

## THE HELLENISTIC RULERS AND THEIR POETS. SILENCING DANGEROUS CRITICS?\*

### I

The beginning of the reign of Ptolemy VII Euergetes II in the year 145 BC following the death of his brother Ptolemy VI Philometor was described in a very negative way by ancient authors<sup>1</sup>. According to Athenaeus

Ptolemy who ruled over Egypt... received from the Alexandrians appropriately the name of Malefactor. For he murdered many of the Alexandrians; not a few he sent into exile, and filled the islands and towns with men who had grown up with his brother — philologists, philosophers, mathematicians, musicians, painters, athletic trainers, physicians, and many other men of skill in their profession<sup>2</sup>.

It is true that anecdotal tradition, as we find it here, is mostly of tendentious origin, «but the course of the events suggests that the gossip-mon-

\* This article is the expanded version of a paper given on 2 November 1995, at the University of St Andrews, and — in a slightly changed version — on 3 November 1995, during the «Leeds Latin Seminar» on «Epigrams and Politics». I would like to thank my colleagues there very much, especially Michael Whitby (now Warwick), for their invitation, their hospitality, and stimulating discussions. Moreover, I would like to thank Jürgen Malitz (Eichstätt), Doris Meyer and Eckhard Wirbelauer (both Freiburg/BrsG.) for numerous suggestions, Joachim Mathieu (Eichstätt/Atlanta) for the translation, and Roland G. Mayer (London) for his support in preparing the paper.

<sup>1</sup> For biographical details cf. H. VOLKMAN, art. *Ptolemaios VIII. Euergetes II.* (27), *RE* XXIII (1959), col. 1721-1736; G. HÖLBL, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches*, Darmstadt 1994, p. 172f.; T. SCHNEIDER, *Lexikon der Pharaonen. Die altägyptischen Könige von der Frühzeit bis zur Römerherrschaft*, Zurich 1994. For the chronology of 145 BC cf. now M. CHAUVEAU, *Un été 145, BIFAO* 90 (1990), p. 135-168; 91 (1991), p. 129-134; E. LANCIEIS, *Some Observations on the Events in Egypt in 145 B.C.*, *Simbolos* 1 (1995), p. 33-39; esp. H. HEINEN, in: *Akten des 21. Internat. Papyrologenkongr.* III, Stuttgart - Leipzig 1997, p. 449-460.

<sup>2</sup> IV 184b-c: ἐγένετο οὖν ἀνανέωσις πάλιν παιδείας ἀπάσης κατὰ τὸν βασιλεύσαντα Αἰγύπτου Πτολεμαῖον, τὸν κυρίως ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων καλούμενον Κακεργέτην. οὗτος γὰρ πολλοὺς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων ἀποσφάζας, οὐκ ὀλίγους δὲ καὶ φυγαδεύσας τῶν κατὰ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐφηρησάντων ἐποίησε πλήρεις τὰς τε νήσους καὶ πόλεις ἀνδρῶν γραμματικῶν, φιλοσόφων, γεωμετρῶν, μουσικῶν, ζωγράφων, παιδοτριβῶν τε καὶ ἰατρῶν καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν τεχνιτῶν. Further references in Diod. XXXIII 6 and 12 (= Poseid. fr. 104a + 108 Theiler) and Iust. XXXVIII 8.5-7, who, among other things, also reports the king's attempt to gain attractiveness for foreigners.

gers had more than enough genuine material to work with»<sup>3</sup>. The epithet Φύσκων (potbelly)<sup>4</sup>, which had been conferred on him by his scholarly opponents, also stands for the unfavourable reputation Ptolemy had since then<sup>5</sup>. Even though the true extent of pogroms and expulsions can only be assessed with difficulty, there is, at first glance, a contrast between the far reaching expulsion of intellectual potential at the Ptolemaic court and the king's acknowledged intellectual interests. The latter are evident in the writing of twenty-four books 'Hypomnemata'<sup>6</sup>.

This contrast points at two basic factors of Hellenistic rule, which only at first sight do not correlate.

(1) An Hellenistic ruler has in his territory — τὰ πράγματα τῆς βασιλείας —, especially at his court, the unlimited right to decide about life or death. Without having to take any considerations and as long as he has executing helpers at his disposal, he can theoretically arrest any person, have him or her punished or expelled from his territory<sup>7</sup>. Such

<sup>3</sup> See P. GREEN, *Alexander to Actium. The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1990, p. 875 n. 102.

<sup>4</sup> See Strab. XVII 1.11, 795 (ὁ δεύτερος Εὐεργέτης, ὃν καὶ Φύσκωνα προσαγορεύουσι) and Plut., *Coriol.* 11; cf. P.M. FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria I*, Oxford 1972, p. 86ff. and *passim*; R. PFEIFFER, *Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus*, Munich 1978<sup>2</sup>, p. 258ff.

<sup>5</sup> Especially the conception of the ruler's τρυφή has been criticized, for this cf. J. TONDRIAU, *La 'tryphe', philosophie royale ptolémaïque*, REA 50 (1943), p. 49-54; for the sources A. ALFÖLDI, *Gewaltherrscher und Theaterkönig. Die Auseinandersetzung einer attischen Ideenprägung mit persischen Repräsentationsformen im politischen Denken und in der Kunst bis zur Schwelle des Mittelalters*, in: K. WEITZMANN (ed.), *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of A.M. Friend Jr.*, Princeton 1955, p. 15-55, esp. 16ff.; U. COZZOLI, *La tryphe nella interpretazione delle crisi politiche*, in: *Tra Grecia e Roma. Temi antichi e metodologie moderne*, Rome 1980, p. 133-145; H. HEINEN, *Die 'Tryphè' des Ptolemaios VIII. Euergetes II. Beobachtungen zum ptolemäischen Herrscherideal und zu einer römischen Gesandtschaft in Ägypten (140/39 v.Chr.)*, in: ID. (ed.), *Althistorische Studien H. Bengtson zum 70. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 1983, p. 116-130, esp. 119ff.; J. MALITZ, *Die Historien des Poseidonios (Zetemata, 79)*, Munich 1983, p. 246-250. Furthermore G. HÖLBL, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 172f., referring to numerous amnesties and the ruler's attempt to win public acceptance.

<sup>6</sup> *FGrHist* 234, see the commentary by F. JACOBY (ii b, p. 658f.); cf. R. PFEIFFER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 260, there also further information about the list of Alexandrian librarians in *P. Oxy.* X 1241.

<sup>7</sup> This does not necessarily have to correlate with today's understanding of the 'judiciary' (for the ruler's 'authorization' see J. MODRZEJEWSKI, *Zum Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*, ZRG 80, 1963, p. 42-82, esp. 44f.; H.J. WOLFF, *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*, Munich 1970<sup>2</sup>, p. 5ff.), especially because it is not evident whether in the following cases one had stuck to the formalities at all. Cf. A. HEUSS, *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus in ihren staats- und völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen (Klio, Beiheft 39)*, Leipzig 1937, there information on the notion of 'rule' (*Herrschaft*), referring to the relations between

measures could be essential for the continuance of his own rule, however, they could also be regarded as sheer arbitrariness and have negative effects on the ruler's reputation. The ruler was also integrated into the interactive structures of his court, i.e. he consulted his φίλοι, preferred opinions and interests of one faction or the other — or he tried a solo effort, which could, however, isolate him<sup>8</sup>.

(2) It was advantageous for a ruler's reputation, if libraries and research institutions, as well as eminent authorities in the fields of scholarship, poetry and the fine arts were part of his court. Among his own Greek subjects, and among other kings of the Greek world and among the free *poleis* the mere presence of intellectuals at *his* court granted him remarkable prestige<sup>9</sup>. Poets and other artists were evidently not rigidly forced to become small cogwheels in the clock-work mechanism of the ruler's propaganda, neither did they have to follow strict guide-lines throughout. They had a certain amount of scope<sup>10</sup>. Their sheer presence, the contact with them, as well as their appearance at festivities for the court, the capital and foreign visitors were what mattered most to the ruler<sup>11</sup>.

The example from Ptolemaic Alexandria shows that the king could find himself in situations, in which he had to decide with regard to the two described factors: was the expulsion of intellectuals, some of them friends of his murdered brother, more important, and possible damage to his image in the outside world had to be accepted? Or could the king's

state and king; B.-J. MÜLLER, *Ptolemaeus II. Philadelphus als Gesetzgeber*, Diss. Cologne 1968; H.-J. GEHRKE, *Der siegreiche König. Überlegungen zur Hellenistischen Monarchie*, AKG 64 (1982), p. 247-277, here: 248f.

<sup>8</sup> See G. WEBER, *Interaktion, Repräsentation und Herrschaft. Der Königshof im Hellenismus*, in: A. WINTERLING (ed.), *Zwischen 'Haus' und 'Staat'. Antike Höfe im Vergleich* (HZ, Beiheft 23), München 1997, p. 28-71.

<sup>9</sup> For this aspect cf. G. WEBER, *Herrscher, Hof und Dichter. Aspekte der Legitimierung und Repräsentation hellenistischer Könige am Beispiel der ersten drei Antigoniden*, *Historia* 44 (1995), p. 283-316.

<sup>10</sup> The reception of Egyptian-pharaonic aspects in Hellenistic poetry with the aim of making contents lucid for a Greek audience is controversial; see on this most recently an impressive study of L. KOENEN, *The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure*, in: A. BULLOCK et al. (eds.), *Images and Ideologies. Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley 1993, p. 25-119 (with additional remarks by R. HUNTER, *TLS* 4802, 14 April 1995, p. 7), cf. also my differing view: G. WEBER, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft. Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer* (Hermes, Einzelschriften 62), Stuttgart 1993, p. 369ff.

<sup>11</sup> As an example for early Hellenism cf. G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), *passim*; W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *Kunst und Gesellschaft an den Höfen Alexanders d. Gr. und seiner Nachfolger* (Quellen und Forschungen zur Alten Welt, 15), München 1993.

position at his court have been harmed by literary agitation and political intrigue against him? Our source material does not enable us to say anything about the second possibility, since we do not have corresponding pamphlets. However, especially Ptolemy VIII was by no means somebody who hated intellectuals, instead, he had grown up in the very environment that had now gotten under attack. Regardless of a possibly genuine threat, the expulsions and executions seem like an irrational sweeping blow in the heat of the moment. For Ptolemy sending critics into exile as a means to silence them had apparently been sufficient<sup>12</sup>.

The event under Ptolemy is particularly spectacular because of its relevance for the history of classical philology, yet it is certainly not unique. However, especially anecdotal tradition offers numerous separate examples of expelled and executed intellectuals<sup>13</sup>. Subject of the following exposition will be cases in which rulers did not exile, but killed the literati: the cases in question are Theocritus of Chios under Antigonos I Monophthalmus, Sotades of Maroneia under Ptolemy II Philadelphus, and Daphidas of Telmessus under the Attalids. They have not been subject of a *common* interpretation<sup>14</sup>. Even though they might only be 'minor' or occasional poets<sup>15</sup>, it is still remarkable that not only the occurrences as such, but also parts of their literature, especially epigrams and other verses, have come down to us<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. M.I. FINLEY, *Censorship in Classical Antiquity*, *TLS* 76 (1977), p. 923-925: «Death remains the most certain way of preventing anything 'immoral, heretical, or offensive or injurious to the State'... from being propagated. (923)... Remove a man physically from his audience and the danger he represents is also removed» (924).

