (661 silver talents) gained by the embassy of the son of Mnesitheos from Antigonos Gonatas. Given the extraordinary sum of the donation and the damage to the corresponding place in the inscription, researchers, who have already processed the decree from Rhamnous, do not exclude the possibility that the funds donated to the Athenians were much more modest¹⁵. The very fact of a monetary gift made to independent Athens (cf. notes 14-15) by Gonatas himself, who, unlike other Hellenistic monarchs (cf. note 15), cherished hereditary ambitions to rule over the specified polis (cf. e.g. notes 3, 5). However, in the author's opinion, there is a certain important factor that could determine the authenticity of Antigonos' donation of the above sum to Athens, objectively hostile to him. In this way, the said Hellenistic ruler could guarantee the inviolability of the important Athenian port subordinated to him – Piraeus (see below)¹⁶. For their part, given the constant need for external material support at the

¹³ Plut. Mor. 851d-f; see also note 14.

¹⁴ Clinton K. Op. cit. P. 12-13; Cf. *Rose Th., Wallace Sh.* Op. cit. P. 167n, not. 5. About Demochares, see also – *Kralli I.* Early Hellenistic Athens: Leadership and diplomacy: Diss... PhD. London: University College London, 1996. P. 156-168; *Paschidis P.* Op. cit. P. 153-159. In modern historiography, there is an established tradition according to which the specified recovery of Eleusis by the Athenians from the power of the Antigonids occurred in the middle of 280 – see, for example: *Shear T.* Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C // *Hesperia* (suppl.). 1978. Vol. 17. P. 80-86; *Hammond N., Walbank F.* Op. cit. P. 231n, not. 5, 237, not. 3; *Kralli I.* Op. cit. P. 165-167; *Dreyer B.* Op. cit. P. 199, 235-238, 271; *Gabbert J.* Op. cit. P. 19-20; *Paschidis P.* Op. cit. P. 154-155; *Worthington I.* Op. cit. P. 104-106; *Roberts M.* Alexander the Great's Legacy. The Decline of Macedonian Europe in the Wake of the Wars of the Successors. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2022. P. 128. Assumption of K. Clinton contradicted this tradition, regarding the dating of the above-mentioned event to the end of 80s of the 3rd century, was partly supported by C. Habicht and G. Oliver – *Clinton K.* Macedonians at Eleusis in the early third century // *The Macedonians in Athens 322-229 B.C.* Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 24-26, 2001 / ed. *O. Palagia* and *S. Tracy.* Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2003. P. 75-81; cf. *Habicht Ch.* Athens from Alexander to Antony: transl. from germ. 2nd pr. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999. P. 129; *Oliver G.* Op. cit. P. 125-127; *Knoepfler D.* Épigraphie et histoire des cités grecques: cours: Athènes hellénistique (2e partie) // *L'annuaire du Collège de France.* 2012. T. 111. P. 445-446. The introduction of *I. Rhamnous, VI, 404* into scientific circulation given the association of the recovery of Eleusis with the stay of Gonatas in Asia (see above), makes the second dating more likely – cf. *Rose T., Wallace S.* Op. cit. P. 173 (as well as note 18 of the author of the paper), albeit slightly shifting it in time (see below).

¹⁵ See, for example: *Rose Th., Wallace Sh.* Op. cit. P. 167, not. 4. For comparison: during 286-279 (besides the grain donations), King Lysimachos presented the Athenians 130 silver talents – *Plut. Mor.* 851e, Ptolemy I Soter – 50 silver talents – *Plut. Mor.* 851e; SIG, III, 409, 29 (?), Ptolemy II Philadelphus – 50 silver talents – SEG, XXVIII, 66, 43-54, and Antipatros Etusias – 20 silver talents – *Plut. Mor.* 851e. For more information about the aforementioned royal gifts, see, for example: *Shear T.* Op. cit. P. 25-26, 80-82; *Habicht Ch.* Athens from Alexander to Antony. P. 127-128; *Kralli I.* Op. cit. P. 70, 166; *Dreyer B.* Op. cit. S. 230-231, 235; *Paschidis P.* Op. cit. P. 123, 143, 148, 154-157; *Osborne M.* Athens in the Third Century B.C. Athenai: Hellēnikē Epigraphikē Hetaireia, 2012. P. 47-49; *Grainger J.* Antipater's Dynasty. Alexander the Great's Regent and his Successors. Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2019. P. 212-213.

¹⁶ With that said, a natural question arises as to the sources of such a substantial sum of money in the treasury of Gonatas. Even if Aristeides' embassy took place before the first conquest of Macedonia by Antigonos II (277/276 – cf. note 28), at the disposal of the said king could be funds raised by him as taxes

time (see note 15), under the specified conditions, the Athenians could well refuse to try to recover a fundamentally important for them port, considering such a refusal as a temporary necessity¹⁷.

