EMMANUEL MICROYANNAKIS

ΑΡΚΥΣ (WEB) OF VIEWS

The purpose of this paper is to present a new practice in historio-graphy: it is a historical composition in pursuit of a special mark along with the expression of my grierance.

The majority of publications are done in English; some of them are excellent but many are not. Sometimes a writer acts dishonestly; he takes a whole or a part of a written work, he modifies some points in the expression and he presents it as his own. His written sources come usually from a less speaking language. Obviously he hopes that his cheat will not be revealed. There are two versions of plagiarism; either the writer does not mention at all the sources or he mentions them in order to express objestion to certain points.

If in the future thanks to technological progress the written texts will be translated into any other language, then many «secreta» will be revealed to our surpise. I' ll give two examples. My first publication was in 1967 on Hellenistic Crete[1]. In 1970, three years later, my peer and compatriot St. Spyridakis from Crete as myself, wrote a thesis in English with the same subject[2]. He took my ideas and used the one half of my book. He did not mention my name.

In 1992, twenty five years after the publication of my thesis, S. Kreuter in Germany, wrote her thesis plagiarizing my ideas[3]. First she titled her thesis taking the subtitle of mine. Just a reading of the con-tents of her thesis proves that she used the same ideas, subjects, titles. Thus the two halves of my thesis were used to be made another two theses.

The above complaint is not only an expression of my sentiments.

---

1. «῾Η Κρήτη κατὰ τοὺς ῾Ελληνιστικοὺς χρόνους. Αἱ πολιτικαὶ ἰδίᾳ σχέσεις τῆς νή-σου μετ' ἄλλων πόλεων ἢ κρατῶν», ᾿Αθηνᾶ, Σειρὰ διατριβῶν 5, Athens 1967.

2. St. Spyridakis, *Ptolemaic Itanos and Hellenistic Crete*, Berkeley 1970.

3. S. Kreuter, *Aussenbeziehungen kretischer Gemeinden zu den hellenistischen Staaten im 3 und 2 Jh. v. Chr.*, München 1992. See my review in *Πλάτων* v. 49(1997), pp. 302-305.

I reduce my «indignatio» to present arguments contributing to scientific research. Here I' m not going to give with details or analyse my stances but to give a simple and brief description of the main and most representative of my published papers (it is the 1/3 of the whole).

In ordering my papers I took into consideration the periods of Ancient History (Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic), and exposed my points in a simple way.

The main points of my papers are the following (starting from the early Hellenic history and going to the Roman).

Βουλὴ κακὴ τῷ βουλεύσαντι κακίστη[4]

In Hesiod's *Works and Days* I argue that various versions in Greek and Hebrew literary tradition converge in Plotinus' work. Many distinctive features of Plotinus' character and personality are taken from Greek and Eastern civilization.

Themistocles and Delphi: two γνώμονες[5]

I argue that during the invasion of Xerxes Themistocles, κράτιστος γνώμων, came in contact with the oracle of Delphi and the Pythia ordered that the Athenians ought to evacuate Athens and fight in Salamis. The plan of Themistocles (the Πύθιος) and his collaboration with Delphi (ἄρας χρησμούς) saved Greece. Πύθιος means that he in fact replaced Pythia.

Solon's εὖ τελευτᾶν[6]

In the general headings in happiness Solon occupied a prominent position. Nevertheless, Solon's view of εὐδαιμονία brisks with many problems. Why in his judgement of πρωτεῖα (and δευτερεῖα) did he prefer Tellos (and the two Argeans Cleovis and Biton)? What criteria did he use?

I believe that Solon places special importance on the moment of death. Such was for example the case of Tellos whose great eudaimonia

---

4. *Βουλὴ κακὴ τῷ βουλεύσαντι κακίστη*, Athens 1989.

5. «Θεμιστοκλῆς καὶ Δελφοί: Δύο γνώμονες», *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν (ΕΕΦΣΠΑ)*, v. XXXII (1998-2000), Athens 2000, pp. 9-22.

6. «Εὖ τελευτᾶν τοῦ Σόλωνος καὶ *facilis exitus* τοῦ Ὀκταβιανοῦ Αὐγούστου», *Μνήμη Γ. Κουρμούλη*, Athens 1979, pp. 1-15.

at the moment of death came while he was rather an old man, after his deliberate participation in war activities, his βοή, his decisive interference that was made wholeheartily and brought victory to his compatriots.

Cleobis and Biton received the δευτερεῖα, dying in a similar way, while sleeping, after a praiseworthy action. This is the εὖ τελευτᾶν.

In this study several other problems are discussed: Tellos' struggle (ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι) was against the Eleusinians or Megarians? If we accept the first theory, Tellos could have participated in the final and decisive struggle of the Athenians against the Eleusinians which took place in the 13th century B.C. If we accept the second view, then Tellos and Solon are actually involved in the war for Salamis (in the 6th century B.C.), in which the Athenians were urged to participate but Solon and Tellos would complete it. We should not nevertheless dismiss the possibility that the name Tellos is fictitious and was made up by Solon because of its similarity with the root τέλειος, τέλος, τελευτή or τέλλω which means «to execute». If this assumption is correct, it falls conveniently with Solon's position to connect the end (τέλος) with εὐδαιμονία.

