

The Regnal Years of Philip and Alexander

N. G. L. Hammond

THERE HAS BEEN AND IS much dispute about the regnal years of Philip. Some have held that he became king on the death of Perdiccas, and others that he was for a time guardian of Perdiccas' son and became king only later. Even the year of Perdiccas' death has become a matter of dispute; for in view of an inscription from Oleveni it has been suggested that Philip became king not in 359, as had been generally agreed, but in 360. There has also been disagreement about the time of Philip's death. The majority placed it in summer 336; Fears and Bosworth argued for October 336.¹ A decision between these two times affects the accession of Alexander and the duration of his reign. In the last fifteen years there have been some new approaches to these problems; work in source-criticism has led to a better evaluation of the literary evidence; and the Oleveni inscription is a new factor of importance. Moreover, a closer study of some passages is overdue.

It is important to bear in mind the ancient systems of chronology. The twelve-month lunar year was common to all Greek states. On the other hand, the states had different names for the months, and they began the civil year at different times, e.g. Athens *ca* June and Macedonia *ca* October; moreover, the insertion of an intercalary month every two or three years was irregular as between state and state. Thus for interstate calculations of time-intervals the seasonal year was the common unit, the Third Sacred War for instance being "the ten-year war" (Aeschin. 2.131); and in these calculations the reckoning was inclusive, the initial year and the final year both being counted. Any correlation of civil years between state and state was inexact but is nevertheless valuable for us. Thus the state-

¹ J. R. Fears, "Pausanias the Assassin of Philip," *Athenaeum* 53 (1975) 114 n.10, doubting the majority view; A. B. BOSWORTH, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander, Books 1-3* (Oxford 1980: hereafter 'Bosworth, *Comm.*') 45f, producing arguments against it.

ment (neglected in recent studies) that Plato's death fell in a named archon-year at Athens and in the thirteenth year of Philip's reign enables us to place it in our chronology between *ca* October 348 and *ca* June 347. Whereas the Molossian state defined its year both by the reign of a named king and by a named official, the Macedonian state did so by the king alone and added his regnal year. The awkwardness of this system was that within a civil year one king died and another was elected. The solution in Macedonia was to give such a year to the new king.

I. The Birth of Alexander and his Regnal Years

I start with Alexander because we have more evidence about him than about Philip. Alexander was born in 356, the year of an Olympic festival. The day of the month was supplied by Plutarch as "early in Hecatombaeon, which Macedonians call Loüs, on the sixth day, during which the temple of Ephesian Artemis was burnt" (*Alex.* 3.5) The correspondence between the Athenian month Hecatombaeon and the Macedonian month Loüs was not exact; all that can be deduced is that the sixth day of Hecatombaeon fell within the Macedonian month Loüs. In my analysis of Plutarch's sources I have argued that the synchronisation of Athenian, Macedonian, and Ephesian datings was due to Timaeus, himself born in 356 and dependable as a contemporary. So sixth Hecatombaeon is to be accepted.² It is generally agreed that it corresponds with some day in the second half of July in our calendar.

There are three indications of Alexander's age in the latter part of 336, the year of Philip's death. The first is in a passage that has sometimes been misinterpreted. Arrian wrote at the beginning of the *Anabasis*: λέγεται δὴ Φίλιππος μὲν τελευτῆσαι ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Πυθοδήλου Ἀθηνησί· παραλαβόντα δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀλέξανδρον, παῖδα ὄντα Φιλίππου, ἐς Πελοπόν-

² See my arguments in *Sources for Alexander the Great: Plutarch's Life and Arrian's Anabasis Alexandrou* (Cambridge 1993: hereafter 'Hammond, *Sources A*') 18ff.

νησον παρελθεῖν· εἶναι δὲ τότε ἄμφι τὰ εἴκοσιν ἔτη Ἀλέξανδρον.³

The Loeb edition⁴ gives an incorrect translation: “then about twenty, Alexander succeeded.” That, however, is not what Arrian said; for he gave Alexander’s age on his arrival in the Peloponnese, where he asked the Greeks for the command against Persia. That age was relevant in his dealing with them because official responsibility in a city-state was entrusted only to men over thirty.⁵ Plutarch mentions Alexander’s age with the same relevance. “He took over the kingdom, having been born twenty years before (ἔτη γεγωνῶς εἴκοσι), when it was exposed to great rivalries, bitter hatreds, and dangers on all sides” (*Alex.* 11.1); but he acted “with audacity and greatness of spirit.”⁶ Justin describes the fears of the Macedonians in the face of so many dangers at the death of Philip, the curing of those fears through the oratory of Alexander, and the inspiration of hope. “He had been born twenty years before” (*erat hic annos XX natus*). Once again his youth is contrasted with the handling of a dangerous situation.⁷ Thus in none of these passages is it said that Alexander was exactly twenty when he succeeded to the throne. Rather, they indicate that he was in his twenty-first year both when Philip died and when Alexander entered the Peloponnese. Thus they do not support the view of those who

³ “Philip is said indeed to have died in the archonship of Pythodelus at Athens [*i.e.*, between *ca* June 336 and *ca* June 335], and (it is said that) Alexander, after taking over the kingdom, being Philip’s son, proceeded into the Peloponnese; and that Alexander was at that time around twenty years.”

⁴ P. A. Brunt, tr., *Arrian, Anabasis* (Loeb edition: Cambridge [Mass.] 1976–83) I 5.

