

## SOME PASSAGES IN ARRIAN CONCERNING ALEXANDER<sup>1</sup>

The following abbreviations are used:

<i>Anc. Mac. I</i>	= <i>Ancient Macedonia</i> , edd. B. Laourdas and Ch. Makaronas (Thessaloniki, 1970).
<i>Anc. Mac. II</i>	= <i>Ancient Macedonia</i> , ed. K. Mitsakis (Thessaloniki, 1977).
Brunt	= P. A. Brunt, Loeb edn. of Arrian, I (London, 1976).
Berve	= H. Berve, <i>Das Alexanderreich</i> (Munich, 1926).
<i>Ep.</i>	= N. G. L. Hammond, <i>Epirus</i> (Oxford, 1967).
Lane Fox	= R. Lane Fox, <i>Alexander the Great</i> (London, 1973).
<i>Mac. I</i>	= N. G. L. Hammond, <i>A History of Macedonia</i> , I (Oxford, 1972).
<i>Mac. II</i>	= N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, <i>A History of Macedonia</i> , II (Oxford, 1979).
Tarn	= W. W. Tarn in <i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> , VI (Cambridge, 1927).
Wilcken	= U. Wilcken, <i>Alexander the Great</i> (tr. G. C. Richards, London, 1932).

### I

Arr. 1. 1. 5 ὁρμηθέντα δὴ ἐξ Ἀμφιπόλεως ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς Θράκην τὴν τῶν αὐτονόμων καλουμένων Φιλίππους πόλιν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ ἔχοντα καὶ τὸν Ὀρβηλον τὸ ὄρος. διαβάς δὲ τὸν Νέστον . . .

'Alexander, it is said, starting from Amphipolis and keeping on his left the city Philippi and the mountain Orbelus, invaded Thrace, that part occupied by the so-called self-governing Thracians. He crossed the river Nestus, and in ten days, they say, he reached the mountain Haemus.'

Any traveller in the Strymon basin is familiar with two great mountains, the towering wall of Belasitsa (2,031 m) north-west of Amphipolis and the isolated mass of Pangaeus (1,872 m) to the east of Amphipolis. There is a road on either side of Pangaeus to Philippi; but if you aim to keep Philippi on your left and proceed to the Nestus, you will take the road on the south side of Pangaeus, pass through Aymgdaleon (between Philippi and Kavalla, the ancient Neapolis), and reach the lower Nestus between Stavroupolis and its mouth. You are in fact taking the coastal road to Byzantium.<sup>2</sup> On this journey you leave Mt. Orbelus,

<sup>1</sup> I am most grateful to Mr. G. T. Griffith and Professor F. W. Walbank for commenting on a number of these passages.

<sup>2</sup> So Alexander is made to do by Tarn, p. 355 and Wilcken, p. 67; but thereafter Tarn and Wilcken parted company. According to Tarn, Alexander 'turned Rhodope, went north, roughly by Adrianople' (viz.

Edirne), and so entered the central plain; but this would make far too long a distance from the Nestus crossing to Mt. Haemus for any army to cover in nine days (see n. 7, below). According to Wilcken, Alexander followed the course of the Nestus inland from the coast, but the Nestus inland of Stavroupolis flows through a series of im-

which is certainly Mt. Belasitsa, far behind you and some 90 kilometres away; what you keep 'on your left' is Pangaeus. The only way to make sense of Arrian is to read Φιλιππούπολιν following the reading of codex H, and to identify this Philippoupolis with that mentioned in Strabo 7, fr. 36, where it is one of the four cities of the Parorbelia, the rift on the south side of Mt. Orbelus.<sup>3</sup> This rift or 'aulōn', as Strabo calls it, ran from Eidomene to Heraclea Sintica, and Philippoupolis was evidently at the eastern end of it, in the Kumli valley. Thus from Amphipolis Alexander headed north, passed through the Rupel pass with Philippoupolis and Mt. Orbelus on his left, and proceeded up the lower Strymon valley. This was, of course, a much more direct route towards Mt. Haemus than the coastal route would have been.

Where was the land of 'the self-governing Thracians'? The significance of the epithet in Arrian seems to be 'republican' as opposed to being subject to a king; the clearest examples are at 5.21.5 and 4.22.1-2. To be independent of any foreign power was another thing, ἐλευθερία as in 6.14.2, ἐπιθυμῶν . . . ἐλευθερίας τε καὶ αὐτόνομοι εἶναι.<sup>4</sup> 'The so-called self-governing Thracians' were most probably those mentioned by Thucydides at 2.96.2, τῶν ὀρεινῶν Θρακῶν . . . τῶν αὐτονόμων καὶ μαχαιοφόρων οἱ Δῖοι καλοῦνται τὴν Ῥοδόπην οἱ πλείστοι οἰκοῦντες.

The fastnesses of these Thracians were in Mt. Pirin and Mt. Rhodope (the traditional centre of Bulgarian resistance is at Rila Monastery), and Alexander entered their territory as he went up the Gradevska Reka. Near the head of this river he crossed by the Predela pass into the Nestus valley near Razlog, ascended the right bank of that river to above Jakoruda, crossed it, and marched by the Vakilinski pass into a tributary of the Maritsa (ancient Hebrus). He entered the central plain of Thrace near Pazardžik. This route again was certainly the most direct, and it had the added advantage that his army crossed the Nestus, a huge river in the spring floods, not at or near the mouth but in its upper course. The route, which I followed in 1970, is a natural but not easy one through spectacular mountains densely wooded on the valley sides.<sup>5</sup>

The boundary of Thrace was no doubt well defined for a Macedonian in 335 BC. Philip had set his frontier with Thrace on the lower course of the Nestus (Str. 323) and Alexander maintained it there (Str. 7, fr. 33). Thus on the coastal route Alexander would have entered Thrace only *after* crossing the Nestus where it flows through the plain. Our passage in Arrian shows that Alexander entered a particular part of Thrace *before* he crossed the Nestus; and this is understandable if the Predela pass in particular and the watershed in general between the middle

passable gorges (the railway tunnels its way past them). In fact the route taken by Alexander has not been studied, and in consequence Brunt's comment (7 n. 4) that his route is 'unclear' is an appropriate understatement.

<sup>3</sup> Described in *Mac.* I, 199 f. The highest point of Mt. Orbelus lies to the west of the Rupel pass. The mountainous area east of that pass was the Paroreia, and the range of Orbelus was carried by Ptolemy northwards and inland of the Paroreia.

<sup>4</sup> I therefore disagree with Brunt's translation 'the independent Thracians' and his note 'as distinguished from the Thracian principalities near the coast which Philip had annexed'. Rather, Philip conquered Thrace as far as the Lower Danube, as his dealings with Cothelas and Atheas show (*Mac.* II, 560 f.), and put an end to the unruly conduct of the Thracians (Diod. 16.71.2; see *Mac.* II, 672 f.).

<sup>5</sup> The route is clearly shown on sheet Rila of the Tourist Map issued by Kartproekt, Sofia, 1969. One leaves the Strymon valley at Simitli above the Kresna defile.

Strymon and the upper Nestus formed the frontier of Thrace at that time. Farther north we know from Dexippus (*FGrHist* 100 F 8, 3) that the Agrianes at the head of the Strymon valley were in Antipater's command and therefore not under 'the General of Thrace'.<sup>6</sup>

The distance from the crossing of the Nestus near Jakoruda to the Shipka pass on Mt. Haemus is some 243 kilometres on a road map, and if we reckon on nine full days of marching he averaged 27 kilometres = 17 miles a day. On the other hand, if he had crossed the Nestus near its mouth, he would have had some 360 kilometres to cover, going via Komotini, in order to use the Makaza pass. An average of 40 kilometres for nine days, being 25 miles, is unacceptable for Alexander's army when moving with its supply-train and siege-equipment.<sup>7</sup> On all counts, then, we need to read *Φιλιππούπολιν*.

## II

Arr. 1.7.6. ἄλλον γάρ τινα ἦκειν Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Ἀερόπου.

Arr. 1.25.3 αὐτὸν βασιλέα καταστήσῃσιν Μακεδονίας.

'For' (the Theban leaders said) 'another Alexander has come, the son of Aëropus'.

(Darius promised that) 'he would establish him as king of Macedonia'.

If we believe, as I do, the statement of Arrian at the beginning of this book, his sources for these remarks were the accounts of Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus; and in those sources too the remarks were presumably reported statements. The point of interest is the assumption by contemporaries that, on the death of Alexander the king in Illyria, this Alexander might well be commanding the Macedonian army; and that if Alexander the king were to be assassinated this Alexander could be established as king. The context in each case is relevant.

The leaders of the revolt at Thebes persuaded the people to rise by declaring that Alexander had been killed in Illyria. When a Macedonian army arrived unexpectedly at Onchestus in Boeotia, they said it had come from Macedonia (i.e. not from Illyria) and was the army of Antipater (i.e. the deputy-commander in Macedonia in the king's absence). On reports then being made that 'Alexander himself was there leading his troops', they angrily repeated their declaration and said that this Alexander was another, the son of Aëropus. In order to carry conviction, this Alexander, the son of Aëropus, had to be someone that Thebans would regard as superior to Antipater in rank and as the leader of the army (*προσάγει*). In fact he has to be thought of as a likely regent or king. The second passage comes from a reported plot of a familiar kind. Darius wished to establish

<sup>6</sup> The division was for purposes of military administration. Antipater as 'General in Europe' controlled areas outside the Macedonian kingdom such as the territory of the Agrianes and the Maedi (see Curt. 9.6.20) on my interpretation (see below where I discuss his control of northern Epirus).

