

E. BADIAN

HISTORY FROM 'SQUARE BRACKETS'

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 59–70

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## HISTORY FROM 'SQUARE BRACKETS'

As every working historian knows, there is a peculiar brand of historical fiction created by those (most often primarily historians, not epigraphists) who build far-ranging historical theories on words or phrases which their epigraphist predecessors have inserted - meaning no harm, and often *exempli gratia* - between square brackets in a fragmentary text. The epigraphic facts will be admitted, sometimes even discussed, with the conclusion that the supplement is "necessary" or "inevitable". As every epigraphist knows, and some historians as well, such a statement, especially in non-stoichedon texts and non-formulaic phrases, is often a warning that the wish has been father to the thought, and that scrutiny is needed. Two examples concerning the history of Philip II and Alexander have recently come to my attention, and they may as well be discussed together, in order of publication.

### I

In the first, it can be clearly seen that the wish is father to the thought: preconceived ideas, overriding method and logic, produce the "proof" that is to give them epigraphic support. We must therefore approach the purely epigraphic point in a roundabout way.

In one of the leading journals, the *Annual of the British School at Athens* 79 (1984) 229-235, David S. Potter published a slightly revised text of IG II<sup>2</sup> 399 with commentary, under the promising subtitle, "Evidence for Athenian Involvement in the War of Agis III". (There is not even a question-mark.) The inscription, copied by Fourmont and published by Raoul-Rochette in 1822, was never seen by anyone again, so that the text cannot be trusted in detail. It is a decree moved by Demades, honouring a certain Eurylochus (apparently of Cydonia) for, i.a., ransoming many Athenians and sending them home at his own expense. The important lines (15-19) must be quoted:

καὶ πολλοὺς Ἀθηναίων λ[υτρωά]  
μενος ἐκ Κρήτης ἀπέστ[ειλε τοῖς]  
αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup> ἀναλώμασιν καὶ [αἴτιος ἐ]  
γένετο τοῦ σωθῆναι ἐκ [τῶν πολ]  
[εμίω]ν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν, συν[<sup>2</sup>

Epigraphic evidence on the war raised by Agis III against Alexander the Great would be of major importance, for the literary sources are scanty and confused. In particular, all we really know about Athens is a passage in Aeschines 3, 165ff. (quoted by Potter), to the effect that his opponent Demosthenes talked a great deal, in obscure language, apparently about

<sup>1</sup>Potter in fact prints αὐτοῦ.

<sup>2</sup>Potter's suggestion συν[τάξας εἰς ἐφόδια ... δραχμάς] seems to me much better than Moretti's συν[αγωνιζόμενος...]. I do not understand the objection to it by the reviewer in REG 100 (1987) 319.

assisting Agis, but did nothing. (See also Din. 1,34f.; Plut. Dem. 24,1.) It was rightly pointed out by G.E.M. de Ste. Croix that a number of Athenian citizens had been retained in Alexander's service and were de facto hostages, and that the Athenians would not lightly have exposed them to retaliation. The point had been insufficiently attended to by myself and others.<sup>3</sup>

That was all that was known. Potter arrives at a new and, in the light of our other evidence, startling conclusion: nothing less than that the "many Athenians" whom Eurylochus had ransomed in Crete had been captured when fighting for Alexander against Agis. His case obviously needs careful investigation.

He first notes that it should no longer be held that the mention of symproedroi in the prescript dates the decree after Alexander's death, for A.S.Henry (The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees (1977) 39-41) showed that this feature first appears somewhat earlier. Now, here is the first snag. When we check Henry's book, what he actually says is that from 333/2 the symproedroi are mentioned paratactically (the word appears after the chairman's name), followed by a list of their names. He then notes that a decree of 321/0, "if correctly dated", seems to be the earliest example of the mention of symproedroi with no list of their names following. "From this time on" (p.41) that becomes the regular formula.

Since the text used by Potter for his purpose has [καὶ σύμ]πρόεδροι and no list, Henry's rule firmly puts this text, not "as early as the 330s" (as Potter 230 n.4 claims, with the reference to Henry), but not earlier than 321/0. The mover, of course, may still be the great Demades, who died in 319. But it is now difficult to see how Athenians captured by Agis in 332 or 331 had waited so long for a foreigner to ransom them (or, to be precise, why the benefactor had had to wait so long to be honoured).

