

THE WOUNDING OF PHILIP II OF MACEDON: FACT AND FABRICATION*

THIS paper, concerning one element in the ancient biographical tradition of Philip II of Macedon, demonstrates the manner in which facts—that the Macedonian monarch was gravely wounded in the right eye, in the collar bone, and in the leg—became the basis of fictitious fabrications entered into the biographical tradition and accepted as elements of Philip's 'life'. A diachronic analysis of the complete literary testimonia which convey information concerning these traumata attempts to determine when and how the biographical facts were altered and embellished over the centuries following Philip's death. Since the stunning discovery by Andronicos at Vergina in 1977 of the tomb designated Royal Tomb II, identified by the excavator as the tomb of Philip II,¹ considerable interest has been focused on the wounds of

* This paper has benefitted significantly from a careful reading by Michael Flower, whose many corrections and suggestions have been incorporated into this final version. The flaws remaining I claim as my own. I am grateful to Howard University for a sabbatical leave making possible the pursuit of this topic and to the Center for Hellenic Studies where most of the research was conducted.

¹ Identification of the deceased as Philip II provides a specific date for the sealing of the tomb following the assassination of Philip in 336 BC. Andronicos identified the tomb as Philip's in the year of its discovery and defended this identification in the years following, see M. Andronicos, 'Vergina, the royal graves in the great tumulus', *AAA* x (1977) 1-39; 'The royal tomb of Philip II: an unlooted Macedonian grave at Vergina', *Archaeology* xxxi.5 (1978) 33-41; and *Vergina: the royal tombs and the ancient city* (Athens 1984). A number of the finds from Royal Tomb II are illustrated in the catalogue *The search for Alexander: an exhibition* (Boston 1980) which also includes a chapter by Andronicos, 'The royal tombs at Vergina: a brief account of the excavations', 26-38. While the contents of this unlooted tomb are rich, and surely royal, it is their special and unique nature that makes a definite date elusive. Andronicos initially based his identification and dating on the items linked to Philip II by his known disabilities (see n. 2) and then subsequently on the skull injuries observed by Prag, Musgrave, and Neave (see n. 3). The identification of the Royal Tomb II as belonging to Philip II has found both supporters and critics who have argued alternative solutions. Most recently, E.N. Borza, *In the shadow of Olympus: the emergence of Macedon* (Princeton 1990) 256-66 provides a lively description of the Vergina tombs and a detailed and balanced statement of the arguments advanced in support of the two Macedonian monarchs most likely to be interred in Tomb II. A.B. Bosworth, *Conquest and empire: the reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge 1988) 27 n. 9 adds some pointed observations. Scholars who support Andronicos' identification of the tomb as belonging to Philip II (reserving, however, differing opinions concerning the woman in the antechamber) include: N.G.L. Hammond ('Philip's tomb in historical context', *GRBS* xix [1978] 331-50; 'The evidence for the identity of the royal tombs at Vergina', in W.L. Adams and E.N. Borza, edd., *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian heritage* [Washington 1982] 111-27; 'Arms and the king: the insignia of Alexander the Great', *Phoenix* xliii [1989] 217-24, and P. Green ('The royal tombs at Vergina: a historical analysis' in Adams-Borza 129-51). Those who argue for a date later than the reign of Philip II and for Philip III Arrhidaeus and his wife Eurydice as the probable occupants begin with P.W. Lehmann ('The so-called tomb of Philip II: a different interpretation', *AJA* lxxxiv [1980] 527-31; 'Once again the royal tomb at Vergina', *AAA* xiv [1981] 134-44) and include A.M. Prestianni Giallombardo ('Riflessioni storiografiche sulla cronologia del grande tumulo e delle tombe reali di Vergina [Campagne di scavo 1976-77]', *Πρακτικά τοῦ XII διεθνoῦς συνεδρίου κλασσικῆς ἀρχαιολογίας* [Athens 1985] 237-42) and E.N. Borza ('The royal Macedonian tombs and the paraphernalia of Alexander', *Phoenix* xli [1987] 105-21). Arguments for the tomb's date have also considered the circumstances leading to the appearance of vaulted chamber tombs in Macedonia within the second half of the fourth century BC. Lehmann and others agreeing that the Royal Tomb II is to be dated later than 336 BC argue that the vaulted roof construction employed in the tomb was not introduced to the Greek mainland until after the expedition of Alexander when architects and engineers in his company observed vaulted structures in the East and introduced them into the Macedonian architectural repertoire. This argument supports the identification of the tomb as the burial spot of Arrhidaeus, murdered in 317 BC and given a state burial by Cassander in 316. However, the notion of a deliberate and dateable introduction of the barrel vault is refuted by Andronicos, 'Some reflections on the Macedonian tombs', *BSA* lxxxii (1987) 1-16 and R.A. Tomlinson, 'The architectural content of the Macedonian vaulted tombs', *BSA* lxxxii (1987) 305-12. Their examination of Macedonian burial practices shows that the barrel vaulted tomb (of which Royal Tomb II is but one example) found in Macedonia beginning in the second half of the fourth century BC is not necessarily an imported architectural form. The design of these vaulted tombs can be explained as an elaboration of the characteristically Macedonian cist-tombs in use throughout the early fourth

Philip II in linking items recovered from the tomb² and the physical remains of the male decedent with the great king of Macedon.³ A diachronic review of the literary traditions regarding Philip's injuries, useful to those arguing the identification of the occupant of Royal Tomb II, reveals a great deal about ancient biographical practices. Particularly in the case of the blinding wound to Philip's right eye, it is evident that the facts are very soon obscured by an overlay of fictitious embellishments, frequently amusing, which were created to heighten interest in an occurrence of lasting impact on Philip⁴ and became stock items in his βίος.

INJURIES IN GENERAL: TESTIMONIA

Isocrates *Ep.* ii 1-12.

Demosthenes xviii 67.

[Demosthenes] xi 22.

Didymus *in Dem.* xi 22 cols. xii 40-xiii 12 (45-7 [Pearson-Stephens]).

Scholion *in Dem.* xviii 67.124 (1:215 [Dilts]).

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1012c fr. 9 col. iii 46-55.

Aulus Gellius ii 27.

Seneca *Contr.* x 5.6.

INJURIES IN GENERAL: DISCUSSION

That Philip was gravely wounded on several occasions in the course of his many campaigns is beyond doubt. Testimonia begin with Attic orators contemporary with Philip himself. Isocrates speaks of a grave but unspecified injury when he writes his second letter to Philip (*Ep.* ii 1-12). In oration xi 22 Philip is described by [Demosthenes] as one who, enjoying the risks involved, dealt his entire body punishment for the sake of power: οὕτως εἶναι φιλοκίνδυνον

century. Moreover, Tomlinson 311 rightly cautions that Alexander's invasion did not afford Greeks and Macedonians their first opportunity to observe eastern architecture and to introduce new forms into mainland structures.

² Two items from Royal Tomb II, the miniature bearded ivory head and the mismatched pair of gilt bronze greaves, were taken by Andronicos (*Vergina* [n. 1] 226-31) as indications that the tomb was the resting place of Philip II because he believed they could be connected to Philip's well-attested injuries in his right eye and in one leg. The ivory head portrays a mature male face with a prominent vertical scar midway through the right eyebrow and a right eyeball which has a vacant and unfocused appearance. The identification of the head with Philip II has found wide acceptance. Andronicos further argued that the set of unequal greaves (the left is shorter than the right by 3.5 cms) was customized for Philip who was lame owing to a wound sustained in the leg. Green (n. 1) 135-36 contests this association of the unequal greaves with Philip II on the grounds that Didymus, the only source to specify left or right side, reports a wound to Philip's right leg and that, inasmuch as the wound was to the upper leg or thigh, it could not have caused the atrophy of the lower leg indicated by the shortened greave. However, discussion of the leg wound (below, pp. 116-18 and n. 61) shows that in later antiquity the tradition was uncertain as to which leg was injured.

³ The cremated skeletal remains have been examined for signs of injury by two sets of experts whose conclusions disagree sharply. Physical anthropologists N.I. Xirotiris and F. Langenscheidt, 'The cremations from the royal Macedonian tombs of Vergina', *Archaiologike Ephemeris* (1981) 142-60, found that the bones, including those of the skull, from the cremated male bore no evidence of injury; in their estimation the skeletal remains were consistent with Philip's known age at death but did not provide positive proof of identity based on observable injuries to the bones. Subsequently, the skull bones were examined by the anatomist J.H. Musgrave who observed indications of severe trauma on the right supraorbital margin and cheek bone. On the basis of literary accounts recording a blinding wound sustained by Philip in the right eye, Musgrave and his collaborators, A.J.N.W. Prag and R.A.H. Neave, identified the skull positively as Philip II and have attempted to reconstruct the skull and face of the cremated male, see A.J.N.W. Prag, J.H. Musgrave and R.A.H. Neave, 'The skull from tomb II at Vergina: King Philip of Macedon', *JHS* civ (1984) 60-78, and, more recently, A.J.N.W. Prag, 'Reconstructing the Skull of Philip of Macedon', in E.C. Daniell, ed., *The world of Philip and Alexander: a symposium on Greek life and times* (Philadelphia 1990) 35-36 and 'Reconstructing King Philip II: the "nice" version', *AJA* xciv (1990) 237-47.

