

# The Dating of Perdiccas' Death and the Assembly at Triparadeisus

Edward M. Anson

IN 1992 A. B. Bosworth published two articles challenging the Manni-Errington chronology of the early Hellenistic period.<sup>1</sup> This chronology, often referred to as the "low chronology," which placed in 320 B.C. the death of the regent Perdiccas and the army assembly at Triparadeisus,<sup>2</sup> had been generally accepted by scholars.<sup>3</sup> Bosworth resurrected with modifications the "high chronology," championed by Beloch,<sup>4</sup> which dated these two chronologically critical events in 321. Bosworth's arguments have now begun to be reflected in the literature.<sup>5</sup> It is the purpose of this paper to challenge Bos-

<sup>1</sup> "History and Artifice in Plutarch's *Eumenes*," in P. A. Stadter, ed., *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition* (London/New York 1992) 56–89; "Philip III Arrhidaeus and the Chronology of the Successors," *Chiron* 22 (1992) 55–81 [hereafter BOSWORTH and short title].

<sup>2</sup> E. Mani, "Tre note di cronologia ellenistica," *RendLinc* SER. IV 8 (1949) 53–54, and *Demetrio Poliorcete* (Rome 1951) 67–73, originally presented this chronology, but it was R. M. Errington's work in the 1970s that solidified its acceptance: "From Babylon to Triparadeisus: 323 B.C.–320 B.C.," *JHS* 80 (1970) 75–77; "Diodorus Siculus and the Chronology of the Early Diadochoi 320–311 B.C.," *Hermes* (1977) 478–504 (hereafter ERRINGTON and short title).

<sup>3</sup> This is shown by its use in general histories of the Hellenistic age, e.g. F. W. Walbank, *The Hellenistic World* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1992) 49, 253; P. Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1990) 14–15, 684; J. Boardman, J. Griffin, O. Murray, *Greece and the Hellenistic World* (Oxford 1988) 422.

<sup>4</sup> K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* IV.2 (Berlin/Leipzig 1927) 237–241.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. J. Geiger, "Plutarch on Hellenistic Politics: The Case of Eumenes of Cardia," in I. Gallo and B. Scardigli, edd., *Teoria e Prassi politica nelle opere di Plutarco, Atti del V Convegno plutarco* (Naples 1995) 174 n.3; P. Wheatley, "The Young Demetrius Poliorcetes," *AHB* 13 (1999) 12 n.57; E. Poddighe, "Il decreto dell'isola di Nesos in onore di Tersippo: Ancora una nota sulla politica greca di Poliperconte nel 319 a. C.," *AHB* 15 (2001) 97, 98 n.27, 100.

worth's defense of the high chronology, and to put forth the case once more for the low chronology.

Much of this controversy stems from the narrative of the major surviving source for this period, Diodorus of Sicily. While Diodorus attempted to organize his work around the framework of archon years, consulships, and Olympiads, he often did so inaccurately. In the case of the archon years 321/320 and 320/319, years critical to the establishment of early Hellenistic chronology, Diodorus omits all reference to any of his usual dating referents: there is for these years no mention of archons or consuls or Olympiads (320 was an Olympic year). Unfortunately, the other surviving narrative sources for these years are not especially helpful for chronology. While both Justin's abridgement of Pompeius Trogus and Photius' epitome of Arrian's *History of the Successors* tend to narrate events in a sequential fashion, neither presents a systematic chronology; nor for these years are Plutarch's or Nepos' relevant biographies more than marginally useful chronologically.

Dating events then in this critical period, 321–319, depends on a careful analysis of chronological references in the surviving narrative histories, especially Diodorus, and on a number of non-narrative chronological materials. These include the *Parian Marble*, an inscription of the mid-third century B.C. listing notable events chronologically from the mythic kings of Athens down to 264/3;<sup>6</sup> and a number of Mesopotamian cuneiform texts from the Hellenistic period. The latter include a temple chronicle of Babylonian history, the *Babylonian*, or *Diadochi Chronicle* (BM 34660, 36313);<sup>7</sup> a roster of kings and their regnal years, the *Uruk King List*;<sup>8</sup> and astronomical texts, the *Saros*

<sup>6</sup> *FGrHist* 239.B F 11; Tod, *GHI* II 205

<sup>7</sup> S. Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts* (London 1924) 124–149; A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley 1975) 115–119.

<sup>8</sup> F. Joannes, "Les successeurs d'Alexandre le Grand en Babylonie. Essai de détermination chronologique d'après les documents cunéiformes," *Anatolica* 7

*Canon* (BM 34597)<sup>9</sup> and the *Solar Saros* (BM 36754).<sup>10</sup> Mesopotamians had long kept king-lists as part of their calendric calculations and as a framework for recording important events. By the early or middle fourth century B.C. their lunar calendar had been fixed to a 19-year intercalation cycle, and correlated with astronomical calculations involving the rising and setting of the fixed stars and the record of solar and lunar eclipses. Apart from scribal errors, these texts are generally recognized as being reliable.<sup>11</sup> From these non-narrative sources, one of the clearly dated events in the period 321–319 would appear to be Perdiccas' invasion of Egypt.<sup>12</sup> The *Parian Marble* puts Perdiccas' expedition to Egypt and his subsequent death in the Athenian archon year July 321/June 320, and the *Babylonian Chronicle* places a battle between the "king" and the satrap of Egypt in the fourth year of Philip III, in the Babylonian month of Aiuru (Iyyar).<sup>13</sup> Philip's first regnal year would appear to be 323/322;

(1979–80) 100–101; A. K. Grayson, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 6 (1980–83) 97–98

<sup>9</sup> A. Aaboe, J. P. Britton, J. A. Henderson, O. Neugebauer, and A. Sachs, *Saros Cycle Dates and Related Babylonian Astronomical Texts* (TAPhS 81 [1991]) 13–22.