For the author, first of all, the problem of determining the exact time, as well as place, and circumstances of the Athenian embassy's Asian contact with Gonatas, whose political interests were mainly focused on the Balkan Peninsula, became the key issue (cf. note 5). In particular, the mentioned issues will be at the center of the proposed study. Given the current source base at our disposal, we can consider two points that connected the mentioned Hellenistic ruler with the Asian, or rather, the Asia Minor context. It is about his hereditary ownership of the Carian polis of Kaunos (see below) and waging war in 280-278 against the ruler of the Seleucid state, Antiochos I (281-261), with the aim of gaining a foothold in the latter's possessions in Asia Minor (see below)¹⁸. Despite the recent introduction to the scientific circulation of I. Rhamnous, VI, 404, both possibilities, albeit in a preliminary form, have been reflected in the so-far modest historiography devoted to the decree from Rhamnous. Ch. Habicht and R. Waterfield spoke out in favor of the meeting of the Athenian embassy with Gonatas during the latter's hypothetical Kaunos campaign¹⁹. In turn, K. Clinton, D. Knoepfler, T. Rose, and S. Wallace, also without going into details, consider it more appropriate to associate the Asian diplomatic mission of Aristides son of Mnesitheos with the war between Antigonos and Antiochos²⁰. The passing

or state revenues from the cities under his control – see *Wheatley P., Dunn Ch.* Op. cit. P. 431, not. 10; *Waterfield R.* Op. cit. P. 113; also cf. approx. 28, the sums of money left to him by Demetrios before or during the latter's Asia Minor campaign – cf. *Plut. Demetr* 46, or even war booty looted during the war with Antiochos I (see below). In any case, the presence of considerable funds at Gonatas' disposal is evidenced by the luxurious mortuary ceremony he arranged in 282 for his father, *Plut. Demetr* 53 and the riches seen in his military camp by the Galatian ambassadors in 277 – *Just. XXV*, 1; see also note 28.

¹⁷ In modern historiography, two views regarding the ownership of Piraeus in the 80s – 60s of the 3rd century are presented. According to the first point of view, the said port was in the hands of the Antigonids all that time – see, for example: *Ferguson W.* Hellenistic Athens. London: MacMillan Company, 1911. P. 152-155; *Hammond N., Walbank F.* Op. cit. P. 259, 264, 269-270, 280, 286; *Habicht Ch.* Athens from Alexander to Antony. P. 124-125, 139, 143, 146; *Kralli I.* Op. cit. P. 305-308; *Taylor M.* When the Peiraieus and the City Are Reunited // *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik.* 1998. Bd. 123. P. 207-212; *Gabbert J.* Op. cit. P. 19-22, 24-27, 37-38; *Oliver G.* Op. cit. P. 54-68; *Paschidis P.* Op. cit. P. 134-135; *O'Neil J.* Op. cit. P. 71-72; *Osborne M.* Panathenaic Fantasies // *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik.* 2016. Bd. 198. P. 88-93; *Worthington I.* Op. cit. P. 103, 111, 116-117; *Waterfield R.* Op. cit. P. 69, 72, 74, 113, 164; *Rose Th., Wallace Sh.* Op. cit. P. 166-178; *Romm J.* Op. cit. P. 165-166, 174, 181. According to the second view, Piraeus ca. 281 was returned under the control of the Athenians for several years – see, for example: *Shear T.* Op. cit. P. 27-29; *Reger G.* Athens and Tenos in the Early Hellenistic Age // *The Classical Quarterly.* 1992. No. 2. P. 368-379; *Dreyer B.* Op. cit. S. 257-278; *Knoepfler D.* Op. cit. P. 446-449, 451; *Clinton K.* The Reunion of the Athenian Asty with the Piraeus, 280-279 B.C. P. 1-16.

The author of these lines supports the first one of views mentioned above, which is supported by the fact that Piraeus belonged to Gonatas before the end of the Chremonidean War – cf. *FrGrHist*, 244, f44; *Paus.* III, VI, 6; *Polyaen.* IV, VI, 20; see also note 3. In particular, the mentioned circumstance makes the supporters of an alternative point of view build too complex logical constructions and offer source interpretations close to hypercriticism, designed to answer the inevitable question about the time and circumstances of 'the getting back' of Piraeus under the rule of the son of Demetrios Poliorketes.

¹⁸ On the other hand, we do not have any source that would evidence of the presence of Gonatas in Asia Minor during the last Asia Minor campaign or Demetrios' captivity – cf. eg.: *Wheatley P., Dunn Ch.* Op. cit. P. 407-436; *Waterfield R.* Op. cit. P. 34-36; *Romm J.* Op. cit. P. 153-182.

¹⁹ *Waterfield R.* Op. cit. P. 159.

²⁰ *Clinton K.* The Reunion of the Athenian Asty with the Piraeus, 280-279 B.C. P. 12-13; *Knoepfler D.* Op. cit. P. 446; *Rose Th., Wallace Sh.* Op. cit. P. 173. In 2021, within the framework of private correspondence,

nature of the previously expressed views and the lack of substantial argumentation given in their support prompts a thorough study and analysis of both of the above-mentioned possibilities in order to find out the most reliable variant.

The fact that Kaunos belonged to the possessions of Antigonos Gonatas became known thanks to a local inscription dated to the 15th year of the mentioned ruler's reign (270/269 – cf. note 12)²¹. The active presence of Demetrios Poliorketes in the mentioned polis during his last military campaign (years 286-285²²)²³, convincingly indicates a very high probability of further inheritance of Kaunos by his son and successor²⁴.

At the same time, in the view of the author of this study, the demands for the recovery of Eleusis, and probably Piraeus (see above), could have been put forward by the Athenians to Gonatas and for the most part, fulfilled by the latter only under the condition that the said ruler had serious problems of a military nature (cf. below). However, based on the source evidence at our disposal, during 284/283-271/270 (see above) Antigonos did not have, and even could not have had, any military complications associated with Kaunos. Firstly, the inheritance of the city from his father (see note 24) meant that there was no need for military action to conquer it. Secondly, the redeployment of Demetrios' fleet²⁵ from Kaunos to Europe did not

Yu. Kuzmin, Candidate of Historical Science also made an intuitive assumption in favor of dating the events reflected in lines 12-14 of the Rhamnous decree to the context of the war between Antigonos and Antiochos (ca. 280).

