

A Papyrus Commentary on Alexander's Balkan Campaign

N. G. L. Hammond

WE OWE OUR knowledge of P. British Library 3085 verso to the alertness of T. C. Skeat and to the excellent publication of the fragments by W. Clarysse and G. Schepens.¹ The papyrus comes from a mummy cartonnage found by D. G. Hogarth at Rifeh in 1906/7. Clarysse and Schepens have supplied a valuable commentary on the fragments. "We cannot be far wrong," they write, "in dating our text to the second century B.C."

Any interpretation of the nature of the document is to some extent tentative. Clarysse and Schepens come to the conclusion that the fragments of text are part of a historical narrative—hence their title—and they find that this narrative's "first striking peculiarity is the remarkable narrative speed, combined with a high density of factual information, almost in telegram style" (37). They are candid in saying that there are difficulties which their interpretation does not solve. Thus, for instance, in commenting on lines 5, 8, and 9 they observe: "Still, the problems involved have not been satisfactorily resolved and leave serious doubts as to the interpretation of the text" (41).

1. *The Text*

Let us look at those problems in lines 1–14 as numbered and restored by Clarysse and Schepens. For later reference I have added the number of letters in each line.²

1	[]	..		
2	[.....]	ρα	[.....]	μησασ	
3	[....]	ταν και	[.....]	πορευθηι	
4	Κόρραγον	.εν.	[....	κατ]αστήσας	27
5	ένα	των φίλων	[.....]	.s τῆς δυ-	23
6	νάμειως	τὸ	πρὸς τ[ῆν]	χρείαν οἰκεῖ-	26

¹ "A Ptolemaic Fragment of an Alexander History," *ChrEg* 60 (1985) 30–47. I refer to this article in the notes as "C/S."

² I am most grateful to Mr T. S. Pattie, the successor of T. C. Skeat in the Department of Manuscripts, for permission to see the papyrus.

7	ον παρὰ τὰ τῆς Ἰλλυ[ρί]ας ὄρια πυ-	25
8	κνάς προσέταξε πο[ιού]μενον	23
9	τάς ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπ[εδον.]ς ὑποδει-	27
10	κνύειν τὸν ἐσόμ[ερον κί]νδυνον	25
11	ἐπ[.....]. ἐπερ-	26
12	χομέ[ν]ης [[τῆς]] [.....] χ[ώρα].	26
13	Εἰς δὲ τὴν Ἐορδαί[αν.....]	25
14	τῆι πλησίον Ἐλειμία[ι.....]	25

In line 4 the dependence of *Κόρραγον* on [κατ]αστήσας is clear, because *πορευθῆι* is intransitive. The phrase *ἕνα τῶν φίλων* (5) may be taken to be in apposition to *Κόρραγον*. In the following lines Clarysse and Schepens understand that *προσέταξε* governs the infinitive *ὑποδεικνύειν*, and that *ὑποδεικνύειν* governs *τὸν ἐσόμ[ερον κί]νδυνον*. Thus for them the main structure is coherent. The problems arise from all the other words in the long sentence. They do not cohere to the main structure.³ For instance, there is no noun after the adjective *πυκνάς*, and no noun after the article *τάς*. In fact, if we accept the main structure as understood by Clarysse and Schepens, we must conclude that the rest of the long sentence is ungrammatical.

Let us now consider the translation they offer:

. . . having appointed Korragos, one of the friends . . . and having sent this part of the army which was fit for the matter along the frontier of Illyria, he gave order to signal the coming danger by making frequent messages (?) to the army . . . when the . . . came . . . to Eordaia . . . (in?) the neighbouring part of Elimeia.

When we try to relate this translation to the Greek text, we face many problems. Despite their translation Clarysse and Schepens say that *καὶ πέμψ]ας* (5) “would give the required sense but is too long” for the lacuna.⁴ In any case their translation does not help with the difficulties in what follows. For *πυκνάς* in line 8 has no noun. Clarysse and Schepens in their translation “by making frequent messages” have to assume that the word *ἀγγελίας* stood in the original text and that the scribe omitted it in this copy. There are two objections. The active voice and not the middle of *ποιέω* should be used with *ἀγγελίας* (see LSJ *s.v.* *ποιέω* II.5), quite apart from the normal expression being

³ Thus C/S 42 find the lacuna in line 5 “difficult to fill,” think “along the frontier of Illyria” (41) “cannot . . . go with what follows” (42), and are so puzzled by lines 7 to 9 that “the idea of a copyist’s error . . . is all we can suggest here” (43).

⁴ Here P. Parsons proposed [καὶ δο]ύς, but C/S 42 find that it does not account for “along the frontier of Illyria.” Also this proposal would give a line of only 23 letters.

ἀγγελίας πέμπειν. It is most unlikely that the scribe made such an error; for his lettering is excellent, and his careful revision is indicated by his bracketing of τῆς in line 12 as mistaken and by his addition of τῆν in line 27 of fr.b (C/S p.46). Then, even if we accept πυκνὰς <ἀγγελίας> πο[ιού]μενον τὰς ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπ[εδον], we shall find it very hard to parallel τὰς ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον as a way of saying 'to the army'.⁵

In my opinion these difficulties are insurmountable. The text they have given us cannot be that of a consecutive historical narrative.⁶ If the text is not that of a historical narrative, what is the alternative? There is, I think, only one alternative: it is the text of a commentary.

