

a cura di
CINZIA BEARZOT
FRANCA LANDUCCI

Diodoro e l'altra Grecia

**Macedonia, Occidente, Ellenismo
nella Biblioteca storica**

**Atti del Convegno
Milano, 15-16 gennaio 2004**

ESTRATTO

STORIA | RICERCHE

V&P

MILTIADES HATZOPOULOS

The reliability of Diodorus' account of Philip II's assassination

1. *Introduction*

Some twenty-five years ago I started writing a book on the ancient literary traditions concerning the death of Philip II of Macedon¹. I was convinced that the accounts of this momentous event, situated as it was at the intersection of two major historiographical traditions, that of the reign of Philip II and that of Alexander the Great, constituted a privileged case for cross-checking the reliability of some of the most influential ancient writers; the more so that the (then) recent and sensational archaeological discoveries at Vergina offered a unique opportunity – at least as I thought at the time – of confronting these ancient literary sources with the new archaeological finds.

Indeed some of the most controversial questions of these two great reigns are, so to say, squeezed in the events of a single day: the effectiveness of the unification of Macedonia, the Panhellenic and the Persian policy of Philip, his divinisation, his private life and his relationship with his son and heir, Alexander's attitude towards his parents, his visit to the Ammonion and the questions asked from the oracle, his belief in his divine parentage and, what englobes all the rest, his personality and character. I believed that from the interpretation of the circumstances of the assassination and of the events that preceded and followed it depended to a large extent our understanding of the forces which expanded the Greek world to the limits of the *oikoumene* and put an everlasting mark on world History.

¹ M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *The Oleveni Inscription and the Dates of Philip II's Reign*, in *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*, 26, n. 8; cfr. Id., *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine*, «Meletémata», 19, Athens 1994, p. 97, n. 1.

During the last quarter of century I have lost much of my pristine optimism and confidence. Yet, I may one day finish this book. For the time being I would concentrate on the narrative of Diodorus at the end of the XVth book of his *Historical Library*, for it constitutes the basis of most modern accounts of Philip's assassination to be found in general histories, specialised monographs and scholarly articles. Moreover, it has served as the principle – indeed the unique – piece of evidence for constructing theories on a variety of important issues ranging from Philip's domestic and foreign policies to Macedonian attitudes to religion or – even – to sex.

The popularity of Diodorus' narrative among modern historians is easy to understand. It not only is the most extensive but also the most dramatic, the most highly coloured one that we possess. Neither in Justin nor in Plutarch – let alone Aristotle – do we read so many romanesque details. Nowhere else is the motif of ambiguity and double entente of words, of opposition between apparent and hidden meaning, between present apotheosis and imminent disaster so elaborate. No other surviving source depicts more theatrically the utter blindness of a ruler at the peak of his power and glory, who, insensible to divine premonitions, inexorably advances towards the final catastrophe.

That being said, it is obvious that the historical value of this colourful account, written some three centuries after the events, depends to a very large extent on the quality of the primary source used by Diodorus. This question, after having been extensively debated, has been considered as settled since N. G. L. Hammond² convincingly identified it with the Athenian Diyllos. But even more important than putting a name – of a practically unknown author³, since his work has almost completely perished – to Diodorus' source, is the evaluation, through internal evidence and confrontation with external data, of its qualities and defects, and especially of its reliability.

² HAMMOND, *Royal Pages, Personal Pages and Boys Trained in the Macedonian Manner during the Period of the Temenid Monarchy*, «Historia», 39 (1990), p. 89-90.

³ Cf. *FGH* 73; J. SEIBERT, *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen*, Darmstadt 1983, pp. 19-21 (who, however, ignores Hammond's fundamental article).

The narrative of Philip's end⁴ opens with the invasion of Asia Minor by a Macedonian advance force under Parmenion and Attalos and the ambiguous response given to the king's query concerning the success of the expedition by the Delphic oracle: «Wreathed is the bull. All is done. There is also the one who will smite him»⁵. It continues with the description of the festive preparations at Aigeai for the wedding of Alexander the Molossian, the brother of Olympias, with hers and Philip's daughter Kleopatra; the omen of the Athenian proclamation that anyone who would plot against Philip and seek refuge in Athens would be delivered up; finally, the equally premonitory recitation by Neoptolemos, the famous actor from Skyros, of a tragic piece alluding to the overturn of fortune which might soon overtake the rich and mighty Persian king. Philip having failed to grasp the meaning of the signs announcing not the overthrow of the Persian monarchy, but his own ruin, committed the ultimate hubris, a procession of the statues of the twelve gods along with a thirteenth one of himself raised thus to a divine status. The stage was set for the final act at the theatre of Aigeai, where his Nemesis, Pausanias, a bodyguard from Orestis, was awaiting the king, a Celtic sword in his hand.

There follows a retrospect explaining the motive of the imminent murder, the ambush in the theatre, where Pausanias stabbed Philip as he was entering alone, without his retinue, the assassin's flight towards the city gates, where he had posted horses, and his accidental fall and brutal killing by the bodyguards Leonnatos, Perdikkas and Attalos.

As we said before, a wide spectrum of scholarly studies, ranging from political and religious history to social anthropology, have been based on Diodorus' account of Philip's murder. Only a year before (2002) I attended a conference where as many as three papers on the motives of Pausanias' desperate gesture and on the sexual habits of the Macedonian court were read⁶. They

⁴ Diod. XVI 91, 1-94-94 (translation C.B. Welles).

⁵ Diod. XVI 91, 2: ἔστεπται μὲν ὁ ταῦρος, ἔχει τέλος, ἔστιν ὁ θύσων (translation C. B. Welles).

⁶ D. OGDEN, *A War of Witches at the Court of Philip II?*; K. MORTENSEN, *Homosexuality at the Macedonian Court and the Death of Philip II*; E. BADIAN, *The Death of Philip II; a Survey*,

incite me to focus the present paper on these two aspects of the narrative, adding to them a third one closely connected to the first of these, Philip's supposed apotheosis.

2. *The motive of Pausanias*

Amongst the contradictions and controversies surrounding the assassination of Philip there is one fact that emerges as incontrovertible and undisputed: the name of his murderer. For it is guaranteed by the testimony of the only surviving contemporary witness, Aristotle: «(the plot) against Philip by Pausanias because he had let him be outraged by Attalos and his band»⁷.

The Stagiritan philosopher, besides the name, supplies the motive for the assassination, the personal grudge of its perpetrator, to wit, that Philip had suffered Pausanias to be outraged by Attalos and his men. This is clear even from the short notice introducing several similar cases: «Most of them make the attempts not in order to prevail, but in anger in order to take revenge»⁸. No details are forthcoming about the precise nature of the outrage (although the context leaves no doubt that sexual abuse is meant) or the way in which Philip 'allowed' the outrage.

