Arybbas the Molossian

R. M. Errington

EPIRUS, it is well known, played an important rôle in establishing the security of Macedonia during the reign of Philip II. The known events which shed light on the relationship between the two states in these years are few enough. Their chronology, however, is unfortunately not by any means as firmly fixed as most modern writers seem to assume. The critical series of events concerns the career of Arybbas, king of the Molossians. Arybbas is first mentioned by Justin (7.6.10–12), at the time of Philip's marriage with Olympias, after he had overcome the initial difficulties of his reign. Since the first child of the marriage, Alexander, was born in 356 B.C., the accepted date of 357 for the marriage is reasonably likely to be correct.[1] Olympias was a niece of Arybbas, who was then already king of the Molossians and who, after the death of his brother Neop-

[1] *Cf. e.g.* J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² III.1 (Berlin/Leipzig 1922) 490; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* II (München 1926) no.581. The date is in fact no more than an approximation, a *terminus ante quem* reckoned from the birth of Alexander on 6th Loos 356 B.C. (Plut. *Alex.* 3); but the order in the list of Philip's wives in Satyrus (*FHG* III, 161 F 5 = Athen. 13.557C–D) makes it more probable, if that list can be shown to be in chronological order. The fragment begins with the comment that the wives listed were Philip's during his kingship, that is after his accession in 359, and that he always married in wartime. In the list Olympias occupies fifth place. The two immediate predecessors in the list, the two Thessalian women Nicesopolis of Pherae and Philinna of Pharsalus, are clearly grouped by their origin; and since Philip made no serious attempt—perhaps indeed no attempt at all—to interfere in Thessaly before 354 (*cf.* C. Ehrhardt, *CQ* 61 [1967] 296f), Satyrus for some reason (perhaps because they, like the first two wives of the list, did not interfere with Olympias' rights, since Philip merely ἐπαιδοποιήσατο and did not bring them home with him or officially acknowledge them) must have displaced them, since he connects them explicitly with Philip's attempts to 'tame' Thessaly. Of the two wives who come after Olympias in the list, Meda daughter of Cothelas the Thracian and Cleopatra (Berve no.434), Satyrus remarks explicitly that they were additional to Olympias; they therefore clearly came after her. This leaves us with the first two names in the list, Audata the Illyrian, mother of Cynnane (Berve no.456), whose daughter Adea-Eurydice (Berve no.23) was old enough in 321 to marry Philip Arrhidaeus and to cause political trouble for Perdiccas and Antipater, and Phila, sister of Derdas and Machetas, who is otherwise unknown. If Philip married these two women before Olympias (and Satyrus, by placing them at the head of his list, in view of the demonstrable chronological order of the end of the list, certainly implies this), it is difficult to imagine that Olympias can have become Philip's wife before 357, though 358 cannot be wholly excluded.

tolemos, Olympias' father, had taken her and her brother Alexander into his guardianship. Olympias' sister Troas was at this time wife of Arybbas.[2] Whether this marriage took place before or after the death of Neoptolemos (the date of which is not attested) is not known, but it does not affect the subsequent story.

Olympias' marriage with Philip was therefore arranged by Arybbas —*conciliante nuptias fratre patrueli auctore virginis Arybba* (7.6.11)—who, according to Justin, had great hopes for his relationship with Philip which were in the event sadly disappointed. This conventional rhetorically expressed *peripeteia* has nevertheless a firm basis in the facts: *nam dum incrementa adfinitate Philippi adquisiturum sperat, proprio regno ab eodem privatus in exilio consenuit.* Typically, Justin does not indicate any date for Arybbas' expulsion and subsequent death as an old man in exile.[3]

The next mention of Arybbas is by Demosthenes (1.13), in the *First Olynthiac*, which was delivered in summer 349. After a list of Philip's conquests, which is chronological up to the attack on Olynthus itself, he adds: *τὰς δ' ἐπ' Ἰλλυριοὺς καὶ Παίονας αὐτοῦ καὶ πρὸς Ἀρύββαν καὶ ὅποι τις ἂν εἴποι παραλείπω στρατείας.* It is clear that the Athenians were expected to recognize the point of this reference to Arybbas (whose family were honorary citizens of Athens),[4] but it is unfortunately not possible to date it accurately. Attacks on Illyrians and Paeonians could have taken place at any time—such attacks indeed probably took place regularly in these early years of Philip's reign, when he was struggling to establish the security of his borders—and give us no solid help at all in dating the attack on Arybbas.[5] We are

[2] Just. *Epit.* 7.6.10 (Olympias and Troas); 8.6.4–5 (Alexander).

