

N. G. L. HAMMOND

INSCRIPTIONS CONCERNING PHILIPPI AND CALINDOEIA IN THE REIGN OF
ALEXANDER THE GREAT

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 82 (1990) 167–175

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

INSCRIPTIONS CONCERNING PHILIPPI AND CALINDOEA IN THE REIGN OF
ALEXANDER THE GREAT

In volume 79 (1989) of this journal¹ E.Badian discussed some aspects of the two inscriptions with which this article is concerned. He made reference to the commentaries on the Philippi inscription by C.Vatin in 1984 and by L.Missitzis in 1985, on the Calindoea inscription by I.P.Vokotopoulou in 1986, and on both inscriptions by myself in 1988.² Unfortunately he made no reference to the reports by M.B.Hatzopoulos of the Philippi inscription in Bull.Epigr. 100 (1987) 436-9, and of the Calindoea inscription in Bull.Epigr. 101 (1988) 444ff. Because some of Badian's comments will form starting points, I give below the two texts which he was using, namely those published by C.Vatin and by I.P.Vokotopoulou.

I A (Vatin's text)

	≠ 27-30		...]ρσιδ[...]
	≠ 18		...]ης [...έπ]ρέσβευσαν
		[πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀλέ]ξα[νδ]ρον καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος	
4	≠ 11	...]ν τὴν ἀργὸν ἐργάζεσθαι [...π	
	≠ 10	...]ιν χώρα καὶ προστελοῦσ[ι ...]	
	≠ 13	...τ]ὴν ἀργὸν ὀρίσαι δὲ τὴν [χώραν]	
	≠ 12	...]ς Φιλώταν καὶ Λεονν[άτον....]	
8	≠ 9	...έπεισβε]βήκασιν τῆς χά[ρας....]	
	≠ 7	...ῆν Φιλίπ]ποις ἔδωκεν Φί[λιππος...]	
	≠ 13	... κα]ῖ ἐπισκέψα[σθαι]	
	≠ 13-14	...]ασιν τοῦ [--- ≠ 13 --]	
12	≠ 12	ἐ]πεισβεβήκ[ασιν... ≠ 13 ...]	
	≠ 12	...]έξελεῖν δ[ἐ... ≠ 16 ...]	
	≠ 12	...] πλέθρα δισχι[λίαια ... ≠ 10 ...]	
	≠ 12	...] Δάτου χώρα [... ≠ 14 ...]	
		vac.	

¹ His article, entitled 'History from Square Brackets', 59-70, dealt also with an article by D.S.Potter, for which see also H.Wankel, ZPE 71,1988,202 note 8.

² C.Vatin, 'Lettre adressée à la cité de Philippes par les ambassadeurs auprès d'Alexandre', Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἡ' Διεθνoῦς Συνεδρίου Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς Ἐπιγραφικῆς I (Athens, 1984) 259-70. L.Missitzis, 'A royal decree of Alexander the Great on the Lands of Philippi', The Ancient World 13 (1985) 3-14. I.P.Vokotopoulou, ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῶν Καλινδοίων, Ancient Macedonia 4 (1986) 87-114. N.G.L.Hammond, 'The king and the land in the Macedonian kingdom', CQ 38 (1988) 382-91. My chief concern was with the ownership of land by the Macedonian king and what it entailed. I refer to the above articles simply by the name of the author.

I B

- [... ≠ 16πρ]οσλα[β]ε[ῖν] ἀπό [... ≠ 7 ...]
 μ[... ≠ 11 στ]αδίουσ τ[ῆ]ν μὲν ἄ[λλην]
 ν[... ≠ 15 ...]ς ὅσα δὲ τοῖς Θραιξι[ν. . . .]
 4 [... ≠ 18 ...]ται καρπίζεσθαι τοὺς Θρ[ᾱ]-
 [ικας καθάπερ Ἀλέξαν]δρος περὶ αὐτῶν δια-
 [τέταχεν Φιλίππου]ς δὲ ἔχειν τὴν χώραν τὴν
 [... ≠ 14 ... ὧ]ς οἱ λόφοι ἑκατέρωθεν ἔχου-
 8 [σιν. . . ≠ 9 ...]η[... ≠ 6 ...]ρισειραικὴν γῆν καὶ
 Δαινηρον νέμεσθαι Φιλίππους καθάπερ ἔδω-
 κε Φίλιππος τὴν δὲ γῆν τὴν ἐν Δυ[. . . .]ι μη-
 θένα πωλεῖν τέως ἢ πρεσβεία πα[ρὰ τοῦ Ἀλε]-
 12 ξάνδρου ἐπανέλθῃ· τὰ δὲ ἔλη ε[ῖναι τῶν]
 Φιλίπων ἕως γεφύρας. vac.
 vac.