Diodorus, on the contrary, provides a much more circumstantial testimony⁹. Pausanias was a Macedonian from Orestis; he was a royal 'bodyguard' (σωματοφύλαξ); because of his beauty he had become Philip's minion. We then hear that the king had another minion also named Pausanias; that the two Pausanias quarelled, the first accusing the second of being androgynous and promiscuous; that the latter, burning under the insult resolved to take a desperate action and confided his decision to his friend Attalos; that the opportunity to put his resolve into effect presented itself

papers read at the Vth International Symposium on Ancient Macedonia held in Thessalonike in 2002.

⁷ Arist. *Pol.* 1311b: ἡ δὲ Φιλίππου ὑπὸ Πανυσανίου διὰ τὸ ἔασαι ὑβρισθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ Ἀτταλον.

⁸ Arist. *Pol.* 1331a: τῶν δ' ὀργιζομένων σχεδὸν οἱ πλεῖστοι τιμωρίας χάριν ἐπιτίθενται ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑπεροχῆς.

⁹ Diod. XVI 93, 3-94, 2.

«a few days later»: «as Philip was fighting against Pleurias, king of the Illyrians, (Pausanias) standing in front of the king, received on his body all the blows directed against him (Philip) and died»¹⁰. Attalos, to avenge his friend, invited the surviving Pausanias to dinner, made him drunk with unmixed wine and «delivered his body to the muleteers to outrage and to drunken whoredom» (εἰς ὕβριν καὶ παροιनीαν ἑταιρικὴν). When he came to his senses, Pausanias charged Attalos with the outrage before the king. But Philip did not punish Attalos because he was the nephew of Kleopatra, his new wife, and because he had appointed him general of the expeditionary force. Instead, he tried to assuage Pausanias with presents (δωρεάς) and promoted him in the bodyguard corps. But it was to no avail...

To this motive Diodorus adds a second one, the advice of the sophist Hermokrates, Pausanias' teacher, who in answer to his pupil's query for a way to become a celebrity suggested the killing of a great man.

The scholars who have studied the circumstances of Philip's death, usually compare Diodorus' narrative, with the other main one which can be read in Justin's *Epitoma*¹¹, in order either to combine or reject elements from either or both of them. However, before any collation, it would be instructive to evaluate Diodorus' story in itself and in the light of the historical events and the institutions of Philip's Macedonia.

Even those who privilege the account of Diodorus have long been suspicious of the inherently improbable stories of the second Pausanias and of the «Herostratian» sophist¹². These two elements alone suffice according to A. Momigliano to characterise the Siceliote historian's account: «Nessuno scrupolo di maggiore verità la guida; solo lo sforzo di rendere più drammatico l'episodio, più "letterario", sia con l'introdurvi quell'altro Pausania,

¹⁰ Diod. XVI 93, 6: μετ' ὀλίγας γὰρ ἡμέρας τοῦ Φιλίππου πρὸς Πλευρίαν τὸν τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν βασιλέα διαγωνιζομένου πρὸ τοῦ βασιλέως στὰς ἀπάσας τὰς φερομένας ἐπ' αὐτὸν πληγὰς ἀνεδέξατο τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι καὶ μετήλλαξε (translation C.B. Welles).

¹¹ Just. *Epit.* 9, 6, 1-7, 14.

¹² A. MOMIGLIANO, *Le fonti della storia greca e macedone nel libro XVI di Diodoro*, RedIstLomb, 45 (1932), p. 529; J.R. ELLIS, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism*, London 1976, pp. 224-225; cfr. DEVELIN, *The Murder of Philip II*, «Antichthon», 15 (1981), pp. 87-88.

che, se non è inventato, non doveva avere nulla da fare con la morte del re, sia con il mostrare l'assessino trascinato da uno di quei sogni di immortalità in qualunque modo raggiunta, che col pivano l'immaginazione del pubblico greco...». To these artificial literary inventions he adds the ambiguous oracle announcing Philip's death, the omen of the Athenian decree and the prophetic allusions to the impending disaster in the declamation of the actor Neoptolemos. To plagiarise F. W. Walbank's early paper on Philip V¹³, Diodorus, or rather his source, had committed a first Φίλιππος τραγωιδούμενος long before Polybius attempted to compose the tragic end of the king's later namesake. This opinion is echoed in a A. B. Bosworth's early paper: «The account of the death of Philip is typical of the more sensational type of Hellenistic historiography... Everything is geared to emphasise the contrast between the success of Philip, consummated in the appearance at Aegae as *synthronos* of the Olympians, and his sudden assassination... The story is dressed up with a battery of riddling oracles and double-edged prophesies, and the scandalous story of the outrage to Pausanias is given at titillating length»¹⁴.

In spite of these serious reserves concerning Diodorus' trustworthiness, much of the discussion on the motives and circumstances of Philip's murder have been based on learned exegeseis of his text, even by those who denounce it as unreliable and «patently late and ill-informed»¹⁵.

The main point of contention has been the lapse of time between Pausanias' outrage and his spectacular revenge. For, as it has been argued, the longer the delay the less the motive of personal revenge can be accepted as plausible. K. J. Beloch was first

¹³ F.W. WALBANK, ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ, JHS, 58 (1938) pp. 55-68.

¹⁴ A.B. BOSWORTH, *Philip II and Upper Macedonia*, CQ, 21 (1971), pp. 95-96; cfr. H. BERVE, *Das Alexanderreich auf Prosopografischer Grundlage I-II*, Munich 1926, n. 614; P. TREVES, *Per la critica e l'analisi del libro XVI di Diodoro*, Ann Pisa, 16 (1937), pp. 277-278; N.G.L. HAMMOND, *The Sources of Diodorus Siculus I*, CQ, 31 (1937), pp. 84; 90; 91; E. BADIAN, *The Death of Philip II*, «Phoenix», 17 (1963), pp. 244-250; ID., *Konrad Kraft, Der 'rationale' Alexander (review)*, «Gnomon», 47 (1975), p. 53. Hammond, who in his paper on the sources of the XVIII book of Diodorus characterises Diyllos as an unreliable author («nor, to judge from the colour of the fragments, was he a respecter of facts»), in a much later article (*The Sources of Justin on Macedonia to the Death of Philip*, CQ, 41 [1991], p. 504), rather surprisingly finds him «more dependable» (than Trogus).

¹⁵ BADIAN, *Kraft*, p. 53.

to argue that long years had passed between the first event, which according to a previous chapter (XVI 69, 7) of Diodorus himself he dates in 344, and the second one firmly dated in 336. He found additional evidence for a long lapse of time in the fact that at the moment of the assassination Pausanias as a *somatophylax* «kann als kein ganz junger Mann mehr gewesen sein», whereas according to Justin (of whom more below) he had been sexually abused by Attalos *primis pubertatis annis*¹⁶. Badian reiterated Beloch's arguments – apparently without being aware of doing so – insisting that the «precise setting» of the battle against Pleurias left no doubt about the date of the event and confirmed that «the whole grievance dated back about eight years»¹⁷.

Challenge came independently from a posthumous book by K. Kraft and from an article by J.R. Fears. The first questioned Justin's evidence on the pederastic nature of Attalos' offence, and invoking the authority of H. Berve¹⁸ argued that Pausanias, as well as the other *somatophylakes* mentioned by Diodorus, Perdikkas, Leonnatos, Attalos (probably son of Andromenes) and, apparently, the second Pausanias were not honorary bodyguards, that is to say high court officials, a dignity that Ptolemaios attained at the age of 37, but young soldiers of the guard regiment in their early twenties¹⁹.