[3] Just. *Epit.* 7.6.12. That *consenuit* ought to imply death in old age seems reasonably clear both from the context and from the detailed examination of P. Treves, "The Meaning of *Consenesco* and King Arybbas of Epirus," *AJP* 63 (1942) 129–53.

[4] Tod, *GHI* 173=Ditt. *Syll.*[3] 228.

[5] F. Reuss, "König Arybbas von Epeiros," *RhM* 36 (1881) 161ff, is followed by most subsequent writers when he argues (163ff) that the attacks on the Illyrians, Paeonians and Arybbas are all also in chronological order, and indeed fall after Philip's illness in Thrace, therefore 351 or 350; and that the attack on Olynthus is singled out, out of chronological order, because it is the most important event for Demosthenes' speech. This is implausible: the list of events which are certainly in chronological order have their order carefully pointed out with *τὸ πρῶτον* (Amphipolis), *μετὰ ταῦτα* (Pydna), *πάλιν* (Potidaea), *αὖθις* (Methone), *εἶτα* (Thessaly), *μετὰ ταῦτα* (Pherae, Pagasae, Magnesia, Thrace); Philip's sickness in Thrace is followed by *πάλιν ῥᾴσας οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ ῥᾳθυμεῖν ἀπέκλινεν, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς Ὀλυνθίοις ἐπεχείρησεν* (12–13). In contrast to this deliberately careful chronology, building up to the climax with Olynthus, the attacks on Illyria, the Paeonians and Arybbas are introduced

also probably justified in inferring from Demosthenes' language that in Arybbas' case also a *strateia* was involved, which would seem to imply more than the regulation of a slight family disagreement. We shall return to this point.

At the end of his eighth book Justin adds a summary of Philip's position in Greece after the Phocian war, in the course of which he adds information about affairs in Epirus, introducing it with the phrase (8.6.4f): *sed nec a proximis manus abstinet.* The substance of this situation report is this: that Philip decided to expel Arybbas and replace him with Olympias' brother Alexander. He sent for Alexander *nomine sororis* to come to Macedon, corrupted his morals, and when he reached the age of 20 handed over to him Arybbas' kingdom, from which Arybbas had been expelled. At this point Justin ends his book. Trogus, as is clear from the surviving *Prologus* to Book 8, did not end his book at this point, but continued it to include Philip's failure at Perinthus (*et frustra Perinthos oppugnante*), an event which Justin does not mention at all. But since Trogus presumably followed the pattern of Theopompus in dealing with groups of related events together, rather than everything in strict chronological order—as is clear also from Justin's meagre epitome—we have no reason to believe that (apart from obvious omissions of events which Trogus had included) Justin otherwise seriously altered the structure of Trogus' book. Since therefore Trogus included, as the penultimate body of material in his eighth book, *et rex Epiro datus Alexander eiecto Arybba*, this will presumably have been treated in the mid-term-report form in which Justin gives it, and will have been connected with an assessment of Philip's position after the Phocian war: the previous events men-

---

merely with τὰc δ' which, in the context, seems tantamount to indicating that these are not in deliberate chronological order. Whirlwind campaigns between Philip's sickness in Thrace and his attack on Olynthus against the Illyrians, Paeonians and Arybbas should therefore probably be erased from such modern accounts in which they occur. A more likely point of reference for the attacks on the Illyrians and Paeonians, in which Athens was certainly involved, might perhaps be Philip's swift destruction of the triple alliance of Ketriporis of Thrace, Lyppeios of Paeonia and Grabos of Illyria, which Athens joined in summer 356 (Diod. 16.22.3; Tod, *GHI* 157=*Staatsverträge* II 309). In this case the three instances will perhaps have been grouped together by Demosthenes merely as examples of Athens' less important friends who had also suffered from Philip (*cf.* καὶ ὅποι τιc ἂν εἴποι immediately following the mention of Arybbas, which hints at that). But even if this is right, it offers us no point of chronological reference for the attack on Arybbas, which must remain floating somewhere between 357 (marriage of Olympias) and summer 349 (Demosthenes' *First Olynthiac*).

