

DIVINE HONORS FOR PHILIP II

E.A. FREDRICKSMEYER

University of Colorado

According to a note in Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* 4.54.5, the Athenians, apparently after the battle at Chaeronea, enacted a law to worship Philip: . . . τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον ἐν Κυνοσάργει νομοθετοῦντες προσκυνεῖν. Some scholars accept this information as historical, others do not.¹ But it has never been subjected to a critical examination. This, then, is a *desideratum*. Philip's honors, or alleged honors, at Athens in turn must be understood in the context of other, similar honors which were bestowed upon him, or which he bestowed upon himself, elsewhere. The whole question is of interest not only for our understanding of Philip himself, but also for that of the ruler cult and of the phenomenon of *Gottmenschentum* among the Greeks in general.² I will first consider the information of Clement, and then the larger question of Philip's other honors.

I.

The information forms part of a diatribe by Clement against the deification of living men by the pagan Greeks. It contains a catalogue of eight examples, of which that of Philip is one. In order to evaluate with any assurance the statement about Philip, it is necessary to examine the whole passage in which it occurs and of which it is an integral part. I will first quote the passage. After listing the mythological case of Ceyx and Alcyone, Clement says (*Protr.* 4.54.2-6, pp. 42-43 Stählin):

¹E.g., *pro*, L. R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, CT 1931) 12; A. Momigliano, *Filippo il Macedone* (Florence 1934) 176. *Contra*, A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* III (Leipzig 1887²) 32, note 1; C. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte* (Munich 1956, 1970) 13. None give reasons.

It is also said that Philip and his descendants were granted Athenian citizenship (Plut. *Dem.* 22) and that his statue was erected in the agora (Paus. 1.9.4).

²I discuss the tradition of *Gottmenschentum* and precedents of deifications of living men before Philip in the paper "On the Background of the Ruler Cult," *Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Archaeology in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (Thessaloniki 1979).

Ptolemy the fourth was called Dionysus, and so was Mithridates of Pontus. And Alexander wished to be thought of as the son of Ammon, and to be depicted with horns by the artists, being eager as he was to outrage the beautiful face of man by a horn. And indeed, not only kings but also private individuals used to exalt themselves with divine appellations, as Menecrates the physician, being called Zeus. Why need I name Alexarchus? This man, as Aristus the Salaminian relates, was a scholar by virtue of his knowledge but he assumed the part of Helios. And why need I mention Nicagoras, a man from Zeleia, who lived in the time of Alexander. He was addressed as Hermes and wore the garb of Hermes, according to his own testimony. For indeed even whole nations and cities, with all their people, assuming the mask of flattery, disparage the stories about the gods, mere men, transforming men like themselves into the equals of the gods, blown up with vainglory, and voting them extravagant honors; at one time they enact by law at Cynosarges the worship of Philip the son of Amyntas, the Macedonian from Pella, with his broken collar-bone and maimed leg, with one eye knocked out, at another they proclaim Demetrius a god in his turn; and where he dismounted from his horse on entering Athens is now a sanctuary of Demetrius Kataibates, while his altars are everywhere. And a marriage with Athena was made ready for him by the Athenians, but he scorned the goddess, not being able to marry her statue. He went up to the Acropolis, however, with the courtesan Lamia and copulated with her (*ἐνεφύρατο*) in Athena's sacred bridal chamber (*τῷ παστῷ*), exhibiting to the old virgin the postures of the young courtesan.³

Early in this century, J. Gabrielsson tried to show that nearly all information in Clement on Greek history, mythology, and culture, including the above catalogue of deifications, was taken from a single encyclopedic source, the *Παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία* of Favorinus.⁴ It has been shown, however, that this theory is untenable, and that Clement did not use one, or even several *Hauptquellen*, but drew upon many sources, including compilations, as well as upon his own considerable erudition.⁵ As for our

³Clement continues (55.1): "We should not feel angry, therefore, even with Hippo, who represented his death as deification of himself. This Hippo ordered the following couplet to be inscribed on his monument:

This is the tomb of Hippo whom in death
Fate made an equal to the immortal gods."

Clement goes on to comment that Hippo meant to point out that all gods once were men who died.

It is interesting to note that the tradition of *Gottmenschentum* was so strong among the Greeks that Clement himself adopts and uses its vocabulary and some of its ideas among the articles of his own Christian faith. See G. W. Butterworth, "The Deification of Man in Clement of Alexandria," *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1916) 157-69.

⁴*Über die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus* (Upsala and Leipzig) I (1906), II (1909).

⁵O. Stählin, *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 28 (1908) 387 ff.; 31 (1911) 603 ff.; M.

catalogue, it is quite possible, of course, that Clement took it *in toto* from some earlier source. But even if he did, and we could identify it (as we cannot), the question of the *historicity* of the information still would remain open. In order to assess it, we must consider each item of information individually. I number them by individuals, 1. Ptolemy IV, 2. Mithridates, 3. Alexander, 4. Menecrates, 5. Alexarchus, 6. Nicagoras, 7. Philip, and 8. Demetrius.

1. (54.2) Ptolemy IV (ruled 222–204 B.C.) was of course, like the other Ptolemies, a deified ruler. Was he also, as Clement says, called Dionysus? We know that he was much devoted to the cult of Dionysus, and his celebrations of Dionysiac rites were notorious. He even had his body tattooed with ivy-leaves.⁶ Beyond this, there is the testimony of Ptolemy's contemporary the Alexandrian grammarian and poet Euphronius of Cherronesus (in Egypt), who in a fragment of a *Priapeum* refers to the rites of a "new Dionysus."⁷ Since Ptolemy XII (ruled 80–51 B.C.), who officially bore the title *Neos Dionysos*, lived (some two hundred years) after Euphronius, it is legitimate to conclude that Euphronius was referring to his contemporary Ptolemy IV.⁸

It is possible, therefore, that it was Ptolemy IV who introduced a series of silver coins showing on the obverse the king as Dionysus with diadem, ivy-wreath, and thyrsus and on the reverse the Ptolemaic eagle with the lightning bolt.⁹ If this is correct, we infer that Ptolemy's identification with Dionysus was sanctioned and perhaps initiated by the king and therefore official. If we exclude the coins, we suppose that the identification was

Pohlenz, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 32 (1907) 718 ff.; 37 (1912) 109 ff.; K. Münscher, *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 149 (1911) 25 ff.; R. Münzel, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 30 (1909) 30 ff.; W. von Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Munich 1913⁵) 602, 1092.

On Clement's sources and method of composition, see also W. Christ, *Philologische Studien zu Clemens Alexandrinus* (Munich 1900), and the review by P. Koetschau, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 26 (1901) 415–21. And E. Hiller, "Zur Quellenkritik des Clemens Alexandrinus," *Hermes* 21 (1886) 126–33.

⁶Satyrus, *FGrHist* 631 Fr. 1 = Theophil. *Ad Autol.* 2.7; Plut. *Mor.* 56e; Cleom. 33; *Etym.* M. s.v. Gallos.

⁷J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford 1925) 176.

⁸So already A. Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina* (Berlin 1843) 342 ff. and 406, who was followed by F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit* I (Leipzig 1891) 282, note 60.

⁹B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (Oxford 1887) 715, attributes it to Ptol. IV, but in the second edition (1911), p. 854, registers uncertainty, without explaining.

unofficial, introduced probably by the king's courtiers.¹⁰ In either case, Clement's statement that Ptolemy was called Dionysus must be regarded as correct.

