

# PHILIP OF MACEDON'S EARLY INTERVENTIONS IN THESSALY (358–352 B.C.)

IN his stimulating article on this topic Mr. Christopher Ehrhardt sought to show that there is no good reason to believe in any intervention by Philip of Macedon in Thessaly earlier than his campaign of 353.<sup>1</sup> The second half of his paper is devoted to the date of Philip's capture of Pagasae, which Diodorus appears to put in the Athenian archon year 354/3 after the fall of Methone, a date adopted by most modern interpreters accepting the emendation *Παγασάς* for the unidentifiable *Πάγας* in the text of Diodorus. Ehrhardt shows well the difficulties of believing in any capture of Pagasae, the port of Pherae, earlier than the capture of Pherae itself (in 352), and concludes that the emendation is to be rejected.<sup>2</sup> In this I think he is right, and I am joining him in dating the capture of Pagasae in 352 after Pherae itself had fallen.<sup>3</sup> The first half of his paper, however, rejecting all the evidence suggesting other interventions by Philip in Thessaly earlier than 353, is much harder to accept, for two reasons:

1. The evidence which many writers earlier had accepted as referring to one or more interventions by Philip between 358 and 353 ought not to be rejected, it seems to me, as easily as Ehrhardt rejects it.

2. These events (or non-events) of 358–353 ought not to be considered in isolation, but in relation to events both before and after, to Macedonian–Thessalian relations in the previous decade on the one hand, and on the other hand to Philip's position in Thessaly after 352. Both these things may well help us to a clearer idea of what may be considered probable in any alleged Thessalian activities of Philip in the four or five years of darkness or twilight themselves.

First, then, to reconsider the evidence which Ehrhardt considered and rejected.<sup>4</sup> There are five passages:

(i) Diodorus 16. 14. 1–2.

*Κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἑλλάδα Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Φερῶν τύραννος ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας γυναικὸς Θήβης καὶ τῶν ταύτης ἀδελφῶν Λυκόφρονος καὶ Τισιφώνου ἐδοιοφονήθη. οὗτοι δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὡς τυραννοκτόνοι μεγάλης ἐτύγχανον ἀποδοχῆς, ὕστερον δὲ μετανόησαντες καὶ τοὺς μισθοφόρους χρήμασι πείσαντες ἀνέδειξαν ἑαυτοὺς τυράννους καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν ἀντιπραπτομένων ἀνείλον, κατασκευασάμενοι δὲ τὴν δύναμιν ἀξιόλογον βία κατεῖχον τὴν ἀρχήν. οἱ δ' Ἀλευάδαι καλούμενοι παρὰ*

<sup>1</sup> 'Two Notes on Philip of Macedon's first interventions in Thessaly', *CQ* xvii (1967), 296.

<sup>2</sup> Diod. 16. 31. 6.

<sup>3</sup> I would add to Ehrhardt's arguments that any capture of Pagasae must really have belonged to campaigns which Diodorus described (16. 34–38), and his omission of it there would be surprising, especially since Pagasae could fall, one would think, only in

some interesting way, either by siege or by a *coup* whether of arms or artifice. It ought to come, therefore, as Ehrhardt proposes, after the capture of Pherae in 352 at the end of the campaign.

<sup>4</sup> On all this see especially M. Sordi, *La lega Tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno* (1958), 230 ff., 348 ff.—an admirable study, with full bibliography.

τοῖς Θετταλοῖς, δι' εὐγένειαν δὲ ἀξίωμα ἔχοντες περιβόητον, ἀντεπράττοντο τοῖς τυράννοις. οὐκ ὄντες δὲ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἀξιόμαχοι προσελάβοντο Φίλιππον σύμμαχον τὸν Μακεδόνων βασιλέα. οὗτος δὲ παρελθὼν εἰς τὴν Θετταλίαν κατεπολέμησε τοὺς τυράννους καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀνακτησάμενος τὴν ἐλευθερίαν μεγάλην εὐνοίαν εἰς τοὺς Θετταλοὺς ἐνεδείξατο· διόπερ ἐν ταῖς μετὰ ταῦτα πράξεσιν αἰεὶ συναγωνιστὰς ἔσχεν οὐ μόνον αὐτός, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ υἱὸς Ἀλέξανδρος.

I agree with Ehrhardt that this passage is proleptic, referring to the future fortunes of the tyrannicides at Pherae down to their expulsion by Philip in 352, although Diodorus links them here to the death of Alexander which he is placing in the archon year 357/6 (the true date being probably as early as 358/7). I agree, too, that the text as printed (following the Teubner edition of Fischer) contains nothing which invites us to believe that Philip became involved with the rulers of Pherae at any time earlier than the occasions of his well-known Thessalian campaigns of 353 and 352. But the text as printed contains an important departure from the MSS., Hertlein's emendation δὲ παρελθὼν for δ' ἐπανελθὼν of the MSS. Though Ehrhardt duly recalls this fact in a footnote he does not explain its very important implications. If Diodorus really wrote ἐπανελθὼν when alluding to Philip's invasion of Thessaly in 353 in response to the Aleuad invitation, it follows that he knew that this was *not* Philip's first intervention.<sup>1</sup> On this supposition we should need to think that Diodorus, condensing and selecting from his narrative source(s) here in Book 16 as always, knew of an earlier occasion or occasions when Philip had visited Thessaly, and wrote of him here as '*returning*' in 353, though he never included any account or mention of any such occasion at its appropriate chronological place in his own abridged narrative. To think this of Diodorus is to convict him of a notably unskilful performance here as a narrator. But no one, I imagine, who knows him will pronounce him incapable of this, and personally I consider Hertlein's emendation unnecessary, and most likely a disservice to the modern interpreter. It seems to me very possible that Diodorus did write ἐπανελθὼν; and if he did, then already we *know* that Philip did do something in Thessaly earlier than 353, whether on one occasion or on more than one. At all events it seems very dangerous to emend this passage of Diodorus and then use it in support of the opposite view.

This notion, incidentally, is reinforced by Diod. 16. 35. 1—μετὰ δὲ ταῦθ' ὁ Φ. ὑπὸ Θετταλῶν μετακληθεὶς ἦκεν εἰς Θετταλίαν μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως (for the campaign of 353)—if we translate 'Philip, *recalled* by the Thessalians, . . .' as most probably we ought.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This point was made by Sordi, *LT* 349.