But let us grant the possibility; although the guess that they had been captured in the Lamian War, rather cursorily rejected by Potter (232f.), is obviously a much more reasonable one. What makes it difficult to believe that solution is that, on the text as Potter accepts it, the Athenians were ransomed directly from their enemies (noted p.232), and the Athenians had no enemies on the island of Crete at that time. A great deal can be seen to depend on [πολεμίων].

In fact, it seems impossible to find enemies of Athens on Crete anywhere near that time. But as we have seen, Potter provides them. He reminds us of Agis' strategy in Crete (233)<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> How many Athenians were serving on the twenty ships (presumably all triremes) that Alexander retained in his service (Diod. 17,22,5) we cannot reasonably conjecture. That the crews were wholly Athenian ("not far short of 4,000 hostages": Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (1972) 378) is rather unlikely. By this time it was only on special occasions that the Athenians sent out ships wholly manned by citizens, but there were always some Athenians (perhaps as few as 15 or 20) on an Athenian trireme. See the treatment of this by M.H.Hansen, *Demography and Democracy* (1985) 21-25. There is no reason to think that the Athenians would have chosen to send 4000 of their citizens away for an indefinite time, perhaps to fight against superior Persian forces, and we are not told that Alexander demanded this.

<sup>4</sup> But he does not mention the fact that Agis is reported to have subdued most of the cities there in one campaign (Diod. 17,48,2).

and, after some juggling with figures of Greeks fighting in that war,<sup>5</sup> finally unveils his opposition to Agis' cause: most Greeks did not want to owe freedom to a Spartan. After giving his surprising interpretation of the text, he reveals his full commitment in a rousing peroration at the end: "Agis was technically and in fact an enemy not only of Alexander, but also of those who cared for the freedom and honour of Greece" (234).

That is as may be. This is not the arena for fighting ancient battles. I have quoted it only because, as I initially put it, it shows his wish as father to his thought. Errors that are at first sight astonishing (we have already seen one) are evidently due to this emotional commitment.

Can it be argued that "the Athenians who ... were ransomed ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων were probably *victims* [my emphasis] of Agis' Cretan campaign"? And (for this is the main point) that the "enemies" of Athens here mentioned are the Spartans (*ibid.*)? I do not see how, but perhaps it can. Potter, at any rate, makes no attempt to do so. He merely assumes it, on the basis of his commitment.<sup>6</sup>

For we must at least ask: why "victims" of Agis' campaign? Why not "victims" (if we must have the word) of the campaign by Alexander's commander, whether Amphoterus (sent, according to Curtius 4,8,15, quoted by Potter, *ad liberandam Cretam*) or, if (as can be argued) he never got there, another sent in his place? Presumably because that would make the Spartans friends and Alexander the "enemy" -- or, to be precise, his Cretan allies and collaborators -- and this is not an idea Potter wishes to entertain. Yet how do we know that these Athenians' views on "the freedom and honour of Greece" were the same as Mr. Potter's? The answer is that we do not; and what we do know makes it more likely that these Athenians had indeed been fighting for Agis and not against him.

Let us lay ideology aside and consider the actual situation. During the war itself fighting seems to have continued somewhere in Crete all the time (see Curt. 4,1,40; 4,8,15). Agis had taken "most of the cities" in one campaign, but not all, and Alexander naturally soon launched a counter-attack, though we are ill informed on its details. At this time there was also fighting going on at sea. This was therefore not the time when prisoners would be ransomed and sent home. They would have to wait for stable conditions, which only came with Alexander's final reconquest of the island. We do not know how and when this was achieved, but it cannot have been long delayed after Agis' defeat and death. Once the war

---

<sup>5</sup> See p.233 with n.7: Agis' army had only 6000 Greeks who were not either Laconians or mercenaries, whereas Antipater had 28000! The figures come largely from Ste Croix (*cit. n.3*) who shares Potter's attitude to Agis III, but they are further distorted. They are not difficult to refute; e.g., Diodorus (17,62,7) says that "not less than" 20000 infantry and "about" 2000 cavalry joined the levy called by the Spartans, from cities in Peloponnese and the rest of Greece.

<sup>6</sup> Potter is so carried away that he misses the fact that the Spartans cannot possibly be the "enemies" here referred to in lines 18-19, as he states p.234, admitting that some might be "upset" by this statement, but apparently not seeing why. As he elsewhere points out, the Athenian prisoners were (on his interpretation of the text) ransomed and sent to safety from the enemy to their homes. It is nowhere alleged that Eurylochus ransomed them from Sparta.

was over, negotiations over prisoners could start, just as (e.g.) prisoners taken by Philip at Olynthus were ransomed after that war was over.