<sup>10</sup> Aaboe *et al.* (*supra* n.9) 24–31; T. Boiy, "Dating Methods during the Early Hellenistic Period," *JCS* 52 (2000) 117–118. While the *Solar Saros* typically lists regnal years without reference to royal names (except in the case of Antigonos, where an equivalent of *an*, suggesting Antigonos, appears after a 3, and *se*, Seleucus, after a 7), these unnamed years correspond to the names and regnal years found in other chronological texts (Aaboe *et al.* 26–27; Boiy 117).

<sup>11</sup> R. A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology, 626 B.C.–A.D. 75* (Providence 1956: hereafter PARKER/DUBBERSTEIN) 2, 25–26; H. W. E. Saggs, *Civilization before Greece and Rome* (New Haven/London 1989) 236–239.

<sup>12</sup> Manni (*supra* n.2) 53–54; Errington, "Diodorus" 75, "Babylon" 478; L. Schober, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Babyloniens und der Oberen Satrapien von 323–303 v. Chr.* (Frankfurt/Bern 1981: hereafter SCHOBBER) 52; E. M. Anson, "Diodorus and the Date of Triparadeisus," *AJP* 107 (1986) 212–213; B. Gullath and L. Schober, "Zur Chronologie der frühen Diadochenzeit: die Jahre 320 bis 315 v. Chr.," in H. Kalcyk *et al.*, edd., *Studien zur alten Geschichte: Siegfried Lauffer zum 70. Geburtstag* (Rome 1986) 333–334.

<sup>13</sup> Grayson (*supra* n.7) 115–116 lines 4–7; Smith (*supra* n.7) 140, 142 lines 3–4, 6. While the actual year is unstated, line 7 (Grayson; 6 Smith) makes reference to "Philip's fifth year" and associates it with Antipater's crossing to

the death of his half-brother, Alexander III, occurred on June 10, 323,<sup>14</sup> and the start of the Babylonian year was on April 15.<sup>15</sup>

Bosworth, however, argues that the *Marble* is in error, and that the first year of Philip III's reign as recorded by the *Babylonian Chronicle* was, in actuality, 324/323. With respect to the *Marble*, Bosworth points out that on occasion it is incorrect,<sup>16</sup> including in the period from 323 to 301. The *Marble* does wrongly place a solar eclipse, which occurred on August 15, 310, in 312/311.<sup>17</sup> More intricate is Bosworth's argument that Philip III began his rule in Babylon in 324, sharing his first regnal year with what would be Alexander's last, and as the *Chronicle* records Perdikkas' invasion of Egypt in Philip's fourth year, Perdikkas' expedition and death therefore took place in 321 ("Philip" 61). It derives from what he sees as two inconsistencies in the *Chronicle's* dating of events. The *Chronicle* reports the return of Antipater to Macedonia in Philip's fifth year (319/318), even though, according to Bosworth, the crossing was at "the end of winter 320/319" ("Philip" 59). While this dating of Antipater's crossing to Europe would appear to be correct, the evidence is hardly conclusive (Diod. 18.39.7; Arr. *Succ.* 1.44). Moreover, the *Chronicle* itself puts the crossing in "an unknown month" (obv. line 6), demonstrating that there was considerable doubt regarding the chronology of this event even as late as the date of the *Chronicle's* composition, which could have been long after the

---

Europe. There is no significant gap in the text here, so the year must be "fourth," not "third" (see Bosworth, "Philip" 59 n.19). Moreover, there was no other time in this period when a "king did battle with the satrap of Egypt" (Grayson's translation of line 5).

<sup>14</sup> Errington, "Babylon" 75 and n.169; Schober 48, 50–51; Parker/Dubberstein 19–20; Joannes (*supra* n.8) 100. The Babylonian calendar ran roughly from April to March (Parker/Dubberstein 1).

<sup>15</sup> Parker/Dubberstein 36.

<sup>16</sup> This is especially true for Alexander III's reign, see Anson (*supra* n.12) 212 n.25.

<sup>17</sup> Beloch, GG IV.1 190; F. R. Stephenson, *Historical Eclipses and Earth's Rotation* (Cambridge 1997) 348. The eclipse is recorded in Diod. 20.5.5; Just. 22.6.1–2; Frontin. *Str.* 1.12.9.

fact.<sup>18</sup> In any case, the news of Antipater's passage to Macedonia with respect to the time of his crossing may have been misreported, misinterpreted, etc., as Bosworth himself acknowledges ("Philip" 60).

