

IAN WORTHINGTON

ALEXANDER THE GREAT AND THE DATE OF THE MYTILENE DECREE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 83 (1990) 194–214

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## ALEXANDER THE GREAT AND THE DATE OF THE MYTILENE DECREE

The Mytilene decree<sup>1</sup> is almost as controversial a document as the circumstances in which it was passed. Its contents, centring on the means by which returning exiles to Mytilene on the island of Lesbos could be reconciled with those resident there, point to a dating, presumably, of 324 BC, the year in which Alexander III of Macedon issued the famous Exiles Decree, applicable to the Greek cities.<sup>2</sup> The text of the Exiles Decree is given at Diodorus 18.8.4, although it is quite likely that he did not quote it in its entirety since in this passage he states that all exiles except for those under a curse are to be restored to their native cities; elsewhere (17.109.1), he says those charged with sacrilege and murder are also excluded (cf. Curtius 10.2.4 and Justin 13.5.2), whilst Pseudo-Plutarch (*Mor.* 221a) indicates that the Thebans were also excluded.<sup>3</sup> Although the Exiles Decree is inextricably linked to any assessment of the Mytilene decree, it is the latter which is the subject of this paper.

---

<sup>1</sup> *IG* xii 2, 6, *OGIS* 2 = Tod, *GHI* ii no.201, *SEG* xiii 434. Especially significant is the new redaction (based on autopsy) and photograph (the first made available) of A.J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks: The Epigraphic Evidence* (Norman: 1980) – hereafter Heisserer, *Alexander* – pp. 118-141, to be read with A.J. Heisserer & R. Hodot, ‘The Mytilenean Decree on Concord’, *ZPE* 63 (1986) pp. 109-128, especially pp. 120ff. (with pls.II-III)–hereafter Heisserer & Hodot, ‘Concord’ –, and cf. C.D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago: 1955) no.26 pp.214-216. The stone survives today in two large fragments (alpha and beta) found at modern Mitilini which, despite only the one name in the inscription (Smithinas in line 36; see further below), lends weight to the *communis opinio* that the stone belongs to Mytilene and that the basileus of line 28 is Alexander the Great since, as Heisserer so succinctly notes, “stones of such weight cannot wander very far” (*Alexander* p.118). Both fragments are now housed in the Archaeological Museum at Mytilini (fragment alpha is numberless; fragment beta = no.218). The inscription was cut stoichedon pattern, 49-52.

<sup>2</sup> The Exiles Decree is not a prime concern of this paper; on the background see the excellent discussion of E. Badian, *JHS* 81 (1961) pp.25-31 (= G.T. Griffith [ed.] *Alexander the Great, the Main Problems* [Cambridge: 1966] pp.215-221), with A.B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire: the Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge: 1988) pp.220-228 and S. Jaschinski, *Alexander und Griechenland unter dem Eindruck der Flucht des Harpalos* (Bonn: 1981) pp.69-92 and 120-140.

<sup>3</sup> The omission of the Thebans by Diodorus is puzzling since he goes to such trouble in citing the decree. Heisserer’s point (*Alexander* pp.226-227), that, since the Thebans had been banished in 335 by a decree (δόγμα) of the synhedrion of the allies (Diod. 17.14; cf. Justin 11.3.8), the lack of a reference to their exclusion under the provisions of the edict demonstrates that the synhedrion was bypassed in the promulgation of the Exiles Decree, is a valid one, but it may also be that the Thebans were excluded. As Bosworth suggests, Alexander probably did not intend anyone exiled on his own specific orders to return home (hence the exclusion of the Thebans), but only those exiled by the actions of others (*Conquest and Empire* p.224); cf. below, n.26.

However, the decree in question is not the only one from Mytilene concerned with the restoration of exiles. Heisserer & Hodot, ‘Concord’ pp. 109-119, connect a new inscription from Mytilene (the “Decree on Concord”), dealing with those exiled legally and illegally (lines 12ff.), with *IG* xii 2, 6 (the Mytilene decree) and xii 2, 8 (now lost), pointing out the “exceptionally close resemblance” between the decree on Concord and our inscription (ibid. p.115 n.9), and propose that xii 2, 8 is either a (lost) part of this decree or of another document closely associated with the procedures of this decree: ibid. pp. 115-119 (cf. p.116 for a proposed text of xii 2, 8). Of importance in the following argument is that the decree on Concord was passed before our inscription (ibid. pp. 119 and 121-122), and they are right to connect this with the disturbances of the 330s BC. Thus, it appears that we have a general decree calling for concord between those returning from (illegal) exile and those who then dwelt in the city, and then a further decree (xii 2, 6) specifying some of the details of the return.<sup>4</sup>

To return to the Mytilene decree (xii 2, 6): I give below the revised text of Heisserer & Hodot, ‘Concord’, retaining some suggested restorations in the text put forward by Heisserer in *Alexander*.

[.....<sup>12</sup>..... καὶ οἱ βασι[λ]ηες προστί[θη]σ[θ]ον τῷ κατεληλύθον-]  
 [τι ὡς τέχναν τεχνα]μέν[ω] τῷ ἐ[ν] τᾷ πόλι πρόσθε [ἔ]οντος. Αἱ δέ κέ τις  
 [τῷ κατεληλυθόν]των μὴ ἐμμένη ἐν ταῖς διαλυσί[ε]σσι ταύτ[αι]σι,  
 [μή]κετι ἀπυκομιζέσθω παρ τᾶς πόλιος κτήματος μήδενος μη[δὲ] στ-]  
 [ειχέτω ἐπὶ μῆ]δεν τῷ παρεχώρησαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἐν τᾷ πόλι πρό[σ]θε] 5  
 [ἔ]οντες, ἀλλὰ σ[τ]είχοντον ἐπὶ ταῦτα τὰ κτήματα οἱ παρχωρήσαν[τ-]  
 [ε]ς αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν ἐν τᾷ πόλι πρόσθε ἔόντων, καὶ οἱ στρόταγοι εἰσ-  
 [αὐ]θις ἀπυφέρο]ντον ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν τᾷ πόλι πρόσθε ἔοντα τὰ κτήματα  
 [ὡς μὴ συναλλαγ]μένω τῷ κατεληλύθοντος, καὶ οἱ βασι[λ]ηες προστί- 10  
 [θη]σθον τῷ ἐν τᾷ πόλι πρόσθε ἔοντι ὡς τέχναν τεχναμένω τῷ κα-  
 [τεληλύθοντος]· μηδ’ αἴ κέ τις δίκαν γράφηται περὶ τ[ο]ύτων, μὴ εἰσά-  
 [γοντον οἱ περὶ]δρομοὶ καὶ οἱ δικάσκοποι μηδὲ ἄ[λλ]α ἄρχα μηδέϊα.  
 [.....<sup>11</sup>..... δέ] τοῖς στροτάγοις καὶ τοῖς βασι[λ]ηας καὶ τοῖς πε-

<sup>4</sup> If so, then, following the argument to be put forward that the exiles who are to return are those banished in 333, the prytany of Ditas (specified in line 18 of the decree on Concord) should refer to this year with the return of the exiles (and decrees) in the following year – although see the reservation of Heisserer & Hodot ‘Concord’ pp. 116-117 on the dating of Ditas, and cf. below, n.45. The connection between the two decrees and date is further maintained by A.J. Heisserer, *ZPE* 74 (1988) pp. 112-113.

