

# THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE THIRD DIADOCH WAR, 315–311 B.C.

PAT WHEATLEY

FOR SCHOLARS OF THE DIADOCHOI, the most vexatious aspect of the period without doubt must be the chronology. In this respect, the years 315–311 are no exception. Two mainstreams of opinion have emerged, which have split researchers evenly,<sup>1</sup> and have caused some confusion to be evident in the recent publications on the period.<sup>2</sup> However, it would seem the “low” chronological system expounded by R. M. Errington in his articles of 1970 and 1977 has now passed its zenith, and thanks to four recent publications of A. B. Bosworth, the traditional “high” chronological system has seen a renaissance.<sup>3</sup> Bosworth has convincingly fixed the chronology of the Diadochoi to the battle of Gabiene, which, in his system, falls after the winter solstice of 317/6 B.C. (Diod. 19.37.3), but unfortunately, confusion extends past this point to the battle of Gaza in 312 B.C. In this paper I aim to rationalise the chronology of the years 315–311 independently and postulate an accurate date for the conflict between Demetrius Poliorcetes and Ptolemy Soter at Gaza. To do so, I will draw on several pieces of literary, epigraphic, and numismatic evidence and use them as pegs in order to place the historical narrative of Diodorus in its chronological context.

Diodorus conveniently provides what may be perceived as a “fixed point,” or platform, from which to begin chronological discussion of the third Diadoch War:

ὥς δ' εἰς Μάλλον παρεγένετο, διεμέρισε τὴν δύναμιν εἰς παραχειμασίαν μετὰ δύσιν Ὠρίωνος.

He [Antigonos] arrived at Mallus, and, after the setting of Orion, divided the army for passing the winter.<sup>4</sup>

The astronomical pointer is typical of Hieronymus, and derives from him. Diodorus has assimilated it into his historical narrative and his chronographic

An earlier version of this paper was delivered in the “Aspects of Power in the Ancient World” conference at the Australian National University, Canberra, in July 1995.

<sup>1</sup> For a convenient bibliography, see Bosworth 1992b: 55, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Billows 1990; Grainger 1990; Winnicki 1989 and 1991; Lund 1992. These works all presume Errington’s “low” chronology for the years 315–311.

<sup>3</sup> Bosworth 1992a, 1992b, 1993, and 1994. See also Wheatley 1995.

<sup>4</sup> Diod. 19.56.5, tr. Geer, Loeb ed. The context is after the defeat of Eumenes (shortly after the previous winter solstice, Diod. 19.37.3), and the reorganisation of the upper satrapies. Antigonos with his victorious army and enormous booty arrived at Mallus in Cilicia (Strabo 14.5.16) at some time in November.

scheme under the archon year of Praxibulus (315/4).<sup>5</sup> So far so good; now arises the controversy: proponents of the "high" chronology assert this year to be 316; followers of the "low" place Antigonos' return to Cilicia in 315. This paper will show that the only feasible winter for Antigonos' return to Cilicia is 316/5. It is my belief that this assumption can be readily justified by an examination of selected documents.

#### I. NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE

The first evidence that is of value in any chronological discussion of this period is of a numismatic nature. A simple, but often overlooked point which weighs against placing the start of the war in 314 is the unprecedented mint activity in Phoenicia commencing in 315. The dated coinage of Sidon and Ake from these years, first expounded by E. T. Newell,<sup>6</sup> is fundamental to chronographers, and where the issues can be linked to the historical narrative of Diodorus, it is sometimes possible to produce compelling hypotheses. Newell observes (1916: 35) that the coinages in his Series VI (317–309 B.C.) were relatively small issues with the exception of years 18 (date mark Σ) and 19 (T). Whereas there was normally one new obverse and two new reverse dies cut per year, for the eighteenth year there were five new obverses and seven reverses for the combined gold and silver issues.<sup>7</sup> He knew of no tetradrachms with the date mark T, but observed correctly that with the plentiful issue of staters, there would also have been tetradrachms.<sup>8</sup> Newell connected these unusually large issues with the flurry of activity in the Levant occasioned by Antigonos' annexation of the Phoenician cities, including Sidon, and the beginning of the siege of Tyre. This activity is well documented by Diodorus,<sup>9</sup> as is Antigonos' strenuous ship-building programme, which would have massively stimulated commercial activity in the region, necessitating much larger mint issues than usual.<sup>10</sup> The Sidonian minting year at this time is generally taken to run parallel to the Macedonian year,<sup>11</sup> thus commencement of the activity at Sidon can fairly be placed between ca October 316 and October 315,

<sup>5</sup> Archon change: Diod. 19.55.1. For discussion of Diodorus' and Hieronymus' relative chronographic systems, see Smith 1961; Geer 1954: Introduction, x–xii; Bizière 1975: Notice, x–xv; Hornblower 1981: ch. 2 and esp. 32–35, 109; Bosworth 1992b: 73–74.

<sup>6</sup> Newell 1916; with some refinements by Merker 1964.

<sup>7</sup> Even more specimens have been found since: for example, three in the Phacous hoard: see Jenkins 1960: 17–37, 22.

<sup>8</sup> Newell 1916: 18, n. 18. Examples of the T tetradrachms have since been found: for example, Price 1991: 1.443, no. 3506.

<sup>9</sup> Diod. 19.58, 59.2, 61.5; cf. Appian *Syr.* 53.

<sup>10</sup> Antigonos undertook the building of 500 ships (Diod. 19.58.6) and although only a maximum of 240 are ever attested by Diodorus (19.62.8), it seems they were built quickly, as Antigonos commenced the fifteen-month siege of Tyre with almost no fleet (19.58.1, 6) but by the end of the siege he was completely dominant at sea (19.61.5), at least on the Phoenician coast.

<sup>11</sup> From autumn to autumn, Newell accepts the first month to be October, as does Bellinger 1950–53: 47, no. 140. However, Mørkholm 1978: 137, n. 11, is cautionary.

continuing into the following year. If the obvious hypothesis connecting the coin issues with Diodorus' narrative is correct, then it precludes the chronology of Errington (1977: 496), who would not have Antigonos return from the east until the setting of Orion in mid-November 315. In this case, the prolific issues from Sidon in the previous year need another explanation.

As long as the dating of these coins is accurate, a numismatic case for the "high" chronology exists. However, some caution must be exercised, as is evident from scrutiny of the remarkable Sidonian issues of year 22 (date mark X, 312/1). These anomalous coins, as we will see, have far-reaching effects on theories for dating the battle of Gaza, and their significance must be carefully analysed in conjunction with the other ancient evidence. There seem to be no surviving gold issues for year 22, but there are two distinct and incompatible series of tetradrachms: one, the continuing Alexander issues with an obverse Heracles in lion's scalp and seated Zeus reverse;<sup>12</sup> the other a Ptolemaic issue with an obverse Alexander in elephant's scalp and on the reverse a "fighting" Athena.<sup>13</sup>

It is the latter specimens which are of great interest to historians and numismatists alike, as these "satrapal" issues of Ptolemy are taken to be from his brief occupation of Syria and Phoenicia after the battle of Gaza in 312.<sup>14</sup> The problem

<sup>12</sup>There appear to be four extant specimens of this coin; Merker (1964: 14–15) knew of only two. One, from the Byblos hoard (see Thompson *et al.* 1973: no. 1515), has the date mark OX, taken by Bellinger (1950–53: 42) to be a die cutter's error for X, and indicative of considerable disruption in the city in that year (illustrated pl. VI, no. 53; see also, Price 1991: 443, no. 3512). A second, from the Kuff hoard (Thompson *et al.* 1973: no. 1670), passed into the Strachan Davidson Collection, and was published by Newell 1916: 19, series VI, no. 57 (illustrated pl. IV, no. 16; and SNG 5 [Oxford 1976] Part III, no. 3024; cf. Nash 1974: esp. 14 and 22). These two, and a third specimen, from the Phillips Collection, are now in the ANS, and were struck from the same obverse die, one which was carried over from the previous year (year 21, date mark Φ), but does not continue into year 23 (date mark Ξ). It is reasonable to suppose the carry-over of dies from year to year was halted by Ptolemy's invasion, and that the issue of year 23 reverted to standard types and was struck from fresh dies. A fourth X marked tetradrachm is in the Hersh Collection (Price 1991: 443, no. 3511). I am extremely grateful to Dr O. H. Zervos for information concerning these coins (and suggestions concerning their context) imparted in private correspondence, 1996, and also to Mr C. A. Hersh, who kindly provided me with details of the specimen in his possession. As this article goes to press, I have been made aware of the presence of at least one more specimen in a new hoard from Phoenicia found in 1997. As yet, no further details regarding this new evidence are available; see Hersh 1998.

<sup>13</sup>There seem to be only three extant examples, see Zervos 1974: 242; cf. Merker 1964: 15; and Emmons 1954: 75, n. 15 (who both knew of only two). All three pieces were struck from one obverse and two reverse dies. One, now in the ANS, is from the Abu Hommos hoard (Thompson *et al.* 1973: no. 1667), illustrated by Zervos 1967: pl. IV, no. 22; Brett 1938: pl. IV, no. 7; 1950: pl. XI, no. 6; Mørkholm 1978: pl. 1, no. 1; 1991: pl. VI, no. 94.

A second specimen, from the Dattari Collection, is in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Zervos 1974: 242—I am again indebted to the author for informing me of the existence of this piece).

The third, struck from a different reverse die, is from the Byblos hoard (Thompson *et al.* 1973: 208, no. 1515, illustrated in Bellinger 1950–53: pl. VI, no. 140). The present whereabouts of this specimen is uncertain.

<sup>14</sup>Diod. 19.86.1. The text indicates that Sidon was easily won over by Ptolemy, in contrast to Tyre, where Andronicus the *phourarch* resisted his blandishments (86.2). Ptolemy abandoned Phoenicia

arises because scholars in both fields use these coins for their own purposes: historians use the coins to date the battle of Gaza,<sup>15</sup> and numismatists use the battle of Gaza to date the coins.<sup>16</sup> What is perhaps not generally realised among numismatists, however, is that the date of Gaza is far from settled,<sup>17</sup> and a primary aim of any discussion of these years must be to end the controversy surrounding this battle. Clearly, there is considerable danger of circularity in this argument, and further analysis of the evidence must be made before chronological conclusions can be drawn.