⁴ [Demetrius] *De eloc.* 293 reports that Philip was so sensitive about his loss that mere mention of the word ὀφθαλμῶς would enrage him.

(sc. τὸν Φίλιππον) ὥστε ὑπὲρ τοῦ μείζω ποιῆσαι τὴν ἀρχὴν κατατετρῶσθαι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα τοῖς πολεμίοις μαχόμενον. In the *De corona* (xviii 67) Demosthenes provides a brief but powerful catalogue of injuries—loss of an eye, a broken collar bone, a maimed arm and leg: τὸν Φίλιππον...τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐκκεκομμένον, τὴν κλεῖν κατεαγῶτα, τὴν χεῖρα, τὸ σκέλος πεπηρωμένον. Three perfect passive participles in agreement with Philip himself describe the injuries; the injured body parts are expressed in the accusative of respect. This list is incorporated in the period set forth in chapters 66-67 of *De corona* which develops the contrast between the aggressive advance of Philip, the man from insignificant Pella, and the passivity of the Athenians in spite of their city's glorious past reputation. This passage, and particularly the description of Philip's mutilations graphically stated in succession, has been cited by critics ancient and modern alike in explicating the forcefulness and grandeur of Demosthenes' style.⁵ No supplementary details detract from the power of Demosthenes' description. The orator is concerned with the injuries only to underscore his conclusion that Philip willingly bore the blows of fortune in exchange for honour and glory (πᾶν ὃ τι βουληθεῖη μέρος ἢ τύχη τοῦ σώματος παρελῆσθαι, τοῦτο προῖέμενον, ὥστε τῷ λοιπῷ μετὰ τιμῆς καὶ δόξης ζῆν).

As the discussion below will show, Demosthenes' celebrated image of the monarch of Macedon, battered and scarred in body, was a main source of inspiration for those fabricating 'biographical' material about Philip's injuries. The image created by Demosthenes in *De corona* is of Philip's body mutilated in eye, collar bone, arm, and leg.⁶ This image of the traumatized Philip suggested to at least one ancient reader that Philip bore his wounds simultaneously. The scholiasts, including that of *POxy.* 1012c, make it clear, however, that the injuries listed were received on different campaigns. The scholiast in *Dem.* xviii 67.124 localizes the occasions: the eye was wounded at Methone, the collar bone (sc. fighting) among the Illyrians, the leg and arm among the Scythians. Once the campaigns are specified, it is obvious that Demosthenes has listed the injuries in chronological order: Methone (354 BC), the Illyrians (344 BC), the Scythians (339 BC).

In his commentary on Demosthenes' orations preserved in *Papyrus Berolinensis* 9780, Didymus Chalcenterus, the first century BC Alexandrian scholar, includes a scholion to Demosthenes xi 22 which describes the circumstances of three of the four wounds listed by Demosthenes himself in xviii 67. Didymus (cols. 12.40-13.12) supplies details which add fact and colour to Demosthenes' brief list. Column 12.40 begins with the statement that he has elsewhere discussed Philip's wounds in a thorough way (ἐντελῶς);⁷ what follows is his compressed reprise (καὶ) νυνὶ δ' εἰς βραχὺ ὑπομνηστέον) which is, in fact, the best preserved source for the injuries of Philip.⁸ In the discussion below the injuries of eye, collar bone, and leg will be treated in the order, apparently chronological, established by Demosthenes

⁵ See the critical comments of T. Castricius recorded in Gel. ii 27. Castricius contends that *Dem.* xviii 67 was the model for Sallust's description of Sertorius in i 88 and that in this case the dependent passage lacks the power of the original. For a modern assessment of xviii 66-67 see G.O. Rowe, 'Demosthenes' use of language' in J.J. Murphy, ed., *Demosthenes' 'On the crown': a critical case study of a masterpiece of ancient oratory* (New York 1967) 190.

⁶ Seneca *Con.* x 5.6 is clearly influenced by Demosthenes' description. Seneca expresses outrage at the Athenian painter Parrhasius who is said to have purchased a hapless Olynthian sold into slavery after Philip's destruction of his city and then to have tortured him to death to use his body for a model in a painting of Prometheus (to complete the travesty, the painting was dedicated in the temple of Minerva). Finally, continues Seneca, if Parrhasius wanted a real model there was one available to him—Philip himself, mutilated not by human insolence but by the very gods: *crure debili, oculo effosso, iugulo fracto, per tot damna a dis immortalibus tortum.*

⁷ This detailed discussion is not preserved.

⁸ This assessment is based on the fact that Didymus cites certain of his sources by name (Theopompus, Marsyas, Duris) and provides some details of the campaigns where the injuries occurred. It is, however, not possible to confirm the accuracy of these details in every instance.

and adhered to by Didymus. The wounded arm, omitted by Didymus, is referred to only by Demosthenes and the scholiast to xviii 67.124;⁹ it does not recur in the later tradition.

WOUND TO THE EYE: TESTIMONIA

Demosthenes xviii 67.

Didymus *in Dem.* xi 22 col. xii 43-64 (45-6 [Pearson-Stephens]).

[Demetrius] *de Eloc.* 293.

Diodorus Siculus xvi 34.5.

Strabo vii *fr.* 22 and *fr.* 22a (v 162 [Baladié]), viii 6.15 (v 173 [Baladié]).

Seneca *Con.* x 5.6.

Pliny *NH* vii 124.

Justin vii 6.14.

Plutarch *Alex.* iii 2.

Lucian *Hist. conscr.* 38.

[Plutarch] *Mor.* 307d.

Athenaeus vi 248f.

Solinus viii 7.

Scholia *in Dem.* iii 5.43a (i 88 [Dilts]) and xviii 67.124 (i 215 [Dilts]).

Themistius xxiii 284c (ii 78 [Schenk]).

Stobaeus iii 7.67 (i 332 [Hense]).

Photius 190 (149a) (iii 58 [Henry]).

Suidas s.v. Κόρανος (iii 30.27-32 [Adler]).

Eustathius *ad Il.* ii 716 [328] (i 512.41-43 [van der Valk] and *ad Il.* xiv 404 [995] (iii 671.12-15 [van der Valk]).

Gnomologium Vaticanum 539 (195 [Sternbach]).

WOUND TO THE EYE: DISCUSSION

Didymus provides key information for tracing the very rich tradition constructed around the blinding wound received by Philip at the siege of Methone. For most of the details he records earlier sources are given (Theopompus, Marsyas, and Duris). Citing first the historian Theopompus of Chios (*FGrH* 115 F 52) in book iv of his *Philippika* (col. xii 43-9), Didymus notes specific details: the occasion was the siege of Methone,¹⁰ the wound was to the right eye, the instrument was an arrow (τὸν δεξιὸν ὀφθαλμ[ὸ]ν ἐξεκόπη τοξεύματι πληγείς). A subsequent clause in the single, compressed sentence devoted to Theopompus' version adds that Philip was wounded while inspecting the Macedonian siege mechanisms—τὰ μηχανώματα (cranes) καὶ τὰς χωστρίδας (sheds shielding the besiegers and enabling them to fill in the protective ditch around a town wall). The point is that Philip was on an inspection tour when wounded and was not engaged in combat. That the fateful arrow was shot from the city wall of Methone is an obvious inference.

Theopompus himself may have been a visitor to Philip's court at Pella; it is surely safe to

⁹ The scholiast to xviii 67.124 notes that both arm and leg wounds were sustained ἐν Σκύθαις. As the third anonymous reader of this paper rightly observes, the rhythm of Demosthenes xviii 67 is broken by τὴν χεῖρα which stands without a separate participle. The suggestion, however, that τὴν χεῖρα is an intrusion in the original text is not found in the standard commentaries on this passage in Demosthenes.

