

THESSALY AND MACEDON AT DELPHI

Emma M.M. Aston

Abstract: The Daochos Monument at Delphi has received some scholarly attention from an art-historical and archaeological perspective; this article, however, examines it rather as a reflection of contemporary Thessalian history and discourse, an aspect which has been almost entirely neglected. Through its visual imagery and its inscriptions, the monument adopts and adapts long-standing Thessalian themes of governance and identity, and achieves a delicate balance with Macedonian concerns to forge a symbolic rapprochement between powers and cultures in the Greek north. Its dedicator, Daochos, emerges as far more than just the puppet of Philip II of Macedon. This hostile and largely Demosthenic characterisation, which remains influential even in modern historiography, is far from adequate in allowing for an understanding of the relationship between Thessalian and Macedonian motivations at this time, or of the importance of Delphi as the pan-Hellenic setting of their interaction. Looking closely at the Daochos Monument allows for a rare glimpse into the Thessalian perspective in all its complexity.

Keywords: Daochos, Philip II of Macedon, the Daochos Monument, Delphi, Thessaly.

Introduction

Reconstructing Thessaly's early involvement in Delphi and its Amphiktyony draws the scholar towards the shimmering mirage of Archaic Thessalian history. Like all mirages, it is alluring, and represents something which the viewer wishes keenly to find: in this case an ambitious, powerful, energetic Thessaly extending its influence outside its own borders and claiming a stake in wider Greek affairs.¹ Also in the nature of mirages, when grasped it proves insubstantial. It is made, in large part, of legend – figures such as Aleuas and Skopas, who plainly were important historical figures but whose deeds are

¹ See for example Larsen 1968: 13. Here the strong and ambitious Thessaly of the Archaic period is described as 'the original Thessaly' – the 'weakened Thessaly' of the fifth and fourth centuries is seen as degenerate successor to this powerful state. Sordi places the Thessalian heyday later, at the end of the sixth century and the opening years of the fifth: it is in this period that she locates the activities of Skopas and Aleuas, who establish control over Thessaly and its *perioikis*; Delphic involvement, in her view, follows as a secondary stage. For critical discussion of her views, see Helly 1995: 134–137.

overlaid by the fantastic² and are in any case hard to tether to specific times. More notably still, with very few exceptions the ancient testimonies on which the reconstruction of early Thessaly and Delphi rests derive from the fourth century BC or later. The First Sacred War is the perfect encapsulation of this situation. It *may* represent Thessalian control of one of the crucial early phases of the Delphic Amphiktyony's development in the early sixth century, but the episode is hopelessly hard to reconstruct convincingly;³ more specifically, the role of the Thessalian Eurylochos as the commander of the forces against Krisa is only detailed explicitly by Pindaric *scholia*, although it is likely that these drew on the fourth century *Register of Pythian Victors* compiled apparently by Aristotle and Kallisthenes.⁴ Aristotle was also responsible for the *Constitution of the Thessalians* to which we are indebted for our (very limited) knowledge of Aleuas and his reforms.⁵ A direct link between Aleuas and Delphi has to wait as late as Plutarch.⁶

The date of the earliest mentions of Aleuas alerts us to something which is either frustrating or significant, depending on one's point of view: the extreme importance of the fourth century BC as a time when Thessalian history was being written about. This is frustrating if one is trying to recover sixth century events: every lead one follows abruptly deposits one two centuries later. But if one is prepared to relinquish the mirage of the Archaic Thessalian heyday the fourth century can in fact provide fruitful territory for the reconstruction of various Thessalian ambitions and preoccupations, in which Delphi has an undeniably important role to play.

That said, the fourth century presents a new factor which may appear to muddy the waters: the involvement of Macedon. From the moment when Philip II becomes involved at Delphi, Thessalian activity in the sanctuary has Macedonian 'fingerprints' all over it, and it becomes distinctly difficult to disentangle the agendas of the two northern powers. The Thessalian Amphiktyons, for all their sudden gratifying visibility in the epigraphic record, can start to seem mere puppets, worked by strong Macedonian hands. It is easy for the historian of Thessaly to deplore this situation, concerned as he or she naturally is with lifting Thessalians out of their perennial obscurity. However, it is dangerous to become too preoccupied with sole agency, especially at Delphi, a place where interaction was paramount. In this article, I shall argue for the value of seeing the sanctuary in

² Especially Aleuas: according to the Hellenistic author Hegemon (*FGrH* 110 F 1 = Ael. *De Nat. An.* 8.11) he inspired erotic affection in a serpent. Helly obviates the implications of such tales by positing two figures called Aleuas: a purely legendary one, and a historical leader of the sixth century responsible for political reform (Helly 1995: 118–124). I should rather suggest that by the time of Hegemon's writing – and possibly earlier – it was amply possible to endow the historical Aleuas with mythical qualities and deeds. The far more famous example of Alexander the Great shows how an undoubtedly real person may become embellished with elements of the legendary and the fabulous almost as soon as he has perished.

³ For an argument of extreme scepticism, see Robertson 1978, who claims that the war was wholly and entirely a fourth century invention designed to legitimise Macedonian involvement at Delphi. For a less stark discussion of the historical uncertainties and their implications, see Hall 2007: 276–283.

⁴ What remains of the *Register* is Aristotle frs. 615–617 Rose. We also have an inscription (*SIG*³ 275) recording formal Amphiktyonic praise of Aristotle and Kallisthenes for their work. For discussion of the text of the inscription, see Rhodes/Osborne 2003: 392–395. For the influence of the *Register* on the Pindaric *scholia*, see Robertson 1978: 54–60.

⁵ Aristotle frs. 497–498 Rose.

⁶ Plut. *De Frat. Am.* 21.

the fourth century as a place where Thessalians and Macedonians could stage a delicate symbolic interaction founded on shared northern culture, myth and religion.

The main example used to demonstrate this will be Daochos of Pharsalos and his Monument, the first actual building commissioned by a Thessalian at Delphi, which housed a series of statues of Daochos and his family, each accompanied by an inscription detailing the person's activities and virtues. The dating of the Monument is uncertain (the controversy is discussed in detail below), but the most probable theories place it between 337 and 332 BC – that is, either in the last two years of Philip II's life or in the first four years of the reign of Alexander. Considerable archaeological and art-historical attention has been granted to the Daochos Monument in recent decades, and the present article does not attempt to add to that sphere of work; it will not, for example, reflect at length on the stylistic features of the structure or of the statues within it. On the other hand, there has never yet been a detailed discussion of its expressive power set in proper context – that of recent Thessalian history and the Thessaly/Macedon relationship. It has tended to be read simply as an advertisement of lineage, but as this article will show it bears a great deal more significance than that.

1. Some historical background

The strong and abiding links between Thessaly and the Argead kings of Macedon have recently started to achieve more recognition from scholars working on northern Greek culture.⁷ Throughout the Classical period we receive sporadic glimpses of a relationship between the Argeads and the Larisaian Aleuadai,⁸ which Graninger is surely right to identify as a case of *xenia* between families;⁹ certainly it has not the consistency of a formal alliance, for it seems flexible enough to survive some serious temporary deviations such as Amyntas III's alliance with Jason of Pherai in 371 BC.¹⁰ The Macedon/Pherai rapprochement, however, died with Jason; thereafter on a number of occasions the Macedonian kings sent aid to the Aleuadai against the rulers of Pherai, and it is this emerging pattern which provides the backdrop for Philip II's Thessalian connections, connections which were of the greatest possible importance in furthering his southward ambitions.¹¹ Philip was called in by the Aleuadai to aid them against Lykophron of Pherai in around 353; his subsequent defeat of Lykophron allowed him to accomplish an ideo-

⁷ For example, the recent *Blackwell Companion to Ancient Macedonia* contains an article on Macedon and Thessaly (Graninger 2010). Earlier extensive discussion of political and cultural overlap between Macedon and Thessaly may be found in Hatzopoulos 1994.

⁸ For example, when the Spartan general Brasidas marches north through Thessaly in 424, he is aided by one Nikonidas of Larisa, a friend of the Macedonian king Perdikkas: Thuc. 4.78.2. At the end of the fifth century, Archelaos appears to have become deeply involved in Larisaian politics; Thrasymachos' fragmentary *On Behalf of the Larisaians* bewails the 'enslavement' of the Larisaians to the Macedonian king, but the precise details of the king's intervention are unknown; it is likely that he provided support for the ruling oligarchic faction.

