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ABSTRACT

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

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

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

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

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

Висновки. Запропоновано як terminus post quem для афінського посольства, згаданого у Рамнунтському декреті, рік набуття Антігоном Гонатом царського статусу (284/283 р. до Р.Х.). Висунуто гіпотезу стосовно достовірності надання Гонатом афінням 661 срібного таланта як ціни збереження царського контролю над Піреєм. Спростовано припущення Р. Уотерфільда щодо зустрічі Гоната з афінськими послами у карийському Кавні, віднесено вищезгаданим дослідником на кін. 270-х рр. до Р.Х. Підсумовано сучасний стан джерельної бази війни Антігона Гоната з Антіохом Сотером. Вказано на зайнятість Антігона у зазначений війні як на причину добровільної згоди останнього передати афінням місто Елевсін згідно з вимогою посольства за участю Арістіда. Зроблено припущення щодо зв’язку між домовленостями афінського посольства з Гонатом і тривалою перервою у контактах елліністичних Афін з царським домом Селевкідів. Запропоновано низку аргументів на користь передування посольства за участю Арістіда галатському нашестю на Грецію, котре почалося восени 279 р. до Р.Х. Відзначено належність Рамнунтського декрету до нечисленних джерел, які проливають світло на події війни Антігона Гоната й Антіоха Сотера.

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

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, the Greek epigraphist V. Petrakos announced the introduction into scientific circulation of the honorific decree from Rhamnous, which is rich in historical content and was constituted in honor of the Athenian military and political figure of the 1st half of the 3rd century (hereafter – BCE) Aristeides, son of Mnesitheos of Lamptrai1. However, for reasons unknown to us, this document was published only

17 years after its announcement\(^2\). As mentioned above, the central figure in the decree is Aristeides, the son of Mnesitheos, who was elected military strategos of Athens at least twice and served as a diplomatic envoy on behalf of his polis several times. Among his merits to Athens, the authors of the decree (troops stationed in the town of Rhamnous) indicate the following: involvement in the recovery of the occupied by the Antigonids (cf. below) fortification on the Mouseion Hill (lines 5-11), playing a key role in the recovery of the Athenian polis of Eleusis and obtaining a significant sum of money for Athens from King Antigonos Gonatas (lines 12-14), successful command of the Eleusis garrison before the Chremonidean War\(^3\) (lines 14-18), participation in the embassy to the Spartan king Areus within the framework of the formation of the anti-Macedonian coalition (lines 18-22), skillful discharge of military and civilian powers in the conditions of war in the position of strategos of the Rhamnous garrison in the year of constituting of the decree (lines 22-34)\(^4\).

**The Embassy to Antigonos Gonatas**

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

---


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


a show of hands as an ambassador to Antigonos in Asia and honored [by the king – author’s note] of the entire embassy he [Aristeides – author’s note] recovered Eleusis and secured 661 (?!) silver talents".

In the author’s opinion, this fragment needs a few additional comments. First of all, we are considering a complex of nuances related to its previous dating. When taking into account the chronological sequence of the events presented in the decree, the above passage is dated between 287/286 (the date of the recovery of the fortifications on the Mouseion) and 270/269 (Aristeides’ position of strategos in Eleusis). At the same time, the terminus post quem can certainly be shifted, at least to 284/283 – the year Antigonos Gonatas was given a royal title. If the assumption

---


7 χειροτονηθείς υπὸ τοῦ δήμου πρεσβευτῆς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν πρὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ διαλεχθεὶς μετὰ τῶν συμπροσβευτῶν ἐκομισάτο τὴν Ἑλευσίνα καὶ [...] τάλαντα ἄργυρου – I. Rhamnous, VI, 404, 12-14; Rose Th., Wallace Sh. Op. cit. P. 175. The author is sincerely thankful to V. Stavniuk, Dr. of Historical Science (Kyiv) for the invaluable assistance provided during the work with the foregoing fragment.


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

12 A set of documents related to the international recognition of the inviolability of the temple of Asklepios on the island of Kos and the Panhellenic status of the Kos Games in honor of Asklepios now evidence in favor of 284/283 as the date when Gonatas was given a royal title. The matter concerns the decrees of the Macedonian cities of Amphipolis and Beroea, dated to the month of Gorpiaios (July/August) of the 41st year of Antigonos Gonatas – IG, XII, IV, 1, 22011; Bosnakis D., Hallof K. Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos VI // Chiron. 2020. Bd. 50. S. 291-293, 298-300, and about the letter of the Bithynian king Ziaelas, which is dating the corresponding large-scale campaign of the Kos theoría to 243. – Ibid. S. 294, 312; Зелінський А. Зовнішньополітичні орієнтири віфільського царя Зіела у світлі нових коських написів // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В.Н. Каразіна. Серія «Історія». 2021. Вип. 60. С. 30.

proposed by K. Clinton regarding the involvement of another Athenian statesman, Demochares\textsuperscript{13}, the nephew of Demosthenes, in the procedure of regaining control over Eleusis is correct, the terminus ante quem of Aristeides’ embassy can be shifted to 271/270 when a posthumous decree honoring the specified politician was constituted\textsuperscript{14}.

