Classical Quarterly **41** (ii) 496–508 (1991) *Printed in Great Britain*

THE SOURCES OF JUSTIN ON MACEDONIA TO THE DEATH OF PHILIP

I. INTRODUCTION

In this article I am making what is, as far as I know, the first systematic analysis of Justin books 7, 8 and 9.[1] The method is that which I employed in analysing the sources of Diodorus 16 in *CQ* 31 (1937), 79ff. and 32 (1938), 137ff. Previous scholars had looked for similarities between the fragments of ancient historians and details in the text of Diodorus, and they had taken any such similarity as proof of a particular source being followed. They had carried their method to extremes: A. Momigliano, for instance, had concluded that Diodorus changed his source 12 times within 23 chapters, and R. Laqueur 18 times within 4 chapters in book 16.[2] My system was to define separable Groups of narrative on the basis of fullness, accuracy, military and political detail, and attitude to the general theme, and to see how far any one Group could be attributed to an ancient author. I begin, therefore, with separable Groups of narrative.

[1] The following abbreviations are used:

Ellis, *Amyntas*	J. R. Ellis, 'Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great', *JHS* 91 (1971), 15–24.
HM 2 (Griffith)	Chapters by G. T. Griffith in *A History of Macedonia* 2 (Oxford, 1979).
HM 2 (Hammond)	Chapters by N. G. L. Hammond ditto.
Hamilton, *C*	J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch Alexander: a Commentary* (Oxford, 1969).
Hammond, *AG*^{2}	N. G. L. Hammond, *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman* (Bristol, 1989).
Hammond, *MS*	N. G. L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State* (Oxford, 1989).
Hammond, *THA*	N. G. L. Hammond, *Three Historians of Alexander: the So-called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius* (Cambridge, 1983).
Heckel, *Marsyas*	W. Heckel, 'Marsyas', *Hermes* 108 (1980), 444–62.
Philip of Macedon	M. B. Hatzopoulos and L. D. Loukopoulos edd., *Philip of Macedon* (Athens, 1980).

References are to the Teubner text of 1972 ed. O. Seel. Translations are my own. I am most grateful for helpful comments on the first draft of this article by Dr E. Baynham of the University of Newcastle, N.S.W., where it was written. J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London, 1976 and G. L. Cawkwell, *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1978) did not discuss the sources of Justin at all. *HM* 2 (Griffith) mentioned passages from Justin with the addition '? Theopompus' (208f. with the footnotes) or 'Theopompus' (560), and 'the Greek source(s) of Trogus' (627), but usually without any such qualification. I opted for Theopompus as Justin's source in *HM* 2.9 and 12 for the oracle about Caranus – in this article I put forward a different view – but I did not express a view in other references to Justin. In *THA*, pp. 88ff., I argued that Cleitarchus was the source of Justin 9.5.8–9.6.8 and 9.8.1–3, and that Satyrus was the source of Justin 9.7.1–14. I adhere to those arguments in this article.

Most scholars have discussed the sources of Justin (Trogus) in general terms rather than in specific books of Justin. A. Enmann, *Untersuchungen über die Quellen des Pompeius Trogus für die griechische und sicilische Geschichte* (Dorpat, 1880) was an exception, but he did not deal with books 7, 8 and 9. Of the divide between book 6 and book 7 he was content with the general remark: 'damit beginnt auch das Gebiet des Theopomp, der von nun an an die Stelle des Ephorus tritt' (p. 111). An early theory, that Trogus followed Timagenes, who himself had drawn on various sources, was overthrown by O. Seel, *Die Praefatio des Pompeius Trogus* (Erlangen, 1955), pp. 18ff. The literature on the subject was well reviewed by E. Forni, *Valore storico e fonti di Pompeo Trogo* (Urbino, 1958), pp. 21–44, to which should be added the bibliography in O. Seel's Teubner text of Justin, pp. xix–xxviii.

[2] For these and other criticisms of their methods see *CQ* 31 (1937), 79–81.

Group 1: Justin 7.1.1–7.4.2

The text praises the Macedonians for their diligence (7.1.4, 'industria'), for their toughness in battle which was due to almost daily practice, and the glory won by their fame as warriors (7.2.6). It praises the Macedonian kings also for their excellence ('virtus' being probably a translation of ἀρετή). That sort of tribute is paid to most of the early kings individually: Emathio at 7.1.1 'virtutis', Caranus at 7.1.9 'religiose', Argeus at 7.2.5 'moderate', Amyntas at 7.2.13 'propria virtute', and Alexander at 7.2.13–14 'egregia indole omnium virtutum' and at 7.4.2 'virtute'. It was the combination of the people's 'industria' and the 'virtus' of the kings which carried Macedonia first to the conquest of its neighbours and then to the rule over peoples and nations as far as the extreme limits of the East (7.1.4 'usque extremos Orientis terminos').

These opening chapters of book 7 are somewhat simplistic. Faith in oracles, prophecies and auspices is prominent at 7.1.7, 7.1.8, 7.2.1–4, and 7.2.9–10. For instance the oracle which ordered Caranus to follow goats as leaders in seeking a kingdom was duly fulfilled, and it was to commemorate their service to him that he called Edessa 'Aegaeae' and his people 'Aegeades',[3] these names being onomatopoeic, like the Greek word for a goat αἴξ. One might translate the new names as 'Bleaters' and 'Bleatmen'. The story of the baby king in the cradle being brought to the battlefield and inspiring the Macedonian soldiers with the courage which won them a victory is told in an unsophisticated manner. The story of Alexander disguising youths as young women and ordering them to kill the wanton Persian envoys was a piece of Macedonian folklore, on which Herodotus drew also for his lengthy version of the episode (5.18–20).[4] This attempt to conceal the shame of Macedonia having been for a generation subject to Persia is simple and not narrated tongue in cheek. The rise of Macedonia to world power is presented as a steady progress of growth: 7.1.2 'incrementa', 7.1.12 'valida incrementorum fundamenta', and 7.4.2 'regnum ampliavit'. The marriage of the daughter of Amyntas to Bubares is said to ensure 'the peace', as if it was contracted between the aristocrats of two states rather than between the daughter of a client king and an official of the Persian Empire (7.3.9–7.4.1).

