

DIODORUS ON PHILIP II AND THESSALY IN THE 350S B.C.

THOMAS R. MARTIN

THE sources for Philip II's actions in Thessaly in the 350s B.C. are difficult to interpret, not least because it is Diodorus who provides our only detailed account. Two of Diodorus' details create special problems for the interpreter. In his recent comprehensive discussion of Philip's relations with Thessaly in this period, G. T. Griffith argues on the first of these two difficult points that the participle "returning" used by Diodorus at 16. 14. 2 to describe Philip on his entry into Thessaly in the later 350s supports the view that Justin at 7. 6. 7-9 preserves the record of an earlier entry by Philip into Thessaly late in 358. On the second point, Griffith believes that the accepted dates of 353 and 352 for Philip's two major campaigns in Thessaly described by Diodorus at 16. 35 and 16. 38. 1-2 exclude the possibility of emending the meaningless "Pagae" at 16. 31. 6 to "Pagasae" as the city subdued by Philip in 354/53.¹ It is my contention in this paper, however, that the occurrence of the word "returning" need not be evidence for an earlier entry and that the two major campaigns should be dated to 354 and 353, a chronology which allows the emendation and, in addition, offers a solution to the puzzle of the date of Demosthenes' *First Philippic*.

THE "RETURN OF PHILIP"

At 16. 14. 1-2 Diodorus turns from events in Sicily to a mention of the death of Alexander of Pherae and subsequent events in Thessaly. At first, Diodorus says, all went well after the succession of Lycophron and Tisiphonus, but later they revealed their tyrannical aims and ruled by force. The Aleuads of Larissa then began to oppose the tyrants but were too weak to prevail without help. They therefore allied themselves with Philip, who came to Thessaly, defeated the tyrants, and reestablished the independence of the Thessalian cities. In the manuscripts of Diodorus at 16. 14. 2, ἐπαγελθών is used to describe Philip when he came to Thessaly on this occasion, and Griffith, following M. Sordi, rightly says that this word should, on the face of it, mean that Philip was "returning" to Thessaly when he came to fight the tyrants, even though Diodorus has made no mention of a previous entry into Thessaly by Philip.² Griffith explains

1. N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 224-25. Cf. Griffith, "Philip of Macedon's Early Interventions in Thessaly (358-352 B.C.)," *CQ* 20 (1970): 67-68. The importance of "returning" was first pointed out by M. Sordi, *La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno* (Rome, 1958), p. 349. Griffith follows C. Ehrhardt, "Two Notes on Philip of Macedon's First Interventions in Thessaly," *CQ* 17 (1967): 298-301, in rejecting the emendation on historical grounds.

2. *History*, 2: 224-25. This difficulty presumably motivated Hertlein to emend the text δ' ἐπαγελθών to δὲ παρελθών, a change which has been commonly accepted.

Diodorus' mention of a "return" by the assumption that Diodorus' source knew of an earlier entry by Philip into Thessaly and alluded to it at this point, an allusion which Diodorus has preserved despite the absence of any reference in his narrative to an earlier entry.³ But there is another explanation of "returning" which does not require us to assume such an oversight on the part of Diodorus. Diodorus is, as Griffith says,⁴ "condensing and selecting from his narrative source(s) here in Book 16 as always," and the compression of a fuller account can explain Diodorus' language. First, Diodorus' information on Philip's actions in Thessaly in 16. 14. 2 is proleptic.⁵ The expulsion of the tyrants from Pherae came only after Philip's second major campaign, much later than 357/56, the ostensible date of 16. 14. 2.⁶ Since the important event for Diodorus at this point is the subsequent expulsion of Alexander's successors and its consequences, not the details of Philip's campaigns in Thessaly, Diodorus does not bother to make explicit what he obviously knows, that Philip expelled the tyrants not on his first major campaign but only after the second. This crucial information comes later in Diodorus' narrative history of Philip's actions. At 16. 35 we learn that the Thessalians called in Philip against Pherae after the fall of Methone. According to Diodorus, Philip came to Thessaly *ὑπὸ Θετταλῶν μετακληθείς*. Griffith seeks to reinforce his interpretation of "returning" by translating this phrase at 16. 35. 1 as "recalled by the Thessalians," that is, for the first major campaign in 354/53.⁷ But Griffith himself points out that Diodorus could easily have used *μετακαλέω* to mean "to call away or to another place" rather than "to recall." Furthermore, Griffith's choice of "recalled" as the meaning of the participle here depends on his assumption that Philip was not "called away" from Methone to Thessaly for his first major campaign because, he says, the Methone campaign and the first Thessalian campaign were in succeeding years. But, as we shall see in the section on chronology, one cannot assume without argument, as Griffith does, that the campaigns were in succeeding years. We shall see that the chronology implied by Diodorus' language here makes good sense historically and that Philip may well have been "called away to another place"; that is, the participle in this case can be translated as an instance of the meaning of the verb given as "summon" in LSJ, s.v. *μετακαλέω* I. 2. More precisely, Diodorus may have meant to indicate by the use of the passive

3. "Early Interventions," p. 68; *History*, 2:224–25, 228–29. In his second discussion Griffith expands on his earlier suggestion ("Early Interventions," p. 79) to argue that Diod. 16. 14. 2 refers both to an entry into Thessaly by Philip in 355 B.C. and to the ultimately victorious campaigns against the tyrants described in Diod. 16. 35 and 16. 38. 1–2. However, "returning" could not refer to Philip on an entry in 355 because the content of 16. 14. 2 is entirely concerned with Philip's later success against the tyrants. That this proleptic reference comes where it does in Diodorus' account could be taken as significant for the question of an intervention very early in Philip's reign, a point which I hope to discuss elsewhere in connection with the other evidence for such an early intervention.

4. "Early Interventions," p. 68.