- [Ἀγαθάνωρ Ἀγάθων[ος]
 [ἱερατε]ύσας{ας} Ἀσκληπιῶι
 [Ἀπόλλ]ωνι ἀνέθηκεν
 [οἶδε] ἱερεῖς ἐγένοντο
 5 [ἀφ' οὗ] βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξαν-
 δρος ἔδωκε Μακεδόσι
 Καλίνδοια καὶ τὰ χωρία
 τὰ περὶ Καλίνδοια Θαμίσ-
 10 κίαν Καμακαίαν Τριπο-
 ἄτιν· Σίβρας Ἡροδώρου
 Τρωῖλος Ἀντιγόνου
 Καλλίας Ἀπολλωνίου
 Ἰκκότας Γύρτου
 Ἡγήσιππος Νικοζέγου
 15 Λυκοῦργος Νικάνορος
 Ἀγαθάνωρ Ἀγάθων[ος]
 Μενέλαος Μενάνδ[ρου]
 Ἀντίγονος Μενάνδ[ρου]
 Ἀντιμένων Μενάνδ[ρου]
 20 Κράτιππος Εὐρυτίου
 Γύλις Εὐ[ι] <ρ>υτίου
 Κάνουν Ἀσσα[-]μίκου
 Κερτίμας Κρίθωνος
 Φιλώτας Λεωγ[ίδου]
 25 Πτολέμας Μ[. . . .]
 Μύας Φιλίσ[κου]
 Ἀμερίας Κυδ[ία]
 Πάσων Σκύθ[ου]
 Φίλαγρος Μενά[νδρου]

- 30 Γυδίας Κρίθω[νος]
 Φιλόξενος Ε[- - -]
 Περδίκκας Ἀμμα[δίσκου]
 Νικάνωρ Νίκω[νος]
 Νικάνωρ Σώσ[ο]υ
- 35 Γάδδυς Ἀστίωγ[ος]
 Ἀντιφάνης Σώσ[ω]νος
 Παρμενίωγ Ἀλ[- - -]
 Γλαυκίας Δαβρ[εία]
 Ἄρπαλος Φα[- - -]

Badian warns us of the danger of making restorations in lacunose texts and then of drawing historical deductions from the restorations. No one will dispute the soundness of his warning. Restorations, however, are not to be judged en bloc. Some restorations are made inevitable by the context: for instance in 1 A 8 and 12, 1 A 9 and 1 B 9-10, 1 B 4 and 5-6, and 1 B 11-12, or in 2, 1 and 16. Others are made probable by Greek usage or by usage elsewhere in the inscription: e.g. 1 B 1 and 1 B 2, of the restorations by Missitzis in 1 B 8 to read πε]ρὶ *Κεῖριακὴν γῆν*,³ and, because the definite article was not so used in 1 A 3 and 1 B 9, to read with probability in 1 B 11 and 12 π[ά]λιν παρ' Ἀλε]ξάνδρου and ε[ἶ]να πάντα]. In 2. 1 the restoration is due to 2. 16; and Hatzopoulos is surely correct in writing of this inscription "le texte de 39 lignes peut être reconstitué presque entièrement" (Bull.Epigr. 101. 444). The worst restorations are those which are affixed to a minimum of surviving letters and are inspired by a historical theory. Examples of this last category are provided by Badian's proposed restorations. Having suggested that "the ambassadors had had to find Alexander in the heart of Asia", he proposed for the four surviving letters of 1 A 1 ρσιδ the restore "some form of the word Persis"; and choosing to interpret ὀρίσαι in 1 A 6 as referring to a past action he proposed to add to the letter sigma [χώραν Φιλίππου ζῶντο]c or [γῆν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πατρὸς]c.⁴

The restoration in 1 A 2-3 ἐπ]ρέβευσαν [πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀλε]ξά[νδ]ρον, which was proposed by Vatin, supported by Missitzis and myself and not commented on by Hatzopoulos, was in line with the practice of the Macedonian court. As Missitzis wrote (4), "the royal chancellery, after the customary salutation, starts the letter by making a reference to the embassy's mission and often recording the ambassadors' names." If this is accepted,

³ Supported by Hatzopoulos in Bull.Epigr. 100, 437f. The ancient inhabitants of modern Serres were known sometime as *Κίρινοι*, and their city as *Κίρις τῆς Πατιονίας*. The form in the inscription was evidently that used locally.

