

'Philip's Tomb' in Historical Context

N. G. L. Hammond

IT WAS an act of generosity on the part of Professor M. Andronikos to share the excitement of his discovery with the public and to announce his preliminary conclusions a fortnight or so after his entry into the unlooted tomb. The announcement which he made then in Thessaloniki was sufficiently precise and detailed to enable scholars to think about the identity of the tomb, and he has since then released a number of illustrations which give a good general idea of the main finds. While any assured and final opinions must be deferred until Andronikos has published his official report on his excavations—a report which will be of an exemplary quality, if we may judge from his superb publication of the Cemetery of Tumuli at Vergina—it has seemed reasonable at this stage to put forward some reflections on the historical context within which this tomb has to be set.¹ In an article of this length it is not possible to discuss the historical evidence in depth; for there is a great deal of it.

I. Some General Considerations

The literary tradition asserts that all Macedonian kings except Alexander the Great were buried at Aegae. If, then, the unlooted tomb at Vergina is to be rated that of a Macedonian king, Vergina has to be the ancient Aegae. I argued in 1968 that this was so;² and since then my view has been strengthened by the discovery of worship

¹ The account which I have used mainly is that in *Hellenikos Borrás* of 25 November 1977, which was kindly sent to me by Professor Vokotopoulos; other accounts which I have seen are in *The New York Times Magazine* of 25 December 1977, *The Sunday Times Magazine* of 5 February 1978, *Makedonike Zoe* no.91 and *Epikaira* both of December 1977, and the article in *The National Geographic Magazine* 154 (July 1978) 54–77 by M. Andronikos. His book *Vergina I* was published at Athens in 1969. He has been most generous in writing to me of his excavations, and an early draft of this article was sent by me to him. Professor Andronikos' most recent account of his remarkable discovery, in *Archaeology* 31 (1978) 33–41, has appeared after the present study was sent to press.

² At a conference in August 1968, of which the papers are published by the Hetaireia Makedonikon Spoudon as *Ancient Macedonia* (Thessaloniki 1970); further see N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia I* (Oxford 1972) 156f with maps on pp.124 and 140, and R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London 1973) 19 and 553.

being paid in the 'tholos' room of the Palace at Vergina to Heracles Patroüs³ (for Heracles was the ancestor of the Temenid kings) and by the richness and the nature of the objects found at Vergina by Andronikos in November 1977, which indicate a royal burial.

The literary tradition makes it clear that the Temenid kings practised tumulus-burial. When the remains of Philip II had been interred at Aegae, the corpse of the assassin was exposed and later burnt "above the remains" (Justin 9.7.11) and those condemned as accomplices were killed later "at the tumulus" (Justin 11.2.1).⁴ Again, when Alexander honoured Hephaestion as a hero, he made for him a burial (*ταφή*) and a tumulus (*τύμβος*); and in honouring the Macedonian dead near Bukhara, he had a tumulus raised over their bones and conducted funerary sacrifices "in the Macedonian manner" (Plut. *Alex.* 72.5 and Curt. 7.9.21 and 11.2.1), the quoted words indicating a custom already traditional.⁵ Does Vergina offer us tumulus-burial? Two kinds have been excavated. (1) Burials in cist-tombs, open graves or *pithoi* under a low tumulus up to 23 m. in diameter; the central burial was usually the oldest, later burials were added often in higher layers.⁶ (2) One or two burials in a 'built-tomb' under a low tumulus *ca* 10 m. in diameter; there are now four such tombs, one excavated by Daumet,⁷ one by Rhomaios⁸ and two by Andronikos. The bulk of (1) were of the period *ca* 1050 B.C. to *ca* 650 B.C.; there are none of *ca* 650 to *ca* 330 B.C.; and there were some of Hellenistic period. Although only 100 out of 300 tumuli have as yet been excavated, this pattern may be typical. The burials in (2) date in the judgements of the excavators between *ca* 350 B.C. and the "early Hellenistic period." Thus, as Philip II was buried at Aegae (= Vergina) in 336 B.C., we should expect his remains to have been laid in a built-tomb.

A feature peculiar to Vergina, and never found as far as I know elsewhere, is that Andronikos' two tombs were covered with a

³ *Deltion* 25 (1970) B 2.394 and *AJA* 77 (1973) 70.

⁴ What is undependable in Justin is not the facts but the interpretation put upon them, namely that Olympias burnt the assassin's remains.

⁵ I discuss these customs in G. T. Griffith and N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia II* (Oxford 1978) 151, and suggest they were transmitted by Marsyas Macedon (*FGrHist* 135).

⁶ See M. Andronikos, *Vergina I* (Athens 1969), and Hammond, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 328f.

⁷ L. Heuzey and H. Daumet, *Mission archéologique de Macédoine* (Paris 1876) 227f.

⁸ K. A. Rhomaios, *Ὁ Μακεδονικὸς τάφος τῆς Βεργίνης* (Athens 1951), with a throne, no doubt royal.

secondary tumulus of moderate height. We may call it a form of 'double tumulus'. Homer described Achilles' wish that a secondary tumulus should be raised over the remains of Patroclus and himself, when his time came (*Iliad* 23.245f). Double tumuli have been excavated in Albania; rare in Greece, they have been found most recently at Argos in the Peloponnese on the Aspis citadel, the latest burials in them being of the Geometric period.⁹ It is very probable that the founder of the Temenid dynasty in Macedonia brought this practice of tumulus-burial from Argos to Aegeae in the early seventh century B.C.¹⁰ The double tumulus at Vergina was designed both to link the two tombs together, and, since it either encroached on or covered the adjacent 'hieron', to associate the two tombs alike with some form of worship. Again, a hieron is not found with any other of the numerous built-tombs of Macedonia. In short, this complex under a secondary tumulus is quite extraordinary.

According to the literary tradition two kings of the Temenid dynasty in the fourth century B.C. were worshipped: Amyntas, father of Philip, at Pydna, where his hieron was called the Amyntaeum; and Philip himself at Amphipolis "as a god." Both worships were probably posthumous and not limited to these cities.¹¹ The hieron may now come into focus at Aegeae, where Philip's statue was carried after those of the Twelve Gods on the day of his death.¹² It was built initially for the worship of Amyntas, the occupant of the immediately adjacent tomb (the plundered one); and its use was extended by the secondary tumulus to the occupant of the farther off tomb (the intact one), that of Philip.

