

## APPENDIX ONE. Philip II and the Career of Simus of Larissa: The Historical Evidence

The usual reconstruction of the career of Simus of Larissa as a collaborator with Philip II is based on various pieces of evidence from the historical sources. Difficulties of interpretation arise with each of these items. The first one occurs in the oration *On the Crown* (18.48, of 330 B.C.). As part of a list of Greek traitors, Demosthenes claims that a Eudicus and a Simus of Larissa were called friends of Philip until they had put Thessaly into Philip's hands. Neither the chronology nor the precise fate of those fallen from grace is made explicit, as so often in Demosthenes. He probably means to imply that Simus, along with the other Greek collaborators mentioned in the same passage, suffered exile as the penalty of Philip's lost friendship, but his language is not entirely clear on this point.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, it is an open question whether Demosthenes was correct, if this was his implication. Even if he knows the facts in

<sup>1</sup> Immediately after the list which includes Simus, Demosthenes says "Then the whole world has become full of traitors [reading *προδοτῶν* with all the manuscripts except S] exiled, treated violently, suffering every evil. What of Aristratus of Sicyon, and what of Perilaus of Megara? Are they not outcasts?" If the sentence beginning with "Then the whole world" refers in a generalizing way to the persons named in the list found in the preceding sentence (where the name of Simus occurs), it seems a bit odd that Demosthenes should then go on to cite additional specific examples of the generalizing statement. It is conceivable that the fate of the men in the first list was simply no longer to be regarded by Philip as special friends and therefore to have lost the benefits conferred by that status. The generalizing sentence would then introduce a new point in Demosthenes' description of the unhappy endings of those who collaborated with Philip, a point which is made specific by the mention of Aristratus and Perilaus. The usual interpretation is that this passage does presuppose the exile of all the men listed by Demosthenes. See Hermann Wankel, *Demosthenes. Rede für Ktesiphon. Ueber den Kranz* (Heidelberg, 1976), vol. 1, pp. 335, 339-41.

every case, Demosthenes can be quite cavalier in the assembling of a list of this sort. For example, Aristrotus of Sicyon and Perilaus of Megara, whom Demosthenes explicitly names as exiles after the list in which Simus occurs, reappear later in the same oration in a list which purports to name traitors who gave away their cities' freedom first to Philip and *now* to Alexander.<sup>2</sup> Equally instructive is the case of Euthycrates of Olynthus, another traitor to Philip. Demosthenes claims that he too was treated as one of the king's intimates until he and an associate had betrayed their city. Then, says Demosthenes, "they came to the worst ruin of all."<sup>3</sup> The orator Hypereides, however, reports that the same Euthycrates was alive and apparently a man of some influence even after 338 B.C.<sup>4</sup> Demosthenes is simply not to be trusted in the matter of the fate of those who helped Philip because the orator was at pains to show how the crimes of traitors did not pay. Truth took second place to exaggeration and even invention in the interest of Demosthenes' partisan message against collaboration. We cannot safely conclude on the basis of Demosthenes' oratory that Simus' fall from Philip's favor meant expulsion from Larissa.

Next, we learn from Harpocration's notes to Demosthenes' oration *On the Crown* that Eudicus was "one of those established by Philip as lords of all Thessaly," but his comment on Simus mentions no special office or power. Simus was, according to Harpocration, "one of the Aleuads who was among those who seem to have cooperated with the Macedonian."<sup>5</sup> Since Diodorus tells us that the Aleuads called on Philip for help against the tyrants of Pherae in the 350s B.C., it makes sense to regard Simus as one of those who brought the Macedonian king to Thessaly and supported his election as leader of the Thessalian confederacy.<sup>6</sup> These are the only pieces of evidence which can confidently be considered as referring to Simus' career during the period of Philip's influence in Thessaly. So far, then, the evidence appears

<sup>2</sup> 18.295-296.

<sup>3</sup> 8.40.

<sup>4</sup> Frag. 76 (*OCT*) = frag. B 19.1 (LCL, *Minor Attic Orators*, vol. 2).

<sup>5</sup> *S. v.* Εὐδικος; Σίμος.

<sup>6</sup> 16.14.1-2, 16.35, 16.38.1.

to indicate that Simus was already a prominent citizen of Larissa by the time Philip intervened in Thessaly, not that Simus owed his prominence to Philip. In fact, an earlier prominence would help to explain why Simus would have been an initially useful ally for Philip to select as one of his "friends" at Larissa.

