

# The Essential Philip of Macedon: A Byzantine Epitome of His Life

*Brad L. Cook*

OF PHILIP II, King of Macedon, “not one ancient Life survives from antiquity.”<sup>1</sup> An epitome, however, of Philip’s life does survive in *Vaticanus graecus* 96 (12<sup>th</sup> century).<sup>2</sup> One hundred eighty-three words, nearly a full page of the manuscript, portray Philip on three campaigns: against Methone, against Byzantium, and, amidst a description of his talents and character, against Athens. Though this text resurfaced briefly, and obscurely, in 1838,<sup>3</sup> its importance for Philip and for Byzantine scholarship has never been examined. In this paper I describe briefly the contents and characteristics of *Vat. gr.* 96. Second, I present the text with a translation and analyze the content and structure of the three episodes of the Philip epitome. I then compare the text to some earlier vignettes of Philip in the ancient tradition and conclude that the twelfth-century scholar who wrote this epitome collected and consciously organized his material to form a brief but

<sup>1</sup> G. T. Griffith, in N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II* (Oxford 1979) 204.

<sup>2</sup> *Vat. gr.* 96 is dated by its script and its relationship to *Vat. Pal. gr.* 93, which is copied, in part (10<sup>r</sup>–141<sup>r</sup>), from *Vat. gr.* 96, and has a terminus ante quem of 1152 based on marginalia; see the arguments of Ciro Giannelli as reported by Artur Biedl, *Zur Textgeschichte des Laertios Diogenes: Das grosse Exzerpt* (Studi e Testi 184 [1955]) 88–89, and N. G. Wilson, “Scholarly Hands of the Middle Byzantine Period,” in *La Paléographie grecque et byzantine* (Paris 1977) 221–239, esp. 235–237.

<sup>3</sup> C. L. Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati Vitae Sophistarum* (Heidelberg 1838) xv–xvi; Kayser mentioned the Philip text again and printed the epitome of Demosthenes that precedes it in the MS. in C. L. Kayser, review of Albert Jahn, *Symbolae ad emendandum et illustrandum Philostrati librum de Vitae Sophistarum* (Bern 1837), *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* 28 (1839) 218–219.

cohesive text on Philip. The manuscript not only presents a new text on Philip that is quite sophisticated in its praise and condemnation of the conquering king but also allows us to see how a Byzantine scholar compiled excerpts from earlier texts to form his unique epitome of Philip.

1. *Codex Vaticanus graecus 96*

*Vaticanus graecus 96*, a miniscule, paper manuscript of the twelfth century that fills 229 folia, is a hodgepodge of texts and excerpts from nearly twenty known ancient authors.<sup>4</sup> The first ten folia contain fifty-three of Philostratus' *Erotic Epistles*, and folia 11<sup>r</sup>–18<sup>v</sup> contain two complete declamations of M. Antonius Polemon. The next eighty folia contain biographical texts: pseudo-Hesychius' *De viris illustribus* (19<sup>r</sup>–29<sup>v</sup>),<sup>5</sup> excerpts from Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers* (29<sup>v</sup>–88<sup>r</sup>),<sup>6</sup> sixteen sayings of famous ancients (88<sup>r</sup>–88<sup>v</sup>),<sup>7</sup> excerpts from pseudo-Herodotus' *Life of Homer* (88<sup>v</sup>–89<sup>r</sup>),<sup>8</sup> excerpts from Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* (89<sup>r</sup>–97<sup>v</sup>),<sup>9</sup> excerpts from two Lives of Demosthenes (97<sup>v</sup>–98<sup>v</sup>),<sup>10</sup> and the epitome of Philip (98<sup>v</sup>). At the end of the epitome of Philip are appended two

<sup>4</sup> See Biedl, *Textgeschichte* 55–56, for the fullest details.

<sup>5</sup> Printed by M. Marcovich, *Diogenes Laertius, Vitae Philosophorum II* (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1999) 89–138.

<sup>6</sup> Printed by Marcovich, *Diogenes Laertius II* 140–320.

<sup>7</sup> Printed by Alessandra Bertini Malgarini, “Alcuni detti di Diogene Cinico nel Cod. Vat. gr. 96,” in Franco Piperno (ed.), *Studi per Riccardo Ribuoli* (Rome 1986) 17–26, who publishes an image of f. 88<sup>r-v</sup> between pp.18 and 19.

<sup>8</sup> Biedl, *Textgeschichte*, in his listing for *Vat. gr. 96*, incorrectly ends the Herodotean Life of Homer (and starts Philostratus' Lives) on 89<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati*, prints the epitome of Philostratus' text at the foot of the relevant pages in his 1838 edition; he also prints a different epitome from *Parisina epitome* Suppl. 134 which consists only of an introduction and excerpts from nine Lives before it breaks off during the Life of Herodes (Philostr. *VS* 2.1 [557]).

<sup>10</sup> Excerpts from two “manuscript” Lives of Demosthenes, one by Zosimus of Ascalon, the other anonymous; see the complete text of these two Lives in Anton Westermann, *ΒΙΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ: Vitarum scriptores Graeci minores* (Braunschweig 1845) 297–302 (Zosimus), 302–309 (Anonymous).

gnomai (98<sup>v</sup>–99<sup>r</sup>).<sup>11</sup> The next block of texts are excerpts of a historical cast: excerpts from John of Antioch's *Archaeologia* (99<sup>r</sup>–100<sup>v</sup>), a collection of unattributed texts (100<sup>v</sup>–102<sup>v</sup>, 103<sup>r-v</sup>, 106<sup>r</sup>–111<sup>v</sup>) mingled with excerpts from Agathias *Historia de regno Iustiniani* (103<sup>v</sup>–105<sup>v</sup>, 112<sup>r</sup>–114<sup>v</sup>), from Aelian *Varia Historia* (114<sup>v</sup>–131<sup>v</sup>),<sup>12</sup> and from Heraclides of Lembus *Peri politeias* (131<sup>v</sup>). The rest of the manuscript contains excerpts from Aelian *De animalium natura* (132<sup>r</sup>–229<sup>r</sup>),<sup>13</sup> which is briefly interrupted by some excerpts on marvels (157<sup>v</sup>–159<sup>r</sup>).<sup>14</sup>

The manuscript as a whole looks like a set of notes, or hypomnemata, made by a scholar for his own use.<sup>15</sup> Except for the first eighteen folia, the manuscript is filled with excerpts. Many of the excerpts could be labeled gnomai, brief, pithy truisms, or apophthegms, less universal than gnomai and situated in context with speaker and setting. But these excerpts are not organized by speaker or nationality, as in the collections of apophthegms of Plutarch or in various Byzantine collections of

<sup>11</sup> Σκια τὰ θνητῶν ἐν μιᾷ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν εὐτυχῆ τίθησι δυστυχῆ θεός. This text also appears in a MS. in the Zavorda monastery, quoted by K. Tsanatsanoglou, “Οἱ στίχοι 55–87 τῆς Comoedia Florentina καὶ τὰ ἀμφισβητήσιμα καὶ ψευδεπίγραφα τοῦ Μενάνδρου,” Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης 9 (1965) 255–265, at 258; for the shadow image cf. Eur. *Med.* 1224–1232; the second half, ἐν μιᾷ γὰρ ..., is found in Men. *Aspis* 417–418 quoted from Carcinus (= *TrGF* I 70 F 5a). Κλεόβουλος ὁ Λίνδιος ἐκ τῶν ἴσων ὑποτίθεται γαμεῖν. ἂν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν κρειττόνων λάβῃς, φησί, δεσπότης κτήσῃ τοὺς συγγενέας; cf. the very similar text in Stobaeus 3.1.172 from Demetrius of Phalerum's *Sayings of the Seven Wisemen* (= fr.114 in F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*<sup>2</sup> IV [Basel/Stuttgart 1968]).

