Nicanor Son of Balacrus
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The labyrinth of Macedonian prosopography offers numerous paths of inquiry, but inevitably, in the case of each individual, only one of these can lead to daylight; for it is clear that there is but a single correct identification. Without certainty, however, various paths offer hope, and with it a set of implications for the interpretation of events. A case in point is the mysterious Nicanor son of Balacrus, named by the Suda (N 376) and Harpocrasion (s.v.), though curiously without further comment. Since they list him together with Nicanor son of Parmenion, the commander of Alexander’s hypaspists, and Nicanor of Stageira, who proclaimed the “Exiles’ Decree” in 324, it is highly likely that the son of Balacrus was also an agent or officer of Alexander the Great. Berve lists five individuals under the name Balacrus, but these can probably be reduced to three, of whom the most famous was Balacrus son of Nicanor, the former Somatophylax of Alexander and satrap of Cilicia. Hence it is tempting to regard Nicanor son of Balacrus as a son of the Somatophylax and named for his paternal grandfather. Nevertheless, one would not expect a lexicographer to remark on this individual unless he had made some significant historical contribution. What then could have been Nicanor’s claim to fame?

1 For Balacrus son of Nicanor see Arr. Anab. 2.12.2, cf. Diod. 18.22.1. H. Berve, Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage II (Munich 1926) 100–101, no. 200; W. Heckel, The Marshals of Alexander’s Empire (London 1992) 260–261; the Balacrus who campaigned in Asia Minor (Berve no. 203) is almost certainly the former Somatophylax. The others of this name are the son of Amyntas who was left in Egypt with Peucestas son of Macaratus (Arr. 3.5.6) and the commander of the akonistai (Berve no. 201; he is probably identical with Berve’s no. 202, and I see no reason for assuming that Arr. 4.24.10 refers solely to pezhetairoi). See W. Heckel, Who’s Who in the Age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander’s Empire (Oxford 2006) 68–69.
The garrison commander of Munychia

A. B. Bosworth has argued persuasively against the commonly accepted view that the garrison commander of Munychia installed by Cassander in place of Menyllus was Aristotle’s nephew, Nicanor of Stageira.² Certainly this man had none of the qualifications for the office—though, admittedly, this could be said of many officials throughout history.³ But one would expect the Suda to have remarked upon the Stageirite’s role as phrourarchos and naval victor, if this had in fact formed part of his career. Furthermore, it would indeed be surprising for Aristotle’s nephew to have played such an important role in Athenian politics without eliciting comment from any historian or orator, whether in an original text or from information gleaned from lost sources and preserved in writers like Athenaeus, Polyaenus, or even the lexicographers. In this case, silence surely counts for something.

Bosworth contends that Nicanor son of Balacrus, about whom the Suda records nothing else, was Cassander’s phrourarchos and the admiral who defeated—albeit with substantial help from Antigonus’ ground forces—Polyperchon’s nauarchos, White Cleitus.⁴ What argues for, but also against, this theory is Bosworth’s identification of Nicanor as the son of Cassander’s

² “A New Macedonian Prince,” CQ 44 (1994) 57–65; cf. Chr. Habicht, Athens from Alexander to Antony (Cambridge [Mass.] 1997) 40 n.37. For the replacement of Menyllus by Nicanor see Diod. 18.64, Plut. Phoc. 31. For his identification with Nicanor of Stageira see W. S. Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens (London 1911) 28 n.3, 36; he would not, however, be unique in Greek history as a philosopher among politicians.

³ As the adopted son and son-in-law of Aristotle, he had connections with Antipater and his family; in the period immediately after 323 a rumor circulated that Antipater and Cassander, with the help of Aristotle, had poisoned Alexander (Plut. Alex. 77.2–4). Aristotle himself left Athens in 322 and died in Chalcis. If his adopted son, who was associated with the immensely unpopular (in Athens) Exiles’ Decree, was the man who controlled Munychia, it is surprising that the sources do not mention this.