5. *Ibid.*

6. Diod. 16. 37. 3, 16. 38. 1.

7. "Early Interventions," p. 68. Cf. Griffith, *History*, 2:225, n. 1. 354/53 is the proper archon year for the first major campaign, regardless of the proper calendar year.

that Philip was kept from going back to Macedonia by the Thessalians.⁸ In any case, Griffith's choice of "recalled" should not be the translation of μετακληθεῖς at 16. 35. 1 if the campaign against Methone and the first major Thessalian campaign were in the same year.

The details of Philip's campaigns in Thessaly after the fall of Methone allow us to see what has happened in Diodorus' very compressed prolepsis at 16. 14. 2. After some successes in his first campaign, Philip later suffered such a severe defeat in battle against Onomarchus and his Phocian army that the king only with difficulty managed to rally his forces and withdraw to Macedonia. But in a great reversal of fortune Philip *returned* to Thessaly on a second campaign in which he was at last victorious.⁹ In the aftermath of this great victory Philip ended the tyranny at Pherae and restored freedom to the city.¹⁰ But the important point for our argument is that Philip had to retire from Thessaly to Macedonia after his defeat by Onomarchus before returning to Thessaly in a second campaign which ended in a Macedonian victory and the abolition of tyranny in Pherae. The retirement probably lasted through a winter season and gave Philip time to reorganize and discipline the army which had almost mutinied after its defeat.¹¹ We can therefore see that Philip did indeed "return" to Thessaly, but on his second major campaign, not his first. The idea of returning was so prominent because Philip himself had promised after the ignominious defeat of the first campaign that he would return like a ram to butt even harder the second time.¹² Philip's ultimate defeat of Onomarchus was a "return" par excellence, and it was very probably played up as such in favorable accounts. In his condensed version at 16. 14. 2 of Philip's campaigns against Pherae, Diodorus' ἐπανεθῶν reflects the truth and the propaganda of Philip's victory over Pherae and its Phocian allies, but the compression at this point is so severe as to render obscure the participle, "returning." The renown of Philip's brilliant victory after his return to Thessaly is more

8. Prof. C. Rubincam has kindly supplied me with four other references to this verb from the concordance to Diodorus compiled at the University of Toronto Computer Centre on the basis of a machine-readable text of Diodorus supplied by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* Project. In the middle, the translation "to recall" or "to summon back" is apt, as at 16. 43. 4 ("having recalled his attendants") and at 16. 10. 2 ("to recall from rebellion"). However, "to be recalled" is not the right translation for the two instances of the passive supplied by Rubincam. Both at 2. 26. 1 and 20. 43. 2, the sense of the passive participle is not "recalled" but rather "restrained from going somewhere else, from going away, or from doing something." In the first passage, the disheartened rebel forces are for the second time (see 2. 25. 5 for the first) kept from going home by Belesys' persuasion. They cannot be said to have been "recalled" because they had not yet departed. In the second passage, Bormilcar is restrained by his sense of caution from attempting to establish a tyranny. Again, "recalled" would not be an appropriate translation because Bormilcar had not in fact done anything yet from which he could be recalled. In other words, the passive in these instances seems to suggest that the subject was kept from doing something he might otherwise have done. The passive participle at 16. 35. 1 could also be interpreted as expressing this nuance of meaning: Philip is kept from going home to Macedonia from Methone (as he would otherwise have done) by the Thessalians and their request for aid. This nuance is of course implicit in the meaning of the verb in the passive as "summoned." To the references for this meaning in LSJ, one can add, from Stephanus, [Plato] *Axiochus* 372a16 and schol. to Philostr. *Heroicus* 2. 14.

9. Diod. 16. 35. 3.

10. Diod. 16. 38. 1.

11. Cf. Griffith, *History*, 2: 267-68.

12. Polyaeus *Strat.* 2. 38. 2.

likely to be the source of "returning" at 16. 14. 2 than is an allusion to an earlier intervention in Thessaly about which Diodorus appears to know nothing.¹³

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE TWO MAJOR CAMPAIGNS

The uncertainty of the chronology of Philip's activities in Thessaly after the capture of Methone is due to the ambiguity of Diodorus' account of Philip's activities in the 350s. In the first place, Diodorus does not report something about Philip in every year. He describes activities of Philip in his narrative for 360/59 (16. 2-3. 7), 359/58 (16. 4), and 358/57 (16. 8) which seem to be correctly dated, but the reference for 357/56 (16. 14. 2) is proleptic, as we have seen. Activities of Philip are again recorded in the narrative for 356/55 (16. 22. 3), but there is nothing concerning Philip for 355/54. There is also nothing in the narrative section of 354/53, but at the very end of this year (16. 31. 6-7) Philip's capture and razing of Methone as well as the fall of "Pagae" (according to the manuscripts) are listed in one of Diodorus' so-called chronographic sections. The chronographic nature of this section is obvious from its content, a summary list of events and successions in different places, and from its placement at the very end of the year. Similar sections appear nearby at the end of 353/52 (16. 36. 2-5), of 351/50 (16. 45. 7-9), and of 349/48 (16. 52. 9-10).¹⁴ In the next year, 353/52, Diodorus returns to Philip's activities in his narrative at 16. 34. 4-5. The first activity recorded is the capture and razing of Methone (16. 34. 4-5). The date implied by this section for the fall of Methone obviously differs by one year from the date given by the chronographic section in 354/53. This difference is perhaps significant, as we shall see. Immediately after his narrative account of the fall of Methone Diodorus proceeds to describe in 16. 35 Philip's two campaigns in Thessaly that culminated in the defeat and death of the Phocian commander, Onomarchus, in the battle that has come to be known as the Battle of the Crocus Field.¹⁵ Diodorus has no more to say about Philip in 353/52 and does not return to the narrative of the king's activities before 16. 37. 3 in 352/51. There he describes the surrender of Pherae to Philip under terms of a truce. At 16. 38. 1-2, still in 352/51, Diodorus again refers to Philip's takeover of Pherae, then to the abortive advance to Thermopylae after the settlement of Thessaly, and, finally, to Philip's return to Macedonia.