The dilemma of τεθνάναι or ζώειν was posed long before Shakespeare's Hamlet and τεθνάναι (τὸ μὴ εἶναι) was chosen.

Octavianus with the synonymous word εὐθανασία (facilis exitus), means (like Plutarch) a famous life and a peaceful end without pains (like it is considered nowadays).

A somewhat middle position is held by Thucydides as it is shown in his saying, found in the Funeral Oration (II, 44, 1), in which he states that happy are these οἷς ἐνευδαιμονῆσαί τε ὁ βίος καὶ ἐντελευτῆσαι ξυνεμετρήθη. In this elegant sentence the span of life is identified with the duration of εὐδαιμονία.

The Solonian element of τελευτή is also found in other parts of the Funeral. The meaning of τέλος was enriched by the Greek thought (in particular by Aristotle) and formed one of the basic meanings of philosophy and culture of the same importance as ἀρχή.

Tragedy of democracy[7]

I argue about the tragedy of continuous effort for establishing full democracy. However, all the attempts are never completed. At the end

7. «The Pathology of Democracy», Πρακτικὰ Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου «2500 χρόνια δημοκρατίας», Athens 1992, pp. 56-60.

rather they fail. The main points of this tragedy is the adventure (πε-
ριπέτεια), the basic characteristic of democracy, especially of the Athenian
democracy. The more the citizens are looking for establishing rhe con-
stitution of democracy, — especially the full type of it, the more the con-
stitution is undermined and finally is reduced to tyranny. Thus, what we
have to do? Democracy is flourished only when it is performed to a mo-
derate degree.

Aiginetans driven out of their Island[8]

The Athenians decided in 431 to drive the inhabitants of Aegina
out of their island in order to safeguard their front in the Saronic
Gulf for the fear of an imminent war, beçause the Aeginetans were con-
sidered dangerous enemies. The Aeginetans, as modern historians assert
in general, found refuge in Thyrea but the Athenians under Nicias at-
tacked them there, caught them and executed them. It is obvious that
Athenians wanted to annihilate the Aeginetans whereever they were found
in order to remove any chance of their returning to their homeland at
a later date under a new peace treaty,and regain their island on which
the Athenians had settled κληρούχους. Paradoxically, while the Aegine-
tans were supposed to be all executed, it is said that Lysandros gave
them back their island after 405. The question which naturally arises
is to whom? There is an obvious discrepancy here.

The present author expresses the view that not all the Aeginetans
were executed but part of them — if we pay attention to Thucydides'
explicit reference — ἐσπάρησαν κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα. Those must have
found refuge in Cydonia of Crete. The author brings forth the follo-
wing arguments. There were close ties because of their kinship and com-
mon religion between Aegina and Cydonia. While Crete remained neu-
tral in the Peloponnesian war, it is not coincidental that at the begin-
ning of the war, in 429, shortly after the expulsion of the Aeginetans
from their island by the Athenians, Cydonia, solely from all the Cretan
towns, was attacked by the Athenians. This is due to the fact that the
Athenians, in their desire to annihilate all Aeginetans whereever they
were found, attempted to exterminate those who found refuge in Cydo-
nia. This Athenian expedition preceded Nicias' expedition to Thyrea.
The Athenian expedition against Cydonia failed and the Aeginetans

---

8. «Ἡ τύχη τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐξοικισθέντων Αἰγινητῶν», *Κρητικὰ Χρονικά*,
v. XXXIII, Ἡράκλειον Κρήτης 1971, pp. 395-424.

who found refuge there were most probably those who returned and reinhabited Aegina in accordance with Lysandros' decision.

Ἐγχρονισμὸς of the Peloponnesian War[9]

With the term Ἐγχρονισμὸς I mean the enrollment, connection and relevance of the Peloponnesian war within the chronological systems composed in antiquity. The author points out Thucydides' attempt to examine the Peloponnesian War within certain termini and to place it among the accepted systems. He connects it with the wars of Troy, Persian war, the Athenian and Spartan eponymoi and the women priests of Argos. He only occasionally mentions the Olympic games. Of special interest are Thucydides' references to the Trojςn war and to the women priests of Argos. I believe that Thucydides chose to include also the system of the Argeans for serious reasons and not simply conventionally, in order to make mention of Hellanikos, as asserted by Prakken who understimates the serious undertaking of the Greek historian. Since women priests of Argos usually held their office for about half a century (Chrysis kept it for 56½ years), the whole time sequence of the past could be easily divided into big (and well understood) chronological divisions which reached and even superceded the Trojan events. This is of particular importance because with this system (which at the time of Thucydides was recorded by Hellanicos) one could easily find the distance of various events (therefore also of the Peloponnesian war) from the Trojan events and it is for this reason that Thucydides did not mention explicitly this chronological distance as he does in other similar cases (as for example speaking of the construction of Samian trirenes by the Corinthian Ameinocles in 704 B.C., (ἔτη μάλιστα τριακόσια ἐς τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου. Ι. 13, 3).