⁴ For the victory over Cleitus see Diod. 18.72, Polyena. Strat. 4.6.8; and R. Engel, “Polyäns Strategem IV 6, 8 zur ‘Seeschlacht am Hellespont’,” Klio 55 (1973) 141–145; R. A. Billows, Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1990) 86–98; Heckel, Marshals 186–187.
sister, Phila, who is elsewhere attested as a wife of Balacrus. In the plus column we would chalk up the “fact” that the garrison commander was Cassander’s nephew, and thus an ideal candidate for the position; though, as events would prove, Cassander had reasons to distrust him after his naval victory and had him assassinated. In the minus column we may put a number of arguments, including those e silentio: the failure of any source to identify the phrourarchos by patronymikon, as the nephew of Cassander, or as the stepson of Demetrius Poliorcetes; the fact of Nicanor’s youth and lack of experience; and the impli-


6 Antigonus Gonatas was later to place his half-brother Craterus—who is (significantly?) identified as such—in charge of Corinth (Plut. Mor. 486A).


8 Nicanor son of Balacrus would thus have been a half-brother of Antigonus Gonatas, and it would be surprising if Hieronymus of Cardia withheld the information, especially when he noted the relationship of various individuals in the Antigonid camp (for example, Diod. 19.59.3, 6: Phila, former wife of Craterus and now wife of Demetrius; 19.62.9: Diodocrides, nephew of Antigonus; 20.27.3: Ptolemaeus/Polemaeus, nephew of Antigonus) and elsewhere (Diod. 18.37.2: Atalante, the sister of Perdiccas and wife of Attalus; 19.11.8: Nicanor, brother of Cassander; 19.14.1: Eudamus, brother of Peithon; 19.75.1: Agathon, brother of Asander). Of course, Diodorus might have omitted information supplied by Hieronymus concerning Nicanor’s identity, but it is surprising that no other source, particularly Plutarch, attests a relationship between Cassander and Nicanor.

9 Although this is a factor, it cannot stand on its own, since the age of Alexander and the Diadochoi has no shortage of young commanders, and one could add that, before the Lamian War, White Cleitus had no experience as a naval commander. But the strategic and tactical knowledge that comes from previous service (even if on land) must be taken into account, and the combination of youth and inexperience deserves consideration.
cations of Nicanor’s assassination for the relationship between Cassander and Phila.\textsuperscript{10}

\textit{Balacrus the Somatophylax and his sons}

It is with the father, Balacrus, that we must begin. His life-span is difficult to determine. Since we do not hear of Balacrus’ appointment as Somatophylax during Alexander’s reign, there is a strong likelihood that he served in this capacity under Philip II.\textsuperscript{11} After the battle of Issus (November 333), he was replaced as Somatophylax by Menes and appointed satrap of Cilicia (Arr. 2.12.2). In this capacity he campaigned with Antigonus and Calas, two other satraps of Asia Minor, against the remnants of the Persian forces (Curt. 4.5.13), which had actually increased after Darius’ defeat at Issus.\textsuperscript{12} Although we are told that he was killed in battle against the Pisidians, the dating of this event is uncertain. Diodorus says only that it occurred while Alexander was still alive (18.22.1, ἕττο ζῶντος Ἀλεξάνδρου), which probably indicates that it occurred not long before Alexander died, and Balacrus’ death is best linked to the events that preceded or coincided with the flight of Har---

\textsuperscript{10} See Plut. Demetr. 32.4 for Phila’s role as a liaison between Demetrius and Cassander in the period after Ipsus.

\textsuperscript{11} Alexander must have inherited a number of officials at the court, as well as officers in the army, at the time of his accession. It was a matter of time before he could replace these with men of his own choosing, and, if Balacrus son of Nicanor was the son-in-law of Antipater, on whose support Alexander relied at the beginning of his reign, his position in 336 must have been secure. Other Somatophylakes from Philip’s era were Arybbas and Demetrius; perhaps even Peithon, Lysimachus, and Aristonus. See W. Heckel, “The Somatophylakes of Alexander the Great: Some Thoughts,” Historia 27 (1978) 224–228; Marshals 257–262.