If we put aside the question of absolute dates for a moment, we can see that Diodorus' narrative account makes perfectly good sense in terms of relative chronology. In one archon year Philip takes Methone and then proceeds to Thessaly. He is defeated by Onomarchus on his first campaign

13. That is, an intervention early in the reign of Philip for which Justin 7. 6. 7-9 would be the evidence.

14. For a brief discussion of the chronographic sections in Diodorus, see E. Schwartz, s.v. "Diodorus," *RE* 9 (1903): 665-69. Schwartz (col. 669) believes that the dates given in these sections are generally reliable.

15. The identification is K. J. Beloch's, *Griechische Geschichte*², 4 vols. (Berlin and Leipzig, 1912-27), 3.1:477, n. 1, but the location of the battlefield is in fact very speculative.

and forced to retire to Macedonia. The winter of the archon year would be an appropriate time for the retreat and the necessary reorganization of the Macedonian army. Still in the same archon year, Philip returns to defeat and kill Onomarchus. In the following archon year, Pherae is surrendered, after which Philip makes his unsuccessful attempt to move south through the pass at Thermopylae and then marches back to Macedonia.

But what are the correct years for Philip's activities in Thessaly at this period? N. G. L. Hammond's major article of 1937 has become the basis for the generally accepted view, adopted by Griffith, that the first campaign belongs in 353 and the successful return in 352.¹⁶ Hammond argues that Methone fell to Philip in the autumn of 354 and that Pagasae (accepting the emendation of "Pagae" to "Pagasae" at Diodorus 16. 31. 6) was taken not long thereafter in the same campaigning season. The campaign in Thessaly narrated by Diodorus in 16. 35. 1-3 (immediately after Diodorus' account of the fall of Methone) Hammond then dates to the spring and summer of 353, with the retreat to Macedonia in winter 353/52, and the final, victorious campaign in Thessaly (16. 35. 3-6) in the spring of 352.¹⁷ Hammond's aim was to take as few liberties as possible with Diodorus' account, but in fact his chronology meshes very poorly with Diodorus because it necessitates the assumption of three Thessalian campaigns by Philip rather than the two implicitly described by Diodorus and involves a general disregard for Diodorus' distribution in different archon years of the events of Philip's campaigns. The trouble begins with the duplicate references to the fall of Methone at 16. 31. 6 and 16. 34. 4-5. Hammond and the scholars who accept his chronology have agreed that the fall of Methone belongs to 354/53 on the basis of the so-called chronographic section, 16. 31. 6. They therefore implicitly accept the assumption that the narrative account of the city's fall at 16. 34. 4-5, ostensibly dated by Diodorus to 353/52, has been displaced from its proper place in the narrative of 354/53, where, as we have seen, Diodorus omitted all mention of Philip's activities. Immediately after his narrative account of the fall of Methone, Diodorus in 16. 35 begins his narrative account of Philip's campaigns in Thessaly. Hammond places the start of the Thessalian campaign described in 16. 35. 1-2 in the spring of 353, that is, in 354/53 and not in 353/52 as Diodorus' account implies. In other words, Hammond believes that at least part of this campaign has also been displaced from its proper place in 354/53. But he apparently does not believe that anything else has been displaced from 354/53 to 353/52 in Diodorus' narrative and achieves a synchronization with Diodorus' chronology by placing the end of the first campaign, the return to Macedonia, and the second campaign in 353/52 (described in 16. 35. 3-6).

16. "Diodorus' Narrative of the Sacred War and the Chronological Problems of 357-352 B.C.," *JHS* 57 (1937): 44-78, republished with no pertinent changes as "Diodorus' Narrative of the Third Sacred War," in Hammond's *Studies in Greek History* (Oxford, 1973), pp. 486-533. For Griffith's position, see *History*, 2: 224, n. 2. Like Griffith, in their recent books on Philip, J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London, 1976), pp. 77-80, 82-87, and G. Cawkwell, *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1978), pp. 185-86, basically accept Hammond's chronology with the exception of his date of 354/53 for the fall of Pagasae.

17. "Diodorus' Narrative," pp. 58, 65-67.

Diodorus, of course, does not divide the events of 16. 35 between two archon years. The temporary synchronization lapses immediately because Hammond places the surrender of Pherae (16. 37. 3, 16. 38. 1) and Philip's subsequent advance to Thermopylae, where the king was met by the Phocians and the Athenians (16. 38. 1–2), still in 353/52, not in 352/51 as Diodorus' narrative suggests. Hammond has good reason to retain these events in 353/52 because Dionysius of Halicarnassus *De Dinarcho* 13 (665) says that the date of the Athenian expedition to Thermopylae was 353/52. Dionysius quotes the date in order to prove that a speech mentioning the Athenian expedition as "recent" is too early to have been written by Dinarchus, and he obviously took the date from a historian or similar chronographic source. Jacoby believed that the source was Philochorus.¹⁸