tioned in the *Prologus* to Book 8, *ut Illyrici reges ab eo victi sunt et Thracia atque Thessalia subactae*, will be included by Justin's portfolio phrases: *Atque ita ex multis gentibus nationibusque unum regnum populumque constituit. Compositis ordinatisque Macedoniae rebus Dardanos ceterosque finitimos fraude captos expugnat.* Justin's own interest and emphasis on the personal corruptness of Philip and of his influence will account for his choosing to relate the family history of Philip's interference in Epirus at such disproportionate length: Trogus, one might hope, devoted proportionally more space to the other events mentioned in the assessment.

The historian's problem, however, is to date these events which, I have tried to show, are presented by Justin basically without chronological intent or indication after the termination of the Phocian War, doubtless because that was a suitable place, as modern historians have also found, to summarise Philip's career and his achievements midway, as it were, between his accession and the battle of Chaeronea. And the fact that the connection which Justin makes with the other events of the chapter is a thematic one (*sed nec a proximis manus abstinet*), not a chronological one, only emphasises this chronological uncertainty further.

Diodorus, however, ought to help—indeed, has usually been thought to solve the problem. At the beginning of his year of the archon Sosigenes (342/1) he records, in a typical citation from his chronological table, the death of Arybbas ἄρξας ἔτη δέκα leaving behind his son Aeacides, father of Pyrrhus. *Τὴν δ' ἀρχὴν διεδέξατο Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ὀλυμπιάδος, συνεργήσαντος Φιλίππου τοῦ Μακεδόνος* (16.72.1). This passage seems straightforward enough, but unfortunately it raises quite as many problems as it seems to solve. Modern writers, without exception so far as I can see, have brought it into connection with the passage of Justin which we have just been considering and explained: that Diodorus records the expulsion of Arybbas[6] (despite the perfectly clear meaning of ἐτελεύτησεν), that therefore Alexander (who succeeded at the age of 20) was 20 in this year, and therefore that 342/1 marks the control of Philip in Epirus. This, however, raises another problem since by the time of the speech on Halonnesos, which Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ad Amm.* 10) places

[6] *E.g.* Reuss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 165; Beloch, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) III.2 292; Treves, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 142f; A. Momigliano, *Filippo il Macedone* (Firenze 1934) 144; N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967) 533–34. Further refs. in Tod, *GHI* II 173 *ad* p.218.

in the archonship of Pythodorus (343/2), Philip had already attacked Ambracia and taken three cities of Cassopeia (Pandosia, Bouchetas and Elatreia), which *παρέδωκεν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ κηδεστῇ ἑαυτοῦ δουλεύειν* ([Dem.] 7.32). This suggests very strongly that Alexander was already installed in Epirus and in a position to take over effective control (*δουλεύειν*, even in a speech, is strong stuff) of these newly won cities. The traditional reconstruction therefore, having used Diodorus' date to create a connection with Justin, proceeds to alter it and to put the expulsion of Arybbas and the accession of Alexander in 343/2.[7]

This will not do. Diodorus might indeed be wrong, but he must not be made wrong through misrepresentation. Diodorus relates three relevant facts about Epirus under his archon Sosigenes (presumably from his chronographic source): the *death* of Arybbas (Diodorus seems to know nothing of his expulsion and exile); the fact that he had ruled for ten years; and the succession of Alexander. Two of these three facts are ignored by the prevalent modern reconstruction: the death is transmogrified into an expulsion, and the ten years of rule are rarely seriously discussed; and when they are, they are merely 'explained away' by more or less unlikely theories.[8] And the whole nexus