<sup>7</sup> My distances are taken from the Tourist Office's map 1:800,000, Sofia. In my forthcoming book on Alexander I give

examples of marches of up to 20 miles on successive days with baggage-train and siege-train, but not of 25 miles. Tarn's route would add about 120 kilometres to the total. 'The self-governing Thracians' on Mt. Haemus (Arr. 1.1.6) were local to that area, as they were said by Arrian to know the ground (1.1.13); they were thus different from those whom Alexander reached before crossing the Nestus.

as king someone who would be acceptable not only to himself but also to some Macedonians, with the help of a thousand gold talents (which Darius promised also) and no doubt of troops, if necessary. So Athens had hoped to establish Argaeus; the Thracian king had hoped to establish Pausanias; and the Chalcidians had hoped to establish Arrhidaeus or Menelaus. Those persons had all been members of the royal house, the Temenidae.<sup>8</sup>

If Alexander, son of Aëropus, was indeed thought by some to be acceptable as king, we can understand why Alexander, son of Philip, was so grateful to him for being one of the first to support his election as king.<sup>9</sup> As we know from the treaty between Perdiccas II and Athens,<sup>10</sup> members of the royal house who did support the king were given the top positions at court and in public life. Thus Leonnatus and Perdiccas, members of the royal house, had been Bodyguards of Philip II and were given respectively diplomatic tasks and command of an infantry brigade by Alexander. Although two sons of Aëropus had been executed on the charge of being accomplices in the assassination of Philip, this other son of Aëropus was exalted even above Leonnatus and Perdiccas; for he was kept close to the king's person, then made 'General of Thrace' when Thrace was vital for the line of supply to Asia, and finally given command of the Thessalian cavalry, much the largest individual unit of cavalry in the army.<sup>11</sup> All this is understandable, not simply if he was congenial to Alexander as a person, but particularly if he was of the royal blood. It is then not surprising that Olympias warned the young king to beware particularly of 'the Lyncestian Alexander' (Diod. 17.32.1).

It is this epichoric adjunct 'the Lyncestian' which is responsible for the *communis opinio* that this Alexander was a member of the Lyncestian royal house, the Bacchiadae; and I myself have advocated it.<sup>12</sup> However, study of Macedonia's earlier history has made me realize that 'Lyncestes' means only a resident of Lyncus, since every Macedonian had a local citizenship, just as every Epirote had a local ethnic;<sup>13</sup> and further that *only* members of the Temenid house in the male line became king or regent or were run as pretenders. This was expressed concisely in the remark made by the Macedonian phalangites that they would not accept anyone as king unless 'he was born to rule' (Curt. 10.7.15 'nisi genitum ut regnaret'). That being so, no member of an alien house, such as the Bacchiadae, had any hope of gaining support in Macedonia outside Lyncus. Another reason for supposing this Alexander to belong to the Bacchiad clan was his brother's name, Arrhabaeus, which fits naturally into the Bacchiad family tree. But that name was not the monopoly of the Bacchiad house. It was found in the Aeacidae (the Molossian royal house) in the forms Arybbas and Aryptaëus,

<sup>8</sup> For Argaeus, Arrhidaeus, and Menelaus see the stemma in *Mac.* II facing p. 176; Pausanias may have been a brother of Argaeus, as in the stemma, or a son of some other member of the lines descended from Perdiccas II or Menelaus, son of Alexander I.

<sup>9</sup> Arr. 1.25.5; Justin 11.2.2; Curt. 7.1.6.

<sup>10</sup> See *Mac.* II, 134 f., where seven members of the royal family come after the king in swearing to the treaty.

<sup>11</sup> See Arr. 1.25.5 f. on the importance

of this command.

<sup>12</sup> In *Mac.* II, 15 f., written in 1974; see Beloch *GG*<sup>2</sup> 3.2.77 with stemma, Berve, Nos. 37, 144, and 355, and recently J. R. Ellis in *JHS* xci (1971), 15 f. and esp. 23 f., and C. Habicht in *Anc. Mac.* II, 513 f. with stemma.

<sup>13</sup> See *Mac.* II, 647 f. and *Ep.* 795, where I mentioned 115 ethnics to which others in inscriptions at Buthrotum may be added.

and probably in the Pelagonian royal house; and later in Orestis and Amphipolis.<sup>14</sup> The fact is that names such as Arrhabaeus, Menelaus, and Pausanias were becoming common coin among the noble houses of Macedonia in the generation of Alexander.

Interest in Alexander's brother's name has diverted attention from their father's name Aëropus. This is certainly a Temenid name, held by a brother of the first king, by a sixth-century king, and by a king who reigned c. 398 to 39 BC and issued his own coins. This king, Aëropus II, was succeeded by his son, Pausanias, who reigned as king for a short time in 394/3. If we suppose that a grandson of Aëropus II was called Aëropus, then he might well have been the father of the Lyncestian Alexander and his brothers. The following stemma shows the possible relationship of the two Alexanders—the son of Aëropus and the son of Philip. I use capitals for those who became kings.

floruit

c. 490	ALEXANDER I			
c. 460	PERDICCAS II	Amyntas		
c. 430	AËROPUS II	Arrhidaeus		
c. 400	PAUSANIAS	AMYNTAS III		
c. 370	Aëropus	ALEXANDER II	PERDICCAS III	PHILIP II
c. 340	Heromenes Arrhabaeus Alexander	AMYNTAS IV	ALEXANDER III	

There is no doubt that this stemma is just as probable as one which fits Arrhabaeus, son of Aëropus, into the Bacchiad house.<sup>15</sup> It has further advantages. It explains why the two sons of Aëropus were charged and found guilty of being involved in a conspiracy to remove Philip and very probably his son Alexander;<sup>16</sup> for either of them had as good a claim to the throne as Amyntas, son of Perdiccas II, or the half-witted Arrhidaeus, son of Philip II. It explains also why Alexander on his election as king was so pleased to have Alexander, son of Aëropus, declare for him. For the statement in Plutarch, *de fort. Alex.* 1.3, that after the death of Philip all Macedonia was festering with discontent 'looking to Amyntas and the sons of Aëropus', may well be true; and the declaration by Alexander, son of Aëropus, seemed to indicate that the members of that elder branch of the Temenid house were not competing for the throne. Lastly, it may explain why Alexander kept Alexander, son of Aëropus, in custody and did not bring him to trial; for in the event of his own death who in the royal line had more ability to reign than this man?

There remains a tangled skein in Justin, which we must try to unravel for the sake of completeness. At 11.2.2, 11.7.1, and 12.14.1 all codices have 'Alexander Lyncestarum', with such variations as 'Lincistarum' and 'Lingistarum', in mentioning the Alexander who was a son of Aëropus. The declination of 'Lyncestae' (as in Livy 45.30.6 and Pliny 4.10.17) is as of 'Persae, Persarum'. This was evidently the way in which Justin and no doubt his source, Trogus, translated the Greek expression ὁ Λυγκηστής 'Ἀλέξανδρος' (Diod. 17.80.2); other Latin

<sup>14</sup> See *Ep.* 799 and *Mac.* II, 20; and D. Kanatsoulis, *Makedonike Prosopographia* s.v. 'Ἀραβέος'.

<sup>15</sup> In one sense more probable, because the only certain occurrence of Aëropus in connection with Lynceus was as 'a son of

Emathio', cited probably as a contrast to the usurpers, the Bacchiad clan; see *Mac.* II, 37.

<sup>16</sup> For the suggestion that the plot was aimed also at Alexander see my article in *GRBS* xix (1978), 347.

writers had 'Lyncestes Alexander' (e.g. Curt. 7.1.5). When all codices of Justin in three separate places give this reading, it seems unreasonable to emend the text. This has, however, been done by O. Seel in the Teubner edition of 1972 for 11.2.2, the only passage in which the sense is affected by emendation. I give the text with his emendation in square brackets.

Prima illi (Alexandro) cura paternarum exsequiarum fuit; in quibus ante omnia caedis conscios ad tumultum patris occidi iussit. Soli Alexandro Lyncestarum fratri pepercit [Alexandro Lyncestae <parricidarum> fratri], servans in eo auspiciū dignitatis suae; nam regem eum primus salutaverat (the last words referring to the incident which Arr. 1.25.2 narrates).

If we discard the emendation as lacking any palaeographical grounds, we have two possible translations. First, 'he spared only Alexander, the brother of the Lyncestians'; and we justify this by supposing that Troguus had labelled the 'caedis conscios' as 'Lyncestas' and that Justin in abbreviating Troguus' account failed to make this as clear as he should have done. Second, 'he spared only Alexander of the Lyncestians as his brother'; and the reason for this translation is that the expression for the Lyncestian Alexander is to be taken as in the other two passages. Then 'his brother' means 'Alexander-the-king's brother' in the sense of a male cousin (as in 17.3.16; cf. L-S s.v. *frater* II C); but in this case a cousin at many removes on the male side and so a gross rhetorical exaggeration, even if in Justin's style. If this is so, then the 'fratres interfecti' of 12.6.14 might refer to this Alexander and Caranus. The choice between the two translations may be left open. For the decision does not alter my contention that Alexander, son of Aëropus, a resident of Lyncus and so called 'the Lyncestian', was connected with Alexander the Great not as a member of the Bacchiad house of Lyncus through a common grandmother, Eurydice, but as a member of the Temenid house of Macedon through the male line.<sup>17</sup>

### III

Arr. 1.16.3-4 ἔπεσον δὲ καὶ ἡγεμόνες τῶν Περσῶν . . . Ἀροίτης δὲ ἐκ μὲν τῆς μάχης φεύγει ἐς Φρυγίαν, ἐκεῖ δὲ ἀποθνήσκει αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοῦ, ὡς λόγος, ὅτι αἰτίως ἐδόκει Πέρσαις γενέσθαι τοῦ ἐν τῷ τότε πταίσματος. Μακεδόνων δὲ τῶν μὲν ἐταίρων ἀμφὶ τοὺς εἴκοσι καὶ πέντε ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ προσβολῇ ἀπέθανον· καὶ τούτων χαλκαὶ εἰκόνες ἐν Δίῳ ἐστᾶσι, Ἀλεξάνδρου κελεύσαντος Λύσιππον ποιῆσαι, ὅσπερ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον μόνος προκριθεὶς ἐποίει.