¹⁰ The difficulties in dating of the siege of Methone are discussed by J. Buckler, *Philip II and the Sacred War*, *Mnem. Suppl.* cix (Leiden 1989), 'Appendix 1: Chronology', 181-85. Buckler argues that Methone was invested in winter 355 BC and fell during the summer of 354.

say that the details he recorded of Philip's wounded eye summarized the version approved by and circulated in Macedonian court circles.¹¹ Further indication that this was the accepted version is seen in Didymus' citation of Marsyas of Macedonia (*FGrH* 135-6 F 16, col. xii 49-50), probably dating to the early third century BC, who is said to concur with Theopompus.¹²

Of the later sources who tell of the wounding at Methone,¹³ Diodorus Siculus, Strabo and Justin record information which, in the main, agrees with Theopompus' report. Justin,¹⁴ the epitomator of Pompeius Trogus (late first century BC), provides the version closest to Theopompus.¹⁵ Diodorus Siculus (first century BC) gives few details: Philip was struck in the eye by bow-shot during the siege and lost his vision. Much of the sixteenth book of Diodorus is widely believed to be dependent on the fourth century historian Ephorus for events down to 341 BC.¹⁶ If this is the case for xvi 34.5, then Ephorus provided an account of the wound at Methone consistent with that of Theopompus. This assumed consistency between Ephorus and Theopompus on the circumstances of the eye wound adds further credibility to Theopompus' version. Strabo (late first century BC to first century AD) mentions the wounding twice, but briefly. Insofar as he places it in the context of the siege of Methone, Strabo agrees with Ephorus and Theopompus; but in book vii *fr.* 22a, Strabo, alone of all the preserved authorities, claims that the wound was done by a projectile from a catapult.¹⁷

If Theopompus reports the official version in circulation during Philip's lifetime, these bare facts are soon embroidered upon by the biographical tradition where Philip's loss of his right eye becomes an important episode, as surely it was, in his life story. The later versions are five in number. Below they are ranked in a chronological sequence based on the earliest testimonium, and the variant forms recorded in later antiquity are discussed.

Variant 1: Anecdotes concerning Aster, the archer named as the man who wounded Philip.

The earliest source to give Aster's name is the historian Duris of Samos (*FGrH* 76 F 36) whose contributions to the description of the fateful event in Methone are set forth by Didymus (col. xii 50-62) after the citation from Theopompus. Duris, whose career falls in the later fourth

¹¹ Speusippus' letter to Philip (*FGrH* 115 T7 = *Ep. Socrat.* xxx 12) places Theopompus at the court of Philip. The authenticity of this letter has been questioned, see L. Bertelli, 'L'epistola di Speusippo a Filippo: Un problema di cronologia', *AAT* cx (1976) 275-300 and 'La lettera di Speusippo a Filippo: Il problema dell'autenticità', *AAT* cxi (1977) 75-111. Theopompus, however, made himself well-informed regarding information current in court circles, see *FGrH* 115 T20 where Dionysius of Halicarnassus commends the historian for the range of individuals interviewed when garnering data for his history. Even if he did not actually visit the court of Philip, Theopompus clearly had access to reports from Pella.

¹² N.G.L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia, Volume II: 550-336 BC* (Oxford 1979) 257 n. 2: 'The details of Theopompus and Marsyas are likely to be right'. It is uncertain whether Didymus here refers to Marsyas Pellaeus or Marsyas Philippeus (*FGrH* 135-136). Both wrote on Macedonian matters; Jacoby, *FGrH*, Teil 2B Kommentar 480-81 assigns them a post fourth century date.

¹³ The only source to describe the medical treatment received by Philip is Pliny *NH* vii 124, see Prag (1990) (n. 3).

¹⁴ Recently R. Syme, 'The date of Justin and the discovery of Trogus' *Historia*, *Historia* xxxvii (1988) 358-71, reviewing the dates commonly assigned to Justin, suggests a late fourth century date for the epitomator.

¹⁵ Justin vii 6.14 records that during the siege of Mothone (*sic*) Philip was struck 'as he passed by' (*in praetereuntem*) by an arrow shot from the city wall (*de muris sagitta iacta*), and that his right eye was destroyed.

¹⁶ See N.G.L. Hammond, 'The sources of Diodorus Siculus xvi', *CQ* xxxi (1937) 86-9. Even those readers of Diodorus who attribute to him a measure of originality admit that book xvi depends on Ephorus, see for example K.S. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the first century* (Princeton 1990) 12-15 and n. 18).

¹⁷ *Frag.* 22a (5:162 [Baladié]): καταπελτικῶ βέλει. See Hammond (1979) (n. 12) 257 n. 2 for the remark that it is highly unlikely that even Philip could have survived such a blow. However, the trend to heroize Philip over time could be reflected in the upgrading of the weapon, compare Duris' claim below that a spear struck Philip's eye. See below, pp. 108, 109 and 118 for other manifestations of this trend.

to the early third century, provides two new pieces of information. If the text is sound, Duris notes that the weapon of destruction was a javelin (τὸ ἀκ[όντιον]) hurled by one Aster. The injured eye is not specified. In col. xii 53-55 of Didymus a genitive absolute follows (probably from the pen of Didymus and not part of the citation of Duris) in which the reader is reminded that nearly all the contemporary eye-witnesses stated that Philip was wounded by an arrow ([τ]ῶν [συ]νεστρα]τευκόντων αὐτῶι σχε[δ]ὸν [πάν]των τοξεύμα[τι] λεγόντων [α]ὐτὸ[ν] τετρώσθαι); the detail of the javelin is, then, rejected by Didymus in light of earlier, conflicting testimony. Regarding Aster, the name given by Duris for the successful archer, Didymus seems dubious. The text reads as follows (col. xii 50-53): ὁ δ(ὲ) Δοῦρις, ἔδει γ(ὰρ) αὐτὸν κ(αὶ) ἐνταῦθα τερατ[ε]ύσε[σθαι], Ἄστ[ε]ρα φησὶ (εἶναι) τοῦνομα τοῦ τὸ ἀκ[όντιον] καιρίως] ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀφέντος. Didymus' cramped comment, seemingly sarcastic, about Duris' need to obscure the account with 'talk of marvels' is illuminated by a passage in Photius (190 [149a]). Photius here draws from Ptolemaeus Chennus Καὶνῆ ἰστορίᾳ iii 30 (26 [Chatziz]). Chennus, writing in the second century AD at the time of Trajan and Hadrian, provides a catalogue of historical coincidences, probably as false as they are amazing. The passage in question tells of Philip, still a boy, attempting nightly to shoot as far as the stars (ὡς ἀστέρας ἐπειράτο καθ' ἑσπέρων τοξεύειν). On the one hand, continues Chennus, a prophet named Diogenetus foretold Philip's future power, but on the other hand a star (= Aster) cut out his eye with an arrow.

Underlying the coincidences known to Chennus is the notion that punishment was called for by Philip's presumptuous behaviour in trying to shoot a star. Certainly Didymus recognized that Duris was making a subtle reference to divine forces at play when he recorded the name of Aster: see his comment about 'talk of marvels' which serves as prologue to this first citation from Duris. From the text of Didymus, however, it is unclear whether some version of this foolish story of the 'star's revenge' was referred to by Duris or whether he simply gave the name of 'Aster' to hint at an agency greater than human. The question of divine intervention in bringing about the wounding at Methone is discussed below, see *Variant 5*.

We will never know whether the anecdote of the young Philip's celestial targets inspired the naming of the archer at Methone or whether the story of Philip's youthful preoccupation grew out of the supposed name of the man who shot from the walls with such crippling effect on the young king of Macedon. While Didymus correctly seems unconvinced of Duris' reliability, in the later biographical tradition Aster the archer becomes an integral part of the story¹⁸ and modern scholarship has accepted his existence and role in the wounding drama as factual.¹⁹

¹⁸ The contributions of [Callisthenes], Solinus, Themistius, and the sources of the anonymous scholiast to Demosthenes and of Suidas are discussed below. Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 38, a citation dating to the second century AD when the Aster story enjoys apparent popularity, uses the wounding of Philip at Methone to illustrate his point that the historian should not conceal offensive descriptive details in portraying the character of his subject (Φίλιππος... τοιοῦτος οἶος ἦν δειχθήσεται). Lucian alone records Aster here as a citizen of Amphipolis but places the wounding in Olynthus, as does [Callisthenes], see below pp. 112-13.

¹⁹ See Kaerst, *RE* ii (1896) s.v. 'Aster (4)' 1780 and, most recently, Prag (1984) (n. 3) 75 and n. 38 and (1990) (n. 3) 243. As demonstrated below, the sources for Aster, and the embellishments regarding his role, are abundant. The 1758 biography of Philip II by Thomas Leland, D.D., *The history of the life and reign of Philip king of Macedon; the father of Alexander*, printed by Thomas Harrison for W. Johnston in St. Paul's Church Yard i 135-6 includes yet another anecdotal account. According to this account, Aster, a man of either Amphipolis or Olynthus (here a 'latter day Ephialtes' of sorts), offered his services to Philip, was rejected, and then deliberately shot Philip in the eye to validate his claim to be an excellent marksman. For this anecdote Leland cites only a note to Demosthenes' first *Philippic* in the *Translation of the Philippic orations of Demosthenes* of one Monsieur Tourreil (noted briefly as a modern source in Leland's preface 1 xxvii). Leland himself, clearly savouring a good story, apologizes for his inability to cite a reliable ancient author, 136: 'but if the particulars, which Monsieur Tourreil relates, be really authentic (his authority, indeed, I confess, I have not been able to discover) ...' To be sure, this anecdote with its 'punishment suits the crime' motif could well have been fabricated in antiquity, but to my knowledge it lacks ancient attribution.

