

Some Macedonian offices c. 336–309 BC

The contention of this paper is that the Macedonians had their own names for the offices in their state; that Hieronymus, who spent a long life in the Macedonian administrative service, used those names in his history; and that some of the names have come through to us—not always consistently—in the accounts which were derived from the history of Hieronymus.¹ Those accounts are in Diodorus, Justin and Photius' epitomes of Arrian and Dexippus. The account in Curtius is not inspired by Hieronymus; it is therefore not discussed here.

The troubles which followed Alexander's death led to an *entente* between the infantrymen and the officers of the cavalry. The first condition of the *entente* according to Arrian *Succ. FGtH* 156 F 1.3 was that Antipater should be 'general of those in Europe' (*στρατηγὸν εἶναι τῶν κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην*). No one will question that *στρατηγός* was a Macedonian term, and there is no need to expand upon the demonstration by Bengtson that the *στρατηγός* was a Macedonian official with military functions.² Antipater, then, was to undertake military duties.

The second condition of the *entente* concerned Craterus, the most popular and the most respected of all the generals. At the time of the *entente* he was on the way to Macedonia and happened to be in Cilicia with the 10,000 Macedonian veterans who were under his command (Diod. xviii 4.1, 12.1). According to Arr. *Succ.* F 1.3, Craterus was to be *prostatēs* of the kingship of Arrhidaeus' (*Κρατερὸν δὲ προστάτην τῆς Ἀρριδαίου βασιλείας*). That he was to proceed to Macedonia and hold his office there is made clear by the allocation of areas to him and Antipater in the detailed settlement, which was reported at Arr. *Succ.* F 1.7: 'the areas beyond Thrace up to the Illyrians, the Triballians and the Agrianians, and Macedonia itself, and Epirus up to the Ceraunian mountains, and all Greece were allocated to Craterus and Antipater' (*Κρατερῷ καὶ Ἀντιπάτρῳ ἐνεμήθη*).³ The functions of Craterus and Antipater were evidently complementary. For as long as the king stayed in Asia, Craterus was to carry out the

civil duties of the kingship, of which the most important were the religious duties;⁴ and Antipater was to exercise the military authority (which in the detailed settlement was reduced by the subtraction of Thrace).

That the title *prostatēs* was not just an *ad hoc* arrangement but pertained to an already existing office in the Macedonian state is made probable by analogy and certain by the parallel passage in Dexippus. The most relevant analogy is in the tribal states of Epirus, which developed almost *pari passu* with the tribal states of Macedonia, not surprisingly as the Molossians were closely related in dialect and customs to the states of Upper Macedonia.⁵ There, in 429 BC, to quote Jowett's translation of Thuc. ii 80.5, 'the Chaonians, having no king, were led by Photius and Nicanor, both of the governing family and holding the presidency for a year'. The word for 'presidency' is *προστατεία* or *προστασία*, these being variant readings. Either is acceptable as the name of the office which was held by these two senior officials in the Chaonian state.⁶ We now have inscriptions of the Molossian state from 370–368 BC onwards in which the senior official beside the king was a *προστάτας*: for example, *βασιλεύοντος Νεοπτολέμου . . . ἐπὶ προστάτα Μολοσσῶν Εἰδύμμα Ἀρκτάνος, γραμματέος Ἀμφικορίου Ἀρκτάνος*. In Molossia, since the military command was vested in the Molossian king, the duties of the *prostatēs* were civil.⁷ There are other analogies. For officials of this name were found in Greek city-states and not far away, for instance at Amphipolis when it was taken over by Philip II (Tod, *GHI* 150).

The passage in Dexippus which is parallel to the report of the detailed settlement in Arrian states that 'Craterus was entrusted with the care of, and all that makes for the protection of, the kingship, the office ranking as the very first in the eyes of the Macedonians' (*FGtH* 100 F 8.4, *τὴν δὲ κηδεμονίαν καὶ ὅση προστασία τῆς βασιλείας Κρατερὸς ἐπετρόπη, ὃ δὴ πρῶτιστον τιμῆς τέλος παρὰ Μακεδόσι*). Thus the title of the office held by Craterus as *προστάτης τῆς Ἀρριδαίου βασιλείας* (Arr. *Succ.* F 1.3) appears here as *ἡ προστασία τῆς βασιλείας*.⁸ The remark, that this 'office' (*τέλος*) was so very prestigious, was due presumably not to Dexippus, writing in the third century AD, but to his source, Hieronymus. It was relevant to the allocation of offices in 323 BC because Craterus was the most respected of the generals.