2. (54.2) Was Mithridates of Pontus called Dionysus? There is no question of it. His deification in 88 B.C. with the cult name Dionysus is a well-known fact, and it suffices here to register the evidence.¹¹

3. (54.2) Did Alexander wish to be "thought of as the son of Ammon, and to be depicted with horns by the artists?" Early in 331 B.C., at the Oracle of Ammon (at Siwa), whom the Greeks identified with Zeus, the High Priest greeted, or/and the Oracle confirmed, Alexander as son of the god.¹² There can be no doubt that henceforth Alexander wished to be thought of as his son. Timaeus' statement (*FGrHist* 566 Fr. 155 = Polyb. 12.12b) that (Alexander's court-historian) Callisthenes invested Alexander with aegis and thunderbolt means that he celebrated him as son of Zeus-Ammon. We may be sure that this accorded with Alexander's wishes, and that it encouraged his depiction by artists as the god's son. Before the battle at Gaugamela, in an address to the Thessalians and other Greeks, Alexander appealed to the gods, asking them, "if he was indeed the son of Zeus," to defend and strengthen the Greeks (Callisthenes, *FGrHist* 124 Fr. 36 = Plut. *Alex.* 33.1). Clitus the Black, in his altercation with Alexander in 327 B.C. in Eastern Iran, said that it was through the sacrifices of himself and the Macedonians that Alexander had reached the point "as to disavow Philip and make yourself the son of Ammon." (Plut. *Alex.* 50.6; the source is probably Alexander's Court Chamberlain Chares.) In 324 B.C. at Opis, the rebellious Macedonians called on Alexander to discharge them all "and carry on the war with his father, mockingly referring to Ammon" (Arr. 7.8.3, probably from Ptolemy). In 323 B.C., in a letter to the Athenians, Alexander referred to "'my so-called father,' meaning Philip" (Plut. *Alex.* 28.1).¹³ And Quintus Curtius says that Alexander "not only allowed himself to be called the son of Iupiter but even ordered it" (4.7.30), and that

¹⁰This is the view of P. Perdrizet, "Le fragment de Satyros sur les dèmes d'Alexandrie," *REA* 12 (1910) 230, but solely on the basis of Clement. A. D. Nock, "Notes on Ruler Cult," *JHS* 48 (1928) 26, remarks that Ptolemy IV "posed as Dionysos," but refers only to Perdrizet. ¹¹*OGI* 1. 370; Posidonius of Apamea, *FGrHist* 87 Fr. 36 = Athen. 5.212d; Cic. *pro Flacc.* 60; App. *Mithr.* 10; *IGR* 1. 905; *Inscr. Délos* IV. 2040; F. Durrbach, *Choix d'inscr. de Délos* 133, 134.

¹²The evidence is conveniently collected at H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte* (Munich 1969⁴) 344-45.

¹³For the authenticity of the letter, see J. R. Hamilton, "Alexander and his so-called Father," *CQ* 3 (1953) 151-57.

“he not only wished to be called but even to be believed to be the son of Jupiter” (8.5.5).¹⁴

As for Clement’s statement that Alexander wished to be depicted with the horns of Ammon, this of course should not be taken to mean that he wished to be depicted exclusively with the horns, but that he *encouraged* such a portrayal.¹⁵ The earliest known depictions of Alexander with the horn of Ammon are on coins issued by Ptolemy I some time between 323 and 312 B.C., and by Lysimachus beginning with 306 B.C.¹⁶ They may well be based on contemporary prototypes. It has been suggested that the portrait on the Lysimachus coins was modeled on an engraving by Pyrgoteles, who was Alexander’s favorite artist in this medium.¹⁷ This would not necessarily mean that already Pyrgoteles included the horn in his portrait, but it certainly is possible. We know that Apelles depicted Alexander with a thunderbolt, as son of Zeus-Ammon, and Alexander was so pleased with the painting that he rewarded the artist with the colossal sum of twenty talents.¹⁸ This certainly meant encouragement of his portrayal as son of Zeus-Ammon, and there is no reason to think that such a portrayal was meant to exclude the god’s horns. Clement’s statement therefore should be taken as essentially correct.

4. (54.3) Was Menecrates the doctor called, or did he call himself, Zeus? There is sufficient evidence. After successfully treating several supposedly incurable cases of epilepsy, Menecrates apparently came to believe that he was an incarnation of Zeus. His recovered patients served as his attendants, and he called them both his slaves and Olympian gods, identified them with individual gods and decked them out in their respective garb. He himself

¹⁴Cf. Arr. 4.9.9; 7.8.3; 7.29.3; Plut. *Mor.* 339e; Diod. 17.49–51; Just. 11.11.2–12; Satyrus, *FHG* III. 164 Fr. 18 = Athen. 6.250f; Curt. 6.9.18 and *passim*.

¹⁵Ephippus of Olynthus says (*FGrHist* 126 Fr. 5 = Athen. 12.537e) that on certain occasions Alexander played the parts of certain gods and wore their garments and insignia, as of Hermes, Heracles, and Artemis; and that he would wear “the purple robe of Ammon, and sandals and horns, just like the god.” Ephippus was a contemporary but also very hostile to Alexander, and allowance must be made for distortion and mendacity (cf. F. Jacoby, *FGrHist ad* 126 and Fr. 5). But it probably is true that at certain religious ceremonies Alexander assumed the insignia of Ammon. Cf. Fr. 5 = Athen. 538b.

¹⁶T. Schreiber, “Studien über das Bildnis Alexanders des Grossen,” *Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl., 21.3 (1903) 167–72; J. Naue, “Die Porträtdarstellung Alexanders des Grossen auf griechischen Münzen des Königs Lysimachos von Tracien,” *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* 8 (1881) 31 ff.

¹⁷R. Hinks, *Greek and Roman Portrait Sculpture* (London 1935) 9.

¹⁸Plin. *NH* 35.92; Plut. *Alex.* 4.2; *Mor.* 335b. In 324 B.C. coins were struck at Babylon to commemorate Alexander’s Indian campaign depicting him as son of Zeus-Ammon, with thunderbolt. C. Seltman, *Greek Coins* (London 1955²) 213.

dressed as Zeus, with purple robe, golden wreath, scepter, and *krêpides*, and signed his letters “Menecrates Zeus.”¹⁹

5. (54.3) As for Alexarchus, “as Aristus of Salamis relates, he was a scholar by virtue of his knowledge but he assumed the part of Helius” (... αὐτὸν κατεσχημάτιζεν εἰς Ἥλιον). The Aristus referred to is almost certainly the historian Aristus (fl. c. 250 B.C.) who was a friend of Antiochus II and thus nearly contemporary with Alexarchus.²⁰ Is his claim about Alexarchus correct? Alexarchus’ scholarly philological preoccupations are attested by the second c. B.C. historian Heraclides Lembus who says (*FHG* III. 169 Fr. 5 = Athen. 3.98e) that he substituted words of his own invention for the traditional ones, and quotes a letter to the magistrates of Cassandrea so full of this vocabulary as to be unintelligible. Alexarchus founded, no doubt under the aegis of his brother Cassander, a large city on the Athos peninsula and named it Ouranopolis.²¹ In c. 300 B.C. he struck an entirely unprecedented series of coins on which the inhabitants of Ouranopolis are called *Ouranidai*, “children of heaven,” and on which are depicted the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars.²² If the stars symbolize the citizens of Ouranopolis, the children of heaven,²³ then the Sun must be Alexarchus, and the Moon his consort.²⁴ Clearly Alexarchus was an eccentric, a visionary and intellectual of sorts, perhaps schizophrenic, with grandiose ideas of a religious and quasi-philosophical nature.²⁵ There is no good reason to doubt the statement of Clement, or rather of Aristus, that Alexarchus somehow identified himself with Helius.

6. (54.4) Was Nicagoras of Zeleia “addressed as Hermes and [did he] wear the garb of Hermes?” For this statement Clement appeals to Nicagoras’ own evidence, ὡς αὐτὸς μαρτυρεῖ. Nicagoras was tyrant of Zeleia at the time of Alexander’s invasion of Asia Minor in 334 B.C. and

¹⁹Plut. *Ages*. 21.5; *Mor.* 191a and 213a; Aelian, *VH* 12.51; Suda s.v. *Menekrates*; Athen. 7.289a–290a, with reference to Hegesander, an early second c. B.C. writer of *Hypomnemata* (*FHG* IV. 414 Fr. 5), to the third c. B.C. Syracusan historian Baton (*FGrHist* 268 Fr. 2), and to two contemporaries of Menecrates, the comic writers Alexis (*CAF* II p. 346 Kock) and Ephippus (*CAF* II p. 260 Kock). Menecrates has been labelled a psychopath, not because of his claim to divinity, but because of the extravagance of his conduct and pretensions. O. Weinreich, “Menekrates Zeus und Salmoneus,” *Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 18 (1933) 82 ff.

²⁰F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 143 Fr. 4, with testimonia and commentary.