The legend naming Aster takes a new twist in the telling of [Callisthenes] cited ἐν τρίτῳ Μακεδονικῶν by [Plutarch] and Stobaeus. The date of this Callisthenes cannot be argued with certitude; Jacoby places citations circulated under his name in the second century AD. In these two instances [Callisthenes] is cited for the measured trimeter uttered by Aster as he took aim at Philip's head: Ἀστὴρ Φιλίπῳ θανάσιμον πέμπει βέλος. In syntax reminiscent of dedicatory inscriptions, Aster's boast has an ironic ring, for while the βέλος did, indeed, strike its target it was not, in fact, θανάσιμον.

A subsequent variant is found in the report that Aster inscribed his projectile before sending it against Philip.²⁰ This version is known to Solinus in his *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* (third century AD) and is alluded to by the fourth century AD orator Themistius. Neither records the actual words inscribed by Aster, but Solinus does claim that Aster wrote his own name, the name of the person targeted, and the spot he intended to wound (*locus vulneris*). Themistius' figurative use of Aster's signed arrows bespeaks a well-known story.²¹

The final variant, amusing but improbable in the extreme, portrays Philip, once Aster's arrow has been extracted, reading the inscription and then inscribing his own threat to Aster: Ἀστέρῳ Φίλιππος ἦν λάβη κρεμήσεται. The sources for this final variant are the anonymous scholion 43a to Demosthenes iii 5 and Suidas, who agree in most regards. The scholiast returns to Duris' version that the weapon was a spear and describes Aster as an otherwise unknown Methonian soldier (Ἀστέρος τινὸς στρατιώτου Μεθωναίου) at the time of Philip's siege who first wrote on his spear (ἐπιγράψαντος τῷ δόρατι) and then hurled it. The inscription is cited verbatim and repeats exactly the words quoted by [Callisthenes] as Aster's verbal boast or threat. The scholiast stresses the element of τύχη in the episode (Ἀστέρος...κατὰ τύχην τινὰ ἐπιτυχόντος κατὰ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ). He then reports that Philip wrote back to Aster (the words cited above) but was not lucky in his throw (οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν αὐτός).

Suidas, however, supplies a different fate for the lucky archer.²² Following Aster's successful shot, Philip takes up the offending weapon, writes his threat in return, and sends it back. While he did not strike Aster, nevertheless, as Suidas tells it, Philip's threat was fulfilled. καὶ ὑποσχόμενος εἰρήνην ἐξήτησε καὶ λαβὼν ἐκρέμασεν. ('Promising peace, Philip demanded and got Aster, whom he hung'.) This final twist portrays Philip heroically at the moment of trauma. He does not passively suffer in his injury but uses the very weapon of Aster to deliver an immediate threat which, in the version of Suidas, is brought to pass: Philip, not Aster, 'has the last word'.

Variant 2. A contest of flute players was held just before Philip was injured in the eye.

This anecdote tells of a prophetic contest in which all three participants played, by chance,

²⁰ Arrowheads bearing the inscription ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΟ cast in relief on the stem were recovered at Olynthus; one is illustrated in the catalogue *Search for Alexander* (n. 1) item 104, colour pl. 16. D.M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus* x (1941) illustrates Type C arrowheads nos. 1907-11 in pl. 120; the excavator claims that the inscription is the mark of Macedonian issue weapons, see 382-83. Borza (1990) (n. 1) 299 wonders if the arrowheads and sling bullets similarly inscribed with the name of Philip and his commanders (Robinson 418-43 nos. 2176-2380) were not of Olynthian make. The practice of inscribing the name of the enemy on a weapon is indeed an aspect of the 'long tradition of warfare', see, for a recent example, 'Cheney, Powell inscribe a bomb to Saddam', *The Washington Post* (February 11, 1991) A17.

²¹ In *Or.* xxiii 283c Themistius likens anonymous accusations flung at him by his assailants to a shower of arrows. In 284c he suggests that if he pause to pick up and examine one single arrow, it might prove to bear a name, as was the case with the Bowman who shot Philip while supervising the siege of Methone: his name proved to be Aster for it was branded (ἐγκέκρυτο) on the arrow. Themistius omits reference to Philip's wound and loss of sight: surely his audience knew the result of Aster's shot at Methone.

²² The weapon is here called βέλος. The short notice places the events in Methone, Aster inscribes the same words on the βέλος as in the scholiast's account.

compositions entitled the *Cyclops*. Didymus, the sole source for this literary joke (col. xii 55-62), draws again on Duris of Samos (*FGrH* 76 F 36) and then cites Marsyas (*FGrH* 135-6 F 17) to bolster Duris' authority.²³ The flute contest is a second example of Duris' predilection for the marvelous, noted by Didymus (col. xii 50-51). According to Duris and Marsyas, this omen took place by providence (κ[ατὰ] δαίμονα) while Philip was conducting a musical contest just before the disaster.²⁴

Duris' story of the contest is spun from a bitter joke which has Philip listening to (and laughing at?) the story of the single-eyed Cyclops shortly before the wound at Methone reduced him to single-sighted vision as well. From [Demetrius] (*de Eloc.* 293) comes a report that, following the injury at Methone, Philip would fly into a rage if anyone so much as mentioned the words 'Cyclops' or 'eye' in his presence (Φίλιππος μὲν διὰ τὸ ἑτερόφθαλμος εἶναι ὠργίζετο, εἴ τις ὀνομάσειεν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ Κύκλωπα ἢ ὀφθαλμὸν δλωσ).²⁵ It is a reasonable inference that 'the Cyclops' was an epithet applied to Philip during his lifetime. Duris' story of the contest probably grows out of the nickname which the king found so offensive.

As told by Duris, the anecdote has considerable pedantic embellishment, for he continues to name the three flute players who participated in the contest and the three authors of the dithyrambs which were played. The first pair of names, Antigeneides playing the *Κύκλωψ* of Philoxenus, has a certain air of credibility. The dithyramb entitled *Κύκλωψ ἢ Γαλάτεια* of Philoxenus of Cythera was well known (witness specific mention by Aristotle in the *Poetics*)²⁶ and Antigeneides, the celebrated flautist, could still have been performing in 354.²⁷

For the second set of contestants Duris named Stesichorus as poet, Chrysogonus as flute player. One Stesichorus is known from the *Marmor Parium* to have taken second place in a dithyrambic contest in 370/68 BC.²⁸ A flute player of the name of Chrysogonus is well attested; whether he was performing at the time of the siege of Methone is uncertain.²⁹

The final pair of names is problematic. Oeniades, named as author of the third version of the

²³ In col. xii 55, following a genitive absolute which serves as a parenthetical interjection of sources opposing Duris' information, Didymus returns to his citation of Duris with the words τὰ μ(ὲν) γ(ὰρ) περὶ τῶν ἀόλητ(ῶν). For Marsyas see n. 12.

²⁴ Compare the 'literary omen' recorded by Diodorus Siculus xvi 92.3 which befell Philip the day before his assassination and was similarly ignored.

²⁵ The date of [Demetrius] is disputed: third century BC on the authority of G.M.A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman cities* (Toronto 1965) 110-21; first century BC on the authority of D.A. Russell, *Criticism in antiquity* (London 1981) 40.

²⁶ *Poet.* 1448 a11 (= *PMG* 782). For fragments of Philoxenus' *Κύκλωψ* see Page, *PMG* nos. 815-824. Ancient gossip regarding this dithyramb is found in Phaenias (*fr.* 13 [Wehrli]), Duris (*FGrH* 76 F 58 = *PMG* 817), Ath. i 6e-7a (= *PMG* 816), Aelian *VH* xii 44, Suidas s.v. Φιλῶξενοσ (iv 729 [Adler]).

²⁷ A notice in Suidas, s.v. Ἀντιγενεΐδης (i 235 [Adler]) links the flute player Antigeneides with Philoxenus (born 455/4 BC, died 380/79) in dithyrambic performances in Athens. Elsewhere Antigeneides of Thebes is attested as a brilliant player and teacher of the flute (Thphr. *HP* iv 11.4, Gel. xv 17, Apul. *Flor.* i 4, Plu. *Mor.* 1138b). While Gellius, drawing on Pamphile *fr.* 9 (*FHG* iii 521 [Müller]) has Antigeneides as the teacher of Alcibiades, a later date for the flautist is suggested by Anaxandrides *fr.* 42.16 K-A and anecdotes known to Plutarch in *Mor.* 193f and 335a.

²⁸ *FGrH* 239 F73: Στησίχορος ὁ Ἰμεραῖος ὁ δεῦτερος ἐνίκησεν Ἀθήνησιν. Page (*PMG* 841) identifies this younger compatriot and homonym of the great Stesichorus of Himera with the Stesichorus named by Duris as one of the contestants.