⁵ At 1.1.1ff Arrian was drawing not on Ptolemy and Aristobulus but on some unnamed sources that reviewed the effect of Alexander on the city-states: see Hammond, *Sources A* 191; also Bosworth *Comm.* 45; Brunt (*supra* n.4) I 4 n.2.

⁶ In this unusually rhetorical passage Plutarch was probably following Cleitarchus (Hammond, *Sources A* 24, 27), who was a contemporary and is likely to have reported Alexander’s age correctly.

⁷ Just. 11.1.1–9, abbreviating a rhetorical account in Trogus, *Historiae Philippicae*. The source, in my opinion, was Cleitarchus (*Three Historians of Alexander the Great: The So-Called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius* [Cambridge 1983: hereafter ‘Hammond, *THA*’] 94f). If I am correct in each case, Justin’s phrase *erat hic annos XX natus* was derived from the same source as Plutarch’s ἔτη γεγωνῶς εἴκοσι, which is found also in *Suda s.v. Karanos*.

have placed the death of Philip and the accession of Alexander in summer 336,⁸ because Alexander's birthday was in July.

Positive evidence for the month of Alexander's accession is to be inferred from Arr. *Ind.* 21.1, a passage that was based on the narrative of Nearchus, the commander of the expedition by sea from the river Indus in the year 325: "When the etesian winds that dominate the whole summer season ... sank to rest, then indeed they set out." Thus Nearchus sailed when summer ended, that is in late September or early October of our calendar.⁹ Arrian proceeded to give the year and the month by two systems: the Athenian year, with the name of the archon (mistakenly giving Cephisodorus instead of Anticles), and the twentieth day of the month Boedromion, "as Athenians reckon"; and "as Macedonians and Asians reckoned [on the xth day of the month Hyperberetaeus] during the eleventh [year] of Alexander's reign." The words in brackets have to be supplied; for it is obvious that part of the text has been lost in the transmission. Because Nearchus was a Macedonian (*Ind.* 18.4, 6) and wrote for Macedonians and others in Asia, he presumably used the Macedonian calendar that was current in Asia, and that is what Arrian indicates in his words "as Macedonians and Asians reckoned" (he uses the present tense for the Athenian reckoning in general and the historical past tense ἦγον for the Macedonian and Asian reckoning on this occasion). Hyperberetaeus, overlapping with Boedromion, was the last month of the Macedonian year. Thus Nearchus set sail towards the very end of the Macedonian year that ran from Dius of our year 326 to Hyperberetaeus of our year 325. Since that year was the eleventh year of his reign, Alexander acceded to the throne in the course of the year that ran from Dius 336 to Hyperberetaeus 335.

⁸ That has been the orthodox view since K. J. BELOCH (*Griechische Geschichte*² III.2 [Berlin 1923: hereafter 'Beloch'] 60); see for instance W. W. Tarn, *CAH*¹ VI 269; J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch, Alexander: A Commentary* (Oxford 1969) 28; R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London 1973) 17; J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976) 222, 306 n.53; G. T. GRIFFITH, in N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia* II (Oxford 1979: 'Griffith') 726 with 681 n.1; and my *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman* (Atlantic Heights 1980¹; Bristol 1989²: 'Hammond, AG') 37; G. Wirth, *Philipp II* (Stuttgart 1985) 66.

⁹ He started while there was still an unfavourable wind because the natives were hostile: *Ind.* 21.5, 12; Strab. C721; Beloch 305f.

The conclusion then is that Philip was killed and Alexander succeeded in Dius 336, *i.e.*, approximately in October 336. One can hardly propose a later date, because Philip intended to invade Asia that autumn (when the Persian navy would be moving into winter quarters), and because after his accession Alexander conducted a trial and a funeral, obtained support in Thessaly, and was elected commander against Persia, all presumably before winter weather commenced.

In 1990 E. Grzybek brought a passage in Josephus to bear on the date of Philip's death for the first time.¹⁰ It described the assassination of the Emperor Caligula by a Roman officer at the Ludi Palatini in 41 A.D.; and the obvious parallel with the assassination of Philip led Josephus to add the comment: "it is agreed too that the day happened to be that day on which Philip, son of Amyntas, king of the Macedonians, was killed when entering the theatre by Pausanias, one of his Companions" (*AJ* 19.95). The day of the month was the same, the twenty-fourth, in each case, and it was therefore regarded as a day of ill omen.¹¹ Because Grzybek argued in favour of Philip's death falling around October, he concluded that Josephus was alluding to 24 Dius, *i.e.*, late in the first month of the Macedonian year 336–335.

A final and important point was made by M. B. Hatzopoulos in connection with the great festival at Aegeae during which Philip was assassinated. I had argued that the Olympian festival in honour of Zeus and the Pierian Muses was held in autumn 335 not only at Diium but also at Aegeae (*Diod.* 17.16.3f; *Arr. Anab.* 1.11.1); for both places are on the main routes that are used by transhumant shepherds moving their flocks in October from Mt Olympus and the Pierian range to winter pastures in the Emathian plain and on the Pierian coast.¹² It was

¹⁰ E. Grzybek, *Du calendrier Macédonien au calendrier Ptolémaïque* (Basel 1990) 21–28.

¹¹ Cf. *Hes. Op.* 765–828 at 825, where "a day is sometimes a stepmother and at other times a mother."

