

SATYRUS THE PERIPATETIC AND THE MARRIAGES OF PHILIP II*

I. INTRODUCTION

A fragment, cited by Athenaeus (*Deipn.* xiii 557b-e = *fr.* 21)¹ from the life of Philip II of Macedon by the Peripatetic² biographer Satyrus, has been regarded by modern scholarship as a fundamental source for Philip's early campaigns and 'matrimonial politics'.³ Here Satyrus lists Philip's wives, apparently in chronological sequence.⁴ The fragment, as it is usually printed, also states that during his reign Philip *αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει*. This has led scholars to infer a reasonably accurate account of Philip's method of conducting foreign policy through contracting political marriages.⁵

Beloch⁶ was among the first of modern scholars to link Philip's marriages (as listed in the fragment) with specific wars and even to alter their chronological order so that most of them can be pegged to the few known campaigns of Philip's early career. He tacitly repudiated Satyrus' order by placing the marriage of Phila of Elimeia before that of Audata of Illyria and relegating Audata to the position of *Nebenfrau*, raising her status to that of *Gemahlin* only after the (hypothetical) death of Phila. He gave no specific reason for doing this, but it would appear that he regarded the marriage between Philip and a woman of the politically unstable region of Elimeia as being more appropriate to the time of his accession and therefore more likely to have taken place before his marriage to the Illyrian.⁷ Beloch also inverted the order of Philip's Thessalian wives, Nikesipolis of Pherae and Philinna of Larisa, in order to connect the Larisan alliance with Philip's early intervention in Thessaly on behalf of the Aleuads, in about 358/357 BC,⁸ and in order to connect the Pheraeon alliance with the Sacred War against Onomarchus the Phocian and Lycophron the tyrant of Pherae (355-352), which ended in their defeat and the liberation of Thessaly.⁹ The daughter born from the latter marriage could thus aptly be named Thessalonike, and Satyrus' statement that Philip *αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει* made more comprehensible. The seeds of doubt concerning Satyrus' chronological accuracy having been

* This paper is based on a seminar topic presented at Harvard in spring 1980. I wish to thank Prof. E. Badian for his interest in this subject as well as his valuable criticism and encouragement. Preliminary research for this paper was completed at Harvard during a period of sabbatical leave generously financed by the Human Sciences Research Council of South Africa and by the University of South Africa. The views and interpretations here expressed are my own and in no way reflect those of the persons or institutions mentioned above.

¹ The fragments of Satyrus are collected in C. F. Kumaniecki, *De Satyro Peripatetico* (Krakow 1929); commentary on *fr.* 21 at 73 f. Cf. Müller, *FHG* iii 161 *fr.* 5.

² Satyrus is given the epithet *Περικατητικός* three times in Athenaeus: vi 248d; xii 541c; xii 556a. S. West, in an important article (see n. 11), has argued convincingly that there are no grounds for disputing the authenticity of this epithet.

³ This is explicitly stated by A. M. Prestianni Giallombardo in a recent and exhaustive analysis of this fragment, *RSA* vi-vii (1976-7) 81-110. The frequent discussions of this fragment (e.g. in the works cited in n. 5, and elsewhere) support this statement.

⁴ The order of Philip's wives, according to Satyrus, is as follows: Audata of Illyria (359); Phila of Elimeia

(359/358); Nikesipolis of Pherae and Philinna of Larisa (358/357); Olympias of Epirus (357: Alexander born in 356); Meda of Thrace (?340/339); Cleopatra of Macedon (337). The dates, except for that of Olympias, which can be calculated from the known date of Alexander's birth, are conjectural and approximate.

⁵ Important interpretations have been based on this premiss, e.g. K. J. Beloch, *GG*² iii.2 68-70; C. Ehrhardt, *CQ* xvii (1967) 296-301; G. T. Griffith, *CQ* xx (1970) 66-80; R. M. Errington, *GRBS* xvi (1975) 41 n. 1; J. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976) 212-14; and more recently in H. J. Dell, *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (Thessaloniki 1981) 100-37; N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *History of Macedonia* (Oxford 1978) ii 214 f. and 220-30 (hereafter *HMac* ii); T. R. Martin, *HSCP* lxxxvi (1982) 55-78; Prestianni Giallombardo (n. 3).

⁶ *Op. cit.* (n. 5) 68-70.

⁷ G. T. Griffith (*HMac* ii 215) accepts Beloch's alteration without question and refers to a renewal of an old marriage alliance between Macedon and Elimeia. Cf. Ellis 1976 (n. 5) 38, who also accepts Beloch's interpretation.

⁸ *D.S.* xvi 14.

⁹ *Ibid.* 35.

thus sown, modern scholars have generally accepted Beloch's adjustment wholly or in part, or stated in specific terms their dissatisfaction with Satyrus as a source.¹⁰

This paper argues that Beloch and subsequent scholars regard this fragment as an unsatisfactory source because they expect Satyrus to provide information which he had no intention of providing. It will try to find out what the fragment actually does say, to place it in its proper context in Athenaeus and, as far as possible, to sift out the content of Satyrus' text from that of Athenaeus. In conclusion the fragment will be re-evaluated as an historical source.

II. SATYRUS THE PERIPATETIC: BACKGROUND AND RELIABILITY

Before evaluating the fragment we must examine the credentials of its author. Stephanie West has effectively undermined Wilamowitz's image of Satyrus as an Alexandrian scholar 'strongly influenced by Callimachus . . . (and) deserving serious attention'.¹¹ She proves that there are no reasonable grounds for identifying Satyrus the biographer, as Wilamowitz and his followers do,¹² with the homonymous author of a treatise on the demes of Alexandria quoted by Theophilus of Antioch,¹³ and thereby shows that the author of our fragment was probably a true *Peripatetikos*, that is, a member of Aristotle's school in Athens. Consequently Wilamowitz's criterion for assigning a date, or rather, a *terminus ante quem non*, for Satyrus (the last quarter of the third century BC) falls away, since he based his argument on the dates of the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–203), during which the Alexandrian demes were organized in the manner described in the treatise. Only an approximate *terminus ante quem* for Satyrus' date may be established by that of his epitomator, Herakleides Lembos, who wrote in the first half of the second century BC, during the reign of Ptolemy VI Philopator (186–145).¹⁴ As West has pointed out there is no way of establishing how many years intervened between Satyrus' lifetime and the epitomizing of his work, although it is not impossible that Herakleides published the epitome—as that of Sotion—during the lifetime of the author.¹⁵