Before we put this alternative to the test, there are some textual points that arose when Mr Pattie and I had a close look at the papyrus fragments in the British Library. In line 7 after the break each of us read an *omicron* and not, as Clarysse and Schepens did, an *alpha*. This enabled us to restore the text as Ἰλλυ[ρίδ]ος, which is surely right since it is the standard form in the Hellenistic period, Polybius using no other. Since we now have an additional letter in the break in line 7, we may allow an additional letter also in the break in line 8. On the other hand, lines 6 and 9 are correctly juxtaposed and restored, yielding τὸ πρὸς τ[ῆν] χρεῖαν and [ὦ]ς; for the single letter before the *sigma* can only be *omega*. The numbers of letters in lines 6 to 10 then become 26, 26, 24, 27, and 25. The reason for the 24 and 27 is that the scribe chose not to split the definite article τὰς between two lines. When Mr Pattie looked at line 8, he noted at the end of the break a dot that might, in his opinion, be the end of the righthand branch of an *upsilon*. As we now have an additional letter to introduce here, I suggest πο[ριο]ύμενον. The end of line 11 and the beginning of line 12 are on different fragments of papyrus, which Clarysse and Schepens wisely put together to yield ἐπερχομέ[ν]ης.⁷ The join is supported by

⁵ C/S 42f thought the probable meaning to be an 'army' rather than a 'camp'. Their citation of πυκνὰς προσβολὰς ποιεῖσθαι in Diod. 13.62.1 and 14.103.3 does not help to solve the problem. It is here that they suggest a copyist's error.

⁶ It is worth noting that there seems to be no question that the fragments have been assembled correctly. Clarysse and Schepens were confident that this is so, and Pattie and I agree with them. In the first place within the eight lines, when the fragments are placed together, there are five instances in which the last letters of one line and the opening letters of the next line make acceptable Greek words (δυνάμεως, οἰκείου, πυκνὰς, ὑποδεικνύειν, ἐπερχομέ[ν]ης); this cannot be accidental. In the second place, when we make probable restorations in the gap between the two fragments of papyrus, we shall find that the numbers of the letters within each line vary from 24 to 27, which is acceptable. It must therefore be conceded that the text as we have it is as it was written in the course of the second century B.C.

⁷ C/S 39 have no doubt about the join being correctly made.

slight traces of letters at the top of the beginning of line 12.

On the supposition that the text is that of a commentary I suggest restorations in line 4 and 5. These are *exempli gratia*; they show what is possible within the spaces available. My text then is as follows:

1	[]	..	
2	[.....]	ρα[.....]	μησασ	
3	[....]	ταν καὶ.[.....]	πορευθῆι	
4	Κόρραγον	[Μ]εν[οίτου κατ]	αστήσας·	26
5	ἕνα τῶν φίλων.	[μέγα μέρος]	τῆς δυ-	25
6	νάμεως· τὸ πρὸς τ[ῆν]	χρειαὶν οἰκεί-		26
7	ον παρὰ τὰ τῆς Ἰλλυ	[ρίδ]ος ὄρια.	πυ-	25
8	κνάς· προσέταξε πο	[ριο]ύμενον		24
9	τὰς ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπ	[εδον. ὦ]ς ὑποδει-		27
10	κνύειν τὸν ἐσόμ	[ενον κί]νδυνον·		25
11	επ.....[.....].	ἐπερ-		25
12	χομέ[ν]ης	[τῆς]	[.....]ωρα.	25
<hr/>				
13	Εἰς δὲ τῆν Ἐορδαί	[αν		26
14	τῆι πλησίον Ἐλειμία	[ι		26

In my translation I italicise the word or phrase that invited the commentator's entry:

*Appointing Corragus, son of Menoitias:*⁸ one of the Friends. *A large part of the force:* what was appropriate to the need along the frontier with Illyris. *He prescribed close-packed (ones):* (for) him to provide those for the camp. *So as to indicate the future danger:* . . . on the approach of. . . And into Eordaea . . . for the nearby Eleimia. . .

The first comment explains why this task was given to Corragus. The second provides the reason for a large part of the available force being detached. The third gives us the clue to the missing substantive with *πυκνάς*, namely *χάρακας*, of which the gender is masculine or feminine in extant authors. A particular type of stake was to be provided for making the fortified camp which was customary from at least the time of Philip II in Macedonian warfare (e.g. Dem. 6.23 *χαρακώματα* and 18.87 *χάρακα βαλόμενος*). This type of stake is here called *πυκνή*. Its meaning is clear from Polybius' comparison of Greek and Roman palisaded camps, where the branches on each stake were 'close-packed' (*πυκνῶν*) and so interwoven in the branches of the

⁸ Or a name of similar length. Here H. Maehler proposed reading *Κόρραγον* [μ]έν[τοι], but he had no suggestion for filling the remaining lacuna of three letters. C/S 41 "do not see how the very short lacuna . . . could possibly be filled."

neighbouring stakes (18.18.13, *πυκνῶν οὐσῶν καὶ προσπιπτουσῶν αὐ-ταῖς*). Thus the meaning of our lines 7–9 is not that stakes were to be planted close to one another, but that special stakes namely *πυκνὰ χάρακες*, were to be provided for making the camp.⁹ The fourth comment is almost totally lost. It probably explained the system of indication (some sort of signalling) and defined the danger; for the word *ἐπερχομένης* is virtually certain, whether we supply *στρατιᾶς* or some other feminine noun with it.

Up to this point it is clear, I think, that the text is much more convincingly explained as that of a commentary than as that of an historical text. But the next two lines, 13 and 14, introduced by the first *δέ* so far, seem to provide a historical step. We may note that they are paralleled by lines 32–35, which seem to be of the same nature. At the front of each passage there is a *paragraphos* in the papyrus. We shall consider the significance of that line later in this article.

