

PERDICCAS AND THE KINGS

New evidence often complicates as much as it clarifies. That truth is well illustrated by Stephen Tracy's recent and brilliant discovery that a tiny unpublished fragment of an Attic inscription belongs to a known decree (*IG* ii². 402).¹ The decree has hitherto been recognised as an enactment of the oligarchy imposed by Antipater in 322. Its proposer, Archedicus of Lamptrae, was a leading member of the new regime and held the most influential office of state, that of *anagrapheus*, in 320/19.² Appropriately enough the decree confers honours upon members of the Macedonian court, but as the stone now reveals, it is phrased in a remarkable and anomalous manner: 'in order that as many as possible of the friends of the king and of Antipater may be honoured by the Athenian people and confer benefactions upon the city'.³ There is no question about the meaning. The decree refers to friends of an unknown king, who are also friends of Antipater. But after Alexander's death there was a dual kingship. Philip III Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV reigned jointly and are generally termed 'the kings'.⁴ How can the singular singular be explained?

Tracy's admittedly tentative solution is to place the inscription in the last year of Philip II, but in my opinion that cannot be entertained even tentatively. On Attic stones Philip II is referred to by his name alone, and the regal title does not appear.⁵ It is inconceivable, I think, that he could have been styled 'the king' without any qualification, especially when there was a Persian king to reckon with. It would be easier if, as Christian Habicht has suggested,⁶ the king of the decree were Alexander the Great and the decree dated not long before his death. Even so the unqualified regal title is strange in a decree of the democracy.⁷ Still stranger is the fact that

¹ The fragment comes from the Agora (I 4990), and the new text is published by Stephen V. Tracy in *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 249–51. I am most grateful to have had the opportunity of reading the article in draft by courtesy of Professors Tracy and Habicht, both of whom suggested that I develop my ideas in print. They should not be held responsible for what has emerged.

² See now the study by Chr. Habicht, 'The Comic Poet Archedikos', *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 253–6 which convincingly identifies the oligarch Archedicus with the comic poet of the same name, notorious for his attacks on Demochares, the nephew of Demosthenes (Polyb. 12.13.3 = Timaeus, *FGrH* 566 F 35). For the role of Archedicus as *anagrapheus* see *IG* ii². 380–84 with Sterling Dow, 'The Athenian Anagrapheis', *HSCP* 67 (1963) 37–54, esp. 45–7.

³ ll. 3–7: [ὅπως ἂν ὡς πλείστοι τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως φίλων καὶ Ἀντιπάτρου τε | τιμημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων εὐεργετώσιν τὴν πόλιν | τὴν Ἀθηναίων.

⁴ For the evidence see the study by Chr. Habicht, 'Literarische und epigraphische Überlieferung zur Geschichte Alexanders und seiner ersten Nachfolger', *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik* (Vestigia 17: Munich 1973) 367–77.

⁵ See particularly *IG* ii². 240, ll. 12–15 (= Tod 181): ὡς Φίλιππον, [πράττων] ἀγαθὸν ὅτι δύνανται Ἀθηναίοις παρὰ [Φίλιππου]; *IG* ii². 211 (Tod 166); 127 (Tod 157). The oath after Chaeronea committed the Athenians not to undermine τὴν βασιλείαν [τὴν Φίλιππου] (*IG* ii². 236, ll. 12–13 = Tod 177), but the regal title itself does not appear. Nor does it elsewhere. Even at Delphi the Macedonian *hieromnemones* are termed οἱ παρὰ Φιλίππου.

⁶ Above, n. 2, at note 12.

⁷ No extant decree from the last years of the reign refers explicitly to Alexander. In *IG* ii². 329 (A. J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks* [Norman, 1980] 4–5) he is simply Ἀλέξανδρος (but cf. A. Tronson, *ANW* 12 [1985] 15–19, arguing that this may be Alexander's uncle, Alexander II). In other states he is βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος (cf. Heisserer 44, 80, 143, 146, 173; *IG* vii. 3206 = Tod 197), and in Athens itself Demosthenes is alleged to have proposed an