Fears defends the internal coherence of Diodorus' account, which does not connect the events leading to Pausanias' outrage with the Illyrian war of 344, since it situates this conflict in the last couple of years of Philip's reign; attempts to chronologically dissociate this war from the rape of Pausanias; and contests the usual chronological interpretation of Justin's account and perhaps implicitly the legitimacy of combining the two narratives. He concludes that both Diodorus and Plutarch (of which more below) securely place the outrage suffered by Pausanias after Philip's marriage to Kleopatra and that such a date is consistent with the account of Justin²⁰.

¹⁶ BELOCH, *Geschichte*, III 1, p. 606.

¹⁷ BADIEN, *The Death of Philip II*, p. 247 and n. 19.

¹⁸ BERVE, *Das Alexanderreich*, I, p. 123.

¹⁹ K. KRAFT, *Der 'rationale' Alexander*, Frankfurt, 1971, pp. 35-36.

²⁰ J.R. FEARS, *Pausanias, the Assassin of Philip II*, «Athenaeum», 63 (1975), pp. 121-123.

Badian counter-attacked with a scathing review of Kraft's book. Explicitating Beloch's argument he submitted that the Illyrian king Pleurias was a mistake for Pleuratos, known from Didymus' commentary to Demosthenes (12, 64f), against whom Philip had waged a battle in which «he received a serious leg injury (and 150 *hetairoi* were killed)» – a stunningly erroneous statement of the reviewer; in fact, as we shall see below, Philip suffered a collar bone wound and 150 *hetairoi* were not killed, but simply wounded. He further argued that this Illyrian war was identical with the one mentioned by Diodorus under the year 344/3²¹.

To no avail. Almost all subsequent treatments of the question accept a late date (338/7-336) for the Illyrian war and Pausanias' rape²². I have had twice the opportunity to express my disagreement with the new *communis opinio*, but as it was stated only as a side issue in papers dealing with chronological problems of Philip's reign and with his policy in Illyria²³, they seem to have remained unnoticed. And yet a careful reading of the evidence leaves no doubt that Philip's last Illyrian war, in which he was severely wounded and his comrades in arms deplored many casualties, took place in 345. I think that it is worthwhile to go once again into it; for, as Griffith rightly observes, «the identification (to wit, of the 345 and the 337 or 336 wars) has very serious consequences for interpreters of the story of Philip's death»²⁴.

The testimonies for this war are the following:

1) Diodorus XVI 69, 7²⁵: «In Macedonia, Philip had inherited

²¹ Diod. XVI 69, 7: BADIAN, *Konrad Kraft*, p. 54.

²² Cfr. G.T. GRIFFITH, in N.G.L. HAMMOND - G.T. GRIFFITH, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. II, Oxford 1979, pp. 684-85; N.G.L. HAMMOND, *The end of Philip*, in *Philip of Macedon*, Athens 1980, p. 170; ID. *Philip of Macedon*, London 1994, pp. 175-179; J.R. ELLIS, *The Assassination of Philip II*, «Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson», Thessalonike 1981, p. 134; DEVELIN, *The Murder of Philip II*, p. 88, n. 6.

²³ HATZOPOULOS, *The Olevni Inscription*, pp. 26-30; ID., *Les limites de l'expansion macédonienne en Illyrie sous Philippe II*, in *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Illyrie dans l'Antiquité*, Clermont-Ferrand 1987, pp. 87-91; ID., *La lettre royale d'Olévéni*, «Chiron», 25 (1995), pp. 170-171.

²⁴ G.T. GRIFFITH, in G.L.H. HAMMOND - G.T. GRIFFITH, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. II, Oxford 1979, p. 473. The recent discussion of the date of this campaign by E. ARENA (*REA*, 105 [2003] pp. 49-81), has nothing useful to add.

²⁵ Κατὰ δὲ τὴν Μακεδονίαν Φίλιππος πατρικὴν ἔχθραν διαδεδεγμένος πρὸς Ἰλλυριοῦς καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν ἀμετάθετον ἔχων ἐνέβαλεν εἰς τὴν Ἰλλυρίδα μετὰ

from his father a quarrel with the Illyrians and found no means of reconciling the disagreement. He therefore invaded Illyria with a large force, devastated the countryside, captured many towns, and returned to Macedonia laden with booty». Hammond assigns this notice to a 'text-book' of fourth century history²⁶. I rather agree with Marta Sordi that its source is Ephoros²⁷. Diodorus places these events in the Athenian year 334/3 B.C. But, as first Böhnecke and Schaefer and more recently Cawkwell have firmly established, they belong to the campaign season of 345²⁸.

2) Pompeius Trogus, *ProL.* 8: «How the Illyrian kings were defeated by him (Philip)»²⁹.

3) The corresponding passage of Justin's *Epitoma* 8, 6, 3: «(Philip) having settled and put in order his affairs in Macedonia, he took by deception (lured by tricks?) and conquered the Dardanians and other neighbouring peoples»³⁰.

4-6) We find echoes of this war in Demosthenes (XVIII 44: «Philip was going about subduing Illyrians, Triballians and even some Greeks») ³¹, in a strategem of Philip at the expense of the Sarnousians reported by Polyainos (IV 2, 12) and in a fragment of Theopompos (*FGrH* 115 F 182) mentioning the Illyrian town of Oidantion.

7) An inscription found near the village Oleveni, just north of the present Greek frontier and containing a royal letter dated on the 19th of the Macedonian month Panemos of a 16th regnal year

πολλῆς δυνάμεως. πορθήσας δὲ τὴν χώραν καὶ πολλὰ τῶν πολισιμάτων χειροσάμενος μετὰ πολλῶν λαφύρων ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν (translation C.B. Welles).

²⁶ HAMMOND, *The Sources of Diodorus Siculus I*, pp. 90-91.

²⁷ M. SORDI, *Diodori Siculi Liber XVI*, «Biblioteca di Studi superiori», 56, Firenze 1969, pp. XXVII e XXX.

²⁸ K.G. BÖHNECKE, *Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Attischen Redner und der Geschichte ihren Zeit*, Berlin 184, pp. 428-429; 435, 735; A. SCHAEFER, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*, II², Leipzig 1886, p. 345, n. 3; G.L. CAWKWELL, *Demosthenes' Policy after the Peace of Philocrates*, I, CQ, 13 (1963), pp. 126-127; ID., *Philip of Macedon*, London-Boston 1978, pp. 114-115; cfr. HATZOPOULOS, *The Oleveni Inscription*, pp. 29-30.

²⁹ *Ut Illyrici reges ab eo victi sunt.*

³⁰ *Compositis ordinatisque Macedoniae rebus Dardanos ceterosque finitimos fraude captos expugnat.*

³¹ Ὅτε γὰρ περιιών Φίλιππος Ἰλλυριοὺς καὶ Τριβαλλοὺς τινὰς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καταστρέφετο.

and a dedication mentioning «those of the Katlestai who stood in battle with Philip the king against the Dardanians and conquered». Although it remains uncertain whether the term Katlestai is an ethnic or designates a military unit, there is little doubt that this document dates from July 345 and refers to the same Illyrian war³².