If any Athenians did fight against Agis (and we must keep remembering that there is no evidence for this whatsoever outside Potter's interpretation of this stone), they might be taken prisoner by him and would be handed over to his Cretan allies. So far so good. When Alexander's commander "liberated Crete", the terms made with the various cities would undoubtedly include the return of all prisoners taken by the enemy: that was a standard, and obvious, condition after defeat or even after a stalemate. So the Athenians who had putatively fought for Alexander against Agis would be freed and would no doubt return home in honour. Those who would remain, and who would need to be ransomed, would be those who had (putatively) fought on Agis' side against the liberation. It is surprising that ideological commitment seems to have concealed this simple fact from Potter. Perhaps he could have answered the argument. But he did not even think of it.

As a matter of plain fact, of course, we do not know of any Athenians voluntarily fighting on Alexander's side at this time (though we must concede that those conscripted into his allied navy may not all have been unwilling to go). On the other hand, we do know of Athenians fighting against Alexander, and we do know that the city's sentiment was against him, whatever the "honour of Greece" might be thought to require. From leaders like Chares, and we might add Charidemus (see Berve, *Alexanderreich II* nos.819 and 823), to the ordinary Athenians who fought for the King at the Granicus and, if captured and not killed, were sent to hard labour in Macedonia and not released until Alexander thought it politic to court Athenian favour when he first heard that a revolt against him had begun in Peloponnese (Arr. 3,6,2-3; contrast his refusal earlier, 1,29,5f.), all classes were represented. And we must not forget the Athenian embassies to Darius captured by Alexander, composed of Athenians of the most distinguished families.<sup>7</sup> Thus if any Athenians did fight in Agis' war, it is much more likely that they were fighting on his side.

Has Potter thus inadvertently proved the opposite of what he intended and claimed? Alas, no: it is not as simple as that. And here we must return to the actual text. It will be seen that *πολεμίων* in lines 18-19 is modern restoration: like many such, acceptable *exempli gratia*, but needing careful scrutiny if they are to become the foundation of historical edifices.

Potter is well aware of this and devotes some discussion to the point (230f.). He properly reports that pirates, rather than enemies, have been suggested as an obvious possibility, since Cretans were known (i.a.) for that pursuit. Moretti suggested *πειρατῶν* or *ληιπτῶν* (ISE I 2: we recall that the inscription is non-stoichedon). Potter very usefully surveys the

---

<sup>7</sup> The details are complex, but the names of Iphicrates, Dropides and Aristogiton, given by Curtius, should be accepted. Iphicrates was the son of the famous general; Dropides should belong to the descendants of the archon Dropides, relative and friend of Solon and ancestor of Critias (the name is unknown outside that family in Classical Athens); hence it has been suggested that Aristogiton should belong to the family of the tyrannicide. None of the three were prominent politicians: it looks as if social status was the reason for their selection.

use of the word *πειρατής* (234f.) and clearly shows that it is impossible to suggest it here.<sup>8</sup> But what about the alternative, the normal Greek term for a pirate? Here, unfortunately, we get no serious discussion. Potter merely states (231): "*ληϊστῆς* would have to appear as *ληϊστῶν*,"<sup>9</sup> which will not do in a text where the division appears elsewhere to be syllabic." That is all. On the strength of this, he convinces himself that the notion of pirates must be abandoned: indeed, by the time we get to the next page (232), the very possibility of it "might appeal only to the perverse". Perhaps perversity should not be presumed without actual discussion. Moretti, for one, is not known for perversity.

Let us consider the two objections.

(1) Is division syllabic? Potter, though he asserts it for this purpose, does not seem to think so in his text. There, he takes over the conjectured division [*πολλεμίω*]ν from his predecessors without a word of comment. So it is doubly odd for him to insist on syllabic division in precisely the same gap, when he wants to reject an alternative restoration. Since no editor has ever seen this text, we cannot in fact tell how many letters should be restored at the beginning of line 19, or whether syllabic division would here be possible. Whether (in the absence of positive indications) it is probable can be decided only from inspection of contemporary texts. The answer must be that it is not probable. IG II<sup>2</sup> 1 (a good base for comparisons) yields 21 decrees assigned to the period between 336/5 and the Chremonidean War (I omit a few put there on "various arguments", unspecified) which are non-stoichedon and where enough survives for a conclusion on this point: all of them ignore syllabic division, though several (whether or not by accident) have it most of the time. Against this, there is only one (no.509) where there may be syllabic division: nine lines of text survive and only one word is divided!<sup>10</sup>

The conclusion must be that we have no reason whatever to think that syllabic division will be observed in a decree of this period, except by accident, even if we consistently find it in a surviving fragment of a text. Hence the traditional conjecture [*πολλεμίω*]ν -- accepted by Potter, as we saw -- is technically unobjectionable.

