ELECTRUM Vol. 14
Kraków 2008

Sławomir Sprawski

LEONNATUS'S CAMPAIGN OF 322 BC

In the spring of 322 Leonnatus, one of Alexander the Great's closest companions and the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia, crossed over from Asia to Macedonia and marched south towards Lamia. His intention was to help Antipater, besieged in the walls of Lamia by the army of the Greek allies. He did not reach his destination; he was killed in a cavalry battle against the Greek forces. His campaign was one episode in the war which began in 323 and which is called the Greek or Lamian War.

Leonnatus's campaign has attracted only marginal interest of researchers so far. Scant source information means that the authors of most publications restrict themselves to a few sentences about this event. A lack of detailed data in source texts means that contemporary historians disagree on the route which Leonnatus took, how far south he marched and where he fought his last battle. Most publications do not go beyond saying that the battle took place on the Thessalian lowlands, where the Greeks managed to catch up with Leonnatus's forces. In his otherwise outstanding work, Berve mistakenly has Leonnatus die at Crannon, a place in the middle of Thessaly, where a famous battle that decided the outcome of the war was fought several months later. Arnold Schaefer in his classic book *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* points out that the battle took place not far from Meliteia, at the foot of Mount Othrys. According to him, Leonnatus was killed on the wetlands on the River Enipeus. Herman Schefer put forward a different proposal in his work on the Lamian War. In his opinion, the battle took place near Lake Xynias. Oliver Schmitt repeated this opinion in his book on the Lamian War. This view did not meet with universal approval and some researchers came to the conclusion that the battle had to have been fought further north. H.D. Westlake pointed to the southern part of the Pelasgiotis plain as the place, which would have to mean the region between Larissa and Cynoscephalae or the area around Pherae. K.J. Beloch and W. Heckel, in turn, proposed that the battlefield was in Thessaliotis on the River Peneios, and Kanatsoulis believes it was near Pharsalus.[1] There were also those who guessed the battlefield should be sought not in the south but in the north of Thessaly.[2]

[1] Schaefer 1858, III: 345–346; Schäfer 1886: 30; Beloch 1925: 72 n. 1; Geyer 1925: 2037; Berve 1926, II: 235; Westlake 1935: 232; Kanatsulis 1968: 137; Walbank 1988: 111; Schmitt 1992: 123 n. 30; Heckel 1992: 44 n. 134.

[2] Billows 1990: 58.

*

Leonnatus was undoubtedly one of Alexander's closest companions, as well as member of the greatest Macedonian aristocracy.[3] Quintus Curtius Rufus (10.7.8) mentions his royal descent, which is also confirmed in the *Liber Suda* (s.v. Leonnatos) account. According to this late source, Leonnatus was supposedly related to Philip II's mother, Eurydice. She was the daughter of Irras or Sirras, probably one of the rulers of Lyncestis in the mountains of Upper Macedonia. Plutarch (*Mor*. 14 B–C) wrote that she was an Illyrian, which contributed to triggering off a discussion about their ethnicity among researchers. Without going into details we may only conclude that Leonnatus was probably related to the rulers of Lyncestis or Orestis, who were subjugated by Philip II. It is believed that his father was Anteas, probably one of Philip II's *hetairoi*. According to the *Suda*, Leonnatus was young Alexander's companion as his *syntrophos*, which means that he must have spent his early youth on the royal court of the Temenids.[4]

The first event in which he participated that was recorded in sources was the pursuit of Philip II's assassins in 336 (Diod.16.94.4). Then, he set off to Asia at Alexander's side, as one of his *hetairoi* (Arr. *Anab.* 3.5.5). In 332–1, after Arrybas died in Egypt, Leonnatus became one of the king's seven *somatophylakes*. Sources recorded his participation in the banquet in Marakanda, during which Alexander assailed Cleitos (Curt. 8.1.46), and his criticism of *proskynesis* (Arr. 4.12.2). According to Curtius, Leonnatus and Ptolemy played a key role in discovering the plot of the royal pages (Curt. 8.6.22).

The first information about him acting as commander relates to the fights in Sogdiana in the spring of 327. Leonnatus, together with Perdiccas and Ptolemy, was supposed to command the troops besieging the mountain fortress called the Rock of Choriene (Arr. *Anab.* 4.21.4). During the Indian campaign he and Ptolemy commanded the troops comprising the part of the army that stayed under Alexander's direct command; he was wounded in battle in the Choes River area (Arr. *Anab.* 4.23.3). He was also able to demonstrate his skills in the fights against the Aspasians (Arr. *Anab.* 4.25.3).

Leonnatus rose to the height of his fame in the winter of 326–325 in Punjab, during the siege of the city of the Indian tribe Malli. Together with Peucestas he accompanied Alexander in a bold attack on the walls and together with the king he forced his way into the besieged city. According to Arrian (*Anab.* 6.10.1–2), when they were surrounded by the Malli, the king was wounded and fainted, and Leonnatus, shielding him with his own body, fell wounded as well. Although other accounts do not mention his name, Leonnatus's participation in these events seems hardly questionable. Arrian (*Anab.* 7.5.5) mentions that after returning to Susa, Alexander rewarded Leonnatus and Peucestas for bravery and saving his life.[5] After the events at Malli town, Leonnatus seems to have won greater trust of Alexander's, who entrusted him with increasingly responsible tasks. During the campaign in the Indus River basin Leonnatus supposedly was given command of a unit comprising a thousand cavalry and eight thousand of heavy and light troops at the time when Alexander took over command of the fleet (Arr. *Anab.* 6.18.3). Having reached

[3] On the career of Leonnatus see: Geyer 1925: 2035–2038; Berve 1926: 232–235; Heckel 1978: 459–461; Heckel 1992: 91–106.

[4] Strabo 7.7.8; Just. 7.4.4–5; On Sirras see: Arist. *Pol*. 5. 1311b 12–14; Berve 1925, II: 232–233; Bosworth 1971: 99–100; Hammond 1991: 403 n. 24; Heckel 1992: 91; Kapetanopoulos 1994: 9–14.

[5] Cf. Arr. *Ind.* 23.6; Curt. 9.5.15,17; Plut. *de f. Al*. I, 13 p. 344 D. For discussion see Hamilton 1969: 177; Heckel 1992: 100–101.

Oreitis, Alexander divided his army into three, giving command of one of the parts to Leonnatus and the other to Ptolemy, ordering them to plunder the country (Diod. 18.104.5–6).

Leonnatus was given his most responsible task when Alexander and his army started to retreat westwards from Oreitis. Leaving, the king left him a strong unit comprised of all the Agrianians, some archers, cavalry and infantry, as well as the whole mercenary Greek cavalry, entrusting him with the task of keeping peace in the region until the fleet arrived (Arr. *Anab.* 6.22.3). Alexander also ordered to found a port on the coast which was to serve as a shelter for the fleet and a place where the prepared provisions were kept. Keeping this base was of utmost importance because this was to be the last point where the fleet could safely reach port and take provisions for a long voyage west. Entrusting Leonnatus with such a responsible task may be proof that Alexander had faith in his abilities. During the wait for the fleet, a rebellion of the Oreitae took place; they attacked Leonnatus's forces but were warded off, suffering considerable losses. Probably soon afterwards there was another attack and a regular battle won by Leonnatus. His troops supposedly suffered surprisingly minimal losses – only 15 horsemen and several infantrymen. According to Curtius (9.10.19), Leonnatus reported in a letter to Alexander that he managed to defeat forces comprised of 8,000 infantry and 400 cavalry. This achievement also won him Alexander's esteem.

The victory over the Oreitae was Leonnatus's greatest achievement during the Asian campaign and earned him Alexander's recognition. Prior to this Leonnatus had made a name for himself as a good soldier, not afraid to risk his life, devoted to Alexander; in Oreitis he proved that he was capable of independent command and victory. It is difficult not to notice, however, that his successes came when he was in charge of mercenaries and non-Macedonian troops and that we have no information whether he was permanently entrusted with command of a regular unit of Macedonian cavalry or infantry.[6]

* *

After Alexander's death Leonnatus found himself in the group of people considered as candidates for the highest offices. If we are to believe Curtius Rufus (10.7.8), Peithon put forward Perdiccas and Leonnatus, who had royal blood running in their veins (*stripe regia genitos*), as candidates for *guardians for Roxane's future son*, while the care of European affairs was to be entrusted to Antipater and Craterus. This proposal was accepted and, it follows from Curtius's account, Perdiccas and Leonnatus made an oath of allegiance to the unborn son of Alexander. For a while, Leonnatus found himself at the very top of hierarchy of Alexander's successors. Perdiccas was apparently prepared to share co-regency with him, which may have won him the support of the remaining generals: Ptolemy, Lysimachus, Aristonous, Seleucus and Eumenes of Cardia, who were leaning towards appointing a council which would guard the country and the future king (Curtius Rufus 10.6.13–16). The support of Macedonian nobles was therefore needed in the face of Meleager's strong reaction, supported by the phalanx and speaking in defense of the rights of Philip II's son, Arrhidaeus.[7] Meleager's stubbornness put an end to the compromise that had been reached and Perdiccas was forced to recognise Arrhidaeus as king. In the new compromise Leonnatus lost his high position and had to settle for a strategically located satrapy, Hellespontine Phrygia, which was an important title but not comparable to that of