Based on Eusebios, the author connects also the Peloponnesian war with other big systems of antiquity. An attempt is also made to connect the Peloponnesian war with the systems which are not mentioned by Eusebios, as for example the system of στεφανηφόροι of Miletos. One στεφανηφόρος (ἐπώνυμος of Miletos) was honoured by the Athenians in this stephanephoria (314/13 B.C.) ἐπὶ Νικοδώρου ἄρχοντος, as it is attested in an Attican inscription. Because from the beginning of the Peloponnesian war until 314/13 the tables of Miletos and Athens do not have ge-

---

9. «Ἐγχρονισμὸς τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου», Πεπραγμένα Α' Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακῶν Σπουδῶν 1975, Athens 1976, v. II, pp. 77-85.

nerally any vacums, full correspondence is achieved between them as well as with the ephoroi of Sparta, of cource only within the restricted time span of the Peloponnesian war in which the names of the ephoroi of Sparta have been preserved in Xenophon's work. At the end the author points out the contribution of astronomy to the clarification of such problems and the importance of Petavius' work (17th cent.) and Ginzel's (20th cent.) for the understanding of such problems.

Note: It is obvious that this study must be further developed in a more expanded work.

Θουκυδίδεια[10]

I. Re-evaluation of the Past. Troica and Medica are not considered wars (πόλεμοι) but ἔργα by Thucydides. Troica and Medica have only beginning and (after ten years) one end. The Peloponnesian War on the other hand, whose the opponents entered the war with propensity and in ἀκμή, continued it in the same way and rather with increasing tension. But which are the other wars before the PW? The Lelantine and the war between the Aiginetans and the Athenians.

II. Τὰ δέοντα

The method chapter (I, 22) is perhaps the most celebrated passage of Thucydides' Work; particularly the point concerning the set speeches is considered to have been thoroughly examined. The meaning is focused on the words τὰ δέοντα which are thought to be the key concept to understand not only the passage but the set speeches to some extent as well. However, in spite of the weight the term obviously carries, it has been generally interpreted in an indefinite, weak and colourless way. The researchers accept that the word is derived from δέω which means need and they use the corresponding words or phrases: appropriate, what was called for, what was necessary or demanded, the essentials, the decisive elements, the sentiments. Some of these interpretations —for example the three last ones— stand off the meaning field of δέω = need.

I think that the word δέοντα derives from δέω or its usual contracted form δῶ which means bind/fetter/enchain. Δέοντα or δοῦντα are the binding

---

10. *Θουκυδίδεια.* Athens 1991 (I, pp. 17 ff. II, 21 ff. III 47-69. Cf. «Thucydides' Reevaluation of the Past», *Παρουσία*, v. XIII-XIV, 1998-2000, Athens, pp. 201-213.

or compelling circumstances. I also accept the connotations coming from
the meaning field of etymologically related words such as δίω = flight;
chase; hunt, and that very δέω interpreted as need. Δέοντα when meaning
«those that bind or drive to στενοχωρίαν —as in corresponding passages
of Theognis, Pindar, Euripides and Thucydides himself —along with all
its possible connotations mean: critical, depressing moments; extreme and
formidable.

Concerning τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων commentators empha-
size that the historian accepts that it was practically impossible for him
to know and remember in every detail whatever was said. Wouldn't it
be too naive for Thucydides to declare something self-understood? Are
the speeches delivered by ἕκαστοι in perhaps three decades so few in
number that could be read in a single day?

I believe that by saying τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν Thucydides suggests
a carefull sorting; selection; τὴν φυλοκρίνησιν of that was said here and
there so that only was associated with the most eminent moments of
the great war would be kept. In those critical moments Thucydides
sets the speakers and makes them say all that bind the drama. They are
the moments which mostly cause ἀπορίαν, despair and fear, moments
that strike you dumb. In this case, the historian offers his word. Thu-
cydides does not pick the easy circumstances when the orators speak
ἀδεῶς, he illuminates the critical moments, he is our guide out of despair.
Speakers express briefly seriousness, deadlock and dilemma. Word is con-
sistent with the key concept of the moment; and it is aimed straight
at the target.

Thucydides' work is said to be a tragedy. Then which is the δέσις
of the drama? It is just this, τὰ δέοντα and the narrative accompanying
them.

Now, something quite remarkable which is related to the structure
of the whole work and the absence of set speeches from book VIII: It
has been well emphasized that, after the disaster of the Athenian army
at Syracuse in 413 B.C., Athens was already going to her doom and
only struggled to retard her downfall.

In such a case, which part of the war consists the δέσις? That ac-
cording to Aristole spread ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι τούτου τοῦ μέρους ὃ ἔσχατόν ἐστι.

It is the war until the end of Σικελικά.

Syracuse is the ἔσχατον. From this point λύσις starts off. The con-
nection of δέοντα to δέσις clearly expresses why the set speeches are
placed in the δέσις of this drama.

III. Κρίσις τοῦ Μηδικοῦ «ὁμῶς»

The Thucydidean A 23,1 has raised a great many problems to modern scholars and, therefore, has been the cause of incessable debate among them. Which are the four battles that determined τὸ Μηδικόν? It is this point, as well as some others related to the passage, that are to be discussed here.

One of the things to be made clear in the first place is the differentiation that exists between the concepts τὸ ἔργον and ὁ πόλεμος, even if they converge to a smaller or greater extent. It is also worth pointing out that a task (even a war) may well include other rather partial tasks.