8) More immediately relevant to the matter at hand is an entry of the *Etymologicum Magnum* 699, 47-48, s.v. πεζέταιρος: «Having with him the so-called Macedonian *pezetairoi*, a picked force, he invaded Illyria»³³. As Griffith (*A History of Macedonia*, pp. 706 and 709) has rightly seen, this notice, which is probably taken from Theopompos, refers to one of Philip II's Illyrian wars³⁴. The British historian hesitated between the 345 and the 337 (or 336) one. But as we shall see the second one is a duplication of the first.

9) Isoc. *Ep.* 2, 3; 5; 6; 9; 11; 12, in an allusive language, criticises Philip for taking unnecessary risks in an inglorious war against obscure barbarians («and emulate not those who wish to get rid of an unhappy life or those who because of a higher salary choo-

³² HATZOPOULOS, *La lettre royale d'Oleveni*, 163-85: Κατλεστῶν οἱ παραταξάμενοι μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Φιλίππου πρὸς Δαρδανέας [καὶ νικῆσαντες. The attribution of this inscription to the reign of Philip II was challenged by FANOULA PAPAZOGLOU, *L'inscription d'Oléveni*, «TEKMHPIA», 4 (1998-1999), pp. 89-100, with arguments based on a series of false assumptions: 1) that the date did not belong to the letter; 2) that we know of no inscription from the reign of Alexander or one of his predecessors dated in the Macedonian fashion; 3) that the attribution of the inscription to Philip II would entail the conquest of Dardania by the Macedonians during his reign, which she deemed impossible. In fact, 1) the date occupies the same position as always at the end of the official document; 2) we do possess inscriptions dated in the Macedonian fashion, that is to say by Macedonian month and/or year, one from the very beginning of Philip II's reign dated by the Macedonian month Xandikos (M. B. HATZOPOULOS, *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis* [«Meletemata», 14; Athens 1991] pp. 31-33, n. V) and another one from 326/5 dated by the eleventh year of Alexander the Great's reign; moreover E. GRZYBEK (*Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaïque* [Basel 1990] 24, n. 15), whose authority Papazoglou invokes, does admit the possibility that the Oleveni inscription belongs to the reign of Philip II; a Macedonian victory against the Dardanians in no way entails the conquest of the latter's homeland (Cfr. BullEpigr 2000, p. 452). Practically the same arguments are recently recycled in an extraordinarily prolix article by E. ARENA, *La lettera di Oleveni. Fra Filippo II e Filippo V di Macedonia*, REA, 105 (2003), pp. 49-82.

³³ Πεζέταιρος: Δημοσθένης Φιλίππικῶν δευτέρῳ. Καὶ τῶν Μακεδόνων τοὺς πεζεταίρους μὲν καλουμένους, ὄντας δὲ ἀπολέκτους, ἐνέβαλεν εἰς τὴν Ἰλλυρίδα ἔχων.

³⁴ GRIFFITH, *A History of Macedonia*, pp. 706, 709.

se deliberately purposeless dangers») ³⁵ instead of turning all his energies against the Great King, and implicitly establishes a disparaging comparison between Philip's bodyguards and those of the Lacedaemonian kings («You could also see that the Lacedaemonians, who take great care of the security of the kings, appoint the most eminent of the citizens as their guards; it is more shameful for them to suffer them (their kings) get killed than to lose their own shields») ³⁶. From these allusions one may conclude that in this war Philip put himself in grave danger fighting like someone aspiring to put an end to his life or like a mercenary soldier, whereas his bodyguards did not prove themselves equal to the circumstances.

10) The exact circumstances to which Isocrates alluded are preserved in a fragment probably of the contemporary Macedonian historian Marsyas from Pella cited in Didymus' commentary to Demosthenes (11, 22). *FGrH* 135-136 F 17: «they... say that he (had) his right collar bone (smashed) in Illyria from a spear (wound) as he was pursuing the Illyrian Pleuratos, when a hundred and fifty of the *hetairoi* were wounded and Hippostratos son of Amyntas was killed» ³⁷.

11) Now, this Hippostratos son of Amyntas was important enough to deserve a separate mention, because he was none other than the brother of Kleopatra, Philip's last wife, as it became clear soon after the publication of the Marsyas fragment ³⁸, which could now be connected with a fragment of Philip II's bio-

³⁵ Μηδ' ἀμιλλάσθαι τοῖς ἢ βίου συστυχοῦς ἀπαλλαγῆναι βουλομένοις ἢ μισθοφορᾶς ἔνεκα μείζονος εἰκῆ τοὺς κινδύνους προαιρουμένοις.

³⁶ Ἰδοὺς δ' ἂν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους περὶ τῆς τῶν βασιλέων σωτηρίας πολλὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιουμένους καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους τῶν πολιτῶν φύλακας αὐτῶν καθιστάνας, οἷς αἰσχίον ἐστὶ ἐκείνους τελευτήσαντας περιδεῖν ἢ τὰς ἀσπίδας ἀποβαλεῖν.

³⁷ Τὸν μὲν οὖν ὀφθαλμὸν οὕτω φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐκκοπήναι τὴν δὲ κλ<ε>ὶν τὴν δεξιᾶν ἐν Ἰλλυριοῖς λόγῃ τὸν Ἰλλυρίων Πλευράτον διώκοντα, ὄθ' ἑκατὸν μὲν καὶ πεντήκοντα τῶν ἐταίρων τραυματίζονται, τελευτᾷ δὲ Ἰππόστρατος ὁ Ἀμύντου. Cfr. ALICE SWIFT RIGINOS, *The Wounding of Philip II of Macedon: Fact and Fabrication*, JHS, 114 (1994), pp. 115-16.

³⁸ F. STÄLIN, *Die griechischen Historikerfragmente bei Didymos*, «Klio», 5 (1905) pp. 150-151; E. MEYER, *Isokrates' zweiter Brief an Philipp und Demosthenes' zweite Philippika*, SBBerl, 1909, pp. 758-761; P. FOUART, *Etudes sur Didymos*, «MémAcInscr», 38, 1 (1909), pp. 118-121.

graphy by Satyros: *FHG* III 161, fr. 5 (= Athenaios, *Deip.* 13, 557d-e): «Then, in addition to all these, he (Philip) married Cleopatra, the sister of Hippostratus and niece of Attalus, having fallen in love with her. And when he brought her into his household beside Olympias, he threw his whole life into confusion. For immediately, during the actual wedding celebrations Attalus said, 'Now surely there will be born for us true-bred (*i.e.* legitimate) kings and not bastards'. Now Alexander, when he heard this, threw the cup, which he was holding in his hands, at Attalus; thereupon he too threw his goblet at Alexander. After this, Olympias fled (or: went into exile) to the Molossians and Alexander (fled) to the Illyrians. And Cleopatra bore Philip the daughter named Europa»³⁹.