\textsuperscript{12} Berve, Alexanderreich II 101, no. 203, rejects this identification; J. E. Atkinson, A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus’ Historiae Alexandri Magni, Books 3 and 4 (Amsterdam 1980) 327, remarks that “there is no obvious reason why the satrap of Cilicia should have operated as far west as Miletus.” In fact, the Macedonians were taking a page out of the Persian defense manual; just as a coalition of Asia Minor satraps had attempted to deal with the initial invasion, so now a Macedonian coalition was at work removing the pockets resistance (cf. Billows, Antigonus 44). The appointment of Socrates to Cilicia (Curt. 4.5.9) probably refers to his role as strategos of the troops stationed there for the satrapy’s defense. That is, Socrates controlled Cilicia in Balacrus’ absence.
palus and the arrival of Craterus in Cilicia.\textsuperscript{13}

The date of Balacrus’ birth will depend, to a certain extent, on whether Philip son of Balacrus was his son. This man was sufficiently well established in 331 to stand in as taxarch of the Tymphaean battalion of \textit{pezhetairoi} at Gaugamela in place of Amyntas son of Andromenes. Arrian (3.11.9) says that the \textit{taxis} was commanded by Simmias, apparently the brother of Amyntas, but the text is corrupt in that it refers to Amyntas as “son of Philip” rather than “son of Andromenes”: τούτων δὲ ἐχομένη ἡ Κοῖνου τοῦ Πολεμωρχάτους τάξες ἦν, μετὰ δὲ τούτων ἡ Περίδίκου τοῦ Ὀρόντου, ἔπειτα ἡ Μελεάγρου τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου, ἐπὶ δὲ ἡ Πολυπέρχοντος τοῦ Σιμμίου, ἐπὶ δὲ ἡ Ἄμυντου τοῦ Φιλίππος ταύτης δὲ ἒγέρει τοῖς ἑαυτῷ Σιμίασ, ὅτι Αμύντας ἐπὶ Μακεδονίας ἐς ξυλογήν στρατιάς ἐστηλμένος ἦν. Now, one would be tempted to see the name Simmias as an intrusion into the text resulting from the mention of “Polyperchon son of Simmias” in the preceding line, but the younger Simmias’ command is confirmed at 3.14.4. Diod. 17.57.3 says that the \textit{taxis} next to Polyperchon’s was led by Philip son of Balacrus; and this finds some support in Curt. 4.13.28, where \textit{Philippus Balacri} [or \textit{Balagri}] is the obvious correction of the MSS. reading \textit{phaligrus}. It appears that the common source of Diodorus and Curtius indicated that Philip son of Balacrus commanded Amyntas’ battalion in his absence. Arrian’s assignment of the \textit{taxis} to Simmias may mean that he, as Amyntas’ brother, had nominal command of the battalion, but that the practical leadership was given to a more experienced officer. Philip son of Balacrus may, in fact, have led a battalion at the Granicus. It is tempting to identify him with the “Philip son of Amyntas,” named by Arrian 1.14.2, and to emend the text to read ἐπὶ δὲ ἡ Ἄμυντου τοῦ Ἀνδρομένους ἐπὶ δὲ ἐν τοῖς Φιλίππος ὁ [Βαλάκρου] ἤχες, on the assumption that Ἄμυντου has intruded from the preceding line. At Gaugamela, Simmias’ [i.e. Philip’s] battalion did not return to its normal place (third in the line from Alex-

ander) but remained in the fifth position, between Polyperchon and Craterus, which may also indicate that Alexander was concerned about the performance of the unit in Amyntas’ absence.\textsuperscript{14}

Since Philip is unlikely to have been born much later than 360, his father must have been born ca. 380 and was thus roughly coeval with Antigonus the One-Eyed. On the other hand, Balacrus’ widow, Phila, married the young Demetrius in 320 and, although she was considerably older than her last husband (Plut. \textit{Demetr.} 14.3),\textsuperscript{15} she can scarcely have been born much earlier than 360. Furthermore, if Balacrus adopted traditional naming practices (that is, naming the first-born son after the paternal grandfather), Nicanor son of Balacrus may have been an older brother of Philip. At best, Phila was their younger stepmother.\textsuperscript{16} The oldest son of Phila and Balacrus was apparently named Antipater in honor of the maternal grandfather.\textsuperscript{17} Certainly none of this rules out Nicanor son of

\textsuperscript{14} Unless there is some confusion in the sources, Amyntas’ battalion occupied the number five spot at Issus (Arr. 2.8.4, Curt. 3.9.7). For Simmias’ conduct at Gaugamela see A. B. Bosworth, “Arrian and the Alexander Valgate,” in E. Badian (ed.), \textit{Alexandre le Grand: image et réalité} [Entretiens Hardt 22 [Geneva 1976]] 1–46, esp. 9–14; cf. A. B. Bosworth, “Errors in Arrian,” \textit{CQ} 26 (1976) 117–139, at 125. The existence of a phalanx commander named Philip is made virtually certain by the fact that Arrian (perhaps having difficulty reconciling his sources) mentions his battalion twice, although in the second case (1.14.3) Philip is listed without patronymic.

