Hieronymus of Cardia's lost history of the diadochs was the main source for the literary tradition about the early Hellenistic epoch from Alexander's to Pyrrhus' death, 323–272. The later authors covering this period depend on him to a large extent, directly or indirectly: Arrianus' work Τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον, followed by Dexippus, was wholly based on him. Diodorus used him in his Bibliotheca beginning with bk. XVIII, perhaps through an intermediary source, as did Plutarch in the biographies of Phocion, Eumenes, Demetrius, and Pyrrhus. The Epitome Heidelbergensis and the nucleus of Pompeius Trogus, bk. XIII–XVII, can be traced back to him. Traces are found in Cornelius Nepos' Vita Phocionis and Vita Eumenis, in Appian's Syriaca, in Polyænus, in Curtius Rufus, bk. X, and in Pausanias. By comparing these secondary authorities we may partly identify the original and form some idea of this important work and its author.

Successful investigations have been conducted in this field. Naturally not every question could be answered and many details are still unsolved. In this article I will study one aspect which has often been noticed but never specifically treated, namely the political documents used by Hieronymus.

Because Hieronymus is not associated by the later authors with any single document, I will discuss first the extent to which one is entitled to attribute to him the use of documentary material. In the second part follows a numbered chronological collection of all the passages where Hieronymus seems to have been used and where documentary material (treaties, letters, etc.) appears in any form whatever, whether as a direct or indirect quotation, or as an abridgement or as an isolated reference. In the last two cases it is impossible to say in what manner the documents appeared in Hieronymus.

1. The fragments in Jacoby F Gr Hist 154.
2. F Gr Hist 156 F 1–11.
3. F Gr Hist 100 F 8.
4. Bks. XVIII–XX are complete; of the later books we possess only fragments.
5. Since c. 23, i.e. from 323 B.C.
7. In the epitome of Justinus.
8. A good summary is given by F. Jacoby RE VIII (1913), col. 1540–1560, s.v. Hieronymos. He also cites earlier literature still of value.
9. The idea resulted from a discussion with Prof. Dr. F. Gschnitzer, Heidelberg (Germany), about early Hellenistic treaties. – I regret that the 3rd volume of H. Bengtson, Die Staatsverträge des Altertums, was not yet available.
He too may only have referred briefly to them; but it is also conceivable that he had given the detailed text and the abridgements were made later. But this would not mean that he simply reproduced documents, since instances of copies set out in full, such as King Philip's diagramma to the Greeks in 319 (Diod. XVIII 56), were exceptional. And even in the directly quoted pieces he confined himself to those items which were relevant to the immediate context.

I have omitted all those passages which record only the fact of a documentary procedure without further specification, such as συμμαχίαν ἐποιήσατο or πρέσβεις ἔξεχαμεν. Here, likewise, two possibilities exist: either Hieronymus did not have the detailed knowledge—although each alliance was no doubt put into writing and although each embassy handed over a written note—or the abridgement was made afterwards. I therefore realise that there will be many gaps in the second part of my study. However, it is not intended to be a complete historical catalogue.

The deadline of the collection is the year 302. There the continuous narration of Diodorus breaks off and with it the practical possibility of combining and proving a parallel literary tradition. Doubtless a great number of the treaties and letters found for the ensuing period in the Vita Demetrii and Vita Pyrrhi of Plutarch also go back to Hieronymus.

In the remarks made on the individual items I have attempted to offer as complete a description as possible of the contents of the original documents, their character and their position in the historical context and, where necessary for this purpose, I have cited the text of the secondary authorities. In addition, to the extent that it has not been covered in the general survey, the probable manner in which Hieronymus acquired his knowledge of particular documents is considered. Finally my remarks do, in part, serve to show the significance of the documents in the specific context of his work. Since the discussion of problems will be confined to the stated limits many important historical questions will admittedly be excluded.

The comments which follow show in a general way that Hieronymus has in fact made a fair use of documents. In the sections where it is agreed that the later authors are based on him, we find many traces of such material, in contrast to those sections for which they follow other sources. For instance in his Sicilian history, bks. XIX and XX, Diodorus goes back to Duris of Samos and not to Hieronymus. In this part of his work I noticed only two passages which contain recognizable traces of documents, in contrast to the great number in the Hieronymian parts of bks. XVIII-XX. A significant example is Alexander's refugee-letter and the origins of the Lamian War. This is dealt with twice by Diodorus (XVII 109,1; 111 and XVIII 8-11) because it also occurred in the source he used for Alexander's last period.

10. Cf. p. 53 and p. 64.
11. XX 69,3; XX 77,3.
But only the second report is corroborated by documentary evidence; and here the refugee-letter is actually quoted verbatim by Diodorus, just as it had appeared in Hieronymus.

A similar difference appears in Plutarch's *Vita Phocionis*. As far as ch. 22, i.e. 323, there is scarcely any mention of a psephisma and, in this respect, it can compare with the biography of Demosthenes which covers almost the same period. But after Alexander's death the number of treaties and psephismata, sometimes dealt with explicitly, increases together with an improvement in the quality of the historical content. As far as documentary material is concerned the later part of the vita resembles the *Vita Demetrii* and to a less extent the *Vita Pyrrhi*.

In fact, owing to the mixture of sources, not all documents tracable in our secondary sources come from Hieronymus as we shall see; sometimes they were taken over from other authors. This happens seldom in Diodorus, who makes only small additions to his main source, but it occurs more frequently in Plutarch. This does not, however, detract from the fact that Hieronymus did make considerable use of documents, a fact which is finally proved by Arrian who goes back directly and exclusively to Hieronymus. Even in the scanty excerpts we possess of his history of the diadochs many such traces can be seen.

If one looks at the distribution of documentary material several concentrations can be discerned: there is a first group which comprises the reorganisation of Alexander's empire in Babylon in 323, together with the consequent activity of Perdiccas and his troubles with the other diadochs. A second group concerns Eumenes, his struggles in Asia, the changes in his position and, connected with this, the politics of the regent Polyperchon and the queen mother Olympias. In the period from Eumenes' death till the battle of Ipsus, 316–301, most of the documents are concerned with Antigonus and his son Demetrius Poliorcetes. An obvious inference is that Hieronymus' use of documentary material corresponds in the same way to his activities as does the composition of his work. The following survey will illustrate this.

We cannot determine the point at which Hieronymus went into the service of Eumenes; Jacoby supposed that he was already staying with him during Alexander's lifetime. This means that he would have been in Babylon in 323, where Eumenes took an active part in settling the quarrels and reaching a compromise between the rival groups. He could therefore easily have obtained an insight into these negotiations and their outcome as laid down in the records which form part of the first group mentioned above.

---

12. T. S. Brown is the most recent to have treated Hieronymus' biography and shown how his life and work were related ('Hieronymus of Cardia', *The Am. Hist. Review* 52, 1946/7, p. 684–696).
The same is true for the following two groups covering the period up to Ipsus. Both when he accompanied Eumenes in Asia and later when he was in the service of Antigonus and Demetrius, he always had access to primary sources. Finally, during his last years at the court of Antigonus Gonatas he also used the Macedonian archives.

As to the other diadochs, documents almost always appear which were concerned with the Antigonids, and the contents of which Hieronymus had the opportunity of learning. The same is true for some of the Athenian psephismata and treaties which make up another group of documents. In regard to a number of other Athenian documents there can be little doubt that Hieronymus himself visited Athens, possibly for the first time in 307 in the suite of Demetrius whose arrival and sojourn is described so vividly in Diodorus, that we are led to believe that his source was an eye-witness. There were also other occasions, during 304/3 and 291/90, on which Demetrius visited Athens. During the latter period Hieronymus was himself made harmost and epimeletes of the neighbouring Boeotian cities.

Antigonus Gonatas also had close connections with Athens, both political and intellectual. For him and the circle he gathered around him this city was still the centre of the world of thought and letters. Hieronymus who belonged to this circle was influenced by its attitude. Yet he did not write Greek history, except as a facet of the history of the diadochs. But he did not underrate the significance which Greece and especially Athens had for the diadochs. This is reflected in Arrian, Diodorus, and Plutarch and, apart from many points of agreement in historical details, justifies the inference that Hieronymus was also a common source for Athenian history. Since

15. For his use of royal diaries see R. Schubert, *Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit*, Leipzig 1914, p. 28-35.
16. This supposition has already been made by J. G. Droysen, *Hermes* 11, 1876. We hear about the Macedonian archives at the condemnation of Demades (Diod. XVIII 48,2; cf. p. 63).
20. The Diyllus-hypothesis advocated especially by Schubert (cf. his index p. 286) is now disproved (cf. Jacoby, *FGr Hist* 73 II C, p. 112). In the small excerpt of Arrhidaeus to the Greek cities (Diod. XVIII 8,4; 56). This means that Hieronymus has strongly stressed them. As to the diagramma, he seems even to have inserted the copy destined for the Athenians, for it contains a special provision that Athens should give up Oropus and regain Samus (56, 6/7). Unlike the naming of those inhabitants who were prohibited from returning to their homelands (56,5), these territorial regulations were of no common – Greek interest. A hint of the Hieronymian origin of the history of the Lamian War in Diod. XVIII 8 sqq. is ἰδιόπραγμα 9,2 and κοινόπραγμα 9,5. Diodorus uses ἰδιόπραγμα ἰδιόπραγμα several times in bk. XVIII (cf. J. Palm, *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*, Lund 1955, p. 109) and κοινόπραγμα κοινόπραγμα, with a few exceptions, only in bks. XVIII–XX. As they appear always in a context
for Plutarch he was one source among several others, all passages for which there are no parallels in Diodorus and Arrian must be studied individually. Athens, too, was a place where Hieronymus could procure documentary material directly and he certainly availed himself of every occasion offered. For though he wrote history near the end of his life he did not start collecting material in his old age. 21 By that time he was gathering in the harvest of a life-long preparation.

II

(1) The Royal Succession (323)

The new order of the empire after Alexander’s death came about in Babylon through a compromise which was made after violent rivalries between the Macedonian nobles and the phalanx. It included the regulation of the royal succession and, as a result of further negotiations, the institution of the heads of government. After the private agreements in the council of the nobles and the tumultuous proclamation of Arrhidaeus as king by the phalanx, the settlement concerning the monarchy was the first definite procedure with legal validity whose outcome was officially announced:

Arr. F 1,1... τὴν ἀνάρρησιν Ἀρριδαίου... ἐφ’ ὦ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, ὅν ἐμελέλεις εἶς Ἀλεξάνδρου τίκτειν Ἡρώανη, συμβασιλεύειν αὐτῷ... τὸν Ἀρριδαίον δὲ ἀνείπόντες μετανόμασαν Φίλιππον.

Dex. F 8,1... εἰς τὸν ἄδελφον Ἀλεξάνδρου τὸν Ἀρριδαίον... ἢ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἀρχή περιέστη, εἰς αὐτὸν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα Ἀλεξάνδρου παιδα τίκτεσθαι ἐκ Ἡρώανης.

Diod. XVIII 2,4 εὖ θεό δὲ (after having reached unity) βασιλέα κατέστησαν τὸν Φιλίππον ὑόν Ἀρριδαίον καὶ μετανόμασαν Φιλίππον.

Just. XIII 4,2/3 Tum equites in concordiam revocati in Arridaeum regem consentiunt. Servata est portio regni Alexandri filio, si natus esset.

App. Syr. 52,261... εἴλοντο (sc. οἱ Μακεδόνες) σφῶν βασιλεύειν Ἀρριδαίον, τὸν ἄδελφον Ἀλεξάνδρου... μετανομασάντες δὴ Φιλίππον ἀντὶ Ἀρριδαίου.

Epit. Heid. F 1,1... ἐτάξιθε βασιλεύειν ὁ δομοπάτριος ἄδελφος Ἀλεξάνδρος ὁ Ἀρριδαῖος, δὲ καὶ Φιλίππος ὑπερεῖρον ὄνομαθείς, μέχρις ὅτι φθάσῃ εἰς ἀνήκεσαν ἥλικιάν ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρος παῖς.

Paus. I 25,3... Μακεδόνες μὲν βασιλεύειν εἴλοντο Αρριδαίον....

In constituting itself as a military assembly and proclaiming Arrhidaeus, the phalanx exercised its traditional prerogative. 22 In the finally documented originating without doubt from Hieronymus, we may say that these words are typically his (cf. p. 53/4 and n. 52). And finally, Diodorus’ tradition about the Lamian War is in no way anti-Macedonian as is shown at the end of the war (cf. p. 59 and n. 64).

22. Cf. ἀνάρρησιν and ἀνείπόντες in Arr. F 1,1.
the legality was probably expressed by the appearance of the nobles together with the phalanx as of Μακεδόνες representing the whole Macedonian people. The documentary evidence is best shown by Arrian and the Epitome Heidelbergensis. The discrepancies in the tradition concerning the άνάρρησις admit of the following reconstruction. It consisted of two parts, each subdivided:

a) 1. Arrhidaeus shall be king;
   2. he shall have the dynastic name Philip;

b) 3. should Roxane bear a son, he shall share the kingship;
   4. he shall have the right of succession.

(2) The Institution of the Government (323)

Arr. F 1,3 ... συμβαίνουσιν οί τε τῶν βασιλέα ἀνειπόντες πεζοί καὶ οἱ τῶν ἰππέων ἱγμόνες, ὥστε ὁ Ἀντίπατρος μὲν στρατηγὸν εἶναι τῶν κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην, Κρατερὸν δὲ προστάτην τῆς Άρριδαίου βασιλείας. Περ­
dίκκας δὲ χιλιαρχέως χιλιαρχίας ... Μελέαγρον δὲ ὑπαρχὸς Περδίκκου.

Dex. F 8,3/4 Ἀντίπατρος δὲ ἔπι πᾶσι Μακεδόνι καὶ Ἑλλησὶ καὶ Ἰλ­
lυρίοις καὶ Τίριβαλλόταις καὶ Ἄγριοι καὶ ὁσα τῆς Ἡπείρου ἔξετε Ἀλεξάν­
dρου στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ ἐπέτακτο. τὴν δὲ κηδεμονίαν καὶ δὴν προστασία τῆς βασιλείας Κρατερὸς ἐπετράπη ... Περδίκκας δὲ τὴν Ἡφαιστίωνος χιλιαρχίαν.

Diod. XVIII 2,4 ... ἐστὶ μετῆν δὲ τῆς βασιλείας Περδίκκας (κατέστη­
sαν οἱ Μακεδόνες).

Just. XIII 4,5 Macedonicae et Graeciae Antipater praeponitur, regiae pecuniae custodia Cratero traditur, castrorum et exercitus et rerum cura Meleagro et Perdicce adsignatur.

Curt. X 10,4 ... Perdicca ut cum rege esset copiisque praesset, quae regem sequabantur.

Arrian shows clearly that the top posts of the administration were regulated by another common resolution,24 and the wording in Justinus fits this; Diodorus mixes it up with the άνάρρησις. Once again Arrian has best preserved the documentary form. The preamble may have run: ἔδοξε τοῖς Μακεδόνις. While the election of the king was the prerogative of the Macedonian army, this dogma was revolutionary and may be accounted for only in the light of the special circumstances. Its instrument was tripartite enumerating the positions of Antipater, Craterus, and Perdiccas; the order of the names is confirmed by Arrian, Dexippus and Justinus. Each appeared with his new title by which his function in the administration of the empire was expressed: Antipater as strategos of Europe, Craterus as prostates, and Perdiccas as chiliarch; to the latter, Meleagrus was adjoined as hyparch. In the scheme itself Arrian and Justinus agree most closely; Diodorus mentions only Perdiccas, and Antipater appears at the distribution of the satrapies

24. εἶτα διαπρεπεῖσθαι πρὸς ἄλληλοις πολλάκις, καὶ τέλος συμβάνουσιν ...
Arrian mentions Craterus and Antipater a second time in connection with the distribution (F 1,7); and Dexippus names them exclusively there (cf. the next section).

Prostasia and chiliarchia coincided but vaguely with the offices formerly expressed by these terms. Actually they became new magistracies embracing different functions. The jurisdiction of their holders was not defined in the dogma itself but in one of King Philip's subsequent diagrammata. This was how the mixed distribution came about in the secondary authorities.

(3–6) The Royal Diagrammata of the Reorganization of the Empire (323)

The so-called list of satrapies in Arr. F 1,5–8, Dex. F 8,2–7, Diod. XVIII 3,1–3, Just. XIII 4,10–24, and Curt. X 10,1–4 apart from some small errors and gaps is uniform and admittedly stems from Hieronymus. Yet, the original was not a mere geographical list as is usually assumed, nor was there one procedure by which the whole administration of the empire was regulated. Arrian says F 1,5... εἰς σατραπείας ἀνείπειν ὁς ὑπότευκεν, ὡς Ἀρριδαῖον κελέδοντος, ἔγγον (sc. Περδίκκας); App. Syr. 52,262... Περδίκκου διανέμοντος... ὑπὸ τῷ βασιλεί Φιλίππω (sc. τὰς σατραπείας).

Both sources refer to a royal edict, a diagramma. The king announced the new satraps and their satrapies, and charged Perdiccas with the execution of the announcement, in this way officially sanctioning the former resolution by which he was made chiliarch. But this diagramma had validity only for the eastern territories as the Asiatic chiliarchia had no jurisdiction over the European parts of the empire. It is shown also by the sources: Arrian (F 1,6/7), Dexippus (F 8,3), and Diodorus (3,2) have distinctly separated the organization of Europe which follows; Diodorus even switches to the passive voice after having named Perdiccas responsible for distributing the Asiatic satrapies. There was a second diagramma which had a similar double purpose: it gave the king's authorization to Antipater and Craterus for their

25. They constitute one of the most complicated and widely treated problems of early Hellenistic history. I shall discuss them in a special article on p. 95–110: Die Reichsordnung von Babylon.


27. For diagramma in the Macedonian and Hellenistic chancellery, C. B. Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period, New Haven 1934, p. 324; E. Bikerman, ΔΙΑΓΡΑΜΜΑ, Rev. de Phil. 3.ser. 11, 1938, p. 295–312.

28. Similarly in Alexander's refugee-letter (Diod. XVIII 8,4) and in Philip's diagramma about Greek freedom (Diod. XVIII 56,7) Antipater and Polyperchon are named resp. as executing magistrates.
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new positions and at the same time regulated the administration of Europe including Thrace which was given to Lysimachus.