Group 2: Justin 7.4.5–8; 7.5.4–8; 7.6.10–12; and 9.7.1–14

The first two passages portray Eurydice, wife of Amyntas III and mother of Philip II, as a monster of villainy, infidelity, lust and ruthlessness. There are very full details of the royal family and of the children of Amyntas' two wives, whereas historical events figure very briefly (e.g. at 7.4.6). The crimes which were attributed to Eurydice are certainly fictitious.[5] Whereas in Justin the death of Alexander II is due to plotting by Eurydice (7.5.4), his death during a war-dance was caused by 'the party of Ptolemy' according to Marsyas Macedon (*FGrHist* 135/6 F 3); and in Diodorus 15.71.1, probably following Ephorus, 'Ptolemy Alorites, son of Amyntas' (i.e. of Amyntas II)[6] assassinated Alexander. Again, whereas Justin says that the death of Perdiccas III was brought about by the treacherous plot of Eurydice (7.5.6), all other writers stated that he was killed in battle against the Illyrians.

[3] The MSS. reading 'Aegeadas' is preferable to O. Abel's emendation to 'Argeadas', because the latter lacks the onomatopoeic element, the sound of 'bleating'.

[4] See *HM* 2 (Hammond), pp. 98f.

[5] See *HM* 2 (Hammond), pp. 182f. and *Philip of Macedon*, p. 168.

[6] A genealogy is provided in *HM* 2 (Hammond) facing p. 176; see p. 182.

At 7.6.10–12 Philip was reported to have married Olympias. She was 'the daughter of Neoptolemus, the Molossian king, the marriage being arranged by the bride's cousin[7] on her father's side, Arybbas, who was her guardian and king of the Molossians, he having married Troas, sister of Olympias, which marriage was the cause of his destruction and of all his ills. For while he hoped to obtain an increase of this kingdom through his relationship with Philip, he was deprived of his own kingdom and grew old in exile.'

At 9.7.1–14, having described the assassination of Philip by Pausanias, Justin continued as follows. 'It has been believed also that Pausanias was set upon him by Olympias, the mother of Alexander, and that Alexander himself had not been unaware of the [intended] murder of his father.' Other relationships within the royal family are supplied, and a series of horrendous acts by Olympias follow, most of them palpably invented and fictitious.[8] There is a link between 7.5.8 and 9.7.13 in the mention of 'the little boy' (the grandson of Eurydice) and 'the little girl', which Olympias had once been.

It is obvious that this Group is entirely different in content and in attitude from Group 1. We shall see that it is also poles apart from Group 3.

Group 3: Justin 7.6.3–9; 8.1.1–8.6.8; 9.1.1–9.5.7

At 7.6.3 Justin begins his detailed account of the rule of Philip II with a fine rhetorical period, in which the situation of Macedonia in 359 is analysed in a very sophisticated manner:

> At the beginning of things, when on the one hand the deaths of the brothers unworthily slain, on the other the multitude of enemies, on the one hand the fear of plots, on the other the impoverishment due to continual warring and to the exhaustion of the kingdom were pressing upon the tender years of the novice-king from this side and from that, he thought that he must sort out the wars which were converging from different directions at one and the same time, because many peoples were aiming at the subjugation of Macedonia as if by conspiratorial agreement; for he was not equal to tackling them all, and so he settled some wars by an *ad hoc* pact, and he concluded others by attacking his easiest opponents, so that victory fortified his soldiers' panicky state of mind and also made his enemies give up their scorn of him.

This passage is most remarkable in its comprehensive grasp, its keen insight into Philip's situation, and its psychological touches, such as the soldiers' feelings and the neighbours' contempt.[9] We see the same grasp and a similar rhetorical power in the first sentence of the next book, 8.1.1–4, which describes the situation in the Greek city-states when they became involved with Macedonia:

> In their desire to exercise power over one another the states of Greece all lost their own power.[10] Because they rushed headlong into mutual annihilation, they realised only when they were subjugated that the very thing individual states were losing was being lost by them all; seeing that Philip, the king of Macedonia, perched as it were on a watch-tower, having laid his ambushes against the liberties of one and all, while he fed the flames of inter-state rivalries by affording help to the weaker party, compelled conquerors and conquered alike to accept enslavement to a king.

The writer looked forward to the final day of defeat at Chaeronea. 'This day brought for the whole of Greece an end to the glory of supremacy and to aeons of

[7] The correct relationship of Arybbas to Olympias was paternal uncle; so G. N. Cross, *Epirus* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 39.

[8] *Philip of Macedon*, p. 174.

[9] The corresponding passages in Diod. 16.2.5–3.6 and 16.4.1–7 provided many more facts but showed less psychological insight. A modern account of the period is given in *HM* 2 (Griffith), pp. 210–12.

[10] This point was made at greater length by Isocrates in *Philippus* 43–4 and in *Ep.* 3.

liberty' (9.3.11 'hic dies universae Graeciae et gloriam dominationis et vetustissimam libertatem finivit'). In the writer's opinion the Greeks had themselves to blame. He censured individual states for their stupidity: Thebes at 8.1.4f. ('imbecillo animo... superbe'); Thebes and Thessaly at 8.2.1–2 ('externae dominationi... sponte succedunt'); Athens at 8.2.8–12 ('nequaquam simili aut virtute aut causa'); the Thracian kings at 8.3.14–15; Thessaly and Boeotia at 8.4.4–5 ('crudescente ira'); Greece and especially Thebes and Sparta at 8.4.7–9 ('foedum prorsus miserandumque spectaculum').