(2) I cannot see, however, since he does not tell us, what made Potter think that the form *ληϊστῶν* "would *have* to appear as *ληϊστῶν*" [my emphasis; on the bracket see n.9 above]. He does not comment on the fact that Moretti in fact proposed [*ληϊστῶν*]<sup>11</sup> as well as the (untenable, as Potter has shown) [*πειρατῶν*]ν, although his apparatus carefully reports it. Since (I must repeat) none of its editors ever saw this text, we cannot have any precise idea

---

<sup>8</sup> It might be mentioned that the Latin word *pirata* never successfully competes with the proper term *praedo*. It is not found before Cicero, who uses it massively in the *Verrines* and hardly anywhere else; the purist Caesar avoids it, using *bellum praedonum* for what in Cicero, as later in Tacitus, is the *bellum piraticum* of Pompey. Livy, with one exception, confines it to piracy in Greek waters.

<sup>9</sup> Misprinted for [*ληϊστῶν*]ν: see the text above.

<sup>10</sup> We might add the prescript of 348, peculiarly shaped: 7 lines, one (syllabic) division. On that prescript, see Henry, *Prescript* 34f.

<sup>11</sup> The misprint is in Moretti.

of the number of letters lost at the beginning of line 19. Even if Potter himself saw Fourmont's "sketch" (he does not report doing so), it would be unwise, in the light of Fourmont's record, to put one's full faith in it.

It therefore seems to me "perverse" to deny that [ληιτῶ]ν, as intended by Moretti, is a serious possibility -- which incidentally, unlike the alternative accepted by Potter, would also preserve syllabic division (since ττ- can begin a word).

We can only conclude that the wish (Potter's obvious personal commitment, in that war of over 2300 years ago) has been father to the thought. It has misled him on the chronology made likely by the prescript, which the very page that he cites makes clear, and on the possibility of a different supplement in the crucial gap, and has disguised from him the fact that, with all of his assumptions granted, the reasonable conclusion would be the very opposite of what he wanted to prove.

What should be our conclusion about the actual text? First, that technically both πολεμίων and ληιτῶν may be read in lines 18-19, but that historically no plausible "enemy" in whose territory the Athenians might have been held can be produced, so that ληιτῶν should be accepted. We are therefore, on present showing, left with a standard honorary decree for rather an unimportant person (as shown by Potter, p.232), moved by Demades in about the last year of his life, to thank him for redeeming Athenian citizens held by Cretan pirates.<sup>12</sup> Since there were "many" of them, they may possibly have been acquired by the Cretans in the Lamian War and spent a long time in captivity (though not as long as on Potter's interpretation!); or we may have an indication of the insecurity of the Aegean after the destruction of the Athenian navy and during a time when the first of the Successors were at one another's throats.

Of course, if it turns out that the mover is the great Demades' grandson, "Demades II", then we shall have to think again. But that is for the experts on Athenian lettering and its practitioners to decide: Potter and I cannot do so.

## II

In volume I of the Acta of the Eighth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (Athens 1984), Cl.Vatin at last published (pp.259-260) a text that had been lying around, and much talked about, for over forty years and that may conveniently (whether or not with entire accuracy) be referred to as a letter of Alexander the Great to the city of Philippi, founded by his father (see the appendix to this article, no.1).<sup>13</sup> The editio princeps

---

<sup>12</sup> Potter's statement that Demades was not allowed to speak during the Lamian War (233) should be corrected: it goes well beyond any evidence we have. All we know, from the sources in fact cited by him (Plut.Phoc. 26,3 and Diod. 18,18,2), is that at the end of that war he was ἄτιμος, after being several times convicted παρὰ νόμων.

