

MICHAEL ARNUSH

THE ARCHONSHIP OF SARPADON AT DELPHI

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 105 (1995) 95–104

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE ARCHONSHIP OF SARPADON AT DELPHI*

Inv. 4181. Discovered April 1899 in "un vieux mur" east of the Roman agora, near the present-day main entrance to the *temenos*. Current location: ἀποθήκη κ., r. 85. Fragment of a badly abraded marble stele. Dimensions: 0.25x0.25x0.06 m. Letters: 0.010-0.011 m. Interlinear: 0.010-0.011 m. Stoichedon.¹

1	[Δελφοὶ ἔδω]κ[αν Πολυπέρ]- [χοντι Σιμμίου Μ[ακεδό]-
	[νι αὐτ]ῷ καὶ ἐκγό[νοις]
	[προξε]νίαν, προμα[ντεύ]-
5	[αν, ἀτέ]λειαν, προε[δρίαν], [ἀσυλία]γ ἐν Δελφο[ῖς, προ]- [δικίαν π]οτὶ Δελφ[ούς].
	[ἄρχοντο]ς Καρπαδ[όνος],
	[βουλευόν]των Πυ[θοδό]-
10	[ρου, Πολυκλ]ήτον, [Δαμάρ]- [χου, Πεισίλα, Θέωνος].

The following readings are Bousquet's. L.1: [ἔδωκαν .7 max.]. L.2: [.5. Σιμμίου Μ[.6 max.]. L.4: προμα[ντεύ]-. L.10: [Πολυκλή]το[ν].

In the *editio princeps* of this inscription in 1899 Bourguet proposed restoring the name of the honorand as [Ποσειδίππωι] Σιμμίου Μ[άγνητι], which Bousquet demonstrated in 1957 was unlikely due to the unusual word breaks and *lacunae* needed to accommodate this restoration in contrast to the systematic distribution of words and the regular syllabic breaks in the remainder of the text. Here I propose a different honorand, and this proposal not only meets the criteria which proved an obstacle to Bourguet's restoration but also requires a reexamination of Greek politics in the latter half of the 4th century B.C.

The key to this proposal rests with the link between the patronymic and the ethnic adjective, since the *nomen* Simmias appears relatively infrequently in epigraphic corpora.² Indi-

* I wish to thank T. Scholten and S. Tracy for several useful suggestions and corrections.

¹ É. Bourguet, *BCH* 23 (1899) 507-509 no. 24; J. Bousquet, *BCH* 81 (1957) 487-489; *SEG* 17 (1960) 230.

² The only other name which could possibly fit the restoration of the patronymic on l. 2 would be Νιμμίου, which appears once in a bilingual text in the 2nd century B.C. on Delos (*ID* 4.1750.r.2, courtesy of the Packard Humanities Institute CD Rom #6 [The Packard Humanities Institute 1991]). However, this Greek transliteration of a Latin name does not appear prior to the 2nd century.

viduals named Simmias appear in documents from Achaia,³ Athens,⁴ Boiotia,⁵ Delos,⁶ Thesaly,⁷ Magnesia⁸ and Macedonia.⁹ Bousquet in fact suggested that a restoration of M[ακεδόνι] (as well as at least five other ethnic adjectives in the dative) would be eminently more reasonable than M[άγνητι],¹⁰ which was possible in theory but which would have meant that the stonemason deliberately left two *vacats* at the end of l. 2 when he could have fit the entire ethnic on that line. In a stoichedon arrangement in accordance with the use of syllabic breaks, a restoration of M[ακεδόνι] leaves an "acceptable" *vacat* of only one *stoichos* at the end of the line. The absence of epigraphic evidence for individuals named Simmias from other *poleis* that fit the requirements of ll. 2-3 of Inv. 4181 suggests that a restoration of Cιμμίον M[ακεδό]|[νι] is the most likely.

The literary testimonia from the second half of the 4th century B.C. records the careers of two Macedonians who bore this name. One, the son of Andromenes, is mentioned only in the context of the conspiracy of Philotas against Alexander in 330/29.¹¹ Nothing else is known about this Simmias, including whether or not he had any progeny. Simmias' grandfather and namesake was the father of Polyperchon, a member of the Macedonian royal family, one of Alexander's Companions, and the eventual regent.¹² The earliest confirmed historical account of Polyperchon son of Simmias places him at Gaugamela in September/October of 331 as a commander of Stymphaian *pezhetairoi*.¹³ The *nomen* [Πολυπέρχοντι] fits the space allotted on ll. 1-2 of Inv. 4181 perfectly, and allows for the kind of syllabic division which also occurs on ll. 4, 6, 9 and 10. If this tentative restoration is correct, admittedly it seems unusual, though not unique, that Polyperchon was not described with the full ethnic adjective, ἐκ

³ *IG IX.2.90.*

⁴ J. Kirchner, *PA* 12664 (Plut. *Perikl.* 35); 12665 (Hypereides frg. 162 Bl.3).