What were the duties of Craterus in holding 'the protection' of the kingship of Arrhidaeus, if we may so translate *prostatia* in this phrase? While the king himself was in Asia, we may assume that Craterus carried out the civil duties involved in the maintenance of the kingship in the kingdom of Macedonia. Thus he

This paper owes much to M. B. Hatzopoulos, T. A. Martin, G. T. Griffith and F. W. Walbank, the Editor's advisers, members of a seminar at Brisbane on August 27–29, 1984, and Evelyn Smith who made a fair copy at Adelaide.

¹ See recently F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander in Babylon und die Reichsordnung nach seinem Tode* (Vienna 1970) 104–30: 'Wir haben . . . mit zweierlei Überlieferungssträngen zu tun . . . Die andere Version [i.e. other than that in Curtius] geht auf Hieronymos.' P. A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill 1980) 148: 'the congruence with Diodorus suggests that they both [Arrian and Diodorus] used the same source, Hieronymus of Cardia'. J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford 1981) 64–5 (for Justin), 39 (for Diodorus), 87 f. (for Plut. *Eumenes*).

² H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit* i (Munich 1937, repr. 1964) 15 ff.

³ Otherwise Bengtson (n. 2) 81, 'das Amt des Krateros hat sich jedoch m.E. nicht speziell auf Makedonien . . . bezugen'; and 80, 'das eigentliche Wirkungsfeld des Krateros Asien sein sollte'. This despite Arrian cited above, and (from a different tradition) Curt. x 7.9, *in Europa Craterus et Antipater res administrarent*! He held that the king's treasury (Just. xiii 4.5) was in Cilicia (75 with n. 2, 120) but the money was brought to Cilicia only three years later (Arr. *Succ.* F 9.38). He proposed also to delete *Κρατερῷ* as a 'Randnote'. Such arbitrary expedients are to be rejected. For the geography see my article in *CQ* xxx (1980) 471 ff.

⁴ See N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia* ii (Oxford 1979) 155.

⁵ See N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967) 460 ff., 479.

⁶ See G. N. Cross, *Epirus* (Cambridge 1932) 16 with n. 1, 18 with n. 2; and Hammond (n. 5) 501.

⁷ When the monarchy fell, a general took the king's place: e.g. *PAE* 1969, 35, *στραταγοῦντος . . . προστατεύοντος δὲ . . .* For the inscriptions of 370–368 BC see D. Evangelides, *Eph. Arch.* 1956, 1 ff. and Hammond (n. 5) 525 ff. For the forms of noun and verb see the Glossary of constitutional terms in Hammond (n. 5) 818 f. and P. Cabanes in *The Ancient World* viii (1983) 9.

⁸ Schachermeyr (n. 1) 116, saw that this office 'muss bei Hieronymos gestanden haben', but he went on to talk of 'mitregenten' and 'eine Flüchtigkeit des Photios'.

undertook the conduct of sacrifices and festivals in honour of the gods,⁹ the administration of the royal possessions (mint at Pella, gold and silver mines, fine timber, parklands for hunting and various estates), the receipt of certain taxes, and the disbursement of large sums of money. As the representative of the king's physical presence, he accompanied the Macedonian army¹⁰ but not in the position of command, which was held by Antipater (e.g. at Diod. xviii 16.5). And he operated alongside Antipater in the areas outside Macedonia as defined by Arr. *Succ.* F 1.7. The division of duties was expressed succinctly by Just. xiii 4.5 in his account of the *entente*: 'Antipater is placed in charge of Macedonia and Greece, Craterus is given charge of the Royal property' ('Macedoniae et Graeciae Antipater praepositur, regiae pecuniae custodia Cratero traditur').¹¹ In some situations, as we shall see later, the *stratēgos* and the *prostatēs* acted together.

That *prostatia* was a word used by Hieronymus may be inferred from its meaning at Diod. xviii 49.4. Elsewhere in Diodorus the word occurs eight times meaning leadership in a religious context, three times leadership in action (e.g. xvii 34.6), and twice protection (xviii 23.2, xxxiii 3.1).¹² At xviii 49.4 it means 'dignity'. This meaning is found in Polybius: at iv 2.6 Achaeus has 'not only royal dignity but also (royal) power', and at xi 34.3 Antiochus III is asked not to grudge Euthydemus 'the name and dignity of the king'. It seems that this was a Hellenistic use of *prostatia*, such as we should expect from Hieronymus.

The third condition of the *entente* according to Arr. *Succ.* F 1.3 was that Perdiccas should be Chiliarch in charge of 'the whole kingdom': Περδίκκων δὲ χιλιαρχεῖν χιλιαρχίας ἧς ἦρχεν Ἡφαισίων (τὸ δὲ ἦν ἐπιτροπή τῆς ξυμπάσης βασιλείας). The title Chiliarch had been adopted from the Persian court. 'The whole kingdom' in this context was thus the Kingdom of Asia, an entity which Alexander had kept distinct from the Kingdom of Macedonia.¹³ As Chiliarch Perdiccas was superior in authority to the satraps of the divisions of the Kingdom of Asia; but he had no authority over Craterus, Antipater¹⁴ and Lysimachus, whose spheres of administration lay in the Macedonian realm in Europe.