The major inconsistency, noted by Bosworth, is that the *Chronicle* gives Philip III eight regnal years, while Diodorus, likely copying his source Hieronymus of Cardia,<sup>19</sup> states that Philip ruled six years and four months, which puts his death in October or early November 317.<sup>20</sup> According to Bosworth, the best way to accommodate the *Chronicle's* eight regnal years for Philip III is to assume that it began Philip's reign in 324.<sup>21</sup> Since the Babylonian year began in April this might give Philip the eight years stated in the *Chronicle*. Bosworth postulates that Philip was appointed the "ceremonial" king of Babylon by his brother in 324.<sup>22</sup> No source confirms this, and T. Boiy argues convincingly that the listing of both a seventh and an eighth year is

<sup>18</sup> Any dating of the *Chronicle* is speculative. An apparently related text begins a chronological account of Babylonian history with the reign of Nabunassar (747–734) and carries it down to the reign of Seleucus III (see Grayson [*supra* n.7] 10, 27–28). This text may be a copy of an earlier document, or even an extract from a larger version.

<sup>19</sup> Given Diodorus' difficulties, while abridging his sources, of estimating time intervals, exact time references are in all likelihood copied directly from his source (see Anson [*supra* n.12] 209–211), which for his Books 18–20 is generally believed to be Hieronymus (M. J. Fontana, *Le lotte per la successione di Alessandro Magno dal 323 al 315* [Palermo 1960] 151–237; J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* [Oxford 1981] 2–3; K. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* [Princeton 1990] 21, 40, 41, cf. 99, 158).

<sup>20</sup> 19.11.5. The exact date would depend on whether Philip III's reign was calculated from Alexander's death or from the formal settlement at the end of the strife that broke out in Babylon. The period of conflict and the conclusion of the settlement took approximately one week (Curt. 10.10.9). Justin (14.5.10) lists Philip's reign as six years, Porphyry (*FGrHist* 260 F 3) as seven.

<sup>21</sup> Bosworth, "Philip" 75–79. Smith (*supra* n.7: 127, and "The Deaths of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaios," *JRAS* [1928] 618–621; cf. B. Dreyer, "Zum ersten Diadochenkrieg," *ZPE* 125 [1999] 48 and n.91) also places the beginning of Philip III's reign in 324/323, suggesting that Alexander III died in February or March 323. This suggestion is rejected by Bosworth. For a full refutation of Smith's argument, see Schober 50–51.

<sup>22</sup> Bosworth, "Philip" 75–79.

simply an example of posthumous dating.<sup>23</sup> As G. F. Del Monte states, "L'esistenza di un anno settimo e soprattutto di un anno ottavo di Filippo, sia nella Cronaca che nei documenti della vita di tutti i giorni, e probabilmente anche nei Diari astronomici che purtroppo per questi anni non ci sono pervenuti, va considerata dipendente da decisioni politiche contemporanee e non è utilizzabile a fini cronologici."<sup>24</sup>

There is evidence, moreover, which conclusively shows that Philip's first regnal year was 323/322. The *Solar Saros*, as well as certain other cuneiform texts, lists Philip III as reigning eight years.<sup>25</sup> While the *Saros Canon* and the *Uruk King List* both assign but six years to Philip's reign, these texts along with the *Solar Saros* assign seven years to Alexander III.<sup>26</sup> Alexander the Great entered Babylon in the late fall or winter of 331.<sup>27</sup> His first regnal year was recorded as 330/329.<sup>28</sup> Other cuneiform texts list Alexander III as reigning thirteen years, basing their numbering on his reign as king of Macedonia.<sup>29</sup> Whether dating

<sup>23</sup> *Supra* n.10: 118 and n.15.

<sup>24</sup> *Testi dalla Babilonia ellenistica* (Pisa/Rome 1997) 186. The period after Philip III's death occasioned considerable confusion in Babylon. Regnal years in some texts continued to be listed as Philip's long after news of his death must have reached Babylon. The *Babylonian King List* (BM 35603 obv. lines 3–5; see A. J. Sachs and D. J. Wiseman, "A Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period," *Iraq* 16 [1954] 203–205; E. Grzybek, "Zu einer babylonischen Königsliste aus der hellenistischen Zeit," *Historia* 41 [1992] 191–192) records a "kingless" period followed by a reference to a sixth year for Alexander IV. The latter reference agrees with the *Solar Saros'* listing of regnal years six through eleven, following Antigonos' sixth year, obviously referring to Alexander IV (see Boiy [*supra* n.10] 116, 120–121). Neither the *Saros Canon* nor the *Uruk King List* records regnal years for Alexander IV.

<sup>25</sup> Aaboe *et al.* (*supra* n.9) 24; Boiy (*supra* n.10) 118.

<sup>26</sup> Aaboe *et al.* (*supra* n.9) 15, 25, 27.

<sup>27</sup> The battle of Gaugamela occurred only days after a lunar eclipse dated September 20, 331. Alexander moved immediately to Babylon, arriving perhaps three weeks later (see A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great* [Cambridge 1988] 86–87).

<sup>28</sup> Parker/Dubberstein 19, 36; Boiy (*supra* n.10) 121.