<sup>12</sup> Discussed by Mervin R. Dilts, “The Testimonia of Aelian's *Varia Historia*,” *Manuscripta* 15 (1971) 3–12, and the *Vat. gr.* 96 excerpts are listed in Mervin R. Dilts, *Claudius Aelianus, Varia Historia* (Leipzig 1974) vii–viii.

<sup>13</sup> A sample printed by Luigi De Stefani, “Gli excerpta della ‘Historia animalium’ di Eliano,” *StIt* 12 (1904) 145–180, esp. 154–158 and 176–178.

<sup>14</sup> Printed by Luigi De Stefani, “Excerptum Vaticanum de rebus mirabilibus,” *StIt* 11 (1903) 93–98, with collation of four copies of *Vat. gr.* 96.

<sup>15</sup> On ὑπομνήματα see Plutarch at the opening of *On Quiet of Mind* 464F. On excerpting see e.g. Jørgen Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background* (*Hermes Einzelschr.* 40 [1978]) 16–29.

gnomai, or gnomologies.<sup>16</sup> Nor are the many excerpts of the manuscript organized topically for the education of a young reader, as in Stobaeus' *Anthology*. With the exception of the page on Philip, the groups of excerpts from each larger work are not epitomes that give an overall understanding of the entire work, as with the epitomes of various ancient works, such as the tenth- or eleventh-century epitome of the *Deipnosophistai* of Athenaeus.<sup>17</sup> Unlike these more structured works which are of immediate use to readers other than the compiler or epitomator, in *Vat. gr.* 96, with its many seemingly unrelated excerpts, carefully transcribed within the framework of the original work, with the author, title, and even the book number in the case of the *Lives* of Diogenes Laertius, included in the text and margins, we have a scholar's manuscript of notes for personal use. If, as N. G. Wilson believes, the hand of the manuscript is that of a scholar rather than of a professional scribe, then not just the content and structure of the manuscript but even the handwriting point to this conclusion.<sup>18</sup>

Among the excerpts from biographical texts, the beginning of each set of excerpts about a given individual was marked with the subject's name in the margin in letters twice as large as those of the text and by writing in the same manner the first

<sup>16</sup> On the ancient and modern use of the terms γνώμη, ἀπόφθεγμα, χρεία and on ancient collections see Konstantin Horna and Kurt von Fritz, "Gnome, Gnomendichtung, Gnomologien," *RE* Suppl. 6 (1935) 74–90; Henry Chadwick, "Florilegium," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 7 (1969) 1131–1160; Jan Fredrik Kindstrand, "Diogenes Laertius and the Chreia Tradition," *Elenchos* 7 (1986) 219–243; Denis M. Searby, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition* (Uppsala 1998); Leslie Kurke, "Gender, Politics, and Subversion in the *Chreiai* of Machon," *PCPS* 48 (2002) 20–65, esp. 20–23. For an overview of earlier scholarship and a list of published gnomologies, Dimitri Gutas, *Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation: A Study of the Graeco-Arabic Gnomologia* (New Haven 1975) 1–35.

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Geoffrey Arnott, "Athenaeus and the Epitome: Texts, Manuscripts, and Early Editions," in David Braund and John Wilkin (eds.), *Athenaeus and His World* (Exeter 2000) 41–52 and 542–543, and for a survey of Latin epitomes, with an introductory chapter on Greek epitomes, see Marco Galdi, *L'epitome nella letteratura latina* (Napoli 1922).

<sup>18</sup> Wilson, in *La Paléographie*, esp. 221–222, 235–237, with a sample, fig. 12, from *Vat. gr.* 96, f. 109<sup>r</sup>.

letter of the first word of the selection, whether that word was the subject's name or some other word. The excerptor marked the end of the set of excerpts with the mark :- and left a gap of 5 mm before starting the next set of excerpts. In addition, these extra-large letters in the margin and the text and the special punctuation were written in red ink. The most striking evidence that the author expended extraordinary effort to record the process of excerption is the manner in which he distinguished the start not of a new Life, or set of excerpts, but of individual excerpts within a Life. At the end of an excerpt within a Life the author leaves a large gap, as between Lives, but, instead of using his red closing mark :-, he marks the start of the new excerpt by using a yellow wash, or highlighting, over the first letters or words of the new excerpt.

## 2. *The epitome of Philip's life*

The epitome covers nearly all of f. 98<sup>v</sup>, from the third line to the start of line twenty-eight, the last of the page. A double-sized, red-traced phi stands in the left margin as "Philip" begins the epitome. There is, however, no marginal title for the epitome as there normally is, e.g. for the immediately preceding excerpts from two Lives of Demosthenes, from Philostratus' *Lives*, and elsewhere. The excerpts on Demosthenes follow the excerpts from Philostratus' Life of Varus of Laodicea as if the text had been part of the *Lives* of Philostratus and as if the last five Lives of Philostratus' text were ignored or missing. It appears, then, that the excerpts on Demosthenes and the Philip epitome are treated as if they were part of Philostratus' *Lives*.<sup>19</sup> The Greek text of the Philip epitome printed below preserves the line divisions of the manuscript, with extra space in lines 7 and 13 where the new excerpts begin, with ἐπεχείρησε in 7 and ἦν in 13 highlighted with the yellow wash used to mark the start of new excerpts. The punctuation is that of the manuscript

<sup>19</sup> This may explain why the Demosthenes and Philip texts in *Vat. gr.* 96 are not listed in I. Mercati and P. Franchi De' Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticani Graeci I Codices 1-329* (Rome 1923) 108-109, nor the copies in the dependent MS., *Vat. Pal. gr.* 93, in Henry M. Stevenson, *Codices manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome 1885).