We see therefore that Hammond's attempt to accommodate all of Diodorus' dates has actually resulted in a good deal of the sort of reshuffling he decries.¹⁹ A much simpler solution to the chronological difficulties created by Diodorus' account is possible if we assume only one consistent error of displacement in Diodorus. The clue to the solution is provided by the duplicate references to the fall of Methone. As we saw earlier, Diodorus completely omitted reference to Philip's activities in 355/54 and all of 354/53 until the chronographic section tacked on at the very end of 354/53 at 16. 31. 6–7. This omission probably took place because Diodorus decided to devote the entire narrative of 355/54 and 354/53 to the history of the beginning of the Sacred War. Diodorus mentions nothing else from 16. 23, the start of 355/54, until 16. 31. 6–7, the list of events at the end of 354/53. Since the narrative of 354/53 was entirely devoted to the Sacred War, it is possible that other events which by their actual date properly belong to the narrative of 354/53 were pushed ahead for reasons of convenience in literary composition to 353/52. The narrative account of the fall of Methone at 16. 34. 4–5 is very probably a clear example of this sort of displacement, as we can see from the mention of the fall of the city in the chronographic section of 354/53 at 16. 31. 6. But if we assume that the fall of Methone in 16. 34. 4–5 has been displaced by Diodorus from 354/53 to 353/52, we might also assume that all the events in Thessaly described in 16. 35 immediately after the fall of Methone have been similarly displaced. There is nothing which requires us to separate the fall of Methone (16. 34. 4–5) from the following events in Thessaly (16. 35) by a winter, as Hammond does.²⁰ In fact, Diodorus at the start of 16. 35 perhaps meant to say that Philip was called away from Methone to Thessaly.²¹ Furthermore, the meaningless Πάγας at 16. 31. 6, referred to along with the fall of Methone in the list of events of 354/53, is very easily emended to Παγαράς on paleographical

18. *FGrH* 328 F 153. The Dionysius reference is mistakenly given as "*Demosthenes* 13, p. 655" in Hammond, "Diodorus' Narrative," p. 57, n. 43.

19. "Diodorus' Narrative," pp. 56, 65–66.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 67. He is followed by Griffith, "Early Interventions," p. 68, n. 2, and *History*, 2:267.

21. See the text above and n. 8.

grounds, and no other equally plausible emendation is available.²² A mention of the fall of Pagasae at 16. 31. 6 would fit perfectly with the assumption that Philip's triumph in Thessaly came in the same archon year as the fall of Methone because the fall of Pagasae is most easily understood as a consequence of Philip's victory over Onomarchus.

In short, a perfectly consistent chronology can be achieved by assuming that Diodorus in his narrative has consistently shifted Philip's activities in Thessaly of 354/53 into 353/52 and of 353/52 to 352/51. The two campaigns would therefore belong in 354 and 353. After the fall of Methone in 354/53 (16. 34. 4–5), Philip proceeds to Thessaly for his first, unsuccessful campaign (16. 35. 1–2). After his defeat by Onomarchus he retires to Macedonia for the winter of 354/53 (16. 35. 3) but returns in the spring of 354/53 for the second, successful campaign against the Pheraeans and Onomarchus' Phocians (16. 35. 3–6). The fall of Pagasae, which Diodorus fails to mention in his compressed narrative account, should come at this time in 354/53, probably after Philip's rout of the Pheraean and Phocian forces. The paleographically attractive emendation to "Pagasae" at Diodorus 16. 31. 6 is therefore acceptable on historical grounds as well.²³ The surrender of Pherae (16. 37. 3, 16. 38. 1) probably belongs in 353/52, where the advance to Thermopylae (16. 38. 1–2) certainly belongs, as we can deduce from Dionysius' date for the Athenian expedition to Thermopylae. This scheme would at least respect Diodorus' division of events into different archon years, something Hammond's scheme does not do. Of course, there is no guarantee that Diodorus' division is correct, but it should be pointed out that he can get this sort of thing right. For example, Dionysius *Epistula ad Ammaeum* 1. 10 shows that Diodorus correctly split Philip's actions against Olynthus into two archon years (16. 52. 9 in 349/48 and 16. 53 in 348/47).

One uncertainty in the scheme is the precise date of the surrender of Pherae. Demosthenes at 1. 12–13 describes the way in which Philip has grown great. First he took Amphipolis, after that Pydna, next Potidaea, thereafter Methone; then he invaded Thessaly. After this, having arranged matters to his satisfaction in Pherae, in Pagasae, in Magnesia, in all of Thessaly, he went to Thrace. The order Pherae, Pagasae could conceivably mean that Demosthenes thought Philip had received the surrender of Pherae before he took Pagasae,²⁴ but there are several reasons for preferring

22. Griffith, following Ehrhardt, "Two Notes," rejects the emendation, suggesting the historically and paleographically difficult *Παίονας*. See *History*, 2:224, 251, 264, n. 2.

23. Ehrhardt's argument in "Two Notes" for rejecting the emendation depends on the assumption that Philip's victory over Onomarchus must have been in 352. He follows Hammond, "Diodorus' Narrative," p. 65, in the assumption that the fall of "Pagae" at Diod. 16. 31. 6 must have come immediately after the fall of Methone. However, Diodorus gives no indication in this passage of the interval between the fall of Methone and the fall of "Pagae." He indicates only that the two places fell in the same archon year. Ehrhardt's suggestion (p. 300; adopted by Griffith, *History*, 2:224, n. 3), that Diodorus' language at 16. 31. 6 seems "better applicable to an independent tribe or people, rather than to a town with no political status" is vitiated by Diodorus' use of the same terms at 16. 52. 9, where, as in 16. 31. 6, he is contrasting, on the one hand, the razing of a Greek settlement with, on the other, forced surrender of a different place or places.