²¹Heraclides, *loc. cit.*; Demetrius of Scepsis (fl. c. 175 B.C.) in Strabo 7, fr. 35; Plin. *NH* 4.37.

²²B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (Oxford 1911²) 206; *B. M. Coins, Macedon* (London 1879) 133 f.

²³Cf. *SVF* III Fr. 337 = Philo, *de Mundi Opificio* 144.

²⁴So W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* II (Cambridge 1948) 430 f.

²⁵Cf. O. Weinreich (above, note 19) 14 and 76.

after his victory at the Granicus probably was expelled or perhaps killed.²⁶ We infer from Clement that he produced some sort of an account which provided the information about his identification with Hermes, and on this basis there is no good reason to disbelieve it. It is corroborated by the third c. B.C. historian Baton of Sinope. In discussing Menecrates and his retinue, Athenaeus says (7.289c): “Another attendant, with *chlamys* and the *kêrykeion* and, in addition, wings, like (ὥς) *Nicagoras of Zeleia* who became tyrant of his native city, according to the account given by Baton in his *History of the Tyrants of Ephesus*.”²⁷

7. (54.5) The case of Philip.

8. (54.5–6) As for Demetrius, there can be no doubt of the accuracy of Clement’s information. In 315 B.C. his father Antigonos announced as his objective the liberation of the Athenians from the unpopular regime of Cassander’s regent Demetrius of Phalerum. In 307 B.C. Demetrius (s. of Antigonos) removed Cassander’s garrison at Munichia, entered Athens, and proclaimed the restoration of liberty. The Athenians decreed divine honors for Antigonos and Demetrius as “Saviors.” They also decreed to crown them with wreaths worth two hundred talents, to found and name new tribes after them, to establish annual games, sacrifices and processions for them as eponymous gods of these tribes, to name two new triremes after them, to include their pictures with those of the (other) gods in the peplos of Athena, to institute regular competitions for the best paian in their honor, and to send a delegation to Antigonos to convey the *psêphisma* of his honors. Antigonos in turn handed over to them the island of Imbros and sent shipments of grain and timber.²⁸

Subsequently, Athenian attention shifted to Demetrius alone. During his absence in 306/4 B.C. Cassander laid the city under siege. The Athenians appealed to Demetrius. In 304 B.C. he expelled Cassander from central Greece and entered Athens. Clement’s information refers to this occasion:

²⁶H. Berve, *RE* 17 (1936) 215.

²⁷Wilamowitz (Stählin’s *app.*) suggested changing Clement’s text from ὥς αὐτὸς (Nicagoras) μαρτυρεῖ to ὥς (ὁ) αὐτὸς μαρτυρεῖ, referring to Aristus, who is cited for the preceding information on Alexarchus. But since there is intrinsically nothing implausible about Nicagoras providing an account of his activities, the emendation is not necessary. Even less likely is Stählin’s suggestion (*app.*), on the basis of the Athenaeus passage (quoted above), that we read Βάτων for αὐτὸς (μαρτυρεῖ). Cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 268 *ad* Fr. 2. Stählin wisely took neither suggestion into the text. If we do follow Wilamowitz, we could speculate that Baton’s information is derived from Aristus. As for the accuracy of Clement’s information, we would have then in support of it, at the least, the authority either of Aristus (Wilamowitz) or of Baton (Stählin), and there would still be no good reason to reject it.

²⁸For a collection and critical discussion of the evidence, see C. Habicht (above, note 1) 44–48. Cf. K. Scott, “The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes,” *AJP* 49 (1928) 137–66, 217–39.

αὐθις δὲ τὸν Δημήτριον θεὸν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύοντες· καὶ ἔνθα μὲν ἀπέβη τοῦ ἵππου Ἀθήναζε εἰσιὼν, Καταιβάτου ἱερόν ἐστι Δημητρίου, βωμοὶ δὲ πανταχοῦ. This is corroborated by Plutarch (*Demetr.* 10.5): καὶ τὸν τόπον, ὅπου πρῶτον ἀπέβη τοῦ ἄρματος, καθιερώσαντες καὶ βωμὸν ἐπιθέντες Δημητρίου Καταιβάτου προσηγόρευσαν. And (*Mor.* 338a): Δημήτριος δὲ ... Καταιβάτης καλούμενος ὑπήκουε.²⁹ Thus the key information, the establishment of a cult of Demetrius as *Kataibates*, is provided in all three passages. Clement's statement that at the spot where Demetrius dismounted is now a sanctuary, ἱερόν, is paralleled by Plutarch's statement that the Athenians sanctified the place, καθιερώσαντες, and built an altar.

Clement continues: καὶ γάμος ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων αὐτῷ ὁ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἡντρεπίζετο. Compare Plutarch (*Dem.* 23): τὸν γὰρ ὀπισθοδόμον τοῦ Παρθενῶνος ἀπέδειξαν αὐτῷ κατάλυσιν· κάκει δίαίταν εἶχε τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς λεγομένης ὑποδέχασθαι καὶ ξενίζειν αὐτόν ... It is possible that Demetrius celebrated an ἱερὸς γάμος with the goddess.³⁰ Clement's next comment, ὁ δὲ τὴν μὲν θεὸν ὑπερφάνει, τὸ ἄγαλμα γῆμαι μὴ δυνάμενος, is meant to make the transition from Demetrius' *gamos* with the goddess to the desecration of her temple with the courtesan: Λαμίαν δὲ τὴν ἐταίραν ἔχων εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἀνῆει καὶ τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐνεφυρᾶτο παστῷ, τῇ παλαιᾷ παρθένῳ τὰ τῆς νέας ἐπιδεικνὺς ἐταίρας σχήματα. This detail is paralleled by a similar account in Plutarch (*Demetr.* 23.5–24.1), and it is verified by a contemporary of Demetrius, the poet Philipides (*CAF* III. p. 308 Kock = Plut. *Demetr.* 26):

ὁ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν πανδοκεῖον ὑπολαβὼν
καὶ τὰς ἐταίρας εἰσαγαγὼν τῇ παρθένῳ.

The affront to the goddess by the courtesans and their sexual shenanigans with Demetrius under her very eyes, as it were, apparently caught the fancy of the people at the time, and Clement has preserved a vivid impression of them. This suggests that Clement's account derives from a contemporary source, and this impression is corroborated by the fact that Clement uses the present tense (clearly not an historical present) in saying that at the spot where Demetrius dismounted (ἀπέβη) on his arrival, Καταιβάτου ἱερόν ἐστι Δημητρίου, βωμοὶ δὲ πανταχοῦ. It appears that Clement is reproducing verbatim the account of his source who wrote while the cult still existed, that is, before 289/8 B.C., and who thus was a contemporary

²⁹Plut. *Demetr.* 10.5 lists the institution of the Kataibates cult among the honors of 307 B.C., but C. Habicht (above, note 1) 48–50 has shown that it took place on this occasion. On the significance of the cult-name, see K. Scott (above, note 28) 164f.

³⁰So also C. Habicht (above, note 1) 49. Cf. Schol. *ad* Clem. Alex. *Protr.* I p. 313, 21 Stählin.

and perhaps eyewitness of the events he relates.³¹ We conclude that Demetrius' deification, his cult name *Kataibates*, and his sexual trysts with Lamia in the Parthenon are certainly historical, while the remark about the "marriage" to the goddess may echo the performance of a *hieros gamos*.³²

This lengthy examination has been justified by the result. The information provided in Clement's catalogue is amazingly accurate. All seven cases which we have examined, of Ptolemy IV, Mithridates, Alexander, Menecrates, Alexarchus, Aristus, and Demetrius are not only historical in substance, but accurate even in the details. This establishes a strong presumption that the one case still in question, that of Philip, is historical as well. For the information on Alexarchus, Clement cites Aristus of Salamis who was a near-contemporary of Alexarchus. For that on Nicagoras, he appeals to Nicagoras' own evidence. But what is most significant is that the information on Demetrius probably derives from a contemporary, and perhaps eyewitness, account. Now the statement about Demetrius is closely coupled with that about Philip: *νῦν μὲν τὸν Μακεδόνα τὸν ἐκ Πέλλης τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον ἐν Κυνοσάργει νομοθετοῦντες προσκυνεῖν . . . αὐτοῖς δὲ τὸν Δημήτριον θεὸν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύοντες*. It is not unlikely, therefore, that the information about Philip comes from the same source. Clement himself certainly regarded the information about Philip as historical. The effectiveness of his invective against the deifications of the pagans depended on the accuracy of the examples he cited. Spurious cases would damage his credibility. The other seven examples are accurate even in their details, and we may be sure that if Clement had doubted the historicity of Philip's case, he would have used another one instead, as he had many well-known historical examples to choose from.