⁹ Graninger 2010: 310.

¹⁰ Diod. 15.60.2.

¹¹ For detailed analysis of Philip's relations with Thessaly, see Sprawski 2005.

logically powerful ‘freeing’ of Pherai and a settlement of the whole of Thessaly, obscure in its details but no doubt highly advantageous to his interests.¹² Philip gained immense influence in Thessaly, which he cemented in his own typical style with two strategic marriages, with Philinna of Larisa and with Nikesipolis of Pherai. These marriages illustrate the way in which Philip, ever adroit, balanced inherited Larisaian connections with other, newer ties.

Thessaly was for Philip a gateway to Delphi, geographically and metaphorically. At the Thessalians’ invitation he led their forces in the Third Sacred War which was waged against the Phokians and their allies (including Athens and Sparta) from c. 354 to 346 BC.¹³ When the Phokians, defeated, were stripped of their two votes in the Amphiktyonic council, these votes were awarded to Philip instead. Thus, overall, we can see that the relationship between Thessaly and Macedon in the Delphic sanctuary was no superficial or short-term phenomenon, but rather is one of the many instances of Philip exploiting long-standing arrangements, with a generous admixture of luck, to manoeuvre himself into positions of the greatest influence.

Alexander the Great largely continued his father’s relationship with Thessaly and certainly inherited his recognition of the region’s usefulness. In the wake of Philip’s assassination, the region joined in to some extent with the surge of anti-Macedonian feeling in Greece, but briefly and without success:¹⁴ Alexander overcame resistance at Tempe, and, marching south through Thessaly on the way to quash southern insurrection, was ratified as the leader of the Thessalian *koinon*.¹⁵ Thessalians – both individuals¹⁶ and the famous cavalry¹⁷ – contributed significantly to his campaigns. And though himself far distant from Greece, Alexander continued Macedon’s Amphiktyonic representation, his representatives rubbing shoulders with those of Thessaly.¹⁸

Exactly what reorganisation Philip imposed on Thessaly’s political structure is not entirely clear. Demosthenes tells us that Philip set up *tetrarchiai* in Thessaly;¹⁹ his reference to Philip enslaving the Thessalians ‘by tribe’ indicates that the institution of *tetrarchiai* should probably be read as a recycling of the long-standing division of the region into the four cantons of Thessaliotis, Phthiotis, Pelasgiotis and Hestiaiotis. Philip presumably increased their functional importance as administrative units, each controlled by a *tetrarchos*. (One of these *tetrarchoi* was the chief subject of this article, Daochos of Pharsalos.)

¹² Diod. 16.38.1.

¹³ On Thessaly and Macedon in the context of the Third Sacred War, see Buckler 1989: 58–81.

¹⁴ Polyain. 4.3.23.

¹⁵ Just. *Epit.* 11.3.

¹⁶ Not surprisingly given the region’s reputation for gluttony, it was a Thessalian, Medeios, who persuaded Alexander to rejoin the party which may have contributed to his ill-health and eventual demise! (Arr. *Anab.* 7.25.) On Thessalians as gluttonous in ancient perception, see Bakola 2005: 611–612; Pownall 2009.

¹⁷ Thessalian excellence at the battle of Gaugamela: Diod. 17.21.4.

¹⁸ Stamatopoulou 2007: 222 notes the high degree of continuity in the Thessalian presence at Delphi between the reigns of Philip and Alexander, especially the prominence of Pharsalians. On the Delphic involvement of Philip and Alexander, see Miller 2000: 267–274.

¹⁹ Demosth. 9.26: ἀλλὰ Θετταλία πῶς ἔχει; οὐχὶ τὰς πολιτείας καὶ τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν παρήρηται καὶ τετραρχίας κατέστησεν, ἵνα μὴ μόνον κατὰ πόλεις ἀλλὰ καὶ κατ’ ἔθνη δουλεύωσιν.

Considerable doubt and controversy attend the question of whether Philip's settlement of Thessaly included his own election as Archon of the Thessalian league.²⁰ Probably influenced by Demosthenes' rhetoric of enslavement, past scholarship has tended to assume so, and to interpret certain literary sources accordingly.²¹ However, a challenge to this perspective comes from Sprawski (2003), who makes the attractive suggestion that Philip's position in Thessaly should be considered in terms of influence rather than a fixed constitutional command, with a close parallel being identified in the case of the Theban Pelopidas. The analogy is a strong one: Pelopidas, like Philip, combined political reshaping²² with military involvement; Pelopidas, like Philip, adroitly espoused the cause of Thessalian freedom and won considerable Thessalian support – and all this without an official title such as Archon or Tagos. This picture of the situation does not, however, lessen the extent to which Philip was able to steer Thessalian affairs; his leadership in the Third Sacred War and his control of customs and revenues (strongly linked with control of the *perioikis*)²³ gave him unsurpassed influence in the region, and his relationship with individuals such as Daochos also reveals the power of his backing: having Philip on one's side was plainly very useful to an ambitious local figure keen to further his own standing.

2. Daochos and Macedon

Daochos is a prime example of Philip's particularly assiduous cultivation of Pharsalian connections. Pharsalos had a greater record of Delphic involvement than the traditional Macedonian ally, Larisa, at least if the dedications are anything to go by,²⁴ and this fact would surely have been an ingredient in their usefulness to Philip. From what we can see, Philip conferred on Daochos a position of great power within Thessaly, or at least ratified and enhanced his existing status,²⁵ though the precise nature of the arrangements is unclear. In the inscription attached to his statue (see below), Daochos refers to himself as '*tetrarchos* of the Thessalians,' and, as has been said, Philip set up a system of *tetrarchiai* in Thessaly;²⁶ it therefore seems likely that Philip used his influence to install Daochos as a *tetrarchos* or ruler of one of the four parts, presumably Phthiotis, the part

²⁰ It should be noted that the very nature of centralised power in Thessaly is fraught with difficulties of interpretation and reconstruction. The fullest – and at the same time the most contentious – discussion of the subject is that of Helly 1995, which builds on (and substantially disagrees with) Sordi 1958 and Larsen 1968. For useful briefer summaries of the evidence and interpretations, however, see Sprawski 1999: 18–20, and Graninger 2011: 7–23. Some of the pivotal evidence is collated by Rhodes 1986: 182–185.

²¹ The key texts in this matter are Diod. 17.4.1 and Just. *Epit.* 11.3.1–2, both of which speak of Alexander the Great taking over his father's position in Thessaly.

²² Diod. 15.67; Plut. *Pelop.* 26 (relating to 369/368 BC).

²³ Customs and revenues: Demosth. 1.22; the *perioikis*: Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F 56; Sprawski 2003: 60.

²⁴ Earlier Pharsalian dedications: Paus. 10.13.5 (statue-group of mounted Achilles with Patroklos); *SEG* 1.210 (statue of a horse). See Stamatopoulou 2007: 339–340.

²⁵ Helly 1995: 51 argues that Daochos was already ruler before Philip's domination, and was simply confirmed in his position; this is plausible, as we cannot rightly imagine Philip producing him out of nowhere and imposing him on the Pharsalians without some track record of political command.

²⁶ Demosth. 9.26.

in which Pharsalos lay. The importance of Demosthenes as a source of information in this matter is inescapable but also deeply regrettable, since he pursued a strong rhetorical line which consisted of depicting the Thessalians as betrayed by their own countrymen, Daochos prominent among them.²⁷

οἱ, ὅτ' ἦν ἀσθενῆ τὰ Φιλίππου πράγματα καὶ κοιμιδῆ μικρά, πολλάκις προλεγόντων ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλούντων καὶ διδασκόντων τὰ βέλτιστα, τῆς ἰδίας ἕνεκ' αἰσχροκερδίας τὰ κοινῆ συμφέροντα προίεντο, τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας ἕκαστοι πολίτας ἐξαπατῶντες καὶ διαφθείροντες, ἕως δούλους ἐποίησαν, Θετταλοὺς Δάοχος, Κινέας, Θρασύδαος·

At a time when Philip's resources were weak and entirely small, when I was frequently warning and exhorting and instructing for the best, these men flung away shared advantage for the sake of personal gain; they cajoled and corrupted all the citizens within their grasp, until they had made them into slaves. So the Thessalians were treated by Daochos, Kineas, Thrasysdaos...