The righthand parts of lines 1–11 and the lefthand parts of lines 22–30 are on the same fragment of papyrus, and the gap between them shows that they belong to parallel columns of writing. How much text is missing between the surviving fragments of the two columns? Clarysse and Schepens, assuming a papyrus roll of the normal height for the second century B.C., concluded that there must have been “20 lines at least.” Lines 22–30 are by the same hand, and the only complete line, 23 with the restorations, contains 26 letters. It seems, then, that 22–30 is a continuation of the same document; and this is supported by the nature of the content of 22–30.

The text of line 23 is made up of two pieces of papyrus, which Clarysse and Schepens have left slightly apart in their plate. When Mr Pattie and I looked closely at the text, we saw traces of a letter by the gap that justify the *omega* of *Θραικῶν*.¹⁰ When the two pieces are put close together, one has to move the lower fragment further to the left and higher than it appears on the plate of Clarysse and Schepens. When this is done, the wide *μ* of *εκόμισε* stands above the *ν* of *Θραικῶν*.

⁹ In the same way the large enclosure by the ‘hut’ of Achilles was made with stakes that were *πυκνοί* (*Il.* 24.453), which is usually taken to mean that they were close together. This technique is common among transhumant shepherds, whether Macedonians of the centuries before the reign of Philip II (*Arr. Anab.* 7.9.2) or Vlachs and Sarakatsani today, who make enclosures for their sheep and goats with stakes, strong enough to keep predators out. Their speed and skill, “cutting the wood and driving it into the ground with the certainty of long practice,” was admired by E. Howell, *Escape to Live* (London 1952) 136.

¹⁰ In a subsequent letter Mr Pattie said that he could see the tops of the verticals and the upper diagonal of the *kappa* of *Θραικῶν*. C/S 44 expressed some doubt about the join, but Mr Pattie and I have none.

In consequence there is room for some six letters before *εκόμισε*, for three or four letters before *ποταμόν* in line 21, and for two or three letters before *σῦραι* in line 20. At the righthand end of line 22 *αγο* stands above *ψατ* in line 23. Therefore, if the restoration *κα[τ]ε-στρέψατ[ο τοὺς]* is correct, as seems certain, we can allow four or five letters after *προαγο*. The lefthand part of lines 31–33 is on a separate small piece of papyrus. The join here yields line 32, which with the probable restoration made by Clarysse and Schepens has 25 letters. Line 35 is on a scrap that seems to be attached by a strand to line 34 (see their plate).

Clarysse and Schepens print the text for lines 15 to 35 as follows.

15	[.....]τεθ[.....]	
16	[.....]..Σκίον[.....]	
17	[.....].ταστειτ[.....]	
18	[..].ων ...ρ[....]ομεν[ο]ς[.....]	
19	[τῆν] ἤπειρον τῆν κατὰ τὸν π[.....]	26
20	[...]σῦραι βουληθ[εί]ς αὐτὸς τ[.....]	27
21	[..].ποταμόν καὶ τῆν ἄλλη[ν.....]	
22 ἐκόμισε καὶ προαγό[.....]	
23	τῶν Θραικῶν κα[τ]εστρέψατ[ο τοὺς]	26
24	προσεχεῖς τ[.][.][.]αι ρεν [.....]	
25	τοὺς πλησίον βο[.....ε]-	
26	στρεψε ἐπὶ τῆς [.....]	
27	τῶν Ἀγριάνων π[.....]	
28	ξας τοὺς φρουροὺς [..... δε]-	
29	δραμένους ἀπε[.....]	
30	μέ[ν]ην τῆς Παι[ο]νία[ς]	
31	συνεχῆι [τῆι] Π[αι]ονία[ι.....]	
<hr/>		
32	Ἐντεῦθεν [δ]ὲ Φιλώταν [τὸν Παρμε]-	25
33	νίωνος με[τ]ὰ δυνάμεω[ς]	
34	διαδ[.....]χομένας [....., αὐ]-	
35	τὸς δὲ τῆν νῆ[.][.....]	

Their translation is as follows:

— — — (to?) the mainland . . . wanting himself to lay waste . . . the river and the rest of the . . . he brought and . . . of the Thracians . . . he subjected the neighbouring . . . the stream (?) . . . the neighbouring . . . he turned towards . . . the Agrians . . . having massacred (?) the guards . . . Paionia . . . contiguous to Paionia. From there he sent Philotas, the son of Parmenio, with an army . . . he himself — — —

When we consider how few letter-spaces are available for further restoration in these lines, it is not possible to see any coherent his-

torical narrative in this translation. We are driven once again to the alternative explanation, that the text is that of a commentary.

Here too I propose some restorations. They are again *exempli gratia*, in order to show what is possible within the limits of the letter-spaces. In line 20, I propose [ἀπο]σῦραι βουληθ[εῖ]ς αὐτὸς τ[ῆ]ιδε | τὸν ποταμόν, giving a line of 27 letters and meaning “he himself intending to draw away (*i.e.*, divert) the river at this point.”¹¹ The main verbs come in the continuation of the comment which I propose to restore as follows: καὶ τὴν ἄλλη[ν στρατίαν δι]εκόμισε καὶ προαγό[ντων] | τῶν Θραϊκῶν κα[τ]εστρέψατ[ο τοῦ]ς | προσεχέ[ι]ς. Line 21 is then of 25 letters, line 22 of 26 letters and line 23 of 26 letters. The translation is “transported also the rest of the army (*i.e.*, to his side of the river)¹² and with the Thracians leading subdued the nearest (*i.e.*, of the enemy).”¹³ In the next line the last word has almost certainly to be ῥεύ[ματι],¹⁴ and the preceding word will then have been a name in the dative, like Eurotas but shorter, to yield a line of 25 letters. I take it that the document on which the comment is being made had just the article and the name, and the comment is “a stream.” Line 25 begins with the phrase for comment: τοὺς πλησίον βο[υνοῦ]ς, “the nearby hills.”¹⁵ For a word of geographical meaning is needed after πλησίον, as in line 14. I propose to restore the lines of comment as follows: [αὐτὸς ἐπέ]στρεψε ἐπὶ τῆς [μητροπόλεως τῆς] τῶν Ἀγριάνων.¹⁶ I compare the use of αὐτός at line 20, and I choose the compound to match ἐπί. Both lines 25 and 26 are then of 26 letters each, and the meaning is “he himself turned towards the capital of the Agrianians.” In the following lines I propose to restore the phrase inviting comment as π[ολλοὺς καταλέ]ξας, “enlisting many (*i.e.*, Agrianians),” and the com-