<sup>2</sup> In LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. μετακαλέω, only two meanings are given which are apposite to this context: (1) *to call away, or to another place*, (2) in Med. *to call back, recall*. The passive μετακληθεὶς can serve the Middle no less than the Active, I suppose, on the analogy of μεταπεμφθῆναι, serving the (normally) Middle μεταπέμπεσθαι (LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v.).

In the previous sentence (and chapter) here, Philip's loss of an eye in the now completed siege of Methone is recorded. Philip was not *called away* from Methone to Thessaly by the Thessalians: the two campaigns were

in succeeding years. Therefore he was *called back*, the lexicographical alternative. If Diodorus was really thinking while he wrote, it is *certain* that he is recording that P. is now *recalled* to Thessaly. Regrettably however I must allow for the possibility that D. was not really thinking here. If he was writing like a hack, half asleep, he *could* have written that P. was *called away* from Scene A (Methone) to Scene B (Thessaly), merely because the one followed the other in his scheme of things, and he did not care if he was writing nonsense because he was not sufficiently awake to notice it. (*continued*)

(ii) Justin 7. 6. 6-9.

*Primum* illi (*sc.* Philippo) cum Atheniensibus certamen fuit; . . . *Post hos* bello in Illyrios translato multa milia hostium caedit, urbem nobilissimam Larissam capit. *Hinc* Thessaliam non praedae cupiditate, sed quod exercitui suo robur Thessalorum equitum adiungere gestiebat, nihil minus quam bellum metuentem improvisus expugnat, unumque corpus equitum pedestriumque copiarum invicti exercitus fecit. *Quibus rebus feliciter provenientibus* Olympiadem . . . uxorem ducit . . .

The words in italics indicate four stages in the time-sequence which Justin, rightly or wrongly, thought appropriate for the four groups of events which he summarizes here. *Primum*, Philip's clash with Athens in 359. *Post hos*, his Illyrian war of 358. *Quibus rebus . . . provenientibus*, his marriage with Olympias in 357. Between 358 and 357, the allusion to Thessaly, which (like the Diodorus passage already discussed) is obviously proleptic, looking forward years ahead to Philip's final assumption of control over Thessaly and its army. (The sentence about Olympias which follows does just the same thing, going on to allude to the expulsion of her brother Arybbas from his kingdom in 343/2, fourteen or fifteen years after the royal marriage of 357 which is the 'point of entry'.) Is there a corresponding point of entry in 358/7 for the forward-looking sentence about Thessaly, too? That Justin *intended* this seems certain, from his *Hinc* . . . The allusion to Larissa, which looks as if it ought to lead somewhere, may be a blind alley, created by manuscript corruption.<sup>1</sup> The lost name ought to be that of a city of the Illyrians or of western Macedonia in Illyrian hands;<sup>2</sup> and a 'capture' of Larissa by Philip is in contradiction to Diodorus, as Ehrhardt rightly reminds us, and to all that we hear elsewhere of his early relations with Larissa. But the question still remains, why did Justin choose just this place, between the Illyrian war of 358 and the royal wedding of 357, as a point of entry for this allusion to Philip in Thessaly? Justin presumably preserved the sequence of events or topics which he found in Pompeius Trogus whom he summarized. Pompeius Trogus presumably found some reason in his Greek source(s) for inserting here a section on Philip in Thessaly, and it seems undeniable that a very possible reason was because the Greek source(s) recorded some activity of Philip in Thessaly *at this time* (in 358 or 357). This cannot be thought of as a certainty, of course. But it remains a very distinct possibility, and for this reason I think that the evidence of Justin here ought not to be swept under the carpet, but ought to be kept in mind as something that *may* be giving us a clue to something that really happened, in 358 or 357.

(iii) Satyrus (*FHG* iii. 161 Müller) ap. Athenaeus 13. 557 b-d.

Φίλιππος ὁ Μακεδὼν οὐκ ἐπήγετο μὲν εἰς τοὺς πολέμους γυναῖκας, ὥσπερ Δαρείος ὁ ὑπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου καταλυθείς, . . . ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει. "ἐν ἑτεσι γοῦν εἴκοσι καὶ δυσὶν οἷς ἐβασίλευσεν", ὥς φησι Σάτυρος ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Βίου αὐτοῦ, "Ἀνδάταν Ἰλλυρίδα γήμας ἔσχεν ἐξ αὐτῆς θυγατέρα

It is for this reason that I suggest the translation 'recall' as most probable, merely, and not as certain.

<sup>1</sup> H. D. Westlake, *Thessaly in the fourth century*, 167, n. 2. Sordi defends 'Larissam', and repunctuates: '. . . milia hostium caedit. Urbem nobilissimam Larissam capit. Hinc

Thessaliam . . .'. But *capit* remains a difficulty.

<sup>2</sup> The Macedonian Arnissa comes to mind, about 15 miles W. of Edessa. Was it *urbs nobilissima*? I doubt it. But if it was held by the Illyrians, its recapture by Philip could have been important enough to be recorded.

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 Φιλίνα, ἐξ ἧς Ἀρριδαῖον ἐτέκνωσε. προσεκτίσατο δὲ καὶ τὴν Μολοττῶν βασιλείαν γήμας Ὀλυμπιάδα, ἐξ ἧς ἔσχεν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ Κλεοπάτραν. καὶ τὴν Θράκην δὲ ὅτε εἶλεν, ἦκε πρὸς αὐτὸν Κοθῆλας ὁ τῶν Θρακῶν βασιλεὺς ἄγων Μῆδαν τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ δῶρα πολλά. γήμας δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἐπεισῆγαγεν 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. . . .

The interesting tale of Philip's marriages has been best interpreted (so far as I know) by Beloch, on whose conclusions Ehrhardt does not improve. It is not enough to show (what Beloch knew) that Satyrus' list is not in exact chronological order throughout.<sup>1</sup> The girl who really matters here is Philinna of Larissa, whose son by Philip, Arrhidaeus, was old enough in 337 to be sought in marriage by Pixodarus of Caria for his daughter.<sup>2</sup> Ehrhardt proposes 352 as the date of Arrhidaeus' birth, consequent on an association of Philip with Philinna in 353. This seems to me very highly improbable, in the absence of any other evidence for marriages in Greece or Macedonia of boys of 15, even royal princes for reasons of state.<sup>3</sup> Arrhidaeus is much more likely to have been at least 18 in 337, and this would put Philip's association with Philinna in 356 or earlier. If it is thought unlikely (as Beloch thought it) that he associated with Philinna very near in time to his marriage with Olympias (in 357 presumably), this would put 'Philinna' in 358 or early 357.