The progress of Philip towards the conquest of Greece and the cunning and treacherous methods which enabled him to outwit the individual Greek states are foreshadowed in 8.1.1–4. Examples follow in the detailed narrative. Philip victimises his own allies at 8.3.1–5; succeeds by treachery in Thrace at 8.3.6; practises rapine and piracy at 8.3.12–13; commits a criminal act of brigandage at 8.3.15; acts with deceit and bad faith towards the Phocians at 8.5.1–4; and cunningly dissimulates in his dealings with the Greek states after his victory at Chaeronea at 9.4.1. On the other hand, the ability of Philip, 'perched as it were on a watch-tower', is never in doubt. The narrative supplies many examples of his ingenuity: in dealing with Athens at 7.6.6; in obtaining control of Thessaly's cavalry at 7.6.8–9; in acting as champion of Apollo at 8.2.3–7; in outwitting the Thracian kings at 8.3.15; in outmanoeuvring the delegates of the Greek states at 8.4.10–12; in outwitting Arybbas at 8.6.4–8; in practising piracy and in paying for war by war at 9.1.5 and 9; in outwitting Atheas and defeating him by guile at 9.2.5–15; and in calling himself not king of Greece but leader of Greece at 9.4.2.

The focus of these passages of Group 3 is on the foreign policy of Philip. References to conditions within Macedonia and to the Macedonian court are few but interesting. Philip is said to have spread a rumour in the barbarian kingdoms and in the richest Greek states in 351 that he wished to employ contractors 'at great expense' to undertake the building of city-walls, temples and shrines within Macedonia (8.3.7–8);[11] but when contractors came to offer their services, 'they were frustrated by delay after delay and alarmed by the force of the royal majesty, and in silence they departed'. Then, in 345, Philip transplanted 'peoples and cities' (8.5.7 'populos et urbes', a hendiadys for entire city-populations). In accordance with his own whim he placed some on his frontiers and others opposite his enemies. He used them to strengthen some cities and to weaken other cities (8.5.7–8.6.1). The transplantation of the people is described in harrowing terms ('miseranda ubique facies et excidio similis erat').[12] The horrors in 8.5.8–13 rival those suffered by the Phocians at the end of the Sacred War at 8.5.5–6.

'Philip had for long concealed his intention to make war on Athens' (9.3.4). On recovering from the wound which he had suffered at the hands of the Triballi he attacked Athens. Afraid that once Athens was conquered they would be consumed next, the Thebans joined Athens. Some states supported them; others were driven by fear of war to Philip's side. 'The Athenians were far superior in the number of soldiers, but they were defeated by Macedonian valour, hardened by continuous

[11] For the building of fortifications at this time see *HM* 2 (Hammond), pp. 653f. and Hammond, *MS*, pp. 154–9; and the current excavations at Vergina (Aegeae) and Pella, where Eurydice's shrine to Eukleia and the lay-out of the Pella acropolis fall within Philip's reign. See *HM* 1.165 for the gateway at Edessa, and my remark in *HM* 2.670 'very large sums were available evidently for the building of new towns and for the fortification and embellishment of old towns in the years after 348.'

[12] The misery of the dispossessed was a favourite topic for rhetorical display, as in D. 19.65 and Livy 32.13.5–9.

warfare' (9.3.9). Not unmindful of their previous glory the Athenians fell at their posts, 'their wounds being on the fronts of their bodies'. 'Philip cunningly concealed his delight at his victory'... 'on that day' there was no jovial banqueting, no fun and games[13]... 'so that no one should feel he was the victor' (9.4.1). He treated Athens mildly and Thebes harshly. At a convention at Corinth he fixed the terms of peace for the whole of Greece ('pacis legem universae Graeciae... statuit'). 'The Lacedaemonians alone scorned the king and his terms, regarding as servitude a peace which was not brought about by the states themselves but was imposed by the victor' (9.5.3). His aim was to attack Persia.

Within this Group there are also passages which are concerned with Philip's treatment of his relatives, his behaviour at court and the circumstances which led to his assassination. 'Of his step-mother's sons' he killed one, and then after defeating Olynthus he killed the other two in an act of 'parricide' (8.3.10–11).[14] Planning to eject from his kingdom Arybbas, who was closely related through Olympias, he summoned her brother, Alexander, 'a boy of becoming beauty' ('puerum honestae pulchritudinis'), and pretending to be in love forced the boy into the habit of sexual depravity ('ad stupri consuetudinem'). When Alexander became twenty, Philip robbed Arybbas and handed the kingdom to the boy, 'criminally in both cases' (8.6.7).[15]

The source of Group 3 was certainly a Greek writer, proud of Greece's and especially Athens' past but disillusioned and embittered by the mutual destruction and the crass stupidity of the contemporary Greek states. The conquest by Philip was said to end Greek freedom. The writer saw two sides of Philip. He admired Philip's extraordinary ability in the early years, his exploitation of the divisions which split the Greek world, his clever pose as champion of Apollo, and his ingenuity up to and after the Battle of Chaeronea. On the other hand, he condemned Philip as treacherous, hypocritical, cruel, ruthless and spendthrift, and as a criminal guilty of parricide and of the debauchery of his young brother-in-law.

Group 4: Justin 9.5.8–9.6.8 and 9.7.1–3

These passages are interrelated by the delight in reporting scandals in the sexual life of the Macedonian court. Olympias was expelled 'for suspicion of sexual depravity' (9.5.9 'propter stupri suspitionem'), a charge which is given in more detail in Justin 11.11.3–5. At the age of puberty Pausanias suffered perverse sexual abuse by Attalus, and later as a youth homosexual rape by Attalus and Attalus' guests 'like any male prostitute' (9.5.6 'velut scortorum iure'). Philip fathered a son Arrhidaeus 'on a dancing-girl of Larissa' (9.8.2 'ex Larissaea saltatrice'). As we shall see when we consider the identification of the source, this Group contains many inaccuracies, which are incompatible with Group 2.