Let us now look closely at the statement about Philip (*Protr.* 4.54.5):

νῦν μὲν τὸν Μακεδόνα τὸν Πέλλης τὸν Ἀμύντου Φίλιππον ἐν Κυνοσάργει νομοθετοῦντες προσκυνεῖν, τὸν τὴν κλεῖν κατεαγότα καὶ τὸ σκέλος πεπηρωμένον, ὃς ἐξέκόπη τὸν ὀφθαλμόν . . .

³¹It is of course possible that Plutarch's information, both in the *Life of Demetrius* and the *Moralia*, derives from this same source. But there are no close verbal parallels between Plutarch and Clement, and events of such public interest, even fascination, as the doings of Demetrius at Athens no doubt were recorded by a number of witnesses, in addition to the Comic writers.

For the abolition of Demetrius' cult in 289/8 B.C., see C. Habicht (above, note 1) 188.

³²The honors of 304 B.C. were not the last ones which Demetrius received from the Athenians. They defected from him after the battle of Ipsos (301 B.C.) but in 294 B.C. Demetrius returned to Greece and after a difficult siege seized the city. In response to his lenient treatment the Athenians accorded him new and extravagant honors. C. Habicht (above, note 1) 50–55, with references.

The reference to Philip's broken collar-bone, maimed leg, and knocked-out eye is quoted from Demosthenes *de Cor.* 67, but this does not tell us anything, since it could be Clement's own comment, who was knowledgeable enough.

What is the meaning of *proskynein* here? We must note, first, a major distinction in meaning between the Greek and the Persian *proskynêsis*. The Persians performed it before social superiors and a fortiori the Great King. The Great King was not regarded as a god (although the Greeks sometimes thought that he was) and thus the Persian *proskynêsis* was an act of homage and respect, not of worship. The Greeks on the other hand considered *proskynêsis* proper only in worship of the gods and regarded the Persian practice as typical of Oriental servility (e.g., Xen. *Anab.* 3.2.13). There has been considerable controversy among modern scholars about the particular gesture which the act involved, some sort of kiss or kiss-hand (according to etymology), a bow, genuflexion, prostration on the ground or a combination of one of these with some sort of kiss. No doubt the performance varied with time, place, and occasion. But in any case, it is clear that the word early came to mean, *latiore sensu*, "worship," comparable to the Latin *adorare* and *venerari*, without necessarily denoting any one particular physical gesture at all.³³ There can be no doubt that the word is used here in the sense of "worship as a god." The theme of the passage in which the statement is made is the *deifications* and self-deifications of pagan Greeks. The syntax of the sentence clinches it: (Greek cities) *νῦν μὲν τὸν Μακεδόνα . . .* [see above] *νομοθετοῦντες προσκυνεῖν . . .* [see above], *αὐθις δὲ τὸν Δημήτριον θεὸν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύοντες*. Not only is the case of Philip coupled with that of Demetrius by the *nyn men . . . authis de*, but the (*theon*) *kai* (*auton*) clearly refers to Philip, that is, the Athenians proclaimed Demetrius a god in his turn as they did Philip. For *proskynein* we might have expected something like *θεῖν ὡς* or *ὥσπερ θεῶ*, but it is easy to see why Clement or his source chose *proskynein*. It suited his bias perfectly. Because of its Asiatic association in Greek literature, *proskynein* had a pejorative connotation, of inappropriate servility, when extended to a human being, and Clement's purpose is precisely to inveigh against the treatment by the pagans of human beings as divine.

³³See P. Schnabel, "Die Begründung des hellenistischen Königs Kultes durch Alexander," *Klio* 19 (1925) 113–20; G. C. Richards, "Proskynesis," *CR* 48 (1934) 168–70; B. Meissner, "Der Kuss im alten Orient," *SB Berlin Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl., 28 (1934) 922 ff.; B. Marti "Proskynesis and Adorare," *Language* 12 (1936) 272–82; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "The Divinity of Alexander," *Historia* 1 (1950) 371–76; Feodora Prinzessin von Sachsen-Meiningen, "Proskynesis in Iran," in F. Altheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen* II (Berlin 1960) 125 ff.; E. Bickerman, "A propos d'un passage de Charès de Mytilène," *PP* 91 (1963) 244 ff.; J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch, Alexander. A Commentary* (Oxford 1969) 150–51.

Clement says that they, i.e., the Athenians, decreed by law, *nomothetountes*, to worship Philip. The “Athenians” as subject is understood from the context, but literally it is “whole nations and cities, with all their inhabitants” (ὅλα ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις αὐτανδρῶν). This must be taken to mean that the Athenians instituted the cult in their Assembly, and this implies that the cult was public, not private.³⁴ We conclude therefore that Clement’s statement means that the Athenians instituted an official cult of Philip as a god at Cynosarges.

What is the significance of the locale? Cynosarges was a famous sanctuary of Heracles located south of the Acropolis outside the city wall near the Diomeian gate and consisted of a temple, a gymnasium, and a surrounding grove.³⁵ Athenaeus (6.234d–e) has preserved an interesting bit of information about the cult. Commenting on the term *parasitês*, that it once designated “something sacred, like a participant at a sacred feast,” he says *exempli gratia*: “In the Heracleum in Cynosarges there is a tablet on which is inscribed a decree proposed by Alcibiades, the clerk being Stephanus son of Thucydides, and with respect to the term (*parasitês*) the decree reads: ‘The priest shall perform the monthly sacrifices in company with the parasites. These parasites shall be drawn from the *nothoi* and their sons, according to ancestral custom. And whosoever is unwilling to serve as parasite, shall be brought to court on this very charge.’”³⁶ We infer from this information that the cult was public rather than private, and this is in accord with our inference from Clement that the cult of Philip also was public. That is, a public cult of Philip is attached on a subsidiary status to an already existing cult of Heracles which also was public.

Heracles was not the only honorand at Cynosarges. Pausanias (1.19.3): βωμοὶ δέ εἰσι Ἡρακλέους τε καὶ Ἥβης ἣν Διὸς παῖδα οὔσαν συνοικεῖν Ἡρακλεῖ νομίζουσιν Ἀλκμήνης τε βωμὸς καὶ Ἰολάου πεποιήται, δς τὰ πολλὰ Ἡρακλεῖ συνεποίησε τῶν ἔργων. It would appear then that Hebe had a separate altar, beside Heracles’, and Alcmena and Iolaus shared another altar. We may infer that Hebe was honored as Heracles’ wife, Alcmena as his mother, and Iolaus as his helper.

³⁴On the procedure, see G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* I.1³ (Munich 1920) 525 ff.; I.2³ (Munich 1925) 1170 f.

³⁵Paus. 1.19.3; Liv. 31.24.17; Hdt. 5.63; 6.116; Telephanes in Athen. 14.614d–e; Athen. 6.234e; Aristoph. *Ran.* 651 and schol. *ad loc.*; Hesych., Suda, Harpocration s.v. *Kynosarges*; Harpocration s.vv. *en Diomeiois Erakleion*; Eustathius *ad Hom. Il.* 13.408 p. 1747; W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen* (Munich 1931²) 422 f.

³⁶The legal and civic status of *nothoi* in 4th c. Athens is much disputed. See, most recently, P. J. Rhodes, “Bastards as Athenian Citizens,” *CQ* 71 (1978) 89–92. The archetypal *nothos* was Heracles. C. Robert in Preller-Robert, *Griechische Mythologie* II (Berlin 1920) 636.

The foundation legend, which was inscribed in the temple, related how the hero Diomus once was sacrificing to his friend Heracles as a god when a white dog (κύων, ἄργος) made off with the victim, and an oracle ordered the founding of a temple of Heracles at the spot where the dog had deposited it.³⁷ Apparently then the legend did not mention Hebe, Alcmena, or Iolaus, which suggests that their cults were introduced later, or at any rate that those of Alcmena and of Iolaus were introduced subsequently to those of Heracles and of Hebe.

