



Franca Landucci Gattinoni

(Milan, Italy)

**DIODORUS 18. 39.1-7 AND ANTIPATROS'S
SETTLEMENT AT TRIPARADEISOS***

Keywords: Diodorus, Successors' chronology, First War of the Diadochoi, Antipatros, Triparadeisos' settlement

Books 18–20 of Diodorus' *Library* happen to be the amplest and the most ancient historical *continuum* on the Julian years between 323 and 302,¹ this due to the loss of previous Hellenistic historiography, with the exception of few, scattered fragments.

Of these three books, which constitute a compact set and focus on the twenty years following Alexander's death, Book 18 is entirely devoted to the first attempts to re-organize the Macedonian empire in the years 323–318 after the king's sudden death, while in Books 19 and 20, which cover the years 318–302, the narration of events in Greek and East-Greek areas is combined with pages on Agathokles, ruler of Syracuse, and also on the Roman expansion in Southern Italy.

Moreover, the importance of Diodorus' 18 is augmented by the fact that this book describes with precision and abundance of details the territorial re-organization decided by the Macedonians in Babylon and at Triparadeisos,² thus addressing the complex geo-political issues often examined by scholars in

* A first draft of this text was presented as a speech at the Catholic University of Leuven in September 2008, during a workshop on Alexander's Successors. I warmly thank Marek Jan Olbrycht for including my paper in this volume of ANABASIS.

¹ All dates are BC, unless otherwise stated.

² On decisions made in Babylon, see Diod. 18.3.1–5; on decisions made at Triparadeisos, see Diod. 18.39.5–7.

recent years³ and that are now an essential point of departure for further investigation on the origin and the nature of Diadochoi's power.⁴

From a chronological point of view, the narration of the so-called First War of the Diadochoi in Diod. 18.29–39 emphasizes the particularly significant consequences of the omission, in Book 18, of the reference to, actually, two Athenian archons. As already discussed elsewhere,⁵ this omission not only leaves a serious chronological gap, whose causes are difficult if not impossible to identify, but also makes the dating of two important events narrated in Diod. 18.29–39 controversial and debatable, namely the murder, in Egypt, of Perdikkas, the regent of the kingdom, and the consequent summoning of the conference at Triparadeisos to re-distribute among the Diadochoi the territories conquered by Alexander the Great.

More specifically, all the historical-political events related to the First War of the Diadochoi are recounted by Diodorus in 18.29–39 and formally reported under the archonship of Philokles (Attic year 322/1), who is cited at 18.26.1: in these 11 chapters we find the facts from the time when Perdikkas, supported by the Greek Eumenes of Kardia, had to confront the great coalition composed by Antipatros, Krateros, Antigonos and Ptolemy, to the new redistribution of power effected by the victorious allies at Triparadeisos in Syria. The mentioning, at 18.44.1, of the archon Apollodoros (Attic year 319/8) sanctions the omission of his two predecessors, Archippos (I) (Attic year 321/0) and Neaechmos (Attic year 320/19), whose existence is incontestably corroborated by both literary tradition and Attic epigraphy.⁶

³ See Klinkott 1999, 45–93; 2000; Bosworth 2002, 29–63.

⁴ On this issue, see Billows 1995; Boffo 1998, 81–106; Virgilio 2003²; Landucci Gattinoni 2003.

⁵ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, xxiv–xlvi.

⁶ The list of contemporary Athenian archons is attested, first of all, in two independent literary sources: a passage in Dionysius Halicarnassensis (*Din.* 9) which, prior to the list of the titles of the orations of Dinarchus, records the names of the eponymous archons of Athens in the seventy years between the orator's birth and his return from exile; and a papyrus fragment of an anonymous chronicle (*Chronik von Oxyrhynchos* [POxy. I 12] in *FGrH* 255F1.9–10) based on Olympic years and Athenian eponyms, of which annotations on the years between 355/4 and 316/5 have survived. Both texts fully agree on the list of the eponymous archons of Athens in the six years following Alexander's death: Kephisodoros, Philokes, Archippos (I), Neaechmos, Apollodoros, Archippos (II); the anonymous author of the *Oxyrhynchus Chronicle* also mentions Damasias, the victor in the stadion race in the 115th Olympics, celebrated in the summer of the Julian year 320, who, as Archippos (I) in the years 321/0 and Neaechmos in the years 320/19, is not present in the *Library*. Furthermore, the six above mentioned archonships are also found in some Attic inscriptions, several of which have been the object of, even very recent, debate for a long series of historical-epigraphic issues, which however fall outside the scope of the present paper (to approach Athenian epigraphy of the post-Alexander age, see Woodhead's commentary in *Agora XVI*, 134–

Incidentally, with regard to the chronology of the events narrated in Diod. 18.29–39, I wish to confirm my alignment with the so-called Low Chronology System which dates Perdikkas' death in late spring 320 (Attic year 321/0) and the conference at Triparadeisos in late summer 320 (Attic year 320/19). As already detailed elsewhere⁷, the validation of these two milestone dates in Low Chronology is provided by the arguments of Manni and Errington,⁸ as also repeatedly asserted in recent years by Boiy:⁹ the latter, in particular, speaking of the contents of the Babylonian *Chronicle of the Diadochoi*, affirms that Low Chronology 'is the only possible scenario', because the IV year of Philip III's reign remains 320/19 and in the *Chronicle of the Diadochoi* Perdikkas' campaign in Egypt is reported under the IV year of Philip's reign.¹⁰

Apart from these chronological issues, Diodorus' narration at 18.29–39, which is supported by a significant series of parallel sources,¹¹ allows us to reconstruct one of the turning points in the history of those years. In effect, the breaking out of the first conflict among the factions of the Macedonian establishment marked the end of the formal and substantial unity of the empire which Alexander had built on the solid foundations of his father's kingdom, giving way to a long period of uncertainty and instability.¹²

The decisions made by the Diadochoi at Triparadeisos are described by Diodorus at 18.39.1–7, ideally concluding the 11 chapters (18.29–39) devoted to the

62. For precise bibliographical update, see Poddighe 2002, 142–69 and 191–6; 2004, 1–24; Cullasso Gastaldi 2003, 65–98). In particular, the archonship of Archippos (I), attested with certainty in *Marmor Parium* (in *FGrH* 239 FB11), has also been referred to in two Athenian decrees (*IG* II² 546; *Agora XVI* 97), while the archonship of Neaechmos, which is not mentioned in *Marmor Parium*, has been referred to in seven Athenian decrees (*IG* II² 380; 381; 382; 383; 384; 383b [addenda, p. 660]; *Agora XVI* 100).

⁷ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, xxiv–xlvi.