Antipater is placed on the same level as the king himself: the king's friends are his friends. It is a remarkable expression, surely unthinkable in the reign of that most absolute of autocrats, Alexander III. Antipater may have been the king's representative in Macedon, viceroy of the west; but he was certainly not the equal of the king, and it would have been a very tactless politician who suggested it in a matter of public record. On the other hand the language is exactly what one would expect after Alexander's death, particularly after the conference at Triparadeisus, when Antipater was unchallenged as regent and guardian of the kings. But the problem re-emerges. There were two kings before and after Triparadeisus; and an Athenian statesman who proposed honours for the Macedonian court in the delicate years after the Lamian War would be well advised to recognise the fact.⁸

It is still arguable that the decree is technically inaccurate but reflects the reality of the situation. The adult (but mentally incompetent) king was acknowledged in the decree, the infant ignored. For that there is a possible parallel in a contemporary decree (*IG* ii². 401). This is another honorary decree recognising the services of a benefactor of Athens (probably from Cyzicus), who had assisted the city while he was in the service of a satrap. The satrap had been 'appointed by the king, Antipater and the other Macedonians'.⁹ Since Wilhelm's initial publication of the stone the wording has been related to the conference at Triparadeisus.¹⁰ If so, it is certainly vague and inaccurate, mentioning a single king and implying that the Macedonians at large had a role in appointing the satraps. But we cannot be certain that the wording does relate exclusively to Triparadeisus. The name of the satrap is all but lost. The most favoured restoration ([μ]ετ' [᾿Αρριδαί]ου) identifies him as Arrhidaeus, satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia, who did first receive his satrapy at Triparadeisus.¹¹ But that is only one of several possibilities. Another candidate, whose name could be fitted into the traces with equal plausibility, is Asander, satrap of Caria.¹² He was appointed at Babylon, confirmed at Triparadeisus and played an important role in the first coalition war, when he welcomed his kinsman, Antigonos, into his satrapy and helped secure the coast of Asia Minor for the cause of Antipater and Craterus.¹³ If the honorand of *IG* ii². 401 was in his employ, it would have been easy enough for him to assist the convoy of grain to Athens, as he is attested doing in the decree. Rhodes was a regular port

εἰκὼν Ἀλεξάνδρου βασιλέως (Hyper. c. Dem. col. xxxii. 3–5). The name Alexander is usually, if not invariably, given: the one exception is the controversial ruling at Mytilene which twice refers to ὁ βασιλεὺς (*IG* xi. 2.6, ll. 28, 47 = Heisserer 123–4).

⁸ As in the famous decree of the Nesiotae in honour of Thersippus (*OGIS* 4, ll. 13–14): παργενόμενος πρὸς τοῖς βασιλέας καὶ Ἀντίπατρον.

⁹ *IG* ii². 401, ll. 6–10: καὶ νῦν μ[ε]τ' [᾿Αρριδαί]ου ὧν τοῦ καθ[ε]στῶτος σατρα[π]ίου ὑπὸ βασιλ[έ]ως καὶ ᾿Αντιπ[α]τρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Μακεδόνων.

¹⁰ A. Wilhelm, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen* (Vienna, 1906) 215–18; Kirchner, in *IG* ii². 401; Habicht (above, n. 4) 373.

¹¹ Diod. 18.39.6; Arr. *Succ.* F. 1.38 (Roos). On Arrhidaeus' activities see R. A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1990) 67–70, 82, 86.

¹² One would read [μ]ετ[ὰ] Ἀσάνδρου. The hiatus is perfectly acceptable; cf. Wilhelm (above, n. 10) 217; L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* i (Berlin, 1980) 420.

¹³ Babylon: Diod. 18.3.1; Arr. *Succ.* F. 1.6; Dexippus, *FGrH* 100 F 8.4; Justin 13.4.15; Curt. 10.10.2 (the majority of texts – all but Dexippus – erroneously read Κάσανδρος). Triparadeisus: Diod. 18.39.6; Arr. *Succ.* F. 1.37. For the epigraphic record of his government, beginning in the first year of Philip Arrhidaeus, see J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amizon en Carie* i (Paris, 1983) 97ff.; E. Varinlioglu, A. Bresson, P. Brun, P. Debord, and R. Descat, 'Une inscription de Pladasa à Carie', *REA* 92 (1990) 59–78, esp. 62, 73–5. For Asander's activity in 321 see Arr. *Succ.* F. 25.1–3 with H. Hauben, 'The first war of the Successors (321 B.C.)', *AncSoc* 8 (1977) 85–120, esp. 91–4; Billows (above, n. 11) 62–3.