<sup>13</sup> The ancient biographers were always interested in the circumstances of the poets' deaths, also in democratic Athens, cf. M.R. LEFKOWITZ, *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London 1981, p. 72f., 85f. and 96f. In *De lib. educ.* 14 (= *Mor.* 10f), quoted in n. 24, Plutarch describes the examples of Sotades and Theocritus as belonging to a τύπος (other cases of which are not mentioned). This, however, does not *a priori* imply the fictionality of the examples; the same is true for the fact of differing versions or ways of dying in these cases.

<sup>14</sup> C. FRANCO, *Teocrito di Chio, Athenaeum* 79 (1991), p. 445-458, esp. 445 and 454 (with n. 37), refers to Sotades and Theodorus (cf. n. 110). W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 84, gives all the examples that will be examined here when writing about the κόλακες at the courts (see n. 22) — Theocritus is not mentioned explicitly; however, the respective contexts are neglected; similarly F.-J. BRECHT, *Stoff und Form des griechischen Spottepigramms*, Diss. Freiburg/Brsg. 1922, p. 11ff., with more examples.

<sup>15</sup> None of the poets that are studied here is mentioned in G.O. HUTCHINSON, *Hellemistic Poetry*, Oxford 1988; only scarce hints in F. SUSEMIHL, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1891-1892, and in A. LESKY, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Bern-Munich 1971<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> This appears to be an important argument to me, if one wants to recur to the 'worth' of the anecdotes. For the very course of the tradition down to Plutarch or Athenaeus as final points, as like as the motives for recording them can only be reconstructed with difficulty.

Usually the scenario was more or less the same: a poet picked out critical points about the ruler's person or his dynasty as a central theme in open or concealed mockery. As a result the granted patronage came to an end, or the king had poets who did not live at his court arrested and eliminated. In that there is a recurrent connection between the attack on the ruler by means of poetry and the subsequent castigation. The cases on hand might have awoken interest, since with them *παρρησία*, which was connected with the democratic *polis*, had been upheld<sup>17</sup>. The central literary genres were the satire of the Attic comedy and the Hellenistic mock-epigram, coming into effect, for example, as *σκῶμμα* during the symposion<sup>18</sup>. However, even the *παρρησία* in the *poleis* was subject to some restrictions and was not always respected, either. Talking about Hellenistic times we will have to take into account a great amount of idealization with regard to the changed political situation<sup>19</sup>. This led to some exaggeration in the anecdotal tradition<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. J. BRUNSCHWIG, *The Anaxarchus Case. An Essay on Survival*, PBA 92 (1992), p. 59-88, esp. 67ff. with n. 18 (bibliography). Examples also in K.J. DOVER, *The Freedom of the Intellectual in Greek Society*, *Talanta* 7 (1975), p. 24-54, esp. 50ff.; M.I. FINLEY, *art. cit.* (n. 12), p. 924f.; S. HALLIWELL, *Comic Satire and Freedom of Speech in Classical Athens*, *JHS* 111 (1991), p. 48-70. A special genre for this, which was only cultivated by a small number of the literati in question, are the *χρηῖται*, see A.S.F. GOW, *Machon. The Fragments*, Cambridge 1965, p. 1ff.; J.F. KINDSTRAND, *Diogenes Laertius and the 'Chreia' Tradition*, *Elenchos* 7 (1986), p. 217-243.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. F.-J. BRECHT, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 11ff.; M. LAUSBERG, *Das Einzeldistichon. Studien zum antiken Epigramm (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua, 19)*, Munich 1982, p. 380ff.; M.I. FINLEY, *art. cit.* (n. 12), p. 923; S. HALLIWELL, *art. cit.* (n. 17).

<sup>19</sup> For the terms *λοιδορία*, *κατηγορία* etc. see S. HALLIWELL, *The Use of Laughter in Greek Culture*, *CQ* 41 (1991), p. 279-296, esp. 292ff.; for the legislation directed against this in 5th-cent. Athens cf. S. HALLIWELL, *art. cit.* (n. 17), p. 49-54, who, moreover (63f.), emphasizes that the attacks of *ὄνομαστὶ κωμωιδεῖν* became clearly less comparing the Old, Middle and New Comedy. The reasons for this are extraordinarily complex, cf. M.I. FINLEY, *art. cit.* (n. 12), p. 925. Furthermore, it is informative that, according to Halliwell, there was also a limit for mockery etc. in Athens, which was only defined in connection «with especially severe political stresses» (p. 70) and then led to consequences; cf. also the statement of the Attic *demos* with regard to the limits of tolerating mockery in Ps.-Xen., *Ath. Pol.* 2.18. Opposed to that is M.I. FINLEY, *art. cit.* (n. 12), p. 923: «there seems to have been no limit to freedom of defamation... in the law courts...». For the Hellenistic situation cf. A. MOMIGLIANO, *The Social Structure of the Ancient City. Freedom of Speech and Religious Tolerance in the Ancient World*, in: ID., *Sesto Contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome 1980 [originally 1974], vol. II, p. 459-476, esp. 465ff.; M. FUHRMANN, *Lizenzen und Tabus des Lachens. Zur sozialen Grammatik der hellenistisch-römischen Komödie*, *AU* 29 (1986), p. 20-43, esp. 24ff.

<sup>20</sup> M.I. FINLEY, *art. cit.* (n. 12), p. 925, justifiably warns of overestimating the practice of *παρρησία*.

The examples to be dealt with here show yet another characteristic: it has to do with the poets' behaviour, often in the context of the tendency of their poetry, on the other hand, it has to do with the characterization of the positive or negative features of the rulers. The relation to reality of this kind of anti-monarchic agitation cannot be verified in most cases<sup>21</sup>, in my eyes, however, this gives no justification to dismiss the examples at large as unhistorical, and to assign them rather to the ideas of Hellenistic courts, prevailing in Greece in the first and second century AD, than to Hellenistic times proper<sup>22</sup>.

In the following an attempt is to be made to look into the question of whether the described constellation is of a structural kind and whether the reasons for the execution of the intellectuals were actually their criticisms. For methodical reasons we therefore need to put a questionmark behind the subtitle «Silencing the Critics».

First of all the basic situation at Hellenistic courts is to be investigated and one will have to look for precursors. Then the poets, which have already been mentioned, will be examined closely. In doing so, it is imperative to capture the respective situation in which such conflicts arose, with regard to the political and atmospheric background. For this purpose we need to bear in mind the following central questions:

(1) What was the range of statements, such as mockery and irony, a Hellenistic ruler was willing to endure, or in other words: what were the 'limits of clemency'<sup>23</sup>, or how far reached his tolerance towards a ἀκρασία γλώττης or ἄκαιρος παρρησία<sup>24</sup>? (2) Why did a ruler actu-

<sup>21</sup> Cf. especially the remarks in H.S. LUND, *Lysimachus. A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*, Oxford 1992, p. 11f., and J. BRUNSCHWIG, *art. cit.* (n. 17), esp. 62ff. Of methodological importance is also R. SALLER, *Anecdotes as Historical Evidence for the Principate*, *G&R* 27 (1980), p. 69-83.

<sup>22</sup> M.R. LEFKOWITZ, *op. cit.* (n. 13), using the fully handed down lives of poets, he has demonstrated to what great extent information from the authors' works were employed to 'construct' their biographies. As an example cf. also C. PELLING, *Childhood and Personality in Biography*, in: ID. (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, Oxford 1990, p. 213-244, esp. 216ff. Whether the examples in question derive from biographies, which had to achieve the greatest possible degree of completeness, remains doubtful, as much as they could also have to be seen in the context of historical monographs.

<sup>23</sup> Thus the title of S.T. TEODORSSON, *Theocritus the Sophist, Antigonus the One-Eyed, and the Limits of Clemency*, *Hermes* 118 (1990), p. 380-382.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Plut., *De lib. educ.* 14 (= *Mor.* 10f) in the introduction to his examples of Sotades and Theocritus μυρίους δ' ἔγωγ' οἷδ' ἀκούσας ταῖς μεγίσταις συμφοραῖς περιπεσόντας διὰ τὴν τῆς γλώττης ἀκρασίαν. ὦν τοὺς ἄλλους παραλιπὼν ἑνὸς ἢ δυεῖν ἔνεκεν ἐπιμνησθήσομαι («I have heard of countless men who have fallen into the greatest misfortunes through intemperate speech. Of these I shall mention one or two

ally make use of his right to decide on life or death, and to what extent did he have the power to do so? When was mere exiling no longer sufficient? Jane Hornblower describes the context as follows: «How far a writer could go in his criticisms evidently depended on the circumstances and on the monarch». Or in the words of the late Berlin professor of Classics (Humboldt University), Kurt Treu, writing in 1988, who, together with his family, had to suffer the repressions of the East German regime for decades: «Wenn ein Sotades von Maroneia wegen massiven Spottes die persönliche Rache des Monarchen erduldet, so wird das eben deshalb so hervorgehoben, weil es als ungewöhnlich auffiel. Normalerweise endete — das zeigt sich auch an Sotades — der Zwang zur Affirmation spätestens an der Landesgrenze, und die war jederzeit überschreitbar»<sup>25</sup>. (3) Are critical statements only a singular occurrence with the author, or do they represent broader opposition against a certain ruler or aspects of his rule?

What then remains to be examined is, whether similar situations have come down to us with regard to other intellectuals, as well, or whether they affect especially poets. Other executions commanded by the kings, for instance, those of family members, are not going to be subject of this article.

## II

First of all, a few words on the basic situation: a significant characteristic of Hellenism is the establishment of courts, at which a court society developed<sup>26</sup>. Their common denominator was both the exertion of power over their Greek and non-Greek subjects and the display of power before the eyes of the entire Greek world. Members of these court societies, which were almost completely dominated by Greeks and Macedonians

as typical and omit the rest»). Sotades' behaviour is then qualified as ἄκαιρος λαλιά, Theocritus' as ἀθυροστομία and μανία (ἀθυρογλωττία can also be found in Polyb. VIII 10.1, referring to Theopompus). The second set of ideas in Athen. XIV 4.620f. For Greek notions of ridicule, laughter etc. cf. S. HALLIWELL, *art. cit.* (n. 19).

<sup>25</sup> J. HORNBLOWER, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford 1981, p. 185. K. TREU, review of E.-R. SCHWINGE, *Künstlichkeit von Kunst. Zur Geschichtlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie (Zetemata, 84)*, Munich 1986, in: *Klio* 70 (1988), p. 265f. (on K. Treu cf. *APF* 38, 1992, p. 4-6). Especially distinguished literati were certainly free to evade by means of flight to another court; quite certainly they were welcomed there.

<sup>26</sup> For the following cf. H.-J. GEHRKE, *Geschichte des Hellenismus (Oldenbourg Grundriß der Geschichte, 1A)*, Munich 1990, p. 52ff.; W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 7ff.; esp. G. WEBER, *art. cit.* (n. 8) with individual references.

in the 3rd century BC, were next to the core of the ruler's family, his friends and various officials, but also men of letters of different genres. A structural weakness was the disparate composition of the court societies and their sole concentration towards the person of the king: if he failed to achieve the integration of the individuals by means of charisma, military success or the distribution of favours, his rule could be at stake<sup>27</sup>. Since the court society at first had an informal character, competitive relationships among the members, rankings concerning the proximity to the ruler and success in the fulfilment of assigned tasks played an important role<sup>28</sup>. In the 2nd century BC the court system was increasingly formalized, among other things by means of court titles indicating an order of rank, which regulated promotion and proximity to the king<sup>29</sup>. Polybius shows in his appreciation of the sixth Ptolemy what kinds of contact could be maintained at court: Ptolemy «was mild and kind-hearted as ever one of his ancestors. The greatest proof for this is that he, firstly, not executed any of his friends because of any accusa-

<sup>27</sup> For the structures cf. H.-J. GEHRKE, *art. cit.* (n. 7), p. 252ff.