The underlining draws attention to the tenses. It is a commonplace in the narrative of Greek historians and particularly of Arrian that present tenses are used in past narratives for vividness. The passage here cited affords an excellent example of this usage in two contrasted periods, each of which has aorist, present, and imperfect tenses; it is indeed typical of Arrian's conscious style. We may translate as follows.

<sup>17</sup> Consideration for the throne was in the male line, if we go by Hdt. 8.139, Thuc. 2.99.3 and 100.2, and the stemma of subsequent kings. This is not to deny that

relationship to the royal house on the female side was of importance for other purposes (e.g. in the Suda s.v. Leonnatos).

There fell of Persian leaders . . . Arsites escapes from the fighting to Phrygia and dies at his own hand, it is said because he was thought responsible for Persia's failure at the time. Of the Macedonians some twenty-five Companions died in the first assault, and bronze statues of them are set up at Dium, Alexander ordering that they be made by Lysippos, his preferred artist, who alone used to portray Alexander.

The vivid points in the present tenses are the escape and the suicide on the Persian side, and the setting up of the twenty-five statues of the first casualties of the war—a thing unique, I think, both in ancient and in modern warfare. Just as ἀποθνήσκει is vivid for ἀπέθανε, so ἐστᾶσω is vivid for ἔστασαν. It is, of course, the tense and not the diction which imports the vividness, as one can see in Thucydides 4.56.2, for example.

This idiom has been overlooked, I think, by A. B. Bosworth and P. A. Brunt who have related the vivid tense ἐστᾶσω not to the context but to Arrian's own time. 'There are brazen statues of them set up at Dium', as Brunt translates, and he then adds a note that Arrian 'is unaware that the statues had been removed to Rome in 146 BC.'<sup>18</sup> Bosworth, whose opinion of Arrian's intelligence is not high, writes that it must be assumed either that Arrian 'was transcribing his source with the utmost carelessness, or that he had no idea that this monument of Lysippos had been one of the sights of Rome for the past two and a half centuries'.<sup>19</sup> How culpable in a Roman consul familiar with the imperial city, an Archon of Athens, a student of Macedonian history, if this charge is true! But if we note the purpose of the vivid tenses, we shall not make the charge at all. Indeed we may point out that when Arrian does want to say where statues are in his own day, he writes as follows (of the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton) at 3.16.7–8. καὶ ταύτας Ἀθηναίοις ὀπίσω πέμπει (note the vivid present) Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ νῦν κεῖνται Ἀθήνησιν ἐν Κεραμεικῷ αἱ εἰκόνες.

#### IV

Arr. 1.27.4 πείθεσθαι τῷ σατραπῇ <ὕπ> Ἀλεξάνδρου ταχθέντι καὶ φόρους ἀποφέρειν ὅσα ἔτη Μακεδόσι.

Arr. 3.26.2 Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ Λάγου λέγει εἰσαχθῆναι εἰς Μακεδόνας καὶ κατηγορεῖσθαι μὲν αὐτοῦ ἰσχυρῶς Ἀλέξανδρον, ἀπολογήσασθαι δὲ αὐτὸν Φιλώταν.

In the first passage we see the two parts of the Macedonian state side by side, the king as the executive authority and the Macedones as the continuing entity 'year after year'. The two together make up the Macedonian state. In 480 BC Alexander I is βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων (Hdt. 9.44.1), and the function of Philip II in 346 BC is 'to be king of Macedones' (Isoc. *Philippus* 154 Μακεδόνων τε βασιλεύειν); and it is that 'kingship' which the Greeks undertook in 337 BC not to overthrow (Tod. *GHI* 177, line 11). In the same way the king and the Molossoi made up the Molossian state, and the Molossoi undertook to preserve the 'kingship' (Plu. *Pyrrh.* 5.2).

The context of our first passage gives it added interest; for Arrian or rather his source, whether Ptolemy or Aristobulus or both, being contemporaries of Alexander and writing for contemporaries, were evidently citing or paraphrasing

<sup>18</sup> p. 67 with n. 2.

<sup>19</sup> In *CQ* N.S. 22 (1972), 173; and the

same misconception in G. Wirth, *Historia* xiii (1964), 231, though he finds it 'unglaublich'.

a treaty. In the winter of 334 to 333 BC, when Alexander first approached Aspendus, he asked the city to make gifts to the expeditionary force (τῇ στρατιᾷ), namely 50 talents 'towards pay for them' and those horses which Aspendus used to breed for the Persian King as tribute. But when Aspendus defected, Alexander raised the 50 talents to 100 for the expeditionary force, and he imposed new terms, namely hostages, subordination to his satrap,<sup>20</sup> and the payment of tribute annually to 'Macedones', that is to the Macedonian state.<sup>21</sup>

Both parts of the Macedonian state were mentioned in inscriptions. Thus in the treaty between Perdiccas II and Athens (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 71), to be dated probably c.415 BC, the signatories are representatives of 'Macedones', Μακεδ[ονο]ν Περδίκκας, etc.<sup>22</sup> In the treaty between Amyntas III and the Chalcidians c.393 BC, while the contract was between 'Amyntas, son of Errhidaeus' and 'Chalcidians', the payments for the transit and exporting of timber were to be made by 'Chalcidians' and 'Macedones' (Tod, *GHI* 111, line 17 Χαλκιδεῦσι . . . Μακεδόσω).<sup>23</sup> In autumn 325 BC the accounts of the Delphic Amphictyony mention the *hieromnemes* appointed [παρ' Ἀλεξανδρου] and the payment of 5 talents—much the biggest contribution—by Μακεδόνες.<sup>24</sup> It is worthy of note that the authority which made and received payments in these two instances was not the king but the 'Macedones'. The evidence of the two inscriptions is decisive in support of Arrian's words.<sup>25</sup>

Authors of literary works, whose interest was usually focused on the striking personalities of the kings, made fewer references to the 'Macedones'. These references came probably from contemporaries. Thus in Diodorus 16, where the source for Macedonian affairs was very probably Ephorus, a contemporary writing for contemporaries,<sup>26</sup> we read that in winter 359 to 358 BC Philip defeated the Paonians and compelled them to 'obey the Macedones' (16.4.2); in 356 BC he defeated three kings and compelled them to 'accede to the Macedones' (16.22.3); and in 343 to 342 BC he defeated the Thracians and ordered them to 'pay a tithe to the Macedones' (16.71.2). The last of these is another example of payment not to the king but to the 'Macedones'. In 346 BC the Delphic Amphictyony, whose members were tribal states expressed in the ethnic plural, admitted 'Macedones' in place of 'Phoceis'; and the Amphictyonic Council gave the two votes of the Phocians to Μακεδόσω (Paus. 10.8.2; 10.3.3). That this was the

<sup>20</sup> The fact that Aspendus was not subject in the first treaty to Alexander's satrap shows that it was not a native but a Greek city.

<sup>21</sup> R. M. Errington, 'Macedonian "Royal Style" and its historical significance', *JHS* xciv (1974), 32 n. 75, seems to dismiss the passage from consideration on the grounds that it is a summary of 'the document'; but he gives no grounds for supposing that the summary is incorrect.

<sup>22</sup> Errington, *op. cit.*, 33, makes the comment that there is no place for 'the Macedonian People' as such. What then does Μακεδόνες mean? Surely one cannot expect, as at Athens, ὁ δῆμος τῶν Μακεδόνων.

<sup>23</sup> Timber being 'a royal monopoly' (R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *GHI*, p. 278),

it is all the more striking that the payments for services in transit and export were made by and no doubt to 'the Macedones'.

<sup>24</sup> J. Bousquet, 'Le Compte de l'autome 325 à Delphes', *Mélanges G. Daux*, 22 and 24. He found it 'notable' that we have Μακεδόνες between Παγασῖται and [Δελ]φοί as the contributors, p. 27.

<sup>25</sup> There is evidence too that the local units in Macedonia in the late fourth century BC were making their own financial contributions to the shrines at Delphi and Epidauros (Ditt. *Syll.* 3 269 L and *IG* IV 617, 17); the amounts were no doubt fixed by the organ of local government.

<sup>26</sup> N. G. L. Hammond, 'The sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI', *CQ* 21 (1937), 79 ff.

official terminology at Delphi is shown by the inscription of autumn 325 BC, cited above.<sup>27</sup> In 335 BC, when Thebes was destroyed, an exception was made for those who were representatives at Thebes of 'the Macedones' (Plu. *Alex.* 11.12 τοὺς ξένους τῶν Μακεδόνων ἅπαντας); and that this was the correct terminology is clear from the inscription of c.415 BC, where those who swore to the treaty were representatives of 'Macedones', cited above.