²¹ IvKaunos, 4; *Kuzmin Yu. The Antigonids, Caunus and the so-called «Era of Monophthalmus»: Some Observations Prompted by a New Inscription // Deformations and Crises of Ancient Civil Communities / ed. V. Gouschin, P.J. Rhodes. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 2015. P. 73-85; Catling R., Marchand F. Alternative Readings and Restorations of Personal Names in Ikaunos and a Note on P.Cair.Zen. 59037 // Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik. 2014. Bd. 189. P. 224, not. 14; Зелінський А. Від басилевсів-фараонів до фараонів-басилевсів. С. 273н, прим. 209, 354, прим. 719. The presence of Gonatas in Kaunos lasted until the end of the 260s, after which the city came under the rule of the Ptolemies – *Kuzmin Yu. The Antigonids, Caunus and the so-called «Era of Monophthalmus». P. 83-84; Зелінський А. Від басилевсів-фараонів до фараонів-басилевсів. С. 103-104, 354-355, прим. 720-724. At the same time, some scholars, ignoring the fact that there is no mention of Demetrios Poliorketes in the dating protocol of the specified document, and ignoring paleographic factors, are dating *IvKaunos, 4* to 302 – see, for example: *Meadows A. The Ptolemaic Annexation of Lycia: SEG 27.929 // The IIIrd International Symposium on Lycia (Antalya, 07-10 november 2005). Symposium Proceedings: In 2 v. Vol. 2 / Ed. K. Dortluk et al. Istanbul: AKMED on Press, 2007. P. 462-463; Hauben H. Callicrates of Samos and Patroclus of Macedon, champions of Ptolemaic thalassocracy // The Ptolemies, the Sea and the Nile. Studies in Waterborne Power / ed. K. Buraselis, M. Stefanou, D.J. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. P. 44, not. 34.***

²² About her – see, for example: note 18.

²³ IvKaunos, 1; *Plut. Demetr. 49; Rose Th. A historical commentary on Plutarch's Life of Demetrius: diss... PhD. / University of Iowa. Iowa City, 2015. P. 322-324, 333; Kuzmin Yu. The Antigonids, Caunus and the so-called «Era of Monophthalmus». P. 82; Wheatley P., Dunn Ch. Op. cit. P. 409, 426; Romm J. Op. cit. P. 157, 169.*

²⁴ *Wheatley P., Dunn Ch. Op. cit. P. 431, not. 10. In particular, with a high degree of probability, it can be stated that the forcing of Kaunos by Ptolemy' Navarch, Philocles, King of Sidon – Polyæn. III, 16, has nothing to do with the events of the 280s or 270s – Messerschmidt W. Basis einer Ehrenstatue für Philokles, König der Sidonier, aus Kaunos // Istanbuler Mitteilungen. 2008. Bd. 58. S. 419-423 (non vidi); Catling R., Marchand F. Op. cit. P. 122-124; Wheatley P., Dunn Ch. Op. cit. P. 426, not. 56; Зелінський А. Від басилевсів-фараонів до фараонів-басилевсів. С. 273н, прим. 209; cf. *Hauben H. Op. cit. P. 43-45. Regarding objections or doubts regarding the inheritance of Kaunos by Gonatas – see Rose Th. Op. cit. P. 340; Kuzmin Yu. The Antigonids, Caunus and the so-called «Era of Monophthalmus». P. 79, 82-84; Waterfield R. Op. cit. P. 158-159.**

²⁵ *Plut. Demetr. 49; see also note 23.*

require Antigonos to be present there in person²⁶. Finally, thirdly, during 284/283-271 (except the aforementioned war with Antiochos I) all Antigonos' deeds were related to European affairs²⁷. First of all, it was about the long struggle of Gonatas for the Macedonian throne, which began in 281, lasted with variable success, and finally ended victoriously in 272²⁸. Thus, we have every reason to assert the absence of any prerequisites for a connection between the Athenian embassy mentioned in I. Rhamnous, VI, 404 and the Carian possessions of Gonatas.

A completely different situation emerges when considering the few circumstances known to us associated with the war of Antigonos Gonatas against Antiochos I Soter²⁹. We know about that conflict, thanking a few very concise sources. The fact of the war in Asia between Antigonos and Antiochos is stated in the introductions to the 'Philippic Histories' by Pompeius Trogus³⁰. In his turn, Memnon, the author of the historical work 'History of Heracleia', adds several details to the fact of the historicity of the geographically non-localized war between the two kings: 1) the long-term nature of the war; 2) the involvement of a large number of troops in it; 3) participation of the Bithynian king Nicomedes I and Heracleia Pontica in that war on the side of Antigonos, as well as the existence of a certain 'support group' for Antiochos; 4) the successful blocking of the Antiochos' fleet by the Bithynian king³¹. Based on a fragmentary inscription from Kyzikos (a polis in the northwest of Asia Minor), it can be concluded that among the regional supporters of Antiochos during the above-mentioned war near the said polis whose territory had become the arena of hostilities, was the Pergamon dynast Philétairos³²; in one of the anecdotes from

²⁶ Cf. *Tarn W.* Op. cit. P. 114; *Buraselis K.* Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis: Forschungen zur Politik des Kassandros und der drei ersten Antigoniden im Ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien. München: C.H. Beck, 1982. S. 152-153; *Hammond N., Walbank F.* Op. cit. P. 245; *Gabbert J.* Op. cit. P. 23; *Wheatley P., Dunn Ch.* Op. cit. P. 426, not. 56; *Roberts M.* Op. cit. P. 148-149.