[6] Arr. *Ind.* 23.5; Bosworth 1988: 142–143; Bosworth 2002: 54 n. 92.
[7] Errington 1970: 52–54; Billows 1990: 53.

regent. It seems that at that moment he accepted this solution and his relations with Perdiccas were proper as the latter, apart from the satrapy, entrusted him with considerable military forces and the task of conquering Cappadocia and Paphlagonia as future province for Eumenes of Cardia. According to Perdiccas's orders he was to be given help by Antigonus, who controlled Phrygia, Lycaonia, Lycia and Pamphylia. Leonnatus and his army arrived in Asia Minor but, according to Plutarch's account (*Eum*. 3.2–3), neither he nor Antigonus were in a hurry to follow Perdicass's order.[8]

Unexpectedly, Leonnatus's suppressed ambitions were reawakened at the news that reached him from Europe. Antipater, alarmed by the events that had taken place in Greece, decided to do a quick intervention in order to break the anti-Macedonian coalition that was growing in strength. Realising that the forces he had at his disposal were insufficient to both secure Macedonia safety and intervene in Greece, he turned to Craterus and Leonnatus for help. They were both not far away, in Asia Minor, and both had considerable forces that could be used against the Greeks. Antipater probably must have known not only about the large troops that Leonnatus received from Perdiccas, but perhaps about his hurt ambitions as well. In order to persuade Leonnatus to participate in the intervention and simultaneously strengthen his position in the ongoing play for power in Alexander's empire, Antipater offered the would-be regent the hand of one of his daughters. We have no information whether the daughter in question was the widow of Alexander of Lyncestis or Phila.[9]

According to Plutarch (*Eum.* 3.6), Antipater's request for help was brought to Leonnatus by Hecataeus the tyrant of Cardia. Passing on the request he supposedly also informed Leonnatus that following a series of defeats Antipater had to retire to Lamia, besieged by his enemies. This account is in obvious contradiction to Diodorus's (18.12.1), who mentions that Antipater sent his call for help before he set off to Greece. We may therefore guess that Antipater's first request and offer of his daughter's hand reached Leonnatus in the autumn of 323. Hecataeus, on the other hand, brought a dramatic plea for haste at the turn of 323–322.[10]

It seems that Leonnatus, having received Antipater's first call, was in no hurry to march to Greece and manifest open disobedience to Perdiccas. Perhaps he was encouraged to make the final decision by Antigonus's position, as the latter did not show eagerness to perform Perdiccas's orders either. According to Plutarch (*Eum.* 3. 3–5), when Leonnatus was in Phrygia he tried to bring Eumenes over to his side, even offering him to mediate in the argument against Hecataeus the tyrant of Cardia, mentioned above. It was then that Eumenes reportedly learned about the grand plans that Leonnatus had of taking over control in Macedonia. It may be therefore assumed that after he received the first request for help and offer to become related to Antipater, Leonnatus raised the stakes which he was going to play for. Therefore he was in no hurry to help Antipater, as apparently the latter's offer in this game was outbid.

The ambitions Leonnatus revealed were related to the unexpected proposal he received from Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great and widow of Alexander of Epirus who had died a few years earlier. According to Plutarch (*Eum.* 3.5), she send a letter to Leonnatus in which she invited him to Pella and gave promises to marry him. This initiative

[8] Errington 1970: 57; Billows 1990: 57 n. 13; Bosworth 2002: 58.

[9] Diodorus (18.12.1) gives the name of Philotas instead of Leonnatus but it must be his error. See Just. 13.5.14; Greyer 1925: 2037; Kanatsoulis 1968: 131.

[10] Errington 1970: 59–60.

must have come from Cleopatra herself, perhaps with the support of her mother Olympias. Both women had to be aware of how difficult their situation became after Alexander's death; they were in danger of losing their influence and, in the face of a lack of an unquestionable heir, in danger of the power falling into the hands of someone unrelated to the Temenids. Cleopatra's earlier and subsequent behaviour proved that, like her mother, she was an ambitious woman who wanted to have a real part in governing, which she had tasted during her husband's absence in Epirus and perhaps later in Macedonia as well. In the new circumstances, both women, who disfavoured Antipater, must have been very concerned to learn that he was seeking Leonnatus's help.[11] It seems that it was under the influence of Antipater's offer that Cleopatra proposed to marry Leonnatus. The information recorded by Plutarch is not confirmed in other sources but it seems reliable especially in the context of subsequent journeys to Asia by aristocratic Macedonian women wanting to win a husband. That is what Cleopatra did when, after Leonnatus's death, she arrived in Asia and offered her hand to Perdiccas (Arr. *Succ.* 1.21; Diod. 18.23.1–3). Perdiccas ultimately refused Cleopatra's offer because he decided to marry Nikaia, Antipater's daughter, whom the latter brought to Iolaos. Kynane, the widow of Amyntas Perdiccas, also arrived in Asia, bringing her daughter Eurydice to marry her to Arrhidaeus.[12] Therefore it seems very likely that Cleopatra, having learned that Leonnatus would come to Europe as Antipater's supporter and future son-in-law, decided to win him over for her own plans. If it is true that Leonnatus's descent and ties to the royal family made him the best candidate for the regent of Alexander's son next to Perdiccas, he must have been an even more appropriate candidate for Cleopatra's husband.[13]

We may only guess whether Leonnatus was a good candidate for the king of Macedonia. The *Suda* paints a not very favourable picture, probably presenting the last period of his life; the entry devoted to Leonnatus is probably based on Arrian's lost work entitled *Events after Alexander*. According to the *Suda*, Leonnatus stood out because of his noble descent, upbringing and appearance, as he was a strapping and handsome youth. Already during Alexander's life he supposedly easily gave in to Persian habits, which manifested itself in an open tendency to surround himself with splendour. After Alexander's death these tendencies were only strengthened and when he commanded his units he stood out with his rich clothes and ornamented weapons. Moreover, he supposedly started to model his style on Alexander, with his hair let carelessly loose.[14]

We can sense in the *Suda* account an unfavourable attitude towards Leonnatus, emphasised by references to his acceptance of the Persian way of life. Decked out in jewellery, meticulously made up, the commander appears to be a caricature of Alexander rather than a worthy successor. We can have doubts about how realistic this depiction is, since it bears too much resemblance to a sort of catalogue of Alexander and his companions' luxuries, which we can find in other authors' works. Athenaios quotes the works of Polycleitus of Larissa, Phylarchos, Agatharchides of Cnidus, who were probably some of the numerous authors that wrote about this subject. Phylarchus and Agatharchides recorded that Perdiccas and Craterus had leather covers carried with them, which were used to shelter the place where they did athletic exercises which they loved. The authors also

[11] On Cleopatra's position in Macedonia and her coalition with Antipatrus see Plut. *Alex.* 68.3. Hammond 1985: 158–159; Blackwell 1999: 95–96; Carney 2003: 232–233.

[12] Arr. *Succ.* 1.22–23; Polyaen. 8.30; Diod. 19.52.5.

[13] Carney 2000: 123–125.

[14] Suda, s.v. Leonnatos (= Arr. *Succ.* Fr 12); Heckel 1992: 106.

wrote that Leonnatus and Menelaos had hundred-stade-long nets brought after them, which were set around a space where they hunted; the same information is repeated by Aelian. Plutarch relays that Leonnatus supposedly used camels to have sand imported from Egypt for his gymnastic exercises, whereas Philotas was the one who had long nets carried around. Different extravagancies are attributed to different figures. It is difficult to say who was the first to write about this but, as the above examples show, it attracted the attention of many writers.[15] The picture of Leonnatus surrounded by riches, preserved by the *Suda*, may have been the result of such accounts. However, the information on Leonnatus modeling himself on Alexander may indicate a real and deliberate measure. Having been summoned by Antipater and received Cleopatra's proposal, Leonnatus may have already seen himself as the new king of Macedonia and hegemon of the Greeks, and mostly as the new Alexander, returning after a victorious campaign in Asia. Lending splendour to himself by means of rich ornaments and his own *agema* of *hetairoi* may have also served creating this image.