If Gaza was fought in late 312, the dating of the Ptolemaic X tetradrachms to the mint issue of 312/1 is correct: Ptolemy would have controlled the Sidonian mint for the early part of 311, and it would have reverted to the Alexander types after he withdrew in ca early summer 311. If, however, Gaza was fought in spring 312, the dating of these coins must be inaccurate, as Ptolemy would have begun coining his own types in mid 312, still in the 313/2 issue, which, by Newell's system, would have the date mark  $\Phi$ . By this reasoning, the dating criteria for the whole series would be displaced by one year, giving a base date of 334/3. Naturally this possibility must be vetoed, as no Alexander types can have been struck in Phoenicia before the end of 333, when the conqueror first arrived in the region.<sup>18</sup> Scholarly attempts to move the base date in the other direction to 332/1 have also foundered,<sup>19</sup> and it seems that Newell's system of dating these coins can be followed with confidence.

The conclusion that can be reached from this evidence is that Ptolemy certainly controlled the mint at Sidon for part of the year 312/1, minting his own silver currency for some time after October/November 312, but not for the complete

---

and Syria within a short time, probably not much more than six months (Diod. 19.93.7). Sidon is not mentioned as being harmed by Ptolemy in his evacuation, thus it possibly defected willingly after Gaza.

<sup>15</sup> For example, Hauben 1973: 263, n. 31.

<sup>16</sup> For example, Merker 1964: 14, n. 4; Mørkholm 1978: 137.

<sup>17</sup> Briefly, scholars are agreed that this battle fell in the Julian or campaigning year 312, but are divided over whether it occurred in spring or autumn of that year. Generally, the older school of thought, e.g., Kaerst 1901; Jacoby 1926; Beloch 1927; Abel 1937; Elkeles 1941 (and also Wehrli 1968 and Geer 1954), adduce an earlier date; later works, such as Manni 1949 and 1951; Smith 1961; Hauben 1973; Bizière 1975; Errington 1977; Winnicki 1989 and 1991; Grainger 1990; and Billows 1990, place the battle in autumn. Some, such as Seibert 1969 and Devine 1984, are indeterminate, placing the engagement simply in 312. Numismatists are also divided: e.g., Merker 1964 gives a date in spring; Mørkholm 1978 in autumn; Newell 1916 is not specific. The source at the centre of the controversy is Diod. 19.80.5, where Demetrius summons his army to Gaza from their winter quarters, but Diodorus does not specify whether this is the winter of 313/2, or whether he took them from early winter quarters in autumn of 312. For discussion, see below.

<sup>18</sup> These arguments are fully discussed by Newell 1916; Hauben 1973: 263–264, n. 31; Merker 1964: 14–15; and Mørkholm 1978: 137–138, but it has been necessary to reiterate them partially in order to focus on the controversy surrounding the dating of Gaza, and to synchronise numismatic and historical scholarship on the subject.

<sup>19</sup> For discussion and bibliography, see Merker 1964: 15 and n. 9; Hauben 1973: n. 31.

year. This suggests the battle of Gaza to have been fought *late* in 312 rather than early: if he had controlled the Sidonian mint during the year 313/2, there would surely have been some Ptolemaic issues marked Φ. Other factors suggest some disruption in the minting activities during 312/1: the Alexander tetradrachm with the die error OX for X, the paucity of surviving material for this year, and the absence of any gold issue.<sup>20</sup>

The conclusions regarding these coins also fit into the wider historical context. As I have argued elsewhere (1995: 438–439), the split Alexander/Philip III issues (dated Ν) fit nicely into the year 321/0, and the heavier than usual issues of 316/5–315/4 (dated Σ and Τ) mesh with Diodorus' historical narrative for those years, all of which point to a "high" overall chronology for the third Diadoch war, culminating in a "low" date for Gaza.

## II. THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVE OF DIODORUS

Book nineteen of Diodorus is organisationally haphazard, reflecting the difficulty he was having synchronising his own method with that of his source, and clearly any attempt to rationalise material of this nature must be regarded as speculative. However, several useful chronological pointers are evident, and it is possible to trace the outline of Hieronymus' chronographic system. Diodorus has made a mess of transmitting his source, displaying intense compression in some instances, suspicious lacunae in others, and failing to integrate accurately the narrative of what was an extremely complex political situation, involving numerous players, theatres of war, and circumstances.<sup>21</sup>

Not only does Diodorus' chronographic system fail to match that of Hieronymus, but worse, it creates maximum confusion among researchers by being relatively accurate at some points and wildly inaccurate at others. It seems the best method for resolving this confusion is to trace Hieronymus' system where possible, within Diodorus' narrative, then match it to the rival "high" and "low" chronographic schemes. From this analysis, using any reliable chronological fixed points, the relative veracity of the systems should become evident.

Hieronymus used a basic framework of campaigning years to mark the passage of time, supplemented by astronomical data, ending a set year with the winter quarters of the protagonists.<sup>22</sup> If those Hieronymian pointers which remain in Diodorus are observed, some correlation of this method with Diodorus' system of dating events by Olympic, Roman consul, and Athenian archon years may be

<sup>20</sup>Newell (1916: 35) knew of no "staters for years P, Σ or Ω, no tetradrachms of year T." Ninety years later some specimens of these years have turned up: e.g., Price 1991: 1.443, no. 3506 (a T tetradrachm); 442, no. 3502A (a P stater). The absence of gold for 312/1 is to some degree notable, as most years from 327/26 to 309/08 are represented, with the exceptions of 323/2 (no issues whatever, see Wheatley 1995), 319/8 and 310/9: see Price 1991: 1.440–444.

<sup>21</sup>See (generally) Simpson 1959: esp. 376.

<sup>22</sup>Hornblower 1981: 101, 109; Hammond and Walbank 1988: 151, n. 1.

made. Book 19 of Diodorus records the events of seven archonships<sup>23</sup> from 317 to 310, but only five winter quarters are attested for Antigonos.<sup>24</sup> The omissions have caused some perplexity for ancient historians, but if the missing winter quarters can be adduced from the narrative, some order can be restored to the chronology. According to the scheme established by Bosworth, the winter of 318/7 saw Eumenes in Babylonia and Antigonos in Mesopotamia.<sup>25</sup> The following winter was that of Gabiene, and after the battle, Antigonos finally settled in a village near Ecbatana.<sup>26</sup> The next Hieronymean chronological reference is apparent at Diodorus 19.56.5, and includes another astronomical pointer: Antigonos spends his first winter on returning from the east at Mallus in Cilicia, after the setting of Orion.<sup>27</sup> At this point in Diodorus' history, the two chronographic systems *almost* intersect. The archon change is recorded at 19.55.1; Antigonos' winter quarters in the next chapter. However, the archonship is that of Praxibulus (315/4), and Diodorus is over a year out of phase, even on his own putative system of synchronising himself with Hieronymus. This naturally fuels the error of the "low" chronology.<sup>28</sup>

The second winter quarters Diodorus observes for Antigonos are at Celaenae,<sup>29</sup> after he has left Demetrius guarding Syria at the age of twenty-two.<sup>30</sup> Diodorus (19.66.1) has placed this winter in the archonship of Nicodorus (314/3), and from being well over a year out at his previous synchronisation of winter quarters with archon change, he is suddenly accurate, and the two chronographic systems are coincident. This section of the work clearly illustrates the trap that lies in wait for unwary scholars. If Diodorus' chronography in Books 18–20 was regularly or even

<sup>23</sup> Demogenes, 317/6 (Diod. 19.2.1); Democleides, 316/5 (19.17.1); Praxibulus, 315/4 (19.55.1); Nicodorus, 314/3 (19.66.1); Theophrastes, 313/2 (19.73.1); Polemon, 312/1 (19.77.1), and Simonides, 311/10 (19.105.1).

<sup>24</sup> These are: Mesopotamia (Diod. 19.15.6), Ecbatana (19.44.4, 46.1), Mallus (19.56.5), Celaenae (19.69.2), and the Hellespont (19.77.7).

<sup>25</sup> Eumenes: Diod. 19.12.1; Antigonos: Diod. 19.15.6; see Bosworth 1992b: 81.

<sup>26</sup> Winter 317/6: Diod. 19.34.8: Eumenes winters in Gabiene, twenty-five days' march from Antigonos; Diod. 19.37.1, cf. Polyaeus *Strat.* 4.6.15: Antigonos wintering in Gadamala in Media; Diod. 19.37.3: Antigonos marches out at the time of the winter solstice; Diod. 19.39.1: Eumenes wintering in the villages; Diod. 19.44.4, 46.1: after the battle Antigonos winters in a village near Ecbatana.

<sup>27</sup> On the "low" chronology of Errington, this is 315/4; on the chronology of this paper, it is 316/5.

<sup>28</sup> It is noticeable that the points where Diodorus' history tends to become most confused are after a particularly active winter: e.g., that of Paraetacene and Gabiene (317/6), Eupolemus' Carian offensive (314/3), and Gaza. When the campaigning has spilled over into the off-season, problems seem to ensue for Diodorus' chronography. This state of affairs is clearly a side effect of his method: trying to match two inherently incompatible chronographic systems, and he is aware of the tendentiousness of his endeavour (cf. 20.43.7). In the sections of Hieronymus where events failed to fit into a defined campaigning year, Diodorus gets particularly confused, often introducing the next archon year far too early, as he does with Democleides and Praxibulus after the vigorous winter of 317/6, where the campaigning seasons of these two years have virtually run together. Hence Diodorus has Antigonos' winter quarters for 316/5 introduced only two chapters after the archon change for 315/4; see Table 1.

<sup>29</sup> Diod. 19.69.2: παραγενόμενος δ' εἰς Κελαινὰς τῆς Φρυγίας διεῖλε τὸ στρατόπεδον εἰς χειμασίαν.