[ριδρόμοις καὶ τ]οῖς δικασκόποις καὶ ταῖς [ἄλλα]ῖς ἄρχαις, αἵ κε  
 [μὴ γίνηται ἅπαν]τα ὡς ἐν τῷ ψ[αφίσματι γέγραπτ]αι, κατάγρενον 15  
 [δὲ τὸν ἀθέτεντά τι τῶν ἐν τῷ ψαφίσματι γεγρα]μμένων, ὡς κε μῆδ-  
 [εν/εις .....<sup>30/31</sup>..... π]ρὸς τοῖς ἐν τῷ πόλι  
 [πρόσθε ἕοντας, ἀλλὰ ὁμόνοοι καὶ διαε]λύμενοι πάντες πρὸς ἀλ-  
 [λάλοισ πολιτεύοιντο ἀνεπιβολλε]ύτως καὶ ἐμμένοιεν ἐν τῷ ἀ-  
 [ναγραφείσαι διαγράφαι καὶ ἐν τῷ] διαλύσι τῷ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ψα- 20  
 [φίσματι γεγράφται. Καὶ ἔλεσθ]αι τὸν δᾶμον ἄνδρας εἴκοσι, δέκα  
 [μὲν ἐκ τῶν κατελθόντων, δέκ]α δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῷ πόλι πρόσθε ἕοντων·  
 [οὔτοι δὲ σπουδαίως φυλάσσ]οντον καὶ ἐπιμέλεσθον ὡς μῆδεν ἕσ-  
 [ται ἐναντίον τοῖς τε κατ]ελθόντεσσι καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῷ πόλι πρόσ- 25  
 [θε ἕοντεσσι μηδετέρως]· καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητημένων κτημάτων  
 [ὑπὸ τῶν κατελθόντων κ]αὶ πρὸς τοῖς ἐν τῷ πόλι ἕοντας καὶ πρὸς  
 [ἀλλάλοισ, ὡς πάντα μ]ὲν διαλυθήσονται, αἱ δὲ μῆ, ἕσσονται ὡς δίκ-  
 [ασται, χρήμενοι τα]ῖς διαλυσίεσσι ταῖς ὁ βασίλευς ἐπέκριννε  
 [ὡς ἐν τε τῷ διαγράφ]αι ἐμμενέοισι πάντες καὶ οἰκήσοισι τὰμ πό-  
 [λιν καὶ τὰν χώραν ὁ]μονόοντες πρὸς ἀλλάλοισ· καὶ περὶ χρημάτων 30  
 [ὡς ἔσται εἰς τὸ θέσ]θαι ταῖς διαλύσις ὡς πλείστα· καὶ περὶ ὄρκω  
 [τόγ κε ἀπομόσοισι οἱ] πόλιται, περὶ τούτων πάντων ὅσσα κε ὁμο-  
 [λογέωισι πρὸς ἀλλάλο]ῖς, οἱ ἀγρέθεντες ἄνδρες φέροντον ἐπὶ τ-  
 [ὸν δᾶμον, ὁ δὲ δᾶμος ἀκο]ύσαις, αἵ κε ἄγηται συμφέρην, βολλευέτω·  
 [αἱ δὲ κε .....<sup>12</sup>..... τὰ] ὁμολογήμενα πρὸς ἀλλάλοισ συμφέρον- 35  
 [τα, κύρια ἔσται καὶ τοῖς κα]τελθόντεσσι ἐπὶ Σμιθίνα προτάνιος  
 [ὅσσα κε τοῖς λοιποισι (?) ψαφ]ίσθη. Αἱ δὲ κέ τι ἐνδεύη τῷ ψαφίσματος,  
 [περὶ τούτῳ ἀ κρίσις ἔστω ἐπ]ὶ τῷ βόλλαι. Κυρώθεντος δὲ τῷ ψαφίσ-  
 [ματος ὑπὸ τῷ δάμω, εὔξασθαι] τὸν δᾶμον ἐν τῷ εἰκρίσται τῷ μῆννος  
 [τῷ .....<sup>19</sup>.....] τοῖς θεοῖσι ἐπὶ σωτηρία καὶ εὐδαι- 40  
 [μονία τῶν πολίταν πάντων] γένεσθαι τὰν διάλυσαν τοῖς κατελ-  
 [θόντεσσι ...<sup>6</sup>... καὶ τοῖς] ἐν τῷ πόλι ἕοντεσσι, τοῖς δὲ ἱρηας τ-  
 [οῖς δαμοτέλεας πάντας καὶ] ταῖς ἱρείαις οἰείην το[ῖς] ναύοισ καὶ  
 [τὸν δᾶμον πρὸς εὔχαν συνέλ]θην. Τὰ δὲ ἱρα τὰ ὁ δᾶμος ἠῦξατο ὅτε ἐξ-  
 [έπεμψε τοῖς ἀγγέλοισ πρὸς] τὸν βασίληα ἀπυδόμεναι τοῖς βασί-  
 [ληας τοῖς θεοῖσι κατ ὠνία]υτον· παρέμμεναι δὲ τῷ θυσία καὶ  
 [ἅπαντα τὸν δᾶμον καὶ τοῖς ἀ]γγέλοισ τοῖς πρὸς τὸν βασίληα πρ[οσ-]

[πέμφθεντας τοῖς τε ἀπὸ τῶν] ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐόντων καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τ[ῶγ]  
 [κατελθόντων. Τὸ δὲ ψάφισμα τ]οῦτο ἀναγράψαντας τοῖς τ[αμίαις] 50  
 [εἰς στάλαν λιθίναν θέμεναι εἰς τὸ ἱρον τᾶς Ἀθήνας.]

As well as the Mytilene decree (xii 2, 6) we have one from Tegea in Arcadia,<sup>5</sup> apparently of the same date, which is also concerned with the restoration of exiles, and the *communis opinio* is to assign both to the same context of the Exiles Decree of July 324 BC. Given the comprehensiveness of that decree, the number of states and people affected, it appears surprising that we have only two decrees, and not more. Probably this is to be explained by the large number of embassies from Greek states which journeyed to the king at Babylon after the proclamation of the decree, concerned no doubt with its contents and the problems associated with the resettlement of returned exiles as well as with other matters, and the large amount of time taken by royal ratification of individual cities' settlements.<sup>6</sup> Of Course Alexander's death not long after, on 10 June 323,<sup>7</sup> cancelled the applicability of the decree as far as the Greeks were concerned. This would have left most of those directly affected by the decree, that is the exiles, and especially the mercenaries who had collected at the mercenary base at Taenarum in Laconia, frustrated since Antipater, Alexander's regent in Greece, did not champion their cause, and their former cities refused to receive them back. Possibly Tegea and Mytilene were simply faster than the other states in implementing the

<sup>5</sup> *IG* v 2 p.xxxvi, *SIG*<sup>3</sup> i 306 = Tod, *GHI* ii 202, *SEG* i 211. See also Heisserer, *Alexander* pp.205-229; cf. Buck, op.cit. no.22 pp.206-209, and especially the exhaustive discussion by A. Plassart, *BCH* 38 (1914) pp.101-188. The stone (also cut stoichedon pattern), found at Delphi (a duplicate would have been erected at Tegea), is now in the Delphi Museum (no.2988). The text in *IG* was published in 1913 and, as Heisserer demonstrates (*Alexander* pp.205-206), is defective; that put forward by Plassart, which Heisserer follows (*Alexander* pp.206-208), is regarded as authoritative.

<sup>6</sup> Arr. 7.19.1 and 23.2, Diod. 17.113, Pliny, *NH* 3.57 and Justin 12.13.1-2 report embassies only from the west (Carthage, Africa, Spain, Sicily, Gaul, Sardinia and Italy), who came to honour Alexander for his deeds; cf. Arr. 7.15.4-6 (who doubts the presence of a Roman envoy), and also N.G.L. Hammond, *Three Historians of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge: 1983) p.74. W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* ii (Cambridge: 1948) pp.374-378, is probably right to doubt the identification of many of these alleged embassies; cf. P.A. Brunt, *Arrian Anabasis* ii (Loeb edition: 1983) pp.497-498. On the embassies see also Jaschinski, op.cit. pp.120-124, Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* pp.165-167 and 224-225, and see further below. The controversy as to whether some – if not all – of these embassies travelled to Alexander to recognise him as a god is fortunately irrelevant to the argument of this paper, on this issue see, for example, E. Fredricksmeier, *AJAH* 4 (1979) pp.3-5, E. Badian, *Ancient Macedonian Studies... C.F. Edson* (ed. H.J. Dell; Thessaloniki: 1981) pp.55-59, P.A. Brunt, *Arrian Anabasis* ii pp.495-499 and J.R. Hamilton, *Prudentia* 16 (1984) pp. 11-12.