<sup>28</sup> Going over to another court society was, in case of appropriately competent achievements, possible, without further ado; two examples would be Archias, Ptolemaic governor on Cyprus (W. PEREMANS et al., *Prosopographia Ptolemaica VI: La cour, les relations internationales et les possessions extérieures, la vie culturelle* (n<sup>os</sup> 14479-17250), Leuven 1968, 15037 [= PP VI]; L. MOOREN, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt. Introduction and Prosopography*, Brussels 1975, no. 0351; R.S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden 1976, no. 5; J. HOPP, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden* [Vestigia, 25], Munich 1977, p. 82f.), who, according to Polyb. XXXIII 5, wanted to sell his province for 500 talents to Demetrius I in 158/7 BC (cf. L. MOOREN, *Korruption in der hellenistischen Führungsschicht*, in: W. SCHULLER [ed.], *Korruption im Altertum*, Munich-Vienna 1982, p. 93-101, here 94), and the Cretan Bolis (PP VI 14750; cf. W. HUSS, *Untersuchungen zur Außenpolitik Ptolemaios' IV.* [Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 69], München 1976, p. 85f. and 91ff.), who, according to Polyb. VIII 15.1ff., was ordered by Sosibius to get in contact with Achaeus in order to save him, received the offered reward of 10 talents, and then betrayed Achaeus to Antiochus.

<sup>29</sup> At first verified for the Ptolemaic court, cf. L. MOOREN, *La hiérarchie de cour Ptolémaïque. Contribution à l'étude des institutions et des classes dirigeantes à l'époque hellénistique* (Studia Hellenistica, 23), Leuven 1977, p. 20ff. and 50ff. For the Seleucids cf. E. BIKERMAN, *Institutions des Séleucides*, Paris 1938, p. 40-50, esp. 45; H.H. SCHMITT, *art. Hof*, in: H.H. SCHMITT – E. VOGT (eds.), *Kleines Wörterbuch des Hellenismus*, Wiesbaden 1993<sup>2</sup>, p. 253-259, here 256. It appears that the formalization had been decreased under the Antigonids and Attalids, cf. G. CORRADI, *Studi ellenistici*, Turin 1929, p. 347ff.; J. HOPP, *op. cit.* (n. 28), p. 98-100; R.E. ALLEN, *The Attalid Kingdom. A Constitutional History*, Oxford 1983, p. 129ff.; S. LE BOHEC, *Les philoi des rois Antigonides*, REG 98 (1985), p. 93-124, esp. 118f.; EAD., *L'entourage royal à la cour des Antigonides*, in: E. LÉVY (ed.), *Le système palatial en Orient, en Grèce et à Rome*, Straßburg 1987, p. 315-326, esp. 322f.; for all cf. G. WEBER, *art. cit.* (n. 9), p. 292ff.



tion; yet I do believe that of the other Alexandrians none has been killed, either...»<sup>30</sup>. One means to achieve this could have been poetry, by making the ruler and his deeds central themes. Symposia and feasts at court, such as innumerable Ptolemaieia, Antigoneia etc., were especially suitable for publication; or one could also put inscriptions on exceptional buildings. Mentioning Callimachus, the Syracusan Theocritus, and Posidippus may suffice here<sup>31</sup>. Epigrams can be found frequently in this context, especially since their fictitious character and their detachment from their original purpose became habitual in Hellenistic times<sup>32</sup>. Nonetheless, Hellenistic poetry, which combined innovations with references to previous literature, was so complex that its manifold allusions could not be appreciated by everybody. Constitutive elements were irony, a sense of humour, and ambiguity. The line between flattery and criticism appears to have been extremely fine, communication was not infrequently insincere. Therefore the polarization between the alternatives 'propaganda' and 'opposition' does not seem very helpful to reach an adequate understanding of this kind of *poetry*<sup>33</sup>,

<sup>30</sup> Polyb. XXXIX 7:... σημείον δὲ τοῦτο μέγιστον· ὃς πρῶτον μὲν οὐδένα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ φίλων ἐπ' οὐδενὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἐπανείλετο. For the assessment cf. G. HÖLBL, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 171 with n. 62. Killing the father's *philoî* seems to have been a kind of bad tradition, which was practised, for example, by Ptolemy IV (cf. Polyb. V 34.1, see W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* [n. 11], p. 52), Perseus (see L. MOOREN, *art. cit.* [n. 28, 1982], p. 93f.; W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 51f.) and Attalus III (cf. Diod. XXXIV 3 and Iust. XXXVI 4.1-5, cf. J. HOPP, *op. cit.* [n. 28], p. 116-120).

<sup>31</sup> On the significance of the symposium cf. C. PRÉAUX, *Le monde hellénistique. La Grèce et l'Orient de la mort d'Alexandre à la conquête romaine de la Grèce (323-146 av. J.-C.)*, 2 vols., Paris 1978, p. 227ff.; G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 180f.; esp. W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 78ff. On feasts F. PERPILLOU-THOMAS, *Fêtes d'Égypte ptolémaïque et romaine d'après la documentation papyrologique grecque (Studia Hellenistica, 31)*, Leuven 1993. On epigrams on parts of buildings H. VON HESBERG, *Bemerkungen zu Architekturepigrammen des 3. Jahrhunderts v.Chr.*, *Jdl* 96 (1981), p. 55-119.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. A. LESKY, *op. cit.* (n. 15), p. 716: «Man dichtete Epigramme für ihre alte Bestimmung als Aufschrift, daneben liefen sie auch als literarische Kleinkunst oder Mittel der Polemik um. So hat etwa der streitbare Theokrit von Chios, der Gegner Theopomps, auf solche Weise seinem Groll gegen Hermeias und Aristoteles Luft gemacht. Dichter von Rang, Philosophen wie Platon und Dilettanten, alles machte Epigramme. Im Hellenismus hat die Pflege dieser Kunstform ihre Höhe erreicht...». Furthermore (forthcoming) D. MEYER, *Kallimachos und die Tradition des griechischen Epigramms*, Diss. Freiburg/Brsg. 1995.

<sup>33</sup> As most extreme examples: F.T. GRIFFITHS, *Theocritus at Court (Mnemosyne, Suppl. 55)*, Leiden 1979, and E.-R. SCHWINGE, *op. cit.* (n. 25). Fundamental for literary history R. KASSEL, *Die Abgrenzung des Hellenismus in der griechischen Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin-New York 1987 (= R. KASSEL, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. by H.-G. NESSELRATH, Berlin-New York 1991, p. 154-173), and the comments by P. PARSONS and A. HENRICHs in: A. BULLOCH et al., *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 152-170 and 171-195.

to the same extent apostrophizing *all* poets as κόλακες (flatterers) is not helpful to comprehend the interactive structures of the *court society*<sup>34</sup>.

It had to be caused by special circumstances, however, that sharp criticism was directed against the person of the ruler. The same is true for poets, some of them formerly at court themselves, who directed their attacks from the outside, and certainly with by no means negligible effects on the public<sup>35</sup>.

Looking for earlier examples, the classical *polis* will have to be ruled out, but both the existence of courts and the association of rulers with poets had already been common in pre-Hellenistic times<sup>36</sup>. At the court of the tyrant Dionysius I in Syracuse we find two precedents for the expounded connection, however, without the wording of the poems: Dionysius was said to have murdered the tragedian Antiphon. Even though no reasons have come down to us, the reaction of the tyrant might have had something to do with the poet's mockery of Dionysius' attempts to produce poetry himself; apparently the tyrant was rather sensitive on this point<sup>37</sup>. Dionysius is also said to have sent Philoxenus of Cythera, the poet of dithyrambics, to the quarries. He might have infuriated the tyrant with his Κύκλωψ<sup>38</sup>. The Cyclops, as he had been described in the *Odyssey* and whose portrait had become, against the background of literary parody, an important part of the literary canon, represents the counterimage of the *polis*: he is lawless and anti-social<sup>39</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> Thus W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 82ff., who grossly underestimates the scope of the poets, which they certainly enjoyed.

<sup>35</sup> M.I. FINLEY, *art. cit.* (n. 12), p. 923f., asks in this context the question regarding the threads of communication and their effects: a ruler was never able to destroy all existing copies of a defamatory tract, moreover, a significant part of the 'mock-genre' was passed on orally.

<sup>36</sup> With a focus on the connection with poetry cf. G. WEBER, *Poesie und Poeten an den Höfen vorhellenistischer Monarchen*, *Klio* 74 (1992), p. 25-77.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. G. WEBER, *art. cit.* (n. 36), p. 70f. with n. 363 and 372, on work and circumstances.

<sup>38</sup> G. WEBER, *art. cit.* (n. 36), p. 70 with n. 362, with the context and further references.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Hom., *Od.* IX 105-115, see also K.A. RAAFLAUB, *Homer und die Geschichte des 8. Jhs. v.Chr.*, in: J. LATA CZ (ed.), *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung. Rückblick und Ausblick (Colloquium Rauricum, 2)*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1991, p. 205-256, here 245. Cf. R. MONDI, *The Homeric Cyclops: Folktale, Tradition, and Theme*, *TAPhA* 113 (1983), p. 17-38, esp. 29ff. For one-eyedness in antiquity cf. T.W. AFRICA, *The One-Eyed Man against Rome. An Exercise in Euhemerism*, *Historia* 19 (1970), p. 528-538; W.O. MOELLER, *Once more the One-Eyed Man against Rome*, *Historia* 24 (1975), p. 402-410 (referring to W. DEONNA, *Le symbolisme de l'oeil*, Paris 1965, p. 115-121), giving more details on the mythological context: «... among the Celtiberians and Gauls it is almost certain that one-eyedness... was the mark of the magician».

What seems to be common to both examples under Dionysius, is that the tyrant's personal vanity had been affected, since further implications are not known to us. Due to his status as autocrat of a *polis*, who was in contact with powers like Athens and Sparta, it was of utmost importance to Dionysius not to reveal any weakness in his self-portrayal. Not only in this respect, one may call Dionysius a precursor of Hellenistic attitudes<sup>40</sup>.

In this context, obviously, one has also to refer to Alexander the Great<sup>41</sup>: at his court there were intellectuals, too, especially poets, who, however, did not produce anything of quality, at best eulogies<sup>42</sup>. It is important for our context that with Aristotle's nephew Callisthenes a 'historian' had especially been employed to record the events during the campaign; by the help of these, public opinion in Greece was to be influenced<sup>43</sup>. In 327 BC Alexander had Callisthenes executed. His death is the end of the well-known series, which, beginning with Philotas, comprised Parmenion and Clitus. For the latter, who had particularly and finally enraged Alexander with a Euripides quotation, he mourned at least when he was sober<sup>44</sup>. According to Arrian, Callisthenes had

<sup>40</sup> Thus explicitly H.H. SCHMITT, *Zur Inszenierung des Privatlebens des hellenistischen Herrschers*, in: J. SEIBERT (ed.), *Hellenistische Studien. Gedenkschrift H. Bengtson*, München 1991, p. 75-86, here 81. Somewhat too sweeping a statement, FINLEY's evaluation (*art. cit.* [n. 12], p. 923), that freedom of political comments was «more or less non-existent under the tyrants or the autocratic Hellenistic and Roman Monarchs».

<sup>41</sup> For Alexander's 'court' cf. H.-J. GEHRKE, *op. cit.* (n. 26), p. 26ff. and 150f; W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 37ff.; G. WEBER, *art. cit.* (n. 36), p. 67ff.; W.Z. RUBINSOHN, *The Philosopher at Court – Intellectuals and Politics in the Time of Alexander the Great*, in: *Archaia Makedonia* 5, Thessaloniki 1993, p. 1301-1327, esp. 1307ff.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. G. WEBER, *art. cit.* (n. 36), p. 68-70.