⁵ From Chaironeia, *IG VII.3299*, 3322; Orchomenos, VII.3206; Tanagra, *IG VII.538*; Thebes, VII.2429.

⁶ *ID* 1.298, 1409, 1441, 1450; *IG IX.4.1064.*

⁷ From Krannon, *IG IX.2.517*; Larisa, IX.2.60, 521, 629; Pharsalos, IX.2.234; Pherai, IX.2.440; *FD 3.5.47* (= *CID II 74*), 50 (= *CID II 76*), 57 (= *CID II 94, 95*), 58 (= *CID II 97*), 60 (= *CID II 99*), 61 (= *CID II 102*), 91 (= *CID II 119*).

⁸ *FD 3.5.20* (= *CID II 32*).

⁹ *ID 1.313.*

¹⁰ Bousquet 1957 (n.l) 489: M[ελιταιεῖ], M[ελιβουεῖ], M[ιλησίωι], M[εδεωνίωι], and M[εcca-víωι].

¹¹ Q.C. 7.1.10-14, 2.1-10; Arrian 3.27.1-3; Plut. *Alex.* 49.7. Simmias and his brothers Amyntas, Attalos (the future brother-in-law of Perdiccas) and Polemon were charged and then released by Alexander.

¹² Simmias himself had ruled the Tymphaei ca. 370. See N.G.L. Hammond and G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia, vol. II: 550-336 B.C.* (Oxford 1979) 20-21. For a survey of Polyperchon's career which calls attention to his limited military skills see H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, 2 vols. (Munich 1926) II.325-326 no.654. See also Lenschau, *RE* s.v. Polyperchon, XXI.2 (1952), cols. 1797-1806. See also the more recent and very thorough treatment by W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London and New York 1992), iii.5.188-204.

¹³ D.S. 17.57.2; cf. 20.28.1. Arr. 3.11-15; cf. 2.12.2. Curtius 4.13.28; cf. 13.7.

Τυμφαίας Μακεδόνι. ¹⁴ Perhaps the omission of the local residence was due to Philip's abolition of the Macedonian monarchies and their incorporation into the greater *koinon* of Macedon.¹⁵

I cannot explain why Polyperchon should have been the recipient of honors by Delphi, although it would not have been unusual for a member of a local Macedonian monarchical family to have been so honored.¹⁶ This Macedonian "old soldier" was active from his days as a Companion of Alexander in the late 330's until his death *ca.* 302.¹⁷ His earliest appearance in the historical record occurs after Issus and just prior to Gaugamela, and he does not seem to have distinguished himself before then.¹⁸ When he does receive notice in the aftermath of Issus, his promotion to the command of the forces of the dead Ptolemy, son of Seleucus, suggests that he was recognized for a military prowess displayed as he moved up through the ranks. Thus there is no reason to suspect that Polyperchon joined Alexander's army sometime after the initial departure from Greece in the spring of 334.¹⁹ And, although it is theoretically possible that the Delphic *polis* bestowed an honorific upon this Macedonian in his absence there is no compelling evidence to support such a supposition. Accordingly, a grant of *proxenia* to Polyperchon, and hence the archonship of Sarpadon, should have a *terminus ante quem* of spring 335/4.

¹⁴ Between the work done by P. Pedrizet (*BCH* 21 [1897] 102-118, which summarized the decrees issued to Macedonians in the 4th-2nd centuries), and a search I conducted of all Delphic documents published in *FD* using the Packard Humanities Institute CD Rom #6 [The Packard Hurnanities Institute 1991]), I have isolated 16 proxeny decrees from the 4th century B.C. and later granted to Macedonians. Of these, 11 mention the hometowns of the individuals (*FD* 3.1.105, 112, 186, 396; 3.3.117 [*cf.* 3.4.135 col. I.23], 577; 3.4.391, 405, 417 III; Inv. 2784, and Inv. 3404+3405+3406), while five refer only to the honorands' Macedonian ethnicity (*FD* 3.1.108; 3.3.382 *bis*; 3.4.16, 81; Inv. 5556+3419+ 3476 = Bousquet, *BCH* 70 [1946] 38 n.2; my thanks to Prof. Bousquet for this reference). The temple and sanctuary accounts of the 4th century which name Macedonian *naopoioi* (*FD* 3.5.19 I. 74; 20 II. 31, 40; 48 col. I, I. 11; 49 col. II, I. 42; 58, II. 29-30; 60A I. 1) omit the individuals' hometowns, but this is the convention in this dossier.