⁸ Manni 1949, 53–85; Errington 1970, 49–77.

⁹ Boiy 2006, 37–100; Boiy 2007, 199–207; Boiy 2007a.

¹⁰ See Del Monte 1997, 183–84, Ro lines 1–6.

¹¹ See, in particular, Nep. *Eum.* 3–5.1; Plut. *Eum.* 5–8.4; Arr. *Succ.* 1.26–38; Just. 13. 6.14–18; 8.1–10.

¹² Despite the importance of the events narrated in these chapters, the above mentioned chronological issues have catalyzed the interest of scholars, so much so that most modern bibliography still revolves around them (see Landucci Gattinoni 2008, xxiv–xlvi), thus overshadowing event-based matters. Moreover, since the end of the unity of the empire favored the emergence of new figures that have become, short- or long-lasting, protagonists of history, biographical components are beginning to attract significant attention. As an example, after focusing on the ascent of Antigonos (Billows 1990), scholars have recently given attention not only to the loyalist Eumenes (Schäfer 2002; Anson 2004) but also to the ambitious Perdikkas (Rathmann 2005), as proven by the publication of a series of monographs which have by now become essential resources, along with rich bibliography devoted to chronological issues, for the reconstruction of the events.

First War of the Diadochoi; more specifically, at 18.39.1, with a passing geographical indication (κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν),¹³ Diodorus closes a brief digression on the European situation (see Diod.18.38.1–6) and returns to the Middle-East area, last mentioned at 18.37.4.

Most significantly, at 18.39.1–4 Diodorus continues his analysis, from the events following Perdikkas' death to the subsequent division of the satrapies, without explicit interruptions. In particular, Diodorus describes the departure from Egypt of the Perdikkas army which had passed under the authority of Peithon and Arrhidaios.¹⁴ His narration of the expedition to Egypt, which had begun with Perdikkas arriving 'at the Nile'¹⁵, concludes by highlighting that the two new guardians of the kings, Peithon and Arrhidaios, 'had removed the camp from the Nile' (Ἀρριδαῖος καὶ Πίθων οἱ τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμεληταὶ ἀναξέζοντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Νείλου μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ἦκον εἰς Τριπαράδεισον τῆς ἄνω Συρίας), thus portraying the great river as the point of no return for those wishing to threaten militarily the Egyptian territory.

According to Diodorus, the new camp was set up at Triparadeisos, in northern Syria, a site that he mentions also at 19.12.2 referring once again to the allocation of the satrapies therein enacted, but that is unknown to the rest of the literary tradition: in this respect, even Arr. *Succ.* 1.30–38, albeit devoting ample space to the events occurring at Triparadeisos, refrains from mentioning the toponym itself and any coordinate of the setting where the new division of Alexander's empire was framed. With regard to the toponym in particular, Rathmann¹⁶ hypothesizes a possible identification of Triparadeisos with a site named Paradeisos, mentioned by Strabo and Pliny the Elder (Strab. 16.2.19 [C 756]; Plin. *NH* 5.82), who situate it in Syria near the sources of the Orontes river. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the word παράδεισος, used by Strabo and Pliny as a proper noun, may derive, in their original source/s, from the mere transliteration into Greek of a Persian common noun – indicating a luxuriant park belonging to aristocrats or often to kings –, as also attested by the sixteen occurrences of the term in Xenophon, a real expert on the Achaemenid empire, who always treats the word παράδεισος as a common noun.¹⁷

¹³ The geographical indication exemplifies those didascalical passages, of undoubted Diodorean origin, whose opening/closing "markers" convey, as highlighted in Ambaglio 1995, 31, "the historian's intention to connect, albeit artificially, different fronts". On the role of geography in the *Library*, see Ambaglio 1995, 59–63. For comparison between geographical remarks by Diodorus and Polybius, see Spada 2003, 51–2.

¹⁴ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 160–1.

¹⁵ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 148–9.

¹⁶ Rathmann 2005a, 363.

¹⁷ See e.g. Xen. *Oec.* 4.13; 4.21; *Cyr.* 8.1.38; 6.12; *An.* 1.2.7; 4.10; 2.4.14; *Hell.* 4.1.33.

After locating the camp at Triparadeisos, Diodorus begins recounting related events with no further chronological hint;¹⁸ from its beginning Diodorus' text displays substantial consonance with Arr. *Succ.* 1.30–38, the only parallel source which is comparable with it for breadth of contents and accuracy in form; as a matter of fact, Plut. *Eum.* 8.4 and Just. 13.8.10 merely cite Antigonos' appointment as commander in chief in the war against Eumenes, refraining from mentioning the new division of the satrapies.

Consonance between Diodorus and Arrian strongly emerges in the 'foregrounding' of the figure of Eurydike, wife of Philip III Arrhidaios,¹⁹ that both historians present *in medias res* with no further explanation. As can be noted, this is reasonable in Arrian, since as early as at *Succ.* 1.22–23²⁰ he portrays Eurydike in detail while narrating the death of her mother Kynna, daughter of Philip II, and the marriage of Eurydike herself with Philip III Arrhidaios, but it is considerably less obvious in Diodorus, who mentions 'queen Eurydike' for the first time at 18.39.2 (Εὐρυδικῆς τῆς βασιλίσσης πολλὰ περιεργαζομένης), with no further information on her origins and status. As noticed elsewhere,²¹ this 'omission' seems to sustain the hypothesis that Diodorus had decided to 'cut short' on Eurydike at 18.23.1–4, where he was analyzing Perdikkas' matrimonial intrigues, but that he did not realize the need of informing readers on the bride of Philip III Arrhidaios when, at 18.39.2, he began to describe her intense role at Triparadeisos. With regard to this aspect in particular, Diodorus and Arrian agree in pinpointing Eurydike's extreme 'activism', which led her to bitter contrasts with Peithon and Arrhidaios and prompted them to resign; this in turn opened the way for the appointment of Antipatros as guardian of the kings by an assembly of Macedonians that, once again, exercised the legitimate prerogatives of sovereignty.²²

In Diodorus, Antipatros is the *deus ex-machina* in an increasingly explosive situation for the troops camped at Triparadeisos: indeed, on his arrival, he successfully convinces Eurydike to 'calm down' (τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν), while also soothing soldiers' bad moods as fomented by the woman. Diodorus' concise

¹⁸ In this respect, considering that, as already mentioned *supra* (87), the date of the so-called Conference at Triparadeisos is tightly connected with that of Perdikkas' death – which this study has situated in May 320 as claimed by Low Chronology –, then, differently from what High Chronology suggests, the Conference at Triparadeisos must be supposed to have taken place not in the summer of 321 but, rather, in the summer of 320 as claimed by Low Chronology. Cf., most recently, Boiy 2007a, *passim*.