Demosth. 18.295

The quotation comes from Demosthenes' *On the Crown*, delivered in 330 BC, in which he defends his associate Ktesiphon against Aischines' charge of having illegally proposed honours for Demosthenes to the Assembly. Much of his rhetorical energy, however, is expended in defence of his own conduct in opposition to Philip. Here he attempts to deflect Aischines' various accusations by listing men in several Greek states who, he says, in contrast to his own irreproachable behaviour, have betrayed their communities to the Macedonian.

Daochos and Thrasysdaos (or Thrasysdaos as Demosthenes spells it²⁸) in particular tend to appear together in the few scattered references which exist in the literature of the time, and they are always presented as working on Philip's behalf,²⁹ though not always with as much vitriol as Demosthenes deploys on them.³⁰ Despite the very transparent oratorical purpose of Demosthenes' accusation, modern scholars have not really tried to look beyond the characterisation of Daochos as Philip's instrument, and it has certainly coloured readings of their role in Delphic inscriptions. A good example is *FD* 3.5: 47 (*CID* 2.74). This is an Amphiktyonic decree of c. 339/338, concerning the regulation of financial contributions to the sanctuary. Daochos and Thrasysdaos are not the Thessalian hieromnemes in that year (Kottyphos and Kolosimmos are clearly named in that role in line 31);³¹ but they head the inscription in the genitive, plainly responsible in some capacity for the stipulations it contains. This much is clear. But Bourguet's assertion that their function is just that of Philip's agents, pushing through measures *he* desired en-

²⁷ On the depiction of southern Greek presentations of Thessaly-Philip relations at this time, see Sprawski 2003: 55–59; Aston (forthcoming).

²⁸ Because the form Thrasysdaos is the one used in Amphiktyonic inscriptions, it is preferred in this article.

²⁹ See e.g. Plut. *Demosth.* 18, citing Marsyas of Pella: Philip sends Daochos and Thrasysdaos as envoys to persuade the Thebans not to oppose Macedon (whereas Demosthenes urges them to join with Athens against Macedon).

³⁰ For another scathing treatment, however, this time of Thrasysdaos alone, see Theopompos, *FGrH* 115 F 209: 'Philip set up Thrasysdaos the Thessalian as tyrant of his countrymen. He was an intellectual pigmy but a gigantic flatterer.'

³¹ On Thessalian – primarily Pharsalian – hieromnemes in the age of Philip and Alexander, see Stamatopoulou 2007: 222.

acted, is taking a large step into unsupported conjecture. This is just one example of the way in which the Demosthenic perspective has encouraged certain interpretations of the epigraphic material, and certain assumptions with regard to Daochos and Thrasydaios and their relationship with Philip.

It is certainly true that Daochos and Thrasydaios are exceptionally conspicuous in the Delphic inscriptions, all the more so because of the frequent use of the formula *ἱερομνημονούτων τῶν μετὰ Δαόχου καὶ Θρασυδαίου* in lieu of the traditional Amphiktyonic list in which the representatives of all twelve *ethnê* are given. The Thessalians clearly held the presidency of the Amphiktyony while Daochos and Thrasydaios were in post, and it is also probable that they owed this special distinction to Philip, though we are once again reliant on Demosthenes for the theory that Philip gave (or gave back³²) the Amphiktyonic presidency to the Thessalians, and the precise historical circumstances are very unclear.³³ Though it is with Philip that – thanks to Demosthenes – we primarily associate Daochos and his colleague, it must be noted that they continue to be listed as Amphiktyons on Delphic inscriptions after his death, when the formula introducing Macedonian delegates has changed from *παρὰ Φιλίππου* to *παρ' Ἀλεξάνδρου*.

But even if it is true that Daochos and Thrasydaios owed their positions of influence, at Delphi and in Thessaly, to Philip, it does not entitle us to see them as nothing more than shadow-men, following Philip's orders (and later his son's), and forming a useful cloak for the exercise of Macedonian control at Delphi.³⁴ They would have had their own concerns and ambitions. Those of Thrasydaios are entirely beyond discovery, but Daochos holds out more hope: his Monument allows us to catch at least a glimpse of how he wished himself to be perceived by those who came to Delphi: fellow Thessalians, Macedonians, the representatives of other Greek states.

3. The Daochos Monument and questions of dating

The Daochos Monument was, as one of its inscriptions makes clear, a gift to Apollo, and by no means the first which Thessalians had consecrated in the sanctuary.³⁵ However, it

³² This frequent interpretation rests on the assumption, impossible to verify, that the Thessalians had held the presidency at some earlier time, and subsequently lost it.

³³ Demosth. 5.23, 6.22, 10.67.

³⁴ The extent to which Philip obscures his own involvement in the Amphiktyonic inscriptions should not be overstated: if the Thessalian Amphiktyons are a cover for his own power, it is not being used very intensively. Philip's own name is not hidden in the list of representatives, but tends to take second position after the Thessalians. An example in good condition is *FD 3.5: 14 (CID 2:36)*, in which the standardised formula *τῶν παρὰ Φιλίππου* on line 23 immediately follows the names of the Thessalian hieromnemes at the time (somewhere between 343 and 340 BC), Kottiphos and Kolosimmos.

³⁵ Known earlier Thessalian dedications include: a statue of Apollo, 'the earliest,' dedicated by Echekratidas of Larisa (Paus. 10.16.8); a statue of a horse, dedicated by the Thessalians in 457 after the battle of Tanagra (*SEG 17.243*; see Daux 1958); a statue of riders, dedicated by Pherai some time after 457 in celebration of victory over Athenian cavalry (Paus. 10.15.4); a statue of Achilles and Patroklos, dedicated by Pharsalos in the second half of the fifth century BC (Paus. 10.13.5); a statue of a horse, also dedicated by Pharsalos some time during the fifth or fourth centuries BC (*SEG 1.210*); a statue of Pelopidas, dedicated by the Thessalians in 369 BC (*SEG 22.460*).

marked a departure from the previous Thessalian tradition of statue dedication in its size, scale and structure: not one statue but at least nine, and housed in a building which may even, according to one recent reconstruction, have been roofed over.³⁶ It appears to have had at least a partial counterpart set up in the dedicator's homeland: a bronze statue of Hagias by the famous artist Lysippos, accompanied by an inscription identical with that of the Hagias statue in the Monument.³⁷ It is possible that bronze versions of all the statues in the Monument were dedicated in Pharsalos, making it clear that Daochos wished his fellow-countrymen, as well as travellers to Delphi, to be aware of his *grande geste*.

But which Daochos? It is time to acknowledge a lingering controversy as to the identity of the dedicator and the date of the Monument's creation. Jacquemin and Laroche, the scholars who have performed the most recent and most meticulous analysis of the archaeological material, adhere unwaveringly to the longstanding identification of the dedicator as the Daochos known from Demosthenes and the epigraphy to have been Philip's associate. There is, however, a lone voice raised in opposition: that of Geominy, who argues that the structure was in fact consecrated by the grandson of Philip's Daochos in the early third century.³⁸ This Hellenistic Daochos is depicted in the second statue labelled with that name, and the first, rather than being a fifth century figure, is in fact Philip's Daochos. Geominy posits a very different political context for the dedication, in which the Hellenistic Daochos is '[taking] advantage of the short Macedonian power vacuum in 288–278 B.C.E. to demonstrate the key ancestral role the Thessalians had played at Delphi.'³⁹

It is true that, as Geominy points out, one would be unwise to place excessive reliance on the somewhat slippery Lysippan statue which supposedly constituted an exact Pharsalian counterpart to the effigy of Hagias at Delphi; the inscription, seemingly identical in wording to the Delphic one, is now unfortunately lost, and the Lysippan authorship of the statue, and its date, are not wholly secure. However, a re-identification of the two Daochoi as being a generation later is itself more problematic. In the first place, no Hellenistic Daochos appears in the surviving epigraphic record, either of Delphi or of Thessaly, a fact which does not marry comfortably with the idea of an ambitious, self-promoting hieromnemon. In the second, if the elder Daochos were taken as the mid fourth century figure, this would surely not be compatible with the claim in the inscriptions that he 'ruled all Thessaly' (for the inscriptions, see below). The extent of his rule is most likely to have been a single canton, Phthia; it would surely have been exceptionally difficult for the Hellenistic Daochos to claim his grandfather as a pan-Thessalian leader other than by the most bare-faced fiction-writing. Such adjustment of history is perhaps imaginable if the Hellenistic Daochos were, as Geominy argues, trying to assert Delphic predominance at the expense of Macedonian interests, but, as will now be shown, the Daochos Monument has certain features which suggest that it was intended to express a cultural rapprochement between Thessaly and Macedon, rather than competition and separation.

