

constructs a familiar story line around the central detail that Darius was vexed by the queen's tomb. That the elaboration is actually inconsistent with the detail that generated it (Darius' inability to pass underneath a corpse and his opening of the tomb) suggests that it was the detail, not the fable, that was supplied to Herodotus.<sup>33</sup>

What Herodotus has done then with the story of Darius' entry into Nitocris' tomb is really no different from what he did with other strange facts which lay beyond his understanding. A case in point is the story of Darius' horse (3.84–87); it has been shown that it is likely derived from the practice of horse-divination observed in Persia and unknown in Greece.<sup>34</sup> The story as told by Herodotus has clear folktale components which might have helped mediate its strangeness for a Greek audience.<sup>35</sup> The disclosure of the Pseudo-Smerdis may also reflect a similar process (3.68–69); beginning with a story of Persian court intrigue, Herodotus constructs a story whose central panel (Phaedima's discovery that the usurper had no ears) makes sense only in Greek iconographic terms.<sup>36</sup> In Herodotus' transfer of foreign "facts" to Greek stories, the details he gained by inquiry and interrogation remain, but they undergo deformation as they are adapted and explained by him in his effort to make the unfamiliar understandable.<sup>37</sup>

JOHN DILLERY

*University of Michigan*

33. See B. E. Perry, "The Early Greek Capacity for Viewing Things Separately," *TAPhA* 68 (1937): 420–21, for a discussion of Herodotus' tendency to focus on only one aspect of an incident to the exclusion of others, even if this procedure produces logical inconsistency; see especially Perry's general remarks, pp. 404–5.

34. See C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, "Dareios und sein Roß," *Klio* 18 (1923): 59–64; M. A. Dandamaev, *Persien unter den ersten Achämeniden* (6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.), trans. H.-D. Pohl, *Beiträge zur Iranistik* 8 (Wiesbaden, 1976), p. 166 and n. 714; and O. Murray, "Herodotus and Oral History," in *Achaemenid History II*, pp. 114–15.

35. See Balcer, *Herodotus and Bisitun*, p. 38.

36. See A. Demandt, "Die Ohren des falschen Smerdis," *IA* 9 (1972): 94–101; A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom* (Cambridge, 1975), p. 131; and P. Calmeyer, "Greek Historiography and Achaemenid Reliefs," *Achaemenid History II*, pp. 12–13.

37. I have modified the wording in this last sentence from an observation of S. Humphreys, who suggests that Herodotus was essentially concerned with "how to make the unpredictable appear comprehensible"; see "Law, Custom, and Culture in Herodotus," *Arethusa* 20 (1987): 218.

I would like to thank L. Koenen, A. Loftus, S. Myers, D. Potter, and the anonymous readers of *CP* for help in writing this article. I owe my greatest debt to Ruth Scodel and the Editor of *CP*; both substantially improved my argument with their criticisms and suggestions.

## CRATERUS AND THE PROSTASIA

With Alexander the Great's death in Babylon in 323 B.C., the Macedonian nobles (the *principes*) meeting in council created a regency for his half brother Arrhidaeus (Q. Curtius 10.7.3–4; Arr. *Succ.* 1a.3, 8). Later when Roxane gave birth to Alexander's son and namesake, the infant was also hailed by the troops as king and the regency was expanded to encompass this dual monarchy (Arr. *Succ.* 1a.8; cf. Diod. 18.23.3).<sup>1</sup> The exact nature of this regency has been hotly debated over the years.

1. On the nature of the dual kingship, see W. Schwahn, "Die Nachfolge Alexanders des Grossen," *Klio* 24 (1931): 313.

At the center of the controversy is the office of *prostates* and its association with Craterus.<sup>2</sup> While the bestowal of this post on Craterus is not mentioned by Diodorus, the major surviving source for the period of the Diadochi, it appears conclusive that Arrian's more detailed work on the Successors, surviving now only in the fragments of two late epitomes, did make reference to both the office and its allocation to Craterus.<sup>3</sup> Both Photius' epitome of Arrian's *History of the Successors* (*Succ.* 1a.3) and Dexippus' *Ta meta Alexandron* (*FGrH* 100 F 8.4 = *Arr. Succ.* 1b.4), itself based on Arrian's work, state that Craterus was granted the "*prostasia* of Arrhidaeus' kingdom." In Photius' abridgement of Dexippus the *prostasia* is even called "the highest honor (*protiston times telos*) for Macedonians."