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

\textsuperscript{13}Plut. Mor. 851d-f; see also note 14.


\textsuperscript{16}With that said, a natural question arises as to the sources of such a substantial sum of money in the treasury of Gonatas. Even if Aristeides’ embassy took place before the first conquest of Macedonia by Antigonus II (277/276 – cf. note 28), at the disposal of the said king could be funds raised by him as taxes.
time (see note 15), under the specified conditions, the Athenians could well refuse to try to recover a fundamentally important for them port, considering such a refusal as a temporary necessity.\textsuperscript{17}

For the author, first of all, the problem of determining the exact time, as well as place, and circumstances of the Athenian embassy’s Asian contact with Gonatas, whose political interests were mainly focused on the Balkan Peninsula, became the key issue (cf. note 5). In particular, the mentioned issues will be at the center of the proposed study. Given the current source base at our disposal, we can consider two points that connected the mentioned Hellenistic ruler with the Asian, or rather, the Asia Minor context. It is about his hereditary ownership of the Carian polis of Kaunos (see below) and waging war in 280-278 against the ruler of the Seleucid state, Antiochos I (281-261), with the aim of gaining a foothold in the latter’s possessions in Asia Minor (see below).\textsuperscript{18} Despite the recent introduction to the scientific circulation of I. Rhamnous, VI, 404, both possibilities, albeit in a preliminary manner, have been reflected in the so-far modest historiography devoted to the decree from Rhamnous. Ch. Habicht and R. Waterfield spoke out in favor of the meeting of the Athenian embassy with Gonatas during the latter’s hypothetical Kaunos campaign\textsuperscript{19}. In turn, K. Clinton, D. Knoepfler, T. Rose, and S. Wallace, also without going into details, consider it more appropriate to associate the Asian diplomatic mission of Aristeides son of Mnesitheos with the war between Antigonus and Antiochos\textsuperscript{20}. The passing

or state revenues from the cities under his control – see Wheatley \textit{P.}, Dunn Ch. Op. cit. P. 431, not. 10; Waterfield \textit{R.} Op. cit. P. 113; also cf. approx. 28, the sums of money left to him by Demetrios before or during the latter’s Asia Minor campaign – cf. Plut. Demet 46, or even war booty looted during the war with Antiochos I (see below). In any case, the presence of considerable funds at Gonatas’ disposal is evidenced by the luxurious mortuary ceremony he arranged in 282 for his father, Plut. Demet 53 and the riches seen in his military camp by the Galatian ambassadors in 277 – \textit{Just. XXV}, 1; see also note 28.\textsuperscript{17}


The author of these lines supports the first one of views mentioned above, which is supported by the fact that Piraeus belonged to Gonatas before the end of the Chremonidean War – cf. FrGrHist, 244, f44; Paus. III, VI, 6; Polyæn. IV, VI, 20; see also note 3. In particular, the mentioned circumstance makes the supporters of an alternative point of view build too complex logical constructions and offer source interpretations close to hypercriticism, designed to answer the inevitable question about the time and circumstances of ‘the getting back’ of Piraeus under the rule of the son of Demetrios Poliorcetes.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{18} On the other hand, we do not have any source that would evidence of the presence of Gonatas in Asia Minor during the last Asia Minor campaign or Demetrios’ captivity – cf. eg.: Wheatley \textit{P.}, Dunn Ch. Op. cit. P. 407-436; Waterfield \textit{R.} Op. cit. P. 34-36; Romm \textit{J.} Op. cit. P. 153-182.\textsuperscript{19}


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

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

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

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


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


25 Plut. Demetr. 49; see also note 23.
require Antigonos to be present there in person\textsuperscript{26}. Finally, thirdly, during 284/283-271 (except the aforementioned war with Antiochos I) all Antigonos' deeds were related to European affairs\textsuperscript{27}. First of all, it was about the long struggle of Gonatas for the Macedonian throne, which began in 281, lasted with variable success, and finally ended victoriously in 272\textsuperscript{28}. Thus, we have every reason to assert the absence of any prerequisites for a connection between the Athenian embassy mentioned in I. Rhamnous, VI, 404 and the Carian possessions of Gonatas.

