



<https://publications.dainst.org>

---

# iDAI.publications

---

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

A. B. Bosworth

## Philip III Arrhidaeus and the Chronology of the Successors

aus / from

### Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **22 • 1992**

Seite / Page **55–82**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1093/5460> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1992-22-p55-82-v5460.2

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

**©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://dainst.org)

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

A. B. BOSWORTH

## Philip III Arrhidaeus and the Chronology of the Successors

Few chronological problems are more vexed than those of the early years of the Successors.<sup>1</sup> A wealth of factual detail is anchored around depressingly few fixed points, and often the narrative of events in three or even four discrete spheres of operation needs to be correlated. Dated records do exist, notably chronicles, king lists, astronomical diaries and contemporary documents from Babylonia, but their content is often obscure, the text defective and the date of redaction far from certain. In the confusion a nodal point is the succession crisis in Macedonia, which brought in rapid sequence the death of Philip III and his consort, Eurydice, at the hands of Olympias, the defeat of Olympias herself by Cassander, and Cassander's own installation as ruler of Macedon. Simultaneously with these events Antigonus and his allies were fighting their epic campaign against Eumenes and the satraps of

---

<sup>1</sup> The classic discussion is that by K. J. BELOCH, *Griechische Geschichte* IV<sup>2</sup> 2, 1927, who argued strongly for the high chronology. Twenty years later the evidence was reviewed by EUGENIO MANNI, who defended the low chronology on the basis of the Babylonian chronicle and the Parian Marble: *Tre noti di cronologia ellenistica*, *RAL* (Ser. 8) 4, 1949, 53–85, esp. 53–8 (see also: Demetrio Poliorcete, 1951, 67–81). MANNI's chronology was embodied in the detailed political analysis of the period by his pupil, M. J. FONTANA: *Le lotte per la successione di Alessandro Magno dal 323 al 315*, *Atti della accademia di sc., lett. e arti di Palermo*, Ser. 4, 18, 1957/8, 103–333, and it was restated with modifications some years later by E. BACIGALUPO PAREO, *Sulla cronologia di Diodoro XVIII–XIX.1–50*, *MIL* 35/3, 1975, 192–213. The most powerful and influential exposition of the low chronology came in two articles by R. M. ERRINGTON: *From Babylon to Triparadeisus: 323–320 B. C.*, *JHS* 90, 1970, 49–77, esp. 75–7; *Diodorus Siculus and the chronology of the early Diadochoi 320–311 B. C.*, *Hermes* 105, 1977, 478–504. Most recently the low chronology has been defended by LUDWIG SCHÖBER in his excellent dissertation: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Babyloniens und der Oberen Satrapien von 323–303 v. Chr.*, 1981, esp. 46–73. His arguments are refined and developed in a long article co-authored by BRIGITTE GULLATH: B. GULLATH – L. SCHÖBER, *Zur Chronologie der frühen Diadochenzeit: die Jahre 320 bis 315 v. Chr.*, in: H. KALCYK – B. GULLATH – A. GRAEBER edd., *Studien zur Alten Geschichte. Siegfried Lauffer zum 70. Geburtstag ... dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*, 1986, i. 331–78. The low chronology has not gone unchallenged (see P. BRIANT, *Antigone le Borgne*, 1973, 216–21; H. HAUBEN, *The first war of the Successors: chronological and historical problems*, *AncSoc* 8, 1977, 85–120, esp. 86–7, 96–9), but dissenters are in the minority. This present article is a continuation of the arguments expounded in a recent paper: *History and artifice in Plutarch's Eumenes*, in: P. A. STADTER ed., *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*, 1992, 56–89.

the Iranian plateau. Olympias was under siege at Pydna at the same time that Eumenes was defeated in Gabiene,<sup>2</sup> and both events are explicitly dated to the winter.<sup>3</sup> In that there is agreement. Unfortunately there is intense debate whether the winter was that of 317/16 B. C. or that of 316/15 B. C. In recent years the lower date has been strongly favoured, and, now that it has been built into RICHARD BILLOWS' monograph on Antigonus Monophthalmus,<sup>4</sup> it could easily become canonical. But the issues are of fundamental importance and go far beyond chronology itself. A re-examination of the problem is certainly not supererogatory, and new perspectives may well accrue.

### *I. Philip's Regnal Years in Babylon*

One fixed point is the death of Philip III Arrhidaeus. According to Diodorus (19.11.5) he was murdered on Olympias' instructions after a reign of six years and four months. That is a precise statement, embedded in the historical narrative, and there is no doubt that it comes from his source, the contemporary Hieronymus of Cardia. If the calculation is taken from the death of Alexander (10 June 323 B. C.), Philip's murder may be dated to the middle of October 317. It may be placed a few weeks later if Hieronymus was calculating from the reconciliation between Perdicas and the Macedonian infantry, when the shape of the succession was finally ratified;<sup>5</sup> but November 317 seems the latest possible date. That is what emerges from the abbreviated account of Justin, who also notes the period of rule at the time of the murder but rounds it off to six years (*sex annis post Alexandrum potitus regno*).<sup>6</sup> Later chronographers, notably Porphyry, rounded up the reign to seven years but placed Philip's death in the Olympic year 317/16.<sup>7</sup> So far there is agreement.

<sup>2</sup> Diod. 19.50.8, 52.4.

<sup>3</sup> Diod. 19.34.5, 37.3, 44.4 (Eumenes); 19.50.1 (Olympias).

<sup>4</sup> R. A. BILLOWS, *Antigonus the One Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, 1990, esp. 60 with note, 86–105. BILLOWS has some refinements of his own, notably a late dating for Demetrius' campaign in Babylonia (141–3), but for the period covered in this article he is largely in agreement with ERRINGTON (see, however, n. 79 below). That seems to be the recent consensus. An authoritative statement by E. BADIAN has it that the compressed high chronology «has been decisively refuted» (Two postscripts on the marriage of Phila and Balacrus, ZPE 73, 1988, 118).

<sup>5</sup> Justin 13.4.2–3; Curt. 10.8.23; Diod. 18.2.4; Arr. Succ. F 1.3 ROOS; cf. ERRINGTON, JHS 90, 1970, 54.

<sup>6</sup> Justin 14.5.10. The context is the same as in Diodorus and probably derives (at several removes) from Hieronymus.

<sup>7</sup> Porphyry, FGrH 260 F 3(2). Interestingly the immediate source, the Armenian version of Eusebius' Chronicle, gives Philip eight regnal years, which is inconsistent with the Olympic date which follows. The other Greek derivatives read seven, as indeed does an earlier excerpt of Porphyry (FGrH 260 F 2[1] – dealing with the sequence of Egyptian rulers). There is no doubt about the correction, but the error is interesting. Was Porphyry aware of the early Babylonian dating of Philip's reign (see below)? If so, he could have noted it as a variant.

A similar picture emerges from the king lists compiled in Egypt and Babylonia. For Egypt the Ptolemaic Canon gives Philip seven full years, down to November 317, when the reign of Alexander IV begins.<sup>8</sup> From Babylonia two separate king lists, the so-called «Saros Canon» and a much shorter king list from Uruk, give Philip six years, followed by six years for Antigonos and thirty one for Seleucus Nicator.<sup>9</sup> Philip's reign is taken from the Babylonian year in which he inaugurated his rule, i. e. from 1 Nisanu (April 15) 323,<sup>10</sup> and concludes at the end of the last full year of his kingship, the final day of Addaru 317. His death therefore came in the Babylonian year which began in April 317. Thus far matters are deceptively simple. Complications arise from the political confusion in Babylon which is reflected in contemporary documents. The astronomical diaries are explicit about the first two regnal years of Philip. His first year is 323/22, in which Alexander's death is recorded, on 29 Aiaru (10 June); and the second year duly follows in 322/21.<sup>11</sup> The next dated astronomical tablets come from the reign of Alexander IV, whose seventh year is 310/09 and eighth 309/08.<sup>12</sup> In other words his accession year is 316/15, a full year after his predecessor's last regnal year. But there need be no contradiction. As we shall see (below p.65), at least one dating system in Babylonia gave Antigonos one regnal year more than Alexander IV and allowed for a year of sole rule by Antigonos, «the leader of the armies», before the accession year of Alexander's son. As yet there is no contradiction of the general picture that for dating purposes Philip's reign ended in Babylon in April 317. His death proper occurred in the following year.

More intractable is a number of apparently contemporary tablets, mostly of routine economic transactions, which give dates in the seventh and eighth regnal years of Philip. One tablet is dated to 20 Abu of Philip's eighth year (August 316) and another, recently reported, is as late as 18 Tashritu (October 316).<sup>13</sup> Now it might be

<sup>8</sup> The discussion by Ed. MEYER, *Forschungen zur Alten Geschichte* II, 1899, 453–60, is still valuable (with its comparative table at p. 457), even though the mass of evidence has substantially accrued since he wrote. For the Ptolemaic canon see the succinct edition in C. WACHSMUTH, *Einleitung in das Studium der Alten Geschichte*, 1895, 305–6.

<sup>9</sup> Most conveniently discussed by F. JOANNES, *Les successeurs d'Alexandre le Grand en Babylonie*, *Anatolica* 7, 1979/80, 99–115, esp. 100–1. For a text and translation of the Uruk king list (W 20030, 105) see A. K. GRAYSON in *Reallexikon der Assyrologie* VI, 1980–3, 97–8, and for the Saros Canon J. EPPING – J. N. STRASSMAIER, *Der Saros-Canon der Babylonier*, *ZA* 8, 1893, 149–78, esp. 170–1.

<sup>10</sup> For the calendric equivalences see R. A. PARKER – W. DUBBERSTEIN, *Babylonian Chronology* 626 B. C. – A. D. 75, <sup>3</sup>1956.

<sup>11</sup> Now most conveniently consulted in A. SACHS – H. HUNGER, *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia. I. Diaries from 652 B. C. to 262 B. C.*, 1988, 204–19 (Nos. –322 and –321: years 1 and 2 of Philip).

<sup>12</sup> SACHS – HUNGER 228–39 (Nos. –309 and –308).

<sup>13</sup> G. CONTENAU, *Contrats néo-babyloniens*, 1927, 249. The tablet dated to 18 Tashritu (BM 79 012) is not yet published but is reported by E. VARINLIOĞLU – A. BRESSON – P. BRUN –

argued that these tablets are postdated; when they were produced, the news of Philip's death had not penetrated into Babylonia.<sup>14</sup> That is theoretically possible. There is a famous parallel in the death of Seleucus Nicator. That dynast died in Thrace in August or September 281; yet a text from Uruk of December 1/2 of that year still dates by the co-regency of Seleucus and Antiochus.<sup>15</sup> Three months is a long but credible interval. In Egypt for instance the death of Philip III was known and acknowledged by the beginning of 316; the last document of Philip is dated 9 January and the first extant dating by Alexander IV is 10 April.<sup>16</sup> But in the case of Babylon we must allow for a full year before the reality of Philip's death was acknowledged on contemporary documents. That is difficult to swallow. It is possible, and perhaps more likely, that Babylonian scribes continued to date by Philip's reign even after his death was officially known, preferring to wait until the dynastic chaos had subsided before accepting any new ruler.<sup>17</sup> That might explain the continuation of Philip's regnal years upon contemporary documents, but it would be difficult if subsequent records persisted in ignoring the actual date of Philip's death.