Etymologically relevant τὸ ἔρκος, ὅρκος, work, Werk, εἴργω, εἴργω, ὄργανον, ἄρκυς, arceo, arx, the word ἔργον is derived from the root *verg*- and is specified as a close organic unit (with self-sufficiency and a strict outline visualised from a specific standpoint); consequently, the object of every historical research, τὸ ἔργον, is already defined from inside.

After such an elucidation, τὸ Μηδικόν, a broader task, is assumed to comprise minor tasks, through which it soon came to an end. However, are indeed these minor tasks four in number? Could really Thucydides in so clear-cut, explicit and direct a statement leave us in confusion and imply battles that had ended in a defeat of the Greeks? Τὸ Μηδικὸν is generally believed to have been decided at Salamis and Plataiai and by far should be viewed in close connection with these two battles. There is only a corrected form of the passage that contributes to an interpretation convenient to historical fact at large, as follows:

Τῶν δὲ πρότερον ἔργων μέγιστον ἐπράχθη τὸ Μηδικὸν καὶ τοῦτο ὁμῶς δυοῖν, ναυμαχίᾳ καὶ πεζομαχίᾳ, ταχεῖαν τὴν κρίσιν ἔσχεν.

It would have been easy for a copyist to be tempted by δυοῖν to add an Ν to the words that come next. If on the other hand ΟΜΩΣ is taken not as ὅμως but as ὁμῶς, it could well be interpreted as: from an equal basis, towards the same direction, with equal gravity, together, hand in hand.

As a result of the corrections mentioned above, the four battles are thus reduced to two, Salamis and Plataiai, conceived as a whole that tipped the scale of the war.

Ἐπ' Ἀνταλκίδου εἰρήνη[11]

Two passages of Arrian (Anab. II, 1, 3-5 and 2, 2-3) form the focus

---

11. «Ἐπ' Ἀνταλκίδου εἰρήνη», *Ἀθηνᾶ*, v. LXXI, 1970, pp. 236-281.

of this paper. They refer to the treaties of the Persians with the Mytile-
nians and the Tenedians respectively. They were concluded ca. 333 B.C.,
i.e., over half a century after the famous peace treaty of Antalcidas
(386 B.C.) and 34 years after the death of Antalcidas. With these trea-
tises the two Greek cities were forced to break up their relations with
Alexander the Great and accept new enforced obligations. Arrian's two
references have been considered incorrect (Irrtümer) by modern scholars.
The present author after a thorough examination of all relevant sources
(mainly Xenophon, Diodor and Plutarch) has underlined the fact that the
peace treaty of 386 (ἡ βασιλέως εἰρήνη, or ἀνταλκίδειος) and other treaties
till 333 B.C. were all concluded based on one principle, that of Antal-
cidas (ἐπ' Ἀνταλκίδου). This principle was established after special nego-
tiations between Antalcidas on the one hand and Tiribazos and Arta-
xerxes II on the other. The key to understanding this principle is the
meaning of the term ἐπ' Ἀνταλκίδου which should not be interpreted as
«during the time of Antalcidas», but «according to the principle of Antal-
cidas». According to this principle Asia belonged to the Persians and
the Greek cities (beyond the Asiatic orbit) were autonomous. As a result
of this principle Mytilene and Tenedos, which were autonomous in 386
became Persian in 333 B.C. This detrimental for the Greeks principle
ended after the conquest of the Persian state by Alexander the Great.

Was Solon's legislation concerning the Treasures in force in the fourth century B.C.?[12]

Solon's law concerning the Treasurers (6th c. B.C.), if in force in
the 4th c. B.C., commanded for these magistrates to be selected from
among the class of the «pentacosiomedimni», i.e. the wealthiest of the
Athenian citizens. All scholars, however, have for a century or so (1891-
1992) interpreted the relevant passage of Aristotle in the «Constitution
of Athens» (47, 1; cf. 8, 1) in such a way as to imply that even the poorest
citizen had the possibility of beign reserved for this office by lot.

On the basis of such an interpretation the above mentioned law
appears to have a dual connotation (to be or not to be in force!) and
is furthermore indicative of an obvious contradiction. Consequently, scho-
lars seem to accept that the weathly or «possessing» higher classes were
disregarded, that they simply existed as a mere formality with no parti-
cular significance. Is this true? What can be inferred from other in-

---

12. «Ὁ περὶ τῶν ταμιῶν νόμος», Παρουσία, v. X, 1994, pp. 85-92.

stances? Actually, it appears incompatible with prevailing knowledge or what we already know.

A further consideration: Has the relevant passage of Aristotle in the «Constitution of Athens» been rightly interpreted? The crucial phrase in the original is: ἄρχει δ' ὁ λαχὼν κἂν πάνυ πένης ᾖ.Whom does this phrase refer to? To the Treasurers or to some other magistrates? In this process of these observations it may well be suggested that such a magistrate was the archon ἐπώνυμος, the ἄρχων par excellence (cf. ἀναρχία: lack of ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος).