²⁷ Even the urn with the ashes of Demetrios, who died in Syria in 282 (cf. note 18), was met by Gonatas in the Cyclades archipelago, that is, halfway between Europe and Asia – *Plut.* Demetr. 53.

²⁸ See, for example: *Hammond N., Walbank F.* Op. cit. P. 241-267; *Gabbert J.* Op. cit. P. 21-32; *Waterfield R.* Op. cit. P. 36-38, 113-133. Theoretically, during the said period, Gonatas could have visited Caria only in 275, during a short lull in the struggle for the Macedonian throne. However, it would be more logical to assume that the son of Demetrios devoted that quiet year to arrange affairs in Macedonia, which he had conquered for the first time.

²⁹ About this war, see *Tarn W.* Op. cit. P. 160-164, 168; *Tarn W.* The new Hellenistic kingdoms // The Cambridge ancient history (1st ed.): vol. VII. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928. P. 99-101; *Heinen H.* Op. cit. P. 65-69; *Will É.* Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323-30 av. J.-C.): T. 1. 2nd éd. Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1979. P. 108-109; *Жигунин В.* Международные отношения эллинистических государств в 280-220 гг. до н.э. Казань: Изд-во Казанского ун-та, 1980. С. 62, 65-66; *Buraselis K.* Op. cit. S. 110-119; *Hammond N., Walbank F.* Op. cit. P. 250-251; *Walbank F.* Antigonos Gonatas in Thrace (281-277 B.C.) // *Studia in honorem Georgii Mihailov / ed. A. Fol.* Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1995. P. 503-511; *Габелко О.* История Вифинского царства. Санкт-Петербург: Гуманитарная академия, 2005. С. 177-178; *Davaze V.* Memnon, historien d'Héraclée du Pont: commentaire historique. Archéologie et Préhistoire: diss... PhD. Mans: Université du Maine, 2013. P. 340-345; *Paganoni E.* Forging the Crown. A History of the Kingdom of Bithynia from its Origin to Prusias I. Roma; Bristol (CT): «L'ERMA» di BRETSCHNEIDER, 2019. P. 45-57; *Waterfield R.* Op. cit. P. 114-116; *Grainger J.* The Ptolemies, Rise of a Dynasty. P. 103-104. About Antiochos I – see, for example: *Grainger J.* The Rise of the Seleukid Empire (323-223 BC): Seleukos I to Seleukos III. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books Ltd, 2014. P. 101-112, 127-171.

³⁰ P. Trog. Prol. XXIV.

³¹ FrGrHist, 434, f10.

³² OGIS, II, 748, 9-17; cf. *Hansen E.V.* The Attalids of Pergamon. 2nd ed. Itaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1971. P. 18; *Buraselis K.* Op. cit. P. 114-115; *Габелко О.* Указ. соч. С. 190-191. About Philétairos – see, for example: *Hansen E.* Op. cit. P. 14-20.

Polyainos's 'Strategemata', Apollodoros, the tyrant of the Macedonian city of Kassandreia, is named as a close ally of Antiochos I as well³³. Two unrelated details are added to the general picture by one of the Herculaneum papyri, which contains fragments of Philodemos' work 'On the Stoics'; it is about out-of-context references to a certain armistice concluded by Antigonos with somebody, and about the urgent coming of Antigonos back from Macedonia to Asia³⁴. To all the above, we should add an interesting nuance given by Pausanias the author of the 'Description of Greece', who says that during the Galatian invasion of Greece (279/278 – see below), that is, during the war of Antigonos with Antiochos, both rulers sent to the all-Greek army two detachments of 500 men each³⁵. Finally, Justin – the epitomator of the aforementioned 'Philippic Histories' – briefly mentions the fact of the conclusion of peace between Antigonos and Antiochos³⁶, placing this piece of information before the story about the victory of Gonatas over the Galatians in the battle of Lysimacheia (Thrace) (see note 28)³⁷.

Based on the said sources, modern researchers, with some disagreements, approximately reconstructed the following course of the war (see note 29). In late 280 or early 279, Antigonos Gonatas landed in Antiochos' possessions, located in the northwest of the Asia Minor peninsula. The specified expedition was intended to prevent the invasion of Antiochos I into Europe with the aim of conquering Macedonia and Thrace, which in 281 for a short time became the formal possession of the latter's father, Seleukos I Nicator. At the same time, the almost lackland Gonatas (see notes 16, 28) probably intended to recover at least part of the Asia Minor territories, which once belonged to his dynasty³⁸. On the side of Antigonos, given the threat of annexation of their lands by the Seleucid state, fought the king of Bithynia Nicomedes I³⁹ and the poleis, which were part of the so-called Northern League (Byzantion, Heracleia Pontica, and Khalkedon)⁴⁰. In turn, Antiochos was supported by Kyzikos, Philétairos of Pergamon and possibly Apollodoros of Kassandreia. In the

³³ Polyæn. VI, VII, 2; поp. *Davaze V.* Memnon, historien d'Héraclée du Pont: commentaire historique. Archéologie et Préhistoire. P. 342.

³⁴ P. Herc. 155, f8, 4-7; cf. *Tarn W.* Telokles and the Athenian Archons of 288/7-262/1 B.C // The Journal of Hellenic Studies. 1920. Vol. 40. P. 148-149; *Walbank F.* Op. cit. P. 505.

³⁵ Paus. X, XX, 5.

³⁶ Just. XXV, 1, 1. Subsequently, in 276 or 275, the above-mentioned peace treaty was sealed by a dynastic marriage between Gonatas and his niece – the half-sister of Antiochos I, Phila – Vit. Arat. I, P. 8; IV, P. 19-20; *Hammond N., Walbank F.* Op. cit. P. 251; *Waterfield R.* Op. cit. P. 123; *Grainger J.* The Ptolemies, Rise of a Dynasty. P. 103.