of call for grain convoys to Athens,¹⁴ and the cities of the Carian coast presumably served the same purpose. In the troubled times of the coalition war a private individual close to the satrap might have been instrumental in providing anchorage, hospitality and even finance.¹⁵ Given this hypothesis, the language of the decree is more explicable. Asander was first appointed satrap at Babylon, where the commissions were given in the name of the one king who then ruled (Alexander IV was still *in utero*),¹⁶ and confirmed at Triparadeisus (if not before) by Antipater. His appointment was presumably endorsed on both occasions by the royal council, which admittedly had no 'Ernennungsrecht' but must have given some form of approval to the dispositions made in the kings' names.¹⁷ In that case the wording of the decree does correspond to the reality: Asander was originally appointed by a single king. And one might adduce the absence of the definite article, which troubled Wilhelm. After there were two kings, it was inaccurate to describe Asander as appointed by *the* king and better to keep the wording indefinite (*ὅπο βασιλ[έω]ς*).

The decree of Archedicus is somewhat different. In *IG* ii². 401 the position of the satrap is incidental, his legitimation a thing of the past. Here on the contrary the wording relates to the present, to the courtiers who are friends of the king and Antipater. If there were two kings at the time, one would expect to find an unambiguous plural. It is perhaps worth investigating whether the single kingship of Philip Arrhidaeus could have lasted until the establishment of the oligarchy at Athens. It is an unfortunate fact that there is no clear statement when Alexander IV was proclaimed king. The final compromise at Babylon left Arrhidaeus sole king, to be partnered in due course by the posthumous offspring of Alexander – when and if the baby was safely delivered.¹⁸ At that time Rhoxane was still pregnant (in her sixth or eighth month),¹⁹ and the child was consequently born no later than four months after its father's death (by early October 323). The infant Alexander was proclaimed king, as we are specifically informed,²⁰ but there is no indication whether the proclamation came at birth or some time later, when the child had survived the neonatal period.²¹ What is evident is that the initiative lay with the chiliarch Perdikkas, who controlled the army in Asia and protected the persons of the child and

¹⁴ Lycurg. *c. Leocr.* 18. Wilhelm (above, n. 10) 218 supported his identification of the satrap as Arrhidaeus by a reference to *IG* ii². 398, in which an anonymous benefactor of Athens is honoured *inter alia* for his provision of corn from the Hellespont after the naval defeats of 322. That proves only that there was difficulty provisioning Athens. In a time of shortage grain would be welcome from any and every source.

¹⁵ That would have been particularly important in the aftermath of Triparadeisus, when a minor war was fought off Cnidus and Caunus between the Rhodians and Perdikkas exiles under Attalus (*Arr. Succ.* F 1.39; cf. Varinlioglu *et al.* [above, n. 13] 74).

¹⁶ Cf. *Arr. Succ.* F 1.5: *ὡς Ἀρριδιαίου κελεύοντος*.

¹⁷ Diod. 18.3.1: *συνεδρεύσας μετὰ τῶν ἡγεμόνων* (cf. *Arr. Succ.* F 1.30). At Triparadeisus also there was probably some endorsement of Antipater's arrangements (*Arr. Succ.* F 1.38: *Ἀντίπατρος... ὑπὸ πάντων ἔνεκα πάντων ἐπαινούμενος*). The council corresponds to τῶν ἄλλων Μακεδόνων in *IG* ii². 401; see again the Thersippus decree (*OGIS* 4: *ἔων|[τοῖς βασι]λήεσσι φίλος καὶ τοῖς στρατ[ά]γοις| καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Μακεδόνεσσιν*).

¹⁸ *Arr. Succ.* F 1.1; Dexippus, *FGrH* 100 F 8.1; Justin 13.4.3.

¹⁹ Curt. 10.6.9 (*sexthus mensis*); Justin 13.2.5 (*exacto mense octavo*). Pace Droysen (*Geschichte des Hellenismus* ii² [Gotha, 1878] 39 n. 2) and Berve (*Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* [Munich, 1926] ii. 347) there is no way of deciding between the two reports.