The paradox of a dating by non-existent regnal years emerges starkly in the so-called «Chronicle of the Successors». This famous text, first published in 1924 by SIDNEY SMITH, comprises three fragments of a year by year chronicle of events in Babylon.<sup>18</sup> The first segment deals with Philip's reign and contains headings for years five, six and seven. There is also a heading for year eight; the numeral is lost but the regnal name (*Pi]-lip-i-si*) is unambiguous. In other words, if the author of the chronicle took 323/22 to be the accession year of Philip, he continued the reign into an eighth year, beginning 1 Nisanu 316, six clear months after Philip's actual death. This is not a contemporary mistake, for the chronicle was compiled no earlier than the last decade of the fourth century, and the extant text deals with events as late as the ninth year of Alexander IV (308/07). One would have to assume that for reasons of his own the chronicler retained an anachronistic dating system,

---

P. DEBORD – R. DESCAT, Une inscription de Pladasa en Carie, REA 92, 1990, 59–78, esp. 73 n. 50. For a useful compendium of tablets and regnal years see JOANNES (above n. 9) 102–3.

<sup>14</sup> So (e.g.) ERRINGTON, *Hermes* 105, 1977, 482–3; JOANNES 106.

<sup>15</sup> The date of Seleucus' death was unimpeachably fixed by the famous king list published by A. J. SACHS – D. J. WISEMAN, A Babylonian king list of the Hellenistic period, *Iraq* 16, 1954, 202–12 (also edited and translated by GRAYSON [above n. 9] 98–100). The text from Uruk (dated 10/IX/31 S.E.) was previously considered a decisive terminus post quem (cf. BELOCH [above n. 1] IV<sup>2</sup> 2, 108–9).

<sup>16</sup> T. C. SKEAT, *The Reigns of the Ptolemies*, 1954, 27–8.

<sup>17</sup> So (e.g.) J. OELSNER, *Keilschriftliche Beiträge zur politischen Geschichte Babylonien in den ersten Jahrzehnten der griechischen Herrschaft*, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 1, 1974, 129–51, esp. 141; VARINLIOĞLU et al. (above n. 13) 73; GULLATH – SCHÖBER (above n. 1) 338.

<sup>18</sup> S. SMITH, *Babylonian Historical Texts*, 1924, 124–49. His text is now obsolete, thanks to the fundamental re-edition by A. K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 1975, *Chronicle* 10, 115–19. For historical commentary see SCHÖBER (above n. 1) 46–51, 71–2, 106–23.

perhaps copying contemporary notes which began year eight of Philip before Philip's death was reported. On this interpretation the Babylonian chronicle continued Philip's reign into 316/15, and the corollary is a low chronology for the entire period. Perdiccas' fatal Egyptian campaign, dated by the chronicle to the summer of Philip's fourth year,<sup>19</sup> must fall in 320; and the campaign between Eumenes and Antigonus, which seems the subject of notes in years seven and eight, must culminate in the winter of 316/15.

But within this scheme there is a serious inconsistency. In year five of Philip, so the chronicle notes, the king and Antipater crossed to Macedon and did not return. The text is defective, but the sense is quite certain.<sup>20</sup> The context is clearly the end of winter 320/19, when Antipater returned to Macedon with the Argead royalty, leaving Antigonus in charge of the subsequent campaigning. He crossed the Hellespont in the first months of the Julian year 320. That is a necessary assumption if Antigonus' actions against Eumenes and Alcetas are to be fitted into the campaign year. The operations against Eumenes involved a push from Phrygia into Cappadocia, at least two major battles, and the opening of the siege of Nora, hardly later than midsummer 319.<sup>21</sup> Then came Antigonus' lightning march from Cappadocia to Pisidia, his crushing defeat of the Perdiccan forces and the siege of Termessus.<sup>22</sup> It was only when he returned to his headquarters at Cretopolis that he learned of the death of Antipater, which took place in the late summer or early autumn of 319.<sup>23</sup> The inevitable consequence is that Antipater left Asia Minor and crossed into

---

<sup>19</sup> «The month Iyyar the king did battle with the satrap of Egypt . . . king's troops put king's troops to the sword . . .» (BM 34 660 obv. 4–5 = GRAYSON 115). The text only dates the beginning of the campaign; there is no suggestion, as SMITH's translation indicated, that Aiaru (Iyyar) was the month of Perdiccas' death. Nor is the regnal year absolutely certain. The heading is lost; and, although the next year is Philip's fifth, it is not impossible that a year has been omitted from the record. In that case the invasion of Egypt took place in Philip's third year (so E. CAVAIGNAC, *RA* 23, 1926, 5 and OELSNER [above n. 17] 133). The hypothesis has some attractions, making the gap between Perdiccas' death and Antipater's crossing to Europe a little more comfortable. But in a period as eventful as this it is somewhat implausible that an entire year would have been passed over without record.

<sup>20</sup> BM 34 660 obv. 7–8 = GRAYSON 116. There is a reference to the king and to Antigonus and then a statement that somebody «crossed to Macedon and did not return». That can only refer to Antipater's crossing of the Hellespont with both the kings in his entourage (*Arr. Succ.* F 1.44–5).

<sup>21</sup> For the spring campaign of 319 see *Plut. Eum.* 9–10.1; *Diod.* 18.40 with my discussion (above n. 1), 78–9. The siege of Nora, which *Diod.* 18.53.5 claims lasted a year, ended in spring 318 (*Nepos Eum.* 5.7; see below nn. 58–9).

<sup>22</sup> *Diod.* 18.44.1–47.3. Antigonus' movements were rapid: an initial forced march of seven days and nights took him from Cappadocia to Cretopolis (44.2) and even the siege of Termessus was relatively soon terminated (46.4–7). But the entire campaign was eventful (cf. *BILLOWS* [above n. 4] 77–80) and should be numbered in months rather than weeks.

<sup>23</sup> *Diod.* 18.47.4 (news of Antipater's death). A terminus for Antipater's death is provided by the movements of Demades, who was executed in Macedonia while Antipater was in the

Macedon immediately after his unsuccessful winter campaign against Eumenes. In other words the crossing came in the Babylonian year 320/19. It can hardly be delayed until the following year, which began in April 319. Antipater, we may assume, crossed to Macedon towards the end of the Babylonian year 320/19, which must therefore be the fifth of Philip. That would place the Egyptian campaign and with it the death of Perdiccas in the previous Babylonian year, 321/20.

One might attempt to evade this conclusion by arguing for some inaccuracy, or inexactitude in the chronicle. It does not give a specific date for the crossing but refers vaguely to an «unknown month». That might reflect a genuine uncertainty in Babylonia. The news of Antipater's return to Europe will have taken some time to filter through to Mesopotamia and it may not have reached Babylon before the beginning of the official year 319/18. Hence it could have been entered in the chronicle in the wrong regnal year. In that case the fifth year of Philip might still be 319/18. But now the difficulties are historical. If Perdiccas' death is assigned to the summer of 320 and Antipater's crossing comes at the end of winter 320/19, then the chronology is impossibly compressed. As I have argued elsewhere, a year must elapse between the conference at Triparadeisus and the winter campaign of 320/19 against Eumenes.<sup>24</sup> Antipater and Antigonus needed to take their armies from northern Syria to the coast of Asia Minor, where they had a heated interview with Alexander's sister, Cleopatra, at Sardes and then moved up country to begin hostilities in Phrygia, where Eumenes established his winter headquarters at Celaenae.<sup>25</sup> There had obviously been active campaigning before winter set in, and there is no time for it on the conventional chronology, which places the Triparadeisus conference in the late summer or early autumn and has Eumenes in conflict with Antipater and Antigonus immediately afterwards. It is much more likely that the conference and its aftermath took several months (autumn to winter 321) and that Antipater began his march westward in the spring of 320, reaching the coast of Asia Minor in the summer and beginning operations against Eumenes in the autumn. That fits in with the attested actions of Perdiccas' admiral, Attalus, who was apparently in Tyre at the time of Triparadeisus, after which he moved to Caria and fought a campaign off the Rhodian *peraia*.<sup>26</sup> It was only then that he joined Alceas' forces in Pisidia, where he is attested in winter 320/19. One of his companions

---

throes of his last illness (Diod. 18.48.1–4; Plut. Phoc. 30.9). Demades was apparently still active in Athens during the last prytany of the archonship of Neaechmus, in June 319 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 383 b, p. 660; cf. ERRINGTON, *Hermes* 105, 1977, 485 n. 35).

<sup>24</sup> For full discussion and documentation see my article (above n. 1) 75–8.

<sup>25</sup> These events are omitted by Diodorus, who begins with the opening of Antigonus' spring offensive of 319 (18.40.1). They are variously recorded by Plut. *Eum.* 8; Justin 14.1 and *Arr. Succ.* 1.41 (with the palimpsest fragment from Göteborg published by J. NÖRET, *AC* 52, 1983, 235–42), disjointed notes which can be pieced together as a coherent narrative.

<sup>26</sup> For Attalus' movements see Diod. 18.37.3–4; *Arr. Succ.* F 1.33, 39. He is attested in Alceas' camp in winter 320/19 (see the Göteborg palimpsest [above n. 25], fo. 72<sup>r</sup> 13).

was Docimus, another refugee from the eastern arena, who had left his satrapy of Babylonia around the time of Triparadeisus and made his way to Pisidia to throw in his lot with Alcetas.<sup>27</sup> All these movements are more comfortable if there is an interval of a year between the conference at Triparadeisus and the opening of the winter campaign against Eumenes. If, then, we concede that the Babylonian chronicle is correct in its assignment of events to regnal years, that interval is correctly recorded. The Egyptian campaign is in full swing by Aiuru (May/June) of Philip's fourth regnal year, and Antipater returns to Europe in the last months of year five, towards the end of winter. We now have a chronological equation: Antipater's return at the end of winter 319 falls in year five of Philip, in the later part of the Babylonian year 320/19. The eighth year accordingly becomes 317/16, the year in which Philip actually died.