24. Cf. Griffith, *History*, 2:264, n. 2.

the order Pagasae, Pherae implied by Diodorus' account. First, since in any case the interval between the fall of the two cities must have been short, Demosthenes may not have known, or at least not remembered, the exact order in the case of these two nearby cities even if it was his intention to give them in the order of their surrenders. But Demosthenes' words suggest that this was not his intention. The other items in the list of Philip's successes are individually set off by chronological expressions, but Pherae, Pagasae, Magnesia, and the rest of Thessaly are lumped together as one item without separate indications of their chronological order. Indeed, they are all mentioned in the context of Philip's arrangements in Thessaly after his successful invasion and before his advance to Thermopylae, a period to which Diodorus refers at 16. 38. 1.²⁵ Therefore it appears that Demosthenes in this list is only concerned with the correct position of Philip's invasion of Thessaly after the capture of Methone and before the campaign in Thrace, not with the order of Philip's actions in settling affairs in Thessaly, a detail of no importance for Demosthenes' argument here. Moreover, when relative chronology was irrelevant, as it was at this particular point (1. 13) in Demosthenes' capsule history of Philip's rise to greatness, Demosthenes could be quite careless about chronological order in lists of historical events even when the intervals in question were much greater than that between the fall of Pagasae and that of Pherae. For example, at 4. 35 he gives the incorrect order of Methone, Pagasae, Potidaea for the three Athenian relief expeditions that arrived too late to help. At 4. 41 he reverses the order of the Athenian expeditions to Thermopylae and the Chersonese. In short, we need not take Demosthenes 1. 13 as evidence that the fall of Pagasae followed the surrender of Pherae. Demosthenes probably quite naturally mentioned Pherae, Pagasae, and Magnesia in geographical order, from west to east.

Therefore we can retain the order Pagasae, Pherae implied by the mention of the fall of "Pagae" in 354/53 at 16. 31. 6 and the surrender of Pherae in 353/52 at 16. 37. 3. Since only Lycophron is mentioned by Diodorus in 16. 35 in his account of Philip's campaigns in Thessaly in which all information about Pagasae is omitted, it may be that Peitholaus was in command of the Pheraeans at Pagasae. That Lycophron was in command at Pherae may also be implied by Diodorus' description of Lycophron as "tyrant of Pherae" (16. 35. 1, 3) while the two together are called "tyrants of the Pheraeans" (16. 37. 3). Upon the surrender of Pherae Lycophron and Peitholaus, in Diodorus' words (16. 37. 3), "brought together their mercenaries," a remark which perhaps means that Peitholaus brought to join Lycophron the survivors of the Pheraeans forces previously defeated in the siege of Pagasae. It seems reasonable to assume that the fall of Pagasae came before the surrender of Pherae and was in fact the final blow to Pheraeans power that led to the handing over of Pherae itself.

If we accept the assumption that Diodorus has displaced by one year Philip's two campaigns in Thessaly, the dates of these campaigns would

25. Cf. Hammond, "Diodorus' Narrative," p. 66; Griffith, *History*, 2:264, n. 2.

properly be given as 354 and 353, not 353 and 352 as is now generally assumed. But there remain two questions relevant to this assumption which must be discussed. First, since the date of the fall of Methone is crucial for the argument, is the general confidence of scholars in the reliability of the date of 354/53 given in Diodorus' chronographic section at 16. 31. 6 justified? Second, how does the assumption that Philip had retreated from Thermopylae by 353/52 fit with what Demosthenes says about Philip's subsequent activities?

At 16. 31. 6-7 the fall of Methone and of "Pagae" are listed along with the report of the death of Leucon and the succession of Spartocus (spelled Spartacus by Diodorus) in the Pontus region, of a war between the Romans and the Faliscans, and of the death of Dion and the rise to power of Callippus in Sicily. As pointed out earlier, three other similar, brief lists of events at the end of a year occur for this period in 353/52 (16. 36. 2-5), 351/50 (16. 45. 7-9), and 349/48 (16. 52. 9-10).²⁶ We must test the reliability of the dates for the events listed in these sections.

The references to Roman history are a special case. Diodorus puts Roman events under the same Roman consuls as given for these events in Livy, but his absolute dates at this period (as determined by the archon years) are consistently four years more recent than Livy's dates because Diodorus' Roman chronology omits four years in the second half of the fourth century B.C. that had dictators instead of consuls.²⁷ This consistent error of four years does not apply to Greek events, whose dates are derived from a source different from that used by Diodorus for Roman dates.²⁸ Diodorus' wrongly synchronized Roman and Greek chronology was a result of the difficulty of compiling one account from different sources and has no bearing on the accuracy or inaccuracy of his dates for Greek events in the chronographic sections under discussion.

The Greek events in these sections take place in Sicily, Heraclea, Caria, the Pontus region, and Greece itself. Diodorus mentions events in Sicily at 16. 31. 7, 16. 36. 5, and 16. 45. 9. There is no evidence to show that these dates are wrong, and they are accepted by Beloch in his Greek history and by H. Berve in his study of Dion.²⁹ The date of Clearchus' succession at

26. These chronographic sections can also occur at the very beginning of an archon year in Diodorus' account, but there is none of this kind for the period with which we are concerned. M. Toney, "Die Chronologie des dritten heiligen Krieges und die Jahreseinteilung im XVI Buch Diodors," *Studia historico-philologica Serdicensia* 1 (1938): 178-80, asserts against Hammond, "Diodorus' Narrative," pp. 64-65, 68-69, that 16. 34. 3-4 rather than 16. 36. 2-5 is the chronographic section for 353/52 and that 16. 36. 2-5 belongs to 352/51 although Diodorus puts it in 353/52. But this is impossible because 353/52 appears to be the correct date for the death of Mausolus (16. 36. 2) and the expulsion of Callippus (16. 36. 5). See the text below. The events in 16. 34. 3-4 simply mark Diodorus' return to the narration of affairs in Greece after his attention to Asia in 16. 34. 1-2.

27. G. Perl, *Kritische Untersuchungen zu Diodors römischer Jahrzahl* (Berlin, 1957), pp. 108-9. Cf. the review of Perl by J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Gnomon* 30 (1958): 297. Diodorus 16. 31. 7 corresponds to Livy 7. 16. 2, 16. 36. 4 to 7. 17. 6, and 16. 45. 8 to 7. 19. 1-3.