<sup>30</sup> Diod. 19.69.1; Plut. *Demetr.* 5.2; Appian *Syr.* 54.

irregularly erratic, the problem would be less labyrinthine, but an oscillation in only fourteen chapters from total error to accuracy is positively diabolical. There is, in this case, a reasonable explanation. Diodorus has omitted a winter between those of Mallus and Celaenae. It is impossible to tell whether Hieronymus also failed to attest this winter directly, but Diodorus is not aware, or fails to mention directly, the winter following that of Mallus, and suddenly finds that, by the archonship of Nicodorus (314/3), he is miraculously back in phase with his source. However, although Antigonus' first winter quarters after Mallus are not *directly* attested by Diodorus,<sup>31</sup> there is an *indirect* pointer, and it must be inferred from the narrative that he spent this winter before Tyre.<sup>32</sup> In the scheme of this paper, then, the winter of 315/4 saw Antigonus before Tyre, Polemaeus on the borders of Caria, and Ptolemy concentrating his forces in Cyprus ready for dispersal to various theatres.<sup>33</sup> Antigonus' naval build-up evidently continued over the winter until he had a fleet sufficiently powerful to blockade Tyre,<sup>34</sup> which probably fell by late summer/early autumn of 314. Here is the genesis of chronological error in the third Diadoch war: *a missing winter*, further complicating the confusion created by the two campaigning seasons of 317 and 316 running together, and enabling the compression of the events of 315 and 314. The missing winter is unfortunate for posterity, as it enables Diodorus to sidestep the consequences of the mistakes in his account of the campaign in Gabiene. Otherwise, the errors would have compounded, perhaps forcing him to revise this section of his work and unravel the chronological tangle he has bequeathed us.

The third winter quarters recorded for Antigonus in this period are at the Hellespont.<sup>35</sup> This is placed in context *after* Antigonus' annihilation of Asander,<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> And here lies a foundation for the "low" chronology pundits, who peg the winter at Mallus to 315/4 and can thus feasibly make the first winter of the war the one mentioned in Diod. 19.69.2 (Antigonus at Celaenae, Demetrius in Syria) and 19.68.6 (Polemaeus in Caria) in 314/3. If the winter at Mallus is that of 316/5, then the winter quarters of 315/4 seem to be unattested in Diodorus' narrative, as the next one (Antigonus at the Hellespont, Diod. 19.77.7) is suddenly very far out of sequence, in the archonship of Theophrastus (313/2).

<sup>32</sup> Diod. 19.61.5: θαλασσοκρατῶν δὲ καὶ διακωλύων σίτον εἰσάγεσθαι προσεκατέρησε μὲν ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ τρεῖς μῆνας: "[Antigonus] pressed the siege with vigour for a year and three months, controlling the sea and preventing food from being brought in..." (trans. Geer, Loeb ed.); beginning in the summer mentioned at Diod. 19.58.6, which was the first campaigning season of the third Diadoch war.

<sup>33</sup> Diod. 19.61.5 (Antigonus); 19.62.5 (Polemaeus); 19.62.2–4 (Seleucus, Menelaus, Myrmidon, and Polycleitus in Cyprus).

<sup>34</sup> Diod. 19.61.5 (Tyre blockaded); 19.62.7–9 (Antigonus' naval buildup). Another pointer here is Antigonus undertaking to have a fleet of 500 ships "in that very summer," ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ θερίᾳ (Diod. 19.58.6; above, n. 32); see also Beloch 1927: 241. This is the summer of 315.

<sup>35</sup> Paus. 1.6.5; Diod. 19.77.7: ὁ δ' Ἀντίγονος δυσχερηστούμενος ἐπὶ τούτοις, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῆς χειμερινῆς ὥρας συγκλειούσης διέδωκε τοὺς στρατιώτας κατὰ πόλιν εἰς τὴν χειμασίαν. For discussion of this passage, see Hauben 1973: 259, n. 17; Bakhuizen 1970: 160. These are the third winter quarters observed by the sources, but as we have seen, probably the *fourth* of the war (313/2).

<sup>36</sup> Diod. 19.75.1–5.

which independent epigraphical evidence places between March 313 and February 312.<sup>37</sup> A list of *stephanephoroi* from Miletus records that the city was liberated and made autonomous and democratic by Antigonos in that year; he clearly moved north to the Hellespont to threaten Lysimachus and Cassander after his Carian *Blitzkrieg*.<sup>38</sup> The winter on the Hellespont must, therefore, be that of 313/2. Diodorus, however, has *again* managed to introduce an archon too early, in this case Polemon (312/1), before mentioning Antigonos' winter quarters for the previous year.<sup>39</sup> That these winter quarters are indeed those of 313/2 is confirmed by *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 450. Asander disappears from history after the annexation of his satrapy, and it seems unlikely that he could have appeared at Athens and provided any form of military assistance after the loss of Caria, even if he escaped with his life. Thus it is not feasible to postulate a retrojection of Antigonos' Carian campaign to late 314, and anyway, the Milesian *stephanephoroi* listing for 313/2 precludes this, securely pegging the takeover to that year. In this case, we cannot suggest a missing winter in Hieronymus to explain Diodorus' wild chronography, but once again, the delineation between campaigning seasons is blurred.<sup>40</sup> Diodorus, therefore, may have introduced Theophrastus, the archon for 313/2 correctly—according to his system—but mistakenly introduces Polemon before he has finished his digest of Hieronymus' campaigning year for 313.

We have now managed to discern three directly attested winters for Antigonos between 318 and 311, and one that is implied. What of the fifth winter, that of 312/1? As this is one of the contentious winters, and is perhaps the one in which Gaza and the ensuing conflict between Demetrius and Ptolemy occurred, it has fallen into the obscurity engendered by Diodorus' chronographic method. Two sources hint that Antigonos spent the winter of 312/1 back at Celaenae.<sup>41</sup> Diodorus and Plutarch agree both about Antigonos' whereabouts and the context: he was at Celaenae when he heard of Demetrius' victory over

<sup>37</sup> Kawerau and Rehm 1914: 258–259, no. 123; see also Beloch 1927: 101–102; Billows 1990: 121, n. 51, and 210, n. 58 for translation; cf. Diod. 19.75.4. For further discussion, see below, 273–276.

<sup>38</sup> Campaign against Lysimachus in Thrace and Pontus: Diod. 19.73. Initiatives against Cassander in Greece: Diod. 19.74.1–2.

<sup>39</sup> Archon change, 312/1: Polemon, Diod. 19.77.1. Winter quarters of Antigonos, 313/2: Diod. 19.77.7. The pattern is similar to that of the winter of 316/5, Diod. 19.56.5, where the winter quarters are documented *after* the next year's archon is introduced (Diod. 19.55.1).

<sup>40</sup> Diod. 19.68.5–7. The campaign of Eupolemus against Polemaeus occurs in winter, certainly that of 314/3.

<sup>41</sup> Diod. 19.93.4: ὁ δ' Ἀντίγονος ἐτύχχανε μὲν ὦν ἐν Κελαιναῖς τῆς Φρυγίας; Plut. *Demetr.* 6.3: Ἀντίγονον δὲ κατήγαγεν ἐκ Κελαινῶν. See also Smith 1961: 289–290 and n. 23; Hauben 1973: 259–260 and n. 18. The latter, however, for no good reason, conflates these documents with the surely much earlier winter quarters of the Hellespont (Diod. 19.77.7). This hypothesis must be regarded as incorrect, as it makes Diodorus' narrative nonsensical. Antigonos' whereabouts at this point in Diodorus' work, if indeed the season was winter, must refer to the one mentioned at Diod. 19.89.2, not that of Diod. 19.77.7, where both Cassander's and Antigonos' winter quarters of 313/2 are synchronised (see below, 268 and n. 60).



Ptolemy's general Cilles at Myus in Syria.<sup>42</sup> It is reasonable to hypothesise that this is the other missing winter for Antigonos, that of 312/1. A third source reference to Demetrius' winter quarters immediately before Gaza may be relevant to this winter, but is the focus of considerable scholarly debate.<sup>43</sup> However, the controversy surrounding Demetrius' winter quarters prior to the battle of Gaza does not affect the feasibility of Antigonos spending winter 312/1 at Celaenae, and in the absence of further evidence, this scenario seems the most likely.

Having traced Antigonos' seasonal movements in Diodorus' narrative, it is now necessary to attempt to discern the campaigning seasons of the other dynasts, and to synchronise events in Asia and Europe in order to achieve a wider historical perspective. In this regard, the campaigns of Cassander from 315 to 311 are well documented by Diodorus, and the individual campaigning seasons can be readily determined: they are indirectly attested, usually by a reference to Cassander's return to Macedonia at the completion of an enterprise.

Cassander's first moves after the declaration of hostilities were in Boeotia and the Peloponnese against Polyperchon, Alexander, and Aristodemus.<sup>44</sup> He seems to have been successful both on the military and diplomatic front, eventually persuading Alexander to desert the Antigonid cause,<sup>45</sup> and after settling the areas that were friendly, he returned to Macedonia.<sup>46</sup> Diodorus provides another vital chronological clue at this point: that Cassander presided over the Nemean Games before departing the Peloponnese. This reference has been observed by some scholars, yet its chronological significance seems to have been overlooked. A biennial festival held in the second and fourth years of the Olympiad,<sup>47</sup> the Nemea in question must be either that of 315 or 313.<sup>48</sup> Errington postulates the latter date, based on the placement of Antigonos' return from Media in late 315. On the chronology proposed here, however, this is impossible: it is far out of context in Diodorus' narrative, and would connect Antigonos' return in late 316 with an event three years later. The biennial nature of the Nemean

<sup>42</sup> Diod. 19.93.1–3; Plut. *Demetr.* 6.1–2. The site of Myus is unknown, but the sources agree that the ambush of Cilles took place in Syria, as Demetrius made a forced march from upper Syria to intercept him in Syria proper (Diod. 19.93.2).

<sup>43</sup> Diod. 19.80.5. This is a contentious passage, which has been variously interpreted to refer to spring 312 (i.e., winter quarters of 313/2), or autumn of that year (i.e., early winter quarters of 312/1). For discussion, see Smith 1961: 288–290; Bakhuizen 1970: 161; Hauben 1973: 258–261; Errington 1977: 499–500; Winnicki 1989: 59–60.

<sup>44</sup> Diod. 19.63.

<sup>45</sup> Through the negotiations of Prepelaus after his return to Macedonia, Diod. 19.64.2–3.

<sup>46</sup> Diod. 19.64.1: αὐτὸς δὲ παρελθὼν εἰς τὴν Ἀργεῖαν καὶ θεῖς τὸν τῶν Νεμέων ἀγῶνα τὴν εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἐπάνοδον ἐποιήσατο.

<sup>47</sup> Hanell 1935: 2325; *OCD*<sup>3</sup> s.v. "Nemea."