The similarities between Diodorus' Illyrian war in XVI 93, 3-9 and the 345 Illyrian war which can be reconstituted from the above notices are too many to be dismissed as a mere coincidence.

In both cases it is a war against Illyrians (or Illyrians and Dardanians, who may be subsumed under the more comprehensive ethnic of 'Illyrians'). The Illyrian king is called Pleurias in the first instance and Pleuratos in the other. However, it has been established that, whereas Pleuratos is an authentic Illyrian personal name⁴⁰, Pleurias is simply otherwise unknown as a name. The inescapable conclusion is that we are dealing with a simple mista-

³⁹ Ἐπὶ πάσαις δ' ἔγημε Κλεοπάτραν ἐρασθεὶς τὴν Ἴπποστράτου μὲν ἀδελφὴν, Ἀττάλου δὲ ἀδελφίδην καὶ ταύτην ἐπεισάγων τῇ Ὀλυμπιάδι ἅπαντα τὸν βίον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ συνέχεεν. εὐθέως γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς γάμοις ὁ μὲν Ἄτταλος ἔνυ μέντοι γνήσιοι, ἔφη, καὶ οὐ νόθοι βασιλεῖς γεννηθήσονται.' καὶ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀκούσας ἔβαλεν ἢ μετὰ χεῖρας εἶχεν κύλικι τὸν Ἀτταλον, ἔπειτα κάκεινος αὐτὸν ποτηρίῳ. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ὀλυμπιάς μὲν εἰς Μολοττοὺς ἔφυγεν, Ἀλέξανδρος δ' εἰς Ἰλλυριοὺς. καὶ ἡ Κλεοπάτρα δ' ἐγέννησε τῷ Φιλίππῳ θυγατέρα τὴν κληθεῖσαν Εὐρώπην. (Translation by A. TRONSON, *Satyros the Peripatetic and the Marriages of Philip II*, *JHS*, 104 [1984], p. 120).

⁴⁰ Cfr. O. MASSON, *Les rapports entre les Grecs et les Illyriens d'après l'onomastique d'Apollonia d'Illyrie et de Dyrrhachion*, Actes du Ier Congrès international des Etudes balkaniques et Sud-Est européennes (Sofia 1968) 235; ID., *A propos de la réimpression des 'Beamtennamen auf den griechischen Münzen' de Rudolf Münsterberg*, *RevPhil*, 51 (1977), p. 87; ID., *Encore les noms grecs et les noms illyriens à Apollonia et Dyrrhachion, Grecs et Illyriens dans les inscriptions de langue grecque d'Epidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia d'Illyrie*, Paris 1993, p. 161. FANOULA PAPAZOGLOU, *Structures ethniques et sociales dans les régions centrales des Balkans à la lumière des études onomastiques*, Actes du VIIIe Congrès international d'Epigraphie grecque et latine, Bucarest-Paris 1979, pp. 157-158.

ke instead of Pleuratos. In both instances Philip invaded Illyria accompanied by his bodyguards (cfr. Theopompos *FGrH* 115 F 348: «Theopompos says that picked men out of all the Macedonians, the tallest and strongest, served as King's Guards [ἔδορυφόρου] and they were called *pezetairoi*») ⁴¹, there was a fierce battle, the king's life was endangered, and one of his men was killed. The name of this man is Pausanias (bis) in Diodorus, but Hippostratos in Marsyas.

Independently of all other testimonies the story of the two Pausanias had been dismissed as hardly credible. It is difficult to escape the obvious conclusion that the real name of the bodyguard heroically dead was Hippostratos and that he was the brother of Kleopatra and the nephew of Attalos.

Now we finally hold the contours of a plausible story. This is how I resumed it some twenty years ago: «At the beginning of the campaigning season the Macedonian king, having heard that the Illyrians and Dardanians were planning to invade Macedonia, entered Illyria first at the head of his Royal Bodyguards. He hastened to the στενὰ τῆς Πελαγονίας to deal with the Dardanians, who were coming down the Treska valley into the Pelagonian plain, before they joined forces with the Illyrians. King Philip won the day, but instead of contenting himself with the repulsion of the danger that threatened Macedonia, he engaged in a reckless pursuit of king Pleuratos, during which the enemy rallied and the Macedonians suffered near disaster. Philip himself sustained a severe wound to the collar bone and was nearly killed, 150 bodyguards were wounded and one of them, Hippostratos, probably the nephew of Attalos and brother of Kleopatra, Philip's future wife, was killed, presumably while trying to save the life of the king. It would seem that the near disaster suffered by the Macedonian forces caused bitter controversy concerning the responsibility of the king himself, of the Bodyguards corps as a whole and of some Bodyguards in particular» ⁴². I consider this reconstruction as still essentially valid, except that I would per-

⁴¹ Θεόπομπός φησιν ὅτι ἐκ πάντων Μακεδόνων ἐπίλεκτοι οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ ἰσχυρότατοι ἔδορυφόρου τὸν βασιλέα καὶ ἐκαλοῦντο πεζεταῖροι.

⁴² HATZOPOULOS, *The Oliveni Inscription*, pp. 28-29.

haps put the beginning of the campaign a little later in summer in accordance with the date of the letter dated in June 345.

Had Hippostratos, like the fictitious second Pausanias, been Philip's minion? Naturally, it cannot be excluded, but it is no longer necessary in order to understand the behaviour of the protagonists of the drama. It is plausible that Philip, who had proved himself foolhardy at the battle against Pleuratos, felt responsible for the death of Hippostratos and for the well being of young Kleopatra, probably an orphan, since she is identified not as daughter of Amyntas but as sister of Hippostratos and niece of Attalos, her successive tutors. That would explain how he fell in love and married her. On the other hand, we can surmise from Isocrates' second letter to Philip that there was a bitter controversy among the bodyguards and in the public opinion concerning the responsibilities for the near disaster at the battle and the death of Hippostratos. Was some blame laid at Pausanias' door? It must be considered significant in this respect that according to Plutarch, whose ultimate source, as I hope to show elsewhere, is Theopompos, Pausanias was «outrageously dealt with at the instance of Attalus and Kleopatra»⁴³. Kleopatra's instigation, utterly out of place in the case of a homosexual broil, would be fully justified, if Pausanias' cruel punishment was intended as a revenge for his alleged responsibility for the death of Hippostratos.

If the above reconstruction is correct, the inescapable conclusion is that Diodorus' account concerning Pausanias' motivation is utterly unreliable and therefore useless. It should rather be considered as an early specimen of Hellenistic fiction, whoever its ultimate author – Diyllos or someone else – may be.

Moreover, the reconstruction that we have attempted finds ample support in the other main, although much shorter account, that of Justin, which, as I also hope to show elsewhere, has the contemporary historian Theopompos as its ultimate source.