²⁹ Chrysogonus ὁ ἀόλητῆς is mentioned by Aristoxenus (*fr.* 45 [Wehrli]) recorded in Athenaeus xiv 648d, without indication of his date. Duris himself (*FGrH* 76 F70) is the only source to supply a date for Chrysogonus in reporting that he played at Alcibiades' triumphant return to Athens in 408 BC. This citation of Duris is found in Plutarch *Alc.* 32; Plutarch, however, seems to question Duris' authenticity when he notes that such details of Alcibiades' return are not found in Theopompus, Ephorus, or Xenophon and that he himself finds such a lavish display unlikely given the circumstances of Alcibiades' exile. Athenaeus xii 535d follows the details of Duris F70 without citing a source.

Κύκλωψ, is not attested elsewhere as a poet,³⁰ but the name is known for a flautist of the year 384/3.³¹ The name Timotheus, given by Duris to the final flute player, is that of a well known dithyrambist whose Κύκλωψ is also cited by Aristotle as famous and exemplary.³² The conjecture has been put forth that the names of the final flute player and dithyrambist in Didymus ought to be interchanged.³³ However, references from the historian Chares of Mytilene (*FGrH* 125 F 4) and others to a flute player named Timotheus in Alexander's retinue³⁴ give plausibility to Duris' listing a Timotheus in the contest held by Philip.

Duris has obviously taken pains to wrap his anecdote in verisimilitude by supplying appropriate specific names for poets and players. He takes liberties, to be sure, with the chronology, but the fiction is amusing, appealing to the *recherché* literary tastes of his own day. It was amusing, also, to Didymus, or so one infers from the fact that he included it in his commentary.³⁵

Variant 3: Cleisophos, Philip's κόλαξ, bound his eye in sympathy when Philip was wounded.

Differing from the other four variants in that it does not involve the occasion of wounding *per se*, this version is preserved by Athenaeus, who cites Satyrus (*fr.* 22 [Kumaniecki]) of the second half of the third century BC, and by Eustathius of the twelfth century AD. In vi 248d-249a Athenaeus discusses the behaviour of one Cleisophos³⁶ who was a κόλαξ, or flatterer, at Philip's court.³⁷ A series of anecdotes is recounted, drawn from Lynceus, Hegesander, and Satyrus.³⁸ Lynceus' anecdotes are witty verbal exchanges, where first the κόλαξ, then the king, delivers the final comment. Hegesander's contribution is a *topos* ascribed to other sets of kings and their flatterers.³⁹ Capping this cluster is a set of three anecdotes from ὁ τοῦ Φιλίππου βίος by Satyrus. All three of Satyrus' anecdotes conform to the stock motif of the parasite who suffers sympathetically with his lord's affliction, but the first two are particularly successful because their humour turns upon the specific battle wounds and resultant disabilities attested for Philip. When Philip lost his eye, says Satyrus in the first anecdote, Cleisophos put in an

³⁰ Page, *PMG* 840 accepts the reference from Duris as legitimate.

³¹ *IG* ii² 3064: Οἰνιάδης Προνόμου ἤδλει.

³² Mentioned together with Philoxenus (n. 26). Two fragments of Timotheus' *Cyclops* survive: *PMG* 780 and 781.

³³ See the conjecture of Foucart.

³⁴ Chares is here cited in Ath. xii 538b-539a; see also Ath. xiii 565a. An anecdote in Plutarch *Mor.* 335A (n. 27) about Alexander and Antigeneides is retold with the name of Timotheus as flute player by: D. Chr. *Or.* i 1-6, Him. *Or.* xvi 3-4, Suidas s.v. 'Αλέξανδρος (i 103.14-19 [Adler]). Clearly Antigeneides and Timotheus are interchangeable names of famous flautists.

³⁵ Part of the humour in Duris' account of the contest targets Philip's critical sensibilities. To be sure, Diodorus Siculus xvi 91.5 does refer to contests Philip arranged for the wedding festivities of his daughter, Cleopatra, but Theopompus, while reporting (*FGrH* 115 F 236) that Philip surrounded himself with musicians and buffoons, refers (F225 A and B) to contests that are scarcely musical. On Philip as a critic of music and art see Plutarch's comments *Mor.* 334c which preface an anecdote about Philip's inexpert critique of a harp player (334c-d), an anecdote repeated in *Mor.* 67f, 179b, 634c-d.

³⁶ Cleisophos is not known beyond this passage in the *Deipnosophistae*, yet Athenaeus introduces him in vi 248d as follows: Κλείσοφον γοῦν τὸν ὑπὸ πάντων κόλακα Φιλίππου τοῦ τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλέως ἀναγραφόμενον. His notoriety is attested by the fact that Athenaeus takes his information from three cited sources.

³⁷ Satyrus is also cited a second time in the same passage from Athenaeus (*fr.* 23 [Kumaniecki]) for the information that Cleisophos was an Athenian—the point is made that he was a foreign guest at Philip's court and, therefore, was not, technically speaking, a παρὰσιτος.

³⁸ Lynceus of Samos, brother of the historian Duris, dates to the late fourth-early third century BC; Hegesander of Delos dates to the late second century BC.

³⁹ See Ath. vi 250c-d where Timaeus of Tauromenion is the source (*FGrH* 566 F 32).

appearance with his corresponding eye bound up! (συμπροῆλθεν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Κλεισοφος, τελαμωνισθεῖς τὸν αὐτὸν ὀφθαλμὸν).⁴⁰ The second anecdote attributed to Satyrus forms a pair with the first in that it records Cleisophos' behaviour when Philip was wounded in his leg; this is discussed below in connection with Philip's leg injury. Both anecdotes, however, reveal a link to the narrative of Demosthenes xviii 67 in the choice of words employed by Satyrus to describe the king's wounds: ὅτε (φησὶ) Φίλιππος τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐξεκόπη...καὶ πάλιν, ὅτε τὸ σκέλος ἐπηρώθη. The Attic orator's forceful words are deliberately echoed by the third century biographer, substituting aorist passive verbs for perfect passive participles. Surely Satyrus was counting on his cultured readership to recognize the citation of the famous words from Demosthenes' most celebrated oration. Perhaps he expected that his anecdotes would gain credibility if he made an obvious acknowledgement of his source. From this citation it is clear, however, that the anecdotes are fictions spun from the bare list of injuries in the *De corona*.

Variant 4: Philip was shot while forcing his way across the bridge over the river Sardon.

[Callisthenes] is cited by both [Plutarch] and Stobaeus, the only sources to record this variant. As noted above, the date for [Callisthenes], while not secure, is probably not later than the second century AD. Deviating from the earlier accounts, [Callisthenes] claims that Philip, intending to lay waste both Methone and Olynthus, was forcing his way across the bridge spanning the river Sardon⁴¹ and was opposed by a throng of Olynthians. The archer who successfully targeted Philip is named as Aster (see *Variant 1*); both sources quote his boastful words as he sent his arrow. Aster is here said by [Plutarch] to be an Olynthian, not, as elsewhere, from Methone.⁴² Both [Plutarch] and Stobaeus describe how the gravely wounded Philip threw himself into the river and swam to safety.

This variant represents a re-working of the details for heightened dramatic effect. The inspection tour of siege machinery is replaced by a gallant charge across the bridge where the king is isolated as a target. Philip displays heroic qualities as he saves his own life even though severely wounded. The portrayal of Philip's heroism has here been recast to evoke the legendary stand of the early Roman hero Horatius against the Etruscans at the Sublician bridge. Although the Roman was the defender, the Macedonian the aggressor, the solitary swim to safety by the wounded hero is a motif taken from the legend of Horatius at the Tiber and ascribed to Philip. What may have prompted this variant, first seen in the relatively late source [Callisthenes], in altering the firmly established saga of Philip's eye wound at the walls of Methone? The probable answer lies in consideration of the common disability of the Macedonian and the Roman

⁴⁰ Eustathius *ad II.* xiv 404-5 repeats the exact words ascribed to Satyrus in a learned gloss to the rare verb τελαμωνίζειν. While he declines to cite his source (ὁ ἱστορησας) the verbatim wording points to Satyrus. Here and *ad II.* ii 716 Eustathius knows the name of Aster as the successful archer. It is tempting to conjecture that Satyrus, too, reported the name of the Methonian Bowman. The story of Cleisophos' eye bandage is the first in Satyrus' set of three anecdotes. See below for the matching anecdote portraying Cleisophos' reaction to Philip's leg wound. The third anecdote is not so pointed: Cleisophos is said to have grimaced whenever he saw the king of Macedon eat something sour.

⁴¹ Stobaeus names the river Sardon (ποταμοῦ Σάρδωνος) while [Plutarch] calls it the Sandanus (ἐπὶ τῷ Σανδάνῳ ποταμῷ). N.G.L. Hammond, *A history of Macedonia, Volume 1: historical geography and prehistory* (Oxford 1972) 129 and n.3 identifies the Sardon/Sandanus as the modern Toponitsa, a tributary of the Haliacmon, to the south of the region of Methone. Since the Sardon/Sandanus river is not attested elsewhere and since the narrative details of the two texts drawn from [Callisthenes] point to Olynthus as the besieged city, Hammond's identification seems open to question.