This conclusion leads to another paradox. There seem to be two dating systems current in Babylon. One, that of the king lists, gives Philip six full years of kingship, beginning in 323 and ending in 317. The other, that of the Babylonian chronicle, gives him an eighth regnal year, 317/16, the incomplete year in which he died. So far the variation is understandable and acceptable. But the chronicle seems to begin the count of years in 324/23, which ought to be the last regnal year of Alexander the Great, and that creates an anomaly which has hitherto eluded explanation. How could Philip III have been king during the life-time of his brother? That is a problem which must be reserved for later discussion (below pp. 75–79). For the moment we should concentrate upon the fact that the chronicle places the campaigns in Asia between Antigonus and Eumenes in Philip's seventh and eighth years. How can that be squared with the other evidence?

## *II. Chronological Equations: the Events of 317 and 316*

In Diodorus' (and Plutarch's) narrative of events in Asia there is remarkably little correlation with other theatres of operation. Antigonus' march through the desert, which preceded the decisive battle of Gabiene and the capture of Eumenes, took place around the time of the winter solstice.<sup>28</sup> Cassander's defeat of Olympias also took place over the winter. The surrender of Pydna came at the beginning of spring (Diod. 19.50.1), and Aristonous stubbornly refused to give up the defence of Amphipolis because he was still ignorant of Eumenes' death (Diod. 19.50.8). The battle of Gabiene and the siege of Pydna were contemporaneous and occurred during the winter. During which winter? Diodorus clearly implies that it was the winter which saw the death of Philip Arrhidaeus. In his narrative the news of Philip's death and

---

<sup>27</sup> On Docimus see particularly the Vatican palimpsest of Arrian's *History of the Successors* (F 24.3–5 Roos = FG<sup>r</sup>H 156 F10A). For his adherence to Alcetas, again in winter 320/19, see Plut. *Eum.* 8.3 and the Göteborg palimpsest (fo. 73<sup>r</sup> 1).

<sup>28</sup> See above, p. 56.



Olympias' excesses reached Cassander while he was in the Peloponnese laying siege to Tegea.<sup>29</sup> His reaction was to raise the siege and take his forces to Macedon. He arrived rapidly<sup>30</sup> and frustrated Olympias' efforts to block the passes into Pieria.<sup>31</sup> An expeditionary force from Epirus was also outmanoeuvred and dissolved ingloriously. As a result Olympias' hopes were frustrated «in a short time».<sup>32</sup> The siege which followed was relatively brief. The provisions were soon exhausted (Diod. 19.49.2) and Olympias was forced to negotiate surrender at the beginning of spring (Diod. 19.50.1). All this suggests that the critical winter was the winter of 317/16.

Some years ago MALCOLM ERRINGTON advanced a counter-argument which he believed decisive.<sup>33</sup> When Eumenes was in Persis after his summer campaign in Susiane, he undermined the popularity of his rival, Peucestas, by forging a letter (in Aramaic) which conveyed the «news» that Olympias had returned to Macedon, had assumed the care of the young Alexander and gained firm control of the kingdom. Cassander was dead and Polyperchon had crossed to Asia with the royal army and the elephants.<sup>34</sup> Philip is not mentioned, only the young Alexander, and ERRINGTON accordingly drew the inference that «the recipients of the fabricated «news» already knew of Philip's death and of Cassander's second invasion of Macedon». The letter was forged around September,<sup>35</sup> which clearly cannot have been Septem-

<sup>29</sup> Diod. 19.35.1. Cassander reacted immediately. The effect of his abrupt departure was to leave his allies ἐν πολλῇ παραχῆ, at the mercy of Polyperchon's son Alexander.

<sup>30</sup> There was a slight delay while Cassander gathered transport vessels in Locris and Euboea in order to circumvent the Aetolian blockade of Thermopylae (Diod. 19.35.2). That may have taken days or weeks but hardly caused a delay into the following spring or summer, as is required by ERRINGTON's reconstruction (Hermes 105, 1977, 495). S. DUŠANIĆ, The year of the Athenian archon Archippus II (318/7), BCH 89, 1965, 128–41, esp. 134, emphasises Cassander's haste and dates his «improvised sail» soon after Philip's death.

<sup>31</sup> Diod. 19.35.4. Neither Polyperchon nor Olympias were able to secure the passes effectively, and they hardly (pace ERRINGTON) had a matter of six months to prepare their defence.

<sup>32</sup> Diod. 19.36.6. The immediate context is the dissolution of Polyperchon's force in Perhaebia, which followed the debacle of Aeacides. There was clearly little interval. Events were moving very quickly.

<sup>33</sup> ERRINGTON, Hermes 105, 1977, 483, enlarging on a suggestion made by E. BADIAN, Studies in Greek and Roman History, 1964, 268. BADIAN was criticising FONTANA (above n. 1) 227–31, who had inferred (correctly) that Eumenes' letter related to the situation before Philip's death and was forced to explain a hiatus of «circa dieci mesi» (238) during which the armies of the east were ignorant of events in Europe.

<sup>34</sup> Diod. 19.23.2–3. The story is also recorded by Polyaeus (4.8.3) in an abbreviated and garbled form.

<sup>35</sup> Some ten weeks after the rising of Sirius (25 July), when the battle of the Coprates was fought (Diod. 19.17.3, 18.2). After that campaign Antigonus withdrew over the Zagros to Media, arriving some forty days after the rising of Sirius (Diod. 19.20.1). At the news of his arrival Eumenes took his army to Persepolis, a march of some twenty four days (Diod. 19.21.1–2). The sixty four days produced by this combination is a minimum. One must allow time for news of Antigonus' movements to reach the army in Susiana, and there was an interval at Persepolis before Eumenes forged his letter.

ber 317 (when Philip was still alive). September 316 is the only possible date for the letter, and that places Eumenes' defeat and death ineluctably in the subsequent winter.

But ERRINGTON's primary inference is flawed. According to Diodorus the effect of the letter was to strengthen Eumenes' position. The army now believed that he would be able to promote whomever he wished in the name of the kings.<sup>36</sup> The plural is explicit and disproves the suggestion that Eumenes' men knew of Philip's death. On the contrary they react as though both kings were alive and functional, not merely the infant Alexander. Diodorus may have blundered, but without corroborative evidence we may not assume it. Indeed there is an argument from silence which confirms his statement. Eumenes' position in the coalition of satraps was precarious in the extreme, and his survival depended on intrigue and subversion.<sup>37</sup> The one thing which buttressed his position was his mandate in the name of the kings.<sup>38</sup> After the schism in Macedonia, when Eurydice manipulated her husband into disowning Polyperchon and siding with Cassander, his position was fatally weakened. It could then be argued that the division between the kings cancelled Eumenes' commission, which had been issued in both their names. Yet in all the story of deceit and jealousy that forms the political counterpoint to the campaign in Paratacena there is no suggestion that Eumenes' commission to represent the kings was ever called into question. The crucial battles were fought before news of the dynastic turmoil in the homeland had penetrated to the contending parties in Iran.

The forged letter fits neatly into the situation before the split in the royal house. When Polyperchon first contacted Eumenes in 318, he also appealed to Olympias to return to Macedonia and assume the care of the young Alexander (Diod. 18.57.2). Shortly afterwards Eumenes himself had advised Olympias to remain in Epirus until the war with Cassander was resolved.<sup>39</sup> The return of Olympias would therefore mark the end of the war in Greece. That was what Eumenes' forged letter announced. Cassander was killed, and there was no opposition left in the Balkans. Eumenes' patron, the Queen Mother, had returned to Macedon and held the reins of power there; and Polyperchon had his hands free to transfer the royal army and elephants into Asia Minor.<sup>40</sup> Philip is omitted because he was unimportant. He had been a cipher, and a cipher he would remain under the dominance of the formidable Olympias. But his mandate would continue to hold, as Eumenes' troops naturally

<sup>36</sup> Diod. 19.23.3: ὡς τούτου δυνασομένου καὶ προάγειν διὰ τῶν βασιλέων οὓς ἂν βούληται. Polyaeus (4.8.3) states that the troops proclaimed Olympias and the young Alexander, but that means only that they recognised the success of Eumenes' primary backers. There are no implications that Philip had disappeared.

<sup>37</sup> For documentation see my article (above n. 1) 68–70.

<sup>38</sup> Diod. 18.57.3, 58.1, 62.2; 19.13.6; cf. Plut. Eum. 13.2 (a commission from Polyperchon and King Philip).

<sup>39</sup> Diod. 18.57.2–4; cf. Nepos Eum. 6.1–4; Plut. Eum. 13.1.

<sup>40</sup> As he had offered to do in 318 (Diod. 18.57.4).

inferred. No doubt the forces in Iran had heard some previous news, and that news was probably a report of Cassander's first invasion of Macedonia, early in 317.<sup>41</sup> Eumenes' letter supplied news of his total defeat. The reality was less sensational. Cassander's invasion had been inconclusive. He failed to gain control of the country and withdrew, but he withdrew alive and in possession of a good number of Polyperchon's elephants (Diod. 19.35.7). An audience which knew of that outcome would have been singularly unimpressed with «news» of a force of elephants with Polyperchon in Cappadocia.

Eumenes' letter was forged in ignorance of the dynastic troubles and of Philip's death. The time can only be the late summer of 317, before Eurydice's challenge to Polyperchon was known; and we have confirmation that the subsequent campaign against Antigonos took place over the winter of 317/16. Eumenes' death came some weeks after the solstice, and by the end of the winter Antigonos was unchallenged master of the upper satrapies.<sup>42</sup> The Babylonian king lists accordingly date his rule in Asia from the beginning of the Babylonian year 317/16.<sup>43</sup> But it was some time before the *de facto* situation was recognised in Macedonia. Until Cassander occupied the capitals and possessed the person of the young king, Antigonos was still officially a rebel, under arms against the central authority. Cassander was not secure in his mastery until the spring, and the news will not have reached Babylonia until the beginning of the local year 316/15. One of his first acts will undoubtedly have been to legitimise the position of his ally and benefactor. At the time of Olympias' execution he was still unaware of the turn of events in Asia,<sup>44</sup> and he may have delayed a little, until he received news of Eumenes' death, before confirming Antigonos' command in the east.<sup>45</sup> That helps explain the curious oscillation in the Babylonian dating. As we have seen, the Saros Canon and the tablet of regnal years from Uruk give Antigonos six years of rule, from 317/16 to 312/11 inclusive. But there was another dating, represented by the curious «eighteen year tablet», a compila-

<sup>41</sup> Diod. 18.75.1; 19.35.7. See below pp. 71–72.

<sup>42</sup> After the battle of Gabiene Antigonos saw the winter out near Ecbatana (Diod. 19.44.4, 46.1). There followed the destruction of Peithon in Media. Seleucus' expulsion from Babylon took place later in the year, after a stay in Persis and Susa. Antigonos finally returned to the coast at the setting of Orion, in late November (Diod. 19.56.6).