Hieronymus now went on with the appointment of Seleucus as hipparchus and of Cassander as leader of the hypaspistai[31], and with the order to the satrap Arrhidaeus to transfer Alexander’s corpse to the temple of Ammon.[32] As regards their subject these dispositions belonged neither to the first nor to the second edict. We must assume a third diagramma by which special tasks and posts were distributed after the settlement both of the heads of the government and of the provincial administration. Perhaps it comprised still more items regarding the military and civil administration; there certainly was a need for a number of instructions.

The following passage also should be regarded as a diagramma concerned with those satrapies in the East whose satraps remained the same as under Alexander, and where only particular instructions were required. Dexippus (F 8,5/6) alone gives a simple enumeration.[33] The character of the decree however can still be seen in Justinus (XIII, 4,19–23) and in Diodorus (3,2/3) who also names Perdiccas as executor.

Final proof that there really were different diagrammata is offered by the sequence of the four passages in Hieronymus.[34] Arrian, Dexippus and Justinus kept it, whereas Diodorus altered it and put all territorial dispositions together (3,1–3). In 3,5 after the mention of Seleucus (3,4) the manuscript-tradition says that Taxiles and Poros remained kings, as Alexander had ordered. But Taxiles has already been mentioned in 3,3. Therefore Kallenberg believed[35] there was a mistake in the tradition and placed the second passage before 3,3, and the editors (Fischer in the Teubner-, Geer in the Loeb-edition) followed him. But the mistake was made by Diodorus who changed the original sequence and quite naturally joined the unaltered Asiatic satrapies to the others. When, after the third diagramma (3,4), he returned to this passage in his source he unwittingly repeated it.

Diodorus tried to get a more convenient order. For if there had been one diagramma the sequence of the items would be difficult to understand since an edict of such importance would surely have been carefully revised. (That the sequence comes from Hieronymus himself is still less credible). If revised, one would have expected the following order: heads of the government; central civil and military administration (Seleucus, Cassander, etc.); altered

31. Just. XIII 4,17–18, and Diod. 3,4, who, however, omits Cassander.
32. Diod. 3,5. Just. XIII 4,6 has inserted the order into the compromise. The wrong position is due to his confusing the king and the satrap Arrhidaeus. Besides he would have wanted to avoid the double reference to Antipater and Craterus. He therefore omitted them the second time and mixed the diagramma and the dogma, preserving in this way the regiae pecuniae custodia of Craterus which dropped out of the other sources.
33. The excerpt of Arrian has only a general hint (F I,8).
34. Cf. also the regulations of Triparadeisus (20–22), p. 61/2.
satrapies; unaltered satrapies. Possibly the sequence in Hieronymus reflected the chronology of the publication of the individual diagrammata which were usually published in the capital⁸⁶ and copies were not only sent to the people concerned but were also deposited in the archives.

(7) The Dogma concerning Alexander’s orders to Craterus (323)

Diod. XVIII 4,1... (Κρατέρος) ἕλπιδος ἐντολάς ἢν ἐγγράπτους, ἢς ἔδωκε μὲν δ' ἑπισκόπος αὐτῷ συντελέσαι, μεταλλάξαντος δ' Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῖς διοδόχοις ἔδοξε μή συντελεῖν τὰ βεβουλευμένα. Diodorus alone mentions this. One cannot decide on the strength of ἔδοξε alone whether there was an official dogma or only an internal administrative act. Diodorus proceeds: ὁ γὰρ Περδίκκας παραλαβὼν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τοῦ βασιλέως τὴν τε συντέλειαν τῆς Ἑραστίωνος πυρᾶ... Perdiccas saw that the completion of the pyre and other commands in the hypomnemata were too expensive to be carried out. But he did not dare to cancel them on his own authority and therefore made a submission to the army which annulled them on the ground of their impracticability (4,2–6).

The authenticity of the hypomnemata is among the most controversial problems concerning Alexander.⁹⁷ The scholars who reject it, deny in advance that 4,2–6 comes from Hieronymus and believe that passage to be of a more recent date. But their arguments are based exclusively on objections to its content.⁹⁸ Considerations of style are almost wholly neglected by them.⁹⁹ But these considerations are particularly pertinent and require some comment.

Diodorus’ narrative up to this point in bk. XVIII is a rapid succession of events arranged in a swift-moving sequence with many puzzling abbreviations of his source. Even in ch. 3, where he is more detailed, he confines himself to the bare facts. In contrast to this the train of thought in 4,2–6 is clumsy and involved: he mentions the completion of Hephaestion’s pyre as

39. Only Tarn (Alexander, vol. II, p. 381) characterizes the whole chapter generally as patchwork and refers to other interpolations in Diod. XVIII. But his only stylistic counter-evidence (p. 379) is the linking-up with γὰρ (4,2) which expresses a formal identity of the ἐντολάς to Craterus and to the hypomnemata which are wholly different. H. Endres (RhM 72, 1917/18, p. 437–45) had contested this (cf. below).
the first of the orders found by Perdiccas in the hypomnemata. In addition to this he refers in general to τὰς τε λοιπὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπιβολὰς πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας οὕτως, and reaffirms: καὶ δαπάνας ἀνυπερβλήτως ἐχούσας. Then follows the submission to the army (4,3); but he does not report its decision immediately, for in a digression he goes back to the ἐπιβολαῖ which he proceeds to specify: ἣν δὲ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων τὰ μέγιστα καὶ μνήμης ἔξια τάδε.

In the subsequent enumeration he makes two further digressions using, in peculiar fashion, the same technique of referring back. He selects five memorabilia:

a) construction of a fleet to conquer the western hemisphere;
b) construction of roads as far as the pillars of Hercules;
c) construction of six temples. Then comes another digression in which he jumps back to a/b, and it is even explicitly specified by ἀκολούθως δὲ τῷ τηλικοῦτῳ στόλῳ: harbours and dock-yards were to be constructed at suitable places;
d) European-Asiatic synoikismoi. And then, overlapping this intervening point, he refers back in his final third digression to c (τοὺς δὲ προειρημένους ναοὺς . . .), naming the places where the six temples should be constructed. The last is the Athena-temple on Cyprus and Diodorus remarks, in what we may call an associative addendum, that in Ilium too a temple of Athena should be built (4,5);
e) construction of a pyramid-tomb for Alexander’s father, Philip.

Diodorus thereupon resumes the main thread, the submission of the hypomnemata to the army and their rejection (4,6). Fischer in the Teubner edition and, following him, Geer in the Loeb, try to readjust the manuscript tradition by transposing c and the second digression. Consequently they should also have altered the position of the last digression but they probably hesitated on account of its being thrice as long. The fault, as in 3,4 (cf. p. 48), lies not in the tradition but in Diodorus himself. In short, 4,2–6 was badly composed by him. But what explanation can be found for this in a subject which could hardly have offered difficulty? Tarn seems to believe that in 4,2–6 Diodorus mixed up several sentences of Hieronymus with those from another source. But even a stupid compiler would surely have inserted an additional note at the right spot in the main source. The style of 4,2–6 suggests a modification of Tarn’s view.

As far as we can judge, Hieronymus’ style in the narrative parts was rather prosaic,40 and up to 4,1 the same is true of Diodorus. On the other hand in 4,2–6 the magnitude of the projects is stressed in a pathetic manner which contrasts with their actual significance in the historical context dealt with by Diodorus. Although he always adorns the source material with his

individual style the character of the source may sometimes be discerned. Now in 4,2–6 we have a style which is very similar to that of a certain branch of the literary tradition about Alexander classified as vulgata. Hieronymus' writing did not in any way resemble it. Therefore this is no patchwork of sources, and Hieronymus does not feature in it at all. Perhaps the contents of the hypomnemata formed the conclusion of a work of the vulgate tradition; and it may be closely related to the tradition about Alexander's fictitious testament which is mentioned as a fact by Diodorus XX 81,3, and which did not originate with Hieronymus either. To adapt the widely and rhetorically amplified theme was more difficult than simply to incorporate some notices into the main source. Accustomed to the clear diction of Hieronymus Diodorus muffed this effort.

Besides the style, there is a further argument against Hieronymus' authorship: Arrian reports at the beginning of Anab. VII I on Alexander's plans to conquer the western and northern hemisphere referring to his sources generally 1,2 by οἱ δὲ καὶ τάδε ἄνεγραφαν, and 1,3 by οἱ μὲν λέγουσιν . . . οἱ δὲ. I,4 he gives his own opinion: 'I cannot make conjectures about Alexander's intentions nor do I care to guess. In this, however, I for my own part feel assured that he had no small or mean conceptions ...'. The Anabasis is later than the History of the Diadochs. If Arrian had read the documentary hypomnemata in Hieronymus, he could never have passed judgment on Alexander's plans in this way. Moreover, the inability to find any trace of the Diodorean passage, either in the excerpts of the History of the Diadochs or in Justinus and Curtius although it had such an impressive representation in the original, does not speak in favour of Hieronymus as an intermediate source. This lends strong support to the historically-grounded arguments against the genuineness of the hypomnemata which alone can give the final decision; but that is not relevant here.


43. At the beginning of his work Polybius makes a tacit correction of the tradition about Alexander's plans by showing the Imperium Romanum to be a world empire in comparison with the smaller empire of the Macedonians—he does not name Alexander. I 2,6 he says: Σικελίας μὲν γῆ καὶ Σαρδόνες καὶ Λιβύης οὐδ' ἐπεβάλλοντο καθάπαξ ἐμφασίζοντες . . . . Following A. Mauersberger (Polybios - Lexikon, Berlin 1956 sqq. col. 911) ἐπεβάλλοντο in Polybius can mean: to intend, to plan, to have in mind, i.e. a mere mental act, but also concretely: to attempt, to undertake, which Mauersberger claims for I 2,6. Yet, even with the concrete meaning, the idea of planning cannot be excluded and in consequence of the negation and the emphatic καθάπαξ the first meaning seems to me to be dominant: there was not even a suspicion of ambition in the West. — Also the authenticity of Alexander's so-called ephemerides was recently refuted by A. E. Samuel,
Diodorus uses γάρ to connect the hypomnemata with the decision to cancel Alexander’s ἔντολαι ἐγγραπτοί to Craterus. The causative particle is strange and its explanation gave rise to the discussion whether the commands and the hypomnemata were identical. But even if the identity is admitted, the construction remains strained. γάρ only becomes understandable, although not well-positioned, if we look in general to the prevailing thought which induced Diodorus to put 4.1 and 4.2–6 together. It is not the identity of the subjects but of what, as he believed, had happened to them both. The diadochs resolved to cancel the orders to Craterus, but they, and especially Perdiccas, the leading man in Babylon, did not presume to do so on their own account. Perdiccas therefore requested a dogma from the army. This Diodorus found in Hieronymus who knew the dogma, and seeing a corresponding passage in another author he combined them. But he encountered stylistic difficulties not only in the new text but also in the transition to a new style, and so forgot to detail the annulment of the ἔντολαι as well as their contents. The contents were also recorded by Hieronymus as is shown in 12,1, where Diodorus corrects the earlier omission in a parenthesis: οὗτοι Μακεδόνιαι τοῖς ἀπολελυμένοις τῆς στρατείας Μακεδόνας, δόντας ὑπὲρ τοὺς μυρίους.44

(8) Perdiccas’ Orders to Antigonus and Leonnatus (323)

In distributing the satrapies Perdiccas had acted in the king’s name. But as far as the further supervision of the Asiatic territory was concerned he took decisions by virtue of his own authority as chiliarch as we see from (8) and (9). Eumenes was allotted the satrapy of Cappadocia, but it was held by Ariarathes. Therefore Perdiccas ordered the neighbouring satraps, Antigonus and Leonnatus, by letter,45 χειρὶ μεγάλῃ τὸν Εὐμενῆ καταγγέλτας ἁποδείξαι τῆς χώρας στρατόπεδην (Plut. Eum. 3,4).46

(9) Perdiccas’ Orders to the Satraps for Military Support (323)

Perdiccas sent Peithon against the Greek mercenaries in the upper satrapies, who had revolted after Alexander’s death. He gave him written requests for support to the other satraps, ἐπιστολὰς, ἐν αἷς γεγραμμένον ἣν στρατιώτας δοθῆ τῷ Πιθανῷ μυρίους μὲν πεζούς, ἵππεις δὲ ὀκτακυστίλιους (Diod. XVIII 7,3). It is clear from the detailed figures that Hieronymus either read a copy of this letter or learnt its contents from Eumenes, who lived in Babylon until his satrapy was reconquered by Perdiccas and who

co-operated with him. Therefore the other figures in this passage are also given exactly.

(10) Alexander’s Letter to the Greek Refugees (324/23)

The mercenaries’ riot belonged in Hieronymus together with the commotion on Rhodes and the Lamian War to a section about the staseis after Alexander’s death. The Lamian War, being the most serious, occupied the largest part. Its cause was Alexander’s order that all political refugees in Greece should be restored. This was announced in a letter at the Olympic games in 324/23 and is the first document which we can say with certainty was cited by Hieronymus verbatim:

Diod. XVIII 8.4 Ασσηλεύως Ἀλέξανδρος τοις ἐκ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων φυγάσα, τοῦ μὲν φεύγειν ὡμᾶς οὐχ ἡμεῖς αἰτιοι γεγόναμεν, τοῦ δὲ κατελθεῖν εἰς τὰς ἱδίας πατρίδας ἡμεῖς ἐσόμεθα πλὴν τῶν ἑαυτῶν. γεγράφαμεν δὲ Αντιπάτρῳ περὶ τούτων, ὅπως τὰς μὴ βουλομένας τῶν πόλεων κατάγειν ἀναγκάσῃ. Just. XIII 5.2 causae belli erant, quod reversus ab India Alexander epistulas in Graeciam miserat, quibus omnium civitatum exules, praeter caedis damnati, restituebantur. Curt. X 2.4 . . . (Alexander) exules praeter eos, qui civei sanguine aspersi erant, recipi ab omnibus Graecorum civitibus, quis pulsi erant, iussit.

The congruence in all three authors concerning the text and the relevance to the Lamian War in Diodorus and Justinus prove the Hieronymian origin. The Diodorean narration gives an insight into Hieronymus’ ability to analyse critically a historical process, to sketch its development, and to confirm the result by documentary evidence: τοῦτο δὲ (τὸ πολέμου) τὰς 

47. Diod. XVIII 8.1.
48. Arr. F 1.9 στάσεων δὲ μετὰ τῶν Ἀλέξανδρου θάνατον πάντα ἐπιληφθοῦν.
49. About the other tradition cf. p. 42.
examples of his predecessors were of primary importance and he referred to their diagrammata (56,3). Hieronymus has deliberately shown this relation. He elaborated the main lines of the dynasts' politics towards Greece, and as an essential means to this end, he also used documentary material at later stages. To this Greek thread which runs through the whole work\textsuperscript{51} the historical analysis at its beginning constitutes, so to speak, a prooemium.\textsuperscript{83}

Hieronymus quoted only the two most important sentences from the beginning and the end of Alexander's letter. In between them there were other special dispositions.\textsuperscript{53} He also did not cite his legal diagramma, first published in Susa\textsuperscript{54} and subsequently sent to Antipater,\textsuperscript{55} nor any of the special edicts for the individual leagues\textsuperscript{56} and cities.\textsuperscript{57} He knew them, but apart from the general letter regarded them as less relevant.

The letters of Philip II, Alexander, and Philip Arrhidaeus also belong together in so far as they combine political measures with propaganda. The propaganda formula is always the same: all the kings disclaim responsibility for incidents as a result of which they are now taking action on behalf of the addressees.\textsuperscript{58}

(11) Athenian Psephisma concerning Entry into War (323)

\textsuperscript{51} Cf. p. 44. In Plut. \textit{Vita Demetrii} and \textit{Vita Pyrhi} we can trace it till the end.

\textsuperscript{52} Seeing this connection, this is a further proof of Hieronymus' authorship of the passages in Diodorus about the Lamian War or Phocion.

\textsuperscript{53} Plut. \textit{Apophth. Lac.} p. 221 A9 'Αλεξάνδρου δὲ κηρύξαντος ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ κατέναν τοὺς φυγάδας ἀπαντάς εἰς τὴν ἵδιαν πλήν Θηβάν (cf. Diod. XIX 61,2/3).

\textsuperscript{54} Bikerman, \textit{Diagramma}, p. 299.

\textsuperscript{55} Cf. the last sentence of the letter in Diodorus.

\textsuperscript{56} Hyperides, \textit{or.} V, col. XVIII, (Coll. Budé, ed. G. Colin, Paris 1946, p. 255) speaks about τῆς ἀφίξεως τῆς Νικάνωρος καὶ τῶν ἐπιταγμάτων ἀν ἠκέφωρον παρ' Ἀλεξάνδρου περὶ τῶν φυγάδων καὶ περὶ τοῦ τούτου κοινοῦς συνάλλογους Ἀχαϊῶν καὶ Ἀρκάδων καὶ τοιοῦτον... Against his own former view Colin thinks (p. 224–27; 255) that Nicanor brought only one edict to Olympia. But the plural ἐπιταγμάτων (in spite of Colin p. 226 n. 1), together with the reiteration of the preposition περί, leave little doubt that there were different letters. Either in Diodorus or more likely in Hieronymus we have an abridgement.

\textsuperscript{57} For these we have epigraphical evidence: \textit{SIG} 306; \textit{OGIS} 2; cf. E. Balogh, \textit{Political Refugees in Ancient Greece}, Johannesburg 1943, p. 67–82, with references to former literature in the notes, p. 121–129.

\textsuperscript{58} Philip II attributes the length of his letter (Ps. Dem. XII 1) to his need to defend himself against many accusations; cf. Diod. 56,3.—When Antipater, the strategos of Europe, saw the Greek preparations for war, he wrote to Craterus in Cilicia to help him. Hieronymus could here only report the fact (Diod. XVIII 12,1). He was better acquainted with Leonnatus whom Antipater also asked for support, sending him Hecateus, the tyrant of his native town, Cardia, as a messenger (Plut. \textit{Eum.} 3,6) and promising him one of his daughters (Diod. \textit{loc. cit.}, but here he confuses Leonnatus with Philotas). Leonnatus was about to install Eumenes in his satrapy but desisted at once and tried to persuade him to come along to Greece. He showed him several letters of Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great, μεταπεμφομένης αὐτὸν εἰς Πέλλαν ὡς γαμησομένης (Plut. 3,9).
Hieronymus gave a rather complete text of the psephisma (Diod. XVIII 10,2/3). It consisted of two parts, the first dealt with the Athenian military preparations, the second with the diplomatic preparations in other Greek states. The dominant thought appeared in the introductory sentence, the κοινὴ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔλευθερία, which the Athenian demos should take pains to guard. The 'common Greek' idea is once again emphatically assumed in the second part.