Some extremely dubious evidence has been marshalled to reconstruct the later career of Simus. First comes an ambiguous passage in the *Politics* of Aristotle.<sup>7</sup> In a discussion of the causes of the overturning of oligarchies, Aristotle mentions the case of Larissa when it was under Aleuad rulership headed by Simus as an example of revolution in times of peace brought about by strife between factions in the oligarchy itself.<sup>8</sup> According to Aristotle, the factions chose a "mediating magistrate" backed by military force to resolve the difficulties. This magistrate did not operate as the factions had intended, however, but he instead used his position to acquire tyrannical power for himself, thereby overturning the oligarchy.

Aristotle unfortunately fails to make it clear who became mediating magistrate at Larissa in this episode, or when it took place. For example, Aristotle has been taken to mean that Simus

<sup>7</sup> 5.1306a26–31: ἐν δὲ τῇ εἰρήνῃ διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐγχειρίζουσι τὴν φυλακὴν στρατιώταις καὶ ἄρχοντι μεσιδίῳ, ὃς ἐνίστε γίνεται κύριος ἀμφοτέρων, ὅπερ συνέβη ἐν Λαρίσῃ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀλευαδῶν ἀρχῆς τῶν περὶ Σίμων, καὶ ἐν Ἀβύδῳ ἐπὶ τῶν ἑταιριῶν ὧν ἦν μία ἡ Ἰφιάδου.

<sup>8</sup> The ambiguity arises from several sources. Since the expression οἱ περὶ Σίμων could mean either "those associated with Simus" (cf. *Pol.* 5.1314b25) or simply "Simus" (cf. *Pol.* 5.1305b25–26), the exact translation is uncertain. It could be "at the time of the rule of the Aleuads associated with Simus," or "at the time of the rule of Simus the Aleuad." On these uses of *περὶ* in Aristotle, see Rudolf Eucken, *Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Aristoteles. Beobachtungen über die Praepositionen* (Berlin, 1868), p. 66; Hermann Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus* (Berlin, 1870), s. v. *περὶ* 3. Second, the name Σίμων is an emendation (Schlosser) for σάμων found in all the manuscripts and the Latin translation.

The story of murder and revenge involving a Simus to which Callimachus alludes is sometimes connected with this episode, but it does not help with chronology. See Callimachus frag. 588 (Pfeiffer); Ch. Habicht, "Epigraphische Zeugnisse zur Geschichte Thessaliens unter der makedonischen Herrschaft," in *Ancient Macedonia*, vol. 1 (Thessaloniki, 1970), pp. 266–268.

himself became the magistrate and therefore tyrant.<sup>9</sup> Alternatively, the same words have been interpreted to mean that Philip or one of his subordinates became magistrate to settle the factional strife that had arisen while Simus was in power.<sup>10</sup> Finally, the same passage has been viewed as evidence that an unspecified magistrate (neither Simus nor Philip) was chosen when strife arose at Larissa over the association of Simus and the Aleuads with Philip and Simus' "controversial position."<sup>11</sup> The difficulty is only compounded when one remembers that there is no guarantee that the episode described so briefly by Aristotle belongs to this period.<sup>12</sup> Aristotle's Simus could be the Simus of Demosthenes at an earlier date before Philip's appearance in Thessaly, or even a completely different person.<sup>13</sup>

The evidence used to establish the view that Simus was expelled by Philip in 344 B.C. inspires even less confidence. As we have seen, Demosthenes' testimony on this point is not

<sup>9</sup> See J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London, 1976), pp. 137–138.

<sup>10</sup> See Sordi, *LT*, p. 286, and *AJIN* 3 (1956), pp. 18–19.

<sup>11</sup> See Griffith, *HM*, pp. 525–526.

<sup>12</sup> The only independent argument offered in order to date the episode from the *Politics* is that Aristotle would have further identified Simus if he had not been describing a recent and familiar event involving the Simus who had collaborated with Philip. See H. D. Westlake, *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.* (London, 1935), p. 191, n. 1, and Sordi, *LT*, p. 365. But we cannot judge how familiar even the Simus of Philip's time would have been to Aristotle's audience, and a glance at this section of the *Politics* shows how wide ranging Aristotle was in his references. For example, he begins his discussion of revolutionary change in oligarchies with a reference to Lygdamis in the sixth century B.C. (5.1305a41), and the episode of Simus is linked with an otherwise unattested incident at Abydos involving the obscure Iphiades (5.1306a31).