<sup>43</sup> So the Saros Canon and the Uruk king list (see above n. 9). See also OELSNER (above n. 17) 133–4. We have an economic text dated 12 Aiaru (late May) in Antigonos' seventh year (CT 49, 50; cf. JOANNES [above n. 9] 103). This can surely be no later than May 311, the year of Seleucus' return to Babylon. If so, Antigonos' rule was calculated from 317/16.

<sup>44</sup> Diod. 19.52.4: ἄμα δ' οὐδὲν πεπυσμένος τῶν περὶ Ἀντίγονον.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. MANNI (above n. 1) 58: «i satrapi riconobbero Alessandro II soltanto quando, asse-diata Olimpiade in Pidna, Cassandro si proclamò – probabilmente – tutore dal giovane re.» The difficulties in this hypothesis (Cassander's position recognised while Pydna was still under siege) are eliminated if one rejects MANNI's date for the siege (summer 316) and accepts the correlation of Cassander's seizure of power with the arrival of news of Antigonos' victory in Asia.

tion of the Parthian period which gives precise regnal dates at intervals of eighteen years.<sup>46</sup> This places Antigonus' second regnal year in 315, and its compiler clearly began Antigonus' regime in 316/15, the year of its legitimisation. In the same way the accession date of Alexander IV is recognised as 316/15, the year in which he came under the «protection» of Cassander.<sup>47</sup> The period from the death of Philip III to the establishment of Cassander's regime seems to have been regarded as a period of anarchy. That emerges clearly from the famous king list published in 1954 by SACHS and WISEMAN.<sup>48</sup> It gives a number of years for Philip's reign (the figure is lost) and notes that in the following year «there was no king in the land». The regnal years of Alexander IV only begin with Seleucus' return to Babylon, in 311/10. That is exceptional. Contemporary documents give regnal years of Alexander down to year eleven (306/05), the year before Seleucus' own assumption of the kingship.<sup>49</sup> But there is uncertainty over the interlude between Philip and Antigonus. That uncertainty emerges in the Babylonian chronicle. There Philip has an eighth year, 317/16 in its entirety; and the first year of Alexander IV evidently begins on 1 Nisanu 316.<sup>50</sup> But the years of Antigonus are out of phase. Year seven of Antigonus corresponds to year six of Alexander IV,<sup>51</sup> and the chronicler manifestly dated the beginning of Antigonus' regime to the year in which he acquired power by his victory over Eumenes.

Given the fixing of Eumenes' death and Antigonus' accession to power the other events in Asia fall neatly into place and the fragmentary evidence of the Babylonian chronicle is totally compatible. In year seven of Philip (318/17) various data are provided, but in a sadly mutilated form. In the month of Tashritu (October/November) the army of the king is mentioned with a note that it was stationed at some unspecified place (*Du . . .*); and there is a laconic reference to the palace at Babylon. There has never been any doubt that these references are best explained as alluding to Eumenes' passage through Babylonia with his «royal army», the Silver Shields who had joined him in Cilicia and the forces he had levied locally. The Silver Shields moreover had come from Susa and a neighbouring satrapy (Paraetacene?), and they

<sup>46</sup> Otherwise known as the «Saros Tablet». Cf. MEYER (above n. 8) 456; F.X. KUGLER, *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel II*, 1912, 363–5; OELSNER (above n. 17) 135. It begins with year seven of Nabonidus and continues until year 213 of the Seleucid era (99/98 B. C.).

<sup>47</sup> The astronomical diaries fix 310/09 as his seventh regnal year and 309/08 as his eighth (see n. 12 above). The king lists tend not to record his reign, moving from Philip to Antigonus and then to Seleucus.

<sup>48</sup> Above n. 15. See also JOANNES (above n. 9) 100.

<sup>49</sup> For documentation see JOANNES (above n. 9) 102, 107–8.

<sup>50</sup> Philip is the only ruler named in the heading for 317/16; there is no qualification that it was also the first year of his successor. Years seven and (apparently) nine of Alexander IV are recorded in the latter part of the extant text.

<sup>51</sup> BM 34660 rev. 3 = GRAYSON (above n. 18) 117. Here an apparent reference to the seventh year of Antigonus is firmly embedded in the sixth year of Alexander.

were led by their satrapal commanders, Antigenes and Teutamus.<sup>52</sup> They must surely be the troops described in the chronicle as «the Hanaeans whom the king had stationed to reinforce the guard points between . . .». Mutinous and recalcitrant at Triparadeisus, they were assigned to guard duty on the southern borders of the Zagros, as later they were to be relegated even further east to dangerous postings in Arachosia.<sup>53</sup> But we cannot probe further beneath the surface of the chronicle. It mentioned Eumenes' army, some transaction relating to the palace at Babylon (or an official of the palace) and alluded to the Silver Shields. All this fits well enough into the winter and early spring before the campaigns of Paraetacene and Gabiene. According to Diodorus (19.12.1) Eumenes spent the winter in Babylonia at the so-called «villages of the Carians» after he vacated Phoenicia in the face of Antigonus' advance. That is the point of reference for the Babylonian chronicle. It mentioned the place (*Du . . .*) where Eumenes stationed his army before he moved eastwards to Mesopotamia in the month of Tashritu. Then came some reference to the subsequent manoeuvres when Seleucus opposed Eumenes' crossing of Babylonia and the royal forces were nearly inundated (clearly around high water at the beginning of spring).<sup>54</sup> There followed the summer campaign in Susiana which led to the discomfiture of Antigonus at the time of the rising of Sirius (mid July). Antigonus himself had spent the winter in Mesopotamia west of the Euphrates. He moved into Babylonia at the summons of Seleucus and Peithon shortly before he engaged with Eumenes in midsummer. He did not impinge upon Babylonia until the local year 317/16 had begun, and he is duly mentioned in the Babylonian chronicle under Philip's eighth regnal year in the month of Duzu (July/August).<sup>55</sup> That was presumably a reference to the fighting in Susiana which began at the rising of Sirius and continued for some weeks.

### *III. From Antipater's Death to the Murder of Philip (Autumn 319 – Autumn 317)*

Events in Asia can now be taken back to the fixed point of the death of Antipater, in the later summer or autumn of 319. At that juncture Eumenes had been defeated in Cappadocia and was besieged by Antigonus' troops in the fortress of Nora.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Diod. 18.62.4 implies clearly that both commanders were satraps. For the argument in favour of Paraetacene see my article (above n. 1) 66–7.

<sup>53</sup> Arr. Succ. F 1.33; Polyæn. 4.6.4 (mutiny at Triparadeisus); Arr. Succ. F 1.38 (assignment of the mutineers to Antigenes in Susa); Diod. 19.48.3–4; Plut. Eum. 19.3; Polyæn. 4.6.15 (guard duty in Arachosia).

<sup>54</sup> Diod. 19.13.2; cf. Arr. Anab. 7.21.4; Strabo 16.1.9 (740).

<sup>55</sup> Diod. 19.13.5, 15.6, 17.2. He arrived in Babylonia in summer, before the rising of Sirius. The Babylonian tradition that his reign began in 317/16 can only be explained if that summer was the summer of 317.

<sup>56</sup> Diod. 18.41–2; Plut. Eum. 10–11; Nepos Eum. 5.3–7; Justin 14.2.2–4.

Antigonus had achieved the famous forced march from Cappadocia to Cretopolis in Pisidia and eliminated the faction of Alcetas. The news of Antipater's death and the regency of Polyperchon reached him when he returned to Cretopolis, and the next campaigning season saw him at Celaenae.<sup>57</sup> At that point he negotiated with Eumenes and secured the formal surrender of Nora, shortly before the advent of spring 318.<sup>58</sup> The siege had begun the previous summer and had taken the best part of a year.<sup>59</sup> There ensued a period of collaboration between Eumenes and Antigonus, which was brusquely shattered when Eumenes accepted Polyperchon's commission to take command of the royal forces in the east.

These happenings are correlated with developments in Macedonia. Cassander had refused to accept Polyperchon's nomination as regent; and shortly after his father's death he took flight, first to the Hellespont and then to the court of Antigonus.<sup>60</sup> The immediate result was that Polyperchon reversed the restrictive policy of Antipater in Greece and proclaimed the restitution of the exiles, who were to return home before the Macedonian month of Xandikos (March).<sup>61</sup> That can only be March 318. The edict was naturally issued some months before, to allow time for the cities to make arrangements for the reception of the returnees. Shortly afterwards Polyperchon called on Olympias to return to Macedon and invited Eumenes to assume command of the war against Antigonus.<sup>62</sup> It was his reaction to the news that Antigonus was giving succour and material aid to Cassander. The most plausible reconstruction would date the flight of Cassander to the winter of 319/18, while Eumenes was negotiating the surrender of Nora. The commission to Eumenes came in the following spring, when Antigonus' backing for Cassander was firmly established.

<sup>57</sup> Diod. 18.47.3, 52.1.

<sup>58</sup> Nepos Eum. 5.7 (Eumenes kept inside Nora *quandiu hiems fuit*; when spring was approaching, he began negotiations). That fits well with Diodorus' story that Antigonus began negotiations through Eumenes' friend, Hieronymus, immediately after Antipater's death (18.50.4).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Diod. 18.53.5 (ἐνιαυσίου δ' οὔσης τῆς πολιορκίας), on which see E. M. ANSON, The siege of Nora: a source conflict, GRBS 18, 1977, 255–6. The fact that Diodorus (18.58.1) begins the archon year 318/17 with a note that Eumenes had recently made his withdrawal from Nora is surely compatible with a date early in the spring (cf. ANSON 256).

<sup>60</sup> Diod. 18.49.1–3, 54.1–3.

<sup>61</sup> Diod. 18.56.5. As far as I can ascertain, the equation of the month Xandikos in the decree with March 318 has been questioned only by BACIGALUPO PAREO (above n. 1) 202, who argues for almost a year of tense coexistence before Cassander fled Macedon. On this GULLATH and SCHÖBER (above n. 1) 347 are rightly sceptical.

<sup>62</sup> Diod. 18.57.2–3, 58.1. The exact chronology is difficult to establish. Eumenes received his commission from Polyperchon shortly after his surrender of Nora, and it is theoretically possible that Polyperchon wrote to him while the siege was still in progress (note the appeal πρὸς μὲν Ἀντίγονον μὴ διαλύσθαι τὴν ἀλλοτριότητα). But the terms of the commission presuppose that he had some freedom of movement and was no longer cooped up in Nora.