¹⁵ Hammond and Griffith, *Macedonia* (n.12) 650-651. This theory cannot not be readily confirmed, since only five of the 16 proxeny decrees for Macedonians listed above date with certainty to the reigns of Philip and Alexander. Although only one (*BCH* 70 [1946] p. 38 n.2) of the five excludes the honorand's hometown, none of these decrees can be dated more precisely since the names of the archons and accompanying bouleutic magistrates are not extant.

¹⁶ Hammond and Griffith, *Macedonia* (n.12) 650-651.

¹⁷ P. Green, *Alexander of Macedon, 356-323 B.C.: A Historical Biography* (Berkeley 1991) 28. Cf. R.A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley 1990) 172 n.20, who suggested (with Plut. *Pyrrhos* 8.3) that Polyperchon may have lived into the 3rd century. Lenschau, *RE* (n.12) col. 1798, dated his birth to *ca.* 390-380; this would locate his award from Delphi to when he was in his 40's or 50's.

¹⁸ Arr. 2.12.2. Lenschau, *RE* (n.12) col. 1798, proposed that, due to the uniqueness of the name Poly(s)perchon in antiquity, the Polyperchon who along with Leptines murdered Kallipos of Rhegion, Dion's assassin (Plut. *Dion* 58.6) in the 350's might be identified with the Macedonian soldier. If so, then his military career might have begun when he was roughly 30 years old, in southern Italy. W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London 1992) 189, considered the identification of the assassin with the Macedonian commander at Gaugamela implausible.

¹⁹ Arr. 1. 11; D.S. 17.17.

Bousquet's reconstruction of Delphic chronology can accommodate Sarpadon's archonship in only a few different periods: 351/0-346/5, 339/8-338/7, 335/4, and *post* 313/2.²⁰ The first range, the period of the Third Sacred War, is clearly impossible, since the *polis* of Delphi under Phocian domination was in no position to grant honorifics to anyone, whether to a Macedonian soldier/statesman or an Aitolian *koinon*. The epigraphic record for this period is understandably silent: except for resistance to the Phocians Delphi's political structure survived at little more than subsistence level during the Phocian occupation and degradation of the sanctuary.²¹ We may also dismiss a date after 313/2: Bousquet has already shown that a date "dans les dix dernières années du IV^e s." as first proposed by Bourguet²² is extremely unlikely, for it depends in part on identifying the recipient of honors in Inv. 4181 as [Ποσειδίππωι Σιμμίου Μ[άγνη..]τι] and the son of Simmias Homolius of Magnesia, a *hieromnemon* during the archonship of Charixenos in 326/5.²³ Bourguet's argument hinged as well upon the political relationship between Aitolia and Delphi which blossomed at the end of the 4th century,²⁴ and which seems to have had its earliest expression in another document in the Sarpadon dossier, which records a grant of collective *promanteia*, *proedria*, and *ateleia* to the Aitolians.²⁵ Bousquet viewed the grant of collective *promanteia* in the context of Delphi's expression of gratitude for Aitolian patronage and protection, to which I shall return. Bousquet's convincing rejection of Bourguet's restoration nullifies the justification for such a low date.

Bourguet's thesis that Sarpadon's archonship belongs at the end of the 4th century is also refuted by the paleographic evidence, for the letter-forms of the dossier of texts issued during Sarpadon's archonship bear little resemblance to the letter-forms of the end of the 4th century.²⁶ With one exception²⁷ all of the texts are written in the stoichedon style, line breaks coincide with syllabic divisions, and the letters are well-cut, even in shape²⁸ and evenly placed within their *stoichoi*. The letter-forms exhibit few of the characteristics of the "deterriorated style" of the end of the century: shallow and ugly letters, with tapering *hastae*.²⁹ As is the case with any attempt to date inscriptions on the basis of letterforms, these distinctions

²⁰ Études sur les comptes de Delphes (Paris 1988) 15-16 and 199.

