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A
crypto
cal and forged documents played a role in the world histo-
ry. The Letter of prester John encouraged European explorers, treasure
hunters and missionaries to search for John's marvellous kingdom; the
Protocols of the Elders of Zion have been still inflaming anti-Semitic minds;
the domination of pope had been underpinned by the Donatio Constantini. Per libe-
ter homines id, quod volunt, credunt. The aim of this contribution is to analyse
how one of such documents, called usually Privilegium Slavicum, functioned and
found its way into 17th-century record books of Lublin gród. It is also a study
on usage and poten-tial of common ancient heritage, so often exploited to prove
ones rights, justify deeds and claims.

The Lublin version of Privilegium Slavicum was inserted into one of the record books
(closed in 1629 — it is terminus post quem) of local gród, a court for the contempler
gentry. The inscription, together with an oblatum formula, runs as follows
(division into paragraphs according to Pflister):

Oblatua Privilegij D(onum)norum Sclavorum Ad Officium et Acta pra(e)mnia Capi-
(tu)ea Castra(s)ia Lublinensis(item) p(ersonalit)ie veniens n(obis)lis Maximnus
Janusculus Suchodolec famulus G(eneris)ei Stanislae Lubieniecki n(min)is to	us no-
bi(litatis) scalo

cium et obu(t)

texhibit offic(i)ae pra(e)nomii privilegium inscriptum, illustri prosor
to et lingua D(onum)norum Sclavorum per Alexander Regem sibi)

datum, petens hoc ideum privilegium perpetuum memoriae gratia(m)ae inacta in
acta nostra permodum oblatae suscepti, culis affectationi nos anno(m)undo, priv
e(legium) hoccase de verbo ad verbum hic insert mandavimus in eum sequitur modum (§)

NOS ALEXANDER PHILIPHI Regis Macedoniis Hyeres Filii Monarcha figuratus. Graecorum
Imperij Inchoatoris magni DEI Iovis Filiius Natchonum nuncius Alcutiis, Bragantium
et Armenia Solis et Lunea conciliarius Dominus mundi ad artu Solis isque(ou) ad
occidentem a Meridiae usque(ou) ad Septentrionem (§) Illustri prosopae et linguae
Dominorum Sclavorum gratiam et pacem a nobis succcssoribusque nostris. (§)

Quoniam adhaeris nobis semper in fide veraces, et armis strenues, coadae
bello
cosi et Robusti, duos(ou) et consensus Vobis libere, et in perpetuum Totam plagum

1 Coes., BG. 3.18.
2 Pflister 1961.
3 Original: canceled.
to insight into the cultural role played by antiquity in the 17th century Renaissance.

Friedrich Pflister knew four Latin manuscript versions10 of the Privilegium, and makes the Lublin text the fifth one. Four of them were written in 17th century; and the oldest one in 1516. Printed version are more numerous.11 The narration of the Privilegium is more or less stable, and there are not too many differences between extant specimens, handwritten or printed. The copies are distinguished usually by different stylizations of Alexander's titulature, list of witnesses and datation.

The titulature of Alexander in the Latin Privilegium is very simplified and developed. Nos Alexander Philippus regis Macedonum is common among Latin versions, only Sarnicki omitted regis. More important is hyeres, monarca figuratus - Pflister's standard version of redaction I prefers hicurus monarcae figuratus, other, like manuscript B and C, Cylieus and Sarnicki have archos - just Paprocki (and his follower Balbus) share this phrase with Lublin clerks. Graecorum imperii inducator is again to be found in the Pflister's standard I. Magni dei lovis filius is also common with slight differences - summi (Paprocki), summi dei (Balbus), magni lovis (Sarnicki).

Narctubon nuncius Allector, Bragmundoarum et Arabum, Solis et Lunae conciliator is interesting, because it is an echo of the Alexander romance. Narctubon is a corrupted version of name Nectanebo - Nectanebo II, Egyptian pharaoh, legendary father of the greatest king of Macedonia. Nectanebo also foreseen Alexander's successes and rule.11 This connection has historical basis. It is probable that the Egyptians created an ideological interpretation of Macedonian conquest giving Alexander a native origin, even before the Ptolemies (the same happened later in Persia) - just like they had already done earlier with Cambyses. Another thing is, that probably Alexander's body had been temporarily deposited in Nectanebo's sarcophagus.12 The Lublin clerks had not known the Romance -

