

MARTHA C. TAYLOR

WHEN THE PEIRAEUS AND THE CITY ARE REUNITED

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 123 (1998) 207–212

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

WHEN THE PEIRAIIEUS AND THE CITY ARE REUNITED¹

In the year 282/1, a year in which a man named Nicias was archon in Athens, a decree was passed in honor of Euthios, archon in the previous year, which tells Euthios to expect some further benefit "when the city and the Peiraiieus are reunited"—ὅταν ὁ Πειραιεὺς καὶ τὸ ἄστυ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένηται.² At this time the Peiraiieus was under the control of a Macedonian garrison, although the *asty* itself had been free since its revolt from Demetrios in 287.³ The decree suggests both that Euthios was making efforts to free the Peiraiieus from its Macedonian overlords in order to reunite it with Athens, and that the Athenians expected that these efforts would soon bear fruit and, thus, justify further honors for Euthios.

The Athenian expectation registered on the decree for Euthios figures in the debate over whether the Athenians did, in fact, manage to expel the Macedonians from the Peiraiieus in 281. Scholars are divided on the issue, with some arguing that the Athenians did eject the foreign garrison from Peiraiieus in 281 (either through military action or negotiation)⁴, and others arguing that the Macedonians remained in control of the Peiraiieus until at least the end of the Chremonidean war.⁵ The present paper will, by no means, settle this issue. I do hope to show, however, that the arguments of those who believe the Peiraiieus was recaptured by the Athenians in 281 rest in part on unexamined, unargued, and, I think, unlikely assumptions about the effect on the Peiraiieus and the Peiraiieans of the presence of a Macedonian garrison in their deme. At issue is what the Athenians were trying to effect by bringing the *asty* and the Peiraiieus ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ.

The hope that the Athenians apparently felt in 282/1 about their prospects for expelling the Macedonians from the Peiraiieus does not prove military or even diplomatic success, and the expectation recorded in the decree for Euthios does not show that the Athenians achieved their aim. The argument that the Athenians' hope was realized depends upon two other elements. First, Pausanias says of the Athenian general Olympiodoros that his recovery of the Mouseion in 287, which freed the *asty* from the Macedonians, was his greatest deed "except for those things he did recovering (ἀναχωράμενος) the Peiraiieus and the Mounychia" (1.26.3). This exploit is, however, completely undated. It may be (and has been) placed as early as the "Four-Years" War of 307-304.⁶ It was dismissed by Gauthier, who argued that the Athenians expelled the Macedonians from the Peiraiieus, but believed that they did this through negotiation, not the martial deeds of Olympiodoros.⁷ And Habicht has argued that it need not even mean

¹ An earlier, brief version of this argument appeared in my book *Salamis and the Salaminioi. The History of an Unofficial Athenian Demos* (Amsterdam 1997), 230-233 and in a paper at the 1997 AIA/APA Annual Meeting in Chicago. All dates in this paper are BC.

² *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 100ff., no. 18.30-31 (*SEG* 25.89.30-31). L. Moretti *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*, I (Florence 1967), 29 mistranslates this phrase as "quando il Pireo e la città siano in suo (cioè del popolo) possesso." Consequently he concludes (30) that "anche l' ἄστυ era occupato dai Macedoni nel febbraio 281."

³ For the date see C. Habicht, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Munich 1979), 51-60; M. J. Osborne, *ZPE* 35 (1979) 181-194. This dating is followed by P. Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley 1990), 128. Contrast T. L. Shear, Jr., *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 BC. Hesperia Supplement* 17 (Princeton 1978), 14 and n. 23, 63, chapter 3.

⁴ See, e.g., P. Gauthier, *REG* 92 (1979) 371-374, who argues that the port was taken through negotiation, and Shear (n. 3), 28-29, who argues that it was captured through military action.

⁵ Habicht (n. 3), 95-109 and now *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Cambridge, MA, 1997), 124; in this view he is in concert with M. J. Osborne (n. 3), 193 and R. Garland *The Piraeus from the Fifth to the First Century B.C.* (Ithaca 1987), 51.