⁴ To refer back to the lifetime of Philip seems otiose when the inscription contains instructions for the future, that is from 330 onwards in Badian's chronology. His alternative restoration introduces the first person which is not found elsewhere in the inscription (if accepted, it implies, unlike the rest of the inscription, that the text was written by Alexander); and the periphrasis "my father", instead of "Philip" which does occur in both columns of the inscription, is an English rather than a Greek variation. The restorations which he offers in n.15 are no better; for κοινῇ is redundant as embassies always represent a community, and the mention of their journey is irrelevant, except in as far as ἀναβάντες was chosen to imply an anabasis like those described by Xenophon and Arrian.

the four letters in line 1 may be the remains of an ambassador's name ending in ἴδης or ἴδου. The interval between ἐπ[ρέεβευσαν and Ἴαλε[ξά[νδ]ρον has to be filled by πρός and by a definition of Alexander. As I pointed out, Μακεδόνα would be otiose within Macedonia, and Φιλίππου would not precede but follow Alexander's name. The restoration πρὸς βασιλέα then is "almost certain", as I wrote (390). Both Vatin and Missitzis held that the inscribed text began with line 1 A 1 and ended with line 1 B 28.

Badian offered a new interpretation of 1 A 6-7. He deduced from the aorist tense ὀρίσαι that boundaries had "already been defined" (67). There are two objections. If the definition of boundaries had been prior to the time of the text, we should expect to find a pluperfect tense, such as we have in 1 A 12 ἐπεῖτε βεβήκατε. Then we should be guided by the usage within the text, which employs the present tense for a continuing action (in 1 A 4, 5 being a participle, 1 B 4, 6, 9 and 11) and the aorist tense for a single action (in 1 A 6, 10, 13, and in 1 B 1 and 12, being a subjunctive). For an analogy we may turn to Alexander's instructions to the people of Chios in 332 (Tod, GHI no. 192), where the opening lines provide the present tenses κατιέναι and εἶναι for the exiles returning and for the continuing constitution of Chios, and the aorist tense αἰρεθῆναι δὲ νομογράφους οὔτινες γράψουσι for the future work of the codifiers. The meaning here is not that the codifiers had been elected, but that they were to be elected, i.e. as a single act. That Philotas and Leonnatus were to define the boundaries was stated by Vatin (262), Missitzis (8), myself (383), and Hatzopoulos (Bull.Epigr. 100. 437 "la délimitation de la chôra sera effectuée par Philotas et Leonnatos"). Badian's interpretation of ὀρίσαι is to be rejected. In any case what would have been the point of including a completed action of the past in the arrangements for the future?

Restorations are of course restricted by the length of the line in 1 A and 1 B, as Vatin (261) and Missitzis (4) have pointed out. The complete line, including a certain restoration, of 1 B 9 provides an approximate measure of 35 letters, approximate because some letters took more space than others (Vatin 261). This measure is clearly applicable to the other lines of 1 B, because the initial letters of lines 9-13 were carefully aligned and the final letters of lines 5-10 were roughly aligned on the stone, as the drawing by Missitzis shows (his p. 5). That the same length of line was used in 1 A is to be expected on general grounds. There is also a particular reason. For since the initial letters of 1 B 2 and 3 survived on the piece of stone which carried the final letters of 1 A 2 and 3, it is clear that A and B were symmetrically arranged in parallel columns on the single slab of marble of which we have broken pieces. In order to maintain that symmetry the lines of A were of the same length as those of B. Thus, when we take the observations of Missitzis into account, it is not the case that the restorations, especially in 1 A 3, were the basis of our determining of the length of

line in A.⁵

Important issues are the nature and the date of the inscription found at Philippi. If the members of the embassy mentioned in 1 A 2 were named in 1 A 1 and 2, then it was no doubt this embassy which was meant in 1 B 12 "until the embassy shall return from Alexander". In that case the purpose of the inscription was to publish at Philippi those decisions which Alexander had laid down, and it mentioned in 1 B 10-11 one matter (there may have been others) on which Alexander had deferred a decision and intended to convey a decision through the embassy on its return. This was the view of Vatin, who thought that the decisions recorded in the inscription were conveyed in the form of a letter from the embassy (hence his title "lettre adressée à la cité de Philippes par les ambassadeurs auprès d'Alexandre" and pp. 259 and 261). Missitzis (13) supposed that there had been two embassies: one sent by Alexander to Philippi concerning the matter in 1 B 25-26 (this embassy, he supposed, had gone back to Alexander but was expected to come again to Philippi, i.e. as in 1 B 26-27), and another embassy sent by Philippi to Alexander concerning the allocation of land (this embassy, he supposed, had returned with a letter from Alexander, of which "a summary or epitome" was given in the inscription).