though I have added hyphens and iota-subscripts:<sup>20</sup>

Φίλιππος Μεθώνην πολεμῶν τὴν ἐπὶ Θράκης, ἐπηρώθη  
τὸν δεξιὸν ὀφθαλμόν· βέλει βληθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος τῶν Μεθω-  
ναίων Ἀστέρος ἐπιγράψαντός τι τῷ βέλει τοιοῦτον· “Ἀστὴρ  
Φιλίππῳ θανάσιμον πέμπει βέλος.” ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος ἀν-  
τιγράψας τῷ βέλει “Ἀστέρα Φίλιππος ἦν λάβη κρε- 5  
μήσεται.”<sup>21</sup> ἐζήτησε πρὸς τιμωρίαν αὐτὸν εἰρήνην ὑπο-  
σχόμενος καὶ λαβὼν ἀπέκτεινεν· ἐπεχείρησε δὲ καὶ  
Βυζαντίους πολεμεῖν· Πύθωνος προδιδόντος καὶ στρα-  
τηγοῦντος Λέοντος· ὃν Φίλιππος διαβάλλειν θέλων, ἔ-  
γραψε Βυζαντίους· εἰ ὅσα ἠτήθη ὑπὸ Λέοντος ἔ- 10  
δωκα χρήματα, εἶλον ἂν Βυζάντιον· πιστεύαν-  
τος δὲ τοῦ πλήθους καὶ ἐπισυστάντος ἐπ’ αὐτὸν, ὁ Λέων ἀ-  
πήγξατο· καὶ οὕτω, Φίλιππος Βυζαντίων περιεγένετο· ἦν  
δὲ Φίλιππος συνετός· καὶ δεινὸς εἰπεῖν· καὶ εὐτυχῆς  
πεῖσαι· καὶ πανούργος· καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα προιδεῖν ἰ- 15  
κανός· καὶ πρὸς τὰς πράξεις ὀξύς· οὐ μελ(λ)ητῆς οὐδὲ βρα-  
δύς· ἀλλ’ ἅμα τῷ βούλεσθαί τι πράττων· καὶ ταῖς γνώ-  
μας αὐτοῦ αἱ πράξεις παρειστήκεσαν· διὰ τοῦτο πάν-  
των περιεγένετο. καὶ μάλιστα τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως· οὐ-  
σης νοθρᾶς καὶ βραδείας· καὶ πολλὰς ἀγούσης ἐκκλη- 20  
σίας· καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἑορταῖς σχολαζούσης· ὅθεν τὴν Ἀθηναίων  
ἀργίαν καὶ βραδυτήτα καὶ ἀσχολίαν ἰδίαν εὐκαι-  
ρίαν νομίσας, περιεγένετο τῶν πραγμάτων· ἦν δὲ καὶ ἀ-  
ποστερησάει πονηρός· καὶ πλεονεκτῆσαι, πιθανός· μισῶν  
εἰρήνην· ἐρῶν πολέμου· τὰ πολλὰ ὁμνὺς καὶ παρασπον- 25  
δῶν τοῖς ὄρκοις :-

<sup>20</sup> The text printed by Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati*, was based on the copy made for him of the epitome in the Laurentian MS. LIX 37, which another person collated with *Vat. gr.* 96. He prints and marks with “sic” Θράκης (l. 1), Φιλίππῳ (4), κρεμάσεται (5–6), μελητής (16), πράττων (17) which has been “corrected” to πράττει, ἐκκλησίας (20–21); of these six, Φιλίππῳ, κρεμήσεται, and ἐκκλησίας are spelled correctly in *Vat. gr.* 96; he marks Θράκης either because he prefers Θράκης or, more likely, because he considers this a geographical error; μελητής I too have emended; with πράττων, I see no difficulty, nor has it been altered in *Vat. gr.* 96 to πράττει.

<sup>21</sup> These two inscriptions are marked in the left margin of the MS. with quotation marks.

Philip, while attacking Methone which is near Thrace, was maimed in his right eye by an arrow, having been hit by one of the Methonians named Aster, who wrote something like this on the arrow: "Aster sends Philip a deadly arrow." But Philip, having (5) written in turn on the arrow, "Aster, if Philip seizes him, he will crucify," sought him out of vengeance after proposing peace and, having seized him, he killed him. And he undertook to make war also on the Byzantines, while Python was betraying them and Leon was general; Philip, wanting to slander him, (10) wrote to the Byzantines: "If I had paid out as much money as had been asked for by Leon, I would have taken Byzantium." And when the multitude believed this and conspired against him, Leon hanged himself; and thus Philip prevailed over the Byzantines. And Philip was clever; and he was brilliant at speaking; and he was successful (15) at persuading; and he was capable of anything; and he could foresee the future; and in his actions he was quick; he was not hesitant nor slow; but he was active the moment he desired something; and alongside his ideas his actions stood ready; on account of this he prevailed over all, and especially over the city of the Athenians since (20) it was sluggish and slow, was holding many assemblies and was spending all its free time in festivals; whereupon, judging the Athenians' laziness and slowness and lack of free time his special opportunity, he prevailed over the circumstances; and also at depriving others he was wicked; and at acquiring more he was persuasive; he hated (25) peace; he loved war; he frequently swore and transgressed oaths. :-

The epitome begins abruptly with Philip at Methone, which city he attacked and besieged in the winter and spring of 355/4.<sup>22</sup> The Methone section is a self-contained episode, an anecdote, but one that the author of the epitome has selected for some purpose. The emphasis in the passage on Philip's anger, threat of vengeance, and killing of the archer Aster under a treaty of peace will be seen to accord with the author's concluding assessment that Philip was a treacherous, vengeful warmonger who used any means to achieve his goals.

The language and content of the Methone text are very similar to a passage in the tenth-century *Suda*. The *Suda* passage,

<sup>22</sup> Griffith, *History* 254–258.

ostensibly on Caranus, who is described as the founder of the Macedonian royal family,<sup>23</sup> spends two and a half lines on Caranus and the remaining twenty-four and a half on Philip. It contains the Methone account in almost the same form as the Vatican epitome (K 356):

Μεθωναίοις δὲ τοῖς ἐπὶ Θράκης πολεμῶν τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐπηρώθη,  
 Ἄστέρος τινὸς ὄνομα βαλόντος αὐτὸν βέλει, ἐπιγράψαντός τε τῷ  
 βέλει· “Ἄστηρ Φιλίππῳ θανάσιμον πέμπει βέλος.” πρὸς ὃν ἀντι-  
 γράψας ἔπεμψε βέλος ὁ Φίλιππος· “Ἄστέρα Φίλιππος, ἦν λάβη,  
 κρεμήσεται.” καὶ ὑποσχόμενος εἰρήνην ἐξήτησε καὶ λαβῶν ἐκρέ-  
 μασεν.

While waging war on the Methonians near Thrace, he lost an eye when a certain man named Aster struck him with an arrow; he had written on the arrow, “Aster sends a deadly arrow to Philip.” Philip sent an arrow to him, after writing in response, “Aster, if Philip seizes him, he will crucify.” And, after offering peace, he made demands for him and, having seized him, he crucified him.

There are forty-three words in the *Suda* version and forty-seven in the Vatican version; of these, twenty-nine words are identical in form though not always in precisely the same order; four words in the *Suda* and five in the Vatican version are of the same stem but with different inflections; eight words in the *Suda* and six in the Vatican version do not appear in the other but do not alter the text much; two words in the *Suda* version have been turned into equivalents, ἐξήτησε into ἐζήτησε, which could be a misreading, and ἐκρέμασεν into ἀπέκτεινεν, perhaps for *variatio*. Five words, in three sets, are unique to the Vatican version—δεξιόν, τι ... τοιοῦτον, πρὸς τιμωρίαν—all of which look as if they have been added by our author.