Observations on the «Cretan state» of Plato[13]

The author discusses at the beginning the important subject of the established politeia's number of houses (not of the citizens, as Ehrenberg writes). The number of the houses is mentioned as 5.040. This particular number has puzzled not only specialists in Platonic and ancient studies but moreover, political theorists and sociologists. Why not 5,000 or 10,000? Wilamowitz, in his famous (in two volumes) work on Plato expresses the opinion that Plato arbitrarily (beliebig) and «ganz unbehindert nach Wunsh» chose that number, simply («dediglich») because it allows convenient divisions. I believe that in contrast to Wilamowitz's view, Plato deliberately chose the number 5.040. Plato proposed the number 5.040 inspired by his mathematical mind, taking silmutaneously into consideration various geopolitical and humanistic factors. In a politeia which would be composed on a mathematical basis, the concern for the number would be kept steadily and the 37 νομοφύλακες would be like the mind in humans. As the mind cannot be divided likewise the ἄρχοντες would not be specialized in any particular fields, except only for short intervals. The νομοφύλακες are not without any control in a πολιτεία, where I emphasize, there is no division of labour and authority but mutual checking. Actually, the εὔθυνοι are ὑπεύθυνοι.

A Platonic Leader (Euphraios)[14]

A member of the Platonic Academy is beign sent to Macedonia to organise the state of monarchy. The very same member later on fights for democracy in Euboia. Was he an opportunist?

---

13. «Διαρθρωτικά προβλήματα τῆς Κρητικῆς πολιτείας (Νόμων) τοῦ Πλάτωνος», Πεπραγμένα Δ' Κρητολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου (1976), Athens 1980, v. Α'(1), pp. 341-351.

14. «Εὐφραῖος ὁ 'Ωρείτης», Πρακτικά Γ' Πανελληνίου Συνεδρίου Φιλοσοφίας, «Ἀθήνα καὶ 'Εσπερία», Athens 2001, pp. 181-192.

I believe not. He was able to find «the voice of each constitution» that saves it and therefore in Macedonia he introduces in monarchy elements of democracy (aiming for an aristocratic state) and in Euboia he introduces elements of monarchy and even aristocracy going for the same result.

I believe that in both cases he «ἐμετρίαζε».

Demos in Flourishing Politeiai[15]

The author discusses Aristotle's view and criticism about the «demoi» of three flourishing politeiai of his time, i.e., political systems which existed at his time and enjoyed good reputation i.e., Lacedaemonian, Cretan and Carthaginian. From the careful examination of Aristotle's work we can conclude that Lacedaemonians' δῆμος is satisfied, because it is from it that the ἔφοροι are selected: therefore it participates in the μεγίστη ἀρχή. Nevertheless, in the Lacedaemonian ἐκκλησία the citizens' power is restricted to the acceptance or rejection of any suggested proposals. The citizens never speak. In Crete there is good social structure, but in the general councils, citizens have the power simply to approve any proposals. Finally in Carthage there is no good politicosocial structure but the demos has the right to object to suggested proposals (καὶ ἀντειπεῖν ἔξεστιν).

In conclusion it is evident that no absolute superiority of any demos exists, since each has its own merits and drawbacks.

The Diplomatic Contacts between Alexander III and Dareius[16]

The author, based on letters which are transmitted mainly by five authors, examines the nature of the dialogue between Alexander the Great as representative of the Greek (actually European) world and Darius, «the king of Asia». The order of sending these letters and the particular disposition of the two parties are discussed.

The author expresses the view that perhaps there were three stages in the development of the relations between Dareios and Alexander instead of two as usually accepted. Moreover, he discusses the possibility

---

15. «Ὁ δῆμος εἰς τὰς "εὐδοκιμούσας" πολιτείας κατ' Ἀριστοτέλη, «Λειμωνάριον», Ν. Τωμαδάκη», Athens 1973, pp. 402-415.

16. Ὁ Διακρατικὸς διάλογος κατὰ τὴν Ἀρχαιότητα. Αἱ μεταξὺ Ἀλεξάνδρου Γ' καὶ Δαρείου Γ' διπλωματικαὶ ἐπαφαί, Athens 1969.

that Dareios' offers to Alexander followed an accelerated pace in accord-
ance to Alexander's constantly continuing, military successes, without
ignoring the other political factors which contributed to this develop-
ment. The author also expresses the view that during the two hundred
years of the Greek Persian drama this dialogue, which followed a parallel
line with military events (from November 333 until October 331 B.C.)
reflects the culmination of the Greek Persian relations.

Self comparisons of Alexander the Great[17]

It is of great interest to study in a comprehensive work the myriad
comparisons of various personalities which were compared with Alexan-
der the Great in ancient history. I started originally to work on this
project limiting myself to the chronological terminus of the 4th cent.
A.D. Finally I decided to limit myself in the above paper only to the
comparisons made by Alexander the Great himself with various personali-
ties. In that case Alexander was simultaneously the judged one and the
judge as well. Mortals and immortals who were compared with Alexander
by himself are examined and Alexander's views are studied.

The Dynasty of Antipatridai[18]

In this work I have examined the matters of political nature caused
by the House of Antipatros (The Antipatridae as it would be possible
to call them) and also the reasons which in my opinion allow us to con-
sider it as a separate dynasty, basically consisting of Cassandros and
his sons.

