
Review

Reviewed Work(s): Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C. by T. Leslie Shear,

Review by: Roger S. Bagnall

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 101, No. 2 (Summer, 1980), pp. 244-247

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/294441>

Accessed: 12-06-2017 14:08 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*

parisons with Freud's nineteenth century Viennese family conflicts, adds little that is of value.

In his description of the "medical model," Simon limits himself to the Hippocratic writings and Aristotelian discussions of melancholy; aside from some references to Galen, he does not treat medical theory of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman periods, and he does not attempt to include the healing cult of Asclepius or a full treatment of Aristotle. He well summarizes scattered materials, in which madness is never treated as a particular type of disease separate from other illnesses, and ably documents the basic fact of Greek medical theories of madness: all aberrations of the mind have clear physical causes and it is to these causes that the doctor as "therapist" must address himself. After discussing epilepsy and melancholy, Simon focuses extensively on hysteria. He turns modern concepts of hysterical conversion and full hysteria upon such Hippocratic descriptions as that in "Diseases of Young Girls" and upon group ecstatic possession. Following the theories of Charcot and Freud and more recent psychiatrists, he suggests sexual frustration and conflict arising from the inferior social status of women as causes of the Greek cases of hysteria.

This book, in which several chapters are revisions and expansions of earlier articles, is a noteworthy attempt to clarify a confused and difficult body of material and to consider fundamental and often hidden assumptions of our own culture. If the modern models that Simon hopes to clarify by their comparison with the ancient material affect his use of this material, this is not surprising. Though Simon, a psychiatrist and amateur classicist, depends rather heavily on a few modern authorities (especially E. Havelock and the less reliable P. Slater), and though he has not fully solved the problem of addressing simultaneously both Hellenists and psychiatrists, one can only be grateful for his bold attempt to synthesize two disciplines and to cast light both on the objects of our studies and on ourselves.

PENELOPE RAINEY

PHILADELPHIA, PA

T. LESLIE SHEAR, JR. *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.* Princeton, N.J., American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1978. Pp. x + 117. \$10.00 (*Hesperia*: Supplement 17)

This book is the publication, with full historical commentary, of one of the most important Hellenistic inscriptions found in recent decades. This is a 109-line honorific decree of the Athenian democracy, passed in the archonship of Sosistratos (270/69, Shear argues) and found in the Athenian Agora in 1971, for Kallias of Sphettos, an Athenian democrat who spent years in the military service of Ptolemy

I and Ptolemy II. The decree is very explicit and detailed about the nature of Kallias' services, unlike most decrees with their exasperating reticence and banal generalities; it is also virtually completely preserved and offers little difficulty in the establishment and understanding of the text.

The ramifications for the political history of the period, however, are extensive, and Shear devotes the bulk of the book to an attempt, in two parts, to fit the new evidence into our previous knowledge. First comes a commentary to the inscription, section by section, occupying 52 pages and presenting the material in detail; then come three chapters devoted to the Athenian revolt of 286 B.C. against Demetrius Poliorcetes, the 'peace' which followed its partial success, and the history of Athens' attempts afterward to dislodge the remaining Macedonian garrisons from the forts around Attica. An appendix conveniently reproduces the principal previously-known texts pertinent to the period, and excellent source and subject indexes close the work. The plates are not very clear, and one wonders if enlarged photographs of squeezes might not have been more useful; but the inscription is fortunately not one which will give the reader much need to check the correctness of the text.

Kallias, the inscription tells us, was in command of a Ptolemaic force stationed on Andros at the time when the Athenians overthrew the Macedonian-supported government and expelled the Macedonians from the *asty*. Demetrius' troops still held the Mouseion, Piraeus and most of the rest of Attica; and Demetrius himself was approaching from the Peloponnesos. Kallias, with 1,000 picked men, drawn from a Ptolemaic force on Andros, landed in Attica, protected those harvesting grain for the city, fought against Demetrius' siege and was wounded. He then took part as the envoy of the Demos to peace negotiations in the Piraeus with representatives of Ptolemy and Demetrius (and other kings as well, Shear suggests), and finally returned to Ptolemaic service. Later, at the accession of Ptolemy II, Kallias successfully petitioned him in Cyprus for grain and money for the desperate city. He further served as *architheoros* for Athens at the first celebration of the Ptolemaieia, secured contributions from Ptolemy to the next Panathenaic festival, and returned to Ptolemaic service in Halikarnassos, from which vantage point he continued to foster Athenian and Ptolemaic relations.

It is scarcely possible here even to summarize the consequences which Shear draws for the history of the early third century, especially the period from 290 to 270; suffice it to say that a great deal of flesh can be added to the skeleton of events in Athens in this period, and the internal politics of international conflicts come alive. If much remains uncertain, we must remember that many of the questions could not even be asked previously. Shear's commentary is a model—thorough yet economical, conscientious, imaginative but not fantastic. Every scholar who deals with this period will need to face the implications of this inscription, and it will be some years before its

significance is fully clear. But Shear has laid a foundation for future work and has been attentive to a wide range of concerns. What follows is a tentative continuation of the discussion of just a few points of interest raised for the Ptolemaic historian by the decree for Kallias.