Philinna was described by Justin as *saltatrix* and *scortum*.<sup>4</sup> If she was really a *hetaira*, it need not have been in Larissa that Philip made her acquaintance: an enterprising girl might have gone to Macedonia to seek her fortune. But would the *hetaira*'s son have been brought up at court, as Arrhidaeus evidently was? *Saltatrix*, *scortum* sounds a bit like Theopompus in the background; Theopompus who loved writing about Vice, and who had no opinion of Thessalians anyway.<sup>5</sup> If Satyrus is to be taken seriously with his οἰκειώσασθαι δὲ

<sup>1</sup> Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* iii<sup>2</sup>. 2. 68 ff. The list seems to be drawn up on two principles, which occasionally conflict. The chronological basis is shown by ἐπεισῆγαγεν (and ἐπεισάγων) τῇ Ὀλυμπιάδι, which anchors the last three names firmly in order, relative to each other. But Satyrus was concerned, too, to illustrate his introductory remark. It was necessary for his *first* name to be that of a woman married κατὰ πόλεμον, whether or not she was the first wife. Audata's marriage will have been in 358, but for all we know Phila's may have been earlier: Phila, the Elimiot Macedonian princess, was not married κατὰ πόλεμον. Olympias was not married κατὰ πόλεμον. But of the two Thessalians Nicesipolis certainly *was*, as her daughter's name Thessalonike commemorates, and this is probably why Nicesipolis precedes Olympias in the list, though the probable date of her marriage is 352 (Olympias 357). The other Thessalian,

Philinna, was certainly married before Nicesipolis too (see text), but Satyrus put Nicesipolis first because of her association with the famous victory, which was better value for illustrating κατὰ πόλεμον.

<sup>2</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 10. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (1968), 106 f., 212, 313 nn. 10 and 11. Mr. Lacey kindly tells me that he knows of no instances of boys marrying at (e.g.) 15.

<sup>4</sup> Justin 9. 8. 2; 13. 2. 11.

<sup>5</sup> On Vice, Theopompus frs. (e.g.) 62, 81, 121, 143, 204, 213, 224-5, 227, 236; on Thessalians (of Pharsalus), fr. 49 (Jacoby, no. 115). Justin 9. 8. 4-5, following close on the *saltatrix* allusion, may owe something to Theopompus fr. 224 (στρατιώτης γὰρ ὢν . . . etc.). Justin 13. 2. 11 contains the *scortum* allusion in a speech attributed to Ptolemy at Babylon in 323. Ptolemy knew the facts about Philinna, no doubt; but this reported speech may well be a literary invention, and

θέλων καὶ τὸ Θετταλῶν ἔθνος, it would seem more likely that Philinna was the daughter of a good family of Larissa.<sup>1</sup> This *would* establish that Philip spent time in Larissa, and in 358 or early 357 if Beloch's chronological arguments are accepted; and probably though not certainly κατὰ πόλεμον.

It does seem to me very unwise to reject what Satyrus offers us here. We cannot be certain that Beloch was right in his interpretation and chronology; but there must be a very good chance that he was.

(iv) Theopompus fr. 35 (Jacoby, no. 115) = Harpocration s.v. Κινέας:

ὡμολόγηται καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς, ὅτι Κινέας εἰς ἤν τῶν προιεμένων Φιλίππῳ τὰ Θετταλῶν πράγματα, καὶ μάλιστα Θεοπόμπῳ ἐν ᾧ, ἅμα καὶ διεξ-ερχομένῳ τὰ περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα.

(v) Theopompus Frs. 34 and 48 = Steph. Byz. s.v. Χάλκη:

ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη Χάλκη Λαρισσαίας πόλις. λέγεται καὶ πληθυντικῶς Χάλκαι· Θεόπομπος ᾧ Φιλιππικῶν \* \* καὶ γ', "ἔτι συνεπολέμησεν ὠρμημένους ἐκ Χαλκῶν τῆς Λαρισσαίας".

The internal economy of Theopompus' *Philippica* is so unclear to us that we cannot infer from these two allusions in Books 1 and 3 that Thessaly and Larissa must have been occupying Philip's attention in the first year or two of his reign. Ehrhardt, if he has already convinced us that Diodorus, Justin, and Satyrus tell us nothing of any early activity of Philip in Thessaly, is therefore entitled to add now that Theopompus here tells us nothing either of any such thing. But if we are not satisfied by Ehrhardt's proofs, if we think that Diodorus, Justin, and Satyrus, and particularly Satyrus on Philinna amplified by Plutarch on Arrhidaeus, do encourage us to think it possible, even probable, that Philip *was* in Thessaly early in his reign and at Larissa in particular, then Theopompus can be thought perhaps to lend here some small support. It is still possible to argue these two fragments away; but I am not sure that it is possible to do this without being left with the uneasy feeling that perhaps after all Kineas does appear in Theopompus' First Book because Philip *was* involved in some way in Thessaly at the very start of his reign; and that in the Third Book perhaps it *was* Philip after all who was using Chalke as a military base. Uninformative by themselves, when added to the other evidence these two fragments *may* be thought perhaps to add some small element of corroboration, as Beloch, Westlake, and Sordi saw, to name no others.<sup>2</sup> More than that no one would claim for them.

Considered in sum, I suggest, the five passages do amount to something. Each of them individually, except the Satyrus passage, can be devalued to nothing or next to nothing: Diodorus by accepting the emendation *παρελθῶν* (while forgetting *μετακληθεῖς* of 16. 35. 1), Justin by insisting on his *prolepsis* to the exclusion of all else; Theopompus by blankly saying we do not know what made him write of these things in these early books. The Satyrus passage, however, with Plutarch, does seem to establish a probable connection of Philip

if so this bit could easily be based on Theopompus likewise.