In other matters too the king and the Macedones acted as the two complementary parts of the state. In war most obviously. In state ceremonial king and Macedones under arms joined in processions, parades, festivals, and ritual acts such as purification (Curt. 10.9.12; Livy 40.6) and sacrifice. An interesting example of the last is recorded on a fragment of papyrus, cited in P. H. Thomas, *Epit. rerum gest. Alex.* 44, which enjoins that the Macedones or special representatives of them shall carry out traditional sacrifices with (or in the interest of) the king who will succeed Alexander the Great: συντελειώσω-  
[αν] Μακεδόνες Ἀργεᾶδ[αις or αι] τὰ νομιζόμενα [μετὰ τοῦ or ὑπὲρ τοῦ] βασιλέως.

That the 'Macedones' appointed persons to sign treaties, protect their interests abroad, and carry out sacrifices, that they approved some out-payments and accepted some in-payments, and that they accepted diplomatic offers such as membership of the Delphic Amphictyony—that they did these and other things through the medium of an assembly of full citizens would be obvious from analogy alone. It may have met seldom, and it may have granted very great powers to a Philip and an Alexander; and its meetings in Macedonia did not interest Greek writers of the time. Even so there is some evidence of the meetings in ancient authors. In 406 BC, when the Athenians sent an embassy to ask that the remains of Euripides be brought from Macedonia to Athens, 'the Macedones with general agreement persisted in their refusal' (A. Gellius, *AN* 15.20.10).<sup>28</sup> After a year's reign Amyntas III was expelled c.393 BC by 'Macedones' (Porphyr. fr. 1, *FHG* 3.691 ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων ἐξεβλήθη); and we may compare the expulsion of the Molossian king, Aeacides, in 317 BC by a public decree of banishment (Diod. 19.36.4 κωῶ δόγματι), carried by the Epirote Alliance and also by the Molossoi.<sup>29</sup>

The clearest information about the assembly of the Macedones comes to us from the period when Macedonia did not have a standing army. In 359 BC the king and almost half the Macedonian levy were killed by the Illyrians. The regent,

<sup>27</sup> Pausanias was relating the history not of Macedon but of the Amphictyony, so that he or his source was drawing on Delphic records. Authors who were focused on Philip gave him the membership and the votes (Speusippus' *Letter to Philip* 9; Diod. 16.60.1; and Demosthenes often and only once in the correct form οἱ . . . Μακεδόνες but with his addition καὶ βάρβαροι at 19.327).

<sup>28</sup> For the historicity of details about Euripides in Macedonia see *Mac.* II, 162.

<sup>29</sup> None of the evidence cited so far, except for the expulsion of Amyntas III, has been taken into account in a recent article by R. M. Errington, 'The nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy',

*Chiron* viii (1978), 78–133; he makes the mistake, shared by almost all writers on this subject, of working backwards from the Hellenistic period and preferring Latin writers such as Curtius to contemporary Greek inscriptions and writers. The passages which are quoted in the rest of this section have been much discussed, e.g. by F. Granier, *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung*; P. de Francisci, *Arcana Imperii*, II; A. Aymard, *Études d'histoire ancienne*, pp. 143 ff.; P. Briant, *Antigone le Borgne*; and most recently by R. Lock, 'The Macedonian Army Assembly in the time of Alexander', *CP* lxxii (1977), 91 ff. The views of Griffith and Hammond will be found in *Mac.* II, 150 ff. and 383 ff.

Philip, 'convened the Macedones in a series of assemblies and heartened them by the intensity of his speeches' (16.3.1 *τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἐν συνεχέσιν ἐκκλησίαις συνέχων καὶ τῇ τοῦ λόγου δεινότητι προτρεπόμενος*); and the following spring, having trained the men during the winter, 'he convened an assembly, encouraged the soldiers for the war, and led them into Illyrian territory' (16.4.3 *συναγαγὼν ἐκκλησίαν*). The decision to seek out the enemy was reached in that assembly, just as the decision to seek out the Persians at Marathon was reached in the assembly at Athens in 490 BC. It is also apparent that the bulk of those attending the assembly were men-under-arms, who were then led into Illyrian territory.<sup>30</sup> As we mentioned above, the source from which Diodorus very probably drew this account was a contemporary, Ephorus. When Alexander came to the throne, he too set about winning the support of the Macedonian people by speaking in the assembly (17.2.2); this too in Macedonia, though we do not know from whom Diodorus was drawing his account.

If we ask how the assembly of Macedones worked, we may turn to parts of Diodorus which were based on a contemporary, Hieronymus of Cardia, writing for contemporaries. On Alexander's death the plans in his papers were brought by Perdiccas, the protector of the kingship, before 'the general assembly of the Macedones' in Babylon (18.4.3, *τὸ κοινὸν Μακεδόνων πλῆθος*), and 'the Macedones' decided not to carry them out (18.4.6).<sup>31</sup> Again, in 315 BC, Antigonos as successor to Perdiccas' position (19.61.3) convened a 'general assembly of the soldiers and those resident there', that was all Macedones available at and near Tyre, and denounced the acts of Cassander. When the crowd responded favourably, he made a proposal (19.61.3 *ἔγραψε δόγμα*), 'the soldiers voted in favour', and Antigonos took steps to publish the decision (*τὸ δόγμα*) which was referred to at 19.62.1 as *τὰ δεδογμένα τοῖς μετ' Ἀντιγόνου Μακεδόσι*. There is nothing surprising in these procedures to anyone who has even a slight knowledge of Greek history; and it is apparent that both Perdiccas and Antigonos, as representatives of the Macedonian king, were trying to conform with constitutional precedent.

As the second passage from Arrian shows, one function of the assembly of Macedones was to try cases of treason and pass their verdict. The particular importance of Arr. 3.26.2 is that the report is by Ptolemy, a Macedonian himself and a contemporary who wrote for contemporaries: the man suspected of treason, Philotas, 'was brought before (the) Macedones, was vigorously accused by Alexander and defended himself . . . he and others were found guilty of a plot and were shot down by the Macedones with javelins'. This was standard practice in Alexander's reign. On the same occasion Amyntas stood trial for treason, defended himself vigorously *ἐν Μακεδόσι*, and was acquitted (3.27.2); Hermolaus 'brought before the Macedones' confessed, etc. (4.14.2); as Philotas denied complicity in the plot, the matter was referred for verdict to 'the Macedones' (Diod. 17.79.6 *τῇν κρίσιν . . . τοῖς Μακεδόσιν*); and Alexander

<sup>30</sup> The suggestion made by Errington, *op. cit.*, 105, that 'the king (presumably) travelled round the country and tried to convince those whom he addressed', is most unconvincing. It is closer to the method of presidential candidates in the USA than to the concept of the ancient 'ekklesia', an 'assembly duly summoned' (LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v.), to

which as many of the electorate as possible came. In order to work up popular patriotic fervour one needs mass meetings at a centre, not gatherings round the village pump.

<sup>31</sup> I give reasons for supposing the plans and meeting to be historical in my forthcoming book on Alexander the Great.

Lyncestes was brought for trial before 'the Macedones' (Diod. 17.80.2 *εἰς τὴν τῶν Μακεδόνων κρίσιν*). For the trial of Amyntas the sources were both Ptolemy and Aristobulus; for that of Hermolaus, Ptolemy, Aristobulus, and others unnamed; and for the accounts in Diodorus sources other than Ptolemy and Aristobulus. The consensus of evidence is overwhelming. In particular Ptolemy and Aristobulus, writing for contemporaries, could not have invented trials and procedures and imposed their inventions on their contemporaries.

For good measure we may add the evidence of another contemporary, Hieronymus of Cardia, as seen in the accounts in Diodorus of a trial in Macedonia in 316 BC. Having won Macedonia by force and promised Olympias her life, Cassander encouraged the relatives of Olympias' victims to accuse her in the court of the 'general assembly of Macedones', and 'the Macedones' condemned her to death *in absentia* (19.51.1–2). Olympias countered by saying she was willing to stand trial 'in the court of all Macedones', implying that only Cassander's supporters had attended the court which had condemned her (19.51.4 *ἐν πᾶσι Μακεδόσι κριθῆναι*). Both Cassander and Olympias were adhering to old procedures, which had probably been in use for centuries.<sup>32</sup>

## V

Arr. 5.11.3 καὶ Κράτερος ὑπελέλειπτο ἐπὶ στρατοπέδου τὴν τε αὐτοῦ ἔχων ἱππαρχίαν καὶ . . . 5.12.2 τὴν Κλείτου τε καὶ Κοῖνου τάξιν . . . 5.16.3 Κοῖνον δὲ πέμπει ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ δεξιόν, τὴν Δημητρίου καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἔχοντα ἱππαρχίαν.

In the Hydaspes campaign Arrian describes the units which made up the three detachments—those in camp at 5.11.3, those higher up the right bank at 5.12.1, and those who were to make the first crossing at 5.12.2. No doubt he had his information from Ptolemy, a participant as Bodyguard (5.13.1), and we have no reason to question his accuracy. The Companion Cavalry units in the detachments were the Royal Squadron (*agema*) and four Hipparchies (one in

<sup>32</sup> For these trials and other aspects of them see my article 'Philip's Tomb in historical context', *GRBS* xix (1978), 340. It seems, from Antigonus' behaviour near Tyre and Olympias' claim, to be clear that the assembly of Macedones included not only serving Macedones but resident Macedones, the latter mainly ex-servicemen or those rendering another important form of service to the king. This is not the place to say who was a full citizen, a 'Macedon' (my views are stated in *Mac.* II, 647 ff.), or to discuss the evidence for the assembly of Macedones electing and deposing a king.