Shear has argued (72-73) that Ptolemy I acquired the Phoenician cities Tyre and Sidon in late 288 or early 287, and that this acquisition gave him the naval strength to take part in the coalition against Demetrius; he then places in early 285, as part of the negotiated peace, the acquisition by Ptolemy of the League of the Islanders (cf. chronological chart, p. 90). This reconstruction seems to me improbable. The argument (72) for 288/7 as the date of Demetrius' loss of Tyre and Sidon rests upon Newell's dating of a series of Tyrian didrachms now recognized as misread and to be attributed to an earlier period. Shear cites the article of I. L. Merker (*AncSoc* 5 (1974) 119-26) in which this subject is fully treated, but does not seem to have understood that the supports for the 288/7 date have been knocked out. Whether Ptolemy did capture Tyre and Sidon around the time of his recovery of Cyprus (294; Merker's 296/5 is based on a different dating of Athenian archons) or shortly before the Aegean expedition of 287 cannot be demonstrated on available evidence; but I now think 294 is the more likely date. At the least it is certain that the supposed evidence for 288/7 is no evidence at all.

Ptolemy's control over the islands is no more certain, but 285 is unlikely. The Ietan inscription for the Ptolemaic naval commander Zenon (*IG* XII 5 1004) refers to him as *ὁ καταλειφθεὶς ὑπὸ Βάκχωνος τοῦ νησιάρχου*. The incident for which he is honored stems from a stop by the fleet in Ios evidently en route to Greece for the offensive and is probably to be placed in 287, at the latest in 286. Bacchon is already nesiarch at this time and Ptolemaic control must therefore antedate this inscription. There is another consideration, moreover, the nesiarch Apollodoros of Kyzikos (for references see *Pros. Ptol.* VI 15035), who was active in the first two decades of the third century and must precede Bacchon as nesiarch. If he was a Ptolemaic appointee, Ptolemaic control of the League must antedate Bacchon's term of office. I have made a tentative case for his being a Ptolemaic official (*Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* [Leiden 1976] 137-38); Shear does not discuss the subject. Ptolemy was already strong enough at sea in 294 to retake Cyprus, and his hegemony in the Aegean could have begun then; but here again, the evidence is still inconclusive.

The nature of Ptolemaic control of the islands is also, to my mind, somewhat misconceived (p. 17 and n. 21). What is clear from an examination of the evidence is that garrisons are rather uncommon, being found only at key naval bases during the Chremonidean War (Keos, Methana, Thera), and that naval power plus diplomacy was the principal means of control (*Adm. Ptol. Poss.* 156). It is evidently not the case that "such mercenary garrisons came later to be the basic instrument of Ptolemaic hegemony over the islands of the Aegean."

As to the situation in the 280's, there is no evidence of any island garrison except the one on Andros mentioned in the new inscription; and we do not have any reason to assert that it was permanent rather than merely a temporary place of keeping troops until needed for action during the current war. Zenon was *not* stationed on Ios, but only visited it. There is no evidence in *Syll.*³ 390 of a 'Ptolemaic base' on Samos, and I do not believe that Pelops was a garrison commander there during the Chremonidean War (see *Adm. Ptol. Poss.* 83-84). Philothenos (*JG* XII 5 1066) was *not* resident on Keos. The Ptolemies in fact avoided garrisoning the islands, keeping permanently only a few crucial naval bases. Kallias' presence on Andros may have begun only in 287.

Every historian will find his own points of interest, and I have indicated only enough to show the value for Hellenistic history of the new evidence which Shear has presented to us with such care and competence.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

G. M. A. HANFMANN and N. H. RAMAGE. *Sculpture from Sardis: The Finds through 1975*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1978. Pp. xxi + 322; ill. \$30.00 (*Report; Archaeological Exploration of Sardis*, 2)

The first American expedition to Sardis under the leadership of H. C. Butler and T. L. Shear in the years 1910–11, 1914 and 1922 made notable contributions *inter alia* to architectural, epigraphic and numismatic studies. Regrettably, however, little attention—with the important exception of C. R. Morey's pioneering monograph on the sarcophagus of Claudia Antonia Sabina—seems to have been paid to sculpture; though a careful photographic record was kept, most of the sculpture recovered by that expedition remained unpublished. The balance has now been strikingly redressed by the publication of this book reporting on the discoveries of the second American excavations at the site between 1958 and 1975; surviving material from the first expedition is included.

The publication plans of the second expedition call for twenty volumes of reports and monographs, of which seven, including this one, have appeared already; two others are in press (May 1979), these on the *Ancient Glass* and on *Greek, Roman and Islamic Coins*, while a third, on the *Gymnasium Complex*, is in the final stage of editorial preparation. Thus, the great plan of excavation and promise of publication launched by George Hanfmann twenty years ago is coming to fruition. It is an achievement of heroic proportions at a time when rapidity of publication and sustained commitment to objectives are not always the most prominent of archaeological characteristics.