With the psephisma Hieronymus concluded the debate between κτηματικοῖ and δημοκράτεις about the entry into the war (Diod. 10,1). Then he added a critical evaluation, from the point of view of the later historian, by citing the meaning of the συνέσεις διαφέροντες over against the masses. On the one hand there was φρόνησις, on the other hand idle ambition, which had learnt nothing from history (10,4). In this way he sarcastically unmasked the discrepancy between the confession of the common Greek ideal, documented in the psephisma, and the real motive of the Athenian demos. In the whole passage the Thucydidean influence is once more discernible.

(12) The Hellenic League (323/22)

Diod. XVIII 11,1 and Paus. I 25,4 give a detailed list of the participants in the symmachy against Macedonia, which has for a long time been supposed to go back to an official record. Neither author makes a simple enumeration but each forms single groups. Diodorus has eight groups which he links up with one another, giving them in that way a special order:

1. Αἰτωλοί μὲν οὖν ἄπαντες πρός τοῦ τήν συμμαχίαν.
2. The second group is introduced by μετὰ δὲ τούτων. It consists of the Thessalians (πλῆν Πελινναίων), the Oetaeans (πλῆν Ἡρακλεωτῶν), the Phthiotian Achaeans (πλῆν Ὀηβαίων), the Melians (πλῆν Λαμιέων).
3. ἐξής δὲ: all the Dorians, the Locrians and the Phocians.

59. The only other mention is in Dex. F 36.
60. The words in Diod. 10,3 that one must enlighten the other Greek cities that ὁ δήμος . . . νῦν ὁμοίως ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίας καὶ σώματι καὶ χρήσιμοι καὶ ναυσὶ προκινήσεις, are similar to a passage in the epiphìsios of Hyperides (or. VI 5, col. III, p. 293 Colin): . . . ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν διατελεῖ . . . τοις δὲ ἱδίοις κινδύνοις καὶ δισάναις κοινήν ἄδειαν τοῖς Ἐλλησι παρασκευάζουσα (cf. Colin, p. 293, n. 1). Although this statement is rather topical, the direct allusion to the psephisma was close at hand for Hyperides because he was one of the orators who proposed it.
61. Fragments of two literary speeches, the one by Hyperides, the other probably by Phocion, are preserved in Dex. F 32/33.
62. It would be only too easy to see here the pro-Macedonian historian defending the Athenian oligarchs. Plut. Phoc. 23 follows him and transforms his thought in anecdotal manner, showing Phocion as an opponent of the democratic war-will represented by Leosthenes and Hyperides.
4. ἐπὶ δὲ: the Aenianians, the Alyzaeans and the Dolopians.
5. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις: the Athamanians, the Leucadians and the Molossians of Aryptaeus, who later betrayed the allies and fought on the side of the Macedonians.
6. Few Illyrians and Thracians joined the symmachy on account of their hatred of the Macedonians.
7. ἐξῆς δὲ: the Carystians.
8. τελευταῖοι δὲ τῶν Πελοποννησίων: the Argives, the Sicyonians, the Eleans, the Messenians and those who dwell on Acte.

Pausanias distinguishes roughly between two groups, the Peloponnesians and those ἐξ ὀς Κορινθίων ἵσθαιο, namely the Locrians, Phocians, Thessalians, Carystus and the Acarnanians ἐς τὸ Ἀιτωλικὸν συντελεύτης. His list of the Peloponnesians is more complete, omitting only the people of Acte; he names other cities alternately with those in Diodorus’ enumeration, putting in Epidaurus between Argus and Sicyon, Troizen between Sicyon and the Eleans, and the Phliasians between the Eleans and the Messenians. It seems that Diodorus has mechanically shortened the original list by leaving out each second member. Both Diodorus (11,3/4) and Pausanias add a note that the Boeotian cities remained on the Macedonian side as they feared that Athens would repatriate the Thebans.

Niese (loc.cit.) believed that the order of the symmachoi in Diodorus almost followed the temporal sequence of their entry into the alliance, with the exception of the Thessalians, of whom the historian himself says that in the beginning they fought together with Antipater (12,3). In fact, the Aetolians were the first allies of Athens, and therefore they appear at the head of the list, as is clearly expressed by Diodorus. The others did not join until the Athenian Assembly had officially decided on war and had sent ambassadors round Greece to recruit allies (Diod. 10,3/4). The negotiations were not easy62b and needed time. But it is obvious that the entry into an alliance with the Peloponnesian cities in the vicinity of Athens was achieved more quickly than that with the more loosely-knit tribes in the North or in the West. Besides, Hyperides says that Leosthenes, after encircling Antipater in Lamia, won over τοὺς ἄλλους ἄπαντας τοὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ συμμάχους (or. VI 13, col. V, p. 295 Colin). They, i.e. parts of the second and the sixth group in Diodorus, joined the symmachy only now that they had the Athenian success before their eyes. If, therefore, we omit the Aetolians, we may not understand the links between the different groups in Diodorus in a temporal sense. Also within the single groups in Diodorus and Pausanias there is no temporal order, as documentary evidence shows that Sicyon was the first Peloponnesian city to join Athens (SIG 317, ll. 13-15).

Bearing this in mind, and looking to Pausanias (οἱ δὲ ἐξ ὀς τοῦ Κορινθίων

one probable system of arrangement is obviously the geographical. For not only are neighbouring allies combined within the groups, but these groups themselves follow one another according to their adjacent position, at least the first six of them. With the geographical order _ipso facto_ another one is connected. For at the beginning Diodorus says comprehensively (10,5): _ail πλείσται μὲν (sc. πόλεις) συνέδρα τὴν συμμαχίαν, _ai μὲν κατ’ ἑδύνος, _ai δὲ κατὰ πόλιν_. Once more the first six groups are separate. With the exception of the Alyzaeans in the fourth group there are only ἑδύνη, then follow the πόλεις, Carystus and the Peloponnesians; but there the last named, too, are to be ranked amongst the ἑδύνη. The positioning of the Peloponnesians in Pausanias seems to be a change of his own or, more likely, of his intermediary source, surely induced by the impressive treatment earlier of the winning over of the Peloponnesians and Demosthenes’ rôle in it; Plut. _Demosth_. 27 is the illustration for the short notice in Diod. 10,5.

The arrangement κατ’ ἑδύνος in the first groups is shown also by mention of those cities which, while belonging to an ἑδύνος, did not share its policies. Contrary to the remark about the Molossians and the later deserter Aryptaeus which is made from hindsight, or about the few Thracians and Illyrians, the uniform series of exceptions with _πλήν_ is documentary. It gives a hint at the character of the original. It is not simply a roll of the allies or a military list of the forces of the symmachy, as in that case the specific mention of those who did not take part would be strange.

We are given another hint from the Athenian honorary decree for Timosthenes of Carystus (SIG 327). In ll. 8–12 his action during the Lamian War is described: _πεμφθείς ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως σύνεδρος ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἧγονιζε τοῦτο ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας λέγων καὶ πράττον τὰ συνεφόροντα τῷ τε κοινῷ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ Καρυστίων. This casts further light on the symmachy:

a) It was a hegemonial symmachy (Ἄθηναίων καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι) as is also obvious from Diodorus’ report.  
b) It had a federal organization with a synhedrion. 
c) The synhedroi met in the war-camp, i.e. in front of Lamia during winter 323/22, when Antipater was besieged there. 

**a/b point to the immediate model for the alliance of 323. It was the Second Athenian Sea-League.** There the allies were connected with the hegemon by single symmachy treaties, but were represented as a whole by their own synhedrion. It met in Athens and she herself had no part in it. The Athenian Assembly worked in conjunction with the synhedrion; both bodies had equal rights and, in causes of the League, had to act together. In _IG II² 43 (= Tod 123)_ we have a testimony. It is an Attic psphisma with regulations and obligations concerning the confederacy, and at the end the names of the symmachoi are added, showing in that way the dualistic organization.

Also in 323, the participants of the alliance were joined in single treaties...
The fact that the synhedroi gathered in the war-camp may be a proof that now, too, there was a dualism between synhedrion and ecclesia. On account of the political organization, and not merely of the symmachy, the honorary decree for Timosthenes speaks in II. 11/12 of the κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων — this reconstruction is certainly correct — Diodorus mentions the σύστημα τῶν Ἑλλήνων (18,1) which after the war was dissolved by Antipater, and Plutarch says (Demosth. 27,1, after Alexander’s death): τὰ δ’ Ἑλληνικὰ συνίστατο πάλιν, referring to another federal association after the former leagues.

IG II² 43 may now also give the solution as to the original document from which the list in Diodorus and Pausanias is derived. There was a similar decree with dispositions on the new institution. With respect to the foregoing Athenian psephisma about the entry into the war (11) and the fact that Diodorus’ history of that period is centred on Athens, it is even probable that, as in the case of IG II² 43, the decree was the Attic psephisma; as such it was passed in the Assembly and here, too, the allies were named at the end.

As has been said above (p. 55), the common Greek idea in the Lamian War was much stressed by the Athenians; and this is shown also by the epitaphios of Hyperides and by the documents (SIG 317,9–11; 327,6–8). It was emphasized still further in the constitutional decree of the new league. This resulted in the naming of those poleis amongst the ἔθνη which refused their support to the common Greek cause, in that way giving them a harsh rebuke, and, at the same time, praising their tribesmen.

Just. XIII 5,10 names Corinth as one of the Peloponnesian cities which were persuaded by Demosthenes to make symmachy with Athens. It is omitted by Diodorus and Pausanias. Beloch believes this tradition to be false, for he says that Corinth was kept by a Macedonian garrison (Griechische Geschichte IV² 1, p. 70). But there is no proof and we are not allowed to reject Justinus’ testimony. On the other hand, Diodorus and Pausanias, or at least one of them, would have mentioned this important ally if he had appeared in the decree amongst the others. There is one explanation: Corinth was indeed persuaded by Demosthenes, but then stood apart and did not join the League.

The formation of the league was achieved only after the foregoing single symmachy treaties, as is shown by the nontemporal order of the allies. There was no time during the intensive war-preparations. The right moment came when the first part of the war was successfully completed. The defeat and blockade of Antipater during winter 323/22 gave the hegemon Athens the time as well as the moral preponderance to attempt a renewal of her former position.

62c. IG II² 367 (Phocians); 370 (Aetolians). For another fragment referring to the treaty between Athens and Phocis, see O. Broneer, Hesperia 2, 1932, p. 397/98, nr. 17.
It is unlikely that Hieronymus treated the short-lived political creation in detail. That he at least touched upon it is attested by the words τὸ σῶτημα τῶν Ἐλλήνων in Diod. 18,1. Of its constitutional decree he made use only in so far as it was relevant for the global aspect of the history of the Lamian War and the Diadochs.

(13) The Athenian Request for Peace (322)

In contrast to the Athenian psephisma by which the ecclesia voted for war, stands the decision designed to halt the activity of the Macedonian army: the desperate population recalled the banned orator Demades and sent him as mediator to Antipater. Both his recall and dispatch as an envoy, together with Phocion and others, were brought about by a psephisma. Diodorus (XVIII 18,1/2) has set out the legal procedure; Plutarch (Phoc. 26,3) mentions the decree explicitly and the special disposition that the envoys should be αὐτοκράτορες, but he wrongly calls Demades the mover and says that he dispatched the envoys.63

(14) The Peace-Treaty (322)

The peace Athens received was at the dictate of Antipater. Hieronymus called it philanthropic; both Diodorus (18,4) and Plutarch (Phoc. 27,6) use the same expression.64 By combining them, the following provisions of the treaty can be established:

a) φιλία καὶ σωμαχία (Plut. 27,5);
b) guarantee of the property of the citizens and that of the polis (Diod. 18,4);
c) leaving the decision on Samos to the kings (Diod. 18,6);
d) extradition of Demosthenes, Hypereides, and other anti-Macedonians (Plut. 27,5; cf. Polyb. IX 29,3);
e) restriction of the civil rights to those who have property of more than 2000 drachmae (Diod. 18,4; Plut. 27,5);65
f) admission of a Macedonian garrison to Munychia (Plut. 27,5; 7–9; cf. Diod. 18,5 and Paus. VII 10,4);
g) payment of the costs of the war (Plut. 27,5);
h) payment of a fine (Plut. ib.).

Hieronymus hinted broadly at similar treaties concluded by Antipater in association with Craterus with other cities or koinā (Diod. 17,7).

63. The alteration of the text by K. Ziegler in the Teubner-edition removes only the second difficulty. The manuscript tradition is sound, Plutarch himself has made the mistake.
64. The opposite tradition which seems expressly to contradict Hieronymus' interpretation is represented by Plutarch himself (26,3; 28,1–6), Polyb. IX 29,2/3, and Paus. VII 10,4.
65. Later the lower classes were given the opportunity of settling in Thracia. But in the treaty there was no mention of this, although Diodorus adds it immediately after the constitutional change to a timocracy. It is later reported in the right sequence by Plut. 28,7.
(15) Condemnation of Demosthenes (322)

Following the provision that the chiefs of the anti-Macedonian party be handed over (14 d), the Athenian orator Demades proposed a psephisma to sentence them to death (Arr. F9, 13; Suda s.v. Antipatros; cf. Plut. Demosth. 28,2; Nepos, Phoc. 2,2). As the most famous Greek orator was involved the facts were generally known, and Hieronymus did not need to know the exact text of the psephisma. But he handed down the name of the mover. He knew more than the mere fact, and perhaps he included in some form a reference to Demades’ own death shortly afterwards.

The next great complex in Hieronymus’ work after the Lamian War, was the struggle for supreme power, i.e. the rise of Perdiccas and the reaction he caused. All documents refer to this main argument which concerned Eumenes and Hieronymus personally.

(16) Perdiccas’ Orders to Eumenes (322/21)

When Antipater and Craterus prepared an invasion of Asia from Greece, Perdiccas entrusted Eumenes with the defence. Hieronymus cited the letter he sent to Eumenes who at this time was in his satrapy, Cappadocia. It contained the following points:

a) appointment of Eumenes as τὸν Ἐμινία καὶ Καππαδοκίας δυνάμεων αὐτοκράτωρ στρατηγός (Plut. Eum. 5,1);

b) subordination of Neoptolemus, general in Armenia, and Alcetas, Perdiccas’ brother, together with others under his command (Plut. 5,2; Diod. 29,2);

c) the military task: to go to the Hellespont καλύσοντα τούς περὶ τὸν Ἀντιπατρόν καὶ Κρατερόν διαβαίνειν εἰς τὴν Ασίαν (Diod. 29,1);

d) Eumenes’ right of disposal χρῆσθαι τοῖς πράγμασι δῶσις αὐτὸς ἔγνωκεν (Plut. 5,3).

The reason Diodorus adduces for the subordination of the generals, διὰ τὴν στρατηγίαν αὐτός καὶ διὰ τὴν τῆς πίστεως βεβαιότητα (29,2), sounds like a formula from a decree. We have here another sentence from the letter which gave the Greek Eumenes the authorization to command Macedonian nobles.

(17) Antipater’s and Craterus’ Offer to Eumenes (321)

Antipater and Craterus sent an embassy to Eumenes and asked him (Plut. Eum. 5,6):

a) μεταβέβαια πρὸς αὐτούς,
The rigid scheme of the words (2×2 participial sentences both with μέν - δε, but asyndetical to each other) and the formula ἄντι ἔχθροι φίλοι γενόμενον, which is later reversed by Eumenes, make it clear that we have here not a mere informal offer. The letter embodied a type of treaty with the request that Eumenes should subscribe to it.

(18) Eumenes’ Answer (321)

Hieronymus cited also from Eumenes’ answer. Its written wording corresponded to the treaty style of the offer (Plut. Eum. 5,7/8):

a) Eumenes refused to become Antipater’s friend;
b) he offered to reconcile Craterus and Perdiccas and bring them together, ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵσοις καὶ δικαίοις;
c) he confessed that he would always aid the injured side and rather lose his life than his honour.

The historian in this way gave undoubted proof of the integrity of his superior.

(19) Eumenes’ Treaty with Craterus’ Army (321)

Once more Hieronymus confirmed Eumenes’ integrity by quoting the treaty concluded by him with the defeated army of Craterus who had lost his life in the battle against him: διεπέμψατο πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἡττημένων φάλαγγα, παρακαλῶν ἑαυτῷ προσθέσονται καὶ διδοὺς ἡξουσίαν ἐκάστοις ἵπποι βούλονται τὴν ἀποχώρησιν ποιήσασθαι (Diod. XVIII 32,2). From a papyrus fragment of Arrian’s History of the Diadochs (PSI 1284) we know that the negotiations and the conditions of surrender were reproduced in detail.69

(20–22) The Reorganization of Triparadeisos (321)

For the redistribution of the satrapies in Triparadeisos, as for Babylon, Hieronymus had no geographical register available. Here too the data were supplied by several decrees. Antipater, recently elected regent by the army, enacted them;70 Arrian has in part even kept the decree-form when he starts the distribution: Ἀγνωστον μὲν γὰρ καὶ Αἰβὸν ... Πολεμαῖοι εἶναι· Δομίδοντι δὲ τῷ Μιττυληναίῳ Συρίαν ἐπιτετράφανθαι. As in Babylon, on this occasion also, the sequence of the satrapies, agreeing in Diodorus and

70. In Arr. F 9,34–38; Diod. XVIII 39; Epit. Heid. 1,4 he is named several times as the man responsible for the reorganization.
Arrian,71 proves that we do not have the final editing of an official gazetteer, as the successive publication can still be seen.

The order is at first geographical, beginning in the west with Egypt and Syria, then proceeding to Cilicia, and from there as far as the Indian kingdoms. In Babylon the satrapies of Asia Minor were named subsequent to and together with those of Egypt, Syria, Cilicia, and Media which, apart from the last, is the natural order. In Triparadeisos they follow at the end, but as a separate group.