We can now venture an opinion on why the Athenians chose Cynosarges for Philip's cult. It was both appropriate and convenient. It was added to the cult of Heracles who was regarded as his ancestor. As Heracles' descendant, Philip fitted in well with Heracles' wife Hebe, his mother Alcmena, and his helpmate Iolaus. The addition of Philip's cult to that of Heracles was not unprecedented insofar as those of Hebe, Alcmena, and Iolaus apparently also were additions. These circumstances, as well as the location of Cynosarges outside the city wall, made the cult less drastic an innovation than it would have been otherwise.³⁸

II.

We now turn to Philip's other honors during the course of his career. It is at least a possibility that he received divine honors quite early, before 357 B.C., at Amphipolis. Aelius Aristides says (38.480, p. 715 Dindorf) that the Athenians in their negotiations with the Thebans in 340/39 B.C. mentioned, apropos of Philip's capture of Amphipolis in the fall of 357 B.C., that the

³⁷Paus. 1.19.3; Hesych. s.v. *Kynosarges*; schol. ad Aristoph. *Ran.* 651.

³⁸If, as K. Atkinson believes ("Demosthenes, Alexander, and Asebeia," *Athenaeum* 51 [1973] 310 ff.), there existed at Athens a law making it illegal to propose the reception of new deities into the Athenian state cult, it is possible that the location of Philip's cult, and its subsidiary status to that of Heracles, were expected to obviate a possible charge of illegality. But the evidence cited by Atkinson does not demonstrate such a law. Her key passage is Dinarchus c. *Dem.* 94, criticizing Demosthenes' role in the discussions of divine honors for Alexander in 324 B.C. at Athens: καὶ τότε μὲν γράφων καὶ ἀπαγορεύων μηδένα νομίζειν ἄλλον θεὸν ἢ τοὺς παραδεδομένους, τότε δὲ λέγων ὡς οὐ δεῖ τὸν δῆμον ἀμφισβητεῖν τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ τιμῶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ . . . Atkinson thinks that in the first clause Dinarchus refers to a threat by Demosthenes to prefer an indictment in court for a motion offending against an already existing law (*graphê paranomôn*). But this is not what Dinarchus says. I translate: "At one time he made a motion forbidding (*graphôn kai apagoreuôn*) anyone to acknowledge any but the traditional gods, at another, etc." Dinarchus, that is, is referring to a motion by Demosthenes in the Assembly aimed at *preventing* a proposal to acknowledge Alexander as a god. There is no indication here of an already existing law which would make such a proposal *ipso facto* illegal. Nor does our information on the trial of Socrates on a charge of *asebeia* demonstrate such a law in 399 B.C. (Pl. *Ap.*, *Cri.*, *Phd.*, *Euthphr.*; X. *Ap.*, *Mem.*).

people there had been sacrificing to him as a god (*ἔθνον ὡς θεῷ*). C. Habicht has suggested (12 f.) that the cult was founded under a new democratic regime in 359 B.C., in appreciation of Philip's withdrawal of the Macedonian garrison, which was regarded as a *de facto* restoration of the city's independence. But while Habicht concedes that this must remain speculation, he is satisfied that the cult itself is historical.³⁹ However, this remains uncertain.

It is possible that Philip also received divine honors at Eresos, on Lesbos, in 343 B.C. An inscription from Eresos mentions among other misdeeds of the tyrant Agonippus at the time of Alexander's campaign in Asia Minor in 334 B.C. the tearing down of "altars of Zeus Philippios" and the initiation of hostilities against Alexander (*OGI* I. 8a). C. Habicht has suggested (15) that the altars were dedicated in 343 B.C. by the new democratic regime in appreciation of Philip's aid in the overthrow of the tyrants. But what is the meaning of "Zeus Philippios?" Habicht thinks (14), with reference to Zeus Seleucios, Apollo Pasparios, and Aphrodite Stratonikis, that the title designates Philip as *Hypostase*, that is, a manifestation of Zeus. But it is equally possible that the term designates Zeus in his special capacity as champion of Philip, as M. P. Nilsson has suggested (*Geschichte der griechischen Religion* II² [Munich 1961] 142). If this is correct, Philip's

³⁹Cf. A Momigliano (above, note 1) 176. *Contra*, F. Taeger, *Charisma* I (Stuttgart 1957) 174.

It is possible that already Philip's father Amyntas received divine honors during his lifetime, from the people of Pydna. The evidence again is Aelius Aristides who in the passage referred to in the text quotes the Athenians as saying (38.480): οὐθ' ὑπερβάλλουσθ' ἂν Ἀμφιπολίτας καὶ Πυδναίους, ὧν οἱ μὲν ἔθνον ὡς θεῷ, οἱ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ νεῶν εἶχον δεικνύναι. . . Amyntas' temple is attested also by the scholiast to Demosthenes (*Ol.* 1.5) who says, apropos of Philip's capture of the city in 357 B.C., that some of its inhabitants, when they realized they would not be spared, *ἔφυγον ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀμύντειον* (for the reading of the text, see C. Habicht [above, note 1] 11, note 1). And he adds: *κολακεύοντες γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν πατέρα οἱ Πυδναῖοι ἱερὸν αὐτοῦ ἐποίησαν*. Thus it appears certain that a sanctuary of Amyntas did exist in 357 B.C. When was it built? There are two possibilities. One, the scholiast may have based his explanation, that the Pydnaeans built the temple to flatter Amyntas, on information that this took place during his lifetime, and the information may be correct. So Habicht (above, note 1) 11 f. Two, the explanation may be simply the scholiast's inference from the *existence* of the temple in 357 B.C., in which case the cult may be posthumous.

It has been suggested, on the evidence of the scholiast, that in building the temple the Pydnaeans imitated a Macedonian custom of paying posthumous divine honors to their kings. H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* I (Munich 1926) 96, note 1; A. Momigliano (above, note 1) 173 f. This certainly remains at most a possibility. The only other possible evidence is a statement of the philosopher Anaxarchus in his debate with Callisthenes on the proposition of divine honors for Alexander, in Arrian 4.10.7, that the Macedonians no doubt *ἀπελθόντα γε ἐς ἀνθρώπων ὡς θεὸν τιμήσουσι· πόσω δὲ δικαιότερον ζῶντα γεραίρειν ἢ περ τελευτήσαντα ἐς οὐδὲν ὄφελος τῷ τιμωμένῳ*. But this speech is almost certainly fictitious. Cf. T. S. Brown, "Callisthenes and Alexander," *AJP* 70 (1949) 242.

honors were not divine but very nearly so, inasmuch as they elevated him high above the ordinary level to a special close association with Zeus.

Whatever honors Philip received, we may be sure that he welcomed them eagerly. His monumental self-esteem and *philotimia* are attested even from the beginning of his career. In 356 B.C., he refounded Crenides near Mt. Pangaeus and named it after himself Philippi, and similarly in 342/1 B.C. he founded Philippopolis on the Hebrus. A mortal man never before had given his own name to a city, and by so doing Philip usurped the honor traditionally reserved for the tutelary deity.⁴⁰ At the same time he judiciously cultivated his image as the descendant of Heracles and the devoted worshipper and champion of the Hellenic gods, by sacrificing to them, celebrating their festivals, and consulting their oracles. During the years from 352 to 338 B.C. he established his hegemony over north and central Greece by prosecuting two "sacred wars" in behalf of the Delphic Amphictiony. At the conclusion of the first, the Council, now Philip's instrument, deprived the offenders, the "godless" Phocians, of their seat and votes and accorded them to Philip (and his descendants) as descendant of Heracles and champion of Apollo. Before this, only *communities*, that is, the twelve Greek tribes through their representatives, had been members of the Amphictionic Council. Now for the first time a powerful individual became a member in his own behalf. Thus the oldest and most venerable religious Association in Greece gave official sanction to Philip's leadership in the affairs of Greece.⁴¹

There is evidence that after the battle of Chaeronea Philip not only received divine honors at Athens (Clem.), but also planned to found a dynastic cult, of himself and his family, at Olympia. Pausanias reports (5.20.9–10):

⁴⁰H. Nissen, *Orientation. Studien zur Geschichte der Religion* III (Berlin 1910) 333. Philip was imitated by Alexander on a large scale, but there is no evidence of either one receiving a founder's cult during his lifetime.