These three small but noteworthy additions in the Vatican

<sup>23</sup> Earlier sources make Perdiccas I the founder of the royal line (Hdt. 8.137.1); see Hammond, *History* 3–14; on the source of Pompeius Trogus’ account, as preserved in Justin’s epitome, cf. Hammond, “The Sources of Justin on Macedonia to the Death of Philip,” *CQ* 41 (1991) 496–508, and Hammond, *Philip of Macedon* (London 1994) 14.



epitome reveal the hand of an attentive, critical, and informed reader. The first word added in the Vatican epitome and absent from the *Suda* is δέξιον, “right,” specifying which of Philip’s eyes was struck. This detail is not common. In addition to *Vat. gr.* 96, thirty texts, from antiquity through the Byzantine period, twenty-five Greek and five Latin, say something about Philip losing an eye.<sup>24</sup> Of these texts only eight mention which eye was hit; three of these are identical lexical entries,<sup>25</sup> so that only six distinct texts out of twenty-seven note the detail: Didymus, Strabo, Harpocration, Solinus, Justin, and George Cedrenus (11/12<sup>th</sup> century) specify the right eye, in addition to *Vat. gr.* 96. It seems extraordinary that this detail is not more common, much less universal, but its occurrence is rare. If the *Suda* entry, or the source common to the *Suda* and the Vatican epitome, once had this detail, it seems an odd word for the *Suda* version to drop; it seems more likely that someone would attempt to add the detail. Either way, the author of the Vatican epitome has shown his interest in detail, whether by retaining what others dropped or by finding fuller sources and supplementing the text at hand.

The second addition consists of two words added to the introduction of the arrow inscription: τι ... τοιοῦτον, “something of this sort,” which is followed by the text of the inscription. The addition of both the indefinite pronoun τι and the characterizing adjective τοιοῦτον, which are then followed by a verbatim quote, may signify suspicion on the part of our

<sup>24</sup> Dem. 18.67; Didymus 12.43–64 (= Theopompus *FGrHist* 115 F 52, Marsyas 135 F 16, Duris 76 F 36); Diod. 16.34.5; Strab. 7 fr.22/22a (Baladié), 8.6.15; [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 293; Sen. *Controv.* 10.5.6; Plin. *HN* 7.124; Plut. *Alex.* 3.2; [Plut.] *Parall.min.* 307D (= Callisthenes *FGrHist* 124 F 57; cf. Stob. *Flor.* 3.7.67); Lucian *Hist.conscr.* 38; Ael. *NA* 9.7; Harp. s.v. Μεθώνη; Just. *Epit.* 7.6.13–16; Ath. 6.248F (= Satyrus *FHG* III 161); Solin. 8.7, 9.17–18; Lib. *Progymn.* 9.3; Themist. *Or.* 23 (*Sophistes*) 284c; schol. in Dem. 3.5.43a (I 88 Dilts), 18.67.124 (I 215); Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 190 (149a), *Lex.* s.v. Μεθώνη (M 196 Theodoridis) (= *FHG* IV 382); *Suda* s.v. Κάρανος (K 356), Μεθώνη (M 434); George Cedrenus 1.265; *Gnom. Vat.* 539; Eustath. *Il.* 2.716 (I 512.39–43 van der Valk), 14.404 (III 671.12–15). Cf. Alice Swift Riginos, “The Wounding of Philip II of Macedon: Fact and Fabrication,” *JHS* 114 (1994) 103–119, who lists and discusses twenty-three of these sources.

<sup>25</sup> Photius and the *Suda* repeating Harpocration.

author. From excavations at Olynthus, besieged and taken by Philip in the middle of 348, we know that some arrowheads (and sling bullets) were cast with Philip's name on them, ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟ.<sup>26</sup> Perhaps the tradition of inscribing missiles persisted through the centuries and our author was familiar enough with the procedure to realize that such a lengthy text could not be written on an arrow, head or shaft. The earliest extant sources, Didymus (12.51–53), quoting Duris (*FGrHist* 76 F 36), and Lucian (*Hist.conscr.* 38), and later Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 190, 149a), say nothing about an inscription; the next source, Plutarch, or pseudo-Plutarch (*Parall.min.* 307D), and later Stobaeus (3.7.67), report the line, "Aster to Philip sends a deadly shaft," but they both report that Aster spoke this line as he fired at Philip. With Solinus, ca. A.D. 200, we find the earliest account in which Aster inscribed the arrow with "his own name, the place to be wounded, and the person sought," though the inscribed text itself is not quoted (*Coll. rerum memor.* 8.7, 9.17–18). Such a text would be even longer than the subsequently reported texts since these do not include the place to be wounded.

Our earliest Greek version of the inscribed arrow appears in the fourth century in a speech of Themistius. He complains that unseen people are showering him with accusations the way one might shoot arrows from afar; continuing the metaphor, he suggests that if you pick up one of these arrows and examine it, we might find near the barbs of the arrowhead (γλοφίδες) even the name of shooter emblazoned, just as Aster's name was on

<sup>26</sup> David M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus X* (Baltimore 1941) 382–383, nos. 1907–1911, pl. CXX; these labelled arrowheads, 6.6–7 cm. long, are now thought to be for use in an early non-torsion catapult, see E. W. Marsden, "Macedonian Military Machinery and Its Designers under Philip and Alexander," in *Ancient Macedonia II* (Thessaloniki 1977) 211–223, esp. 213–215. The arrowhead that hit Philip must have been shot by a bow, not by a bolt catapult, though Strabo (7 fr.22) and Hammond (*Philip* 35) claim as much; see Griffith's remark, *History* 257 n.2, "interesting but implausible, for Philip would have been less likely to survive this." Cf. E. W. Marsden, *Greek and Roman Artillery I* (Oxford 1969) 86–97, on catapult bolts and their effect according to ancient sources and in modern tests.

the arrow that hit Philip.<sup>27</sup> Themistius appears to know whereof he speaks and expects to find only the name of the sender, and nothing more, as with the Philip arrows from Olynthus. Aster's much longer, five-word sentence, uttered in Plutarch and Stobaeus and described in Solinus, is first fully quoted as inscribed on the arrow in the scholion to Demosthenes 3.5.41 (I 88 Dilts), and later in the *Suda* entry on Caranus. The author of the Vatican epitome had the same text as the scholion and the *Suda*, but he appears to have had the common sense to question the practicability of inscribing such a lengthy message on the arrow and marks that suspicion with the qualifying phrase "something of the sort." If  $\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  does signal his suspicion, we are then compelled to ask why he selected and saved the anecdote. He must have found the motif of personal attack and vengeance, initially frustrated but eventually successful, so telling of Philip's character that he was willing to accept the lengthy inscriptions, however implausible.