I did not enter into this difference between Vatin and Missitzis; but I noted (382 n. 1) that the inscription was in my opinion "an exact record of Alexander's arrangements" and not a summary. Hatzopoulos (438) decided for one embassy, as Vatin had done, and against the two embassies of Missitzis, and he argued that \leq $\pi\rho\epsilon\beta\epsilon\epsilon\alpha$ in 1 B 11 could refer only to the embassy of 1 A 2. Badian (68 with n. 23) made the same decision and advanced the same argument about \leq $\pi\rho\epsilon\beta\epsilon\epsilon\alpha$ as Hatzopoulos had done. My view is as follows. There was only one embassy and its members, Philippians, were named in 1 A 1-2. They reached Alexander and they were still with him when our text was inscribed at Philippi. The text published Alexander's decisions on some matters. But decisions on other matters, including the item in 1 B 10-1, were to be brought back from Alexander by the embassy on its return to Philippi.

A clue to the date was seen in the names "Philotas and Leonnatus" of 1 A 7. Vatin (262) held that Leonnatus could only be the officer who was in 336 a Bodyguard of Philip II (Diod. 16. 94. 4). In looking for a Philotas of equal rank (262 "de rang égal") he pitched on Philotas, son of Parmenion. Because this Philotas was executed in 330, a terminus ante quem for the inscription was provided. He argued that, once engaged in operations in Asia from spring 334, Leonnatus and this Philotas were not available for work at Philippi; and he therefore concluded that the inscription was set up before the start of the Asian campaign and

⁵ Badian suggested (65) that "the amount of text lost on the left of the first column seems to be estimated in part on the basis of it" (i.e. of the restoration including the word $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$); see also the end of his note 15. This suggestion is important to him; for it was this restoration alone which might justify his title "History from Square Brackets" as far as our two inscriptions were discussed by him.

"very probably" about the end of 335. Missitzis (8) opted for the same two men and for either early 335 or "before the Persioan campaign", i.e. before spring 334. I accepted the views of Vatin and Missitzis on the two officers without discussion (383) and suggested that the decisions of Alexander were recorded at Philippi at some time during the winter of 335/334.

As regards the whereabouts of Alexander when the embassy of Philippians was with him, Vatin suggested Thebes (262); I made no suggestion, although Badian (68) alleged, without giving any reference,⁶ that I opted for "Pella". A new opinion was voiced by Hatzopoulos (Bull.Epigr. 100. 438f.). While accepting the identifications of Philotas and Leonnatus, he argued for the embassy being with Alexander in Asia, and for the intention of Alexander being to send Philotas and Leonnatus from Asia to Philippi. By restoring in line 2 Π[ε]ρσίδ[ι] he narrowed the date to December 331, when Alexander was in Persis. Badian, as we have noted, thought that Philotas and Leonnatus, whom he identified as the others had done, had carried out the definition of boundaries before the time of the inscription (67). Thus they had no relevance for the dating. But he proposed to restore a form of Περσίς, and thus to have the embassy from Philippi reach Alexander in Persis, again as Hatzopoulos had proposed in 1987.

The divergent views on the dating deserve further investigation. In December 331 Philotas, son of Parmenion, had become a very experienced officer and as Commander of the entire Companion Cavalry had won added distinction at the Battle of Gaugamela in October 331. Leonnatus' services had been outstanding; for he had been promoted to be a Bodyguard of Alexander in winter 332-331. Alexander, acclaimed "King of Asia" after the victory at Gaugamela, was planning in December 331 to conquer "all Asia".⁷ It was no time to send his senior Cavalry Commander and one of his Bodyguards on such a trivial task as fixing boundaries in a land-division at far-away Philippi, a task which officers under Antipater in Macedonia were perfectly capable of discharging. What we need is a time when officers of these names were available in the vicinity of Philippi, i.e. before the campaign in Asia. That within the years 336-334 the Leonnatus of our inscription was the man who had been a Bodyguard of Philip II in 336 seems to be inescapable.⁸ However, in 336-335 Philotas, son of Parmenion, was still making his way to the top, and he distinguished

⁶ He is very sparing with precise references.