⁴¹F. Wuest, *Philip II. von Makedonien und Griechenland in den Jahren 346 bis 338* (Munich 1938) 17 ff. Philip's partisans advanced a telling rationale for his membership. In an open letter to Philip in 342 B.C., Pseusippus, Plato's nephew and successor as head of the Academy, cited with approval an account of the historian Antipater, now living in Athens, of how the Phlegians were expelled from the Amphictiony by Apollo, the Dryopians by Heracles, and the Crissaeans by the Amphictyons, and their seats and votes given to others, and how Philip had now followed their example, and had obtained as prize for his crusade the seat and two votes of the Phocians (§8). E. Bickermann and J. Sykutris, "Pseusipps Brief an König Philipp," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, phil.-hist. Kl., 80 (1928). The story illustrates not only the continued political efficacy of mythological (i.e., "historical") *exempla* in the fourth c., but also the readiness of Philip's supporters to compare and associate him with the gods.

ἔστι δὲ ἐντὸς τῆς Ἀλτῆως ... οἴκημα περιφερὲς ὀνομαζόμενον Φιλιππείον Φιλίππῳ δὲ ἐποιήθη μετὰ τὸ ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ὀλισθεῖν· κεῖνται δὲ αὐτόθι Φιλίππος τε καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος, σὺν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἀμύντας ὁ Φιλίππου πατήρ· ἔργα δὲ ἔστι καὶ ταῦτα Λεωχάρους ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ, καθὰ καὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ Εὐρυδίκης εἰσὶν (αἱ) εἰκόνες.⁴²

The remains of the building have been uncovered in the excavations. It was not an hero shrine but a temple. And, as Pausanias says, the statues were wrought in ivory and gold. This technique was used exclusively for statues of gods. The statue of Philip apparently occupied the front and center of the group, while those of the others were set back to form approximately a third-circle, Amyntas and Alexander being closest to Philip, and Olympias and Eurydice on the outside.⁴³

But the presence of Olympias' statue has caused a problem. It has traditionally been thought that Philip (formally or informally) divorced Olympias at some time in 337 B.C. At this time the Philippeum and the statues cannot yet have been completed. But certainly after this time, and perhaps since some time before this, as Philip's relations with Olympias deteriorated, he would not have set up her statue at the Philippeum. In appreciation of this difficulty A. Momigliano has proposed an interesting theory about the Philippeum (174 f.). Philip commissioned the building at some time in the spring of 337 B.C., during or after the Congress at Corinth, and it was completed at some time after his death in August 336 B.C.; Philip

⁴²At 5.17.4 Pausanias says that the chryselephantine statues of Eurydice and (Olympias) were at some later time moved to the temple of Hera.

It is possible, but perhaps not very likely, that the Eleans commissioned the project. Apart from the fact that Pausanias gives no indication of this, the ambitiousness of the project is against the assumption. On the other hand the Eleans, who had been allies of Philip since 343 B.C. but had failed to support him at Chaeronea, now had good reason to ingratiate themselves with him. They did this however by joining him in the invasion of Laconia (of course for their own gain). C. Roebuck, "The Settlements of Philip II in 338," *CP* 43 (1948) 84.

⁴³G. Treu, "Vermischte Bemerkungen," *Archäologische Zeitung* 40 (1882) 66-70; E. N. Gardiner, *Olympia. Its History and Remains* (Oxford 1925) 131 ff.; T. Schreiber (above, note 16) 234. The temple "was raised upon three steps of Parian marble, and adorned on the outside with a circular colonnade of eighteen slender Ionic columns, which supported an entablature and a cornice . . . The diameter of the building, measured on the top step, was 15.25 metres. Round the circular wall of the interior there were, on the inside, twelve engaged Corinthian columns . . . Above these engaged columns there was apparently another set of twelve smaller engaged columns, which supported the roof of the circular chamber at a higher level than the roof of the outer colonnade." J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* III (London 1898) 622 f. For full details, see F. Adler in *Olympia. Die Ergebnisse der von dem Deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabung*. E. Curtius und F. Adler. II. *Die Baudenkmäler* (Berlin 1892) 129 ff.

intended it as a treasury-temple dedicated to Olympian Zeus in analogy to other such buildings erected by various states at Olympia, to house his offerings to the god and to serve as his diplomatic headquarters; he did not commission the statues at all, but in 324 B.C. Alexander conceived the idea of founding a dynastic cult of himself and his family, and to this end converted the treasury-temple, dedicated to Zeus, into his own family-temple and commissioned for it the chryselephantine statues of the five honorands. Since Curtius Rufus says (9.6.26; 10.5.30) that during the Indian campaign Alexander expressed his intention to deify Olympias *after her death*, it is to be assumed that subsequently Alexander changed his mind and initiated the dynastic cult at Olympia, in about 324 B.C.

But a simpler explanation seems preferable. Nothing can be made, I believe, of the fact that all eleven treasuries at Olympia stood in a row on a terrace overlooking the Altis, while the Philippeum was built within the Altis, and was unique among the treasuries in being a tholos-temple.⁴⁴ Philip was not the man to consider himself bound by precedent. But more to the point, it is intrinsically unlikely that Alexander, who all through his life exhibited a punctilious reverence for the gods, converted a temple (treasury) of Zeus into a temple of himself and his family. It is also unlikely that in 324 B.C. he would have planned a dynastic cult centering on Philip, and including even his paternal grandparents. Further, our whole knowledge of the Philippeum and its significance rests on the information provided by Pausanias, supplemented by the excavation. Any interpretation therefore should accord as closely as possible with this evidence. But Pausanias seems to know nothing of the scenario proposed by Momigliano. He says that the Philippeum was built after the defeat (τὸ ὀλισθεῖν) of Greece at Chaeronea. This suggests that Philip initiated the project as the victor of Chaeronea not long after the battle (perhaps he was encouraged also by his honors at Athens) rather than as the Hegemon of the Corinthian League some months afterwards. Since he was an ally of Elis (since 343 B.C.), it is proper to date the project to within weeks, perhaps days, after the battle on August 2, 338 B.C., and certainly no later than at his move into the Peloponnese (he may have visited Olympia) in November, rather than at the time of, or even after, the congress of Corinth in the spring or early summer of 337 B.C. In the fall of 338 B.C., Olympias was still the queen and mother of the crown-prince. At this time Philip still treated her with deference, if only to keep up appearances and to please Alexander, who adored her. The affair and marriage with the young Cleopatra lay still in the future, perhaps as much as seven or eight months. There certainly is

⁴⁴L. Dyer, "Olympian Treasuries," *JHS* 25 (1905) 294 ff.

no reason to doubt, therefore, that Philip's plan for the Philippeum originally included Olympias. If the temple and statues were completed while he was still alive (and this is certainly a possibility, especially since Leochares can be assumed to have worked with the help of assistants⁴⁵), we could suppose that he dedicated them, but not the statue of Olympias, and that Alexander added her after Philip's death; if the project was completed after Philip's death, we can assume that Alexander set up all five statues in accordance with Philip's *original* design.

But let us note that a problem about Olympias' statue exists only if we believe that Philip divorced her in 337 B.C. and that subsequently he would not have erected her statue at the Philippeum. There is good reason to think, however, that the problem does not exist. J. R. Ellis has recently argued, very plausibly, that in the polygamistic world of the Macedonian royal house the official position of a wife of the king was secure as long as the king acknowledged a son of hers as being his chosen successor, that Philip never disavowed Alexander as his successor, that he never divorced or rejected Olympias as his queen, that Alexander's and Olympias' absence from court in 337 B.C. was in the nature of a self-imposed exile from which not only Alexander but also Olympias soon returned, and that to the end of Philip's life the status of Olympias as queen and mother of the heir-apparent was intact.⁴⁶ If Ellis is right, as he may well be, the presence of Olympias at the Philippeum is no puzzle at all. Depending on the time of its completion, the statues were set up either by Philip shortly before his death or by Alexander shortly afterwards in accordance with Philip's original design.⁴⁷

The conclusion that after Chaeronea Philip conceived the plan of establishing a dynastic cult of himself, Alexander, Olympias, Amyntas, and Eurydice is corroborated by a correspondence between the Philippeum and Cynosarges which is unlikely to be fortuitous. As we have seen, there was at Cynosarges an association of five honorands, Heracles, his wife Hebe, his mother Alcmena, his helper Iolaus, and now, if we believe Clement, his descendant Philip. At the Philippeum, there was a comparable association of *five*. Philip corresponded to Heracles; his wife Olympias to Hebe; his mother Eurydice to Alcmena; his son Alexander

⁴⁵According to Diogenes Laertius 5.75, 360 statues of Demetrius Poliorcetes, representing him on horseback or driving a chariot or a pair of horses, were completed in less than 300 days.