²⁰ *Arr. Succ.* F 1.8: *καὶ εἰς βασιλεία τὸ τεχθὲν ἀνείπε τὸ πλήθος*.

²¹ Droysen (above, n. 19) assumed that the proclamation immediately followed the child's birth. For that there is no evidence whatsoever, as Malcolm Errington has clearly stated ('From Babylon to Triparadeisus, 323–20 B.C.', *JHS* 90 [1970] 49–77, esp. 58): 'it would be entirely consistent with his (*sc.* Perdikkas) earlier behaviour if he did not feel in full control until after the baby's birth and after its acclamation – which may have been some time afterwards.'

his mother. His were the troops who ultimately proclaimed the new king, and the stage management of the affair was in his hands. It would have taken place at his convenience – but when was that?

The first reference to the two kings comes in Diodorus (18.18.6), who records that the question of the Athenian cleruchs on Samos was remitted to them. That decision was taken after the surrender of the city and is placed after the arrival of the Macedonian garrison, in September 322. The ruling was of course made by Perdiccas but pronounced in the name of the kings, who were duly honoured at Samos with an *agon* (τοῖς βασιλεῶσι).²² That is a fixed point. By the autumn of 322 there were two kings, and the dual kingship was recognised at Athens. The actual transition came some time earlier. Its date may perhaps be inferred from Diodorus. Following his principal source, Hieronymus of Cardia, the historian refers scrupulously to the kings as a plurality and does so on dozens of occasions. Even when he reproduces Philip's edict of late 319 (framed in the royal plural but issued by the single king) he emphasises that the proclamation of democracy which it embodies was made in the name of the kings.²³ However, when Perdiccas invaded Cappadocia in the spring of 322 he did so 'with king Philip and the royal army', and later in the year Diodorus notes that the defeat of Ariarathes was inflicted by Perdiccas and king Philip.²⁴ By that time the infant Alexander was certainly born. It is virtually unthinkable that Perdiccas left him in Babylon, where he might be abducted and used against him. Indeed we are explicitly informed that the baby was with the army. Plutarch (*Eum.* 3.14) describes how Eumenes was confirmed in his satrapy after the defeat of Ariarathes but took pains to remain at court, 'not wishing to be separated from the kings (καὶ τῶν βασιλέων ἀπολείπεσθαι μὴ βουλόμενος)'. If we take Plutarch at face value, the infant Alexander was recognised as king shortly after the campaign in Cappadocia. That is corroborated by Justin, who reports that Perdiccas had both kings present at his *consilium* when he decided on war with Ptolemy (winter 322/1);²⁵ and Diodorus (18.29.1) is explicit that the kings accompanied the army when Perdiccas marched on Egypt. That suggests a working hypothesis. During the campaign against Ariarathes, in the spring and summer of 322, there was still a single king, Philip III Arrhidaeus. By the autumn Alexander IV had been proclaimed co-ruler, and news of the proclamation had reached Athens.

Diodorus' coverage of events in the Perdiccan camp in 322 is sparse, overshadowed by the Lamian War, and there is no direct record of the proclamation. It is, however, hinted at in the famous and problematic chapter which deals with Perdiccas' marital intrigues. Set in the aftermath of the destruction of Isaura and Laranda (late 322), it describes how Perdiccas initially intended to work with Antipater and pursued the hand of his daughter, Nicaea. He did so while his own position was not securely consolidated, but after he had assumed command of the royal armies and the protectorate of the kings, he changed his calculations.²⁶ The passage refers to a

²² Habicht, *Ath. Mitt.* 72 (1957) 158, no. 1B, l. 11. See also Habicht (above, n. 4) 371.

²³ Diod. 18.55.4: τὴν τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τῶν ἡγεμόνων εὐνοίαν. The *diagramma* which follows is couched in the first person plural, but refers to Philip II as 'our father' (18.56.2, 7), language only appropriate to Philip Arrhidaeus.

²⁴ Diod. 18.16.1; 22.1. Habicht (above, n. 4) 374 takes it as axiomatic that 'König Alexander war dabei nicht zugegen.'