<sup>7</sup> D.M. Lewis, *CR*<sup>2</sup> 19 (1969) pp.271-272; see also J.R. Hamilton, *Plutarch Alexander, A Commentary* (Oxford: 1969) p.152.

decree, having done so before Alexander died, which is why we have only the two inscriptions.<sup>8</sup>

Such thoughts still link the two decrees to the same context and therefore year. I am as confident as one can be given the nature and condition of the evidence that the Tegea decree does belong to 324. Although the upper portion of the stone is missing, and along with it any personal names to aid dating, the restoration in line 2 of [βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξ]ανδρος by Plassart, in *BCH* 1914, is almost certainly correct. Heisserer mused about restoring [Κάσσ]ανδρος, thereby linking the decree to the conflict between Polyperchon, chief adviser to the young king Philip Arrhidaeus,<sup>9</sup> and Cassander, son of Antipater, following the issue of the 319 *diagramma*, but he believes this identification implausible, and (at least at present) I think rightly so.<sup>10</sup>

However, the date of 324 for the Mytilene decree is not as clear-cut as we might expect. That year has been challenged before, most recently and most compellingly by A.J. Heisserer, who argues for a date in the late 330s, specifically 332,<sup>11</sup> and as well as briefly referring to his arguments I wish to draw attention to certain differences existing between that decree and the Tegean, which Heisserer does not consider, and link these to the coinage of Mytilene. These, in my opinion, outweigh the similarities, and point all the more to a different date and context for the return of Mytilene's exiles.

To begin with, there is what we may call the scope of the two decrees. The Tegea inscription reveals a wider number of areas and administrative arrangements connected with the smooth return of the banished Tegean citizens. For example, the amount of property

---

<sup>8</sup> Professor Godfrey Tanner raised the point that the likely reason for Tegea's speedy implementation of the Exiles Decree was owing to the geographical proximity of Taenarum and the vast accumulation of mercenaries there. This is indeed attractive, and may be taken to indicate that it was the mercenaries who forced the implementation of the decree on their countrymen rather than the Tegeans' desire to obey the king.

<sup>9</sup> At *Alexander* p.137 n.22, Heisserer refers to an unpublished article ('Arrhidaios') by the late Professor K. Lehmann which shows "that Philip Arrhidaios acted as king in full authority and that Polyperchon functioned not as a regent for an imbecile monarch but as his chief adviser". One hopes that the paper, given its importance, will still be published.

<sup>10</sup> On the date see Heisserer, *Alexander* especially pp.211-212 and 219-220. In his review of Heisserer P.M. Fraser, *CR*<sup>2</sup> 32 (1982) pp.241-243, believes the suggestion "attractive, if only as showing the tenuous nature of the link of the inscription with the Exiles Decree" (ibid. p.243); perhaps this later dating does deserve further scrutiny, although cf. below, n.26.

<sup>11</sup> Heisserer, *Alexander* pp.118-139, especially 131-139; see also further below. Also dated to 332 by, for example, C.B. Welles, *AJA* 42 (1938) p.258 n.4, E. Bickerman, *REA* 42 (1940) p.33 and J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *Historia* 1 (1950) p.384 n. 115 (= *Alexander the Great, the Main Problems* p.200).

which the returned are to recover is geared to family relationships upon exile. All exiles (τὸς φυγάδας: line 4, but probably just males) were to recover paternal property held at the time of banishment, whilst women were to recover maternal property inherited whilst they were unmarried and brotherless – or if a brother had died and not left heirs (lines 4-9). Later (lines 48-57) another clause concerns women, whereby any wife or daughter of an exile who had either stayed at Tegea or returned to the city from exile and remarried was excluded from the enquiry assessing property held at the time of banishment. Other restrictions were equally wide-sweeping and severe; for example, each exile was allowed only one house and garden subject to certain specifications (lines 9-19),<sup>12</sup> and the city was to render a binding decision on the absence of exiles from public festivals (lines 21-24). I suspect the latter refers more to religious considerations<sup>13</sup> since the city was also to reassess payment of debts owing to the goddess Athena Alea: very much an economic measure.<sup>14</sup>

Such arrangements must have been time-consuming and problematic to say the least, and accordingly the contents or scope of this inscription point to exiles who have been absent from the city for quite some time, certainly a period of years. This is not the case with the Mytilene decree. It is, of course, concerned, primarily so in fact, with the restitution of property and the avoidance of enmity between the banished and those citizens who remained in the city (for example, lines 1-2; cf. 9-11) and restrictions are again applied – for example, if any of the returned exiles refused to live according to the imposed agreement, then no property was to be restored, nor were they to retain any already ceded (lines 2-12) and they were to be condemned in order to prevent disputes (lines 13-21). Yet the measures by which all of this is to be effected are not as complex as in the Tegea decree, and, unlike that decree, were to be decided by a local board of twenty elected commissioners, ten from the returned exiles and ten from those living previously in the city (lines 21-37), who were to follow general principles.<sup>15</sup> We shall return to this administrative arrangement in a moment. The

---

<sup>12</sup> Fortunately the difficulties involved in the interpretation of the decree; for example, the property rights or the assessment of the houses (lines 16-19; on which see Plassart, *op.cit.* pp.222-225 and Heisserer, *Alexander* pp.213-216), do not apply to the argument of this paper.

<sup>13</sup> Although see Plassart's reservation, *op.cit.* p.142.

<sup>14</sup> Lines 37-38 are fragmentary: Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῖς ἱεροῖς χρήμασι λω...ν τοῖς ὀφειλήμασι. This was clearly, though, an economic measure since the money belonging to the goddess was an important financial reserve for the city; cf. Plassart, *op.cit.* pp.151-153 and Heisserer. *Alexander* pp.224-225.

<sup>15</sup> See Heisserer & Hodot, 'Concord' pp.123-125 on the economic and political reconciliations, but the complexities which they rightly outline refer to the status of the various people involved and not to procedure.

Mytilenean people were to ratify the agreements reached by the board of the special commissioners (lines 33-37; cf. 38-39) and the Boule had the power to deal with anything which lay outside the jurisdiction of the decree (lines 37-38). Such guidelines indicate a settlement which would be more straightforward to implement and so plausibly apply to those who have not been exiled for very long. What may be called the time factor here is, in my opinion, of great importance in any argument concerned with dating the Mytilene decree, and one which has hitherto been neglected.

In connection with this we need also to consider the use of tribunals in order to effect a fairer settlement. This was to be expected, of course, since courts made up of outsiders were seen as a fair way of settling property disputes.<sup>16</sup> Alexander may well have indicated some general guidelines governing the return of exiles in his decree which included the establishment of such tribunals in order to determine a fairer settlement. At Mytilene we note that the people were to elect twenty special commissioners in order to reallocate property and to decide disputes (lines 21-31), but the final decision rested with the people, to whom the commissioners were to submit their report (lines 32-37). There is not the same formal judicial machinery as at Tegea, where a foreign court (δικαστήριον ξενικόν), probably composed of Mantineans,<sup>17</sup> arbitrates for the first sixty days, and then such matters fall under the jurisdiction of a citizen court (δικαστήριον πολιτικόν: lines 24-28). Even after this period appeals could still be made to Mantinea (lines 31-37).<sup>18</sup> Heisserer considers that the civil court (line 28) was composed of previous citizens and returned exiles, as had been the case at Mytilene.<sup>19</sup> In other words, by extension, Tegea in 324 (and perhaps also other states about which we do not hear) was putting into practice a system that had *already* been tried and tested in Mytilene.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Xen. *Hellenica* 5.2.10 and 3.10: I owe this reference to Dr. D.H. Kelly.

<sup>17</sup> Since line 35 refers to Mantinea it is plausible to assume that the Mantineans composed this court; cf. Plassart, *op.cit.* p.143 n.1, Tod, *GHI* ii p.298, Buck, *op.cit.* p.209, Heisserer, *Alexander* p.216.