A reference in Athenaeus (xiii 556a = Satyrus *fr.* 10 K = 15 M) provides a more positive indication of Satyrus' date and affiliations. The following authors, according to Athenaeus, said that Socrates was a bigamist: εἰσὶ δὲ Καλλισθένης, Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς, Σάτυρος ὁ περιπατητικός, Ἀριστόξενος, οἷς τὸ ἐνδόσιμον Ἀριστοτέλης ἔδωκεν ἱστορῶν τοῦτο ἐν τῷ περὶ Εὐγενείας. Callisthenes, Demetrius of Phalerum and Aristoxenus were all contemporaries and pupils of Aristotle.¹⁶ The fact that Satyrus is grouped with them and that Athenaeus refers to them collectively (οἷς) as receiving the ἐνδόσιμον of Aristotle, suggests that Satyrus himself may have been a younger contemporary of Aristotle, and thus closer in time to Philip than is generally believed.

Only this much may be inferred about the date of Satyrus, but how much is known about his works? According to available evidence Satyrus wrote at least two works,¹⁷ περὶ

¹⁰ Cf. M. Sordi, *La Lega Tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno* (Rome 1958) 351–2; Ehrhardt (n. 5) 297: 'the list is not in chronological order'; Ellis 1976 (n. 5) 212: 'this account is clearly unsatisfactory in some ways, in that its relative chronology is suspect and often wrong'. Also Griffith 1970 (n. 5) 70 and n. 1.

¹¹ *GRBS* xv (1974) 279–87. This image was established by U. v. Wilamowitz in *Hermes* xxxiv (1899) 633 ff. = *Kl. Schr.* iv (1962) 103 ff., and maintained by F. Leo, *Die gr.-röm. Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form* (Leipzig 1901) 118 ff; Gudeman, *RE*, zweite Reihe, iii (1921) Satyrus 16; A. Dihle, *Stud. zur gr. Biographie* (Göttingen 1956) 104 f.; and A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Harvard 1971) 79 ff.

¹² Cf. Kumaniecki (n. 1) 2; Momigliano (n. 11) 79.

¹³ *ad Autolyicum* ii 94 (= *fr.* 227 (K)umaniecki; 217 (M)üller).

¹⁴ *Suda* H 462.

¹⁵ See *RE* viii (1913) Herakleides 51, 489 and 491. Cf. Crönert's suggestion (*ibid.* 491) that some of Herakleides' works were themselves epitomized by his *grammateus*, Agatharchides of Cnidus: cf. *RE* i (1894) 739.

¹⁶ See *RE* x (1919) 1675, iv (1901) 2818, ii (1896) 1058 respectively.

¹⁷ The work on the Alexandrian demes was, as set out above, probably written by another Satyrus. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* i 68.2 refers to a Σάτυρος ὁ τοὺς ἀρχαίους μύθους συναγαγών, cf. Schol. ad *Il.* xiv 216 and *Od.* viii 288 and Kumaniecki (n. 1) 4 for other references. Kumaniecki, following Gudeman in *RE*, does not identify the biographer with the mythographer, basing his argument largely on stylistic grounds.

Χαρακτήρων, cited only in Athenaeus iv 168c, and a corpus of *Lives* (*βίοι*) of statesmen, poets and philosophers, which is frequently cited.¹⁸ An indication of Satyrus' literary propensities may be gained from some of the more extensive fragments,¹⁹ which reveal the mind and methods of a moralist and gossip-monger and abound in sensationalistic descriptions of outrageous behaviour and extravagance. Since these fragments are mostly quoted in sensationalistic contexts, they may not be truly representative of Satyrus. Nevertheless the papyrus *Life of Euripides* (see n. 18)—an important piece of evidence, in that it is uncontaminated by the personal predilections of excerptors—shows that the extracts in Athenaeus (and in other authors) could be typical of his approach and that his *Lives* were, after all, moralistic and anecdotal in character. The following instances may serve as an illustration: Diogenes Laertius viii 4 attributes to Satyrus the story that Pythagoras starved himself to death and the *Lives of the Orators* ([Plut.] *Mor.* 849) attributes to him the story that Demosthenes committed suicide by sucking a poisoned pen. Satyrus' affinity for sensationalism is further revealed in the *Life of Euripides* where he accounts for the cause of the poet's alleged misogyny (*fr.* 39 col. 12), refers to his conflicts with women (*fr.* 39 col. 15), gives a general indication of his character through word and action (*fr.* 9, *fr.* 39 coll. 9, 13, 18, 20, 22) and relates the well known story of how he was killed by the dogs of Archelaus, King of Macedon (*fr.* 39 col. 20). The fragments cited by Athenaeus (see n. 19) show Satyrus dealing with the outrageous lifestyle of Alcibiades, the bigamy of Socrates, the dining couches of Dionysius II and the gross flattery of Philip's courtier Cleisophus. Satyrus thus had a propensity for relating not only bizarre deaths but also *exempla* of moral excess or extravagance—a category which fits the account of the seven wives of Philip of Macedon. The extant portions of Satyrus' work show, therefore, that the *Lives* cannot be regarded as serious history and that caution will have to be exercised in interpreting our fragment as a 'fundamental source' on Philip's conduct of 'foreign policy through marriage'.²⁰

III. THE CONTEXT OF THE FRAGMENT IN THE *DEIPNOSOPHISTAE*

Deipnosophistae xiii is the only book in the work which was given a title in antiquity.²¹ Since this is obviously a booksellers' title it suggests not only that the book had a unified thematic structure, but also that it achieved 'bestseller' status because of the nature of its theme, explicitly stated at its beginning: 'εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν Ἐρατώ, πάρ θ' ἴστασο καί μοι ἐνισπέ' τίνες λόγοι περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἔρωτος καὶ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἐλέχθησαν (555b). The mock-epic invocation and the pun on the name of the muse show the light-hearted manner in which the reader can expect the author to treat his subject.