²⁵ Justin 13.6.10. The text is corrupt, but the reference to both kings is clear enough. The manuscript reading, which has been variously emended, is: *Arrhidaeum et Alexandri Magni filium in Cappadocia quorum cura illi mandata fuerat de summa belli adhibet*. Diodorus 18.25.6 refers to the council of war (in Pisidia) but mentions only Perdiccas' friends and commanders.

²⁶ Diod. 18.23.2: ὁ δὲ Περδίκκας πρότερον μὲν ἦν κεκρικῶς κοινοπραγίαν...ὥς δὲ παρέλαβε τὰς τε βασιλικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τὴν τῶν βασιλέων προστασίαν, μετέπεσε τοῖς

change of plan after Alexander's death, after Perdiccas' position was markedly strengthened. It also makes it clear that his protectorate applied to both the kings. Now the proclamation of the young Alexander could well have seen the arrogation or consolidation of powers for Perdiccas. The time, while Antipater was still in the throes of the Lamian War, was ideal. Unfortunately Diodorus' phraseology is particularly bland and uninformative,²⁷ but he seems to be describing public recognition of Perdiccas' position and powers, recognition which would be appropriate at the time of Alexander's proclamation. His control of the army was confirmed. Whatever checks had been imposed on him at Babylon, when Meleager was named his deputy,²⁸ were formally removed and Perdiccas was declared supreme in Asia by the troops under his command. At the same time his men acknowledged him as the protector and representative of the kings who were physically in his power.

The proclamation was a direct result of the military situation in 322. Perdiccas had fought a triumphant campaign in Cappadocia while Antipater was struggling in the west and had (for the moment) established himself as the dominant figure among the Successors. Now he could act unilaterally. His troops proclaimed the son of Alexander king and colleague of Philip Arrhidaeus. That was only the ratification of what had been agreed in principle at Babylon. Then there had been little thought of long term developments. The priority had been to resolve the actual succession without civil war. Philip was duly proclaimed king and Perdiccas as chiliarch directed the government in the east. But there is no suggestion in any source that Philip was expected to remain with him indefinitely, and none whatsoever that any thought had been given to the ultimate destiny of the son of Alexander. Perdiccas now forced the issue. His troops approved the *de facto* custody he had enjoyed over Philip and combined it with custody of the infant Alexander, whom they now acclaimed as king. With the kudos of a decisive victory he could be confident that his army's actions would not be contested. In the west Antipater and Craterus were in an unenviable situation. The elevation of the infant king had been agreed in advance and was now

λογισμοῖς. I must withdraw my suggestion, made two decades ago (*CQ* 21 [1971] 135), that the *koinopragia* relates to Alexander's reign and that the change of calculation came when Perdiccas' position was secured at Babylon. There must have been an interval of coexistence after Alexander's death. For the interminable bibliography on the Babylon settlement, fortunately of little relevance here, see J. Seibert, *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen* (Darmstadt, 1983) 84–9, to which add the recent discussions by N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia* iii (Oxford, 1988) 98–107; *The Macedonian State* (Oxford, 1989) 237–43.

²⁷ It is possible that there was no actual vote. Diodorus may be referring to the actualities of the situation: Perdiccas had taken over the royal armies when he invaded Cappadocia and, since the kings were with him in person, he was automatically their protector. But Perdiccas had used the army in the past to enforce his will (Diod. 18.4.3–6; cf. E. Badian, 'A king's notebooks', *HSCP* 72 [1967] 183–204, esp. 201–4; R. M. Errington, 'The nature of the Macedonian state under the monarchy', *Chiron* 8 [1978] 77–133, esp. 115–18), and he probably did have the troops make him formally responsible for the kings at the same time as they proclaimed the infant Alexander. It was not in any sense a usurpation of the powers of Craterus, as has often been argued, most elaborately by Fritz Schachermeyr (*Alexander in Babylon*) [SB Vienna 268/3: 1970] 170, 183; see also his intervention after Habicht's paper [above, n. 4] 377). Craterus probably represented royalty in Macedonia as before. What was fixed in Cappadocia was the welfare of the kings, now committed formally to Perdiccas. Unless he returned with them to Macedonia, there was no necessary conflict of roles.