³⁶ Jacquemin/Laroche 2001.

³⁷ The inscription: *IG IX² 249*; Decourt 1995: 73–75, no. 57. Discussion: Preuner 1900; Maass 1993: 206; Jacquemin/Laroche 2001: 125.

³⁸ Geominy 2007.

³⁹ Geominy 2007: 85.

4. Position: an *espace thessalien*?

The Daochos Monument would have been recognised as a significant departure from previous Thessalian dedicatory practices in the sanctuary, through its size and function. In common with other Amphiktyonic communities, the Thessalians had not previously inclined towards monumental dedication, instead preferring to give statues and statue-groups. Daochos' decision to house his statues within a substantial built structure, possibly roofed although this remains uncertain, is therefore all the more striking. However, at Delphi sheer size is not the only way of making an impression.

It hardly needs stating that, when it came to adding a monument or other dedication to the crowded built environment of the Apollo sanctuary, positioning was of paramount importance. Daochos was plainly aware of this, and did not shrink from claiming a spot of the greatest visibility and prominence, near the entrance to the Temple and at the culmination of the Sacred Way. In addition, a key ingredient of position is juxtaposition, and it is important to examine whether by placing his Monument where he did Daochos was establishing any significant connections with existing structures and objects. It has in fact been claimed that the Monument occupied a place within what has been termed an *espace thessalien*, a zone with particularly strong Thessalian associations.⁴⁰ If true, this would have some important implications. Daochos would be consolidating an assertion of special Thessalian identity rather than just the credentials of his own family.

The theory of the *espace thessalien* rests chiefly on the Daochos Monument's immediate neighbour to the north-east: the shrine of Neoptolemos. There is absolutely no doubt that this shrine and the Daochos Monument were intended to be viewed together and to strike the viewer with their visual and spatial correspondence. So similar are the two structures in design and execution that it has been plausibly argued that the creation of the Daochos Monument included, at the same time, a Thessalian restoration of the Neoptolemos shrine, and in particular the creation of a new *peribolos*.⁴¹ So to look for some kind of thematic and symbolic relationship between Daochos and the figure of Neoptolemos is quite justifiable. However, caution must be applied as to how exactly that relationship is defined. In particular, problems occur when one tries to argue that what Daochos was associating himself with was a hero – and a hero-cult – of predominantly Thessalian identity and character. This supposition underpins the idea of a Thessalian zone, but requires closer examination.

There is absolutely no evidence for special Thessalian involvement in the cult of Neoptolemos at Delphi before the construction of the Daochos Monument.⁴² The details of the cult are hard to reconstruct, but we have evidence of one important regular ritual, the *theoxenia*, at which Apollo entertained a number of heroes at a ritual meal whose chief element was the symbolic distribution of shares of meat among the human participants.⁴³ Neoptolemos seems to have had a privileged role in this ritual, presiding over the distribution of the meat as guarantor of good order. This benevolent role forms

⁴⁰ Jacquemin 1999: 52, reasserting the suggestion of Pouilloux/Roux 1963: 144–145.

⁴¹ Homolle 1899: 424–425; Jacquemin/Laroche 2001: 308.

⁴² This despite the attempt by Sordi 1979 to argue that the cult of Neoptolemos was a mainstay of the Delphic propaganda campaign of Aleuas the Red in the late sixth century and early fifth.

⁴³ Rutherford 2001: 310–315.

an inverted counterpart of his depiction in myth, specifically the stories concerning his death, in which he is killed during a rather shabby quarrel over the distribution of sacrificial carcasses.⁴⁴

There are some suggestions from the evidence that the cult of Neoptolemos was, so to speak, *about* Thessaly, that it reflected in the conjoined languages of ritual and myth upon the role of Thessaly at Delphi.⁴⁵ But who took part in the *theoxenia*, and would it have involved Thessalians? Pindar's sixth *Paian* says that the sacrifice is made 'on behalf of illustrious Panhellas',⁴⁶ but this does not reveal the extent of actual participation, let alone giving detail of constituent groups. Epigraphic evidence reveals a link between Delphi and the island of Skiathos, and the inscription in question does make mention of the *theoxenia*, suggesting that a group on the periphery of Thessaly's orbit was involved in some capacity.⁴⁷

However, from Pindar's seventh *Nemean* and sixth *Paian*, the Aiginetans are the group which emerge as the most energetic in their participation. The two poems by themselves are clear evidence of great interest in Neoptolemos by Aiginetans, and indeed Aiakid references abound in Pindar's Aiginetan odes; but there seems to have been a basis of ritual reality as well. Both Rutherford and Currie argue for a regular *theoria* from Aigina to Delphi for the *theoxenia*, and though the reconstruction of this event involves some conjecture from scanty evidence it is plausible on the basis of known religious links between the two places.⁴⁸ Aigina claimed to be the birthplace of Aiakos, the offspring of Zeus and the nymph Aigina,⁴⁹ and thus to have produced the whole Aiakid line. The interest in Neoptolemos is therefore part of this wider pattern of Aiginetan self-representation, and they certainly seem to have been the group most actively involved in his Delphic cult, though there is faint evidence also of Molossian interest,⁵⁰ which tallies with the claims to descent from Neoptolemos made by the Molossian royal family.⁵¹ The

⁴⁴ For enumeration and analysis of all the variants of the myth of Neoptolemos' death, see Fontenrose 1960: 191–266; Suárez de la Torre 1997: 154–155. For a sophisticated reading of both myth and cult within the framework of the characterisation of the Homeric hero, see Nagy 1979: 118–141.

⁴⁵ The fullest and most recent exposition of this view is that of Kowalzig 2007: 198–199, who argues that the myths of Neoptolemos' death at Delphi were developed as a reflection of, and on, the fraught circumstances in and following the First Sacred War which led to the establishment of Amphiktyonic power at Delphi, with Thessaly in the dominant role. For an earlier political reading of Neoptolemos's cult and mythology, see Woodbury 1979.

⁴⁶ Pind. *Pai.* 6.61.

⁴⁷ Sokolowski 1962: no. 41; Amandry 1939 and 1944–1945.

⁴⁸ Rutherford 2001: 331; Currie 2005: 331–343; see also Walter-Karydi 2000. For a somewhat different view, see Figueira 1981: 314–321; he argues that the Aiginetan cult of Apollo Pythiaieus, a key component of their Delphic connections, was in fact strongly oriented as much towards the Peloponnese as towards Delphi.

⁴⁹ Among the earliest sources for this genealogy (apart from several references in Pindar): Hes. *Cat.* fr. 53 M-W = schol. Pind. *Nem.* 3.21; Bacchyl. frs. 9 and 13 Snell-Maehler; Corinna fr. 654 Page.

⁵⁰ Molossian interest in the depiction of Neoptolemos is discernible in Pind. *Nem.* 7.64–67, though this does not provide secure evidence of Molossian involvement in the Delphic cult.

⁵¹ Molossian claims to Aiakid origins go back to the Epic Cycle, to the *Nostoi* (in the summary provided by Proklos in his *Chrestomathia*), which describes Neoptolemos as returning from Troy after its fall, in which he has been savagely instrumental; he briefly meets Odysseus in Thrace, and comes to Molossia where he is greeted by Peleus.

Aiakid stemma serves as a strong link between Molossian and Thessalian mythology;⁵² however, Thessalian involvement in the Delphic cult of Neoptolemos is simply not discernible.