¹⁹ On Eurydike's biography, see, besides Carney 2000, 132–46, which elaborates on Carney 1987, 496–502, also the brief biographical sketch in Heckel 2006, 4–5.

²⁰ See commentary *ad loca* in Simonetti Agostinetti 1993, 60–2.

²¹ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 124–6.

²² On the role and relevance of Macedonian assemblies, see Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 160–1.

narration, which employs terminology semantically related to the possible outbreak of mutiny, does not clarify the motivations behind the troops' discontent, while clearly intending to highlight the 'happy-ended' full reconciliation between the ordinary soldiers and the new regent. Interestingly, Arrian's reconstruction displays such a happy ending too (see Arr. *Succ.* 1.33), but his scenario is entirely different. First of all, Arrian clarifies that Antipatros was saved by the decisive intervention of Antigonos and Seleukos (both unmentioned in Diodorus); furthermore, Arrian details the motives behind the troops' discontent: according to him, Antipatros responded to the pressing demands of the soldiers denying to be able to pay them for 'their participation in the Asian expedition as promised by Alexander' (Arr. *Succ.* 1.32: τὰ παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ὑποσχεθέντα αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῇ συστρατεία χρήματα).

Therefore, in Diodorus and Arrian we read two different versions of the same events; when we find substantial convergence between the two authors, they evidently portray the facts as they really were: the contrasts between the queen Eurydike on the one hand and the commanders Peithon and Arrhidaios on the other; their resignation; Antipatros's appointment as new guardian of the kings; the troops' discontent; the final agreement which, *mutatis mutandis*, re-echoes the agreement reached in Babylon in June 323. Yet, by 'cancelling' Antigonos and Seleukos from his narration, Diodorus displays an evident pro-Antipatros stance according to which Antipatros himself 'towers' over the rest of the characters as the protagonist of the encounter/clash with 'the Macedonians' who were threatening mutiny. Arrian instead reveals himself to be not only more hostile to the new regent, described as being at the mercy of events (and of Eurydike's false accusations), but also sounds extremely favorable to Antigonos who, with Seleukos, stands out as the true *deus ex-machina* of the situation.²³

At 18.39.5–7, Diodorus details the new distribution of the satrapies as enacted by Antipatros, with a list which closely reminds the reader of the territorial division decided by Perdikkas in Babylon in 323, the latter minutely illustrated by Diodorus as early as at 18.3.1–4.²⁴ Echoes between the two passages are further sustained by the fact that at 18.39.5–7, as at 18.3.1, the first part of the list is focused on the south-western area of the empire, progressing south to north from Egypt to Cilicia;²⁵ furthermore, Diodorus' list of the decisions made at Triparade-

²³ On the supposed existence of two distinct historiographical traditions backing different formulations in Diodorus' and in Arrian's versions, see *infra*, 91–92.

²⁴ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 23–37 for 18.3.1–4; 171–80 for 18.39.5–7.

²⁵ These echoes can be heard, despite the fact that, as rightly pointed out by Klinkott 2000, 72, at 18.39.5–7 Diodorus does not mention European territories (referred to at 18.3.1 instead), almost as if Antipatros, unlike Perdikkas, had wished to underline their extraneity to the oriental system of the satrapies (in this perspective, it is noteworthy the absence of the name of Lysi-

isos has full correspondence with Arr. *Succ.* 1.34–38, which is the only other existing source on the matter.²⁶

The comparison between the lists of Diodorus and Arrian²⁷ results in undeniable consonance in the narration of the events; yet, once again, it highlights intense conceptual dissonance between the historians, with regard, this time, to the figures of Ptolemy and, as usual, Antigonos. About the former, both historians portray his 'inamovability' from Egypt, which he dominated as a 'spear-won prize' (δορίκτητος);²⁸ yet, while Diodorus underlines that such 'inamovability' derived from his great personal value, Arrian merely records his sovereignty over Egypt with no reference to his human qualities. Similarly, both historians report on Antigonos' appointment as commander of the royal army that had been led by Perdikkas, and on the fact that Antipatros appointed his son Kassander as chiliarch of Antigonos; yet, while Diodorus notes that Kassander was to prevent Antigonos from acting secretly and autonomously, in order to underline Antipatros's distrust of the Monophthalmos, Arrian simply narrates Kassander's appointment, without any comment, thus omitting any negative remark on the Monophthalmos, who, in this way, seems to be enjoying Antipatros's full trust.²⁹

On these bases, although these two lists do reflect, in my opinion, the essence of the official document issued at Triparadeisos with the *imprimatur* of the major representatives of the coalition that had eliminated Perdikkas, they must however descend from two separate historiographic traditions, each fully quoting the aforementioned document while colouring it with different hues: favorable to Antigonos but not to Ptolemy in Arrian; favorable to the satrap of Egypt and hostile to Monophthalmos in Diodorus.

In this reconstruction I think it is evident that only Arrian's pro-Antigonos source can be identified with Hieronymus of Kardia, since, as I have repeatedly

machos, who was instead tacitly confirmed as satrap of Thracia, see Landucci Gattinoni 1992, 105).

²⁶ Differently, 13 versions of Babylon Settlement have survived; among these, however, only five are significantly pertinent (beside Diod. 18.3.1–3, see Arr. *Succ.* 1.5–8; Dexipp. in *FGrH* 100 F8.2; Curt. 10.10.1; Just. 13.4.9–25), as the other eight belong to late and/or learned traditions, more or less directly, traceable back to the above mentioned five (for a general survey on tradition, with ample bibliographic discussion, see Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 23–9).

²⁷ See, most recently, the precise analysis of the issue in Klinkott 2000, 64–74.

²⁸ On the meaning of the adjective δορίκτητος, see Landucci Gattinoni 2008 (commentary on 195–7).