\textsuperscript{15} Of course, the date of Demetrius’ marriage to Phila involves the thorny question of the chronology of the early Successors. I would date Triparadies to 320 B.C., but the arguments for 321 are still accepted by many scholars. For a discussion of the chronological problems see P. Wheatley, “An Introduction to the Chronological Problems in Early Diadoch Sources and Scholarship,” in W. Heckel, L. A. Tritle, and P. Wheatley (eds.), \textit{Alexander’s Empire: Formulation to Decay} (Claremont 2007) 179–192.

\textsuperscript{16} Landucci Gattinoni, \textit{L’arte del potere} 68–69 n.67: “nato non dalle nozze con Fila, ma da un precedente …”

\textsuperscript{17} The naming of the first son for the maternal grandfather often indicates that the groom has “married up”: for example, Pyrrhus named his first son, Ptolemy, in honor of his father-in-law, Ptolemy Soter (Plut. \textit{Pyrrh.} 4.7), Antigone’s stepfather. The dedications on Delos name Antipater, Thraseas, and even a Balagros or Balacrus (see G. Reger, “The Family of Balakros son of Nikanor, the Macedonian, on Delos,” \textit{ZPE} 89 [1991] 151–
Balacrus as Cassander’s lieutenant in Athens, but it does eliminate the direct family connection and thus makes the identification somewhat less compelling.

Richard Billows restores as Βαλάκρους or Βαλάγρου the patronymikon of a certain Philip, honored by the Athenians in a decree of Stratoctes (IG II² 561) between 307 and 301 and identified as a former Somatophylax of “King Alexander” (the king’s name must be restored, but it is virtually certain) but currently serving with Antigonus and Demetrius. When I inspected the stone in the Épigraphic Museum in 1980, I believed that the first letter of the patronymikon should be restored as Μ, but Billows has argued, on the basis of his own observations, that the letter must be Β, Ε, Γ, or Π. The stone is badly weathered, and what seems to be a diagonal chisel stroke may be the result of natural wear. If the correct reading is Β, we may have hard evidence that Philip son of Balacrus was a supporter of the Antigonids in the last decade of the fourth century, if not earlier. Billows does not, however, identify Philip’s father with Balacrus son of Nicanor, although I believe a case can be made for this.

Despite the tension that developed between Antigonus and Antipater in the year of Triparadeisus, and the relief with which Antigonus greeted the old regent’s death in 319, there is little doubt that the two families were political allies in the reigns of Philip II and Alexander III. In fact, in the first years of

154), and it is not impossible that Phila was the mother of all three. It is difficult, however, to account for the name Thraseas, which is otherwise unattested amongst Macedonians of this period. Bosworth, CQ 44 (1994) 60–61, is circumspect.

18 The arguments for the various Philippoi are conveniently summed up in P. V. Wheatley, “Problems in Analysing Source Documents in Ancient History: The Case of Philip, Adviser to Demetrius Poliorcetes,” Limina 3 (1997) 61–70. Billows does not, however, accept the view that Philip was one of the three Somatophylakes of Alexander IV. I know of no other inscriptive evidence in which somatophylax is used to mean hypaspistes, and since we know that three of the four Somatophylakes of Philip III were relatives of Somatophylakes of Alexander the Great, the possibility that a son of Balacrus the Somatophylax served Alexander IV in a similar capacity becomes more attractive. For the text of the inscription, see W. Heckel, “Honours for Philip and Iolaos (IG II² 561),” ZPE 44 (1981) 75–77.
the Asiatic campaign, much of Asia Minor was in the hands of administrators who might be termed members of the Antipatrid-Antigonid group. Antipater’s general in the Peloponese, Corrhapas (Aesch. 3.165), may have been the father of Stratonice, Antigonus’ wife and the mother of Demetrius and Philip (Plut. Demetr. 2.1). And Balacrus, who is linked with Antigonus in the suppression of insurgents and the remnants of the Persian forces after Issus (Curt. 4.5.13), had married Phila before the beginning of Alexander’s expedition. Hence, if there were two mature sons of Balacrus campaigning with Alexander, it would not be surprising to find them amongst the friends of Antigonus and Antipater.