The main contribution to this discourse is given by the banquet's host, Larensis. It is an encomium on married women,²² which deals in turn with Spartan promiscuity, Athenian monogamy as established by Cecrops (555d), Socrates' alleged bigamy (556a) and finally polygamy. A contrast is drawn between barbarian wives' tolerance of co-wives and concubines and the jealousy of Greek wives, who wreak havoc on households when their husbands introduce other wives or concubines (556c). The author cites examples from both myth and history: the mythical barbarian polygamist, Priam, has as his historical counterpart the King of

¹⁸ Bias (D.L. i 82); Chilon (D.L. i 68); Pythagoras (D.L. viii 40); Empedocles (D.L. viii 53, 58); Zeno (D.L. ix 5); Anaxagoras (D.L. ii 3); Socrates (Ath. xiii 556a); Diogenes the Cynic (D.L. vi 80, cf. Jerome *ad Iov.* ii 14: 'refert Satyrus qui illustrium virorum scribit historias . . .'); Anaxarchus (Ath. vi 260f); Stilpo (Ath. xiii 584a); Sophocles (*Vita* 8); Euripides (*POxy* ix [1912] 1176 p. 124 ff., cf. G. Arrighetti, *Satiro: vita di Euripide*, Stud. Class. e Or. xiii [1964]); Alcibiades (Ath. xii 534b); Dionysius II (Ath. xii 541c); Philip II (Ath. vi

248d, xiii 557b); Demosthenes (Plut. *Mor.* 847a); a life of Aeschylus is also mentioned on the title page of the papyrus *Life of Euripides*, *fr.* 39 col. 23 K.

¹⁹ Ath. vi 248a, xii 534b, 541a.

²⁰ Cf. Giallombardo (n. 3) 82: 'il testo fondamentale . . . sulla politica matrimoniale di Filippo II . . .'

²¹ *περὶ γυναικῶν*: cf. C. B. Gulick, Athenaeus (Loeb 1927) vol. vi 3, note a.

²² *Καὶ γὰρ τὰς γαμετὰς ὁ καλὸς ἡμῶν ἐστιάτωρ ἐπαυνῶν.*

Persia, while several Greek womanizers of the heroic age (Jason, Agamemnon, Heracles, Aegeus and Theseus) have their historical counterpart in Philip II of Macedon. Among the legendary prototypes attention is given to Medea (a 'hellenized' barbarian) and in particular to Clytemnestra, the jealous wife *par excellence*, who περιπαθῆς γενομένη murdered Agamemnon and Cassandra ἦν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ὁ κρείων ἐπηγάγετο (cf. A. Ag. 1438–40). He also mentions Heracles, who foreshadowed his descendant Philip in that ὁ δὲ Ἡρακλῆς πλείστας δόξας ἐσχηκέναι γυναῖκας (ἦν γὰρ φιλογύνης) ἀνὰ μέρος αὐτὰς εἶχεν, ὡς ἂν στρατευόμενος καὶ κατὰ διάφορα γιγνόμενος χωρία· ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῷ πλήθος ἐγένετο (xiii 556e–f, emphasis mine). Philip, of course, according to our fragment, αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει.

Although it is hard to find any formal structure in Athenaeus' vast and sprawling discourse, the paragraph on Philip does seem to form a conclusion to Larensis' discussion of polygamy, which begins at 556b, since the second section of his speech consists of a comparison of γαμεταί and ἑταῖραι, an altogether different theme.²³

IV. TEXT AND TRANSLATION²⁴

Φίλιππος δ' ὁ Μακεδῶν οὐκ ἐπήγετο μὲν εἰς τοὺς πολέμους γυναῖκας, ὥσπερ Δαρεῖος ὁ ὑπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου καταλυθείς, ὃς περὶ τῶν ὄλων πολεμῶν τριακοσίας ἐξήκοντα περιήγετο παλλακάς, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Δικαίαρχος ἐν τρίτῳ περὶ τοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος Βίου· ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει. ἐν ἔτεσι γοῦν εἴκοσι καὶ δυσὶν οἷς ἐβασίλευεν, ὡς φησι Σάτυρος ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Βίου αὐτοῦ, Αὐδάταν Ἰλλυρίδα γήμας ἔσχεν ἐξ αὐτῆς θυγατέρα Κύνναν· ἔγημεν δὲ καὶ Φίλαν ἀδελφὴν Δέρδα καὶ Μαχάτα. οἰκειώσασθαι δὲ θέλων καὶ τὸ Θετταλῶν ἔθνος ἐπαιδοποιήσατο ἐκ δύο Θετταλίδων γυναικῶν, ὧν ἡ μὲν ἦν Φεραία Νικησίπολις, ἣτις αὐτῷ ἐγέννησε Θετταλονίκην, ἡ δὲ Λαρισαία Φίλινα, ἐξ ἧς Ἀρριδαῖον ἐτέκνωσε. προσεκλήσατο δὲ καὶ τὴν Μολοττῶν βασιλείαν γήμας Ὀλυμπιάδα, ἐξ ἧς ἔσχεν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ Κλεοπάτραν. καὶ τὴν Θράκην δὲ ὅτε εἶλεν, ἤκε πρὸς αὐτὸν Κοθήλας ὁ τῶν Θρακῶν βασιλεὺς ἄγων Μήδαν τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ δῶρα πολλά. γήμας δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἐπεισήγαγεν τῇ Ὀλυμπιάδι. ἐπὶ πάσαις δ' ἔγημε Κλεοπάτραν ἐρασθεὶς τὴν Ἱπποστράτου μὲν ἀδελφὴν, Ἀττάλου δὲ ἀδελφιδὴν· καὶ ταύτην ἐπεισάγων τῇ Ὀλυμπιάδι ἅπαντα τὸν βίον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ συνέχεεν. εὐθέως γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς γάμοις ὁ μὲν Ἀτταλος ἔνυν μέντοι γνήσιοι, ἔφη, καὶ οὐ νόθοι βασιλεῖς γεννηθήσονται.' καὶ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀκούσας ἔβαλεν ἡ μετὰ χεῖρας εἶχεν κύλικι τὸν Ἀτταλον, ἔπειτα κάκεῖνος αὐτὸν τῷ ποτηρίῳ. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ὀλυμπιάς μὲν εἰς Μολοττοὺς ἔφυγεν, Ἀλέξανδρος δ' εἰς Ἰλλυριοὺς. καὶ ἡ Κλεοπάτρα δ' ἐγέννησε τῷ Φιλίππῳ θυγατέρα τὴν κληθεῖσαν Εὐρώπην.'