Justin's narrative is divided into two parts: a first one limited to the bare facts and a second expanding into hypotheses and speculations based on rumour and concerning the instigators of the

⁴³ Plut. *Alex.* 10, 6: 'Ἐπεὶ δὲ Πausανίας Ἀττάλου γνώμη καὶ Κλεοπάτρας ὕβρισθεῖς... (B. Perrin's translation).

assassination, which need not retain us here: «Meanwhile, as the reinforcements were gathering from Greece, he (Philip) celebrated the wedding of his daughter Kleopatra with Alexander, whom he had made king of Epirus. The event was remarkable in its pomp, because of the greatness of the two kings, both the one who was giving his daughter away and the one who was taking her as wife. Nor did the games lack in magnificence. As Philip was hastening to assist without bodyguards, in the midst of the two Alexanders, his son and his son-in-law, Pausanias, a young Macedonian, unsuspected by anyone, having occupied a narrow passage, cut him down as he was going by and rendered the happy event hideous with mourning of death. This Pausanias in the early years of his adolescence had been sexually assaulted by Attalos, to which indignity this horror had been also added: having taken him to a banquet and filled him up with undiluted wine, he had submitted him not only to his own but, as if he were a prostitute, also to the lust of his guests and made him the laughing stock of all among the youths of his age. Pausanias hardly bearing the insult often complained to Philip. As he was dismissed with a variety of pretexts and even with derision, and as on top of that he saw his enemy honoured with a generalship, he turned his anger against Philip himself and sought from the unfair judge the revenge that he could not obtain from his enemy»⁴⁴.

Justin's narrative confirms our reconstruction on two important points: 1) The grudge of Pausanias did not date from one year or two but was an old one⁴⁵. Apparently, it was Kleopatra's

⁴⁴ *Iust. Epit.* 9, 6: *Interea, dum auxilia a Graecia coeunt, nuptias Cleopatrae filiae et Alexandri, quem regem Epiri fecerat, celebrat. Dies erat pro magnitudine duorum regum, et conlocantis filiam et uxorem ducentis, apparatus insignis. Sed nec ludorum magnificentia deerat; ad quorum spectaculum Philippus cum sine custodibus corporis medius inter duos Alexandros, filium generumque, contenderet, Pausanias, nobilis ex Macedonibus adulescens, nemini suspectus, occupatis angustiis Philippum in transitu obruncat diemque laetitiae destinatum foedum luctu funeris facit. Hic primis pubertatis annis stuprum per iniuriam passus ab Attalo fuerat, cuius indignitati haec etiam foeditas accesserat. Nam perductum in convivium solutumque mero Attalus non suae tantum, verum et convivarum libidini velut scortum iure subiecerat ludibriumque omnium inter aequales reddiderat. Hanc rem aegre ferens Pausanias querelam Philippo saepe detulerat. Cum variis frustrationibus non sine risu deferretur et honoratum insuper ducatu adversarium cerneret, iram in ipsum Philippum vertit ultionemque, quam ab adversario non poterat, ab iniquo iudice exegit.*

⁴⁵ The rape of Pausanias by Attalos' friends belongs too to this early period, as the reference to the *aequales* (ἡλικιώται?), probably the other royal pages, suggests (cfr.

mariage with Philip, which put her uncle beyond retribution, and the latter's elevation to one of the highest military commands that prompted Pausanias to make his move against the king. 2) Pausanias' homosexual relation with Philip, without being excluded, is by no means necessary for understanding the sequence of events, which is satisfactorily explained by the relationship with Attalos. And this brings us to the next item.

Sexual habits at the Macedonian court

In a paper read the year before at the VIIIth International Symposium on Ancient Macedonia Kate Mortensen, on the basis of Diodorus' account of Philip's end, developed a theory on the different character of homosexual relations in the Macedonian court as compared to the rest of the Greek world⁴⁶.

Although the mere suggestion that homosexuality was practiced in ancient Macedonia was enough to nearly trigger a riot in the Macedonian capital, the fact is that such relations are amply attested in the Macedonian court and have been extensively studied. Aristotle himself, after citing the example of Philip's assassination by Pausanias as a result of the outrage inflicted by Attalos, pursues with the case of Amyntas II assassinated by Derdas, «because he boasted (to have plucked) the flower of his youth»⁴⁷, and a little further down, among the cases of attempts made «because of bodily dishonour inflicted by monarchs»⁴⁸ he reports that of Krataias (in fact Krateuas) against Archelaos: «For he continued to bear impatiently the relation (with Archelaos), so that a minor pretext proved sufficient; because he (Archelaos), although he had agreed, did not give him to marriage any of his daughters, but the elder one he gave to the king of Elimeia,

Arist. *Pol.* 1311b: διὰ τὸ καυχῆσασθαι εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ; cfr. *ibi*: χρώμενος αὐτοῦ τῆ ἡλικίᾳ).

⁴⁶ K. MORTENSEN, *Homosexuality at the Macedonian Court and the Death of Philip II*, in *Ancient Macedonia VII* (forthcoming).

⁴⁷ Arist. *Pol.* 1311b: καὶ ἡ Ἀμύντου τοῦ μικροῦ ὑπὸ Δέρδα διὰ τὸ καυχῆσασθαι εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ.

⁴⁸ Arist. *Pol.* 1311b: πολλὰ δ' ἐπιθέσεις γέγνηνται καὶ διὰ τὸ εἰς τὸ σῶμα αἰσχύνεσθαι τῶν μονάρχων τινάς.

because he was pressed by war against Sirrhas and Arrhabaios, and the younger one to the son of Amyntas, expecting that in this way he would quell the rivalry with his (Archelaos') son from Kleopatra. But in fact the origin of his hostility was that he resented the sexual favours (that he was obliged to grant to Archelaos). Hellanokrates from Larissa joined the attempt for the same reason. For, as he (Archelaos) took advantage of his youth, but, in spite of his promise, did not restore him (in Larissa), he considered that the relation was not motivated by loving passion but by (the will to) outrage (him)»⁴⁹. In the assassination of Archelaos took also part a certain Dekamnichos, whom Aristotle mentions a few lines below under the heading of those who assassinated rulers «because they had suffered bodily ill-treatment»⁵⁰: «Dekamnichos was the leader of the attempt against Archelaos and was the first to spur on the assailants. The cause of his anger was that he (Archelaos) handed him to Euripides, the poet, to flogg him. Euripides was sore against him (Dekamnichos), because he had said something about his bad breath»⁵¹.

On the evidence of Diodorus' implicitly late (337-336 B.C.) chronology of the war against Pleurias and of his depiction of Pausanias, especially as it has been interpreted by a series of scholars from K.J. Beloch⁵² to N.G.L. Hammond⁵³, who have identified

⁴⁹ Arist. *Pol.* 1311b: οἷον καὶ ἡ Κραταίου εἰς Ἀρχέλαον· αἰεὶ γὰρ βαρέως εἶχε πρὸς τὴν ὁμιλίαν, ὥστε ἰκανὴ καὶ ἐλάττων ἐγένετο πρόφασις, ἢ διότι τῶν θυγατέρων οὐδεμίαν ἔδωκε ὁμολογήσας αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν προτέραν κατεχόμενος ὑπὸ Σίρραν καὶ Ἀρραβαῖον ἔδωκε τῷ τῆς Ἑλιμείας, τὴν δὲ νεωτέραν τῷ υἱεὶ Ἀμύντα οἰόμενος οὕτως ἂν ἐκείνον ἦκιστα διαφέρεσθαι καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῆς Κλεοπάτρας· ἀλλὰ τῆς γε ἀλλοτριότητος ὑτῆρχε ἀρχὴ τὸ βαρέως φέρειν πρὸς τὴν ἀφροδισιαστικὴν χάριν. συνεπέθετο δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνοκράτης ὁ Λαρισαῖος διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν· ὡς γὰρ χρώμενος αὐτοῦ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ οὐ κατήγεν ὑποσχόμενος, δι' ὕβριν καὶ οὐ δι' ἐρωτικὴν ἐπιθυμίαν φετ' εἶναι τὴν γεγεννημένην ὁμιλίαν.