<sup>1</sup> Beloch, *ibid.* 69, 'ohne Zweifel' (and probably Aleuad, he adds). Myself, I do find room for doubt, but not very much.

This association with Philinna does seem to make Philip's actual presence in Larissa very probable.

<sup>2</sup> Beloch, *iii*<sup>2</sup>. 1. 228; Sordi, *loc. cit.*; Westlake, *op. cit.*, 166 ff.

with Larissa in 358 or early 357. If that is granted, then the other passages gain in stature, Diodorus (accepting now the MSS. reading *ἐπανελθών*) and Justin especially so. When all is said and done they are only hints, meagre enough; but they are hints worth taking, provided that they are not asking us to believe the impossible, or the unacceptably improbable. Beloch and others have accepted and used them in full awareness of this choice. The best criterion must be their compatibility (or not) with what we know of Macedonian-Thessalian relations in the years before Philip's accession, and also with what we can learn of the development of these relations after 353-2, the years of his two grand-scale campaigns in Thessaly.

Ehrhardt concludes his Note with the words 'And, to turn to general considerations, Philip had enough to do at home, at least till 356, without gratuitously intervening in Thessaly, where he had no direct interests'.<sup>1</sup> With the statement that he had enough to do, no one will quarrel. The pretenders to the throne; the intervention of Athens; the campaigns against the Paeonians and the Illyrians; Amphipolis, the Chalcidian League, Potidaea, Krenides: each of these things called for critical decisions on policy, and some of them called for the full military effort of the Macedonian kingdom, as Ehrhardt rightly implies.<sup>2</sup> In these conditions no Macedonian ruler in his senses would have involved himself in Thessaly just for the hell of it: on this everyone will agree. It is the view that Philip 'had no direct interests' in Thessaly that needs to be questioned and re-examined.

Thessaly had been an interest of Macedonian kings since the time of Archelaus.<sup>3</sup> An expansionist's role in Thessaly like that of Archelaus himself was a luxury which Philip certainly could not afford in his first year or two. But the more recent history of Macedonian kings was a reminder that to take an active interest in Thessaly was not so much a dissipation of valuable time and strength, as an elementary exercise in self-preservation.<sup>4</sup> Philip's father Amyntas is said to have recovered his throne on one occasion with support from Thessaly, and towards the end of his reign had had some cause for anxiety in the concentration of power under Jason of Pherae at the expense of his own friends there.<sup>5</sup> In 369 Philip's eldest brother Alexander II reinforced the Aleuadae of Larissa and others in their struggle to free themselves from the grip of Alexander of Pherae: this was sound defensive policy, preventing the union

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. 298.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> [Herodes] *Περὶ πολιτείας* 26 f.; Thrasymachus fr. 2 (Diels-Kranz ii<sup>6</sup>. 324); cf. Sordi, *LT* 148 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Isoc. 5. 20 can write of *Θετταλοῦς μὲν τοὺς πρότερον ἐπάρχοντας Μακεδονίας*, in rhetorical antithesis to their present state of subordination (in 346). See below, pp. 74-5.

<sup>5</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6. 1. 11, reports Polydamas of Pharsalus at Sparta (374) as reporting that Jason contemplated the conquest of Macedonia: *εἰ δὲ εἰκότα λογίζομαι, σκόπει, ἔφη, καὶ ταῦτα. ἔχοντες μὲν γε Μακεδονίαν, ἔνθεν καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ ξύλα ἄγονται, πολὺ δ' ἡπὺ πλείους ἐκείνων ἱκανοὶ ἐσόμεθα ναὺς ποιήσασθαι*. Polydamas was concerned of

course to magnify the grandeur of Jason's designs. Nevertheless Sordi (*LT* 165, 168, 174, 179 f.) interprets the 'alliance' of Jason and Amyntas recorded by Diodorus (15. 60. 2) as a subjection of Macedonia to Jason — rightly perhaps.

For the earlier restoration of Amyntas with Thessalian aid, Diod. 14. 92. 3; cf. Sordi, *LT* 155, with bibliography. There is some reason to suspect that Diodorus duplicates restorations of Amyntas (cf. 15. 19. 2 f., with *Spartan* aid, in 383/2); but in any case it is very unlikely that D. invented Thessalian participation, which presumably he found in Ephorus, though he may have misplaced it in his own record.

of all Thessaly under yet another *tagos* from Pherae. Any more ambitious hopes that Alexander II may have had were removed by the Boeotian intervention under Pelopidas which followed swiftly.<sup>1</sup> The Boeotian ascendancy of the 360s in Thessaly is illustrated by the presence at the battle of Mantinea (362) of allied contingents from both Thessalian groups, that of the League and that of Pherae (and both on the right side).<sup>2</sup> In this period Macedonia herself twice experienced Boeotian interventions in her own succession wars:<sup>3</sup> the young Philip himself was removed to Thebes for three years as a hostage.<sup>4</sup> Philip had no excuse for not knowing that he could not afford to tell himself or anyone else that he had no time or concern for Thessaly. It represented one more potential threat to Macedonia, whether from the Thessalians themselves should they be re-united, or from those Boeotians behind them, whom he knew well and whom he had every reason not to underrate. To neglect no chance of making or keeping good friends in Thessaly, and without alienating the Boeotians, was good policy by every standard. He was encircled by enemies, and needed every good friend he could find. At any time after his successful campaign against the Illyrians was completed (358), any appeal from Thessaly (e.g. from Larissa for help against Pherae) was not a thing to be ignored. The Aleuad (Larissa) connection especially was a valuable one. If we do find reason to believe that Philip did intervene in Thessaly supporting Larissa as early as 358 or early 357, we can be surprised certainly that he found the time to do so. But once granted that he could and did, we can at least feel sure that he is taking up this sector of Macedonian foreign policy where his father and his elder brother had left off, and that in this sense an interpretation which allows him to intervene is really much more convincing than one which does not.