<sup>29</sup> Boiy (*supra* n.10) 118. Alexander reigned for either twelve years and seven months (Diod. 16.94.5) or twelve years and eight months (Arr. *Anab.* 7.28.1). Given Alexander's death in June of 323, this would place Philip's assassination in October/November of 336.

from 336/335 (thirteen years), or 330/329 (seven), Alexander's last regnal year in these texts is clearly 324/323.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, an analysis of the *Saros Canon* and *Solar Saros* make it quite evident that Alexander's seventh (or thirteenth) regnal year (324/323) and Philip's first are not identical. Clearly, when there was political confusion over who was the actual ruler, the compiler of the *Solar Saros* noted both traditions. For example, after Philip's eighth regnal year, the *Solar Saros* takes up Antigonos' third; after Alexander IV's eleventh, Seleucus I's seventh.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, if Alexander III and Philip III were perceived as having shared 324/323, the *Solar Saros* would have listed 323/322 as the latter's second regnal year, not his first. Moreover, the *Saros Canon* gives Philip six years, as does the *Uruk King List*, with the following year recorded as Antigonos' first; all three, the *Solar Saros*, *Saros Canon*, and *Uruk King List*, assign six regnal years to Antigonos. Philip's seventh year in the *Babylonian Chronicle* and the *Solar Saros* then corresponds to the implied first year of Antigonos' reign in the *Solar Saros*, and the stated first year in the *Saros Canon* and the *Uruk King List*. Philip's eighth regnal year would then be Antigonos' second. By this reckoning Antigonos' first year would be 317/316, which agrees with Diodorus' statement that Philip III died after reigning six years and four months. The *Uruk King List*, the *Saros Canon*, and the *Solar Saros* all begin Seleucus' regnal years after Antigonos' sixth year. Seleucus retook Babylon in the spring of 311,<sup>32</sup> and his official reign in these documents then began in April of 311.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> See Schober 50–51.

<sup>31</sup> The *Saros Tablet*, a text of the Parthian period, also equates Antigonos' third year (see Boiy [*supra* n.10] 117–118 and n.12) with 315/314.

<sup>32</sup> L. C. Smith, "Books XVIII–XX of Diodorus Siculus," *AJP* 82 (1961) 288–290; H. Hauben, "On the Chronology of the Years 313–311 B.C.," *AJP* 94 (1973) 256–267; Errington, "Diodorus," 499–500.

<sup>33</sup> Many cuneiform documents begin Seleucus' regnal years in 305/304 (when he officially assumed the kingship, see E. Gruen, "The Coronation of the

These cuneiform texts make it a certainty that Philip III's first regnal year was 323/322, not 324/323. Philip began his rule in Babylon at the same time that he became king of the Macedonians. The confusion in many texts regarding the end of his reign derives from the circumstances of his death in distant Macedonia and the ambiguity of both Alexander IV's and Antigonos' positions in these years.<sup>34</sup> The battle in Egypt between the king and the satrap, by the dating of the *Chronicle*, occurred between May 11 and June 8 of 320;<sup>35</sup> this likely puts the invasion in May/June of 320 as well, which agrees with the dating found on the *Marble*.<sup>36</sup>

Also supporting this dating is Diodorus' statement that Perdikkas' death occurred after he had held power for three years (ἄρξας ἔτη τρία, 18.36.7). Perdikkas became regent for Alexander's heirs seven days after Alexander died (Curt. 10.10.9). The Nile had begun to flood during Perdikkas' invasion (Diod. 18.33.2, 18.34.7, 18.35.3). Typically the inundation began in May/June.<sup>37</sup> Diodorus' statement would then affirm, like the *Marble* and the *Chronicle*, that Perdikkas' death came in June 320.

---

Diadochoi," in J. W. Eadie and J. Ober, edd., *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr* [Lanham 1985] 258–259 and n.41). Plutarch (*Demetr.* 18.5) notes that in 305/304 Seleucus now was a king to his Greek subjects, but that he had long acted as king with the "barbarians." Cuneiform texts dating Seleucus' reign from his official proclamation speak of his reigning twenty-five years; those beginning his rule in 311/310, thirty-one. The concluding year is the date of Seleucus' murder in late summer of 281, specifically dated in the *Babylonian King List* (Sachs/Wiseman [*supra* n.24] 205–206), and probably referred to in BM 32957 rev. 1–4 (*Chronicle concerning the end of the reign of Seleucus I*: Grayson [*supra* n.7] 27, 122). Those texts that begin Seleucus' reign in 311 either ignore Alexander IV (so the *Uruk King List* and the *Saros Canon*) or associate both reigns (so the *Solar Saros*).

<sup>34</sup> Antigonos had been appointed royal general in Asia by the regent Antipater at Triparadeisus, but Antipater's successor, Polyperchon, transferred that position to Eumenes. Even after Philip's murder, Alexander IV remained officially king of the empire.

<sup>35</sup> Parker/Dubberstein 36.

<sup>36</sup> Errington, "Babylon" 75; Parker/Dubberstein 20.

<sup>37</sup> See A. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (Oxford 1961) 27–28; Saggs (*supra* n.11) 230–231.