²¹ J. Buckler, *Philip II and the Sacred War* (Leiden 1989) 196-204.

²² Bourguet 1899 (n.1) 509.

²³ Bousquet, Études (n.20) 488-491.

²⁴ This has been carefully outlined by R. Flacelière (*Les Aitoliens à Delphes* [Paris 1937] 49-91), and more recently by J. Scholten (*Aetolian Foreign Relations During the Era of Expansion, ca. 300-217 B.C.* [Berkeley diss. 1987] 45-49).

²⁵ Inv. 7088 A,B = Bousquet 1957 (n.1) 485.

²⁶ Bousquet 1957 (n.1) 487.

²⁷ FD 3.1.140.

²⁸ Unlike inscriptions from the end of the 4th century, the rounded letters—ΘΟΩ—in the Sarpadon dossier are only slightly (*ca.* 0.001 m) smaller than the other letters.

²⁹ S. Dow, "The Study of Lettering," in S.V. Tracy's *The Lettering of an Athenian Mason*, *Hesperia Suppl.* XV (Princeton 1975) xiii-xxiii.

are not drawn sharply, and a style which seems to prevail from the 330's to the 310's could extend beyond either or both periods. Nonetheless, the letter-forms of the Sarpadon dossier conform well with documents issued during the third quarter of the 4th century.

In his examination of Sarpadon's career Bousquet also rejected 332/1 on the grounds that after the destruction of Thebes by Alexander in 335/4 the Aitolians, recipients of *promanteia*, *proedria*, and *ateleia* from Delphi under Sarpadon, had seen their relationship with Macedonia

deteriorate so severely that until 330 they could not have received such honors from a sanctuary which had fallen under Macedonian control after the Third Sacred War in 346.³⁰ Instead, Bousquet opted for 338/7, placing the award in the context of an attempt by Philip to reinforce the strategic importance of his Aitolian allies against the Peloponnese by "rewarding" them with *promanteia* and the promise of Naupaktos, a promise which apparently never materialized.³¹ Yet recently Bousquet recanted this position, and instead has suggested placing the archonship of [E]risamos in 338/7, succeeding that of Etymondas in 339/8.³² How can this be reconciled with the few open dates for Sarpadon's archonship? Even if the ascription of [E]risamos to 338/7 is incorrect (and Bousquet himself has admitted that the one text from his archonship³³ resembles paleographically the award of *promanteia* to the Naxians in 328/7³⁴) Sarpadon still cannot have held the archonship in either 338/7 or 339/8, since naopic financial inscriptions from both years record accounts received during the archonships

³⁰ 1957 (n.1) 487 and 492. The evidence for the origins of the *animus* comes from Arrian (1.7.4, 10.2), who cites first the untrustworthiness of the Aitolians from Alexander's perspective prior to the razing of Thebes, and then their eagerness to appease the conquering monarch after they had thrown their support to the rebels (see *infra* n.40).

³¹ 1957 (n.1) 492-493. On the issue of Naupaktos, see A.B. Bosworth, *AJAH* 1 (1976) 164-181.

³² Bousquet, *Études* (n.20) 57-61, esp. 58 n.50.

³³ Inv. 3843+6690; J. Bousquet, *BCH* 64/5 (1940/1) 91-92. The stone, though badly abraded, has yielded a few new readings since its last publication:

1	Θεός.
	Δημητρίῳ Ἐπηράτου
	Κνωσίῳ αὐτ[ῷ]ι καὶ ἐκγ[ό]-
	νοις [Δ]ελφ[οὶ] ἔδ]ωκον
5	προξ[ενίαν, εύ]εργε-
	σίαν, προ[μαντ]είαν,
	ἀτέλεια[ν], πρ[ο]δικίαν,
	ἀσυλίαν καὶ κατὰ γῆν
	καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν,
10	καὶ ἐπιτιμὰν καθάπερ
	[Δε]λφοῖς. Ἀρχοντο[ς]
	[Ἐρι]εάμου, βουλευ-
	[όν]των Μαντία,
	[Ἡρ]οίου.

Bousquet: 1.1, Θεός; 1.2, Ἐπηράτου; 1.4, Δ]ελφ[οὶ]; 1.5, προξενίαν, προδικίαν; 1.9, καὶ κατὰ [θ]άλασσαν; 1.10, [κ]αὶ ἐπιτιμὰν; 1.11, [Δ]ελφοῖς. Ἀρχοντο[ς]; 1.12, [Ἐρι]εάμου; 1.13, [ό]ντων; 1.14, [Ἡρ]οίου.