This does not, of course, mean that Daochos was not trying to assert the Thessalianity (to coin a word) of Neoptolemos by aligning his ancestors with the hero; it just means that we cannot see his dedication as exploiting an existing association between the hero and Thessaly which viewers would have recognised and mentally referred to. Instead, he must be viewed as an innovator in this regard, and a slightly audacious one, given how very un-Thessalian Neoptolemos actually was. True, his father Achilles was born and raised in Thessaly, in Phthia no less, on Daochos' very doorstep, and there is some evidence of religious interest in Neoptolemos' mother Thetis in Pharsalos and its environs,⁵³ but Neoptolemos himself was born on Skyros, and even his movements as an adult – Troy, Molossia, Delphi – generally do not include Thessaly.⁵⁴ Thessaly does not have an automatic claim on Neoptolemos, and if Daochos was intending to establish a Thessalian zone around his shrine the hero would not have provided an uncontroversial basis for it.

There is, however, another way of reading the significance of Neoptolemos in this situation: to see it as expressing, not simply a bold Thessalian claim of ownership, but rather a combination of Thessalian and Macedonian interests. In 357 BC Philip of Macedon married Olympias, a Molossian princess, who brought with her into the Macedonian court some discernible elements of her native culture, not least a fervent identification with the Aiakids of myth. It is probable that by the time the Daochos Monument was erected Olympias had become alienated from Philip; 337 BC saw Philip's marriage to his last wife, and the famous symposium at which Alexander perceived his own status to have been slighted by the girl's father Attalos, and responded by taking his mother back to Molossia and himself to Illyria.⁵⁵ However, this estrangement did not terminate Philip's Molossian connections; far from it. He adroitly ensured that the important connection was not severed, by marrying his daughter Kleopatra to Alexandros of Epeiros, whom he had installed as king in 342;⁵⁶ and we know that Alexander the Great cherished

⁵² The Molossians seem sometimes to have exploited this connection: Paus. 1.13.2–3 relates how, in the third century, the Molossian Pyrrhos, having defeated Antigonos Gonatas in battle, dedicates some of the spoils in the federal Thessalian sanctuary of Athena Itonia, with an inscription referring to himself as an Aiakid.

⁵³ Thetis appears to have had a cult in the area of Pharsalos, and perhaps also in the city itself, though the evidence is not unproblematic. References to a Thetideion (or a place called Thetideion) near Pharsalos suggest cult: see e.g. Plut. *Pelop.* 32.1; Polyb. 18.20.6. Euripides (*Andr.* 20) and Strabo (9.431) indicate a cult within the city, but the corroboration of this which has been thought to be provided by an inscription (*SEG* 45.637) is in fact insubstantial because the restoration of the text which includes Thetis' name and details of cult practice is almost certainly faulty. For the older, more optimistic reading see Arvanitopoulos 1911; for a more recent and more sceptical interpretation, see Decourt 1995: 97–99, no. 77. My own inspection of the stone has led me to believe that scepticism is unfortunately warranted.

⁵⁴ Homer's *Odyssey* (3.188–189) has Neoptolemos bring the Myrmidons back to their home in Phthia; likewise Euripides in the *Andromache* makes Neoptolemos come to Thessaly. This has led some to suggest a Thessalian performance-context for the play, and Thessalian concerns shaping its plot: see e.g. Taplin 1999: 44–48. Other versions tend to exclude Thessaly entirely from Neoptolemos' route.

⁵⁵ Plut. *Alex.* 9.

⁵⁶ Just. *Epit.* 8.6.4–5 – though the author characteristically lards his account with sexual scandal, the basic events are likely to be correct.

a strong identification with Achilles, partly inherited, partly personal.⁵⁷ So, whether one thinks that the Daochos Monument was built in Philip's time or during the reign of his son, it is extremely plausible to suggest that its connection with the Neoptolemos shrine would have chimed resoundingly with Macedonian interests, beliefs and self-perception.

I would argue that this is not accidental: that Daochos was deliberately choosing to locate his Monument where he did in order to assert common mythical material linking Thessaly and Macedon. This reading is, if anything, strengthened if we imagine that Alexander was king at the time, in light of Justin's assertion that Alexander himself, at the beginning of his reign, referred to shared Aiakid associations as a way of appealing for Thessalian loyalty and support.⁵⁸ Diodoros makes him cite Herakles as common ancestor instead;⁵⁹ this is his paternal rather than maternal heritage, and reveals how much common mythology northern states and regions could indeed draw upon when desired, especially once the arrival of Olympias into the Macedonian royal family had added Aiakid strands to existing Heraklid ones.⁶⁰ If Alexander was on the Macedonian throne when the Daochos Monument was commissioned and constructed, it is very plausible to see it as a gesture by Daochos towards this shared mythology which Alexander himself had previously cited before a Thessalian audience, this time intended to reassure the king of Daochos' loyalty.

In addition, it should be remembered that in all their various manifestations the Aiakidai are far better suited to the expression of inclusion than of exclusive ownership, and are used accordingly by communities and individuals. Through motifs of travel and genealogy, they serve to link places and peoples, and even the most energetic claims on association with them do not attempt to work against this. The case of the Aiginetan Aiakid-myths is a good illustration of this. Developing the story that she produced Aiaikos himself gave Aigina a special position, and indeed claims of primacy are a common tool,⁶¹ but she did not use this position to cut her off from other regions. Her claim was not to the detriment of the other places involved. It did not deprive Thessaly, or Molossia, of their respective shares in the Aiakidai. In the realm of the pan-Hellenic (pan-Hellenic epic stories, pan-Hellenic gatherings and events), status derives from *connection*, from involvement in something broader than the boundaries of an individual place or community. In keeping with this, the Daochos Monument's location would have been

⁵⁷ For a collection and discussion of the sources relating to Olympias' and Alexander's interest in Achilles and the Aiakids, see Carney 2006: 5–6.

⁵⁸ Just. *Epit.* 11.3.

⁵⁹ Diod. 17.4.1. It should be noted that mythological links between Molossia and Thessaly predated Philip by a considerable time, and were not limited to the Aiakid connection; for example, in the early fifth century, we hear of a Molossian ruler called Admetos (Thuc. 1.136), a name with Pheraean associations. It is probable, therefore, that Olympias' introduction into the Macedonian court brought with it a stronger sense of legendary connection with Thessaly than Philip and his son would otherwise have felt.

⁶⁰ Within Thessaly, the group who laid the most energetic claim on Heraklid ancestry was the Aleuadai of Larisa, who also had traditional ties with the Argeads, as discussed above. The opening lines of Pindar's *Pythian* 10, commissioned by an Aleuad, emphasises this ancestry.

⁶¹ It is worth noting the opposite device, the claim of being last, exercised by the Molossians – at Eur. *Andr.* 1246–1247 the child of Andromache and Neoptolemos, the forefather of the Molossian royalty, is described as the last of the Aiakid line. In this way, the Molossian kings gained a form of uniqueness on the grounds that they alone perpetuated a dynasty otherwise confined to the distant past.

calling upon Neoptolemos' power to forge connections, with Macedon certainly being an intended target.

Its position was not the only feature of the Daochos Monument which can plausibly be read as expressing Thessaly/Macedon connections. For one thing, it has long been recognised that it bears a physical similarity with the Philippeion at Olympia, another family statue group set up either by Philip or by Alexander,⁶² and it may well have been influenced by that structure; festival-goers attending both the Pythian and the Olympic games may have noticed the correspondence. Moreover, it has been argued that the cloak worn by the statue of Daochos I is of a distinctively Macedonian type.⁶³ Claims regarding the precise development of the Macedonian garment are open to various criticisms, but one thing is clear and interesting; short cloaks associated with horse-riding and the cavalry were connected in antiquity *both* with Macedon *and* with Thessaly.⁶⁴ Thus the striking use of the garment in the Daochos Monument may have been intended to reinforce the sense of a shared northern identity common to both Thessaly and Macedon.

The inscriptions, however, which accompany the statues in the Monument give a rather different impression. They do not make any mention of shared epic past or of the contemporary reality of the rapprochement between Daochos and the Macedonian throne. Instead they refer to specifically Thessalian history (with an admixture of legend, perhaps). And it is in the inscriptions that a visitor able to read would have found messages detaching Daochos and his family from the ambit of Macedon, and asserting their own independent credentials.

5. The inscriptions: sole rule and just rule

For the sake of completeness, I provide in table form all the inscriptions accompanying the eight statues contained within the Monument; however, the discussion will focus on three, which are highlighted in bold text.