In the summer of 318 Eumenes evacuated Cappadocia, retreating before an army sent by Antigonus. Once in Cilicia he joined forces with the Silver Shields, who had (on Polyperchon's instructions) travelled from Susa to place themselves at his disposal.<sup>63</sup> From his base in Cilicia he spent the rest of the summer recruiting mercenaries in southern Asia Minor and Syria and resisted attempts by Antigonus and Ptolemy to undermine his authority with the troops. Later he moved into Phoenicia, where he began to collect a navy to give Polyperchon the naval superiority that Craterus and Cleitus had given Antipater in 322.<sup>64</sup> It was then that Antigonus acted. For most of the year he had been detained by war on the Ionian coast. First he had clashed with Arrhidaeus, the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia, during the winter of 319/18 while the siege of Nora was still in progress.<sup>65</sup> Then he attacked Cleitus, the satrap of Lydia, and occupied Ephesus, Cyme and numerous other cities. With his vast army<sup>66</sup> he could operate simultaneously on several fronts. By midsummer Arrhidaeus was virtually deprived of his satrapy and blockaded at Cius (Diod. 18.73.2). An attempt by Cleitus to relieve him and secure the Hellespont ended in disaster when Antigonus intervened and attacked his fleet from the land at his camp near Byzantium. This decisive victory in the west allowed him to concentrate his forces against Eumenes, who abandoned Phoenicia and moved into Babylonia. That was around October 318. The ensuing winter Eumenes spent at the Carian villages and Antigonus in Mesopotamia.

We may now turn to events in Greece and Macedon. The one explicit date (apart from the death of Philip III) is provided by Plutarch (Phoc. 37.1), who informs us that Phocion was executed on 19 Munychion, around the beginning of May. It has recently (and rightly) been emphasised that there is a close correlation between Phocion's downfall and the return of the exiles to Athens on the strength of Polyperchon's edict.<sup>67</sup> Events had moved swiftly since Antipater's death. Cassander had sent his officer, Nicanor, to take charge of the garrison at Athens before news of his father's death broke there (Plut. Phoc. 31.1). That was in the early autumn of 319. The following winter saw democratic feeling increase at Athens, encouraged by missives from Polyperchon and Olympias; and Nicanor occupied the Peiraeus, assisted by the masterly inactivity of Phocion.<sup>68</sup> By the late winter military action had begun. Polyperchon's son, Alexander, invaded Attica with a group of Athenian exiles, who packed the «promiscuous and unruly assembly» which deposed Phocion

<sup>63</sup> Diod. 18.58.1, 59.1–3; Plut. Eum. 13.3–4. On their movements see my article (above n. 1).

<sup>64</sup> Diod. 18.63.6. On the importance of the fleet for the outcome of the Lamian War see now BOSWORTH, *From Arrian to Alexander*, 1988, 197–9.

<sup>65</sup> Diod. 18.51–52.4. Note Arrhidaeus' attempt to relieve Nora and liberate Eumenes (18.52.4). That clearly took place in winter 319/18.

<sup>66</sup> Diod. 18.50.3 gives figures of 60,000 foot, 10,000 horse and 30 elephants.

<sup>67</sup> J. M. WILLIAMS, A note on Athenian chronology, 319/8–318/7 B. C., *Hermes* 112, 1984, 300–5, esp. 302–3, contra ERRINGTON, *Hermes* 105, 1977, 491–2.

<sup>68</sup> Plut. Phoc. 32; Diod. 18.64–65.2.

and appointed other generals.<sup>69</sup> Shortly afterwards Phocion and his associates left the city to plead their cause with Polyperchon himself. They were delayed for «several days» by Deinarchus' illness at Elateia, long enough for the Athenians to send the counter-embassy which reached Polyperchon at the same time as Phocion and his friends.<sup>70</sup> After the hearing (in Phocis) Phocion was sent back to Athens to face trial and execution.

There is clearly a delay between Phocion's departure from Athens and the hearing before Polyperchon, but it is a matter of weeks rather than months. The second Athenian embassy to Philip in 346 had taken some twenty three days to reach Macedon via Oreos, and that, Demosthenes alleges, was scandalously protracted.<sup>71</sup> It was also a longer journey than Phocion's and was not a matter of life or death for the ambassadors. We may confidently date the democratic revolution at Athens to the early spring of 318 and Phocion's death to May of the same year. The revolution correlates neatly with the evidence of Athenian decrees. During the Attic year 319/18 the oligarchic *anagrapheus* is deposed from his previous position of preeminence. In the fourth prytany the *anagrapheus* (Eucadmus) still heads the list of officials, but by the end of the seventh prytany (12 Elaphebolion 318) the archon is restored to his primacy and the *anagrapheus* takes second place.<sup>72</sup> In 318/17 there is no *anagrapheus* recorded. Eucadmus presumably retained office with diminished status until the end of 319/18, by which time the democratic revolution had taken place.

The rapid momentum of events continued. While Polyperchon was still in Phocis, Cassander arrived in Peiraeus with a fleet kindly supplied by Antigonos and drew Polyperchon rapidly down into Attica (Diod. 18.68.2). The regent did not linger. After his son's invasion Attica was short of provisions,<sup>73</sup> and the harvest was

<sup>69</sup> Plut. Phoc. 33.1–2; Diod. 18.65.6. Cf. WILLIAMS (above n. 67) 302.

<sup>70</sup> Plut. Phoc. 33.4–6; Diod. 18.66.1–2; Nepos Phoc. 3.2–3. The delay is an important factor for ERRINGTON (492) who stretches events over more than six months. See, however, WILLIAMS 304.

<sup>71</sup> Dem. 19.155.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. SEG 21, 310, 312. The evidence was neatly amassed and discussed by STERLING DOW, *The Athenian Anagrapheis*, HSCP 67, 1963, 37–54, esp. 44–51. ERRINGTON 488–90 (so already MANNI, *Demetrio Poliorcete* 72) argued that the demotion of Eucadmus was not caused by the democratic revolution proper. Rather the news of Antipater's death brought about a slight relaxation of the oligarchy; the democracy was only restored in the following archon year. This reconstruction has been independently attacked by WILLIAMS (above n. 67), by M. J. OSBORNE, *Naturalization in Athens II*, 1982, 98, 100–1, and by GULLATH – SCHOBER (above n. 1) 342–7. OSBORNE emphasises (surely correctly) that SEG 21, 314 (his D35) records grants of citizenship voted by the demos on the recommendation of Polyperchon. That implies that Polyperchon effectively controlled Athens by the date of the decree, the tenth prytany of the archon year 319/18 (so GULLATH – SCHOBER 344).

<sup>73</sup> Diod. 18.68.3 σπανίζων δὲ τροφῆς. Compare the Spartan invasion of Attica in 425, which began too early, while the corn was still green, and the invaders accordingly ἐσπώνιζον



some time away.<sup>74</sup> He therefore left a force large enough to be sustained by the available grain and diverged into the Peloponnese, while Cassander occupied Aegina and attacked Salamis.<sup>75</sup> By midsummer Cassander's allies, the Megalopolitans, were isolated in the Peloponnese and under siege. Dramatic though the siege was, it was not protracted. Diodorus insists that Polyperchon could not remain long.<sup>76</sup> Plausibly so, for the crops of Megalopolis must have been harvested and stored safely in the city.<sup>77</sup> Polyperchon accordingly raised the siege and dispatched his admiral Cleitus (the former satrap of Lydia) to fight his campaign in the Hellespont (Diod. 18.72.2). That, as we have seen, was in late summer. By the autumn of 318 Cleitus had lost the battle of Byzantium and his life, and Antigonus was free to march against Eumenes in Cilicia. These events fit closely together and cannot be extended into 317 without long hiatuses, both unattested and implausible. Either the transition from oligarchy to democracy at Athens is extended over a full year,<sup>78</sup> or Polyperchon's operations in Attica and the Peloponnese are artificially protracted and Antigonus is left cooling his heels in Asia Minor over the autumn and winter of 318/17.<sup>79</sup> On the contrary the defection of Cassander in the autumn of 319 provoked a chain reaction of consequences, which precluded slow, deliberated action. This was a period of political ferment and immediate military response.

But there is a hiatus in our knowledge thanks to the priorities of our main source, Diodorus Siculus. Diodorus began book nineteen with Sicilian affairs, a theme neglected in the previous two books because of the greater interest of Alexander's reign and its sequel. Book nineteen resumes with the archon year 317/16 and the accession of Agathocles. The change of theme and consequent change of source created compositional difficulties. Diodorus felt the need to wind down his narrative of

---

τροφῆς (Thuc. 4.6.1). WILLIAMS (above n. 67) 305 assumes that Polyperchon spent some months in Attica before the food shortage drove him out.

<sup>74</sup> In modern times harvesting begins in Attica at the end of May (cf. A. W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides II*, 1956, 70–1).

<sup>75</sup> Diod. 18.68.3–69.2. Polyperchon sent a force to relieve the siege of Salamis and was not far away, presumably in the vicinity of Corinth.

<sup>76</sup> Diod. 18.72.1 *πολὸν χρόνον ἐπιμένειν οὐ δυνάμενος*.

<sup>77</sup> The city had ample warning of his intentions (Diod. 18.68.3), and its officials could make careful preparations (18.70.1).

<sup>78</sup> So FONTANA (above n. 1) 203–9; ERRINGTON, *Hermes* 105, 1977, 488–92.

<sup>79</sup> So WILLIAMS (above n. 67) 305, followed by BILLOWS (above n. 4) 86–7. See also GULLATH – SCHÖBER (above n. 1) 351–5, who have Polyperchon return to Macedon, amass a fleet and send out Cleitus nearly a year after the siege of Megalopolis. In other words the events of almost a year have fallen out between consecutive sentences of Diodorus. The more natural inference is that Cleitus' mission followed immediately upon the siege of Megalopolis. As GULLATH – SCHÖBER concede (352 n. 60), Polyperchon had some ships at his disposal in Southern Greece (Diod. 18.68.3). The rest of the Macedonian fleet could have been ordered to the Hellespont to await Cleitus' arrival with the additional squadron from the south. An apparent paucity of warships with Polyperchon does not exclude a Macedonian navy operating in force in the Hellespont.

Macedonian history before reverting to the new theatre in Sicily. Accordingly he ends book eighteen with two short prospective passages. The first deals with Eumenes' retreat from Phoenicia in the autumn of 318, his passage of Babylonia and his escape to Persis.<sup>80</sup> This overlaps the narrative later in book nineteen, and Diodorus felt the need to reach some definite conclusion before tackling Sicilian affairs, even at the price of anticipating himself. The second section (18.74–5) deals with Cassander and is rather longer. It covers the capitulation of Athens and the installation of Demetrius of Phalerum in the early months of 317.<sup>81</sup> Next (18.75) comes the triumphal return of Nicanor from the Hellespont and his arrest and death, an invasion of Macedonia by Cassander and a general defection of Greek cities from Polyperchon. One would expect this material to be resumed and amplified in the next book. Instead there is a sharp break. Diodorus re-enters Macedonian history with disconcerting abruptness (at 19.11.1). Eurydice has already made her bid for power; Cassander is in the Peloponnese, and Polyperchon, with Olympias and the young Alexander in his train, is poised to invade Macedon from Epirus. The time is just before (a matter of weeks at most) the death of Philip III in October 317. A large chunk of narrative in Hieronymus has simply been omitted,<sup>82</sup> and we can only speculate about the movements of the principal actors during the first half of 317.