It is accepted that Leonnatus set off from Phrygia to Europe in the early spring of 322. It may be deduced from Plutarch's account that Leonnatus delayed the expedition to Europe even after he had received Cleopatra's proposal. It was only when Eumenes rejected his offer and escaped to Perdiccas, revealing the information he had obtained, that Leonnatus decided he could not postpone his decision any further, gathered the units that had been left at his disposal, and set off to Europe.[16]

The first serious obstacle he had to overcome was the Hellespont. However, the sources do not mention at all that he had any problems whatsoever crossing the Hellespont. Such obstacles were, however, suggested by Tadeusz Wałek in his study of marine operations during the Lamian War. The author concluded that Leonnatus could not cross the Hellespont for a prolonged period of time because he was blocked by the Athenian fleet; it was only after the latter was defeated by Cleitus's fleet at Abydos that the Hellespont crossing was reopened to the Macedonians.[17] The chronology of evens put forward by T. Wałek did not meet with universal approval and most researchers date Cleitus's clash against the Athenians to the late spring of 322. It also follows from Plutarch's account that Leonnatus decided to intervene in Europe without Perdiccas's knowledge or approval, probably before the latter decided to send Cleitus's fleet against the Athenians. Thus, Leonnatus could have made a safe crossing to Europe in the wintertime, when marine operations were suspended.[18]

Having left Asia, Leonnatus reached Macedonia without problems. Once there, he decided to reinforce his troops by new enlistment and, according to Diodorus, recruited many Macedonian soldiers. He could have carried out the enlistment officially presenting himself as Antipater's ally, although Cleopatra's favour may have also been of significance; she may have cared about her future husband gathering appropriately large forces. We do not know how many people Leonnatus brought with him from Asia, but as we remember Perdiccas had entrusted him with an army strong enough to conquer Cappadocia and Paphlagonia and large enough to attract the attention of Antipater seeking help. The only information we have comes from Diodorus, who wrote that Leonnatus entered Thessaly

[15] Athen. 12.539; Plut. *Alex.* 40.1; Aelian, *VH* 9.3; Heckel 1992: 106; Malinowski 1997: 253–255.
[16] Errington 1970: 60.
[17] Wałek 1924: 27 ff.
[18] Cary 1932: 381–383; Morrison 1987: 94; Schmitt 1992: 134–136.

with 20,000 infantry and 1,500 cavalry. We may only guess how large a percentage of his army was comprised of men from the new enlistment. At that time Macedonia must have been really stripped of men capable of military duty. Diodorus clearly states that when Antipater had set off to Greece a few months earlier, he could only manage 13,000 infantry and 600 cavalry because Macedonia lacked citizen soldiers as a result of reinforcements sent earlier to Alexander's army. Even so, Antipater ordered Sippas, who was left behind in Macedonia, to collect as many soldiers as he could to protect the country. Although we do not know whether Sippas was to recruit Macedonians or mercenaries[19] it seems unlikely that a few months later Leonnatus managed to enlist a considerable number of Macedonians. There is an assumption that, unable to enlist Macedonian recruits, Leonnatus reached for Thracian and Illyrian mercenaries, but the sources are silent on this subject and recruiting Thracian mercenaries may have been more difficult because of the ongoing war between Lysimachus and Seuthes. Leonnatus could have taken control over Sippas's units but he could not leave Macedonia completely stripped of military forces. The number of the reinforcements was probably not too great and there is doubt whether it exceeded half of the whole army which marched off to Thessaly.[20] If Diodorus's information is true and the recruits were Macedonians, he must have reached for the deepest reserves and enlisted very young and inexperienced men, which was not without an influence on their combat value and the scenario of Leonnatus's last battle. The core of his army must have been the units brought from Asia, among which the cavalry was perhaps the most valuable.

The *Suda* account provides information that Leonnatus owned Nisayan horses. The Nisayan breed was thought, next to the Bactrian one, to be the best breed available first to the Persians and then to Alexander and his successors. The horses, regarded as the greatest, were bred on the Nisayan Plain in Media, south of Ecbatana. Depicted on the reliefs from Ecbatana as large, muscular animals, they were reportedly characterised by disproportionately smaller heads. Their outstanding size emphasised by ancient writers was probably a decisive factor in their value, as they were able to carry a heavily armed warrior. They are mentioned in this context in the description of the battle of Gaugamela.[21] Leonnatus owned the horses, although they did not come from Media but, according to the *Suda* account, from the Phasis River area in Colchis. The country was famous for breeding horses and supplied the kings of Urartu with them as tribute. According to Strabo, the Nisayan breed was reared not only in Media but also in Armenia, and apparently there was even a dispute as to which of these countries the horses originally came from. It cannot be ruled out that this breed was also introduced in Colchis, which boasted magnificent grazing land. Perhaps the horses were also bred in the south of Asia Minor, in the Chalibs' country. Xenophon, passing through these parts with an army, saw horses bred for the Persian king, although in his times, as he emphasised, a different breed was reared there.[22] Judging from Herodotus's comments (7.196) the Nisayan breed had a great reputation among the Greeks. Perhaps horses of this breed defeated the Thessalian horses in the competition held by Xerxes.

The *Suda* account also provides us with information that Leonnatus set off to war surrounded by an *agema* of *heitairoi*, i.e., as we can presume, an elite cavalry unit. In

[19] Diod. 18.12.2; Bosworth 2002:

[20] For discussion see: Beloch 1886: 209; Brunt 1963: 35–36; Griffith 1965: 132–133; Bosworth 1986: 8; Hammond 1989: 65; Marinovič 1989: 101–102; Billows 1990: 57 n. 13.

[21] Herodotus 7.40; Arr. *Anab*. 7.13.1; Hyland 2003: 30–31; Sidnell 2007: 86–88.

[22] Xenophon *Anab*. 4.5.34–36; Strabo 11.13.7; Hyland 2003: 29–31, 91.

Alexander's army, the *agema* appeared after the cavalry was reorganized in 329; the name *agema* replaced the name *basilike ile*. It is believed that after Alexander's death this elite unit may have been dismantled but it quickly appeared again in the armies of his successors, Eumenes, Antigonus, and Ptolemy. The *agema* being an elite cavalry unit, it accompanied the general and was a crack unit, which could tip the scales of victory. We may conclude from the information available that it was usually comprised of 200 or 300 horsemen. The *agema* appeared in armies during the first wars of the Diadochi and later mainly in the Seleucid army.[23]

It may be assumed that in Leonnatus's army, the *agema* of *hetairoi* were not merely a group of dressed up flatterers, but the most valuable unit. His troops must have included units of high combat value that were the core of the army he was given by Perdiccas to subjugate Cappadocia and Paphlagonia, which he must have brought to Europe. If this unit was indeed 300 strong, it was a half of Leonnatus's cavalry.

As Leonnatus probably brought his cavalry from Asia, there is the question of whether it (especially the *agema*) was also comprised of Orientals, which would be suggested by the mention of Nisayan horses and the opinion that Leonnatus remained under Persian influences.[24] However, the sources are silent on this subject and the information about the Nisayan horses may be referring to Leonnatus himself, or perhaps a group of his highest-ranked officers. Just like the rich ornaments mentioned by the *Suda*, highly-valued Nisayan horses could emphasise the owner's social status, as was the case with the commander of cavalry in Mardonios's army, Masistios (mentioned by Herodotus) or Pyrrhus during his campaign to Italy.[25] It seems, however, that by the end of Alexander's life the Orientals made up a considerable portion of his forces and were part of the *agema* as well, especially after a large group of Macedonian veterans had been sent back with Craterus and Greek mercenaries had been discharged. The Orientals could be found both in Alexander's *agema* and after his death in Eumenes's and the Seleukid's ones.[26] It seems likely that they also had to be part of the forces that Leonnatus received from Craterus. Some of them could have been mercenaries descended from the peoples of Asia Minor.[27] It cannot be excluded that during his several-month-long stay in Phrygia, Leonnatus increased the numbers of his cavalry by recruiting soldiers from among the local people. The fact that Leonnatus's Nisayan horses came not from Media but from Colchis, located much nearer Phrygia, would support such a version of the events.

The preceding analysis may lead us to the conclusion that the forces collected by Leonnatus may have been of various value. He probably trusted his cavalry the most and that is why he tried to decide the outcome of the battle against the Greeks in a cavalry clash.

* * *

Having reinforced his army, Leonnatus finally marched off south towards Lamia. The reconstruction of his campaign can only be based on several minor pieces of source information. In regard to the first stage of the campaign we only have Diodorus's brief

[23] Bar-Kochva 1976: 68; 236 n. 50 and 60; Bosworth 1988: 268–269.
[24] Bar-Kochva 1976: 237 n. 50.
[25] Herodotus 9.20; Plutarch *Pyrrh.* 11.2.
[26] Plut. *Eum.*7, Arr. *Anab.* 7.6.3, Badian 1965: 160–161; Bar-Kochva 1976: 67–75; 237 n. 50. The Seleukid's army: Polyb. 30.25.8; Appian *Syr*. 32 (163–164); Livy 37.40.6,11.
[27] For discussion see Brunt 1963: 35–45; Bosworth 1988: 266–273; Olbrycht 2005: 192–202.

statement (18.14.5) that Leonnatus had marched across Thessaly prior to the battle. There is no mention of the Thessalians attempting to stop his march or of Leonnatus himself taking any sabotage actions e.g. to force the Greek troops to abandon the siege of Lamia. We may therefore assume that Leonnatus's objective was to cross Thessaly as fast as possible which, as Thucydides (4.78.2) observed, was always a difficult task for an enemy army. The expansive Thessalian plains made the enemy vulnerable to attacks of the local cavalry, reputed to be the best in the Greek world. Although in 395 Agesilaos managed to march across the Thessalian territory safely and even defeat them in a cavalry encounter, he had a sufficient number of well-trained cavalry with him and deftly took advantage of a mistake made by an overconfident enemy. Both Agesilaos and Brasidas in 424 benefitted from a lack of unity among the Thessalians.[28] Leonnatus found himself in a more difficult situation as there is no mention of any internal struggle in Thessaly at the time.[29] He also had to consider the fact that the Thessalians were able to muster a much bigger cavalry force than the one at his own disposal, and he had had the opportunity to find out about its efficiency numerous times during the Asian campaign. In these circumstances it may be assumed that he decided to try and join Antipater's forces as soon as possible and keep his march a secret for as long as possible in order not to provoke the Thessalians to withdraw from Lamia and attack him on the Thessalian plains. It may be concluded from Diodorus's and Justin's accounts that the Greek forces at Lamia were surprised by Leonnatus's appearance which suggests that he almost succeeded in *appearing before their eyes before they even knew he was on his way,* as Xenophon (*Hell.* 6.4.21) wrote about Jason's lightning-fast march to Leuctra across hostile Phokis in 371.