In modern scholarship opinion concerning the nature of this office has ranged from an honorific without power<sup>4</sup> to the most powerful post in the new order.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, consensus on any aspect of the *prostasia* has proven to be elusive. This paper will show that the *prostasia* was an official but extraordinary Macedonian office whose functions were synonymous with a regency. The *prostasia* came into existence only when the Macedonian nobility, the *principes*, deemed the monarch to be incapable of ruling on his own. Furthermore, this paper will argue that, while Craterus was initially mentioned as a possible *prostates*, i.e., regent, in the final settlement he was supplanted by Perdiccas.

That the office of *prostates* was an extraordinary one appears clear from the evidence. Certainly telling against its regularity is the argument from silence. Nowhere in the sources is the *prostasia* associated with Macedonia prior to its appearance during this particular succession crisis;<sup>6</sup> this is true not just of the historians and the contemporary speeches of Demosthenes, but also of the surviving inscriptions. Nor can Dexippus' reference to the *prostasia* as the "highest honor" be taken as evidence for the regularity or traditional nature of the office.<sup>7</sup> The phrase is placed in a context that casts no light on whether the office was a recent creation or traditional, extraordinary or usual. More important, it is difficult to see what responsibilities such a regular constitutional official would perform. N. G. L. Hammond has argued that the office was primarily a civil and religious

2. For a review of the literature, see K. Rosen, "Die Reichsordnung von Babylon (323 v. Chr.)," *AC* 10 (1967): 100–106; and P. Goukowsky, *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre (336–270 av. J.-C.)* (Nancy, 1978), pp. 195–97.

3. It is generally believed that both Diodorus' universal history, books 18–20, and Arrian's history of the Successors relied heavily on the contemporary history of Hieronymus of Cardia; see, most recently, J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 39–65.

4. M. J. Fontana, *Le lotte per la successione di Alessandro Magno dal 323 al 315* (Palermo, 1960), pp. 46–47.

5. Rosen, "Die Reichsordnung," pp. 102–9; W. Heckel, *The Last Days and Testament of Alexander the Great* (Stuttgart, 1988), pp. 19–20.

6. N. G. L. Hammond, "Some Macedonian Offices: c. 336–309 B.C.," *JHS* 105 (1985): 158, has argued that in Alexander's absence his mother, Olympias, was the *prostates* of Macedonia. His argument, however, is unconvincing. In the first place, nowhere is Olympias called *prostates*. Secondly, while on occasion she performs duties Hammond associates with the *prostates*, these responsibilities appear to be performed exclusively on an ad hoc basis. Telling against Olympias' holding any official magistracy is the clear evidence that her actions were not based on the holding of any magistracy but on her use of her position as Alexander's mother "to meddle" (*polupragmonein*) in affairs of state (*Plut. Alex.* 12–13; cf. *Diod.* 17.18.1).

7. So Hammond, "Some Macedonian Offices," p. 156; R. M. Errington, "From Babylon to Triparaeis: 323 B.C.–320 B.C.," *JHS* 80 (1970): 55 n. 48, claims that the phrase "highest honor" is the invention of either Dexippus or Photius.

one.<sup>8</sup> Hammond's argument is based in large part on the existence of a *prostates* in the neighboring Molossian kingdom of Epirus. Unfortunately, such an analogy is suspect given the different natures of the respective kingdoms. Epirus was clearly a limited monarchy,<sup>9</sup> while Macedonia was an autocracy.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, the evidence suggests that the *prostates* had powers which transcended those described by Hammond. Diodorus (18.23.2–3) states that after solidifying his hold on the *prostasia*, Perdikkas began to dream of acquiring the kingship in his own right. Diodorus here associates the phrase *basileon prostasian* with *basilikas dunameis*. As noted by K. Rosen, the parallelism of the *prostasia* and the *basilikas dunameis* is unmistakable.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, Appian (Syr. 52) states that Perdikkas' authority to dispense satrapies derived from his possession of the *prostasia*. In 318 Olympias was invited by Polyperchon, "the *epimeletes* of the kings" (Diod. 18.48.4, 55.1), to come to Macedonia and become the *epimeletes* of the young Alexander and the *prostates* of the kingdom (Diod. 18.49.4; cf. 57.2). In this dual capacity she dispatched orders to garrison commanders (Diod. 18.65.1), commanded troops (Diod. 19.35.3, 50.1), appointed generals (Diod. 19.35.4), and administered justice (Diod. 19.11.8–9). Reportedly Antipater on his deathbed had advised, "Never permit a woman [given the context an obvious reference to Olympias] to be *prostates* of the kingdom" (Diod. 19.11.9).