²⁸ On Meleager's position see Arr. *Succ.* F 1.3 (ὑπαρχὸν Περδίκκα); cf. Justin 13.4.5: *castrorum et exercitus et rerum cura Meleagro et Perdiccae adsignatur* (Madvig's 'correction', *regum for rerum* is uncalled for and quite misleading). Meleager's execution shortly after the settlement made Perdiccas a free agent, but he may not have considered it prudent to have his dominance acknowledged and sanctioned by the army (which after the troubles of the accession might have been reluctant to confer more power upon him).

inseparable from the question of the guardianship. They could not easily contest the issue; it would run the risk of war with the army which had made the proclamation. That was unthinkable before the battle of Crannon, in August 322, which effectively ended the war in the west. It is hardly surprising that Antipater promptly dispatched his daughter to Asia so that she could marry Perdiccas before he changed his mind.²⁹ He could not as yet challenge him and attempted to create a bond which would prevent Perdiccas challenging him, or at least delay the challenge.

The proclamation in Cappadocia had revealed Perdiccas' ambitions and fostered antagonism. At first Antipater's response was cautious. He continued in pursuit of the marital alliance, but he was inevitably affronted, and one of the first signs of his changed attitude was the referral of the Samian question to the kings. Other than the actual abolition of the democracy it was the most controversial aspect of the settlement at Athens. Perdiccas and his kings could have the odium of expelling the Athenian cleruchs and, if necessary, enforcing their expulsion.³⁰ Antipater might have made the ruling himself. With an oligarchic government backed by a Macedonian garrison the Athenians could not object, still less resist; and, now that the eastern Aegean was at the mercy of Craterus' admiral, Cleitus,³¹ there was no problem in policing the evacuation. But the decision was referred to 'higher' authority, maybe on the technical ground that the question of Samos was under appeal at the time of Alexander's death and ought to be resolved by his successors. Yet it was a thankless task which would inevitably cause bitterness, at Athens or among the Samian exiles, and Perdiccas will not have welcomed it.

The suspicions excited in the summer of 322 deepened in the following months. Perdiccas honoured his agreement with Antipater and married Nicaea, but on the heels of the marriage came the affair of Cynane. This princess was the daughter of Philip II and had once been the wife of the ill-fated Amyntas, son and briefly successor of Perdiccas II. During the summer of 322 she had broken her way out of Macedon, forcing the passage of the Strymon in the face of guards sent by Antipater.³² She made her way through Asia Minor with her daughter and was killed at the hands of Alcetas, the brother of Perdiccas, under dark and mysterious circumstances. Her demise will not have been unwelcome to Antipater, but its sequel certainly was. To mitigate the unpopularity with the rank-and-file which Cynane's death had caused, Perdiccas organised a marriage between her daughter, Eurydice, and the elder king, Philip Arrhidaeus.³³ It was a union between relatives, an Amazon and an idiot, and it would have fateful consequences. But for the moment it could only strengthen Perdiccas' position. His protectorate now embraced yet another member of the Argead house, and his camp was the centre of the empire. When Antigonus fled to Europe and attached himself to Antipater's campaign in Aetolia in the depths of winter 322/1, the allegations he made were readily believable: Perdiccas

²⁹ Diod. 18.23.1; Arr. *Succ.* F 1.21; Justin 13.6.5–6; *P. Berl.* 13045 = V. di Falco, *Demade oratore* (Naples, 1954) 74–5. Nicaea reached Perdiccas' court after the destruction of Isaura and Laranda and was presumably sent out by her father in the late summer, the moment the news of the proclamation of Alexander IV broke in Greece.

³⁰ Diod. 18.18.9. For what it is worth (surely not much) the fictitious dialogue between Deinarchus and Demades (*P. Berl.* 13045, ll. 195ff. = di Falco [above, n. 29] 75–7) seems to connect Nicaea's arrival with Athenian negotiations over Samos.

³¹ Cleitus' victory was complete by midsummer 322 (cf. N. G. Ashton, 'The *naumachia* near Amorgos in 322 B.C.', *ABSA* 72 [1977] 1–11). Athens was in no position to resist; her ships, perhaps commandeered after defeat, were used by Antigonus for his escape to Macedonia later that year (Diod. 18.23.4).