While it is not my intention to cover the Hellenistic period, it should be noted that we have evidence from the late fourth century BC onwards of many *κοινά* of tribes and tribal states in Epirus, as generally in north-western Greece (e.g. *Ep.* 528, line 15 τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Μολοσσῶν and 537 τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμύμων). As yet Macedonia

has yielded only late inscriptions, but they include *κοινά* of small tribes, e.g. Neapolitai and Dostoneis (*Mac.* I, 88, citing *Spomenik* lxxi (1931), No. 63), of cantonal tribes (*Anc. Mac.* II (1977), 130 f. Elimiotai, Orestai, and Lyncestai) and τὸ κοινὸν Μ[ακε]-δόν[ων] which honoured its king βασιλέα Φίλιππον, probably c.220 BC (*IG* XI 4. 1102). It is most unlikely that these *κοινά* were created in late Hellenistic times in Macedonia, whereas they were active already in the fourth century in the neighbouring region, Epirus. What the Macedonian kings called themselves at home and abroad and called the neighbouring kings (e.g. in *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 71, lines 27 and 61 τὸς βασιλέας; in Tod, *GHI* 111 with patronymic; 177 as Μακεδῶν; and 192 as βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος) seems to have no bearing on their constitutional relations with the Μακεδόνες.

camp and three in the force for the first crossing). In the course of the actions Alexander led the Royal Squadron (5.16.4); three Hipparchies were named after their Hipparchs before the actions began—Hephaestion, Perdikkas, and Demetrius—at 5.12.2; one Hipparchy was named some weeks later, after the crossing of the Hydraotes, as that of Cleitus at 5.22.6; and in the passages we have cited above Craterus and Coenus were mentioned as each having ‘his own Hipparchy’. If these last two were Hipparchs, then Arrian has given us four Hipparchies and six Hipparchs. This is the problem with which scholars have wrestled.<sup>33</sup>

If we begin with the observation that the description of the units is correct and gives us only four Hipparchies, and if we realize that an officer in command of a detachment took command also of a unit, the problem is at once resolved. Thus Alexander set the example: he commanded the force for the crossing and for the main battle, and he also commanded the Royal Squadron in the main actions (5.12.2 *ξὺν τῇ ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν ἵππῳ*; 5.16.4 *τοὺς ἐταίρους ἔχων τοὺς ἱππέας*, cf. 5.22.6–7). Craterus likewise commanded the detachment in camp also ‘his own Hipparchy’, i.e. that posted to his detachment (whatever name its regular Hipparch had); and again Coenus, sent off with a detachment of two Hipparchies at 5.16.3, took command also of one of those two Hipparchies as ‘his own Hipparchy’. We find the same phrases at 5.21.5 when Hephaestion had command of ‘a part of the army’ and also had ‘his own Hipparchy’; and at 5.22.6 and at 6.6.4 when Perdikkas was given a detachment of troops and also had ‘his own Hipparchy’, *τὴν τε αὐτοῦ ἔχων ἱππαρχίαν*. The solution, then, of the problem is that the Companion Cavalry units in the Hydaspes campaign were the Royal Squadron commanded in action by Alexander, the Hipparchy of Cleitus commanded in action by Craterus, the Hipparchy of Perdikkas commanded in action by Coenus,<sup>34</sup> the Hipparchy of Hephaestion commanded in action by Hephaestion, and the Hipparchy of Demetrius commanded in action by Demetrius. In all, the Royal Squadron and four Hipparchies. It was to these four Hipparchies that ‘a fifth Hipparchy was added’ two years later according to Arrian 7.6.3.

If our view is correct, there is no need to suppose that there were six (or more) Hipparchies in 326 BC, four Hipparchies some time later, and then five Hipparchies in 324 BC; that Arrian or Ptolemy failed to include two Hipparchies when he gave the forces of the three detachments in the Hydaspes campaign; and that Craterus and Coenus each had two units named after him, one of cavalry and one of infantry. By 326 BC Craterus had had an infantry brigade named after him for ten years according to Berve; so too had Coenus, and his named brigade operated in the Hydaspes action but not under his command in the final battle (5.12.3 and 5.16.3). Berve and others had supposed that one Hipparchy was named regularly after Craterus and another regularly after Coenus. Their supposition raises practical difficulties. For since *taxis* was used for both infantry and cavalry alike, the expression ‘Craterus’ unit’ would be ambiguous; and that is just the sort of ambiguity no competent commander

<sup>33</sup> See, for instance, Berve, I, 109 f. For the Hydaspes campaign Tarn, p. 407 gave five Hipparchies; P. A. Brunt five in his article in *JHS* lxxxi (1963), 29, and in his Loeb edition of Arrian, vol. I, p. lxxiii, ‘at least six Hipparchs’ and ‘it seems’ seven Hipparchies; and G. T. Griffith in the same *JHS* either seven Hipparchies (71 n. 3) or

‘six Hipparchies (out of eight) at the Hydaspes’. In citing these numbers, as far as I have understood them, I have not included the *agema* in the count.

<sup>34</sup> I have chosen this Hipparchy for Coenus, because Perdikkas was acting as a Bodyguard with Alexander at the time (5.13.1).

would countenance. In order to strengthen his view, Berve argued that Cleitus had both a cavalry unit and an infantry unit named after him (5.12.2 and 5.22.6). But there were probably two men of that common name: an old man in 324 BC who was to be repatriated with Craterus (Justin 12.12.8), and a man who served with exceptional distinction as an admiral and was killed in 318 BC. The former, I suggest, was the infantry commander, to whom Berve allotted a brigade in 327 and 326 BC, and the latter was the Hipparch in 326 BC, the dandy of Athenaeus 12. 539C, and the admiral.<sup>35</sup>

In his campaigns west of the Indus Alexander had had at least seven and perhaps even eight Hipparchies of Companion Cavalry, as we can infer from Arr. 4.22.7, 4.23.1, and 4.24.1, and there is no doubt that he had increased his cavalry to that high number during the years of fighting in Sogdiana and Bactria, where he had faced very large forces of excellent cavalry in open country. If our conclusion is correct, Alexander reorganized his cavalry when he reached the Indus and was about to engage a different kind of enemy, skilled in the use of elephants. The proportion of Macedonian cavalrymen in the eight Hipparchies must have been small, and he doubled that proportion by reducing the eight Hipparchies of Companion Cavalry to four Hipparchies, which together with the Royal Squadron (*agema*) became his special assault force of cavalry in the actions against Porus' son (5.15.3) and against Porus' left wing in the main battle (5.17.1-2). Those non-Macedonian cavalrymen who were not retained in the newly organized four Hipparchies of Companion Cavalry were used in part probably for policing and garrison duties on the long line of communications and were reorganized in part to form the special units of cavalry from Sogdiana and Bactria, which together with the squadrons of Scythians and Dahae were used to good effect at the Hydaspes river. The reorganization of the cavalry forces was justified by victory.

## VI

Arr. 6.20.4 εὐπορωτέραν τε κατέμαθεν τὴν ἐπὶ τάδε τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ἐκβολὴν καὶ αὐτὸς προσορμισθεὶς τῷ αἰγιαλῷ καὶ τῶν ἱππέων τινὰς ἅμα οἱ ἔχων παρὰ θάλασσαν ἤει σταθμούς τρεῖς.

The opening sentence has been mistranslated by E. I. Robson in the 1933 Loeb edition as 'the passage by this branch of the Indus was an easier one', as if Arrian had written τὴνδε τὴν ἐκβολὴν. And it has been misinterpreted by Tarn and others, who have supposed the references to be to 'the eastern arm' of the Indus river and therefore made Nearchus start from there.<sup>36</sup> The distance between the two arms was then 1,800 stades (6.20.2) = some 333 kilometres. To make Nearchus row along the coast of the delta was to add that number of kilometres to his voyage; in addition it was surely unnecessary for Alexander to

<sup>35</sup> Beloch, *GG*<sup>2</sup> 3.2.330 suggested that there were two men with the name Cleitus.

<sup>36</sup> Tarn, p. 414 'Alexander began to build a harbour on the lake as a starting-point for Nearchus', and 'Nearchus dropped down the eastern arm of the Indus to its mouth.' I

think all writers since 1927 except Lambrick (see n. 38) have followed Tarn; thus J. R. Hamilton has no hesitation in making Nearchus start from the eastern branch of the Indus (*Plutarch, Alexander: A Commentary*, p. 183).

have had wells dug (6.20.4) along that stretch of the delta into which various streams of the Indus must have descended (Arrian used the plural *ἐκβολαί* at 6.19.5).

If we translate the Greek correctly, there is no ambiguity. 'The Indus outlet on this side' (*τὴν ἐπὶ τὰδε τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ἐκβολήν*) is the western outlet, that nearest to the writer's viewpoint. We have an exact parallel in Arr. 3.25.8 where, Alexander being in Zarangaea, Barsaentes fled to the Indians 'this side of the Indus river', *ἐς Ἰνδοῦς τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰδε τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ποταμοῦ ἔφυγε*. And we have examples of the antithetic expression *ἐπέκεινα* at Arr. 1.3.5 *ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Ἰστροῦ* and 4.3.6 *τῶν ἐπέκεινα τοῦ ποταμοῦ βαρβάρων*, i.e. on 'that side', the far side, of the Danube and the Tanais (Syr-darya). So too at 5.2.1 and 6.19.3.