Bosworth, however, argues that Diodorus has not accurately recorded from his source the time interval of Perdiccas' regency.<sup>38</sup> Certainly it is plausible that Diodorus might have rounded up a more precise figure for the length of Perdiccas' regency, or that his source placed the regent's death "in his third year" and Diodorus has "turned the ordinal into a cardinal" (Bosworth, "Philip" 79). But while it is possible that Diodorus may have simplified his source's precise statement of the length of the reign, this is unlikely. Alexander died on June 10, and it is probable that Perdiccas died in the corresponding month. As Bosworth himself suggests as a possibility, the death of Perdiccas could have occurred only a couple of weeks after the battle recorded in the *Chronicle* between May 11 and June 8 ("Philip" 76). The *Parian Marble* puts Perdiccas' death no later than mid July (B F 11). Even if Diodorus' source had given a precise figure for the length of Perdiccas' regency, it is likely that it would only have exceeded the three-year calculation by less than one month. Diodorus would then have been far more likely to round the figure down instead of up. Equally unlikely is the possibility that Diodorus has made his source's "in his third year" into "after three years." It is doubtful that Diodorus' source, most likely Hieronymus, would have been so imprecise, since Perdiccas' death, if in 321 as Bosworth argues, would have been barely, if at all, into his third year as regent.

Additional support for the low chronology is found in Diodorus' statement (18.28.2) that Alexander's funeral carriage took "nearly (σχεδόν) two years" to complete. This would give a date in May/June 321 for the hearse's completion.<sup>39</sup> The carriage then left Babylon to travel to Macedonia, but it was

<sup>38</sup> Bosworth, "History" 75–78; "Philip" 60–61.

<sup>39</sup> Diodorus (18.26.1) places the completion in the Athenian archon year 322/321. However, as noted earlier, he does not end this year, and in fact only picks up his chronological system again with the archon year 319/318. Moreover, he associates the archon year 322/321 with the year of the consuls Gaius Sulpicius and Gaius Aelius, which was 323 (Livy 8.37.1, 3).

intercepted by Ptolemy who took it and Alexander's body to Egypt (Diod. 18.28.2–3; Arr. *Succ.* 24–25). Here again, Bosworth argues that Diodorus has misrepresented his source. Certainly *σχεδόν* might suggest that the approximation originated with Diodorus.<sup>40</sup> However, to fit Bosworth's chronology, the estimate would have to be radically out of line. It was only after Ptolemy's seizure of Alexander's corpse that Perdiccas launched his expedition against the Egyptian satrap (Arr. *Succ.* 1.25; Diod. 18.28.2; Strab. 17.1.8). Given the ornateness of the carriage (Diod. 18.26.5–6, 18.27.3–5) and the ceremonial nature of the procession (18.28.1), it would have taken the funeral cortege at least ninety days to complete the journey from Babylon to Syria where Ptolemy intercepted it.<sup>41</sup> Additional time would be spent transporting the body to Egypt. As Bosworth himself notes, this would require the funeral procession to have left Babylon in the previous autumn, *i.e.* on the high chronology autumn 322. By this calculation the time from the start of construction to the start of the journey west, Diodorus' "nearly two years," becomes less than eighteen months. Moreover, "nearly two years" refers to the time of construction (*σχεδόν ἔτη δύο καταναλώσας περὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν ἔργων*), not to whatever additional period was spent preparing for the body's transportation (*cf.* 18.26.1). While Diodorus was certainly capable of making miscalculations of this magnitude,<sup>42</sup> it should be noted that elsewhere when he uses *σχεδόν* chronologically, and where the reference can be checked, it is used accurately.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> *σχεδόν* is used by Diodorus over 100 times in a number of different contexts.

<sup>41</sup> This estimate is predicated on the carriage traveling directly from Babylon to Damascus where Ptolemy met Arrhidaeus (Arr. *Succ.* 1.25), approximately 800 miles. See D. W. Engels, *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1978) 67–70; Anson (*supra* n.12) 212–213.

<sup>42</sup> See Anson (*supra* n.12) 210.

<sup>43</sup> For example, Diod. 11.68.6, 13.90.5, 15.9.2, 16.76.5, 17.94.1.

Moreover, there is nothing here to suggest that in this particular case Diodorus has made a miscalculation, or that this reference even originates with Diodorus and not his source Hieronymus. In all probability, while the carriage was completed in early summer, the procession did not leave Babylon until September 321 at the earliest. The hottest months in Mesopotamia are July and August. Departure in September would place the rendezvous with Ptolemy in the winter of 321/320, agreeing with the other evidence placing Perdiccas' invasion of Egypt in 320.

Bosworth further argues that it is too difficult to fit into a matter of months, as one must on the low chronology, the various events between Perdiccas' death and Antipater's crossing back into Europe.<sup>44</sup> Much of this seeming difficulty is caused by Bosworth's insistence that Perdiccas' death in Egypt occurred at the earliest in mid-summer, and that the conference at Triparadeisus took place "at the advent of autumn."<sup>45</sup> But if Perdiccas was assassinated in June, or no later than early July (so the *Parian Marble*), much of this compression disappears. The Nile had begun to rise, and there is no evidence that this war in Egypt was very drawn out. Desertions began almost immediately upon Perdiccas' entrance into Egypt (Diod. 18.33.1); the major campaigning all took place in the vicinity of Memphis (18.34.6, *cf.* 18.37.4). And, while Diodorus has clearly abbreviated events, there were apparently but two major battles, relatively close to one another in time (18.33.6– 18.35.6),<sup>46</sup> one of

<sup>44</sup> Bosworth, "Philip" 60. Beloch's original chronology had Antipater returning to Macedonia early in 320, not in 319 (*GG* IV.2 92–93).