<sup>13</sup> Ulrich Kahrstedt, "Grundherrschaft, Freistadt und Staat in Thessalien," in *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen aus dem Jahre 1924. Philologisch-historische Klasse* (Berlin, 1925), pp. 136–137, suggests that this episode took place between 394 and 364 B.C. For other possible candidates for this Simus besides the one involved with Philip, see Sordi, *LT*, p. 365. One can add that if the Simus who collaborated with Philip was a relatively young man at the time, his grandfather could have been active at Larissa early in the fourth century. By a well-known pattern of Greek nomenclature, they could have both been named Simus. This pattern was observed among the Aleuads, as the Daochus inscription shows (*SIG* 3 274).

necessarily reliable. The remaining evidence is certainly unreliable. In his narrative, Diodorus succinctly reports that in 344/3 B.C. Philip won the goodwill of the Thessalians "by expelling the tyrants from the cities."<sup>14</sup> Diodorus goes on to say that Philip's aim was to win over the Greeks once he had the Thessalians as allies. His plan succeeded: joining themselves with the decision of the Thessalians, the neighboring Greeks allied themselves with Philip. This passage is odd and disturbing because the clear implication is that Philip acquired the Thessalians as allies as a result of his actions in 344/3 B.C., which is absurd because Philip had done that long before in his interventions of the 350s B.C. In the light of the generally muddle-headed nature of the details of this passage, in which Diodorus seems to be at the very least amalgamating events of the 350s and the 340s, we cannot be certain of the accuracy of Diodorus' statement that Philip expelled tyrants from more than one city in 344/3 B.C. The only city where this certainly took place was Pherae, Philip's perennial trouble spot in Thessaly. If a second city is required, an obvious possibility would be nearby Pagasae, where the tyrants of Pherae had been established at the time of Philip's earlier expulsion of them. If tyrants had returned to Pherae by 344 B.C., they could also have returned to Pagasae. But it may simply be the case that Diodorus is generalizing here from a single case of the expulsion of tyrants.

Nevertheless, Larissa has been nominated as another city from which Philip expelled tyrants in 344 B.C. because the scholia to Demosthenes refer to the Aleuads as tyrants whom Philip expelled. It is a simple matter, however, to show that this testimony is worthless. Schol. Dem. 2.14 (Dindorf vol. 8, p. 92, on 22,7) incorrectly explains Demosthenes' reference to the "tyrannical house" which Philip recently helped the Thessalians combat as a reference to the Aleuads of Larissa. As Diodorus' account shows, at the time of this oration of Demosthenes the expression "tyrannical house" can only be a reference to the tyrants of Pherae whom Philip fought on behalf of the Aleuads. The scholiast has reversed the identification of the Aleuads and the

<sup>14</sup> 16.69.8.

tyrants of Pherae. The same mistake occurs in a more egregious fashion in schol. Dem. 1.22 (Dindorf vol. 8, p. 64, on 15,18). There, the scholiast essentially relates the story of Philip's intervention in Thessaly against the tyrants of Pherae in the 350s while managing to interchange the roles of Pherae and Larissa, the leader of the Thessalian confederacy against Pherae. Thanks to this outrageous blunder, the scholiast has Philip drive out the Aleuads, rather than the tyrants of Pherae, in the period before the events described in the oration to which the note is appended, i.e., in the period before the war with Olynthus in 349 B.C. This scenario is ridiculous, and it would be unjustified to say that the scholiast knows of a later expulsion of the Aleuads by Philip which he has retrojected into the 350s B.C. Nothing of historical value can be gleaned from these two scholia. We cannot use them as the basis for assuming that Philip expelled Simus and the other Aleuads in 344 B.C.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> One cannot use Polyaeus, *Strat.* 4.2.11, to argue that Philip expelled the Aleuads. Since Polyaeus says that Philip tried to take action against "some Aleuads," it appears that he was intervening in an Aleuad factional fight and no more. As it turned out, Philip failed to catch even the Aleuads he was after.