Two other offices were conferred on Perdiccas. As the king was unfit in person to command 'the Royal Army' (Diod. xviii 16.1, τὴν βασιλικὴν δύναμιν), Perdiccas was elected 'dux' (Just. xiii 4.1, *dux ab omnibus legeretur*), that is in Macedonian terms *στρατηγός* (as in Plut. *Eum.* 3.6, αὐτοῦ Περδίκκου παρόντος καὶ

στρατηγοῦντος). In the second place Perdiccas was made 'manager of the kingship' (Diod. xviii 2.4, ἐπιμελητὴν δὲ τῆς βασιλείας Περδίκκων). In this capacity Perdiccas executed the orders of the kingship as represented by Arrhidaeus, the only king at the time. When the detailed settlement was made, the fiction that the king issued the orders was maintained: 'Perdiccas decided to appoint persons to satrapal commands as on the order of Arrhidaeus' (Arr. *Succ.* F 1.5, ὡς Ἀρριδαίου κελεύοντος). The term *epimelētēs*, which I have translated 'manager', was a Macedonian official title for an office which was probably called ἡ ἐπιμέλεια.¹⁵ The title was, of course, different from that held by Craterus as *προστατῆς τῆς Ἀρριδαίου βασιλείας*.¹⁶ The object of management was sometimes personified. For instance Peithon and Arrhidaeus were 'elected managers of the kings' (Diod. xviii 36.7, εἰλοντο τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμελητάς). The two offices of Perdiccas were correctly described by Justin (he was anticipating the birth and election of Alexander IV) in the following words: 'castrorum et exercitus et regum cura Meleagro et Perdiccae adsignatur' (xiii 4.5), that is 'charge of the encampment and the army and the kings was given to Meleager and Perdiccas'. After the elimination of Meleager Perdiccas on his own was *stratēgos* and *epimelētēs*, as well as *chiliarchēs*.

The word *epimelētēs* was used twenty-nine times by Diodorus, and of these twenty were in books xviii–xx, where Hieronymus was the main source for Macedonian affairs. This concentration suggests that *epimelētēs* was taken from Hieronymus. The word *chiliarchēs* fell out of use after 323 BC in our sources. In the one occurrence, at Diod. xviii 48.4, where Antipater is said to have appointed his son Cassander as *chiliarchos* and second in authority', it is not clear whether the word meant controller of Asia or just second to Polyperchon.

The last office we have to consider is that of the ἐπίτροπος, 'the person entrusted with . . .', or in our terminology 'the guardian of'. The Latin equivalent was *tutor*. When Arrhidaeus was being excluded from consideration, the leading Macedonian officers elected four from their own number to be *tutores* of the expected child of Roxane, if it should prove to be a boy (Just. xiii 2.13). This arrangement lapsed with the *entente*. Thereafter there was no mention of a guardian of Alexander IV in the extant accounts until the death of Arrhidaeus. The reason is clearly that Arrhidaeus, the uncle and so the nearest male agnate of the infant king, was the guardian in accordance with Macedonian practice.¹⁷ However, the guardianship of Heracles, the son of Alexander by Barsine out of wedlock, was

⁹ See C. F. Edson *OCD*² 634. Court ceremonial was also important.

¹⁰ For an infant king being taken into battle see Just. vii 2.8–12.

¹¹ The MSS have *rerum pecuniae*. This was emended to *regum pecuniae* by Madvig and to *regiae pecuniae* by Rühl. The meaning anyhow is clear; see Schachermeyr (n. 1) 126 f. with n. 58. The word *pecunia* meant probably 'property' rather than coined money (see LS s.v. 1).

¹² I owe these and other statistics (below) to the kindness of Prof. C. Rubincam.

¹³ So Bengtson (n. 2) i 36; 'der asiatischen βασιλεία . . . die dem χιλιάρχης Perdikkas unterstanden hat'. For the Kingdom of Asia see N. G. L. Hammond, *Alexander the Great: King, commander and statesman* (New Jersey 1980) 258 f.

¹⁴ He sought Antipater's favour to gain recruits (Just. xiii 6.6). For him to come to Europe was to seek the throne for himself (Diod. xviii 25.3).