[13] This passage is incompatible with the 'story' (λέγουσί τινες) in Diod. 16.87 (cf. Plut. *Demosth.* 20.3) that immediately after the victory Philip and his Friends had a drunken party, Philip became abusive, and he was brought to his senses by Demades. I attributed the Diodorus passage to Diyllus as source in *CQ* 31 (1937), 84 and 90.

[14] 'Parricide' is appropriate for a Greek writer. Macedonians saw the elimination of a pretender to the throne as the penalty for treason.

[15] The loss of his kingdom by Arybbas had been mentioned already at 7.6.12. The repetition here suggests that the passages belong to different Groups, as we are maintaining.

II. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE SOURCES USED IN GROUPS 1, 2, 3 AND 4

For Group 1 we need a Macedonian writer, who wrote with patriotic fervour of Macedonia's early kings and industrious people. It was this writer to whom Trogus turned for 'Macedonian origins and the kings from the founder of the race, Caranus' (*Prologue* VII). The obvious choice is Marsyas Macedon, who wrote *Makedonika*, beginning 'from the first king of the Macedonians' (Souda s.v. = *FGrHist* 135/6 T 1). A Macedonian of Pella, brought up with Alexander (i.e. as a Royal Page), half-brother of Antigonus Monophthalmus, commander of Antigonus' fleet in 307 (T 3) and dying some years later. His *Makedonika* broke off in 331, when Alexander returned to Syria from Egypt. No doubt he took part in the expedition of Alexander in Asia.[16]

Some points in Group 1 support this identification. The extension of Macedonian power to the farthest East (7.1.4) would have been vivid in the experience of Marsyas Macedon. Paeonia was said to be 'now a part of Macedonia' (7.1.5), which would be appropriate to Marsyas, born *c.* 356, since Paeonia was annexed in the 350s. The earliest origins in 7.1.1–5 were derived from the *Iliad*: Emathia as the country (*Iliad* 14.226), whence the first king is supposed to be Emathio (7.1.1); Pelegonus and Asteropaeus (2.848a); and Pelasgi, to whose god at Dodona a prayer was made by Achilles (16.233). Alexander and his Companions drew their inspiration from the *Iliad* and especially from Achilles.[17] Marsyas was one of them. Caranus was the founder of the Greek settlement of Emathia (7.1.7). We know that in Alexander's time Caranus was held to be the first Temenid king, descended from Heracles (Plu. *Alex.* 2.1).[18] It was due to Caranus that peoples of varied races were incorporated into the one body 'Macedonia', and it was from this basis that Macedonia was to become great (7.1.12). Such concepts were natural in Marsyas, who grew up during the reign of Philip. We have seen that the author behind Group 1 had a simple faith in oracles, prophecies and auspices, and a belief in particular in the valour and excellence of the Macedonians. Both the faith and the belief were salient characteristics of Alexander and his Companions.[19]

When we consider the fragments of Marsyas Macedon, we are faced with the difficulty that there are fragments also of Marsyas of Philippi and of Marsyas of Tabae. The former of these two wrote in the late Hellenistic period; he too wrote a *Makedonika* (*FGrHist* 135/6 F 4, F 5, F 6). The latter is not relevant to our inquiry. Marsyas Macedon was sometimes called 'the older Marsyas' in contrast to 'the younger' Marsyas of Philippi. In Jacoby's arrangement of the fragments of the three bearers of the name Marsyas, F 1, being of 'the older Marsyas', came from the sixth book of his *Makedonika*. It mentioned Myrtanon, a fort in Thrace, to which Demosthenes referred in a context to be dated *c.* 347 (18.27). Since there were ten

[16] See Heckel, *Marsyas* for his career.

[17] For example, Alexander and his Companion ran a race naked in honour of Achilles and garlanded the tomb of Achilles in the Troad (Plut. *Alex.* 15.8).

[18] Caranus was introduced into the Temenid genealogy by Archelaus; so H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* (Oxford, 1956), i.64, *HM* 2 (Hammond), pp. 5 and 9, and for the head of Caranus on the coins of Archelaus and subsequent kings see Hammond in *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*, ed. W. G. Moon (Wisconsin, 1983), p. 253. W. Greenwalt argued in *GRBS* 26 (1985), 49 that Caranus was introduced first by Amyntas III, but he failed to deal with the arguments in favour of Archelaus.

[19] See Hammond, *AG*^{2}, pp. 264 and 271.

books of *Makedonika*, the mention of this fort in the sixth book indicates that the central part of the *Makedonika* was the reign of Philip. F 11, recording the death of Alexander II in 368, came from the third book of Marsyas' *Makedonika*. If it is the work of Marsyas Macedon, then the history of Macedonia before the reign of Philip II occupied some three books. At the other end two books may have sufficed for Alexander III down to early 331.[20] The scale of the work was such that Trogus could easily abbreviate what he wanted from the first two or three books.

Other fragments are of uncertain attribution. F 13, mentioning Amathus as a son of Macedon, is incompatible with the position of Emathio in Justin 7.1.1, but only if Amathus is a variant form of Emathio, which is doubtful. F 14, in which Caranus was succeeded by Coenus, is incompatible with Justin 7.2.1, where the successor is Perdiccas. Both of these fragments could have been from Marsyas of Philippi.[21] The danger involved in trying to argue from the unassigned fragments is illustrated by the following instance. Didymus, commenting on Demosthenes 12.43, said that Philip lost his eye at Methone through being struck by an arrow (*τόξευμα*) 'as narrated by Theopompus, with which Marsyas agrees' (F 16). This event was reported also by Duris (*FGrHist* 70 F 36). A. Momigliano deduced from all this that, because Diodorus 16.34.5 used *τόξευμα* in describing the same event, Diodorus followed 'certamente' Duris, who himself had followed Theopompus[22] (he did not mention Marsyas F 16). Yet neither Didymus nor Diodorus was quoting verbatim. In any writer *τόξευμα* is the common word for an arrow.