The secondary tumulus was covered by the Great Tumulus, rising some 12 m. above ground level today and 100 m. in diameter, twice as massive as the tumulus at Marathon and unparalleled in size in the Balkans. Why was this huge construction made? The literary tradition comes to our aid. Alexander had a tumulus built "great in circumference" and 39 m. high after the death of Demaratus of Corinth in

⁹ For Albania a summary in Hammond, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 257f; for Argos, *Deltion* 26 (1971) *Chron.* 79f, 28 (1973) *Chron.* 95 and 98.

¹⁰ Arguments for accepting as sound the traditions given by Hdt. 5.22 and 8.137.1 and by Thuc. 2.99.3 and 5.80.2 for this dynasty appear in *A History of Macedonia II* (*supra* n.5) 3f.

¹¹ Schol. *ad* Dem. 1.5; Aristides, *Symmach.* A (Or. 38) 1 p.715 D.; see C. Habicht, *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*² (Munich 1970) 11, dating the worship within their lives.

¹² Diod. 16.92.5, the source being probably Diyllus of Athens as I argued in *CQ* 31 (1937) 79f and 32 (1938) 149f.

India; since he sent the ashes of Demaratus to his home, the great tumulus in India was a memorial (Plut. *Alex.* 56.2). The plans which Alexander had in mind at Babylon before his death included two similar projects: to build a vast superstructure over the tumulus which crowned the remains of Hephaestion (Plut. *Alex.* 72.5 etc.), and to make "a memorial to rival the greatest pyramid" over Philip's tomb at Aegae (Diod. 18.4.3–6).¹³ The purpose at least is clear. The execution of all the plans was rejected by the Assembly of the Macedones after Alexander's death. Yet the Great Tumulus is a witness that a memorial was so made, and to whom more appropriately than to Philip and his father? We may be reasonably confident that his tomb or their tombs lay somewhere under it.

When were the various tumuli made? The little one as soon as the built-tomb was ready. The secondary one in Alexander's lifetime, since Alexander planned a third one. And the third, the Great Tumulus, sometime after his death, but when? In the upper layers of it, and never deeper than three metres from the surface, a large number of *stelai* bearing the names of leading Macedonians were found from 1948 onwards; at first they were dated to the late fourth century, but recently (with more discovered) from *ca* 330 to 275 B.C.¹⁴ All the *stelai* were broken, no doubt by Pyrrhus' Gauls, who plundered the royal tombs in 274 B.C. (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 26.6). If they were *in situ*, marking secondary burials as in many large tumuli or just as memorials of associated Companions, the lettering gives the late fourth century as the *terminus ante quem* the Great Tumulus was built. An appropriate occasion was the end of the Temenid dynasty in 311 B.C. when Alexander IV was put to death.

If the Great Tumulus was there before 274 B.C., we can understand why the Gauls failed to find the unplundered tomb. Unable to dig down through so huge a mass, they evidently drove a horizontal tunnel from the edge, as Daumet did without using props in a similar tumulus,¹⁵ and found the hieron and the first tomb; but being on a different line, they missed the second tomb. In making this suggestion

¹³ These plans were regarded as spurious by Tarn and others, but there is nothing improbable about this particular plan. They do not mention the reports of Daumet (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.7]) on the Great Tumulus and on two similar but smaller tumuli at Kourinos near ancient Pydna (Daumet, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.7] 242f), which I have visited.

¹⁴ *BCH* 79 (1955) 87f; *AAA* 9.2 (1976) 123–29.

¹⁵ *As in* n.13.

I am at variance with the preliminary view of Andronikos, that the broken *stelai* were brought from burials elsewhere and became part of the fill, and that the Great Tumulus was therefore built after 274 B.C. His current excavations may solve this question.

II. The Chief Features of Philip's Tomb

The following points are compatible with the tomb being that of Philip II:

(1) Of the two chambers of the tomb the larger one contained a gold diadem, a gold sceptre,¹⁶ a gold coffer, a magnificent set of armour (including greaves), weapons and other offerings, and the other a gold wreath of myrtle, gold coffer, gold quiver, arrowheads and fine greaves. Thus the man was certainly a king and the woman a queen; for the diadem was worn by Macedonian kings¹⁷ and a wreath by Macedonian queens on Hellenistic coins.

(2) The pottery and especially a lamp of a special kind enabled Andronikos, a most capable and experienced archaeologist, to date the tomb within the bracket 350–320 B.C.; and Philip II was buried in 336 B.C.

(3) The teeth in the gold coffer containing the man's remains have been analysed as those of a man over thirty-two years of age; Philip II was in his forty-sixth year when he died.

(4) The gold quiver, the arrowheads and the two gold-engraved greaves show that the queen was a warrior. The quiver was of a Scythian type, and one at least of four known examples was found in a royal burial in Scythia.¹⁸ The most famous warrior among the women of Philip's house was his daughter Cynna by his Illyrian wife

¹⁶ The diadem of an alloy of gold and silver is pale in colour. The sceptre, some two metres long (*NY Times Magazine* [*supra* n.1] 18), is as tall as that of Zeus the King on Alexander's coins.

¹⁷ A diadem is worn on the marble head at Copenhagen which has been identified as that of Philip II by G. M. A. Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks* III (London 1965) 253 fig. 1708, and by others. In fact this head bears a strong resemblance to the ivory head from 'Philip's Tomb', but a complete publication is needed for a proper comparison. A diadem is worn also by the Tarsus Medallion head which some have identified with the head of Philip II. The type of plain diadem found in the tomb was worn evidently for Macedonian occasions by Alexander as King of Macedon; but after 330 B.C. as King of Asia he used for oriental occasions an oriental version of the diadem with a double ribbon at the back, as on the medallion commemorating the defeat of Porus.

¹⁸ Illustrated in *BMMA* 1975, "From the Lands of the Scythians," p.128 no.186.