¹¹ C/S propose to restore [κα|τα]σῦραι ‘to lay waste’ as “more likely” than any other compound. They have no suggestion for the lacuna of three letters after π that is then left in line 19. The compound ἀποσύρειν is used for drawing off a fatty fluid; see LSJ s.v.

¹² To capture an island in a river by diverting the water of one channel was a well-known method after the Persian capture of the island of Prosopitis in the Nile by this means (Thuc. 1.109.4).

¹³ C/S 44 thought of restoring [δι]εκόμισε but made the objection that the verb in its simple form and with various compounds is rather “suited for the transport of things.” But people were transported too, *e.g.* at Thuc. 3.75.5. They say also that “the traces at the beginning of line 22 are not favourable” to this restoration. However, their plate shows that the traces are minimal. They note that προαγο has to be part of the participle of the verb. They would prefer to restore προαγό[μενος] and then translate “those of the Thracians who were nearby”; but προάγω is not used in the middle in the sense they want.

¹⁴ As C/S (41) imply when they translate “the stream (?)”

¹⁵ The word is used, for instance, by Polybius at 18.24.7.

¹⁶ Alexander placed ‘metropolis’ on coins minted at Babylon, and Hellenistic states referred to their ‘metropoleis’. For the second τῆς see the article τὰς in line 9.

ment itself as τὸς φρουροὺς . . . ἀπέ[στειλε], “he discharged the guards. . . .” The opening letters of line 29 may be the genitive case of the name of the guards’ commander; for it is difficult to restore a verb if the letters are those of a participial ending.¹⁷

I propose to restore at lines 29–30 [τὴν Εἶδο] | με[ν] ἦν τῆς Παι[ο]νία[ς]. We need a name (such as this) that occurs in the Macedonian homeland, in order to account for the attribution τῆς Παιονίας (we may compare Thuc. 2.98.2, Δόβηρον τὴν Παιονικήν).¹⁸ In line 31 there is a difficulty in that Clarysse and Schepens print συνεχῆι with a circumflex accent, as if this were a variant form of συνεχεῖ.¹⁹ I do not know of any such form. The slight trace on the papyrus favours the final *iota*, in the opinion of Mr Pattie and myself, and we must see συνέχῆι as the verb συνέχω in the subjunctive, comparing the subjective πορευθῆι in line 3. I suggest as a possible restoration [ὡς τὸν πεζόν] | συνέχῆι [τῆς] Π[αι]ονία[ς], and translate “in order that he may keep together the infantry of Paeonia.” Line 31 is short; but that is no problem since it precedes the *paragraphos*.

At line 32 we have a *paragraphos* and then the connective as we had at line 13. I take it that the *paragraphos* was not added by the scribe but was in the text he was copying. It was, I suggest, intended to warn the reader that something different was being provided. What was it? I suggest that the author of the commentary jumped from point A (Paeonia) in the text on which he was commenting to point B in the text, thus omitting a chunk of that text on which he chose not to comment. In order to keep his reader abreast of what was happening, he made the *paragraphos* and then added a short piece of narrative to bridge the gap.²⁰ In this instance, then, he wrote “and from there, *i.e.*, from Paeonia, he (?sent ahead) Philotas and he himself . . .” (accepting from Clarysse and Schepens [αὖ] | τὸς in lines 34f). The restoration of αὐτὸς is probable in the context; we may compare line 20 and even

¹⁷ C/S propose to restore [διώ]ξας or [ἀποσφά]ξας without offering a word to fill the gap between τ and the participle. They think that -δραμένους may be a perfect participle passive of δράω, but offer no translation.

¹⁸ Since there was an Eidomene in Amphaxitis in Lower Macedonia (see N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia I* [Oxford 1972] 169ff). We do not know of an Eidomene in Paeonia; but the repetition of a homeland place-name was common, *e.g.* Petra in Pieria and Petra in the territory of the Maedi.

¹⁹ C/S 41 translate as “contiguous to Paeonia” as if they read συνεχεῖ.

²⁰ C/S 43 suppose that the *paragraphos* line and the connective δέ indicate either the beginning of a new section of the narrative (for they believe the text to be a historical narrative) “or perhaps more probably in the context separate two different locations where security forces were posted.” At line 32 they think the same features “introduce a new section.”

my proposed restoration in line 25. We are able to infer that the *paraphros* at line 13 served the same purpose; and it was followed by a similar piece of narrative: “and into Eordaea . . . to the nearby Elimea.” The restoration in line 32, meaning “the son of Parmenion,” is highly probable in itself and yields a line of 25 letters. It should be noted that if a patronymic is supplied at line 4 in a phrase lifted (on my interpretation) from the ‘document’, there was no article before the genitive; but in line 32, written by the commentator, there was an article before the genitive. The difference is no doubt due to different authors of the ‘document’ and of the commentary.