Trying to establish Leonnatus's route we can only refer to the cases of other armies marching through this region. In order to cover the distance between Macedonia and Lamia he had several alternative routes to chose from. The first one ran along the coast of the Thermaic Gulf to the Vale of Tempe and further across the plain to Larissa. This variant of the route was the most likely one according to Schmitt.[30] Further on he could have crossed the Pelasgiotis plain heading south-west of Larissa towards Crannon and into the Enipeus Valley towards Pharsalus, passing the city from the west and continuing the march south towards Thaumakoi (near Domokos) and the Derven-Phourka Pass. From Larissa he could also choose a shorter route straight south to Pharsalus, which roughly corresponded to the modern National Road through Zapeion and Halkides. Marching past Pharsalus from the west side he could continue through the Narthakion (Kassidiaris) range towards Meliteia and then to Lamia. The last variant would have corresponded to Agesialos's itinerary in 395.[31]

The route through Tempe was definitely one of the fastest but also the most risky one. The narrow valley was very easy to blockade. Livius mentioned that forty men were enough to stop the enemy army in the narrowest spot. Marching a large army through this bottleneck could have been troublesome if one did not have a secure exit from the valley. It was an excellent opportunity for the defenders to trap the enemy troops. Polyaionos quotes such a case of the Thessalians blocking Alexander's path. Regardless of whether the anecdote refers to Alexander III the Great or Alexander II, it shows the ease with which

[28] Sprawski 1999: 26–28.

[29] However Westlake (1935: 231) supposed that not only Pelinna but the whole north-western Thessaly refused to join anti-Macedonian coalition.

[30] Schmitt 1992: 122.

[31] Decourt 1992: 89–92; Mottas/Decourt 1997: 332–335.

even a relatively small group of desperate defenders could trouble even a large army. Further march in the vicinity of the main city of the region, Larissa, across the open plains, seems even more risky. It is quite unlikely that such a variant of the route would have been chosen.[32] This view is further confirmed by analysing Brasidas's itinerary in 424, whose circumstances bore some resemblance: the Spartan general, marching in the direction opposite to that of Leonnatus, set off from almost the same spot to which Leonnatus was heading, i.e. Herakleia in Trachis near Lamia, and he reached Dion in Macedonia. His goal was to traverse the country as fast as possible since the majority of local people were hostile towards his army. According to Thucydides (Thucydides 4.78.5–6), Brasidas *set out from Melitia he performed the whole distance to Pharsalos, and encamped on the river Apidanus; and so to Phakion, and from thence to Perrhaebia. Here his Thessalian escort went back, and the Perrhaebians, who are subjects of Thessaly, set him down at Dion*. According to this account Brasidas's march was divided into five stretches which he probably covered on five consecutive days: the first from Herakleia to Meliteia in Phthiotian Achaea at the foot of Mount Othrys; the second from Meliteia to the area of Pharsalus; the third from Pharsalus to Phakion, which was to be the last Thessalian city on his route; the fourth day saw him reach Perrhaebia, and the next – Dion in Macedonia. Brasidas and his Thessalian guides apparently concluded that this would be the fastest and safest route across Thessaly.[33]

Heading south, Leonnatus could take advantage of the fact that the Perrhaebians had not joined the anti-Macedonian coalition and he was able to use the safe route across their lands. His march likely led south from Pella to the Haliakomn valley and from there he entered Perrhaebia through the Volustana Pass, which had been a gate to the south since time immemorial. The main route south ran via Azoros (Vouvala), Malloia (Paleokastro), Chyretiai (Domeniko) to Mylai (Vlachogianni).[34] Later on Leonnatus could have entered the Peneios valley and crossed the river near Atrax, then headed to Crannon and on to Pharsalus. If, however, Leonnatus did not want to alert the Thessalians to his presence there and had no reason to approach Larissa, he could have chosen a different variant of the route, which guaranteed him more discretion. To this end, leaving Malloia he could have headed south-west of Pelinna, which is usually located in Palaiogardiki on the left bank of the Peneios.[35] The place was only a few kilometres away from the mouth of the Enipeus, whose valley was, it seems, Leonnatus's next destination. What could have been an incentive to choose this route was the position of Pelinna, situated in the verge of the Neochoritis valley, which was the only Thessalian city not to join the anti-Macedonian coalition. Alexander, returning from his campaign against the Illyrians in 335, reportedly also chose the route via Pelinna to enter Thessaly.[36]

Setting out from Pelinna, Leonnatus's army reached the Thessaliotis plain and, with a stroke of luck, it was only on this day that the Thessalians would be able to find out about its presence. Choosing the relatively safe and fast route along the Enipeus, Leonnatus could reach Pharsalus in one day, covering a slightly longer stretch than Brasidas. The route,

[32] See my forthcoming paper *Alexander at Tempe (Polyaenus 4.3.23).*

[33] Decourt 1990: 87–88.

[34] Lucas 1997: 36–38.

[35] Livy 36.13.1–3; Stählin 1924: 25–31; Decourt 1990: 116–120.

[36] Diod. 18.11.1; Arr. *Anab.* 1.7.5; Westlake 1935: 231. The localization of Pelinna is not certain but traditionally it has been located near Palaiogardiki. For the discussion see Tziaphalias 1992: 124–131; *Barrington Atlas*: 56 and *ICGP*: 700.

running along a range of hills separating the two Thessalian plains, was popular among the armies in antiquity, as Jean Decourt showed in his work.[37] The further route must have run through the Othrys range and down to the Spercheious valley, towards Lamia besieged by the Greek troops.

Leonnatus did not reach his destination. In his way to Lamia he was killed in a cavalry battle against the Greek forces. Diodorus's brief report (18.15.2–4) on the battle only allows us to conclude that when Leonnatus led his troops across Thessaly, the Greeks decided to abandon the siege and burn their camp, then sent the baggage train and all the people accompanying the army but unable to fight to Meliteia. Unburdened and battle-ready, they set off to meet the enemy, striving to do battle before Leonnatus managed to join his forces with those of Antipater's. When both armies met, there was a fierce and prolonged cavalry battle (γεομένης δ᾽ ἱππομαχίας ἰσχυρᾶς ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον 18.15.3). The Thessalians managed to gain advantage over Leonnatus's cavalry and push him to wet ground (εἰς τόπον τελματώδη 18.15.3). Leonnatus, having suffered multiple wounds, fell on the battlefield and his body was carried to the baggage train by his companions. After the cavalry's defeat, the Macedonian phalanx, stripped off the protection of its cavalrymen, immediately withdrew from the plain to the rough ground above it (ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου πρὸς τὰς ὑπερκειμένας δυσχωρίας 18.15.4) and took up safer positions (καὶ τῇ τῶν τόπων ὀχυρότητι τὴν ἀσφάλειαν περιεποιήσατο 18.15.4). The Macedonians' manoeuvre did not discourage the Thessalian cavalry from attacking, but it proved futile because of the rough ground (διὰ τὴν δυσχωρίαν). Thus the battle ended. The Greeks set up a *tropaion* and tended to the bodies of the dead, confirming their victory. Then they withdrew from the battlefield, probably expecting Antipater's arrival. Indeed, on the next day Antipater and his troops reached the battlefield and joined Leonnatus's forces. Both armies set up camp together. Antipater decided to end the campaign and return to Macedonia. He decided to retreat from Thessaly not across the plain but through the rough country. He also made sure that his advance guard took any points of vantage beforehand. Diodorus emphasises the decisive contribution of the Thessalians to the victory of the Thessalian cavalry and the merits of the cavalry commander, Menon. On the other hand he names Antiphilus as the Greek general who won the battle, which suggests that he probably participated in the battle as the commander-in-chief of the coalition forces.

In Justin's *Epitome* (13.5) the description of the campaign is necessarily much briefer and covered in just one sentence. He devotes more attention to the consequences of the battle. Therefore he only mentions that Antipater requested Leonnatus's help and then he moves on to the moment when the Athenians learned about his arrival and set out against Leonnatus; like Diodorus, he relays that they set out in battle array. Badly wounded, Leonnatus dies during the cavalry clash. Then Antipater takes over command of the remaining army, reinforcing the units already at his disposal. It does not follow from Justin's account that Antipater followed the Greeks to the battlefield; on the contrary, he suggests that it was only after he took over command of the survivors of Leonnatus's army that he managed to get reinforcements to break the siege and return to Macedonia. What is also striking is a lack of information on the Thessalian cavalry and its role in the battle. In Justin's account it is the Athenians that fought the battle against Leonnatus; what is more, the author does not even mention the Thessalians' participation in the war against Antipater. The list of things he never mentions is longer; he writes about Antipater retiring

[37] Decourt 1990: 127–132.

behind the walls of Herakleia instead of Lamia and he passes in silence over the events of 322, including the battle of Crannon. Thus, the value of his account seems to be very limited.