28. Perl, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, p. 157.

29. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*², 3.2:378-79, 3.1:258, 262; H. Berve, *Dion* (Mainz, 1956), p. 120, n. 3, pp. 123-24 (Berve's equation on p. 124 of Diod. 16. 45. 9 with 352/51 is presumably an unintentional substitution for 351/50). Toney's proposal, "Die Chronologie," pp. 202-3, to

Heraclea given at 16. 36. 3 appears to be in the correct archon year according to Beloch although he does consider the possibility of a date one year later.³⁰ The dates of the Carian dynasts, Mausolus and Artemisia, given in 16. 36. 2 and 16. 45. 7 are correct.³¹

Diodorus has, however, gone wrong in the chronology of the Spartocid dynasty. In 16. 52. 10 he gives a date of 349/48 for the death of Spartocus and the accession to the throne of Pairisades. But *IG*, 2². 212, an Athenian decree passed in the eighth prytany of 347/46, honors and gives thanks to Spartocus and his brother Pairisades for their benefactions to Athens. If Spartocus was being honored in 347/46, he cannot have died in 349/48. Diodorus presumably made this mistake because he did not know that the Spartocid dynasts often shared a joint rule. The error can be corrected by assuming a joint rule of Spartocus and Pairisades beginning in 349/48 after the death of their father, Leucon.³² Since Diodorus did not know that Spartocus and Pairisades ruled jointly, he was compelled to place the five-year rule of Spartocus in the years before Pairisades' accession to the throne in 349/48. Therefore Diodorus has wrongly dated to 354/53 the death of Leucon and the coming to the throne of Spartocus. This inaccuracy in the chronology of the Spartocid dynasty can justifiably be attributed to Diodorus' difficulties in trying to integrate a complicated set of chronological data into his history without knowledge of the critical information that Spartocid brothers could rule jointly. As in the case of his inaccuracy in Roman chronology, Diodorus' muddle of Spartocid dates is the result of special circumstances and does not reflect on the accuracy of dates not derived from sources that required special handling or special knowledge for correct interpretation.

Unfortunately, we have almost no other evidence concerning the dates of the events in the final category found in the chronographic sections relevant to our period, the events listed from Greece proper. Neither the fall of "Pagae" (16. 31. 6) nor the fall of Γέλραν and Philip's expedition against Pherae (16. 52. 9) can be otherwise dated. For the fall of Methone (16. 31. 6), however, we do have one hint that 354/53 is in fact a reasonable date. Since *IG*, 2². 130 of the fifth prytany of 355/54 implies that Methone was already under siege (or soon would be) by this date, it makes good sense historically to believe that the city fell in the archon year following 355/54.

Therefore we see that there is some evidence for, and no evidence against,

lower Beloch's dates by one year must be rejected because he fails to recognize that Plut. *Dion* 56. 4-6 has mistakenly substituted the Koreia festival at Syracuse (whose precise date in the summer is in any case unknown) for the Thesmophoria. See M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 358. Since the Thesmophoria took place in the fall, Dion's murder at the festival belongs in the fall of 354. His successor Callippus' rule of thirteen months therefore comes to an end in 353/52, where Diodorus puts it in his chronographic section at 16. 36. 5, and cannot extend into 352/51, where Toney wants it.

30. *Griechische Geschichte*², 3.2:94-96. Cf. Toney, "Die Chronologie," p. 202.

31. E. Badian, "A Document of Artaxerxes IV?," *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory. Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyer on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. K. H. Kinzl (Berlin, 1977), p. 41, n. 1 (on p. 42); Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*², 3.2:143-45.

32. See R. Werner, "Die Dynastie der Spartokiden," *Historia* 4 (1955): 415-21, 430.

believing that the date of 354/53 given in the chronographic section at 16. 31. 6 is correct for the fall of Methone. The mistaken dates in the chronographic sections relevant to our period occur because of the difficulty in synchronizing a series of events, but the record of the date of the fall of a city under a certain archon was a much simpler matter requiring no synchronization with other events and therefore presumably less susceptible to confusion. We should accept 354/53 as the correct date of the fall of Methone. And if this date is correct for the fall of Methone, we should also believe that it is correct for the fall of "Pagae." As we saw in our chronological investigation, the fall of Pagasae is best placed at the end of Philip's second Thessalian campaign in 353, and therefore we should surely accept Gemistius' correction of a simple case of haplography and read Παγασαί at 16. 31. 6.

We now come to the second question posed above. If we assume that Philip's activities in Thessaly ended in 353, is it possible to reconcile Demosthenes' references to Philip's activities after his retreat from Thermopylae at the end of his second Thessalian campaign with this date? At 1. 12-13, as we have seen, Demosthenes describes the steps by which Philip became powerful. According to Demosthenes, Philip went to Thrace after his activity in Thessaly. There the king fell ill, Demosthenes adds, but on his recovery he immediately attacked Olynthus. The same order of events is given at 4. 17. Since we are now concerned with questions of chronology, it is perhaps worth pointing out that in these lists Demosthenes is concerned with Philip's freedom to march wherever he pleases without Athenian resistance and is not making a point about Philip's speed in going from place to place. Furthermore, the list of events in 1. 12 gives no indication of the precise intervals between one of Philip's actions and the next. Nevertheless, the natural implication of Demosthenes' language at 1. 13 is that Philip went more or less directly from Thermopylae to Thrace in the same campaigning season.³³ Assuming that Demosthenes is being precise on this chronological point, we must believe that Philip marched from Thermopylae to Thrace, on the generally accepted chronology, in 352. Could the year be 353 instead? The evidence, unfortunately, is the very troublesome passage on the news of the siege of Heraion Teichos in Demosthenes' *Third Olynthiac* (3. 4). There we learn that this distressing report reached Athens *τρίτον ἢ τέταρτον ἔτος τοῦτ',* in the month of Maimacterion. From the mention of Philip's illness at 3. 5 we know that this is the same Thracian campaign as the one mentioned at 1. 13. The date Demosthenes gives for the news about the siege is crucial for our investigation, but it is frustratingly inexact because Demosthenes knows the month but not the year. And, although it is bad enough that Demosthenes does not give the exact number of years, the difficulty is compounded by his failure to explain whether he meant archon years or calendar years. If Demosthenes here meant calendar years of