¹² N. G. L. HAMMOND, with G. T. GRIFFITH (vol. II) and F. W. WALBANK (vol. III), *A History of Macedonia* (Oxford 1972–88: hereafter 'Hammond, *Hist. Mac.*') II 150 and *AG*¹ 63 with n.23, arguing against F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zu Thronbesteigung Philipps II* (Munich 1930) 100, and A. B. Bosworth, "Errors in Arrian," *CQ* n.s. 26 (1976) 120 and *Comm.* 97; cf. N. G. L. HAMMOND, *The Macedonian State* (Oxford 1989: 'Hammond, *MS*') 3f and *The Miracle That Was Macedonia* (London 1991) 2f. In October 1992 I talked with a shepherd who had just brought his flock from the summer pastures of Mt Olympus to Diium.

during this festival that the marriage of Philip's daughter Cleopatra to the Molossian king, Alexander, was to take place. Hatzopoulos argued that this autumn festival was a traditional occasion for marriages, even as the autumn festival of St Demetrios was in 1903 "the marrying season among the Macedonian peasants."¹³ He pointed out that Diodorus four times gave first place in his narrative to the festival with its sacrifices, contests, and procession but only second place to the marriage (16.91.3ff, 92.1: πολλῶν πανταχόθεν πρὸς τὴν πανήγυριν συρρεόντων καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων καὶ γάμων συντελουμένων; 92.5; 94.2). Thus the incidence of the festival in the autumn determines the date of the assassination of Philip. That festival was called 'Dia', was celebrated at 'Dion' in the shadow of Olympus, and gave its name to the first month of the year 'Dios'.¹⁴ It was then that Philip was assassinated, in our chronology *ca* October 336.

The data concerning the length of Alexander's reign are also relevant. Thanks mainly to the work of A. E. Samuel the date of Alexander's death is agreed to have been 10 June 323 in our chronology, thus falling within both the Attic year and the Macedonian year 324/323. Of four writers¹⁵ giving a round number of years for Alexander's reign two record twelve years and two thirteen years, the truth no doubt being in between. Two writers give years and months: Diodorus 12 years, 7 months (17.117.4), and Arrian 12 years, 8 months (*Anab.* 7.28.1). Diodorus used the Athenian chronology for his Book 17, whereas Arrian may well have taken his statement from a Macedonian chronology, his main sources being Ptolemy and Aristobulus (Arr. *Anab.* praef.).¹⁶ Since the Athenian months

¹³ M. B. HATZOPOULOS, "The Oleveni Inscription and the Dates of Philip II's Reign," in W. L. Adams and E. N. Borza, edd., *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (Washington 1982: hereafter 'Hatzopoulos') 41, gives the quotation, which is from G. F. Abbot, *Macedonian Folklore* (Cambridge 1903) 155.

¹⁴ The Macedonian months were named after religious festivals, and 'Dios' was so named after the festival in honour of Zeus; see J. N. Kalléris, *Les anciens Macedoniens* (Athens 1954-76) II 554f, 557 with notes.

¹⁵ *P.Oxy.* I 12.31f; Liv. 45.9 (following Polybius); Eratosthenes, in Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.138; Porphyry, in Euseb. *Chron.* 1.160.

¹⁶ Beloch (59) attributed Arrian's statement of the length of Alexander's reign to Aristobulus. That was a mistake; for what Arrian attributed to Aristobulus was the previous sentence, that Alexander lived thirty-two years and eight months (see Hammond, *Sources A* 311). As regards the length of

did not match but merely overlapped the Macedonian months, it would not be surprising if there was a discrepancy of a month between the two systems in calculating the length of the reign. If then we take the 12 years, 8 months to be in Macedonian chronology, his accession was in Dios 336 and his death in Daesius 323, the intervening six months being Apellaeus, Audnaeus, Peritius, Lystrus, Xandicus and Artemisius.¹⁷ Once again the death of Philip and the accession of Alexander were approximately in October 336.

When we take all these arguments together, it seems certain that Philip was killed not in summer but in autumn 336; that the date of his death was 24 Dius, the first month of the Macedonian year 336/335; that Alexander succeeded to the throne in that first month; and that Alexander's first regnal year was the Macedonian year 336/335. This last point confirms, at least in this instance, the belief of Meyer (*supra* n.16: II 443) that the year of a king's death counts not as his regnal year but as the regnal year of his successor.

II. The Date at Which Philip Came to Power in Whatever Capacity

According to Diodorus, Philip "took over the kingdom when it was in a bad way" in the archonship of Callimedes, 360/359 (16.2.1,4: παρέλαβε τὴν βασιλείαν κακῶς διακειμένην). The source of Diodorus in this chapter was on my interpretation Ephorus, a contemporary of Philip and the writer of a world history that was addressed to a very wide Greek audience.¹⁸

Alexander's life, such a mistake could not possibly have been made by Aristobulus (pace E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* [Halle 1892-99] II 447f, for instance); we must conclude that the text of Arrian has become corrupt during transmission. The actual length was thirty-two years and eleven months. Justin (12.6.1) gives the number as thirty-three years (*annos tres et XXX natus*), which was inaccurate. His ultimate source was Cleitarchus in my opinion (*THA* 109); if he put the death of Alexander (actually on 10 June) into the archon-year 323/322, the thirty archon-years would have been correct for the length of Alexander's life. See Bosworth, *Comm.* 46 with references.