10 Pflister 323-324.
11 Here for the sake of comparison are used the ones given by Pflister and Paprocki's, cf. Paprocki 1965; 6. Nos Alexander Philippus regis Macedonum haeres, Monarcha figuratus per Nectanebnum annucentus, Surni Dei lovis filius, allocutor Brachmanorum, Solis & Lunae conciliator, a Solis ortu ad Occasum, a Sopertrione ad meridem Dominum, Illustri prosopie ac Linguarum Masionisque saeclum. Qui nobis semper in fide verax, in Armis strenuus, nostris militiae ac solius consilio robustissimi fidelis, domini vobis haec testamentel vocatur, aut Aquilone vobis) ad partem Italiae Meridionalis, ut nullus alius sit ishke manere aut Se locare nisi vestrae, & quicunque alius inuentum fuerit, ille manesc sit Serua vestra, & eis postea vestro rustro & postea rustro rustro rustro rustro rustro rustro rustro rustro.
12 Secomska 1977, 139-140, Nawrotka 2005, 23.
13 See Maczuk 1999.
they had no idea who Nectanebo was, what was his role in Alexander's life and deeds. This is why they recognized "Nectanebo" as another title — Nectanebo nuncius. The same happened with allocutor Bramundorum & Arabum. It is next distortion. The proper wording should be allocutor Brahmanorum, interlocutor of the brahmans. The clerks had not heard about Indian philosophers and their contacts with the Macedonians, so they came to a conclusion, that Alexander had a conversation with a certain Bramundus. The King dealt with the Arabs (he planned to conquer them), but they had not been partners in debates. The clerks here, as Cylenius and Sarnicki earlier, made an mistake. According to the Romance Alexander had an opportunity to talk to the trees of Sun and Moon. Unaware of this, this clerks matched the original arborum with more familiar Arabum — at least man, even king, cannot talk to trees. Paprocki was even more correct — he excised this mention at all.

This mistaken lection led to another variations. Original and proper allocutor arborum Solis and Lunae was contaminated into Solis et Lunae conciliator (Paprocki: conciliator). It is a distorted reading of next phrase: conciliator Persorum et Medorum (Sarnicki has here Persorum ac Medorum domum). What is obvious is that it is Rublin clerks were not attuned to the Romance and even to any correct version of the Privilegium.

The same conclusion can be reached when analysing closing formulas. The place where document was drawn up is Alexandria, civitas nova fandationis superst magno fluvio Aegipti Nill, and it took place during the 12th year of Alexander's rule, with help from gods (Liblin redaction has aspirantibus instead of more common arrenditibus, but the meaning is the same) — and all specimens are more or less unanimous. Serious differences between extant versions are to be found within the list of witnesses. The standard redaction I mentioned Antiochus logotheta noster, and not named eleven principes and heirs. Lublin Lecata is one of damaged sections of Antiochus logotheta (logotheta — Lecata).

Lublin clerks used a Latin version of the Privilegium. All the mistakes made by them resulted from lack of any knowledge about Alexander's fantastic adventures described in the Romance, and distortions committed while copying the document. But they tried to give this exotic (for them) text some logic. This is why they amended it according to the information they had and grammar. In fact such manoeuvres with the Privilegium were not seldom. Paprocki, Cylenius and Sarnicki also deformed the wording. What can be deduced from differences within Lublin redaction of the Privilegium is that its authors used a handwritten copy based on or close to Paprocki's version. Some blurred lessons can be explained by mistaken reading of handwriting.

It is reasonable that the clerks were conscious what was the meaning of the document they decided to exploit. The oldest extant copies of the Privilegium come from 15th century Bohemia and were recorded in Czech. In this country legends about Alexander had been in circulation from at least 13th century. Modern scholars usually stress the anti-Germanic message of these tales and close relation to the international plans of the Pammulian dynasty. In the end of the 14th century appeared first known mentions about the Privilegium. According to Albert Prazek in 1396 Przemysl, abbott of famous Emaus monastery in Prague, introduced into record-books of the cloister text of the Privilegium. In the next century there is possible that more Latin and Czech versions circulated. All were connected with the Hussite movement. First printed Czech version published in 1541 Ladislav Hajek (1553) in his chronicle.

The Privilegium had not been created by Bohemian intellectuals. The most probable source used by them was located somewhere in Croatia. It is possible that the Privilegium is an invention of the Balkan region. The Emaus monastery was founded by Charles IV in 1347 and he settled there monks from Croatia or modern Slovenia. They could bring the Privilegium with them. There are some hints in extant evidence that suggest such lineage.