Officers named Nicanor

There are at least twelve attested Nicanors in the histories of Alexander and the Successors, of whom only two can be eliminated on the basis of patronymikon—the sons of Parmenion and Antipater. The most likely candidate for identification with the son of Balacrus is, to my mind, Antigonus’ agent, who negotiated the surrender of Eumenes after the battle of Gaugamela (Plut. Eum. 17.5). Billows identifies this Nicanor with the man who was awarded Cappadocia at Triparadeisus (Diod. 18.39.6, Arr. FGrHist 156 F 9.37), which may indeed be the case. At Triparadeisus, where the friends and supporters of


20 He is certainly not the Corrhapas who was humiliated by the pankratias Dioxippus in India (Diod. 17.100.1–101.6, Curt. 9.7.16–26, cf. Aelian VH 10.22).


22 I do not, however, accept Billows’ view (Antigonos 409) that Nicanor was removed from Cappadocia in favor of Menander. This reads too much into Diod. 18.59.1, which merely indicates that Menander was sent at the head of the forces sent by Antigonus into Cappadocia and does not mean that he was strategos in the military-administrative sense. I am inclined to take δύναμιν ἀξιόλογον καὶ στρατηγοὺς τοὺς περὶ Μένανδρον to mean that Menander was the senior commander of the force sent into Cappadocia.
Antipater and Antigonus were amply rewarded, one member of the latter’s family was appointed Somatophylax of Philip III Arrhidaeus (there were four of these: Arr. 156 F 9.38); Philip son of Balacrus was apparently appointed as one of the three Somatophylakes of Alexander IV (IG II² 561) and his brother, Nicanor, received Cappadocia. In 318/7, Nicanor accompanied Antigonus eastward with his satrapal forces, fought at Paraetacene and Gabiene, and then secured the arrest of Eumenes. Afterwards, he was appointed strategos of the Upper Satrapies (Diod. 19.100.3), the position once held by Peithon son of Crateus (Diod. 18.7.3). He was subsequently killed in battle with Seleucus (App. Syr. 55, 57).

*The phrourarchos of Munychia (again)*

What then of the phrourarchos of Munychia. If he was not the kinsman of Aristotle, Nicanor of Stageira, then we must find another viable candidate. I believe such a person is not far to seek. In 334, the first year of Alexander’s Asiatic campaign, the allied fleet, which contained a substantial Athenian contingent, was commanded by a certain Nicanor (Arr. 1.18.4, 19.3). After the Miletus campaign, the fleet was disbanded and Nicanor is not heard of again (Arr. 1.20.1). He may, of course, have joined the land army, but we should be hard pressed to

---

23 At least two brothers of the four Somatophylakes of Philip III Arrhidaeus were assigned satrapies at Triparadeisus (Peucestas, Lysimachus).

24 Nicanor is not named in the accounts of either battle, but Antigonus’ troop deployments are not given in the same detail as those of Eumenes, certainly an indication of Hieronymus’ presence in the latter camp.

25 See the discussion in H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit I* (Munich 1937) 176–186.

26 App. Syr. 55 calls him Antigonus’ satrap of Media. But Diod. 19.46.5 says that Antigonus installed a Mede named Orontobates. Meleager and Menoeatas may have intended to replace him with another Mede named Ocranes (19.47.4). At any rate, Nicanor appears to have exercised control over several satrapies as strategos. Cf. Billows, *Antigonos* 413–414 s.v. “Orontobates.”