The reorganization of this important part of the empire was complicated. Only Asander and Antigonus kept their former territories. Cappadocia, the satrapy of Eumenes who was banished by the army, and Hellespontic Phrygia of Leonnatus, killed in the Lamian War, had to be filled. The change in Lydia is surprising: Cleitus, the victor of the naval battle of Amorgus, received it as a reward. But the former satrap Menandros had also joined the coalition against Perdiccas and Eumenes.72 The office of general under Antigonus which he received as compensation73 was in fact demotion. For all these settlements more time was needed than for the other parts of the empire where, on the whole, the satraps remained unchanged, or where the decision was clear as in the case of the vacant Babylon, which was taken over by Seleucus, the mightiest of those who up to now had not had satrapies. Concerning Asia Minor struggles behind the scene are likely to have taken place before Antipater could publish the special decree. Its later enactment, after the regulations of the other parts of the empire had already been officially documented, is shown by the above-mentioned position.

Finally there was at least one more decree which disposed of special posts as well as specific temporary tasks. Antigonus became leader of the βασιλικαὶ δυνάμεις;74 Cassander joined him as chiliarch (Arr. 9,38; Diod. 39,7); Antigenses was ordered to transport the royal treasure from Babylon (Arr. ib.); four σωματοφύλακες were appointed (Arr. ib.). On this last point particularly, Hieronymus' authentic knowledge becomes obvious when he mentions the names and the patronymics of the new holders who, on their own, were not very important.

After Triparadeisos there follow the documents chiefly concerned with Eumenes' important role on the stage of diadoch history (cf. p. 43), which later formed part of Polyperechon's struggle for the undisputed leadership of the empire. The greater number are letters and some of them, such as (18) and (19), clearly demonstrate the high moral, political and military qualities of Eumenes.

---

72. Arr. F 10,7 (= Fragmentum Vaticanum B 7).
73. Cf. Diod. XVIII 59,1.
74. About the βασιλικαὶ δυνάμεις cf. below, *Die Reichsordnung von Babylon*, p. 103 n. 63.
(23) A Statement of Account by Eumenes (321)

Eumenes appropriated horses from the royal stud at mount Ida and sent the inspectors an exact γραφή of their number. Antipater scoffed at such honesty (Plut. Eum. 8,5).

(24) Demades’ Condemnation (320)

The letters, on account of which the Athenian orator Demades was condemned and executed by Cassander, could have been found by Hieronymus in the Macedonian archives. He quoted the most damaging letter which called Perdiccas to Greece in 322 to remove Antipater. The invective against Antipater is transmitted exactly:

Arr. F 9,14 ἐγραψε Περδίκκα σφέτειν τοὺς Ἑλλήνας ἀπὸ σαπροῦ καὶ παλαιοῦ στήμονος ἣρτημένους.

Plut. Demosth. 31,5 γράμματα γὰρ ἐξέπεσεν αὐτοῦ, δι’ ἄν παρεκάλει Περδίκκαν ἐπισχείρην Μακεδονία καὶ σφέτειν τοὺς Ἑλλήνας, ὡς ἀπὸ σαπροῦ καὶ παλαιοῦ στήμονος... ἣρτημένους.

Phoc. 30,9⁷⁶... παρακαλοῦντος αὐτὸν ἐπιφανῆς τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ Μακεδονίαν, ἐκ παλαιοῦ καὶ σαπροῦ κρεμαμένοις στήμονος.

Diod. 48,2 only... ὁ Δημάδης παρακαλῶν τὸν Περδίκκαν κατὰ τάχος διαβαίνειν εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην ἐπ’ Ἀντίπατρον... .

(25) Antigonus’ Negotiation with Eumenes (319)

After Antipater’s death, Antigonus wished to come to terms with Eumenes, who at this time was besieged by his troops in Nora. He asked for Hieronymus as a negotiator and sent him back with a suggested treaty about a symmachy. From Diod. XVIII 50,4 and Plut. Eum. 12,2/3 we are able to reconstruct its several points:

a) In the preamble both kings were named besides Antigonus (Plutarch).
b) The instrument comprised:

1. in general, Antigonus’ offer to Eumenes, τῆς μὲν περὶ Καππαδοκίαν μάχης γενομένης πρῶς αὐτὸν ἐπιλαθέσθαι, γενέσθαι δὲ φίλον καὶ σύμμαχον αὐτῷ (Diodorus);
2. in particular, the restitution of rights and possessions held by Eumenes as a satrap and the augmentation of his former satrapy (Diodorus);
3. the commitment to Eumenes, καθόλου πρωτευόντα τῶν παρ’ ἐαυτῶ φίλων κοινονὸν ἔσσεσθαι τῆς δὴ ἐπιβολῆς (Diodorus).

c) The oath-formula, corresponding to b) 1, Ἀντιγόνῳ μόνον νευνοῦσεν καὶ ἐκεῖνῳ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχοντι ἔξειν καὶ φίλον (Plutarch). Eumenes changed the formula and inserted in c) Olympias and the kings besides Antigonus (Plutarch).

⁷⁵. Cf. p. 44 with n. 16.
⁷⁶. Plutarch has here confused Antigonus and Perdiccas.
As a means of holding his regency against Antipater's son Cassander, Polyperchon induced King Philip Arrhidaeus to make a declaration about Greek freedom. It is the longest document preserved from Hieronymus (Diod. XVIII 56), and the only one which permits a stylistic analysis.

The decree, a diagramma, edited at the court and handed to the envoys of the Greek states for speedy publication, is divided into two parts, 56, 1–3 and 4–8. In the first part the king referred to the attitude of Philip II and Alexander towards Greece, promised that he would follow them, and rejected Antipater's policies after the Lamian War. The second part contained special dispositions. Stylistically the two parts differ. Because each single point of the historical review is interwoven with the general undertaking to keep up the predecessors' policy, we have long and involved constructions except in the introduction. The development of intention is intricate, and the decisive statement comes only at the end. The contents of the second part was more usual for a chancellery and easier to express; here the sentences are shorter and clearer. The large number of subordinate sentences proves that this is not an adaption of the decree by Diodorus, who avoids subordination in favour of participial constructions.

The essential problem of the diagramma is its relationship to the Corinthian League—did Philip Arrhidaeus want to renew in any form the

77. Diod. 55,4; 57,1; cf. Bikerman, Diagramma, p. 299/300.
77a. A. Heuβ ('Antigonos Monophthalmos und die griechischen Städte', Hermes 73, 1938, p. 143) gives a wrong interpretation of 56,3. He says: "Sie (sc. die in der Zwischenzeit getroffenen Neuerungen) seien eine bedauerliche Notwendigkeit gewesen, da sich die Griechen durch ihre Strategen hätten auf falsche Wege führen lassen." But in the sentence τούτων μὲν τοὺς στρατηγούς αὐτίους ὑπολαβέσαι γεγενήσθαι τοὺς στρατηγούς after ἡμετέρων στρατηγῶν in the previous sentence can only refer to Antipater and Craterus (cf. p. 59 and n. 65a). And after all, it was precisely the reversal of Antipater's policies which was aimed at, as Diodorus has explained at great length in 55,1-3. Also V. Ehrenberg ('Alexander and the liberated Greek cities', in Alexander and the Greeks, Oxford 1938, p. 42) is not right in assuming that τοὺς στρατηγούς refers mostly to Cassander, who had up till then only been chiliarch.

78. It starts with ἐπείδη, the preferred form in the Attic decrees (W. Larfeld, 'Griechische Epigraphik', in: Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 1,5, (3rd ed.), München, 1914, p. 359. ἐπείδη is used once more 56,7, but 56,3 ἐπεί. In the royal letters the causal conjunction, immediately after the preamble, occurs seldom (two examples in Welles, RC nr. 67 and 73).

79. Palm, Sprache und Stil des Diodoros, p. 40–42; 68; 117–121.—Another sign is Ἀλέξανδρος μεταλλάξαντος in 56,2. Since Alexander's death the euphemism is used in regard to the deification of the late king (Welles RC, p. 348). But for Alexander's death, Diodorus always uses τελευτάν (XVIII 2,1; 9,1) and τελευτή (8,2; 9,4). Only at 9,4, when he reports the official announcement in Athens, does he speak of μεταλλάξει which occurs also in the Marmor Parium B 8. Cf. OGIS 4,3/4 διὰ δ' Ἀλέξανδρος διάλλαξεν τὸν μετ' ἄνθρωπον βιον.
status of 33880 or did he only resume Alexander’s Greek policy from 324/23?81
The diagramma is already his second declaration for Greece. As he says in 56,2, he wrote letters to all Greek cities after Alexander’s death, because he believed it necessary, ἐπαναγαγεῖν πάντας ἐπὶ τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ τὰς πολιτείας ὡς Φίλιππος ὁ ἡμέτερος πατήρ κατέστησεν. This can only mean that in 323 he attempted to conclude the treaty his father had concluded at Corinth in 338.
For peace and constitutional stability are his aims as summed up in his first letter, and these correspond exactly to two of the main topics of that treaty as we can see from its extant oath.81a Four years later, Philip regrets that the renewal was disturbed by the Lamian War but confirms that he still adheres to his former policy and is preparing for peace and the restoration of the governments which existed under Philip and Alexander (56,3). Therefore this diagramma also links up with the treaty of 338.82
One argument in favour of the view that the League was not renewed in 319 is that Philip would otherwise have had to declare αὐτονομίαν καὶ ἐλευθερίαν, notions which are not found in the Diodorean text of the diagramma.83 Now, Diodorus says in 55,2 when describes its process of enactment: ἔδοξαν αὐτοῖς τὰς μὲν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πόλεις ἐλευθεροῦν, τὰς δὲ ἐν αὐταῖς ὀλιγαρχίας καθεσταμένας ὑπ’ Αντιπάτρου καταλύειν. In the one part of the sentence we have the ἐλευθερία; in the other the significant notion αὐτονομία is included. In 64,3 Diodorus speaks explicitly of the διαγράμμα τὸ γραφεὶν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων αὐτονομίας, according to which the Athenians asked Polyperchon to liberate them from the Macedonian garrison. They sent Phocion with other pro-Macedonian nobles to the garrison commander, Nicanor, ἄξιοντες δὲ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν αὐτονομίαν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὸ γεγενημένον διάταγμα (64,5). These passages led Beloch to infer that there was a clause in the edict about the withdrawal of the Macedonian garrisons.84 In 66,2 another Athenian embassy directed against Phocion, asked Polyperchon once more, τὴν Μουνυχίαν αὐτοῖς δοθῆναι μετὰ τῆς αὐτονομίας.85 In 69,4 Diodorus reports from the states in the Peloponnese: τὴν ἐκ τῆς αὐτονομίας παραπήσαν ἀπέλαβον. Shortly before, Polyperchon had repeated his

81a. Tod, Greek Historical Inscriptions 177.
82. Neither in Philip’s mention of his first letter nor in his diagramma does the word συμμαχία occur. This fact backs those scholars who believe that συμμαχία also did not occur in the constituting treaty of the Corinthian League (cf. the discussion at Tod, p. 228/29).
83. Heuß, loc. cit. p. 143.
84. Griechische Geschichte IV 1, p. 100 n. 1.
85. Cf. Diod. 65,2.
orders in this connection, τοὺς μὲν δὲν Ἀντιπάτρου καθεσταμένους ἀρχοντας ἐπὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἱκάρικας θανατώσας, τοὺς δὲ δήμους ἀποδοθῶστη τὴν αὐτονομίαν (69,3). Philip left the decision about Phocion to the Athenians, ἐλευθέρως τε δὴ καὶ αὐτονόμως ὁδός (Plut. Phoc. 34,4). In 315 Antigonus published a dogma in Tyrus, (53), in which he announced: εἶναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἑλλήνας ἀπαντας ἐλευθέρους, ἀφρούρητους, αὐτονομους (Diod. XIX 61,3). Against Cassander he used the same political methods as Philip and Polyperchon, who had just sent his son to him in order to transfer to him the regency and to make an alliance. Antigonus doubtless referred in his dogma to his predecessor using the same stock words which appeared again and again in the treaties of κοινῆ εἰρήνη and the declarations of Greek freedom. Philip’s diagramma is no exception. It also proclaimed the Greeks to be ἐλεύθεροι, ἀφρούρητοι, αὐτόνομοι. I think the exact passage where this appeared can still be located: it is found between 56,3 and 4 where we have the stylistic break when the diagramma starts dealing with the special dispositions. It was quite natural that, after the statement of his general intention to follow his predecessors and the hint of εἰρήνη, Philip proclaimed his programme positively on his own behalf. When the passage dropped out there was no transition and a harsh break remained. It seems that Hieronymus had already shortened the extensive document in order to abbreviate the quotation. The reason why he did not cut out the special dispositions was their connection with former events: Alexander’s refugee-letter and Athens’ loss of Samos after the Lamian War (cf. p. 44, n. 20).

Now at least the connection with the official supposition of the regulation of 338 is obvious. Besides, it would be difficult to understand if the emphatic reference to the Greek politics of Philip and Alexander had, in particular, excluded its central item—the freedom and autonomy of the Greeks. The same goes for εἰρήνη (56,3) which, for those scholars who accepted the connection with 338, was patently the revival of the former κοινῆ εἰρήνη. Heuss believed it impossible that the simple substantive without an article could have this meaning. It is true that Philip avoided the special term—the reason we shall see below—but here too one cannot exclude the association supported also by the context: the subsequent assertion that he will restore such governments as the Greeks enjoyed under Philip II and Alexander, refers to the article in the peace-treaty that all cities should retain the constitutions in existence when they had sworn to uphold the peace. And finally the dogma requested from all Greeks by the king (μήδενα μήτε στρατευειν μήτε πράττειν ὑπεναντία ἡμῖν 56,7) is a renewal of this oath.

86. Bengtson, Strategie I, p. 84/5.
88. Tod 177, 12–14.
88a. Cf. the provision in Alexander’s decree for the restoration of the Chian exiles, that those who betrayed the city to the Persians but have escaped shall be banished from all.
All these points of agreement are immediately concerned with the aim of the decree as described in 55,2: the oligarchies, which were established by Antipater and gave support to Cassander, were to be overthrown. But so far only a part of the political arrangements of 338 is covered. Regarding the hegemony of the Macedonian king no word was necessary. Its continuance was implicit and it was diplomatic not to stress it. The whole of the diagramma reflects the hegemon. Philip inherited this position from his predecessor as had Alexander from Philip II. 89 The relationship between the king and the Greeks was disturbed, but not juridically interrupted, by the Lamian War. 90

What is said about the hegemony is in a similar way conclusive for the federal organization which is also not mentioned. One could suppose that it was treated in the gap, but in contrast to ἔλευθερία and αὐτονομία no direct hint is found, either earlier or later. The working of the synhedrion depended on the hegemon who summoned its members. By implication Philip had the power to do so. 91 But he set no great store by it because the Greeks did not either. And even if he had done so, he would have gained nothing. For him, the decisive consideration was simply that the states severally were bound to him (56,7) as they had also been bound in 338 to the Macedonian king. The diagramma was carefully designed to harmonize with these aims. To have called it simply a renewal of the Corinthian League or to have denied any connexion with the latter, would not have met the complicated circumstances.

A further proof of this 'selective relationship' is found in the diagramma itself: Philip orders 56,3 . . . καὶ τάλλα πράττειν κατὰ τὰ διαγράμματα τὰ πρότερον ὑπ’ ἐκείνων γραφέντα. These diagrammata do not belong directly to the treaty of the League. In the case of Philip II, they concern those dispositions in the treaties he had made previously with the individual states; they dealt mostly with territorial disputes 92 as is shown also in 56,6/7. In the case of Alexander they embrace not only the exiles' decree but also other

the states which participate in the peace, i.e. the Corinthian League, and shall be subject to trial, κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων (Tod 192, 10-13).

89. Cf. in the oath, the obligation οὔτε τὴν βασιλείαν τὴν Φιλίππου καὶ τῶν ἐκχώνων καταλύσα (Tod 177. 11/12).

90. Bengtson, loc. cit. When Antipater ordered the Greeks to make peace with him separately, it meant that he did not recognize their symmachy of 323 by which the κοινὴ εἰρήνη of 338 was infringed.

91. One case has been transmitted: Πολυπέρχον δὲ βουλόμενος τὰ κατὰ τὴν Πελο­πόννησον διοικήσαι συμφερόντος, παρῆλθε καὶ συναγαγὼν ἐκ τῶν πόλεων συνέδρους διελέχθη περὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν συμμαχίας (Diod. 69,3). For Heuß (p. 145) this is inconclusive, but his reasoning does not carry conviction. If συνέδρος had been used in a non-technical sense, as he assumes, Diodorus would have said πρεσβεύεται as in 55,4. XVII 4,9 at the meeting of the League summoned by Alexander, τὰς πρεσβείας καὶ τοὺς συνέδρους are clearly distinguished.

92. E.g. he diminished Sparta's territory in favour of Arcadia, Messene, and Argos (Beloch, Griechische Geschichte III 1, p. 574/75).
orders given personally at first, later through his strategos, Antipater. Philip Arrhidaeus approved them but not without exception or the possibility of revision (56,6)92a. It was the same selective method intended to promote his own political advantage.

The following accumulation of letters to and from the Macedonian court may be explained in this way: in the negotiations with Polyperchon, Eumenes received not only his personal correspondence but also copies or reports of letters directed to others. These were seen by Hieronymus prior to his access to the Macedonian archives.

(27–28) Polyperchon’s Supplements to the Diagramma (319)

The regent supplemented the general diagramma with special instructions. Diodorus (57,1) mentions the letter to Argos and other Greek cities in which he ordered, τοὺς διψηγησμένους ἀντιπάτρου τῶν πολιτευμάτων φυγαδέσαι, τινῶν δὲ καὶ θάνατον καταγνώσαι καὶ δημεῦσαι τὰς οδύσεις, ὅπως ταπεινωθέντες εἰς τέλος μηδὲν ἵσχυσσαι συνεργεῖν Κασάνδρῳ. In 69,3 Diodorus says, under the year 318, that Polyperchon went to the Peloponnese and summoned the synhedrion of the cities.93 He goes on: ἐξέστησε δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὰς πόλεις προσβεβάσας, προστάτων τοὺς μὲν δὲ ἀντιπάτρου καθεσταμένους ἀρχοντας ἐπὶ τῆς ὁλιγαρχίας θανατώσαι, τοῖς δὲ δῆμοις ἀποδοθέναι τὴν αὐτονομίαν. This is impossible. Polyperchon did not personally negotiate with the deputies of the cities and, at the same time and for the same reason, send embassies to them. Rather ἐξέστησε has a pluperfect meaning and Diodorus repeats, with a slight alteration, the contents of the circular of 57,1. Now it also becomes clear why prominence is given to Argos, a Peloponnesian city; it is because Hieronymus mentioned the circular in connection with Polyperchon’s proposed expedition to the Peloponnese. Besides he may have seen the copy sent to Argos.