Audata, who had been renamed Eurydice; for Cynna led troops in battle and once killed an Illyrian queen in action (Polyaenus 8.60). We may doubt the truth of the story that Cynna's mother, Eurydice, engaged Olympias in single combat, the former equipped in Macedonian fashion and the latter as a Bacchant (*FGrHist* 76 [Duris] F 52); yet there are good grounds for supposing that Audata-Eurydice may have been a warrior, like her daughter. But there are two other possibilities. One was Meda, daughter of a Getic king Cothelas; the other was a daughter of the Scythian king Atheas, if, as seems almost certain, her hand was given in marriage to Philip when Atheas, despite having a son, promised to adopt Philip as heir to his throne.¹⁹ Now, taken together, the facts that the inner walls of Philip's Tomb were unplastered and that the fine mural was on the outside wall and not, as was usual, on the inside wall are probable indications that there was a relatively short interval between the death of the king and the closing of the built-tomb. If so, the queen must have died in this interval of time. The chance of coincidence through disease is remote. Did she take her own life or give her own life in honour of the king? It was a custom so to do both among the Getae (Steph.Byz. s.v. *Getia*) and among the Scythians in the fifth century (Hdt. 4.71.4); and the dead woman was then buried beside the dead man. Given the fact that the unusual quiver was Scythian, we may suppose that the dead queen was the daughter of Atheas.²⁰

(5) Andronikos has reported that five small ivory heads, found in the king's chamber, were portraits of Philip's parents Amyntas and Eurydice, and of Philip, Olympias and Alexander, and he has made the point that they were miniatures (each head being some two centimetres high) of the five gold and ivory statues of these persons which Philip dedicated in his Philippeum at Olympia (Paus. 5.20.10), most probably between 338 and 336 B.C. He no doubt will give his reasons later. Meanwhile, if the dead king is Philip, it is understandable that

¹⁹ Justin 9.2.1–6; as Philip sent help, he is likely to have obtained possession of the princess either then or after his defeat of Atheas. Admittedly Satyrus did not mention her in his account of Philip's wives and children in Athen. *Deip.* 557B–E.

²⁰ Here I differ from M. Andronikos, who considered that the queen was Philip's last wife Cleopatra; but being of a leading Macedonian family, she is unlikely to have been so equipped, and her guardian, Attalus, was under suspicion if not already marked down for arrest by the time of the closing of the tomb. Olympias, of course, was buried at Pydna (see C. F. Edson, *Hesperia* 18 [1949] 78f). Antipater, who has been suggested in this connection, was not a member of the royal house.

Philip might have expressed the wish or that Alexander might have thought it appropriate to have the miniatures in his last resting-place. Remains of the gold and ivory bodies belonging to the heads were seen on the floor. Gold and ivory images (*eidola*) made for Hephaestion's funeral were evidently such as these (Diod. 17.115.1).

(6) In the tumulus on top of the built-tomb there was a brick surround enclosing the cremated trappings of four horses which had evidently been killed in honour of the king and burnt nearby. We are reminded of the famous horses thrice victorious in the chariot-race which were sacrificed at the burial of their owner, the Athenian Cimon 'the Booby' (Hdt. 6.103.3). Since Philip prided himself on his victories in the chariot-race, the sacrifice of a team near his tumulus was appropriate.²¹

(7) As we have seen above, worship of the occupants of the tombs is implied by the hieron. This is compatible with Philip being one of them.

There is, however, another possibility to be considered. In 316 B.C. Cassander held the funerals at Aegeae of the king and queen, Philip Arrhidaeus and Eurydice, who had been murdered on the order of Olympias, and also of Cynna, the mother of this Eurydice and the daughter of Philip II as we mentioned (4) above, who had been killed by Alcetas. Apart from the infant child of Alexander, Philip Arrhidaeus was the last of the Temenid line, and Cynna and Eurydice among the last of Philip's female descendants. Cassander "honoured them with all other fitting rites and held a contest in single combat, in which four of his soldiers took part" (*FGrHist* 73 [Diyllus] F 1). Now Cynna had taught her daughter, the younger Eurydice, to be a warrior. Here we can find an answer to the questions raised in (4), why a king and a queen were buried together and how it came about that the queen was dead when the king was buried. Further, as Eurydice, daughter of Cynna, was trained for combat (Polyaenus 8.60), it was natural that she had armour and weapons in her chamber, and all we need suppose about the Scythian type of quiver is that it was a spoil of war. Furthermore, we have in Cynna an occupant for the other (plundered) tomb, in which only two clay pots survived; and the female figures on its internal walls might have been appropriate to Cynna as Queen Mother.

As this hypothesis looks attractive at first sight, let us align it to the

²¹ Or of the horses awaiting the assassin (p.346 below).

points made above. (1) fits well enough. (2) Andronikos' date is firmer at the top, as it relates to a type of lamp first appearing, than at the bottom where the length of time that pottery is in use is naturally somewhat elastic. A date of 316 B.C. would be possible for Philip's Tomb. But this date will hardly do for the other tomb because Andronikos has dated its murals to *ca* 350 B.C.²² Moreover, it seems unlikely that the two tombs were for the same occasion because one is finished internally and the other is unfinished; and the murals are inside in one case and outside in the other. (3) fits Philip Arrhidaeus. (4) One would expect Eurydice to have been equipped in Macedonian fashion, as her grandmother had allegedly been (*FGrHist* 76 [Duris] F 52), and not with a foreign type of quiver. (5) The five small heads may be explained well enough if we suppose that Cassander felt they belonged with the last of the line and was glad to bury the past with them, as he intended to start a new dynasty of Macedonian kings. But there is a snag. Would he have included a head of Olympias, who was not only not in the Temenid line of descent but had had the occupants of the tomb murdered? The answer is surely no. (6) We do not know of Philip Arrhidaeus winning Olympic victories in the chariot-race. (7) Although Duris says they received "fitting rites," there is no indication that worship was to be paid to them.

On the general balance the odds so far are strongly in favour of the larger tomb being that of Philip II and his Scythian (or, failing her, his Getic) queen. The other tomb, which is smaller and not vaulted²³ and has the earlier murals, is most likely to be that of Amyntas, who died in 370 B.C.; or, if that is too early a date, that of Alexander II *ob.* 368 B.C. or Perdiccas III *ob.* 359 B.C. The murals suggest that the occupant was of the Orphic faith, which included a belief in survival after death.

²² Arguments for dating the murals are inevitably subjective as we have no contemporary frescoes for comparison.