Strabo (9.5.10) mentions the Lamian War when describing Phthiotian Achaea, listing Lamia as one of the cities in the region; he writes that it was a war fought by the Athenians against Antipater. He mentions the death of Leonnatus, *a hetairos of King Alexander*, as a notable fact. However, Strabo does not mention the Thessalians' participation in these events. It seems that the war for the freedom of the Greeks was worth noting mostly because Leonnatus, Alexander's companion, died then.

In a very brief mention, Plutarch (*Phoc*. 25) writes that Antipater was defeated in Thessaly in a great battle by the forces of the allied Greeks, even though Leonnatus and the Macedonians from Asia came to help him and joined forces with him. Although Plutarch suggests a different chronology of events, he agrees with Diodorus on two important issues; the Thessalian cavalry was commanded by Menon while the infantry was under Antiphilus, and Leonnatus died in the battle. This last fact is also confirmed in a very brief mention about the Lamian War in Arrian's summaries found in Photios's volumes.[38]

Based on these accounts we can put forward three alternative reconstructions of the events:

– according to Diodorus, the Greeks found out about Leonnatus approaching, left the camp at Lamia and set off to meet him, sending the baggage train to Meliteia; on the same day there was a cavalry clash in which Leonnatus was killed; the Greeks, unable to destroy his infantry, withdrew from the battlefield; on the next day Antipater reached the battlefield and joined Leonnatus's survivors; on the following day Antipater set off towards Macedonia.

– according to Justin, the Greeks found out about Leonnatus's army approaching and set off to meet it; there was a battle during which Leonnatus died; survivors from his army reached Antipater besieged in Herakleia; after the Macedonian forces were united Antipater was strong enough to leave the city and march to Macedonia.

– according to Plutarch, Antipater fought the battle of Lamia against the Greeks, which he lost despite Leonnatus joining him; Leonnatus died during the fight.

Plutarch's version presents the events so briefly that it may be the reason why their picture is distorted. Justin's version has been accepted by some historians, of course with the correction that Antipater was besieged in Lamia, not Herakleia.[39] In this case Leonnatus would have to have reached Lamia, where the battle was fought, which enabled some of his soldiers to fight their way into the city. This would mean, however, that the Greeks, despite their victory, were unable to stop them. There is also no explanation for the passivity of Antipater, who must have witnessed the battle from the city walls. It seems, therefore, that the most logical sequence of events is presented in the longest account by Diodorus, who states that the battle was fought at some distance from Lamia, and Antipater was able to leave the city only because earlier the Greeks decided to lift the siege and leave.

It follows from the above that in order to understand the progress of the campaign it is essential to establish where the battle was fought. It is difficult to resist the impression that Diodorus's account resembles the description of the most famous battle fought in Thessaly,

[38] See also Oros. *Hist.* 3.23.14.

[39] Habicht 1997: 39: *…on the following day his* [Leonnatus's] *infantry, which had not participated in the first day's fighting, entered Lamia, and Antipater was saved.*

i.e. the clash between the armies of Caesar and Pompey in 48 BC. The battle was fought on the plain near Pharsalus; cavalry participated in the battle; Pompey's cavalry was thrown into disarray and retreated, as Caesar wrote (*Bell.Civ*. 3.93.5.) to the high hills *in altissimos montes* adjacent to the battlefield; soon other units followed, looking for shelter against the Caesar's troops (*Bell.Civ.* 3.95.4). Moreover, Plutarch adds that Pompey's camp was 'close to marshy ground' (*Brut*. 4.), and Brutus fled after the battle through a gate leading to 'a marshy spot full o water and reeds' (*Brut.* 6). Frontinus (*Strat.* 2.3.22) and Lucan (7.224–226) also mention wet ground on the battlefield. The valley of the Enipeus in the vicinity of Pharsalus fits Diodorus's description of the place where Leonnatus fought his last battle. The flat ground was fit for fighting a cavalry battle, it was full of wet spots which could have been where Leonnatus was mortally wounded, as well as hills where the Macedonian infantry could have sought shelter and the Thessalian cavalry attacked in vain. The cavalry was commanded by Menon who came from Pharsalus, so it can be assumed that the people from this city made up the core of the Thessalian cavalry, just like in 395 in the war against Agesilaos and during Alexander's campaign. It would have been obvious for them, having learned of Leonnatus's arrival, to strive to move the armies besieging Lamia to their native land, which consequently could have led to the battle being fought near their native city.

Although the exact place of the battle between Pompey and Caesar is in contention, the battle descriptions leave no doubt that it was in the vicinity of Pharsalus, in the valley between the Enipeus and the Apidanos rivers. If it was near the spot where Brasidas set up camp, as we remember it took his army a day's march to reach there from Meliteia, and two day's march from Herakleia. Meanwhile, it follows from Diodorus's and Justin's descriptions that the Greeks left Lamia ready for battle, i.e. they expected to meet the enemy at any moment. What is more, it follows from these accounts that the battle was fought on the same day. If this reconstruction is correct, it seems the Greeks had too little time to cover the distance from Lamia to the Enipeus valley near Pharsalus and to fight a battle. It is also difficult to imagine that the Greeks marched the whole distance in full battle readiness. A weaker argument that also disproves this conception is the fact that no author names Pharsalus as the place of the battle. It is difficult to resist the impression that after 48 the place was known well enough for such a fact not to be overlooked.

It seems much more likely that the battle took place much closer to Lamia, on the plateau separating the Peneios valley from the Spercheios valley, where Lamia is located. This mountainous region was never a barrier to transit between the north and the south; moreover itineraries of war expeditions often cut across it, and it was a place of numerous battles.

* * * *

The western part of the Othrys range is made up of two expansive valleys. The westernmost valley was called Daukli and it constituted the basin of Lake Xynias, drained in the modern times; to the east was the other valley, called Avaritsa or Chiliadou (Phyliadon or Avaritsa), which constituted the basin of the upper Enipeus. Avaritsa was a fertile plain cut through by numerous streams, which joined to create the upper Enipeus. The main city of the region was Meliteia, located on the southern verge of the plain.[40]

[40] Stählin 1924: 159–170; Philippson 1950: 191–198.

An important route between northern and southern Greece, often used for military purposes, led through the Othrys range. The road from Larissa via Kranon Proerne, Thaumakoi to the Spercheios valley was the easiest, the fastest, and without major obstacles.[41] The present road from Lamia to Pharsalus, after reaching the Fourka Pass, descends to the vast basin of the now-drained lake which was called Xynias in antiquity, and later Daukli or Nezeros/Ozeros. Cutting across the plain, the road went past a range of small hills on the right, separating the Xynias basin from Chiliadou.[42] The description of this road (going in the opposite direction) may be found in Livy (32.4.3–4), who wrote that going from Thermopylae and Lamia to Thaumakoi, one passed rough terrain, by roads winding along the valleys. Only after some time the traveller's eyes saw an amazing view on the Thessalian plain, spreading from their feet to the horizon. The Greek name of the city of Thaumakoi, located on the verge of the plateau, came from this wonderful view, added the writer. Livius's description mentions winding roads but not Lake Xynias and the expansive plain. The ancient route which he mentions apparently steered clear off the shores of Xynias Lake and ran further east than today's road. From the Fourka Pass, the road headed north-east, then cut across the plain and went on towards contemporary Nea Mavrisi, and further on towards contemporary Lefka; it did not reach the latter, but steering past the low hills it turned west to Mati and Thaumakoi. Such a route can be seen on maps and sketches from the 19th century. However, even in ancient times there was another route from Thaumakoi along the shores of Lake Xynias to the city of Xyniai and further on through the Karya Derveni Pass to the Spercheios valley, which can be deduced from Livius's reference to the march of the Aetolians via Xyniai to Thaumakoi.[43] Xerxes's army led by local guides probably reached Thermopylae by the road near Thaumakoi and Fourka-Derveni. Although Herodotus's account (7.196) names no names that would enable us to clearly reconstruct the chosen route, it contains clues which make such a possibility very likely. Herodotus mentions that the Persians reached the Apidanos river, whose source is in the Othrys range and which flows parallel to the Enipeus.[44]

As we can see, the roads through Othrys range were not a major obstacle for the marching armies. The most important issue for us is whether the area could have been the spot where a cavalry battle was fought. To answer this, we must turn to Thucydides's account about Brasidas's march in 424, who avoided clashing against the Thessalians in this region, and to Xenophon's report about Agesilaos's victorious cavalry battle at Narthakion in 395.