Armed with a correct translation of Arr. 6.20.4, we can see what Alexander was doing. He found at Pattala that the Indus divided into two large rivers (6.18.2). First he went down the 'right-hand' river, i.e. to the western outlet or *ἐκβολή*. There he met rough water, caused by wind and tide setting against the current of the river, and he found a wide part of the river and a side-channel off it, where he sought shelter. Farther downstream he came to an island and soon emerged into the sea. It seems that he had no difficulty in clearing the mouth of the river, as conditions were at that time (6.19.4). Once out at sea, he made sacrifices. One was for the success of the naval expedition of Nearchus, on which he had already decided.

Next he returned to Pattala. From there he sailed down the other arm of the Indus to the other mouth, the eastern one (6.20.2; cf. *Ind.* 20.10). His aim was to learn which mouth gave easier access to the sea (*ὅπη εὐπωτέρα ἢ ἐκβολή τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ἐς τὸν πόντον γίγνεται* 6.20.2). This was important because Nearchus' ships moved under oar, and it is extremely difficult, if wind and tide are adverse, to row out on the flow of a great river, because the waves become very steep and dangerous. Moreover, the monsoon winds were beginning; they blew onshore (6.21.1) and created continuous surf. As he went down the eastern arm, Alexander came to a great lake (6.20.3), something which did not exist on the western arm; he left his main force at the lake and went on himself to the outlet. He then rowed out to sea (6.20.4). 'Thus he learnt that the mouth of the Indus on this side was the easier', i.e. the western outlet. The expedition of Nearchus, then, was to sail from the western arm of the Indus.

In what follows Arrian has written so concisely that the meaning is not always clear (indeed it is this conciseness which has led in part to the misunderstanding of *τὴν ἐπὶ τὰδε . . . ἐκβολήν*). So let us see next how Nearchus fared.<sup>37</sup> On his way down the Indus he passed some side-canals but no lake, which shows he was not on the eastern arm, and he found it impossible to clear the mouth under the adverse conditions of the weather; for there was a bar (*ἔρμα*) or silt-bank, over which the sea was breaking. Nearchus made a channel through the bank and rowed the ships through it at the turn of high tide (*Ind.*

<sup>37</sup> In *Ind.* 19.9 Nearchus 'set out from the outlets of the Indus', i.e. from the delta, and more exactly at 21.2 'from the naval base'. This base was evidently the one built at Pattala (6.18.2 and 6.20.1). From this base Nearchus travelled some 160 stades, i.e. 30 kilometres, to the outlet (*Ind.* 21.

2-5). The other 'naval base', built beside the lake on the eastern arm, was almost at the outlet (6.20.3), and certainly not 30 kilometres inland. So the evidence points again to the western arm being used by Nearchus.

21.6). Once at sea, he encountered no river until he reached the Arabis; this again shows that he had not come from the eastern arm of the Indus.<sup>38</sup>

Let us return now to 6.20.4. Having learnt which outlet was the better, Alexander put into shore. He landed with some cavalry and conducted a three days' reconnaissance along the coast to see what the land for the coastal voyage was like (*ὅποια τίς ἐστὼν ἢ ἐν τῷ παράπλῳ*) and to arrange for the digging of wells, so that 'those who were sailing' might draw water. In other words, he was preparing for the first part of Nearchus' voyage to the west of the western arm. Later he sent another force to continue this good work. He himself returned to Pattala, presumably rowing up the western arm. Then he sailed down again 'to the lake', i.e. the lake on the eastern arm of the Indus, where he had a harbour and a dockyard made and left a garrison. This was, of course, to be his eastern frontier. Next, he collected four months' supply for the army (*τῇ στρατιᾷ*)—which he was to lead overland—and he made 'the other preparations' for the coastal voyage, i.e. in addition to the well-digging operations. As the army was to start from Pattala (6.21.3), he collected the supplies for the army at Pattala. After marching with the entire army to the river Arabis, he took part of his force along the coast and dug wells, 'so that there should be water in plenty for those who were making the coastal voyage' (6.21.3). It is an excellent example of Alexander's planning.

## VII

Arr. 7.8.1 *ἐπιδώσει δὲ μένουσιν ὅσα αὐτοὺς τε ζηλωτοτέρους ποιήσει τοῖς οἴκοι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Μακεδόνας ἐξορμήσει ἐς τὸ ἐθέλειν τῶν αὐτῶν κινδύνων τε καὶ πόνων μετέχειν.*

Curt. 10.2.9 *priusquam excerneret quos erat retenturus . . . 10.2.12 ut cognitum est alios remitti domos, alios retineri.*

Justin 12.11 *sed retenti veteranorum discessum aegre ferentes missionem et ipsi flagitabant.*

In these passages the scene is being set for the mutiny at Opis. Alexander had two problems, as the wording of the passages shows: how best to discharge the over-age and maimed Macedonians (Arr. 7.8.1 *τοὺς ὑπὸ γῆρως ἢ πηρωσέως τοῦ σώματος ἀχρεῖους ἐς τὰ πολέμια ὄντας*), and how best to retain Macedonians in Asia. Alexander may have thought the latter problem the more difficult; for it

<sup>38</sup> If he had, the detailed account in *Ind.* 21.7–13 would have mentioned the outlet of the western arm of the Indus. When we tot up the stades given by Nearchus for his journey from the outlet of the Indus to the Arabis mouth (*Ind.* 21.7–22.8), they come to not more than 1,300 stades (allowing 300 stades for a day's sail for which the distance was not recorded). If he had started from the eastern mouth, he would not even have reached the western mouth after covering 1,300 stades, since he put the mouths 1,800 stades apart (6.20.2; Str. 701). The

variant figures given by Aristobulus and Onesicritus, 1,000 and 2,000, show that the delta coast had not been traversed by Nearchus. Some of these points were noted by H. T. Lambrick, *Sind: a General Introduction* (Hyderabad, 1975), pp. 114 f., who supposed that Alexander intended Nearchus to sail from the eastern arm, that Nearchus was compelled by changing conditions to sail from the western arm, and that he did not tell Alexander what he had done; I thank Professor R. M. Ogilvie for informing me of the book when this article was accepted.

was obvious that all Macedonians were eager to return to Macedonia after so long a period of service abroad.

According to Arrian, Alexander announced at an assembly of the Macedonians that 'he is discharging from the army and sending to their homes those who are incapacitated for active service by age or injury, and that he will freely give to those staying as many benefits as will make them an object of greater envy to those at home and will arouse in the other Macedonians the desire to share in the same dangers and labours'. The benefits were evidently to be so great that those who stayed were more to be envied than those who were repatriated, and that those others who were to come out as a new draft would actually be eager to share in the service of those who were staying in Asia. The reaction to Alexander's announcement was a mutiny, led by those who were being discharged but shared by those he proposed should stay; for 'they ordered Alexander to discharge them all from the army' (7.8.3). When the mutiny ended, Alexander retained some Macedonians in Asia, and one of the benefits he gave them was double pay for serving with the Asians in the new type of army (7.23.3-4).

Curtius and Justin differ from Arrian in some respects, but they all agree on the sequence of the announcements and on the two groups, those to be discharged and those to be retained in Asia. Curtius begins with the discharge: 'senioribus militum in patriam remissis'.<sup>39</sup> He then passes on to Alexander's order that 13,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry be selected for retention in Asia; describes Alexander's payment of the soldiers' debts; and then mentions as the immediate antecedent to the mutiny the realization that 'some were being sent home and some were being retained'.<sup>40</sup> The text of Curtius breaks off after the arrest of the leading mutineers; otherwise we would probably have his mention of the conditions of service for those who were retained. Justin is much shorter. 'Dimissis veteranis, exercitum iunioribus supplet. Sed retenti veteranorum discessum aegre ferentes et ipsi flagitabant.' 'The veterans having been discharged, he fills their place in the army with younger men.'<sup>41</sup> Those who were retained, being annoyed at the discharge of the veterans, demanded their own discharge too.' Thus both Curtius and Justin agree with Arrian on the importance of those who were to stay in Asia, the 'retenti' or μένοντες.

One reason for emphasizing this aspect of the mutiny is that the transmitted text of all manuscripts, as cited above, has been so emended by Krüger and Roos that the word μένοντων is ejected. For Krüger put in its place ἀπωϋσσω not on any palaeographical grounds but to obtain the sense he wanted. Roos simply bracketed the word and wrote 'delevi'. Thereby they removed the problem of those to be retained in Asia. Their lead has been followed by those who have described the mutiny at Opis, from Tarn to Lane Fox.<sup>42</sup> Yet such arbitrary handling of the text is unwarranted. If we regard the text as corrupt, we should be guided by the words in the texts of Curtius and Justin, which no one has condemned as corrupt. What seems to have happened to the text of Arrian is the loss of the

<sup>39</sup> R. D. Milns in *Entretiens Hardt* xxii (1975), 112, has reversed the order of events; but there is no ambiguity about an ablative absolute in Latin.

<sup>40</sup> Yet others were to accompany Alexander on his intended campaign in Arabia;

but they were not relevant to the mutiny.

<sup>41</sup> A reference probably not to a new draft from Macedonia but to the young Persians, called by Arrian 'the Epigoni', in this context (7.8.2).

<sup>42</sup> Tarn, p. 420 and Lane Fox, p. 424.

definite article before μένουσιν.<sup>43</sup> If we read τοῖς μένουσιν, whether as a present participle or as a future participle, there is no problem and we shall have a fuller understanding of what Alexander aimed to do at Opis.<sup>44</sup>

## VIII

(a) Arrian F I, 7 (*FGrHist* 156) τὰ δὲ ἐπέκεια τῆς Θραίκης ὡς ἐπὶ Ἰλλυριοῦς καὶ Τριβαλλοῦς καὶ Ἀγριᾶνας καὶ αὐτῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἡ Ἠπειρος ὡς ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ Κεραυνία ἀνήκουσα καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες σύμπαντες.