The third addition to the anecdote also consists of two words and constitutes an important addition to the story. In response to Aster's inscribed arrow, Philip writes back to Aster on the same arrow, it seems, and shoots it back. He misses the mark. Philip, however, now employs diplomacy to hit his target, a point made by both the *Suda* version and the Vatican epitome. Our author, however, has added the phrase  $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\ \tau\iota\mu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ , "out of vengeance," to make explicit what is implied in the *Suda*. He makes it obvious that Philip is motivated by nothing except personal vengeance; the alteration of  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon$ , "he demanded," to  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\zeta\eta\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon$ , "he sought," whether accidental or

<sup>27</sup> Themist. *Or.* 23 (*Sophistes*) 284c, ἴσως δ' ἂν καὶ πυκνὰ ἐπαφόμενοι καὶ μεταστρέφοντες εὐροιμεν ἀγχοῦ τῶν γλυφίδων καὶ τοῦνομα τοῦ βάλλοντος ἐγκεχαραγμένον· ὅθενπερ καὶ Φιλίππῳ ἐφωράθη τῷ Μακεδόνι πολιορκοῦντι Μεθώνην ὁ βαλὼν ἐκ τοῦ τείχους τοξότης. Ἄστηρ ὄνομα ἦν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ἐγκέκαυτο ἐν τῷ βέλει. Themistius clearly understands any name on an arrowhead to mark the sender of the arrow; this ancient example should lead us to assume that the variously labelled projectiles, arrows, and sling stones from Olynthus also bear the names of the senders, not those of the intended recipients. The γλυφίδες must be the barbs of the arrowhead, such as those on the Philip arrows from Olynthus, see Robinson, *Excavations* 382–383; cf. LSJ s.v. γλυφίς.

intentional, echoes this shift from a word that suggests a formal demand to one that imagines Philip going about the city in person in search of Aster. Our author sees Philip's offer of peace to the city as having nothing to do with his brilliant handling of his difficulty at taking Methone by siege, much less with what must be his poor health due to his recent trauma. He used the pretense of peace because it was the only way that he could get his hands on one individual citizen who had personally assaulted him. The entire story of Aster and the overly-inscribed arrow are most likely creative accretions to the core fact that Philip lost an eye, but our author uses the anecdote, qualified by  $\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\tau\omicron\nu$ , because the anecdote illustrates so well that Philip took the insult, not just the injury to his eye, not as a part of war but as a personal assault and accordingly employed any means, including the deceitful use of diplomacy, to wreak vengeance on Aster.

It is possible that the Vatican version relies directly on the version of the anecdote in the *Suda*, but it seems more likely that both used a common, earlier source. The overall contents and structure of *Vat. gr.* 96 have little in common with the *Suda* and suggest independence of anything like the *Suda*. If we consider the two *Suda* entries on Philip proper, we find that one,  $\Phi$  354, is a eulogistic summary almost verbatim from Polybius 5.10.1–5; the second,  $\Phi$  355, which is similar to Polybius 23.10.15, is more grim, like the tone of the Vatican epitome. Another source, however, gives definite evidence of independence from the *Suda*. In a thirteenth-century manuscript in Paris is a collection of 343 gnomes and anecdotes, the *Gnomologium Parisinum ineditum* (*GPI*).<sup>28</sup> Nearly all the texts come from known works, such as Aelian's *Varia Historia* and Stobaeus' *Anthology*, and nearly half of them from a collection of gnomes attributed to Maximus the Confessor.<sup>29</sup> The first fourteen gnomes in *GPI*, however, are found in *Vat. gr.* 96 but they do not appear all together there. Thirteen, *GPI* nos. 1–10,

<sup>28</sup> Leo Sternbach, "Gnomologium Parisinum ineditum," *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności. Wydział Filologiczny* Ser. II 5 (1894) 135–171.

<sup>29</sup> Denis M. Searby, "The Sources of the So-called Gnomologium Parisinum Ineditum," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 29 (1999) 295–300.

12–14, appear in the collection of sixteen gnomes in *Vat. gr.* 96 on f. 88<sup>r-v</sup>; the remaining *GPI* gnome, no. 11, is all but identical to the Methone/Aster anecdote as it appears in the Vatican Philip epitome:<sup>30</sup>

Φίλιππος Μοθώνην [*sic*] πολεμῶν τὴν ἐπὶ Θράκη ἐπηρώθη τὸν δεξιὸν ὀφθαλμόν, βέλει βληθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος τῶν Μοθωναίων [*sic*] Ἄστέρος ὀνομαζομένου ἐπιγράψαντός τι τῷ βέλει τοιοῦτον· “Ἄστηρ Φιλίππῳ θανάσιμον πέμπει βέλος·” ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος ἀντέγραψε τῷ βέλει· “Ἄστέρα Φίλιππος ἦν λάβη κρεμήσεται.”

The *GPI* text differs from the *Vat. gr.* 96 text in four minor details: (1) it misspells Methone; (2) it has Θράκη rather than the more classical, prose genitive usage;<sup>31</sup> (3) it has the superfluous ὀνομαζομένου; (4) it has the finite ἀντέγραψε rather than the participle. This last change results from the loss of the closing sentence that appears in the Vatican version: ἐζήτησε πρὸς τιμωρίαν αὐτὸν εἰρήνην ὑποσχόμενος καὶ λαβὼν ἀπέκτεινε. Dropping this last sentence produces a snappier anecdote but robs the text of its historical significance. I think that these variants in the Methone/Aster text come from the thirteenth-century creator of *GPI*, and it is most likely that the Methone/Aster text, along with the other, thirteen, gnomes, comes either from *Vat. gr.* 96 or from an earlier text on which both *Vat. gr.* 96 and *GPI* depend.

There are some difficulties in the relationship. Of the sixteen sayings in *Vat. gr.* 96 why do nos. 3, 7, 13 not appear in the *GPI*

<sup>30</sup> Biedl, *Textgeschichte* 55 n.1, first connected *Vat. gr.* 96 to *GPI* but only for the first five and the last sayings in *Vat. gr.* 96 because of the images available to him; for a fuller comparison see Bertini Malgarini, *Studi* 17–26. From the perspective of *GPI*, Searby, *Revue d'histoire des textes* 29 (1999) 296, briefly lists the equivalences between *GPI* nos. 1–14 and the respective sayings in *Vat. gr.* 96, f. 88<sup>r-v</sup>, on the basis of the publication of Bertini Malgarini; he says, however, that *GPI* no. 2 equals *Vat. gr.* 96 no. 6, whereas it is a combination of nos. 6 and 7, as noted by Bertini Malgarini (22). For *GPI* no. 11, the Methone text, Searby cannot cite the Philip epitome in *Vat. gr.* 96 because he was not aware of its existence; he lists as its source Stob. 3.7.67, but the Stobaeus passage is quite different and could only be very distantly related.

<sup>31</sup> LSJ s.v. ἐπί A.I.1 and B; cf. e.g. Thuc. 1.57.5, 2.58.1, 4.7.1, etc.

collection? Why is the order so different? The *Vat. gr.* 96 sayings appear in *GPI* as nos. 2, 6+7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, the Methone anecdote, nos. 4, 5, 1. The inclusion of the Methone/Aster anecdote in the *GPI* collection proves that it was in the source common to both (unless we imagine the creator of *GPI*, or of its source, reading through *Vat. gr.* 96, passing up all the similar sayings and such in the excerpts from Ps.-Hesychius and Diogenes Laertius, copying thirteen of the sixteen sayings on f. 88<sup>r-v</sup>, skipping all the sayings in the excerpts from Philostratus, then extracting the Methone/Aster anecdote from the Philip epitome on f. 98<sup>v</sup>). This relationship tells us nothing about the creation of the collection of sayings shared by the two manuscripts. We can, however, conclude that the three details, discussed above, that mark the *Vat. gr.* 96 (and *GPI*) version of the Methone/Aster incident as being far more sophisticated than the version in the *Suda* belong not to the author of the *Vat. gr.* 96 Philip epitome but to an earlier author. We have, thus, not merely one, twelfth-century, figure interested in this anecdote about Philip but a second, earlier author who produced this version of the Methone/Aster anecdote. I believe, then, that the creator of *Vat. gr.* 96, while working from the text that *GPI* also later used, included on f. 88<sup>r-v</sup> thirteen of the fourteen shared anecdotes but was so intrigued by the Methone/Aster anecdote that he consciously set it aside so that he could develop its theme into his epitome of Philip on f. 98<sup>v</sup>.