<sup>43</sup> On Callisthenes cf. T.S. BROWN, *Callisthenes and Alexander*, *AJPh* 70 (1949), p. 225-248; M. PLEZIA, *Der Titel und der Zweck von Kallisthenes' Alexandergeschichte*, *Eos* 60 (1972), p. 263-268; L. PRANDI, *Callistene. Uno storico tra Aristotele e i re macedoni*, Milan 1985; D. GOLAN, *The Fate of a Court Historian, Callisthenes*, *Athenaeum* 66 (1988), p. 99-120; W.Z. RUBINSOHN, *art. cit.* (n. 41), p. 1316ff.; A.M. DEVINE, *Alexander's Propaganda Machine. Callisthenes as the Ultimate Source for Arrian, Anabasis I-3*, in: I. WORTHINGTON (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*, Oxford 1994, p. 89-102.

For the professional 'historian' cf. B. MEISSNER, *Historiker zwischen Polis und Königshof. Studien zur Stellung der Geschichtsschreiber in der griechischen Gesellschaft in spätklassischer und frühhellenistischer Zeit (Hypomnemata, 99)*, Göttingen 1992.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. H. BERVE, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage II*, Munich 1926, p. 206ff. (no. 427); E. CARNEY, *The Death of Clitus*, *GRBS* 2 (1981), p. 149-160; H.-J. GEHRKE, *op. cit.* (n. 26), p. 23, justifiably stresses that Clitus was «kein Vertreter einer prinzipiellen makedonischen Opposition»; cf. the research survey in J. SEIBERT, *Alexander der Große (EdF, 10)*, Darmstadt 1972, p. 141-143, which has unfortunately not been updated even in the 3rd edition of 1990; A.B. BOSWORTH, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander II*, Oxford 1995, p. 51ff.

demanded that Alexander should rule οὐδὲ βία, ἀλλὰ νόμῳ, for otherwise he would become estranged from Macedonian tradition<sup>45</sup>. Callisthenes' death was, however, not caused by Alexander's being dissatisfied with the way he fulfilled his task, and did not have anything to do with a personal insult, either. Instead, there was a connection with the argument about proskynesis among the Macedonian ruling class<sup>46</sup>. Thus, it becomes evident that the physical preservation of rule had priority over propagandistic functions and measures for maintaining the royal image<sup>47</sup>.

### III

Theocritus of Chios embodies the kind of 'politician'<sup>48</sup>, whose intellectual stance has, at least in parts, still left traces<sup>49</sup>. What has come down to us is an early epigram directed against Aristotle, which is peppered

<sup>45</sup> Arr., *Anab.* IV 11.6, cf. R.M. ERRINGTON, *The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy*, *Chiron* 8 (1978), p. 77-133, here 80f.; J. BRUNSCHWIG, *art. cit.* (n. 17), p. 68 with n. 20; W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 41f.; A.B. BOSWORTH, *op. cit.* (n. 44), p. 84.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. esp. W.Z. RUBINSOHN, *art. cit.* (n. 41), p. 1322-1325.

<sup>47</sup> Moreover, it is remarkable that Arrian (*Anab.* IV 14.2-4) gives different versions for Callisthenes' death: caused by disease after a prolonged imprisonment or by breaking on the wheel and hanging. The first version «mitigates Alexander's guilt and probably represents an official version», cf. W.Z. RUBINSOHN, *art. cit.* (n. 41), p. 1325f.

<sup>48</sup> On Theocritus cf. F. SCHRÖDER, *Theokritos von Chios, Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 139 (1889), p. 317-334; R. LAQUEUR, *art. Theokritos* (2), *RE* VA 1 (1935), col. 2025-2027; T. SARIKAKIS, *Chiaki Prosopografia*, Athens 1989, p. 223-225 (no. 62); S.T. TEODORSSON, *art. cit.* (n. 23); R.A. BILLOWS, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1990, p. 311 and 436f. (no. 114); the most recent exhaustive study is by C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 445-458 (with many inaccuracies concerning quotations and references); W. HECKEL, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*, London-New York 1992, p. 55; B. MEISSNER, *op. cit.* (n. 43), p. 519, n. 458.

<sup>49</sup> For his works cf. Suda, s.v. Θεόκριτος (II 697, Θ166, ed. Adler) and Strab. XIV 4, 645, here once referred as ῥήτωρ, at another point as σοφιστής (cf. also Athenaeus and Plutarch), see also *FHG* II 86f. ed. Müller = *FGrHist* 760, for this C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 445f. In *Ep.* 27 Gow = *AP* IX 434 the Syracusan Theocritus clearly dissociates himself from his Chian namesake, the epigram has perhaps to be seen as beginning of an edition: Ἄλλος ὁ Χίος, ἐγὼ δὲ Θεόκριτος ὃς τάδ' ἔγραψα | εἷς ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν εἰμι Συρακοσίων, | υἱὸς Πραξαγόραο περικλειτῆς τε Φιλίννας· | Μοῦσαν δ' ὀθείναν οὔτιν' ἔφελκυσάμαν («The Chian is another, but I, Theocritus, the author of these works, am a Syracusan, one among many, the son of Praxagoras and renowned Philinna, and I have taken to myself no alien muse»). The discussion of this, also concerning its authenticity, in A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus* II, Cambridge 1952, p. 549f.; C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 457f. Thus, it becomes evident that even one or two generations later the Chian must have been a well-known figure.

with numerous allusions to the Platonic dialogues and sexual discredit. All in all this is an agitation against Aristotle's affinity to Macedonia<sup>50</sup>. Proof for that can be found in several anecdotes, which put Theocritus into opposition against Theopompus, his fellow citizen, and the Macedonian kings. He attacked especially Alexander sharp-wittedly with a Homeric verse, when Alexander asked the Chians for crimson for his ἑταῖροι<sup>51</sup>. This can only be explained, knowing that Theocritus had been involved in the conflict about a pro-Persian or pro-Macedonian line in his home town<sup>52</sup>. The scant traces of written records render an anti-Macedonian and anti-monarchic inclination of Theocritus probable.

Chios had presumably in 319/18 BC been occupied by Antigonos<sup>53</sup>. During the years after that (and before the death of Antigonos in 301 BC) there had existed contact between the Successor and Theocritus, and

<sup>50</sup> D.L. PAGE, *Further Greek Epigrams*, Cambridge 1981, p. 93ff. (no. I) = H. LLOYD-JONES - P. PARSONS, *Supplementum Hellenisticum (Texte und Kommentare, 11)*, Berlin-New York 1983, p. 355, no. 738 (= SH): 'Ερμίου εὐνούχου τε καὶ Εὐβούλου τόδε δούλου | σῆμα κενὸν κενόφρων θῆκεν / τεύξεν Ἀριστοτέλης, | ὃς διὰ τὴν ἀκρατῆ γαστρὸς φύσιν εἴλετο ναίειν | ἀντ' Ἀκαδημίας Βορβόρου ἐν προχοαῖς. It is also possible to understand Borboros not as Macedonian river, but, like Platon, as 'dirt' or 'mud' and apply it to the Academy. Cf. F. SCHRÖDER, *art. cit.* (n. 48), p. 330ff.; F.-J. BRECHT, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 12f.; R. LAQUEUR, *art. cit.* (n. 48), col. 2025f., date given as roughly 341 BC; I. DÜRING, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*, Göteborg 1957, p. 277 and 391f.; C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 448f., who apparently was not aware of the existence of D.T. RUNIA, *Theocritus of Chios' Epigram against Aristotle, CQ* 36 (1986), p. 531-534. The tomb epigram is, of course, fictitious (the different and not justifiable opinion in F. SCHRÖDER, *art. cit.*, p. 331) and it is a replica of a tomb inscription of Aristotle for Hermias (cf. Diog. Laert. V 5 and Athen. XV 697a).

<sup>51</sup> Thus Athen. XII 540a; similarly Plut., *De lib. educ.* 14 (= *Mor.* 11a-b). According to Clem. Alex., *Protr.* X 77f., Theocritus mocked Alexander's claim to divine honours after Alexander's death. Cf. F. SCHRÖDER, *art. cit.* (n. 48), p. 319f.; R. LAQUEUR, *art. cit.* (n. 48), col. 206; C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 452f.

<sup>52</sup> For the context cf. F. SCHRÖDER, *art. cit.* (n. 48), p. 318ff., esp. C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 450ff., who justifiably emphasizes that our knowledge about Theocritus and about 4th cent. Chios is just too fragmentary in order to classify the politician reasonably. On Theopompus most recently R. LANE FOX, *Theopompus of Chios and the Greek World 411-322 BC*, in: J. BOARDMAN (ed.), *Chios. A Conference at the Homereion of Chios*, Oxford 1984, p. 105-120, and G.S. SHRIMPTON, *Theopompus the Historian*, Montreal et al. 1991; both of them do not mention discrepancies with Theocritus.

<sup>53</sup> On the history of Chios, which is scarcely recorded for the 4th cent. BC, cf. G. DUNST, *Ein neues chiisches Dekret aus Kos, Klio* 37 (1959), p. 63-68; H.-J. GEHRKE, *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v.Chr. (Vestigia, 35)*, Munich 1985, p. 46-49; F. GRAF, *Nordionische Kulte. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*, Rome 1985, p. 16f.; H.-J. GEHRKE, *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta. Das dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt*, Munich 1986, p. 120ff.; C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 450f.

here the situation occurred that led to the Chian's execution<sup>54</sup>: the by no means minor question whether Theocritus had spent some time at the court of Antigonos, cannot be answered conclusively<sup>55</sup>. Theocritus' death is recorded by Plutarch and Macrobius. Plutarch reports in a passage dealing with jests about physical defects that Antigonos himself could laugh about his one-eyedness, Theocritus, however, he had killed (for it):

Indeed, Antigonos, though it was his habit to make fun of himself about his one eye and once, when he received a petition written in big letters, he said, «This is clear even to a blind man», — the same Antigonos nevertheless put to death Theocritus of Chios because, when someone said, «Stand before the eyes of the king, and you will be saved», Theocritus replied, «The Salvation you recommend to me is impossible»<sup>56</sup>.

Macrobius gives a rather similar account (*Sat.* VII 3.12). What is remarkable here, is the contrast between the ruler's ability to laugh about himself and how he also tolerates others to laugh about him, and his «violent reaction to the irony of Theocritus»<sup>57</sup>. If this scene was recorded without any context and just because it was relevant for the topic, then it seems to presuppose some transgression by Theocritus. The reference to the king's one-eyedness accordingly stands for a brusque and haughty rejection of the *clementia regis*, as Macrobius puts it explicitly<sup>58</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. F. SCHRÖDER, *art. cit.* (n. 48), p. 333f., C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 453f.: «in linea ipotetica va considerata la possibilità che Teocrito sia morto anche fuori Chio, magari esilato, come ben s'attagierebbe ad un parresiasta».

<sup>55</sup> R.A. BILLOWS, *op. cit.* (n. 48), p. 311, is sure that Theocritus «was living at Antigonos' court at the time».

<sup>56</sup> Plut., *Quaest. conv.* 2.1 (= *Mor.* 633c): καὶ γὰρ Ἀντίγονος αὐτὸς μὲν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἔσκαπτεν, καὶ ποτε λαβὼν ἀξίωμα μεγάλῳις γράμμασι γεγραμμένον, «ταυτὶ μὲν», ἔφη, «καὶ τυφλῷ δῆλα». Θεόκριτον δὲ τὸν Χίῳ ἀπέκτεινεν, ὅτι φήσαντός τινος, «εἰς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἂν βασιλέως παραγένῃ, σωθήσῃ», «ἀλλὰ μοι», εἶπεν, «ἀδύνατόν τιν' ὑποφαίνεις τὴν σωτηρίαν».