Previous scholarly interest has been focused chiefly on the three brothers distinguished by their athletic accomplishments, Hagias, Telemachos and Agelaos,⁶⁵ and Aknonios and the two Daochoi have been comparatively neglected. But in fact the inscriptions accompanying the statues of Aknonios and Daochos I constitute a far more intricate reflection on the dedicator's own position than has previously been recognised, and their full implications cannot be understood without reference to important aspects of recent and contemporary Thessalian history. The most obvious contemporary ref-

⁶² For the Philippeion and its artistic and architectural parallels, see Schulz 2009. Whether one regards it as having been set up by Philip or his successor depends on how one reads the dative case in Pausanias' comment, φιλιππῶ δέ ἐποιήθη (Paus. 5.20.10): does this mean 'it was made by Philip' or 'it was made *for* Philip'? For discussion, see Schulz 2009: 128–131, who argues that in any case the monument was constructed according to Philip's plan.

⁶³ Lattimore 1975.

⁶⁴ Cloaks of a distinctively Thessalian style: Bacchyl. 18.54; Philostr. *Vit. Ap. Ty.* 4.16 and *Her.* 10.5. It has been argued that the Macedonian version was very similar but with rounded corners; see e.g. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 1993: 143–145.

⁶⁵ See e.g. Ebert 1972, esp. 137–145.

Personage	Inscription	Translation
Aknonios, son of Aparos	Ἀκνόνιος Ἀπάρου τέτταρχος Θεσσαλῶν.	Aknonios son of Aparos, tetrarch of the Thessalians.
Hagias, son of Aknonios	πρῶτος Ὀλύμπια παγκράτιον, Φαρσάλιαι, νικᾷς, Ἅγία Ἀκνονίου, γῆς ἀπὸ Θεσσαλίας, πεντάκις ἐν Νεμέαι, τρίς Πύθια, πεντάκις Ἴσθμοι· καὶ σῶν οὐδεὶς πω στήσῃ τροπαῖα χερῶν.	You, Pharsalian, Hagias son of Aknonios, won the Pankration at Olympia, the first to do so from the land of Thessaly; five times you won at Nemea, thrice at Pythia, five times at the Isthmos. And no-one ever set up trophies of victory from your hands.
Telemachos, son of Aknonios	κἀγὼ τοῦδε ὁμάδελ[φος ἔ]φυν, ἀριθμὸν δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν ἤμασι τοῖς αὐτοῖς [ἐχφέρ]ομαι στεφάνων, νικῶν μουνοπά[λης], Τ[. .]σηνῶν δὲ ἄνδρα κρᾶτιστον κτεῖνα, ἔθειλοντό [γε δ' οὐ]· Τηλέμαχος δ' ὄνομα.	I was born own brother to this man, and I bear away the same number of victory-garlands on the same days, winning as a wrestler; I killed the best man of the ...ians, though I did not will it. My name is Telemachos.
Agelaos, son of Aknonios	οἶδε μὲν ἀθλοφόρου ρόμης ἴσον ἔσχον, ἐγὼ δὲ σύγγονος ἀμφοτέρων τῶνδε Ἀγέλαος ἔφυν· νικῶ δὲ στάδιον τούτοις ἅμα Πύθια παῖδας· μούνοι δὲ θνητῶν τούσδ' ἔχομεν στεφάνους.	These men had equal shares of prize-winning strength, and I Agelaos was born the sibling of them both. I won the staderace for boys at the Pythian games alongside them; we alone of mortals have these victory-garlands.
Daochos I, son of Hagias	Δάοχος Ἅγία εἰμί, πατρίς Φάρσαλος, ἀπάσης Θεσσαλίας ἄρξας vac. οὐ βίαι ἀλλὰ νόμοι, ἐπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσι ἔτη, πολλῇ δὲ καὶ ἀγλαοκάρπῳ εἰρήνῃ πλούτῳ τε ἔβρυε Θεσσαλία.	I am Daochos son of Hagias. My homeland was Pharsalos; I ruled all of Thessaly, not with force but with law, for twenty-seven years, and Thessaly burgeoned with great and fruitful peace, and with wealth.
Sisyphos I, son of Daochos	οὐκ ἔψευσέσε Παλλὰς ἐν ὕπνῳ, Δαόχου υἱὲ Σίσυφε, ἃδ' εἶπε σαφῆ θῆκεν ὑποσχεσίαν· ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἔδυσ περι τεύχεα χρωτί, οὐτ' ἔφυγες δῆϊους οὔτε τι τραυμ' ἔλαβες.	Pallas did not deceive you in a dream, Sisyphos son of Daochos, and the clear things which she told you she set down as a promise. For from the moment you first clothed your skin with armour, you never fled your foes nor received a single wound.
Daochos II, the dedicant, presumably son of Sisyphos I	αὖξων οἰκειῶν προγόνων ἀρετὰς τάδε δῶρα στήσεμ Φοίβῳ ἄνακτι, γένος καὶ πατρίδα τιμῶν, Δάοχος εὐδόξῳ χρώμενος εὐλογίαι, τέτταρχος Θεσσαλῶν ἱερομνήμων Ἀμφικτυόνων.	Increasing the virtues of my family's ancestors, I set up these gifts to lord Phoibos, honouring my people and my homeland – I, Daochos, possessed of glorious praise, tetrarch of the Thessalians, hieromnemon of the Amphiktyons.
Sisyphos II, son of Daochos II	Σίσυφος Δαόχου.	Sisyphos son of Daochos

erence has already been mentioned: Daochos held the position of *tetrarchos*, and the verbal echo of the phrase *tetrarchos Thessalôn* between the Aknonios inscription and that of Daochos II⁶⁶ reinforces the sense that the ancestral figure of Aknonios provides a precedent for his scion's position. This precedence simply cannot be verified historically; scholarly reconstructions of the career of Daochos I tend to rely exclusively on the Daochos Monument's inscriptions, an arrangement of hideous circularity. But claiming an ancestor whose existence is somewhat mythical is of course a common strategy in ancient power-display.

The Daochos I inscription is longer and even more ambitious than that of Aknonios. It lays claim not to the rule of a tetrad, but to pan-Thessalian rule. This appears to present Daochos the dedicator in a very different light to that of Demosthenes' obsequious lackey – as the name-sharing successor of a man who occupied that most contested of positions, ruler of all of Thessaly. Should this be interpreted as a *rebuttal* of the hostile characterisation, and as a claim on political legitimacy through inheritance? Would the rule of Daochos I have served to validate the more limited⁶⁷ sway of his grandson in the face of swirling accusations of treachery?

In favour of such an interpretation is the fact that the fourth century saw other cases of Thessalians with ambitions to rule developing ancestral figures as a way of reinforcing their claims. As has been mentioned, the figure of Aleuas, legendary ruler of all Thessaly, is certainly shaped and burnished – of not actually invented – in the fourth century. One of the two precious surviving fragments of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Thessalians* in fact names the legendary Aleuas the Red as the originator of the tetradic division of Thessaly.⁶⁸ It is impossible to ascertain where and from which group(s) Aristotle derived his material about Aleuas' tetradic organisation, but the appearance of his head on Larisaian coins⁶⁹ testifies to the interest felt by the leading men of that city in asserting their ownership of the eponym and his achievements. Pharsalian Daochos lays claim far more directly by naming his ancestor *tetrarchos* on the Delphic stage where the gesture would have been seen by Macedonians and southern Greeks.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Though it should be noted that in the Daochos II inscription the phrase is extra-metrical: this, however, gives it more prominence if anything, and a certain quality of the bluntly factual quite different from the idealising language which otherwise prevails.

⁶⁷ That said, the formula *tetrarchos Thessalôn* does seem designed to convey a pan-Thessalian impression.

⁶⁸ Harpokration s.v. *Tetrarchia*: τετάρων μερῶν ὄντων τῆς Θεσσαλίας ἕκαστον μέρος τετράς ἐκαλεῖτο, καθὰ φησιν Ἐλλάνικοις ἐν τοῖς Θεσσαλικοῖς, ὄνομα δὲ φησιν εἶναι ταῖς τετράσι Θεσσαλιῶτιν Φθιώτιν Πελασγιῶτιν Ἑστιαῶτιν. καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν τῇ κοινῇ Θεσσαλῶν πολιτείᾳ ἐπὶ Ἀλεῦα τοῦ Πυρροῦ διηρῆσθαι φησιν εἰς ὁμοίρας τὴν Θεσσαλίαν. ('Thessaly was divided into four parts, each of which was called a tetrad, as Hellanikos says in his *Thessalian History* [FGH 4 F 52]: he says the names of the tetrads were Thessaliotis, Phthiotis, Pelasgiotis and Hestiatotis. Aristotle in his *Thessalian Constitution* [fr. 497 Rose] says that the Thessalians were divided into four sections at the time of Aleuas the Red.')