Brasidas, heading from Herakleia in Trachis to Thrace reached Meliteia in Phthiotian Achaea, where he met his Thessalian friends, who agreed to guide him safely across their country. At this point of his march, Brasidas probably did not decide to choose the route through Fourka-Derveni, which was further west, but a less busy but direct route to Meliteia through the Divri valley.[45] Although Brasidas tried to traverse Thessaly as fast as possible and without any conflicts, he encountered difficulties the moment when he appeared at Meliteia. The Thessalians who were hostile towards him started gathering by the Enipeus river, trying to stop him from marching on. Although Thucydides does not mention where exactly their place of gathering was, we may assume that it must have been

[41] Decourt 1990: 121–122.
[42] Stählin 1924: 161.
[43] Daux/de La Coste-Messelière 1924: 348–354; Cantarelli 1992: 303–328.
[44] Bequignon 1935: 275; Müller 1987: 285; Decourt 1990: 82–83; Mottas/Decourt 1997: 336–337.
[45] Cantarelli 1992: 308.

close to Meliteia since Brasidas attempted to negotiate with them. The Enipeus has its source near Meliteia and probably the hostile Thessalians gathered somewhere by the upper stream near the road to Pharsalus. It must have been already on the territory of Phthiotian Achaea, since the Phthiotian border ran further north, across the Rizi plateau, crossing the Enipeus near Koloklobasi. Perhaps the spot on the Enipeus mentioned by Thucydides was situated near the place where later, after the failed attempt to capture Meliteia, Philip V supposedly set up camp, preparing for further march towards Phthiotian Thebes.[46] The gathering Thessalians apparently tried to block Brasidas's path. From Meliteia Brasidas could have headed west towards Thaumakoi, to descend to the Thessaliotis plain, or he could have chosen the road traversing the western slopes of Narthakion (Kassiadris) in the direction of Proerna, and going past this city join the road leading to Thaumakoi. He could also have chosen the route running along the eastern slopes of Narthakion, more or less overlapping with the modern road via Skopia, Dendrohori, Nartahki, reaching the vicinity of Pharsalus from the south east. Since Brasidas wanted to avoid confrontation with the hostile Thessalians, he probably chose a route steering clear of cities and open plains. For this reason he could have decided to take one of the alternative routes to the Enipeus valley, probably forcing him to choose one of the less busy crossings over Narthakion (Kassidiaris). Perhaps the route of his march, perhaps the one almost overlapping with the contemporary road, went via Petroto/Tsatma (which Stahlin identified as Peraia) towards modern Rizi. On the same day that Brasidas set off from Meliteia, he reached Pharsalus and set up camp at a distance from the city on the Apidanos river.[47]

The route of Agesilaos's 394 march from Asia to Boeotia, during which there was a cavalry battle against the Thessalians, also went through the Othrys range. The Spartan army was to march across Thessaly in hollow square formation, protected at the rear by half of the cavalry. The Thessalians bothered the rear guard until Agesilaos brought the whole cavalry in front of them. As Xenophon writes, the Thessalians did not decide to fight a cavalry battle right next to the Spartan hoplites, abandoned further chase and turned back. Agesilaos took advantage of this moment, ordering his cavalry to carry out a sudden attack against the retreating enemy, which gave him an unexpected victory. Agesialos's itinerary and the place of the battle against the Thessalians can only be established hypothetically, based on the scant topographic information. According to Xenophon, the defeated Thessalian cavalry retreated from the slope of Narthakion, and the victorious Agesilaos remained on the battlefield and set up a trophy between Narthakion and Pras. On the next day, the Spartan army crossed the Achaean mountains of Phthia and reached friendly territory.[48] Therefore, the battle must have been fought in the area of the Othrys range, between Pharsalus and the Spercheios valley. The most important clue enabling us to reconstruct Agesilaos's itinerary and the location of the battle is an inscription dated to 2nd century BC, found near Limogardi in the southern part of the Othrys range. The inscription allowed us to establish that there used to be an ancient city of Narthakion near Limogardi, which for many years had a border dispute with Meliteia, located further north.[49] Although Xenophon does not mention the city of Narthakion but a mountain of this name, it seems likely that the city could have taken the name of one of the neighbouring peaks (according

[46] Thucyd. 4.78.3; Strabo 9.5.6; Polyb. 5.99.1; Stählin 1924: 83; Decourt 1990: 39 and 86–87.
[47] Decourt 1990: 87; Cantarella 1992: 317–324.
[48] Xenophon *Hell*. 4.3.3–9; *Ages*. 2.4–5; Plut. *Ages*. 16.5.
[49] IG IX.2 89; Ager 156. For discussion see Baker 2000: 33–47.

to Stahlin, Xerovouni Avaritsis 1022 m). This would enable us to identify the ruins not far from nearby Divri as remnants of Pras, mentioned by Xenophon. If these identifications are correct, Agesilaos's army steered clear of hostile Pharsalus, marched past Meliteia and further across the Ankaditsa plain, to descend to the shore of the Gulf of Malis through the Xerias Potamos valley. The battle was supposedly fought on the plateau stretching north of Limogardi.[50] Doubts about this reconstruction are raised by Xenophon's statement that Agesilaos's army crossed the Achaean mountains of Phthia only after the battle, which suggests that it must have been fought north of the Othrys range, which cannot be reconciled with the location of Narthakion near Limogardi. If we keep to Xenophon's words we would have to assume that Mount Narthakion mentioned by him should not necessarily be searched for in the direct neighbourhood of the city of the same name. Before the aforementioned inscription was found, Mount Narthakion was believed to have been among the hills south of Pharsalus, which bears this name at present (Turkish Kassidiaris), and the battle was thought to have been fought in the Enipeus valley or on the south verge of the Thessaliotis plain, near Pharsalus, en route to Thaumakoi.[51] Although this reconstruction ignores the aforementioned topographic findings, it seems to be in better agreement with Xenophon's account. The Thessalians could have followed Agesilaos as far as the verge of the plain and decided to turn back when the Spartan army approached the climb up the Othrys range. The open plain also seems to be a better place to draw up the hollow square formation mentioned by Xenophon.[52] The place of the battle can also be searched for in the basin of the Daukli or Avaritsa, where the lay of the land allowed Agesilaos to return to the hollow square formation. If Agesilaos chose a route similar to Brasidas's, the Thessalians could have followed him to the borders of their territory, more or less to the same spot where they gathered to stop the Spartan army in 424. J. Decourt's analysis allows us to assume that Agesilaos traversed Thessaly choosing the shortest road from Larissa southwards, on the verge of the territories of Karnnon, Skotussa and Pharsalus; a road that enabled him to march round Pharsalus and Narthakion (Kassidiaris) from the east. In this way he did not have to turn west to cross the Othrys range taking the road through Thaumakoi and Fourka-Derveni, but rather similarly to Brasidas, through the Dirvi valley.[53] Locating the battlefield in the basin of the upper Enipeus would match Xenophon's description, since it would explain why the defeated Thessalians could retreat north towards Narthakion-Kassidiaris. After the battle Agesilaos still had to traverse the ridge descending from Mount Othrys, bordering Chiliadou from the south and separating it from the Spercheiosu valley.

The Othrys range was also the location of military operations during the Macedonian wars. In 199 Philip V tried in vain to capture the city of Thaumakoi. Despite a large siege his efforts came to nothing and the king retreated to Macedonia (Liv. 32.4.3–4). A year later the citizens of Xyniai were slaughtered by the Aetolians heading to Thaumakoi (Liv. 32.13). In 197 Flamininus set up his camp on the shore of Lake Xynias; setting out against Philip V, he decided to wait for the forces of the allied Aetolians there. His army reached this place having started at Elateia, via Tronion and Skarpheia, and having joined with the Aetolians, headed further against Phthiotian Thebes (Liv. 33.3.8). In 191 the consul Acilius

[50] Stählin 1924: 187, 228; Bequignon 1937: 290–292; Cantarrelli 1990: 308–314; Decourt 1990: 89–90.
[51] Stählin 1924: 170.
[52] Leake 1835, IV: 471–472; Shipley 1997: 219–221. See also Stählin 1924: 188.
[53] Decourt 1992: 90–92.

Glabrio led his troops through this region moving from Larissa to the Gulf of Malis. According to Livy (36.14.12–14), his route went from Larissa via Crannon to Proerna. Located on the southern verge of the Thessaliotis plain, Proerna was captured together with the nearby fortresses. Then, the Roman army climbed a pass near Thaumakoi to march towards the Gulf of Malis. Livy relays that young citizens of Thaumakoi gathered on the woody hills and tried to attack the Romans from there. The consul tried to negotiate with them but when this failed he sent two military units to surround their positions and cut them off; then he gave the order to capture the city. Hearing shouts coming from the city, the young warriors left their positions and rushed to rescue their countrymen. The Romans killed off the men descending from the hills. On the next day the consul and his army marched down to the Spercheios valley and headed towards the land of the Hypatians. We may guess that leaving Thaumakoi he did not choose the road straight south through the Derven-Phourka Pass but the alternative route further west, along the shore of Lake Xynias to the Derven-Karya Pass. In 85 Sulla reached Meliteia and set up camp there on his way from Boeotia to Thessaly (Plut. *Sull*. 20.1) .