<sup>18</sup> See Plassart, *op.cit.* pp. 142-151.

<sup>19</sup> Heisserer *Alexander* p.216.

<sup>20</sup> See C. Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques* (Hildesheim: 1976) no. 417, lines 44f. for a decree of Calymna, praising the people of Iasus and a tribunal of five Iasians which had settled over 350 suits. Although the decree has been thought to be contemporary with that of Tegea (for example, Tod, *GHI* ii p.301) and is further evidence of a foreign element in the resettlement of exiles, it is more than likely that the decree of Calymna is to be dated to the first quarter of the third century: see in detail M. Segre, *Tituli Calymnii* (Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente vi-vii [new series]: 1944-45) no.XVI pp. 19-24; cf. Heisserer, *Alexander* p.91 n.29.



The time factor is again important. By 324 many exiles were returning to Greece, and many were already there: Diodorus (18.8.5) tells us that those who heard the proclamation of the Exiles Decree at Olympia numbered 20,000. This figure probably only represents those able to journey to Olympia in time to hear the proclamation<sup>21</sup> since the Athenian Leosthenes had already transported some 50,000 ex-mercenaries (who would have included those exiled by their cities and forced into mercenary pay overseas in order to survive) from Asia to Taenarum probably in 325/4 (Paus. 1.25.5, 8.52.5).<sup>22</sup> We can imagine that most would not have wasted time in returning home since in the same passage Diodorus adds that those exiles at Olympia were euphoric at the prospect of going home. For the majority of the Tegean exiles sixty days, a little over two months, in which the foreign tribunal was in power, was richly ample.

Thus we have a further distinction between the two decrees in terms of the settlement bodies with the *local* element at Mytilene versus the *foreign* element at Tegea. In the case of Tegea this must surely be that because the returning exiles had been away for so long a foreign ruling was necessary in order to bring about an effective compromise settlement – for compromise would be the order of the day since the returning exiles would naturally desire the restitution of all properties held at the time of exile, especially if that exile had been political at the hands of a ruling oligarchy, whilst those who had stayed in the city would equally naturally not wish to surrender their acquired property, especially to a political exile who might soon be influential again under a different régime.<sup>23</sup> We must consider also the relationship between a returned exile and his ex-wife, since, although the banishment of a man from Tegea did not compel his wife and daughter(s) to follow him, it did dissolve the existing marriage.<sup>24</sup> This surely added to tension, not to mention to the complexities of restoring property, if women whose divorce had been enforced by the state had over a period of time remarried, for example, and had any additional children. An outside ruling may well have been seen as less subjective and in the best interests of all.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Badian, *op.cit.* p.28 (= *Alexander the Great, The Main Problems* p.218); *contra* U. Wilcken, *Alexander the Great* (English trans.; New York: 1967) pp.215-216.

<sup>22</sup> As trierarch in 325/4 before his *strategia* in 324/3; for dating see Ian Worthington, *Historia* 36 (1987) pp.489-491, although I am not swayed by V. Gabrielsen's reservation: *C&M* 39 (1988) p.83 n.41

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Heisserer, *Alexander* p.225.

<sup>24</sup> See Plassart, *op.cit.* pp. 153-159 and Heisserer, *Alexander* pp.217-218.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* p.225.

Can we determine approximately how long the Tegean exiles had been absent since that would help to reinforce the point put forward here, that the measures were to deal with absences of some years? We know from Aeschines (3.165) that the Tegeans had supported the abortive Spartan revolt led by Agis III against the Macedonian hegemony in the late 330s, and from Curtius (6.1.20) we learn that in 331 when the revolt was crushed the Tegeans, apart from those of their number who advised support, were pardoned by the synhedrion of the allies, to whom Antipater had entrusted judgement on the rebels (Diod. 17.73.5-6). Probably these ringleaders were included amongst those returning in 324, and so had been banished for several years.<sup>26</sup> We can go back even further and include the survivors and descendants of those exiled in the 360s when the Arcadian League was established.<sup>27</sup> However, the less elaborate arrangements at Mytilene indicate, in my opinion, that a settlement was not fraught with the same problems because the exiles had not been away for so long.<sup>28</sup>

We can also take into account here the measures taken by the king towards the various states after the proclamation of the Exiles Decree in 324. Lines 1-4 of the Tegea decree refer to revisions made by Alexander in connection with the returning exiles, and clearly he was not happy with the original Tegean settlement. We know that many embassies travelled to

---

<sup>26</sup> Heisserer (*Alexander* p.221 with n.17) wonders whether the *stèle* was erected in 329 on Alexander's orders so that pro-Macedonians, banished when the revolt broke out, could be reinstated. However, 329 is too soon a dating in view of the elaborate arrangements contained in the decree (as argued above), and more importantly the ringleaders of the revolt had been exiled by the synhedrion's directive (Curtius 6.1.20), which has interesting affinities with the opening of the Exiles Decree, as quoted by Diod. 18.8.4, where Alexander denies that he was responsible for the exiles' banishment (τοῦ μὲν φεύγειν ὑμᾶς οὐχ ἡμεῖς αἴτιοι γεγονάμεν).

Probably the king was trying to shirk responsibility for the chaos which his decree would cause by subtly wording it to refer to the league's ruling on such men (cf. above, n.3), but in my opinion this echo fixes the Tegea decree more firmly in 324. So also does the frustratingly fragmented passage in Hyp. 5.31 which seems to contain an order from Alexander, proclaimed by Nicanor at Olympia simultaneous with the Exiles Decree, to at least the Arcadian, Achaean and Boeotian Leagues. I argue that this order was to prohibit a joint muster of allied forces once the full implications of the Exiles Decree were realised amongst the Greek states since contacts of a military nature had been maintained: see *C&M* 37 (1986) pp. 115-121; cf. *ZPE* 57 (1984) pp. 139-144. Indeed, more weight is lent to a date of 324 by the fact that Tegea was not on the list of Greek allies in the Lamian War (Diod. 18.11.1-2, Paus. 1.25.4 [cf. 8.6.2 and 27.10] and Justin 13.5.1), an indication that the state was adhering to the terms of the *recently* sworn decree.

<sup>27</sup> Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* p.223.

<sup>28</sup> This is not to say that settlements would be straightforward; for example, how to prove someone guilty of fraud (see lines 1-12) and note the various categories into which those returning and those not exiled fell (Heisserer & Hodot, 'Concord' pp. 123-125).

Alexander at Babylon after the proclamation of the decree (Arr. 7.19.1, 7.23.2; Diod. 17.113; Pliny, *NH* 3.57),<sup>29</sup> and many if not most must have been concerned with the return of the exiles. I think it implausible that Alexander could have made detailed arrangements for each city's return of its exiles simultaneously with the issue of the decree; probably he laid down only general lines of restoration, hoping that the cities themselves would be able to settle the finer points of detail.<sup>30</sup> It is likely that these arrangements were then submitted to Alexander for final ratification, as seems to have been the case with Tegea. Weight is lent to this by the statement in Diodorus (17.113.3) that Alexander divided the visiting Greek embassies into five groups in their order of importance and heard them in this order: (i) those petitioning him on religious matters, (ii) those bringing gifts, (iii) those with border disputes, (iv) those with problems relating only to themselves (περὶ τῶν ἰδιωτικῶν),<sup>31</sup> and (v) those concerned with the return of the exiles (περὶ τῆς καθόδου τῶν φυγάδων). The order is interesting; no other source refers to it,<sup>32</sup> and given the gravity of the situation we should expect to find petitions concerned with the Exiles Decree placed second, behind religious matters. Clearly Alexander expected to deal with large numbers and so settled other administrative and routine matters before occupying his attention with the exiles problem. Some of the embassies were protesting against the enforced return of exiles; for example, Curtius (10.2.6-8) tells us that the Athenians refused to receive back their exiles, then gathering at Megara according to Deinarchus (1.58 & 94), and also appealed against the loss of Samos. Perhaps also the Aetolians, threatened with retribution for having seized Oeniadae from the Acarnanian League in 330 (Diod. 18.8.6, Plut. *Alex.* 49.15),<sup>33</sup> were appealing for clemency. Alexander seems to have dealt with such instances on an individual

---

<sup>29</sup> Probably 5 August, 324 since the victorious herald proclaimed the decree and the heralds' contest opened the games; the Olympic games of 324 were dated to 31 July to 4 August by R. Sealey, *CR* 10 (1960) pp.185-186.