¹⁷ For the calendar see Kallérís (*supra* n.14) II 554 n.2.

¹⁸ N. G. L. HAMMOND, "The Sources of Diodorus 16: Part I," *CQ* 31 (1937) 81, 85f.

Ephorus used the standard chronological system, that of Attic archon-years, for dating his material; thus he dated the rise of Philip to power between *ca* June 360 and *ca* June 359. Theopompus, also a contemporary of Philip, wrote a work in fifty-eight books entitled *Philippica* on events within the period of Philip but with numerous digressions. He began the *Philippica* with the archon-year 360–359 (Diod. 16.3.8), no doubt because Philip came to power during that year. Neither Ephorus nor Theopompus could have been mistaken.

Confirmation and elaboration came from other sources. Diogenes Laertius placed the death of Xenophon in an Olympiad year, Callidemides being archon, “in whose time (of office) Philip, son of Amyntas, took control of Macedonians” (2.56: ἐφ’ οὗ καὶ Φίλιππος ὁ Ἀμύντου Μακεδόνων ἤρξε, the tense being aorist and not imperfect). Diogenes cited as his authority “Stesiclides,” emended by Wilamowitz to “Ctesiclides,” a variant of Ctesicles who wrote a *Chronica*,¹⁹ and he correlated the Attic system and the Macedonian system. Diogenes reported also the death of Plato—which on other evidence was in the archon-year 348/347—and said that it occurred “during the thirteenth year of Philip’s reign” (3.40: Φιλίππου βασιλεύοντος ἔτος τρισκαιδέκατον) “as Favorinus²⁰ says in Bk 3 of his *Apomnemonemata*, and Theopompus says that he [Plato] was honoured by Philip.” Once again we have a correlation between two chronological systems. The Macedonian system of dating by the years of a king’s reign, which we have seen in the case of Alexander (Arr. *Ind.* 21.1), was evidently in use already in Philip’s reign, and we may be sure long before that reign. If the Oleveni inscription referred to Philip II—to be discussed later—we have a contemporary example of this system of dating. Because in the present case the thirteenth year was correlated to the archon-year 348/347, the first year of his reign was the Macedonian year 360/359, with which the archon-year 360/359 largely overlapped. Moreover, because the year in which a king died was allotted to his successor, it follows that Perdicas died in the course of the Macedonian year, that is, between *ca* October 360 and *ca* October 359.

¹⁹ See R. Laqueur, “Ktesikles (2),” *RE* 11.2 (1922) 2077.

²⁰ He wrote in the second century A.D. and probably derived from Theopompus his comment on hares in Bisaltia: W. Schmid, “Favorinus,” *RE* 6.2 (1909) 2081.

A further check is provided for Perdikkas. At 15.77.5 Diodorus recorded under the archon-year 365/364 the death of Ptolemy Alorites and the accession of Perdikkas, who "reigned over Macedonia for five years," *i.e.*, to 361/360, that being the his last full year; for the year 360/359, in the course of which Perdikkas was killed, belonged to his successor in the Macedonian system of chronology. On the other hand, Diodorus (16.2.4), using the Attic system of chronology, put the end of Perdikkas' reign in the archon-year 360/359 (during a narrative drawn in my opinion from Ephorus). Thus we see that Diodorus took one piece of information from an author working on the Macedonian system of chronology and another piece from an author working on the Attic system, namely Ephorus. Who was the first author?

In *Hist. Mac.* II 174ff, when I was considering Diodorus' narrative of Amyntas' reign, I rejected Beloch's theory of a "doublet,"²¹ and I argued that Diodorus drew on authors using two different systems of chronology. Thus on three occasions (14.89.2, 92.3; 15.60.3) Diodorus gave the length of Amyntas' reign as twenty-four years; but on another occasion (14.92.4) he attributed to Argaeus a reign of two years within that period. Aware of his inconsistency Diodorus added in the last instance "some say" (14.92.4: ἔνιοι δὲ φασί). For the first three occasions he must have drawn on an author using the Macedonian system of chronology; for the twenty-four years is not compatible with Diodorus' dating by Attic archon-years of Amyntas' accession in 394/393 (15.60.3) and of Amyntas' death in 370/369 (15.60.3), which yields a reign of twenty-five years.²² In *Hist. Mac.* II 182, having taken into consideration variant accounts of the troubled successions of 399 to 393 and of the death of Alexander II, I came to the conclusion that Diodorus "drew on Marsyas Macedon for his official list of Macedonian kings,"²³ which had been compiled on the Macedonian system of chronology. This Marsyas, a contemporary of Alexander III, wrote a *Macedonica*

²¹ Beloch 57f, his term being "Duplikat."

²² Beloch (60) made an unusual mistake in calculating 360/359 to 336/335 as "24 Regierungsjahre," whereas he had correctly used inclusive reckoning in the previous sentence.

²³ Insistence on Caranus being the first Temenid king in Macedonia was probably due to Amyntas and his successors: see *Hist. Mac.* II 8ff and my "The Sources of Justin on Macedonia to the Death of Philip," *CQ* N.S. 41 (1991) 501f.

“from the first king of Macedonians” down to 331 (*FGrHist* 135/136 T 1). His sympathies naturally were with Amyntas, father of Philip and grandfather of Alexander III, and he recorded the reign of Amyntas as if it had been unbroken and so lasted for twenty-four years.