¹⁵ Thus Peithon and Arrhidaeus resigned τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν (Diod. xviii 39.2). I see no justification for the view of F. W. Walbank, *A historical commentary on Polybius* (Oxford 1957) i 533 f. and Hornblower (n. 1) 13, that an *epimelētēs* was 'a military governor'; and the passages they cite—X. *Hell.* iii 2.11 and Plb. iv 80.15—are of no help because command of troops is not mentioned. Rather 'a military governor' was ἐπιμελητῆς καὶ στρατηγός, as examples in Diodorus show (e.g. i 17.3, xviii 48.4).

¹⁶ Yet Bengtson (n. 2) 81 more or less equated the two: 'Krateros' Stellung ist vielmehr in gewisser Weise der später von Perdikkas usurpierten Würde des ἐπιμελητῆς τῶν βασιλέων gleichzusetzen.'

¹⁷ So F. Jacoby, *FGrH* iiB 548: 'so wäre Arrhidaios ohne weiteres auch Vormund des jungen Alexander'. For uncle–nephew guardians in the royal house see Diod. xiv 37.6 (Aëropus–Orestes), Schol. to Aeschin. ii 29 (Ptolemy–Perdiccas and Philip), Just. vii 5.9 (Philip–Amyntas).

conferred on Antipater, presumably at the time of the *entente* (Suda s.v. 'Antipatros', ἐπετρόπευσε μὲν τὸν υἱὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου, τὸν Ἡρακλέα κληθέντα). Although Heracles was not regarded as being in the line of succession, it was important that he should be under the authority of a trusted and powerful person.¹⁸

During the definition and the clarification of these four offices I have paid closer attention to the Greek and Latin texts than my predecessors have done, and the resulting interpretation differs radically from theirs. It may suffice to quote a few examples. Rostovtzeff described Craterus as 'a sort of guardian and prime minister, superior in rank to Perdiccas'.¹⁹ Cary wrote of Craterus as 'guardian of Philip Arrhidaeus and keeper of the purse' with 'a general power of veto', and he saw Perdiccas as 'in effect promoted over Craterus' head' with Perdiccas holding 'the chief executive authority' and 'the regency'.²⁰ Tarn saw Meleager as 'guardian of Philip Arrhidaeus' and Craterus as 'executive of Philip's kingship (not kingdom), i.e. his guardian in lunacy'.²¹ The term 'regent' has been widely used by recent writers; thus Errington called Peithon and Arrhidaeus 'regents'.²² But it is imprecise. For while it conveys the meaning of a person ruling instead of a king, it implies an overall authority and an official position, two things which did not arise in the situation after Alexander's death. Indeed Greek and Latin do not have a word equivalent to our word 'regent'. The confusion to which these quotations testify is due to some extent to the fact that Macedonia has often been seen through the eyes of Demosthenes as a primitive and lawless society under the arbitrary rule of an absolute monarch.

We must now consider some passages where the words which were used, on our interpretation, for offices in the Macedonian state were employed with a general meaning. As the position of Perdiccas grew stronger, Diodorus described the increase in his ambitions as follows: ὡς δὲ παρέλαβε τὰς τε βασιλικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τὴν τῶν βασιλέων προστασίαν μετέπεσε τοῖς λογισμοῖς (xviii 23.2), 'Perdiccas changed in his calculations when he took over the royal forces and the protection of the kings'. Here *προστασία* is general, as often (see LSJ s.v. IIc); it is not the office of the *προστάτης*, which Craterus was then holding, in Macedonia.²³ When Antipater took charge of the kings, Appian used the verb *προστατεύω* in a general sense in the sentence Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ μετὰ τὸν Περδίκκων προστατεύοντος τῶν βασιλέων (*Syr.* 52). So too ἐπίτροπος and ἐπιτροπή were used not in the technical sense of 'guardian' and 'guardianship' in the Heidelberg Epitome (*FGrH* 155 F 1.2 and 1.5 ἤρεθῃ ἐπίτροπος καὶ ἐπιμελητῆς τῶν βασιλικῶν πραγμάτων [*sc.* Perdiccas], and διεδέξατο τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν βασιλικῶν πραγμάτων

ὁ Πολυσπέρχων); rather the words ἐπιτροπή and ἐπιμέλεια were practically synonymous in meaning and reinforced one another in the 'Asiatic' style of oratory.

