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The cultic honours of Philip II of Macedonia have for some time been the subject of learned discussion. However, one amongst the various testimonies has received little attention, viz. a remark of Clemens Alexandrinus: νῦν μὲν τὸν Μακεδόνα τὸν ἐκ Πέλλης τὸν Ἀμόντου Φίλοππον ἐν Κυνοσάργει νομοθετοῦντες προσκυνεῖν, τὸν τὴν κλεῖν καταγορα καὶ τὸ σκέλος πεπηρωμένον, δὲ ἐξεκότη τὸν ὑφθαλμόν.

Obviously this remark does not refer to the statue of the Macedonian king situated in front of the Odeion in Athens. The authenticity of Pausanias' statement on this statue has not been contested. The reference of Clemens, on the other hand, has reached only the foot-notes of the well-known works on ruler-cult, to be discarded as spurious in some of them. Taeger—without argumentation—considers the testimony unauthentic and thinks that like many similar reports it has been created as "ein Paradestück wirksam-voller Greuelpropaganda in der Schulrhetorik". Here it may be remarked that the cults to which Taeger's qualification refers, viz. Philip's cult in Amphipolis and Amyntas' cult in Pydna, are unquestionably authentic, as Habicht has demonstrated. Moreover, throughout his work Taeger is inclined to discard as many testimonies of ruler-cult before Alexander as possible. Other authorities arrive at different conclusions. Cerfaux-Tondriau

1) Clem. Alex. Protr. 4, 54 (p. 48 P).
2) Pausan. I 9. 4.
seem to accept a cult of Philip in Kynosarges, Lily Ross Taylor 1) explicitly does so. Habicht 2), though generally inclined to accept testimonies on ruler-cult, first rightly rejects an assertion of Apsines 3) that Philip was declared to be the thirteenth state-god in Athens, and continues: "Auch Clemens Alex. Protr. 4, 54 beweist keinen Kult". If I understand him rightly, he does not exclude the genuineness of the testimony itself. G. de Sanctis 4), while accepting the evidence, has his doubts on the respective dates of the erection of the statue and the beginning of its cultic function: "nel νομοθετούντες non si tratterà forse d’un regolamento del ginnasio che potrebbe anche essere posteriore?". Against this theory it may be argued that we know of no cult of Philip introduced after his death anywhere and that particularly in Athens, where even Alexander’s cult was—temporarily—dropped after his decease, a similar posthumous honour is not to be expected in the case of Philip 5). This is one of the reasons that induce me to follow Nilsson 6), who contends that the statement of Clemens should be taken seriously. Though προσκυνεῖν is not a cultic act—thus Nilsson argues—it is very close to it. Since Philip never came to Athens personally, we must understand the προσκύνησις as being directed to a statue. According to Nilsson, the personal, polemic tone proves that the passage has been borrowed from an ancient source. Here we can both specify and add support to the argument. The part τῶν τῆς κλάσης κατεχόμενα καὶ τὸ σκέλος πετηρωμένον is a quotation taken from Demosthenes, De corona 67. This increases the probability that the whole context has been taken from a contemporaneous opponent of the Macedonian. Moreover, the passage on Philip is surrounded

1) L. Ross Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor (Middleton 1931), 12.
4) Riv. Fil. N.S. 18 (1940), 9 n. 2.
5) A. Momigliano, Filippo il Macedone (Firenze 1934), 174, who is firmly convinced of the genuineness of Philip’s cult in Kynosarges, has the following argument: "Non credo possa supporre che questa adorazione di Filippo nel Cinosargo sia posteriore alla morte di Filippo, perché vi sarebbe stato certamente associato Alessandro, e Clemente (la sua fonte) non mancherebbe di ricordarlo".