Given the powers associated with the *prostasia* by the sources, the office can refer only to a guardianship or a regency. This is the only meaning possible for *prostates* in these contexts. Only the authority usually associated with a regent or guardian covers the broad range of powers associated with the *prostates*. The *prostates* was the alter ego of the king and since the king's authority was absolute in all areas of rule,<sup>12</sup> the *prostates* would have corresponding duties. The *prostasia* was then the traditional title for a Macedonian regency. Such circumstances were rare in Macedonia. Only one regency is definitely attested in Macedonian history, that of Ptolemy Alorites for Perdikkas (Plut. *Pel.* 27.3; Aeschin. 2.29), with one other possible regency, that of Philip for Amyntas, the son of Perdikkas.<sup>13</sup> In neither case, however, are the technical terms, *prostasia* or *prostates*, used by the sources; rather the generic terms *epitropos* (Aeschin. 2.29) and *tutor* (Just. 7.5.9) are employed. In neither case are the sources attempting precision.

If *prostates* was the official title for the regent of Macedonia, a difficulty presents itself. The terms *epimeletes* and *epitropos* are also used by the sources with

8. Hammond, "Some Macedonian Offices," p. 157.

9. N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 527, 538–39.

10. See R. M. Errington, "The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy," *Chiron* 8 (1978): 77–133; E. M. Anson, "Macedonia's Alleged Constitutionalism," *CJ* 80 (1985): 303–16. Even those who see constitutional limitations placed on the powers of the Macedonian king see these restraints operating only in very select and limited areas; see F. Granier, *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung: Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht* (Munich, 1931), pp. 4–28, 48–57; and N. G. L. Hammond in Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 161–62. Despite the controversy all are agreed that the monarchy was the central Macedonian political institution. As G. T. Griffith states, there simply was no government apart from the king (*History of Macedonia*, 2:384).

11. Rosen, "Die Reichsordnung," p. 103.

12. See Errington, "The Nature of the Macedonian State," pp. 131–32; Anson, "Macedonia's Alleged Constitutionalism," pp. 303–7.

13. Hammond and Griffith, *History of Macedonia*, 2:651 and n. 1.

respect to those exercising the duties of a regent or guardian. While this use of multiple terms to describe the same office would appear to confuse the issue, in fact it clarifies the situation. The *prostates* was the traditional title of the regent or guardian of a king; *epimeletes* and *epitropos* were generic terms used to describe the functions, but were not traditional Macedonian titles.<sup>14</sup> Our sources' use of general terms in their descriptions of Macedonian offices is clearly seen in their repeated employment of the term *hegemon* (for example, Diod. 18.3.1, 36.6–7, 49.1, 54.1), which is often associated with *epimeletes autokrator* (Diod. 18.36.7, 39.2) and *epimeletes kai strategos autokrator* (Diod. 18.48.4). That the terms *prostates*, *epimeletes*, and *epitropos* were used virtually interchangeably is demonstrated by the frequent use of the different terms to describe the powers and duties of the same individual. Perdikkas is called *prostates* (Diod. 18.23.2; App. Syr. 52), *epimeletes* (Diod. 18.2.4), and *epitropos* (Arr. Succ. 1a.3). Antipater, likewise, is called both *prostates* (App. Syr. 52) and *epimeletes autokrator* (Diod. 18.39.1–2). In Egypt Pithon and Arrhidaeus are referred to as *epimeletai autokratores* (Diod. 18.39.1–2) and Polyperchon is later called *epimeletes kai strategos autokrator* (Diod. 18.48.4, 49.4, 55.1).

Certainly the term *epimeletes autokrator* (Diod. 18.36.7, 39.2), absolute regent, refers to the *prostasia*. *Autokrator* was commonly used to indicate supreme overall authority. In 320 Perdikkas appointed Eumenes “*autokrator strategos* of the forces in Cappadocia and Armenia” (Plut. *Eum.* 5.1). That *autokrator* is used in conjunction with *epimeletes* makes it clear that the latter term was in need of clarification, whereas *prostates* never requires such a qualifier. As noted, when Polyperchon invited Olympias to Macedonia he retained his *epimeletia* for Philip, but relinquished similar authority over Alexander IV (Diod. 18.49.4). Moreover, he acknowledged Olympias as holding superior authority by his bestowal on her of the *basilika prostasia*. It is noteworthy that the clear implication in Dexippus (*FGRH* 100 F 8.4 = Arr. *Succ.* 1b.4) that the chiliarch was inferior in authority to the *prostates* corresponds to Diodorus' assertion (18.48.4) that the former office was inferior to that of the *epimeletes kai strategos autokrator*.<sup>15</sup> Additionally, Pithon and Arrhidaeus, according to Photius' epitome of Arrian's *Successors* (30), “shared the power.” This passage is remarkably similar to that of Diodorus 18.23.2–3, wherein such power is directly associated with the *prostasia*. While the *prostates* was the official title for the guardian or regent, as a result of the confusing situation of two individuals being regarded as royal, neither of whom was perceived by the *principes* as capable of ruling in his own right, it does appear that *epimeletes* became a quasi-official title. In this way Polyperchon retained his responsibilities as guardian with regard to Philip while relinquishing overall authority at least in theory to Olympias. *Epitropos* is the least used term and there is no hint that it ever acquired in this period any but a generic meaning. Indeed,