A completely different situation emerges when considering the few circumstances known to us associated with the war of Antigonos Gonatas against Antiochos I Soter\textsuperscript{29}. We know about that conflict, thanking a few very concise sources. The fact of the war in Asia between Antigonos and Antiochos is stated in the introductions to the 'Philippic Histories' by Pompeius Trogus\textsuperscript{30}. In his turn, Memnon, the author of the historical work 'History of Heracleia', adds several details to the fact of the historicity of the geographically non-localized war between the two kings: 1) the long-term nature of the war; 2) the involvement of a large number of troops in it; 3) participation of the Bithynian king Nicomedes I and Heracleia Pontica in that war on the side of Antigonos, as well as the existence of a certain 'support group' for Antiochos; 4) the successful blocking of the Antiochos' fleet by the Bithynian king\textsuperscript{31}. Based on a fragmentary inscription from Kyzikos (a polis in the northwest of Asia Minor), it can be concluded that among the regional supporters of Antigonos during the above-mentioned war near the said polis whose territory had become the arena of hostilities, was the Pergamon dynast Philétairos\textsuperscript{32}; in one of the anecdotes from

---


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

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


\textsuperscript{30} P. Trog. Prol. XXIV.

\textsuperscript{31} FrGrHist, 434, f10.

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

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

35 Paus. X, XX, 5.
37 O. Gabelko sees an indication of the peace concluded between the two rulers behind the back of Nicomedes I of Bithynia (see above) in the text of one of the Ilion decrees, constituted in honor of King Antiochos – OGIS, I, 219, identified by him as Antiochos I – Габелко О. Указ. соч. С. 177-178; cf. Buraselis K. Op. cit. S. 113-114. However, the author of this paper is inclined to the view that the said unidentified king – see, for example: Ma J. Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. P. 254-259 – was Antiochos III. The latter circumstance may be indicated by the absence of a mention of Seleukos, the eldest son and co-ruler of Antiochos I in the Ilion decree (about him – see, for example: Holton J. The ideology of Seleukid joint kingship: the case of Seleukos, son of Antiochos I // The Seleukid Empire, 281-222 BC: War within the Family / ed. K. Erickson. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2018. P. 101-128).
39 Instead, E. Paganoni assumed without any grounds that Gonatas held a position of some kind of condottiere in the service of the Bithynian king, during the latter’s war with Antiochos – Paganoni E. Op. cit. P. 45-57.
40 About the Northern League – see, for example: Габелко О. Указ. соч. С. 168-191.
middle of 279, the warring parties concluded an armistice due to their sending military contingents to fight the Galatian invasion of Hellas. After repulsing the Galatians, Antigonos engaged in some military operations in Macedonia but had to retreat to the territory under his control in Asia Minor. Eventually, in 278, a peace treaty was concluded between the two kings, according to which Antigonos gave up his claims on the Seleucid possessions in Asia Minor, while Antiochos relinquished his claims to Macedonia; in turn, Thrace temporarily fell into a kind of a gray zone with uncertain territorial belonging.

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

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

---


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


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

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

46 Cf. Polyaen, V, XVII, 1. On the dating of the corresponding Polyainos' anecdote to mid. 280s, see the sources from note 17 to this paper.
concessions on the part of the latter. Among the agreements reached regarding Piraeus, in addition to the donation of the above-mentioned sum, there could have been Gonatas’ permission for the Athenians to usage of the Piraeus port and the royal consent for the participation of Athenian citizens living in Piraeus in the political life of the polis (see note 47). In addition, it should be noted that the Asian arrangements, as a result of which Antigonos was probably able to use the garrisons based in Attica against Antiochos, could be one of the reasons for the lack of contact between Athens and the Seleucids, observed during the period between the death of the founder of the dynasty, Seleukos Nicator (281) and the end of the 3rd century. In the author’s opinion, Antiochos I, whose father gave the island of Lemnos back to the Athenians, could quite rightly consider the above agreement reached between Antigonos and Athens, as a manifestation of the latter’s black ingratitude. The memory of such an insult could quite possibly have been preserved in the royal house of the Seleucids for several generations.

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

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

---

50 Paus. X, XX, 5.  
mentioned Lysimachos and Ptolemy, could have had the title of a king\textsuperscript{53}. Thus, the named person could only be Antipatros Etesias, who reigned in Macedonia for 45 days in the period of the end of April – middle of July 279. Based on this, we can assume that Demochares managed to combine two diplomatic missions by joining Aristeides’ embassy after a successful visit to Antipatros. Given such a possibility, the Athenian embassy to Antigonos in Asia, highly likely, should be dated to the end of spring – the 1\textsuperscript{st} half of summer 279\textsuperscript{54}. By the way, this dating fully corresponds to the peculiarities of the Mediterranean navigation season, which began in the middle of spring\textsuperscript{55}, making an earlier voyage of the Athenian embassy to Asia Minor highly doubtful.

CONCLUSIONS

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

I. Rhamnous – Ο δήμος τού Ραμνοῦντος, Athens.
IG – Inscriptiones Graecae, Berlin.
IvKaunos – Die Inschriften von Kaunos, München.
OGIS – Orientis Graeci inscriptiones Selectae, Leipzig.
P. Herc. – Herculaneum Papyri, Napoli.
SEG – Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecorum, Leiden.
SIG – Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum, Leipzig.