Philip of Macedon did not, like Darius (the one overthrown by Alexander, who, though fighting for the survival of his whole empire, took three hundred and sixty concubines around with him, as Dicaearchus recounts in the third book of the *History of Greece*), take women along to war: Philip rather on each occasion used to contract marriages to do with (?according to)²⁵ (the) war (currently in hand). At any rate,²⁶ 'in the twenty-two years he was king', as Satyrus says in his biography of him, 'he married Audata the Illyrian and had from her a daughter Cynna. And then he married Phila, the sister of Derdas and Machatas. Then, as he wanted to appropriate the Thessalian people as well, on grounds of kinship,²⁷

²³ A brief anecdote about the alleged 'philogyny' of Euripides forms a link between the two main themes of Larensis' discourse (the second main theme: 557f–558e).

²⁴ G. Kaibel, *Athenaei Naucraticae Deipnosophistae* (Leipzig 1887) iii (557b–e) 228–9.

²⁵ The phrase κατὰ πόλεμον cannot mean anything else in this context, associated as it is so closely with αἰεὶ: certainly it does not mean 'in wartime' (Errington) or 'in guerra' (Giallombardo). Ellis' translation, 'for mili-

tary purposes' (Ellis 1981 [n. 5] 111) is also not accurate in this context.

²⁶ The particle γοῦν here has inferential force: cf. LSJ s.v. 'freq. in adducing an instance . . .'—as Denniston calls it (GP 449) 'part proof', supported by a statement. Here Athenaeus is supporting his statement by citing Satyrus.

²⁷ The word οἰκειοῦσθαι has the basic connotation of 'making something one's own', or, 'claiming on

he fathered children by two Thessalian women, one of whom was Nikesipolis of Pherae, who bore him Thessalonike, and the other, Philinna of Larisa, by whom he fathered Arrhidaeus. Then he acquired the kingdom of the Molossians as well, by marrying Olympias. From her he had Alexander and Cleopatra. And then, when he conquered Thrace, Cothelas, the King of the Thracians, came over to him bringing his daughter Meda and many gifts. Having married her too, he brought her into his household²⁸ besides Olympias. Then, in addition to all these, he 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.

V. INTERPRETATION

The first sentence merits serious attention: both Müller and Kumaniecki, followed by all the scholars referred to in this discussion, take *ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει* as part of the fragment. Giallombardo, however, raised the possibility that the clause might belong to Athenaeus, but dismissed this notion too hastily by maintaining that it sums up the impression conveyed by the fragment.²⁹ This, however, is precisely the intention that Athenaeus had in mind, since he was using Satyrus to support his own thesis. This becomes evident on analysing the opening sentence. The sentence is a balanced comparison of Philip and Darius. The first half, *Φίλιππος δ' ὁ Μακεδῶν . . . οὐκ ἐπήγετο μὲν . . . γυναῖκας ὡσπερ Δαρείος . . .* says what Philip did *not* do: namely, take women with him while on campaign, as Darius did. Athenaeus here cites Dicaearchus to support his statement about Darius. The second half *ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος . . . ἐγάμει . . .* says what Philip actually *did*: namely, he contracted marriages 'to do with' the war with which he was currently occupied. This is clearly Athenaeus' and not Satyrus' thesis. Satyrus now, like Dicaearchus in the first clause, is being adduced by the inferential particle *γούν* in support of Athenaeus' thesis, which is expounded in the second clause. The text therefore does not indicate that it was Satyrus who maintained that Philip *αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει*. Furthermore, the obvious parallel of Philip and his progenitor Heracles, who married his wives *στρατευόμενος* (see section III) is surely Athenaeus' idea and has nothing to do with Satyrus. It must also be borne in mind that Athenaeus is possibly not quoting his source *verbatim*, but adapting and paraphrasing it. The words *ὡς φησι Σάτυρος* may no more guarantee *verbatim* quotation from Satyrus than the words *ἱστορεῖ Δικαίαρχος* (earlier in the paragraph) guarantee *verbatim* quotation from Dicaearchus.³⁰

The Satyrus fragment thus ostensibly begins with a statement about the number of years that Philip was on the throne. It is generally accepted that Philip's reign could not have begun later than 359 and that he did not act as regent on behalf of his nephew Amyntas, as the tradition reflected in Justin vii 5.9–10 would have it.³¹ The testimony of the scholiast to Aeschines iii 51

grounds of ties of kinship', (it certainly does not mean 'taming' as Errington translates, or 'commandeering' (Ellis 1981 [n. 5] 111, 1976 [n. 5] 41 n. 1). For the meaning 'make one's own', cf. Hdt. i 4, i 94. For the meaning 'claim on grounds of kinship', cf. Thuc. iii 65. In the present instance *οἰκειοῦσθαι* has both meanings. Philip claims the Thessalian people as kin, on grounds of his offspring from Thessalian wives. Thus in the present context, Cawkwell's interpretation, (n. 31) 61, 'make friends with' is not strictly accurate.

²⁸ For this technical sense of *ἐπιεσάγειν*, 'bring in a second wife', see LSJ quoting *Comment. in Aristot. Gr.* and a fourth century Pap. Eleph. 1, 8.

²⁹ *Op. cit.* (n. 3) 82: '... ma ad ogni modo doveva riassumere l'impressione emergente dalla lettura del *Bios* di Satyros...'. The possibility that Athenaeus re-worked the original passage has also been suggested by Martin (n. 5) 69 and Ellis 1981 (n. 5) 113.

³⁰ On the accuracy of quotations in ancient authors, see P. A. Brunt, *CQ* xxx (1980) 447–94; on Athenaeus' method of quotation see below, nn. 54 and 57.