Finally there are some tatters of papyrus, labelled Fragments b, c, and d, that cannot be given particular positions in relation to the text we have been considering. Fragment b has the three letters λλυ, which might be part of ‘Illyrians’ or part of a verb, and then two lines later λαὶ <τῆν> Μαίδων, the τῆν having been added by the scribe as a correction in the interlinear space.²¹

2. Historical Questions

For ease of reference I give the text with my proposed restorations and punctuation:

1	[]	..	
2	[.....]	ρα[.....]	μησασ	25
3	[....]	ταν καὶ	[.....] πορευθῆι	25
4	Κόρραγον	[Μεν[οίτου κατ]	αστήσας·	26
5	ένα τῶν φίλων.	[μέγα μέρος]	τῆς δυ-	25
6	νάμεως· τὸ πρὸς τ[ῆν]	χρείαν οἰκεῖ-		26
7	ον παρὰ τὰ τῆς Ἰλλυ[ρίδ]ος ὄρια.	πυ-		26
8	κνάς· προσέταξε πο[ριο]ύμενον			24
9	τὰς ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπ[εδον. ὦ]ς ὑποδει-			27
10	κνύειν τὸν ἐσόμ[ενον κί]νδυνον·			25
11	ἐπ[.....]	[.....].	ἐπερ-	25
12	χομέ[ν]ης	[τῆς]	[.....] φρα.	25
13	εἰς δὲ τῆν Ἐορδαί[αν			25
14	τῆι πλησίον Ἐλειμία[ι			25
A gap of at least 20 lines follows.				
15	[.....]	τρεθ[.....]		25
16	[.....]	..Σκίον[.....]		25

²¹ H. Maehler thought that they could be joined, but C/S remained sceptical. I think rightly.

17	[.....].τάς τε τ[.....]	25
18	[..].ων...ρ[....]ομεν[ο]ς.[.....]	25
19	[τὴν] ἤπειρον τὴν κατὰ τὸν π[οταμόν·]	25
20	[ἀπο]σῦραι βουληθ[εῖ]ς αὐτὸς τ[ῆ]δε]	27
21	τὸν ποταμόν καὶ τὴν ἄλλη[ν στρα]-	25
22	[τίαν δι]εκόμισε καὶ προαγό[ντων]	26
23	τῶν Θραικῶν κα[τ]εστρέψατ[ο τοὺς]	26
24	προσεχεῖς· τ[ωι].[..]αι· ῥεύ[ματι].	25
25	τοὺς πλησίον βο[υνοῦς· αὐτὸς ἐπέ]-	26
26	στρεψε ἐπὶ τῆς [μητροπόλεως τῆς]	26
27	τῶν Ἀγριάνων. π[ολλοὺς καταλέ]-	24
28	ξας· τοὺς φρουροὺς [τοὺς μετὰ Εὐ]-	25
29	δραμένους ἀπέ[στειλε. τὴν Εἶδο]-	25
30	με[ν]ὴν τῆς Παι[ο]νία[ς· ὡς τὸν πεζὸν]	26
31	συνέχηι [τῆς] Π[αι]ονία[ς].	18
<hr/>		
32	ἐντεῦθεν [δ]ὲ Φιλώταν [τὸν Παρμε]-	25
33	νίωνος με[τ]ὰ δυνάμεω[ς.....]	25
34	διαδ...[....]χομένους [..... αὐ]-	25
35	τὸς δὲ τὴννη[.].[.....]	25

Appointing Corragus, son of Menoitias: one of the Friends. A large part of the force: what was appropriate to the need along the frontier with Illyris. He prescribed close-packed (ones): (for) him to provide those for the camp. So as to indicate the future danger . . . on the approach of. . .

And into Eordaea . . . for the nearby Eleimia. . . (lacuna) . . . Skios . . . the mainland by the river: he, intending to draw away (*i.e.*, divert) the river at this point, transported the rest of the force also, and with his Thracians in the lead subdued the nearest (*i.e.*, of the enemy). The . . . -as: a stream. The nearby hills: he turned towards the capital of the Agrianians. Enlisting many men: he discharged the guards, those with Eudramenes (*vel sim.*). Eidomene of Paeonia: in order to keep together the infantry of Paeonia. . .

and from there (he sent?) Philotas, son of Parmenion, with a force . . . and he himself. . .

Without deciding whether the text is a historical narrative or a commentary, we can see that there are a number of historical clues to the situation in the text. As Clarysse and Schepens said, the appointer of Corragus was a king of Macedon, who was mentioned simply as “he” (in line 20 and, if so restored, 25, and lines 34f). Part of the (available) force was to be posted along the frontier with Illyris that

was within the Macedonian cantons of Pelagonia and Lynceus, which alone marched with Illyris. On my interpretation of the text the commander (presumably Corragus) was to make a camp fortified with a palisade made up of special stakes. We happen to know of such a fortified camp, called 'Preamble', on the main road from Heraclea in Lynceus towards Illyris; for in Macedonian military language *parembole* meant 'encampment'. Danger of an invasion, evidently from Illyris, was imminent. From there the king moved into Eordaea, the adjacent canton to the south, which was part of the old kingdom before the expansion under Philip II, and from there he made some arrangement for Elimea, the neighbouring canton to the south.²² It seems likely that he was travelling along the main road, later called the Via Egnatia, which led to Edessa in Lower Macedonia.