In the second section of the epitome, lines 7–13, we find Philip again besieging a city and taking vengeance on a hitherto victorious opponent, again, through underhanded means. The devious brilliance of Philip's victory over Leon and the Byzantines stands out all the more because it is an invention. Sources on Philip's siege of Byzantium, from autumn 340 to spring 339, and on Leon of Byzantium are not numerous,<sup>32</sup> but the account here, though rhetorically effective, is historically erroneous. It is certain that the conclusion of the passage is

<sup>32</sup> See E. Bux, "Leon (23)," *RE* 12 (1925) 2008–2012, and Jacoby ad *FGrHist* 132. After the possibly confused *Suda* entry, the most important text is Philostr. *VS* 1.2.

incorrect: Philip failed to take Byzantium and abandoned the siege.<sup>33</sup> That Leon committed suicide is possible, but it certainly did not happen during the siege if his old friendship with Phocion played a role in saving Byzantium (Plut. *Phoc.* 14.4).<sup>34</sup> These historical inaccuracies show that our author wanted to use this anecdote to illustrate Philip's character and that concern with character was paramount.

Alteration of the Leon anecdote also appears, though with a different message, in the other preserved version of this text. In the *Suda* entry on Leon (Λ 265), amidst a hodgepodge of facts

<sup>33</sup> Diod. 16.77.3; Griffith, *History* 578–581, and John Buckler, *Aegean Greece in the Fourth Century BC* (Leiden 2003) 482–488.

<sup>34</sup> There is modern division over the historicity of the account of Leon's suicide as it appears in the *Suda*, to which this version in *Vat. gr.* 96 is a new witness. The modern reconstruction that makes the most balanced use of the greatest number of texts, though it strips Leon of the authorship of the texts listed in the *Suda* entry, is A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig 1885–1887) II 509–513, III 51, followed by Bux, *RE* 12 (1925) 2008–2012, Jacoby ad *FGrHist* 132, and C. J. Tuplin, “Leon (1),” *OCD*<sup>3</sup> (1996) (though he says that Leon was “executed”). On the related question of the renewal of the Byzantine alliance with Philip, whether the supposed attack on Leon is out of anger at Leon or out of fear of Philip, and its date, see Schaefer III 51; cf. E. I. McQueen, *Diodorus Siculus, The Reign of Philip II* (London 1995) 154–155 (though I would question the historical accuracy of the decree appended to [Plut.] *Lives of the Ten Orators* 851B; cf. the list of allies in Dem. 18.237); contra, J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976) 184–185; on these two topics, Buckler, *Aegean Greece*, says nothing, though he does erroneously say that Leon was “previously a diplomatic agent of Philip” (484). The alternative position maintains Leon's authorship of the works in the *Suda* entry and rejects the suicide altogether as a fabrication, perhaps on the basis of Leon's utterance in Plut. *Nic.* 22.3; this is the position of Helmut Berve, *Das Alexanderreich I* (Munich 1926) 235; Griffith, *History* 574 n.1 and 715 n.2, cf. 573–580; Andrea Würle, *Die politische Tätigkeit der Schüler Platons* (Lauterburg 1981) 124–127; Kai Trampedach, *Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik* (*Hermes Einzelschr.* 66 [1994]) 97–100; and the notes to the Leon entry at *Suda On Line* (<http://www.stoa.org/sol/>). Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati* 166 and 243, suggested, on the basis of Philostr. *VS* 1.20 (514), that the story of Philip's slander of Leon and his suicide may have been transferred to him from Python; this intriguing suggestion deserves consideration, contra the opposite suggestion of W. C. Wright, *Philostratus and Eunapius* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1921) 70 n.2.

which may be about at least two different Leons,<sup>35</sup> we find this anecdote about Leon and Philip:

οὗτος ὁ Λέων ἀποκρουόμενος τὸν Φίλιππον ἀπὸ τοῦ Βυζαντίου διεβλήθη παρὰ Φιλίππου πρὸς τοὺς Βυζαντίους δι' ἐπιστολῆς, ἐχούσης οὕτως· “εἰ τοσαῦτα χρήματα παρεῖχον Λέοντι, ὅποσα με ἤτεῖτο, ἐκ πρώτης ἂν ἔλαβον τὸ Βυζάντιον.” ταῦτα ἀκούσαντος τοῦ δήμου καὶ ἐπισυστάντος τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Λέοντος, φοβηθεὶς μή πως λιθόλευστος παρ' αὐτῶν γένηται, ἑαυτὸν ἤγξε, μηδὲν ἀπὸ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῶν λόγων κερδάνας ὁ δειλῆαιος.

This fellow Leon, while repelling Philip from Byzantium, was slandered by Philip in a letter to the Byzantines as follows: “If I had given Leon as much money as he asked for, I would have taken Byzantium in the beginning.” When the people heard these things and gathered at Leon’s house, he, fearing that he would be stoned by them, hanged himself, the sorry man having gained nothing from his cleverness and speeches.

The two texts derive from a common tradition, but overt and minor details produce two different stories. As the *Suda* version uses the anecdote to focus on Leon, so the Vatican version focuses on Philip. In the *Suda* version Leon starts as the grammatical subject; in the Vatican version Philip starts as the grammatical subject and Leon appears in a genitive absolute. The addition of Python at the opening of the Vatican version implicitly keeps Philip at the fore.<sup>36</sup> At the end, too, the *Suda* presents a moral that mocks the futile learning and speechifying of Leon, while the Vatican epitome presents an overly succinct appreciation of Philip’s clever manipulation of the people and the situation,<sup>37</sup> “And thus, Philip prevailed over the Byzantines.”

<sup>35</sup> Leon of Byzantium and the first century B.C. Leon of Alabanda (*Suda* Λ 266; *FGrHist* 278); see Bux, *RE* 12 (1925) 2008–2012; Jacoby ad *FGrHist* 132, Tuplin, *OCD*<sup>3</sup>. The very slender evidence for a Peripatetic Leon, as cited by Jacoby, is the mention in Theophrastus’ will of a Leon who is the father of two of Theophrastus’ heirs (Diog. Laert. 5.51).

<sup>36</sup> For what little is known about Python, see Hatto H. Schmitt, “Python (4),” *RE* 24 (1963) 611–613.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Philip’s ploy in his letter, [Dem.] 12.20; see Griffith, *History* 716.