<sup>13</sup> Vatin thinks it a letter written by the ambassadors, Missitzis opts for a letter sent, as a royal order, by Alexander. I do not see how we can decide.



sets out to be quite conservative in its actual text. The editor says (259 n.4): "On n'y trouvera aucune restitution hypothétique." Interpretations and supplements that do not appear to him certain are, quite properly, suggested in the long commentary. The text was reprinted, with one or two further supplements and an additional commentary, by L.Missitzis, in *The Ancient World* 12 (1985) 3ff., and that version was reproduced by N.G.L.Hammond at the beginning of his article in *Classical Quarterly* 38 (1988) 382f., together with part of another inscription, found at Kalindoia and published by I.P.Votokopoulou in *Ancient Macedonia* 4 (1986) 87ff. (See appendix no.2.)

Some points in the text from Philippi seemed obvious and uncontested. First, that Alexander must have the title of βασιλεύς: even Vatin took this for granted, and the amount of text lost on the left of the first column seems to be estimated in part on the basis of it.<sup>14</sup> It turned out to be an important assumption. Hammond, taking it over from his predecessors, devotes part of his article (which deals with various aspects of Macedonian Staatsrecht) to stressing its importance. Arguing against R.M.Errington and (largely following him) G.T.Griffith, who had denied the use of the royal title by Argead kings before Alexander's expedition, he remarks that this text "ends the long controversy over the use of the title βασιλεύς". (He does not claim that use of the title was compulsory.)

The word does not seem a necessary and inevitable supplement: alternatives can be supplied without any great trouble.<sup>15</sup> But let us accept it for the sake of argument. Hammond finds parallel and supplementary proof in the Kalindoia inscription, where the title survives. Of course, for all this to be relevant, it is essential that these texts be dated at the beginning of Alexander's reign. No one doubts that, by the time he had won the battle of Gaugamela (autumn 331), Alexander called himself King (whether of Macedon, or of Persia, or of Asia) and would encourage others to address him by that title. Inscriptions set up after 331 are therefore irrelevant to this question. Hammond comments (p.390): "The particular interest of our inscriptions is that they were set up within Macedonia some eighteen months after the accession of Alexander."

As regards the Kalindoia text, this is simply not so. Hammond himself knows (p.384) that Votokopoulou put the engraving of the first part of the stele (here alone relevant) in 323,

<sup>14</sup> For the uncertainty of this (within the limits of a few letters) and for the "very probable" restoration in line 3, see Vatin p.261.

<sup>15</sup> E.g., with the citizens as the subject,

2 [διεπ]ρεσβεύσαν

3 [το κοινῆι πρὸς Ἀλέ]ξ[νδ]ρον

Or, with the ambassadors as the subject,

2 [..ἐπ]ρέσβευσαν

3 [ἀναβάντες πρὸς Ἀλέ]ξ[νδ]ρον

(On line 3 in this reconstruction, see further below, for the possible destination of the ambassadors.) It should be noted that the alignment reported by the editor (it cannot be seen on the photo), of ΞΑ in A line 3 above HNA in line 4, allows for the precise number of letters he gives only if based on the actual supplementation of the line.

and this must be at least approximately correct.<sup>16</sup> This inscription is therefore irrelevant to the question which Hammond wants to answer. There can be no doubt that, by 324 or 323, he would be called βασιλεύς even in a reference to earlier arrangements.

Hammond refers to a third text in which Alexander calls himself king. Although he does not in fact use it in connection with this discussion, it will be as well if we positively remove it from this question. It is the inscription (Tod, Greek Hist.Inscr. II 185) in which Alexander finally regulates the affairs of Priene and of Naulochum. Hammond puts it "a year later" than our other texts (p.387) and says that "we are fortunate to have three inscriptions, dating ... between winter 335 and summer 334 ...". As for the date of the arrangement recorded, I showed some time ago that the language used in the text requires a date several years later;<sup>17</sup> and S.M.Sherwin-White has since shown, in JHS 105 (1985) 69-87, that the archaeological context makes it clear that the stone was set up in the reign of Lysimachus. This text, therefore, is also irrelevant to our present question .

We are left with the Philippi text and nothing else. It requires all the more careful scrutiny. We have already seen that, in the text as we have it, the insertion of the royal name is by no means as inevitable as the first editor thought. Next, the date: how is it arrived at? Let us quote Hammond, who puts the case most clearly:<sup>18</sup>

"Inscription A [the Philippi document] authorised 'Philotas and Leonnatus' to define a boundary. It follows that the authorisation was made before they departed to Asia in spring 334. Alexander probably made himself familiar with the situation at Philippi early in 335 ... The embassy was sent presumably when Alexander was known to be back in Macedonia, i.e. in November or December 335. Thus the ruling of Alexander and the recording of it at Philippi may be dated confidently to the winter of 335-334." It follows, of course, that Alexander was at that time given the royal title, as here supplemented.