<sup>45</sup> Bosworth, "History" 76; "Philip" 60.

<sup>46</sup> While Bosworth ("History" 76) assumes that there was constant fighting from Pelusium to Memphis, this is not recorded in the sources. Diodorus, admittedly in a very compressed account, records just two battles and separates these by a couple of days; the second he places "opposite Memphis" (18.33.5–18.34.6). It is unlikely that Perdiccas, after his failure to clear a canal (18.33.2), planned to cross the Nile at Pelusium, since here he would have to struggle over two branches of the river (Hdt. 2.17; Jos. *BJ* 4.11.5), both of which were defended (*cf.* Diod. 18.33.3). It is also to be noted that Perdiccas learned of Eumenes' defeat of Neoptolemus shortly after his arrival in Egypt

which was between May 11 and June 8.<sup>47</sup> Perdikkas' death occurred in the evening after the second battle (18.36.3–4), and there was apparently no lingering in Egypt after the regent's murder. The "next day" the soldiers met in assembly, elected two new regents, Pithon and Arrhidaeus,<sup>48</sup> condemned most of those still remaining loyal to Perdikkas, and subsequently withdrew (18.36.6–18.37.2, 18.39.1). A week or two may have been spent in preparation and to rest the army from its ordeal, but Ptolemy would have been anxious to have the force and the new regents leave Egypt as soon as possible. While it is unstated, it is likely that any wounded would have remained in Egypt. The march from Memphis to Triparadeisus in northern Syria where the royal army met Antipater (18.39.1) would have taken approximately seventy days; the distance is roughly 650 miles.<sup>49</sup>

---

(18.33.1), and the notice of that commander's victory over Craterus arrived two days after Perdikkas' assassination (Plut. *Eum.* 8.3; cf. Diod. 18.37.1). The first battle against Neoptolemus occurred ten days before the second against both Neoptolemus and Craterus (Plut. *Eum.* 8. 1), but the actual time involved in the dispatch and receipt of the news in Egypt of either battle is unknown. In any case, the total time involved would not have been long. It has been argued that Diodorus has confusedly reported the notice of Eumenes' latter victory twice, but this is very improbable. In neither case is Diodorus summarizing his material; and, while the first victory over Neoptolemus alone has been called "unimportant" (so R. M. Geer in the Loeb, 105 n.1), it clearly was critical to preserving any semblance of Perdiccan control in Asia Minor (see A. Vezin, *Eumenes von Cardia: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit* [Münster 1907] 52; Errington, "Babylon" 66 n.127).

<sup>47</sup> Parker/Dubberstein 36.

<sup>48</sup> This was the same Arrhidaeus who was charged to take Alexander's funeral carriage to Macedonia, but plotted with Ptolemy to take it to Egypt.

<sup>49</sup> While Triparadeisus has not been positively identified, it was most likely in the valley of the Orontes in northern Syria (P. Perdrizet, "Syriaca. I: Triparadeisos," *RA* 32 [1898] 34–39; F. M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine* [Paris 1952] I 26; R. Dussaud, "Triparadeisos," *RA* 33 [1899] 113–121, and *Topographie historique de la Syrie* [Paris 1927] 112; D. Schlumberger, "Triparadisios," *BMBeyr* 22 [1969] 147–149). An army encumbered with elephants, it has been argued, can only average nine miles per day, including days of extended rest (see Engels [*supra* n.41] 155–156). The rate of march postulated by Engels probably could be exceeded given the most favorable of travel conditions. D. Proctor (*Hannibal's March in History* [Oxford 1971] 34) concludes that Hannibal's army, which included 37 elephants (Polyb. 3.42.11), averaged twelve miles per day including days of rest "in open country along the route of a main highway." Engels estimates that Alexander and his army took thirty days to

This would put the meeting at Triparadeisis no later than the latter half of August.

As further evidence for his position, Bosworth argues that the sequence of events from the appointment of Seleucus as satrap of Babylonia at the Triparadeisis meeting, to the expulsion of Docimus from that post, and the latter's retreat to Pisidia, cannot be accommodated in the same year as Perdiccas' death in Egypt.<sup>50</sup> An army journeying from Syria to Babylon would have taken less than two months.<sup>51</sup> If the conference at Triparadeisis was in August, as argued above, Seleucus' entrance into Babylon could have come as early as October, but certainly no later than November.<sup>52</sup> The *Babylonian Chronicle* (obv. line 5) places Seleucus' arrival on 10 Marcheswan (Heshvan),<sup>53</sup> November 14.<sup>54</sup> The sources do not indicate that there was any resistance to the change in command.<sup>55</sup> Docimus had himself occupied the

---

move from Memphis to Pelusium, a distance of 136 miles, but Alexander had moved his army across the Nile and needed the extra time to cross back (Proctor 63–64). The royal army under Perdiccas had not succeeded in crossing to the west bank before the regent's assassination (Diod. 18.33.6–18.35.6). With Ptolemy friendly there would have been no difficulty being supplied while transiting Sinai. The fleet which had accompanied Perdiccas to Egypt had retreated to Tyre (18.37.3). Ptolemy had at least thirty triremes in 320 (cf. Arr. *Anab.* 3.5.5), and perhaps others from Cyprus (cf. H. Hauben, "The First War of the Successors (321 B.C.): Chronological and Historical Problems," *AncSoc* 8 [1977] 114).