The author behind Group 2 was a malicious scandalmonger with little or no regard for historical truth and with a penchant for horrendous tales. The most likely candidate on general grounds is Satyrus of Callatis, who wrote his *Life of Philip* a century or so after Philip's death, by which time the true facts were of little or no concern to most readers. Particular grounds for choosing Satyrus are provided by Justin 9.7.1–4. There 'it has been believed' that Pausanias was set on Philip by Olympias, and that Alexander had knowledge of his father's [impending] murder; that Alexander had feared as a rival a brother born of a step-mother; and that at the banquet Alexander quarrelled first with Attalus, then with Philip, so that Philip drew his sword and was with difficulty persuaded not to kill his son. A similar story was told by Satyrus, as cited by Athenaeus 13.557d–e and 560c. In *THA* 89f. I made a comparison of the two stories. I concluded that Justin and Athenaeus went back to a common source, and that the source was Satyrus, *Life of Philip*.

If my conclusion is correct, Satyrus was the source used by Trogus for what we read in Justin 7.4.5–8 and 7.5.4–8, both being the record of Eurydice's crimes; and also for Justin 7.6.10–12, in which we learn of the complicated relations of Arybbas and the disastrous end to which his ties with Philip led him.

The probable source of the passages of Group 3 is a work of Theopompus of Chios, *Philippicae Historiae*, in fifty-eight books. Residing at Philip's court in 342 (*FGrHist* 115 T 7), Theopompus was censured by Speusippus for his behaviour there, and later when he went to Egypt he was regarded as an interfering busybody by Ptolemy, who

[20] See Heckel, 459, who makes similar divisions. I differ from him as regards the meaning of *'Αλεξάνδρου 'Αγωγή* (T 1) and *τὰ περὶ 'Αλέξανδρον* (F 2 and F 3). He thinks on p. 459 that both titles refer to the last two books of *Makedonika*, whereas I believe that the former was a separate work, as in T 1.

[21] Heckel attributed F 13 and F 14 to Marsyas of Philippi.

[22] For references and further points see *CQ* 31 (1937), 81. The quotation is from 'Le fonti della Storia Greca e Macedone nel libro xvi di Diod.', *Rend. Ist. Lombardo* 65 (1932), 523–43, p. 530.

would have liked to do away with him (T 2). 'He was remarkable for wide and critical research and for the harshness of his verdicts.'[23] His history of the period of Philip began in 360/359. This fits 'the beginning of things' ('principio rerum'), which Justin, epitomising Trogus, marked at 7.6.3. The judgements of the Greek states in Justin 8.1–2 and 4, and 9.3.5–9 were certainly harsh and censorious.

The attitude towards Philip in Justin, as we have seen, was two-sided. Theopompus had the same attitude. We learn this principally from Polybius, whose critique of Theopompus at 8.9–11 may be summarised as follows. On the one hand Theopompus said that 'Europe had never produced such a man all in all as Philip, the son of Amyntas'.[24] On the other hand, he represented Philip as 'most intemperate in his pursuit of women', 'most unprincipled in the matter of friendships and alliances', 'a destroyer of city-states through treachery, deceit and violence', and 'addicted to heavy drinking' (Plb. 8.9.1–4).[25] All these features appeared in Justin: praise of Philip's ability at 7.6.3–5 and occasionally thereafter; and condemnation of Philip's treachery to allies (8.3.1–5), destruction or transplantation of cities (8.3.3–5, 8.3.11, 8.5.5, and 8.5.7–13), and deceit (8.3.1, 8.3.6, 8.3.15, 8.5.1 and 4, and 9.2.14). Polybius also stressed the harshness of Theopompus' strictures on the Companions of Philip (Plb. 8.9.6–10.11). Justin paid attention not to womanising but to homosexual excess in Philip (8.6.5–8).

At the same time Theopompus was 'remarkable for wide and critical research'. Signs of this research appeared in Justin 7.6.3–9 (Philip's early years), 8.3.7–9 (Philip's building plans), 8.5.7–6.2 (Philip's transplantation of cities), 9.2.1–16 (Philip's Scythian campaign), and 9.4.6–10 (conditions at Thebes after the Battle of Chaeronea). Thus the summary of Theopompus' merits and defects which Polybius based on his own reading of the *Philippicae Historiae* fits precisely the passages of Group 3. We now ascribe these passages to the use by Trogus of Theopompus' work.[26]

For the passages of Group 4 we need an author who is at variance with other writers. At 9.5.9 Cleopatra is a sister of Attalus, whereas in Athenaeus, who at 557d was abbreviating the work of Satyrus, Cleopatra is 'the sister of Hippostratus and the niece of Attalus'. When Philip married Cleopatra, 'Olympias had been expelled on suspicion of sexual depravity' (9.5.9 'expulsa ... propter stupri suspitionem'), whereas in Athenaeus 557d Philip 'brought Cleopatra in alongside Olympias' (*ταύτην ἐπεισάγων τῇ Ὀλυμπιάδι*) and after the wedding Olympias fled to Epirus. Then

[23] G. L. Barber in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*[2], edd. N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard (Oxford, 1970), p. 1059.

[24] It is important to remember that Polybius was familiar with all the work of Theopompus, whereas we have only fragments by which to judge. Polybius knew that Theopompus was praising Philip highly in this sentence (as Theopompus did also in F 256). The attempt by W. R. Connor in *GRBS* 8 (1967), 138f. to make the sentence 'ironic', to suppose that Polybius failed to realise this, and even to think he (Connor) has a better understanding of the Greek expression *τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα* is misjudged. Polybius, after all, knew his author and his own language better than any of us moderns can hope to do.