It seems obvious that the required sense can be got out of the text. It involves taking the aorist ὀρίσαι (A line 6) as an order addressed to the two Macedonians, i.e. a change of subject, since the ἐργάζεσθαι preceding it (A line 4) is clearly addressed to Philippi. Such an order to two Macedonians, in fact his own hetairoi, embodied in a document addressed to

---

<sup>16</sup> The dedication and the first ten names are engraved in the same hand, the later names by various hands (no doubt, as the editor suggests, annually, when the stele was already standing). Her calculation is, however, inaccurate. She assumes that the first priest took office in 334/3 and (explicitly) puts the tenth in 324/3: it should, on that premiss, be 325/4, with the engraving done in 324. One might (imaginatively) keep her terminal date and suggest 333/2 for the first priest: the cult may have taken some time to organise, before a priest could be elected. The decision, by an ex-priest, to dedicate the stele in 323 might then be explained by news of Alexander's death having reached the area (in the summer of 323), which might be a suitable occasion for setting up a permanent record of all the priests who had served in his reign.

<sup>17</sup> Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg (Oxford, 1966) pp.47ff.

<sup>18</sup> Vatin and Missitzis suggest slightly different occasions for the embassy, and places to which it may have gone; but they agree in dating it before Alexander's departure for Asia.

the city of Philippi, is certainly odd, but it would be rash to argue that it is impossible.<sup>19</sup> On that basis, the date must be accepted.

But a question arises: since all the land concerned had apparently been given to Philippi by Philip, had he not seen to it that it was properly surveyed and the boundaries marked?<sup>20</sup> Such careless conduct would be rather unexpected. In any case, the main dispute here does not seem to be over boundaries, but over the right (of Thracians?) to cross them (see A lines 8 and 12), and perhaps over their rights to a usufruct (B lines 4ff.). If we assume that Philip took his royal duty seriously, the boundaries (including those of the fallow land) would already have been marked, and things now look different.

On that basis, one might suggest that Alexander is in fact explaining that there is no need to occupy himself with boundaries, because they have already been defined. In other words, the sentence referring to Philotas and Leonnatus is a parenthesis, not an order. One might supplement (purely *exempli gratia*, especially in view of the uncertainty over the number of letters missing):

6 ὀρίσαι δὲ τὴν [χώραν]

7 [Φιλίππου ζῶντο]c Φιλώταν καὶ Λεονν[άτον ...

or:

6 ὀρίσαι δὲ τὴν [γῆν ἐπὶ]

7 [τοῦ ἐμοῦ πατρὸς]c κτλ.

Both Philotas and Leonnatus (who, as was at once recognised, must be the noble commanders closely associated with Alexander on his Asian campaign) were active and prominent under Philip, certainly near the end of his reign:<sup>21</sup> Philotas was chosen by Philip to witness the uncomfortable heart-to-heart talk between father and son that followed Philip's discovery of Alexander's intrigue with the satrap Pixodarus (Plut. Alex. 10,3), and Leonnatus was one of his 'bodyguards' and was related to the royal family.<sup>22</sup> In fact, he was one of the men who caught and killed Philip's assassin.

If this alternative interpretation is correct and the two men named had been deputed by Philip to mark out the boundaries (perhaps for the whole colony, perhaps only for the fallow land: we cannot tell), then we lose our indication for the date of the inscription. We also do not know where the embassy met him. It has naturally been assumed, in view of the interpretation adopted regarding the two Macedonians and the date that followed from it, that

<sup>19</sup> The infinitive addressed to the Thracians (B line 4) is not parallel, since they are clearly a party to whatever problem Alexander is adjudicating.

<sup>20</sup> Vatin thinks the aim of the embassy was to secure permission to work fallow land, which had not been assigned to the colony. This cannot be refuted. But in any case, the land must have belonged to someone (the king?) and, when the colony was founded, ought to have been given fixed boundaries -- the more so if, as Vatin thinks, it was intended for future colonists.