<sup>48</sup> Errington (1977: 497) and Billows (1990: 117) both postulate 313. Beloch (1927: 242), Hammond and Walbank (1988: 157), and Hornblower (1981: 118) suppose 315, the date proffered in this paper. Hornblower also discusses the possibility that Cassander was responsible for the building programme and innovative architecture evident in excavations of the sanctuary and dating to the Hellenistic period.

Games works against the “low” chronology, as this event cannot be displaced by one year, but must be dislocated by two.<sup>49</sup> If this is allowed, the chronology is seriously unhinged, and associated events must be compressed into the already crowded schedule for 313.<sup>50</sup> Furthermore, by the time Diodorus’ narrative reaches 313, two more of Cassander’s campaigns have been described in north-western Greece, Epirus, and the Adriatic coast.<sup>51</sup> There is no indication that he returned, or was even proximate to the Peloponnese during these expeditions, and no reason to suppose that Diodorus has recounted Cassander’s activities so far out of sequence.

Cassander’s next campaign, that of 314, is placed by Diodorus in the archon year of Nicodorus (314/3). At the end of this expedition (to Acarnania, the Adriatic coast, and Illyria), he again returns to Macedonia.<sup>52</sup> Here we again discern Hieronymus’ chronographic system: this marks the end of Cassander’s second campaigning season of the war. This hypothesis is further supported by the description of the expedition despatched to Caria under Asander and Prepelaus, which is explicitly linked to the winter season (Diod. 19.68.5). This is, therefore, the summer campaign following the Nemea of 315, i.e., 314, and the winter in Caria, as we have already seen, must be that of 314/3.

Diodorus’ account of Cassander’s activities in 313 becomes even more convoluted than usual, and it seems that before he has finished narrating the events of this year he introduces the archonship of Polemon (312/1).<sup>53</sup> It would seem that he has again lost control of his material and we must look for the skeleton of Hieronymus’ chronographic system as Diodorus’ own method lapses back into chaos. The single sign of rationality in the account is the link between Cassander’s hurried return to Macedonia from Chalcis and Boeotia, and Antigonos’ winter quarters on the Hellespont.<sup>54</sup> As it turned out, Antigonos was unable

<sup>49</sup> Although occasions when festivals and games have been celebrated out of place or out of sequence are recorded in the sources, e.g., Plut. *Ages.* 21.1–3 (Isthmian games of 390 held twice); Plut. *Demetr.* 40.4 (Pythian games of 290 held at Athens, see Hammond and Walbank 1988: 224; Tarn 1913: 48–49), in this case a special observance in Cassander’s honour seems unlikely. See also Suet. *Nero* 23.1 (with Bradley 1978a: 64–65 and 1978b: 140–141), for the equivalent occurrence on a grand scale in the Roman milieu.

<sup>50</sup> For instance, Polycleitus’ naval expedition (Diod. 19.64.4–8) cannot possibly be placed in 313 as Errington suggests. Antigonos had already left Phoenicia by this year and during the course of 313 personally wiped out Asander in Caria (Milesian *Stephanephoroi* list no. 123), and moved to winter quarters at the Hellespont (Diod. 19.77.7). Clearly he cannot have been at Ecregma negotiating with Ptolemy (Diod. 19.64.8) and at the Hellespont threatening Cassander simultaneously (see below, Table 2). Although this one is very striking, there are numerous other incongruities engendered by placing the Nemea of Diodorus 19.64.1 in 313.

<sup>51</sup> Diod. 19.67: Acarnania, Adriatic coast, and Illyria; Diod. 19.77: Epirus, Euboea, and Boeotia. See below, Table 2.

<sup>52</sup> Diod. 19.67.7: τὴν δὲ τῶν Ἐπιδαμνίων πόλιν προσαγαγόμενος καὶ φρουρὰν ἐγκαταστήσας ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς Μακεδονίαν.

<sup>53</sup> Diod. 19.77.1; see below, Table 1.

<sup>54</sup> Diod. 19.77.6–7, 19.78–2. Cassander’s abrupt departure from Chalcis, leaving his brother Pleistarchus as *phourarch*, is enough indication that Antigonos had exerted almost unbearable

to subvert the Byzantines, and, impelled by the onset of winter, bivouacked his soldiers among the Hellepontine cities (Diod. 19.77.7). This passage serves the vital purpose of synchronising the campaigning seasons of the protagonists in Europe and Asia: this is the winter of 313/2, even though Diodorus has already introduced the archon for 312/1, Polemon.<sup>55</sup> This has occasionally led scholars to conflate the winters mentioned by Diodorus at 19.77.7 and 19.89.2, a hypothesis which can only lead to serious error.<sup>56</sup> It has also provided “proof” for the low chronology, displacing as it does some of the events of 313 to 312, yet this “proof” is at the expense of narratorial sense, and will not sustain close critical analysis.<sup>57</sup> It is at this crescendo of the war that options run out for the “low” chronological scheme: a huge number of events must be crammed into the campaigning season of 312, a late date for Gaza is inescapable, certain events (such as the winters at Diodorus 19.77.7 and 89.2) must be conflated, and some chronological pointers in Diodorus’ text must be ignored.<sup>58</sup> This detailed analysis

---

strategic military pressure on him, with a two-pronged offensive in central Greece and at the Hellespont. Cassander had already raised his siege of Oreus (Diod. 19.75.7–8, 19.77.5; see also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 682, lines 13–18), where Telesphorus evidently still had some ships (Diod. 19.77.4), and now stormed Oropus on the mainland, hurriedly settled with the Boeotians, and, leaving Eupolemus as his *strategos*, rushed to defend Macedonia. For discussion, see Smith 1961: 289 and n. 20; Bakhuizen 1970: 105–130 and (for chronological discussion) 160–161; Hauben 1973: 258–260; Billows 1990: 121–122 (I cannot accept the latter’s chronology, however).

<sup>55</sup> Diod. 19.77.1. Even a simple glance at the length of Diodorus’ narrative for Polemon’s year (chapters 77–104 inclusive) as compared to the previous year of Theophrastus (chapters 73–76 inclusive) alerts the researcher to serious chronographic problems, and indeed the false insertion of this archon change has caused great difficulties for scholars of these years, and rendered the already abbreviated narrative chronologically incomprehensible.

<sup>56</sup> For example, Bizière 1975: xiii, 109, 122. Hauben (1973: 258–261) has fallen into this trap in his attempt to refute Bakhuizen (1970: 160–161). Hauben’s error is partially founded on his attempt to maintain an overall traditional “high” chronology while supporting Smith’s (1961: 288–290) later date for Gaza. As I will demonstrate, such a scheme requires no manipulations of Diodorus’ text. Cassander’s intervention in Epirus through the agency of his brother Philip (Diod. 19.74.3–6) in summer 313 need not be conflated with his personal expedition to support Lyciscus in late 312 (Diod. 19.88–89); see below, Table 2. Bakhuizen’s analysis (1970: 160) is compelling.

<sup>57</sup> Billows (1990: 122–124 and n. 52) observes problems in Diodorus’ text at 19.73–75, and offers a rearrangement of these chapters as a solution. He places the campaigns of Polemaeus in central Greece to summer 312, presumably following Smith (1961: 289, n. 20), who prefers the struggle for Euboea and central Greece in 312 in order to support his placement of Gaza in autumn, rather than spring, of that year. Billows is silent regarding Cassander’s later intervention in Epirus (Diod. 19.88–89), and at any rate, there is no room for it in the “low” chronological scheme.

<sup>58</sup> Such as Diod. 19.79.1: τῆς δ’ αὐτῆς θερίας οἱ Κυρηναῖοι μὲν ἀποστάντες Πτολεμαίου τὴν ἄκραν περιστρατοπέδευσαν, ὥς αὐτίκα μάλα τὴν φρουρὰν ἐκβαλοῦντες . . . . “In that same summer . . .” (tr. Geer, Loeb ed.). This must be the same summer as the previous chapter, which describes the campaign of Polemaeus in central Greece. This is telling, as Ptolemy surely cannot have pursued campaigns in Cyrene (Diod. 19.79.1–3), Cyprus (19.79.4–6), Cilicia and Upper Syria (19.79.6–7) in the same year as his expedition to Coelè Syria culminating in the battle of Gaza. These activities of Ptolemy’s must surely have overlapped two campaigning seasons, those of 313 and 312, and if the revolt in Cyrene is linked chronologically to Polemaeus’ campaign, these events would seem to be best placed in summer 313. However, Champion (forthcoming) offers a cogent refinement,

of Diodorus' account reveals Hieronymus' chronographic system to be operating steadily and feasibly behind Diodorus' wildly fluctuating archon changes. However, it quickly becomes clear that within Hieronymus' system there is little room for a "low" chronological scheme, and it is eliminated by the pointers within Diodorus' narrative.

The fourth and final campaigning season for Cassander described by Diodorus is more easily defined. A complete campaign in Epirus is revealed, in which Cassander, apparently misled by poor intelligence, intervened personally to assist his generals Lyciscus, Deinias, Micythus, and Lysander (the latter two of whom had already been killed).<sup>59</sup> The campaign is described in some detail, and culminates in an abortive siege of Apollonia on the Adriatic coast, where Cassander apparently received a mauling. Once again the onset of winter forced him to return to Macedonia.<sup>60</sup> This must certainly be the winter of 312/1, and the Epirote campaign must belong to the summer of 312. Further evidence of this is the link in Diodorus' text of these events to the situation in Syria and the battle of Gaza, which is also placed within the year 312,<sup>61</sup> and, once again there can be no justification for conflating the winters of Diodorus 19.77.7 and 89.2. It is also reasonable to link Antigonus' presence at Celaenae around this time with Cassander's winter quarters,<sup>62</sup> and this correlation sets up a feasible chronography for events in both Asia and Europe (see below, Table 2).

Although corrupt and highly compressed, Diodorus' historical narrative still contains evidence of Hieronymus' regular and rational chronographic system. This system strongly supports the veracity of a "high" chronology for the years 316–311, and it remains to examine certain epigraphic documents which will clinch the argument.