⁷ Plu. Alex. 34. 1; see my article, 'The kingdom of Asia and the Persian Throne', *Antichthon* 20 (1986) 76f. with n. 19, for the significance of this acclamation.

⁸ Whereas H.Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Munich, 1926) 2. 232ff. listed two men of this name, there seem to have been three, of whom "the son of Anteus" was a close contemporary and intimate friend of Alexander (Arr. An. 6. 28. 4; Arr. Succ. fr. 12 and 1 a 2, ed. Roos). The Bodyguard of Philip (Diod. 16. 94. 4; probably also an envoy to Athens in 335 in Ps. Call. 2. 2) was probably an older man, either "the son of Eunous" (Arr. Ind. 18. 3) or "the son of Antipater" (Ind. 18. 6).

himself in a cavalry command near Pelium in late July or early August 335.⁹ He was not yet of equal rank with Leonnatus. But there was another Philotas who was of comparable standing with Leonnatus. This Philotas and Lysanias were made responsible for taking the booty won from the Thracians between Amphipolis and the Haemus pass "to the cities by the sea" (Arr. An. 1. 2. 1); and his status was evidently like that of the two officers who were given the same task with the booty from the Danube area, Meleager and Philip, who each commanded an Infantry Brigade at the Battle of the Granicus in 334 (1. 4. 5 and 1. 14. 3).¹⁰ In journeying to "the cities by the sea" Philotas and Lysanias came probably to Philippi.

My suggestion is that this is the Philotas of the inscription. It provides an answer to other questions. Alexander had probably familiarised himself with the problems of land-tenure in the vicinity of Philippi in the winter of 336-335, and they were in his mind when he set off on the spring campaign in 335. The embassy of Philippians joined him either at Amphipolis or en route to the Haemus area.¹¹ When Alexander sent Philotas back with the booty, he gave him the text of his decisions so far, instructed him in the details of the boundary-fixing, and asked him to publicise the ban on selling timber,¹² which was to stand "until the embassy shall return". Thus the embassy stayed on the Danube area.¹³ We see then that the wording of the inscription was not that of a letter from the embassy, as Vatin supposed, nor that of a royal decree, as Missitzis supposed. It is the wording used by Philotas and Leonnatus to convey Alexander's decisions, and it includes the authorisation that they were to fix the boundaries (L-S-J⁹ s.v. ὀρίζω II. 1). It described Alexander at the first mention "almost certainly" as king and thereafter referred to him only as "Alexander". This was evidently the custom of Macedonians in referring to their king.

If this is correct, the inscription was set up at Philippi in May or so of 335. Leonnatus was already, we assume, near or at Philippi, where he may have been left by Alexander to investigate the situation. The embassy may not have come back to Philippi until late in the summer or early in the autumn of 335, by which time the inscription was already in place. Alexander wanted a continuing ban on the selling of the timber, which was evidently

⁹ The patronymic "son of Parmenion" is provided for Philotas on this campaign by Papyrus British Library 3085, lines 32-33 Φιλώταν [τὸν Παρμε]νίωνος. See my article in GRBS 28 (1987) 339. Philotas was one of three squadron-commanders in Arr. An. 1. 2. 5.

¹⁰ It has been recognised that Arrian mentioned two officers of the name Philotas in An. 1. 2. 1 and 1. 2. 5. On this his first campaign as Commander-in-Chief Alexander was relying on many senior commanders whom Philip had appointed.

¹¹ For the route Alexander took from Amphipolis to the Haemus range see my article in CQ 30 (1980) 455f. Others hold that his army passed close to Philippi.

¹² Where Vatin read τὴν δὲ γῆν Missitzis read τὴν δὲ [ὑλ]ην and this reading was adopted by Hatzopoulos in Bull.Epigr. 100. 438.