⁴² Only Lucian joins [Callisthenes] in making Aster an Olynthian.

alike: Horatius, as his cognomen Cocles commemorates, is said to have had but a single eye.⁴³

In all the other sources Philip is maimed at Methone. Here, however, [Callisthenes] overlooks chronological and geographical objections and joins the sieges of Methone and Olynthus into one campaign. Such details as making Aster an Olynthian and placing a crowd of Olynthians at the bridge make it clear that the event is here part of the saga of Olynthus, whose devastation in 348 BC was one of Philip's most notorious acts. And in this version, the destruction of Olynthus may just possibly be considered Philip's revenge for the wound he sustained.

Variant 5: Divine agency in the loss of Philip's eye.

Under this final variant are collected disparate attempts to express the ultimate responsibility for Philip's wound. Did Philip bring his injury upon himself or were divine forces controlling his fate at Methone? The passage in the *De corona* of Demosthenes admits a certain ambiguity. Demosthenes admires Philip's willingness to sacrifice his body for the sake of his ambitions; the traumata he lists are exchanged for ἀρχή and δυναστεία (Demosthenes' realistic assessment, xviii 66), for τιμή and δόξα. (Demosthenes idealizes Philip's motives, xviii 67). The notion of divinely-directed destiny, τύχη, presiding over Philip's bartering of his scarred body is, however, raised with the words πᾶν ὃ τι βουλευθείη μέρος ἢ τύχη τοῦ σώματος παρελέσθαι, τοῦτο προίεμενον, ὥστε τῷ λοιπῷ μετὰ τιμῆς καὶ δόξης ζῆν. Philip's readiness for self-sacrifice is not sufficient to realize his ambitions; control is administered by τύχη.⁴⁴ The later biographical tradition supports both possibilities, containing items which clearly point to the guiding role of τύχη⁴⁵ but also including material showing Philip to be responsible for his disability.

A single anecdote preserved in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (539) portrays Philip's recognition of personal responsibility for the loss of his eye: when asked who pierced his eye, Philip said, 'The desire for Hellas' (Φίλιππος ἐρωτηθεὶς τίς αὐτῷ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐξέκοψεν, εἶπεν· ὁ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἕρωος). The phrasing of the question (τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐξέκοψεν) suggests that Demosthenes xviii 67 was the inspiration for the anecdote; note, too, that Philip's answer succinctly expresses the ambitious drive Demosthenes ascribes to Philip, xviii 67-8. Philip's words indicate that he knew the risks in which his ambition placed him and accepted his wound as the consequence.

A very different account of divine intervention with tragic overtones is recorded in Plutarch *Alex.* iii 1 according to which Philip inadvertently offended Zeus Ammon and consequently suffered punishment. Plutarch has previously discussed (ii 3-6) a number of omens concerning Olympias' conception of Alexander, including the report that a serpent was once seen stretched out in her bed while Olympias slept. This sight, as the anonymous tradition (λέγουσιν) continues in ii 6, alienated Philip's desire and affection, either owing to fear of a spell against him or the suspicion that she had slept with a 'higher being' (τὴν ὀμίλιαν ὡς κρείττονι

⁴³ See Münzer, *RE* viii (1913) s.v. 'Horatius (9)' 2331-36. Horatius is usually said to have earned his cognomen before his stand at the bridge. However, in *Mor.* 307d-f Plutarch records the stories of first Philip, then Horatius, in conflated versions that place each man alone on a bridge, outnumbered by the enemy, wounded in the eye and then swimming the river. The parallelism is completed by the miraculous survival of each with only the loss of an eye.

⁴⁴ See the discussion in Rowe (n. 5) 180-81 of the imagery drawn from meteorological phenomena which is employed by Demosthenes to project the struggle between the Athenians and Philip 'to cosmic proportions'. According to Demosthenes, Philip was destined to prevail, but it was yet in Athens' power to assert a moral choice and keep her dignity intact.

⁴⁵ Seneca *Con.* x 5.6 is quite emphatic in placing responsibility with the gods, see his description, clearly based on Demosthenes xviii 67, of Philip's tortured body: *pinge Philippum crure debili, oculo effosso, iugulo fracto, per tot damna a dis immortalibus tortum.*

συνούσης ἀφοσιούμενον). Following a digression (ii 7-9) on Olympias' enthusiastic involvement in Orphic and Dionysiac practices, particularly the ritual handling of snakes, Plutarch returns to Philip in iii 1. After the vision (τὸ φάσμα: presumably that of his wife in bed with a serpent) Philip sent an intermediary to Delphi who reported the following oracle from Apollo. In the first place, Philip was ordered to revere Zeus Ammon; in the second place, the prediction was made that Philip would lose an eye,⁴⁶ the same eye with which he spied through a crack in the door (details Plutarch omits in ii 6) and glimpsed his wife in bed with the god in serpent form (confirming Philip's prior suspicion)—κατώπτευσεν ἐν μορφῇ δράκοντος συνευναζόμενον τῇ γυναικὶ τὸν θεόν. In this version Philip's hybris (spying on the god) is justly punished by the loss of the offending eye. While no other source reports this act of unwitting insolence on Philip's part, underlying the story is the mythic paradigm of punishment for one who intrudes upon and gains illicit knowledge of a divinity.⁴⁷ The narrative in Plutarch also blends here Philip's injury with the question of Alexander's divine filiation; this is not seen elsewhere in the tradition. Obviously, the story of the Delphic prophecy to Philip regarding honours due to Zeus Ammon was circulated after Alexander's visit to the oracle of this divinity at Siwah in 331 BC when he was reportedly declared to be the god's son. This in turn suggests that the notion of the blinding being a punishment for spying on Olympias was woven into the tradition long after the actual injury to Philip, probably by a source who can be vaguely but conveniently dated as 'Hellenistic'.⁴⁸ Plutarch, at any rate, is drawing on popular accounts in circulation in his day and probably earlier.

While the two anecdotes from Plutarch and the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* indicate Philip's accountability, intimations that destiny, or τύχη, bore the responsibility for Philip's injury are seen in Duris' record of the wounding preserved in Didymus, as discussed above.⁴⁹ Here the account includes as agent of destruction the archer with the ominous name of Aster and the portent of the flute contest. As far as one can ascertain from the abridged record of Duris' version contained in Didymus, Duris did not equate Philip's injury with punishment for a specific misdeed of the king. In his emphasis on the marvellous Duris was probably expressing the time-worn Greek moral notion that success breeds envy on the part of the gods and that some personal sacrifice may be required to balance great good fortune.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ ἀποβαλεῖν δὲ τῶν ὄψεων αὐτὸν τὴν ἑτέραν': no echo of Demosthenes' wording.

⁴⁷ Among the many mythic examples which illustrate this topos, Philip's punishment most closely resembles the blinding of Tiresias, particularly the version told at length by Callimachus in *Hymn 5*, see the discussion of A.W. Bulloch, *Callimachus: the Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge 1985) 17-23. Both Tiresias and Philip acquire illicit sexual knowledge while encountering the divine; the resultant metamorphosis leaves Tiresias clairvoyant but blinded in both eyes, Philip blind in a single eye but illuminated as to why he must suffer this disability.

⁴⁸ Compare the popularity of variants treating Tiresias' blinding among Hellenistic authors, see Dicaearchus *fr.* 37 (Wehrli), Cleitarchus (*FGrH* 137 F 37), Callimachus *Hymn 5* and *fr.* 576 (Pfeiffer).

⁴⁹ The text of the Didymus scholion shows that Duris intended some portentous association in giving the name 'Aster'. Ptolemaeus Chennus, however, is the only preserved source to imply that Philip was punished for insolently trying to shoot at the stars, see p. 108 above. The role of τύχη is most explicit in the telling of the Aster story in the anonymous scholiast to Demosthenes iii 5, see p. 109 above.

⁵⁰ This is the idea conveyed in an anecdote told twice by Plutarch (*Mor.* 105a-b, 177c no. 3) which records Philip's prayer upon learning of a triple coincidence of good luck to befall him in a single day. His prayer portrays the certainty that he will have to suffer; his wish is that the sacrifice required to compensate his great fortune be modest. See also *Alex.* iii 8-9 where the anecdote is reworked as an omen concerning Alexander's birth.

BROKEN COLLAR BONE: TESTIMONIA

Demosthenes xviii 67.

Didymus in *Dem.* xi 22 cols. xii 64-xiii 2 (46 [Pearson-Stephens]).

Seneca *Con.* x 5.6

Plutarch *Mor.* 177f no. 9.

Gnomologium Vaticanum 540 (195 [Sternbach]).