---

suggesting that Ptolemy's activities in Cyrene be placed in 313, while the thrusts against Cyprus and Cilicia drop into 312. This scheme would effectively relieve the compression of 313 and fill the apparent lull in spring/summer of 312, and should probably be accepted. It is at this point that the "low" chronology becomes overtly impossible. (Note also that this same summer is where Errington, followed by Billows, places Cassander's celebration of the Nemea!) For discussion of the numismatic chronology of Cyrene in these years, see Mørkholm 1980: 155, who acknowledges rival chronologies for Cyrene following the revolt, but admits: "it must be stressed that the choice between the two dating systems is still mainly dependent on our interpretation of the literary evidence."

<sup>59</sup> Diod. 19.88–89.

<sup>60</sup> Diod. 19.89.2: ὁ δὲ Κάσανδρος πολλοὺς στρατιώτας ἀποβαλὼν καὶ δύναμιν μὲν οὐκ ἔχων περὶ αὐτὸν ἀξιόχρεω τὴν δὲ χειμερινὴν ὥραν θεωρῶν ἐπανήλθεν εἰς Μακεδονίαν. Cassander's return from Apollonia is also noted by Justin 15.2.1 in the same context as the winter of Gaza.

<sup>61</sup> There is also a link with the revolt of Telesphorus (Diod. 19.87) which should likewise be placed in the year 312. Again, an internal link in the narrative pushes Polemaeus' campaign in central Greece back into the year 313: Telephorus' motive for rebellion is stated as jealousy over Polemaeus' control over Greek affairs: [Τελεσφόρος] ἐπειδὴ Πτολεμαῖον εἶδρα μᾶλλον ἑαυτοῦ προαγόμενον καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πραγμάτων πιστευόμενον ἀπάντων. . . . This implies that Polemaeus had completed his conquest of the area beforehand, i.e., probably in the previous campaigning season. See below, Table 1.

<sup>62</sup> Diod. 19.93.4; Plut. *Demetr.* 6.3.

III. ASANDER AND IG II<sup>2</sup> 450

An Athenian inscription dated to Gamelion in the archonship of Nicodorus (January/February 313) is an important chronographic document for the period:

Ἀσανδρον Ἀγάθωνος Μακεδόνα ἐπαινέσαι ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἰδίαι τε περὶ Ἀθηναίους τοὺς ἀφικνουμένους εἰς τὴν χώραν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κοινεῖ περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς τὴν πόλιν τάς τε ναῦς τὰς ἰδίας καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας παρ[έχεται]. Ἀθ[η]ν[α]ίσις εἰς τὰς χ[ρ]είας — — — — — ]ρ

Asandros the son of Agathon, the Macedonian, is to be praised because he is a good man in a private capacity to those Athenians who reach his country, and publicly to the demos of the Athenians, and, arriving in the city, he provided ships and soldiers to the Athenians from his own means for their military requirements . . . .<sup>63</sup>

In it Asander the son of Agathon, the Macedonian satrap of Caria, is attested as having visited the city during the winter of 314/3,<sup>64</sup> and is honoured for his benevolence in general to the Athenians (lines 11–16), and for supplying specific military aid to the city at his own expense (lines 16–22). The aid must have been significant and timely, as the second fragment<sup>65</sup> documents considerable honours voted for Asander, including lifetime *sitesis* at the Prytaneion, *proedria*, and permission to erect a bronze equestrian statue of himself anywhere in the agora except near the statues of the tyrannicides, Harmodius and Aristogeiton (lines 25–34).

There has been some small confusion as to the identity of this Asander, but his specifically preserved patronymic and nationality identifies him with the satrap of Caria appointed after the death of Alexander, who figures occasionally in the literary and epigraphic sources until 313/2.<sup>66</sup> If the chronological pointer

<sup>63</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 450, lines 11–22, (=SIG<sup>3</sup> 320; see also SEG 25.75), conveniently published by Osborne 1981a: 1.109–112, no. D42; see 2.113–115 for commentary.

<sup>64</sup> If the restoration of the present tense παρέχεται at lines 20–21 (Osborne 1981a: 1.110–111, whose examination of the stone precludes the possibility of an aorist) is correct, then Asander's personal visit to the city may be assumed to have occurred that very winter, if indeed he was not still there in January 313. I am grateful to an anonymous referee for pointing out that, although it is possible that he was actually present in the city when the decree was proposed, the honours granted in the second fragment (see below) do not necessarily support this assumption: the award of *sitesis* in this case is a general one rather than the usual invitation to the Prytaneion on a specific day, as is the permission to erect a statue of himself (see Ellis 1968: 229). For discussion of honours voted to foreigners by the Athenians, and the formulae adopted, see Dow 1963: 86–92; Osborne 1981b: 153–170; Henry 1981: 100–110; 1983: ch. 9 and esp. 275.

<sup>65</sup> This second fragment, comprising lines 23–34 of the decree, has not been proven beyond doubt to derive from the same stele, although the probability that it does is high. O'Sullivan (1997: 114–116), makes a strong case for dating this fragment slightly later than the first one. She advances the hypothesis that Asander fled to Athens after his loss of Caria, upon which he was awarded the extraordinary honours recorded by this document; see also Palagia 1998.

<sup>66</sup> For source references and discussion, see Kaerst 1896; Berve 1926: 2.164; Robert 1983: 98–118; Osborne 1981a: 2.114; Herman 1981: 109–110, 122–123, and Table 1, A3; Habicht 1995: 72.

contained in this decree can be definitively placed in the context of Diodorus' historical narrative, cogent evidence for the chronology of the war should emerge.

Asander is first attested in these years by Diodorus as being brought into alliance with Ptolemy around the time of Antigonus' decree at Tyre for the freedom of the Greeks.<sup>67</sup> This event was a part of the extensive preliminaries and propaganda war carried on by the protagonists for some time before direct hostilities broke out. Errington, followed by Billows, would place these events in summer/autumn of 314,<sup>68</sup> and the independent evidence for Asander's whereabouts in winter 314/3 thus places excessive strain on Diodorus' narrative in this chronographic framework. However, if the "high" chronology is imposed, a more reasonable picture of the complex manoeuvres in the war emerges.

Asander's defection from the Antigonid camp<sup>69</sup> was probably a surprise, and indeed, a coup for the allied cause, as he was a powerful player in the game: this is clearly stated by Diodorus, who adds that he had charge of a considerable number of cities. It is easy to see here the hand of Seleucus, and the effects of Antigonus' treatment of the eastern satraps.<sup>70</sup> Asander must have considerably underestimated the length of his opponent's arm, however, and was highly dependent on aid from his new allies. Ptolemy was the first to send such aid, furnishing him with a force of mercenaries under the command of an Athenian named Myrmidon.<sup>71</sup> Apparently, Asander was already under pressure, as the highly efficient Polemaeus was on his borders with an army fresh from a victorious grand tour of Cappadocia, Bithynia, Hellespontine Phrygia, Ionia, and Lydia.<sup>72</sup>

Asander's motivation in joining Ptolemy is open to question and it seems likely that he was disturbed by Antigonus' decree of freedom for the Greek

<sup>67</sup> Diod. 19.62.2. Diodorus has placed these events in the archonship of Praxibulus (315/4). For discussion, see Seibert 1969: 159–160.

<sup>68</sup> Errington 1977: 500; Billows 1990: 116–117.

<sup>69</sup> Little is heard of Asander from Triparadeisus until the third Diadoch war, but he is attested as having helped Antigonus on his return from Europe in 321 (Arrian *Succ. fr.* 25.1 [Vatican palimpsest]), and having been under Antipater's orders in 320 (Arrian *Succ. fr.* 1.42). It is reasonable to assume that Antigonus would have considered him an ally and been dismayed at the news of his defection. Other source attestations of Asander between 321–315 are documented by Robert 1983: 98–118, and Billows 1989: 184–185. See also Billows 1995: 91–92.

<sup>70</sup> Such as Pithon, Peucestes, Eudamus, and Antigenes; see Diod. 19.56. Seleucus evidently worked hard at sowing suspicion of Antigonus amongst the dynasts. He proved an extremely effective propagandist and diplomat, subverting even Cassander, who owed his position to Antigonus' aid in 318. Diodorus is emphatic that by Seleucus' actions, the "seeds of a quarrel and of great wars began to grow." See also Grainger 1990: 52–75.

<sup>71</sup> Diod. 19.62.4–5, see Parke 1933: 216–217. Myrmidon initially commanded 10,000 men, but it is unclear how many went to Caria, probably at least half that number; on Myrmidon, see Stephan 1933; Kirchner 1901–03: 107, no. 10479; Peremans and Van't Dack 1968: 112, no. 15223. It is possible that there is some connection between Myrmidon's nationality and the wording of *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 450, lines 13–16: ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἰδίαι τε περὶ Ἀθηναίους τοὺς ἀφικνουμένους εἰς τὴν χώραν. At any rate, Asander was evidently in good standing with the Athenians by 313.

<sup>72</sup> Diod. 19.60.2–4. Seleucus was forced to abandon the siege of Erythrae due to Polemaeus' proximity.

cities. Although highly subjective in interpretation, the decree of *autonomia* would be likely to have the effect of loosening Asander's control over his Carian cities, and certainly would undermine any major dynastic ambitions he entertained.<sup>73</sup> Asander's chances of maintaining a power base independently of the major dynasts were probably poor, despite the wealth of his satrapy. Clearly, it seemed to him that his best course was to ally himself with Ptolemy, despite the latter's copycat decree for the Greeks (Diod. 19.62.1), which would in effect have the same implications for him as the Antigonid decree.

The formulaic ἅμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις at the beginning of Diodorus 19.62 indicates that Asander's reinforcement by Myrmidon was synchronous with Antigonus' fifteen-month siege of Tyre,<sup>74</sup> and all these events are placed in the archon year of 315/4. This fits Diodorus' presumed method of including in an archon year the events from the campaigning year in which it began.<sup>75</sup> Thus Diodorus has placed these events, and the beginning of the war, in the year 315. Errington and Billows, however, displace the framework by one year to 314.<sup>76</sup> Whichever year saw Asander throw in his lot with Ptolemy, it was late in the season, probably late summer/autumn. This can be deduced from the context of Diodorus' narrative: Antigonus winters his troops at the setting of Orion (19.56.5). The ultimatum from the other dynasts occurred "while Antigonus was going into upper Syria" (19.57.1–2).<sup>77</sup> Antigonus' flurry of diplomatic activity (19.57.4–5), and campaigns into Syria and Phoenicia (19.58), before settling in to besiege Tyre in earnest (19.61.5), must have

<sup>73</sup> The Milesian *stephanephoroi* list entry for 314/3, which names Asander as the *stephanephoros* for that year (no. 122: Ἀσανδρος Ἀγαθ[ω]νος), may be an indication of tightening satrapal control in the Carian cities brought on by the threat of war.