³⁷ O. Gabelko sees an indication of the peace concluded between the two rulers behind the back of Nicomedes I of Bithynia (see above) in the text of one of the Ilion decrees, constituted in honor of King Antiochos – OGIS, I, 219, identified by him as Antiochos I – *Габелко О.* Указ. соч. С. 177-178; cf. *Buraselis K.* Op. cit. S. 113-114. However, the author of this paper is inclined to the view that the said unidentified king – see, for example: *Ma J.* Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. P. 254-259 – was Antiochos III. The latter circumstance may be indicated by the absence of a mention of Seleukos, the eldest son and co-ruler of Antiochos I in the Ilion decree (about him – see, for example: *Holton J.* The ideology of Seleukid joint kingship: the case of Seleukos, son of Antiochos I // The Seleukid Empire, 281-222 BC: War within the Family / ed. *K. Erickson.* Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2018. P. 101-128).

³⁸ See, for example: *Champion J.* Antigonos the One-Eyed: Greatest of the Successors. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books Ltd, 2014. 235 p.; *Wheatley P., Dunn Ch.* Op. cit. 496 p.; *Romm J.* Op. cit. 210 p.

³⁹ Instead, E. Paganoni assumed without any grounds that Gonatas held a position of some kind of condottiere in the service of the Bithynian king, during the latter's war with Antiochos – *Paganoni E.* Op. cit. P. 45-57.

⁴⁰ About the Northern League – see, for example: *Габелко О.* Указ. соч. С. 168-191.

middle of 279, the warring parties concluded an armistice due to their sending military contingents to fight the Galatian invasion of Hellas⁴¹. After repulsing the Galatians, Antigonos engaged in some military operations in Macedonia but had to retreat to the territory under his control in Asia Minor. Eventually, in 278, a peace treaty was concluded between the two kings, according to which Antigonos gave up his claims on the Seleucid possessions in Asia Minor, while Antiochos relinquished his claims to Macedonia; in turn, Thrace temporarily fell into a kind of a gray zone with uncertain territorial belonging.

In the author's opinion, there were two circumstances that make it possible to date the Aristeides embassy mentioned in the decree from Rhamnous to the time of the war between Gonatas and Antiochos I. First, it is about the scale of the demands put forward by the Athenians to Gonatas. As we remember, the Athenian ambassadors demanded from the son of Demetrios the recovery of their polis of Eleusis, as well as presumably Piraeus (see above), which would have nullified the said king's control over Attica (cf. note 17). Secondly, it refers to Antigonos' reaction to those demands. He considered it expedient not only to recover Athenians' Eleusis but also to pay them a large (or even very large – see above) sum in silver. The latter, as already mentioned, could serve as a guarantee of the preservation of Gonatas' power over Piraeus⁴².

Described above state of affairs evidences in favor of Antigonos' weakened negotiating position, which the Athenians knew about in advance and which the king himself was aware of. This situation fully corresponds to the known circumstances of the war of 280-278. On the one hand, Gonatas, engaged in hostilities in northwestern Asia Minor, essentially left his Attic garrisons without proper support, which would naturally have a negative impact on their ability to counter the Athenians. Aristeides, who was an Athenian strategos in 280/279 and had a thorough understanding of the military situation in Attica at the time⁴³, probably emphasized the point. On the other hand, the king needed a large number of troops to fight the army of Antiochos⁴⁴; therefore, he would not have refused the possibility of deploying to Asia Minor at least a part of the mentioned Attic garrisons⁴⁵, which numbered not less, but most likely over two thousand men⁴⁶. Said considerations could both encourage the Athenians to impose rather tough demands on Antigonos and make partial

⁴¹ Regarding the Galatian invasion of Greece and the neighboring regions, see *Nachtergäl G.* Les Galâtes en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes. Bruxelles: Palais de Académies, 1977. P. 126-207; *Казакевич Г.М.* Східні кельти: культури, ідентичності, історіографічні конструкції. Київ-Вінниця: ТОВ Нілан ЛТД, 2015. С. 93-119; *Grainger J.* The Galatians: Celtic Invaders of Greece and Asia Minor. Barnsley; Philadelphia: Pen & Sword, 2020. P. 1-54. D. Knoepfler, not taking into account the evidence from Philodemos' treatise (see above), believes that the necessity of a joint fight against the Galatians pushed both kings to conclude a full-fledged peace treaty – *Knoepfler D.* Op. cit. P. 450.

⁴² In this context, it is worth mentioning the assumption of M. Taylor, according to which the inhabitants of Piraeus could participate in the political life of Athens, despite the occupation of the said port by the troops of Gonatas – *Taylor M.* Op. cit. P. 211-212. If such a state of affairs did occur, it could have been the result of agreements between the son of Demetrios and the embassy of Aristeides.

⁴³ IG, II, 2, № 2797, 7 = IG, III, 3, № 4, 7; *Clinton K.* The Reunion of the Athenian Asty with the Piraeus. P. 9; *Rose Th., Wallace Sh.* Op. cit. P. 168.

⁴⁴ On the large number of troops involved on both sides of the conflict – see *FrGrHist*, 434, f10, 1.

⁴⁵ This assumption is partly aligned with the opinion of K. Clinton, according to which the amount paid by Antigonos could be the price of the humane attitude of the Athenians towards the King's garrison in Eleusis – *Clinton K.* The Reunion of the Athenian Asty with the Piraeus. P. 13.