²⁹ According to Arr. *Succ.* 1.38, the regent ruler even likely ordered Antigonos "to defend and to take care of the kings": a pro-Antigonos note which proves clearly false as the kings returned to Macedonia with the regent ruler leaving Asia for goods (on the return of the kings in Macedonia, see also the *Chronicle of the Diadochoi*, in Del Monte 1997, 183–9, Ro lines 7–9, in which it is emphasized that king Philip, in the fifth year of his reign, "crossed [the Euphrates] heading to Macedonia and never came back").

tried to demonstrate,³⁰ Hieronymus is the only Early Hellenistic historian whose ties with the Antigonids could significantly influence his work. The anti-Antigonos source of Diodorus is instead undoubtedly different from Hieronymus, and, in my opinion,³¹ could be identified with Duris of Samos. Conversely, the *communis opinio* of modern scholars runs counter to such a reconstruction, insofar as they generally view consonance of facts as settling and ignore dissonance in orientation: suffice it here to mention the opinion of Hornblower³² who claims common dependence on Hieronymus of Kardia for both Diodorus and Arrian who would thus fully overlap.³³

With respect to the names of the satraps and the indication of the territories assigned to them, Diod. 18.39.5–6 re-proposes elements already listed at 18.3.1; these repetitions obviously refer to those who in the First War of the Diadochoi had allied against the regent Perdikkas and for this reason had been rewarded by his victorious enemies.³⁴ There are yet some novelties introduced by Antipatros – also in these cases generally favouring those who, having been (variously) hostile to Perdikkas, had gained the winners’ trust.³⁵

More specifically, it is reported that Egypt and Syria remain with Ptolemy of Lagos and with Laomedon of Mytilene, respectively; while the former’s merits

³⁰ See Landucci Gattinoni 1981/82, 13–26; Landucci Gattinoni 1997, 194–204; Landucci Gattinoni 2005, 175–90; Landucci Gattinoni 2008, xii–xxiv.

³¹ Cfr. Landucci Gattinoni 1997, 194–204.

³² Hornblower 1981, 64.

³³ See also Goukowsky 1978, 57, n. 1, which, embracing the hypothesis that the two authors draw from the same source, merely recalls the precise geographical correspondence between the two texts; such consonance also led Thornton 1995, 111–4, which hastily alludes to this issue, to state the dependence of both sources on Hieronymus of Kardia as a fact. As for the hypothesis of the existence of two separate historiographic traditions, the presence of the list of the satrapies “allotted” at Triparadeisos in both traditions poses the problem of their mutual relation, for which two possible solutions can be envisaged: either their independent use of an official document already universally known in the Greek-Macedonian world, or the dependence of the more recent source on the more ancient. In particular, being the latter the case, then the prior source (be it Hieronymus or Duris) must have used the document imprinting it with his own orientation, and the later source (be it Duris or Hieronymus) must have drawn the same document (for the significance of its content) from the prior one, yet reversing its ‘colour’. In any case, this position reopens the age-old issue of the chronological relation between Duris of Samos’ and Hieronymus of Cardia’s works – which is however destined to remain unsettled since the absence of parallel passages in the existing fragments makes their comparison in no way conclusive (for the investigation of this issue, and ample discussion of bibliography, see Landucci Gattinoni 1997, 78–9).

³⁴ To approach biographical and bibliographical information on the historical figures appointed by Antipatros and mentioned by Diodorus, see Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 23–9.

³⁵ For a global, parallel survey on Diodorus’ and Arrian’s lists, see Klinkott 2000, 64–74. A brief analysis of Arrian’s list is also in Simonetti Agostinetti 1993, 82–5; an analysis of Diodorus’ list is in Rathmann 2005a, 364–8.

in the defeat of Perdikkas are well known, no information is available on the latter's participation in the First War of the Diadochoi – although his confirmation legitimizes the hypothesis that he must have closely supported the 'moves' of the satrap of Egypt, who however was shortly to eliminate him from the political scene.³⁶ Conversely, the destiny of Cilicia changes, insofar as it is no longer assigned to Philotas but to a not better identified Philoxenos; according to Arr. *Succ.* 24.2, Philotas had already been deprived of his government by Perdikkas and replaced with Philoxenos, a Macedonian of unknown origin (ἕνα τῶν ἀφανῶν Μακεδόνων), because he was loyal to Krateros: so it is easy to assume³⁷ that Philoxenos likely betrayed the old regent, acquiring significant, though to us unknown, merits in the eyes of Antipatros, who, as attested at Diod. 18.33.1,³⁸ pursuing Perdikkas in his approach march to Egypt, had crossed Kilikia already in Philoxenos' hands.³⁹

The list continues then with the so-called ἄνω σατραπεῖαι, the internal satrapies, which comprised the Asian territories east of Syria, from Mesopotamia to India: Mesopotamia and Arbelitis, that is the region of Arbela, previously assigned to an unknown Arkesilaos, are bestowed on an equally unknown Amphimachos.⁴⁰ Babylonia, assigned in 323 to the unknown Archon, shortly

³⁶ This is also claimed in Heckel 2006, 146. On the defeat and capture of Laomedon, attested at Diod.18.43.1, see Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 195–8.

³⁷ On this issue, see Simonetti Agostinetti 1993, 82; Heckel 2006, 220.

³⁸ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 148–9.

³⁹ Much has been said about this Philoxenos: although Berve 1926, II, nn° 793–796, relates this name to four historical figures, it has been later assumed that he must be the same Macedon officer who, according to [Arist.] *Oec.* II 31,1351b, had been satrap of Karia after the death of Ada, the last representative of the local dynasty of the Hekatomnids (on Ada, see most recently a brief synthesis in Heckel 2006, 3; on the dynasty of the Hekatomnids, see, besides the, by now, classical observations in Beloch *GG*, III.2, 141–5, Hornblower 1982), and the same Macedon officer who is repeatedly mentioned by Arrian (see Arr. *An.* 3.6.4; 7. 23.1; 24.1) in different contexts (on this hypothesis, see in particular Bosworth 1980, 280–1, which elaborates on a hint already in Bengtson 1937, 140–5, partially opposed in Badian 1966, 60–1; for the mere survey of the *status quaestionis*, with no conceptual stand, see Sisti 2001, 477–8. Simonetti Agostinetti 1993, 82; [Sisti]–Zambrini 2004, 642; Rathmann 2005a, 364; Heckel 2006, 220, embrace Bosworth's hypothesis).

⁴⁰ Arr. *Succ.* 1.35 qualifies Amphimachos as “brother of the king” (τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀδελφῷ). On these bases, Berve 1926, II, n° 66, assumes that he must be one of Philip III Arrhidaios' step-brothers – born to his mother but from a different father (Bosworth 2002, 113 and n. 60; Carney 2000, 61 and 276 with n. 45 share the same opinion); Jacoby in *FGrH* II D, Komm., 563, instead, as Beloch *GG* IV.2, 316, assumes that Amphimachos must be brother to that Arrhidaios who had been entrusted with the transportation of Alexander's corpse, mistaken for king Philip III Arrhidaios by Photius, who likely erased the proper noun “Arrhidaios” from the text and replaced it with the term *king* (Simonetti Agostinetti 1993, 82, and Heckel 2006, 22, agree with Jacoby; Rathmann 2005a, 364 takes no explicit stand).