<sup>74</sup> Diod. 19.61.5. For discussion of the formulaic ἅμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις, see Winnicki 1989: 68, n. 56; Bosworth 1992b: 73, n. 88.

<sup>75</sup> Smith 1961: 283; Geer 1954: Intro., x.

<sup>76</sup> Errington 1977: 500; Billows 1990: 109–116. Numerous other scholars also follow Errington: e.g., Badian (1988: 118, n. 7), who describes the evidence for the "low" chronology as "full and conclusive."

<sup>77</sup> The timing of the ultimatum is unclear. There is an outside possibility, raised by Grainger (1990: 55) that it arrived as Antigonus passed through Syria en route to Mallus *before* the wintering of Diod. 19.56.5. While it is entirely possible that Diodorus has these events out of sequence, we cannot be sure Antigonus approached Mallus via Syria, and indeed, it seems strange that he should back-track after winter if he had already passed through the region. It seems more reasonable to suppose that the ultimatum occurred in the *spring* following 19.56.5, while Antigonus was on his way into Syria and Phoenicia for the first time, and that Diodorus has his sequence correct. Furthermore, Seleucus was not dispossessed until late in the year following Gabiene, and would hardly have time to engineer the complex and delicate political manoeuvres between the scattered dynasts leading up to the ultimatum by the end of the same year. Although it cannot be ruled out that Antigonus was simply backtracking into Syria in 315, it is also reasonable to suggest that, intent on controlling the treasury at Cyinda, he approached Cilicia directly from the east, perhaps via the Bahçe pass (as did Darius en route to Issus in 333). On the ultimatum in general, see Rosen 1967: 76–78; Billows 1990: 109–110.

taken up most of the spring and early summer. Polemaeus' odyssey around Anatolia (19.60.2–4) must also have been of several months duration, as must the negotiations between Aristodemus, Alexander, and Polyperchon (19.60.1). Thus Antigonos' decree at Tyre (19.61) must be placed later in the year, and concomitantly Ptolemy's own decree and preparations, and the alliance with Asander (19.62) even later again. The foregoing events all took up the first campaigning season of the war; the question disputed by scholars is of course: which year, 315 or 314? By following Asander in Diodorus' narrative, and integrating the information in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 450 concerning his visit to Athens shortly before or during January 313, the relative veracity of the two chronographic schemes may be tested.

Asander next appears as joint commander with Prepelaus of an expedition to Caria prepared by Cassander.<sup>78</sup> This chapter of Diodorus is largely devoted to events in Caria, and placed in the archon year of Nicodorus (314/3), therefore describing events in the campaigning season of 314.<sup>79</sup> It is probable that hostilities in Caria began in earnest in spring of that year, but nothing is heard again of the fate of Myrmidon and his mercenaries. The news that reached Cassander, however, was that the Carian cities allied to Ptolemy and Seleucus were under considerable pressure. He determined to send them aid, both to honour the alliance with Ptolemy, and to distract Antigonos from causing trouble in Europe, and it is at this point that the narrative of Diodorus and the testimony of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 450 must be integrated.

It is generally accepted that Cassander's expeditionary force to Caria was sent late in the campaigning season,<sup>80</sup> and Asander's visit to Athens in winter 314/3 must almost certainly be connected with negotiating and preparing this move. It is not possible to determine whether Asander was on his way to solicit aid from Cassander, or on his way back from Macedonia en route to Caria with the army. A third, but unlikely, possibility is that Asander went to Athens for some purpose *after* the defeat of Eupolemus. The aid he rendered the Athenians, however, is most often assumed to be in connection with their mission to Lemnos.<sup>81</sup> This aid could have been either in outfitting the expedition to Lemnos, or have taken the form of a rescue mission for fugitives *after* the disastrous outcome of

<sup>78</sup> Diod. 19.68.5; see Seibert 1969: 161–162.

<sup>79</sup> Still presuming, of course, the set relationship between the chronographic schemes of Diodorus and Hieronymus (as outlined above), is correct.

<sup>80</sup> For example, by Billows 1990: 119; Errington 1977: 498; Hauben 1978: 53, n. 47. This is evident from the context of Diod. 19.68.5, where Cassander's expeditionary force seems to have arrived after Polemaeus had divided his army for wintering. Eupolemus' fiasco occurred, most probably, early in the winter of 314/3. Antigonos himself was concerned enough about Cassander's designs on Asia to risk heavy losses in two attempts at crossing the Taurus in deep snow, and leave his son in charge of Syria (Diod. 19.69).

<sup>81</sup> Diod. 19.68.3–4; see Simpson 1955: 34 and n. 1; also fully discussed by Osborne 1981: 2.114. For the "low" chronology view, with earlier bibliography, see Errington 1977: 498, n. 63; Billows 1990: 116–117 and n. 43.



this skirmish.<sup>82</sup> At any rate, the details are lost, and all hypotheses must be regarded as speculation. For the purposes of this paper, however, the presence of Asander in Athens around this time is almost certainly fatal for the “low” chronology. A look at Errington’s scheme (1977: 500) immediately highlights the difficulty. Asander’s visit to Athens makes no sense whatever when placed in a “low” chronographical framework, whereas, when placed in the “high” system, although the details are not clear, there is at least a rational context for his visit to Athens evident in Diodorus’ highly compressed historical narrative: Cassander’s expedition to Caria, the Athenian mission to Lemnos, the ships of the Pydnaeans: all provide feasible contexts for *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 450. With a “low” chronology for these years, Asander is left high and dry at Athens just before January 313, having left his satrapy with a hostile Polemaeus on its borders, when one would expect him to be reinforcing the cities and integrating the troops of Myrmidon into his defences in preparation for the expected assault in the next campaigning season. He then renders considerable aid to the Athenians for no apparent reason and presumably returns to Caria to wage the war described by Diodorus (19.68.2). Cassander’s expedition then falls at the end of that year (i.e., 313), and this, as we have already seen, compresses many events, which otherwise sit comfortably, into 312, causing chaos further down the time-line.<sup>83</sup>

The conclusion is simple. Asander’s presence in Athens in mid-winter 314/3, when integrated with Diodorus’ historical narrative, is far more comfortably placed in a “high” chronographical framework than a “low” one. With a “low” system superimposed, his visit to Athens may only be rationalised with difficulty, and a considerable suspension of disbelief. The “high” system not only allows a more natural progression of events, but supplies Asander with motive, and places this chronological peg neatly in Diodorus’ history.

#### IV. MILESIAN *STEPHANEPHOROI* LIST, NO. 123

A vital chronological clue is contained in the 313/2 entry of the Milesian *stephanephoroi* list:

Ἰππόμαχος Θήρωνος ἐπὶ τούτου ἡ πόλις ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο ὑπο Ἀντιγό-  
νου καὶ ἡ δημοκρατία ἀπεδόθη.

<sup>82</sup> Lemnos was obviously strategically placed on the communications route between Macedonia and Caria, particularly if Cassander was using Macedonian ships from, for instance, Pydna to escort the force: see Hauben 1978: 53–54; Billows 1990: 119. However, a new theory has recently been formulated which offers an alternative solution to the problem. O’Sullivan (1997), adducing two Samian inscriptions, persuasively argues that Asander’s aid to Athens at this time was in relation to an attempted Athenian reclamation of Samos. Strategically, such an endeavour would have been of mutual benefit, and if this attractive interpretation is accepted, it supplies a far better context for the partnership.

<sup>83</sup> Such a scheme causes, for example, the conflation of the two winters at Diod. 19.77.7 and 89.2, a compression of Ptolemy’s activities in Cyrene, Cyprus, and Cilicia into 312 with the campaign of Gaza, and the dislocation of Polemaeus’ campaign in central Greece; see below, n. 88.

Hippomachus, son of Theron: under this man the city was made free and autonomous by Antigonus, and the democracy was restored.<sup>84</sup>

This document provides a most fortuitous independent chronological peg on which to place Diodorus' account of Antigonus' subjugation of Caria (Diod. 19.75). The liberation of Miletus is specifically recounted:

οὗτοι δὲ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τῶν Μιλησίων τοὺς τε πολίτας ἐκάλουν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὴν φρουρουμένην ἄκραν ἐκπολιορκήσαντες εἰς αὐτονομίαν ἀποκατέστησαν τὸ πολίτευμα.

These men [Docimus and Medius], coming to the city of the Milesians, encouraged the citizens to assert their freedom; and, after taking by siege the citadel, which was held by a garrison, they restored the independence of the government.<sup>85</sup>

The *stephanephoroi* list thus places Antigonus' takeover of Caria in the year from March 313 to February 312.<sup>86</sup> Billows, following his "low" chronological scheme, prefers it as late as possible, in February 312, but this must surely be regarded as inconsistent with the evidence of Diodorus already discussed in this paper. As we have seen, the winter of Cassander's expedition to Caria, which precedes Antigonus' conquest of the satrapy must have been that of 314/3; not, as Billows (1990: 118–119) suggests, 313/2. This becomes evident from scrutiny of the context of Diodorus' narrative. After destroying Asander's power base, Antigonus moves north to the Hellespont, severely pressuring Cassander with a two-pronged initiative in Euboea and at the Propontis. These manoeuvres are terminated by the onset of winter.<sup>87</sup> On the scheme proposed by Billows, if the elimination of Asander occurs as late as February 312, the following winter at the Hellespont would be that of 312/1! The resultant displacement of events becomes obvious even to the most casual observer: Antigonus is still sparring with Cassander *after* the battle of Gaza. The chronological pointer linking the movements of Ptolemy in Cyrene and Cyprus to Polemaeus' campaign in central Greece to the same summer (Diod. 19.79.1) would have to be discounted, as all these events must then be crammed into the season of 312.<sup>88</sup> Furthermore, as we have seen, the movements of Cassander become problematic on this scheme. If

<sup>84</sup> Kauer and Rehm 1914: no. 123, translated at Billows 1990: 210. See also Beloch 1927: 101–103; Habicht 1995: 72, n. 77.

<sup>85</sup> Diod. 19.75.4, tr. Geer, Loeb ed.