Is there any evidence of these offices being held in Macedonia before the latter part of 323 BC? In 334 Alexander 'entrusted to Antipater the affairs of Macedonia and the Greeks' (*Arr. An.* i 11.3), giving him 'the command' (*Diod.* xvii 17.5, τὴν ἡγεμονίαν) as general of Europe (*Diod.* xviii 12.1, Ἀντίπατρος δ' ἀπολελειμμένος . . . στρατηγὸς τῆς Εὐρώπης). The terms are military. Who then held the office which ranked as the very first in the eyes of the Macedonians, ἡ προστασία τῆς βασιλείας? Of the adult members of the royal house resident in Macedonia in 334 BC there was only one person available, Olympias, widow of Philip II and mother of the absent king, Alexander.²⁴ She was well fitted to carry out the religious duties of the office, since she had been initiated in the rites of the Cabeiri, Orpheus and Dionysus (*Plut. Alex.* 2.2, 7-9). There is clear evidence, which I have cited elsewhere,²⁵ that during Alexander's absence Olympias was the official representative of the Macedonian state in matters of food-supply (*SEG* ix 2), religion (*Hyp. Eux.* 32), dedication of spoils (*Syll.* i³ 252 N 5 ff.) and security (*Diod.* xvii 108.7). She and Antipater acted together (as Craterus and Antipater were to do later).²⁶ It is clear that neither outranked the other (*Arr. An.* vii 12.5-7; *Plut. Alex.* 39.12-13; *Diod.* xvii 118.1; *Just.* xii 14.3). The important role of Olympias in conducting state-sacrifices in Alexander's absence is clear from the remark in a letter to Alexander that a priestly server whom she recommended knew not only the 'Argeadic and Bacchic' rites but also 'all the sacrifices which Olympias offers beforehand' or 'for your sake' (*Athen.* xiv 659f, ὅσα τε Ὀλυμπιάς προθύεται).²⁷ For an office of such eminence we have only one title in the tradition, ἡ προστασία τῆς βασιλείας.

A contemporary analogy to the position of Olympias is afforded by the position in the Molossian state of Cleopatra, daughter of Olympias and widow of the Molossian king, Alexander. In 331-30 BC she received envoys from Athens and then sacred envoys from Argos as the official representative of the Epirote League (*Aeschin.* iii 242 and *BCH* xc [1966] 156),²⁸ and in 330-326 she exported and imported large quantities of cereals on behalf of the state (*Lyc. c. Leocr.* 26, *SEG* ix 2). The position which she held in Molossia was evidently the leading office in civil affairs, which we know from inscriptions was the *prostasia*.

In 324 Alexander made new arrangements. Antipater in Macedonia was to be replaced by Craterus; Olympias in Macedonia was to be replaced by Cleopatra; and Olympias was to hold in Molossia the post vacated by

¹⁸ Otherwise Nearchus as brother-in-law to Heracles would have been more appropriate (*Arr. An.* vii 4.6).

¹⁹ M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and economic history of the Hellenistic World* i (Oxford 1941) 4.

²⁰ M. Cary, *A history of the Greek world from 323 to 146 B.C.*² (London 1951) 3, 11.

²¹ W. W. Tarn, *CAH* vi (1927) 461.

²² R. M. Errington, *JHS* xc (1970) 67. German scholars use the term *Reichsverweser*.

²³ Pace Bengtson (n. 2) 75, who argued that Perdiccas took from Craterus not only the office of *προστάτης* but also the command of the 'Reichsheer' in Asia, and E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* i (Nancy 1966) 31 'Perdiccas . . . prostates des rois'.

²⁴ Alexander took to Asia at least three members of the royal house (Arrhidaeus, Leonnatus and Perdiccas) and probably a fourth, namely Alexander Lyncestes, as I argued *art. cit.* (n. 3) 457 ff.

²⁵ Hammond (n. 3) 461 ff.

²⁶ At *Diod.* xviii 16.5, 18.7, 24.1, 25.4; *Plut. Phoc.* 26.3-4.

²⁷ The second translation is preferred by E. A. Fredricksmeyr, 'The ancestral rites of Alexander the Great', *CPh* lxi (1966) 180, with the comment 'i.e. on his, Alexander's behalf and interest'. This would define one aspect of the function of the *προστάτης* τῆς βασιλείας—an office which Fredricksmeyr did not have in mind.

²⁸ This inscription destroyed the theory of H. Berve and others that Olympias was head of the Molossian state or 'Herrin von Epeiros c. 331-0'; see Hammond (n. 3) 471 ff.

Cleopatra. As Craterus was still in Asia when Alexander died, and as other arrangements were made for Craterus under the *entente*, Antipater continued in office as *stratēgos*. By then Olympias had taken up her office in Molossia (Plut. *Alex.* 68.4),²⁹ and Cleopatra hers in Macedonia—on our interpretation as *prostatēs*. Cleopatra held that office for a year or two. She intrigued first with Leonnatus as a member of the royal house, and then she was displaced by Craterus. In 322 she sought the hand of another member of the royal house, Perdiccas.³⁰