14. Contra: Hammond, “Some Macedonian Offices,” pp. 156–57.

15. The chiliarch was “the first man after the king,” or in this case the first after whoever exercised power in the king's name, i.e., the *prostates* (Rosen, “Die Reichsordnung,” pp. 102–4, 109; P. Goukowsky, *Essai*, p. 195; Heckel, *Alexander the Great*, pp. 19–20). Additionally, the office of chiliarch, given its adoption from the usages of Persia, at this time probably applied solely to Asia (Hammond, “Some Macedonian Offices,” p. 157).

Arrian *Successors* 1a.3 uses the term to clarify the office of chiliarch, having already clearly distinguished that office from the *prostasia*.

The next area of inquiry concerns Arrian's (*Succ.* 1a.3, 1b.4) association of the *prostasia* with Craterus. Since the regency is immediately associated by Diodorus (18.2.4) with Perdiccas, the obvious question is what became of Craterus' *prostasia*. This is an especially vexing question since Arrian, in the same context wherein the *prostasia* was associated with Craterus, connects Perdiccas to the office of chiliarch (*Arr. Succ.* 1a.3; cf. *FGrH* 100 F 8.4 = *Succ.* 1b.4). It could be argued that Perdiccas had simply usurped the *prostasia*.<sup>16</sup> However, as noted by P. Goukowsky, Justin's (13.6.10) statement that the kings were entrusted (*mandata*) to Perdiccas' care suggests that no usurpation took place.<sup>17</sup> The answer to the question is that Craterus' *prostasia* was part of an initial compromise agreement reached between the infantry and the cavalry.<sup>18</sup> The context of Dexippus' statement (*FGrH* 100 F 8.4 = *Arr. Succ.* 1b.4) concerning Craterus' *prostasia* can only be this compromise agreement. While this phrase is found in a description of the distribution of satrapies which followed the reconciliation, the parallel passage in Photius' epitome of Arrian's *Successors* (1a.3), the major source for Dexippus, associates the assignment of the chiliarchy to Perdiccas and the *prostasia* to Craterus with a position for Meleager (cf. Q. Curtius 10.8.22; Just. 13.4.5). Meleager himself, however, only briefly survived the ceremony of reconciliation (Q. Curtius 10.9.21; *Arr. Succ.* 1a.4; Just. 13.4.5; Diod. 18.4.7). Moreover, it is clear that at least the command for Meleager was never more than a ploy to separate him from the king (Curt. 10.9.7–8, 20–21; cf. Just. 13.4.7–8; *Arr. Succ.* 1a.4; Diod. 18.5.7). The agreement made with Meleager and the infantry, the one conferring the *prostasia* on Craterus and the chiliarchy on Perdiccas, was intended solely to quell the rebellion of the infantry. Craterus himself was not present in Babylon, but was in Cilicia.<sup>19</sup> The *principes* in Babylon were willing to grant the absent Craterus the title of *prostates*, as they were a military command to Meleager, if that would place the mutineers in their hands.<sup>20</sup> For the *principes* the compromise made with the rebels was never meant to be binding.<sup>21</sup> Once Meleager and the other leaders of the infantry's revolt were dead, the *principes* returned to Babylon and arranged a settlement in line with their own interests. As Errington states, "the Perdiccans

16. Heckel (*Alexander the Great*, p. 21) has Craterus' *prostasia* quietly forgotten.

17. *Essai*, p. 197; Goukowsky, basing his argument on Justin 13.6.10, further asserts that the *prostasia* was conferred on Perdiccas by an army assembly convened after his victory over Ariarathes. However, Justin (13.4.5) himself states that Perdiccas (in conjunction with Meleager [cf. *Arr. Succ.* 1a.4; Q. Curtius 10.8.22]) was assigned "castrorum et exercitus et regum cura." Indeed, Justin mentions nothing of a *prostasia* or its equivalent for Craterus, but rather has Craterus given control of the treasury (13.4.5).