[7] All writers since Beloch, *loc.cit.*, have done this either explicitly or by implication. To the list above add P. R. Franke, *Alt-Epirus und das Königtum der Molosser* (Kallmünz 1955) 29; G. N. Cross, *Epirus* (Cambridge 1932) 39. Earlier there were some laudable attempts to save some of the phenomena. B. G. Niebuhr (*Römische Geschichte* III [Berlin 1874] 188) assumed that Alexander received only Cassopeia in 343/2, and only succeeded Arybbas in Molossis on his death in 342/1. This was attacked by A. Schaefer (*Demosthenes und seine Zeit*[2] II [Leipzig 1886] 426 n.1), who laid the ground for Beloch's establishment of current orthodoxy. Reuss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 166, tried bravely to develop this view and argued, unfortunately very feebly, that Arybbas' *expulsion* belonged as late as 340. His arguments do not need to be refuted in detail: it is clear that no such reconstruction can claim any support from a source. Not surprisingly, nobody has been convinced.

[8] Reuss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 165, realised finally that Diodorus mentions Arybbas' death rather than exile ("Diodor erzählt die Vertreibung oder vielmehr den Tod des Arybbas . . .") but does not appear to regard the difference as significant. The ten years' rule are dealt with thus (166): "damit kann vielleicht die seit dem Krieg mit Philipp verflossene Zeit bezeichnet sein (351/0–341/40)." Beloch mentions the same possibility in a footnote (*GG*[2] III.1 491 n.1): "Es ist also entweder die Zahl verderbt . . . oder die 10 Jahre sind seit Philipps Intervention in Epeiros gerechnet." Treves, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.6), thinks the ten years are reckoned from a *recognition* of Arybbas by Philip in 352; Momigliano, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 109, refers to Justin 7.6.12 for the view that Arybbas was to rule (from about 351) until Alexander's maturity (Justin however has no hint of such a thing). This idea, that the ten years *begin ca* 352/1, is the counsel of utter despair. Justin calls Arybbas firmly *rex* already in 357 (7.6.11), and all scholars who bother about the problem recognise that Arybbas was a fully independent king at that time. It is clearly absurd to assume that the 10 years of rule

of events is moved one year forward to fit the reference in the speech on Halonnesos. Even the report of Arybbas' death was ignored by Reuss, to the extent that he identified one Aryptaios, who crops up as a Molossian leader in the Lamian War, with our Arybbas. And he won some support for his view.[9]

We must return to the texts. There is clearly something wrong with Diodorus' passage as it stands, but this does not entitle us to play cavalierly with it. Perhaps, indeed, there is not so much wrong with it as previous interpreters, with their misreading of an expulsion where Diodorus recorded a death, have assumed. Arybbas grew old and died in exile, probably in Athens, from where we have an undatable decree confirming for Arybbas and his descendants the citizenship and other privileges which had been granted to his grandfather and father, and promising support for his return to his *arche*.[10] Since the decree is not precisely datable, however, it can merely confirm the correctness of Justin's assertion that Arybbas was expelled and grew old in exile: it adds only that his place of exile was Athens. We might nevertheless expect that the date of the death of such a distinguished honorary citizen, as well as the length of time he had ruled, might be remembered at Athens and be available for collection by whoever it was who provided Diodorus with his chronographic notices (Apollodorus perhaps, himself an Athenian?). It would also of course be well known that Olympias' brother Alexander succeeded Arybbas as ruler of the Molossians; and since, as we have seen, Diodorus knows nothing of a period of exile for Arybbas, only that Philip was responsible for securing the succession of Alexander, it seems probable that his chronographic source was induced by these facts to take the short and apparently logical step, which in the case of most throne-changes in most places would be fully justified, to the deduction that Alexander succeeded on the death of his predecessor Arybbas.

The ten years of Arybbas' rule, therefore, have a reasonable claim to being canonical; the date of his death might also reasonably be correct. We have already seen, from Philip's handing over the towns

---

refer to the period during which (according to most views) Arybbas was in fact only semi-independent (*cf.* most recently, Hammond, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.6] 545f: "a dependent subordinate king") and ignore the earlier years of real independence.

[9] Diod. 18.11.1. Reuss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 171ff; *cf.* M. P. Nilsson, *Studien zur Geschichte des alten Epeiros* (Lund Årsskrift VI.4, 1909) 74–75; C. Klotzsch, *Epirotische Geschichte* (Berlin 1911) 95–96; Beloch, GG[2] IV.2 146.