There is now a considerable gap in the text (we must not be misled by the consecutive numbering of lines 14 and 15 adopted by Clarysse and Schepens). It is not possible to estimate even roughly how much action took place in the missing lines. The story resumes with *σκιον* in line 16. Clarysse and Schepens accepted the suggestion of P. Parsons that this is the accusative of the river called by Herodotus (4.49.1) "the river Skios flowing from the Paeonians and Mt Rhodope" into the Danube (Thucydides 2.96.4 called it the Ὀσκιος).²³ Of course the Greek letters can be fitted into other restorations; but Parsons' suggestion is supported by the occurrence of *ποταμόν* in line 21 and the subsequent mention of three peoples and places close to the river Skios, identified as the Iskar, namely Thracians, Agrianians, and Paeonia. If 'he' was the king, as has been proposed, he was conducting military operations that involved the river (presumably the Skios)²⁴ and the service of Thracian troops.²⁵ He then proceeded through Agri-

²² This is the usual spelling. For the spelling in the text see the third century B.C. inscription in *BCH* 2 (1897) 112: Μακεδόνι Ἐ[λ]ειμιώ[τηι]. For Preamble see Hammond (*supra* n.18) 42 and Map 6.

²³ C/S 43. This river was to the west of the Lyginus river, where Alexander first defeated the Triballi. If he used the Shipka Pass to cross the Haemus range, as I maintained in *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980) 455ff, the Lyginus river was the Rositsa. A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander I* (Oxford 1980) 53, 57, opted for the Trojan Pass and for a tributary of the river Vit near Pleven, which seem to me less likely.

²⁴ C/S 44 hesitated to make the restoration I have adopted in line 9 (*κατὰ τὸν ποταμόν*) because ἡπειρος "is normally opposed to islands in the sea." Here I think it is opposed to an island in the river Skios. Lines 21–24, as restored, support the idea of Alexander having to attack enemy forces which were in part on an island and in part on the other bank from his own main force. This was also the idea of C/S; for they related the operation to Alexander's unsuccessful attempt to land on the island in the Danube. But that incident took place far in space and time from his coming to Agrianaia. See N. G. L. Hammond, *Alexander the Great* (Park Ridge [N.J.] 1980) 49.

²⁵ After Alexander's successes against the 'republican Thracians', King Syrmus of

ania, it seems, to Paeonia. It was from Paeonia that he sent Philotas, the son of Parmenion, with a part of the force, on a separate mission, and he himself did something else.

A separate fragment of papyrus mentions the Maedi, a people to the south of the Agrianians and living in the middle Strymon valley. The hand is the same as that of our text. The fragment may belong to the text, but no one can estimate the gap that divides it from the context of what we have already considered.

Clarysse and Schepens have considered it “virtually certain” that the king was Alexander the Great and the campaign under description was his Balkan campaign of 335 B.C. I agree entirely with their view. Having in the past made a special study of this campaign, I add some points that may supplement theirs. Our knowledge of the campaign is derived from Arrian’s account, which is itself a much abbreviated and sometimes gappy version of what he read in the histories of Ptolemy and Aristobulus.²⁶ Arrian begins his narrative by saying that Alexander learnt that the Illyrians and the Triballians were making threatening movements (*Anab.* 1.1.4, *νεωτερίζειν*), and that Alexander set off towards Thrace, starting (*i.e.*, on the major campaign) from Amphipolis (1.1.5). Now it is obvious that Alexander did not leave an open frontier so that the Illyrians could invade Macedonia, denuded of the major part of its field army. He must have made special provision in the frontier cantons. It is this provision which we find him engaged upon in lines 1–14 of our text, which end with him returning on the main route to Lower Macedonia and so to Amphipolis. The gap between line 14 and lines 15ff must have been very considerable, since it had to cover the advance of Alexander through Mt Haemus to the Danube, his crossing of the river to attack the Getae, and the submission of Syrmus, king of the Triballi. The text resumes with some action near the river Skios, that is, in the territory still of the Triballi. This is not mentioned by Arrian, who failed to describe any action of Alexander over a period of some two months; the action near the river Skios took place evidently towards the end of that period. “Alexander then advanced towards the Agrianians and Paeonians” (1.5.1).²⁷ This advance corresponds with what we read in lines 25–31. The separate mission of Philotas is not mentioned by Arrian; but it was sensible to send him ahead towards the Illyrian frontier, while Alexander himself

the Triballi, and then the Getae, it is not surprising to find Thracian troops in Alexander’s army, as later in 334 B.C.

²⁶ See my reason in “Alexander’s Campaign in Illyria,” *JHS* 94 (1974) 77f, and *Alexander the Great* (*supra* n.24) 48.

²⁷ For his route see *JHS* (*supra* n.26) 78 and *Alexander* (*supra* n.24) 49 with fig. 2.

was making arrangements with Langarus, the king of the Agrianians (1.5.2f). We are not told by Arrian that Alexander made contact in 335 or 334 with the Maedi; but we may be sure that he did so, before he set off from the lower Strymon valley on the march to Asia.

There are thus excellent reasons for supposing that our text was concerned with the campaign of Alexander in the Balkans in 335 B.C. They seem to me to be clinched by the fact that only two personal names are mentioned in the text and both are known to have been distinguished officers in the reign of Alexander—Corragus and Philotas, son of Parmenion.²⁸ Clarysse and Schepens did not consider any other possibility. I have placed in the Appendix the consideration of an alternative in the reign of Philip V; but only to reject it.

3. *The Commentary and its Author*

Could there have been a commentary, available for copying in the second century B.C., that dealt with Alexander's campaign in the Balkans in 335 B.C.? The answer to this question is affected by the fourth-century B.C. Derveni papyrus, which is a commentary on an Orphic Hymn.²⁹ The existence of such a commentary, written say in the third century B.C. with reference to Alexander's campaign, is obviously possible.