A similar instance to that of Amyntas occurred in Diodorus' statements on the length of Philip's reign. On three occasions he said that Philip reigned twenty-four years (16.1.3, 95.1; 17.1.1). On the other hand he placed the accession of Philip under the archon-year 360/359 (16.2.1) and his death under 336/335 (16.94.3), which yielded a reign of twenty-five years. That figure was given independently by Justin (9.8.1: *decessit ... cum annis XXV regnasset*), and also by Orosius 3.12.1, 14.10, probably drawing on Justin's source, Trogus. On my interpretation (*THA* 90–93) Justin (or rather Trogus whose history of Philip's period Justin was abbreviating) drew here on the account of Cleitarchus, an Athenian who was writing for a Greek readership and was therefore using the Attic system of chronology. The explanation of Diodorus' repeated statements that Philip's reign lasted twenty-four years is that he drew that information from a Macedonian writer, in my opinion Marsyas Macedon, who used the Macedonian system of chronology²⁴ and made the year during which Philip died the first year of his successor, Alexander III.

III. The Dating of Events in Philip's Time within the Macedonian Year 360/359

A fragmentary inscription from Oleveni, a village south of Monastir (Bitola) in Yugoslavia, has been the subject of very interesting articles by F. Papazoglou, who republished it in 1970 (revising the text given by N. Vulic in 1948), and by M. B. Hatzopoulos, who discussed it in 1982. Subsequently Hatzopoulos saw the stone and was able to fill the lacunae in an important passage. The officials, it seems, of a city or tribe were to inscribe on a stele and set up in the most conspicuous place the following record: “Of year sixteen, of Panamus nine, those of (the) Katlestai who stood in battle with the king Philip against

²⁴ On the other hand, Hatzopoulos (35f) argued that Justin's twenty-five years came from “the Macedonian chronological system,” and this supported his view that Philip came to power in the Macedonian year 361/360.

Dardanians and made a gift....” If the inscription refers to Philip II—a suggestion that Papazoglou found “tentant, même séduisant” and for which Hatzopoulos judged “the palaeographical arguments” to be “overwhelming”—then the date within it was in our chronology around June (Panamus being the ninth month) of the Macedonian year 345/344, Philip having come to power within the Macedonian year 360/359, as we have seen in the preceding section. On the other hand, if the inscription refers to Philip V, as Papazoglou thought possible, then the date was in our chronology around June of the Macedonian year 207/206, Philip V having come to power within the Macedonian year 222/221.

In her article Papazoglou saw similarities to some of the Oleveni lettering in mainly third-century inscriptions of Epirus,²⁵ and she then added that “all the letters” of *SGDI* 1339—an official document of the Epirote League in the late third or early second century—were of the same type as those of the Oleveni inscription.²⁶ Although I have no specialised knowledge of palaeography, that addition seemed to me decisive²⁷ in favour of a dating to the reign of Philip V and not to the reign of Philip II. Arguments about the historical situation are rather inconclusive. The date in the inscription, corresponding to June, referred apparently not to the date of the battle and then of the gift²⁸ (made presumably after the battle) but to the date of the dedication, whatever that dedication was. Thus we may assume that the ninth of Panamus was some two months after the battle,²⁹ which should itself be dated to April, the beginning of a campaigning season. During that month in 344

²⁵ F. PAPAZOGLOU, “Inscription hellénistique de Lyncestide,” *ZAnt* 20 (1970: hereafter ‘Papazoglou’) 111: “cette écriture singulière se rencontre, à ma connaissance, uniquement en Épire.” That is not surprising; for the Lyncestae and the Pelagones were Molossian tribes by descent and kept contact with Dodona (see my *Epirus* [Oxford 1967] 437–42) rather than with Dium in Pieria.

²⁶ Papazoglou 113: “les caractères y sont tous du même type que ceux de notre inscription quoiqu’ il y ait, il me semble, une différence de style assez claire.”

²⁷ Hatzopoulos (23 with n.5) did not mention *SGDI* 1339.

²⁸ This was probably in money and in kind, for which we may compare the gifts offered by the cities to Perseus for the campaign against Rome: Liv. 42.53.3.

²⁹ Papazoglou 105: “la campagne mentionnée dans notre inscription eut lieu le mois de panémos”; Hatzopoulos 26: “campaign of Philip V in summer 206.”

Philip II was probably engaged in a campaign against the Dardanians and the Illyrians.³⁰ For the corresponding time in 206 the evidence is confused. Philip V made a raid into Aetolia probably in the summer of 206;³¹ but he might well have fought earlier in the year against the Dardanians, who had raided deep into Macedonia in autumn 209 and were a perpetual menace. Indeed Papazoglou suggested that the attack and victory in battle over the Dardanians that Diodorus 28 fr. 2 mentioned (παρατάξει νικήσας), might have been in 206. Thus it is uncertain which king of Macedonia is to be identified with the Philip of the inscription. On balance I favour Philip V.