<sup>57</sup> S.T. TEODORSSON, *art. cit.* (n. 23), p. 380. Further references are Plut., *De cohib. ira* X 458f. and Sen., *De ira* III 22 (cf. R. MALCHOW, *Kommentar zum zweiten und dritten Buch von Senecas Schrift 'de ira' [= dial. 4 und 5]*, Diss. Erlangen-Nuremberg 1986, p. 512f.). For other aspects of courtly life under Antigonos I cf. R.A. BILLOWS, *op. cit.* (n. 48), p. 311-313; G. WEBER, *art. cit.* (n. 9), p. 292-295.

<sup>58</sup> For the sources of Macrobius cf. P. DE PAOLIS, *Macrobio 1934-1984, Lustrum* 28/29 (1986/87), p. 107-249, here 208ff. For *clementia* cf. M. FUHRMANN, *Die Alleinherrschaft und das Problem der Gerechtigkeit (Seneca: De clementia)*, *Gymnasium* 70 (1963), p. 481-514; T. ADAM, *Clementia Principis. Der Einfluß hellenistischer Fürstenspiegel auf den Versuch einer rechtlichen Fundierung des Principats durch Seneca (Kieler Historische Studien, 11)*, Stuttgart 1970, p. 24ff. and 82ff., there especially on Seneca's *De clementia*, which also (cap. 7f.) describes aspects of the cruel ruler.

In the Plutarch passage the courtly integration becomes more evident: Theocritus provoked the king εἰς οὐ μετρίαν ὀργήν, when he not only did not comply with the request to speak with the king (unfortunately the subject is not mentioned), but also when he ridiculed the king as Κύκλωψ; for Theocritus said to the ἀρχιμάγειρος (chief-cook) Eutropion, who acted as messenger: «I know very well that you want to serve me up raw to your Cyclops»<sup>59</sup>. First of all, it is remarkable that Antigonos entrusted the 'chief-cook' with this 'mission'. Possibly there might, however, be some pun involved, as Theocritus labels the messenger as 'slaughterer' or 'butcher'. Thus, it would be due to a misinterpretation by Plutarch not to connect these with his profession as a cook<sup>60</sup>. Accordingly, the commander of the royal guards is called ἀρχιμάγειρος in the Septuaginta text of *Daniel* 2.14, which might also have been the term at other Oriental courts<sup>61</sup>. Antigonos' following messengers were less patient: πέμψας ἀνεῖλε τὸν Θεόκριτον

The question to be asked is, what did actually lead to Theocritus' death, or in other words: did the ruler's ὀργή suffice for it<sup>62</sup>? There are very good reasons for the assumption that «the inexorable stubbornness and insolence of Theocritus» will not have been the only and decisive factor<sup>63</sup>. We do not know anything about the historical context, possible political activities of Theocritus, or courtly intrigues. However, there seems to be more behind this story as it is given by the ancient authors: the basic conflict of regal claims to power versus the citizens' insisting on their own identity and self-determination<sup>64</sup>. The struggle for an identity both as citizen *and* subject had only just begun. During the severe

<sup>59</sup> Plut., *De lib. educ.* 14 (= *Mor.* 11b-c): «εὖ οἶδ'», ἔφησεν, «ὅτι ὁμόν με θέλεις τῷ Κύκλωπι παραθεῖναι». Cf. also Aelian., *VH* XII 43. For Eutropion cf. R.A. BILLOWS, *op. cit.* (n. 48), p. 386 (no. 42).

<sup>60</sup> Thus already suspected by R. SEALEY, quoted by R.A. BILLOWS, *op. cit.* (n. 48), p. 386: «Hence Eutropion was doubtless never other than a military officer — perhaps the captain of Antigonos's bodyguard? — whom Theokritos accused of being Antigonos's chief 'butcher'».

<sup>61</sup> Cf. as references from Hellenistic times *LXX Gen* 37.36, 39.1, 41.10 (for the court of the Pharaohs); *Jer* 52.12ff. (for the Babylonian court). Prior to Plutarch the term had only, perhaps not surprisingly, been used by Philo Judaeus.

<sup>62</sup> Ancient philosophy, especially in a moral context, has exhaustively dealt with this question. Numerous examples can be found in Seneca's dialogue *De ira* III 17ff. and in Plut., *De cohib. ira* (= *Mor.* 452f-464d), cf. R. MALCHOW, *op. cit.* (n. 57), p. 487ff.

<sup>63</sup> Thus S.T. TEODORSSON, *art. cit.* (n. 23), p. 381.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 454: «... lo svolgimento dell'episodio dimostra come la tradizione antica vedesse nell'opposizione antimonarchica, certo intesa come difesa personalmente partecipata della libertà personale e cittadina, un punto qualificante la caratterizzazione di Teocrito».

clashes over Alexander's legacy, however, it seemed advisable to eliminate notorious opposition of single people or opinion-leaders in one's own city and territory.

## IV

Sotades of Maroneia on Crete was apparently associated with the courts of Lysimachus and of the second Ptolemy<sup>65</sup>: Athenaeus records that he «abused first King Lysimachus while he was in Alexandria, then Ptolemy Philadelphus in the presence of Lysimachus, and in fact other kings in other cities»<sup>66</sup>. In contrast to Theocritus, a number of his poems dealing with mythological and political topics have come down to us<sup>67</sup>. The conflict with Ptolemy led to his death, about which there are different versions, similar to the case of Callisthenes: in a poem on the occasion of the king's wedding with his full sister Arsinoe (after 278 BC), the former wife of Lysimachus, there was the verse «Thou thrustest thy prick into an unholy opening»<sup>68</sup>. And Plutarch writes: «thereafter he rotted in prison for many years; and so suffered condign punishment for

<sup>65</sup> For his biography cf. *PP* VI 16717; F. SUSEMIHL, *op. cit.* (n. 15), I, p. 245f.; M. LAUNÉY, *Études d'histoire hellénistique II: L'exécution de Sotadès et l'expédition de Patroklos dans la mer Égée* (266 av. J.-C.), *REA* 47 (1945), p. 33-45, esp. 36ff.; P.M. FRASER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), I, p. 117f.; M. BETTINI, *A proposito dei versi sotadei, greci e romani: con alcuni capitoli di 'analisi metrica lineare'*, *MD* 9 (1982), p. 59-105, esp. 60f. with n. 2 (bibliography); R. PRETAGOSTINI, *Ricerche sulla poesia alessandrina. Teocrito, Callimaco, Sotade*, Rome 1984, p. 139ff.; ID., *La duplice valenza metaforica di κέντρον in Sotade fr. 1 Powell*, *QUCC* n.s. 39 (1991), p. 111-114; G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 269f., 273 (with n. 3) and 425, with more bibliographical notes in the appendix.

<sup>66</sup> Athen. XIV 620f.: κακῶς μὲν εἰπόντος Λυσίμαχον τὸν βασιλέα ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, Πτολεμαῖον δὲ τὸν Φιλιάδελφον παρὰ Λυσιμάχῳ, καὶ ἄλλους τῶν βασιλέων ἐν ἄλλαις τῶν πόλεων· διόπερ τῆς δεούσης ἔτυχε τιμωρίας. In this case Carystius of Pergamum and the Hypomnemata by Hegesander of Delphi are the sources of Athenaeus (on both authors of the 2nd cent. BC cf. F. JACOBY, *RE* VII 2, 1912, col. 2600-2602, and X 2 (1919), col. 2254f.; *FHG* IV 359 and 415; not in *FGrHist*). H.S. LUND, *op. cit.* (n. 21) does not mention Sotades in his chapter «Court and Courtiers» (p. 178-182).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. L. ESCHER, *De Sotadis Maronitae reliquiis*, Diss. Gießen 1913, and Fr. 1-24 in I.U. POWELL, *Collectanea Alexandrina. Reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaicae 323-146 A.C.*, Oxford 1925, p. 238-245, one has to remember that only Fr. 1-4 are certifiably authentic. According to Strab. XIV 41.648 ἤρξε δὲ Σωτάδης μὲν πρῶτος τοῦ κιναιδολογεῖν, similarly Athen. XIV 620e.

<sup>68</sup> Fr. 1 Powell: εἰς οὐχ ὄσην τρυμαλιῆν τὸ κέντρον ὄθει. For linguistic aspects of the verse, especially for the discussion of the forms ὄθειξ or ὄθει cf. R. PRETAGOSTINI, *op. cit.* (n. 65), p. 141 with n. 9. For the question of a marriage between a brother and a sister, the reasons and its acceptance cf. E.D. CARNEY, *The Reappearance of Royal Sibling Marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt*, *PP* 42 (1987), p. 420-439.



his untimely talking»<sup>69</sup>. According to Athenaeus, Sotades left Alexandria; before that, however, he said to Ptolemy πολλά ... και ἄλλα δεινά, among others the verse quoted. Then the Ptolemaic strategos Patroclus arrested him, who had already thought he had escaped the danger, and sank him in the sea in a coffin of lead<sup>70</sup>. There have been attempts to harmonize both versions by establishing a chronological order of arrest, flight, and sinking<sup>71</sup>. This is, however, not convincing as we do not know the danger (κίνδυνος) that is mentioned in the text.

It is generally assumed that Sotades expressed in this obscene jest the Greek disapproval of Ptolemaic sibling marriage, and had thus incurred the king's anger<sup>72</sup>. That a sibling marriage had been intended can be confirmed with Pretagostini by bringing Fr. 16 into play, which alludes possibly in its first verse to the alliance of Zeus and Hera<sup>73</sup>. This connection is also confirmed by references in Theocritus of Syracuse and Callimachus, which treat alliances between brothers and sisters positively<sup>74</sup>. Moreover, the legitimacy of Ptolemy's rule is discredited by the use of the ambiguous term κέντρον, which can stand for the male sexual organ, and can also be an emblem of the tyrant<sup>75</sup>.

<sup>69</sup> Plut., *De lib. educ.* 14 (= *Mor.* 11a): ἐν δεσμοτηρίῳ πολλοὺς κατεσάπη χρόνους και τῆς ἀκαίρου λαλιᾶς οὐ μεμπτήν ἔδωκε δίκην.

<sup>70</sup> Athen. XIV 620a. On the Macedonian Patroclus (*PP* VI 15063), who was apparently a high-ranking member of the court and who was an important military strategos during the Chremonidean War, and who also functioned as second eponymous priest of the deified Ptolemies in 271/70 BC (cf. W. CLARYSSE – G. VAN DER VEKEN, *The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt. Chronological Lists of the Priests of Alexandria and Ptolemais with a Study of the Demotic Transcriptions of their Names* [*Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava*, 24]), Leiden 1983, no. 20), cf. M. LAUNEY, *art. cit.* (n. 65), p. 35ff.; G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 141 n. 3 and 144 n. 8. For the setting cf. R. PRETAGOSTINI, *op. cit.* (n. 65), p. 141 with n. 8 (Caunus in Caria), differently P.M. FRASER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), I, p. 118, M. LAUNEY, *art. cit.*, p. 35, following (Kaudos, island on the southern coast of Crete).

<sup>71</sup> See P.M. FRASER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), I, p. 117. M. LAUNEY, *art. cit.* (n. 65), p. 33, preferred as «plus raisonnable» the version of Plutarch.