The area around Thaumakoi earned its name as a place of fierce fights also in modern times. In May of 1897 the front line went across the Othrys range during the Greco-Turkish war. Greek troops, driven out of Thessaly, tried to stop the enemy from their fortification at Domokos, i.e. ancient Thaumakoi. The Turkish army was moving from Pharsalus towards the Greek positions at Domokos. The battle, which started in the morning of May 17, was one of the bloodiest clashes of this war. The Greek forces totalled 35–40,000 of infantrymen and about 500 cavalrymen.[54] The author of the description mentions that the Greek units were *on the long well-protected slope of the valley east of Domokos, and crowded on every peak from which a view of the action could be obtained* (p. 238). The Turkish forces, totaling about 50,000 men, were divided into three units. The main strike was carried out from the Thessaliotis lowland straight at the Greek positions at Domokos. Two units were to carry out a flank march simultaneously in order to cut the Greeks off from retreating towards Lamia. To this end, the Turkish troops had to march across the Kassidiaris range, the same one that Brasidas had crossed. In his account of the war, Kinnard Rose made a general remark about crossing this range: *Kassidiaris range can be crossed from Pharsala in three directions – one on the west, by Ryzi and Karodzali (Kratsali); the second in the centre, by Seterli; and the third on the east, by Kiozlar; a branch from the latter leading east to Armyro (Halmyros). The Turkish commander had sent a strong force of infantry, cavalry, and mountain-artillery by all three roads* (p. 235–236). Memdouk Pasha's division was given the task of crossing by the road running furthest east through a mountainous area between the Halmyros lowland and Chiliadou, to cut across the routes between them and reach the Domokos-Lamia road. The third group of soldiers was made up of Hamdi Pasha's division that was supposed to cross the Kassidiaris mountains, pass Domokos at a distance of three miles, and cut across the Greek line of retreat to Lamia. Although his division set off early in the morning, the crossing of the gorges and hills of Kassidiaris took the whole day.[55] It could have been the same route Brasidas used to descend from Meliteia to the Peneios valley. In the morning of May 17 the Turkish forces approached Domokos and, after the initial fire exchange, the assault against the front line of the Greek fortifications across the plain began around 2 pm. A few hours

[54] Kinnaird Rose 1897: 236.
[55] Kinnaird Rose 1897: 235–236; Stählin 1935: 167 n. 145.

later the Greek forces were forced to retreat to the second defence line on the hills at the foot of Domokos. The Turks engaged the Greek forces in a frontal attack, trying to divert their attention from the decisive flank manoeuvre carried out by Hamdi Pasha. At approximately 6 pm, having captured Karatsali, his division marched towards the right flank of the Greek forces. The road to Lamia was threatened which required for a reserve of 3,000 infantry and 500 cavalry to be sent to cover this important route. As a result of the fact that the Turkish units of Hamdi Pasha were too tired to continue, the fire was ceased at around 7.30 pm.[56] At night, the commander-in-chief of the Greek forces, Crown Prince Constantinos, trying to avoid being enveloped, decided to withdraw from Domokos and retreat to Lamia. Memdouk Pasha, who had set off from Pharsalus on May 15, did not manage to get there in time to cut off their retreat. On May 18, only his skirmishers reached the set positions, while the main forces travelled over hills and through gorges at a much slower pace than it had been anticipated.[57] At night and in the morning of May 18, the Greek troops managed to retreat; as a result there were only minor clashes which are nevertheless interesting for our analysis. When the last units of the Greek army were approaching by the road from Domokos to the Fourka Pass, they were attacked by three squadrons of Turkish cavalry commanded by Seifulah and supported by artillery. The attacking Turks managed to push the Greeks back from the plain to the Fourka Pass, where they occupied inaccessible positions. The cavalry was unable to take them and was forced to abandon the attack and wait for the infantry to come.[58]

* * * * *

The above examples show that even quite large armies, even with cavalry units, could operate and fight battles in the area of the Othrys Range. There are, therefore, no obstacles to trying to locate Leonnatus's last battle in this area.

The news of Leonnatus's arrival in the area around Pharsalus must have reached the Greek camp at Lamia at the last moment. Otherwise it is difficult to imagine that the Thessalians decided to quickly return to the north to defend their cities. This is what the Aetolians did in 321 when, during the campaign in Thessaly, they received news of the Acarnans invading their country and without thinking long turned back to defend their land, leaving their allies to their own resources (Diod. 18.38.4–5). If Leonnatus, on the first day of his march across Thessaly, covered the distance from Pelinna to the area around Pharsalus, the Thessalians did not have much time to pass on this news to the Greek camp at Lamia. It may be assumed that Antiphilus and Menon found out about the danger at night or dawn of the next day. Their reaction must have been quick. They decided to abandon the siege and set their camp on fire, perhaps intending for the smoke to make it more difficult to observe their move. Next, the Greeks set off to meet Leonnatus's army in order to prevent him from joining forces with Antipater. It seems that they expected to encounter the enemy at any moment, since they sent everybody who would not participate in battle back to Meliteia, and marched against the enemy unencumbered and ready to fight (αὐτοὶ δ᾽ εὔζωνοι καὶ πρὸς μάχην ὄντες ἕτοιμοι προῆγον –18.15.1).[59] Since they sent back the baggage train back to Meliteia, they must have realised that the enemy was approaching

[56] Bratlett 1897: 237, 241.
[57] Bartlett 1897: 234; Kinnaird Rose 1897: 235–247.
[58] Bartlett 1897: 245.
[59] Cf. Diod. 14.9.1.

Lamia by a different route, i.e. the road near Thaumakoi. For the same reason they themselves must have chosen the route through Derven Fourka – the shortest route which could take them to the Daukli plateau.

Meanwhile, Leonnatus was marching in the opposite direction. It seems that since Brasidas needed only two days to get from Meliteia along the Enipeus to the Peneios valley, Leonnatus was also able to reach the Daukli basin south of Thaumakoi. After an overnight stopover near Pharsalus, his army had to cover about 30 km to Thaumakoi. The Greeks marching from Lamia had to cover approximately the same distance (about 34 km) to get to the same place. As we remember, in his description of the place of the battle Diodorus mentions wetland and hills on which the Macedonian infantry looked for shelter. It seems that the north-east part of Daukli basin corresponds with this description – the plain is surrounded by gentle hills, stretching to the shore of Lake Xynias.[60] Leonnatus's units reached this area in the late afternoon, perhaps planning to set up camp on the lakeshore, as Flammininus did in 197. It is difficult to say whether after arriving in Daukli basin he meant to head straight for Lamia through the Fourka Pass, Derven Karia and down to the Spercheios valley above Lamia. In this way the Greeks would have to abandon the fortifications around Lamia and decide to either fight the battle on the plain, with the city and Antipater behind them, or abandon the siege and retreat. Regardless of what Leonnatus's plans were he never fulfilled them, since the Greek army approached from the opposite direction and a battle took place.

As we remember, according to Diodorus, the infantry did not participate in the fight and the battle was limited to a fierce cavalry clash, which lasted for quite a while (γενομένης δ' ἱππομαχίας ἰσχυρᾶς ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον –18.15.3. This information seems rather surprising if we compare the enemies' numbers. Leonnatus reportedly had 1,500 of cavalry, while the Greeks had 3,500 horsemen, including 2,000 Thessalians of great repute. This leads to two questions; first, how is it possible that Leonnatus's cavalry managed to resist an enemy that outnumbered them for a prolonged period of time; second, why did Leonnatus decide to do battle in a cavalry clash against an enemy that outnumbered his forces, whose combat value he knew very well. He could have refused to fight and occupy convenient defensive positions, as his infantry did later, and wait for Antipater, who was bound to get there sooner or later. Leonnatus's decision could have been a result of his bravado and desire to settle the battle by means of an unexpected attack, trusting his luck more than cool calculation. But perhaps there were circumstances which neutralised the advantage of the Greek cavalry and encouraged Leonnatus to act quickly and use the opportunity to defeat the enemy.

It is possible that the climb to the Fourka Pass resulted in the column of the Greek army stretching too much, as an effect leaving the cavalry too far in front when they reached the plain. The fact that similar events took place there is evidenced by the account of the retreat of the Greek army in 1897, in which we read that "*there was a long block by the springs at the beginning of the ascent of Phurka, caused by a string of 200 horses, which were being driven to Domokos as cavalry and artillerly remounts*." (Kinnaird Rose 1897: 255).

After descending from the pass to the plateau, the Greek cavalry at the front could have started too fast, leaving the column of infantrymen behind. The advance guard were likely the first to reach the area near Leonnatus's army, and the latter made an instant decision to

[60] Leake 1835, I: 459–461; Daux/de La Coste-Messelière 1924: 347–354; Bequingnon 1937: 278–282; Mottas/Decourt 1997: 335–336.

attack them. Leonnatus may have been persuaded to join the battle by the fact that only part of the Greek cavalry was at the front of the marching Greek column, which would have meant that the numbers on both sides were comparable. It seems that the rest of the cavalry was covering the rear of the marching unit. Such a formation was used by marching armies that expected attack on either flank; the best example was the March of Ten Thousand across Asia described by Xenophon and Agesialos's army marching across Thessaly. It seems that Antiphilos and Menon had reasons to leave part of the cavalry at the rear of their troops. We may deduce from Diodorus's description that Antipater did not leave Lamia immediately after the Greek forces withdrew, but after some time, most probably on the next day. Perhaps Antipater wanted to be certain that the Greek forces had really left and that his men would not become an easy target for the cavalry after they left the walls of Lamia. The Greek generals also must have realised that when Antipater understood the situation he could follow them, which he indeed did. In these circumstances it seems justified to leave part of the cavalry at the rear, to discourage Antipater from leaving the city at least until the main forces were at a safe distance.[61]

It may therefore be assumed that when Leonnatus started the battle, part of the Greek cavalry had not reached the battlefield yet. Leonnatus's cavalry could resist the enemy for a longer time and it was only the arrival of the remaining units that tipped the scale in favour of the Greeks. As a result Leonnatus's units were scattered and he was cut off on a wetland, which could have been the shore of Lake Xynias. Since Diodorus emphasises the bravery of the Thessalian cavalry, we may guess that they were the outpost of the Greek forces and took the main brunt of the fight with Leonnatus's cavalry on themselves. Tired by the march, the Macedonian infantry was not eager to fight and took up positions on the nearby hills, where the Thessalians tried in vain to attack them. The approaching Greek infantry apparently did not feel up to attacking the Macedonian positions either. In this situation the Greeks had no choice but to set up the *tropaion* and leave the battlefield, probably in the direction of Meliteia, where they had sent their baggage train. Remaining on the battlefield was dangerous, since they could expect Antipater to arrive at any moment. Indeed, Antipater reached the battlefield the next day. It may be guessed that he had set off from Lamia early in the morning, when he had made sure that the Greek units had left. In the afternoon he arrived in the area of Xynias, where the remnants of Leonnatus's army were waiting to see how the situation would unfold, not daring to leave their safe positions.