⁵⁰ Arist. *Pol.* 1311b: Πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ εἰς τὸ σῶμα αἰκισθῆναι πληγαῖς ὀργισθέντες οἱ μὲν διέφθειραν οἱ δ' ἐνεχείρισαν ὡς ὕβρισθέντες καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ βασιλικὰς δυναστείας.

⁵¹ Arist. *Pol.* 1311b: Καὶ τῆς Ἀρχελάου δ' ἐπιθέσεως Δεκάμνιχος ἡγεμῶν ἐγένετο παροξύνων τοὺς ἐπιθεμένους πρῶτος· αἴτιον δὲ τῆς ὀργῆς ὅτι αὐτὸν ἐξέδωκε μαστιγῶσαι Εὐριπίδῃ τῷ ποιητῇ· ὁ δ' Εὐριπίδης ἐχαλέπαινε εἰπόντος τι αὐτοῦ εἰς δυσωδίαν τοῦ στόματος.

⁵² K.J. BELOCH, *Griechische Geschichte*, III, 1, p. 606.

⁵³ HAMMOND, *Philip of Macedon*, London 1994, p. 176: «Pausanias.... was now a mature man of great military distinction, a Bodyguard».

him as one of the seven senior *somatophylakes*, «one of the noblest of the land», as Badian (*The Death of Philip II*, p. 248) would call him⁵⁴, Miss Mortensen has elaborated a theory according to which in Macedonia homosexual relations were not fundamentally pederastic as in the rest of the Greek world, but were mainly practiced between grown adults of comparable age. That would indeed be the case if Pausanias had been Philip's paramour just before being promoted to the position of an honorary *somatophylax*, presumably in his late thirties, as, for instance Ptolemaios in the court of Alexander the Great. Instead, we know now that Pausanias was in his twenties⁵⁵ and that the outrage which he had suffered had occurred when he was some eight years younger⁵⁶. Moreover, it is not at all sure that he had ever been Philip's minion, although this cannot be excluded, since Pausanias had probably been a royal page and homosexual relations with the king were frequent among the members of this corps. In any case, his rape by Attalos' guests (or muleteers) was not an ordinary homosexual affair but a vengeance. His homosexual affair with Attalos, who was a grown up man belonging to an older generation, that of Philip, goes back to an early stage, when Pausanias was a young adolescent. We thus fall back to the classical pattern of Greek pederasty, only that in the Macedonian court the institution of the royal pages, which was the breeding ground of the royal bodyguards corps, conferred to it a character both more rigid and more explosive.

It should be recalled here that the βασιλικοὶ παῖδες at the Macedonian court were expected to accompany the king at hunting, but without being allowed to kill the 'nobler' game, such as the boar, to serve him at table and even share his meal, but without permission to lie on a couch, to keep watch on the king's sleep, but often also to satisfy his sexual desires, to assist him in all ways and make themselves useful, but in case of breach of discipline to be flogged by the king. The prohibition to lie down on a couch at meal and to kill boars at hunting, the passive role in

⁵⁴ Badian, *The Death of Philip II*, p. 248.

⁵⁵ Cfr. Just. *Epit.* 9, 6, 4: *adulescens*; Plut. *Alex.* 10, 6: τῷ νεανίσκῳ.

⁵⁶ Just. *Epit.* 9, 6, 5: *primis pubertatis annis*. Cfr. HATZOPOULOS, *Cultes et rites de passage*, pp. 100-101 and 109.

homosexual relations, the flogging, separately as well as taken together underline the inferior position of the royal pages and their exclusion from the world of grown up men, battle and table companions of the king and free citizens of their cities and of the Macedonian *ethnos*⁵⁷. No wonder that city-state Greek writers would confuse them with slaves, overlooking that the inferior status of the pages was a transient one and that most of them were destined to occupy the highest positions in the kingdom⁵⁸.

As N. G. L. Hammond has successfully established, Archelaos' assassination, which according to Diodorus took the form of a hunting accident⁵⁹, was perpetrated by a trio of royal pages⁶⁰. The combination of the hunting motif, the flogging of Dekamnichos and the passive homosexual role of Krateuas and Hellanokrates leave little doubt about it. In fact, the diverse grudges of the conspirators against the king can be resumed in a single one: the refusal or the inability of Archelaos to let them attain adult status, be it through marriage (Krateuas), or access to political activity (Hellanokrates), and his persistence to maintain them in that of persons under age symbolised by corporal punishments and homosexual relations, although they had moved beyond that age. As P. Vidal-Naquet has aptly pointed out, the same pattern is recognisable in the conspiracy of the royal pages against Alexander the Great in 327⁶¹. Is Kallisthenes not supposed to have incited them to act by reminding them that «they were men already»⁶² or that «free men could not suffer Alexander's insulting behaviour»⁶³?

Had Hippostratos been Philip's homosexual partner? It cannot be excluded, the more so that he had probably been a royal page. However, there is no trace of positive evidence about it out-

⁵⁷ *Ibi*, pp. 93-98; cfr. P. VIDAL-NAQUET, «Alexandre et les chasseurs noirs», *Flavius Arrien entre deux mondes*, in *Histoire d'Alexandre le Grand*, Paris 1984, pp. 362-363.

⁵⁸ HAMMOND, *History*, p. 154; ID., *Royal Pages*, p. 263.

⁵⁹ Diod. XIV 37, 6.

⁶⁰ HAMMOND, *History*, pp. 167-168; ID., *Royal Pages*, p. 263.

⁶¹ VIDAL-NAQUET, *Alexandre*, pp. 362-363.

⁶² Curt. VII 8, 3: *iam viros esse*.

⁶³ Arr. *Anab.* IV 14, 2: καὶ γὰρ οὐκ εἶναι ἐλευθέρῳ ἀνδρὶ φέρειν τὴν ὄβριον τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου.

side the story of pseudo-Pausanias bis in Diodorus' romanticised account. In any case, at the time of his death Hippostratos, even if he was presumably older than his sister Kleopatra, was still a very young man, belonging to a younger generation than Philip.