³⁴ Bousquet, *Études* (n.20) 58; the archon is Theolytos, the text *GDI* 2617.

of individuals whose names in the genitive contain eight letters.³⁵ The only remaining year for Sarpadon's archonship is 335/4,³⁶ which will have represented the beginning of a brief, concentrated period of political activity for this Delphian: Sarpadon's archonship was then followed in short order by a post as a *prytanis* in 331/0 under the archon [Thy]meas,³⁷ after which he disappears from the prosopographic and epigraphic record altogether.

Bosworth maintained that the key to the relationship between Aitolia and Philip was the confirmation provided by the latter to the Achaeans of their possession of Naupaktos in 338/7, an action which "formed the watershed in relations between Macedon and Aetolia. The Aetolians were transformed overnight into inveterate enemies."³⁸ The spillover of the increasing hostility between the Aitolians and Philip had already been explored by Bousquet, who situated the grant of *promanteia* to the Aitolians in the context of improved relations between the two in the year of Chaironea and attributed the award to Philip's ability "obtenir le privilège de la promantie à ses alliés Aitaliens" from Delphi in lieu of awarding them seats on the Amphiktyonic *synedrion*, a privilege the king himself had realized recently.³⁹ Bousquet envisaged the first manifestation of the deterioration in relations between these two powers when Aitolia decided to side with Thebes in 335, while Bosworth expected that shortly after the affair of the strategically important Naupaktos the disaffected and dissatisfied Aitolians increased hostilities towards the Macedonian king.⁴⁰ Although Bosworth was sur-

³⁵ For Etymondas, see *FD* 3.5.21 (= *CID* II 44) and 3.5.25IIIB (= *CID* II 51). For [E]risamos (now [Eri]samos), *FD* 3.5.24 (= *CID* II 52), 37 (= *CID* II 50) and 38 (= *CID* II 55); cf. 3.5.31 (= *CID* II 58). See also G. Roux, *L'amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IV^e siècle* (Lyon and Paris 1979) 193-196 and fig. 2; Bousquet, *Études* (n.20) 48-50, 57-60.

³⁶ Bousquet, *Études* (n.20) 57, tentatively assigned the archon Ornichidas to 335/4 but this is far from certain. None of the documents that name Ornichidas are securely dated: *IG* IX 1, 112 and *SIG³* 233 have a *terminus post quem* of 338/7, while *FD* III 4, 280B may have a *terminus ante quem* of 334/3. Both Ornichidas and Sarpadon probably belong in the mid-330's, as Bousquet seems to have acknowledged: "Je pense à présent que j'ai voulu dater trop haut, en 338/7, l'archontat de Sarpadon ... pourtant d'une superbe écriture" (58 n. 50). Bousquet 1957 (n.1) 492, dismissed assigning Sarpadon to 335/4 because by September of that year, when Thebes was destroyed, "les Aitaliens sont en mauvais termes avec la monarchie macédonienne, et que la tension dure au moins jusqu'en 330," and thus would not have condoned a grant of *promanteia* to the enemy. As I suggest *infra*, the deteriorating relationship with Macedonia did not prevent the Aitolians from being honored by the Delphians *after* 335/4.

³⁷ *FD* 3.5.54 (= *CID* II 86).

³⁸ 1976 (n.31) 172.

³⁹ 1957 (n.1) 493. For Aitolian support of Philip before and at Chaironea see *infra* n.60.

⁴⁰ Bousquet 1957 (n. 1) 493; Bosworth 1976 (n.31) 172-174. On the Aitolian role in the revolt and destruction of Thebes, see Arrian 1.7.4; 10.2. On Naupaktos and the Aitolians see Dem. 9.34; Strabo 9.4.7; Theopompos in both the Suda (*s.v.* φρουρήσεις ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ) and Zenobius (6.33). After the Thebans rebelled against Alexander in 335, Arrian records that Alexander took this seriously, for he feared that the Spartans, other Peloponnesians, and the Aitolians "who were unreliable" (οὐ βέβαιοι ὄντες) (1.7.4) might join the Thebans. After the defeat of the allied forces and the destruction of the city, Arrian notes that "the Aitolians sent embassies, tribe by tribe, and begged forgiveness for revolting on the news brought from Thebes" (Αἰτωλοὶ δὲ πρεσβείας εφῶν κατὰ ἔθνη πέμψαντες ξυγγνώμης τυχεῖν ἐδέοντο, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοί τι πρὸς τὰ παρὰ τῶν Θηβαίων ἀπαγγελθέντα ἐνεωτέριαν [1.10.2]).