⁶ Habicht (n. 3), 102-107; Green (n. 3), 128, n. 84. G. De Sanctis, *Riv. Fil.* n.s. 14 (1936) 144-147 placed the episode in the era of the tyrant Lachares.

⁷ Gauthier (n. 4), 373 dismisses the passage as "tardive, isolée et non datée." G. Reger, *CQ* 42 (1992) 372-373, who follows Gauthier in believing that the Peiraiieus was recovered in 281 through negotiation, argues that Pausanias' reference to Olympiodoros' recovery of the Peiraiieus should be taken to refer to his "diplomatic, and not his military skills."

what it appears to say, urging that we understand Pausanias to mean not that Olympiodoros captured the Peiraeus from the Macedonians, but rather kept it safe from the Macedonians at a time when it was under Athenian control, i.e. before 295/4.⁸ In any event, this passage alone does not prove that the Athenians achieved their aim of expelling the Macedonians from the Peiraeus in 281, and those who argue that the Athenians did so turn to a specific interpretation of several decrees that name Nikias *Hysteros* as archon.⁹ Because Athenian inscriptions do not regularly label as first or second different archons who bear the same name, the designation *Hysteros* has been plausibly interpreted to indicate that the year in which Nikias was archon was divided in two because of a change in regime that involved the dissolution and reconstitution of the democratic council and assembly. Nikias *Hysteros*, then, indicates Nikias' service in the second part of his divided year. There were three men named Nikias who served as archon in Athens, one in 296/5, one in 266/5, and one in 282/1, the year on which our investigation focuses.¹⁰ If the designation Nikias *Hysteros* refers to the first Nikias of 296/5, Osborne has found a plausible explanation for the division of the year into two in the fall from power of the tyrant Lachares and the return of democracy to Athens which can be dated to this year.¹¹ Osborne (*loc. cit.* [n. 10] 276) supports this position by noting that the second half of Nikias' year is "ostentatiously democratic, embodying at no little trouble a miniature prytany-year in which all of the tribes served minuscule prytanies of a few days' duration."

Gauthier, on the other hand, argued that Nikias *Hysteros* referred to the Nikias of 282/1 and found in the reconstitution of the government in the year of Nikias *Hysteros* proof that the Athenians had succeeded in expelling the Macedonians from the Peiraeus. There is, of course, no actual change in regime in Athens suggested for 282/1, as there was a change of regime when the tyrant Lachares was deposed from power. Rather, those that believe that the Macedonians were expelled from the Peiraeus must find an explanation for the reconstitution of the democratic council and assembly in Nikias' year in the supposed expulsion itself, and, most importantly, in their assumption of what the presence of the Macedonians in the Peiraeus meant for the daily life of that port town. For example, Gauthier (*loc. cit.* [n. 4] 392) baldly asserts that while under the control of the Macedonians "the inhabitants of the Peiraeus were not able to go to the assembly, nor were they able to be represented in the council nor to be candidates for magistracies." Garland agreed, writing "self-evidently citizens resident in the Piraeus could no longer attend meetings of the Athenian Assembly, become elected to the boule or hold any office of state."¹² Gauthier (*loc. cit.* [n. 4] 357) insisted that because of these constraints, "forming a community apart, the deme of Peiraeus, with its assembly and magistrates, was constrained to transform itself *de facto* into a mini city." It is the reversal of this profound separation, then, that we are to understand is represented by the reconstitution of the entire government in the year of Nikias *Hysteros*. Gauthier (pp. 392f.) explains as follows: "immediately and quite logically, while the Ekklesia was reformed anew with all those who had been excluded previously [i.e. those Peiraeians who had been prevented from active citizenship by the Macedonian garrison in their deme], a new Boule was put in place in which the whole civic population could be represented." Thirteen years after his article, Reger (*loc. cit.* [n. 7] 378f.) reasserted Gauthier's position. He accepts that many persons in the Peiraeus were "excluded

⁸ Habicht (n. 3), 104-105 takes ἀνασώζαμενος to mean not "recover what is lost" but rather "rescue, save preserve". Furthermore, he interprets the remarks that follow concerning an encounter at Eleusis not as a new point, but as further clarification of the first sentence, the δέ standing for γάρ.