<sup>30</sup> E. Balogh, *Political Refugees in Ancient Greece* (Johannesburg: 1934) p.80, considers that Alexander's order prescribed such an oath but left the formulation to individual cities. Balogh also thinks that provision was made for foreign courts, with each state having the right to decide its arbitrator (*ibid.* p.77).

<sup>31</sup> Not internal affairs (= δημόσια) as Tarn says (*Alexander the Great* ii p.377), which were not Alexander's business – if he took the autonomy principle seriously, that is!

<sup>32</sup> Tarn suggests that Diodorus' source was Aristobulus (*Alexander the Great* ii pp.377-378); *contra* Hammond, *Three Historians of Alexander the Great* p.74; cf. pp.79-85, who argues for Diyllus. Pliny, *NH* 3.57 quotes from Cleitarchus (*FGH* 137 F 31) and Theopompus (*FGH* 115 F 317) on the embassies, but neither refer to any order of audience.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. R. Flacelière, *Les Aitoliens à Delphes* (Paris: 1937) p.42 and Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* p.227.

basis and not all of the embassies met with success (Diod.17.113.4).<sup>34</sup>

However, we have no mention of royal ratification of a settlement on the Mytilene decree; despite the arguments of Heisserer and Hodot that Mytilene had sent a delegation to Alexander to obtain a similar approval of the settlement, the king's *diagramma* in lines 28-29 (cf. line 20) is more likely Alexander's order that the exiles are to return, which move prompted the decree on Concord (see further below).<sup>35</sup> Thus, again there is not enough similarity to justify fitting both decrees in the same context without question.

We need, therefore, to find a context, and Heisserer has recently advanced some persuasive arguments for the period 334-332, contemporary with Alexander's letter to the Chians (which he redates from 332 to 334).<sup>36</sup> Heisserer argues, *inter alia*, that our inscription best fits the political see-sawing which affected Mytilene in the late 330s since there is no evidence whatsoever of Alexander's relations with Mytilene in 324, and because of the similarity with Alexander's directives to the tyrants of Eresus, the Chians and Priene, north of Miletus, of the 330s BC.

Certainly in the 330s Mytilene was the scene of swift political changes. In 336 the city probably joined the League of Corinth as a result of Parmenion's activities in Asia Minor;<sup>37</sup> but in 335 was lost owing to the energies of Memnon of Rhodes, commander of the Persian fleet. However in 334 after the Battle of Granicus Alexander again reestablished

---

<sup>34</sup> Including the Aetolian? For Alexander's ruling against the Athenian claim to Samos see Diod. 18.8.6; *contra* Plut. *Alex.* 28.1: his "letter" recognising that claim, on which see J.R. Hamilton, *CQ*<sup>2</sup> 3 (1953) pp.151-157 (= *Alexander the Great, the Main Problems* pp.235-241), but cf. K. Rosen, *Historia* 27 (1978) pp.20-25 and Ian Worthington, *ZPE* 57 (1984) p.143.

<sup>35</sup> Heisserer & Hodot, 'Concord' pp. 123ff. (lines 28-29 and 47ff.). Although I follow their restoration for lines 28-29, I believe they have confused Alexander's decree that the Mytilenean exiles return with some official sanctioning on his part of the procedures for that return (as is the case with the Tegeans). Although well aware of its speculative nature, I put forward the suggestion that there were *two* embassies: that of lines 44-45 was one of goodwill, thanking Alexander for his clemency and probably taking word of the decree on Concord (since the latter predated the implementation of the exiles' return by some time; see further below), and that of lines 47-49 was a different one (note the distinction made between those who had returned and those not exiled), probably taking news of the exiles' actual return. Lines 25ff. of the decree as restored by Heisserer and Hodot do not necessarily indicate that Alexander, dissatisfied with the Mytileneans' provisions for the return of property, had laid down the law (see 'Concord' pp.123-125 in particular); if anything he may simply be approving the decree on Concord. Thus it is still the Mytileneans themselves who are ultimately responsible for the measures by which their exiles returned.

<sup>36</sup> Heisserer, *Alexander* pp. 118-139, especially 131-139. For others who date the decree to 332 see above, n.11. For Heisserer's redating of the letter to the Chians (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 283, Tod, *GHI* ii 192; what he calls the first Chios *stele*) see *Alexander* pp.79-95; cf. *Historia* 32 (1973) pp. 191-204, and below, nn.44 and 51.

<sup>37</sup> See Heisserer, *Alexander* p.131; cf. following note. Tod, *GHI* ii p.293, believes in 338. See also S. Ruzicka, *Phoenix* 42 (1988) pp.131-151 on operations in the Aegean in the period 333-331.

Macedonian rule (bringing Mytilene back into the League of Corinth), only to see Mytilene besieged and taken by Persian generals in 333. In the context of the 333 Persian retake Arrian (2.1.4) says that the Mytileneans were to expel the mercenaries sent by Alexander under an alliance, to destroy the *stelae* (plural) that allied them to Alexander, to ally with the Persian king under the terms of the King's Peace or Peace of Antalcidas of 386 and to recall exiles, restoring to them half of the property held when exiled. The first three stipulations support the various seizures by Persia and Macedonia and show that in 333 Mytilene was a member of another league, which would have been the League of Corinth.<sup>38</sup>

As one of the islands excluded from the King's Peace Lesbos could join the Second Athenian Confederacy of 378/7 without violating that peace. When Darius III became king in 336 and wished to reassert his authority in the Greek world, authority which had been weakened by the growth of Macedonian imperialism under Philip II and by the mandate of the League of Corinth to free the Greek inhabitants of Asia Minor from Persian rule (cf. Diod. 16.91.2), he appealed, at first diplomatically and then militarily,<sup>39</sup> to the islands (members by then of the League of Corinth) to adhere to the terms of the King's Peace since they would not have to pay tribute (*syntaxis*) or have garrisons imposed upon them, as was the case under the Macedonian Common Peace.<sup>40</sup> Now, Arrian (2.1.4) stipulates that Mytilene was to expel the mercenaries (τοὺς ξένους) sent by Alexander, probably as part of the 334 alliance. Heisserer interprets ξένους as a garrison force, and ingeniously suggests that Darius was exploiting a psychological advantage by offering the King's Peace to a city already occupied by a garrison, that is, a Macedonian one. He draws the parallel with the same conditions in Alexander's letter to the Chians as an additional argument for a dating to 334. However, he rejects this 334 date for the Mytilene decree since this refers only to exiles' restoration and says nothing about rejoining the League of Corinth nor does it mention the allied synhedrion, unlike the Chios *stèle*, and accordingly he assigns the Mytilene decree to 332 when Hegelochus, Alexander's admiral, retook Mytilene yet again

---

<sup>38</sup> Heisserer, *Alexander* p.134, believes that τὰς στήλας at Arr. 2.1.4 refer to the alliance and agreement between Alexander and Mytilene of 334. His suggestion at *Alexander* pp. 140-141 that the fragment *IG* xii 2, 8 survives from either the 334 alliance (Arr. 2.1.4) or that of 336 between Mytilene and Philip II when the city joined the League of Corinth is retracted in 'Concord' p.115 n. 10 in the light of the new epigraphical evidence.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Curtius 4.6.1: Dareus, desperata pace quam per litteras legatosque impetrari posse crediderat, ad reparandas vires bellumque impigre renovandum intendit animum.

<sup>40</sup> See T.T.B. Ryder, *Koine Eirene* (Oxford: 1965) pp.34-36, 58-60 and Appendices 1 and 2.

(Arr. 3.2.6, Curtius 4.5.22).<sup>41</sup> We shall return to Hegelochus in a moment.