<sup>21</sup> The date when these arrangements were made by Philip is quite irrecoverable. That they were made when he founded the colony is a possible guess, but no more. It may equally have been in the settlement after his last Thracian campaign.

<sup>22</sup> See, conveniently, Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian I* p.220.

the ambassadors travelled only a short distance: perhaps only to Pella, perhaps as far as Thebes, as Hammond and Vatin respectively suggested. But this leaves the prohibition on the sale of something until the return of the ambassadors very mysterious.<sup>23</sup> It surely ought to be assumed that the envoys would bring back with them precise instructions, too detailed to be incorporated in the document, regarding such a proposed sale. Why was the document engraved without those instructions? The most obvious suggestion is that the citizens of Philippi, receiving this message to the effect that they had essentially won their case and received all they wanted, rushed to engrave the answer and display it, without waiting for the embassy to return from what might be a far-away place. It should at least be suggested that the ambassadors had had to find Alexander in the heart of Asia, from where it would take them several months to return; whereas an express messenger could bring them the document announcing their success in a very short time.

Perhaps the few letters left in the first line are relevant. Although there are no doubt other possibilities, they would certainly lend themselves to a reconstruction into some form of the word "Persis". (So far, no alternative has been suggested.) The letters could not be made to refer to Persian men. But the land of Persis, as distinct from its armies, could not easily be relevant to any document of the first two years of Alexander, when a march as far as Persepolis, even if it was dimly envisaged, would hardly be officially proclaimed.

My concern has been to point out how, once we rid ourselves of an understandable eagerness to have a document of Alexander's beginning as king (and perhaps, i.a., to settle once and for all the question of the Macedonian king's official title before the conquests of Alexander), we must consider alternative interpretations of this very fragmentary document, which may in some respects present advantages and avoid difficulties. Perhaps some of the missing fragments will turn up (or, if they already have, be recognised), to settle the matter. In the meantime, this text also illustrates the point that history should not be written with any confidence from what is inside square brackets in published inscriptions.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> B 10-12. Missitzis, recognising this, suggests that a different embassy is referred to: "otherwise one cannot explain how Alexander's royal decree reached Philippi and was already inscribed on the stone when the Philippian ambassadors who received it [he believes it was sent by Alexander himself] are yet to return" (p.131). He has seen a very real difficulty, on the premises which he shares with Vatin. But his solution will not do. The required reference to a different embassy cannot be got out of the Greek (ἡ πρεσβεία).

<sup>24</sup> For the sake of completeness, it should be mentioned that some believe the problem of the use of the royal title before Alexander's conquests was settled some time ago. An inscription found at Oleveni, first ascribed to Philip V, then tentatively to Philip II, was firmly claimed for the latter by M.B.Hatzopoulos in W.L.Lindsay and E.N.Borza (ed.), *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (1982), pp.21ff. (It is reproduced in the Appendix as no.3.) His argument for Philip II, that the lettering of the inscription is different from the known "official" style of Philip V, does not convince me: I should have to see a positive parallel for the rather characteristic and carelessly executed script (see his plate, p.24). Professor D.M.Lewis tells me that he knows of nothing like it in the fourth century and cannot easily imagine it even in the third. The case must remain sub judice, at the best. (For full bibliography up to 1982, see Hatzopoulos.) Nothing in the document (incidentally) says that the campaign mentioned took place in "year 16".

## APPENDIX: The texts in Part II

## 1. The letter to Philippi (Vatin's text).

## A

[... ≠ 27-30 ...]ρσιδ[...]  
 [... ≠ 18 ...]ης [..ἐπ]ρέσβευσαν  
 [πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀλέ]ξα[νδ]ρον καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος  
 4 [... ≠ 11 ...]ν τὴν ἀργὸν ἐργάζεσθαι [...π  
 [... ≠ 10 ...]ιν χώρα καὶ προστελοῦσι [...]  
 [... ≠ 13 ...]τὴν ἀργὸν ὀρίσαι δὲ τὴν [χώραν]  
 [... ≠ 12 ...]ς Φιλώταν καὶ Λεονν[άτον]....]  
 8 [... ≠ 9 ...]ἐπεισβε[βή]κασιν τῆς χώ[ρας]....]  
 [... ≠ 7 ...]ῆν Φιλίπ[ποι]ς ἔδωκεν Φί[λιππος]...]  
 [... ≠ 13 ...] καὶ ἐπισκέψα[σθαι] .....]  
 [... ≠ 13-14 ...]ασιν τοῦ [--- ≠ 13 ---]  
 12 [... ≠ 12 ἐ]πεισβεβήκ[ασιν]... ≠ 13 ...]  
 [... ≠ 12 ...]ἔξελεῖν δ[ἐ]... ≠ 16 ...]  
 [... ≠ 12 ...] πλέθρα δισχ[ίλια] ... ≠ 10 ...]  
 [... ≠ 12 ...] Δάτου χώρα [... ≠ 14 ...]  
 vac.