(b) Dexippus F 8, 3 (*FGrHist* 100) Ἀντίπατρος δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Μακεδόσι καὶ Ἕλλησι καὶ Ἰλλυριοῖς καὶ Τριβαλλοῖς καὶ Ἀγριάσι καὶ ὅσα τῆς Ἠπειρου ἐξέτι Ἀλεξάνδρου στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ ἐτέτακτο. τὴν δὲ κηδεμονίαν καὶ ὅσην προστασία τῆς βασιλείας Κράτερος ἐπετράπη ὃ δὴ πρῶτιστον τιμῆς τέλος παρὰ Μακεδόσι.

(c) Plutarch, *Alex.* 68.4 καὶ πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον Ὀλυμπιάς καὶ Κλεοπάτρα στασιάζουσαι διείλοντο τὴν ἀρχὴν, Ὀλυμπιάς μὲν Ἠπειρον Κλεοπάτρα δὲ Μακεδονίαν παραλαβοῦσα.

Passages (a) and (b) are both summaries of what Arrian had written in his book on events after Alexander's death in 323 BC, and they should be used to supplement one another. They refer to the short period during which Antipater and Craterus together held power in Europe, a period mentioned also by Curt. 10.7.9 and Justin 13.2.13–14. Passage (a) is part of the distribution of territories which was made at Babylon by the Successors, and the word ἐπέκεια is seen from their viewpoint, i.e. areas 'beyond Thrace' are on its far or western side (cf. areas 'beyond Pindus' in *A. Supp.* 257): Illyrians farthest west, Triballi centred in the region of Niš (Str. 318), and Agrianes south of Sofia. Macedonia and Epirus are given from the same viewpoint, so that we should think of the area beyond Macedonia as 'Epirus extending up to the Ceraunian mountains', i.e. that part of Epirus subject to Antipater: namely, the ancient districts of Parauaea and Chaonia, the latter extending up to the Ceraunian mountains which form the coast of northern Epirus from north of Buthrotus to Cape Glossa.

<sup>43</sup> At least we should expect the article in Classical Greek. At times Arrian uses the participle almost as in Latin which lacks the article; thus at 1.27.4 the text τῷ σατράπῃ τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρου ταχθέντι (without the addition of ὑπὸ) may well be what Arrian wrote under the influence of Latin.

<sup>44</sup> Of the other accounts Diodorus 17.109.1 has Curtius' sequence of events: discharge τῶν πολιτῶν, i.e. the Macedonian citizens; payment of debts; the mutiny τῶν ἀπολειπομένων Μακεδόνων ἀπειθούντων, 'those being left behind'; and he differs from Justin in that he puts the replacing of the veterans with Persians after the end of the mutiny (17.110.1). Plutarch, *Alex.* 71, seems to give his own conflation of what he had read; for it includes the fears of the

Macedonians being aroused by the smartness of the Epigoni, and the discharge of 'the weak and maimed' causing the demand that all should be dismissed. The order of events in Arrian is likely to be correct in that it is derived from Ptolemy and/or Aristobulus: payment of debts (7.5.1–3); arrival of Epigoni (7.6.1); annoyance of the Macedonians at favours accorded to the Persians (not part of the *logos* at 7.6.2, as Badian suggested in *JHS* lxxxv (1965), 160, because not in the accusative and infinitive); and after a considerable interval the announcement to the army (7.8.1). Arr. 7.8.2 is not a doublet of 7.6.1, as has been suggested, but it is Arrian's way of showing the background of discontent and the points which came to the fore in the mutiny.

Dexippus makes it clear that only part of Epirus was involved; and he adds the important point that that part of Epirus had been under Antipater's authority when Alexander was still alive. By implication Epirus south of Chaonia had then been independent. In my book *Epirus*, completed in 1964 and published in 1967, I accepted passages (a) and (b) as correct and concluded that 'Antipater's authority then ran in Chaonia at least' (p. 558). In addition I dated the formation of the Epirote Alliance, οἱ σύμμαχοι τῶν Ἀπειρωτῶν, to 'between 331 BC and 326/5 BC' (*Ep.* 537 and 559). In this I ran counter to some earlier views: that the Chaonians from the beginning belonged to the Epirote Alliance; that after the death of Alexander, the Molossian king, in 331 BC Epirus was incorporated entirely in the Macedonian empire; and that Olympias took control of Epirus very soon after the death of her brother, Alexander, in 331 BC.<sup>45</sup>

The veracity of Arrian has been remarkably vindicated by the publication in 1966 of a list of Argive Theorodoci (they welcomed sacred envoys), which gave the name of a state and then that of a host. It includes 'Apeiros Kleopatra' and after it 'Phoinika'. This means that there was an independent Epirotic state, viz. the Epirote Alliance, and that the Chaones, whose administrative centre was indisputably at Phoenice, did not belong to it. Further, the inscription was dated *circa* 330 BC by P. Charneux in *BCH* xc (1966), 156 ff.<sup>46</sup> So far, so good. But the rest of the inscription raises some problems. I give the relevant part as published by Charneux on the right and my proposed restoration on the left.

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
|          | 9 [Αργος]·Λαδικος                                 |
|          | 10 [Αμβρ]α[κία]·Φ]ορβαδας                         |
|          | 11 [Απε]ρος·Κλεοπατρα                             |
|          | 12 [Φοι]κα·Σατυριως Πυλαδας ∟Καρχαξ               |
| [Κεμα]ρα | 13 [Κασσωπ]α·[. . . . .]ιδας Αισχυριων Τευθραντος |
|          | 14 [Απο]λ[λ]ωνια·Δω[.]θεος                        |
| [Ωρικος] | 15 [. . . . .]ν[.]θεος                            |
|          | 16 [Κορκ]υρα·Ναι[. . . . .]                       |

The names of the states were usually given in the best geographical order for a sequence of visits. Thus here Amphilochian Argos, Ambracia, 'Apeiros' with its centre at Dodona or Passaron, and Phoenice are in such a sequence. But Cassope is completely off course, since it lies about 100 kilometres south of Phoenice, and Apollonia is about 100 kilometres north of Phoenice. We need a place between Phoenice and Apollonia, and in a list of Delphic Theorodoci, dated c.220 to 189 BC, we find between Phoenice and Dyrrachium two places,

<sup>45</sup> For instance, Berve, 2.287; G. N. Cross, *Epirus* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 43; P. R. Franke, *Alt-Epirus u. d. Königium d. Molosser* (Kallmünz, 1955), p. 46.

<sup>46</sup> The inscription is discussed in the same volume on pp. 710 ff.; *REG* lxxxii (1969), 550 f.; lxxxiv, 355; *Bull. Epigr.* 1967. 261; and printed with restorations in *SEG* xxiii, 189. P. Cabanes, *L'Épire de la mort de Pyrrhos à la conquête romaine* (Paris, 1976), pp. 117 f. and 173 f. discusses it with his own suggestions. It should be

noted that Charneux in *BCH* xc, 710 reaffirmed that he read in line 13 only -ρα (not as in Cabanes's version -υρα); hence my preference for [κεμα]ρα. In line 16 he and others propose ['Εν]κυρναια[ι], but this is geographically a *non sequitur*, since no one would think of travelling from Apollonia to Cyrenaica and then back to the 'Peloponnese and Cephallenia'. See my forthcoming article on the lists of Theorodoci in Epirus in *Epiroica Chronica*, New Series.

'Kemara' and 'Abantia' (a variant of Amantia). My preference is for Kemara.<sup>47</sup> The same list has 'Orikos' in a group with Apollonia; so I suggest restoring Orikos in line 15. From there by sea to Corcyra, and after three lacunose entries (? for Ithaca and the Oeniadae area) to the Peloponnese and Cephallenia. This makes a coherent series of visits.

The political interest of this list is heightened by a comparison with the list of Epidaurian Theorodoci, inscribed for our area c. 360 to 355 BC.<sup>48</sup> It begins with Pandosia, an Elean colony then independent; but subjugated by Philip II to the Molossian state c. 342 BC. Then, Cassope, centre or region of the Cassopi; similarly made subject c. 342 BC. Then Thesproti, an independent tribal state. Then offshore Corcyra. Next, back on the mainland, Chaonia, an independent state of the Chaones. Next Artichia, the area of the Atintanes perhaps. Next Molossoi, the tribal state; and then Ambracia and Argos. On the other hand, circa 330 BC Pandosia, Cassope, Thesproti, and Molossoi are merged into an independent state 'Apeiros', which at this time began to issue its coinage 'Apeirotan'. Chaonia has split into two states, Phoenice standing for the Chaones and Kemara probably for the Kares. Artichia has disappeared, the Atintanes perhaps having been absorbed into the Epirote Alliance. Arrian, then, is correct in drawing the limit of independence (under Antipater's general oversight) at the Ceraunian range's southern end. To the south Ambracia too was independent, and it too was under Macedonian surveillance. Another comparison arises over the name 'Apeiros'. In the Epidaurian list general geographical names were given: 'Makedonia', 'Akarnania', 'Apeiros', 'Korkura', 'Chaonia', etc. In this case Epirus stood for the south-western part only of what we should call Epirus. Circa 330 BC, when these names were political, 'Apeiros' stood for a state which covered all southern Epirus with the exception of Ambracia.