Another possible date for the inscription which Heisserer considers is 319 BC, linking it to Polyperchon's *diagramma* (Diod. 18.56).<sup>42</sup> This *diagramma* was proclaimed in order to offset support for Antipater's son Cassander, who was challenging the power of Polyperchon and the young king Philip Arrhidaeus in the aftermath of Alexander's death, by freeing cities from the oligarchies and garrisons installed by Antipater and by bringing back exiles. Heisserer suggests that parts of the document which refer to restitution of property and a reconciliation in the best interests of all (Diod. 18.56.4-6) could supply a context for the Mytilene decree. I am not overly swayed by this, and indeed Heisserer, who puts the theory forward only to cover all dating possibilities, regards it as less plausible (*Alexander* p.139).

What, then, of a date in the late 330s? After all, Arrian (3.2.3f.) tells us that Alexander's admiral Hegelochus had put down a number of revolts in the years 334-333 including those of Chios, Mytilene and other cities on Lesbos. Logically, then, we ought to consider this period, but were relations between Alexander and Mytilene good enough in this period, picking up on the points put forward earlier, that exiles could return without Alexander's interference in the move (*contra* the post-Exiles Decree situation as revealed in the Tegea decree),<sup>43</sup> and particularly when the exile had not been for such an extended period that detailed arrangements need have been made? The answer to both questions is affirmative

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Heisserer & Hodot, 'Concord' p.119. In *Alexander* Heisserer also draws attention to the large number of magistrates and details of the Mytilenean constitution mentioned in the decree: the *demos* (lines 21, 34f., 39, 44) and *boule* (line 38), the *basileis* (lines 1, 9, 13), *stratego*i (lines 7, 13), *peridromoi* (line 12f.), *dikaskopoi* (lines 12, 14), *tamiai* (line 49), eponymous *prytanis* (line 36), extraordinarily elected *diallaktai* (line 21 as restored by Tod, but certainly commissioners of some sort) plus *allai archai* (line 14; cf. 12), which he sees as the product of years of political seesawing between the various factions and reflecting "an almost feverish effort at local rule". Although we do not know enough about local government in Mytilene prior to the 330s to make this judgement, the large number of magistrates (presumably newly elected/appointed) does seem to reflect the political confusion of the period 335-332 and attempts to restore some sort of order, and thus again points to a date of 332.

<sup>42</sup> Diod. 18.56; see Heisserer, *Alexander* pp.137-139. Cf. above with nn.10 and 26 for the possibility that the Tegea decree belongs to this context, although this is unlikely.

<sup>43</sup> See above on the embassies travelling to the king and the Tegean settlement of 324. When Hegelochus retook Chios Alexander himself, for example, was to approve new democratic laws (Heisserer, *Alexander* p.80, lines 6-7), and to decide any disputes arising between those who had stayed in the city and those now returning (lines 15-17), Chios was to provide at its own expense twenty warships for the Greek fleet (lines 8-9) and a Macedonian garrison (again at the Chians' expense) was to be stationed in Chios (lines 17-19). No such interference is found in the Mytilenean resettlement, perhaps grounds for redating the Chian decree to 334 (on this see following footnote).

and, in support, will take us into some consideration of the last issue of the Mytilenean electrum *hektai* coinage.

Firstly, the context. In the late 330s we have seen that relations between Alexander and Mytilene fluctuated to say the least. In 333 the Persian siege had forced the Mytileneans to renounce the 334 treaty with Alexander and to recall some recently exiled oligarchs, a pro-Persian faction obviously, probably exiled either when Mytilene joined the League of Corinth in 336 or, more likely, following the 334 treaty with Alexander. Soon after the Athenian general Chares is found in possession of Mytilene with a force of 2000 Persians, but this did not last long since Hegelochus retook it for Alexander in 332 (Arr. 3.2.6). The fate of Mytilene then hung in the balance: would the city be punished, especially if it had been swayed by Darius' "psychological offer", and the instigators of the revolt, the returned pro-Persian group, be shipped away as happened to the ringleaders of the Chian revolution?<sup>44</sup> The answer is negative. Mytilene was spared the hardships which befell Chios, probably becoming a member of the League of Corinth again and so could breathe a sigh of relief. Why Alexander did not cause the pro-Persian Mytileneans to suffer the same fate as the Chians is unknown, but a possible explanation is explored below.

A passage of Arrian (3.2.6) detailing how Hegelochus retook Mytilene and the other revolting Lesbian cities is in my opinion of great importance in supporting the argument for assigning the Mytilene decree to 332: καὶ Μιτυλήνην (*sic*) δὲ Χάρητα ἔχοντα ὅτι ἀφείλετο καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς ἐν Λέσβῳ πόλεις καὶ αὐτὰς ὁμολογίᾳ προσηγάγετο. Heisserer (*Alexander* p.135 with n.14) translates the whole passage as "[Hegelochus] had taken both Mitylene [*sic*], which was being held by Chares, and the other cities on Lesbos and had brought them over to the Macedonian side *through an agreement* (ὁμολογίᾳ)", but in my opinion Brunt's translation in the new Loeb edition of Arrian is closer to the mark: "[Hegelochus] reported that he had also captured Mytilene from Chares, and had won over *by agreement* (ὁμολογίᾳ) the other cities in Lesbos as well". The interpretation of ὁμολογίᾳ is significant: it should not, I think, be taken to refer to Mytilene *and* the other Lesbian cities, but to the latter *alone*; καὶ αὐτὰς of the Arrian passage must surely indicate a distinction in Hegelochus' campaign against Lesbos in this

---

<sup>44</sup> They were sent to Elephantine in Egypt, despite the decree of Chios that the synhedrion of the allies should try them: Arr. 3.2.7. Chios had also been under the rule of a pro-Persian oligarchy in 333 (Diod. 17.29.2, Arr. 2.1.1) until its liberation by Hegelochus in 332 (Arr. 3.2.3). For the moment I reserve judgement on Heisserer's redating of the Chian decree from 332 to 334 (on which see nn.36 and 51); further on Alexander's relations with Chios and the synhedrion of the allies see Wilcken, *Alexander the Great* p.120.

way, and the implication is, I suggest, that there was resistance on the part of the pro-Persian faction in Mytilene.

I put forward the scenario, in view of this, that during the oligarchic domination of Mytilene in 333 the democrats who had been responsible for the banishment of the oligarchs earlier (these oligarchs were recalled under the terms of the Persian occupation of 333) were themselves exiled. These exiled democrats may have then gone to work on the other Lesbian cities in order to leave Mytilene, which seems to have resisted Hegelochus, isolated if Alexander would champion their cause to return. I suggest that he did this with the order that all of those banished were to return, and we have the measures implementing this in the shape of the Mytilene decree, foreshadowed by the decree on Concord. The exiles referred to in the prytany of Smithinas (line 36), then, could be those returning immediately after Alexander's decree and the Mytilenean decree on Concord (most exiled in the prytany of Ditas of the previous year [?] as stated on the decree on Concord) but before the "full" measures to implement their return were passed (= xii 2, 6). If so, then we may date Smithinas' office in the same year as the Mytilene decree.<sup>45</sup> The "oligarchy", to call it that, of 333 lasted for about a year, enough time, then, to exile opponents and to seize property, but short enough not to require resettlement procedures as elaborate as in the Tegea decree.

Such a move on Alexander's part, like the vast majority of his others throughout his reign, was deliberate policy. Rather than merely expelling the anti-Macedonian Mytileneans in 332 and punishing Mytilene generally, thereby only adding to a tension which could have been exploited by any Persian satrap (for example) ambitious enough, he attempted to reconcile both parties, oligarchs and democrats, by allowing them to live in their native city. This theory receives some weight from lines 18-19 of the decree (admittedly, almost all restoration): "... but all [being of one mind] and [reconcil]ed to one another [may live as citizens without intrigue]".<sup>46</sup> If the *gist* of this restoration is correct, then it is plausible to single out the anti-Macedonian faction in Mytilene, which had caused the city to fluctuate so radically in political loyalty over a number of years.