²³ R. A. Tomlinson, "Vaulting Techniques of the Macedonian Tombs," *Ancient Macedonia II* (Thessaloniki 1977) 473–79, writing before Andronikos' discovery, derived the vault from Alexander's experience in the East and dated the earliest example in Macedonia to the Hellenistic period. We now have a *terminus post quem* in the plundered tomb; and the intact tomb, if that of Philip II, advances the date of the earliest example of a vaulted tomb to 336 B.C. The semicircular tower, which employs the same principle, was probably built during Philip's reign; and in the mid-fourth century Plato (*Laws* 947D with schol.) mentioned the underground vault of a sewer, made in porous stone, a material used at Vergina.

III. The Circumstances attending the Demise and Burial of Philip II

An investigation of the circumstances may help us to come to a final decision, and at the same time it is worthwhile in its own right.²⁴

Diodorus 17.2.1 gives in a concise manner the *sequence* of events after the assassination of Philip in the theatre at Aegeae. "Alexander succeeded to the throne, made the murderers of his father undergo the fitting punishment, and after that took every possible care over the burial of his parent." That the succession to the throne preceded the trial is implicit in the accounts of Arrian and Curtius. For Arrian explains that Alexander Lyncestes played a part in the succession-procedure and was only subsequently put on trial (1.25.2, *τότε αἰτίαν χόοντα*);²⁵ and then he was "let go" by Alexander. And Curtius says that "Alexander Lyncestes had been the *first*" (*i.e.* of those who did so) "to have saluted Alexander as king," and therefore he had been released "from the sentence rather than the charge," since it was "taken for proved" that he had conspired with Pausanias to kill Philip (7.1.6). Incidentally, we learn from Arrian that two brothers of Alexander Lyncestes, by name Heromenes and Arrhabaeus, were found guilty of "joining with (Pausanias) in the killing of Philip." Next, that the trial preceded the completion of the burial is indicated by Justin, who reports at 11.2.1 that "the accomplices in the murder" (*i.e.* those judged to be so) were executed "at the tumulus" of Philip. In these executions we may see some discrepancy with the sequence as given by Diodorus; but it is resolved if we suppose that some of those found guilty were executed at once and others were kept for the finale at the tumulus.

The murder-and-burial of Philip was a spectacular, world-shaking event. It was the subject of at least one and perhaps two detailed accounts which were drawn on by our surviving authorities—Diodorus, Arrian, Pausanias, Curtius and Justin. In particular Diyllus of Athens was probably the author of one such account which was copied by

²⁴ Much has been written about the death of Philip in recent years: *e.g.*, E. Badian, *Phoenix* 17 (1963) 224ff; J. R. Hamilton, *G&R* 12 (1965) 117ff; A. B. Bosworth, *CQ* 21 (1971) 93ff; J. R. Ellis, *JHS* 91 (1971) 15ff; and K. Kraft, *Der rationale Alexander* (Frankfurter alt-historische Studien 5, Kallmünz 1971) 11f. This is not the place to discuss their views.

²⁵ The aorist tense is significant; for the meaning see LSJ *s.v.* *αἰτία* 1 and Diod. 17.80.2. The translation by P. A. Brunt (Loeb ed.) "though he was implicated at the time" is far vaguer than the Greek words.

Diodorus in 16.92.5 to 16.94.4 and (much condensed) in 17.2.1.²⁶ The account or accounts evidently were based on reports by eye-witnesses, and there is no good reason to question the *sequence* of events.

Three hundred years of traditional rule by a royal family of exceptional ability had brought the Macedonian state to full maturity; and its customary procedures, the *Macedonum mores*, whether written or unwritten, were developed and established long before the accession of Philip II. We find these *mores* frequently in our sources, deriving probably from a Macedonian writer such as Marsyas Macedon (see n.5 above) or from a Greek writer familiar with Macedonian institutions. They include the following.

Between the death of a king and the election of his successor the 'Friends' of the dead king were charged with the responsibility of guarding the corpse; and thereafter it was they who were charged with the preparation of the body for laying-out and burial (Curt. 10.7.16f and 10.10.12, *amicis*). A purification ceremony (Curt. 10.9.11f) took place in 323 B.C. *patrio more* between the election and the preparation of the corpse. In the course of the election in 336 B.C., when Alexander had been acclaimed as king, Alexander Lyncestes "saluted" him and put on his own cuirass; so in 323 B.C., when Philip Arrhidaeus had put on the royal robe, Meleager as a "follower of the new king" (Curt. 10.7.14, *novi regis satellites*) put on his own cuirass. The first duty of Alexander in 336 B.C. was to start investigations into the circumstances of his father's death, and it must have taken a week or two to follow up the contacts of the assassin Pausanias. This done, Alexander was ready to prosecute under the following procedure, which is fully attested in our sources.

First, the king ordered the arrest of those who were to be prosecuted (Arr. 4.13.7; Diod. 17.79.5; Curt. 6.7.24; 6.8.20, where we supply *ab Alexandro* with *missus*; and 8.6.27), and he then had them brought before "the Macedones" for trial (Arr. 3.26.2, citing Ptolemy, *εἰς Μακεδόνας*; 3.27.2 *τὴν δίκην . . . ἐν Μακεδόσι*; 4.14.2 *ἐς τοὺς Μακεδόνας*; Diod. 17.79.6 *τὴν κρίσιν . . . τοῖς Μακεδόσιν*; 17.80.2 *τὴν τῶν Μακεδόνων κρίσιν*); not only the living but also the dead—the corpse of Dymnus in 330 B.C. (Curt. 6.8.26) and—by analogy—that of Pausanias in 336 B.C. Next, the accused were prosecuted before the Macedones by the king and defended themselves with freedom of speech (Arr. 3.26.2,

²⁶ See my articles "The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI," *CQ* 31 (1937) 79ff and 32 (1938) 149ff. P. Goukowsky discusses sources in the Budé ed. of Diodorus 17 (Paris 1976) x–xxxi.