<sup>86</sup> Billows 1990: 121 and n. 51; see also Hornblower 1981: 115. For discussion of the Milesian calendar year, see Beloch 1927: 101: the year runs from spring to spring, beginning with the month Taureon (= Attic Munychion).

<sup>87</sup> Diod. 19.77.7. This winter must certainly be differentiated from the one in which Cassander's Carian expedition operated (Diod. 19.68.5–7), and which Antigonus spent in Celaenae (Diod. 19.69.2). As we have already seen, it must also be separated from the winter of Diod. 19.89.2, when Cassander returned to Macedonia from his defeat at Apollonia.

<sup>88</sup> It must surely be stretching the imagination to postulate that Ptolemy campaigned in Cyrene, Cyprus, and Cilicia, then returned to Egypt to prepare the Syrian offensive and fought Gaza all in one campaigning season, yet this, effectively, is the thesis of the "low" chronology; for a better analysis,

his stand-off with Antigonus at the Hellespont is placed in 312/1, his expeditions to Epirus and the siege of Apollonia<sup>89</sup> must either be conflated with the earlier campaigns in Epirus, Euboea, and Boeotia<sup>90</sup> leading up to this confrontation, or displaced to the season of 311. When, as here, the evidence of Diodorus is scrutinised and the progress of events is extrapolated in detail against the backdrop of a “low” chronological system, it becomes clear that, whereas these “low” scenarios are *possible*, the *likelihood* of them reflecting the true course of events is infinitesimally small.

However, when the Milesian document is placed in Diodorus’ text against a backdrop of the “high” chronology, an entirely different picture emerges. The subjugation of Caria can be placed within the campaigning year of 313, and a believable train of events ensues: after spending the winter of 314/3 at Celaenae (Diod. 19.69.2), which is also the winter of Cassander’s abortive expedition to Caria when Polemaeus so decisively deals with Eupolemus (Diod. 19.68.5–7), Antigonus begins operations against Lysimachus, who is attempting to subdue a rebellion amongst the cities on the Black Sea.<sup>91</sup> Meanwhile, it seems that, following his success against Eupolemus in the winter, Polemaeus had brought Asander to the point of negotiation. The latter, however, reneged on the agreement, and Antigonus decided to focus the full might of his war machine and crush Asander for good.<sup>92</sup> Having ruthlessly and efficiently accomplished this, Antigonus was able to direct his two-pronged attack on Cassander, sending Polemaeus to Euboea<sup>93</sup> and himself proceeding to the Hellespont. The liberation

---

see Seibert 1969: 147–151; and Champion forthcoming. Similarly, Polemaeus’ campaigns must be shifted to the year 312, and, although this is not so grievous to the credibility of the “low” system as Ptolemy’s movements (Polemaeus’ campaign is already compressed on the “high” system, and can only be rationalised by postulating its continuation from 313 over the winter and into the next season, 312, thus pushing Telesphorus’ revolt [Diod. 19.87] down to late 312 or 311—see below, Table 2), such a theory necessitates considerable dislocation; see also above, n. 58.

<sup>89</sup> Diod. 19.88–89.

<sup>90</sup> Diod. 19.74.3–6. (Epirus), 19.75.6–8 (Euboea), 19.77.5–7 (Euboea and Boeotia).

<sup>91</sup> Diod. 19.73. The ringleader apparently was Callantia (Callatis in Strabo 7.5.12), but the insurrection had spread to the neighbouring cities and the Scythian and Thracian tribes. This rebellion, fuelled by intrigue and at least two expeditions sent by Antigonus, was designed to keep Lysimachus preoccupied in the northern part of his realm while Antigonus moved directly at Macedonia. Only luck and excellent generalship by Lysimachus thwarted these plans; for discussion, see Lund 1992: 33–43.

<sup>92</sup> Diod. 19.75.1–6; for discussion see Billows 1990: 121; Habicht 1995: 72.

<sup>93</sup> Diod. 19.77.1. As we have observed, the exact date of Polemaeus’ arrival in Greece is uncertain. Scholars are divided: Beloch (1927: 243), Simpson (1955: 35), Bakhuizen (1970: 160–161), and Hammond and Walbank (1988: 158–159) postulate 313; Smith (1961: 289, n. 20), Hauben (1973: 258–261 and n. 19, “spring 312”), Errington (1977: 500, “summer 312”), and Billows (1990: 123, “mid summer 312”) support the later date. The most reasonable conclusion, and that of this paper, must be to follow Hammond and Walbank, and place Polemaeus’ initial arrival in Greece in late 313, with his activities continuing into 312. Smith (1961: 289, n. 20), cogently observes that “Polemaeus’ operations in Greece [are] narrated in two parts by Diodorus”: 19.77.2–4 and 78.2–5. Although

of Miletus, therefore, is most likely to have taken place in high summer of 313<sup>94</sup> after a protracted six month struggle. Clearly, the Milesian *stephanephoroi* list entry is powerful supporting evidence for a "high" chronological scheme.

#### CONCLUSION

The conclusions of this paper are self-evident. The ascendancy of the "low" chronology for the third Diadoch war must be at an end, as it clearly cannot be sustained by the ancient sources. The integration of the epigraphic and numismatic evidence into the matrix of Diodorus' historical narrative allows only one equation: a "high" chronology must be accepted for the years 316–311, and, by corollary, for the preceding years from 322 to 316. Errington's hypotheses must finally be laid to rest, and scholars now have a firm temporal framework from which to continue scrutiny of the period.<sup>95</sup>

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS AND ANCIENT HISTORY  
THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA  
NEDLANDS 6009  
WESTERN AUSTRALIA

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, F. M. 1937. "L'Expédition des Grecs à Pétra en 312 avant J.-C.," *Revue Biblique* 46: 373–391.
- Badian, E. 1988. "Two Postscripts on the Marriage of Phila and Balacrus," *ZPE* 73: 116–118.
- Bakhuizen, S. C. 1970. *Salgameus and the Fortifications on its Mountains*. Groningen.
- Bellinger, A. R. 1950–53. "An Alexander Hoard from Byblos," *Berytus* 10: 37–49.
- Beloch, K. J. 1927. *Griechische Geschichte* 4<sup>2</sup>. Berlin and Leipzig.
- Berve, H. 1926. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. 2 vols. Munich.
- Billows, R. A. 1989. "Anatolian Dynasts: The Case of the Macedonian Eupolemos in Karia," *Cl. Ant.* 8: 173–206.
- 1990. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- 1995. *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*. Leiden, New York, and Cologne.
- Bizièvre, F. tr. 1975. *Diodore de Sicile: Bibliothèque Historique Livre XIX*. (Budé ed.) Paris.

Diodorus has placed both in the archonship of Polemon (312/1), the bipartite structure may well indicate the subjugation of Greece was spaced over two seasons.

<sup>94</sup> So Beloch 1927: 102.

<sup>95</sup> I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Professor A. B. Bosworth and Dr E. J. Baynham for reading and criticising earlier drafts of this paper; and my appreciation to Associate Professor J. R. Melville-Jones for his encouragement, comments, and helpful discussion of the numismatic section. I am also most obliged to Dr O. H. Zervos for his extremely helpful and cordial correspondence concerning the Sidonian Ptolemaic issues and the date of the battle of Gaza. Finally, I am deeply indebted to the late Charles Hersh for so kindly and generously sharing his numismatic expertise with me.

- Bosworth, A. B. 1992a. "History and Artifice in Plutarch's *Eumenes*," in P. A. Stadter (ed.), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*. London. 56–89.
- 1992b. "Philip III Arrhidaeus and the Chronology of the Successors," *Chiron* 22: 55–81.
- 1993. "Perdiccas and the Kings," *CQ* N.s. 43: 420–427.
- 1994. "A New Macedonian Prince," *CQ* N.s. 44: 57–65.
- Bradley, K. R. 1978a. "The Chronology of Nero's visit to Greece, A.D. 66/67," *Iatomus* 37: 61–72.
- 1978b. *Suetonius' Life of Nero: An Historical Commentary*. Brussels.
- Brett, A. B. 1938. "The Aphlaston, Symbol of Naval Victory or Supremacy on Greek and Roman Coins," in H. Mattingly and E. S. G. Robinson (eds.), *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress 1936*. London. 23–32.
- 1950. "Athena ΑΛΚΙΑΗΜΟΣ of Pella," *ANSMN* 4: 55–72.
- Champion, J. forthcoming. *The Strategy of Antigonos Monophthalmos, 315–301 B.C.* Diss., University of Western Australia.
- Devine, A. M. 1984. "Diodorus' Account of the Battle of Gaza," *Acta Classica* 27: 31–40.
- Dow, S. 1963. "The Athenian Honors for Aristonikos of Karystos, 'Alexander's ΣΦΑΙΡΙΣΤΗΣ,'" *HSCP* 67: 77–92.
- Elkeles, G. 1941. *Demetrios der Städtebelagerer*. Diss., Breslau.
- Ellis, J. R. 1968. "IG II<sup>2</sup>. 450b, ll.7–8: An Emendation," *ABSA* 63: 229.
- Emmons, B. 1954. "The Overstruck Coinage of Ptolemy," *ANSMN* 6: 69–83.
- Errington, R. M. 1970. "From Babylon to Tripuradeisos: 323–320 B.C.," *JHS* 90: 49–77.
- 1977. "Diodorus Siculus and the Chronology of the Early Diadochoi, 320–311 B.C.," *Hermes* 105: 478–504.
- Geer, R. M. tr. 1954. *Diodorus of Sicily X*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass., and London.
- Grainger, J. D. 1990. *Seleucus Nikator: Constructing a Hellenistic Kingdom*. London.
- Habicht, C. 1995. *Athen: Die Geschichte der Stadt in Hellenistischer Zeit*. Munich.
- Hammond, N. G. L. and F. W. Walbank. 1988. *A History of Macedonia 3: 336–167 B.C.* Oxford.
- Hanell, K. 1935. "Nemea (4)," *RE* 16.2: 2322–27.
- Hauben, H. 1973 "On the Chronology of the Years 313–311 B.C.," *AJP* 94: 256–267.
- 1978. "The Ships of the Pydnaeans: Remarks on Kassandros' Naval Situation in 314/313 B.C.," *Ancient Society* 9: 47–54.
- Henry, A. S. 1981. "Invitations to the Prytaneion at Athens," *Antichthon* 15: 100–110.
- 1983. *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees. The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees*. New York.
- Herman, G. 1981. "The 'Friends' of the Early Hellenistic Rulers: Servants or Officials?," *Talanta* 13: 103–149.
- Hersh, C. A. 1998. "The Phoenicia 1997 Hoard of Alexander-Type Tetradrachms," *AJN* 10: 37–40.
- Hornblower, J. 1981. *Hieronymus of Cardia*. Oxford.
- Jacoby, F. 1926. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker B, nr. 106–261, Kommentar*. Leiden.
- Jenkins, G. K. 1960. "An Early Ptolemaic Hoard from Phacous," *ANSMN* 9: 17–37.
- Kaerst, J. 1896. "Asandros (3)," *RE* 2: 1515–16.
- 1901. "Demetrios (33)," *RE* 4.2: 2769–92.