---

<sup>45</sup> Not 324, in the context of the Exiles Decree, as is usually thought; for example, by Tod, *GHI* ii p.192; cf. Heisserer & Hodot, 'Concord' p.124 for the view that the prytany belongs to the current year. My proposal is necessarily speculative and Professor Heisserer warns me about sticking my neck out too far. Professor G.R. Bugh rightly points out that the date of the prytany cannot be certain: he suggests that the missing top portion of the stone may have mentioned Smithinas by way of explanation or even that the decree and *stèle* could belong to 324 but refer back to arrangements made following the expulsion of the pro-Persian faction in 332 and the return of the pro-Macedonian exiles. On Ditas see above, n.4.

<sup>46</sup> [ἀλλὰ ὁμόνοοι καὶ διαλε]λύμενοι πάντες πρὸς ἀλ[λάλοισ πολιτεύοιντο ἀνεπιβολλε]ύτως.



In the long run Alexander's intention, coupled with the swearing of an oath in order to maintain a stable society, would be of benefit in keeping Mytilene friendly, hence the need to recall the pro-Macedonian exiles.<sup>47</sup> This is reflected at the start of the decree when the returned exiles are favoured over those who remained in the city (I would think this is directed principally at the pro-Persian faction) and are to receive back their property. It was clearly necessary for Alexander's supporters to regain their former influence, and in support of this Arrian asserts at 2.1.4 (see above) that the Persians in 333 demanded that their adherents receive back *one half* of their property, but the Mytilene decree does not carry any such stipulation: those exiled for adhering to Alexander seem to have received back *all* of their property.

The arguments which can be extracted from the actual decree against a dating of 332 in favour of the "traditional" 324 involve lines 28-29: "depending on the agreements of reconciliation that the king has sanctioned, in order that all may respect his ordinance...", and lines 44ff. with the reference to the messengers to the king. Both seem to have affinities with Diodorus (17.113.3) on the embassies to Alexander after the proclamation of the Exiles Decree and with the Tegea decree of 324, alluding to the king's royal ratification of the various settlements. Is this the case here?

I would argue not. I take the first instance, lines 28-29, to refer simply to Alexander's decree recalling the exiles. There is nothing to suggest that the king amended an original settlement, as was the case with the Tegea decree. With restorations the latter tells us that king Alexander sent back his decision to Tegea and then, in a passage which requires less restoration, it states quite specifically that the "revised" version is to be inscribed "in

---

<sup>47</sup> Arrian 1.18.1-3 (with A.B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* [Oxford: 1980] pp.133-136) tells us that in Asia Minor Alexander was determined to restore the democracies (cf. his treatment of Chios in 332). Pseudo-Demosthenes 17, the only contemporary speech detailing his treatment of the Greeks in this period (probably to be dated to 333, although W. Will, *RhM* 125 [1982] pp.202-213, argues for 331), informs us that he was creating puppet oligarchies on mainland Greece; for example, chapter 4: the sons of Philiades (identified as Neon and Thrasylochus at Dem. 18.295). These apparently conflicting policies on the part of Alexander seem not to have been motivated by ideological reasons but more from the desire to establish new groups in power owing their dominance to the new patron (himself): his dealings with Mytilene were, then, part of this policy.

accordance with those things the city has corrected".<sup>48</sup> Possibly, as Heisserer suggests, in connection with the Mytilene decree, Hegelochus had established some sort of guiding principles in a *diagramma* after the Macedonian conquest of the Aegean area which were then officially sanctioned by Alexander in 332.<sup>49</sup>

To move to the second argument, which involves lines 44f. and the messengers to Alexander. As Heisserer noted, the problem here revolved around Böckh's restoration τοῖς βασί[ληος] at the end of line 45 in order to connect this section with Alexander's alleged request to be honoured as a god by the Greeks and the belief that the people of Mytilene celebrated the king's birthday.<sup>50</sup> Thus a date of 324 is reached since the alleged request for deification and the Exiles Decree belong to the same year. Heisserer proposed, rightly I think, τοῖς βασί[ληας], the city's magistrates, at the end of line 45, picking up on τοῖς β[ασίλ]ηας of line 13, and thereby making ΤΟΙΣ at the end of 45 accusative not dative (see the decree quoted above). This is much more plausible. I would suggest further that we have *two* sets of embassies in lines 44-49: one (lines 44-45) which conveyed thanks to Alexander for his clemency; his policy towards Chios would still be fresh in contemporary minds, and it would be only politic to keep in his favour, and then a second (lines 47-49), perhaps consisting of (or including some or all of) the twenty special commissioners, which carried news of the exiles' actual return. These messengers, together with the whole demos, would then be present at annual sacrifices to Alexander, first celebrated when the goodwill embassy was sent to him, and it is therefore plausible to connect these sacrifices with the

<sup>48</sup> Heisserer's text (*Alexander* p.206):

[.....<sup>12</sup>..... Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀ πόλις ἀπέστηλε τὸς π]  
 [ρέσβεας καὶ τὰν κρίσιν ἀπέπεμψε πο]ς ἡ[μέας ὁ βασι]  
 [λεὺς Ἀλέξ]ανδρος, τὸ διάγρ[α]μμα γραφῆναι κατὸ τὰ ἐ-  
 [πανωρ]θώσατο ἀ πόλις τὰ ἰν τοῖ διαγράμματι ἀντιλεγόμενα.

See also above, n.35.

<sup>49</sup> Heisserer, *Alexander* pp. 135-136.

<sup>50</sup> Heisserer, *Alexander* p.130. Lines 44-46 of Tod, *GHI* ii 201 (with Böckh's restoration) are:

Τὰ δὲ ἴρα τὰ ὁ δᾶμος (ε)ὔξατο, ὅτε ἐξ-  
 [έπεμψε τοῖς ἀγγέλοις πρὸς] τὸν βασίληα, ἀπυδόμενα τοῖς βασί-  
 [ληος γενεθλίοισι κατ' ἐνίαυ]τον

passing of the decree on Concord.<sup>51</sup>

Moves to recall the exiles were quickly undertaken, as evidenced by the decree on Concord. That the Mytileneans reacted promptly to Alexander's demand because they were escaping essentially unpunished, unlike the Chians (see above), is in my opinion reflected in the issue of coins, specifically the last issue of electrum *hektai* at Mytilene. In particular we have one which appears to commemorate Alexander, and a photograph of this is reproduced as Plate VI.<sup>52</sup> Brief description: on the obverse is a youthful beardless head in profile (right), the eye (characteristic of fourth-century) is deeply cut, and the figure is wearing a close-fitting helmet with ram's horn attached in imitation of Zeus Ammon; on the reverse is an eagle, standing to right, with body, wing and head in profile. The obverse type has been described as Zeus Ammon or even his rival Apollo Cameius, but both attributions are inaccurate, as Healy has demonstrated, and what we have is a youthful male head connected in some way with Zeus Ammon. Healy dated the coinage to c.330 BC, drawing attention to the portraiture and the visit of Alexander to the oracle of Zeus Ammon in the oasis of Siwah in winter 332. As a result of this visit of course Alexander openly began to call himself son of Zeus (Callisthenes, *apud* Strabo 17.1.43), perhaps owing to a misinterpretation of some form of address to Alexander by the priests on his arrival, as Plutarch tells us (*Alex.* 27.8-10).<sup>53</sup> The coincidence is too much, and Healy is surely right.<sup>54</sup> I would like to enlarge on this by linking the coinage and the decree to the same period, both as goodwill gestures on

---

<sup>51</sup> See also above, n.35; I do not accept Heisserer & Hodot's restoration at line 47 of [τοῖς διαττάταις καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις. Professor Heisserer informs me that he and Hodot rejected ἅπαντα τὸν δᾶμον because it is too vague since both xii 2, 6 and the decree on Concord are "remarkable for their specifics". Yet there are sufficient grounds for another text and indeed they supply διαττάταις in line 47 on the basis of its restored appearance in line 21! If my argument is correct, then this would keep the Chian decree in 332 and not see it redated to 334 by Heisserer; cf. nn.36 and 44.