identify him with another officer of the same name.\textsuperscript{28} He may have returned to Macedonia and remained with Antipater. But, since Antipater’s Macedonian fleet, which was sent to deal with the Persian threat in the Aegean, was commanded by Proteas, this seems unlikely.\textsuperscript{29} When Alexander reconstituted the fleet in 333, he entrusted it to Amphoterus and Hegelochus. What, then, became of Nicanor? Possibly, the twenty Athenian ships from the original allied (or “Hellenic”) fleet, which remained with Alexander (Diod. 17.22.5) as “hostages” for the good behavior of the Athenians, were commanded by Nicanor.\textsuperscript{30} In 318, in the light of his earlier associations with Athens and his naval experience, he was placed in charge of Munychia, and he proved his worth as a naval commander in the Propontis.\textsuperscript{31} Like White Cleitus, who, after the victory at Amorgus, had played the part of Poseidon, Nicanor let the victory go to his head, and he incurred the envy and distrust of Cassander, who had him killed.\textsuperscript{32}

There is, of course, nothing to rule out the identification of Alexander’s admiral and Cassander’s phrourarchos (if they are in fact the same man) with the son of Balacrus. But it is more likely that the sources did not mention his lineage because it was not particularly distinguished. Certainly the admiral of Alexander’s “Hellenic” fleet could not have been a son of

\textsuperscript{28} Identification with the hyparchos of Parapamisadae is not impossible, but unlikely (see Berve, Alexanderreich II 275–276, no. 556).

\textsuperscript{29} Arr. 2.2.4–5. Proteas was the son of Andronicus and Lanice (the sister of Black Cleitus). See Heckel, Who’s Who 233.

\textsuperscript{30} These were the ships with which Hephaestion conveyed the siege equipment from Tyre to Gaza in 332 (Curt. 4.5.10), but this does not rule out Nicanor’s command of them. The entire Hellenic fleet had numbered 160 ships (Arr. 1.18.4).

\textsuperscript{31} Diod. 18.72.3–8, Polyaien. 4.6.8. Whether Nicanor’s fleet was crewed by Athenians or Macedonians is unclear. K. Buraselis, Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis. Forschungen zur Politik des Kassandros und der drei ersten Antigoniden (Munich 1982) 33 n.188, notes that Polyaienus’ reference to the inexperience of the sailors (τῶν ναυτῶν ἐπὶ ἀπειρίας πρὸς ἐναντίον κῦμα βιαζομένων) suggests that they were raw Macedonian recruits.

\textsuperscript{32} Diod. 18.75.1, Polyaien. 4.11.2. Polyaienus says that Cassander handed Nicanor over to the Athenians, who executed him for his past “crimes” against the state, but Diodorus speaks of assassination (ἐδολοφόνησεν).
Phila, and the fact remains that we have no firm evidence that Phila ever bore a son named Nicanor, despite the occurrence of the name in the Antipatrid family. It is also significant that Nicanor held the rank of phrourarchos, not a prestigious office, and that when Cassander occupies Piraeus there is no indication in the sources of friendship or familial connections. Cassander is said, at first, to have looked favorably upon Nicanor’s naval victory on account of his good fortune, but his secretive elimination of the man is reported in a matter-of-fact way, without any concern for the implications of killing a man who was linked by blood and marriage to both Antigonus and Demetrius, and to Cassander himself. Political connections, and considerations of age, favor the identification of Nicanor son of Balacrurus with the officer of Antigonus the One-Eyed rather than with the agent of Cassander.
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33 The known phrourarchoi in Alexander’s lifetime are Archelaus (Bactrian Aornus), another Archelaus (Tyre), Attinas (Bactria/Sogdiana: specific location unknown), Nicarchides (Persepolis), Pantaleon (Memphis), Pausanias (Sardis), Peucolaus (Bactria/Sogdiana: specific location unknown), Philip (Peucelaotis), Philotas (Thebes), another Philotas (Tyre), Polemon (Pelusium) and Xenophilus (Susa). Unless we can identify the phrourarchos of Peucelaotis with the son of Machatas, which I think is unlikely, there is not one prominent individual in this group. Several are described as hetairoi, and in some cases we known their father’s names, but they clearly belong to what we might call the lesser nobility. The regional strategoi are higher-ranking officials and are more frequently attested with patronymika. Xenophilus the phrourarchos played an important role in the early history of the Successors and is called gazophylax, but his origins are entirely obscure, and much the same can be said for Andronicus the Olynthian, who became Antigonus’ commandant in Tyre. Menyllus, appointed as phrourarchos in Munychia after the death of Alexander, fits the pattern as well. Why should we expect anything different from Nicanor?
* Phila’s second husband was Craterus, to whom she bore the younger Craterus.