3.27.2, 4.14.2; Curt. 6.8.24, 8.6.30, 8.7.1). The Macedones then pronounced the verdicts: on one occasion acquittals with permission to recall another suspect (Arr. 3.27.2–3 ἀφίεται τῆς αἰτίας . . . ἀπέφυγεν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ . . . καὶ οἱ Μακεδόνες ξυγχωροῦσιν; Curt. 7.2.7 *una vox* . . . *consensu*); on another a condemnation (Diod. 17.80.1 οἱ Μακεδόνες κατέγνωσαν); and on another a condemnation and an intended treatment of a corpse (Curt. 8.2.12 *Macedones decernunt*, concerning the burial of Cleitus). If the sentence was death and there was no reason to delay, the Macedones killed the condemned at once by stoning (Plut. *Alex.* 55.7, citing a letter of Alexander, ὑπὸ τῶν Μακεδόνων; Arr. 4.14.3; Curt. 6.11.38 *more patrio*), or by javelins (Arr. 3.26.3; Curt. 7.1.9) or just “in the Macedonian manner” (Diod. 17.80.2). When there was reason to delay, the king kept the condemned under arrest and handed them over at the appointed time for execution (as in the case of the Pages in Curt. 8.8.20, *tradique damnatos hominibus qui ex eadem cohorte erant iussit*; this instance may be unhistorical, if Arr. 4.14.3 is preferred).

Since these sources from Ptolemy onwards are unanimous, we can use them to clarify a generalisation in Curtius 6.8.25, which has been unwisely tampered with by textual critics. When untouched, the text reads: *de capitalibus rebus vetusto Macedonum modo inquirebat exercitus—in pace erat vulgi—et nihil potestas regum valebat nisi prius valuisset auctoritas*. “In the age-old manner of the Macedones the inquiring into capital charges was made by the army—in peacetime it was (a or the) part of the commons—and the royal power was not effective, except in as far as a king’s personal prestige had been of influence before (*i.e.* before the verdict).”²⁷ It is obvious enough that Curtius was writing in a manner appropriate to Roman readers who would catch the references in the contrast between *potestas* and *auctoritas* and in the king addressing the *milites* in a *contio* after the manner of Scipio Africanus. But in doing so he has got the lines crossed; for “the Macedones” were not synonymous with the *exercitus*, which included

²⁷ There is nothing in the text to suggest a lacuna which Hedicke assumed to have existed. Moreover, the meaning of the text as it stands is complete, and the contrast between *exercitus* and *reges* is already there. In the preceding sentence the function of the *rex*, as expressed in a future tense, is to speak as prosecutor. The king lays the capital charges, and the army inquires into them. See *OLD* s.v. *capitalis* l.c. ‘(of charges, cases, trials)’ and s.v. *inquirō* 3 ‘to make inquiries (judicial or otherwise)’. For further references and discussion of this passage see *A History of Macedonia II* (*supra* n.5) 160 n.1 (by Hammond) and 389f (by Griffith).

Greeks, Paeonians, Thracians and others. So too the aside *in pace erat vulgi* seems to be an idea of Curtius himself (he used *vulgus* in the previous sentence). The proper term in war and in peace was "the Macedones." That those available at Aegeae in 336 B.C. were not the same as those available in Zarangaea in 330 B.C. is not in dispute; but it would have been more accurate for Curtius to have said that "the Macedones" of 330 were only a part of "the Macedones" in a peace-time trial in Macedonia.

This form of trial was equitable. Whereas the Macedonian king judged in many cases (Philip being famous for his judgements and Alexander for his concentration in hearing cases), he was not judge in his own cause. Indeed for a prosecutor to be judge would be an absurdity. In a trial for treason the judges were "the Macedones," acting as a People's Court. Similarly at Athens charges of treason were tried not by magistrates but first by the Council of the Areopagus and later by "the Athenians" in their Assembly (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 3.5 *fin.* with 8.4 *fin.* and 43.4). The verdict was entirely that of "the Macedones." Authors, ancient or modern, who use such expressions as "Alexander killed Philotas," are inaccurate and misleading, the reason being that their thinking is dominated by Alexander to the exclusion of the Macedonian state.²⁸

Returning now to the assassination of Philip we may reconstruct the sequence of events from Macedonian practice as follows. First, the new king was elected at Aegeae on that day or a following day. Second, the king instigated investigations and issued orders for the arrest of the suspects. Third, the suspects were brought before the assembly of the Macedones for trial; and together with them the corpse of the assassin, Pausanias. Alexander prosecuted; the suspects defended themselves; and the Macedones pronounced their verdict on the living and the dead. Fourth, the verdicts were carried out over a period of time. The corpse was hung on a cross forthwith (Justin 9.7.10), and some of the condemned persons were executed on the spot (Diod. 17.2.1). "A few days later" the corpse was taken down and

²⁸ Justin, for instance, pictures Alexander thinking of the past and recalling loosely *Parmenion et Philotas . . . interfecti* (12.6.14); but he had been precise just before at 12.5.3, when he said *de utroque prius quaestionibus habitis* (cf. Diod. 17.80.1 and Curt. 6.11.39–40). This is not the place to discuss other aspects of the Macedonian assembly, which are treated in *A History of Macedonia II*.

re-hung and finally burnt “above the remains” of Philip (Justin 9.7.11); and later still some men condemned as accomplices were executed “at the tumulus” of Philip (Justin 11.2.1). Among them were Heromenes and Arrhabaeus (Arr. 1.25.2 τῶν ξυνεπιλαβόντων τῆς φεαγῆς) and three sons of Pausanias (*Itin.Alex.* 5; see Curt. 8.6.28 for the *mos Macedonum* governing the execution of these male relatives).²⁹ Later still, perhaps in the light of further evidence, arrangements were made (perhaps on a decision of the Macedones, as later in the case of Parmenio) for the arrest of Attalus. In the event he was killed; later, his ward, Cleopatra the wife of Philip, her infant child, and other kin of Attalus were killed, probably as relatives of a man condemned for treason.³⁰

IV. The Evidence of *P.Oxy.* 1798

The first fragment of a second-century papyrus containing an unattributed history of Alexander (*P.Oxy.* XV 1798, republished as *FGrHist* 148 F 1) gives an account of the death of Philip II offering some details not found in other sources. I repeat here the *editio princeps*:

.....]τους μ[.] [. . .
θ]εατ[ρ]ωι κα[.] [. . .
]ους απε[.] [. . .
]ε περι θρον[ον
 5]ιν τοις μ[.] [. . .
π]αρεδωκε[
] απετυπαν[ι
 σαν αυτο]ν το δε σωμ[α
 του Φιλ]ιππου θερα[
 10 πουσι θαψ]αι παρεδωκ[ε
π]ερι την [. . .
]σκλ[

²⁹ Curtius made Alexander say that he himself had abrogated this *mos*, i.e. before 327 B.C. (8.8.18). This statement being in a fictitious speech, probably of Curtius' own invention, is of questionable value, even though the narrative at 8.6.28 refers to it. But there are grounds for believing it to be correct. In 336 B.C. the sons of Pausanias were executed; on the other hand in 330 B.C. the son of Alexander Lyncestes, another person executed for treason, lived to have a son himself (OGIS 4.23–28 and IG IV.1³ 96, 97, discussed by C. Habicht in *Ancient Macedonia II* [1977] 511f).