⁹ ἐπὶ Νικίου ἄρχοντος τοῦ ὑτέρου: *IG II² 644* (cf. *SEG 29.101*); 645 (cf. *SEG 29.101*), *SEG 29.101* (*Hesperia* 11 [1942] 281f. no. 54.1).

¹⁰ M. J. Osborne, *ZPE* 58 (1985) 275, citing J. and L. Robert "Bulletin Épigraphique", *REG* 94 (1981) 402ff. and B.D. Meritt, *Historia* 26 (1977) 171ff.

¹¹ Osborne (n. 11), 276. Habicht (n. 3), 1-21 had argued that the term *Hysteros* was applied when Lachares' tyranny began, but now (n. 5), 83 follows Osborne's interpretation of the term.

¹² Garland (n. 5) 50. He follows Gauthier in his understanding of how the Macedonian presence in the Peiraeus affected the active citizenship of the Peiraeians, but he denies that the Athenians succeeded in expelling the garrison in 282/1.

from participation for many years" because of the presence there of a Macedonian garrison, and insists that "Gauthier's point still remains that the Athenians would have had to reconstitute the government after the recovery of the Peiraieus to accommodate the participation of citizens of Peiraiean demes."

Despite Garland's and Gauthier's claim that this is all "self-evident" and quite "logical", it is neither. There are two points that need to be investigated. First, did the presence of the Macedonian garrison in the Peiraieus from 287, the year in which the Athenians expelled the Macedonians from the Mouseion and so regained their liberty, to 282/1 (or beyond) mean that the residents of the Peiraieus were profoundly separated from the rest of (democratic) Attica? Did it really mean that they had no chance to attend the assembly, serve in the Boule, or attend religious festivals? Second, if that was the case, and if the Athenians expelled the Macedonians from the Peiraieus in 282/1, would they have reconstituted their entire government in order to mark the Peiraieans' return to active citizenship? This is a crucial point in the argument that the Athenians did recover the Peiraieus in 282/1. It is the supposed recovery of the Peiraieus that explains the reconstitution of the government in the decrees of Nikias *Hysteros*, allowing those decrees to be dated to 282/1 and not 296/5 and so to serve as evidence that the Peiraieus was recovered in 282/1.

Let us take the second point first. Even if one grants that under the Macedonians the residents of the Peiraieus could not attend the assembly or serve in the Boule or be elected to other magistracies, this does not mean that there would be no Peiraieans involved in the government. Both Gauthier and Garland imagine that many residents of the Peiraieus would have chosen to "abandon their homes, preferring. . . a life of freedom in the *asty*."¹³ These men as well as any demesmen of the Peiraieus who were not resident in their deme, could have attended the assembly, and could have constituted a delegation of "Peiraieans in exile" in the Boule. For this reason, the presence of a delegation from the Peiraieus on the great bouleutic list of 281/0 can not serve, for those who think the Peiraieus under the Macedonians was isolated from the rest of Attica, as proof that the Peiraieus was recovered by the Athenians before this date, for these Peiraieans may be men who at the time lived outside their deme.¹⁴

There were, then, probably men from the Peiraieus participating in the government even while the Macedonians held the Peiraieus. If the Peiraieus was reconquered, and suddenly *more* men from the Peiraieus, and men actually resident in the Peiraieus, were able to participate in the government, would it really have been necessary to reconstitute the entire organization in celebration as Gauthier, Garland and Reger assert? Those who believe it would have been necessary to reorganize the government after a reconquest of the Peiraieus can point for support to the reorganization during the period of Nikias *Hysteros* which constituted (as Osborne put it for 296/5) "a miniature prytany-year in which all of the tribes served minuscule prytanies of a few days' duration (Osborne [n. 10], 276)." However, in 282/1 the only prytany whose composition would change due to the recovery of the Peiraieus was that of Hippothontis, the tribe to which the deme of Peiraieus belonged. I imagine that Garland and Gauthier assume that once the Peiraieus was recovered there was a meeting of the deme assembly to chose new *bouleutai* from *all* Peiraieans. Thus the composition of their delegation to the Boule would, presumably, change. But the deme of Peiraieus provided only 10 members of its prytany, one fifth of its delegation to the Boule, and one sixtieth of the Boule itself.¹⁵ Would a change in the composition of that percent of one tribe's prytany require that a new prytany year be begun in which all twelve tribes serve a tiny prytany term? In

¹³ The quotation is from Garland (n. 5), 50; Gauthier (n. 4), 357 also remarked that it was plausible that some inhabitants of the Peiraieus "chose freedom" and fled the Peiraieus.