<sup>72</sup> For the traditional understanding e.g. A.E.-A. HORSTMANN, *Ironie und Humor bei Theokrit* (*Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie*, 67), Meisenheim/Glan 1976, p. 33 with n. 62; G. HÖLBL, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 40f.

<sup>73</sup> Ἥρην ποτέ φασιν Δία τὸν τερπικέραυνον. Cf. R. PRETAGOSTINI, *op. cit.* (n. 65), p. 144f.; ID., *art. cit.* (n. 65), p. 111f.

<sup>74</sup> Theocr. XV 64, XVII 131ff. and Call., *Ait.* fr. 75.4f. and fr. 392 Pfeiffer, see G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 273f., and esp. for linguistic references R. PRETAGOSTINI, *op. cit.* (n. 65), p. 142-147, who concludes: «Tuttavia questo dissenso di cui Sotade si fece portavoce rimase sicuramente ad un ristretto numero di intellettuali» (p. 142); R. PRETAGOSTINI, *art. cit.* (n. 65), p. 111 with n. 2.

<sup>75</sup> Thus convincingly R. PRETAGOSTINI, *art. cit.* (n. 65), p. 112f.

Sotades was, and this we have to keep in mind when considering the king's reaction, well-known for his ceaseless attacks. The Suda article in an index of his works refers to a poem called εἰς Βελεστίχην and written by Sotades. Scholars generally agree that this Belestiche or Bilistiche must be one of Ptolemy II's mistresses, particularly because the name is extremely uncommon<sup>76</sup>. In 268 BC and in 264 BC Bilistiche had won in Olympia, for 251/50 BC she is verified as canephore of the deified Arsinoe, and, moreover, she was worshipped as Aphrodite Bilistiche<sup>77</sup>. It is not evident from the title, whether the poem as such had a positive or negative bias<sup>78</sup>, the over-all context, however, would suggest a verbal attack.

And yet, in my eyes, the execution of Sotades because of the verses on sibling marriage only makes sense if there had been a connection to the current state of affairs. After Arsinoe's death in 268 BC there was no such connection any more. The verses on Bilistiche, on the other hand, belong most likely to the period *after* 268 BC, as it clashes with the general view of the 2nd Arsinoe to have tolerated a mistress with Ptolemy<sup>79</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> Fr. 5 Powell. For example, there is no entry in the volumes of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* which have been published so far. The origin of Bilistiche is said to be Macedonia or Argos, references in *PP* VI 14717, p. 42. The references from *TLG* and from the PHI Disk #7 all refer to the same person. On the formation of the name cf. J. and L. ROBERT, *BE* 1954, p. 116f.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. J. KIRCHNER, art. *Belistiche*, *RE* III 1 (1897), col. 240; esp. *PP* VI 14717; P.M. FRASER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), II, p. 210 (n. 206) and 240; esp. A. CAMERON, *Two Mistresses of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, *GRBS* 31 (1990), p. 287-311, 295ff.; G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 138 with n. 2 and 269f., with further bibliographical notes. G. HÖLBL, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 291 (n. 3), sets forth the hypothesis that Bilistiche could be the mother of Ptolemy Andromachou, since both of them had high offices as priestesses in the same year (thus already K. BURASELIS, *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis. Forschungen zur Politik des Kasandros und der ersten drei Antigoniden im Ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien* [Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 73], Munich 1982, p. 133, for the further context), cf. W. CLARYSSE – G. VAN DER VEKEN, *op. cit.* (n. 70), no. 40.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. *LSJ*, s.v. εἰς, IVb: «of the subject of a work, esp. in titles...» πρός + acc. would be positive, κατά + gen. negative; possibly this is not the original title, or there might have occurred a conscious concealment of its true content. P.M. FRASER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), I, p. 118, goes too far, according to him Sotades had attacked both Bilistiche and Ptolemy; cf. also A. CAMERON, *art. cit.* (n. 77), p. 300ff., who brings out the implications of a positive poem on Bilistiche written by Posidippus (*AP* V 202).

<sup>79</sup> It is, however, possible that Bilistiche had already *prior* to the marriage with his sister been in Ptolemy's entourage. An assessment using moral standards, as, for example, in G. HÖLBL, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 45, is utterly inadequate. On Arsinoe cf. e.g. S.M. BURSTEIN, *Arsinoe II Philadelphos. A Revisionist View*, in: W.L. ADAMS – E.N. BORZA (eds.), *Philipp II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*, Washington 1982, p. 197-212; H. HAUBEN, *Arsinoë II et la politique extérieure de l'Égypte*, in: E. VAN 'T DACK et al. (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World (Studia Hellenistica, 24)*, Leuven 1983, p. 99-127; G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 254 (n. 1) to 263.

Thus, one will no longer insist on an unmitigated connection between the attack on a sibling marriage and subsequent punishment<sup>80</sup>. Apparently a number of incidents must have added up to provoke the king's drastic measure; attributing this merely to Sotades' poetry would, despite the rulers' occasionally great sensitivity, mean overestimating the importance of one single voice<sup>81</sup>. In any case, Sotades was not one of the poets who could easily be integrated into court society. And there is no evidence, either, justifying the claim that he was the mouthpiece of some broader Greek opposition *outside* the courtly environment.

## V

A third example. The following distich by Daphidas of Telmessus has come down to us in Strabo<sup>82</sup>: «Purple stripes, filings of the treasure of Lysimachus, ye rule Lydians and Phrygia»<sup>83</sup>. With regard to the context we learn that the γραμματικός Daphidas was crucified on the mountain Thorax near Magnesia on Meander, since he had mocked τὸς βασιλέας in these very verses; moreover, according to a λόγιον he had received a prophecy from the Delphic oracle to beware of θώραξ (Strab.

<sup>80</sup> Thus also M. LAUNEY, *art. cit.* (n. 65), p. 43, who gives an analysis of Patroclus' activities, and deems the year 266/65 BC probable for Sotades' execution: «C'est donc huit ou dix ans après le mariage, quatre ans après le décès d'Arsinoé, que Sotadès fut mis à mort. Il en résulte que, vraisemblablement, c'est une erreur de croire que Sotadès fut exécuté à cause de son 'épithalame'».

<sup>81</sup> Thus also P.M. FRASER, *op. cit.* (n. 4), I, p. 117. M. LAUNEY, *art. cit.* (n. 65), p. 44f., discusses Arsinoe, Ptolemy and Patroclus as driving forces behind the execution, however, and quite justly the question is not answered conclusively; S.M. BURSTEIN, *art. cit.* (n. 79), p. 211, assumes that the king's fear of a negative public reaction could have been a motive for killing Sotades, accordingly it would have to be seen as preventive measure. There are no indicators for an oppositional movement, cf. P.M. FRASER, *op. cit.* I, p. 118.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Commentariolum grammaticum III*, in: *Kleine Schriften IV*, Berlin 1962, p. 631f. [originally 1889]; O. CRUSIUS, *art. Daphidas*, *RE IV 2* (1901), col. 2134; F.-J. BRECHT, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 14; J. FONTENROSE, *The Crucified Daphidas*, *TAPhA 91* (1960), p. 83-99; E.V. HANSEN, *The Attalids of Pergamum*, *Ithaca 1971*<sup>2</sup>, p. 144; J. HOPP, *op. cit.* (n. 28), p. 119f.; D.L. PAGE, *op. cit.* (n. 50), p. 36f.; esp. D.C. BRAUND, *Three Hellenistic Personages: Amyntander, Prusias II, Daphidas*, *CQ 32* (1982), p. 350-357, here 354ff.; P. GREEN, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 155; H. SONNABEND, *Polybios, die Attaliden und die Griechen. Überlegungen zum Nachruf auf Attalos I. (1841)*, *Tyche 7* (1992), p. 207-216, here 213f.; B. VIRGILIO, *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, eredità, memoria (Studi Ellenistici, 5)*, Pisa 1993, p. 14f.

<sup>83</sup> Πορφύρεοι μώλωπες, ἀπορρινήματα γάζης | Λυσιμάχου, Λυδῶν ἄρχετε καὶ Φρυγίης. The text in D.L. PAGE, *op. cit.* (n. 50), p. 37 and *SH 370*.

XIV 1.39, 647). Another version is given by Valerius Maximus: asking whether he would find his horse again, Daphidas, who did not possess a horse, wanted to put the oracle at Delphi to the test. The answer was that he would find it, but he would be thrown off and die. Shortly after that a king named Attalus ordered that he was to be cast off a rock called *equus*, this as reaction to attacks, which *saepenumero... contumeliosis dictis* were made from a safe distance<sup>84</sup>. This is also the version of the Suda article, which sums it up as follows: ἦν δὲ οὗτος λοιδορούμενος παντὶ καὶ μέχρις αὐτῶν μὴ φειδόμενος τῶν θεῶν<sup>85</sup>.

An apparent point of the distich is that it was aimed at Philetærus, the founder of the Attalid dynasty and a eunuch himself, who together with the city of Pergamon and 9,000 talents of Lysimachus went over to Seleucus, thus a rather dishonourable line of descent<sup>86</sup>. By connecting μώλωψ with the regal colour crimson the rule of the Attalids is under attack, the meaning of the final clause remains unclear<sup>87</sup>. The decisive question, under which king Daphidas was killed, is not answered by these verses: the identification is possible with the first to the third bearer of the name Attalus<sup>88</sup>. Fontenrose has put this episode into the context of the reign of Attalus III and identified Daphidas as supporter of Aristonicus, something that can hardly be proved<sup>89</sup>. In the face of our knowledge about the affair, it is not possible, either, to back up his assessment: «we can hardly believe that either the first or second

<sup>84</sup> V. Max. I 8, ext. 8 = Poseid. fr. 385f. Theiler. The name here is *Daphnites*, his profession is obliquely referred to as 'sophist'. D.C. BRAUND, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 355, presumes some local tradition for Strabo, whereas Valerius recurred to Poseidonius (cf. also Cic., *de fato* III 5). For parallels with regard to the ways they were killed cf. J. FONTENROSE, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 97f.

<sup>85</sup> Suda, s.v. Δαφίδας (II 10, Δ99, ed. Adler = SH 371), similarly Hesych. Miles., *Onom.* 14 (4.160 M). According to the Suda article Daphidas had called Homer a liar, since the Athenians had not taken part in the Trojan war.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Paus. I 10.4f. Most recently E.V. HANSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 82), p. 14ff.; D.C. BRAUND, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 356; H.S. LUND, *op. cit.* (n. 21), p. 186ff.

<sup>87</sup> See J. FONTENROSE, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 85f. and 97; D.L. PAGE, *op. cit.* (n. 50), p. 36f.; D.C. BRAUND, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 355f. For linguistics cf. S.L. RADT, *Φρόνησι 'Phryger'?*, *Mnemosyne* 42 (1989), p. 87.

<sup>88</sup> U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 632 (Daphidas was allegedly a follower of the Seleucids under Attalus I); F. SUSEMIHL, *op. cit.* (n. 15), II, p. 22 n. 11: Attalus II or III; J. FONTENROSE, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 85ff., followed by J. HOPP, *op. cit.* (n. 28): Attalus III; D.C. BRAUND, *art. cit.* (n. 82) considers all bearers of the name conceivable.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. J. MALITZ, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 229 n. 4, similarly D.C. BRAUND, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 357, for the much farther reaching conclusions by J. FONTENROSE, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 99.

Attalus was the sort of ruler who would condemn a man to death by any method because he had made unkind remarks about the dynasty»<sup>90</sup>. Of as little help is the decree of proxeny from Orchomenus in Boeotia, naming a certain Agedicus, son of Daphidas, of Alexandria in the Troad: the dates vary between the second half of the 3rd century and the first half of the 2nd century BC<sup>91</sup>.