thereafter replaced by the equally unknown Dokimos on Perdikkas' intervention, is bestowed on Seleukos⁴¹. Susiana, ignored by Diodorus when speaking of the 323 division, is granted to Antigenes,⁴² with the motivation, explicit both in Diodorus (διὰ τὸ τοῦτον πρῶτον πεποιήσθαι τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν Περδίκκων ἐπιθεσιν) and in Arrian (*Succ.* 1.35: Ἄντιγένει τῷ πρῶτῳ ἐπιθεμένῳ Περδίκκῳ), that he had been the first to attack Perdikkas at his murder.⁴³ Since Cornelius Nepos mentions not only Antigenes but also Seleukos, as the material perpetrators of Perdikkas' murder (see Nep. *Eum.* 5.1: *Perdikkas apud Nilum flumen interficitur a Seleuco et Antigene*), scholars generally accept⁴⁴ that for Seleukos, as for Antigenes, the granting of an important satrapy was the reward of his betrayal of Perdikkas. Persia remains with Peukestas, as Karmania with Tlepolemos and Media with Peithon. Parthia, instead of being under Phrataphernes, who was 'swallowed up in the dark', passes to that unknown Philip who in Babylonia had been appointed satrap of Bactria and Sogdiana, two of the so-called *Doppelsatrapien*.⁴⁵ Finally, at Triparadeisos, Bactria and Sogdiana are assigned to Stasanor of Soli, former satrap of Aria and Drangiana, which are now bestowed on Stasander of Cyprus who was by then still unknown.⁴⁶

After mentioning the list of appointments in the internal satrapies, Diodorus passes to the Indian territories, from the chain of the Hindu Kush (Paropamisos) to the river Indus, for which the 323 decisions are confirmed: the country of the

⁴¹ In the vast bibliography on Seleukos, one of the key historical figures in Early Hellenism, see, besides lexicographical entries – excellently summarized in Heckel 2006, 246–248 –, two monographs devoted to him (Mehl 1986; Grainger 1990) and, more recently, *status quaestionis* and remarks in Landucci Gattinoni 2005a, 155–81; Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 37.

⁴² To approach Antigenes' biography, see most recently Heckel 2006, 30–1.

⁴³ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 156–60.

⁴⁴ See e.g. Mehl 1986, 27–8; Grainger 1990, 32; Bosworth 2002, 210–45; Landucci Gattinoni 2005a, 163–5; Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 177; all with ample discussion of previous bibliography.

⁴⁵ About these wide territories, partly semi-desertic, which lacked appropriate communication networks and in which the process of Hellenization was still in its early stages or rather completely absent, see, besides Klinkott 2000, 82–5, the most recent monographs by Holt [1999 and 2005] which richly discuss previous bibliography.

⁴⁶ Given the common Cypriot origin of Stasander and Stasanor and in spite of the "silence" of the sources, Heckel 2006, 255, assumes some sort of kinship or friendship between the two. Beloch *GG* IV.2, 315, even doubts the existence of Stasander: in his opinion, the hypothesis cannot be ruled out that Stasanor controlled two *Doppelsatrapien* (Bactria-Sogdiana and Aria-Drangiana); in this respect, historiographic tradition might have "created" a new historical figure, Stasander – with a closely-sounding name and identical ethnic origin – to bypass the validation of what seemed to be an exceedingly wide bestowal of power. Also Rathmann 2005a, 366, conforms to this hypothesis, while it is ignored in Simonetti Agostinetti 1993, 83, and Heckel 2006, 255. In my opinion, Beloch's hypothesis is weakened by the fact that in the course of his narration Diodorus mentions once again, in separate contexts, both Stasander (see 19. 14.7) and Stasanor (see 19. 48.1), strengthening the impression of reading about two distinct historical figures.

Paropamisadae remains with Oxyartes, the father of Roxane, and the Indian region bordering with it remains with Peithon, Agenor's son. The two kingdoms to the east of the Indus remain with the two native rulers, Poros and Taxiles, who had been governing for a long time, since – as Diodorus says – these kings could not be 'removed' unless by massive military intervention: Diodorus' words sound as a clear affirmation of the substantial, though not yet formal, autonomy of these territories.⁴⁷

Last but not least, Diodorus lists the Anatolian satrapies north of Taurus Mountains: Kappadokia, that had been ruled by Eumenes, sentenced to death for his loyalty to Perdikkas, is assigned to Nikanor, who is hardly identifiable given the diffusion of this name among the Macedonians of the second half of the IV century.⁴⁸ Nothing changes for Phrygia and Lycia that remain with Antigonos, who, fleeing to Europe to meet Antipatros, had been the true 'conceiver' of the coalition against Perdikkas. Also Asander, satrap of Kappadocia who, according to Arr. *Succ.* 25.1, had immediately aligned himself with Monophthalmos, firmly keeps his territories, while Kleitos, the winning admiral of the Athenian fleet in the Lamian War,⁴⁹ is appointed satrap of Lydia to the detriment of Menander, despite the fact that, as attested in Arr. *Succ.* 25.2, the latter had opposed Perdikkas, collaborating with Antigonos just returned to Asia.⁵⁰ Finally, Hellespontine

⁴⁷ About the kingdoms of Poros and Taxiles in particular, while emphasizing the similarities between Arrian's and Diodorus' lists, Goukowsky 1978, 58 n. 1, highlights that both historians, "assign to Poros that part of India bordering with the Indus (to Patala, according to Arrian), and to Taxiles that part of India stretching along the Idaspes". Consequently, according to Goukowsky (and to Rathmann 2005a, 366, that agrees with this hypothesis) the control of the most eastern Indian reign was mistakenly attributed (not to Poros but) to Taxiles, thus overturning the Indian geography as attested by Alexander historians (see in particular Arr. *Anab.* 5.3.6 [commentary in [Sisti] – Zambrini 2004, 461–2]; 6 2.1 [commentary in [Sisti] – Zambrini 2004, 520–1]).

⁴⁸ See e.g. Berve 1926, II, nn° 553–561, which lists up to 11 historical figures; Heckel 2006, 176–8, in which these become 12. About the Nikanor mentioned by Diodorus, Billows 1990, 409–10, assumes that his appointment as satrap of Kappadokia was likely merely theoretical as he apparently never even tried to take office in Kappadokia (which was still firmly under Eumenes' control), remaining instead in Antigonos' staff, so much so that, according to Plut. *Eum.* 17.5, he was the officer in charge for "receiving" Eumenes himself after his final defeat in Gabiene (*contra* Heckel 2006, 178, s.v. *Nicanor* [10] and [12], that claims that the Nikanor mentioned in Plut. *Eum.* 17.5 is actually a different individual, and that his identification with his namesake, appointed satrap of Kappadokia at Triparadeisos, is in no way validated by evidence. Rathmann 2005a, 366–7, embraces instead Billows' thesis).

⁴⁹ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 90–5.