[10] Tod, *GHI* 173.

of Cassopeia to Alexander, mentioned in the speech on Halonnesos in spring 342, that already by that date Alexander was in a strong position in Epirus—so strong, indeed, that most historians have preferred to ignore Diodorus' date for Arybbas' death and to put his expulsion at the time of the Cassopeia expedition. But, as Niebuhr pointed out long ago, if this were correct it is extraordinary, indeed surely inconceivable, that the orator in the speech on Halonnesos, when mentioning the capture of these in themselves not very important towns of Cassopeia (and exaggerating their fate by using δουλεύειν to describe it) should not have even mentioned in passing the expulsion from the kingship of the Molossi of Athens' honorary citizen Arybbas, who in this case can at the very longest only a few months before the speech have sought exile in Athens, and the handing over of the whole kingdom of the Molossians to Alexander. This omission would be totally inexplicable, and is so inconceivable that it simply cannot be true.

Niebuhr's conclusion, however, was that Alexander was now given *only* Cassopeia by Philip, followed in the next year by the whole of Molossis, when Arybbas died. This solution is also impossible, since it takes no account of the well-attested period of Arybbas' exile. The argument that only the towns of Cassopeia were at this time given to Alexander must however be correct, and needs only to be modified by the additional argument that if Arybbas' expulsion were recent at the time of the Cassopeia expedition, it could not have been omitted by Hegesippus. If, however, at the time of the speech Arybbas' expulsion were already several years old, and Arybbas was in the meanwhile merely quietly declining into honorary decrepitude (*consenuit*), even though at Athens, the simple mention of the orator's immediate grudge against Philip, the capture and 'enslaving' to Alexander of the towns of Cassopeia, is fully comprehensible.

As we have seen, the earliest mention of Arybbas as king occurs in connection with Philip's marriage to Olympias, therefore probably in 357. This is therefore a *terminus ante quem* for Arybbas' own accession. We are in no position, from this evidence alone, to tell further when he might have taken over. His ten years of rule, at the very latest, therefore, would run out sometime in 348. But there is no reason for putting his accession at the very time of Philip's marriage to Olympias (or, indeed, for regarding it as particularly recent at that time): it can perfectly well have lain several years back. The point of this discussion

is that nobody has ever suggested a suitable point of reference for Philip's *strateia* against Arybbas, which Demosthenes mentioned in the *First Olynthiac* in summer 349.[11] A *strateia* is clearly a hostile operation; it therefore must mark a major change in the relationship between Arybbas and Philip; and I therefore suggest that what Demosthenes was referring to was precisely the expulsion of Arybbas from his kingdom. If this is right, we can place it firmly at some time before summer 349, Arybbas' accession to the rule over the Molossians therefore sometime before 359. A date before 349 for Arybbas' expulsion thus lends point to Justin's use of *consenuit* to describe Arybbas' activity during his exile, which clearly ought to indicate a period of some years, even if Arybbas was already fairly old at the time of his expulsion. Moreover, a date sometime in the 350s for Alexander's accession to the Molossian throne would also explain very satisfactorily how Alexander already in 343 was in a position of being able to take control of the *extra* territories in Cassopeia which Philip handed over to him—indeed, how Philip was strategically in a position of safely undertaking an expedition against Ambracia and Cassopeia at all.

It might be objected that Philip must have had to wait until Alexander was 20 before he put him in control, since Justin says explicitly that Alexander was 20 at the time of his accession. But we have no idea at all when Alexander was born.[12] His two sisters were old