The conclusion to the Byzantium anecdote can afford to be succinct because the third section of the epitome describes Philip's methods explicitly. The Byzantium section is also connected to the third by the closing verb, *περιεγένετο*, "he prevailed over." It appears in lines 19 and 23 of the epitome, and, though not an unusual use of the word, the fact that it describes an invented event, and one that fits so well the overall theme of the epitome, I take to be a sure sign of the author selecting, redacting slightly, and connecting these ancient elements with the refrain "he prevailed over" to form his own epitome of Philip. And this second section fits perfectly with the first: Philip, through clever manipulation of the other citizens of the community, destroys this solitary opponent, and, either before or after, takes the city. This paralleling of the two anecdotes allows our author to continue the theme of the first anecdote, namely, that Philip was a clever scoundrel who knew how to manipulate circumstances to his advantage, in this case to destroy the incorruptible Leon and to take the city.

The third section of the Vatican epitome takes up thirteen lines, half of the entire epitome. Unlike the first two sections, it is unparalleled in extant texts. The author, as with the second section, separated the third section from the preceding by an unusually large gap and highlighted the first word, *ἦν*, with a yellow wash. Whereas the first two sections offered brief historical scenes illustrative of Philip's goals and methods, this section describes Philip's skills, circumstances, and motives in general, abstract terms. The section itself falls into three parts: Philip's intellectual skills that brought him such success, the inactive character of the Athenians that facilitated Philip's success, and the desires that compelled him to success. The result is tantamount to a eulogy of Philip's great talents and foul character.

What is most striking about all three parts of the third section is the endless string of adjectives about Philip: *συνετός, δεινός, εὐτυχής, πανούργος, ἰκανός, ὄξύς, οὐ μελλητήης, οὐ βραδύς, πράττων*; and in the third part *πονηρός, πιθανός, μισῶν, ἐρῶν, ὀμνός, παρασπονδῶν*. In the second part of the section, Athens is treated similarly, called *νωθρός, βραδύς, ἄγων (πολλὰς ἐκκλησίας), and σχολάζων (ἑορταίς)*. Only traces of such a compendium of characteristics survive in other texts. Aeschines, for example, says that Philip was *δεινὸς εἰπεῖν*, "marvelous at

speaking” (2.43).<sup>38</sup> The spirit, though not the precise phrases, of aspects of this text can be found in Demosthenes. In his *First Olynthiac* Demosthenes expressed a fear (1.3):

μη πανουργος ὄν καὶ δεινὸς ἄνθρωπος πράγμασι χρῆσθαι, τὰ μὲν εἰκὼν, ἠνίκ' ἂν τύχη, τὰ δ' ἀπειλῶν (ἀξιόπιστος δ' ἂν εἰκότως φαίνοιτο), τὰ δ' ἡμᾶς διαβάλλων καὶ τὴν ἀπουσίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν, τρέψεται καὶ παρασπάσεται τι τῶν ὅλων πραγμάτων.

lest that man, as he is unscrupulous and talented at taking advantage of circumstances, yielding some things when convenient, withdrawing others (and he may rightly *appear* trustworthy), and slandering us and our absence, turn and take to himself some part of our realm.

In the *Second Olynthiac* he summarizes Philip’s motives and means: ὅταν δ' ἐκ πλεονεξίας καὶ πονηρίας τις ὡσπερ οὗτος ἰσχύσῃ, “but whenever someone, as this man does, gains power out of greed and wickedness” (2.9). Fragments such as Theopompus’ enigmatic quip that Philip was δεινὸς ἀναγκοφαγήσαι πράγματα, “marvelous at stomaching things” (*FGrHist* 115 F 262 = [Longinus] *Subl.* 31), make one think that a lost character summary by Theopompus may stand behind our text in some way.<sup>39</sup> If we compare Theopompus’ comments on the Athenian general Chares, we find not only a type of character sketch but one that uses the same language as the description of the Athenians in the epitome, though he is guilty of different distractions: Χάρητός τε νωθροῦ τε ὄντος καὶ βραδέος, καίτοι γε καὶ πρὸς τρυφήν ἤδη ζῶντος, “And Chares was both sluggish and slow and, most certainly, already living wantonly” (F 213 = Ath. 532B–C). But later writers, as well as Theopompus, could have found such language pointedly used of the Athenians as a

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Aeschin. 2.51, imagined in the mouth of Demosthenes, as too the phrase δεινὸς συμπιεῖν, also used of Philip there and at Aeschin. 2.112.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Theopompus F 27 (= Polyb. 8.9.1–4) and the scholarly debate over “such,” e.g. W. R. Connor, “History Without Heroes: Theopompus’ Treatment of Philip of Macedon,” *GRBS* 8 (1967) 133–154, and Michael A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC* (Oxford 1994) 98–115.

whole by Demosthenes.<sup>40</sup>

### 3. *The ancient tradition on Philip and Vat. gr. 96*

Glimpses of the ancient tradition on Philip between the fourth century B.C. and the time of *Vat. gr. 96* are preserved in such writers as Aelian, Justin, and Libanius.<sup>41</sup> Aelian mentions Philip's talent for speaking, and his bravery in war, but only to compare his interest in education (*VH* 4.19). Aelian also touches twice upon Philip's use of deception. Of his treatment of Greek cities after Chaeroneia (6.1): οὐ μὴν ἐφύλαξε τὰς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁμολογίας ὁ Φίλιππος, ἀλλ' ἐδουλώσατο πάντας, ἔκδικα καὶ παράνομα δρῶν, "Philip did not at all observe his agreements with them but he enslaved them all, acting unjustly and contrary to custom." And he records a disputed saying (7.12): δεῖ τοὺς παῖδας τοῖς ἀστραγάλαις ἐξαπατᾶν, τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας τοῖς ὄρκοις, οἱ μὲν Λυσάνδρου εἶναι λέγουσι τὸν λόγον, οἱ δὲ Φιλίππου τοῦ Μακεδόνης, "It is necessary to trick children with knucklebones and men with oaths. Some say that this is Lysander's saying, others that it is Philip's."<sup>42</sup> Aelian presents a Philip who abused the confidence of his opponents in the rules of fair play to deceive and conquer them. This view of Philip is shared by the Vatican epitome.

A complete though brief sketch of Philip's character survives in Justin's epitome of Pompeius Trogus' world history. At the transition between Philip and Alexander we are given a summary of Philip's character with a comparison to that of Alexander (9.8.7–9, 11–12):

*miserordia in eo et perfidia pari iure dilectae. nulla apud eum turpis ratio vincendi. blandus pariter et insidiosus, adloquio qui plura promitteret quam praestaret; in seria et iocos artifex. amicitias utilitate, non fide colebat.*

<sup>40</sup> Demosthenes' favorite word in such passages, ῥαθυμία, "indolence," as in 3.33, 4.8, 8.34, 46, 49, 9.5, 10.7, 25, 71, 13.20, 18.46, is missing from the Vatican epitome.

<sup>41</sup> See Paul Goukowsky, "Philippe tel qu'en lui-même l'Antiquité le change," in Pierre Carlier (ed.), *Le IV<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. Approches historiographiques* (Nancy 1996) 9–27.

<sup>42</sup> Attributed to Lysander: Diod. 10 fr.9.1, Plut. *Lys.* 8.4 and *Mor.* 229B; to Dionysius of Syracuse, *Mor.* 330E–F; to Polycrates of Samos, *Mor.* 741C.