Some things are clear enough. Polyperchon had returned to Macedonia with the bulk of his army, maybe at the end of his campaign at Megalopolis when he «turned to more necessary matters» (Diod. 18.75.1). His son, Alexander, was left to maintain control of the Peloponnesian cities. Polyperchon's lack of success told against him. The Macedonian nobility, previously solid in his support, began to be divided. On the invitation of the disaffected parties<sup>83</sup> Cassander invaded Macedon early in the

<sup>80</sup> Diod. 18.73.2–4 (anticipating 19.12–14). See GOUKOWSKY's note in the Budé edition (p. 170), arguing that Diodorus wrote his summary without referring to his notes; hence a number of lapsus memoriae (confusion of Tigris and Euphrates; substitution of Persis for Suisiana). See also GULLATH – SCHÖBER (above n. 1) 367–9.

<sup>81</sup> An absolute terminus is provided by IG II<sup>2</sup> 448 (OSBORNE [above n. 72] D38), which attests the democracy still in existence at the end of Maemacterion 318/17, in the fourth prytany of the year. Demetrius was therefore installed after December 318. So DUŠANIĆ (above n. 30) 134–5; OSBORNE 104–6. How long afterwards cannot be determined on the present state of the evidence.

<sup>82</sup> That is, of course, far from unique. Compare 18.40.1, where Diodorus skips abruptly from the conference at Triparadeisus to Antigonos' operations against Eumenes during the spring of 319. The whole story of Antipater's return to the coast of Asia Minor and the winter campaign in Phrygia has been totally omitted (with far reaching consequences for the chronology of the period). For details see my article (above n. 1) 76.

<sup>83</sup> According to Polyaeus (4.11.2) Cassander received a letter shortly before Nicanor's assassination, in which he was assured by his friends that the Macedonians were summoning him to the kingship because of their disillusionment with Polyperchon (pace DUŠANIĆ [above n. 30] 137; BACIGALUPO PAREO [above n. 1] 208 n. 72; GULLATH – SCHÖBER 375 there is no reason to assume that the letter was forged: Cassander may have used a genuine invitation to win Nicanor's confidence). For Polyperchon's previous popularity see Diod. 18.54.2.

spring of 317. He had some local support (Diod. 18.75.1) and some military success over Polyperchon, many of whose elephants he captured.<sup>84</sup> But, for whatever reason, he could not gain control and withdrew to the Peloponnese, where he began to detach the cities from their allegiance to Polyperchon. According to Justin (14.5.6–7) his actions in their vicinity galvanised the Spartans into walling their city for the first time in history; and he was laying siege to Tegea when news arrived of Olympias' return and the death of Philip (Diod. 19.35.1). In the meantime Eurydice had made her declaration against Polyperchon and transferred his command to Cassander. At what time exactly cannot be determined. Justin writes as though Eurydice's assumption of power preceded Cassander's Peloponnesian campaign, but we can place little faith in his narrative sequence.<sup>85</sup> It seems that the dynastic turmoil was relatively short-lived and that Eurydice's abortive bid for supremacy was soon stifled, but the lapse of time cannot be quantified in weeks or months. What is certain is that there is a considerable gap in our knowledge. The rich, rapid and turbulent sequence of events which we have traced in 318 continued unabated into 317, but we have minimal documentation. This demonstrable hiatus in Diodorus can only be accommodated by the high

---

<sup>84</sup> Diod. 19.35.7. The campaign apparently aroused lively speculation elsewhere. Theophrastus (Char. 8.5–9) satirises a rumour-monger who claimed that Polyperchon and the king (i. e. Philip) had won and Cassander was captured (BELOCH [above n. 1] IV<sup>2</sup> 2.436; cf. GULLATH – SCHÖBER 374–5), while in Asia, as we have seen, Eumenes fabricated reports of Cassander's defeat and death.

<sup>85</sup> Justin 14.5.5: *dein profectus in Graeciam multis civitatibus bellum infert*. We are not informed what was Cassander's point of departure. The qualification *in Graeciam* gives the impression that he began his campaign from Macedonia, where he had received his commission in person from Eurydice (so GULLATH – SCHÖBER 359–60). But the wording in Justin could well derive from a retrospective reference in Trogus; *dein . . . profectus* could be a digest of a statement in Trogus that Cassander had moved into Greece and was now encouraged by Eurydice's commission (given in absentia) to open a wider offensive in the Peloponnese. His first invasion certainly preceded Eurydice's bid for power and its partial success probably encouraged her to make her move. Justin is too compressed to be used in isolation, as is the even briefer digest in the Prologus to Book 14 of Trogus: *ut in Macedonia Cassander victo Polyperchonte receptaque a defectore Nicanore Munychia . . . Olympiada Pydnae obsessam interfecit*. This cannot be pressed to prove that Cassander invaded Macedonia before he disposed of Nicanor (in contradiction of the narrative sequence in Diodorus: so DUŠANIĆ [above n. 30] 137–8; ERRINGTON, *Hermes* 105, 1977, 495 n. 56). *In Macedonia* merely records the transition (also at Justin 14.5.1) from events in Asia to those of Macedonia. The key event was the death of Olympias (also at Justin 14.6), which was preceded (in Trogus' narrative) by a defeat of Polyperchon and the occupation of Munychia. Now it does not follow (though it is perhaps implied) that Polyperchon was defeated by Cassander; Trogus may have described the entire disastrous failure at Megalopolis. It looks as though he first dealt with events in the Peloponnese as far as Polyperchon's discomfiture and then covered Cassander's actions at Athens from at least the time of the occupation of Munychia (autumn 319). Then came the *pièce de résistance*, the dynastic turmoil in Macedonia. The Prologus delineates three separate sectors of activity, the events of which overlapped in chronology; it cannot be enlisted as independent evidence for their sequence.

chronology advocated in this article. If Polyperchon's debacle at Megalopolis and the naval campaign around Byzantium are pushed back into 317, as the low chronology demands, there is no time before Philip's death for Cassander's first invasion of Macedonia and his operations in the Peloponnese.<sup>86</sup>

#### *IV. Chronological Irrelevancies: Archon Dates in Diodorus and the Parian Marble*

So far I have based my arguments on internal clues from the historical narrative, in particular seasonal and astronomical data, and have deliberately excluded Diodorus' year divisions and the archon dates provided by the Parian Marble. There is good reason for doing so. As is well known, Diodorus' method of arranging his narrative according to archon years is extremely haphazard. In book eighteen there is no heading for the years 321/20 and 320/19, and the archonship of Philocles (322/21) is introduced much too late in the historical narrative.<sup>87</sup> Subsequently his record is somewhat better. The archonship of Apollodorus (319/18) begins appropriately with Antigonos' campaign against Alcetas and the Perdiccan faction in Pisidia (18.44.1), and it contains the death of Antipater and events in Europe down to the «exiles' decree» of Polyperchon. The year of Archippus (318/17) also begins correctly with Eumenes' evacuation of Cappadocia (18.58.1) and the events at Athens are covered reasonably well, except that the sequence begins too early<sup>88</sup> and Phocion's death consequently comes in the wrong archon year. Book nineteen begins with the archonship of Demogenes (317/16), and Diodorus is correct in his placing of Philip's death, the first major event in Europe for the year. But the record of the summer campaign in Susiana comes too late. By the time of the rising of Sirius (at the end of July 317) we are in the archonship of Democleides (316/15).<sup>89</sup> As a result the entire campaign in Iran and with it Cassander's second invasion of Macedonia is placed in the wrong

---

<sup>86</sup> ERRINGTON 494 seems to make the invasion of Macedonia simultaneous with the death of Philip and has Cassander operating in the Peloponnese over the winter of 317/16. BACIGALUPO PAREO (above n. 1) 207–9 and GULLATH – SCHÖBER (above n. 1) 363–76 take scepticism to extremes and deny that there was any first invasion.

<sup>87</sup> For analysis and discussion see GOUKOWSKY's Budé edition, pp. xxv–xxxviii. Philocles' archonship is recorded at 18.26.1, so excluding the battle of Crannon (which fell on 7 Metageitnion 322/21) and Antipater's subsequent occupation of Athens (20 Boedromion).

<sup>88</sup> 18.64.1 begins with Nicanor's actions in Athens over the winter of 319/18 and continues with Polyperchon's campaign in the Peloponnese and the naval war in the Bosphorus. It is only the latter events which are synchronous with Eumenes' occupation of Cilicia and Syria and justify the transition formula (ἀμὰ δὲ τούτοις πρᾶττομένοις).

<sup>89</sup> 19.17.1 (the rising of Sirius is mentioned at 17.3). This is the same type of error as the antedating of Phocion's death, but in the narrative for 318/17 Diodorus continued the archon year to the correct terminal point. Here he compounds the mistake. He changes archons at the right point but fails to see that the narrative is still chronologically prior to the events in Macedon described at 19.11.

year. Some of the trouble must come from the original narrative breaks in Hieronymus. That is evident when Diodorus leaves the story of Olympias' return to Macedonia, which he places correctly in 317/16. At 19.12.1 he turns to the events in Asia, the duel between Eumenes and Antigonus which began during the spring of the previous archon year (April [?] 317). By the time his narrative moved into the summer Diodorus realised (correctly) that a new archon year had begun but failed to grasp that it was the same year as Philip's death. As a consequence the rest of the campaign and with it the death of Eumenes is placed a year too late. The lesson is clear enough. Diodorus' year divisions provide the roughest of checks if a chronology is already established. They cannot be used as primary dating criteria.

The same applies to the dates on the Parian Marble, a document which has acquired an unfortunate reputation for reliability in recent years.<sup>90</sup> A glance at the relatively well established chronology of the reign of Alexander the Great will show how ill-founded that reputation is. Both the Granicus and Issus are recorded under the same archon year (334/33) – wrongly on both counts. Gaugamela, the capture of Babylon and the demobilisation of the allied troops are all placed a year too early (in 332/31). The execution of Bessus is placed in 330/29 instead of 329/28, and the foundation of Alexandria Eschate by contrast comes a year too late (328/27 instead of 329/28).<sup>91</sup> The inaccuracies continue into the period of the Successors. Ptolemy's occupation of Egypt is antedated and placed in the year of Alexander's death (324/23); and the well-known eclipse of August 15, 310, which was total when Agathocles made his celebrated voyage to the Carthaginian coast, comes two years early, in 312/11 (Diodorus has it in the correct place).<sup>92</sup> If, then, the Parian Marble dates the return of Cassander to Macedon a year late (B 13) and places the naval campaign in the Bosphorus in 317/16 instead of 318/17 (B 14), that is entirely consistent with its general accuracy for Alexander's reign. The standard improves somewhat after Alexander's death, it is true, but it would be extremely hazardous to assume that the compiler discarded his slovenly habits and achieved a high degree of accuracy, or that he moved from a non-chronographic source for Alexander's reign to a meticulously documented record of the Successors.<sup>93</sup> The sad fact is that the Parian Marble is as unreliable a chronological guide as the year divisions in Diodorus.