[11] It is often suggested that it was as a result of this intervention that Alexander arrived at Pella. The idea seems to have started with Schaefer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) II 425. Despite its rejection by Reuss, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 163, who rightly draws attention to its incompatibility with Justin's statement (on which see below), it is clearly unkillable, and lives happily on, becoming ever more firm with the years and the stages of transmission: Klotzsch, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.9) 61; Nilsson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.9) 73; Berve, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) II no.38; Cross, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 38–39; Momigliano, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 109; Hammond, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 533–34, by which time we have reached certainty ("... he certainly removed Alexander, the brother of Olympias"). It is not, in fact, a certainty. Indeed, no source at all says it, and grave difficulties in reconciling what the sources do say make it virtually impossible. Demosthenes (1.13) speaks only of a *strateia*, that is, an armed intervention; Justin (8.6.5) writes: *Alexandrum ... in Macedoniam nomine sororis arcessit*, i.e. Alexander was sent for nominally by Olympias, to live at Pella; and if Justin had known anything about a military intervention in this context he would presumably have mentioned it. The only possible implied military intervention in Justin is the final expulsion of Arybbas, which he also implies was some time, perhaps several years (*cum igitur ad XX annos pervenisset*) after the Macedonian pair had sent for Alexander (*ib.* 7). Demosthenes' *strateia* cannot therefore be the occasion when Alexander came to Pella.

[12] Modern dates for his birth are obtained merely by subtracting Justin's 20 years from 342 or 343, the favoured date for his accession, and therefore have no independent value.

enough by 357 to be married, one to Arybbas, the other to Philip; and that Olympias' marriage at least was not just a diplomatic arrangement with a child is adequately attested by the birth of Alexander in 356. There is therefore absolutely no reason why her brother Alexander should not have reached his 20th year sometime during the 350s. Nor does Justin's attachment of his report of Arybbas' expulsion and Alexander's accession to events after the end of the Phocian war have much chronological significance. As we have already seen, this chapter is no more than a mid-term summary of Philip's career. Indeed, if the chronology is to be pressed at all, it ought to indicate that by that time the developments which Justin records had all been completed (*i.e.* that by *ca* 345 Arybbas was already expelled) Alexander had already reached his 20th year and was already in control of Epirus. It certainly should not, indeed, cannot, as has happened in the past, be conflated with Diodorus' indication of the *death* of Arybbas, which, since it is not contradicted by any better information, may perfectly satisfactorily remain in 342/1.

The picture which results from this revised chronology, therefore, is one of Philip's more immediate exploitation of his family connection with Epirus than the traditional one. His marriage with Olympias brought advantages both to Philip himself and to Arybbas (though Justin and most moderns following him have chosen to emphasise Arybbas' gains). Some time afterwards Olympias and Philip sent for Alexander to live at Pella. We do not know when this was (nor can we certainly follow Justin in attributing to Philip an already formulated scheme of replacing Arybbas with Alexander, though Olympias may have had some such notion), but it cannot have been very long after the marriage. Before summer 349, the date of Demosthenes' *First Olynthiac*, Arybbas had given Philip cause to intervene militarily in Epirus. The result was Arybbas' expulsion after having ruled for ten years. He sought refuge with his family with Philip's main enemy Athens, whose honorary citizenship had been enjoyed by his family since it was first voted to his grandfather. As ruler of the Molossians he was replaced by Alexander, who had meanwhile reached the age of 20. This means, therefore, that by the time of Philip's serious attack on Chalcidice and Olynthus, perhaps as early as his attack on Thrace, in any case by the time of his potentially most serious conflicts with Athens, his rear in the neighbouring regions of Epirus was already quite adequately covered by the newly established rule of Olympias'

brother among the Molossians—a detail which perhaps adds a further reason for the military confidence which Philip showed in these years. By 343 Alexander was firmly in the saddle in Molossis. He was in a position to take firm control of the towns of Cassopeia, after having offered Philip a safe base for the expedition which won them—a fact which provided ammunition for Hegesippus in his speech on Halonnesos in spring 342.

In the meantime Arybbas merely grew old in the decent obscurity of an Athenian exile (*in exilio consenuit*) until his death in the archon year of Sosigenes, 342/1. His death may have aroused an interest which his life had not, sufficient at least to be recorded and remembered, for even in king-loving fourth-century Athens it was not every day that a dethroned monarch actually died in the city. His ten years of rule were now recalled, as an accomplished memorable fact; and in due course it was this long-remembered 'death in the archonship of Sosigenes after ten years of rule' which misled Diodorus' chronological source to misdate the accession of his successor.

PHILIPPS-UNIVERSITÄT, MARBURG/LAHN
August, 1974