prisingly unfamiliar with the Delphic grant of *promanteia* and Bousquet's work when discussing whether or not Philip disbanded the Aitolian *koinon*, he did reconstruct a convincing scenario for the dissolution of the *koinon* between the end of Philip's reign and 325/4 and a concomitant rise in competing interests between the Aitolians and Macedonians. Accordingly, as Bousquet had pointed out nearly 20 years earlier, an appropriate moment for Philip to have "directed" Delphi to honor his allies the Aitolians was in 338/7, while relations were still relatively amicable.⁴¹ This scenario assumes, however, that after Philip acquired the two Phokian votes on the Amphiktyonic council he exerted considerable wide-ranging influence on the affairs of the Delphic *polis*.⁴² Although numerous instances arose in the 4th century when *poleis* used the Amphiktyony as a means to promote a particular political agenda these do not constitute an infringement of Delphic autonomy. In fact, in one instance, an attempt by the Amphiktyonic *synedrion* to exile a Delphic citizen was invalidated by the Athenians precisely because it contravened Delphic independence.⁴³ And if Philip sought to improve relations with his new-found (and short-lived) allies the Aitolians in 338, who were not members of the Amphiktyony, then why would he have chosen the Delphic *polis* rather than the Amphiktyonic *synedrion* to convey his good wishes? Surely he could have ushered in this temporary sentiment of Hellenic and Macedonian goodwill towards the Aitolians more effectively by issuing a δόγμα τῶν Ἀμφιτκτυόνων rather than by assenting to Δελφοὶ ἔδωκαν. As has already been noted before, "it may be right to count the Delphic Amphiktyony, too, among Philip's assets; but it would be unwise to overrate it, and to see the hand of Philip in everything done at Delphi is probably mistaken."⁴⁴

Support for divorcing the Macedonian political perspective from Delphic affairs comes from three texts in the sanctuary's epigraphic corpus, all issued after the death of Philip when the tension between Alexander and the Aitolians had become palpable.⁴⁵ Twice in 334/3, during the archonship of Damochares [C20], the Delphic *polis* bestowed the standard honors associated with *proxenia* upon individual Aitolians,⁴⁶ and once again in 329/8, during the

⁴¹ 1957 (n.l) 492-493. Bosworth (*Conquest and Empire: The reign of Alexander the Great* [Cambridge 1988] 196) later referred to the separate tribal embassies from the Aitolians that approached Alexander after the destruction of Thebes as evidence for "the (temporary) renunciation of their federal polity (Arr. 1.10.2)." Cf. 188 and n.2. D. Mendels, *Historia* 33 (1984) 129-180, esp. 137 and n.48, suggested a date of ca. 330/29 for the possible reestablishment of the Aitolian *koinon*, effected perhaps in part by Antipater. See also M. Sordi, *Acme* 6 (1953) 419-445, esp. 432-435, and J.A.O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States* (Oxford 1968) 195-215.

⁴² The most cogent study of Philip's entrance into the exclusive Amphiktyony remains that by G. Daux, *BCH* 81 (1957) 95-120, esp. 100ff.

⁴³ For some examples of the manipulation of the Amphiktyony, and the limitations of the *synedrion*, see Hammond and Griffith, *Macedonia* (n.12) 451-452. For the decree of the *synedrion* see *SIG³* 175 ll. 15ff.

⁴⁴ Hammond and Griffith, *Macedonia* (n.12) 621.

⁴⁵ See Bosworth 1976 (n.31) 173-174; also Bousquet, *Études* (n.20) 188 and n.2.