<sup>90</sup> The most convenient edition is that of JACOBY, *FGrH* 239. There are translations with brief annotations by M. M. AUSTIN, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest*, 1981, 8–9, 39–41 and P. HARDING, *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*, 1985, 1–6. The accuracy of the Parian Marble was an article of faith for MANNI (above n. 1) as it is for ERRINGTON (esp. 503–4), and it is one of the principal buttresses of the low chronology.

<sup>91</sup> The Parian Marble is in fact no better for Alexander's reign than the much maligned *Oxyrhynchus Chronicle* (POxy 12 = *FGrH* 255).

<sup>92</sup> *Diod.* 20.5.5; cf. *Justin* 22.6.1. For ERRINGTON this is a «random error» (504), for JACOBY (*FGrH* II D 700 n. 9) «eine grobe Nachlässigkeit».

<sup>93</sup> As argued by MANNI, *Fasti ellenistici e romani*, 1961, 64.

*V. Ariadne's Thread: Arrhidaeus in Babylon*

We must now return to the most intractable problem of all, the double dating of Philip's reign in Babylonia and the fact that the Babylonian chronicle appears to begin the count of his regnal years in 324/23. The first solution, by SIDNEY SMITH, was impressively radical – to transfer the death of Alexander from June to March 323.<sup>94</sup> Although it has been recently revived,<sup>95</sup> the theory is totally untenable, ignoring the various chronological fixings of Alexander's death, surely one of the best attested dates in antiquity. A more complicated, conservative and popular approach was to assume some calendric confusion.<sup>96</sup> The author of the chronicle on this theory tried to make some accommodation to the Macedonian dating, which made Philip's first regnal year begin around October 324, in the Macedonian month of Dios. If that were converted to the Babylonian calendar, it would give a fictitious first year, down to April 323, when the second regnal year would begin. This, to put it mildly, is a clumsy expedient.<sup>97</sup> It leaves unanswered the question why a Babylonian scribe should have bothered with the Macedonian calendar at all, when the succession to Alexander took place at Babylon and was datable by Babylonian methods. Nor does the extant document show traces of any system other than the local Babylonian calendar. If the accession year of Philip is taken back to 324/23, we must provide a Babylonian context for it.

If the dating is accepted and Alexander's death retained in June 323, then there is an overlap. Philip (or rather, Arrhidaeus, as he then was) was king in Babylon during the lifetime of his brother. At first sight this is an absurdity, but the absurdity is paralleled in earlier history when Babylon was subject to a world empire. There are several examples of a relative of the greater king being endowed with the kingship of Babylon. The most celebrated instance came at the death of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon, who named his eldest son, Ashur-bani-pal, king of Assyria and placed his brother, Shamash-shuma-ukin, on the throne of Babylon, which he occupied for twenty years (668–648 B. C.). Ashur-bani-pal had clear priority and was installed as

<sup>94</sup> S. SMITH, *The deaths of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus*, JRAS 1928, 618–21 (a necessary corollary is the advancement of Philip's death to July 317). He had been more prudent in the past, arguing that the chronicle dated throughout by the Macedonian calendar: *The chronology of Philip Arrhidaeus, Antigonus and Alexander IV*, RA 22, 1925, 179–97, esp. 184–5.

<sup>95</sup> By B. FUNCK, *Die babylonische Chronik Smiths*, in: M. LURKER ed., *In Memoriam Eckhard Unger: Beiträge zur Geschichte, Kultur und Religion des Alten Orients*, 1971, 217–40, esp. 229: «die beste Erklärung dürfte sein, daß Alexander noch im babylonischen Jahr 324/3 starb.»

<sup>96</sup> So MOMIGLIANO, *La cronaca babilonese sui Diadochi*, RFIC 10, 1932, 467–84 = *Quinto Contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, 1975, 863–4, foreshadowed by W. W. TARN, JHS 44, 1924, 287–8 and by SMITH (cf. n. 94 above) and restated in more recent years by HAUBEN (above n. 1) 86 n. 8.

<sup>97</sup> See the sharp critique by SCHÖBER (above n. 1) 50–1.

king a full year before his brother, who seems to have been little more than a figurehead for most of his reign.<sup>98</sup> None the less it is Shamash-shuma-ukin whose regnal years are counted in the Babylonian chronicles of the period.<sup>99</sup> Similarly Sennacherib placed his son, Ashur-nadin-shumi upon the throne of Babylon (699–694) after a disagreeably turbulent period of revolt,<sup>100</sup> and the great conqueror Cyrus apparently did the same with his son, Cambyses, after the annexation of Babylon (for nine months, from April 538). Contemporary Babylonian documents are dated by the first year of Cambyses king of Babylon and of Cyrus king of lands. That usage, it would seem, was confined to the capital and its environs and did not penetrate as far as Nippur and Uruk in the south.<sup>101</sup> The same appears to have obtained with the reign of Philip Arrhidaeus; the chronicle itself recognised eight regnal years, while the king list from Uruk records six, calculating his reign from the date he succeeded Alexander as king of lands. Economic documents similarly might count his regnal years from the date of his installation as king of Babylon (counting into an eighth year)<sup>102</sup> or they might begin the count with his election to the greater kingship (as do the astronomical diaries and the earliest economic tablet yet edited, which refers to the first year of Philip).<sup>103</sup> Confirmation of the hypothesis would require a dating by Arrhidaeus king of Babylon and Alexander king of lands or simply by the first year of Arrhidaeus (he only assumed the regnal name of Philip after his acclamation as Alexander's successor).<sup>104</sup>

My explanation of the variant datings must remain hypothetical, but the hypothesis, I think, has some attractions. Firstly it helps flesh out the skeletal information we possess about the history of Babylonia in Alexander's last years. In the winter of 328/27 a certain Stamenes was appointed satrap of Babylonia in place of the distinguished and defunct Persian noble Mazaesus.<sup>105</sup> Nothing more is heard of him, and in 323 the satrap of Babylonia confirmed in office after Alexander's death was

<sup>98</sup> See now J. A. BRINKMAN, *Prelude to Empire: Babylonian Society and Politics 747–626 B. C.*, 1984, 85–8.

<sup>99</sup> See for instance GRAYSON (above n. 18) 86–7, *Chron.* 1, 4.33 ff., where the accession of both brothers is noted but events in Babylon are dated by Shamash-shuma-ukin alone (see further GRAYSON 243).

<sup>100</sup> Cf. GRAYSON (above n. 18) 210; BRINKMAN 60–1.

<sup>101</sup> See the exemplary discussion by M. SAN NICOLÒ, *Beiträge zu einer Prosopographie neubabylonischer Beamten der Zivil- und Tempelverwaltung*, SB Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss. 1941, II.2, 51–4. Cf. also A. L. OPPENHEIM, *CHIran* II, 1985, 558–9 and A. KUERT, *CAH* IV<sup>2</sup>, 1988, 125–6.

<sup>102</sup> See above, pp. 57–58. There is a useful list in JOANNES (above n. 9) 102.

<sup>103</sup> F. JOANNES, *Textes économiques de la Babylonie récente*, 1982, 351, no. 109.

<sup>104</sup> Diod. 18.2.3; Arr. Succ. F 1.1; Justin 13.3.1; Curt. 10.7.7; Heidelberg Epitome (FGrH 155) 1.1.

<sup>105</sup> Arr. 4.18.3 (cf. H. BERVE, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, 1926, II 361, no. 718). Nothing is known of Stamenes' origins, and it is a guess, albeit a probable one, that he was an oriental (in Curtius 8.4.17 his name appears as Ditamenes).

Archon of Pella, one of the trierarchs at the Hydaspes,<sup>106</sup> who cannot have assumed his satrapal functions until Alexander returned from India. Now Apollodorus, whom Alexander had appointed general of the military forces of Babylonia long ago in 331, was summoned to the king's presence in Carmania.<sup>107</sup> There he escaped the fate of the military commanders in Media, but he was deposed and remained at court in the king's immediate entourage under suspicion (as he clearly believed). There was some consequential reorganisation in Babylonia, and the early months of 324 were probably the time of change. The civil and military administration was apparently united in the hands of the satrap, the Macedonian Archon. No successor to Apollodorus is mentioned in Alexander's reign, and the relatively full record of the disturbances in Babylonia in 321 mentions no troop commander other than Archon.<sup>108</sup> Alexander had abolished the careful division of functions which he had established in 331. Then a Macedonian general had coexisted with an Iranian satrap who had marriage ties with the Babylonian aristocracy.<sup>109</sup> Now the satrap and military commander was one and the same and a Macedonian to boot. Babylonian susceptibilities could well have been wounded.

Local feeling was running high in the old Achaemenid empire, and a number of pretenders had emerged during Alexander's absence in India. In Media a certain Baryaxes had assumed the upright tiara and declared himself king of the Medes and Persians, while in Persis proper a descendant of the Seven, Orxines, had usurped the position of satrap.<sup>110</sup> In Babylon national feeling had always been strong, and the last insurrection, as recent as 335, had seen a brief resurgence of the native kingship.<sup>111</sup> It was prudent to forestall any local unrest by renewing the example of Cyrus, that conqueror and self-proclaimed friend of Babylon, and installing a king

<sup>106</sup> Diod. 18.3.3 (in the list of satraps confirmed in office); Justin 13.4.23 (*Babylonios Archon Pellaeus*); cf. Arr. Succ. F 24.3–5 (Archon satrap in 321). For his trierarchy in 325 see Arr. Ind. 18.3. The literary sources are supplemented by two Delphic epigrams in honour of Archon and his family (J. BOUSQUET, BCH 83, 1959, 158–66 = CEG II 877); these celebrate chariot victories at Delphi (in 338/37 [?]) and the Isthmia, confirm Pella as his domicile and attest his father's name as Κλεῖνος (not Κλεινίας, as in Arr. Succ. 18.3).

<sup>107</sup> Arr. 7.18.1 = Aristobulus, FGrH 139 F 54 (συνέμειξεν ἐπανιόντι αὐτῷ ἐξ Ἰνδοῶν). The text specifies that Apollodorus witnessed the entire spate of executions, which began in Carmania with the trial of Astaspes (BERVE [above, n. 105] no. 173). He was at Ecbatana when Hephaestion died, in autumn 324 (Arr. 7.18.2) and only returned to Babylon with Alexander in 323 (18.4). He had clearly been relieved of his command.