The Derveni commentary is interesting for purposes of comparison. Citation of the Hymn—or, to use a general term, the 'document'—is in the form of a phrase or line or a couple of lines (*e.g.* in col. iv), much as in our text. The comments in the Derveni text are usually long, detailed, and even repetitive (*e.g.* in col. iv.1–8); but this is to be expected because the commentator was producing an exegesis of mystical and riddling terms (*e.g.* in col. iii). The comments in our text, being factual, are much briefer. A striking feature of the Derveni commentary is the recurrence of one or more words of the citation in the commentary, either in the same form or in a related form: *χρησ-τηριάζομαι* (i.2–3), *μαντείον* (i.4–5), *δαίμονες* (ii.2–3), *Εὐμενίδες* and *θύω* (ii.9–10), *αἰνιγματιώδης* (iii.4–5), *Ζεύς*, *ἀλκή*, *δαίμων*, and *κυδρός* (iv.4–8), *ἥλιος* (vi.12–13), *ἄδυτον* (vii.1–2), *Ὀλυμπος* (viii.2–3), *ἀκούω* (ix.1–2), *ῥέζω* and *οὐρανός* (x.5–8), *κεφαλή* (xiii.12–13), *Μοῦρα* (xiv.3), *βασιλεύς* (xv.10–11), *θορνή* (xvii.1–3), *Γῆ* and *Μήτηρ* (xviii.7–8), *Ὠκεανός*

²⁸ H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Munich 1926), listed two leading Macedonians called Corragus in the reign of Alexander (nos. 444 and 445). C/S cite the restoration Παρμε]νίωνος as certain. There was also another leading Macedonian called Philotas on the Balkan campaign (no. 805). His father's name is not known; if anyone prefers him and can think of an alternative name ending *-νίωνος*, it can be inserted here.

²⁹ See *ZPE* 47 (1982) after p.300 and 50 (1983) 12.

and Ζεύς (xix.3–6), Ἀχελῷος (xix.11–12) and εἶός and ἀγαθός (xxii.2–4). Similar repetitions occur with the word ποταμός in lines 19 (as restored) and line 21, and with the word Παιονία in lines 30 and 31.

A commentary on a historical narrative is familiar enough to us in the form of lengthy tomes by A. W. Gomme and F.W. Walbank. This is not, however, in the ancient tradition. The historical narratives of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, for instance, were thought to be self-explanatory, except for a few short scholia, often on textual or linguistic points. If our papyrus fragments came from a commentary on a historical narrative, it would be unique. In fact the ‘document’ that invited the comments was obviously not a historical narrative; for if it had been, it would have stated where the forces were being posted, how the camp was being fortified, how information of an impending attack was relayed, that ‘he’ did bring his army across the river and defeat the nearby enemy, that he did pass near the Agri-anian capital, and that he did discharge the Guards at this point in the campaign. Rather, the document mentioned some isolated points that occurred during an ongoing campaign. These points, or rather some of them, were in need of explication. What the document was is obvious to a student of the Hellenistic age: it was a *Royal Journal*, such as we know was kept for the reigns of Philip II, Alexander III, one of the Antigoni (Polyaen. 4.6.2), Antigonos III (Polyb. 4.87.8), Philip V (18.33.2), Perseus (30.13.10), Pyrrhus (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 21.8), and their counterparts in the kingdoms overseas.³⁰ In the present case the *Royal Journal* was that of Alexander III. Our fragments of papyrus happen to deal with a campaign that was of little interest to writers on Alexander because it was overshadowed by his more glorious achievements in Asia. We may be sure, then, that these fragments are only part of a much longer work that dealt with the *Royal Journal* as a whole.

The commentary was not written in or near the neighbourhood of Macedonia, where the fact that Eordaea was near Elimea (lines 13f) would have been a matter of general knowledge. On the other hand, in an atlas-less age, it was desirable to provide for readers overseas the geographical information we see also in lines 24 and 25f. The ‘document’, whether it was the *Royal Journal of Alexander* or some other work, must have been important both in its category—and Alexan-

³⁰ The *Journal* and papers associated with it were known by various names: αἱ βασιλικοὶ ἑφημερίδες (Arr. *Anab.* 7.25.1: Alexander), τὰ ὑπομνήματα τοῦ βασιλέως (Diod. 18.4.2: Alexander), τὰ βασιλικά ὑπομνήματα (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 21.8: Pyrrhus), τὰ βασιλικά γράμματα (Polyb. 18.33.2: Philip V), etc.

der's *Journal* was certainly that—and in the thought of the time, both when the commentary was composed and later when it was copied by our scribe. The obvious place for such lively interest to flourish was Alexandria in Egypt, where the cult of Alexander was celebrated annually with unparalleled splendour during the third and second centuries B.C.³¹ There is no doubt that the Library at Alexandria possessed a copy of Alexander's *Journal*, whether the original one, as I believe, or a copy of it. We are thus not surprised to find a copy of this commentary on papyrus fragments at Rifeh in Egypt.

That there was indeed a commentary on Alexander's *Journal* is known from an entry in the *Suda*:

Στράττις Ὀλύνθιος ἱστορικός· περὶ τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἐφημερίδων βιβλία πέντε. περὶ ποταμῶν καὶ κρηνῶν καὶ λιμνῶν. περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτῆς.³²

Nothing else is recorded about Strattis, and no fragments of his works have survived hitherto. His commentary in five books is likely to have covered the whole span of Alexander's *Journal*. He must have been highly selective in the items on which he chose to comment, when we reflect that the record of Alexander's words, acts, and correspondence over thirteen years of intense activity must have filled very many volumes. Our small fragments show that Strattis was interested in military objectives, technical military terms, and geographical matters, including mention of a river and a stream appropriate for the author of a work *On rivers, etc.* We owe a debt of gratitude to T. C. Skeat, W. Clarysse, and G. Schepens for enabling us to bring together these fragments of Strattis of Olynthus, and to show that Alexander's *Journal* was available for a commentator in the Hellenistic period. He and others who studied it knew from their firsthand experience of the

³¹ See, for instance, M. M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest* (Cambridge 1981) no. 219.