BROKEN COLLAR BONE: DISCUSSION

Demosthenes' list of Philip's injuries includes in second place the phrase: τὴν κλεῖν κατεαγότα. When Didymus concludes his account of the eye injury (col. xii 43-64), he turns next to the injury of the collar bone (cols. xii 64-xiii 2). The actual wounding is described as follows (col. xii 64-66): τὴν δ(ε) κλεῖν τ(ῆν) δ(ε)ξιάν ἐν Ἰλλυριοῖς λόγῃ τὸν Ἰλλυριὸν Πλευράτον διώκοντα. Some confusion has resulted from the reading of τὴν κλιν in col. xii 64 of the papyrus. In their 1904 edition of Didymus, Diels and Shubart read κν[ήμη]ν for κλιν.⁵¹ However, the edition of Pearson and Stephens (1983) prints the reading κλεῖν of Crönert, followed by Foucart, and this seems the better restoration based both on the letters read on the papyrus and the correspondence with Demosthenes xviii 67.

The shattered collar bone sustained, as reported by Didymus, among the Illyrians is generally believed to be the serious injury which prompted Isocrates to write *Epistle* ii to a recuperating Philip. In this letter the Athenian orator chides Philip (ii 1-12) for placing his person in needless peril when he ought to be reserving his physical resources for more important undertakings (specifically, the projected invasion of Asia). Based on references in the letter to the wider political situation, a date of 345 or 344 BC is suggested for Isocrates' *Epistle* ii and for Philip's wound from the Illyrian encounter.⁵²

While citing no sources by name,⁵³ Didymus provides specific details: he names Pleuratos the Illyrian as Philip's adversary,⁵⁴ he states the circumstances of the blow (on the right collar

⁵¹ This restoration and Seneca *Con.* x 5.6 provide the sole testimonia for a wound in the lower leg, an injury of significance to those believing that the mismatched greaves from Royal Tomb II could be linked to Philip II. As Green (n. 1) 135-36 and n. 16 has pointed out, even those who read κν[ήμη]ν cannot argue that a wound on the right tibia (Didymus is specific) caused a made-to-measure left greave to be shorter and abnormally formed. In the tradition later than Didymus, however, there is uncertainty as to which was Philip's lame leg, see n. 61 for the discussion of Plutarch *Mor.* 739b.

⁵² 345 BC: Hammond (n. 12) 471; 344 BC: G. Mathieu and E. Brémond, eds., *Isocrate* (Paris 1962) iv 175.

⁵³ The long sentence from col. xii 63 to col. xiii 2 includes two clauses governed by φασίν. The first clause sums up all the information set forth about Philip's eye: 'as for the eye, they say he was injured in this way (i.e. as previously stated)'. The second clause moves on to the injured collar bone. In the case of the first clause, the 'they' indicated by φασίν are known: Theopompus, Duris, Marsyas. Can one assume that Didymus drew on these same sources for the information in the second clause? This is, perhaps, expecting too much of an author who admits that he is abridging or summarizing material elsewhere discussed in full (col. xii 40-43).

⁵⁴ Didymus clearly states that Philip's opponent in the fray was Pleuratos the Illyrian. The text, however, admits some ambiguity as to who was charging whom. The indirect discourse following φασίν in line 63 of col. xii has the infinitive ἐκκοπήναι in the first clause with its subject in αὐτόν; the second clause omits the verb and it is not clear whether the participle διώκοντα modifies Philip ('pursuing the Illyrian Pleuratos') or Pleuratos ('Pleuratos the Illyrian pursuing [sc. Philip]'). In the first reading Philip would then have been wounded by other, unnamed, Illyrians; in the second reading Pleuratos would presumably be the cause of Philip's injury. On the basis of these lines from Didymus, it is assumed that the Pleuratos who opposed Philip in this battle was king of the Illyrian Aridaei, see N.G.L. Hammond, 'The kingdoms of Illyria circa 400-167 BC', *BSA* lxi (1966) 239-53 and *History of Macedonia II* (n. 12) 21. Didymus, for all his learning, is only as reliable as his sources; as shown above, he includes information about Philip from Duris which even he finds dubious. Apart from this passage, Pleuratos appears as a recurring name of the Illyrian royal family in the third century BC, beginning with Pleuratos I, c. 260 BC, see Lenschau, *RE* xxi.1 (1951) s.v. 'Pleuratos 1-5' 237-39. This raises the possibility that a source familiar with the

bone, with a lance) and the statistics of those injured or killed in addition to Philip (150 of Philip's companions wounded, Hippostratus, son of Amyntas, killed). None of this information appears in the later biographical tradition.

A single anecdote, found only in Plutarch *Moralia* 177f no. 9 and the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (540), refers to this injury. While the wording of the two sources is not identical, the gist and the humour are. Philip is pitted against an avaricious doctor who is tending his broken κλείς and who demands his fees on a daily basis. Philip, in jest, replies, making a pun on two very different meanings of κλείς, 'collar bone' (LSJ [3]) and 'key' (LSJ [1.3]),⁵⁵ to the effect that 'as long as you have the collar bone/key, pay yourself'! Both versions reveal their dependency on Demosthenes xviii 67⁵⁶ with the verbal echoes τῆς δὲ κλειδὸς αὐτῶ κατεργείσης of Plutarch and ὁ αὐτὸς κατεάξας τὴν κλείν of the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 540. Apparently the anecdote was created in the attempt to enliven the sparse tradition from oration xviii 67 of Demosthenes. In *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 539, the anecdote preceding 540, Philip accounts for the wound to his eye in a joking manner. Possibly 539 and 540 were paired in their original source, just as the pair of anecdotes in Satyrus *fr.* 22 are also jokes based on the list of injuries in Demosthenes xviii 67 and created to enrich the tradition.⁵⁷

WOUND IN THE LEG: TESTIMONIA

Demosthenes xviii 67.

Didymus in *Dem.* xi 22, col. xiii 3-7 (46-7 [Pearson-Stephens]).

Justin ix 3.2

Seneca *Con.* x 5.6.

Plutarch *Mor.* 331b and 739b no. 4.

Athenaeus vi 248f.

Scholion in *Dem.* xviii 67.124 (i 215 [Dilts]).

WOUND IN THE LEG: DISCUSSION

In contrast to the abundant testimonia regarding Philip's eye injury, the sources for a leg wound are few and quite consistent. The wound was to the upper leg or thigh,⁵⁸ was nearly fatal,⁵⁹ and left Philip lame.⁶⁰ Only Didymus reports that the right side of the body was affected: τὴν σάρισσάν τινος τῶν διωκομ(έν)ων εἰς τὸν δεξιὸν αὐτοῦ μηρὸν ὡσαμ(έν)ου κ(αὶ) χλωῶσαντος αὐτόν (col. xiii 4-7). In later antiquity, however, Philip's lameness was well known, but it was considered impossible to determine which leg was injured.

Illyrian kings of the third century, intending to heighten the significance of the event by making king compete with king, provided the name of Pleuratos, illustrious in his own day, for the individual who harmed Philip in the previous century. A similar intention—to magnify the person causing the injury—is seen in the lore surrounding Aster, as previously discussed.

⁵⁵ Plutarch words Philip's riposte as λάμβανε ὅσα βούλει· τὴν γὰρ κλείν ἔχεις, the *Gnom. Vat.* 540 says ἕως τὴν κλείν ἔχεις, ταμειῦου σεαυτόν.

⁵⁶ The pun, it should be noted, precludes substitution of κνήμην for κλείν.

⁵⁷ See pp. 112, 117-18 for further discussion.

⁵⁸ Demosthenes, the scholiast, Plutarch, and Athenaeus refer to τὸ σκέλος; Didymus and Plutarch, ὁ μηρός; Justin says in *femore*. Only Seneca's *crure debili* points to the lower leg.

⁵⁹ See Justin ix 3.3 and Plutarch *Mor.* 331b.

⁶⁰ Didymus and Plutarch *Mor.* 331b make it clear that the wound from the engagement with the Triballi made Philip lame. Satyrus is not specific. Whether the lameness was a passing condition or permanent is not raised. Didymus' concluding remarks col. xiii 11-12 underscores the gravity of his wounds: Φιλ[ί]ππῳ δ(ὲ) τὸ [δλ]ῶν σῶμα δι[ε]λ[ε]λῶβητο.