---

17. «Συγκρίσεις τοῦ Μ. Ἀλεξάνδρου», Γ΄ Διεθνὲς Συμπόσιο Ἀρχαίας Μακεδονίας
1977, Θεσσαλονίκη 1983, pp. 169-183. In a paper presented in the International Con-
gress «The Macedonians in Athens 323-229 B.C.» (Proceedings will be published
soon) I argue that Aristotle and Alexander gradually disappointed each other. Ari-
stotle expected Alexander to support his research and Alexander was eager to re-
ceive an ἔπαινος from Aristotle, especially when Alexander claimed divine honours
for himself. Aristotle in my opinion responded in the most painful and even insulting
way for Alexander. Aristotle did not comply with Alexander's wishes. On the con-
trary; Aristotle praised the tyrant Hermeias instead. So he ignored Alexander.
This would provoke Alexander's fury. We do not know whether Aristotle produced
poison for Alexander but what he wrote was more potent. The bitterness was fatal
to both of them. As Aristotle himself maintained the πάθη of the soul effect the
bodies and sometimes we could say they lead to death.
18. Δυναστεία Ἀντιπατριδῶν, Athens 1972.

In order to attain the goal set in this research, I have examined mainly the methods employed by the first of the Antipatridae to achieve his accession to the throne and the disappearance of the last of them (so that the dynasty can be placed chronologically in relation to the other ones) and the legal status of each one of its members.

The conclusions arising from my research demonstrate that between the big and well-known dynasties of Temenidae (or Argeadae) and the Antigonidae the tumultuous period of the Successors is partly covered by a separate dynasty which contains Cassandrus, Philip IV, Antipatros I, Alexandros V, and Antipatros II. Two more kings, Ptolemy Keraunos and Meleagros, are connected by blood bondage to this short-lived dynasty (as children of Eurydike, daughter of Antipatros and wife of Ptolemy I, Soter). They do not however belong to the dynasty because they were related to Antipatros through one female member of the family while the succession followed the male line.

Cassandros' Cultural Achievements[19]

Cassandros is considered in general as extinctor and «δήμιος τοῦ βα-σιλικοῦ γένους» of the famous household of Temenidai, after his killing of Olympia, Roxane, Alexander IV, and others. Modern scholarship considered Cassandros' activities against Alexander's family as caused solely by his personal animosity. The author believes that this is an over-simplification and that we should take into consideration other factors as well, in particular political calculations. The author meticulously examines Cassandros' political activities, in particular the establishment or reestablishment of cities. In such cases the study of the various factors and political calculations is easier— as for example that of Cassandreia, Thebes, Stratos, Sauria, Agrinion, Antipatria and Thessaloniki (the last one's establishment is placed eleven years later; instead of the traditional date in 316 it is placed in 305 B.C.).

The special conditions which dictated the establishment or reestablishment of each city and the reactions which were created, of a rather political nature, are presented. It is evident from Cassandros' activities that he was a shrewd politician who in the struggle among the Diadochoi manifested unusual sharpness and sagacity.

Concerning his political motivations, the author believes that Cas-

---

19. «Τὸ πολιτιστικὸν ἔργον τοῦ Κασσάνδρου», B' Διεθνὲς Συμπόσιον1 973, Θεσσα-λονίκη 1977, pp. 225-236.

sandros was undoubtedly moved by a constant effort to discredit Alexander's great contribution to history, but although he was motivated by such personal animosity, he acted with such calculated prudence that his activities brought certain benefits to his country.

Restriction of Slave Trade[20]

The treaty for the restriction of slave trade was concluded between the town of Miletos on the coast of Asia Minor and twenty eight towns of Crete, which were divided into three unions (under Cnossos, Gortys and Phaistos). The author, based on the historical and linguistic evidence, shows that this treaty cannot be dated from the year 259-232 B.C. as asserted by H. van Effenterre and M. Guarducci, but instead it should be placed in 293/2. Accordingly, the treaty of «᾿Ορείων» and Maga of Cyrene should be dated ca. 275 B.C., and the first alliance between the Seleucids and Lyttians ca. 265-261 B.C.

Crete in the Hellenistic Age[21]

The author makes an attempt to trace the political isolation of Crete after the Homeric era caused by a deliberate effort of the ruling class of the Cretan towns to seal the island against any foreign influences.

There was close affinity in the political and social systems applied by the numerous towns of Crete. In order to safeguard the political and social status quo the ruling class of all Cretan towns strongly allied together alienating the «demoi» of Crete from the democratic towns of the mainland of Greece. Thus the «demoi» were shut off from the democratic centers from where new ideas could be brought and could incite social upheaval and revolutions. As Aristotle characteristically remarked, the remoteness of Crete («πόρρω») preserved its system.

The author also deals with the imperialism of Cretan States, the use of mercenaries from other places and the important and abrupt change which took place with the advent of Alexander the Great and his expedition. Crete suddenly from a remote state in the periphery of the Greek world became the center on which various rivaling Macedonian and anti-Macedonian factions focused their interest. Thus a chain rea-

---

20. «Χρονολόγησις τῆς συνθήκης Rehm, Delphinion 140», Πεπραγμένα Β' Διεθνοῦς Κρητολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου, v. II 1968, pp. 130-134.
21. See note 1.

ction of continuous changes appears in each Cretan town, interrupting
the monotonous stalemate of the previous times, and new demosratic
tendencies prevail.