⁴⁶*Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976) 211 ff.

⁴⁷M. Andronikos believes that he has discovered Philip's tomb and in the tomb the chryselephantine figurines of Philip, Alexander, Olympias, Amyntas, and Eurydice. See, *pro tem*, M. Andronikos, "Regal Treasures from a Macedonian Tomb," *National Geographic* 154.1 (July 1978) 55 ff.; *The New York Times*, Dec. 25, 1977, 14 f.

after Chaeronea could be regarded as Philip's chief helpmate and thus corresponded to Iolaus; and Philip's father Amyntas corresponded to Heracles' descendant Philip. It appears likely, therefore, that the cult of Heracles and his family at Cynosarges provided for Philip the model for his family cult at Olympia. Olympia was the traditional center of pan-Hellenism and a symbol of opposition to the barbarians. Clearly if Philip, who now planned to attack the barbarians as the pan-Hellenic champion, succeeded in founding a cult of himself and his family that was accepted by the Hellenes, both his own prestige and that of his dynasty would be greatly enhanced everywhere in the Greek world.⁴⁸

As we have remarked, the Philippeum was either completed or nearly completed in August, 336 B.C. By this time, however, Philip's ambitions appear to have gone beyond even the founding of a family cult. On the occasion of his daughter's wedding to her uncle (Olympias' brother), Alexander king of Epirus, on the final day of festivities, Philip staged a *pompê* into the theatre which was crowded with visitors from all over the Greek world and beyond; his own entry—he was flanked by the two Alexanders—was preceded in solemn procession by the statues of the Twelve Gods; and to them was added the statue of Philip himself. Diodorus (16.92.5):

σὺν ταῖς ἄλλαις ταῖς μεγαλοπρεπέσι κατασκευαῖς εἶδωλα τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν ἐπόμενε ταῖς τε δημιουργίαις περιπτῶς εἰργασμένα καὶ τῇ λαμπρότητι τοῦ πλούτου θαυμαστῶς κεκοσμένα· σὺν δὲ τούτοις αὐτοῦ τοῦ Φιλίππου τρισκαίδέκατον ἐπόμενε θεοπρεπὲς εἶδωλον, σύνθρονον ἑαυτὸν ἀποδεικνύντος τοῦ βασιλέως τοῖς δώδεκα θεοῖς.

And (16.95.1):

Φίλιππος μὲν οὖν μέγιστος γενόμενος τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης βασιλέων καὶ διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἀρχῆς ἑαυτὸν τοῖς δώδεκα θεοῖς σύνθρονον καταριθμήσας.⁴⁹

What was the significance of this demonstration, and what were Philip's intentions? We cannot be sure, of course. Even before he reached the end of

⁴⁸If the Macedonian kings traditionally received posthumous divine honors in Macedonia (see above, note 39), Philip's establishment of the dynastic cult was, of course, facilitated.

⁴⁹This information is generally regarded as historical. The source is probably Theopompus. C. B. Welles, *Diodorus of Sicily* (Loeb ed.) VIII (1963) 5; A. Momigliano (above, note 1) 175 f.; O. Weinreich, in Roscher's *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und lateinischen Mythologie* IV (1924–27) 787. The information accords with Theopompus' over-all evaluation of Philip, quoted at the end of this paper. But see also N. G. L. Hammond, "The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI," *CQ* 31 (1937) 79 ff.

the procession in the theatre, Philip was struck down by the assassin, and the ceremony dissolved in chaos. But the following observations allow at least some probable conclusions.

Diodorus says twice, and therefore emphatically, that Philip “showed” (ἀποδεικνύντος), “counted himself” (καταριθμήσας), as “enthroned with” (σύνθρονον) the Twelve Gods. We do not know what exactly *synthronos* means in this context, as the word appears here for the first time in the Greek language. But the throne is the ceremonial seat of the *king* and symbol of his *rule*.⁵⁰ Diodorus connects the word with, in fact he attributes the whole demonstration to, Philip’s greatness as *king* (*megistos basileôn*) and the greatness of his *realm* (*megethos tês archês*). This interpretation probably derives from Diodorus’ source who was an eyewitness (Theopompus?). It is very possible that Philip himself in the procession advertised in some way the idea that he based the right to be *synthronos* with the Twelve Gods on his greatness as king and the greatness of his power. Or else the eyewitness may have *surmised* that this is how Philip justified the claim, and our knowledge of Philip suggests that he was right. The term *theoprepes* indicates that the material and garments of Philip’s statue were on par with those of the Twelve Gods. It is clear, therefore, that Philip presented his statue as thirteenth god along with the Twelve.⁵¹ Thus he served notice that he considered himself *worthy* of divine honors, that he considered himself worthy of such honors on a par and, probably, in conjunction with the *Twelve Gods*, and that he aspired to these honors as *king*, although probably not specifically, or exclusively, as king of the Macedonians.

Now it should be assumed a priori that some sort of cult act was planned before the statues in the theatre, the goal of the procession, and it follows from what we have already noted that this cult act very possibly was to include Philip, most likely as Thirteenth God. O. Weinreich has noted that in the cult of the Attalids, as well as in that of the Roman Emperors, there also were staged processions with statues of the rulers into the theatre, and sacrifices were performed there before them.⁵² Yet the proposition that Philip intended on this occasion, with the greatest possible publicity, to

⁵⁰On the significance of the throne for kings and gods, see H. Herter, “Zum bildlosen Kultus der Alten,” *RhM* 74 (1925) 164 ff. With respect to the Twelve Gods, cf. Libanius *Or.* 25.13: *χρὴ γὰρ οἶεσθαι καὶ τῇ Τύχῃ κεῖσθαι ἐν οὐρανῷ θρόνον εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα θεοῖς ἡρίμηνται.*

⁵¹Cf. Stob. *Flor.* 97 p. 233, 70 Meineke: *Φίλιππον πομπεύσαντα καὶ τρισκαιδέκατον θεὸν ἐπικληθέντα.*

⁵²O. Weinreich (above, note 49) 787, 806–08. For the cult of the Attalids, see E. Kornemann, “Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte,” *Klio* 1 (1901) 87; for the cult of the Emperors, Kornemann, “Neue Dokumente zum lakonischen Kaiserkult,” *Abhandlungen der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Kultur* 1 (1929) 26.

introduce in a formal ceremony his own deification strikes us *a priori* as not very probable. At this time, on the eve of his invasion of Persia, it was a paramount political *desideratum* for him to secure the good will of the Greeks and avoid *invidia* aroused by the magnitude of his power and success.⁵³ Formal deification at this time was certain to exacerbate ill will. Now, there is no evidence that a cult was ever actually practised at the Philippeum which, as we have noted, may have been completed before this time. Correspondingly, it may be legitimate to speculate that Philip planned to limit the cult acts in the theatre to the Twelve Gods, and not to include himself. If this is correct, both here and apparently also at the Philippeum Philip suggested and approximated his deification but stopped just short of actually introducing it formally in a cult. In this case, we conclude that after his victory at Chaeronea Philip conceived the plan for divine honors for himself and for his family but intended to postpone the initiation of an actual cult until some later time, most likely when he would have achieved his final ambition of conquering the king of Persia.