³¹ Cf. Ellis 1976 (n. 5) 250 n. 10; *JHS* xci (1971) 15; G. Cawkwell, *Philip of Macedon* (London 1978) 36; *HMac* ii 208. Older historians, e.g. Grote xi 297 and Beloch *GG*² iii.1 225, accept the existence of the regency without question.

and Diodorus xvi 1.3 certainly suggests this: the scholion says that Philip 'became king' (*ἐβασίλευσε*) over Macedonia in the year of Callidemus' archonship and in the first year of the 105th Olympiad (= 359). Diodorus corroborates this statement by giving the number of years of his reign as twenty-four. Counting back (inclusively) from Philip's death in 336, we find that his reign would have commenced in 360/359.³² The Satyrus fragment, however, states that Philip 'was king' (*ἐβασίλευεν*) for twenty-two years, which would make the date of his accession 357. This is clearly impossible, since our sources reveal that he had certainly been acting as the military and political leader of the Macedonians before this date. Kumaniecki, in his commentary on this passage, simply states: 'Satyrus noster errorem manifestum commisit'. This may be correct, because Satyrus, as has been suggested above, was not a reliable political historian. One would, however, expect him to have known how long Philip was on the throne, especially if he was a pupil of Aristotle (above, section II). If we assume that the figure given by him is correct and discount the possibility that the variation may have been due to a textual error or even to Athenaeus himself, we would indeed have a shred of evidence in support of Justin's account of Philip's regency. Justin says that 'for a considerable time' (*diu*) Philip acted as guardian (*tutor*) for his ward (*pupillus*), that is, Amyntas: but because of the seriousness of the wars that were threatening Macedon, he was made king by popular demand.³³ The crucial word is *diu*: how long is 'a long time'? Two years could well qualify. There seem then to have been two traditions about the length of Philip's reign: the one represented by the source of Trogus-Justin, which spoke of a regency, and the other represented by Diyllus (the source of Diodorus) and the scholiast to Aeschines iii, which maintained that Philip actually became king in 359.³⁴

A list of Philip's wives, presumably in chronological order, follows the statement about the length of his reign. It begins with Audata the Illyrian, whose child by Philip is also mentioned. This accords with the convention regarding lists of marriages in ancient biographies (see n. 56). Although the marriage to Audata was probably occasioned by Philip's Illyrian wars,³⁵ the author does not explicitly say so. The reader is left to infer this, in regard to the first two wives on the list, from the introductory thesis (*κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει*). In fact, throughout the list, except for the penultimate marriage, where military circumstances are mentioned, the author does not mention any specific wars at all. He merely shows, where he can, that Philip's marriages (with one exception) were motivated by political expediency. Phila, whom Philip married after Audata, if the sequence is correct, is attested in no other source and nothing is known about the circumstances, military or otherwise, of this marriage.

The status and chronology of Philip's Thessalian marriages, as they appear in the fragment, are much debated in modern scholarship. Beloch and some more recent scholars who have followed him³⁶ do not see his liaisons with Nikesipolis or Philinna as either formal or legitimate: the main argument for this view is the fact that the author of the fragment uses the term *παιδοποιεῖσθαι* to denote the nature of Philip's relationship with them, instead of the customary

³² Diodorus repeats this figure in xvi 1.3 and in xvi 95.1. The other relevant passages are cited by Ellis 1971 (n. 31) 15, who also adduces the silence of Demosthenes on the regency as concrete evidence that it did not exist. On the reckoning of regnal dates, see E. J. Bickermann, *Chronology of the Ancient World*² (Ithaca, New York 1980) 67, 90. On Diodorus' chronology, see N. G. L. Hammond, *CQ* xxxi (1937) 79–91, *CQ* xxxii (1938) 136–51.

³³ 'itaque Philippus diu non regem, sed tutorem pupilli egit. at ubi graviora bella imminabant serumque auxilium in expectatione infantis erat, compulsus a populo regnum suscepit'.

³⁴ This discrepancy does not make a significant difference. Philip, by any account, was *de facto* king after 359. The fact that Satyrus and Justin (?=Theopompus, cf. A. Klotz, *RE* xlii [1952] 2303, 2307) agree as regards

the period of regency, as well as in the sensationalistic account of court life (cf. Polyb. viii 9, quoting Theopompus), suggests that Satyrus' source was Theopompus, assuming, of course, that Satyrus was not in a position to interview eyewitnesses. On Diodorus' source see Hammond 1937 (n. 32) 91.

³⁵ For Philip's Illyrian campaign early in this reign, see *D.S.* xvi 14; for the political advantages inherent in an alliance with Elimeia, see Beloch (n. 5) 72 f., also Giallombardo (n. 3) 86, esp. n. 13. Ellis 1981 (n. 5) 111 regards the primacy of this marriage as 'paradigmatic'.

³⁶ Beloch (n. 5) 68–9; F. Geyer, *RE* xix. 2 (1938) Philippus 2303; H. G. Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens* (Baltimore 1932) 53 n. 132; *HMac* ii 230, 'Philinna did not become queen', cf. *ibid.* 278 on Nikesipolis. Other literature is cited by Giallombardo (n. 3) 85 n. 8.

γαμειν. Giallombardo has shown, however, that there are good reasons for believing that the marital status of the Thessalians was no different from that of any of Philip's other wives mentioned in the fragment.³⁷ Furthermore, all the women in the list are necessarily γαμεταί on account of Athenaeus' context and prefatory thesis, namely that Philip 'married' (ἐγάμει) κατὰ πόλεμον; and the Thessalians are explicitly referred to as γυναῖκες, which frequently means 'wives' as opposed to ἐταῖραι or παλλακαί.³⁸ The author uses παιδοποιεῖσθαι instead of γαμειν, which one would expect from the context, because of the motive which he ascribes to Philip, namely, that he wanted to 'appropriate the Thessalian people as his own' on grounds of kinship.³⁹ The means of achieving this was, naturally, to produce Thessalian offspring, who would be regarded as γνήσιοι. There is little reason, therefore, to doubt the legitimacy or formality of Philip's Thessalian marriages.

The problem of the relative chronology of the Thessalian wives, as they appear in Satyrus' list, arises partly from scholars' persistence in associating the name of Thessalonike, daughter of Nikesipolis, whose birth is mentioned before Philip's marriage to Olympias, with his victory of 352.⁴⁰ As a result of their eagerness 'to let the marriage fit the war', scholars generally overlook the fact that there are no historical grounds at all for assuming that the child was named after this particular victory, and so Satyrus is blamed for faulty chronology. Even if the child was named after the victory of 352, Thessalonike might have been the first surviving child born to Nikesipolis after five years of marriage. It is equally possible that she was named after an earlier (undocumented) Thessalian triumph.⁴¹

There is, in fact, a valid reason for believing that Philip's marriage to Nikesipolis (and to Philinna, for that matter) preceded his marriage to Olympias and that the chronological order of the wives in the fragment is correct, since the source-tradition points to Philip's efforts to establish ties with Thessaly in the years immediately following his accession,⁴² a strategically necessary move in order to secure the southern frontier during those turbulent times.⁴³

Unlike the first two marriages, for which no specific motives or circumstances are mentioned, the remainder are all linked explicitly with Philip's ambitions: political (the Thessalians and Olympias),⁴⁴ material (Meda the Thracian) and personal (Cleopatra). It is not immediately clear why the author neglected to mention Philip's reasons for the first two marriages, since it may be assumed that Philip's biographer would have been as familiar with the details of his life in the year 359/358 as he was with those of subsequent years. It is possible, therefore, that no circumstances or motives were provided in Satyrus' text and that it was

³⁷ Giallombardo (n. 3) 84–8, and literature cited there. Ellis 1981 (n. 5) 114 also supports this view.