¹⁴ B.D. Meritt and J.S. Traill, ed., *The Athenian Agora. XV. Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors*. (Princeton 1974), #72. There is definitely a delegation from the Peiraieus noted on this list at line 136 (the "Pi" of the deme designation remains on the stone). The names in lines 137-142 that follow the deme designation in the reconstruction given in *Agora XV* are on a separate fragment and probably belong to the Peiraieus but may belong to Dekeleia. See the *editio princeps*: J.S. Traill, *Hesperia* 38 (1969) 470, 489-490.

¹⁵ See J. S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica, Hesperia* Supplement 14 (Princeton 1975), 59, Table VIII Hippothontis. A quota of 10 *bouleutai* is applicable to the years after the reorganization of 307/6 during which it seems that the quota of Peiraieus was raised from 9 to 10 *bouleutai*.

Gauthier's scenario, the most important political result of the capture of the Peiraieus for most Peiraieans, that vast majority who were not chosen to serve on the Boule, would be their opportunity to attend and vote in the assembly. But their presence there would not require any change in the prytanies of the Boule. Thus it is not evident that, as Reger states (*loc. cit.* [n. 7] 378f.), "the Athenians would have had to reconstitute the government after the recovery of the Peiraieus to accommodate the participation of citizens of Peiraiean demes." To accommodate the participation of most of the citizens of the Peiraieus, the Athenians would have needed only to allow them to enter the Pnyx and to vote in the assembly. As Osborne notes, the requirement that the year begin anew has the air of a repudiation of that which has come before. But on Gauthier's interpretation, the Athenians would have no reason in 282/1 to repudiate the prior government or its actions. If, however, the era of Nikias *Hysteros* belongs to the period of the restoration of democracy after the fall of the tyranny of Lachares in 296/5, the beginning of a new year, the repudiation of what has come before all make sense. They reflect, as Osborne remarked, "the desire of the democrats to separate off their period of administration from the horrenda of the tyranny."¹⁶

Discussions of how the Athenians might have celebrated the return to civic participation of the residents of the Peiraieus are dependent on Gauthier's first point, that under the Macedonians the port city would have been wholly cut off from the rest of Attica. Acceptance that Macedonian occupation would have severed a site from its ties with Attica seems to be widespread and has never, to my knowledge, been challenged. Even Osborne (*loc. cit.* [n. 10] 280f.), for example, who argues against the association of the decrees of Nikias *Hysteros* with any re-conquest of the Peiraieus in 281, speaks of the "absence of the Peiraieus" and of "the re-incorporation of the Peiraieus into the Athenian state." He never questions Gauthier's assertion that the Peiraieus would have been completely separated from the rest of Athens by the presence of Macedonian troops. Shear betrays a similar understanding of the effect of Macedonian troops on Eleusis when he concludes from the evidence of free access to the site of Eleusis in the contract for work on a stoa there that it is "obvious that by this time Eleusis was in Athenian control."¹⁷ He must, therefore, believe that if Eleusis was not in Athenian control, stonemasons would have been prevented from working at their trade in the deme. Shear, like Gauthier, seems to assume that the presence of a Macedonian garrison in a deme profoundly severed that deme's ties with the rest of Attica.