Thus, the precise circumstances of Daphidas' death cannot be pinned down, just as little as his previous contacts to Pergamon. What seems important, however, is that Daphidas, who also turned against Homer, Delphi and the gods, not only attacked one of the Attalids with this distich (or even the dynasty as such), but also that he set forth further attacks, until the king had him captured and executed. However, from this instance we cannot come to any definite conclusions with regard to the limits of the king. Daphidas cannot be connected with an opposition movement against the Attalid rule<sup>92</sup>.

## VI

To conclude I would like to offer some more examples of violent deaths of intellectuals in chronological order. What all of them have in common is, that there cannot be traced a strong connection between critical statements and subsequent punishment.

It is certain that the philosopher Anaxarchus of Abdera took part in Alexander's *Anabasis* and produced numerous Apophthegmata, which he sometimes employed to flatter Alexander, but in which he also played open jokes, which have recently been analysed impressively by Jacques Brunschwig<sup>93</sup>. His *παρρησία* was accepted by Alexander, not, however,

<sup>90</sup> J. FONTENROSE, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 87, see also D.C. BRAUND, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 356.

<sup>91</sup> OGIS 316 = IG VII 3167: Θιὸς ἰτιούχαν ἀγαθάν. Ἀλεῦα (ἄρ)λχοντος, ἔδοξε τῷ δάμῳ Ἐ[ρ]χομενίων, Ἀγέδικον Δαλίφίταιο Ἡολεῖα ἀπ' Ἀλεξαν[δρ]είας πρόξενον εἶμεν ἰ[κτῆ] ἐ]δεργέταν ... Another bearer of the name does not seem to be known so far, therefore positively with regard to his identity U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 632; more reservedly J. FONTENROSE, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 87 with n. 13.

<sup>92</sup> Thus also D.C. BRAUND, *art. cit.* (n. 82), p. 356f.

<sup>93</sup> T. GOMPERZ, *Anaxarch und Kallisthenes*, in: *Commentationes Philologicae in honorem Theodori Mommseni*, Berlin 1877, p. 471-480; J. KAERST, *art. Anaxarchos* (1), *RE* I 2 (1894), col. 2080; H. BERVE, *op. cit.* (n. 44), II, p. 33ff. (no. 70); M. GIGANTE - T. DORANDI, *Anassarco e Epicuro 'sul Regno'*, *SicGymn* 33 (1980), p. 479-497; esp. the ingenious articles by P. BERNARD, *Le philosophe Anaxarque et le roi Nicocréon de Salamine*, *JS* 1984, p. 3-49, and J. BRUNSCHWIG, *art. cit.* (n. 17).

by king Nicocreon of Salamis on Cyprus, who had him arrested after Alexander's death, and put a heroically endured — and already in antiquity widely known — end to his life: «putting him in a mortar, he ordered him to be pounded to death with iron pestles»<sup>94</sup>. The hostility had its unknown cause in Alexander's courtly entourage, making Anaxarchus ironically demand the head of the tyrant at a symposion at Tyrus in 331 BC<sup>95</sup>. The reason for his execution was accordingly not so much connected with the wording of his verbal attack, but rather with its exposing in front of Alexander.

There are reports from the court of Lysimachus that the strategos Telesphorus was mutilated and kept in a cage like a wild animal till he died, because he had mocked Arsinoe during a symposion by quoting a tragedian's verse<sup>96</sup>. In addition to that, Athenaeus (XIV 616c) remarks

<sup>94</sup> Diog. Laert. IX 59: καὶ εἰς ὄλμον βαλὼν ἐκέλευσε τύπτεσθαι σιδηροῖς ὑπέροις (for the interpretation and technical details cf. P. BERNARD, *art. cit.* [n. 93], p. 24ff.), see also the epigram (*AP* VII 133) written by Diogenes; the following occurrence about the bitten off tongue belongs more likely to Zenon, thus J. BRUNSCHWIG, *art. cit.* (n. 17), p. 78f. For the spread of the anecdote cf. P. BERNARD, *art. cit.*, p. 20f. with n. 63. On Nicocreon cf. H. BERVE, *op. cit.* (n. 44), p. 279 (no. 586); W. PEREMANS – E. VAN 'T DACK, *Prolégomènes à une étude concernant le commandant de place lagide en dehors de l'Égypte*, in: E. BOSWINKEL et al. (eds.), *Antidoron Martino David*, Leiden 1968, p. 80-99, here 88-90; *PP* VI 15059; H. GESCHE, *Nikokles von Paphos und Nikokreon von Salamis*, *Chiron* 4 (1974), p. 103-125; R.S. BAGNALL, *op. cit.* (n. 28), p. 39f.

<sup>95</sup> Athen. VI 250e, Plut., *Alex.* 28.4-6, *De virt. mor.* 10 (= *Mor.* 449e); Diog. Laert. IX 58f. For the pun, which has many associations, with κέφαλοι, a species of fish, and κεφαλαί, the satraps' heads, cf. P. BERNARD, *art. cit.* (n. 93), p. 8ff. According to Athen. VIII 349 a Kitharist named Stratonicus of Axiothea, the wife of Nicocreon, was killed (ἐν τῷ πελάγει διέλυσε τὴν παρρησίαν), however, this anecdote has also been handed down with regard to Nicocles of Paphus (Athen. 352c-d), see also P. MAAS, *art. Stratonikos* (2), *RE* IVA 1 (1931), col. 36f.; H. GESCHE, *art. cit.* (n. 94), p. 104; P. BERNARD, *art. cit.* (n. 93), p. 6. For the adoption of the event on a Kontorniat medaillon of the year AD 360 cf. A. ALFÖLDI, *art. cit.* (n. 5), p. 15f.

<sup>96</sup> So Plut., *De exil.* 16 (= *Mor.* 606b); Athen. XIV 616c; Sen., *De ira* III 17 (with many embellishments of the whole scenario, cf. R. MALCHOW, *op. cit.* [n. 57], p. 488f.); the respective verse is quoted in Plut., *Quaest. Conv.* II 1 (= *Mor.* 634e), spoken by a certain Timagenes; cf. H.S. LUND, *op. cit.* (n. 21), p. 10ff.; F. LANDUCCI GATTINONI, *Lisimaci di Tracia. Un sovrano nella prospettiva del primo ellenismo*, Mailand 1992, p. 39f.; C. FRANCO, *Il regno di Lisimaco. Strutture amministrative e rapporti con le città (Studi ellenistici, 6)*, Pisa 1993, p. 188 and 262f.; incorrectly W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 84, according to whom Telesphorus had been torn to pieces by wild animals. Telesphorus' fate was used as a reminder for the philosopher and Ptolemaic ambassador Theodorus, cf. n. 110. Telesphorus had apparently served Antigonos I previously, cf. H. BERVE, *art. Telesphoros* (2), *RE* VA 1 (1934), col. 390; more reticently D. POTTER, *Telesphoros, Cousin of Demetrius. A Note on the Trial of Menander*, *Historia* 36 (1987), p. 491-495; T. KRUSE, *Zwei Denkmäler der Antigoniden in Olympia. Eine Untersuchung zu Pausanias 6, 16.3*, *MDAI(A)* 107 (1992), p. 273-293, here 283 with n. 23.

that Lysimachus had also been infuriated by mockery on other occasions, then, however, he had reacted differently; perhaps his reaction towards Telesphorus should make an example, but possibly it might be more likely that it results from some hack's insult<sup>97</sup>.

A slightly different example is the Athenian politician and peripatetic philosopher Demetrius of Phaleron, who, after his flight from Athens (in 298/97 BC), played *the* central role at the Ptolemaic court, not only as intellectual but also as political advisor<sup>98</sup>. Following the death of his patron Ptolemy I he fell out of favour with his successor, since he had at first supported the elder half-brother Ptolemy Keraunos. This provides us with evidence that any literary achievement becomes irrelevant, or also that existing φιλία-relations are discontinued, if vital interests of the ruler concerned were threatened. Public literary agitation was not a good precondition for that.

About Philochorus, the last great writer of an Atthis, we read in the Suda article that Antigonus Gonatas had him killed (probably in 261/60 BC), because he had favoured the 2nd Ptolemy<sup>99</sup>. From the numerous preserved fragments it is, however, not possible to establish any connection between written agitation and his execution. The causes are more likely to be found in the context of the Chremonidean War, among the instigators of which Philochorus is generally counted by scholars. It is most unlikely that he ever spent some time at the Antigonid court<sup>100</sup>.

Furthermore, we know about some Samus or Samius, the son of a certain Chrysogonus and σύντροφος of Philip V<sup>101</sup>. Polybius (V 9.4f.)

<sup>97</sup> Cf. H.S. LUND, *op. cit.* (n. 21), p. 11f.

<sup>98</sup> Diog. Laert. V 77f. Cf. *PP* VI 14597 + 16742, see also H.-J. GEHRKE, *Das Verhältnis von Politik und Philosophie im Wirken des Demetrios von Phaleron*, *Chiron* 8 (1978), p. 149-193; B. MEISSNER, *op. cit.* (n. 43), p. 484ff.; G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 28 with n. 4 and 77 with n. 3-5.

<sup>99</sup> Suda, s.v. Φιλόχορος (= *FGrHist* 328 T1):... ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐνεδρευθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου, τι διεβλήθη προσκεκλικέναι τῇ Πτολεμαίου βασιλείᾳ; F. SUSEMIHL, *op. cit.* (n. 15), I, p. 595; R. LAQUEUR, art. *Philochoros*, *RE* XIX 2 (1938), col. 2434-2442; H. HEINEN, *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum Chremonideischen Krieg (Historia, Einzelschriften 20)*, Wiesbaden 1972, p. 205; K. BURASELIS, *op. cit.* (n. 77), p. 150 with n. 137; B. MEISSNER, *op. cit.* (n. 43), p. 492f. with n. 371.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. *FGrHist* 328 and the index of works in Suda, s.v. see esp. the discussion by F. JACOBY (IIIb 1, p. 220ff.) and J. HORNBLLOWER, *op. cit.* (n. 25), p. 185. For intellectual life under Antigonus Gonatas cf. G. WEBER, *art. cit.* (n. 9), p. 306ff.; for the situation in Athens A. ERSKINE, *Hellenistic Stoa. Political Thought and Action*, London 1990, p. 90ff.

<sup>101</sup> C.F. EDSON, *The Antigonids, Heracles and Beroea*, *HSCP* 45 (1934), p. 213-246; F.W. WALBANK, *Philip V of Macedon*, Cambridge 1940, p. 54f.; S. LE BOHEC, *art. cit.* (n. 29), p. 117.

points out his early discernible poetic talent and gives a verse that had been a standard quotation after the first destruction of Thermus in 218 BC, which had been regarded as revenge for the Aetolians' heinous deed in Dion: ὄρᾳς τὸ δῖον οὐ βέλος διέπτματο, which was a parody of Euripides (*Suppl.* 860). Shortly before 182 BC Philip had him executed together with his family and further prominent members of the court society, in the context of inner-Macedonian unrest<sup>102</sup>. One of his epigrams, in which Philip dedicated a hunting trophy to Heracles, has come down to us in the *Anthology*<sup>103</sup>; possibly two further epigrams were written by him, as well, one of which with another reference to Heracles, the other compares Philip and Zeus<sup>104</sup>. We do not know of what kind the discrepancies between Philip and his σύντροφος had been, in any case, a connection between his murder and his poetry seems unlikely. In this context his contemporary Alcaeus of Messenia also has to be mentioned: Frank Walbank has accurately brought out his change from an ardent admirer of Philip to an embittered enemy, and referred to the custom, which has already been quoted twice, to call the ruler Κύκλωψ<sup>105</sup>. There do not exist reports about his death, nor that Philip tried to get hold of him.