A temporary union of all Cretan towns, except Lyttos, can be pla-
ced ca. 237/6, 229/8 B.C. Lyttos after heavy fighting was destroyed
(221/20 B.C.). Finally the author discusses the relations of Cretan towns
with Philip V and briefly the subject of Cretan piracy.

Duration of Demetrius II 's reign (συμβασιλεὺς and μόνος βασιλεύς)[22]

The duration of the reign of Demetrios II of the dynasty ofAnti-
gonidae became the topic of many debates by a great number of scholars
(A. M. Woodward, M. Andronicos, J. M. R. Cormack, J. and L. Robert,
A. Aymard, E. Manni, P. Trèves, E. Will, M. Chambers, J. Pouilloux,
L. Moretti, R. M. Errington and others). The traditional time of the
duration of his reign based on all sources is 10 years or more than 27.
The great difference in these numbers is due to the fact that some scho-
lars followed Polybios (mainly), while others based their dating on an
inscription found in Veroia (Polybios, II, 44.2 and M. Andronicos Ἀρ-
χαῖαι Ἐπιγραφαὶ Βεροίας, Thessaloniki 1950, p. 9 ff., respectively). In order
to explain this disparity I tried in my work to amend the text of Poly-
bios which would change the μόνον of Δημητρίου δὲ βασιλεύσαντος δέκα
μόνον ἔτη into μόνου. With this emendation Demetrios' reign is divided
in two parts: the time he was συμβασιλεὺς with his father Antigonus
Gonatas and in the decade (239-229 B.C.) that he was the sole king.
Moreover, the problem of συμβασιλεία in Macedonia is illuminated and
the εὔροια πραγμάτων of the Achaean Confederacy is explained, during
the second stage of Demetrius' reign.

---

22. «Περίοδοι τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Δημητρίου Β' (Συμβασιλεὺς καὶ μόνος βασιλεύς)»,
Ἀρχαία Μακεδονία, IV, Thessaloniki 1986, pp. 393-399. In another paper («The
Chremonideam War and Demetrius II, Ancient Macedonia», v. II, 1997, Thess.
1999, pp. 753-761) I accept two periods of kingship as regards both Antigonus II
and Demetrius II. Both kings, father and son, have a period of their reign common
as well as each of the two was for another period μόνος (alone). When did Demetrius
start to be a king? I argue that the Chremonidean War (267-261 B.C.) is the most,
suitable spatium; to be more concrete, in the year 262, when Demetrius was 13
puer admodum. Many aspects of Hellenistic history are becoming clear and can now
be easily and rationally put at a spatium between 250-229. Demetrius' wars on many
levels, his entire activity during the 33 years of his reign, convince us not only that
he is not the ἀσημότατος (the «unbedeutendste») king of Makedonia, but, on the
contrary, he was one of the most active kings of the dynasty.

*Oreioi*²³ *('Ορειοι)*

Many scholars were looking for locating the city of "Ορειοι (IG, VI 723) at Laconia, at the island of Euboia, or it was considered to be oppidum ignotum. Following the inscription and literary sources, I argue that "Ορειοι was located at Crete. It is the confederation of "Ορειοι. I assume that the man mentioned in the above inscription died in Corinth and was buried in Sparta (in 265 B.C.).

*Antigonus Doson: Σελλασία μάχη*²⁴

The below inscription of four verses (I) concerning Antigonus III is completed by Holleaux (II) and me (III) thus

I   II   III

Βασιλεὺς 'Αντίγο   Βασιλεὺς 'Αντίγο[νος βασιλέως   Βασιλεὺς 'Αντίγο[νος
Δημητρίου κα   Δημητρίου κα[ὶ οἱ Μακεδόνες   Δημητρίου Κα[λοῦ
καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι   καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι [ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ   καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι
Σελλασίαν μά   Σελλασίαν μά[χης 'Απόλλωνι   Σελλασίαν μά[χην

I argue that the completion of Holleaux is wrong because Demetrius ὁ Καλὸς was never a king and there is no ground to say that there were three political factors: the king, the Macedonians and the allies. Holleaux besides redoubles the text of inscription whereas only some syllables are appropriate to fill the lacking words. The word Σελλασία on the other hand has the same root with the words σέλας, Ἑλλὰς and means the splendid and glorious victory decisive for all the Greeks.

*Efforts for Disarmament*²⁵

In this short study it is emphasized that Polybios' information that in ancient times treaties were μήτ' ἀδήλοις βέλεσι μηθ' ἐκηβόλοις χρήσασθαι κατ' ἀλλήλων, is the first mentioned effort for disarmament (partial

---

23. «"Ορειοι τῆς Κρήτης στὴ Λακωνία», Α' Συνέδριο Λακωνικῶν Μελετῶν Athens 1983, pp. 268-272.

24. «Ἡ πολιτειακὴ θέση τοῦ 'Αντιγόνου Γ' (τοῦ Δώσωνος)», ΕΕΦΣΠΑ, v. XXVIII (1975-1985), Athens 1985, pp. 413-422.