Plut. Phoc. 32,1 has preserved the letter to Athens interspersed with the diagramma: ἐπέστησεν ἐπιστολὴν τοῖς ἐν ἄστει γεγραμμένην, ὡς τὸν βασιλέα ἀποδίδοντος αὐτοῦς τὴν δημοκρατίαν καὶ πολιτεύεσθαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια πάντας Ἀθηναίοις κελεύοντος. In Diodorus this letter does not appear. He has omitted a passage in Hieronymus which dealt with Macedonian policies towards Athens after Antipater’s death. For in 64,1 he presupposes the replacement of Menyllus, the phrourarchos of Munychia whom Cassander had removed in favour of his adherent, Nicanor (Plut. Phoc. 31,1). Diodorus says that Nicanor heard of Cassander’s departure to Antigonus and of Polyperchon’s intention to come to Athens to secure the city. He has described the first of these two facts in 54,3, and we may suppose that he had second of these two facts been treated by Hieronymus, and

92a. The Eresian tyrant-inscription contains Philip’s rescript to the city in which he emphatically upholds Alexander’s decisions about the exiles (OGIS 8, 95–102).
93. Cf. p. 67, n. 91.
that in this connection he had cited Polyperchon’s letter to Athens. It was closely linked with the plans and correspondence concerning the Peloponnesian; for the regent wished to include Athens in his Greek campaign.

Also the letters which follow were used by the central government in its struggle with the dissidents, Cassander and Antigonus.

(29) Polyperchon to Olympias (319)
The regent requested the queen mother to come quickly from Epirus to Macedonia and take over the επιμέλεια of young Alexander (Diod. 57,2). As the context shows, επιμέλεια means here ‘the guard and tutelage of the four year old boy’ 94 Diodorus had already mentioned the letter in 49,4 at Polyperchon’s entering upon the regency using almost the same words. But this is an anticipation, for Polyperchon’s request was only occasioned by Cassander’s departure some time later for Asia in order to obtain Antigonus’ help in his struggle for the regency (54,3). This further strengthened the regent’s hope that Olympias would follow him, since it was Cassander’s hostility that had kept her in Epirus (49,4).

The letter in Diodorus is not complete. Polyperchon dealt also with his Asiatic policies and requested Olympias’ support. 95 For shortly afterwards she wrote a letter to Eumenes (32) in which she a) passed on Polyperchon’s request to him to come to Macedonia and to assume the care of Alexander (Diod. 58,2; Plut. Eum. 13,1; Nepos, Eum. 6,3); b) emphasized Eumenes’ attitude towards the βασιλική οικία (Diod. loc. cit.); c) conveyed that she had ordered the other satraps to obey him (Diod. 62,2; Nepos 6,4). As we shall see, all three points corresponded to the proceedings of the Macedonian court; it was a concerted action.

(30) Polyperchon’s Offer to Eumenes (319)
B. Niese has rightly supposed that the correspondence of the Macedonian court with Eumenes consisted of two letters. 96 One of them was the royal letter of appointment. But he was not wholly correct in his belief that the other was a covering letter from Polyperchon.

In 57,3 Diodorus says that Polyperchon wrote a letter to Eumenes on behalf of the kings (ἐπιστολήν singular!). The following indirect quotation is the longest from any letter in Diodorus. Its style is typical of an offer and negotiation: at the beginning the wish with δέως; then εἴτε βούλεσθαι—εἴτε μᾶλλον προσωρίζεται; the promise that the kings shall restore to him his former satrapy (57,3); the praise of his loyalty; the writer’s offer to come himself to Asia together with the kings and greater forces (57,4). Nothing

95. G. Bauer, Die Heidelberger Epitome, Diss. Leipzig 1914, p. 76.
96. Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten I, p. 239, n. 3.
definite is said about Eumenes’ appointment and jurisdiction to which only vague allusions are made. To these Diodorus refers shortly in an anticipatory note 53,7: ἐξαλβὲν ἀξὲναν ὥστε παραλαβέν τὰς βασιλικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ προστήναι τῶν βασιλέων πρὸς τοὺς καταλῦειν αὐτῶν τὴν ἄρχην τετολμηκότας.

(31–32) Eumenes’ Appointment and Olympias’ Letter to Him (319)

In 58,1 Diodorus says that Eumenes received the letters (τὰς ἐπιστολὰς) sent off by Polyperchon. After the singular γράφας ἐπιστολήν in 57,3 this wording admits of at least the possibility that there was still another letter, not written by Polyperchon but sent together with his own. Plut. Eum. 13,1/2 corresponds to this: γράμματα . . . Πολυπέρχοντος δὲ καὶ Φιλίππου τοῦ βασιλέως . . . The further details in Diodorus are marked as an addendum, ἐν αἷς ἦν γεγραμμένον χωρίς τῶν προειρημένων:

a) the kings give Eumenes 500 talents as reparation;

b) they have written to the Cilician strategoi and thesaurophylakes to pay this money to him and any more that he needs;

c) they have written to the leaders of the argyraspides to place themselves under the command of Eumenes and to cooperate with him as the appointed strategos τῆς ὀλίγης Ἀσίας αὐτοκράτωρ.

Although Diodorus does not distinguish the letters, it is obvious that this addendum in 58,1 is the royal appointment containing the exact statements which were missing in the former letter. It is confirmed by XIX 13,7 and 15,5, where Diodorus once more refers to 58,1, speaking only of the ἐπιστολαὶ τῶν βασιλέων. To treat both letters as one was quite natural for him and Hieronymus, too, favoured this course since he did not attend separately to those parts which overlapped. As a result Plutarch also combined them, but in such a way that prominence was given to the appointment, although he did not mention explicitly Eumenes’ new title: . . . κελεύσαντων (sc. Πολυπέρχοντος καὶ Φιλίππου) Ἀντιγόνω πολεμεῖν, τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ δυνάμεως ἄρχοντα (13,2). Then follow, mostly in agreement with Diodorus, the above mentioned points a–c.

The Epitome Heidelbergensis says in F 3,2: ἐδεῖχθησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τοῦ Εὐμένους εἰς βοήθειαν ἢ τε Ὀλυμπίας καὶ ὁ Ἄρριδαῖος ὁ Φιλίππος καὶ ἡ Ἄρχανη διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν. The wording seems strange. Nowhere else are Olympias and Roxane joined with Philip as βασιλεῖς, nor are their letters named βασιλικὰ γράμματα. The compiler, or his copy, has thus grouped together the names of the writers of the successive letters: ἐδεῖχθησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς refers to the letter written by Polyperchon ἐκ τῶν βασιλέων ὀνόματος (= Diod. 57,3), but his name dropped out. Then follows the letter of Olympias, the letter of appointment (ὁ Ἄρριδαῖος ὁ Φιλίππος), and a letter of Roxane’s not mentioned elsewhere because Hieronymus cited no details.

As to the sequence of the letters, there is one point of agreement between
Plutarch and the Epitome Heidelbergensis: both cite Olympias’ letter before Philip’s, whereas Diodorus in 58,2/3 inverts the order. The former two have preserved the original order, but Diodorus has altered it and put Philip’s appointment first, in order to combine those letters which had come from the Macedonian court,97 and of which he says, without distinction in 58,1, that they reached Eumenes after his departure from Nora. This resulted in the badly integrated addendum to Polyperchon’s offer in which the chief point, Eumenes’ new position, was implied en passant.

The original sequence of the letters and with it, the chronology of their writing, is in addition confirmed by their contents. For the appointment in Diodorus and Plutarch took it for granted that Eumenes remained in Asia, and the kings in Macedonia with Polyperchon. Nothing more was said of the regent’s proposition to Eumenes to move to Macedonia. But Olympias, referring to Polyperchon’s letter, nevertheless asked him to come over (Diod. 58,2; Plut. 13,1; Nepos 6,397 a). This was because she did not yet know the decision, made by Eumenes in the meantime. He himself alluded to it when in answer to her he recommended that she remain in Epirus and not come to Macedonia. Another argument is that Polyperchon’s letter was earlier and did not simply cover the appointment: he wrote ἐκ τοῦ τῶν βασιλέων δονάμων. But one does not write a covering letter on behalf of the person to whom one refers.

Now we can draw up the exact relations of the documents 29–32: a) Polyperchon wrote simultaneously to Olympias and Eumenes, referring in each letter to the other. b) Eumenes answered Polyperchon’s offer; the text is not transmitted because Hieronymus did not quote it explicitly but only his answer to Olympias (35). c) Her letter reached Eumenes shortly before or at the same time as the king’s official appointment. d) Philip sent it after having received his answer.

(33–34) Orders by the Court and Olympias (319)
Parallel with Eumenes’ appointment went the communications about it to the satraps, the strategoi, the leaders of the argyraspides, and the thesauraphylakes in Cyinda. They were commanded to obey the new strategos autokrator (Diod. 59,3; 62,2; Plut. 13,3). Philip had referred to this in the appointment.

The legal writs of the king and the regent were supported by Olympias who also gave orders by letter (Diod. 62,2) and reported her concerted action to Eumenes in almost the same words as Philip (Nepos 6,4). Perhaps they both even attached copies. The removal of Antigonus as supreme strategos of Asia and commander of the βασιλικαί δυνάμεις was also announced, although it is not reported. The removal order to Nicanor, the

97. This is a similar type of alteration to that made by him in the distribution of the satrapies in Babylon (p. 48).
phrourarchos of the Piraeus, is said by Diodorus (65,1) to have come from Olympias.

(35) Eumenes Answer to Olympias (319)
Diod. 58,4 ὁ δὲ Ἐὐμένης πρὸς μὲν τὴν Ὄλυμπιάδα παραχρῆμα ἀντεγραψε, συμβουλεύοντα κατὰ τὸ παρόν μὲνειν ἐν ᾿Ηπείρῳ, μέχρι δὲν ὁ πόλεμος λάβῃ τυλικά κρίσιν. Nepos, Eum. 6,2 huic ille primum suasit, ne se moveret et exspectaret, quoad Alexandri filius regnum adipisceretur; sin aliqua cupiditate raperetur in Macedonian, oblivisceretur omnium iniuriarum et in neminem acerbiore uteretur imperio. The determination of time in Diodorus is more probable in itself. The limit to her stay in Epirus, given in Nepos, is an alteration made for ornamental effect. The same motive prompted the unhistoric admonition which follows and which owes its existence to hindsight. It is a psychological enlargement of transmitted facts typical of a branch of Hellenistic Historiography.

The agitation of the counter-coalition against the central government is also recorded in letters.

(36–37) Ptolemy’s Agitation against Eumenes (321/19)
Ptolemy wrote at first to the argyraspides that they should not obey Eumenes who had been sentenced to death by the Macedonian army (Diod. 62,1). Then he sent a letter to the thesaurophylakes in Cyinda. Guaranteeing their safety, he asked them to give no money to Eumenes. But the addressees remained loyal (Diod. 62,2). They most probably showed the letters to Eumenes (and Hieronymus).

(38–39) Antigonus’ Repeated Agitation against Eumenes (321/19)
An intensive propaganda campaign was launched by Antigonus. He sent his friend, Philotas and thirty distinguished Macedonians to the camp of Eumenes, with promises to the leaders of the argyraspides and a letter to all troops (κοινὴ ἐπιστολή Diod. 63,1) in which he ordered them to kill him (Diod. loc. cit.; Plut. Eum. 8,11; Just. XIV 1,9), and promised 100 talents to everybody who dared to do this (Plutarch; Justinus: magna praemia).

Whereas the contents of the letter agree more or less in all three sources, the circumstances in Plutarch and Justinus differ from those in Diodorus. The former two place the agitation in 321, shortly after Triparadeisos. In this case a decision cannot be reached from the contents themselves because the matter was the same in 321 as in 319. Plutarch cites it to illustrate the fidelity of the troops, who were not corrupted: καὶ ποτὲ γραμμάτων ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ φανέρων . . . ; this may be an anticipation of a later event.

98. Niese, Geschichte I, p. 239, n. 4.
When he goes on to attribute the loyalty of the soldiers to their eagerness for the great Macedonian honours which Eumenes could award them, it becomes clear that this does not apply to the banned of 321 but to the
epistulae totis castris abiectae inveniuntur. This corresponds to Plutarch, γραμμάτων ... & διέρρυσαν οἱ τῶν πολεμίων ἥγεμόνες ... But Justinus alone has the version that Eumenes overcame the danger by slyly declaring that he had written the letter himself in order to test his troops.\(^9^9\) Plutarch and Justinus (2,14) agree as to the measures the soldiers now took for his safety, and the latter states 2,13: hoc facto et in praesenti labantium animos deterruit et in futurum providit, ut, si quid simile accidisset, non se ab hoste corrumpi, sed ab duce temptari milites arbitaretur. The historian has obviously written this from the standpoint of a similar later event. Therefore we can infer that in 319 Antigonus tried a second time to induce Eumenes' troops to desertion. The new letter resembled the first. Diodorus who treats the initial struggles between both very shortly, has omitted the former. In Justinus it is just the reverse. Plutarch avoided the repetition and treated them as one set of events.

In Athens the struggle of the diadochs was reflected in the party struggles, the outcome of which was set forth in several psephismata. These formed in Hieronymus a second group after those of the Lamian War, as is shown by the traces in Diod. XVIII 64–66, Plut. Phocion 32–34, and Nepos, Phocion 2–4 which are for the greater part in accord. Plutarch usually prefers to say explicitly that there was a psephisma, while Diodorus is often more vague—cf. (13) p. 59—and rarely uses the word.\(^1^0^0\)

(40) Athenian Legation to Nicanor (318)
Keeping in mind this vagueness of Diodorus and according to (41), (42), and (45), a psephisma seems to have been at the root of XVIII 64,5: the Athenians elected Phocion, Conon, and Clearchus as envoys to their friend Nicanor, the phourarchos of the Macedonian garrison stationed at Munychia. They were to submit to him the complaints of the citizens: ἐγκαλοῦντες μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς πεπραγμένους, ἀξιώντες δὲ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν αὐτονομίαν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὸ γεγονημένον διάταγμα (cf. Plut. Phoc. 32,9). This was the motivation of the legation which appeared in the psephisma; cf. (42).

(41) Athenian Mobilization against Nicanor (318)
After the failure of the legation (Diod. 64,6) the ecclesia passed a motion of Philomedes of Lampræa, Ἀθηναῖος ἄπαντας ἐν τοῖς δίπλοις εἶναι καὶ τῇ στρατηγῷ Φωκίωνι προσέχειν (Plut. 32,10, where psephisma is used; Nepos 2,5).

---

99. He later employs a similar stratagem: Diod. XIX 23, 1-3; Polyaeus IV 8,3.
100. E.g. XVIII 10,2; XX 46,2.
(42) Athenian Legation to King Philip (318)

After the overthrow of the oligarchs in Athens\(^{101}\), Phocion and several adherents who were sentenced to death (Diod. 65,6; Plut. 33,2–4; Nepos 3,2), fled to Philip and Polyperchon. Thereupon the ecclesia passed a motion of Hagnonides to send a legation to Macedonia (Diod. 66,2; Plut. 33,6: psephisma; Nepos 3,2). Two reasons were given in the psephisma:

a) the charge brought against Phocion and the oligarchs (Plutarch and Diodorus) because they had betrayed the Piraeus to Cassander’s partisan, Nicanor (Nepos);

b) the claim to have Munychia restored, and the autonomy which was promised in Philip’s diagramma (Diodorus).

(43) Philip’s Letter to Athens (318)

Philip left the final finding about the charges against the oligarchs to Athens, to which place they had been brought back (Diod. 66,3; Plut. 34,2; Nepos 3,4). Plut. 34,4 explicitly cites the covering letter of the king which was read in the ecclesia: αὐτῷ μὲν ἐγνώσθαι προδότας γεγονέναι τοὺς ἀνδράς, ἔκεινοι δὲ διδόναι τὴν κρίσιν, ἔλευθεροι τε ἡ καὶ αὐτονόμοις ὀστὶ. Diodorus mentions this as a fact: διδοὺς (ὁ βασιλεὺς) τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῷ ἰσημερίῳ οὕτε βούλεται θανατοῦν εἰτ’ ἀπολύσαι τῶν ἐγκλημάτων.

(44) Condemnation of Phocion and his Friends (318)

According to the royal letter a motion was proposed by Hagnonides, ψήφισμα . . . καθ’ ὃ τῶν δήμων ἔδει χειροτονεῖν περὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν εἰ δοκοῦσιν ἀδικεῖν, τοὺς δ’ ἀνδρᾶς ἄν καταχειροτονηθῶσιν ἀποθνήσκειν (Plut. 34,9; Diod. 66,4 . . . προτεθείσης κρίσεως . . . ). Diodorus in 66,5 has the σύμπα τής κατηγορίας λόγος, i.e. the motivation in the psephisma: οὗτοι παρατίθενται γεγένηται μετά τὸν Λαμικανόν πόλεμον τῆς τε δουλείας τῇ πατρίδι καὶ τῆς καταλύσεως τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν νόμων. This was the gravest reason. Besides, the former accusation was repeated: . . . propter proditionis suspicionem Piraii maximeque, quod adversus populi commoda in senectute steterat (Nepos 4,1).\(^{102}\)

(45) Athenian Negotiations with Cassander (317)

In XVIII 74,1–2, Diodorus paraphrases the psephisma by which the ecclesia, after violent debates, decided to negotiate with Cassander: ἅπαντον οὖς τῶν ἐπανομένων πολιτῶν εἰπεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ διότι συμφέρει πρὸς Κάσσανδρον διαλύσασθαι.\(^{102}\) . . . ἐδοξεῖ τοῖς πάσι πρεσβεύειν

---

101. Diod. 65,6; Plut. 33,2. The ecclesia in which this happened was tumultuous (Plutarch); nothing is said about a psephisma.