Finally, Athenaeus records a Seleucid example: the Epicurean Diogenes was executed under Antiochus VI (after 145 BC). Diogenes was under Antiochus' predecessor and father Alexander Balas renowned for his disrespectful jests, which also included the person of the king, and which Antiochus allegedly was unwilling to tolerate any longer. The

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Polyb. XXIII 10.9; see also F.W. WALBANK, *op. cit.* (n. 101), p. 244f. and 335; K.-W. WELWEL, *Könige und Königtum im Urteil des Polybios*, Diss. Cologne 1963, p. 50ff. Plut., *Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur* 9 (= *Mor.* 53e) counts Samius and Philip among the examples of an unpleasant ending of a friendship because of criticism and suspicion.

<sup>103</sup> *AP* VI 116. The text in A.S.F. GOW – D.L. PAGE, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams* I, Cambridge 1965, p. 177ff. (Samius I): Σοὶ γέρας, Ἀλκείδα Μινναμάχε, τοῦτο Φίλιππος | δέρμα ταναϊμύκου λευρὸν ἔθηκε βοός | αὐτοῖς σὺν κεράεσσι τὸν ὕβρει κυδιῶντα | ἔσβεσεν Ὀρβηλοῦ τρηχὺν ὑπὸ πρόποδα. | ὁ φθόνος αὐαίνουτο, τὸν δ' ἔτι κῦδος ἀέξει | ῥίζα Βεροιαίου κράντορος Ἡμαθίας. See also F. SUSEMIHL, *op. cit.* (n. 15), II, p. 546f.; GOW–PAGE II, p. 509f.

<sup>104</sup> *AP* VI 114 (Samius II), cf. GOW–PAGE II, p. 510f. A. Plan. 6, see also F.W. WALBANK, *Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome*, *CQ* 36 (1942), p. 134-145, here 144f.; F.W. WALBANK, *op. cit.* (n. 101), p. 74, 120 and 263f.

<sup>105</sup> F.W. WALBANK, *op. cit.* (n. 104) and *CQ* 37 (1943), p. 1-13; furthermore F. SUSEMIHL, *op. cit.* (n. 15), II, p. 544ff.; F.-J. BRECHT, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 13f. Cf. also Plut., *Sert.* 1.4f., see T.W. AFRICA, *art. cit.* (n. 39), p. 528-530, according to him monophthality was politically relevant only for Hannibal and Sertorius.



account is, of course, in so far problematic as Antiochus was probably aged two at the time. Thus, it is more likely that political reasons of his promoter and then murderer Diodotus Tryphon were decisive factors<sup>106</sup>.

## VII

I would like to end the series of examples here, and give a short summary. The analysis of the three cases that have been examined did at least yield a number of clues that might complete our idea of communicational and interactive structures at court, as well as with regard to the perception from outside the court. What the cases have in common is that each of the poets was allegedly executed because of statements directed against a ruler or a dynasty.

The reason why the rule of Hellenistic kings appears in many cases as tyranny is mainly due to its structural weaknesses. This is also expressed in the fragile structure of the court society which had to be integrated anew time and again<sup>107</sup>. It was almost an everyday occurrence that not only claimants to the throne from one's own family were executed, but also other members of the court and irritating subjects. Positive exceptions were already recorded in ancient sources, and this is also confirmed by the image of the ideal king, which is outlined in the treatises *περὶ βασιλείας*, and by the self-portrayal in inscriptions and *προστάγματα*: with regard to our context a king was to be *δίκαιος*, *φιλάνθρωπος* and *ἐπιεικῆς*, as is, for example, repeatedly emphasized in the Aristeas letter from the 2nd century BC<sup>108</sup>. The reiteration of this ideal-

<sup>106</sup> Athen. 211a-d; cf. H. VON ARNIM, art. *Diogenes aus Seleukeia am Tigris* (47), *RE* V 1 (1903), col. 777; inaccurately W. VÖLCKER-JANSSEN, *op. cit.* (n. 11), p. 84, who sees the speeches of Diogenes as cause of the execution. For Antiochus VI cf. U. WILCKEN, art. *Antiochos* (29), *RE* I 2 (1894), col. 2477f. Moreover, Diod. XXXIII 28 (= Poseid. fr. 123 Theiler, with comments).

<sup>107</sup> Further weak points are, for example, the pressure to be successful, the question of succession, external threats, the economic situation, for this cf. M.M. AUSTIN, *Hellenistic Kings, War, and the Economy*, *CQ* 36 (1986), p. 450-466.

<sup>108</sup> See F.W. WALBANK, *The Hellenistic Picture of the King*, in: *CAH<sup>2</sup>* VII 1, Cambridge 1984, p. 75-84; cf. already E.R. GOODENOUGH, *The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship*, *YCS* 1 (1928), p. 55-102; W. SCHUBART, *Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri*, *AFP* 12 (1937), p. 1-26; W. SCHUBART, *Das Königsbild des Hellenismus*, *Die Antike* 13 (1937), p. 272-288; O. MURRAY, *Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship*, *JThS* 18 (1967), p. 336-371; T. ADAM, *op. cit.* (n. 58), p. 12ff.; P. HADOT, art. *Fürstenspiegel*, *RAC* 8 (1972), col. 555-632, here 586ff. Graphically on this Polyb. IV 77.2f.; VIII 10.8ff.; XVIII 41 (cf. H. SONNABEND, *art. cit.* [n. 82]); Suda, s.v. *βασιλεία*

ized image demonstrates that each protagonist should have been familiar with the problem: whoever became part of the court society or came into contact with the ruler in some other way was aware of the tremendous opportunities for promotion. On the other hand, however, one was also aware of the risk, to come into conflict with the ruler, maybe even by accident, or to become the plaything of different interest groups. Still, the deterring effect of examples showing the negative outcome of a relationship between ruler and *polis* Greeks, and these were by no means scarce in number, does not seem to have been too momentous: the attractiveness of the courts was just too great.

Nonetheless, there were singular individuals, who were consciously opposed to the ruler, and who also articulated this. In general the ruler's tolerance was extremely great according to the 'mirrors for princes' (*Fürstenspiegel*). There were no strict rules or uniform consequences, and neither does an understanding of all members of the court society as servants or subordinates give an adequate idea of the basic communicative situation<sup>109</sup>. For the scrutiny of our sources shows that rulers could also react quite generously to poetic libelling, as is proven by various examples in Plutarch<sup>110</sup>.

In the case of suspected or actual threats the rulers did not show any consideration for the status or previous achievements of a poet, and in his own territory he made full use of his monopoly on the use of force<sup>111</sup>. Naturally, irrational actions, especially under the influence of alcohol in the context of a symposium, could never be ruled out. When, however, Theocritus picked out Antigonus' resemblance to a Cyclops as a theme, Sotades the sibling marriage among the Ptolemies, and Daphidas the dishonourable descent of the Attalids, then they touched both on a precari-

(I 457, B147, ed. Adler). Explicit remarks on handling critics or mockers do not seem to exist, the Aristeeas-letter reports about a king merely topics like 'generosity towards enemies', 'renunciation of rage' or 'obedience to the law'.

<sup>109</sup> Differently B. MEISSNER, *op. cit.* (n. 43).

<sup>110</sup> *De cohibenda ira* 9 (= *Mor.* 457ff.): Arcadion of Achaia with Philip II, Philemon and Magas of Cyrene, as like as Ptolemy I and an unknown γραμματικός, cf. G. WEBER, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 79 and 97 with n. 6. Theodoros of Cyrene (called Atheos, 340-245 BC) could be added. He took part in a Ptolemaic mission to Lysimachus and got himself into a troublesome situation by what he said (cf. M. WINIARCZYK, *Diagorae Melii et Theodorii Cyrenaei reliquiae*, Leipzig 1981, p. 32-35, Test. 5-16), see K. VON FRITZ, art. *Theodoros* (32), *RE VA* 1 (1934), col. 1825-1831; C. FRANCO, *art. cit.* (n. 14), p. 454 n. 37.

<sup>111</sup> Dazu M.I. FINLEY, *art. cit.* (n. 12), p. 924. At court one could also defend against competitors for the ruler's favour by means of denunciation, for examples cf. Polybios' remarks on the rule of Ptolemy IV and V.

ous political situation *and* they came into conflict with the ruler's personal sensitivity<sup>112</sup>. The reason why the three literati were executed, must, however, have been more than their criticism in the form of just some verses or a saying. They were especially known as notorious grousers: sometimes, however, they pushed their luck too far. As mavericks they can hardly be described as mouthpiece of a broader Greek opposition, which is also the case for other intellectuals<sup>113</sup>. However, they were able to cause a good deal of unrest in the frail structure of the court society, the exact state of which we cannot determine.

Their agitation has to be explained in the tradition of antiquated thought categories of the *polis* and it has to be understood also as a sign of powerlessness. In this context one has to mention that we are neither in a position to answer the highly important question about effects and publicity of such events in the conflicting area of orality and literacy<sup>114</sup>, nor do we know the contents, the ridicule of which might have been unpleasant for a ruler, especially with regard to his subjects and other kings. Perhaps it was also due to the increasing degree of literacy in Hellenism, especially within its elite, that exiling was no longer sufficient, as it had been, according to Moses Finley (in *TLS* 1977), in societies that were characterized by their orality<sup>115</sup>. Moreover, with regard to the communicative situation, there was not much point in exiling a poet, for

<sup>112</sup> W. KULLMANN, *Die antiken Philosophen und das Lachen*, in: S. JÄKEL – A. TIMONEN (eds.), *Laughter down the Centuries* II, Turku 1995, p. 79–98. With reference to E.R. Dodds, he points out that because of the prevailing 'shame culture' «das Lachen über jemanden eine starke soziale Ächtung und Ausgrenzung bedeuten konnte. Jeder hatte darauf zu achten, daß er sich nicht lächerlich machte» (p. 81). This could be the explanation for what sometimes appears as oversensitivity.

<sup>113</sup> What seems remarkable to me is that we do not know about similar cases in the fields of fine arts or handicraft, as for instance comparable to modern caricatures. This may be due to the fact that, on the one hand, visual agitation is far more difficult to accomplish than literary agitation, and on the other, ancient tradition might not have had the same degree of interest in them.

<sup>114</sup> Explicitly negative in M.I. FINLEY, *art. cit.* (n. 12), p. 924: «Books and pamphlets played no part of any consequence in affecting or moulding public opinion, even in elite circles». Moreover, contemporary society had been determined much more by orality than by literacy. The question concerning the shaping of public opinion and forms of censorship, have, as far as I can see, not yet been answered specifically for Hellenism.

<sup>115</sup> For literacy in Hellenistic times cf. W.V. HARRIS, *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1989, p. 117f. and 124ff.; for the reading audience, exemplified by historians cf. J. MALITZ, *Das Interesse an der Geschichte. Die griechischen Historiker und ihr Publikum*, in: H. VERDIN et al. (eds.), *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.* (*Studia Hellenistica*, 30), Leuven 1990, p. 323–349, esp. 338ff.

example, from the Ptolemaic empire, if he was able to continue his agitation from another court.

Reports about the different ways the poets were killed hint at the possibility that the rulers might have tried to make events seem better, because of the negative reputation of tyrannical measures. On the other hand this could also have been influenced by a moralizing public for agitative reasons. We are, however, not in a position to decide this for each of the cases. At any rate, in order to be successful, courtly communication and regal representation demanded a great amount of fine feeling from all parties involved.

D-85072 Eichstätt

Gregor WEBER

Ostenstraße 26