⁴⁶ Cf. *Polyaen. V, XVII, 1.* On the dating of the corresponding Polyainos' anecdote to mid. 280s, see the sources from note 17 to this paper.

concessions on the part of the latter. Among the agreements reached regarding Piraeus, in addition to the donation of the above-mentioned sum, there could have been Gonatas' permission for the Athenians to usage of the Piraeus port⁴⁷ and the royal consent for the participation of Athenian citizens living in Piraeus in the political life of the polis (see note 42). In addition, it should be noted that the Asian arrangements, as a result of which Antigonos was probably able to use the garrisons based in Attica against Antiochos, could be one of the reasons for the lack of contact between Athens and the Seleucids, observed during the period between the death of the founder of the dynasty, Seleukos Nicator (281) and the end of the 3rd century⁴⁸. In the author's opinion, Antiochos I, whose father gave the island of Lemnos back to the Athenians⁴⁹, could quite rightly consider the above agreement reached between Antigonos and Athens, as a manifestation of the latter's black ingratitude. The memory of such an insult could quite possibly have been preserved in the royal house of the Seleucids for several generations.

Finally, we have at our disposal some indirect source evidence allowing us to specify the dating of Aristides' embassy to Antigonos. It seems that it took place before the conclusion of an armistice between the two kings given the Galatian invasion (see above). In this regard, it is worth starting with a somewhat speculative, but quite realistic assumption, according to which the Athenians would hardly have felt the moral right to make the above-mentioned tough demands to yesterday's (even if forced) ally immediately after the joint victory over the Galatians (cf. note 41). Pausanias tells us about the stay of the Athenian armed contingent and Antigonos' mercenaries in the same military camp⁵⁰. He also tells about the actions of the Athenian fleet, which, according to J. Gabbert's reasonable assumption, set off for the theater of operations from Piraeus, which was under the rule of Antigonos⁵¹. The idea that the joint fight against the enemies of Hellenic civilization was not an empty phrase for Athenian citizens is evidenced by the fact that in the middle 270s, they willingly allowed Antigonos' official, Herakleitos son of Asclepiades, to dedicate a tablet in the polis temple of Athena Nike containing a list of Gonatas' merits in terms of protecting the Hellenic world from the Galatian barbarians⁵².

If the hypothesis regarding the participation of Demochares, the nephew of Demosthenes, in the Athenian embassy to Gonatas is true (see notes 13-14), we get another argument in favor of the clarification made above. In the honorific decree in honor of Demochares given by Pseudo-Plutarch, along with the stating of the latter's involvement in the recovery of Eleusis for Athens, there is a mention that the named politician got 20 silver talents from someone called Antipatros for the needs of the polis. In the context of the general presentation of information in the aforementioned decree, the conclusion is suggested that specified Antipatros, like the previously

⁴⁷ Cf. Gabbert J. Op. cit. P. 27.

⁴⁸ Habicht Ch. Athen und die Seleukiden // Chiron. 1989. Bd. 19. S. 7-10; Habicht Ch. Athens from Alexander to Antony. P. 193, 222; Paschidis P. Op. cit. P. 206-208.

⁴⁹ IG, II, 2, № 672; FrGrHist, 81, f29 = Athen. VI, 254f-255a; and maybe Paus. I, XVI, 1; cf. Habicht Ch. Athen und die Seleukiden. S. 9; Kralli I. Op. cit. P. 197; Oliver G. Op. cit. P. 70; Paschidis P. Op. cit. P. 160-161; Worthington I. Op. cit. P. 107.

⁵⁰ Paus. X, XX, 5.

⁵¹ Paus. I, IV, 1-3; X, XX, 5; XXII, 12; Gabbert J. Op. cit. P. 27.

⁵² SIG, III, 401, 6. Regarding the dating of this inscription to the mid. 270s – see Gabbert J. Op. cit. P. 27; Knoepfler D. Op. cit. P. 450-451; Worthington I. Op. cit. P. 116. Regarding its dating to the 250s – see, for example: Nachtergäl G. Op. cit. P. 170-171; Oliver G. Op. cit. P. 169-170; Paschidis P. Op. cit. P. 177-179.

mentioned Lysimachos and Ptolemy, could have had the title of a king⁵³. Thus, the named person could only be Antipatros Etesias, who reigned in Macedonia for 45 days in the period of the end of April – middle of July 279. Based on this, we can assume that Demochares managed to combine two diplomatic missions by joining Aristeides' embassy after a successful visit to Antipatros. Given such a possibility, the Athenian embassy to Antigonos in Asia, highly likely, should be dated to the end of spring – the 1st half of summer 279⁵⁴. By the way, this dating fully corresponds to the peculiarities of the Mediterranean navigation season, which began in the middle of spring⁵⁵, making an earlier voyage of the Athenian embassy to Asia Minor highly doubtful.

CONCLUSIONS

So, the decree from Rhamnous honoring Aristeides, son of Mnesitheos can surely be added to the few sources describing the course of the war of 280-278 between Antigonos Gonatas and Antiochos I. The specified document argues for Gonatas' stay in Asia in the first half of 279 and also adds some interesting details to the history of the early relations of the said ruler with the Athenian polis. Among the latter are the circumstances of the recovery of Eleusis for Athens and the existence of a possible agreement on the preservation of Piraeus under Gonatas' rule.