102. ἐπανομένον has here a political sense, cf. Hesych. II p. 134 (Latte): ἐπανομένον τῆς κρίσεως καὶ τῆς συμβουλίας καὶ τῆς ἀρχαιεσίας (ἀρχαιεσίας cod.: ἀρχαιεσίας Musurus: μαρτυρίας Latte). SooEh. Θεάτη Σικωνία (p. 189 nr. 252) explains: The explanatory words
πρὸς Κάσανδρον καὶ τίθεσθαι τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς ἄν ἦ δυνατὸν. εἰπεῖν and ἔδοξε, the technical terms for the motion and the sanction in the preamble, are taken over from the psephisma; τοῖς πασὶ in the paraphrase replaces τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.

(46) The Peace-Treaty (317)
After several conferences peace was made on the following terms (Diod. 74,3):

a) φιλία καὶ συμμαχία;
b) guarantees regarding πόλιν τε καὶ χώραν καὶ προσόδους καὶ ναὸς καὶ τῆλα πάντα;
c) maintaining a garrison in Munychia until the war against the kings was concluded;
d) condemnation of the chiefs of the hostile democrats Hagnonides, Epicurus, and Demophilus (this is inferred from Plut. Phoc. 38,2);
e) restriction of the civil rights to those possessing at least ten minae;
f) appointment of an ἐπιμελητής τῆς πόλεως by Cassander.

The agreement between this and the former constitutional change brought about by Antipater's dictate is obvious, and perhaps Hieronymus has drawn a parallel. The points a) to e) have their exact correspondence in (14), except that Cassander has lowered the census by a half to 1000 drachmae.

(47) Polyperchon's Removal (317)
Eurydice wrote to the regent Polyperchon on behalf of her insane husband, Cassandro exercitum tradat, in quem regni administrationem rex transtulerit (Just. XIV 5,3). The relative clause means that Philip had just written at her instigation to Cassander, who was fighting against Polyperchon in the Peloponnese, and appointed him the new στρατηγὸς τῶν βασιλέων καὶ στρατηγὸς τῆς Εὐρώπης.109

(48) Antigonus' Restoration (317)
Subsequently Eurydice wrote to Antigonus: eadem (i.e. Polyperchon's removal) et in Asiam Antigono per epistulas nuntiat (Just. XIV 5,3). This means that Antigonus was restored to his old function as στρατηγὸς τῆς Ἀσίας in the place of Eumenes.104 Here too a letter is to be inferred by which Eumenes was officially informed of his removal,106 in the same way as Antigonus was notified when he was removed two years earlier (cf. p. 71). By writing the forged letter against Peucestes, (49), Eumenes e silentio presupposed the new situation. It is a new phenomenon in Greek constitu-

... may be taken to refer to the approval of an assembly which voted and elected its officers by acclamation.'

tional history, arising from the situation of the empire after Alexander's death, that such drastic government changes were made by letter.

(49) Eumenes Forged Letter against Peucestes (316)

Hieronymus cited the letter in detail as one of the last brilliant stratagems by which Eumenes succeeded in maintaining his hold on his troops. Diodorus (XIX 23,1–3) followed him closely in the immediate context and in his paraphrase of the letter, as is shown by the agreement with Polyaenus, IV 8,3. The letter was written in Syrian characters and Orontes, the satrap of Armenia, was named as the sender. The contents implied that, after Cassander's death, Olympias had come to Macedonia to take over the kingship and that Polyperchon, with the best royal troops, had gone across into Asia against Antigonus.

Eumenes' forged letter followed up precisely the propositions Polyperchon had made a year earlier. His soldiers were familiar with them and were therefore not suspicious.

(50) Antigonus' Overthrow of Pithon (316)

When Pithon, the satrap of Media, showed tendencies to desertion (Diod. XIX 46,1; Polyaenus, IV 6,14) Antigonus summoned him under false pretences by letter, ἀξιών ἦκειν τὴν ταχύτητιν, διὸς κατὰ πρόσωπον περὶ τῶν ἀναγκαῖον κοινολογησάμενος ταχέως τὴν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν κατάβασιν ποιήσεται (Diod. 46,2). This is the first document Hieronymus quoted as follower of Antigonus whose πίστις he had won after Eumenes' death (Diod. 44,3). It is noteworthy that here and in connection with the next document he spoke of negotiations in the synhedrion of Antigonus (Diod. 46,4; 57,1). We may therefore presume that πίστις refers to his membership of the council where he obtained direct information.

(51–52) The Ultimatum to Antigonus and his Reply (315)

Ptolemy, Cassander, and Lysimachus joined forces against Antigonus who after Eumenes' overthrow and Seleucus' expulsion was the mightiest of the diadochs. They sent an ultimatum which was handed to him in his synhedrion by a joint delegation. There Hieronymus first heard it, later he may have read it once more, so that he was able to quote its specific terms. The ultimatum had the following form:

a) the motivation: the war against Eumenes was a κοινὸς πόλεμος, and therefore booty should be shared;

---

106. The description of Antigonus' reaction, . . . τραχύτερον ἄποκριμανέου (Diod. 57,2) suggests that Hieronymus was an eyewitness.

107. Diod. 57,1 gives them explicitly; Just. XV 1,2 and App. Syr. 53,270 speak generally about the conquered regions which should be divided.

108. Diod. loc. cit. . . . καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὺς κεκοιμηθέντας τὸν πολέμου. Cf. below, Ptolemy's and Seleucus' later remark (Diod. 85,3) and Antigonus' answer in Just. loc. cit.
b) the territorial claims: Antigonus should give: i. Cappadocia and Lycia to Cassander; ii. the Hellespontic Phrygia to Lysimachus; iii. the whole of Syria to Ptolemy; and iv. restore Babylonia to Seleucus;
c) the captured royal treasure should be divided;
d) the ultimatum itself: εί δὲ μηδὲν τούτων ποιήσει, συστάντες ἅπαντες ἐφασαν πολεμήσειν αὐτῷ (Diod. 57.1).

Scholars who believed that b)i was wrongly transmitted started from the erroneous supposition that Cassander was interested only in the rule over Macedonia and Greece. Besides the different arguments against this belief inferred from Cassander's politics, there is authentic evidence: in the letter Antigonus wrote to Scepsis, he dealt with the peace of 311 and the preliminary negotiations: ... δράντης τινα ὣν ἡξίου Κάσσανδρος ἐργω- δέστερα ὄντα ... This refers to Cassander's intentions in Asia; the peace-negotiations started on the basis of the ultimatum of 315.

After considering the conditions of the ultimatum, Cloché, in pursuance of former discussions, comes to the conclusion that only the restitution of Babylonia and of the Hellespontic Phrygia, both usurped by Antigonus, was justified. He regarded it as unjust even to claim the latter for Lysimachus instead of appointing a new satrap. But the situation is somewhat more complex. It is best explained by the similar case which occurred after the battle of Ipsus, when Seleucus claimed Coelesyria κατὰ τὰς γενομένας συνθήκας (Diod. XXI F 1,5). Ptolemy, who had occupied it while the other partners fought against Antigonus, objected, ὅτι τὸ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Ἀντίγονον κεκοιμηκότος οὐδὲν αὐτῷ μετέδωκαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς δορκιτήτου χώρας. To this Seleucus answered, δίκαιον εἶναι τούς τῇ παρατάξει κρατήσαντας κυρίους ὑπάρχειν τῶν δορκιτήτων. Ptolemy urged the mere legal point that the coalition against Antigonus had been arranged on the condition that his territories should be divided in the event of victory and that he should get Coelesyria and Phoenicia (Polyb. V 67,10). Seleucus pleaded on the grounds of equity that only active participants in the war had a claim, and that on this argument Ptolemy evidently should receive nothing.

In 315 Antigonus supported the arguments of equity against the coalition's legal quibbles and refused the claims: negavit se in eius belli praemia socios admissurum, in cuius periculum solus descenderit (Just. XV 1,2). But this refusal was not entirely justified; for as far as Seleucus was concerned the coalition could plead equity as well as legality: before the final clash with

---

112. Cf. below p. 94.
Eumenes, he had contacted Antigonus (Diod. XIX 13,5), who after having secured his position with his help, had expelled him. That the basis of this ultimatum, juridically considered, was of a mixed nature, appears indirectly from Antigonus' answer (cf. below) and is explicitly stated by Ptolemy and Seleucus after the battle of Gaza, when they sent the royal baggage and the captured courtiers back to Demetrius with the remark (Diod. XIX 85,3), οὐ γάρ περὶ τούτων... διαφέρεσθαι πρὸς Ἀντίγονον, ἄλλ᾽ ὅτι 1. τοῦ πολέμου γενομένου κοινῶ θεωτερον μὲν πρὸς Περδίκκα, ὕστερον δὲ πρὸς Εὐμένη τὰ μέρη τῆς δορικήτου χώρας οὐκ ἀποδοίη τοῖς φίλοις 2. καὶ συνθέμενος φιλίαν πρὸς αὐτὸν πολύντιον ἀφέλοιτο τὴν σταταπείαν τῆς Βαβυλωνίας Σελεύκου παρὰ πάντα τὰ δίκαια, i.e. against the rules of justice and equity which are claimed for Seleucus alone.113

It is conceivable that Antigonus would perhaps have restored Seleucus; but certainly none of the coalition partners believed that he would ever admit the other claims. It is therefore abundantly clear that they issued the ultimatum in order to have a formal justification for war. Antigonus recognized their intention: ... τὰ πρὸς πόλεμον ἐπόντος παρασκευάζεσθαι (Diod. 57,2). This was the immediate reaction to the ultimatum proper. Moreover, in the written answer he entrusted to the envoys (cf. above Justinus' wording), he refuted the claims as a whole. Nowhere is Seleucus specially named. Antigonus omitted him for tactical reasons lest his own position be prejudiced.

(53) The Dogma of Tyrus (315)

Antigonus' second formal answer followed about half a year later in the dogma of Tyrus, which was distributed throughout the empire (Diod. XIX 61,3) and in which he himself justified his war: ut honestum adversus socios bellum suscipere videretur (Just. XV 1,3). It consisted of two parts (Diod. loc. cit.):

a) an ultimatum to Cassander who was threatened with banishment and war, if he did not accede to the demands as announced, and obey Antigonus as στρατηγός τῆς Άσιας and ἐπιμελητῆς τῆς βασιλείας;
b) the declaration of freedom for all Greeks.

The dogma was passed in an ecclesia convoked by Antigonus and consisting of his soldiers and the παρεπιδημοῦντες (Diod. 61,1). This is the first occasion on which we encounter Antigonus as a regent of the empire. To understand the dogma it is essential to ascertain how he obtained the regency.

When he learned that after his rejection of the ultimatum, Ptolemy, Cassander, and Lysimachus had concluded a symmachy (Diod. 57,2; Just. XV 1,4), he took various measures, in particular resuming relations in the Peloponnese with Polyperchon, who would hardly have recognized his de-
position, and could still be considered regent by those who did not accept Eurydice’s dubious action. Polyperchon sent his son Alexander to Antigonus; after his arrival in Tyrus they made a pact of friendship and Antigonus convoked the ecclesia. Diodorus (61,1) connects both events closely in time. But since in this ecclesia Antigonus appears for the first time as epimeletes, it may have been more than a mere coincidence in time and such a supposition would best explain Alexander’s mission. For immediately after the ecclesia, he departed with 500 talents from Antigonus (Diod. 61,5). He would not have needed to come in person merely to confirm the φιλία and to collect the money. He brought Antigonus the nomination from Polyperchon, who had ceded his rights to him and contented himself with the strategia of the Peloponnesian. It was in fact a procedure somewhat analogous to that followed by Antipater in 319 when he designated Polyperchon successor (Diod. XVIII 48,4). Antigonus therefore says: . . . παρεισπήγωτε τῇν ἐπιμέλειαν . . . , not ἔρημενω ἐπιμελητῇ. He was not elected by the army, as Pithon and Arrhidaeus had been in 321 after Perdiccas’ death (Diod. XVIII 36,7) and Antipater shortly afterwards (39,2).

The transfer was officially announced in the ecclesia which was therefore not a mere military assembly. It certainly gave its assent. On the part of the παρεισπήγωντες this was quite informal; on that of the soldiers however it was a legal confirmation but not an election, which was unnecessary after the transfer. It was for this very result that Antigonus had waited in his negotiations with Polyperchon. Otherwise he could have convoked his soldiers immediately after the receipt of the ultimatum, even in the presence of the envoys of his enemies. Yet to do so and to be elected by them as new regent, to send an ultimatum with the threat of banishment and war to another regent who could adduce some sound justification for his position, to take such actions would have flown in the face of any constitutionalism. But it was precisely this point which Antigonus handled with deliberate care as is shown by the tradition in our sources.

Hieronymus did not simply reproduce the dogma but described how it was passed. At first Antigonus levelled an accusation contained in an indictment

114. Cf. (47); Bengtson, Strategie I, p. 87/88.
115. Diod. 60,1; but his expression that Antigonus’ envoy Aristodemus has ‘nominated’ him is incorrect.
117. J. G. Droysen was the first to suppose that Polyperchon had ceded his office to Antigonus but gave no special reasons (Geschichte des Hellenismus, ed. by E. Bayer, Basel 1952, II, p. 217, n. 87). Apart from Granier loc. cit. most other scholars disagreed, recently R. H. Simpson in a special note (‘Antigonus, Polyperchon and the Macedonian Regency’, Historia 6, 1957, p. 371-73). But there is no convincing argument for an exclusive election by the army (cf. also the vague expressions of Bengtson, Strategie I, p. 115 and n. 2). Simpson underrates the legal formalities of which Antigonus was keenly aware and with which Polyperchon could still comply in spite of his political weakness.
of six counts against Cassander. Having aroused the indignation of the ecclesia, i.e. of both of its groups (συναγαγοντων δε των διχων), he submitted the written dogma in which he declared Cassander an enemy if he did not settle those counts of the indictment which could still be settled—he specified them once again—and if he did not obey the epimeletes Antigonus. This provision, together with the condemnation of Cassander’s politics as far as Greece was concerned, led to the second part of the dogma, the declaration of freedom. Both parts were ratified by the soldiers alone. The decisive Greek words for the juridical essence are: ἔγραψε δόγμα καθ’ δ’ τὸν Κάσσανδρον ἐγγενήσατο πολέμιον εἶναι . . ἐάν μὴ πειθαρχῇ τῷ καθεστα-
μένῳ στρατηγῷ καὶ τῆς βασιλείας παρειληφότι τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν Ἀντιγόνῳ . . ἐπιγνωσιμένον δὲ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τὰ ρηθέντα . . ἐγγενεῖτο and ἐπιγνωσισμένων refer to the double sanction given by Antigonus as well as by the army. He spoke now as epimeletes and this was his first legal act. By virtue of his new status, using the same weapon as Cassander, he put the ultimatum to him thus contesting the legality of his epimeleia. For this reason Justinus says: divulgat se Olympiadis mortem a Cassandro interfectae ulcisci velle et Alexandri, regis sui, filium cum matre obsidione Amphipolinitana liberare (XV 1,3).

But as epimeletes Antigonus could not declare Κάσσανδρον πολέμιον εἶναι. This was the right of the army alone which without the παρειληφώτες now gave its assent as the second authorizing body.118 ἐπὶ γνωσισμένον expresses this additional sanction.119 By this extension Antigonus exceeded the simple ultimatum of his enemies. But both ultimata agree that there was no doubt that those concerned would not obey the conditions. Therefore, here also, ultimatum and banishment combined were in fact a declaration of war.120

The second part of the dogma was, strictly speaking, not affected by the ‘epipsephisma’. Even if a legal confirmation was intended, it would have had no relevance either for the Greeks or the other diadochs. The epimeletes alone was competent to issue a declaration of freedom.121 But here too the ecclesia gave its assent and the intended propaganda effect was achieved.122 Ptolemy at once recognized this and followed with his own declaration

119. Normally ἐγνωσισεθαι occurs in the meaning of the simplex. I have not found a parallel for this precise use of the preposition in the compound. Stephanus and Liddell & Scott give simply the general meaning in the Diodorean passage.
120. Cf. above Justinus’ wording XV 1,3 (p. 78). The modern alternative is wrong, whether we have here a declaration of war (Beloch, Griechische Geschichte IV 1, p. 120) or a banishment (H. Swoboda, ZSRG rom. Abt. 26, 1905, p. 284.)
when he heard ἡ δεδομένα τοῖς μετ' Ἀντιγόνου Μακεδόνες. These words which comprise the sanction in the published dogma, confirm the foregoing interpretation: ἔδοξεν Ἀντιγόνος καὶ τοῖς Μακεδόνες. Antigonus' soldiers acted as οἱ Μακεδόνες. Despite the fact that there were several other Macedonian armies, they could now represent the whole Macedonian people as they had been convoked by the royal epimeletes.

(53a) Cf. addendum, p. 110.

(54) Demetrius to Antigonus (312)

In a letter to his father, Demetrius reported the defeat sustained by him at Gaza at the hands of Ptolemy and asked him, ἡ δύναμιν ἀποστείλαι τὴν ταχύτητι ἢ καὶ αὐτὸν παραβάλειν εἰς τὴν Συρίαν (Diod. XIX 93,3; Plut. Dem. 6,1: Ἀντίγονος τῆν μάχην πυθόμενος). Besides oral sources Hieronymus could have used the letter, especially for the exact number of troops on both sides (Diod. 80,4; 82) and for the losses.124

(55–56) Antigonus and the Nabatians (312)

The Nabatians in a letter to Antigonus complained about his general, Athenaeus, and apologized for their own conduct (Diod. XIX 96,1). The letter was written in Syrian characters.125

The answer was also quoted by Hieronymus who, in a comment of his own, did not conceal Antigonus' intention to deceive the barbarians. Hieronymus had a personal interest in these events as he was shortly afterwards nominated epimeletes of the Asphalt Lake of Nabataea (Diod. 100,1).

(57) Seleucus' Circular Letter (311)

After the battle of Gaza, Seleucus returned to Mesopotamia in an attempt to reconquer his former satrapy, Babylon. He defeated Nicanor, the strategos of Media, and wrote of his success to Ptolemy and his other friends (Diod. 92,5).