[25] The view of Polybius is supported by that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus who wrote thus of Theopompus. He was uniquely able 'to examine the hidden motives of actions and of actors, investigate all the states of the psyche which are not easily discovered by most men, and reveal all the mysteries of seeming virtue and latent vice' (*FGrHist* 115 F 20a (7)). The heavy drinking of Philip and his Companions in Theopompus F 236 took place when the Athenian envoys were about to negotiate, i.e. some days after the battle. It is not mentioned by Justin.

[26] The fact that Theopompus' title, *Philippicae Historiae*, was adopted by Trogus for his own Universal History is a strong indication that Trogus used the account of Theopompus for the reign of Philip.

there is a similar clash between Justin 9.5.9 and 9.7.2–5, where Olympias fled to Epirus after the wedding. Both Athenaeus 557d and Justin 9.7.2–5 came from Satyrus (see p. 502 above).

There are differences too between Justin 9.6.1–8 and Diodorus 16.91.4–94. In Justin Philip was struck down as he was walking between the two Alexanders without his Bodyguards 'in the narrow space' ('occupatis angustiis' in both Justin and Trogus, *Prologue* IX), i.e. in the *parodos* leading towards the theatre. In Diodorus Philip sent his friends ahead, entered the theatre alone and was killed by one of several Bodyguards who were in the *orchestra*. The account in Diodorus is certainly more dependable. It was based probably on the work of Diyllus.

There are further differences between Justin and Diodorus. In Justin the assassin Pausanias is 'a youth' (9.6.4 'adulescens'), who was raped by Attalus and his guests, whereas in Diodorus Pausanias was a mature man, for he was a Bodyguard, recently promoted (16.93.3 and 9), and he had been sexually abused by Attalus' muleteers. In Justin Philip heard the complaints of Pausanias and put him off 'not without some laughter', whereas in Diodorus 16.93.9 Philip was angered by the maltreatment of Pausanias and promoted him 'in the Bodyguardship'.

In Justin 9.8.1–2 Philip is given a reign of 25 years and the mother of Arrhidaeus is a dancing-girl of Larissa (i.e. a slave). In Athenaeus, citing Satyrus as his source at 557b–c, Philip was king for 22 years, and he married two women of Thessaly 'wishing to win over to himself the people of Thessaly', which implies that they were of aristocratic rank. In 9.8.3 Philip had had many sons in addition to Alexander and Arrhidaeus; Athenaeus 557 mentioned those two only. Once again, Justin was not following Satyrus, as he had done in 9.7.

When I considered these passages in *THA*, p. 93, my conclusion was that Justin (Trogus) was following Cleitarchus. He fits the characteristics we have now given for the author behind Group 4. He was careless of the truth, a scandalmonger and a popular writer in the time of Trogus. In *THA* I was writing about the books of Justin which covered Alexander's reign, and in those books the main source was Cleitarchus. A tie with Justin 9.5.9 is provided in Justin 11.11.4–5. The suspicion of sexual depravity ('stuprum') appeared again in the latter passage, where it was explained as copulation with a gigantic snake. Alexander was said to have wanted to clear his mother of this disgrace when he was at Siwa.

III. LINKING PASSAGES BETWEEN THE GROUPS AND WITHIN A GROUP

In his Preface Justin warned his readers. 'I have excerpted what was most worth knowing from the forty-four volumes [of Trogus' work], and I have omitted what was neither pleasurable to learn nor necessary as an example.' It is evident that Justin himself was not adding anything over and above the work of Trogus. Rather, he hoped to win approval as a painstaking abbreviator ('industriae testimonium').[27]

In the allocation of passages to Groups we passed over certain sentences which lay sometimes at a transition from one Group to another Group. These I call 'linking

[27] In particular it is remarkable that neither Trogus nor Justin imposed a uniform style on the material they incorporated. The simple style, almost the 'running style' (εἰρομένη λέξις) of Marsyas Macedon survives in Justin 7.1.1–7.4.2, whereas the antithetic periodic style of Theopompus appears still in Justin 7.6.3–5 and 8.1.1–4. Judging from the fragments alone Heckel, p. 462, wrote that Marsyas 'appears to have written in an unadorned straightforward style, complete yet concise', and he contrasted that style with 'the flamboyance and verbosity of Theopompus'.

passages'. The first occurs at 7.4.3, where Justin omits five or more kings (whom Trogus will have mentioned) and proceeds to Amyntas III, whom he confused with Amyntas II.[28] Thus resuming with Amyntas III Justin ascribed to him the fine qualities which typified the Macedonian kings of Group 1; for Amyntas was 'insignis industria et omnibus imperatoriis virtutibus instructus' (7.4.4). Justin, then, was continuing with Group 1, of which the ultimate source was Marsyas Macedon. At 7.4.5 Justin (Trogus) turned to the source of Group 2 – Satyrus – and followed him through 7.4.5–8 and 7.5.4–8. The linking sentences between 7.4.8 and 7.5.4 praise Philip, who spent time as a hostage with the Illyrians and at Thebes, as a boy of 'egregia indoles', such praise being typical of Group 1 and coming from Marsyas Macedon.

The linking passage 7.5.9–6.2 is particularly interesting. 'Philip acted for long not as king but as guardian of his ward [i.e. the son of Perdiccas being the king]; but when more serious wars were threatening, and it would have been too late to wait for the infant-king to be of any help, he accepted the throne under compulsion from the people. When he did enter on his rule (i.e. as king),[29] everyone had high hopes of him on account both of his character which gave promise of greatness, and of the age-old destiny of Macedonia, wherein it was prophesied that in the reign of one of Amyntas' sons Macedonia would be in its most flourishing condition.' Philip's character had already been praised as 'egregia' in Group 1 at 7.5.2, and the faith in prophecy is typical of Group 1. Thus the author behind this passage is Marsyas Macedon. At 7.6.3 Justin (Trogus) turned to material which came from Theopompus.