¹³ The delay may have been due to Alexander's various preoccupations, or to unsafe conditions in Central Thrace for unarmed and unescorted ambassadors.

exploited by Philippi, because he was preparing a merchant fleet as well as a navy for the transportation of men and supplies to Asia in 334.¹⁴

As regards the second text, which was published with a precise description by I.P.Vokotopoulou, I differed from her in the interpretation of lines 5-6. She thought that Alexander was distributing gifts to leading Macedonians *viritim* in winter 335-334 before the start of the Asian campaign (97). I argued that Alexander was giving territory to "Macedones", the corporate body which formed the other part of the Macedonian State, in order that the Macedones should set up a Macedonian city at Calindoea. Independently Hatzopoulos made the same point in *Bull.Epigr.* 101 (1988) 445; and he added that an inscription of the Roman Empire showed that Calindoea had then all the institutions of a Macedonian city. He added that as in other Macedonian cities the priest of Asclepius and Apollo was a eponymous, annual official (445).

Vokotopoulou showed that lines 1 to 19 of the inscription were inscribed in one hand, and that additions were made thereafter in different hands (see the photographs 88 and 91). In other words the first priest and his successors up to the tenth priest, Antimenon Menandrou, were recorded by the same hand. By comparing the letterings of the inscription with those of datable inscriptions Vokotopoulou narrowed the period within which the entire inscription was begun and completed to 330-300. In consequence the period 330-320 became the time within which the ten first names of the thirty names were cut by one and the same hand; and it followed that the era which started after the giving of Calindoea to the Macedones began between 340 and 330. This calculation coincided well with her hypothesis that Alexander gave the gift in winter 335-334. Accordingly the first priest, Sibras Herodorou, held office for the Macedonian year from autumn 334 to autumn 333; and the stone was set up when Antimenon Menandrou had completed his year of office and then passed his *euthune*, i.e. it was set up between autumn 324 and autumn 323. Let us say in 323.

While I accepted her calculations (384), I extended the period within which the gift was made to the whole of the Macedonian year 335-334, because I did not agree that the gift was to individuals. Rather I put the gift to "Macedones" in autumn 335 after the end of the campaigning season, which gave ample time for the movements of population and the sowing of some crops by new citizens in spring 334. Badian printed only the first 26 lines of the Calindoea inscription in his article (69-70); he did not indicate that he had cut 13 lines. His concern was with the date. While he corrected Vokotopoulou's reckoning of ten years to be 334-333 to 325-324 and allowed more time for the organisation of the cult, he favoured a

¹⁴ For the reading "timber" see n. 12. While the king owned all timber in the kingdom, it is evident here that Philippi had been given some right of selling timber by the king, which was now suspended.

dedication of the stele in 323 (65f. with n. 16).¹⁵ He did not concern himself with the question whether Alexander gave land to individual Macedonians or to "Macedones".

What particularly interested Badian in my article was my remark about the description of Alexander as "king" both in the Philippi inscription, where Vatin, Missitzis and I regarded the restoration as "almost certain", and in the Calindoea inscription, where the gift of 335-334 was made by "king Alexander". Badian's arguments against the restoration in the Philippi inscription were not helped by the alternative restorations which he proposed (see p. 169 above). He pointed out correctly that the wording "king Alexander" in the Calindoea inscription might be the wording not at the time of the gift at the time of the inscribing of the words c. 323. Either is possible. He disliked my citation of the title "king" occurring at Priene, a Greek city in Asia which Alexander treated as a Greek city. In 334 "King Alexander" dedicated the temple there to Athena Polias (Tod, GHI 184). The inscription from which Alexander's arrangements at Priene in 334 are known (Tod, GHI 185) poses the same problem as the Calindoea inscription. For it was set up c. 285 but contained an extract from the original arrangements of 334.¹⁶ My view is that the words "of King Alexander" were original to the extract. But the point is academic; for Alexander's use of "king" on the dedication of the temple¹⁷ proves that he was using that title at Priene in 334.

Clare College, Cambridge

N.G.L.Hammond

¹⁵ Badian's suggestion that the first priest held office in 333/2 would imply the organisation of the new Macedonian city in the preceding year, i.e. from autumn 334 to autumn 333. But by then Alexander needed all available manpower for his operations in Asia.

¹⁶ In *The Macedonian State* (Oxford, 1989) 216 n. 25 I cited the views of S.M.Sherwin-White in *JHS* 105 (1985) 84f.; Badian also made reference to it (66) but without mentioning her view that the inscription contained an extract from an ordinance by Alexander of 334.

¹⁷ The lettering of the block recording the dedication was entirely different from the lettering of the main inscription (see Sherwin-White 73). No doubt the original dedication-stone with its inscription was carefully preserved as a show-piece in the Prienian "archive".