This is seen from Plutarch's *Moralia* 739b where the question ποτέρῳ σκέλει χῶλός ἦν ὁ Φίλιππος is dismissed as unanswerable by means of deduction since Demosthenes gave no clue (οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ Δημοσθένης ὑπόλογον περὶ τούτου δέδωκεν).⁶¹

Some details of the circumstances of Philip's leg injury are provided by Didymus and Justin. Both agree that the wound was sustained in an engagement with the Triballi, following the conclusion of Philip's Scythian campaign.⁶² Didymus describes a wound by sarissa (!) in the course of the attack.⁶³ Justin, after recording the Triballi's demands for Philip's Scythian booty in return for right of passage through the territory they controlled (ix 3.1), describes the engagement tersely but indicates the serious nature of the wound by including the detail that the force of the blow killed Philip's horse from under him: *Hinc iurgium et mox proelium, in quo ita in femore vulneratus est Philippus, ut per corpus eius equus interficeretur* (ix 3.2).⁶⁴

Consistent with the comparative paucity of testimonia for the leg injury, the later tradition provides only two anecdotes which could be considered as embellishments. Both focus on the disability that resulted rather than the circumstances of the injury. The earliest comes from Satyrus' βίος of Philip (*fr.* 22 [Kumaniecki]) quoted by Athenaeus. The anecdote is a companion piece to Satyrus' story of Cleisophos' sympathetic eye bandage, discussed above. This time Cleisophos, the flatterer of Philip, is said to have appeared limping as he followed after Philip: καὶ πάλιν, ὅτε τὸ σκέλος ἐπηρώθη, σκάζων συνεξώδευε τῷ βασιλεῖ. This amusing anecdote, not repeated elsewhere in the tradition, is probably inspired by Demosthenes xviii 67, as discussed above.

The second story comes from Plutarch *Moralia* 331b and features a remark Alexander made to his father. By way of background information, Plutarch reports that Philip was despondent—he had been wounded among the Triballi and escaped death but was afflicted by his lameness (ἀχθομένου δὲ τῇ χῶλότῃ). To his father Alexander spoke words of encouragement which not only demonstrated Alexander's philosophic outlook but which predicted his own fortitude in enduring future injuries: 'θάρρει πάτερ' ἔφη 'καὶ πρόιθι φαιδρῶς, ἵνα τῆς ἀρετῆς κατὰ βῆμα μνημονεύης'. It is interesting to observe that by attributing these words to Alexander, Plutarch employs a topos attested elsewhere for mothers offering encouragement and exhortation

⁶¹ This passage from Plutarch, which makes clear the uncertainty in later centuries concerning Philip's lame leg, has not been considered by those arguing for or against Philip's ownership of the mismatched greaves in Royal Tomb II at Vergina. In *Mor.* 739b the main question posed as a brain-teaser for the assembled company is 'which, according to Homer, of Aphrodite's arms did Diomedes wound'? Zopyrio's indignant retort is that this question is tantamount to asking which was Philip's lame leg—i.e. both questions are beyond solution due to insufficiency of information. Maximus, however, protests that while Demosthenes gives no indication regarding the injury of the Macedonian, Homer provides, in the context of *Il.* v 335-8, clues sufficient for the clever exegete to derive the solution. Maximus then proceeds in 739c to demonstrate that Diomedes pierced the right arm of Aphrodite.

⁶² While Justin alone states this clearly, it is to be inferred from mention of the Triballi in Didymus and Plutarch. The scholiast merely says ἐν Σκύθαις. Conclusion of the Scythian campaign dates the wounding to 339 BC: Hammond, *History of Macedonia, Volume II* (n. 12) 583.

⁶³ Plutarch is the only other source to record the weapon: Φίλιππου λόγχῃ τὸν μηρὸν διαπαρέντος.

⁶⁴ Occurring only three years before his death, it is difficult to imagine that a wound of this impact would not have left indications of trauma in Philip's femur. Compare this observation with the report of Xirotiris and Langenscheidt (n. 2) 15 concerning the skeletal remains of the male decedent in Royal Tomb II at Vergina: 'Fresh or healed damage to the bones or changes due to illness could not be established'. Recently J. Gardiner-Garden, 'Ateas and Theopompus', *JHS* cix (1989) 29-40 has presented arguments to demonstrate that Theopompus is the source for Trogus' information on Philip's Scythian campaign against Ateas recorded in Justin ix 2. Since the encounter with the Triballi is but an epilogue to the major campaign against Ateas of Scythia, there is a possibility that the details of Justin's record of Philip's leg wound in ix 3.2 have the authority of Theopompus. Attractive as the possibility is, the evidence is too slight to press it further.

to their *sons* crippled owing to patriotic valour⁶⁵ but that he here inverts the roles to have the *son* inspire the *father*. In this passage from Plutarch the fact of Philip's leg injury is secondary to the portrayal of his son's ethos.

SOME CATEGORIES OF FALSIFIED BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL

In the complex biographical tradition concerning Philip's eye injury, the account of Theopompus, credited with being the most accurate as well as the earliest surviving, is consistent with later versions from Diodorus Siculus, Strabo and Justin. It appears that Theopompus gave the appropriate details in a colourless manner, specifying place, weapon, and a situation (inspection tour) lacking in drama or valour but probably accurate. More popular, however, are the fictional innovations which fall into several categories. In the first place, there is the obvious intention to recast events in Philip's life in conformation with a divine scheme according to which his eye injury was the result of fate, τύχη. This is seen in the generation following Philip and Alexander, in the history of Duris⁶⁶ whose details are infused with elements of the marvellous (Aster the archer, omen of the flute contest) and indicate (as the phrase κατὰ δαίμονα suggests) that providence was moving against Philip that fateful day at Methone. In the case of the contest where all participants and poets are specified, the anecdote reveals more of the literary knowledge and taste of Duris than anything of the historical Philip. The report about Aster is likewise of dubious historical value but, once added to the events of the eye wounding, it takes on a life of its own, retold with variation following variation, reinforcing the notion of fate's control over human affairs (this is particularly emphatic in later variants).

Yet another tendency is seen in Plutarch's report of the Delphic prophecy to Philip about his eye. Here narrative elements from Philip's reported marital difficulties with Olympias have been reworked to conform to a mythic paradigm which requires Philip's punishment by the offended deity. The result imparts tragic overtones to Philip's blind eye—his sin was inadvertent for he unknowingly spied upon a god in his wife's bed, yet he must suffer by giving up an eye.

One further thread of the tradition plays up Philip's heroic qualities. Duris insists, in spite of contrary testimony from witnesses who were on the campaign when Philip was shot, that the wounding weapon was a spear, not an arrow; Diodorus Siculus claims the wound was caused by a projectile from a catapult. Later variants of the Aster story have the wounded Macedonian inscribing a return threat to the successful archer. The version of [Callisthenes], part conflation, part fictionalization, transfers the blinding episode out of the context of a humdrum inspection tour at Methone to a glorious episode at Olynthus where Philip first charges the bridge and then swims to safety to save his life. This reworking of detail shows that the heroics of the Macedonian king are recast to recall a celebrated legend of early Rome.

Finally, the influence of Demosthenes xviii 67 reveals the practices of biographers in treating

⁶⁵ The sentiment and phraseology of Alexander's words are very close to those expressed by anonymous Spartan women in Plutarch *Mor.* 241e nos. 13, 14, Stobaeus iii 7.28, *Gonom. Vat.* 568, and by the mother of Carvilius in Cicero's *De orat.* ii 61.249.

⁶⁶ It is of particular interest to find that Theopompus' younger contemporary Duris is cited in Didymus' commentary for conflicting information, for Duris is known to have been critical of Theopompus as a writer of history, see *FGrH* 76 F1. This fragment, in which Duris criticizes Ephorus and Theopompus together for lack of μίμησις and ἡδονή ἐν τῷ φράσαι, has been the focus of much controversy in attempting to define what the term μίμησις meant to Duris when he included this critique of Ephorus and Theopompus in book i of his Ἱστοροῦται. For the development of the controversy and recent interpretations see K. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios* (Wiesbaden 1975) 109-26, K. Sacks, *Polybios on the writing of history* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1981) 144-70, C.W. Fornara, *The nature of history in ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1983) 124-34, and V. Gray, 'Mimesis in Greek historical theory', *AJP* cviii (1987) 467-86.

the life of a man of action and statecraft. It is now a commonplace that the writings of poets and philosophers gave inspiration to fictions of all sorts which were inferred to underlie the author's words.⁶⁷ In the case of Philip, a man of action and ambition but not of letters, the most famous literary passage referring to his wounds, the *De corona* chapter 67 of the Athenian Demosthenes, has been used to fabricate 'biographical' material. While this is most apparent in the sets of anecdotes from Satyrus and the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, the phrasing of Demosthenes in listing the injuries echoes through the later tradition. Such echoes are certainly deliberate references on the part of those making up new material, hoping that their word choice would confer the authority of Demosthenes on their foolish anecdotes.

ALICE SWIFT RIGINOS

Howard University

⁶⁷ See J. Fairweather, 'Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers', *Ancient Society* v (1974) 231-75 and 'Traditional narrative, inference and truth in the "Lives" of the ancient Greek poets', *PLLS* iv (1983) 315-69, A.S. Riginos, 'Platonica: the anecdotes concerning the life and writings of Plato', *Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition* iii (Leiden 1976), M.R. Lefkowitz, *The lives of the Greek poets* (London and Baltimore 1981), A. Chitwood, 'The death of Empedocles', *AJP* cvii (1986) 175-91.