³² Polyaeus 8.60; cf. Arr. *Succ.* F 1.22–3; Diod. 19.52.5.

³³ Arr. *Succ.* F 1.23: ἤν καὶ ὕστερον ἡγάγετο Περδίκκα διαπραξαμένου.

was intriguing to marry Alexander's sister, Cleopatra, usurp the kingship and invade Macedonia.³⁴ The man who had used his army to create a king might well use it to confer the kingship upon himself, if the tide of success continued. The precedent of the great Philip, first regent and then king,³⁵ would have been in the minds of all the protagonists; and, even if Perdiccas was not about to claim the kingship, few would have believed that he did not have regal ambitions. It was sufficient to make Antipater and Craterus break off hostilities in Aetolia and prepare to cross into Asia Minor the following spring (Diod. 18.25.5).

The Athenian decree with which we began may now be assigned a precise context. It aims to secure benefits from the friends of the king and of Antipater, and cannot have been voted before the battle of Crannon, which ended Athens' participation in the Lamian War. The battle was fought on 7 Metageitnion (c. August 7, 322), and in its aftermath there were frantic negotiations. Antipater had insisted on separate negotiations with all parties in the Hellenic coalition,³⁶ and his attitude to Athens was made threateningly clear when he demanded the surrender of the orators who had fomented war in 323. The demand was issued after his capture of Pharsalus,³⁷ which was a mere 20 km south of Crannon and must have been taken immediately after the battle. Demosthenes and Hyperides accordingly left the city and were sentenced to death in absentia.³⁸ The *demos* now sent an embassy to negotiate its surrender. It found Antipater and Craterus at Thebes, poised for an invasion of Attica³⁹ and reported their inauspicious conditions back to Athens. This first embassy was followed by a second, which received Antipater's final terms for peace, restriction of political rights and the admission of a garrison.⁴⁰ The demands were reluctantly accepted, as the *demos* bowed to necessity; and Menyllus and his Macedonians finally entered Athens on 20 Boedromion (c. September 19).⁴¹ Six weeks elapsed between the battle of Crannon and the entry of the garrison. In that time there was intense diplomatic activity, and there must have been a plethora of honorific decrees,

³⁴ Diod. 18.25.3. The chronology adopted here and throughout this article is the old 'high' chronology, which I have restated in two forthcoming articles. It has become fashionable to date the Aetolian campaign a year later, to the winter of 321/20 (see L. Schober, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Babyloniens und der Oberen Satrapien von 323–303 v. Chr.* [Frankfurt and Bern, 1981] 54–5; Billows [above, n. 11] 62–4). That seems to me to slow down the pace of events unacceptably. There is a gap of nearly a year before Craterus and Antipater settle accounts with the Aetolians. The campaign began shortly before the onset of winter and the invaders were digging in to starve the enemy out when Antigonus arrived on the scene (Diod. 18.25.1–2). The events need not have engrossed more than two months over the height of winter, so that Antipater and Craterus were free to invade Asia Minor in the spring of 321. Nor does the dedication made at Delphi by Craterus' son (Moretti, *ISE* no. 73) prove that he was born before his father's death (B. Gullath and L. Schober, 'Zur Chronologie der frühen Diadochenzeit', in *Studien zur alten Geschichte* [ed. H. Kalcyk, B. Gullath, A. Graeber: Rome, 1986] 331–78, esp. 355); *καὶ διπὲ παῖδα* at the end of the line cannot be taken with deadly precision and is surely consistent with the younger Craterus having been born posthumously.

³⁵ Justin 7.5.9–10; cf. A. Tronson, 'Satyrus the Peripatetic and the marriages of Philip II', *JHS* 104 [1984] 116–26, esp. 120–21; Hammond, *The Macedonian State* 137). The tradition is often discounted (cf. G. T. Griffith's critical discussion in *A History of Macedonia* ii [Oxford, 1979] 208–9, 702–4); but the variant tradition in Satyrus (Athen. 13.557B) and the 'Suda' (s.v. *Κάπavος*) that Philip had a reign of 22 years (against 24 in Diodorus) is surely decisive.