⁶⁹ See e.g. BMC *Thessaly* pl. 5, no. 12.

⁷⁰ It is worth contemplating the possibility of Larisaian agency behind the story told by Plutarch, of how Aleuas' rule of all of Thessaly was ratified by the Pythia: see Plut. *de Frat. Amor.* 21. If this story was generated by the Aleuadai in the fourth century it would constitute an intriguing challenge to the Pharsalian domination of Thessalian activity in the sanctuary as well as to the history of tetrarchic power.

Pherai, the most ambitious Thessalian community of the century, would not have benefited from a connection with Aleuas,⁷¹ but it does appear that Jason may have found a satisfactory alternative as ancestral precedent for his appropriation of tribute from the *perioikoi* – the figure of Skopas, whose historicity is as nebulous as that of Aleuas. According to Xenophon, Jason προεῖπε δὲ τοῖς περιοίκοις πᾶσι καὶ τὸν φόρον ὡςπερ ἐπὶ Σκόπα τεταγμένος ἦν φέρειν ('ordered all the *perioikoi* to bring the tribute as had been organised in the time of Skopas').⁷² This appears to be another example of a powerful Thessalian making reference to historical precedent to enhance the legitimacy of his actions. The fourth century was a time of great innovation in Thessaly's power structures, and for this very reason generated a surge in the development and adaptation of traditions. Daochos' emphasis on a regional ruler in his family tree should be viewed as part of this wider tendency of the age.

However, on the other side of the scale there are reasons why this strategy would not have been straightforwardly effective. First, it should be borne in mind that there was no strong tradition of *hereditary* sole rule of Thessaly, and therefore heredity itself was not an established and accepted criterion of command. In fact, one of the few things which may be said with certainty about the mysterious institution of the Thessalian *koinon* is that its leader, when there was one, was certainly appointed rather than ruling by right of birth – or else he pushed his way to power through military might and force of character. For this reason, Daochos' conspicuous identification of an Archon among his ancestors does not automatically gild his own status as *tetrarchos*. However, in the fourth century the waters had been muddied, in this regard, by Pherai, many of whose leading men strove for, and at times achieved, pan-Thessalian rule: this rule did have a strongly dynastic dimension. Jason, the most successful such figure, is the only one for whom we have a reasonable amount of information;⁷³ he may well have been the son of Lykophron, with whom Pherai's ambitions to more than local rule essentially began. When Jason was assassinated in 370 BC, various close male relatives took over his position: first his brothers Polydoros and Polyphron, and later his nephew Alexandros. The successors of Jason were hardly unopposed in their assumption of power – in fact it was opposition to Alexandros which eventually brought about Philip's involvement in Thessalian affairs. But their example showed that in the fourth century attempts were made to base pan-Thessalian rule on heredity.

And yet, a further problem for Daochos would have been the tarnished credentials of other figures who had recently vied for pan-Thessalian control. Indeed, at the time of his Delphic activities Pheraian affairs would have made inherited sole rule a *controversial* topic from a Thessalian perspective, rather than something to be accepted and taken for granted. It is also probable that the career of Jason would have left an especially strong aura of discomfort at Delphi. According to Xenophon, whose account – while it is certainly marked by a strong authorial interest in exploring the character of Jason – is not to be dismissed as fictional, Jason's ambitions extended beyond the unification of Thessaly

⁷¹ Pace Wade-Gery 1924: 61–64, who argues that the Aleuas coins of Larisa were in fact minted by Jason once he controlled the city, in a bid to claim that heritage for his own purposes. However, the impossibility of accurately dating the coins makes this pure speculation, and it does not convince.

⁷² Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.19.

⁷³ See the extensive study of this figure by Sprawski 1999.

under his rule: at the time of his assassination, he was planning to stage a dramatic takeover of the presidency of the Pythian Games.⁷⁴ This bid for Amphiktyonic supremacy would, he intended, follow on from an extraordinary *grande geste*: his arrival in the sanctuary with a cavalcade of thousands of sacrificial beasts garnered, symbolically, from all parts of his subordinated homeland. None of this came to pass, in the event, but if Xenophon is correct its imminence caused waves of anxiety in the southern states,⁷⁵ and this must have been especially so in Delphi itself, where there is said to have been fear lest Jason try to appropriate the sacred treasures.⁷⁶ Some three decades later, Daochos and his fellow Thessalians at Delphi must still have been living down this dangerous example of northern involvement.

For this reason, and because mere heredity by itself was not enough to confer legitimacy of status, the inscriptions of the Monument serve another important function: to define rule, within the family, as *just* rule. In particular the phrase ἄρξας οὐ βίαι ἀλλὰ νόμῳ is, for all its apparent simplicity, laden with contemporary and contextual significance. It has been argued that ruling with *nomos* is an especially northern – particularly Macedonian and Thessalian – ideal. This argument rests on the notion that *nomoi* – interpreted as unwritten ancestral customs – were all that northern communities had by way of law, all that held *bia* at bay, in the absence of constitutional government.⁷⁷ Were this so the implications would be important: we could read ἄρξας οὐ βίαι ἀλλὰ νόμῳ as a verbal gesture on Daochos' part towards the northern culture he and Philip shared. However, the theory is made vulnerable by the difficulty of proving that *nomoi*, and rule according to *nomos*, held any special and exclusive significance in Thessaly and Macedon. To see the primacy of unwritten ancestral custom as limited to the north is unrealistic in view of the fact that *nomoi* all over Greece carried this meaning, and that almost no Greek state in the classical period had a written and undeviating constitution. *Nomoi* were no less important as guarantors of good social and political conduct in the south as in the north, and the rhetoric of ruling according to *nomoi* cannot with any security be classed as a uniquely northern one.

That does not, however, rob the phrase of all its special implications with regard to a Thessalian ruler. When in 498 BC Pindar wished to commend the rule of the Aleuad Thorax, who had commissioned his *Tenth* Pythian, good governance (referring specifically to the *nomos Thessalôn*) is one of the motifs used. This was a common enough ingredient of praise, but one which in the next century took on a special urgency. When other Greeks in the fourth century wish to criticise Thessalians or the Thessalian character (which they do with increasing frequency), *anomia* and closely related concepts, such as *ataxia* and *akolasia*, feature prominently among the terms used. This is especially so among philosophical texts, in which Thessaly appears as a paradigm of poor governance; the most famous example of this occurs in Plato's *Crito*, where the personified Laws of Athens say of Thessaly ἐκεῖ γὰρ δὴ πλείστη ἀταξία καὶ ἀκολασία ('There disorder

⁷⁴ Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.29–30; Sprawski 1999: 118–127.

⁷⁵ Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.32. The claim that Jason intended to seize general control of Greece is also made by Diodoros: 15.60.1.

⁷⁶ Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.30.

⁷⁷ Mooren 1983.

and ill-discipline abound'),⁷⁸ and the motif also appears in Xenophon.⁷⁹ However, the theme of Thessalian lawlessness is not limited to philosophy; according to Theopompos, their undisciplined nature was what gave the Thessalians a natural affinity with Philip.⁸⁰ Although it cannot be proved that Daochos was aware of such criticisms against his homeland, it is likely – given his considerable contact with the delegates of other Greek states – that he was, and the Daochos I inscription should be read as a brief but direct refutation of the stereotype.

We may also interpret it as a renewed claim, at a time when such a claim was especially necessary, on the virtues which Pindar accorded to Thorax and his family. That the inscriptions of the Daochos monument contains some strikingly Pindaric qualities has already been demonstrated by Cummins, who discusses the presentation of family relationships in both works;⁸¹ to this broad theme we may add specific verbal echoes of *Pythian* 10 in the Daochos II inscription. In addition to the use of *nomos* mentioned above, the first word of the inscription, *auxôn*, recalls *auxontes* in line 71 of *Pythian* 10 (referring to the governance of Thorax and his brothers). There is also a strong emphasis on heredity in the Ode: the phrase *πατρῴϊαι κεδναὶ πολίων κυβερνάσιες* – 'trusty ancestral governance of cities' – ties good governance and patrilineal succession together, and the Daochos Monument, with its combination of visual imagery and inscriptions, achieves the same juxtaposition.