<sup>50</sup> "History" 77–78. Probably soon after Ptolemy took Alexander's corpse to Egypt in the winter preceding the invasion of Egypt, Perdiccas sent Docimus to replace Archon in Babylon (Arr. *Succ.* 24.3–5). The reasons for this alteration are not stated, but it is likely that Archon was involved in the hijacking of the funeral cortege. Correspondence between Ptolemy and Arrhidaeus, the individual in charge of the cortege, would have been difficult to conceal from the satrap of Babylonia.

<sup>51</sup> The distance is approximately 650 miles (cf. Engels [*supra* n.41] 64–65 and n.61) and the rate of march would be minimally thirteen miles per day (156).

<sup>52</sup> A. Mehl, *Seleukos Nikator und sein Reich* I (Studia Hellenistica 28 [Leuven 1986]) 40 and n.42; Schober 68.

<sup>53</sup> Grayson (*supra* n.7) 117; Smith (*supra* n.7) 143. The name of the satrap is not mentioned and Bosworth postulates that it was Docimus ("History" 77–78). However, as the year (Philip III's fourth) is 320, not 321 as Bosworth holds, the only possible satrap is Seleucus (see Schober 49).

<sup>54</sup> Parker/Dubberstein 36; cf. Schober 68.

<sup>55</sup> See Mehl (*supra* n.52) 40.

position only after a struggle (Arr. *Succ.* 24.3–5), and probably had not been able to establish firmly his authority before Seleucus arrived on the scene with the order of the kings and regent. Additionally, Seleucus was likely accompanied east by Pithon who may have had a sizable army with him. Such forces possibly were given to that commander at Triparadeisus as a solace for the loss of the co-regency (cf. Diod. 18.39.1–2). Pithon's position as satrap of Media (18.3.1), as awarded in Babylon after Alexander's death, was according to Diodorus simply confirmed at Triparadeisus, while Arrhidaeus, the other former co-regent, was apparently given, in addition to the satrapy of Hellespontine Phrygia, 1,000 Macedonians and 500 Persian archers and slingers.<sup>56</sup> Docimus' retreat to Pisidia with whatever meager forces he retained would have taken little time, possibly less than a month, if these forces were cavalry and/or light-armed troops.<sup>57</sup> His presence in Pisidia is noted only after Eumenes had retired into winter quarters (Plut. *Eum.* 8.7–8). It is also quite plausible that Docimus, after replacing Archon in Babylon, returned to the regent and joined him in Egypt, and from there fled to Pisidia (cf. Diod. 18.39.6, 18.45.3; Plut. 8.8).<sup>58</sup> He had been sent to Babylon after the seizure of Alexander's cortege and before the revolt of the Cypriot kings, which occurred while Perdikkas was still in Cilicia (Arr. 24.1–6). Docimus was then probably sent to Babylon sometime during the winter of 321/320.<sup>59</sup>

Bosworth also holds that Antipater's journey from Tripara-

<sup>56</sup> Diod. 18.39.6. Arrhidaeus is found with these forces in 318 (18.51.1), and it does not appear that they could have been acquired except from the royal army. Perhaps his possession of troops from the royal army is indicated by his failed attempt in 317 to seize control of the upper satrapies (19.14.1–3).

<sup>57</sup> Engels (*supra* n.41: 155) suggests that such an army could travel as much as 40–50 miles per day.

<sup>58</sup> As suggested by Mehl, (*supra* n.52) 39–40. If this was indeed the case, then Docimus may have brought whatever troops he had back with him, leaving only a small garrison in Babylon.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Errington, "Babylon" 69 n.135; Schober 68.

deisus to the Hellespont,<sup>60</sup> with the maneuvering and “active campaigning” of the regent and Antigonus against Eumenes, Attalus, and Alcetas, would have taken several months.<sup>61</sup> Our evidence suggests otherwise. The *Gothenbourg Palimpsest* implies that Antipater and Antigonus did nothing to interfere with Eumenes’ operations in Phrygia.<sup>62</sup> Eumenes moved about western Anatolia with virtual impunity. In fact, the *Palimpsest* states that Antipater’s inaction lost him the respect of his own soldiers (73<sup>v</sup>.3–4). Antigonus was evidently criticized for likewise doing nothing. While he had requested the command against the forces still loyal to the former regent (Arr. *Succ.* 1.38), he had done little against them. Antigonus’ major critic was his chiliarch, Antipater’s son Cassander (Arr. 1.42).<sup>63</sup> The most that either did was apparently to send notices to Eumenes’ camp offering a reward of 100 talents and other honors to whoever would carry out the sentence of death enacted by the army in Egypt against all the loyal Perdiccan commanders, and to dispatch a force under the command of Asander to invade Pisidia (Arr. 1.41). In the case of the former, the “Macedonians became incensed and made a decree that a thousand of the leading soldiers should serve him [Eumenes] continually as a bodyguard.”<sup>64</sup> With respect to the latter, Asander was defeated by Alcetas and Attalus (Arr. 1.41) and subsequently rejoined

<sup>60</sup> Antigonus and Antipater followed the southern or Pisidian route west. They would have traveled up the coast from Syria, passing through the Cilician Gates and Iconium.