At 7.6.9–10, when Trogus was dropping Theopompus and picking up Satyrus, Justin made an error in saying that Philip 'captured Larissa'.[30] When he had dealt with Satyrus' version of Olympias' marriage and its effect on Arybbas, Justin made a typical leap from 357 to 354, in which year Philip attacked Methone and lost his right eye, being struck by an arrow from the walls. 'Yet the wound did not make him slower in war or angrier with his enemies, so much so that a few days later he granted them peace at their request and was not merely restrained but even mild to the vanquished' (7.6.15–16). This mildness took the form of banishment with only one garment. No Greek writer, and least of all Theopompus, especially if he is the source, as we argue, of Justin 8.5.5 and 8.5.8–13, would have taken Justin's view. On the other hand, a Macedonian might have compared the fate of the Methonaeans with that of the Potidaeans and the Olynthians, who were sold as slaves. Thus this linking passage came ultimately from Marsyas Macedon. At 8.1.1 Justin (Trogus) resumed Theopompus' account.

The conclusion is that Justin was dependent ultimately on Marsyas Macedon for all the linking passages which we have considered.

[28] Justin meant Amyntas III. But Justin's description of him as 'Amyntas, the son of Menelaus, the brother of Alexander' fitted not Amyntas III but Amyntas II; see *HM* 2 (Hammond), chart facing p. 176. Justin made this error while abbreviating as he shifted from the material of one source to the material from another source in Trogus.

[29] The phrase 'ut est ingressus imperium' at 7.6.1 refers to Philip embarking on his own reign; for it was to be 'while one of the sons of Amyntas was reigning' (regnante) that the oracle was to be fulfilled. Griffith in *HM* 2.209 n. 1 missed this particular point.

[30] See *HM* 2 (Griffith), p. 225.

IV. THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF IDENTIFYING THE SOURCES

The main sources for the reign of Philip are Diodorus and Justin (Trogus).[31] In *CQ* 31 (1937), 79ff. I identified the sources of Diodorus as Ephorus, Demophilus and Diyllus. This identification established the historical worth of the chapters dealing with Philip's early years, the course of the Third Sacred War and the siege of Perinthus, because Ephorus and Demophilus were competent contemporaries and mastered the material. For the other chapters dealing with Philip in Diodorus 16 the authority of Diyllus is that not of a contemporary but of a competent Hellenistic historian, who saw in Philip some of the qualities of an ideal Hellenistic monarch. Although Diodorus and Justin (Trogus) were covering the reign of Philip, their accounts are very different. The reason is that Trogus chose to follow different sources, namely Marsyas Macedon, Satyrus, Theopompus and Cleitarchus.

Of these Marsyas Macedon is of exceptional importance. As an exact contemporary of Alexander the Great, he gives us the views of a capable Macedonian on the early history of Macedonia down to *c.* 357, when Philip was elected king, and on the innate, traditional qualities of the Macedonian people. We owe to him the extension of Macedonian suzerainty over the peoples of Upper Macedonia, which is not recorded elsewhere,[32] and the period of Philip's guardianship of Perdiccas' infant son, Amyntas IV. Both are to be accepted as historical. The period of guardianship was known indirectly through the statement by Satyrus that Philip reigned for 22 years, i.e. from 357 to 336 on internal reckoning, and the kingship of Amyntas IV appeared in an inscription from Lebadea (*IG* vii.3055). Since Marsyas Macedon grew up during the reign of Philip and was writing for Macedonians who were familiar with the facts, there can be no doubt that Amyntas IV was king for two years.[33]

The identification of Satyrus, *Life of Philip*, as the source behind the passages which described the murderous conduct of Eurydice and alleged that Olympias, with the complicity of Alexander, prompted Pausanias to murder Philip means that neither the description nor the allegation are to be taken seriously by any historian. The slanders about Eurydice are palpably false.[34] The allegations date probably from the propaganda-campaign which was waged between Olympias and Cassander and their supporters. Satyrus adopted them as sensational material in the mid-third century B.C., when relations between Macedonia and the Greek states were exceptionally bitter.[35] They are historically worthless.

[31] It is most unfortunate that both authors are disregarded in *The Spectre of Philip* by J. R. Ellis and R. D. Milns (Sydney, 1970).

[32] That the Macedonians had some claim on the Upper Macedonian tribes was clear from Thuc. 2.99, but commentators did not make the connection between that passage and Justin 7.4.1 until I did so in *HM* 2.63f.

[33] As I argued in *HM* 2.651 n. 1, disagreeing with Griffith in *HM* 2.268f. and 702f., and with Ellis, *Amyntas*, pp. 15ff., who both rejected a period of regency. The 'graviora bella' of Just. 7.5.10, which threatened, in early 357 in my opinion, were wars with Athens (Philip having seized Amphipolis), the Chalcidian League, and Grabus the Illyrian – all three being in alliance – while the Paeonians and the Thracian kings were also hostile as they showed in spring 356.

[34] As I pointed out in *HM* 2.183. There was a shrine to Eukleia dedicated by Eurydice, which M. Andronikos has excavated, and Eurydice was one of the family group of whom statues in gold and ivory were dedicated in the Philippeum at Olympia. To suppose that she was known to have murdered two of her sons and betrayed her husband Amyntas III is little short of absurd. Yet Justin's account has been accepted by Beloch, Geyer, Cloché and others.

[35] The allegations in Justin 9.7.1–2 have been taken seriously, for instance, by Beloch and by E. Badian in *Phoenix* 17 (1963), 244ff., whose arguments were approved by Hamilton *C*, p. 28.