It seems very likely that Pindar's ode entered the canon of Thessalian self-representation. Even though Thorax and Daochos were primarily associated with different cities, this is not really an impediment to the idea, given the strong interconnections between Thessalian ruling families; there could even have been a competitive edge to the process: Pharsalian Daochos in the fourth century appropriating ideology cherished by the Aleuadae in the early fifth. Though set upon a pan-Hellenic stage, the Monument represents a continuation and development of established internal Thessalian discourses on power, on who wields it and how.

Conclusions

What has previously been lacking from discussion of the Daochos Monument is discussion of its dedicator *as a Thessalian*, with a Thessalian's background, memory and preoccupations. This article has put forward a portrait of Daochos as the product of his homeland and its history. It is especially in the inscriptions that this character emerges; that of a man striving for connection with the ideals of the past, and separation from the negative associations of the fourth century.

⁷⁸ Plat. *Crito* 53d-e. it should also be noted that Plato's *Meno* presents its Pharsalian subject, Menon, as someone whose idea of the good life is the imposition of one's will on others – essentially, the application of *bia*.

⁷⁹ Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.24: Thessaly is characterised as a place whose inhabitants live in a state of *anomia* rather than *dikaïosunê*. For more detailed discussion of this stereotype, see Pownall 2009; Aston (forthcoming, 2013).

⁸⁰ *FGrH* 115 F 162.

⁸¹ Cummins 2009.

Thessalian Daochos was not, however, operating in a vacuum. In addition to positioning his monument within the richly crowded built landscape of the Apollo sanctuary, he was managing a delicate political relationship with Macedon, first with Philip and then with Alexander. The alignment of the Daochos Monument with the renovated shrine of Neoptolemos expresses, not unique Thessalian religious associations, but rather – via the pan-Hellenic figure of the hero – the inclusion of Thessalians within a wider mythical picture. More specifically, Macedonian interest in the Aiakidai under Philip and Alexander strongly suggest that by positioning his dedication where he did Daochos was making reference to the shared Aiakid associations of his own homeland and the royal family of Macedon. The rhetoric of Demosthenes in the face of Philip's rise to power relied on a simple dichotomy of treachery and loyalty. The Daochos Monument reveals what one could in any case suspect: that the complexities of Daochos' position and self-perception cannot be encompassed within such a basic model.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amandry, P. (1939): Convention religieuse conclue entre Delphes et Skiathos, *BCH* 43: 183–219.
- Amandry, P. (1944–1945): Note sur la convention Delphes–Skiathos, *BCH* 68–69: 411–416.
- Aston, E.M.M. (2013): Friends in High Places: the Stereotype of Dangerous Thessalian Hospitality in the Later Classical Period, *Phoenix*, in press.
- Bakola, E. (2005): A Missed Joke in Aristophanes' Wasps, *CQ* 55: 609–613.
- Buckler, J. (1989): *Philip II and the Sacred War*, Leiden.
- Carney, E. (2006): *Olympias, Mother of Alexander the Great*, London–New York.
- Cummins, M.F. (2009): The Praise of Victorious Brothers in Pindar's *Nemean Six* and on the Monument of Daochos at Delphi, *CQ* 59: 317–334.
- Currie, B. (2005): *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford.
- Daux, G. (1958): Dédicace thessalienne d'une cheval à Delphes, *BCH* 82: 329–334.
- Decourt, J.-C. (1995): *Inscriptions de Thessalie I. Les cités de la vallée de l'Énipeus*, Athens.
- Ebert, J. (1972): *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*, Berlin.
- Figueira, T.J. (1981): *Aegina. Society and Politics*, New York.
- Fontenrose, J. (1960): *The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi*, Berkeley.
- Geominy, W. (2007): The Daochos Monument at Delphi. The Style and Setting of a Family Portrait in Historic Dress, in: P. Schultz, R. von den Hoff (eds.), *Early Hellenistic Portraiture. Image, Style, Context*, Cambridge: 84–98.
- Graninger, D. (2010): Macedonia and Thessaly, in: J. Roisman, I. Worthington (eds.), *Blackwell Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Malden, MA–Oxford: 306–325.
- Graninger, D. (2011): *Cult and Koinon in Hellenistic Thessaly*, Leiden.
- Hall, J. (2007): *A History of the Archaic Greek World, ca. 1200–479 BCE*, Malden, MA–Oxford.
- Helly, B. (1995): *L'État thessalien. Aleuas le Roux, les tétrades et les tagoi*, Lyon.
- Homolle, Th. (1899): Lysippe et l'ex-voto de Daochos, *BCH* 23: 421–485.
- Jacquemin, A. (1999): *Offrandes monumentales à Delphes*, Paris.
- Jacquemin, A., Laroche, D. (2001): Le monument de Daochos ou le trésor des Thessaliens, *BCH* 125: 305–332.
- Kowalzig, B. (2007): *Singing for the Gods*, Oxford.

- Larsen, J.A.O. (1968): *Greek Federal States. Their Institutions and History*, Oxford.
- Lattimore, S. (1975): The Chlamys of Daochus I, *AJA* 79: 87–88.
- Maass, M. (1993): *Das antike Delphi. Orakel, Schätze und Monumente*, Darmstadt.
- Miller, S.G. (2000): Macedonians at Delphi, in: A. Jacquemin (ed.), *Delphes. Cent ans après la grande fouille*, (*BCH* Suppl. 36), Paris: 263–281.
- Mooren, L. (1983): The nature of the Hellenistic monarchy, in: E. Van 't Dack, P. Van Dessel, W. Van Gucht (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*, Leuven: 206–240.
- Nagy, G. (1979): *The Best of Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Baltimore, MD.
- Pouilloux, J., Roux, G. (1963): *Énigmes à Delphes*, Paris.
- Pownall, F. (2009): The Decadence of the Thessalians. A Topos in the Greek Intellectual Tradition from Critias to the Time of Alexander, in: P. Wheatley, R. Hannah (eds.), *Alexander and his Successors. Essays from the Antipodes*, Claremont, CA: 237–260.
- Preuner, H.E. (1900): *Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk*, (Inaugural Dissertation), Strassburg.
- Robertson, N. (1978): The Myth of the First Sacred War, *CQ* 28: 38–73.
- Rhodes, P.J. (1986): *The Greek City States. A Sourcebook*, Cambridge.
- Rhodes, P.J., Osborne, R. (2003): *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Rutherford, I.C. (2001): *Pindar's Paean. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*, Oxford.
- Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, C. (1993): Some Aspects of Macedonian Clothing, *JHS* 113: 122–147.
- Schultz, P. (2009): Divine Images and Royal Iconography in the Philippeion at Olympia, in: J. Jensen et al. (eds.), *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult. Context, Ritual and Iconography*, Aarhus: 125–194.
- Sokolowski, F. (1962): *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément*, Paris.
- Sordi, M. (1958): *La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno*, Rome.
- Sprawski, S. (1999): *Jason of Pherae*, (*Electrum* 3), Kraków.
- Sprawski, S. (2003): Philip II and the Freedom of the Thessalians, *Electrum* 9: 56–66.
- Sprawski, S. (2005): All the King's Men. Thessalians and Philip II's Designs on Greece, in: D. Musiał (ed.), *Society and Religions. Studies in Greek and Roman History*, Toruń: 31–49.
- Stamatopoulou, M. (2007): Thessalians Abroad, the Case of Pharsalos, *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22: 211–236.
- Suárez de la Torre, E. (1997): Neoptolemos at Delphi, *Kernos* 10: 153–176.
- Taplin, O. (1999): Spreading the Word through Performance, in: S. Goldhill, R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge: 33–57.
- Wade-Gery, H.T. (1924): Jason of Pherae and Aleuas the Red, *JHS* 44: 55–64.
- Walter-Karydi, E. (2000): Égine et Delphes, in: A. Jacquemin (ed.), *Delphes. Cent ans après la grande fouille*, (*BCH* Suppl. 36), Paris: 87–98.
- Woodbury, L. (1979): Neoptolemos at Delphi. Pindar, *Nem.* 7.30ff., *Phoenix* 33: 95–133.