⁵⁰ On the "ousting" of Menander, Simonetti Agostinetti 1993, 84, highlights that "it is not easy to understand the reason why the satrap was replaced", so much so that Berve 1926, II, n° 501, never ruled out the possibility that Menander had died before the "subdivision" at Triparadeisos. Differently, today scholars agree (see Errington 1970, 70; Billows 1990, 402–3; Heckel 2006, 163) on identifying this Menander with Antigonos' officer in charge of the baggage in the war

Phrygia is bestowed on Arrhidaios, rewarded for having brought Alexander's body to Egypt,⁵¹ replacing Leonnatos, who had died in Thessaly trying to support Antipatros in the Lamian War.⁵²

After the list of the satrapies 'distributed' by Antipatros to the Macedonian *principes*, at 18.39.7 Diodorus analyzes the last provisions of the new regent. In this respect it is crucial to realize, as already suggested,⁵³ that the historian does not only report the fact that Antigonos was appointed commander in chief of the royal army and that Kassander, Antipatros's son, was to be 'at his side' as chiliarch; as a matter of fact, in order to underline how deeply the new regent distrusted the Monophthalmos, Diodorus also adds that Kassander was to prevent Antigonos from acting secretly and autonomously.

In the immediately following lines Diodorus underlines that 'Antipatros with the kings and his own army, went on into Macedonia in order to restore the kings to their native land' (αὐτὸς [= Antipatros] τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἀναλαβὼν καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν προῆγεν ἐπὶ Μακεδονίαν, κατὰξων τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδα). With this lapidary statement, the historian takes leave from Antipatros, who only reappears at 18.48.1–6, a passage which describes the illness that quickly brought him to death in Macedonia; Diodorus immediately focuses on the beginning of the hostilities between Antigonos and Eumenes, leading readers *in medias res*: as early as at 18.40.1, he narrates that Monophthalmos advanced with his troops to Kappadokia where Eumenes still was.

Conversely, in Photius' summary of Arrian's *Successores* the story's focus remains on Antipatros and on his relations with Antigonos and with Macedonian soldiers. At Arr. *Succ.* 1.38, the description of the decisions made at Triparadeisos concludes with two pieces of information: a) the appointment of Kassander, by his father Antipatros, as chiliarch of the cavalry with no hostile reference to Antigonos; b) the order given to Antigonos by Antipatros before his departure from Triparadeisos for Macedonia 'to defend and to take care of the kings' (τοὺς βασιλέας φρουρεῖν τε καὶ θεραπεύειν), a signal of the regent's full trust in the Monophthalmos.

Arrian's narration proceeds then with six further paragraphs (Arr. *Succ.* 1.39–45), indicated by Photius as being a summary of the tenth (and last) book of the original work, devoted to an ample account of the 'Asian' events that seem

against Eumenes (see Plut. *Eum.* 9.8–12), assuming that Menander, having fled from Lydia at the breaking out of the First War of the Diadochoi, later joined Monophthalmos' army staff who entrusted him with the command of important military missions (see Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 243).

⁵¹ See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 130–3.

⁵² See Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 87–8.

⁵³ See *supra*, 91.

'to accompany' Antipatros's long march from Triparadeisos to Abydos on the Hellespont. The narration of these events, entirely absent in Diodorus, is characterized by a strong tendency to emphasize the difficulties of the new regent in commanding respect. Furthermore, Arr. *Succ.* 1.43 reports on Kassander's attempt to convince his father Antipatros to distrust Antigonos, who, however, 'thanks to his moderation, his cleverness and bravery', was able to dissipate all suspicions against himself: here, as always in Arrian's *Successors*, Antigonos is described in fully positive terms. Yet, in the end, Arrian has to admit that Antipatros decided to take the kings with himself and to lead them to Macedonia (Arr. *Succ.* 1.44: Ἀντίπατρος ἀναλαβὼν τοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ τὴν ἄλλην δύναμιν ἦει ὡς περαιωσόμενος ἐπὶ Μακεδονίαν), thus arriving to Diodorus' same conclusion – also re-echoed in the Babylonian *Chronicle of the Diadochoi*, which states that king Philip (III Arrhidaios), in the fifth year of his reign, 'crossed (the Euphrates) to Macedonia and never came back (to Babylon).'⁵⁴

As a result of the comparison between Diodorus' text and Photius' summary of Arrian's *Successores*, it is clear that Diodorus' passage, at 18.39.7, on Antipatros's return to Macedonia **with the kings**, is not to be paralleled with Arr. *Succ.* 1.38, on the regent's departure from Triparadeisos **without the kings**, but rather with Arr. *Succ.* 1.44, which confirms Antipatros's return to Macedonia **with the kings**. By acknowledging that Diod. 18.39.7 and Arr. *Succ.* 1.44 provide the same piece of information, then, from a chronological point of view, it is absolutely necessary to assume for both authors the same *terminus post quem* as being April 1st, 319, the date of the beginning of the fifth year of king Philip III Arrhidaios' reign, in which, according to the above mentioned *Chronicle of the Diadochoi*, the king returned to Macedonia: indeed, in Babylonian chronography, the correspondence between the fifth year of Philip III Arrhidaios' reign and the year 319/18 seems ascertained.⁵⁵

Specifically, on the 'Asian' events that seem 'to accompany' Antipatros's long march in Photius' summary of Arrian's *Successores* and that are entirely absent in Diodorus, one should note not only that they are also clearly re-echoed in Plut. *Eum.* 8.6–12 and in Just. 14.1.1–9, but also that at least some of them can be referred to a text fragment identified in 1977 in a Greek palimpsest of the XIV-XV centuries preserved in the library of the university of Göteborg.⁵⁶ In

⁵⁴ See Del Monte 1997, 183–9, Ro lines 7–9.

⁵⁵ See, most recently, after the well-articulated observations in Boiy 2006, 37–100, later summarized in Boiy 2007, 199–207, the table provided by Wheatley 2007, 192, himself formerly supporting High Chronology (see, in general, also Boiy 2007a).