Hieronymus' report on the campaign (Diod. 90–92) is based on excellent information which came from informants close to Seleucus (cf. his dream and the mood among his friends 90,1–4). The engagements as such, are mostly seen from his side too, and he appears sometimes in an almost panegyric light (90,3–5; 91,5). All this can best be explained if we presume that in some way a copy of Seleucus' circular fell into Hieronymus' hands, perhaps that of Cassander in the Macedonian archives,126 in which the author was rhapsodizing on his success. At the end of the passage Hieronymus

123. Diod. 62,1. Hieronymus has simply mentioned the fact explaining its political reasons.
124. Instead of 500 in Diod. 85,3 the figure of the casualties must be 5000 according to Plut. Dem. 5,3.
126. Cf. p. 44. and n. 16.
hinted at his source when he mentioned the circular letter. A confirmation
is also the following remark of his about Seleucus: έχον ἡδη βασιλικόν ἀνάστημα καὶ δόξαν δέξαν ἤγεμον. This looks like an impression gained
from a direct reading of the letter and is critical rather than laudatory.

(58) Nicanor to Antigonus (311)
Hieronymus had still another written source but from the opposing side.
Nicanor too sent a letter to Antigonus about his defeat (Diod. 100,3). He
had no reason for high-sounding ostentation. I think the traces are to be
found in 92,1–5 (till ἕρμου), where Hieronymus deals with the events from
Nicanor’s standpoint. It is a jejune report of his failure, with exact numerical
data.

(59) The Peace of 311
The abbreviated text of the peace-treaty in Diod. 105,1 is supplemented by
Antigonus’ letter to Scepsis (Welles RC no. 1) from which we learn in detail
the course of the preliminary negotiations. It appears that at first Antigonus
made peace with Cassander and Lysimachus, and that the isolated Ptolemy
thereupon hastened to join them (ll. 29–31). These moves resulted in one joint
treaty which was the evidence used by Hieronymus. It testified to two legal
procedures: a) the termination of the hostilities (διαλύσεις); b) the positive
regulation of the peace (ὁμολογία or συνθήκαι). a/b are clearly distinguished
in Diodorus and in the royal letter. 127 In the final version they were to some
extent combined as follows: διελώσαντο ἤφε ήτε.
b) comprised two major items:

1. the positions in the empire of the parties to the treaty (Diodorus):
i. Cassander was to be strategos of Europe till the majority of
Alexander IV; ii. Lysimachus was to be master of Thrace; iii. Ptolemy
was to be master of Egypt; iv. Antigonus was to be strategos of the
whole of Asia.
2. Greece: i. on behalf of the four parties to the treaty, all Greek states
were to be free and autonomous (Diodorus; RC ll. 2; 55/56); ii. they
were all to swear an oath, συνδιαφυλάσσεσιν ἄλληλοις τὴν ἐλευθερίαν
καὶ τὴν αὐτονομίαν (RC ll. 54–56; OGIS 6,7/8; 38–41).128

Diodorus specifies the συνθήκαι with ἐν δὲ ταύταις ἤν. This looks as if
he is mentioning only a selection of the terms, i.e. the major items, and is
leaving out certain complementary dispositions. One of these, belonging
either to b) 1, i or b) 2,i or added as a codicil, dealt with Polyperchon and the
strategia of the Peloponnese. For Antigonus says (RC ll. 39/40), that after
the peace with Ptolemy, he had hoped, τὰ πρὸς Πολυπέρχοντα θάσσουν ἄν

127. Diod. loc. cit. διαλύσεις ἐποίησαντο ... καὶ συνθῆκαις ἔγραψαν. RC ll. 30/31...
... διαλυθήναι καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ὁμολογίαν γραφῆναι. 51/53 ἵστε οὖν συντετελεσμένας
τὰς διαλύσεις καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην γεγονημένην. γεγράφαμεν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ ....
128. OGIS 6 is the answer of Scepsis to Antigonus’ letter.
Polyperchon's position needed to be clarified by Antigonus and Cassander, inasmuch as they had since 315 used the Peloponnesian strategia against each other.\textsuperscript{129} The wording in the letter creates the impression that the arrangement in the treaty was not in favour of Antigonus' protegé.\textsuperscript{130} Was there also a similar complementary regulation for Seleucus and the Babylonian satrapy? After a widely ranging discussion the question is nowadays generally answered in the negative.\textsuperscript{131} Seleucus certainly was no autonomous partner; \textit{OGIS} 6,5–7 speaks authentically of \ldots τὰς ὀμολογίας τὰς πρὸς Κάσσανδρον καὶ Πτολεμαίον καὶ Λυσίμαχον αὐτῷ (sc. Ἀντιγόνῳ) γεγενημένας. In spite of being the driving spirit behind the war Seleucus was not one of the four chief belligerents; neither was he a co-signatory of the ultimatum, nor was he expressly named in either of Antigonus' counterblasts. Hence he did not appear in the main instrument as given by Diodorus. Antigonus, too, had his reasons for omitting to mention him in the letter to Scepsis. Here the dominant motive is to show his generosity to the Greeks, on whose behalf he claimed to have yielded to Cassander (\textit{RC} II. 12–16) and to have accepted a disadvantageous peace with Ptolemy (II. 32–46). But now the opening words in this second passage, prior to his reference to Polyperchon, run as follows: 'We saw that it was no small thing to give up part of an ambition for which we had taken no little trouble and incurred much expense, and that too when an agreement had been reached with Cassander and Lysimachus and when the remaining task was easier.'\textsuperscript{132}

Ptolemy was in the weaker position and certainly laid no claim to Syria which he had just lost to Antigonus. 'Ambitions' therefore refer to another territory, and this can only be Mesopotamia, which he wished to recover from Seleucus. He really had 'taken no little trouble and incurred much expense' for it when he sent Demetrius with 5000 Macedonians, 10,000 mercenaries, and 400 horses (Diod. XIX 100,4), and this shortly after his heavy losses at Gaza.\textsuperscript{133} His further remark also fits, namely that the task after the settlement on one front would have been easier for him. So his words indicate that he was under a treaty obligation to Ptolemy to leave the Babylonian satrapy to the latter's friend and ally.

Diod. XIX 100 and Plut. \textit{Dem.} 7 throw further light on this passage in the letter. Let us first look at the chronology. The Seleucid Era begins in October 312. It means that Seleucus had returned to Babylonia shortly before. The struggles with Nicanor (p. 81/82) therefore took place in the

\begin{itemize}
\item 130. Another conclusion from the passage is that there was the danger of an agreement between Polyperchon and Ptolemy. But the first's φιλία to Antigonus continued. Here it is called οἰκείωσις which is wrongly interpreted by Welles \textit{RC}, p. 10 as relationship.
\item 132. Welles' translation, \textit{RC}, p. 6.
\item 133. P. 81 and n. 124.
\end{itemize}
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winter of 312/11 and the news of his defeat reached Antigonus in the spring of 311. On receipt of the news he immediately dispatched Demetrius. Yet this was the moment when he was negotiating with Cassander and Lysimachus, or had possibly already made peace. Now it appears from Diod. 100,7 that Demetrius had to conduct a lightning campaign. His father had set him the deadline for his conquest of Babylon. Yet Antigonus’ intention thus becomes clear. At the first negotiations he could easily predict that Ptolemy would soon join them and that the main matter in dispute between them would be Seleucus. Therefore it was necessary for him to conquer Babylon as quickly as possible to make it a χώρα δορίκτητος, obtaining in this way an incontestable title of which till now Ptolemy in particular had availed himself. He failed in his objective. Demetrius could not succeed in time, for the treaty was signed while he was still laying siege to Babylon. He had to withdraw with the main forces leaving behind a smaller corps.

This interpretation is confirmed by Plutarch who says that, before the withdrawal, Demetrius ordered his soldiers ‘to take and make booty of everything which they could carry or drive from the country’. The reason given for this order was: ἡξίστασθαι γὰρ ἐδόκει τῷ κακοῦν ὡς μηκέτι προσήκοναι (τὴν ἄρχην) αὐτοῖς (7,4). This refers to the new legal situation, the validity of which was recognized in this way by Demetrius. It accorded with the propagandist aim of Antigonus’ letter, to interpret his own failure as an act of generosity; and as Seleucus was de jure subject to his hegemony, there was still less need for him to give names and details.

Lately R. H. Simpson, following other scholars, objected to the inclusion of Seleucus on account of the quarrels which he had with Antigonus in the years after 311, and of which we learn from a Babylonian chronicle. Yet Diodorus himself says immediately after the treaty: οὔ μὴν ἐνέμεινάν γε ταῖς διμολογίαις ταύταις, ἀλλὰ ἐκαστος αὐτῶν προφάσεις εὐλόγους πορικτόμενος πλεονεκτεῖν ἔπειρατο (105,1). When the diadochs made peace they were not led by moral considerations. Just as for Cassander the signature meant the death sentence of Alexander IV, so Antigonus conceded the satrapy to Seleucus with the mental reservation that he would take advantage of him in the new situation as soon as possible. Moreover the interval before the resumption of hostilities between himself and Ptolemy, who was even a major partner in the agreement, was only slightly longer (Diod. XX 19,3–5 for 310/9).

134. . . τοῦ χρόνου συντρέχοντος ἐν ὧν συντεταγμένον ἦν τὴν ἄρχην αὐτῶν ποιήσασθαι.
135. Diod. XVIII 39,5; 43,1; XIX 85,3.
136. At the moment there was no other urgent military reason why he should have done so. The liberation of Halicarnassus adjoined in Plutarch occurred at least a year later.
(60) Polyperchon's Summons to the Aetolians (310)

In Greece, too, conflicts continued. Polyperchon agitated against Cassander's aspiration to hegemony by raising troops from far and wide in order to restore to Macedonia Alexander the Great's bastard son, Heracles, whom he had brought from Pergamum. 183a Of the summonses sent out by Polyperchon the most important was that to the Aetolian league which Hieronymus treated in detail: ἔγγαρε δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν, ἄξιον διόδον τε δοῦναι καὶ συστατεῖν, ἐπαγγελλόμενος πολλαπλασίους χάριτας ἀποδώσειν, ἐὰν συγκατάγωσι τὸ μειράκιον ἐπὶ τὴν πατρῴαν βασιλείαν (Diod. XX 20,3). The historian could have learnt the contents of this summons from Antigonus, who was well informed, since Polyperchon was acting with his consent. Pergamum was within his jurisdiction and, without his connivance, it would have been impossible for Polyperchon to effect so explosive an enterprise as the escape of Heracles. 139

(60a) Cf. addendum, p. 110.

(61) Epimachia between Ptolemy and Demetrius (309/8)

Suda s.v. Ἀδημήτριος: Ἀδημήτριος, ὁ Ἀντιγόνου, καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ἀμολογησαν φιλίαν φιλίαν ἐν σύσκοβδον εἶναι ἐπὶ ἐλευθερώσετ εἰς τῆς πάσης Ἑλλάδος καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ τῇ ἀλλήλων ἐπιμαχεῖν· καὶ ἀμιλλὰ ἦν αὐτὸιν, πότερος μᾶλλον τὰ δόξαντα ἐργῳ ἐμπεδώσει. The article ends: διεμίενε δὲ ἄρα οὔκ ἐπὶ πολύ Πτολεμαῖω καὶ Ἀδημήτριῳ ἡ ὀμολογία τῆς ἐξελίξασεν πέρι.

Suda is the only source which deals with this alliance, and doubts have arisen as to whether there ever was a treaty between Ptolemy and the Antigonids—Demetrius never acted without consulting his father—or as to whether the Suda touches on the peace of 311 and then proceeds directly to the diadochs' politics in Greece in 308. 140 Assuming the former possibility, there was only one occasion on which the epimachia could have been concluded, namely, after Demetrius had rescued Halicarnassus from Ptolemy 141 and the Lagid had sailed to the neighbouring Cos (Diod. XX 27,3). That Ptolemy there murdered Ptolemaeus, 142 Antigonus' general in Greece, who had deserted and who had offered Ptolemy an alliance, is the historical argument for the existence of the epimachia. 143 If this had not been so, he


139. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte IV 1, p. 139, n. 2. When Alexander the Great's sister, Cleopatra, tried to leave Sardis in 308 to marry Ptolemy, she was prohibited by the Sardian epimeletes who had orders from Antigonus to keep her under observation (Diod. XX 37, 3–5).

140. For the different views see H. Volkmann, RE XXIII (1959) s.v. Ptolemaios I Soter (nr. 18), col. 1618/19, who supports the latter view, and Cloché, Dislocation, p. 184 and Will, Histoire politique, p. 60/61; 63, who both champion the former.

141. Cf. p. 84, n. 136.

142. On the form of the name Volkmann, loc. cit. col. 1595/96 s.v. Ptolemaios (nr. 11).

143. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte IV 1, p. 145.
would not have deprived himself of a valuable ally, since their disagreement (Diod. loc. cit.) in any case carried less weight than the advantages Ptolemy would have gained against the Antigonids with such an ally. As far as the 'quellenkritische' aspect of the Suda-article is concerned, the exposition of the politics of Demetrius and Ptolemy in Greece in 308/7 is a condensation of what appears in Diodorus, (XX 37 and 45), who, moreover, has the right chronological sequence, i.e. Ptolemy before Demetrius. For Ptolemy's actions the sources complement each other; the compilers based their accounts on the same original, namely Hieronymus, although they stressed the events differently. Arising from their common origin there seems also to be a peculiar resemblance after the rescue of Halicarnassus where Plut. Dem. 8.1 speaks of the ὁμήθαυμασίος of Demetrius and his father, the Suda of the ἅμμαλα of Demetrius and Ptolemy, to liberate Greece; Diodorus had already characterized Antigonus' and Ptolemy's policies towards the Greeks in that way after the ultimatum in 315: διημικαλάντο πρὸς ἄλληλους περὶ τῆς εἰς τούτους ἐθεργεσίας.

(62) Demetrius' Restoration of Athenian Democracy (307)

Diod. XX 45,5 ὁ δὲ δῆμος τῶν Ἀθηναίων κοινόσωμον τὴν ἔλευθεριάν ... 46,1 ... Δημήτριος ... ὁλόκληρον τῷ δῆμῳ τὴν ἔλευθεριάν ἀποκατέστησεν καὶ φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν πρὸς αὐτοῦς συνέθετο. 46,3 ὁ μὲν οὖν δῆμος ... ἐκομίσατο τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν. Plut. Dem. 10,1 ... συναγαγών (Δημήτριος) τὸν δήμον ἀπέδωκε τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν. καὶ προσφέρσετο παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῖς ἀφίξεσθαι σίτου πεντεκαιδέκα μυρίάδας μεδίμνων καὶ ξύλων ναυτηγησίμων εἰς ἑκατὸν τριήρεις.

Diod. 45,2, Plut. Dem. 8,7 and Polyaeus IV 7,6 agree that Demetrius on his arrival in the Piraeus issued a kerygma, διὲ πέμψανεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ ἀγαθῆς τύχης τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἔλευθερωσάντα καὶ τὴν φρουράν ἐκβαλοῦντα καὶ τοὺς νόμους αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν πάτριον ἀποδώσοντα πολιτείαν.147 The kerygma corresponds to the order Antigonus had given to him, ἔλευθερωσάντας πάσας μὲν τὰς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πόλεις, πρῶτην δὲ τὴν Ἀθηναῖων, φρουρουμένην ὑπὸ Κασσάνδρου (Diod. 45,1). The Plutarchean quotation leads to the supposition that we have here, at one and the same time, the preamble of Demetrius' decree (cf. ἀγαθῆς τύχης) and that in it the words of the kerygma were repeated combined with the affirmation of his and his father's goodwill.

144. Plut. 8,1 is closely connected with c.7 where we have good material from Hieronymus. But then Plutarch's source changes (R. H. Simpson, Historia 8, 1959, p. 408).


146. Plutarch is incorrect: Demetrius did not summon the ecclesia (Jacoby, vol. II, p. 249, n. 24).

147. So the full text given by Plutarch; Polyaeus: κήρυκες δὲ ἀνεβόντων: 'Δημήτριος τάς Ἀθήνας ἔλευθεροι.'
to Athens, which is also reflected in Plutarch’s introductory remarks in c.8. In similar form the immediate response of the Athenians to the kerygma as it is quoted by Plutarch, εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτῆρα προσαγωρεύοντες (Dem. 9,1), appeared in their honorary decree (63), which was their answer to Demetrius’ decree. This comprised two main subjects: a) the proper restoration of democracy; b) the alliance of the city with the Antigonids.

a) In the scheme of the decree the difference between it and the decrees of Antipater (14) and Cassander (46) becomes obvious: there the alliance appeared first, here the ἔλευθερια and the return to the πάτριος πολιτεία. The timocratic restrictions of the earlier two decrees were now annulled. Diodorus (46,1) speaks of ὀλόκληρος ἔλευθερια, alluding to the formula that the Athenians should be ἔλευθεροι, αὐτόνομοι, ἄφροδητοι (cf. p. 65/6), and to some supplementary dispositions. For Philochorus F 66 says that Demetrius gave Munychia back, and a specific clause may be surmised which laid down that it should have no garrison, a reply to the treaties of 321 and 317. The same was true in the case of Chalkis and Imbros which were also restored to Athens. Besides, Demetrius may have added a request for the condemnation of the opponents of the new constitution, as was done by Antipater and Cassander; for Philochorus adds that many citizens were later accused, among them Demetrius of Phalerum.

b) As for Antipater and Cassander the φιλία καὶ συμμαχία was also the principal political aim of the Antigonids. According to Plutarch, in the same ecclesia in which the democracy was restored and the alliance concluded, Demetrius made a promise that the Athenians would receive grain and timber for shipbuilding purposes from his father. It is likely that this promise was included in the agreement as an obligation of the new ally, who, by means of this inducement, made the advantage of the alliance obvious. Diodorus (46,4) reports the fulfilment of the obligation together with the restoration of Imbros at a later stage when he tells of the Athenian embassy which was sent to Antigonus.

(63) Athenian Honours for Antigonus and Demetrius (307)

The psephisma which voted the honours was the answer to Demetrius’
decree, and it was moved at once in the same ecclesia; there is nothing to indicate a later date. Diodorus refers to it incidentally in 45,5, but in 46,2 he gives the explicit quotation.162

Plutarch describes in four chapters the honours awarded by the Athenians to Demetrius and his father (Dem. 10–13). In advance he speaks of the ἄμετρια τῶν τιμῶν (10,2), and this is the leitmotif of the whole passage which has an extremely moral tone; in order to show the excessive accumulation of the honours, he cites several psephismata, an ascending series of bad examples and explicitly characterized as such (11,1; 12,1; 13,1). The moralizing reproach of the Athenians and later of Demetrius recurs at the end of cc. 23/24 and cc. 26/27, where he deals with the second visit of Demetrius to Athens. It is not found in Diodorus, and definitely does not come from Hieronymus. Plutarch has here used another source. It has nothing of the sober Hieronymian narrative which is reflected in a good many of the passages up to c. 10, traces of which we also find intermingled in cc. 23–26 and paralleled on each occasion by Diodorus.