³⁰ Diod. 17.2.3–3.2; Paus. 8.7.5; Just. 9.7.12, 11.2.3, 11.5.1; Plut. *Alex.* 10.6–8. There is an analogy in the arrest of Demetrius after the trial of Philotas was completed (Arr. 3.27.5).

When Grenfell and Hunt published this fragment,³¹ they established the length of the line as between 15 and 18 letters by their restoration of lines 8–10, which carried conviction. They deduced from the hand of the scribe that this papyrus—a copy—was of the middle-to-late second century, and they judged the original to have been a work composed around the time of Augustus—a work, they thought, “on a very considerable scale” because the scribe reached his 2,300th line in describing the Battle of the Granicus River. On further examination of this fragment W. Crönert and U. Wilcken³² concluded that the original work was probably twice as long as had been proposed and that it was composed within the Hellenistic period. Both conclusions seem correct.

In the original publication Grenfell and Hunt noted that the fragment was concerned with the assassination of Philip II. They made the point that “there seems to be no place” for the name Pausanias (that of the assassin), and no one has been able to fit that name into the text by restoration, not surprisingly since the space in line 7 is too small and the earlier lines contain three plurals. Consequently Pausanias is not the object of *απετυπαν[ισαν]*, ‘they crucified’, nor the antecedent of *[αυτο]ν*. There is thus no justification for U. Wilcken and others³³ having assumed that Pausanias was said in this papyrus to have been crucified.

Grenfell and Hunt proposed to restore in lines 1 to 4 *τους μ[ε]ν | [εν τωι θ]εατ[ρ]ωι κα[θ]ημεν[ους] απε[λ]υ[σε] τους (οι τοις) δε*, meaning

³¹ *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XV (London 1922) P.1798 fr.1. I have had the benefit of discussing this with G. T. Griffith. No restoration is more than a *possibility* until the fragment is reedited after further investigation by a papyrologist.

³² U. Wilcken, “Alexander der Grosse und die indischen Gymnosophisten,” originally published in *SitzBerlin* 1923, 150ff, and republished in *Berliner Akademieschriften* ζ. *alt. Geschichte u. Papyruskunde* I (Leipzig 1970). See also F. Bilabel, *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus* (Bonn 1923) no.149.

³³ This *idée fixe* was so strong in Wilcken that despite his inability to restore the name of Pausanias into the text he invented a rival story, resting on nothing more than his imagination, that Pausanias was not killed by the *somatophylakes* of whom three were named. Convinced by his own invention he denied the truth of the account in Diodorus. In this he has been followed, without any exposition of the papyrus, by several scholars, e.g. by Bosworth, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.24), “someone (clearly Pausanias) is handed over to the Macedonians,” and J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch, Alexander* (Oxford 1969) 27, “Pausanias. . . crucified. . . , as stated by the writer of *POxy.* 1798.” J. R. Ellis, *Philip and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976) 307 n.59, treats the matter with more discretion. It is not, of course, a trivial detail. If Pausanias had been taken alive, the torturers would have got some sort of confession out of him. As it was, his immediate death left writers, ancient and modern, the chance to speculate who was behind him.

“he dismissed those who were sitting in the theatre and the...” Wilcken too supposed that the passage described the scene *immediately* (“unmittelbar”) after the assassination; and he went on to suggest that persons who had been arrested in the theatre were brought before Alexander sitting on the throne,³⁴ were interrogated and were then punished or released; and in addition that Alexander referred the decision to the Macedones meeting in assembly (restoring in line 5 τοις μ[ακεδοσι]). All that in a matter of six short lines is impossible! In any event, as we have seen, Alexander had to be elected king before he sat on the throne; and he had to prosecute before the Macedones were able to pass judgement.

The verb ἀποτυμπανίζω was used at Athens where the crucifixion of criminals alive on a plank was in vogue.³⁵ Perhaps the practice was imported from Athens to Macedonia, and if so the victim in this case was perhaps alive.

Having made these preliminary points, we may turn to the assassination of Philip in Diodorus 16.92.5–93.2 and 94.2–4.³⁶ The occasion was the wedding of the daughter of Philip and Olympias, namely Cleopatra sister of Alexander, to the brother of Olympias, namely Alexander who was king of the Molossians in Epirus; and invitations had been accepted by eminent Macedonians, envoys from the Greek states and from the Balkan dependencies, and by many personal friends from abroad. This was by far the greatest event in the diplomatic history of Macedonia. The theatre was packed at dawn with the distinguished guests who awaited the coming of the royal party.

³⁴ Wilcken, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.32) 154, supposed these persons to be political objectors. He was influenced by the least reliable of sources, “The Alexander Romance,” which had Antipater stop the uproar in the theatre at the assassination, “bring Alexander forward into the theatre in a cuirass,” and make a speech recalling the Macedonians to a sense of loyalty and decorum. This was written to be a part of that romantic picture of Alexander as a slip of a boy, which is found also in Plut. *De Alex. fort.* 327D18, a mere μειράκιον... ἄρτι τὴν παιδικὴν παραλλάττον ἡλικίαν, who needed the help of one “in place of father,” the meaning of the name ‘Anti-pater’. This is of course unhistorical, Alexander having already held the highest commands, as was the misapplication of the wearing of a cuirass in the election-procedure. Even the *Suda* has nothing of this in its long note on Antipater. While admitting this source “to be poor,” Badian chose to follow it in his “Death of Philip II,” *op.cit.* (*supra* n.24) 248.