<sup>61</sup> Bosworth, “History” 74–79; “Philip” 60.

<sup>62</sup> J. Noret, “Un fragment du dixième livre de la *Succession d’Alexandre* par Arrien retrouvé dans un palimpseste de Gothenbourg,” *AntCl* 52 (1983) 236–240 (fol. 72<sup>r</sup>.14–73<sup>v</sup>.1–11).

<sup>63</sup> R. A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1990) 72.

<sup>64</sup> Plut. *Eum.* 8.11; Just. 14.1.9–10. According to Justin (14.1.11) Eumenes came forward and claimed responsibility for the letters. This aspect of the incident is unlikely. If it were correct, why would Eumenes’ men still believe there was need of a bodyguard?

Antipater and Antigonos, continuing on to his recently assigned satrapy of Caria (*cf.* Diod. 18.39.6, 19.62.2). This reluctance to face these supporters of Perdiccas was due primarily to doubts about the newly-acquired royal army's loyalty to the new regent.<sup>65</sup> Later at Abydus, many of these same troops, just before their return to Europe with Antipater, rebelled (Arr. 1.44).

The journey from Triparadeisus to the Hellespont would require probably slightly more than three months for an army making only necessary stops.<sup>66</sup> The conference with Cleopatra (*cf.* Arr. 1.40; Plut. *Eum.* 8.4; Just. 14.1.7) and perhaps an extended stay in Sardis would not have added more than a month, and probably considerably less. There were no major military operations, other than the force separated from the main army and sent with Asander against Alcetas, and no reason to suppose, given the reconstruction argued here, that Antipater and Antigonos could not have entered winter quarters as early as late November, but certainly no later than mid-December. Antipater's crossing to Europe then occurred early the next year. The events from Perdiccas' invasion to Antipater's departure can then be readily placed in the period from May 320 to early 319. While this would have certainly been a tiring campaign year, it pales by comparison with many of Alexander's campaigning seasons.<sup>67</sup>

There is consequently no need to reject the dating supported by the statements in Diodorus, the *Parian Marble*, and the

<sup>65</sup> At Triparadeisus the "royal army" had mutinied. During this disturbance the troops were receptive to overtures from Attalus, and almost killed Antipater (Arr. *Succ.* 1.32–33, 39; Polyæn. *Strat.* 4.6.4).

<sup>66</sup> The distance along the Pisidian route is about 900 miles, with the army averaging minimally nine miles per day (see *supra* n.49).

<sup>67</sup> 331 saw Macedonian forces move from Egypt to Persepolis, fighting two major battles and a number of lesser ones along the way. This journey started in the spring (Arr. *Anab.* 3.6.1) and ended in January or February of 330 (Engels [*supra* n.41] 73 and n.14).



*Chronicle*. Perdiccas' Egyptian invasion and death, and all the intervening activities up to Antipater's departure for Europe, can be placed in 320. While Bosworth rightly points out that the *Marble* can on occasion be inaccurate, the *Chronicle* in error, and Diodorus imprecise or simply wrong, it is the totality of their agreement that makes the dating of Perdiccas' death and Triparadeisus in 320 compelling.

*July, 2003*

Dept. of History  
Univ. of Arkansas at Little Rock  
Little Rock, AR 72204  
emanson@ualr.edu

APPENDIX  
 Chronology of Events 321–319  
 [Bosworth's dates are bracketed]

<i>Date</i>	<i>Event</i>
10 June 323	Death of Alexander the Great
323/2 [324/3]	First regnal year of Philip III
Sept. 321 [autumn 322]	Alexander's funeral cortege leaves Babylon
Winter 321/0 [winter 322/1]	Ptolemy's seizure of funeral cortege
[Nov. 321]	Docimus replaces Archon in Babylon
Feb./March 320 [321]	Perdiccas leaves Pisidia for Egypt
April/May 320 [spring 321]	Antipater and Craterus cross to Asia
May 320 [mid-summer 321]	Eumenes defeats Neoptolemus in Asia Minor Perdiccas arrives at Pelusium
May/June 320 [mid-summer 321]	Eumenes defeats Craterus and Neoptolemus Battles between Perdiccas and Ptolemy
June 320 [mid-summer 321]	Perdiccas assassinated
Aug. 320 [autumn 321]	Triparadeisus
14 Nov. 320 [winter 321/0]	Seleucus takes over Babylon
Feb./March 319 [winter 320/19]	Antipater crosses to Europe