Turning now to the later developments (of 352 and after) we are faced with a Thessaly revolutionized by Philip's great victory over Onomarchus and the Phocians in that year. Pherae now was freed from the tyrant house. Thessaly now was reunited and with Philip's friends in the ascendant, Philip himself the hero of the hour.<sup>5</sup> What were his relations with the reunited Thessalian League from now on? The big question which ought not to be left out of any consideration of the evidence on Philip's earliest interventions is, the date at which he actually got control of Thessaly in the end, by being elected archon of the Thessalian League. Most interpreters have placed this step at some point in the years 344-2; but Sordi has recently placed it in 352, immediately after the great victory. I have always thought that this was right, and Sordi's study is so full and so lucid that I do not propose to re-state her arguments here at length, but merely to summarize and, if I can, reinforce them.<sup>6</sup>

(i) Justin (8. 2. 1) appears to state specifically that Philip became in some sense 'ruler' of Thessaly (elected ruler?), and this in 352, since he connects this development closely with the victory over Onomarchus in a way that eliminates here any possibility of *prolepsis*:

<sup>1</sup> Diod. 15. 61. 2 ff.; 67. 3 f.; Plut. *Pelop.* 26.

<sup>2</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 7. 5. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Plut. *Pelop.* 26-7; Diod. 15. 67. 3 f. And see next note.

<sup>4</sup> Plut. *Pelop.* *ibid.*; Aeschines 2. 29; cf.

Beloch *iii*<sup>2</sup>, 1. 182 n. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Diod. 16. 37. 3; 38. 1-2.

<sup>6</sup> Sordi, *LT* 249 ff.; so now J. A. O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States* (1968), 24 and n. 4, 26.

adversus quem (*sc.* Onomarchum) Thebani Thessalique non ex civibus suis, ne victoris potentiam ferre non possent, sed Philippum Macedoniae regem ducem eligunt, et externae dominationi, quam in suis timuerunt, sponte succedunt. Igitur Philippus, quasi sacrilegii, non Thebanorum, ultor esset, omnes milites coronas laureas sumere iubet . . . etc.

Justin has here woven together two threads of condensed narrative in a singularly unhelpful way. The Thebans have a right to be in it, in the sense that Philip *could* be thought of as avenging them by his defeat of Onomarchus. No doubt they were Philip's allies by now,<sup>1</sup> and if they had joined the Thessalians in pressing him to attack Pherae in 353, Justin's 'ducem eligunt' can be thought to be justified by that. But no one can possibly justify Justin's next sentence, 'et externae . . . succedunt', as applied to the Thebans, who did not come under Philip's 'rule' until 338, and then not voluntarily. This *gaffe* of Justin should not blind us, however, to the fact that these same remarks *when applied to the Thessalians* are not open to the same or similar objections. 'Ducem eligunt' *may* be his way of condensing an account of Philip's election as archon of the League: 'externae dominationi . . . sponte succedunt' does summarize not inaptly what the Thessalians did when they did so elect him. Confused though this passage is, it is unwise to reject out of hand what it tells us about the Thessalians because what it tells us about the Thebans is mostly wrong; and Justin does tie this pretty firmly, for what it is worth, to the year 352.

(ii) Isocrates 5. 20 (part of a catalogue of Philip's advantages and achievements):

τί γὰρ ἐλλέλοιπεν; οὐ Θερταλοὺς μὲν τοὺς πρότερον ἐπάρχοντας Μακεδονίας οὕτως οἰκείως πρὸς αὐτὸν διακεῖσθαι πεποίηκεν ὥσθ' ἐκάστους αὐτῶν μᾶλλον ἐκείνῳ πιστεύειν ἢ τοῖς συμπολιτευομένοις; τῶν δὲ πόλεων τῶν περὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκείνον τὰς μὲν ταῖς εὐεργεσίας πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ συμμαχίαν προσήκται, τὰς δὲ σφόδρα λυπούσας αὐτὸν ἀναστάτους πεποίηκεν;

Sordi made the interpretation of this passage unnecessarily difficult for herself, I suggest, by taking both sentences to refer to Thessaly, the second as well as the first.<sup>2</sup> On that assumption she is on a very difficult wicket, for she is obliged to show (which she tries to do, not altogether convincingly) that Philip by 346 had destroyed enough Thessalian cities to justify Isocrates' last clause. And it remains to be faced that to write 'some of them he has brought into his own alliance' would be a very queer way to write of someone who already has been elected archon of a united Thessalian League (as Sordi believed). It would, in fact, be impossible, really. But this difficulty disappears when it is realized that the second sentence refers not to Thessaly but to Macedonia. And why not? The only *τόπος* referred to in the previous sentence is *Μακεδονίας*. The

<sup>1</sup> The date or occasion when an alliance was made between Philip and the Boeotians is nowhere recorded. But the march of Pammenes *via* the Hellespont to Asia Minor (probably spring 353) must have taken him through the kingdom of Macedonia, with Philip's permission and with his active co-operation along the Thracian coast to

Maroneia (Demosth. 23. 183). Though Pammenes and Philip personally were *ξένοι* one of the other (Plut. *Pelop.* 26. 5; *Suda*, s.v. Karanos), it seems likely that their co-operation was not on a purely private level, but that the alliance already existed.

<sup>2</sup> *LT* 254 ff.



preceding paragraph describes certain conditions in *Macedonia*.<sup>1</sup> Our sentence refers to the Chalcidian and other cities of the North, exactly.

It is only the first sentence of the two quoted above in the text that refers to Thessaly. Isocrates, knowing what Philip's position in Thessaly really was in 346 and writing for readers who also knew this, *may* be alluding here in the first sentence to Philip as archon of Thessaly. If this were so, his choice of words must be recognized as apt: 'has he not made them so closely associated with himself that each group of them individually has more confidence in him than in their fellow league-members?'—as they have shown by electing him, and not a Thessalian, as their archon. This *may* be what he means. I do not know how to prove that he can mean *only* this and nothing else. But I do suggest that the possibility is strongly reinforced by οὐ Θετταλοὺς μὲν τοὺς πρότερον ἐπάρχοντας Μακεδονίας . . . The antithetical design of the sentence is obvious. The Thessalians formerly were the political superiors in some sense of Macedonia: now the position is reversed, it is Philip who in some sense is the political superior to them. By their having elected him archon of their league? This was the possibility we started with: this antithesis seems to make it something more than merely possible. It suggests, to me, that Philip *was* archon already in 346.