18. See Errington, "From Babylon to Tripuradeisos," p. 56.

19. At the time of Alexander's death Craterus was in Cilicia with 10,000 veterans discharged and ordered to Macedonia by the king in 324 (*Arr. Anab.* 7.12.3–4; Diod. 18.4.1; Q. Curtius 10.10.15; Just. 12.12.7–9). By Alexander's command Craterus was himself to take charge of Macedonia, Thrace, Thessaly, and Greece (*Arr. Anab.* 7.12.4).

20. While it is not certain who proposed the office for Craterus (see for varying views: Rosen, "Die Reichsordnung," pp. 97–98; Goukowsky, *Essai*, p. 195; Errington, "From Babylon to Tripuradeisos," p. 55), Meleager must have been pleased with this compromise. He had been unable to control the infantry in his own or even in Philip's name (Q. Curtius 10.8.5–7). Moreover, Meleager had served under Craterus (*Arr. Anab.* 6.17.3) and certainly hoped to enhance his position through his association with the absent but popular commander (cf. Plut. *Eum.* 6.2).

21. See Errington, "From Babylon to Tripuradeisos," pp. 56–57.

made the compromise [with Meleager] only to get control of the king and eventually to eliminate Meleager.”<sup>22</sup> By tradition the *principes* were the final authority in any succession; ultimately it was the *principes* present in Babylon who decided the fate of Alexander’s empire.<sup>23</sup> In the final settlement Perdiccas emerged as the regent and guardian (the *prostates*) of the kingdom (Diod. 18.23.2; cf. 2.4, 3.1; cf. Just. 13.6.10). While initially this was for “Arrhidaeus’ kingdom” (cf. Arr. *Succ.* 1a.3; *FGrH* 100 F 8.4 = Arr. *Succ.* 1b.4), with the birth of Roxane’s child and his acclamation as king also (Arr. *Succ.* 1a.8) Perdiccas’ authority became that of *prostates* for both kings (cf. Diod. 18.23.2). In this final arrangement Craterus would share a joint rule with Antipater in Europe (Arr. *Succ.* 1a.7). Hammond’s attempt to associate the *prostasia* with Craterus’ appointment to Macedonia is therefore without foundation.<sup>24</sup> Craterus’ short-lived *prostasia* and his “joint-rule in Europe” were two separate appointments; the first was abrogated in the final settlement in Babylon in favor of the second. In the aftermath of the reconciliation Perdiccas emerged as the “*prostates* of the kingdom.”

However, while the compromise settlement was ignored by the *principes* bargaining in Babylon, its memory lived on, certainly in the minds of the soldiers. This may, in part, explain the great precautions Eumenes took in Cappadocia in 320 to keep his troops ignorant of the fact that they faced Craterus (Plut. *Eum.* 6.4); it could also explain the fury of the troops in Egypt when they learned of Craterus’ death (Diod. 18.37.2; Plut. *Eum.* 8.2). Craterus, also, would remember that at one point he had appeared as an integral part of the power structure in Asia. However, he would also know that this role had been eliminated in the definitive settlement. Since the final settlement gave Craterus power only in Europe, Craterus must have based the legitimacy of his claim for a position in Asia on the compromise agreement.<sup>25</sup> Consequently, he and Antipater remained friendly with Perdiccas, hoping to achieve a position in Asia for Craterus through negotiation.<sup>26</sup> When in 320 Antipater and Craterus had invaded Asia Minor and opened negotiations with Eumenes, the latter offered to reconcile Craterus and Perdiccas (Plut. *Eum.* 5.5). It should also be noted that while Antigonus accused Perdiccas of many things, he never accused him of usurping Craterus’ *prostasia* (Diod. 18.25.3; cf. 23.2–3). Nor does Craterus at any time bring the charge forward. Indeed, Diodorus 18.25.3 states that Perdiccas planned to invade Macedonia and deprive “them” of their hegemony, clearly referring to their assigned joint rule in Europe. Therefore, while the *prostasia*, the regency, was initially associated with the absent Craterus, in the final settlement in Babylon Perdiccas became *prostates* of the entire kingdom and Craterus became Antipater’s partner in Europe.

EDWARD M. ANSON

*University of Arkansas, Little Rock*

22. Ibid., p. 56.

23. Ibid.; Heckel, *Alexander the Great*, pp. 20–21.

24. Hammond, “Some Macedonian Offices,” p. 156.

25. See Rosen, “Die Reichsordnung,” p. 103; and F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander in Babylon und die Reichsordnung nach seinem Tod* (Vienna, 1970), p. 170.

26. Errington, “From Babylon to Triparadeisos,” pp. 61–62.