⁴⁶ *FD* 3.1.147 (to Λεοντομ[ένει] Κτρονγυλίω[νος] Αἰτωλῶι) and 148 (to Κτρονβί[χω]ι Λαττ[ά]βον Αἰτωλῶι).

archonship of Bathyllos [C24].⁴⁷ The first two awards were made shortly after Philip's death, on the heels of the Aitolian restoration in 335/4 of those Akarnanians whom the Macedonian king had exiled, and the subsequent pressure applied to the citizens of Ambrakia to expel the garrison established by Philip.⁴⁸ The third is in roughly the same period to which is attributed Alexander's bitter anger towards the Aitolians for the destruction of Oiniadai.⁴⁹ These three texts all share the same standard formulaic expression of proxeny decrees, which is quite similar to the restored text issued under Sarpadon in honor of the Aitolians.⁵⁰ However substantial the Macedonian monarch's influence may have been over the Amphiktyony, it appears to have receded where matters of Delphic autonomy and the business of the *polis* were concerned. The tension between Aitolia and Macedonia may have been palpable in the fall of 335/4, but it did not necessarily prohibit Delphic overtures to the Aitolians.⁵¹

Why did the Delphians choose to honor the Aitolians in 335/4? The sources are silent on the relations between these two peoples throughout much of the latter half of the century, and until the Aitolians gained a foothold at the sanctuary *ca.* 300 their paths barely crossed in the historical record. For instance, when Diodoros provides the roll-call of pro- and anti-Delphic supporters during the Third Sacred War, the Aitolians receive no mention while other neighbours such as the Dolopeans do.⁵² The *polis* of Delphi is little more than a footnote during the 23 years when Philip II and Alexander II manipulated the Amphiktyony — an archaic institution whose influence was rapidly waning — for their own purposes,⁵³ and the absence of Aitolians from the Delphic financial accounts of the 360's and later attests to the limited contact these neighbouring peoples had. Grants of collective *promanteia* were rare in this

⁴⁷ Bourguet, *BCH* 23 (1899) 356, records the award to an unnamed Aitolian from Makynia, some 10km southwest of Naupaktos.

⁴⁸ D.S. 17.3.3. See Hammond and Griffith, *Macedonia* (n.12) 612-613.

⁴⁹ Plut. *Alex.* 49.8. For the date see Bosworth 1976 (n.31) 180 nn.81, 86. The incident to which Plutarch attaches this anecdote, the murder of Parmenion, dates to 330, while Antipater's secret negotiations with the Aitolians in response to their mutual fear of the king may date to as late as 325/4. See also Bosworth, *Conquest* (n.41) 162; E. Badian *JHS* 81 (1961) 36-37; Mendels 1984 (n.41) 129-180, esp. 137- 140.

⁵⁰ The decree issued during Sarpadon's archonship excludes *proxenia*, a natural omission for the grant to a *koinon* since *proxenia* typically went to individuals.

⁵¹ Arr. 1.9.6-10; D.S. 17.14.1-4; Justin 11.3.8-4.8; Plut. *Alex.* 11.5-6; Bousquet 1957 (n.1) 487. Bousquet (p. 493) argued that the rumor that the Pythia "philippisait" (Plut. *Dem.* 20: ὁ δὲ Δημοσθένης λέγεται ... καὶ τὴν Πυθίαν ὑπονοεῖν ὡς φιλιππίζουσαν) lent credence to the notion that Delphi yielded to Philip. But the honorifics issued by the Delphic *polis* to the Aitolians in a period of increasing hostility between the Macedonian monarch and the Aitolians refute this claim.

⁵² D.S. 16.29.1.

⁵³ So Hammond and Griffith, *Macedonia* (n.12) 451ff., where they show that the majority of states sitting on the Amphiktyonic council were clients of Philip. Cf. Hammond and F.W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. III: 336-167 B.C. (Oxford 1988) 15, for the continuation of this situation under Alexander.

period, as they were in general,⁵⁴ and it may be telling that from the middle of the century until Sarpadon's archonship only Thebes⁵⁵ and Philip⁵⁶ had received this honorific.⁵⁷ These represented two (but of course not all) of the major political and military forces at work jockeying for position and power, and although Aitolia had not yet achieved such prominence Delphi may have responded to the growing strength of her western neighbor by extending a privilege in anticipation of future self-serving advantages.