REFERENCES

- Bosnakis, D. & Hallof, K.** (2020). Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos VI. *Chiron*, 50, 287-326 [in German].
- Buraselis, K.** (1982). *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis: Forschungen zur Politik des Kassandros und der drei ersten Antigoniden im Ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien*. München: C.H. Beck [in German].
- Catling, R. & Marchand, F.** (2014). Alternative Readings and Restorations of Personal Names in IKAunos and a Note on P.Cair.Zen. 59037. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 189, 121-126 [in English].
- Champion, J.** (2014). *Antigonos the One-Eyed: Greatest of the Successors*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books Ltd [in English].
- Clinton, K.** (2003). Macedonians at Eleusis in the early third century. In **Palagia, O. & Tracy, S. (Eds.)**. *The Macedonians in Athens 322-229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 24-26, 2001*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 75-81 [in English].
- Clinton, K.** (2022). The Reunion of the Athenian Asty with the Piraeus, 280-279 B.C. *Grammateion*, 11, 7-16 [in English].
- Coşkun, A.** (2021). The Chronology of the Asyilia Dossier from Kos Revisited in Light of Some Recent Epigraphic Discoveries. *Philia*, 7, 29-46 [in English].
- Coşkun, A.** (2021). The Regnal Years of Antigonos Gonatas. *Karanos*, 4, 49-58 [in English].
- Davaze, V.** (2013). *Memnon, historien d'Héraclée du Pont: commentaire historique*. *Archéologie et Préhistoire* (PhD thesis). Mans: Université du Maine [in French].
- Dreyer, B.** (1999). *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätclassischen Athen (322 – ca. 230 v. Chr.)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag [in German].
- Egetenmeier, Ph.** (2021). *Zwischen zwei Welten. Die Königsfreunde im Dialog zwischen Städten und Monarchen vom Jahr der Könige bis zum Frieden von Apameia (306-188 v. Chr.)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag [in German].
- Ferguson, W.** (1911). *Hellenistic Athens*. London: MacMillan Company [in English].
- Gabbert, J.** (2004). *Antigonos II Gonatas. A political Biography*. 2nd ed. London – New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library [in English].
- Gabelko, O.** (2005). *Istoriya Vifinskogo tsarstva* [The History of the Bithynian Kingdom]. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnaya akademiya [in Russian].

⁵³ *Plut.* Mor. 851d-f; see also note 15.

⁵⁴ *Grainger J.* Antipater's Dynasty. P. 208-213.

⁵⁵ See, for example: *Зелінський А.* Від Басилевсів-фараонів до фараонів-басилевсів. С. 182.

- Grainger, J.** (2019). *Antipater's Dynasty. Alexander the Great's Regent and his Successors*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword [in English].
- Grainger, J.** (2020). *The Galatians: Celtic Invaders of Greece and Asia Minor*. Barnsley – Philadelphia: Pen & Sword [in English].
- Grainger, J.** (2022). *The Ptolemies, Rise of a Dynasty: Ptolemaic Egypt 330-246 BC*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword [in English].
- Grainger, J.** (2014). *The Rise of the Seleukid Empire (323-223 BC): Seleukos I to Seleukos III*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books Ltd [in English].
- Habicht, Ch.** (1976). Aristeides, Sohn des Mnesitheos, aus Lamprai. Ein athenischer Staatsmann aus der Zeit des Chremonideischen Krieges. *Chiron*, 6, 7-10 [in German].
- Habicht, Ch.** (1999). *Athens from Alexander to Antony*: transl. from germ. 2nd pr. Cambridge: Harvard University Press [in German].
- Habicht, Ch.** (1989). Athen und die Seleukiden. *Chiron*, 19, 7-26 [in German].
- Hammond, N. & Walbank, F.** (1988). *A History of Macedonia*: Vol. III. Oxford: Clarendon Press [in English].
- Hansen, E.** (1971). *The Attalids of Pergamon*. 2nd ed. Itaca – London: Cornell University Press [in English].
- Hatzopoulos, M.** (2021). Quatre nouveaux décrets macédoniens: géographie historique et institutions. *Revue des études grecques*, 1 (134), 199-213 [in French].
- Hauben, H.** (2013). Callicrates of Samos and Patroclus of Macedon, champions of Ptolemaic thalassocracy. In **Buraselis, K., Stefanou, M. & Thompson, D. (Eds.)**. *The Ptolemies, the Sea and the Nile. Studies in Waterborne Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 39-65 [in English].
- Heinen, H.** (1972) *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts V. Chr. Zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum Chremonideinischen Krieg*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH [in German].
- Holton, J.** (2018). The ideology of Seleukid joint kingship: the case of Seleukos, son of Antiochos I. In **Erickson, K. (Ed.)**. *The Seleukid Empire, 281-222 BC: War within the Family*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 101-128 [in English].
- Johstono, P.** (2020). *The Army of Ptolemaic Egypt 323 to 204 BC An Institutional and Operational History*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword [in English].
- Kazakevych, H.** (2015). *Skhidni kelty: kultura, identychnosti, istoriohrafichni konstruktsiyi* [The Eastern Celts: cultures, identities, historiographic Constructions]. Kyiv-Vinnitsia: TOV Nilan LTD [in Ukrainian].
- Knoepfler, D.** (2012). Épigraphie et histoire des cités grecques: cours: Athènes hellénistique (2e partie). *L'annuaire du Collège de France*, 111, 435-459 [in French].
- Kralli, I.** (1996). *Early Hellenistic Athens: Leadership and diplomacy* (PhD thesis). London: University College London [in English].
- Kuzmin, Yu.** (2015). The Antigonids, Caunus and the so-called «Era of Monophthalmus»: Some Observations Prompted by a New Inscription. In **Gouschin, V. & Rhodes, P. (Ed.)**. *Deformations and Crises of Ancient Civil Communities*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 73-85 [in English].
- Kuzmin, Yu.** (2021). «Novye» i «starye» dekreti makedonskikh polisov po povodu asilii svyatilishcha Asklepiya na Kose [‘New’ and ‘old’ decrees of the macedonian poleis on the asyilia of the koan sanctuary of Asklepios]. *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultury*, 4, 215-236 [in Russian].
- Ma, J.** (1999). *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press [in English].
- Meadows, A.** (2007). The Ptolemaic Annexation of Lycia: SEG 27.929. In **Dortluk, K. et al. (Eds.)**. *The IIIrd International Symposium on Lycia (Antalya, 07-10 november 2005). Symposium Proceedings*: Vol. 2, Istanbul: AKMED on Press, 459-470 [in English].
- Messerschmidt, W.** (2008). Basis einer Ehrenstatue für Philokles, König der Sidonier, aus Kaunos. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, 58, 419-423 [in German].
- Nachtergäl, G.** (1977). *Les Galâtes en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes*. Bruxelles: Palais de Académies [in French].
- O’Neil, J.** (2008). L. A re-examination of the Chremonidian war. In **McKechnie, P. & Guillaume, Ph. (Eds.)**. *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*. Leiden-Boston: Koninklijke Brill NV, 65-90 [in English].
- Oliver, G.** (2007). *War, Food, and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press [in English].
- Osborne, M.** (2012). *Athens in the Third Century B.C.* Athenai: Hellēnikē Epigraphikē Hetaireia [in English].
- Osborne, M.** (2016). Panathenaic Fantasies. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 198, 88-96 [in English].