³⁸ Cf. Demos. lix 122: a significant, though perhaps exaggerated, statement on what must have been the prevailing Athenian view of marriage and the role of women in society.

³⁹ Cf. n. 27 above. He could have used this term simply for variety.

⁴⁰ Cf. Ellis 1981 (n. 5) 112, Ehrhardt (n. 5) 297; Martin (n. 5) 68 f. argues that there are valid grounds for accepting Satyrus' chronology as far as Philinna is concerned, but has reservations about the date of Nikesipolis' marriage. As he points out, however, the circumstances do not exclude an early date; cf. n. 41.

⁴¹ Suggested by Martin (n. 5) 68. The text does not exclude the possibility that Nikesipolis bore Philip other, less illustrious children: Thessalonike's significant role in subsequent history secured her position in the list.

⁴² D.S. xvi 14.1–2; Justin vii 6.7–9; Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 35 (= Harpocration s.v. *Κινέας*); *id.* F 34 and 48 (= Steph. Byz. s.v. *Χάλλη*). Cf. Orosius, *adv. pag.* iii 12.5–8. Cf. Martin (n. 5) 56.

⁴³ Ellis 1976 (n. 5) 61; Cawkwell (n. 31) 32 ff., also

Martin (n. 5) 59 f. It has been suggested that the order of the marriages on the list was deliberately altered by Satyrus in order, first, to place Thessalonike nearer the beginning of the list to emphasize the κατὰ πόλεμον thesis (Griffith 1970 [n. 5] 70 n. 1; Ellis 1976 [n. 5] 85; Giallombardo [n. 3] 108) and secondly, for stylistic reasons, to link the Thessalians on a geographic basis (Errington [n. 5] 41 n. 1). A view to which I previously subscribed, cf. Martin (n. 5) 69, also suggested that the transposition of the names could have been due to Athenaeus' editing: this is possible, since Athenaeus occasionally transposes the order of items on lists (e.g. vii 329f, quoting Arist. *HA* 342b35). If, however, Satyrus or Athenaeus wanted to emphasize the κατὰ πόλεμον thesis, why place Nikesipolis only third on the list and not first? The limited emphasis which the transposition achieves does not make it worth the effort.

⁴⁴ In the case of the Thessalians, his motive was οἰκειώσασθαι . . . τὸ Θετταλῶν ἔθνος; in the case of Olympias and Meda, the result of the marriage (προσεκτήσατο . . . τὴν Μολοττῶν βασιλείαν . . . δῶρα πολλά), as it is stated in the context, implies Philip's motive on each occasion.

Athenaeus who added them (where he knew them) in support of his *κατὰ πόλεμον* thesis. This support, however, is only partial, since the motives or circumstances mentioned, except for those regarding Meda, are only linked with war in the vaguest possible sense.⁴⁵ The 'political' motive which the fragment suggests for Philip's marrying Olympias also conflicts with Plutarch, who may well have used Satyrus' biography of Philip as a source for the early chapters of his *Life of Alexander*.⁴⁶ Plutarch maintains that Philip, while still a youth, met Olympias at the Samothracian mysteries and fell in love (*ἔρασθήναι*) with her. If this romantic story about Philip and Olympias did ultimately derive from Satyrus, Athenaeus may well have suppressed it in order to make his own argument more persuasive: namely that Philip made a fatal mistake when he allowed love to enter his customary scheme of marrying *κατὰ πόλεμον*. This interpretation is implied by the single instance of the word *ἔρασθείς* (referring to Cleopatra) in the context. Athenaeus was not above adapting or distorting his sources in order to substantiate his assertions.⁴⁷

After mentioning Olympias the author takes a giant leap of twenty years—the style of the narrative renders the time-lapse unnoticeable—and introduces the reader to Philip's sixth bride, Meda the Thracian, who is attested in no other source, but here linked explicitly with a war (*καὶ τὴν Θράκην δὲ ὅτε εἴλεν*). At this point, however, a new element enters the narrative: Meda is brought into the household *besides* Olympias. The word used is *ἐπεισάγειν*.⁴⁸ Olympias does not object (presumably) because of the purely 'political' nature of the marriage and possibly because there would be no issue to threaten the succession of Alexander.⁴⁹ Olympias' attitude is emphasized by the repetition of *ἐπεισάγειν* in two successive sentences. Each sentence describes a different circumstance; in the first no reaction takes place since (it is implied) Olympias has no reason to feel jealous. In the second, however, where *ἔρωσ* is involved, one can expect jealousy and ensuing trouble, since the text explicitly states that Philip, by marrying Cleopatra⁵⁰ and bringing her into his household 'threw his life into confusion'. This sets the scene for a reaction from the jealous wife on the pattern of Clytemnestra or Medea, as the reader has been led to expect, in the light of the theme raised previously, the jealousy of (Greek) wives in polygamous households. The unusual position of the word *ἔρασθείς* emphasizes the difference between the circumstances of this last marriage and those of the ones preceding it.

The paragraph, now at a dramatic climax, *ἅπαντα . . . συνέχεεν*, requires a *dénouement* which will substantiate this sweeping statement. The reader, from the context, expects the jealousy of Olympias to play an important part, as it does in Plutarch *Alexander* 9.3:

αἱ δὲ περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ταραχαί, διὰ τοὺς γάμους καὶ τοὺς ἔρωτας αὐτοῦ τρόπον τινὰ τῆς βασιλείας τῇ γυναικωνίτιδι συννοσοῦσης, πολλὰς αἰτίας καὶ μεγάλας διαφορὰς παρείχον, ὥς ἢ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος χαλεπότης, δυσζήλου καὶ βαρυθύμου γυναικός, ἔτι μείζονας ἐποίει, παροξυνούσης τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον.