⁵⁶ *Editio princeps* in Noret 1983, 235–42; later editions in Schröder 1988, 75–90; Dreyer 1999, 39–60. Commentary and Italian translation in Simonetti Agostinetti 1993, 90–7. See most recently Dreyer 2007, 245–63, with a close-reading of the palimpsest supported by digital tools "spotting" otherwise illegible characters.

particular, scholars fully agree on considering this well-preserved fragment, contained in two sheets (72–73) of the palimpsest and amounting to 58 lines, as the original text of Arr. *Succ.* 1.41. In effect, the fragment reports the request of an alliance, made by Eumenes to other Macedonian generals such as Attalos, Polemon and Dokimos, loyal to Perdikkas, for the war against Antipatros: this request of alliance is expressly referred to in Arr. *Succ.* 1.41 and mentioned, albeit indirectly, by Plut. *Eum.* 8.8, which, as the palimpsest, reports that the negotiations occurred ‘during the winter’.⁵⁷

Apart from the contents of the palimpsest of Göteborg, which most remarkably sheds light on the original structure of the (unfortunately) lost *Successores* by Arrian, Diodorus’ silence on post-Triparadeisos events, described instead with abundance of details in Arrian’s *Successors*, had prompted early 19th century scholars to pose the existence of a lacuna of considerable length between 18.39.7 and 18.40.1 in the text of Diodorus’ *Library*. The assumption of a textual lacuna has also been strengthened by the fact that, at 18.44.1, in the usual chronological arrangement, Diodorus mentions Apollodoros as Athenian eponymous archon, who, as evidenced by concordance between literary tradition and Attic epigraphy, was archon in 319/18. Since the last-mentioned eponymous archon, at 18.26.1, is Philokles, the 322/21 archon, it is then clear that Diodorus omitted the name of actually two Athenian eponymous archons, Archippos (I) (archon in 321/0) and Neaechmos (archon in 320/19), giving way to heavy chronological distortion that also impacted on the reference to the 115th Olympiad, which should have appeared under Neaechmos’ archonship (Attic year 320/19).

The hypothesis that the names of these two Athenian eponymous archons were ‘swallowed’ by a textual lacuna, as sustained by Droysen,⁵⁸ has been harshly contested ever since the second half of the 19th century,⁵⁹ above all because the *Pinakes* of Book 18 do not prove any sign of a textual lacuna, while thanks to the *Pinakes* of Book 17 scholars can reconstruct the events fallen in the lacuna which certainly opens at 17.83.9, immediately after the description of the punishment of Bessos, found guilty of Darius’ death, and which even ‘swallows’ the name of the 327/6 archon. Therefore, scholars⁶⁰ agree today on doubting the existence of a lacuna between 18.39.7 and 18.40.1: rather, the omission of the names of Archippos (I) and Neaechmos is preferably attributed to a series of misinterpretations on the part of Diodorus, undoubtedly favored by the casual presence of two homonymous archons in a few years span (Archippos [I] in 321/0 and Archippos [II] in 318/17).

⁵⁷ On the chronological identification of this winter, see Landucci Gattinoni 2008, 184–7.

⁵⁸ Droysen, I, 804–6.

⁵⁹ See, in particular, the by now canonical argumentations in Kallenberg 1877, 321.

⁶⁰ For a general survey on modern bibliography, see Goukowsky 1978, xxiv–xxvii.

Finally, the *communis opinio* of scholars *versus* the existence of a textual lacuna from Diod. 18.39.7 to 18.40.1 is also supported by the above identified equivalence between Diod. 18.39.7 and Arr. *Succ.* 1.44 (not Arr. *Succ.* 1.38). In effect, in this perspective, Diodorus (or better, his source) likely merely 'cancelled' the 'Asian' events that 'accompanied' Antipatros's long march from Triparadeisos to Hellespont and that we can read in Arr. *Succ.* 1.39–44. In this respect, Diodorus' source appears to have silenced all references to hostility against Antipatros which characterize instead the narration at Arr. *Succ.* 1.39–44, while simultaneously inserting an anti-Antigonos note by mentioning Kassander's supervising role against Antigonos' ambitions.

Bibliography

- Agora XVI* 1997 = A.G. Woodhead (ed.), *The Athenian Agora. Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XVI. Inscriptions: the Decrees*, Princeton 1997.
- Ambaglio, D. 1995: *La Biblioteca Storica di Diodoro Siculo: problemi e metodo*, Como.
- Anson, E.M. 2004: *Eumenes of Cardia. A Greek among Macedonians* (Studies in Philo of Alexandria and Mediterranean Antiquity 3), Boston.
- Badian, E. 1966: 'Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia' in E. Badian (ed.), *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday*, Oxford, 37–69.
- Beloch, K.J. *GG.* 1912–1927² = *Griechische Geschichte*, 4 vols., Berlin – Leipzig.
- Bengtson, H. 1937: 'Φιλόξενος ὁ Μακεδών' *Philologus* 92, 126–55.
- Berve, H. 1926: *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, 2 vols., München.
- Billows, R.A. 1990: *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Berkeley – London.
- Billows, R.A. 1995: *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*, Leiden – New York – Köln.
- Boffo, L. 1998: 'I regni ellenistici: la guerra e il potere' in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società*. Vol.2.3, Torino, 81–106.
- Boiy, T. 2006: 'Aspects chronologiques de la période de transition (350–300 av. J.-C.)' in P. Briant and F. Joannès (eds.), *La transition entre l'empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques* (Persikà 9), 37–100, Paris.
- Boiy, T. 2007: 'Cuneiform Tablets and Aramaic Ostraca: Between the Low and High Chronologies of the Early Diadoch Period' in W. Heckel, L. Tritle and P. Wheatley (eds.), *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, Claremont (CA), 199–207.
- Boiy, T. 2007a: *Between High and Low: A Chronology of the Early Hellenistic Period* (Oikumene Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte 5), Frankfurt am Main.
- Bosworth, A.B. 1980: *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*. Vol. 1, *Books I–III*, Oxford.
- Bosworth, A.B. 2002: *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors*, Oxford.
- Carney, E.D. 1987: 'The Career of Adea-Eurydice' *Historia* 36, 496–502.
- Carney, E.D. 2000: *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*, Norman (Oklahoma).