The tantalizing allusion in Demosthenes' *First Olynthiac* suggests, to me, that he was archon already in 349.<sup>2</sup> Demosthenes reminded the Athenians of two things which worked at that time to Philip's disadvantage: (1) that he must now fight to get Olynthus, (2) Thessaly. . . . εἴτα τὰ τῶν Θετταλῶν. ταῦτα γὰρ ἀπιστα μὲν ἦν δήπου φύσει καὶ αἰεὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, κομιδῇ δ', ὥσπερ ἦν, καὶ ἔστι νῦν τούτῳ. καὶ γὰρ Παγασὰς ἀπαιτεῖν αὐτόν εἰσιν ἐψηφισμένοι, καὶ Μαγνησίαν κεκωλύκασιν τευχίζειν. ἤκουον δ' ἔγωγέ τινων, ὡς οὐδὲ τοὺς λιμένας καὶ τὰς ἀγορὰς ἔτι δώσοιεν αὐτῷ καρποῦσθαι τὰ γὰρ κοινὰ τὰ Θετταλῶν ἀπὸ τούτων δέοι διοικεῖν, οὐ Φίλιππον λαμβάνειν. εἰ δὲ τούτων ἀποστερήσεται τῶν χρημάτων, εἰς στενὸν κομιδῇ τὰ τῆς τροφῆς τοῖς ξένοις αὐτῷ καταστήσεται.<sup>3</sup>

The root of the whole matter lies in this: are we to infer from the words emphasized that Philip already at this date was archon of Thessaly, or are we not? The allusions to Pagasae and to Magnesia do not help us much here (they concern disputed territory, and the dispute could be between allies). If Demosthenes is reporting accurately (we cannot be sure of this), we learn that still at this time the constitutional organs of the Thessalian League were functioning: *psophismata* were being passed by the Assembly.<sup>4</sup> But this proves nothing about who was its archon. Nor would opposition in the Assembly to Philip, if we believed in it, prove that he cannot have been its archon, unless this assembly was unlike any other Greek assembly we have ever heard of. What may be thought to prove something is the rumour, which Demosthenes reports, that the League was going to rescind an earlier vote whereby the proceeds of Thessalian harbour and market taxation had been put at Philip's

<sup>1</sup> Isoc. *ibid.* 19—ἐπεὶ καὶ Μακεδόνων ἔχει περὶ αὐτὸν τοὺς σπουδαιοτάτους, οὓς εἰκός, εἰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπείρως ἔχουσι, τό γε συμφέρον ἐκείνῳ (= Philip) μᾶλλον ἢ σὲ (= Isocrates) γινώσκειν. ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πολλοὺς ἂν ἴδοις ἐκεῖ κατοικοῦντας, οὐκ ἀδόξους ἀνδρας οὐδ' ἀνοήτους, ἀλλ' οἷς ἐκείνος ἀνακοινούμενος οὐκ ἐλάττω τὴν βασιλείαν πεποίηκεν ἀλλ' εὐχῆς ἀξία διαπέπρακται.

Note especially ἐκεῖ κατοικοῦντας.

<sup>2</sup> So, it seems, Larsen, *op. cit.* 24 and n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Demosth. 1. 21–2.

<sup>4</sup> The character of the League Assembly at this period, whether 'direct' or representative, is uncertain. But it will be agreed, I hope, that there was an Assembly. Cf. Sordi, *LT* 329 ff.; Larsen, *op. cit.* 19.

disposal. Whether Demosthenes had really heard the rumour, or had invented it, whether (if he had heard it) it was true, or not, we have no sure means to determine. Nor can we be absolutely sure that the implied *fact* contained in the rumour (that an earlier vote *had* disposed of the taxes in this way), is a genuine fact.<sup>1</sup> We are safe, however, in inferring that it was a fact acceptable as true by the Athenian audience at that time (otherwise some explanation from Demosthenes would have been essential): and this tells us that the relations of Philip and the League were such, and in Athens were known to be such, that this disposal of the taxes seemed perfectly possible and natural. This seems to me, as it has seemed to some others but by no means to all, practically decisive evidence that Philip was already archon in 349 and had been for some little time previously.<sup>2</sup> To put specific taxes at the disposal of another state or ruler goes quite beyond the bounds of any obligations that we hear of elsewhere as between mere allies. In the century or so of Greek history before 349 we hear from time to time not a little about financial obligations of states which became what may be called permanent allies of another state, including some which though in name *σύμμαχοι* were in reality *ὑπήκοοι* of Athens or Sparta. We hear of *phoros* and *syntaxis*, lump-sums payable annually or on demand to the leaders of a confederacy. But for a city or a league of cities to allocate certain of its internal taxes to be at the disposal of a leader is something we never hear of in the Delian Confederacy even at its most 'institutional'. There is an intimacy here which the Athenians, we can see, never thought fit to impose: even when they increased tribute, or imposed a punitive indemnity, they left the means by which the money was to be raised entirely within the competence of the allied cities themselves. This intimacy implies, demands even, that the leader who benefits by it be not an 'external' leader in the Athenian style but one who is in some sense a member of the community himself, presumably its chief executive officer if it has one. Jason of Pherae is reported to have counted on having the use, as *tagos* of Thessaly, of all the *phoros* which would come in from the subject *periōikoi*.<sup>3</sup> Of the financial and fiscal arrangements of the reformed Thessalian League after his death we know nothing of course,<sup>4</sup> though it may be surmised that some care was taken to try to ensure that the archon was to be a constitutional officer and not an autocrat. With this view of the archonship a vote of the Assembly such as Demosthenes mentions would be perfectly in keeping. Its purpose would have been to supply a war chest for the Phocian war. It would have been passed when Philip was elected archon, presumably after the great victory in 352. And it could be reversed if the situation called for it (if, for example, the archon were not giving satisfaction, which is what Demosthenes is concerned to suggest).

If Demosthenes was reporting accurately, this situation about the taxes in Thessaly had been going on for some time when he spoke in 349 (*ὥς οὐδὲ* . . .

<sup>1</sup> Demosthenes in 344 (6. 22) referred again to Philip and the Thessalian revenues: *ἀρ' οἴεσθε* . . . *προσδοκᾶν* (sc. *τοὺς Θετταλοὺς*) . . . *τοῦτον τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν προσόδους παραιρήσεσθαι*;

<sup>2</sup> So Sordi *LT* 249 ff.; Larsen, op. cit. 24, 26.