25. «Προσπάθειες ἀφοπλισμοῦ κατὰ τὴν 'Αρχαιότητα»: «Μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις», Νέοι 'Ορίζοντες, 178 (1978), pp. 19-22.

of course) in history. When was that period in which it was agreed to
fight only with short distance weapons (ἀγχέμαχα) and the use of arrows
was prohibited? According to Strabo (I, 12) the Eretrians and Chalci-
dians, fighting against each other in Lelantine' war in Euboia, decided
to engage in fighting under certain restrictions and it was inscribed in
a stele of the ἱερῷ τῆς ᾿Αμαρυνθίας ᾿Αρτέμιδος the recommendation and
instruction to the fighters μὴ χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις.

῾Επταδικά[26]

In I. Kalitsounakis' work, «*Eptadikai Ereunai*» (Researches on number
seven) *Athena* 53, 1921, pp. 107-199, written in Ancient Greek language,
I have to add to all these versions of seven (eptades, ebdomades v.z.
groups of seven) one more found in the Lord's prayer (Math. 6, 9-15)
included in Jesus' Speech on the mountain.

The division of Christians' requests in seven parts is explained if
we consider their influence by Hebrew preference to number seven. My
final conclusion was based on St. Augustinus' work who stressed that
the power of the Holy Spirit takes seven forms (septiformis) and in the
Speech on the Mountain the «septenarius iste numerus» is dominating.
However, St. Augustinus did not notice that the number seven is found
in the center of the great Speech, in the Lord's prayer.

Δράκων οὗτος[27]

Concerning Psalm 103,26 I argue that the word δράκων in the phrase
δράκων οὗτος ὃν ἔπλασας ἐμπαίζειν αὐτῇ does not mean Leviathan, whale
or crocodile but ὄφις (snake), taking into consideration that the whole
Psalm is a poetical short expression of the Genesis and, I think, that
one essential element in this book is the snake, the cleverest of the
animals (the mind). Through it man managed to create technology (eg.
the ship). Δράκων is taken in the meaning of technology συνεκδοχικῶς.

National Identity[28]

How the national identity is formed? What is this itself? It's the

---

26. «῾Εβδομὰς χριστιανικῶν αἰτημάτων», Παρνασσός, v. XXXI 1989, pp. 188-192.
27. «Δράκων πλασθεὶς ἐμπαίζειν», ᾿Ανάπλασις, 391 (2001), pp. 13-15.
28. «῾Ελλάδος "σῆμα" (σημαία)», ΕΕΦΣΠΑ, v. XXXI, Athens 1997, pp. 51-63.

same: A=A. It's something little that human mind (which divides and gives meaning to things) would like to have it spaceless (ἀδιάστατον) simply as a mark (stigma, stigme). Though little, could mark the whole (holon) as a sign (sema). The visible sign of the nation is the flag which is specified by leaders. The auditory sign of the nation is the national anthem. Everything is gathered in a special mark. That's why a mark is a gathering (synaxis), a symbol, which though brief (in brevi) contains the species (eidos, idion). Without a sign (sema), we find ourselves in trouble or in obscurity of a labyrinth. Greeks are by nature heretics and pagans, that's why they portrayed even Jesus; His face has so many times been described and written about. I would say that in Byzantium the war against pictures was fully developed since «picture» (eikon) is a representation in a statue or in a painting. The victory of Orthodox against enemies of holy pictures in 9th cent. A.D. did not come to an end since orthodox church did not agree with the representation of holy persons in sculpture.

Ἀρχή, ἄρκυς[29]

Arche does not exist alone, but always in relation to something. It may be perceived either as the starting point of an action, or as the area (extent) into which arche wells up to specific limits. All this is relevant to the extent and the quantity of arche.

As far as quality is concerned, arche's capacity to endure is of great importance. This kind of quality is expressed through the meaning of plot, which again forms a wide notional field.

Within the whole philosophical, historical and scientific field, in general, we observe that arche (ἄρχειν τινὸς) is inextricably interwoven into the meaning of plot. There is no arche without plot and, vice versa, there is no plot without arche. It is indicative that everything derives from a point and in the same way, everything returns to it being all the strings in connection.

The Greek language provides the frame for deeper investigation (and may be confirmation) of the relation between arche and plot. (As far as I know, we might come across this kind of relation, up to some

29. «'Ἀρχή: Διπλασιασμὸς, πύκνωση (διὰ πλοκῆς) τοῦ νοηματικοῦ τῆς πεδίου», *ΕΕΦΣΠΑ*, v. XXXIII (2000-2001), Athens 2001, pp. 9-19. Id. «A New Intepretation of ARCHE», *Diotima, Review of Philosophical Research*, v. 30 (2002), pp. 7-17. Id. «Love of Honour and Arche», *Philosophical Enquiry*, v. XXIV, 2002, pp. 23-30.

extent, in other related languages too). The verification is «radical» since the root (radex) of ἄρχω, as I believe, appears in the forms αρχ-αργ- and αρχ-. This root (whence a lot of words springs) is common at the words ἄρκυς (network, plot) ἄκρον, ἕρκος εἴργω, εἴργω, ἀρκέω (and also arx, arceo, arguo).

What do we observe? The derivatives of the root αρκ- (αργ-, αρχ-) cover the whole notional field of arche (and plot.).