- Paganoni, E.** (2019). *Forging the Crown. A History of the Kingdom of Bithynia from its Origin to Prusias I.* Roma-Bristol (CT): «L'ERMA» di BRETSCHNEIDER [in English].
- Paschidis, P.** (2008). *Between city and King. Prosopographical Studies on the Intermediaries Between the Cities of the Greek Mainland and the Aegean and the Royal Courts in the Hellenistic Period (322-190 BC).* Athens: Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity – Diffusion de Boccard [in English].
- Reger, G.** (1992). Athens and Tenos in the Early Hellenistic Age. *The Classical Quarterly*, 2, 365-383 [in English].
- Roberts, M.** (2022). *Alexander the Great's Legacy. The Decline of Macedonian Europe in the Wake of the Wars of the Successors.* Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military [in English].
- Romm, J.** (2022). *Demetrius Sacker of Cities.* New Haven-London: Yale University Press [in English].
- Rose, Th.** (2015). *A historical commentary on Plutarch's Life of Demetrius* (PhD thesis). Iowa City: University of Iowa [in English].
- Rose, Th. & Wallace, Sh.** (2022). The Athenian Revolt from Demetrius Poliorketes: New Evidence from Rhamnous (IRhamnous 404). *Ancient history bulletin*, 3-4, 166-178 [in English].
- Shear, T.** (1978). Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C. *Hesperia (suppl.)*, 17, 1-122 [in English].
- Tarn, W.** (1913). *Antigonos Gonatas.* Oxford: Clarendon press [in English].
- Tarn, W.** (1920). Telokles and the Athenian Archons of 288/7-262/1 B.C. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 40, 143-159 [in English].
- Tarn, W.** (1928). The new Hellenistic kingdoms. *The Cambridge ancient history* (1st ed.): vol. VII. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 75-108 [in English].
- Taylor, M.** (1998). When the Peiraieus and the City Are Reunited. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 123, 207-212 [in English].
- Walbank, F.** (1995). Antigonos Gonatas in Thrace (281-277 B.C.). In **Fol, A. (Ed.)**. *Studia in honorem Georgii Mihailov.* Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 503-511 [in English].
- Waterfield, R.** (2021). *The making of a king: Antigonos Gonatas of Macedon and the Greeks.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press [in English].
- Wheatley, P. & Dunn, Ch.** (2020). *Demetrius the Besieger.* Oxford: Oxford University Press [in English].
- Will, É.** (1979). *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323-30 av. J.-C.):* T. 2. 2nd éd. Nancy: Presses universitaires de nancy [in French].
- Worthington, I.** (2021). *Athens After Empire: a history from Alexander the great to the emperor Hadrian.* New York: Oxford University Press [in English].
- Zelinskyi, A.** (2020). *Vid basylevsv-faraoniv do faraoniv-basylevsv: pershi 100 rokiv ptolemeyivskoyi monarkhiyi* [From Basileis-Pharaohs to Pharaohs-Basileis: the first 100 years of the Ptolemaic Monarchy]. Vinnytsya-Kyiv: 'Tvory' [in Ukrainian].
- Zelinskyi, A.** (2021). Zovnishniopolitychni oryentiry vifinskoho tsaria Ziela u svitli novykh koskykh napsyiv [Foreign policy orientation of the Bithynian king Ziaelas in light of new inscriptions from Kos]. *Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V.N. Karazina. Seriya 'Istoriya'*, 60, 27-48 [in Ukrainian].
- Zhigunin, V.** (1980). *Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya ellinisticheskikh gosudarstv v 280-220 gg. do n.e.* [The international relations of the hellenistic states during 280-220 B.C.]. Kazan: Izdatelstvo Kazanskogo universiteta [in Russian].

ABBREVIATION

FrGrHist – Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Berlin – Leiden.

I. Rhamnous – 'Ο δῆμος τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος, Athens.

IG – Inscriptiones Graecae, Berlin.

IvKaunos – Die Inschriften von Kaunos, München.

OGIS – Orientis Graeci inscriptiones Selectae, Leipzig.

P. Herc. – Herculanum Papyri, Napoli.

SEG – Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecorum, Leiden.

SIG – Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum, Leipzig.