<sup>3</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6. 1. 12. *καὶ χρήμασι γε εἰκὸς δῆπον ἡμᾶς ἀφθονωτέροις χρῆσθαι μὴ εἰς νησύδρια ἀποβλέποντας, ἀλλ' ἡπειρωτικὰ ἔθνη*

*καρπουμένους. πάντα γὰρ δῆπον τὰ κύκλῳ φόρον φέρει, ὅταν ταγέηται τὰ κατὰ Θετταλίαν.*

<sup>4</sup> For the year 336 Justin 11. 3. 2 is presumably reliable evidence: 'Cupide haec Thessalis audientibus exemplo patris dux universae gentis creatus erat et vectigalia omnia reditusque suos ei tradiderant.' (The subject of the sentence is Alexander the Great.)

ἐτι δώσοιεν αὐτῷ καρποῦσθαι). I wrote above that even if Demosthenes invented the information, its bearing on the question of Philip's position in Thessaly at this moment is not affected, because it needed to be an invention which suited his position as the Athenians in the Assembly knew it. But it will be recognized, I hope, that the information offered by Demosthenes does practically rule out the possibility that the Athenians thought now of Philip merely as the *ally* of the Thessalians and nothing more. Let us admit, perhaps (though I know of no other case remotely resembling it), that in 352 the Thessalians in their enthusiasm either for the campaign or arising out of the great victory, might have voted the proceeds of these taxes for Philip, merely as ally, to use towards the expenses of the war in the expectation that he and they together would now carry the war on vigorously. The fact is that in 351, 350, and 349 the war was not carried on vigorously by Philip: we hear nothing of any operations by him against the Phocians in these years. Are we to believe either that the League had voted him, as their ally merely, the money from these taxes till further notice, or that it voted him the money each year in spite of the fact that he was not pressing on with the war? I do not believe in either of those things. The only thing that makes such a vote credible, whether an annual vote or a single one 'till further notice' is, I suggest, if it were made in favour of Philip as archon of the League in time of war, when it will have been taken for granted by the league cities that they had some regular obligations to the federal treasury.<sup>1</sup> The Thessalian complaints about these payments as reported by Demosthenes are credible if they were payments to Philip as archon: 'the money ought to be used for the administration of Thessaly, not for Philip to take': this because there was no serious war expenditure in the years 351-49. But it is not really credible that money could ever have been voted in advance in this way and from these sources if Philip was merely an ally, and at this time an inactive one.

An allusion of Polybius to Philip's subjugation of Thessaly shows, it is clear, that Polybius could think of this as having happened *after* the destruction of Olynthus in 348.<sup>2</sup> And it cannot be denied that the most obvious landmark denoting 'subjugation' here would be Philip's election as archon of the League. That Polybius simply made a mistake about this seems unlikely. The question is complicated by the fact that Polybius did not make this allusion in his own person, but in a speech which he gave to the Aetolian Chlaineas, a hostile interpreter of the Macedonian domination from its beginnings (here). It seems not impossible that Polybius could have slanted these remarks of Chlaineas so as to be even at variance with the truth about Philip's election as archon as he (Polybius) knew it, while still remaining justifiable if interpreted as an allusion to the developments of 344-2 in Thessaly whereby certainly Philip did finally strengthen his grip, whatever the date of his election as archon.<sup>3</sup> Whatever the

<sup>1</sup> See *Hell. Oxyrh.* 16. 4 (ed. V. Bartoletti, 1959), for the Boeotian League: *Xen. Hell.* 5. 2. 16; cf. M. N. Tod, *GHI* 111, 15 ff. for the Chalcidian League. Larsen, *op. cit.* 24, 26, 36, 77 f. rightly draws attention to this financial prerogative of these federal governments when they were in proper control of their territories.

<sup>2</sup> Polyb. 9. 28. 2-3 . . . ἡ τῶν Ὀλυνθίων πόλις. ταύτην ἐξανδραποδισάμενος Φίλιππος καὶ παράδειγμα ποιήσας οὐ μόνον τῶν ἐπὶ

Θράκης πόλεων ἐγένετο κύριος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Θετταλοὺς ὑφ' αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατο διὰ τὸν φόβον.

<sup>3</sup> Walbank, *Commentary on Polybius*, ii. ad loc., describes the allusion to Thessaly as 'a simplification', though he himself believes in 342 as the probable date of Philip's election as archon.

For the events of 344-2, *Demosth.* 6. 22; 9. 26; *Diod.* 16. 69. 8, etc.; cf. the long discussion of Sordi, *LT* 275 ff.

truth about this, I do not see how Polybius here can outweigh the contemporary evidence of Demosthenes about the taxes in 349 and earlier.

This conclusion, if it is acceptable, obviously has an important bearing on the evidence we began by considering, that which is concerned with Philip's presence in Thessaly on occasions earlier than 353-2. *Whenever* he was elected archon of the league, whether as early as 352 or as late as 342, the fact itself of his election is the very reverse of insignificant. It is something without precedent or parallel in the affairs of Greek states up to this time, so far as I know. To address one's mind to it seems an elementary need, and from anyone who does address his mind, a real effort of comprehension seems to be required. For a foreign king to be chosen by free election and without compulsion or intimidation to be head of a league of Greek cities is truly astonishing, and especially so in Thessaly, where the *tagos* or archon was no annual officer, but one who never, so far as we know, relinquished the office once he had got it.<sup>1</sup> It is this that has always been (it seems to me) the main strength of the case for putting the election in the years 344-2, as late as possible in Philip's story; because one can argue that by that date an element of intimidation *can* be shown (as well as the much longer familiarity), making the election less paradoxical. But if the evidence really does point very strongly to the early date 352 (and to me it does), then it would seem to follow that we ought not to accept easily any interpretation of the pre-352 evidence which minimizes Philip's earlier recorded dealings with Thessaly. To wipe out from the record everything before 353 seems to lay the whole burden of explanation, or nearly the whole, on the two great campaigns themselves, the first of them a disaster (353), the second a famous victory, the glory of which Philip himself was careful to share with Apollo.<sup>2</sup> The Thessalians themselves must have been filled with enthusiasm, perhaps more than merely political and secular: perhaps the god himself (Philip his declared champion) really was now inspiring this master of war and his men. Could something of this sort have moved the citizens in Thessaly to this un-Greek and un-Thessalian vote by which they elected him archon, all or nearly all because of the things they had seen in this one campaign? To call it impossible goes beyond what I for one would dare. But I do think it improbable in the extreme.