³⁵ See A. Keramopoulos, *Ὁ Ἀποτυμπανισμός* (Athens 1923), using archaeological evidence; further discussion in Bosworth, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.24) 94 n.1.

³⁶ The account of Diodorus was designed for effect rather than clarity. The sequence of events was (1) the procession of the statues, (2) the entry and seating of Philip’s ‘Friends’, including the two Alexanders, so that the theatre was “filled,” and (3) Philip’s entry alone.

The first entry was made by those carrying statues of the Twelve Gods and behind them a statue of Philip “suitable for a god.” When the theatre was filled, Philip himself entered, wearing a white cloak. He had ordered his special guards (*τοὺς δορυφόρους*) to stand far aside as they escorted him; for he wanted to show to the world that he had no need of special guards since the general goodwill of the Greeks was his protection. As everybody was applauding him and congratulating him at the very pinnacle of his success, a surprising and completely unexpected plot was revealed as death struck (16.93.2).

“Pausanias (the assassin) had posted horses at the gates, and he had come, with a Celtic knife hidden on his person, to the entrance into the theatre.” Philip had not yet made his entry, but was still in the *parodos* area. From there “he ordered the Friends in his entourage to go on ahead into the theatre, and the special guards were already standing aside, when Pausanias saw that the king (having entered the *orchestra*) was isolated. Running forward, he struck him deep through the ribs, laid him dead, and ran for the gates and the horses which had been prepared for the get-away. Some of the Bodyguards ran at once to the king; the others rushed out in pursuit of the assassin—among them Leonnatus, Perdiccas and Attalus. Pausanias was well ahead and would have leapt onto his horse and got away, had he not caught his foot in a vine and fallen, so that Perdiccas and the others caught him as he was rising from the ground, speared him and killed him” (16.94.4).³⁷

Any detective, given this account, would immediately ask: “why ‘the horses’ in the plural?” One assassin wants one fast horse; he does not supply other horses for his pursuers. Two or more would-be-assassins (according to the number of the horses) had expected to be making a get-away that day. This is the assumption of our sources, a

³⁷ This full and detailed account by Diodorus is certainly closer to an original account than is that of Justin 9.6.3–4. That Diodorus and no doubt his source meant Pausanias, Leonnatus, Perdiccas and Attalus to be *somatophylakes* of Philip the king (there is no evidence or likelihood that any princes or others had *somatophylakes*, and for Pausanias see Diod. 16.93.9), and meant Attalus to be the same man as the Attalus of the preceding chapter, *i.e.*, the guardian of Philip’s young wife, Cleopatra, is obvious if one reads the text of Diodorus consecutively. There is no merit in the suggestion of H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich II* (Munich 1926) 233 n.2, followed by C. B. Welles in the Loeb ed. of Diod. 16.66–17, p.101, that they were *somatophylakes* of Alexander and that Attalus was a son of Andromenes (no ancient author mentions Andromenes in this context). That Attalus came back from Asia for the wedding is understandable in view of his close connection by marriage with Philip.

plot involving other persons than Pausanias.³⁸ Where would Pausanias' fellows be placed for assassinating Philip? Like Pausanias, who was one of the seven Bodyguards of Philip (Diod. 16.93.9), they had to be near the king to have a chance: probably then among his Friends, the special guards or the Bodyguards. Any detective would realise too that the plotters could not have foreseen the whim of Philip which led to him being isolated and so the victim of Pausanias' initiative. No doubt the plotters intended to stab Philip when seated on his throne during the theatrical performance; but probably not only Philip, since two or more plotters imply two or more victims. Who were the other victims to be? If the aim was to decapitate the Macedonian state, obviously Alexander as heir and perhaps Alexander the Molossian, both to be seated most conveniently one on either side of Philip.³⁹

Why had the special guards stood aside? On Philip's orders, they will have said, but those orders being *sotto voce* might not have been heard by any independent witnesses. Why had Leonnatus, Perdiccas and Attalus killed Pausanias instead of taking him alive and putting him to the torture? They certainly came under suspicion. Leonnatus and Perdiccas, being of the royal stock (Curt. 10.7.8 *stirpe regia geniti*), might have had a motive as possible successors; and Attalus, an unusually courageous and influential man (Diod. 16.93.8–9), had a connection with the royal house through Philip's marriage to his ward, Cleopatra, and had a quarrel to settle with Philip's son and heir, Alexander.⁴⁰

With this background let me offer a possible restoration of *P.Oxy.* 1798 fr.1 which at least fits into the known procedure in treason trials.

³⁸ The personal action and the personal motive of Pausanias, as given by Arist. *Pol.* 1311b2 and others, are something different. It was agreed that only one man killed Philip. But it was believed also that others were involved and these were loosely called 'murderers' or 'plotters' (see Arr. 1.25 *fin.*, 2.14.5; Diod. 17.2.21 and 17.51.2–3 *τοὺς φονεῖς*; Plut. *Alex.* 10.8 and 27.5; Justin 9.7.1f). The suggestion of P. A. Brunt in the new Loeb edition of Arrian (I p.lx) that to give Pausanias a personal grudge was to deny that others were involved in aiding or using him, is far from what ancient authors supposed, e.g. Justin 9.6 and 7 and Plut. *Alex.* 10.6–8; I find it far from convincing. What the personal grudge of Pausanias against Philip does explain is why Pausanias struck before the situation was ripe for him and his accomplices to act together.

³⁹ Justin 9.6.3 preserves the detail that as he hastened towards the theatre Philip was walking between the two Alexanders.

⁴⁰ The involvement of this Attalus with the younger Pausanias and the assassin Pausanias (Diod. 16.93.3–8) may also have given rise to suspicion, whatever story Attalus put out. Cleopatra too figured in Plutarch's account (10.6).