³⁶ Diod. 18.17.6–7. On the negotiations see H. J. Gehrke, *Phokion* (Munich, 1976) 87–90; L. A. Tittle, *Phocion the Good* (London, New York, Sydney, 1988) 129–31.

³⁷ [Plut.] *Mor.* 847 E; cf. Diod. 18.17.7.

³⁸ Plut. *Phoc.* 26.2; *Dem.* 28.2; *Mor.* 849 A–B. See now J. Engels, *Studien zur politischen Biographie des Hyperides* (Munich, 1989) 381–2.

³⁹ Plut. *Phoc.* 26.3–5; cf. Diod. 18.17.8.

⁴⁰ Plut. *Phoc.* 27; Diod. 18.18.1–3.

⁴¹ Plut. *Phoc.* 28.2; *Cam.* 19.6; *Dem.* 28.1.

designed to massage the vanity of Antipater and those close to him. The technique had worked well enough after Chaeronea,⁴² and it is hard to believe that now, in an even greater crisis, there was not a positive avalanche of cheap but flattering honours. Archedicus, the future *anagrapheus* and apparently no friend of Demosthenes' faction,⁴³ was the natural person to propose such a vote, aimed at ingratiating the city and himself with the widest possible circle of Macedonians: the friends of the king and Antipater. Archedicus refers to a single king, and the chances are that he had not heard of the elevation of the infant Alexander or, if he had, he had no idea whether Antipater would react favourably and continued to speak of a single king. By the end of September, when the question of Samos was referred to the kings, there was no longer any doubt in the matter. There were two kings and Antipater was their representative in Europe, along with Craterus. From that time onwards any honorary decree would need to refer to the kings as a plurality. It was particularly necessary in the tension charged atmosphere of 322, when the fate of Hypereides was an object lesson to watch one's tongue.⁴⁴

The decree of Archedicus is most plausibly located in the weeks following the battle of Crannon, towards the end of August. By that time Perdikkas will have completed his campaign in Cappadocia and disposed of Ariarathes with exemplary ruthlessness. He and king Philip then turned to the south to deal with Isaura and Laranda, which were taken in a matter of days: Laranda at the first assault and Isaura on the third day of the siege.⁴⁵ It was probably in the aftermath of these victories that Perdikkas, elated by a summer of glory, made the decisive move.⁴⁶ The troops proclaimed the infant Alexander king and Perdikkas his protector. By September the news had penetrated to the western world, where Antipater and Craterus squared up to the new situation of two kings and an over-mighty regent. It is hardly surprising that the autumn saw Craterus preparing for his return to Asia (Diod. 18.18.7). Perdikkas could not be left alone in charge of an expanding royal family. The Athenians, however, were spectators, hoping that the masters of the world would destroy themselves but in the meantime acknowledging political realities in their official enactments. There was a single recognised king when Archedicus proposed honours for the friends of Antipater, but by the time the question of Samos came to be resolved there were two. It was a farce, but a farce which had to be treated seriously by those whose welfare depended upon the Macedonian monarchy and its representatives.

University of Western Australia

A. B. BOSWORTH

⁴² On the honorary citizenship conferred upon Philip, Antipater and the crown prince Alexander see M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* iii (Brussels, 1983) 69–71.

⁴³ See above, n. 2.

⁴⁴ Plut. *Dem.* 28.4; *Mor.* 849 C (Hermippus F 68 [b] Wehrli). Cf. Engels (above, n. 38) 386–7.

⁴⁵ Diod. 18.22.2. It is unlikely that this whirlwind campaign was deferred until the spring of the following year, as is assumed by Errington (above, n. 27) 77; Schober (above, n. 34) 58; and Billows (above, n. 11) 58.

⁴⁶ The proclamation may have come somewhat earlier, in the aftermath of the defeat of Ariarathes. Plutarch (*Eum.* 3.14) suggests that Eumenes left Cappadocia with the royal party (*συνανέζευσεν*) and that there were already two kings. But his narrative is contracted. It presumably took Eumenes some time to make the appointments with which Plutarch accredits him (cf. P. Briant, *Rois, tributs et paysans* [Paris, 1982] 15–30); and he may have joined Perdikkas later after the regent had completed his operations at Laranda and Isaura.