33. Since Macedonia is on the route from Thessaly to Thrace, it is not significant for our purposes that Diodorus says at 16. 38. 2 that Philip returned to Macedonia from Thermopylae or that Demosthenes at 4. 17 implies that the raid on Thrace, as well as the others, was launched from Macedonia.

twelve months rather than archon years, "this is the third or fourth year" can be reconciled with a date of 353 for the reception at Athens of the news of the siege.³⁴ The calculation runs as follows. Demosthenes' *Third Olynthiac* appears to have been delivered in 349/48, not in Maimacterion (notice the expression at 3. 4 "then it was Maimacterion") and very probably before that month in the archon year.³⁵ A date for the speech before Maimacterion 349/48 would be in the fourth calendar year of twelve months since Maimacterion 353/52. Therefore the date of the reception of the news of the siege could be 353. Of course, 352 has been the preferred choice ever since Hammond's article of 1937 as a result of the link with his date of 352 for Philip's final campaign in Thessaly and advance to Thermopylae.³⁶ But if there is reason for dating this campaign to 353, as I have tried to show, we should consider dating the siege of Heraion Teichos to 353 as well. The ambiguity of Demosthenes' chronological reference at 3. 4 precludes certainty on this point, but it is perhaps significant that the acceptance of a date of Maimacterion 353/52 for the reception at Athens of the news of the siege of Heraion Teichos would allow us to resolve another chronological difficulty in this same period.

This other problem concerns Dionysius' date of 352/51 for the *First Philippic* (*Epist. ad Amm.* 1. 4). This speech is later than Philip's siege of Heraion Teichos and attack on Olynthus after his illness (4. 17). If Demosthenes 3. 4 did refer to 352/51, it is perhaps possible that the siege of Heraion Teichos, Philip's illness, and his attack on Olynthus could all be fitted into 352/51 with the *First Philippic* placed very late in the year. But the connection of the *First Philippic* with the expedition of Charidemus mentioned at Demosthenes 3. 5 is then troublesome because this expedition was sent out in Boedromion of the archon year following the year in which the news of the siege of Heraion Teichos was reported in Maimacterion.³⁷ If the Maimacterion is of 352/51, this would be Boedromion of 351/50 and therefore at least two months after the latest possible date for the *First Philippic* according to the date given by Dionysius. This interval is difficult to account for and has led scholars to suggest that Charidemus' expedition was voted in late 352/51 but delayed for over sixty days by the Etesian

34. Comparative evidence from the Demosthenic corpus shows that the ordinal number must refer to inclusive reckoning. See, for example, *τρίτων έτος* = *τρίτω έτει* in oration 33. 23–24. See the appendix to this paper for further discussion of the meaning of *έτος* in Demosthenes 3. 4.

35. The date of 349/48 is given by Dion. Hal. *Epist. ad Amm.* 1. 4. For a discussion of the reliability of Dionysius' dates for the speeches of Demosthenes, see R. Sealey, "Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Some Demosthenic Dates," *REG* 68 (1955): 77–120. For early autumn, 349/48, as the date of delivery of the speech, see M. Croiset (ed.), *Démosthène: Harangues*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1959), pp. 90–91, 121–25; G. L. Cawkwell, "The Defence of Olynthus," *CQ* 12 (1962): 133–34.

36. Hammond, "Diodorus' Narrative," p. 57, n. 44, thought the choice for "this is the third or fourth year" was between 352 and 351, which presumably means that he was thinking of archon years. J. R. Ellis, on the other hand, "Philip's Thracian Campaign of 352–351," *CP* 72 (1977): 32, n. 2, makes a choice between 353 and 352, which would suggest that he was thinking of calendar years or of archon years reckoned exclusively.

37. The reference at 4. 43 to "empty triremes" seems to link the *First Philippic* with the "empty ships" of Charidemus' expedition (3. 5). Furthermore, the phrase "the hope of a certain person" at 4. 43 may be an oblique reference to Cersobleptes' insistence that only Charidemus could recover Amphipolis for the Athenians (23. 14).

winds and a lack of haste on the part of the Athenians, or that Dionysius' date for the speech is incorrect.³⁸ But if the Maimacterion of 3. 4 is in 353/52, the Boedromion of 3. 5 would be in 352/51. There would in this case be no difficulty in associating Charidemus' expedition with the *First Philippic* while also accepting Dionysius' date for the speech.

Thanks to Diodorus' and Demosthenes' lack of precision in chronology, certainty is impossible, but the sum of the evidence seems to favor a chronological scheme in which Philip's first major campaign in Thessaly comes in 354 and his second in 353. Pagasae falls in 353. Philip goes from Thermopylae to Thrace by Maimacterion 353/52 but falls ill around that time. Upon his recovery, he attacks Olynthus in 352.³⁹

APPENDIX ON *ἔτος* IN DEMOSTHENES 3. 4

As we saw in the section on chronology, the meaning of *ἔτος* in the phrase "this is the third or fourth year" in the *Third Olynthiac* is important but ambiguous. We would very much like to know whether the years in question were archon years or calendar years of twelve months,⁴⁰ but it is not possible, unfortunately, to make a decision with confidence on the basis of comparative evidence from the speeches of the Demosthenic corpus. *ἔνιαυτός* is the proper term for an archon year, as we see, for example, in 3. 5, where Demosthenes is at pains to point out how long it took the Athenians to send off the expedition of Charidemus in response to the news of Philip's activities in the Chersonese. It was only, he says, in the Boedromion of the next *ἔνιαυτός* following the news received in the previous Maimacterion that the ships were dispatched.