τοὺς μ[ετ' αὐ-
 τοῦ ἐν θ]εάτ[ρ]ωι κα[ὶ ἀ-
 κολουθ]οις ἀπέ[λυ-
 σαν τοὺς τ]ε περὶ θρόν[ον].
 5 τὸν δὲ μάντ]ιν τοῖς Μ[α-
 κεδόσι π]αρέδωκε [κο-
 λάσαι, οἱ δ'] ἀπετυπάν[ι-
 σαν αὐτό]ν. τὸ δὲ σῶμ[α
 τοῦ Φιλ]ίππου θερά-
 10 πουςι θάψ]αι παρέδωκε[ε
 π]ερὶ τήν [τα-
 φήν]εκκλ[

“Those with him in the theatre and his followers they acquitted, and those round the throne. The diviner he delivered to the Macedones to punish, and they crucified him. The body of Philip he delivered to attendants to bury . . . [and] by the burial . . .”⁴¹

Thus restored, the fragment commences with acquittals of certain suspects during the last phase of the trial, namely those we have held likely to have fallen under suspicion. The preceding (missing) lines no doubt recorded other verdicts by the Macedones. Next, the account turns to one of the condemned, the seer, who had evidently declared the omens propitious for Philip for that day. He was crucified forthwith. The trial being concluded, the new king handed over the body of Philip to the Friends to [lay out and] bury.⁴²

A tomb for a reigning king may have been partly built in advance at Aegae; for Philip's brothers had both died untimely deaths, and it may have become a normal practice to have at least the foundations laid. In any case some weeks evidently passed between the assassination and the sealing of the tomb, and they sufficed for the building of a tomb. The approach to the front of the tomb was left open, presumably for the making of sacrifice and at the time for the artist—sum-

⁴¹ For τ]ε in line 4 as a connective see LSJ s.v. A.1.4. For the lack of a definite article with θ]εάτ[ρ]ωι see the same lack with θρόν[ον], and for the lack with [ἀκολουθ]οις see θερά[πουςι]. The word θερά[πουςι] indicates a Greek writer, not a Macedonian, as it was the Friends who attended a king's corpse; so too [ἀκολουθ]οις is un-Macedonian, and a corresponding verb is used of the guards by Diodorus at 16.93.1. The copyist did not seek to avoid hiatus in this and later fragments.

⁴² The 'attendants' were the 'Friends' (see Curt. 10.10.12); one of their duties was to put by the head of the corpse those pieces of the royal insignia which were to go into the tomb (Curt. 10.10.13)—in 'Philip's Tomb' the diadem, the sceptre and the garland, for instance, all of gold.

moned probably from southern Greece—to paint a mural above the door. The corpse was re-hung in the most conspicuous place (we may assume), *i.e.* above the top of the pediment and later burnt there. Exactly at this place (πάνω στον τοίχο της προσόψεως)⁴³ Andronikos found “something like a small pyre, broken vases and small sherds.” Later, when a tumulus of soil was raised over the back, sides and top of the tomb, the condemned men and the sons of Pausanias were executed “at the tumulus”; and the burnt trappings of horses, two burnt swords (perhaps of Heromenes and Arrhabaeus) and a burnt spearhead were laid inside the top part of the tumulus.

V. The Significance of Philip’s Tomb

If Andronikos is correct, as I believe, in his identification of the unplundered tomb as that of Philip II, it has much to tell us. Although it was intended that the offerings within the tomb and the containers of the remains were never to be seen again by human eyes, they were not those of an impoverished house or of an undutiful son. Why, for instance, include those ivory heads and the figures to which they belonged?⁴⁴ Perhaps Philip had owned them as miniature models made by the sculptor of the five gold-and-ivory statues which Philip had dedicated at Olympia between late 338 and his death in 336 B.C., his purpose being presumably to publicise his reconciliation with Olympias and Alexander and his choice of Alexander as his heir.⁴⁵ Since Philip was in his mid-forties and in full vigour in 336, it is unlikely that he had expressed any wishes about offerings to be put with his remains. Rather, Alexander chose to place these tokens of family affection with his father’s remains. Then, who arranged the paying of posthumous honours or worship to Philip? Whatever Philip may have desired, it lay with Alexander to make arrangements. That he united Philip’s tomb with its neighbour in the enjoyment of worship at the hieron is probably an indication that he, like many, regarded Philip as the greatest man that Macedonia, perhaps Europe, had produced.

We may end with some interesting points. The remains of the king

⁴³ I quote from his report in *Hellenikos Borrás* (see n.1).

⁴⁴ The discovery of the figures was first reported in *The Sunday Times Magazine* of 5 February 1978, p.36.

⁴⁵ Philip entered the Peloponnese in autumn 338 B.C.; he may have initiated the programme for building the Philippeum at that time, but the placing of the statues there must have come late in the programme, probably after his marriage with Cleopatra.

and the remains of the queen were found inside golden coffers, or *larnakes*, to use Andronikos' word. Of the king's remains the bones were clean and deep blue in colour, due apparently to their having been washed in some liquid, and on the bottom of the coffer, under the bones, there was a deposit of deep red stuff which was described as the deposit of some organic material such as cloth, leather or wood. The queen's remains were (mainly or solely?) ashes, but they were embedded in decomposed cloth, once purple and now blue. When we consult the descriptions of tumulus-burials in the Homeric poems—those of Patroclus and later Achilles in one tumulus, and that of Hector in another—we find that the bones of the heroes in each case were collected from the pyre and that those of Achilles were treated with unmixed wine and unguents (*Odyssey* 24.72).⁴⁶ In each case, too, the bones were placed in a gold container; and those of Hector were covered with soft purple cloths when they were laid within their gold coffer or *larnax* (*Iliad* 24.795–96). When Achilles sacrificed in honour of Patroclus at the pyre, the sacrifices included not only four horses with arching necks but also twelve young men of the Trojans, the people who had killed Patroclus (*Iliad* 23.171–76).⁴⁷ The inference to be drawn from this comparison is not that Philip and Alexander were Homeric scholars, like ourselves. Rather, the Macedonian kings in the fourth century B.C. were practising a form of burial which even in its *minutiae* had been inherited from the Heroic Age of the Greek epic and had been used through many centuries. The reason that they did so was native to Macedonia: the kings and their companions were still living in a heroic age, complete with the beliefs of that age.⁴⁸

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

July, 1978

⁴⁶ Andronikos drew attention to this in his report of n.1 above; he mentioned also a fatty substance on the bones, and it is to be noted that the bones of Patroclus were laid in a double layer of fat (*Iliad* 23.243).

⁴⁷ The idea of a human sacrifice as an *enagismos* in connection with a tumulus-burial, that of Hephaestion, is reported in Plut. *Alex.* 72.4–5.

⁴⁸ My understanding of Philip's outlook was expressed in my *History of Greece* (Oxford 1959) 576.