- Culasso Gastaldi, E. 2003: 'Eroi della città: Eufrone di Sicione e Licurgo di Atene' in A. Barzanò, C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, L. Prandi and G. Zecchini (eds.), *Modelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea. Atti del Convegno. Bergamo, 20–22 novembre 2001* (Monografie del Centro ricerche e documentazione sull'antichità classica 23), 65–98, Roma.
- Del Monte, G. 1997: *Testi dalla Babilonia Ellenistica*. Vol.1, *Testi Cronografici* (Studi Ellenistici 9), Pisa – Roma.
- Dreyer, B. 1999: 'Zum ersten Diadochenkrieg. Der Göteborger Arrian-Palimpsest (ms. Graec 1)' *ZPE* 125, 39–60.
- Dreyer, B. 2007: 'The Arrian Parchment in Gothenburg. New Digital Processing Methods and Initial Results' in W. Heckel, L. Tritle and P. Wheatley (eds.), *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, Claremont (CA), 245–63.
- Droysen, J.G. 1877–78²: *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, 3 vols., Gotha.
- Errington, R.M. 1970: 'From Babylon to Triparadeisos 323–320 BC' *JHS* 90, 49–77.
- Goukowsky, P. (ed.) 1978: *Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque Historique. Livre 18*, Paris.
- Grainger, J.D. 1990: *Seleukos Nikator: Constructing a Hellenistic Kingdom*. London and New York (translated by C. Ghibellini and E. Siccardi, Genova 1993).
- Heckel, W. 2006: *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great: Prosopography of Alexander's Empire*, Oxford.
- Holt, F.L. 2004: *Alexander the Great and the Mystery of the Elephant Medallions*, Berkeley – London.
- Holt, F.L. 2005: *Alexander the Great in Afghanistan* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 47), Berkeley.
- Hornblower, J. 1981: *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. 1982: *Mausolus*, Oxford.
- Kallenberg, H. 1877: 'Die Quellen für die Nachrichten der alten Historiker über die Diadochenkämpfe bis zum Tode des Eumenes und der Olympias' *Philologus* 36, 305–27, 488–527, 630–70.
- Klinkott, H. 1999: 'Diodors Reichsbeschreibung nach Alexanders Tod: Ist die Satrapienliste 18.5–6 ein persisches Dokument?' in K. Brodersen (ed.), *Zwischen West und Ost. Studien zur Geschichte des Seleukidenreichs*, Hamburg, 45–93.
- Klinkott, H. 2000: *Die Satrapienregister der Alexander- und Diadochenzeit* (Historia Einzelschriften 145), Stuttgart.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 1981/82: 'Ieronimo e la Storia dei Diadochi' *InvLuc* 3/4, 13–26.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 1992: *Lisimaco di Tracia nella prospettiva del primo ellenismo*, Milano.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 1997: *Duride di Samo* (Monografie del Centro ricerche e documentazione sull'antichità classica 18), Roma.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 2003: *L'arte del potere: vita e opere di Cassandro di Macedonia* (Historia Einzelschriften 171), Stuttgart.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 2005: 'Per un commento storico al libro 18 di Diodoro: riflessioni preliminari' in D. Ambaglio (ed.), *Epitomati ed epitomatori: il crocevia di Diodoro Siculo. Atti del Convegno, Pavia, 21–22 aprile 2004* (= *Syngraphé. Materiali e appunti per lo studio della storia e della letteratura antica* 7), Como, 175–90.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 2005a: 'La tradizione su Seleuco in Diodoro 18–20' in C. Bearzot and F. Landucci (eds.), *Diodoro e l'altra Grecia. Macedonia, Occidente, Ellenismo nella Biblioteca storica. Atti del Convegno, Milano, 15–16 gennaio 2004*, Milano, 155–81.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 2008: *Diodoro Siculo. Biblioteca Storica. Libro 18. Commento storico*, Milano.
- Manni, E. 1949: 'Tre note di cronologia ellenistica' *RendLinc* 8.4, 53–85.

- Mehl, A. 1986: *Seleukos Nikator und sein Reich. I. Teil: Seleukos' Leben und die Entwicklung seiner Machtposition* (Studia Hellenistica 28), Leuven.
- Noret, J. 1983: 'Un fragment du dixième livre de la 'Succession d'Alexandre' par Arrien retrouvé dans un palimpseste de Gothenbourg' *AC* 52, 235–42.
- Poddighe, E. 2002: *Nel segno di Antipatro. L'eclissi della democrazia ateniese dal 323/2 al 319/8 a.C.*, Roma.
- Poddighe, E. 2004: 'Atene e le lotte tra i Diadochi nell'anno dell'arconte Archippo II (318/7a.C.)' *AHB* 18, 1–24.
- Rathmann, M. 2005: *Perdikkas zwischen 323 und 320. Nachlassverwalter des Alexanderreiches oder Autokrat?* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 724), Wien.
- Rathmann, M. 2005a: *Griechische Weltgeschichte. Buch 18–20. Teilband B: Kommentar und Anhang* (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur, 63B), Stuttgart.
- Schäfer, Ch. 2002: *Eumenes von Kardia und der Kampf um die Macht im Alexanderreich*, Frankfurt.
- Schröder, S. 1988: 'Zum Göteborger Arrian-Palimpsest' *ZPE* 71, 75–90.
- Simonetti Agostinetti, A. (ed.) 1993: *Flavio Arriano. Gli Eventi dopo Alessandro* (Monografie del Centro ricerche e documentazione sull'antichità classica 15), Roma.
- Sisti, F. (ed.) 2001: *Arriano. Anabasi di Alessandro*, vol. 1, Milano.
- Sisti, F. and A. Zambrini (eds.) 2004: *Arriano. Anabasi di Alessandro*, vol. 2, Milano.
- Spada, S. 2003: 'I libri XVI–XX della *Biblioteca Storica* di Diodoro e le *Storie* di Polibio: adesione e resistenza a un modello storiografico' in D. Ambaglio (ed.), *Syngraphé. Materiali e appunti per lo studio della storia e della letteratura antica* 5, Como, 37–88.
- Thornton, J. 1995: 'Al di qua e al di là del Tauro: una nozione geografica' *RCCM* 37, 97–126.
- Virgilio, B. 2003²: *Lancia, diadema e porpora. Il re e la regalità ellenistica* (Studi Ellenistici 14), Pisa – Roma.
- Wheatley, P.V. 2007: 'An Introduction to the Chronological Problems in Early Diadoch Sources and Scholarship' in W. Heckel, L. Tritle and P. Wheatley (eds.), *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, Claremont (CA), 179–92.

Abstract

Books 18–20 in Diodorus Siculus' *Library* provide a continuous record of events from Alexander the Great's death to the eve of the Battle of Ipsos at the end of the archon year of 302/1. Book 18 deals with the period between 323 and 318 and is entirely devoted to events in Greece and in the East; there is no reference to Sicilian and Roman affairs.

At 18. 39.1–7, Diodorus narrates of the conference at Triparadeisos, an unknown Syrian town: after the Babylon Settlement in June 323, Antipatros supervised another distribution of satrapies. There were few surprises: the murderers of Perdikkas were rewarded; the war against the Perdikkas forces in Asia Minor was assigned to Antigonos; Seleukos received Babylonia, the nucleus of his future kingdom.

At 18. 39.7, Diodorus concludes the chapter portraying Antipatros crossing the Hellespont in order to return to Macedonia with the kings. He says nothing about Antipatros's deeds on the way from Triparadeisos to the Hellespont: about these deeds we are informed only by Arr. *Succ.* 1.40–45. Therefore, we can suppose Diodorus (or, better, his source) actually 'effaced' Antipatros's march across Asia Minor by focusing only on Antipatros's return to Macedonia.