Are there subsequent references to these offices? Antigonos, for instance, was appointed 'general of Asia' (Diod. xviii 40.1), and Polyperchon was appointed 'general', presumably 'of Europe', before and after the death of Antipater (Diod. xviii 38.6, 48.4).³¹ In 321–319 BC Peithon, Arrhidaeus, Antipater, Polyperchon and (in anticipation) Eumenes all became 'managers of the kings', *ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν βασιλέων* (Diod. xviii 36.7, 39.2, 48.4, 57.3). We may infer that Cassander held the same position, because his rival, Antigonos, claimed that office for himself (Diod. xix 61.3). The function and no doubt the name of the office was *ἡ ἐπιμέλεια* (Diod. xviii 39.2, 49.4, 57.2, 65.1; xix 61.3), and the object of management was defined in these passages as *τῶν βασιλέων* (xviii 39.1–2), *τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου υἱοῦ παιδὸς ὄντος* (xviii 49.4; cf. 65.1), and *τῆς βασιλείας* (xix 61.3). Olympias distrusted this sequence of 'managers' (Diod. xviii 58.3). In a treaty between Cassander and Athens, which was summarised by Diodorus at xviii 74.3, Cassander's nominee was to be set up as 'manager of the state' (*ἐπιμελητῆς τῆς πόλεως*); and the nominee, Demetrius of Phalerum, took up 'the management of the state' (*τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς πόλεως*).³² We know of other individuals appointed in this period by Macedon to serve as 'managers' (*ἐπιμεληταὶ*): Pausanias of the citadel of Sardis (Arr. *An.* i 17.7),³³ unnamed persons of Ilion (Strabo 593C), Deinarchus of the Peloponnese (Suda s.v. 'Deinarchos'), Damis 'of Megalopolis' (Diod. xix 64.1) and an unnamed man 'of Sardis' (Diod. xx 37.5). In fact, the evidence for the Macedonian office of *epimelētēs* is stronger than that for the office of *stratēgos* in this period. It is very odd that it has received no attention.

After the abortive appointment of four 'tutores' for Roxane's expected child (Just. xiii 2.13) and the actual appointment of Antipater as guardian of Heracles, son of Alexander and Barsine (Suda s.v. 'Antipatros'), there

is no subsequent mention of 'guardian' and 'guardianship' in our sources. The reason is presumably that the guardianship of Alexander IV was not a matter of contention or of political importance. At first we have suggested that the guardian of the boy was the uncle, Philip Arrhidaeus. The latter was king in his own right. Probably Olympias became official guardian of her grandson, when she disposed of Philip Arrhidaeus; and Thessalonica, wife of Cassander, may have had that position in relation to her first cousin, Alexander IV. But in their cases the positions which mattered were respectively 'the management of the child' (Diod. xviii 65.1, *τοῦ τε παιδίου τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν*), and the marriage to the 'manager'. When Antipater died, who became guardian of Heracles? Presumably Polyperchon, because he succeeded to Antipater's commitments; and this presumption is supported by the ability of Polyperchon to summon Heracles from Pergamum in 309 BC (Diod. xx 20.1).

The office of *prostatēs* became vacant with the departure and death of Craterus in Asia in 321 BC. We do not hear of any immediate replacement. Between 320 and 317 there was no need for a *prostatēs*, because both kings were in Macedonia and Arrhidaeus was able to carry out state sacrifices, as he had done in the lifetime of Alexander (Curt. x 7.2). When Arrhidaeus died, Olympias was in charge of the young king, and we may assume that she conducted sacrifices and acted on his behalf in Macedonia. After her demise Cassander and Thessalonica took control and we may assume that one or other of them acted on behalf of Alexander IV until his death c. 309 BC. Thus the office of *προστάτης τῆς βασιλείας* seems to have lapsed after 321 BC. The prestige which it enjoyed in 323 had been acquired in earlier reigns.

If this conclusion is correct, we can see that when Polyperchon wished Olympias to return to Macedonia from Molossia in 319 his concern was that she should undertake 'the management' of the young king and not the office of *prostatēs*. The situation at the time was rather complicated. When Antipater died, Polyperchon became 'manager of the kings' and 'general', presumably of Europe (Diod. xviii 48.4, *ἐπιμελητὴν τῶν βασιλέων . . . καὶ στρατηγόν*); he consulted his council of advisers, and with their consent invited Olympias, then in Epirus, to 'take over the management of Alexander's son, still a child, and stay in Macedonia, having the royal dignity' (Diod. xviii 49.4, *παρακαλῶν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου υἱοῦ παιδὸς ὄντος παραλαβεῖν καὶ διατρίβειν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ τὴν βασιλικὴν ἔχουσαν προστασίαν*). Diodorus referred later to this invitation in the words 'the intention of the kings and Polyperchon to bring Olympias back to Macedonia, give over to her the management of the child and re-establish for Olympias the honorific reception she had had before during the lifetime of Alexander' (xviii 65.1, *μέλλουσιν οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ Πολυπέρχων κατάγειν εἰς Μακεδονίαν τὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα καὶ τοῦ τε παιδίου τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐκείνη παραδιδόναι καὶ τὴν προϋάρχουσαν ἀποδοχὴν καὶ τιμὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου ζώντος*). The position of substance in each passage was *ἡ ἐπιμέλεια*, 'the management' of Alexander IV. She would be given also the royal honours which she had had as *prostatēs* in Alexander III's lifetime, but not apparently the office itself. It seems that when the office went out of use, the high honours