Certainly the decree for Euthios contains strong language. In its desire that the Peiraieus and the *asty* be reunited it suggests that the split between *asty* and Peiraieus was deeply felt and even speaks of the state as divided when it hopes that they may soon be ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ. But this rhetoric hardly proves that all contact between the Peiraieus and Attica had stopped, and Macedonian control of the Peiraieus does not appear to be dependent on forbidding travel between the garrisoned site and the *asty* or the other demes. It is reasonable to suggest that during times of outright revolt, when Athens was at war with the Macedonians, communication and travel between the *asty* and the demes and towns controlled by the garrisons of the Macedonians might have been impossible. It is much less clear that this was the case for the whole of the period of Macedonian control, however. The decree for Kallias of Sphettos, for example, describes Kallias' deeds during and immediately after the revolt of the *asty* from Demetrios, and dates them with the phrase "but the fort on the Mouseion was still occupied and the countryside in a

¹⁶ Osborne (n. 10), 277. See also 280-281 for a different discussion of how inappropriate this means of celebration is to the "(hypothetical) reacquisition of the Peiraieus."

¹⁷ Shear (n. 3) 85 regarding *IG II² 1682*. This stoa contract is dated to the archonship of a Diotimos who was thought to be the Diotimos who was archon of 285/4. This Diotimos is now shown to be the archon of 354, however, and the stoa contract cannot reveal anything about the date of the recapture of Eleusis. See Habicht (n. 5) 129. Phillipides of Kephale's role as *agonothete* in 284 when he established an additional festival for Demeter and Kore as a memorial to the liberation of the *demos* (*IG II² 657.43-45*) should still mark 284 as the *terminus ante quem* for the liberation of Eleusis if we believe, as Shear (*op. cit.* [n. 3] 84f.) argued, that before that liberation no free Athenian could celebrate at Eleusis. Habicht (n. 5) 126-129 does not bring Phillipides' actions into his discussion of the date of the recapture of Eleusis.

state of war at the hands of the troops from the Peiraieus."¹⁸ This refers to the attempt by Demetrios and his Peiraieus garrison to besiege the *asty* into submission. But Demetrios eventually raised the siege and peace was made that "preserved the independence the Athenians had just won by force of arms."¹⁹ The peace treaty did not, however, provide for the removal of the Macedonian troops from the garrisoned sites they still held. Nevertheless this does not prove that a state of war continued to exist in the countryside and the residents of the Peiraieus were still living under an occupation that profoundly limited their freedom of movement.

Gauthier (*loc. cit.* [n. 4] 356) writes that for the Macedonians in the Peiraieus the Athenians of the city had turned into their enemies and were treated as such. However, this doesn't show that the Athenian residents of the Peiraieus were cut off from all contact with the rest of Attica. Gauthier asserts that for the Peiraieans all communications by land except for certain exceptional safe-conducts were cut by those who guarded the ramparts (*ibid.*). Garland (*op. cit.* [n. 5] 50) on the other hand, says that the Peiraieans were "compelled to acknowledge their shared predicament with the Macedonian garrison. Both were cut off from communications with the rest of Attike and both were wholly dependent upon essential supplies arriving by sea." Both assume that the Peiraieans were cut off, but there is some confusion about who is limiting their movement. Gauthier assumes it is the garrison, while Garland assumes it is the Athenians outside the walls. The confusion comes, I think, because the situation in the Peiraieus was anomalous and cannot be compared to a typical siege. Its difference from a typical besieged site, however, is what suggests that contact between the Peiraieus and the rest of Attica may have been possible. In the Peiraieus, the men guarding the walls were the enemies of the "besiegers"—the Athenians in Attica—but, unlike in a typical siege, the bulk of the residents were not. They should have had nothing to fear from the Athenians beyond the walls, and would face neither attack nor capture if they left the site. Nor is it clear that the Macedonians should have felt that free travel by the citizenry would compromise their control of the Peiraieus. The Macedonians aimed to limit the importation of grain to the *asty*, since large stores of this would allow the *asty* to withstand the siege that would result from any attempt to expel the garrisons that remained (Osborne [n. 3] 189-190). But this does not require prohibiting residents' access to the countryside. So long as the Macedonians controlled the gates, and were not so foolish as to admit back into the area large groups of armed men, some access between the Peiraieus and the countryside and *asty* seems reasonable. Unfortunately we simply have no evidence for what the Macedonians did about the movements of the residents of the Peiraieus. Even the abortive attack on the Peiraieus garrison in which 420 Athenian hoplites were killed can tell us little about a continuous siege of the Peiraieus and the people's ability to move in and out of the Peiraieus.²⁰

Can my scenario fit with the Athenians' desire to see the *asty* and the Peiraieus ἐν τῷ ἀντῷ? Even if the Macedonians did allow the residents of the Peiraieus access to Attica, the Athenians would be aware that their freedom of movement was on sufferance. They and their fellow Athenians could not have failed to feel the ignominy of the walls, gates and checkpoints manned by Macedonians. It would be clear to them that the Peiraieus was no longer fully Athenian. Thus the rhetoric of reunification and a desire to see the Peiraieus and *asty* ἐν τῷ ἀντῷ is not inappropriate even if Peiraieans could travel to the *asty*.