*gratiam fingere in odio, instruere inter concordantes odia, apud utrumque gratiam quaerere sollemnis illi consuetudo. ... huic Alexander filius successit et virtute et vitis patre maior. itaque vincendi ratio utrique diversa. hic aperta vi, ille artibus bella tractabat. deceptis ille gaudere hostibus, hic palam fusis.*

Pity and perfidy were cherished by him on an equal basis. No means of winning was base in his opinion. He was equally charming and insidious, in conversations the sort to promise more than he delivered. In serious and light matters he was a master craftsman. He cultivated friendships out of utility not fidelity. It was his established custom in hatred to appear pleasant, in concord to stir up hatred, in both to seek his advantage. ... His son, Alexander, succeeded him and was greater than his father in both virtue and vice. Accordingly, the means of winning was different for each. This one conducted wars through undisguised force, that one through machinations. That one was overjoyed when the enemy was tricked, this one when he was openly routed.<sup>43</sup>

As in Aelian's brief mentions, so here, in this fuller summary of his character, Philip combines moral baseness with skill to become great. The condemnation of his perfidy as immoral and unheroic is made all the more pointed by comparison with his son who rejected his father's ways. By setting good characteristics, e.g. *miseriordia* and *blandus*, immediately next to their opposites, e.g. *perfidia* and *insidiosus*, any praise is deflated; the juxtaposition with Alexander furthers this effect. By contrast, the Vatican epitome grants Philip a great deal of talent and concludes with moral criticism only after the laziness and dithering of his last opponent has been highlighted.

In the immense corpus of Libanius, we find the closest thing to an ancient biography of Philip. Among his declamations are a set of eight *ψόγοι* or invectives, one of them on Philip, which is ninety-four lines in the Teubner edition. Libanius attacks Philip with all the weapons that a politician or schoolboy would

<sup>43</sup> Cf. J. C. Yardley and W. Heckel, *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus, Book 11–12, Alexander the Great* (Oxford 1979) 330–331, and J. C. Yardley and R. Develin, *Justin, Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus* (Atlanta 1994).

use. He calls Philip a barbarian from nowhere, of low birth, cultureless, a wine-bibber who indulges in pleasures and stops at no shamelessness (9.3.1–3). He will have more to say about Philip's wanton ways (9.3.9–10), but he does interrupt these attacks on his private life to speak of his public career, and here we find the same underhanded, deceitful tactics as in *Vat. gr.* 96 (*Progymn.* 9 [*Vit.*] 3.5–6):

παραλαβὼν δὲ τὰ πράγματα καὶ σωθεὶς σαφῶς ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ τοὺς σεσωκότας τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἐχρήσατο τρόπῳ τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν ἀποστερῶν, τὴν Ποτίδαιαν ἀρπάζων. πολλὰς μὲν εἶλε πόλεις, μετὰ δὲ καλοῦ σχήματος οὐδεμίαν. οὐδὲ γὰρ μαχόμενος κρείττων ἐγένετο τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ δελεάζων καὶ κολακεύων καὶ φιλίαν πλαττόμενος καὶ δωρούμενος τὰ πατρῶα δούλους εἶχε τοὺς λαμβάνοντας. θαυμαστὸν δὲ ἦν οὐ τὸ σύνταγμα τῶν Φιλίππου στρατοπέδων, ἀλλὰ τὸ χρυσίον ὃ τοῖς πολιτευομένοις ἤρχετο. τοιαῦτα γὰρ τὰ κείνου μηχανήματα, δοῦναι, φενακίσει, παρακρούσασθαι. χρηστὴ μὲν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, παμπόνηρα δὲ τὰ ἔργα.

And when he came to power and was clearly saved by the Athenians, in response he treated his saviors in his special way, depriving them of Amphipolis, snatching Potidaia. He seized many cities, in fact, but not one in an upright way. For he overcame men not by fighting them, but, by baiting and flattering them and feigning friendship and giving them their rightful inheritance, he held those who received his offers as slaves. What was amazing about Philip was not the massing of his armies but the gold coin with which he ruled free citizens. Such were the devices of this man: to give, to cheat, to deceive. His promise was noble but his deeds were utterly foul.

Libanius offers examples of Philip's perfidy, returns to his private life, then decries the rest of his public life down to his assassination amidst sacrilegious and disgraceful circumstances (9.3.6–14). Libanius' invective is bluntly extreme, far more in the earlier and later parts of the *psogos*.<sup>44</sup> By contrast, the third part of Vatican epitome is subtle and sophisticated.

We are left, then, without a specific surviving ancient parallel

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the *psogos* of Philip by Aphthonius at Spengel, *Rhet.* II 40–42.

text for the third section of the epitome. It is possible that this last section with its tripartite division reflects the structure of the original, fuller text. But whatever the appearance of the fuller original, not only the use and subdividing role of the refrain “he prevailed” but also the structural parallels to the Methone and Byzantium sections suggest that the author was consciously redacting his source material for his own epitome of Philip. The structure of the third section is: (1) Philip has the talent and skills to achieve any end; (2) the Athenians are all but begging to be subdued (though they have not directly harmed or thwarted Philip, as in the first two sections); (3) Philip has the character to apply his abilities to conquer Athens. The first part describes Philip’s abilities in general, abstract terms; the second presents an object for the application of these abilities; and the third reveals the character that is willing and able to use his talents on the object of his desires. In the first two sections of the epitome we have examples that illustrate this more abstract analysis of Philip’s *modus operandi*. In the Methone section Philip deploys his forces to besiege Methone; when a more particular object of his desire arises, he applies his talents and appeals to the city’s desire for peace, then reveals his true character by seeking and killing Aster. In the Byzantium section we see the same pattern, but there he plays on the citizens’ paranoia to destroy his one true opponent, revealing again his true character—victory and vengeance by any means. If the third section and the inaction of the Athenians and their defeat are taken to refer to the events leading up to Chaeroneia, the author has also arranged the three sections in chronological order.

We have, then, a new text about Philip and an unusually sophisticated example of Byzantine excerpting.<sup>45</sup> In contrast to the epitome of Philip, the other sets of excerpts in the manuscript reveal no obvious principle of selection, noteworthy redaction, or imposed structure. The background to these other excerpts and their connecting structure must have been in the mind of the author of *Vat. gr.* 96 and they could only have been

<sup>45</sup> In saying “new,” it is only fitting to mention again Kayser’s publication, however obscure, of the text in 1838 (*Flaviū Philostrati*).

of use to that author. What he intended to do with them, beyond compiling them, remains a mystery. The evidence of all these other excerpts, then, serves to highlight the care with which the author constructed his epitome of Philip and his apparent interest in him. In the end, he has given us not only further evidence of a more complex ancient tradition about Philip but also a glimpse of the interests and work habits of a Byzantine scholar.<sup>46</sup>

*October, 2004*

Ohio Wesleyan Univ.  
Delaware, OH 43015  
blcook@owu.edu

<sup>46</sup> I would like to thank the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana for allowing me to visit the library and examine *Vat. gr.* 96 and the related MS., *Vat. Pal. gr.* 93; the Provost of Ohio Wesleyan University for travel support; Kerri J. Hame and Donald Lateiner for scholarly and literary advice throughout the article's development; and the readers and editor of *GRBS* for valuable recommendations on the final version. A preliminary version was delivered at the January 2003 annual meeting of the American Philological Association in New Orleans, and I thank the audience for their questions and comments.