- Kawerau, G. and A. Rehm. 1914. *Das Delphinion in Milet*. Berlin.
- Kirchner, J. ed. 1901–03. *Prosopographia Attica* 2. Berlin (repr. 1966).
- Lund, H. 1992. *Lysimachus: A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*. London.
- Manni, E. 1949. "Tre note di cronologia ellenistica," *RAL* 4: 53–85.
- 1951. *Demetrio Poliorcete*. Rome.
- Merker, I. L. 1964. "Notes on Abdalonymus and the Dated Alexander Coinage of Sidon and Ake," *ANSMN* 11: 13–20.
- Mørkholm, O. 1978. "The Alexander Coinage of Nicocles of Paphos," *Chiron* 8: 135–147.
- 1980. "Cyrene and Ptolemy I, Some Numismatic Comments," *Chiron* 10: 145–159.
- 1991. *Early Hellenistic Coinage from the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–186 B.C.)*. Cambridge.
- Nash, D. 1974. "The Kuft Hoard of Alexander III Tetradrachms," *NC* 14: 14–30.
- Newell, E. T. 1916. *The Dated Alexander Coinage of Sidon and Ake*. New York.
- Osborne, M. J. 1981a. *Naturalization in Athens*. 4 vols. Brussels.
- 1981b. "Entertainment in the Prytaneion at Athens," *ZPE* 41: 153–170.
- O'Sullivan, L. 1997. "Asander, Athens and IG II<sup>2</sup> 450: a New Interpretation," *ZPE* 119: 107–116.
- Palagia, O. 1998. "The Enemy Within: A Macedonian in Piraeus," in O. Palagia and W. Coulson (eds.), *Regional Schools in Hellenistic Sculpture*. Oxford. 15–26.
- Parke, H. W. 1933. *Greek Mercenary Soldiers from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus*. Oxford.
- Peremans, W. and E. Van't Dack (eds.). 1968. *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* 6. Louvain.
- Price, M. J. 1991. *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus*. 2 vols. Zurich and London.
- Robert, J. and L. 1983. *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie* 1. Paris.
- Rosen, K. 1967. "Political Documents in Hieronymus of Cardia (323–302 B.C.)," *Acta Classica* 10: 41–94.
- Seibert, J. 1969. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Ptolemaios* 1. Munich.
- Simpson, R. H. 1955. "Ptolemaeus' Invasion of Attica in 313 B.C.," *Mnemosyne* 8: 34–37.
- 1959. "Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus," *AJP* 80: 370–379.
- Smith, L. C. 1961. "The Chronology of Books XVIII–XX of Diodorus Siculus," *AJP* 82: 283–290.
- Stephan, M. 1933. "Myrmidon (2)," *RE* 16.1: 1108.
- Tarn, W. W. 1913. *Antigonos Gonatas*. Oxford.
- Thompson, M., O. Mørkholm, and C. M. Kraay (eds.). 1973. *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards*. New York.
- Wehrli, C. 1968. *Antigone et Démétrios*. Geneva.
- Wheatley, P. V. 1995. "Ptolemy Soter's Annexation of Syria 320 B.C.," *CQ* n.s. 45: 433–440.
- Winnicki, J. K. 1989. "Militäroperationen von Ptolemaios I. und Seleukos I. in Syrien in den Jahren 312–311 v. Chr. (I)," *Ancient Society* 20: 55–92.
- 1991. "Militäroperationen von Ptolemaios I. und Seleukos I. in Syrien in den Jahren 312–311 v. Chr. (II)," *Ancient Society* 22: 147–201.
- Zervos, O. H. 1967. "The Early Tetradrachms of Ptolemy I," *ANSMN* 13: 1–16.
- 1974. *The Alexander Mint of Egypt*. Diss., New York University.

TABLE 1: CHRONOGRAPHIC POINTERS IN THE SOURCES FOR 316–311 B.C.

	HIERONYMUS Antigonids	Allies	DIODORUS Archons
316	Antigonos winters at Malus, Cilicia, after the setting of Orion, Nov. 316 (Diod. 19.56.5)		Democleides, 316/5 (Diod. 19.17.1)
315	Antigonos before Tyre, siege took 15 months (Diod. 19.61.5). He promises naval superiority “that very summer” (Diod. 19.58.6) <i>Unprecedented mint activity at Sidon, 315–314</i>	Cassander campaigns in the Peloponnese, presides over Nemean games, summer 315 (Diod. 19.64.1)	Praxibulus, 315/4 (Diod. 19.55.1)
314	Antigonos winters at Celaenae, late 314/3 (Diod. 19.69.2); Demetrius left in Syria, aged 22 (Diod. 19.69.1; Appian <i>Syr.</i> 54; Plut. <i>Demetr.</i> 5.2)	Cassander campaigns in Acarnania, Adriatic coast, and Illyria (Diod. 19.67) Eupolemus vs Polemaeus in Caria, winter 314/3 (Diod. 19.68.5–7) <i>Asander in Athens, late 314 or Jan. 313 (IG II<sup>2</sup> 450)</i>	Nicodorus, 314/3 (Diod. 19.66.1)
313	<i>Antigonos annihilates Asander, between March 313–Feb. 312 (Milesian Stephanephoroi list, no. 123)</i> Antigonos at the Hellespont for winter 313/2 (Diod. 19.77.7)	Cyrene revolts from Ptolemy, summer 313 (Diod. 19.79.1). ?Ptolemy consolidates in Cyprus, plunders Cilicia, late summer or early 312 (Diod. 19.79.4–7) Cassander campaigns in Epirus and Euboea (Diod. 19.77.4); returns to Macedonia by winter (Diod. 19.77.5–6)	Theophrastus, 313/2 (Diod. 19.73.1)
312	Demetrius at Gaza, withdraws his troops from winter quarters, autumn 312 (Diod. 19.80.5) ?Antigonos winters at Celaenae 312/1 (Diod. 19.93.4; Plut. <i>Demetr.</i> 6.3)	<i>Ptolemy controls Sidonian mint for part of the minting year, Oct. 312–Sept. 311</i> Cassander moves on Epirus (Diod. 19.88); besieges Apollonia, defeated, returns to Macedonia for winter 312/1 (Diod. 19.89.2)	Polemon, 312/1 (Diod. 19.77.1)
311			Simonides, 311/10 (Diod. 19.105.1)

TABLE 2: CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN EUROPE AND ASIA 316–311 B.C.

Date	Events in Europe	Events in Asia
316 Winter		Antigonus at Mallus, Cilicia, Nov. 316 (Diod. 19.56.5)
315 Spring Spring/ Summer	Cassander campaigns in the Peloponnese, presides over Nemean games, (Diod. 19.64.1)	Ultimatum to Antigonus from the allies (Diod. 19.57.1–2) Siege of Tyre begins, lasts 15 months (Diod. 19. 61.5); Asander joins the allies (Diod. 19.62.2)
314 Summer  Winter	Cassander campaigns in Acarnania, Adriatic coast and Illyria (Diod. 19.67)  Cassander sends expeditionary force to Caria (Diod. 19.68.5–7) Asander visits Athens, winter 314/3 ( <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 450)	Siege of Tyre ends, ?late summer  Antigonus at Celaenae (Diod. 19. 69.2) Eupolemus vs Polemaeus in Caria (Diod. 19.68.5–7)
313 Summer   Autumn/ Winter	Cassander intervenes in Epirus (Diod. 19.74.3–6), besieges Oreüs (Diod. 19.75.7–8; <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 682), campaigns in Euboea and Boeotia, returns to Macedonia before winter to forestall Antigonus' threatened invasion (Diod. 19.77)  Polemaeus campaigns in Euboea, Attica, Boeotia, Phocis, and Locris (Diod. 19.78) ?campaign continues into spring/summer 312	Antigonus moves against Lysimachus and Cassander (Diod. 19.73.6–74.2); annihilates Asander between Mar. 313 and Feb. 312 (Milesian <i>steph.</i> list no. 123); sends Polemaeus to Greece (Diod. 19.77.1) Ptolemy suppresses revolt in Cyrene, ?campaigns in Cyprus and Cilicia, perhaps into 312 (Diod. 19.79) Antigonus on the Hellespont, threatens Europe, winters there (Diod. 19.77.5–7)
312 Winter/ Spring Summer  Autumn  Winter	Telesphorus vs Polemaeus in the Peloponnese (Diod. 19.87) Cassander sends expedition to Epirus (Diod. 19.88) Cassander besieges Apollonia, defeated, returns to Macedonia for winter 312/1 (Diod. 19.89.2)	?Ptolemy returns to Egypt, prepares invasion of Coelê-Syria (Diod. 19.80.3)    <i>Battle of Gaza</i> Ptolemy takes control of Sidonian mint for part of 312/1 ?Antigonus at Celaenae (Diod. 19.93.4; Plut. <i>Demetr.</i> 6.3)



Date	Events in Europe	Events in Asia
311	?	Seleucus returns to Babylon (Diod. 19.90)
Spring	?	Demetrius defeats Ciltes; Antigonos enters Syria; Ptolemy retreats to Egypt (Diod. 19.93)
Summer		Demetrius' Nabataean campaign (Diod. 19.96.4–100.3)
Autumn	?	Demetrius' lightning raid on Babylon, returns hastily by winter ?because peace is imminent (Diod. 19.100.4–7; Plut. <i>Demetr.</i> 7.3)
311/310	Peace talks between Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Antigonos, ?Seleucus excluded	
Winter	Peace treaty ratified (Diod. 19.105.1; <i>OGIS</i> 5)	