

N. G. L.HAMMOND

A NOTE ON E. BADIAN, 'ALEXANDER AND PHILIPPI', ZPE 95
(1993) 131–9

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 100 (1994) 385–387

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

The Chians, like the Philippians, set up at home a record of a negotiation with Alexander when he was elsewhere. The record began with the Chian dating and the occasion of the negotiation, namely the receipt of an instruction from Alexander. No doubt the Philippian record began similarly with the Philippian dating and the occasion of the negotiation, namely the coming of Philippian ambassadors⁸ to Alexander and an instruction from Alexander. In the Chian inscription the first mention of Alexander is *παρὰ βασιλέως Ἀλε[ξάνδρ]ου*, and the next mention is simply *πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον*; so too in the Philippian inscription, if Vatin's restoration is accepted. In reporting the instructions of Alexander both inscriptions employed aorist and present infinitives, and both provided for further negotiation.⁹ We are extraordinarily fortunate to have such a close analogy in meaning and in date.¹⁰ In the light of it and of the other evidence which I adduced I regarded Vatin's restoration as 'almost certain'.

In *ZPE* 95 135 B. made the allegation that the restoration *πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀλέξανδρον* in line 3 was mine, and that I introduced it in order to support a theory of mine.¹¹ He went on to compare this alleged behaviour with that of a card-sharper: 'once the conjuror has palmed the card, it is bound to appear when wanted' and 'it is the method of what one might call the forced card'. As he rightly said of his allegation: 'this is no way to argue in serious scholarship'. The allegation, however, is entirely unfounded. The restoration was that of Vatin. I did not introduce it into the debate, nor (to employ B.'s distasteful comparison) did I introduce it into any prearranged pack of cards. In fact in neither article did I suggest any restoration at all. B.'s further allegation¹² that the restoration was made in order to support a theory that Alexander was addressed by his royal title is untrue; for neither Vatin nor Missitzis mentioned any such theory.

Whereas I did not propose any restorations, B. did.¹³ He proposed to regard *ρσιδ* in line 1 as a form of 'Persis', and he suggested restoring the text in lines 2-3 as [*..ἐπ]ρέβευσαν [ἀναβάντες πρὸς Ἀλέ]ξα[νδ]ρον* 'with the ambassadors as the subject'. He chose the

⁸ I agree with Hatzopoulos 438f. (see n. 5 above), that the ambassadors reported the instructions given by Alexander. I therefore reject B.'s alternative restoration with the citizens (of Philippi) as the subject in lines 1-3 [*διεπ]ρεβεύσαν[το κοινῆι πρὸς Ἀλέ]ξα[νδ]ρον* (*ZPE* 79, 65 n. 15).

⁹ Tod, *GHI* 192 line 7 and Vatin's text B lines 11-12.

¹⁰ The Chian inscription being dated by Heisserer to 334 B.C. and by Tod and others to 332 B.C. (which I prefer; see n. 7 above), and the Philippian inscription being dated variously to 335 and 334 B.C. (Vatin 262 and Missitzis 9) and to after 331 B.C. (Hatzopoulos in *Bull. Epigr.* 104 (1991) 505).

¹¹ This allegation seems to be 'the main point' of his article (134). It is stated emphatically, 'his restoration' being repeated on p. 135.

¹² In *ZPE* 95, 134 B. wrote, 'I pointed out that several of the restorations accepted (though not initially suggested) by H., and his whole interpretation of the text based on them, were accepted by him, and suggested by his predecessors, out of a desire to substantiate the 'historical theory' (if we may thus dignify it) that the king of Macedon was normally described as *βασιλεύς* in official texts before 331 B.C.'

¹³ The restorations were given in *ZPE* 79, 65 n. 15 and 67. The boldest, which was introduced to support his interpretation of *ὀρίσαι* was [*χώραν Φιλίππου ζῶντος*]c, of which only the last letter exists in line 7 of the inscription. Nor does *Φιλίππου ζῶντος* commend itself; for it has an English ring, and I doubt if it occurs in any inscription.

word ἀναβάντες 'for the possible destination of the ambassadors'. It is a perfect example of a restoration planned to support a theory, that the ambassadors went to 'Persis'.¹⁴ In *ZPE* 95, 134 B. seemed to think I was making a joke of this (he tried to explain the nature of the joke for his reader); if so, it was less offensive (I hope) than a comparison with card-sharping. But I was and am quite serious, all the more so because B. has not sought to justify his restoration on any other grounds.

An entirely different point concerns the verbs [ἐπειβε]βήκασι and [ἐπειβεβήκ]ασι in lines 8 and 12. Vatin proposed¹⁵ to restore [ἐπειβε]βήκασι in the opening part of line 8, and to complete πειβεβηκ in line 12 as [ἐπειβεβηκ]ότασ. Vatin, Missitzis, I and Hatzopoulos were agreed that the persons involved had encroached on land which was not theirs; B. in *ZPE* 95 did not discuss the matter. In my article in *ZPE* 82 (1990) 170, when I criticised B.'s belief that in line 6 ὀρίσαι meant that boundaries 'had already been defined' e.g. in the lifetime of Philip, I remarked that for his interpretation one would expect a pluperfect tense, such as we have in line 12 [ἐπειβεβήκ]ασι. B. in *ZPE* 95, 136 comments as follows. 'The form is, of course, a perfect and not a pluperfect. H. seems as vague about Greek grammar as he is about Greek word usage'.

The First Greek Grammar by W.G.Rutherford (London, 1918), which I used in learning and teaching Greek Prose Composition for some thirty-five years, showed 'how foreign to English idiom is the peculiar signification of the Greek perfect' (p. 91). Thus the perfect infinitive and the perfect participle in Greek carry in some contexts the pluperfect meaning. One such context is the report of instructions issued in the past. Thus on B.'s supposition that boundaries 'had already been defined' one would expect not ὀρίσαι but ὀρικέναι. So too with Vatin's restoration [ἐπειβεβηκ]ότασ the meaning is that of a pluperfect tense: 'those who had encroached'. When the same meaning was conveyed in a relative clause [ὅσοι ... ἐπειβε]βήκασι the perfect indicative contained the pluperfect sense and is to be translated in English 'those who had encroached'.

Clare College, Cambridge

N.G.L.Hammond

¹⁴ In *ZPE* 82. 170 I said that 'the four letters in line 1 may be the remains of an ambassador's name ending in ιδης or ιδου', and B. kindly suggested some names in *ZPE* 95, 131. I wrote 'may be' because there are other possibilities, such as a dative plural ending in ρσι e.g. τέσσαρσι.

¹⁵ Vatin 263 with the proviso 'la restitution est hypothétique'.