Although the problem of identification is interesting in itself, it does not have a special bearing on the regnal years of Philip II. For although Hatzopoulos argued that Philip came to power in the Macedonian year 361/360, that date is not compatible with the correlation by Favorinus of the thirteenth year of Philip's reign with the archon-year 348/347. In addition, the sixteenth year from 361/360 being 346/345, the campaign against the Dardanians has to be some two months before June 345 rather than before June 344; it therefore falls within the archon-year 346/345, which is far removed from the chronology of Diodorus, who placed a campaign against the Illyrians in his narrative for the archon-year 344/343 (16.69.7).³²

The critical question in the order of events within the archon-year from *ca* June 360 to *ca* June 359 and within the Macedonian year from *ca* October 360 to *ca* October 359 is when did the death of Perdiccas occur? As we saw in Section II above,

³⁰ Trogus *Prologue* 8; Just. 8.6.3; Diod. 16.69.6; Beloch (289) placed the Dardanian war in late 345 or early 344; Papazoglou (106) in the archon-year 344/343, *i.e.*, in June 344 or later; and Hatzopoulos (26–29) “in the campaigning season of 345.” A difficulty with this last date is that Justin's report of a large-scale “organisation and ordering of Macedonian affairs” (8.6.1), with much transplantation of populations, must have taken place during summer weather and probably occupied the campaigning season of 345. Hatzopoulos' dating was part of the case for putting the start of Philip's reign in the Macedonian year not of 360/359 but of 361/360.

³¹ See *Hist. Mac.* III 407. The matter is disputed; see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* II (Oxford 1967) 278.

³² Diodorus attributed the decision of the Amphictyonic Council to the archon-year 346/345 (16.60.3), gave a narrative of affairs in Sicily under 346/345 and under 345/344 (16.65.1–68.11), and turned to Philip's invasion of Illyris and actions in Thessaly under the archon year 344/343 (16.69.7f). It has generally been conceded that Philip's invasion of Illyris should have been placed in the archon-year 345/344.

Perdiccas' death as stated under the two chronological systems occurred between October 360 and June 359. The odds are about three to one numerically that he died in a month of 359. Moreover, it seems unlikely that Bardylis mounted the invasion and fought the battle against Perdiccas in or after October 360 when the weather was deteriorating. One thinks rather of Bardylis invading and winning his victory in spring or early summer 359; then capturing Macedonian cities and organising his control of them (Diod. 16.4.4, 7) into autumn 359; and making preparations that winter for an invasion of 'Macedonia'—the original kingdom—in the next year (16.2.6).³³ If this is correct, Perdiccas was killed and Philip came to power *ca* May 359, in the Macedonian year 360/359 and just before the end of the archon-year 360/359.

During the summer of 359 Philip removed Macedonian troops from Amphipolis and made agreements with the Paeonians and the Thracians, so that he was free to face an expeditionary force organised by Athens. Sailing after the period of the Etesian winds this force reached Methone on the Macedonian coast *ca* September 359, *i.e.*, in the archon-year 359/358. Some confirmation of this date is afforded by the fact that Timotheus was operating at Amphipolis as a general in office for the archon-year 360/359, and that a different general, Mantias, was in command of the force at Methone. Timotheus, who had failed and lost his fleet at Amphipolis, will have been subject to audit *ca* June 359, and Mantias will have assumed office as one of the ten generals for 359/358.³⁴ A remarkable feature was the size of the Athenian force: 3,000 citizen hoplites and "a considerable naval force" (? of at least fifty triremes) that

³³ So Beloch III.1 224, 226; Griffith 722. Ellis (*supra* n.8: 14) put the killing of Perdiccas in winter 359; but a major campaign in winter in that part of the Balkans is highly improbable. For example, the conditions described by Livy 43.21.6–9 were by no means exceptional, as I know from experience in the winter of 1943–44.

³⁴ For the dating of the expedition, Beloch III.2 61 found this decisive ("Das entscheidet die Sache"). Hatzopoulos (36f) has proposed to date the generalship of Mantias to the same archon-year as that of Timotheus, which was in 360/359 (Σ Aeschin. 2.31). Timotheus, however, had great experience of the Macedonian area, and despite his loss of a fleet at Amphipolis (Polyaenus *Strat.* 3.10.8), there is no indication that he was superseded (Nepos, *Timotheus* 3.1, states that he retired as an elderly man). It therefore seems unlikely that he was displaced from the command in this area by Mantias, or that he sent Mantias as a deputy for himself.

was accompanying Argaeus with his Macedonian émigrés and his force of mercenaries. It matched that deployed against Perdiccas II in 432 (then 3,000 hoplites and seventy triremes); and the number of citizen hoplites surpassed the 2,000 citizen hoplites who were later sent to help Olynthus. There is no doubt that Athens placed her best general in command of this exceptionally strong citizen force. Had it sailed before June 359 it would surely have been commanded by Timotheus.

As I wrote in 1937, Diodorus “often bunches all the narrative leading up to a salient dated point into the one year of his own chronological system which contains the salient point.”³⁵ Thus under the archon-year 360/359 the salient point was the accession to power of Philip. The narrative from 16.2.1–3.6 comprised events on both sides of that point, and it ranged from the defeat of Amyntas by the Illyrians *ca* 393 to the encouragement of the Macedonians by Philip on capturing Argaeus (in autumn 359). Similarly his narrative for the archon-year 358/357 took Philip’s campaign against Amphipolis as a salient point. It included a back-reference to Philip’s victory over Bardylis and then reported the capture of Amphipolis, Pydna, and Potidaea, the advance to Crenides, and the obtaining there of gold for hiring mercenaries and bribing politicians in city-states—all being events that are normally dated to within the archon-year 357/356 (see *e.g.* Griffith 722). There is thus no case for dating the capture of Argaeus in Diod. 16.3.6 to within the archon-year 360/359 on the grounds that it was narrated by Diodorus under that year.³⁶

IV. Was Philip Guardian of Amyntas IV?

The answer to this question is of interest in connection less with the Athenian system of chronology than with the Macedonian system and practice.