<sup>52</sup> Plate VI.1, the head, is magnified five times; VI.2, the eagle, three times. For a full description of both sides see especially J.F. Healy, *NC* 2(1962) pp.65-71, with F. Bodenstedt, *Die Elektronmünzen von Phokaia und Mytilene* (Tübingen: 1981) pl.60 Em 104 g with pp.61, 65-66, 83, 100-101 and *Phokäisches Elektron-Geld von 600-326 v.Chr.* (Mainz am Rhein: 1976) p.19, for example. Heisserer, *Alexander* p.139 n.27 rightly criticises some of Healy's argumentation, although he is, in my opinion, overly sceptical in believing that Mytilene did not need to pay such a compliment to Alexander (the coinage) after surrendering to Hegelochus; see further below.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Diod. 17.51, Curtius 4.7.25, Justin 11.11.2-12; cf. also, for example, Tarn, *Alexander the Great* i p.69 n.2 and ii pp.347-348 and Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* pp.71-74 and particularly 282-284; cf. pp.287-288. On Callisthenes' account cf. D. Golan, *Athenaeum* 66 (1988) pp.110-112.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Bodenstedt, *Die Elektronmünzen von Phokaia und Mytilene* p.83, for example (and cf. the references cited above, n.52).

the part of the Mytileneans for Alexander's clemency. In this way the issue of this coinage is narrowed even further to the period 332-330, simultaneous (?) with the erection of the *stele* commemorating the return of the exiles.

So far the king in the Mytilene decree has been taken to refer to Alexander III. However, it has been pointed out to me that the definite article preceding βασιλεύς in the inscription (lines 28, 45 and 47) indicates that the king is not Alexander but the Persian king.<sup>55</sup> Dr. Sekunda writes that it seems to be “standard practice for the Greeks to refer to Alexander as ‘Alexander’ or ‘king Alexander’ in the body of text of their inscriptions,<sup>56</sup> but not as ὁ βασιλεύς. He goes on to say that although the Persian king is generally referred to without the definite article in the fourth century, Dem. 15.9 (referring to Timotheus' expedition in 356) quotes part of a decree πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα and Sekunda believes that the original decree also employed the definite article. He therefore thinks that the king of the Mytilene inscription is the Persian king, and that the restoration of the exiles could refer to either 335 or 333.

Although this is an intriguing possibility I am not convinced. If the decree employed the definite article it would be the only known case in Attic epigraphy,<sup>57</sup> and, moreover, if it is linked to the Persian reconquests of 335 or 333, then why would the *stele* not have been destroyed when Mytilene became pro-Macedonian again in 334 or 332? I find it unlikely that the Mytileneans would have honoured Alexander with a “commemorative” coin which can be dated to the 332-330 period (see above) and yet retained the *stele* which linked them to Alexander's enemy. This would hardly be regarded as good politics! The coinage does, I believe, clinch the matter. Moreover, the 333 dating can be further excluded by the passage in Arrian (2.1.4) which states that in 333 the Persian adherents were to receive back half of the property held when exiled; the Mytilene decree has no such stipulation but rather indicates that all property was to be restored.

Also, the passage in Demosthenes (15.9) should not be read as verbatim quotation; the

---

<sup>55</sup> By Dr. N.V. Sekunda, both verbally and *per epistulam*, and I am very grateful for his comments.

<sup>56</sup> He cites Heisserer, *Alexander* pp.4, 25, 36, 38, 42, 44, 75, 80, 173, 184, 199, 206-208 [ὁ βασιλεύς Ἀλέξανδρος restored at lines 1-2]; cf. Philip on p.9, but these refer only to Athens, Eresus, Chios, Iasus and Tegea, hardly “the Greeks”.

<sup>57</sup> βασιλεύς uniformly means “the Persian king” in Attic inscriptions; cf. K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* (Berlin: 1900) pp.230-231.

orators quite often refer to the Persian monarch using the definite article,<sup>58</sup> and this is probably the case here. The literary convention of referring to the Persian king by the use of the definite article is likely to have arisen in the latter part of the sixth century, but it becomes merely a pedantic argument to claim that this convention was still in force in the 330s. The use or absence of the definite article in a text is, *eo ipso*, not sufficient evidence to mean anything by the 340s, and I suspect that in the preamble to the decree (unfortunately lost) Alexander was specified and thus there would be no ambiguity arising from the references to the king as contained in the decree. Thus, although I am in disagreement with Dr. Sekunda his point does, however, indirectly reinforce the arguments put forward in this paper for taking the Mytilene decree out of the 324 context of the Exiles Decree.

In conclusion, much good work has been done, especially by Professor Heisserer, to question the accepted date of 324 BC for the Mytilene decree. A date in the late 330s appears more likely: I would agree with the specific location in 332, which was advocated by Welles, Bikerman, Balsdon and Heisserer, contemporary or near contemporary with Alexander's letter to the Chians. The major point I have tried to make in this paper, that of the timing factor, is a simple one – one may criticise it on the grounds that it is based on too much supposition or that because we have only the one other decree recalling exiles, that of Tegea, the theory cannot be tested adequately. However, it is my hope that it and the consideration of the coinage further strengthens the argument for taking the Mytilene decree out of a 324 context.

The Exiles Decree vividly illustrates the power of the Macedonian hegemony over Greece; the League of Corinth had long since lapsed into inactivity and, to borrow Heisserer's phraseology, by 324 *diagramma* had become *lex*.<sup>59</sup> However, in taking the Mytilene decree out of its 324 context we are left with probably only the one Greek state, Tegea, which

---

<sup>58</sup> Dr. Kelly points out, quite rightly, that this is somewhat of a sweeping statement: he cites Isocrates, who has 43 instances of βασιλεύς as "the Persian king" and only 12 with the article.

<sup>59</sup> Heisserer, *Alexander* p.229, and cf. pp.226-229; *contra* Ryder, *Koine Eirene* pp. 107-108 for the (mistaken) view that the synhedrion was not ignored in 324/3; cf. Wilcken, *Alexander the Great* p.215 and Tarn, *Alexander the Great* i pp.112-113. Although the tone of the decree is autocratic it was in effect a διάγραμμα and not a διαταγή (see E. Bikerman, *REA* 42 [1940] pp.25-35), and Hammond notes that to say "No" to the *diagramma* was not a rebellious act but merely the start of a discussion (*Alexander the Great* [New Jersey: 1980] p.252). However, the facts that it was issued in the name of βασιλεύς Ἀλέξανδρος (on royal titlature see R.M. Errington, *JHS* 94 [1974] pp.20-37, especially p.22) and that Antipater had been given *carte blanche* in his dealings with any unwilling city would not have been lost on the Greeks. Indeed, this must have been the intention, and the reference to Antipater's directive at the *culmination* of the decree is, I think, significant.

implemented Alexander's edict, despite the fact that the Greek states (excluding Thebes) were ordered to receive back their exiles and that also under its terms Antipater was empowered to coerce any city which was unwilling to do so (Diod. 18.8.4).<sup>60</sup> This demonstrates well the bitterness amongst the Greeks caused by the promulgation of that decree; the resistance brought against it and thereby, by extension, against the Macedonian hegemony. The spirit of Greek autonomy refused to be beaten.<sup>61</sup>

**IAN WORTHINGTON**

The University of New England

---

<sup>60</sup> See above, n.8, for perhaps the real reason why the Tegeans implemented the decree.

<sup>61</sup> I am grateful for the comments made by participants at the epigraphy seminar. In particular, I would like to thank Professors G.R. Bugh, A.J. Heisserer, Dr. D.H. Kelly and Emeritus Professor H.B. Mattingly for generously commenting on a written version of the paper, which can only have improved it. Also fortunately for me my colleague Professor G.R. Stanton read the final version and his always vigilant eye located at least one glaring error which I had still included. I can now safely say that errors which remain are indeed my own.



1)



2)

1) Mytilenean elektrum coin: Obverse: head of Alexander the Great (x 5)

2) Mytilenean electrum coin: Reverse: eagle (x 3)