## B

[... ≠ 16 ...]προσλα[β]ε[ῖν] ἀπὸ [... ≠ 7 ...]  
 μ[... ≠ 11 ...]σταδίου· τ[ῆ]ν μὲν ἄ[λλ]ην  
 ν[... ≠ 15 ...]ς· ὅσα δὲ τοῖς Θραιξί[ν]...]  
 4 [... ≠ 18 ...]ται καρπίζεσθαι τοὺς Θρ[ᾶ]-  
 [िकास καθάπερ Ἀλέξαν]δρος περὶ αὐτῶν δια-  
 [τέταχεν Φιλίππου]ς δὲ ἔχειν τὴν χώραν τὴν  
 [... ≠ 14 ...] ὥς οἱ λόφοι ἑκατέρωθεν ἔχου-  
 8 [σιν]... ≠ 9 ...]η[... ≠ 6 ...]ρσειραικὴν γῆν καὶ  
 Δαινηρον νέμεσθαι Φι[λίππους] καθάπερ ἔδω-  
 κε Φίλιππος· τὴν δὲ γῆν τὴν ἐν Δυ[...μ]η-  
 θένα πωλεῖν τέως ἢ πρεσβεία πα[ρὰ] τοῦ Ἀλε-  
 12 ξάνδρου ἐπανέλθῃ· τὰ δὲ ἔλη ε[ῖναι] τῶν]  
 Φιλίππων ἕως γεφύρας. vac.  
 vac.

## 2. The Kalindoia dedication.

[Ἀγαθά]νωρ Ἀγάθων[ος]  
 [ιερατε]ύσας{ας} Ἀσκληπιῶι  
 [Ἀπόλλ]ωνι ἀνέθηκεν.  
 [οῖδε] ἱερεῖς ἐγένοντο  
 5 [ἄφ' ο]ῦ βασιλεῦς Ἀλέξαν-  
 δρος ἔδωκε Μακεδόσι  
 Καλίνδοια καὶ τὰ χωρία  
 τὰ περὶ Καλίνδοια Θαμίσ-  
 κίαν Καμακαίαν Τριπο-

- 10 ἀτίν Σίβρας Ἡροδώρου  
 Τρωῖλος Ἀντιγόνου  
 Καλλίας Ἀπολλωνίου  
 Ἰκκότας Γύρτου  
 Ἡγήσιππος Νικόξεγου  
 15 Λυκοῦργος Νικάνορος  
 Ἀγαθάνωρ Ἀγάθωνος  
 Μενέλαος Μενάνδρου  
 Ἀντίγονος Μενάνδρου  
 Ἀντιμένων Μενάνδρου  
 20 Κράτιππος Εὐρυτίου  
 Γύλις Εὐ<ρ>υτίου  
 Κάνουν Ἀσσα[ - ]μικου  
 Κερτίμας Κρίθωνος  
 Φιλώτας Λεωνίδου  
 25 Πτολέμας Μ[.....]  
 Μύας Φιλίσκου

3. The inscription from Oleveni. (Hatzopoulos' text, see note 24.)

- [. . . 3 lines . . .]  
 4 [ . . . . Τ Α . . . Α Ν . . ]  
 [ . . ]στενα[ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . ]φοι ταῦτα [εἰ]ς τοὺς  
 [ . . . ΣΑΧΡΑ . Ν] ἀν[α-  
 8 [γρά]ψαντες εἰς σ[τή-  
 [λην] ἀνά[θ]ετε ἐν τῷ  
 ἐπιφαν[ε]στάτῳ τ[ό]πῳ  
 ἔτους Ϻ Πανήμου [ . .  
 12 [ . . ]κατλεστών [οἱ πα-  
 [ρ]αταξάμενοι ἐπὶ  
 τοῦ βασιλέως Φιλίπ-  
 που πρὸς Δαρδανεῖς  
 16 [ . Α . . . . . ]ήσαντες