⁴⁵ The marriages of Nikesipolis and Philinna apparently preceded the Sacred War (see above, p. 122) and should be seen as part of Philip's diplomatic, rather than military, strategy. There is no evidence that Macedon was at war with Epirus at the time of Philip's marriage to Olympias, although the alliance between Philip and the Molossians might have been prompted by the Illyrian danger: cf. Giallombardo (n. 3) 95.

⁴⁶ See n. 52.

⁴⁷ Cf. Brunt (n. 30) 494: 'Fragments and even epitomes reflect the interests of the authors who cite or summarize lost works as much as or more than the characteristics of the works concerned.' Cf. n. 54 below.

⁴⁸ See n. 28 for the technical meaning of this term.

⁴⁹ Cf. Hdt. i 61: the story of Peisistratus and the daughter of Megacles.

⁵⁰ Justin ix 11.2 uses the Roman technical term *repudium* to denote Olympias' status after Philip's

marriage to Cleopatra. This term, however, may not be appropriate in the context of fourth-century Macedonia, in which the notion of divorce, in the formal (Roman or modern) sense—so far as can be ascertained by analogy with Athens—did not exist. Cf. D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (London 1978) 87–9; L. Beauchet, *Droit Privé Athénienne* (Paris 1897) i 381; Giallombardo (n. 3) 104 ff. Apparently Philip's wives suffered a loss of *τίμη* every time a new wife produced (or was expected to produce) an heir apparent (this may be inferred from Arrian's reference to Olympias in *Anab.* iii 6.5) and consequently became 'queen'. The other wives possibly continued to live at court (virtually as hostages, perhaps), while their children were married off, either to form alliances or to strengthen family ties, e.g. Arrhidaeus to the daughter of Pixodarus, Cynna to Amyntas and Cleopatra to Alexander of Epirus. Cf. Ellis 1981 (n. 5) 117.

Instead of such an explanation, however, the famous banquet-scene and the quarrel with Attalus⁵¹ is introduced, without any indication as in Plutarch⁵² that it was the result of the γάμοι and ἔρωτες and that the friendly relationship between Alexander and his father was undermined by the domestic strife caused by Olympias' 'sullen and jealous' nature. In fact the account of the banquet-scene, in relation to its context within the 'fragment', is something of a *non sequitur*, since it is Alexander who is being presented as the outraged party and not, as one would expect from the immediate context, Olympias. There is an abrupt change in the train of thought: up to this point in the fragment the reader has been led toward the conclusion that Philip's life was ruined because of Olympias' jealousy of Cleopatra (since it is implied in the narrative that she condoned his marriage to Meda, contracted as it was in the course of duty). Here, however, we are told about Attalus' insult to Alexander and the latter's violent reaction and subsequent departure (with Olympias) from Macedon. Significant details such as Attalus' being drunk and offering a prayer for legitimate issue, Alexander's verbal retort (which precedes the cup-throwing) and Philip's drunken attack on him, which lend themselves to the sensationalistic treatment for which Satyrus is well known, are not mentioned in the fragment. It is unthinkable that Satyrus would have omitted them, particularly Philip's angry attack, which appears even in Justin's abbreviated treatment of the episode⁵³ and without which, from a historical point of view, the departure of Alexander and his mother is scarcely intelligible. We may therefore be reasonably sure that Athenaeus omitted certain details that would have been essential for a biographical treatment of the episode but which he regarded as dispensable for his specific purpose.

Athenaeus' concern then was to show how Philip ruined his life by not marrying *κατὰ πόλεμον* on that one fateful occasion. His account of Philip's *peripeteia*—the wrecking of his dynastic plans—is terse, vivid and convincing, stating only the salient facts: Attalus' publicly casting doubt on Alexander's legitimacy, the latter's departure from the Macedonian court and, to crown it all, the fact that Cleopatra produced a daughter. Thus, according to Athenaeus, because he allowed emotion to influence politics, Philip was left without an heir. This is the only interpretation of the statement τὸν βίον . . . συνέχεεν which the text allows, since Athenaeus nowhere alludes to Philip's murder, which, according to Plutarch, and probably to Satyrus as well, was the ultimate result of the domestic quarrels arising from Olympias' jealousy. The statement is an exaggeration in that the Attalus episode was only a contributory cause of Philip's ruin and not the real *peripeteia*: hence one cannot imagine that Satyrus would have treated it as the latter.

The question thus arises: How much of the fragment is Satyrus and how much Athenaeus? The validity of this question depends on the assumption that Athenaeus did not quote a continuous passage of Satyrus *verbatim* but instead substantially reworked his source. If such an assumption can be justified, we may ask a further question: From where in Satyrus' biography could Athenaeus have taken his 'quotation'?

The validity of our basic assumption—that what we have here is not a *verbatim* quotation—may be tested by examining Athenaeus' accuracy in quoting other authors. The

⁵¹ Cf. Plut. *Alex.* 9; Ps.-Callisthenes i 20; Justin ix 7.

⁵² *Alex.* 9. Plutarch's direct (though unacknowledged) use of Satyrus is indicated in his works by a number of striking verbal reflections from fragments of Satyrus, quoted by other authors, or from the *Life of Euripides*. For example both Plutarch and Athenaeus say that Philip married Cleopatra because he fell in love with her, using the participial form ἐρασθεῖς. A passage in Plut. *Nicias* 9, which relates how the Athenian prisoners in Sicily were spared by the Syracusans on account of their knowledge of the works of Euripides, parallels the papyrus *Life of Euripides* (POxy ix p. 124) fr. 39 col. 19: here Plutarch uses the word-forms

ἐσώθησαν, συχνοῦς, ἐκδιδάξαντες, where Satyrus uses the forms ἀνασωθῆναι, συχνοῦς, διδάξειαν, in exactly the same context. Plut. *Alcibiades* 16 and 23 and a quotation from Satyrus' *Life of Alcibiades* in Ath. xii 534b abound in parallels in both word and content. The unusual word *καινοτομία* appears in an anecdote in *Mor.* 795d (how Euripides prevented Timotheus from committing suicide).