As long as the brother of Olympias was king of Molossia, it suited Philip and Alexander to strengthen the Molossian state and to encourage the Molossian king to campaign in Italy, as he did from 334 to 331 BC. During those years 'The Molossians and their Allies' were a military coalition, led by the Molossian king, and it is probable that the Chaones were among the Allies. After 331 BC the Epirote Alliance came into existence, one imagines not without Macedonian influence behind the scenes: in consequence the Molossian state lost its primacy, northern Epirus came under the protectorate of Macedonia, and the Chaonia of 360 to 355 BC was now divided into two independent states, centred on Phoenice and Kemara. Antipater, and ultimately Alexander, were perhaps clipping the wings of the Molossian state and weakening the position of the Chaones.<sup>49</sup>

The new inscription also has a bearing on passage (c) in which 'Olympias took Epirus and Cleopatra took Macedonia.' On the basis of that passage and of other evidence to which we shall come Berve and others held that Olympias in 331 or early 330 BC ousted Cleopatra from her position as widowed queen and herself controlled Epirus from then on, even 'seizing the throne of Epirus' or considering herself 'as queen of Molossia'.<sup>50</sup> The inscription now shows that Cleopatra stood c. 330 BC for the Epirote Alliance, as 'Tharyps' (i.e. Arybbas the

<sup>47</sup> See the preceding note.

<sup>48</sup> *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 95; see *Ep.* 517 f. and 532 f.; Franke, pp. 16 f.; Cabanes, *op. cit.*, pp. 116 f.

<sup>49</sup> As suggested in *Ep.* 559; see Franke,

pp. 42 f. for a different view.

<sup>50</sup> Berve, 2.287; G. N. Cross, p. 43; Tarn, p. 354; Franke, p. 41. Cabanes, p. 173 puts her move to Epirus in 325 BC.

king) had stood for the Molossian state in the list of 360 to 355 BC. She was in the religious field acting as head-of-state; and in relation to the infant king, Neoptolemus II, she was no doubt guardian. This is apparent also from Athens sending envoys to condole with Cleopatra after the king's death in 331 BC (Aeschin. 3.242). It seems too that she was in charge of corn-supplies, just as the Macedonian king was in control of timber. In 330 BC corn was shipped 'from Epirus from Cleopatra' to Corinth (Lyc. c. *Leocr.* 26), and in the period of drought, 330 to 326 BC Cyrene sent 50,000 medimni 'to Cleopatra' (*SEG* IX.2), i.e. after 330 BC. For some years, then, Cleopatra had considerable powers and a leading position, not least in the religious field, as guardian of the king; or to use the terms of passage (b) as 'being entrusted with the care and all that makes for the protection of the kingship', in short the *prostasia*. We are encouraged to use that term, because *prostates* was the title of the leading official in most of the tribal states in Epirus.<sup>51</sup>

The idea that Olympias controlled Epirus from 331 BC onwards was formed on the following grounds. Livy 8.24.17 ends his sensational account of the mutilation of the corpse of Alexander the Molossian by bringing the sorry remains home 'ad Cleopatram uxorem sororemque Olympiadem'.<sup>52</sup> If this is a true and not an imaginary picture, it means only that Olympias attended the obsequies as a mourner; after all, Alexander the Great paid his tribute by ordering three days of mourning by the army in Asia. It is a false inference that Olympias held then an official position in Epirus. In 330 BC, or soon after when Hyperides was defending a client, Euxenippus, he envisages Olympias as operating in Macedonia (*Eux.* 32, *fin.*), but he refers to an incident in Epirus which arose when Athens embellished the shrine of Dione at Dodona. Olympias complained in a letter which is cited by Hyperides as containing these words. 'The land in which the shrine stands, Molossia, is my land; so it was not right for you to disturb anything there' (36). She was explaining her status in the matter, as a Molossian by birth and no doubt as a religious woman; it does not follow that she was acting as the Molossian queen or regent.<sup>53</sup> Although Hyperides gives few details, he treats the complaint (probably one of several) as coming officially to Athens from Olympias and Alexander (32 *καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἡκόντας παρ' αὐτῶν δικαιολογεῖσθαι*).

There are strong indications that Olympias held some official position in Macedonia. In 333 BC she made a dedication to Hygieia at Athens for the recovery of Alexander from his illness in Cilicia. In 331 BC she made dedications of great value at Delphi from the spoils won at the battle of Issus and at Damascus, and they were officially recorded at Delphi (*Syll* I<sup>3</sup> 252 N 5 ff.). In 331 to 330 BC complaints were conveyed by envoys from Olympias and Alexander to Athens (*Eux.* 32).<sup>54</sup> In 330 to 326 BC, the years of drought which affected Thessaly, Epirus, Illyria, and no doubt Macedonia, Cyrene sent corn on two occasions, totalling 72,000 medimni, to 'Olympias' (*SEG* IX 2); thus she represented Macedonia, just as Cleopatra represented the Epirote Alliance in this

<sup>51</sup> See *Ep.* 818 f.; the Molossian state and the Macedonian state had much in common, as noted in *Ep.* 539.

<sup>52</sup> The corpse of Alexander, like the corpse of Bessus, was cut up and used for target-practice—a flight of fancy perhaps by Cleitarchus in both cases (Livy 8.24.14–

15 and Diod. 17.83.9).

<sup>53</sup> Berve, 2.287 makes her 'Herrin von Epeiros'.

<sup>54</sup> Hyperides had mentioned Olympias and Alexander at the end of 31 and he resumed them as *ἐκεῖνοι* and *παρ' αὐτῶν* in 32.

matter. Early in 324 BC a demand for the arrest of Harpalus was sent to Athens by 'Antipater and Olympias' (Diod. 17.108.7). If, then, Olympias held an official position, we can readily understand why Alexander sent large amounts of spoil to her (e.g. *FGH Hist* 151 F 1 and Plut. *Alex.* 25.6); why Alexander and Olympias were constantly in correspondence; why she warned him of plots; and why she sent him a specialist in the state-sacrifices which were traditional in Macedonia (Athen. 14.659 F).

Who acted in Macedonia for the absent king? We know from passage (a) and other evidence that Antipater was 'General in Europe' with a defined sphere, and received from Alexander military instructions and large sums of money for military purposes. But who carried out the non-military functions of the monarchy and in particular those sacrificial duties which Alexander in Asia performed daily? No doubt a member of the royal house, just as in Asia Arrhidaeus was the king's 'associate in sacrifices and ceremonies' (Curt. 10.7.2); and there was no member of the royal house who had a stronger claim than Olympias. I suggest, then, that Olympias acted in certain matters for the king.<sup>55</sup> The position which she held, no doubt at the wish of Alexander, was presumably that mentioned in passage (b), the *prostasia*, 'which was indeed the most prestigious post among the Macedones'. When in 319 BC Polyperchon invited Olympias to 'take over the guardianship of Alexander's son and live in Macedonia holding the kingly leadership' (Diod. 18.49.4 *τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν . . . τὴν βασιλικὴν ἔχουσιν προστασίαν*), he was probably offering to her the position which she had held in the years 334 to 324 BC.

It was in the year 324 BC that the friction between Antipater and Olympias reached a critical point. We may assume that Alexander took the decision that Olympias was to withdraw from Macedonia to Epirus (Diod. 18.49.4 and Paus. I.11.3), and that Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander, should take over the *prostasia* in Macedonia. This at least makes sense of passage (c), which gives a slanted version: 'Olympias and Cleopatra formed a faction against Antipater and divided the rule, Olympias taking over Epirus and Cleopatra taking over Macedonia.'<sup>56</sup> As holder of the *prostasia* in Epirus, Olympias was able later to bring about the replacement of Neoptolemus II by Aeacides; and as holder of the *prostasia* in Macedonia Cleopatra offered in a letter from Pella to marry Leonnatus, a connection of the royal house, if he would come to Macedonia and take control of the country (Plut. *Eum.* 3.5).

In 324 BC Alexander had a double change in mind: Cleopatra to replace Olympias, and Craterus to replace Antipater. He showed his usual generosity and tact. He let it be known that he intended Olympias to be rewarded with divine honours at the time of her death<sup>57</sup> (Curt. 9.6.26 and 10.5.30), and he entrusted to the seventy-year-old Antipater the honour of bringing out to Asia a large body of Macedonians. After his death the Successors made their own arrangements: Antipater was to retain his position as 'General in Europe'

<sup>55</sup> Hamilton in commenting on this passage said 'Plutarch seems to mean that this event took place in 324'; but he himself put it back to 'not later than 331'.

<sup>56</sup> This included the handling of the 'royal money', presumably in Macedonia

itself, according to Justin 13.4.5, 'regiae pecuniae custodia'.

<sup>57</sup> See my article in *GRBS* xix (1978), 333, for worship paid after death to Amyntas, father of Philip, and to Philip at Aegeae.

or στρατηγός αὐτοκράτωρ as passage (a) has it, and Craterus was to replace Cleopatra in the *prostasia*,<sup>58</sup> which now became a pawn in the gamble for power. But that is another story.

Clare College, Cambridge

N. G. L. HAMMOND

<sup>58</sup> The complementary summaries of Arrian and Dexippus are Κράτερον δὲ προστάτην τῆς Ἀρριδαίου βασιλείας, and passage (b) above. They do not say, as Tarn, p. 461 supposed, tht Craterus was guardian

of Arrhidaeus (he was under the charge of Perdiccas) but of the *kingship* of Arrhidaeus, a post explained more fully as the *prostasia* in passage (b).