The divinisation of Philip

The Macedonian, like the Lacedaemonian kings (Herod. VI 58, 1-3; Xen. *Resp.* XV 9)⁶⁴, were traditionally entitled to heroic honours after their death, as attested by the *heroon* above Philip's tomb at Vergina⁶⁵. Once they were buried at the royal necropolis of Aigeai, they served as tutelary spirits protecting their country and were invoked as such in times of crisis⁶⁶. This posthumous purely Macedonian cult should be distinguished from the heroic or divine honours which some Temenid kings, according to several more or less reliable sources, received in neighbouring city-states they had conquered or brought under their sway (Amphipolis, Pydna, perhaps Philippoi)⁶⁷ and even more from such or similar honours granted to them in distant allied cities such as Ephesos, Eresos or even perhaps Athens⁶⁸. The procession, as described by Diodorus, of Philip's statue along with the statues of the twelve gods at Aigeai, the old capital in the Macedonian heartland, was quite a different matter. E. Badian very aptly qualifies the idea as 'extravagant'⁶⁹. Nevertheless, as almost all modern historians, he admits the historicity of the event and builds on it a reconstruction of the plot against Philip's life: Antipatros, strongly opposed to such religious practices and jealous of the increased influence of Parmenion, joined forces with Alexander in order to eliminate the king.

⁶⁴ Herod. VI 58, 1-3; Xen. *Resp.* XV 9.

⁶⁵ M. ANDRONIKOS, *Vergina. The Royal Tombs*, Athens 1983, pp. 65; 98; 225; 227; 229; 233.

⁶⁶ Just. *Epit.* XXIV 5, 9-11; cfr. XIII 4, 4; Diod. XIX 22, 1.

⁶⁷ See M.B. HATZOPOULOS - LOUISA D. LOUKOPOULOU, *Morrylos, cité de Crestonie* («Meletemata», 7, 1989), pp. 47-48, with references.

⁶⁸ Arr. *Anab.* I 17, 1; *IG* XII 2, 526; Clem. Alex. IV 54, 5; cfr. A.M. PRESTIANNI GIALLOMBARDO, Φιλίππικὰ I: *Sul 'culto' di Filippo II di Macedonia*, *SicGym*, 28 (1975), p. 20, with references.

⁶⁹ BADIAN, *The Death of Philip II*, p. 247.

However, one may wonder if there is sufficient reason to trust this part of Diodorus' account any more than the one concerning the two Pausanias. It is quite remarkable that it is ignored by all other sources, including the patently scandal-mongering Justin and the historians of Alexander the Great when they deal with the *proskynesis* or the divine honours of the latter king. Only Stobaeus⁷⁰ alludes to them, as well as to the ominous recitation of Neoptolemos, clearly paraphrasing Diodorus or the latter's immediate source. The deliberately theatrical description of the event, which according to the author of the *Anthology* surpasses in tragic pathos the works of «Aeschylus, Sophocles or Euripides», should be an invitation to caution. R. H. Crum detected an «apocryphal flavour» reminiscent rather of Hellenistic ruler cults than of religious practices of Philip's time⁷¹ and his reservations were adopted by J.R. Ellis⁷². In fact, the obvious analogy of the procession described by Diodorus and Justin, which as I have argued elsewhere was part of an autumn religious festival in honour of Zeus⁷³, with a procession at the time of Philip V during the spring festival of Xandika, in which the king paraded with his sons⁷⁴ suggests that Diodorus' source, as in the case of the two Pausanias, used authentic historical material in order to elaborate a much more colourful and dramatic but wildly romanticised narrative.

Nearly fourty years after his first paper E. Badian returned to revisit the death of Philip II⁷⁵. Besides some considerations concerning Olympias and Amyntas, which need not retain us here, 1) he maintains the early date of the battle in Illyria, dismissing the possibility of another campaign in 338 or 337, 2) He stresses that «Pausanias acted only when he saw that Attalus became a relative of Philip and was promoted to high command», 3) He also main-

⁷⁰ Stob. *Anth.* IV 98, 70.

⁷¹ R.H. CRUM, *Philip of Macedon and the City-State* (Diss. Columbia University, 1966), pp. 245-266. Cfr. already, P. Treves' review of A. MOMIGLIANO, *Filippo di Macedone* (Firenze 1934), «Athenaeum», 14 (1936), pp. 203-205.

⁷² ELLIS, *Philip II*, p. 307, n. 58; ID., *The Assassination of Philip II*, p. 124, n. 41.

⁷³ HATZOPOULOS, *The Oliveni Inscription*, pp. 38-41.

⁷⁴ Livy XL 6, 2, 3, after Polybius.

⁷⁵ BADIAN, *The Death of Philip II: A Survey, Ancient Macedonia VII* (forthcoming).

tains the historicity of Plutarch's account of the Pixodaros affair. 4) Moreover, he argues that the determining factor explaining Alexander's attitude was his conviction that he was not going to be appointed regent during his father's absence in Asia, that he had no future, and that his life was in danger in Macedonia. 5) Finally, he asserts that a purpose of the wedding at Aigeai was «to mark Philip's reception among the gods and status above mere king».

The first point is amply justified by the examination of the sources carried out above. The second point is not only explicitly supported by both Justin and Diodorus but is also consistent with common logic. On the other hand, points 3 and 5 cannot be accepted without a preliminary evaluation of the evidence on which they are based. We have already seen that Diodorus' evidence on Philip's divine cult is highly questionable, because it is based on a very unreliable source. The same is true of Plutarch's evidence concerning Pixodaros⁷⁶. Finally, the reconstruction of Alexander's thoughts and convictions is pure guess-work based on a selective use of the available evidence. In my opinion, Badian's assertion that Alexander thought that he had no future in Macedon is in flat contradiction with his being appointed by Philip, along with his Molossian namesake, to escort him in the solemn procession from the palace to the theatre. Had he wished to publicly designate his heir and second in command, he would not have acted otherwise.

To conclude. Diodorus' narrative has been (unjustifiably, because according to the official version Pausanias' accomplices were Arrhabaios and Heromenes, sons of Aeropos⁷⁷, at the possible instigation of Amyntas, son of Perdikkas, not to mention the Persian king) considered as «the official account», because in agreement with Aristotle it lays the blame with Pausanias only and so implicitly disculpates the other suspects, and in particular

⁷⁶ Cfr. M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *A Reconsideration of the Pixodaros Affair, Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* («Studies in the History of Art», 10; Washington D.C. 1982), pp. 59-66. *Contra*, V. FRENCH - P. DIXON, *The Pixodaros Affair: Another view*, *AncW*, 13 (1986), pp. 73-86.

⁷⁷ U. KÖHLER, *Über das Verhältniss Alexanders des Grossen zu seinem Vater*, SBBerl 1892, p. 505; cfr. FEARS, *Pausanias*, p. 111.

Alexander and Olympias. Its deconstruction does not affect in the least the discussion concerning the possible instigators of the assassination. As Aristotle soberly states, Pausanias had grounds enough to seek vengeance, and Philip's marriage and Attalos' promotion satisfactorily explain why he turned his anger against his king several years after the outrage he had suffered. In his attempt he may have been instigated by others. But no verdict can be returned before evaluating the remaining literary, but also the archaeological evidence. This is the object of the yet unfinished book started twenty years ago.