Conversely, Delphi's extension of this privilege may have been a response to a specific act of assistance by Aitolia, perhaps at some point after the Third Sacred War, and the grant of *promanteia* would then represent an expression of gratitude made shortly after the fact, irrespective of the Macedonian position. One possible scenario draws upon the events following the affair of Amphissa and preceding Chaironeia. As Demosthenes was rallying the Greeks around the standard born by the uneasy alliance of Athens and Thebes, Philip brought pressure to bear on the divided Boiotians in a gathering of ambassadors at Thebes in the fall of 339/8.⁵⁸ Those who spoke in Philip's behalf included Thessalian, Ainianian, Aitolian, Dolopian and Phthiotic Achaian ambassadors.⁵⁹ Although the sources are vague on the sides chosen by both Delphi and the Aitolians in the coming *denouement* at Chaironeia, all indications suggest that Delphi either remained neutral or was arrayed against the Greek allies, while the Aitolians lent their full support to Philip, in exchange for the eagerly-sought prize of Naupaktos.⁶⁰ As tensions between Aitolia and Macedonia increased in the next years, which prompted the Aitolians to return the Akarnanians exiled by Philip upon his death,⁶¹ the Delphic *polis* may have hedged its bets by making overtures to Aitolia — a recent ally in an anti-Greek cause — in the first moments of uncertainty after the assassination of Philip. The

⁵⁴ For a survey of the awards of collective *promanteia* see J. Pouilloux, *BCH* 76 (1952) 484-513. A total of 29 such awards were made by the Delphic *polis*, 13 in the 4th century and no more than five from 359-323.

⁵⁵ *SIG*³ 176, in *ca.* 360/59.

⁵⁶ Dem. 9.32, in 346.

⁵⁷ Flacelière (*Aitoliens* [n.24] 38) is right in transferring this privilege from father to son.

⁵⁸ Dem. 18.11; Plut. *Dem.* 18.

⁵⁹ The main source for this unsuccessful "panhellenic" embassy is Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F56b: Φιλ[ίππο]ν δ[ὲ] κατα]λ[α]βόντος Ἐλάτειαν καὶ Κυτίν[ιον] καὶ πρέσβεις πέμψαντες εἰς Θήβας Θε[τ-]αλλῶν, Αἰγ[ι]άνων, Αίτωλῶν, Δολόπων, Φθιωτῶν See also J.R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976) 192-193.

⁶⁰ Ellis [*Philip* (n.59) 194-198 and nn.] argues that 1) Phokis must have sided with Philip against Thebes, 2) Delphi was by this point completely subverted to the Macedonian cause, as evidenced by the presence of Macedonian *hieromnemones* on the Amphiktyonic council *prior* to the battle (*FD* 3.5.21 = *CID* II 44), and 3) Aitolia remained supportive in exchange for Naupaktos. The active political campaigning for Philip by the Aitolians *et al.* prior to the engagement suggests that they provided the Macedonian king logistical support at Chaironeia rather than remain on the sidelines; the Aitolians were probably among the τοὺς ἀφυστεροῦντας τῶν συμμάχων (D.S. 16.85.5). On Aitolia and Naupaktos see Dem. 9.34; Strabo 9.4.7; and D.S. 17.3.3. On the position of Phokis *contra* Ellis see Paus. 10.3.3, and in general for the unfortunately incomplete lists of combatants, Ellis, *Philip* (n.59) 293 n.62.

⁶¹ D.S. 17.3.3.

concurrent award of honors to the Aitolians and to Polyperchon the Macedonian would then reflect the equivocal attitude of the *polis* (but not the Amphiktyony) of Delphi. If Aitolia had supported Delphi in the Macedonian cause in 339/8, as I believe Aitolia behaved analogously nearly 20 years later when in 321 she devastated Amphissan territory and eliminated the Macedonian garrisons in the campaign against Antipater,⁶² then Delphi's grant of collective *promanteia* in 335/4 represents the first tangible expression of this relationship.⁶³

Saratoga Springs, New York

Michael Arnush

⁶² D.S. 18.38.2. See Mendels 1984 (n.41) 155-156 and n. 157, who dismissed the notion that Aitolia might have incorporated western Lokris into her territory at this time or any earlier and reviewed the scholarly positions on this point. See also Scholten, *Aetolian Foreign Relations* (n.24) 85 n.35. Scholten (personal communication) maintains that the Aitolian foray into Amphissan territory was not part of a greater political agenda, but as I shall argue elsewhere the relationship between Delphi and Aitolia in the late 320's seems to speak directly to a *quid pro quo* on Aitolia's part at this time. Scholten, 87 n. 41, points out the strategic importance to the Aitolians of the route from Amphissa to Gravia and beyond, which I think was one of the primary reasons for the Aitolian interest in Delphi and environs, the result of which was the grant of *promanteia* to the Aitolians in 335/4.

⁶³ Since the forces of Alexander departed for Asia Minor in the spring of 335/4 Delphi's award to Polyperchon must have occurred during the first eight or nine months of that year.