A wave of genuine enthusiasm in 352, of however many different sorts, is something one simply must believe in. But for myself I feel the need to believe, too, in everything I can lay my hands on from the previous years, which might give an inkling of a process, for the most part vanished from view, by which over the five years before 353 Philip had become a familiar figure in a number of Thessalian cities, a trusted friend of a number of influential Thessalians, a *xenos* in some noble families who could see him, and especially so in Larissa, to have taken up the role they remembered of his brother and his father, sharing their fear of Pherae and their aversion to its tyrants and their ambitions. Incidentally, his brother (Alexander II) had given his Thessalian allies a fright, by holding on to Larissa and Crannon after 'liberating' them, seventeen years ago now.<sup>3</sup> The friends of Philip and others in 352 will not have forgotten this. They were not likely to elect a Macedonian king as their archon

<sup>1</sup> Sordi, *LT* 336; Larsen, *op. cit.* 24.

<sup>2</sup> Justin 8. 2. 3 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Diod. 15. 61. 5; 67. 4.

unless they thought they could trust him thoroughly, on a longer acquaintance with him rather than a shorter one (unless one takes a very cynical view of Philip's character). I agree with Ehrhardt that it is very difficult to see how Philip can have captured Pagasae in late 354 (or early 353), and that the emendation in the text of Diodorus which demands this of us ought to be eschewed. But an intervention by Philip in 358 (or very early 357) in the course of which he met and married Philinna of Larissa seems to me to supply just what we need to make the later development more credible. And personally I do not rule out the possibility of a second intervention in 355 (though none is attested), because the long delay before the Thessalians began to take any active part in the Phocian War suggests as a cause that the feud between the League and Pherae was active at this time.<sup>1</sup> On Philip's side, his engagements elsewhere in 355 were less pressing than those of the previous year: from this point of view a campaign in Thessaly in the spring or summer of 355 need not be ruled out. It was to his advantage to develop any contacts he had made already there, and (looking further afield) to make himself known to the Boeotians as the ally of their allies in Thessaly and the enemy of their enemies.

In 355 Central Greece could be seen to be on the brink of a considerable war, of which from the start Philip naturally was an interested observer.<sup>2</sup> Thessaly was his lead into this circuit, and he was not the man to insulate himself from all this, even though the obscurity of the future events around Delphi, and his own preoccupations in the parts towards Thrace, made his participation on a grand scale still at this time premature. If he did intervene now, obviously it cannot have been with results that were decisive or far-reaching (Diodorus excluded the campaign, if there was one, from his perfunctory record).<sup>3</sup> But if he did no more than give to Larissa and the League the reinforcements which at this moment they could not get from Thebes (occupied with the Phocians), this could have enabled them to stand up to the tyrants of Pherae, and could explain why in the autumn of 355 the League cities felt able to vote at last for the overdue declaration of an Amphictyonic War on the Phocians.<sup>4</sup> Whether Pherae, too, joined in this vote is not clear (Diodorus wrote merely 'the Thes-salians'). The fact that the Magnetes, normally subject to Pherae, are listed by Diodorus among those who aligned themselves against the Phocians now, suggests that Pherae did toe the Amphictyonic line, temporarily.<sup>5</sup> But the relatively modest size of the Thessalian army in action next year (354) suggests equally strongly that Pherae was not participating then;<sup>6</sup> and in 353 Pherae is found actively co-operating with the Phocians, the signal for Philip to be called

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Sordi, *LT* 235 ff. for a different explanation of this inactivity, not to my mind convincing.

<sup>2</sup> It must have become clear by spring 355 that the Boeotians and Locrians alone were not going to be able to coerce the Phocians quickly: cf. Diod. 16. 24. 4; 25. 1 ff., for the campaigns of 356.

<sup>3</sup> So Westlake, *op. cit.* 166 ff., writing of the years 358-6, thought it possible that P. 'sent more than one expeditionary force into Thessaly', maintaining a 'balance of power' between the tyrants and the League.

<sup>4</sup> Diod. 16. 28. 4; 29. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Diod. 16. 29. 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.* 30. 4: 6,000 men including their "*πλησιοχώρων συμμάχων*". Contrast this with the paper strength of Jason's army of Thessaly when united, without his mercenaries: 6,000 cavalry, more than 10,000 hoplites, and peltasts supplied by the *perioikoi* (Xen. *Hell.* 6. 1. 8 f.). As Westlake (*op. cit.* 170 f.) writes shrewdly, 'However, even if the neighbouring tribes supplied only a thousand men in all, this army' (of 354) 'does not represent the full fighting strength of Thessaly, and large reserves must have been left to watch any movement by the tyrants'.

in by Larissa (the Aleuadai).<sup>1</sup> Any *rapprochement* (as Sordi sees it) of Pherae and the League on the death of Alexander of Pherae (358–7?) was evidently brief and ineffective. Insecurity, still, of Thessalian affairs in these years perhaps did invite further reinforcement by Philip in 355 as I have suggested. In any case it was this endemic malaise of the Thessalians, one ought most probably to conclude, that brought them to entrust the office and the power of the archonship to the King of the Macedonians rather than to any single living Thessalian.<sup>2</sup> The consequences of this decision were something that the Thessalians had to live with for the next 150 years.

#### ADDENDUM

Demosth. 9. 25—καίτοι πανθ' ὅσ' ἐξαμάρτηται καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις . . . καὶ τοῖς ἡμετέροις προγόνους . . . ἐλάττον' ἐστίν . . . ὃν Φίλιππος ἐν τρισὶ καὶ δέκ' οὐχ ὅλοις ἔτεσιν οἷς ἐπιπολάζει ἡδίκηκε τοὺς Ἕλληνας, . . . even if it is accurate, does not rule out *interventions* by Philip earlier than 353; it only rules out aggressions or conquests, which no one has ever claimed for him in his Thessalian activities pre-353.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

G. T. GRIFFITH

<sup>1</sup> Diod., *ibid.* 14. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Isoc. 5. 20: Justin 8. 2. 1 f. See above pp. 73–5.