Polish authors of the second half of the 16th century were absolutely convinced that the original privilege had been kept in Constantinople. It was a marvellous document, written with golden ink, that survived the fall of the city and as booty it found its way into sultans' archives. They were also aware of a fact that two versions of this document existed: Czech and Croatian (or Bulgarian).
These two versions suit ways through the Poles learned about the Privilegium. First of them, and the oldest, leads to early modern Bohemia. The Hussites had close connections with the Polish Jagiellonian court and bold plans on Polish-Czech-Lithuanian commonwealth. This political visions had historical — ideological underpinning — the Privilegium. Some scholars asserts, that the document had a great impact on Polish ideology of the 15th century, but it was more important for the Czech than the Poles.

It is reasonable to understand the Privilegium as an ideological weapon against foreign expansion. This is the most important purpose of this apocrypha. Simultaneously it played a prestigious role. The document introduced the Slavs into the world history and connected them with the most noble events from the antiquity. It also had a slight theological context — Alexander imprisoned the people of Gog and Magog in some barren and rocky land, so his donation to the Slavs could be seen as a positive counterpart of this step. Tracing origin into antiquity in Poland gained the shape of sarmatism, in the Balcan area — illusism. The Slavs from Croatia, Serbia and Slovenia also used their version of the Privilegium (Ilyrian).

As was mentioned above the Balcan are the most probable home of the document. Modern scholars usually connect Balcan Privilegium with anti-Turkish resistance. It is true especially for the later periods, but one cannot forget about Venetian expansion in Croatia and Slovenia. The document had been composed when reminiscences of Byzantine empires writings had been still alive. Most of our sources mentioned the Greek version of this Privilegium; remark about λογοθέτης (logotheta) is also thought-provoking (so far no one tried to compare the Privilegium with Byzantine imperial diplomas). At least in the second half of the 14th century, brought by Croatian monks, the document found its way to Bohemia. It is just one probability. The Czech kings Premysl Ottokar II and Wenceslas II were very interested in Alexander's history. The latter also had Slavic monks in his court that could eased reception of Byzantine chancellery habits and Greek text about the king's hero.

In the 15th century the Privilegium had already been inculcated into Czech tradition. Italian commentators of this fact never discussed its ideological or propagandistic aims — they were indignant at a certain point: ancient origin of the Czechs. Most probably the Italians had already been acquainted with this document through their contacts with the Croatian and the Slovenians. All manuscripts with handwritten copies of the Croatian and the Slovenians. All manuscripts with handwritten copies of the Privilegium have some Italian (or even north-Italian) links. In a book published in 1584 Slovenian Adam Bohorič wrote that his compatriot Sigmund von Herberstein (†1566) was a discoverer of the document. Herberstein was a Habsburg diplomat, explorer, and historian, who boasted about founding Alexander's altar. Pfister believed Bohorič, but closer insight at the evidence undermines this claim.

In the end of the 15th century Slavic pretensions to be of ancient descend had been widely known. The Privilegium played within justifications of this view a minor role. Poles knew it from Bohemian sources. A Polish translation published Maciej Bielski in his Kronika (printed in 1551, 1554, 1564); in 1602 Latin version based on Greek evidence Bartosz Paprocki — in the same period (1559) a certain Greek active in Italy, Domenico Cilenei (Cyllenus) published an "Ilyrian" copy. His redaction was reprinted with some changes by Stanisław Sarnicki in 1587. The Privilegium was not unfamiliar to Marcin Kromer, Stanisław Orzechowski, Stanisław Strzygowski, Aleksander Gwaglin and others. Paprocki and Orzechowski knew only about specimens from old Bohemian chronicles. Strzygowski and Sarnicki besides the ones known to last two writers had also information about Croatian and Bulgarian ("Ilyrian") redactions, kept in the
sultan's archives in Constantinople. For Sarnicki southern specimen was less reliable (huius exemplum inferius a me subicietur). There is also a hint about a copy from a monastery near Cracow. That means that the reception of the Privilegium in Poland is more complex than it has been proposed in scientific literature. The Lublin specimen is another proof of this. What is even more important — the research concentrated on 15th century, and treated the 17th century rather marginally.