According to Diodorus, having joined Leonnatus's forces, Antipater set up joint camp, which means he probably stayed on the spot for the following night. His army, like the Greeks on this previous day, had covered about 30 kilometres and needed rest. He also had to think through the issue of his return to Macedonia. As Diodorus relays, he decided to retreat not across the plain but through the rough terrain, sending advance guards to take control of points of vantage. If Antipater was trying to avoid a plain, it must have been the southern part of the Thessaliotis plain, which could be seen from Thaumakoi. Like Brasidas and part of the Turkish army in 1897, he could have chosen one of the roads cutting across Mount Narthakion (Kassidiaris). Perhaps gorges and hills along this route where the points which he ordered his men to control. Antipater did not have to rush and he was looking not so much for the shortest road as for the safest one. If he headed to Karatsali (Karodzali) and Saterli, he reached Derengli near the place where the Enipeus, flowing down the mountains, turns west and onto the plateau. Several kilometres west of Pharsalus, he crossed the

[61] On the ancient road from Xyniai to Meliteia: Mottas/Decourt 1997: 335–336.

Enipeus and found himself on the slopes of the hills on which the defeated army of Pompey had been looking for shelter from Caesar's army. If he wanted to avoid the plain, he could not head north towards Larissa, but probably continued to march along the range of hills separating the Thessalian plains, like Brasidas marching towards Phakion and perhaps Pelinna. The road ran along the right bank of the Enipeus towards Sykeai, past Phylleion, and was relatively the safest due to the protection from the river and the hills. Between Phakion and Palaiopharsalos it could have overlapped with the part of Philip V's route in 198 which Livy described.[62] Marching down along the Enipeus, two days after leaving Thaumakoi the Macedonian army was able to reach the Peneios valley and Pelinna, which was the first friendly city. Following him into Thessaly was the army of the Greek coalition, which, however, was not taking any offensive actions.

Leonnatus's campaign lasted approximately a mere week and brought him neither fame nor power. Instead, the Thessalian cavalry earned another reason for respect, once again proving its skills and bravery, although the Greek alliance failed to strike the decisive blow against Antipater. From the point of view of Antipater, who was the initiator of this campaign after all, it played its role perhaps more than fully. Antipater was freed from the troublesome siege and regained his freedom of action with no further losses among his men; he also received considerable reinforcements of his troops in the form of Leonnatus's infantry units – without their commander, whose ambitions threatened his position in Macedonia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Badian, E. (1965): Orientals in Alexander's Army, *JHS* 85: 160–161.

Baker, P. (2000): La cause du conflit entre Mélitéa et Narthakion: une note à propos de *IG* IX 2, 89 [in:] L. Dubois & E. Masson (eds.), *Philokypros. Mélanges de philologie et d'antiquités grecques et proche-orientales dédiés à la mémoire d'Olivier Masson,* (*Suplementos à Minos* 16). Salamanca: 33–47.

Bar-Kochva B. (1976): *The Seleucid Army*, Cambridge.

Bartlett, E.A. (1897): *The Battlefields of Thessaly. With Personal Experiences in Turkey and Greece*. London.

Beloch, K.J. (1886): *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, Leipzig.

Beloch, K.J. (1923): *Griechische Geschichte*, vol. 3.2. Berlin–Leipzig.

Beloch, K.J. (1925): *Griechische Geschichte*, vol. 4.1. Berlin–Leipzig.

Bequignon, Y. (1937): *La Vallée du Spercheios des origines au IV^e^ siècle.* Paris.

Berve, H. (1926): *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, Bd. 1–2. München.

Billows, R.A. (1990): *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*. Berkeley, CA.

Blackwell, Ch.W. (1999): *In the Absence of Alexander: Harpalus and the Failure of Macedonian Authority*. New York.

Bosworth, A.B. (1971): Philip and upper Macedonia, CQ n.s. 21: 93–105.

[62] Liv. 32.13.5; Decourt 1990: 97–107.

Bosworth, A.B. (1986): Alexander the Great and the Decline of Macedon, *JHS* 106: 1–12.
Bosworth, A.B. (1988): *Conquest and Empire*: *The Reign of Alexander the Great.* Cambridge, New York.
Bosworth, A.B. (2002): *The Legacy of Alexander. Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors*. Oxford.
Brunt, P.A. (1963): Alexander's Macedonian Cavalry, *JHS* 83: 27–46.
Cantarelli, F. (1992): Tessaglia Meridionale. Ricerche storico-topografiche. Il primo ciclo delle indagini (1989–1991): I sistemi vari antichi, *Bolletino di Archeologia* 16–17–18: 303–328.
Carney, E.D. (2000): *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia.* Norman.
Carney, E.D. (2003): Women in Alexander's court [in:] J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*. Leiden: 227–252.
Cary, M. (1932): *A History of the Greek World 323–146 BC*. London.
Daux, G. & de La Coste-Messelière, P. (1924): De Malide en Thessalie, *BCH* 48: 343–376.
Decourt, J.-Cl. (1990): *La vallée de l'Énipeus en Thessalie. Études de topographie et de géographie antique* (BCH Supp. XXI). Paris.
Errington, R.M. (1970): From Babylon to Triparadeisos: 323–320, *JHS* 90: 49–77.
Geyer, F. (1925): Leonnatos (2), *RE* 12.2: 2035–2038.
Griffith, G.T. (1965): The Macedonian Background, *G&R*, 2nd Ser. 12.2: 125–139.
Habicht, Ch. (1997): *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Cambridge Mass., London.
Hamilton, J.R. (1969): *Plutarch, Alexander. A commentary*. Oxford.
Hammond, N.G.L. (1985): Some Macedonian Offices c. 336–309 BC, *JHS* 105: 156–160.
Hammond, N.G.L. (1989): Casualties and Reinforcements of Citizen Soldiers in Greece and Macedonia, *JHS* 109: 56–68.
Hammond, N.G.L. (1991): The Various Guards of Philip II and Alexander III, *Historia* 40: 396–418.
Hammond, N.G.L. & Walbank, F.W. (1988): *A History of Macedonia*, vol. III. Cambridge.
Heckel, W. (1978): Leonnatos, Polyperchon and the Introduction of Proskynesis, *AJPh* 99: 459–561.
Heckel, W. (1992): *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*. London.
Hyland, A. (2003): *The Horse in the Ancient World*. Stroud.
Kanatsulis, D. (1968): Antipatros als Feldherr und Staatsmann nach dem Tode Alexanders des Grossen, *Makedonika* 8: 123–184.
Kapetanopoulos, E. (1994): Sirras, *AncWorld* 25: 9–14.
Kinnaird Rose, W. (1897): *With the Greeks in Thessaly*. London.
Leake, W. (1835): *Travels in Northern Greece.* London.
Lucas, G. (1997): *Les cités antiques de la Haute Valée du Titarèse. Etude de topographie et de géographie historique.* Lyon.
Malinowski, G. (2007): *Agatarchides z Knidos, Dzieje*. Wrocław.
Marinovič, L.P. (1989): Les mercenaires de la guerre lamiaque, *DHA* 15.2: 97–105.
Morrison, J.S. (1987): Athenian Sea-Power in 323/2 B.C.: Dream and Reality, *JHS* 107: 88–97.
Mottas, F. & Decourt, J.-Cl. (1997): Voies et milliaires romains de Thessalie, *BCH* 121: 311–354.
Müller, D. (1987): *Topographischer Bildkommentar zu den Historien Herodotos'*, Bd. I: *Griechenland*. Tübingen.
Olbrycht, M. (2005): *Alexander Wielki i świat irański*. Rzeszów.
Philippson, A. (1950): *Die griechischen Landschaften*, Bd. I.1: *Thessalien und die Spercheios-Senke*. Frankfurt am Main.
Schaefer, A. (1858): *Demosthenes und seine Zeit,* Bd. 1–3. Leipzig.
Schäfer, H. (1886): *Der Lamische oder Hellenische Krieg*. Diss. Giessen.
Schipley, D.R. (1997): *Plutarch's Life of Agesilaos. Response to Sources in the*

Presentation of Character. Oxford.
Schmitt, O. (1992): *Der Lamische Krieg*. Bonn.
Sidnell, P. (2007): *Warhorse: Cavalry in Ancient World*. London.
Sprawski, S. (1999): *Jason of Pherae. A Study of History of Thessaly in the Years 431–370 BC.* (Electrum 3). Kraków.
Stählin, F. (1924): *Das hellenische Thessalien*. Stuttgart.
Tziaphalias, A. (1992): Archaia Pelinna, *Trikalina* 12: 87–138.
Wałek, T. (1924): Les opérations navales pendant la guerre lamiaque, *RPh* 48: 23–30.
Westlake, H.D. (1935): Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C. London.