<sup>108</sup> Arr. Succ. F 24.4–5. The only official mentioned other than the satrap is the financial superintendent (F 24.3).

<sup>109</sup> Arr. 3.16.4 (with BOSWORTH, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander I*, 1980, 314–5); Diod. 17.64.5; Curt. 5.1.43. For Mazaesus' Babylonian connections see E. BADIAN, *The administration of the empire*, G & R 12, 1965, 166–82, esp. 175.

<sup>110</sup> Arr. 6.29.3 (Baryaxes); Arr. 6.29.2; Curt. 10.1.22–3 (Orxines).

<sup>111</sup> The king list from Uruk (above n. 9) mentions a certain Nidin-Bel, king of Babylon before Darius. That is impossible to explain unless there was a rebellion and an usurper who adopted the old regnal name (cf. BOSWORTH, *Conquest and Empire*, 1988, 34).



there. He had no legitimate son of his own, and the choice was his nearest male relative, his half-brother Arrhidaeus, who will have been solemnly invested as king some time after 1 Nisanu 324. The Babylonians already had the promise that the great religious complex of Esagila would be restored, and now the sacral kingship was theirs again. It gave the city a prestige in the empire which eclipsed that of all the other Achaemenid capitals, and the fact that the kingship was purely ceremonial does not seem to have mattered greatly.

From Alexander's perspective the installation of Arrhidaeus was probably a prudential move. His half-brother was removed from the political scene in Macedon,<sup>112</sup> where he could conceivably have been used as a pawn against Alexander himself, if the tense relationship with Antipater had deteriorated into open hostility. In Babylon he was king of an alien people and effectively in the power of Archon, the Macedonian satrap, whose interests lay in loyalty to Alexander. His kingship in Babylon meant nothing to the Macedonians, and it is not surprising that it does not figure in our abbreviated accounts of the succession crisis after Alexander's death. The throne of Babylon was irrelevant to the kingship of Macedonia. But it does explain how Arrhidaeus happened to be in Babylon at the time of Alexander's death, and how he came to be overlooked in the first accession debate: his presence was only later adverted upon by the troops.<sup>113</sup> He was apparently not a familiar figure in Alexander's entourage. Now according to the soldiers' spokesman in Curtius Arrhidaeus had recently «shared with Alexander in religious rites and ceremonies».<sup>114</sup> The phrase has caused considerable perplexity, and it is usually assumed that Arrhidaeus presided over *Macedonian* ceremony along with the king.<sup>115</sup> But on all the numerous occasions when Alexander is recorded sacrificing there is no record of a co-celebrant,<sup>116</sup> and it would be strange to find anybody other than the king in such a sensitive and symbolic role. On the other hand, if the context is the *Babylonian* ritual, the phrase takes on a heightened meaning. Arrhidaeus, if king of Babylon, would have presided over the state festivities, in particular the great new year celebrations in the month of Nisanu. In April 323 Alexander himself was almost cer-

<sup>112</sup> It is usually assumed that Arrhidaeus accompanied Alexander throughout the campaign; but, as BERVE properly observed ([above, n. 105] II 385–6, no. 781), there is no record of his presence at court until his sudden appearance at Babylon immediately after his brother's death.

<sup>113</sup> Justin 13.3.1; Curt. 10.7.2–7 (cf. ERRINGTON, JHS 90, 1970, 51–2). In Curtius Philip plays no part in the initial debate (10.6.5–18). His candidacy is first mooted by the troops and then promoted by Meleager. According to Justin (13.2.8) Meleager had pressed his claim even before he was discovered by the army.

<sup>114</sup> Curt. 10.7.2: *sacrorum caerimoniarumque consors modo*.

<sup>115</sup> So (e.g.) BERVE (above n. 105) II 386; N. G. L. HAMMOND, Some passages in Arrian concerning Alexander, CQ 30, 1980, 475.

<sup>116</sup> See the evidence compiled by BERVE I 85–7. Note also the comments of HAMMOND, The Macedonian State, 1989, 22–3, who nevertheless opines that «although Arrhidaeus . . . was of unsound mind, he participated with Alexander in religious and secular matters».

tainly in Babylon and will have joined with Arrhidaeus in officiating. So two centuries earlier Cyrus and Cambyses had stood together before Marduk praising his great godhead.<sup>117</sup> In 323 the king of Babylon and the king of lands will have inaugurated the new year together, and it would have been remembered as a recent happening at the time of Alexander's death.

If my hypothesis is accepted, Arrhidaeus had a ceremonial role as king of Babylon, appropriate enough for the idiot of the family. He was installed in 324/23 and in the following year succeeded his brother as king of lands. In Babylon therefore there were two methods of reckoning his reign, which could be allotted a minimum of six or a maximum of eight years. Elsewhere there was no ambiguity. The kingship began with the death of Alexander and continued until October 317, the fixed point for the chronology of the period. Olympias' defeat and the death of Eumenes are now firmly anchored to the winter of 317/16, and the eighth year of Philip as it appears in the Babylonian chronicle can be confidently identified as the year beginning April 317.<sup>118</sup>

### *Appendix I* *Two Problematic Details in Diodorus*

(1) 18.36.7: Perdikkas after three years of rule (ἄρξας ἔτη τρία) lost both his hegemony and his life. At first sight this is a precise statement which fixes Perdikkas' death in the summer of 320, and it has been accepted as such (e. g.) by ERRINGTON, *Hermes* 105, 1977, 480 n. 12, and SCHÖBER (above n. 1) 64. Unfortunately it may not be an accurate reflection of Diodorus' source. The original may have been more precise, giving a figure in years and months (as with the reign of Philip III), which Diodorus has rounded up. Alternatively it could have been vaguer, referring to Perdikkas' death in the third year of his rule, in which case Diodorus will have turned the ordinal into a cardinal. Something similar happened with his dating of the Social War. At 16.7.3 (358/57) he claims that it lasted three years (διέμεινεν ἔτη τρία); at 16.22.2 (356/55) he finishes his narrative with a statement that it had lasted four years. In effect the war began in the summer of 357 and was over by 355 (cf. G. L. CAWKWELL, *Notes on the Social War*, C & M 23, 1962, 34–40). It took place over three campaigning seasons which fell in two archon years (Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 12.7, p. 21 RADERMACHER). The same was the case with Perdikkas, whose tenure of power fell in three consecutive Macedonian (and Athenian) years from June 323 to the summer of 321.

(2) 18.28.2: Arrhidaeus spent nearly two years (σχεδὸν ἔτη δύο καταναλώσας)

<sup>117</sup> Recorded in the Cyrus Cylinder (most conveniently consulted in J. B. PRITCHARD, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*,<sup>3</sup> 1969, 316; see also P. R. BERGER, *Der Kyros-Zylinder mit dem Zusatzfragment BIN II Nr. 32*, ZA 64, 1975, 192–234, esp. 199. For interpretation see OPPENHEIM, in *CHI*ran II, 1985, 549.

<sup>118</sup> I am most grateful to Professor CHRISTIAN HABICHT and Dr. ELLEN RICE for encouragement and comment.

on the construction of Alexander's funerary carriage and then brought the body from Babylon to Egypt. Once again this suits the low chronology better than the high (cf. SCHÖBER 63–4). The cumbersome cortege with its haulage team of sixty four mules and its contingent of road-makers and engineers (18.27.5–28.1) would have required several months to travel from Babylon to Damascus, where Ptolemy took control and escorted it to Egypt. The news of his intervention made Perdiccas even more set on invasion (Arr. Succ. F 24.1; cf. F 1.25). Ptolemy obviously intercepted the body some time before Perdiccas began his attack (May/June), and the progress of the body from Babylon will have required several more months again. On the high chronology Arrhidaeus will have left Babylon around the autumn of 322, closer to one year than two after Alexander's death. But once again we have no indication how precise a figure Diodorus' source gave or even what he attached the figure to. Hieronymus might have begun with a general statement recording the arrival of the body in Egypt «nearly two years after Alexander's death», in which case Diodorus erroneously attached the temporal statement to the completion of the carriage. Alternatively Hieronymus might have described Arrhidaeus' construction work in terms such as «he had spent one year in its construction and was into the second». That could have inspired the misleading approximation in Diodorus.

*Appendix II*  
*Chronology of Events in Greece and Asia*

<i>Date</i>	<i>Events in Europe</i>	<i>Events in Asia</i>
Late summer/ autumn 319	<i>Death of Antipater</i>	Eumenes under siege at Nora;
autumn 319	Nicanor arrives in Athens.	Antigonus' campaign in Pisidia.
	Cassander escapes from Macedonia. Polyperchon is- sues his «exiles' decree».	News of Antipater's death reaches Antigonus.
winter 319/18	Nicanor occupies Peiraeus.	Arrhidaeus attacks Cyzicus and alienates Antigonus, who assists Cassander and opens negotia- tions with Eumenes.
spring 318	Alexander invades Attica and provokes democratic re- volution. Death of Phocion (early May). Arrival of Cas- sander in Peiraeus.	Eumenes vacates Nora. Antigo- nus invades Lydia. In Cappa- docia Eumenes accepts com- mand of the royal army.
summer 318	Polyperchon in the Pelopon- nese. Siege of Megalopolis. Cleitus and Nicanor sent to the Hellespont.	Eumenes recruiting in Cilicia; advent of Silver Shields. Antigonus' intervention at By- zantium.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Events in Europe</i>	<i>Events in Asia</i>
autumn 318	Cassander increases pressure on Athens. Polyperchon returns to Macedon (?).	Eumenes in Cilicia. He moves into Babylonia when Antigonus advances from the west.
winter 318/17	Athens capitulates to Cassander; beginning of regime of Demetrius (after Maemacteron).	Eumenes in winter quarters in Babylonia; Antigonus in Mesopotamia.
summer 317	Cassander's first invasion of Macedon.	Battle of the Coprates (July 317).
autumn 317	Eurydice declares herself against Polyperchon. Cassander in the Peloponnese. Olympias' return to Macedon. <i>Death of Philip III</i> (October).	Antigonus withdraws to Media, Eumenes to Persis (forged letter) – c. September.
winter 317/16	Cassander's second invasion of Macedonia. Siege of Pydna.	Battle of Paraetacene (November?); Battle of Gabiene (January?); Death of Eumenes. Antigonus finishes the winter near Ecbatana.
spring 316	Capitulation of Olympias. Cassander takes control of Macedonia.	Execution of Peithon in Media.
summer 316	Rebuilding of Thebes.	Deposition of Peucestas and Seleucus. Antigonus returns to Cilicia (November).

*Department of Classics and Ancient History  
The University of Western Australia  
Nedlands, Western Australia 6009*