What is sure: the document had been copied, while rewriting mistakes were made. Among the educated classes and political elites it gained same interests but together with criticism. Not only Italians were sceptical — the Polish intellectuals as well, for example Kromer or Jan Kochanowski. This doubt was not connected with a criticism of sarmatism. Ancient origin of Polish gentry did not need Privilegium's help. More important were Greek and Roman historians — reliable sources. It must be also noticed that from the 12th century on Alexander and his adventures became popular among educated classes of Rzeczpospolita, and even among the middle gentry. Alexander's theme was also used to describe victorious kings (but as a king he was not a good model to be followed). This sheds light on methods of using and evaluating of ancient sources.

It can be resumed that in Rzeczpospolita at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries Alexander's privilege was not regarded as a reliable document. The current Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth was not threatened by any external and hostile migration that could deprive the gentry of their position. This fact tells something about motives which directed Lublin clerks' deeds.

They knew that the Privilegium is a forgery. It seems that they thought that only a credulous and uncritical mind could claim Alexander the Great really donated the Slavs any land. And this was the sense of their joke. The oblatum formula mentioned two men: Maximinus Ianuarius Suchodolec and Stanisław Lubieniecki. Suchodolec (Suchodolek) and Lubieniecki are renown families of the Lublin region in the 16th and 17th centuries. Both were connected with arianism. Stanisław Lubieniecki can be identified with an arian minister, publicist and writer Stanisław Lubieniecki, who died in 1653 — this date can serve as terminus ante quem of the inscription. Lubieniecki family closely cooperated with the Suchodolek family. Andrzej Lubieniecki, author of Poloneutychia, a treatise on toleration in Rzecz-

An Unknown Version of Privilegium Slavicum

Polska (or rather its lack) died in a village owned by Suchodolek family. In Poloneutychia he showed a great knowledge of ancient history.

If this identification is correct, the inscription was aimed to ridicule and show arian stupidity or simple-mindedness. The arians were favourite subject of clerks' jokes and puns introduced into the Lublin record-books. To intensify a comic effect of their inscription they gave it all necessary official formulas and seriousness — such recorded document, thanks to these official requirements, could be even extracted. Of course only by a not necessarily wise arian.

Alexander's privilege is a good example of biased use of ancient history. The Czechs, Croats or Poles had been not exceptional here. According to another legendary tales, the great Macedonian donated England to his companion Perceforest, and Scotland to his brother Gadieler. Reception of such stories is a method of including of antiquity into contemporary cultures. It is a very interesting phenomenon worth deeper analyses — just like the Privilegium itself. The Lublin copy indicates, that there were more areas where this apocrypha circulated. Privilegium Slavicum still needs a thorough-going study.
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FOUNDDING OF ALEXANDRIA AS THE EXAMPLE OF MULTICULTURAL POLITICS OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT

Maciej Milczanowski

Alexander the Great during his conquests presented not only military genius or propaganda brilliance, but also widely disputed intercultural awareness. Naturally, his expedition had its ups and downs in this field, but there is ample evidence that his policy was in large extent well thought out. Moreover, it gave the first set of effects, when his empire started to function quite well, just after his return from Gedrosia desert to Babylon before his death. The aim of this paper is to show one of the examples of building multicultural society in his empire, which is founding of Alexandria in Egypt. His stay in Egypt gave exemplification of such a process and Alexandria was the final act focusing his efforts to construct a stable society. It is exceptional as it gives ample examples precisely illustrating his actions as the well organized process toward combining different kind of cultures, believes or traditions into one empire which would be acceptable for most of people living in it. In this paper Alexander’s stay in Egypt is only a background for presenting the founding of Alexandria as the essential aspect of his efforts to build a multicultural society, but all his actions in Egypt are worth more detailed studies in the context of multiculturalism. This topic is especially intriguing today when one of the largest concerns is how to build societies following waves of immigrations to Europe and the USA. Sadly, huge discussion concerning this topic these days often doesn’t seem to be using the knowledge of ancient historians. Conclusions of their scholarly researches should not only be a subject of historical discussions but also the basis for analysis of people constructing multicultural policies and security systems.

Triumphal entrance of Alexander the Great into Egypt, as a liberator from the tyranny of Persians, was a great propaganda motive for the Macedonian king. Egypt was always very special from many reasons, all of which were crucial in this case. Firstly, from pragmatic perspective, Egypt was rich in food. Secondly, there was a significant military aspect for his conquest — cutting the Persian fleet off from the shores around the Mediterranean Sea. Another equally important as the previous motive was propaganda. He was welcomed as a true rescuer from