¹⁸ τοῦ δὲ φρουρίου τοῦ ἐν τῷ Μουσειῷ ἔτι κατεχομένου καὶ τῆς χώρας ἐμ πολέμῳ οὐσης ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Πειραιέως (lines 14-16). The translation is from Shear (n. 3), 5.

¹⁹ Habicht (n. 5), 97. Plutarch *Dem.* 46.2, reports that Demetrios raised the siege. Kallias of Sphettos participated in the negotiations of the peace; see Shear (n. 3), lines 32-40.

²⁰ Polyainos 5.17. This failed attempt on the Peiraieus is generally dated to 286. See Habicht (n. 3), 98; Gauthier (n. 4), 356, 366; Shear (n. 3), 82-83. Osborne (n. 3), 194 dates the attempt to 281 and thinks that this is the military action that had encouraged the city to the hope recorded on the decree for Euthios that the *asty* and Peiraieus would soon be reunited. The attack occurs at night, and the Athenians are betrayed in their hope that the under-commander will open the gates to them. Even if, as I am suggesting, the Macedonians may have allowed the residents of the Peiraieus some access to Attica, I don't suggest that they left the gates open and unguarded, especially at night, so the fact that the walls and gates are closed and guarded at night can say nothing about the movement allowed residents of the Peiraieus during the day.

So too the fact that the decree in honor of Audoleon of Paionia of 285/4 refers to his promise of support for the recovery (κομιδή) of the Peiraieus does not prove that the Peiraieans were locked inside their port town (*IG II² 654. 33f. Syl. 373*). The language merely indicates that the Macedonians were in control of the Peiraieus, and the Athenians needed financial support to recover the harbor city and the control of it presumably through military action.²¹

If I am correct in my interpretation of Macedonian control of the Peiraieus, it would give some insight into Macedonian judgments of Athenian political power. If the Macedonians didn't find it necessary to forbid the men of the Peiraieus from going to the city to serve in the council or assembly, it would suggest that the Macedonians saw no threat in the continued existence of Athenian democratic institutions, or in the participation of the men of the Peiraieus in those institutions. It would suggest that the Macedonians believed that they had little to fear from the residents of the Peiraieus participating in a nominally independent Athenian democratic assembly that, so long as the Macedonians held the forts of Attica, could do little against them. It would imply that in the eyes of the Macedonians, resolutions and decrees could not outweigh a phalanx of armed men, and that the Macedonians felt little need to undercut these obsolete signs of democratic power.

I do not presume that this interpretation is necessarily correct; I merely wish to point out that it is not self-evident that the Peiraieans must have been walled up in their deme year upon year. Interpretations of the decrees of Nikias *Hysteros* that depend upon that assumption are, then, less persuasive; and arguments about the recapture of the Peiraieus in 281 that depend upon those decrees are, consequently, not compelling.

Loyola College in Maryland

Martha C. Taylor

²¹ This may be confirmed by a use of the verb κομίζω in the same decree. The decree refers at one point to the period "when the *demos* had recovered the *asty*" (κοιμαμένου [τ]οῦ δήμ[ο]υ τὸ ἄστυ) (lines 17-18). This must refer to the successful revolt of 287 and the recovery of Athenian liberty in that year. The *asty*, of course, was never actually out of the *hands* of the Athenians, and access to and from the countryside was never denied. The *asty* was, rather, out of their control. When they regain that control, they speak of a "recapture" of the site. Thus the use of the noun κομιδήν to speak of a "recapture" of the Peiraieus does not show that the site is cut off from the rest of the Athenians, only that it is out of their control.