This intermingling of Hieronymian elements with other sources begins with c. 10, with the psephisma which was cited by Hieronymus. Unlike Diodorus, Plutarch did not quote the psephisma as a unit, but dismembered it and dealt with its individual points separately. Consequently one gets the impression that already at this stage in his narrative he is speaking of more than one resolution. But Diodorus is right: there was one psephisma only, which was later brought to Antigonus by the embassy. The dismemberment showed up the moral tendency even more clearly, in that it enabled Plutarch to add the emphasis he desired by supplementing the disposition he found in Hieronymus with dispositions from his other source. In this other source decrees in honour of Demetrius were recorded as passed during each of his visits in 307, 304/3, and 297. Some were included which were never passed. Plutarch made no distinction. Accordingly several dispositions are named which are obviously fictitious,153 even in the context where he uses Hieronymus. Close scrutiny of c. 10 reveals his workmanship: the reference to the ἔρως σωτηρὸς is amplified by the remark that this priest was from that time onwards eponym in the place of the archon eponymus (10,4).164 The peplos of Athena which during the Great Panathenaea was conveyed on a carriage to the Eleusinium, there taken down and carried up to the Acropolis,155 induced him to add that the Athenians had set up an altar on the spot

152. Jacoby, op. cit. vol. I, p. 343/44, discusses the possible explanations of this double reference.
153. They have been recently treated by Ch. Habicht, 'Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte', Zetemata 14, 1956, p. 44–50 passim.
where Demetrius first alighted from his chariot (10,5), an event which only occurred in 304.158. Furthermore at the beginning of the passage, where father and son are addressed together, he added that they were called βασιλεῖς for the first time (10,3). But there is no ground for this anticipation of the title which he himself later contradicts, 18,1 (cf. (65); Diod. XX 53,2).

None of the decrees which Plutarch added from the second source seems to have been mentioned by Hieronymus, here or later where he reported the other visits to Athens. The first honorary decree may now be reconstructed from Diod. 46,2 partly combined with Plut. 10 as follows:

a) the mover was Stratocles (Diodorus and Plutarch);

b) the motivation is separately stated by both authors as their own contribution. In Plutarch it is put at the beginning, and in Diodorus at the end. The latter seems to have the more exact wording: (ἐπειδή) δ... δήμος ἐν τῷ Λαμικῷ πολέμῳ καταλυθεὶς ὑπ’ Ἀντιπάτρου μετ’ ἔτη πεντεκαίδεκα παραδόξως ἐκομίσατο τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν (46,3);

c) erection of golden statues of Antigonus and Demetrius in a chariot near the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton (Diodorus);

d) bestowal on both of honorary crowns worth 200 talents (Diodorus);

e) appellation of both as σωτῆρες (Diodorus; Plutarch wrongly θεοὶ σωτῆρες158);

f) erection of an altar in honour of the σωτῆρες (Diodorus; Plutarch 12,4 wrongly 'altars');

g) election of a τέρωδος σωτήρων for their cult (Plutarch);

h) holding of annual games in their honour with a procession and a sacrifice (Diodorus);

i) weaving of their figures into the peplos of Athena (Diodorus and Plutarch);

k) creation of two new phylai called Demetrias and Antigorus (Diodorus and Plutarch);

l) corresponding increase of the number of the bouleutai from 500 to 600 (Plutarch).

(64) Antigonus' Letter to Demetrius in Greece (306)

Diod. XX 46,5 πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱὸν Δημήτριον ἔγραψε κελέων τῶν μὲν συμμαχίων πόλεων συνέδρους συστήσασθαι τοὺς βουλευσομένους κοινῇ περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος συμφερόντων, αὐτὸν δὲ μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως εἰς Κύπρον πλέον καὶ διαπολεμήσας τὴν ταχύτητα πρὸς τοὺς Πτολεμαίους στρατηγοὺς. Plut. Dem. 15,1 ἐπεὶ δ’ ὁ πατήρ αὐτὸν ἐκάλει Πτολεμαίῳ περὶ Κύπρου πολεμήσοντα....

With this important document Hieronymus showed Antigonus taking

156. Habicht, op. cit. p. 48/49.
158. Habicht, op. cit. p. 44, n. 2; 45, n. 12.
decisive steps in his political career towards both the Greeks and the diadochs.

(65) Antigonus’ Letter to Demetrius in Cyprus (306)

After Demetrius had won the naval battle of Salamis, Antigonus in Syria assumed the title βασιλεύς. He also sent his son a diadem, καὶ γράφων ἐπιστολὴν βασιλέα προσέπεσεν (Plut. Dem. 18,1). Diodorus says in 53,2 more generally: συγχωρήσας καὶ τῷ Δημητρίῳ τῆς αὐτῆς τυχάνειν προσηγορίας καὶ τιμῆς.159

But Antigonus’ letter was not specifically a letter of appointment, nor do Plutarch’s words imply this. For after describing how the other diadochs followed Antigonus’ example he goes on in 19,1 to tell how Antigonus, elated by his son’s victory, at once mounted a campaign against Ptolemy. He himself led his forces by land, while Demetrius with a great fleet co-operated with him by sea. Diodorus (73,1) agrees: Antigonus summoned Demetrius from Cyprus and collected troops in Antigonia since he had decided to move against Egypt. These summonses were contained in his letter which revealed his concept and strategy of a combined sea and land attack. In this way the letter had the same character as (64).

(66) Ptolemy’s Circular Letter (305)

The Lagid warded off Antigonus’ attack. He wrote about his success to Seleucus, Lysimachus and Cassander and also told them the number of those who had deserted to him (Diod. 76,7). From the last remark it is apparent that Hieronymus had a special knowledge of the letter. A parallel case was (57). Here too we may suppose that he probably saw in the Macedonian archives a copy which had been sent to Cassander (cf. p. 44 and n. 16).

(67–68) Ptolemy’s Letters to Rhodes (305/4)

For Demetrius’ siege of Rhodes Diodorus (XX 81–88; 91–99) used another source besides Hieronymus.160 The colour of its narration differs from the usual Hieronymian parts, and it is typical of Hellenistic historiography.161 Diodorus followed Hieronymus in his discussion of the aττία of the Rhodian war in the earlier part of the narrative (81/82), which excels in its historical objectivity and has a parallel in his introduction to the Lamian War.162

159. Just. XV 2,10: hac victoria elatus Antigonus regem se cum Demetrio filio appellari a populo iubet.
161. Peculiarities are the picturesque presentation (e.g. 83,2), the technical discourse about the helepolis (91), the characteristics of Demetrius and his manners (92)—one would never expect to find them in Hieronymus’ continuous work at this place—, the anecdotal expansions (e.g. 93,4; 6/7). The same source was used by Plut. Dem. 21/22 who on those points agrees with Diodorus; Demetrius’ characteristics he has put at the beginning of the siege (19,4–20).
162. Cf. p. 53. A single agreement with another Hieronymian passage is also
He returned to Hieronymus again in c. 99, where he dealt with the correspondence which led to the end of the siege. For in 96,1 and 98,1 he reported Ptolemy's two auxiliary shipments with the exact statistics of their loads which were the same on both occasions; on the second occasion Ptolemy also sent 1500 soldiers along. But in 99,2 we hear: Πτο­λεμαίος δὲ γράψαντος τοὺς Ἀντιγόνους ἵνα μὴ πρῶτον διήμερον οὐκ ἔριξε σῖτου πλῆθος καὶ στρατιώτας τρισχιλίως . . . . Diodorus would not have written this if he had previously found in his other source a hint of this letter. He saw it in Hieronymus and used it as a supplement. Hieronymus cited it in connection with the other letters which led to the lifting of the siege and with the final peace treaty, for in a second letter Ptolemy gave the Rhodians the advice, ἐὰν ἡ δονατών· μετρίως διαλύσασθαι πρὸς Ἀντιγόνον (99,2). The fact that after (64) and (65) a third letter from Antigonus to Demetrius occurs in this passage (69), further supports Hieronymus' authorship in Diodorus 99. Thus the chapter is distinguished from the foregoing context by its rich documentary material. Its concentrated style also marks a change in the source.

(69) Antigonus' Letter to Demetrius (304)

At the same time Antigonus wrote to his son, διαλύσασθαι μετρίως ἕως ἄν ποτε δύνηται (Diod. 99,1).

(70) Treaty between the Antigonids and Rhodes (304)

In consequence of the previous letters and the intercession of an embassy of the Aetolian League, a settlement was arranged (Diod. 99,3; Plut. Dem. 22,8). The scheme in Diodorus of the treaty is somewhat similar to that of the one Demetrius concluded with Athens (62):

a) Rhodes was to be autonomous and free of any garrison and tribute; this is a condition which was basic and therefore first and foremost;

b) then followed the symmachia, containing a proviso that the island was not obliged to share in a campaign against Ptolemy, whether undertaken by Antigonus or Demetrius;

c) the Rhodians were to give 100 hostages, whom Demetrius was to select from among those citizens not in office.

(71) The Corinthian League (302)

Plut. Dem. 25,4 ἐν δὲ Ἰσθμῷ κοίνον συνεδρίου γενομένου καὶ πολλῶν

significant: Antigonus' reaction on the Rhodian embassy which rejected his propositions (82,3) is the same as in 315, when an embassy brought him the ultimatum (XIX 57,2; cf. p. 76, n. 106).

163. The number of soldiers promised does not correspond with the actual contingent. First there came somewhat more than 300 Rhodian mercenaries who had served under Ptolemy (88,9), later with the second transport 1500 soldiers. The fact that the difference goes unnoticed can be put forward as a further argument for two sources.

164. Plut. 22,8 confuses it with an unsuccessful former offer of mediation made by the Athenians (Diod. 98, 2/3).
The renewal of the Corinthian League, the constitution of which is partly preserved epigraphically, is not explicitly mentioned in Diodorus. He stops at 103,7 with the surrender of the last Macedonian garrisons in the Peloponnese to Demetrius, i.e. at the close of the campaigning year 303. After the Italian affairs in this year had been dealt with in XX 104/5, the new annual report in 106 starts with Cassander’s reaction: he became frightened when he saw the δύναμιν τῶν Ἑλλήνων αὐξομένην καὶ πάντα τὸν πόλεμον ἐπὶ τὴν Μακεδονίαν συνιστάμενον. This refers to the new symmachy; for there was no doubt as to the identity of the person against whom the general expression κοινὸς πόλεμος was directed, which occurs several times in the act of constitution. There are also other references in Diodorus: the citizens of Corinth asked Demetrius for a garrison in Acrocorinth, μέχρι ἂν ὁ πρῶς Κάσσανδρον καταλυθῇ πόλεμος (103,3). The words are reminiscent of similar reservations in the constitution. Furthermore, the fact that the great number of 25,000 soldiers from the Greek cities followed Demetrius against Cassander (110,4), is to be attributed to the League and the levy exacted from it. It is to be inferred from this that Hieronymus has dealt with its foundation. The above information from Plutarch also appears in a context derived from Hieronymus. As the League was constituted at the Isthmia in spring 302, i.e. between the war-years 303 and 302, Diodorus overlooked it when he inserted XX 104/5 from another source.

A second legal act must be inferred, namely the League’s resolution on the κοινὸς πόλεμος and its proclamation by the hegemones—Demetrius speaking for his absent father. But whether the proclamation of war actually appeared in Hieronymus, is mere speculation. Cassander admitted the proclamation when he asked Antigonus διαλύσασθαι πρὸς αὐτόν (106,2), using the term for the contractual conclusion of an official state of war. Antigonus made unacceptable conditions for a διάλογος (Diod. loc. cit.), but later Demetrius πρὸς μὲν Κάσσανδρον διαλύσεις ἐκοινάσατο (111,2).

(72) Demetrius’ Request for Initiation (302)

After his successful campaign in Greece in 303/2 Demetrius, while still staying in the Peloponnese, urged his initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries as soon as he returned to Athens (Diod. 110,1). That this was expressed in

165. IG IV* 68.
166. 68, 71; 91; 67/8 κοινὴ στρατευμ.
167. 68, 77; 91; cf. Bengtson, Strategie I, p. 156.
169. Cf. διάλογος in Antigonus’ letter to Scepsis, Welles RC 1,10; 30/31; 46; 52.
170. Cf. (74); Marmor Parium B 26 διάλογος Κασσάνδρῳ καὶ Δημήτριῳ.
a letter we learn from Plut. Dem. 26,1, who agrees with Diodorus. He states that Demetrius wished to pass through all the grades at once. Diodorus adds a further detail from the letter: in support of his unlawful claim, Demetrius referred to his ἔλεγχος towards the city. Diodorus states simply that he persuaded the Athenians with his argument. He does not mention the manipulations this entailed, but Plutarch describes them exactly. However, as the anecdotal expansion at the end of c. 26 proves, this part does not go back to Hieronymus.

(73) The Coalition against the Antigonids (302)

When Cassander had heard Antigonus' conditions for peace (Diod. XX 106,2), he hastily concluded an alliance with Lysimachus; thereupon both applied to Ptolemy and Seleucus. Diodorus (106,3/4) and, with a considerable measure of agreement, Justinus (XV 2,15/16), reproduce their offer in detail, the latter stating explicitly, per epistolulas se invicem confirmantes. Diodorus observes generally ἐξεσεμένων πρεσβευτάς, but when he goes on to name the well-known addressees with their full titles it sounds like the quotation from the heading of the letter. The offer started with a description of the κοινὸς κίνδυνος with which Antigonus confronted the other diadochs; then followed a statement on the advantage of concerted action, in which Ptolemy and Seleucus were invited to participate. Both recognized the rightness of what was said, and the coalition was concluded: συνετάξαντο πρὸς ἄλληλους βοηθῆναι ἀδραίς δυνάμεισι (Diod. 106,5); tempus loca iusque coæundi condicunt bellumque communibus viribus instruunt (Just. loc. cit.).

Whereas the coalition of 315 is clearly defined as a symmachy, the term is not used here or by any other author who mentions the alliance. Its character is best explained in Justinus' wording. It was not a symmachy of the comprehensive type τῶν αὐτῶν ἐξήρων καὶ φιλον νομίζον, but a special war-alliance regulating the circumstances of the imminent engagement (tempus, loca). Nevertheless it stipulated the allies' obligation, πρὸς ἄλληλους βοηθῆναι ἀδραίς δυνάμεισι (Diodorus) and the condition to make no separate peace, both of which belonged to the usual instrument of the symmachy. Ptolemy may have insisted on the latter, especially after his experience in 311.

---

171. Jacoby, F Gr Hist III b (Suppl.), vol. I, p. 347: 'the source ... seems to be the same'.

172. We may assume the written form for Cassander's request and Antigonus' answer, although nothing is said in Diodorus.

173. Diod. XIX 57,2; 62,2; Just. XV 1,4: societas.

174. Diod. 106,2 κοινοπραγία; 106,4 ... ἀκαντάς συμφρονήσας καὶ κοινή πρὸς Ἄντιγονον ἐπανελέσθαι πόλεμον; XXI F 1,2 ... τὴν τῶν ἄλλων κοινοπραγίαν ...; F 1,4b ... τέσσαρις βασιλέσις ὁμονόησας ... Plut. 28,2 τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων βασιλέων ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀντίγονον καὶ συμφερόντων εἰς ταύτα τὰς δυνάμεις ... cf. Polyb. VI 67,7; 10; App. Syr. 55,280.

175. The normal formula is παντὶ σθενεῖ (G. Busolt - H. Swoboda, Griechische Staatskunde II, München 1926, p. 1255, n. 1).

Besides, Justinus speaks of the ius coeundi. This seems to be a positive answer to the question as to whether there was any regulation of Antigonus’ territories in the event of a victory. Another hint is in Polyb. V 67,8: after Ipsos, Cassander, Lysimachus, and Seleucus conferred about the territorial rearrangement κατὰ προσαέρσειν. Yet it is impossible for the political map to have been given beforehand in the form which it was to have after the victory. However, in a general way at least, it did contain an inducement to the partners to distribute the conquered territories according to the right of the χώρα δορίκτητος. Such a distribution could have been made informally at the same time as the planning of the attack, and corresponding to it. Ptolemy referred to it when he complained to Seleucus, ὅτι τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Αντίγονον κεκοιμωνηκότος οὐδὲν αὐτῷ μετέδωκαν ὁι βασιλεῖς τῆς δορικτήτου χώρας (Diod. XXI F 1,5).

The only formal distribution was the one made between Ptolemy and Seleucus: ἐπὶ τοῦτος συμπλημμέναι Σελεύκῳ Πτολεμαίοιν, ἐφ᾽ ὑή μὲν ὀλίγης τῆς Ἀσίας ἀρχῆν Σελεύκῳ περιβεβληκαί, τά δὲ κατὰ Κολήν Συρίαν αὐτῷ κατακτήσασθαι καὶ Φοινίκην (Polyb. V 67,10). From this Ptolemy derived his legal title, to which Seleucus raised the objection of the συνθῆκαι after Ipsos. Cassander and Lysimachus are not mentioned in this connection. It must have been a secret treaty, for these two would never have given their consent to a grant so extensive as to place Seleucus in a stronger position than Antigonus.

(74) Preliminary Peace between Demetrius and Cassander (302)

To oppose the coalition, Antigonus summoned his son from Thessaly where he was waiting in readiness to proceed against Cassander. Demetrius wished to avoid the impression that his retirement amounted to flight, and therefore made a peace-treaty with his opponent, contingent on Antigonus’ consent (Diod. 111,2; cf. p. 92). The διαλύσεις were followed by the guarantee that all Greek cities, in Greece as well as Asia, should be free. This treaty followed the pattern of that of 311. Demetrius concluded the peace expecting that its ratification would be made unnecessary by their victory. It turned out to be unnecessary, but not in the sense he had hoped.*

179. Cf. p. 84.
181. Cf. p. 77/78.
* I am much indebted to Mrs. de Beer, University of South Africa, and to the editors of Acta Classica, Prof. Goin and Naudé, for having corrected my English text and in so doing for having contributed in some measure to the contents.
Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.
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