⁵³ See also n. 51. Philip's attack on his son is mentioned in both Justin and Ps.-Callisthenes. His tumble and Alexander's sarcastic remark appear only in the latter source; nevertheless the anecdote must have appeared in full in Trogus' *Historia Philippica*.

preliminary results of a separate study of Athenaeus' citations of extant prose authors indicates that he is more inclined to adapt and paraphrase his sources, than to quote them *verbatim*.⁵⁴ This applies particularly to extensive passages, where he alters the wording of the original to suit the requirements of his context, omits (to him) irrelevant data and even distorts the meaning of his source in order to support his own arguments. Furthermore, the introductory phrase *ὡς φησι*, which is used in our fragment, always introduces an adapted quotation in Athenaeus.⁵⁵

As far as its original context in Satyrus' biography of Philip is concerned, the fragment appears to be essentially a list of Philip's wives and children, of a kind conventionally included in ancient biography, often as part of an obituary.⁵⁶ In such a context the description of the banquet-scene given here is extraneous. Not only does it disrupt the sequence of the list by coming between the name of the last wife and her child, but it is also a show piece in its own right, demanding a more extensive, rhetorical treatment, in the manner of Plutarch or Ps.-Callisthenes, rather than an abbreviated rendering at the tail end of a catalogue. Elsewhere in *Deipnosophistae* Athenaeus combines widely separated extracts from an author into a single 'quotation' to prove his point.⁵⁷ We may therefore justifiably postulate that Athenaeus interpolated a condensed version of the banquet scene (also from Satyrus' biography) in order to substantiate with a rhetorical flourish his assertion that Philip *ἅπαντα τὸν βίον . . . συνέχεεν*.

Athenaeus' editing of his source might not have been limited to abridgement and the interpolation of the banquet-scene. If the 'quotation' was originally a list, it is possible that the political commentary—the statement, of Philip's motives—was Athenaeus' doing, intended to bring Satyrus' evidence into line with his own *κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει* thesis, and to contrast the political motives characterizing the marriages *κατὰ πόλεμον*, with the personal motive characterizing the marriage to Cleopatra, with its disastrous consequences—the quarrel at the wedding feast and the departure of Olympias and his heir apparent.

VI. CONCLUSION

I would submit therefore that Athenaeus cited Satyrus as evidence for the fact that Philip was *φιλογύνης*,⁵⁸ as was his heroic ancestor, but that it was his own supposition that Philip married his wives 'in the course of duty' (*στρατευόμενος*) and ruined his life once he let personal feelings influence his otherwise pragmatic attitude towards marriage.⁵⁹

The names of the wives, as they appeared on the list, together with the knowledge that Philip fell in love with the last one, must have suggested to Athenaeus a tragic pattern in Philip's career, upon which he elaborated by means of a running commentary on the circumstances of each marriage, carefully contrasting them with those of the fateful seventh.⁶⁰ To stress the moral of his story, that love and politics do not mix, Athenaeus omitted as unnecessary the details of

⁵⁴ A. Tronson, 'The Prose Quotations of Athenaeus', now in preparation. Out of 162 quotations of extant prose authors by Athenaeus, 90 are found to have been drastically shortened, adapted or deliberately misquoted in accordance with the requirements of Athenaeus' contexts, despite the relatively 'high marks' given for accuracy by K. Zepernick, *Philol.* lxxvii (1921) 356, 361 and Brunt (n. 30) 480-1.

⁵⁵ E.g. vii 312e-f (Arist. *HA* 543a24); xii 517a (Hdt. i 17) and about twelve other instances.

⁵⁶ Plut. *Demetr.* 53.4; *Ant.* 87; *Them.* 32; Suet. *Nero* 35. Ath. xiii 557a cites Ister as having included a list of Theseus' women, conveniently categorized into those with whom he had fallen in love, those he had taken by force and those whom he married legally, in the fourteenth book of his *History of Attica*.

⁵⁷ E.g. Ath. vii 317d combines a passage from Arist.

HA 544a6 and 549b31 in the same 'quotation'. Further examples occur at vii 323e (Arist. *HA* 541b12 and 544a) and ii 63b (Arist. *HA* 544a23 and *GA* 762a32). He also interpolates his own words and phrases at ix 396c (Hdt. i 183), xv 680e (Thphr. *HP* vi 6.11) and elsewhere.

⁵⁸ Cf. Ath. xiii 556e quoted above and Polyb. viii 9.1-4, who cites Theopompus on Philip's 'philogyny'.

⁵⁹ Thus assuring for himself, like Agamemnon, a tragic destiny.

⁶⁰ It seems more than mere coincidence that Cleopatra is tacitly presented as Philip's seventh wife. The supernatural associations of the number 7 in antiquity are too numerous to mention here. For detailed treatment of the subject of mystical numbers, see Hopfner, *RE* xiv. 1 (1928) *Mageia* 301-93; and A. Dreizehnter, *Die rhetorische Zahl* (München 1978) 13 and n. 49 for basic literature on this subject.

Olympias' jealousy and the intrigues of the polygamous household (which must have been treated in detail by Satyrus) since these circumstances were implicit in the context of Larensis' discourse as a whole. All Athenaeus required was an effective *dénouement* to prove his point and this he found in Satyrus' account of the wedding feast, which he tailored to his needs. All that we may safely attribute to Satyrus, then, is the list of wives and the bare facts of the wedding feast.

What then is the value of our fragment as a source? Satyrus, as an early—if not a primary—source, might provide a chronologically reliable list of Philip's wives as well as a reasonably accurate though somewhat sensational account of Macedonian court life. Athenaeus, however, since his fidelity in transcribing the *ipsissima verba* of his sources is often suspect, cannot be regarded as a reliable transmitter of such information.

Despite these objections the fragment is valuable. First, it provides some significant information, unobtainable elsewhere, about Philip II, by naming two of his wives, otherwise unattested, and giving the name of Cleopatra's daughter, Europa, which bears on his proposed Asian campaign. Secondly, in stating that Philip reigned for twenty-two years (instead of the more generally accepted period of twenty-four years) it provides evidence, in support of Justin, of a regency after the death of Perdiccas. Finally it is the only ancient source which explicitly links Philip's marriages with his political advancement, thus substantiating the tradition of his preference for campaigning by diplomatic rather than by military means.⁶¹ Our fragment, however, can only be trusted on the first two counts: it certainly cannot be regarded as a 'fundamental source' (least of all as a primary source) for Philip's alleged 'matrimonial' foreign policy, since this notion was apparently that of a literary dilettante who lived five hundred years after Philip's time.

ADRIAN TRONSON

University of South Africa, Pretoria

⁶¹ E.g. D.S. xvi 3, Dem. vi 17–25.