That the same person should be called both guardian (*epitropos*)³⁷ of an underage king and king himself is not surprising. Aëropus was first guardian and then king according

³⁵ *Studies in Greek History* (Oxford 1973) 486–533 (=“Diodorus’ Narrative of the Third Sacred War,” *JHS* 57 [1937] 44–78), esp. 500.

³⁶ That was an argument that was used for instance by Hatzopoulos 36.

³⁷ For this Macedonian office see my “Some Macedonian Offices c. 336–309 B.C.,” *JHS* 105 (1985) 156–60.

to Diodorus (14.37.6, 84.6); Ptolemy Alorites was named as guardian by Aeschines (2.29), as king by Diodorus (15.71.1, 77.5) and the *Marmor Parium* (*FGrHist* 239 A 74), and as both in effect by Σ Aeschin. 2.29 (ἐπιτροπεύσας Περδίκκου καὶ Φιλίππου παίδων ὄντων ἐβασίλευσεν ἔτη ε΄)—all within one and the same period; and Philip was named as guardian by Justin (7.5.9), and as king by Favorinus (in D.L. 3.40) within one and the same period. The explanation is presumably that only persons concerned with internal affairs in Macedonia made the distinction between guardianship and kingship, and that others wrote of the person in power without mention of his office. Some expressions were vague: Diodorus said of Ptolemy and Philip “he took over the kingdom” (16.2.4, 16.2.1; cf. 16.2.4 fin.: παρέλαβε τὴν βασιλείαν κακῶς διακειμένην), and of Aëropus and Amyntas III “he possessed the kingdom” (14.37.6: κάτεσχε τὴν βασιλείαν, 89.2).

It is important to consider what sources of information were used by those who reported guardianships. In *Hist. Mac.* II 170f, I suggested that Marsyas Macedon was the source of Diodorus for Aëropus’ guardianship of Orestes and later recognition as king, as well as for details about Ptolemy Alorites—the term ‘Alorites’ (‘citizen of Alorus’) indicating a Macedonian informant (182). In a recent article I maintained (*supra* n.23: 505) that Marsyas Macedon was the source of Justin’s, *i.e.*, of Trogus’, account of Philip’s guardianship “lasting for long ... until more dangerous wars threatened” (7.5.9). The other person to speak of a guardianship, that of “Ptolemaeus,” was Aeschines in connection with his speech at the court of Philip, where we can assume that his facts were correct. In the case of Philip there are other data. Satyrus in his *Life of Philip* wrote of Philip *verbatim* “within twenty-two years in which he reigned,”³⁸ which indicated that the start of the reign was in Macedonian years 358/357 or, if Attic years are preferred, in the archon-year 357/356. In either case the preceding period of some two years can only have been that in which Philip was guardian and Amyntas IV was king as a minor.³⁹ The other

³⁸ Thereafter Athenaeus abbreviated the account in his own phrases, as Hatzopoulos 34 remarked: “Athenaeus who has obviously rewritten and heavily abridged Satyros’ original text.”

³⁹ See my notes in *Hist. Mac.* II 651 and *MS* 137; D. Kanatsoulis in *Makedonika* 9 (1969) 237ff, who cited the views of earlier scholars. The opposing view is held, for instance, by Griffith 208ff, and Ellis (*supra* n.8) 47,

important items are an inscription at Lebadea in Boeotia, where the authorities included among consultants of their oracle “Amyntas, son of Perdiccas, king of Macedonians” (*IG VII 3055*), and an inscription at Oropus in which Boeotians described Amyntas simply as “Amyntas, son of Perdiccas, a Macedon” before 338 (*IG VII 4251*). The only time before 338 when the authorities at Lebadea would have called Amyntas ‘king’ was *ca* 359–358 when he was king. This is not the place to discuss these issues at length.⁴⁰ It is enough to show that there is very good reason to suppose that Amyntas IV was king for some two years and that Philip was then his guardian and became king in his place *ca* summer 357.

If my arguments are accepted, the Macedonian practice was sometimes to appoint a guardian of a king who was a minor (Orestes, Perdiccas III, and Amyntas IV). If that guardian became king later, most authors added the years of his guardianship to that king’s reign in the tally of his regnal years, as in the case of Philip (D.L. 3.40). Others kept the two separate, as Marsyas Macedon did on my interpretation, and as Satyrus did in his *Life of Philip*.

V. A Note on Coinage during a Period of Guardianship

During the troubled period between 399 and 393 no coinage was issued in the name of Orestes, whose reign as a minor covered some three archon-years (400/399 to 398/397), but coinages were issued in the names of Aëropus, Amyntas II, and Pausanias, of whom the last two reigned probably for less than a

250 and (n.40 *infra*) 15f. See Hatzopoulos 34ff, citing modern literature, and concluding that no king was proclaimed after the death of Perdiccas, that Philip became and remained guardian until late 357 or early 356, and that he counted his regnal years from his accession to power on the death of Perdiccas. The assumption that there was no king at all for two or three years seems unacceptable for religious reasons alone. The matter was discussed by A. Tronson, “Satyrus and Philip II,” *JHS* 104 (1984) 120f, who was apparently unaware of my remarks in *Hist. Mac.* II 651.