On a first impression the use of *ἔνιαυτός* for "archon year" at 3. 5 might suggest that the use of a different word for year, *ἔτος*, immediately before in

38. Cawkwell, "Defence," pp. 126–27; Ellis, "Thracian Campaign," p. 37 (cf. p. 33, n. 5). Cf. Griffith, *History*, 2:297, n. 2.

39. We cannot tell how long Philip's illness lasted. Since it was reported that he had died (3. 5), the malady was perhaps very serious. By the time of the *First Philippic* he had already recovered and attacked Olynthus (4. 17), but the incident was still recent enough for Demosthenes to use it in a chastisement of the Athenians for their inaction (4. 11).

References were given in n. 16 to the most recent views on the chronology of Philip's activities in this period, but four other studies deserve mention. Beloch argued before Hammond's article that Philip's two major Thessalian campaigns belong in 354 and 353, but he placed the siege of Heraion Teichos in 351; *Griechische Geschichte*², 3.2:267–68, 280–82. After Hammond's article there appeared Tonev's work on the chronology of the Sacred War and Diodorus' year divisions in which he puts the capture of Methone in the winter of 354/53 and both campaigns in 353; "Die Chronologie," pp. 170–77, 184–85, 212. Tonev does not mention Heraion Teichos, nor does P. Cloché in his article on the Sacred War written in response to Hammond. Cloché dates the campaigns to 354 and 353 but postulates two separate captures of Pagasae; "La chronologie de la troisième guerre sacrée jusqu'en 352 avant J.-C." *Les études classiques* 8 (1939): 181–82, 191–92. Finally, M. Sordi, "La terza guerra sacra," *RFIC* 86 (1958): 149–52, agrees with Hammond that Pagasae fell immediately after Methone and that Philip also campaigned in 353 and 352, for a total of three Thessalian campaigns. But she is unique in thinking that the advance to Thermopylae is to be dated to 352/51 from Diod. 16. 38. 1–2.

40. It seems to me that the years must have been of one kind or the other. R. Sealey, however, "Demosthenic Dates," p. 95, agrees with the nineteenth-century opinion of Westermann and Weil that the two numbers indicate two methods of reckoning, i.e., the third calendar year but the fourth archon year.

3. 4 indicates a different kind of year, that is, "calendar year" or "period of twelve months reckoned from Maimacterion to Maimacterion." Furthermore, this impression that "year" at 3. 4 might mean a period of twelve months reckoned from a certain month in one archon year to the same month in the next archon year is strengthened by the observation that, of the three other instances in Preuss' *Index Demosthenicus* of *ἔτος τοῦτι* with an ordinal numeral, two instances certainly, and perhaps all three, refer to events whose months of occurrence were known and could therefore be used as points from which to reckon the number of years up to the month of the delivery of the speech. For "this is the third year" at 21. 13 the relevant month is the next month after the celebration of the Dionysia—Munichion—as we know from the second hypothesis to the speech.⁴¹ For "this is the second year" at 56. 4 and 56. 34 the relevant month is Metageitnion, as we know from 56. 5. We cannot be certain about "this is the third year" at 54. 3, but the speaker presumably knew in what month he had left Athens for garrison duty, and it is at least possible that he was reckoning from that month to the month of the delivery of the speech.

Nevertheless, the objection might be raised that *ἐνιαυτός* in the meaning "financial year" obviously could refer to a period of twelve months not necessarily coterminous with an archon year and therefore might have been a logical choice of words at 3. 4 to indicate "the third or fourth period of twelve months."⁴² The answer to this objection is that *ἐνιαυτός* seems to have been regularly used only to refer to one particular year (whether specifically dated or not) and not to a count of years.⁴³ To judge from the entries in Preuss' *Index Demosthenicus*, *ἐνιαυτός* never occurs with a numeral or in the plural in the Demosthenic corpus.⁴⁴ Reference to a numbered year or to "years" of whatever sort is made only by the singular and plural forms of *ἔτος*. Therefore it appears that Demosthenes would normally have used *ἔτος* in an expression such as "this is the third or fourth year" regardless of the kind of year he had in mind. We must therefore reluctantly conclude that *τρίτον ἢ τέταρτον ἔτος τοῦτι* at Demosthenes 3. 4 could, on the face of it, mean either "this is the third or fourth archon year" or "this is the third or fourth period of twelve months." The choice between the two alternatives can be made only on the basis of the circumstantial, historical evidence. My interpretation of that evidence leads me to choose the second alternative.⁴⁵

Harvard University

41. Cf. A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (Oxford, 1968), p. 75.

42. For a discussion of the possible differences in meaning between the two expressions for "year," see A. Wilhelm, "ΕΤΟΣ und ENIATTOΣ," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien* 142 (1900): IV. Abhandlung, pp. 1–12. For *ἐνιαυτός* as "financial year," see, e.g., Dem. 27. 29, 28. 12.

43. Cf. Wilhelm, "ΕΤΟΣ," pp. 11–12.

44. *Ἐνιαυτός* in the meaning of "archon year" is modified by *ἑσπερος* at [Dem.] 49. 30 in order to remind the audience of the relative order of the two archon years in question.

45. Thanks are due to Prof. E. Badian for offering helpful suggestions on an early version of part of this paper, and to the anonymous referee for valuable comments and advice. Neither is to be held responsible for the views expressed here nor for any errors that remain.