The identification of Theopompus as the ultimate source of Justin (Trogus) for most of the account of Philip's reign is valuable in two ways. Firstly, as a contemporary of Philip and Alexander, who was writing for contemporaries, Theopompus was careful to record his facts correctly, and his residence at Pella as well as his capacity for research enabled him to report such matters as Philip's building plans, his remarkable transplantation of city-populations and his campaign against Atheas. His insights into the policies and the politics of the Greek city-states are most illuminating.[36] Secondly, we see through the text of Justin into the mind of Theopompus much more clearly than we can do through the fragments of Theopompus' work. We can confirm that Polybius was completely justified in his critique of Theopompus' attitude towards Philip and the leading Macedonians and we may add towards the Greek city-states. For in the passages of Justin which are derived from him we see what Polybius described as Theopompus' 'bitter feeling and lack of restraint' (8.10.1 *τήν τε πικρίαν καὶ τὴν ἀθυρογλωττίαν*). We should therefore be warned against following the censorious and cynical trend of Theopompus' mind in reading the chapters in Justin which are derived ultimately from Theopompus.

The identification of Cleitarchus as the source behind Justin 9.5.8–9.6.8 and 9.8.1–3 confirms the opinions of the ancient writers who knew the whole work of Cleitarchus. For he was regarded as careless of the truth and notoriously untrustworthy by Cicero (*FGrHist* 137 T 7 and F 34), Strabo (e.g. 505), Curtius (e.g. 9.5.21), Quintilian (*FGrHist* 137 T 6), and Plutarch (*Alex.* 46.1). There is no basis in the surviving fragments on which to whitewash the reputation of Cleitarchus; and if Justin 9.5.8–9.6.8 and 9.8.1–3 are derived from Cleitarchus, they do him no credit.

A final question may be asked. Why did Diodorus Siculus and Pompeius Trogus choose entirely different sets of sources for the period of Philip II? They flourished in the time of Augustus, Diodorus early and Trogus late in the principate. They both wrote a Universal History from the earliest times, Diodorus down to Caesar's Gallic War in 54 B.C. and Trogus down to Parthian affairs in 20 B.C. They had to decide how the Macedonian period stood in relation to world history and in particular in relation to Rome's ascendancy. On this they had different views. As a Sicilian Greek writing in Greek for a Greek readership, Diodorus chose to represent the Macedonian period in a very favourable light: 'Philip, the greatest of the kings in Europe, ... established the greatest monarchical state in the Greek world' and 'Alexander surpassed all kings of all time in his achievements' (16.95.1–2 and 17.1.3).[37] Trogus, writing in Latin for a Roman readership, cut Philip down to a modest size as we see especially in the summary in Justin 9.8.1–21: 'a king more concerned with the apparatus of warfare than of banqueting ... more adroit in acquiring riches than in conserving them ... an

[36] The description which Justin 9.5.1–7 gave of the settlement made by Philip is particularly important – namely the terms of a peace ('pacis legem') for all Greece (cf. 'universae Graeciae' at 9.3.11), the council with representatives of all states except Sparta ('consilium omnium'), the fixing of forces in the event of the king being attacked or a war being declared under his leadership (indicating a defensive and offensive alliance between the Greeks of the common peace and Macedonia), and the forces available for war against Persia being those of the Greeks, the Macedonians and the neighbouring non-Greek subject races. Theopompus as a contemporary cannot have given a false account for a contemporary readership. See my discussion in *HM* 3 (1988), pp. 571ff. and especially 573, being in disagreement with the interpretation of *HM* 2 (Griffith), pp. 623ff. and his view that 'either Justin or Pompeius Trogus or the Greek source(s) of Trogus must have misunderstood something in the terms of the treaty'. Yet, why should they misunderstand?

[37] That Diodorus composed these passages out of his own head was argued in *CQ* 31 (1937), 91 and in *THA*, pp. 28 and 173 n. 15.

eloquent and outstanding speaker.' In comparing Philip and Alexander[38] he concentrated less on their strengths than on their weaknesses (rage, drunkenness, murdering, terrorising of Companions, stinginess and extravagance). Trogus might well have taken his cue from a reading by Livy which included Livy 9.18.

With such different purposes in mind it is not surprising that Diodorus and Trogus chose different sets of sources. Diodorus opened book 16 with a proem derived from Ephorus in which 'Philip through his own excellence gained the leadership of all Greece with the willing consent of the states... and began to liberate the Greek states in Asia.'[39] Where the work of Ephorus stopped, Diodorus continued with that of Ephorus' son, Demophilus, who believed that Philip intended to establish 'peace and concord in Greece' and to lead the Greeks against Persia (16.60.3–5). Thereafter he choose Diyllus who provided favourable aspects of Philip in the Olynthian war and its aftermath (16.53–5), in the story concerning Demades (16.87) and in winning the loyal support of the Greeks for a war against Persia (16.89.2). On the other hand, Trogus selected from Satyrus, *Life of Philip*, Theopompus, *Historiae Philippicae*, and Cleitarchus some passages which portrayed the Macedonian court as the scene of adultery, parricide, drunkenness, depravity and homosexual rape. He chose Theopompus as an author who represented Philip's successes as due mainly to the internecine warfare and the crass stupidity of the Greek states. Philip himself, clever indeed and astute in his early years, became a paragon of bad faith, impiety, treachery, ruthlessness and deceit. His career ended not in the willing consent of the Greek states but in the reduction of the Greek states to slavery (Justin 8.1.3 'subire regiam servitutem'; 9.1.1 'bellum toti Graeciae inferre statuit'; 9.3.11 'vetustissimam libertatem finivit').

University of Newcastle, N.S.W.,
and Clare College, Cambridge N. G. L. HAMMOND

[38] It is probable that this comparison was derived from some such comparison by Theopompus; for he wrote an encomium of Philip and of Alexander, and also a censure of Alexander (*FGrHist* 115 F 255 and 258). For example, Justin 9.8.15 'patri mos erat etiam de convivio in hostem procurrere' may be an echo of Theopompus F 282: ἦν γὰρ πολυπότης καὶ πολλάκις μεθύων ἐξεβοήθει.

[39] See *CQ* 31 (1937), 88 for the source of the Proem being Ephorus.