²⁹ J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch, Alexander: a commentary* (Oxford 1969) 190, saw that Plutarch meant the year 324 BC but disbelieved him. The new inscription (n. 28) shows that Plutarch was correct. Olympias and her daughter Cleopatra acted together not only in opposing Antipater (Plut. *Alex.* 68.4, *πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον Ὀλυμπιάς καὶ Κλεοπάτρα στασιάζουσαι*) but also in approaching Perdiccas (Arr. *Succ.* F 9.21, *Ὀλυμπιάς . . . ἐπέμπε παρ' αὐτὸν κατεγγυωμένη τὴν θυγατέρα Κλεοπάτραν*).

³⁰ See Plut. *Eum.* 3.5 for Leonnatus; Diod. xviii 23.1–3, Just. xiii 6.4 (*non aspernante Olympiade*) and Arr. *Succ.* F 9.21 for Perdiccas.

³¹ So too Cassander was recognized as 'general of Europe' in 311 BC (Diod. xix 105.1).

³² W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London 1911) 47 n. 3, observed that *epimelētēs* here was an official Macedonian term.

³³ In his first book Arrian seems to have used Macedonian terms which he had found in his sources, Ptolemy and Aristoboulus.

associated with it were perpetuated in the use of its title, *προστασία*.³⁴

The last reference to the office as conferring power may be seen in the dying words which Diodorus attributed to Antipater at xix 11.9. 'He advised the Macedonians, as if uttering a prophecy at his last moment, never to allow a woman to take the lead in the kingship' (*καθάπερ χρησιμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς τελευτῆς παρεκελεύσατο μηδέποτε συγχωρῆσαι γυναικὶ τῆς βασιλείας προστατῆσαι*).³⁵ Having just described the atrocities which Olympias did commit when she was in power in Macedonia, Diodorus wanted his readers to see in these words an example of a man's deathbed prophecy being fulfilled in the event (as forecast at xviii 1.1). The words may well be a later invention, a *vaticinium post eventum*. If they are genuine, then Antipater was remembering his own struggle as *stratēgos* with Olympias as *prostatēs* in the absence of Alexander, and he was warning the Macedonians not to let a woman (*viz.* Olympias or Eurydice) obtain that powerful office. Eurydice would also have been in his mind; for by usurping the management of Arrhidaeus as his wife she had caused great trouble to Antipater in 321 (Arr. *Succ.* F 9.31–3) and she was to cause trouble again when she usurped the management of Arrhidaeus³⁶ in Macedonia in 317 at a time when Polyperchon was campaigning in the Peloponnese.

Finally, how were appointments made to these offices? The *entente* itself was made by the Assembly of Macedones in the presence of the dead king (Just. xiii 4.2–4), and the Assembly elected Arrhidaeus king, changed his name, appointed Perdiccas, Meleager, Craterus and Antipater to their respective offices (Dexippus F 8.1, *κρίσει τῶν Μακεδόνων*; Diod. xviii 2.4, where the subject of *κατέστησαν* is to be taken from *αὐτούς* of the preceding sentence; and Just. xiii 4.1–5), and in late summer 323 BC elected and named the newborn son of Roxane as Alexander (Arr. *Succ.* F 1.9, *ἀνείπε τὸ πλῆθος* and Dexippus F 10.6). The debate on the last plans of Alexander was introduced by Perdiccas and decided by the Assembly in June 323 (Diod. xviii 4.3, 6, *τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Μακεδόνων πλῆθος . . . οἱ Μακεδόνες . . . ἔκριναν*). Here the Assembly is indisputably the sovereign body in deciding policy and appointing officers, including the kings.

That the Assembly played a part in appointing satraps in 321 BC is made certain by an inscription, IG ii² 401.7–10: *τοῦ καθ[εστ]ῶτο[ς σατρά]που ὑπὸ βασιλ[έων] καὶ [Ἀντιπά]τρου καὶ τ[ῶν ἄλλων Μ]ακεδόνων*. Here the full procedure involved three parties: the kings, Antipater (as *epimelētēs*) and the Assembly of Macedones. This full procedure is not recorded by our literary sources, which were little concerned with constitutional niceties, but all parts of it appear in one passage or another. Thus the satraps were

³⁴ R. M. Geer (Loeb edition) translated it 'regal dignity'. For its meaning in Polybius see Walbank (n. 15) ii (1967) 93 and iii (1979) 177.