⁴⁰ See J. R. Ellis, “Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great,” *JHS* 91 (1971) 15ff; R. M. Errington, “Macedonian ‘Royal Style’ and its Historical Significance,” *JHS* 94 (1974) 25ff; Griffith 205f with n.4, 702f.

year.⁴¹ The deduction is clear: the coinage of Archelaus was issued posthumously to cover the period of Orestes' minority, whereas a king of mature age coined at once in his own name. An alternative explanation might be that Aëropus as guardian of Orestes coined in his own name; but this is disproved by the fact that Ptolemy Alorites, when guardian of Perdiccas III for some three years, did not issue coinage of his own, whereas Alexander II had coined during his very short reign.

In accordance with these precedents, then, there was no coinage of Amyntas IV as a minor, and the coinage of Perdiccas III continued in use posthumously. As long as Philip was guardian in 359 to 357 (on my chronology), he did not issue coinage in his own name; but after becoming king in 357 he did so. On different grounds I proposed in 1979 and 1983 that the first coinage in the name of Philip was issued in 356, and on the evidence of coin hoards M. J. Price came independently to the same conclusion.⁴² In 1989 C. Hersh published a specimen of a previously unknown issue of a bronze coinage of Philip that had "exactly" the types of the last bronze coins of Perdiccas III.⁴³ His deduction was that this coinage being "copied from and struck at the same mint as the coins of Perdiccas III (even though in a seemingly different denomination)" was issued shortly after the death of Perdiccas and disproved the existence of a period of guardianship when Amyntas IV was king. This argument is not conclusive; for it is equally possible that coins of Perdiccas III were being issued until Philip began to coin as king in 357 or 356, and the change of denomination may have been introduced together with the change of standard in silver coinage that Price (*Coins* [*supra* n.42] 21) dated to Philip's first issue of 356.

⁴¹ For this period see *Hist. Mac.* II 168; for examples of the coins: *SNG* V iii pl. xlv.

⁴² See *Hist. Mac.* II 663f and my "The Lettering and Iconography of Macedonian Coinage," in W. G. Moon, ed., *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison 1983) 254f, arguing against the view of G. Le Rider, *Le monnayage d'argent et d'or de Philippe II frappé en Macédoine 359 à 294* (Paris 1977) 230ff, that Philip coined in his own name from 359 onwards. See M. J. Price, in *Coins of the Macedonians* (London 1974) 21 and *NC* 89 (1979) 230ff. He thought that some coins attributed to Amyntas III might have belonged to Amyntas IV; but Hersh (see next note) rightly rejected that attribution in accordance with the lack of coins in the name of Ptolemy.

⁴³ *AJNum* 1 (1989) 33ff with pl. 3. Mr Hersh very kindly sent me photographs of the bronze coin and a copy of his article.

VI. A Summary of Conclusions

The chronological conclusions may be listed as follows:

- (1) Alexander's birth was on 6 Hecatombaeon (=late July 356), the ultimate source being a contemporary, Timaeus.
- (2) Alexander's accession was in the course of the Macedonian year *ca* October 336 to *ca* October 335, the source being a contemporary, Nearchus. In accordance with (4) below, the accession was in late October or early November 336, which gave him time to proceed to Corinth and be elected Hegemon of "the Greeks" before the end of the year.
- (3) Alexander's regnal years in Macedonian chronology were twelve years from 336/335 to 325/324, the year of his death (on 10 June 323) being accorded to his successor, and in Athenian chronology thirteen years from 336/335 to 324/323.
- (4) Philip's death (followed immediately by Alexander's accession) occurred during *Dia*, the traditional autumn festival which was celebrated during *Dios*, the first month of the Macedonian year, *i.e.*, *ca* October 336, and on the 24th day of the month, an unlucky day in *Jos. AJ* 19.95.
- (5) Philip's accession was in the Macedonian year *ca* October 360 to *ca* October 359 (D.L. 3.40), and in the Attic archon-year *ca* June 360 to *ca* June 359, for which the ultimate sources were Ephorus and Theopompus, who were contemporary with Philip. It occurred *ca* May 359, and he was able later in the year to deal with his neighbours and with the attempt by Mantias to place Argaeus on the Macedonian throne.
- (6) Philip's regnal years were calculated in two ways. Satyrus counted them as twenty-two years in Macedonian chronology, from the deposition of Amyntas IV in 358/357 down to 337/336, the year of his death being accorded to Alexander. Other writers included the years of Philip's guardianship of Amyntas IV and made his number of regnal years twenty-four in Macedonian chronology from 360/359 to 337/336 and twenty-

five in Athenian chronology (which did not attribute the last year of his life to his successor) from 360/359 to 336/335.⁴⁴

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

August, 1993

⁴⁴ I express my deep indebtedness to my friends J. R. Ellis, M. B. Hatzopoulos, C. Hersh, and F. Papazoglou for their articles and their kindness in sending me offprints. I am particularly grateful to M. B. Hatzopoulos who read the first draft, saved me from an error, and stimulated me to write a fuller version. It is only with hesitation that I venture to disagree with them on some points of interpretation.