Shortly after Chaeronea, Isocrates addressed an open letter to Philip in which he declared that if in addition to the glory already achieved he would subjugate the barbarians to the Greeks and compel the Great King to do his bidding, "nothing will be left for you but to become a god" (*Ep.* 3.5). Even if, as some scholars believe, Isocrates meant the statement metaphorically,⁵⁴ he knew that Philip and others could and very possibly would choose to take it in the literal sense. If Philip had already received divine honors in some individual communities (see above), Isocrates' statement, without explanatory qualifications, was tantamount to the suggestion or could be taken as such, that after the conquest of the Great King, Philip receive a *universal* cult, that he become the god of his empire. Did Philip, then, perhaps feeling encouraged by Isocrates, prepare the way for his cult as the Basileus of his expanding empire? Was this cult to be practiced in conjunction with that of the Twelve Gods, which was prominent in the state cults at Athens and probably at most other Greek cities, as well as in Macedonia?⁵⁵ Did Philip by this association, perhaps as *Theos*

⁵³Cf. Isocr. *Ep.* 2.21: πρὸς σὲ μὲν διὰ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ εὐδαιμονίαν οὕτως ἔχουσιν (sc. *invidiose*).

⁵⁴So, e.g., J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "The Divinity of Alexander," *Historia* 1 (1950) 365 ff. *Contra*, H. Bengtson (above, note 12) 326; F. Wuest (above, note 41) 172. The important question for us is not so much what Isocrates meant by the statement as how Philip chose to interpret it. His demonstration at Aigai indicates that he took it as suggesting deification in his lifetime.

⁵⁵O. Weinreich (above, note 49) 764 ff.; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* II (Berlin 1932) 351, note 1; H. Berve (above, note 39) 87; K. Atkinson (above, note 38) 313 and esp. note 14.

Triskaidekatos, hope to be acknowledged as one of the official divinities in conjunction with these cults and thus acquire an extra-legal and constitutional status? Did he, in short, hope to provide a theocratic basis for absolute monarchy? We cannot be sure, but we must acknowledge that the evidence does point in this direction. Ironically, it may have been Aristotle who (no doubt unintentionally) encouraged Philip in this ambition or even initially planted the idea in his mind. In his *Politics* Aristotle writes (3.13.1248a ff.):

But if there is someone who is so far removed in superiority of merit (*aretê*) . . . that it cannot be compared with that of all the rest of the citizens, nor his political power with theirs, . . . one should no longer count such a man, or men, as part of the state; such men would be treated unjustly if accorded equal honor with others, being so superior in respect of *aretê* and political *dynamis*; such a person would rightly be *like a god among men* (ὥσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰκὸς εἶναι τοιοῦτον). Therefore it is clear that legislation also must necessarily be concerned with men who are equal both in descent and ability (*dynamis*). But there can be no law for such men as we have described, for they are themselves the law.

To be sure, the *Politics* was not published until some time after Philip's death. But Aristotle had held these views probably quite some time previously, and Philip probably knew them. Aristotle joined Philip's court at Pella in 342 B.C. Probably he did not mean to suggest the deification of the supreme leader. But for a man like Philip such an application would be tempting, and easy, to make. It has been argued recently that to place himself above the law was precisely Alexander's ambition when in 324 B.C. he requested divine honors from the cities of Greece and at Athens (where we have specific information) Demades proposed his recognition as Thirteenth God.⁵⁶ This cannot be proven. We do know from the subsequent history of the cults of rulers in Greek cities that divine honors did not impart to them any special political rights, and only on this supposition can we account for the ready and indeed increasing willingness of the cities to accord these honors. But this does not tell us much, if anything, about the *ambitions* of Philip and Alexander, since both died before seeing them fulfilled. It is surely fair to say, in any case, that whatever Alexander was after in 324 B.C. when Demades proposed him as

⁵⁶K. Atkinson (above, note 38) 310 ff. and esp. 331 ff. The third c. (A.D.) rhetorician Apsines (*Rhet. Graec.* I p. 221 Spengel-Hammer) says that "Demades proposed to recognize Philip as thirteenth god." This is apparently a confusion of the traditions that (1) Demades proposed Alexander as thirteenth god (Ael. *VH* 5.12. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 10.96.4 p. 70 Stählin; Lucian, *Dial. mort.* 391), (2) at Aigai Philip exhibited his statue as thirteenth god, and (3) at Athens Philip received divine honors.

Thirteenth God at Athens, he was influenced to some extent by what he knew or surmised of Philip's design as Thirteenth God in the ceremony at Aigai.⁵⁷

As we have seen, Philip's ambition for divine honors apparently was aroused at the latest at the time of his victory at Chaeronea. As for the Athenians, after the battle his supporters no doubt knew what he would appreciate, and the people had good reason to flatter him. After their devastating defeat on the battle-field they at first had feared the final extremities. But instead of acting the barbarian he had been made out to be, Philip showed magnanimity and restraint. He released the Athenian prisoners of war without ransom, ordered Alexander and Antipater to conduct the ashes of the dead in solemn procession back to Athens, and offered peace, friendship, and an alliance, on most generous terms, with the stipulation that the city remain free and autonomous. The immediate response at Athens was relief and gratitude. When we remember with what lavish abandon the Athenians only thirty years later showered divine honors on Antigonos and Demetrius, it is not difficult to accept that in those momentous days after Chaeronea they instituted a cult for the man of whom his contemporary Theopompus would soon write (*FGrHist* 115 Fr. 27 = Polyb. 8.11.1),

μηδέποτε τὴν Εὐρώπην ἐννοχέειν τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα παράπαν οἶον τὸν Ἀμύντου φίλιππον.⁵⁸

⁵⁷There is some indication that Philip's ambition to associate himself with the Twelve Gods went back at least to the time of Chaeronea. O. Weinreich has noted ([above, note 49] 838 and 772; "Die lykischen Zwölfgötter Reliefs," *SB Heidelberg Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl., 4 [1913] 8 and 39 f.) that before Philip the tholos-design was typical of temples of the Twelve Gods, and that after Philip it became associated with temples of deified rulers (the Arsenoium on Samothrace, the Antigoneum on Cnidos, the Augusteum at Pergamum, the Augustus-Roma temple at Athens, and the Pantheon at Rome). He suggests that their prototype was the Philippeum, which thus is to be understood as "de monumentale Ausdruck seiner Gleichstellung mit dem olympischen Götterkreis" ("Die lykischen Zwölfgötter Reliefs," 40). Perhaps it was not a coincidence that (as many scholars believe) Alexander's request for divine honors from the cities of Greece was announced at the Festival at Olympia (Aug. 324 B.C.).

⁵⁸I continue to believe, against G. Shrimpton, "Theopompus' Treatment of Philip in the *Philippica*," *Phoenix* 31 (1977) 123 ff., that this statement is a tribute to the magnitude of Philip's impact on history rather than moral condemnation.

It is plausible to speculate that the cult was abolished after Philip's death and that subsequently Alexander acquiesced. Its short duration then would explain why it is not attested in the extant contemporary sources. However, in view of the vicissitudes of our tradition, an argument from silence against Clement would in any case not be persuasive. For instance, most scholars would probably reject the information of Ps.-Callisthenes 1.34, that (in 332 B.C.) Alexander was officially enthroned as Pharaoh of the Egyptians, since it is

mentioned in none of the extant historical accounts. But inscriptions have proved Ps.-Call. right.

Finally, we read in Arrian (1.17.11) that when in 334 B.C. Alexander entered Ephesus, the populace, relieved of fear of the oligarchs, *inter alia* killed those who had plundered the temple of Artemis and those who had thrown down the statue (τὴν εἰκόνα) of Philip in the temple. On this evidence, Habicht ([above, note 1] 14–16) and Momigliano ([above, note 1] 176) suggested that the Ephesians accorded Philip divine honors as σύνναος θεός of Artemis, and Habicht speculated that the honors were initiated when the anti-Persian democratic faction seized power at the occupation of the city by Philip's forces in 336 B.C. In the second edition of his book, p. 245, Habicht has preferred the view that the statue was merely honorific. It is true that Arrian's information does not evince a cult statue, but in the light of Philip's honors elsewhere, especially at Cynosarges where he was apparently σύνναος with Heracles, the Ephesians may well have honored Philip similarly at the Artemisium.

I wish to thank the journal's anonymous referees for valuable observations and suggestions and Professor Richard Minadeo for help with the Italian texts. Any remaining faults are entirely my own responsibility.