³⁵ Or as Geer translates, 'to hold first place in the kingdom'. The words can also mean 'to be *prostatēs* of the kingship', as the verb had this meaning in the tribal states of Epirus: see Hammond (n. 5) 819. The aorist tense favours the interpretation I have given in the text.

³⁶ Just. xiv 5.2, *abutens valetudine viri, cuius officia sibi vindicabat*. Diodorus did not say how she came to power; he simply introduced her at xix 11.1 as already 'at the head of the kingship' (*τῆς βασιλείας προστατῆσα*). Diodorus uses this word often, especially in the form *προεστώς*.

appointed in June 323 BC by 'Perdiccas as on the orders of the king' (Arr. *Succ.* F 1.5) and they had to obey 'the king and Perdiccas' (Diod. xviii 2.4). The 'satraps and generals' were appointed in 321 by the Assembly (Diod. xix 15.3, where in 317 Eumenes refers back to *τοὺς προκεκριμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους σατράπας καὶ στρατηγούς*).³⁷ The mention here of 'generals' being appointed by the Assembly is paralleled by the Assembly's election of Peithon as 'general' in summer 323 (Diod. xviii 7.3, *τοῦ δὲ πλῆθους ἐλομένου στρατηγὸν Πίθωνα*).³⁸ After the assassination of Perdiccas the Assembly appointed Peithon and Arrhidaeus *τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμελητῆς* (Diod. xviii 36.7), condemned Eumenes and fifty others to death and declared war on them (Diod. xviii 37.2 and Just. xiii 8.10, *ab exercitu . . . decernitur*), and later elected Antipater *ἐπιμελητὴν*. Returning now to the full procedure we may conjecture that the king or in these years the manager of the king or kings made proposals for appointments to the Assembly of the Macedones and that these proposals were accepted or rejected by the Assembly.

Our sources tell us little about later appointments. According to Diod. xviii 48.4 Antipater 'appointed' (*ἀπέδειξεν*) Polyperchon *ἐπιμελητὴν τῶν βασιλέων* and Cassander *χιλάρχον καὶ δευτερεύοντα*; but we hear no more of Cassander holding that position. When Eurydice gained control in Macedonia in 317 BC, she instructed Polyperchon 'in the name of the king to hand over his army to Cassander, into whose hands the king had transferred the administration of the kingdom' (Just. xiv 5.3, *regni administrationem* being equivalent to *τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς βασιλείας*). In both these case we may assume that the Assembly of Macedones in Macedonia had its say:³⁹ confirming Polyperchon, rejecting Cassander and supporting Eurydice. On the other hand Olympias in 319 acted from Epirus without any consultation of the Assembly, when she wrote to Eumenes and invited him to take charge of Alexander IV, i.e. to be *epimelētēs* of the young king (Plut. *Eum.* 13.1). This was perhaps the first instance in which the constitutional right of the sovereign Assembly was by-passed.⁴⁰

N. G. L. HAMMOND

*The University of Adelaide,
South Australia*

³⁷ Seleucus made the point that it was the 'Macedones' who had given him his satrapy (Diod. xix 55.3); he was responsible to them and not to Antigonus.

³⁸ This is the reading of RX. It is superior to the other reading *ἐλόμενος*, with which one has to take *τοῦ πλῆθους* to mean not, as at Diod. xviii 4.3, 'the masses' (*viz.* the Assembly), but 'the whole' (so Geer in the Loeb), and because *τοὺς ἀποκληρωθέντας* at the end of the sentence becomes unnecessary. For another example of a general being elected see Plut. *Eum.* 13.5, 14.1, 14.4.

³⁹ It was dominated at that time by the veteran soldiers of Alexander, who favoured elderly commanders like Polyperchon (*πρεσβύτατον σχεδὸν ὄντα τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ συνηστρατευμένων καὶ τιμώμενον ὑπο τῶν κατὰ τὴν Μακεδονίαν*) rather than men of the younger generation like Cassander.

⁴⁰ The Assembly asserted its rights from the day of Alexander's death. These rights were not novel or invented then but had been traditional, as I have indicated (n. 3) 461 ff. They existed before and after this period. See now for the later period F. Papazoglou, in *Ancient Macedonia* iii (Thessalonike 1983) 195 ff. For the opposite theory, that the Assembly exercised rights *only* for a limited period after Alexander's death, see R. M. Errington, 'The nature of the Macedonian state under the Monarchy', *Chiron* viii (1978) 116. For Alexander's veterans see my article in *GRBS* xxv (1984) 51–61.