³² *FGrHist* 118T1. It was suggested by L. Pearson that this meant that Strattis wrote five books of *Ephemerides* about the achievements of Alexander. I doubt that anyone has accepted that suggestion. The expression τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου is never found for the achievements of Alexander; Strattis can never have written 'day-by-day records'; and the order of the Greek words is clearly contrary to his suggestion. This is only one of the arguments that have been advanced either to refute the (to me) indisputable fact that *Ephemerides* were kept for Alexander as for other Macedonian kings, or to suggest that someone subsequently compiled a counterfeit *Ephemerides of Alexander*—covering thirteen years of crowded life as king—and got the counterfeit one accepted in place of the genuine one. I have argued elsewhere that there was only one *Ephemerides of Alexander*, that it went with his corpse to Alexandria, and that it was genuine. See my recent arguments in *Three Historians of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge 1983) 5–10 and *Historia* 36 (1987) 1–21.

whole text that it was authentic and not, as some scholars have supposed in recent years, a forgery.³³

APPENDIX

When I first read the article of Clarysse and Schepens, I was working on the reign of Philip V, so that I had his campaign of winter 211–210 B.C. in mind. Some of the regions through which Philip then passed are mentioned in our papyrus. Moreover, an inscription of his reign records a Corragus as the owner of a large estate by royal grant, who might have been active in 211–210. As Clarysse and Schepens had not noted this campaign and this Corragus, it seemed advisable to investigate the matter.

Philip began operations by making an unexpected attack on Apollonia and Oricum on the Adriatic coast. Having failed there, he marched rapidly into Pelagonia and invaded Dardanian territory, where he won an outstanding success.³⁴ Returning “through Pelagonia, Lyncus, and Bottiaea he descended into Thessaly” (Liv. 26.25.4). He placed Perseus with 4,000 men to hold “the pass of Thessaly” against the Aetolians, returned to Macedonia, and “from there led an army into Thrace and the Maedi.” The capital of the Maedi surrendered after a siege, and he gained further successes,³⁵ when a report from Acarnania caused him to return to Dium in south Macedonia (26.25. 15–18).

The points of contact with our text are that in Pelagonia Philip had a frontier with Illyris (our line 7), his march from there on the route of the later Via Egnatia took him into Eordaea and close to (or into) Elimeia (our lines 13f)³⁶ and then after an interval of time (corresponding perhaps to the gap in our text) he entered Thrace and attacked the Maedi (our line 23 and a small fragment of the papyrus). The arguments against connecting this campaign with our text are that Philip did not enter Paeonia at all (mentioned in lines 30f) and had no dealings with the Agrianians; and if “Skios” in line 16 is the river of that name, it is far to the north of the Maedi.³⁷

³³ The belief of F. Jacoby and others that Strattis, being an Olynthian, must have been granted that citizenship before the destruction of Olynthus by Philip II in 348 B.C. was unlikely in itself, in that the descendants of refugees from Greek cities, such as Aegina, Samos, and Sicyon (Plut. *Arat.* 9.4), seem to have inherited their father’s citizenship, and has been disproved by the mention of an ‘Olynthian’ cavalryman in a papyrus of the mid-third century (*P.Petr.* II xxxv[a]). I am grateful to T. C. Skeat for mentioning the papyrus and to T. S. Pattie for sending me the reference.

³⁴ This probably earned him the title “destroyer of the Dardaneis” (*Anth.Pal.* 6.115).

³⁵ He dedicated spoils from Dardanians and Maedi to Athena at Lindus (*FGrHist* 532F1C.c.42).

³⁶ For this part of the Via Egnatia see N. G. L. Hammond and M. B. Hatzopoulos in *AJAH* 7 (1982) 128–47 and 8 (1983) 48–53, published respectively in 1986 and 1987.

³⁷ For the positions of the Agrianes and the Maedi see Hammond (*supra* n.18) 197f, with Map 17.

In 181 B.C. Philip transferred the ownership of a royal estate from Corragus son of Perdiccas to a group of at least nine military men, who were stationed somewhere near Kozani in Eordaea.³⁸ At that time Corragus was no longer alive; but the grant of land might have been made in connection with services early in the reign of Philip. If this was the Corragus of our line 4, then we should postulate that the Philotas of line 32 was a contemporary of Corragus, whether he was a son of Parmenion or not. The arguments against making such a connection are that we cannot fit “son of Perdiccas” into line 4 and that no Macedonian Parmenion is to be found in the writings of Polybius. Thus the odds are against connecting our text with the reign of Philip V in respect to the campaign and the prosopography.

General considerations are also against such a connection. The historical narrative of that campaign was written by Polybius; it can neither have needed a commentary nor elicited one within the second century B.C. (or within the first century, if one dates the papyrus copy later than Clarysse and Schepens do). The *Journal of Philip*, a part of which was deliberately destroyed after the defeat at Cynoscephalae (Polyb. 18.33.2f, τὰ βασιλικά γράμματα and τῶν ὑπομνημάτων),³⁹ must have remained confidential into the reign of Perseus. By then the star of Macedonia was setting. One cannot suppose that any scholar turned his attention then to writing a commentary on the *Journal of Philip*.⁴⁰

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
July, 1987

³⁸ Moretti, *Istor.ellen.* II 110.

³⁹ This is one of several indications that the *Journal* passed under more than one name in our literary sources.

⁴⁰ I am most grateful to Professor Schepens for sending me a copy of his article. I have gained much from discussion with Dr M. B. Hatzopoulos, Mrs L. Loukopoulou, and Professor F. W. Walbank, and from suggestions made by the readers for *GRBS*. I am most grateful to them all.