NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PERDIKKAS I TO ALEXANDER I: THE FIRST TEN TEMENID KINGS OF ARGEAD MACEDONIA

BY

A. C. REYNOLDS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN

ANCIENT HISTORY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1990

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

ISBN 0-315-60248-1

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Ann C. Reynolds

TITLE OF THESIS: Perdikkas I to Alexander I: The First Ten Temenid Kings of Argead Macedonia

DEGREE: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1990

A. C. Reynolds.....

(Student's signature)

6414 - 111A street

Edmonton, Alberta

Date: April 24, 1990.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THEY HAVE READ, AND RECOMMEND TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH FOR ACCEPTANCE, A THESIS ENTITLED "Perdikkas I to Alexander I: the First Ten Temenid Kings of Argead Macedonia" SUBMITTED BY Ann Reynolds IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE DEGREE OF Master of Arts.

Dr. R.J. Buck

Dr. R.C. Smith

Dr. N. Wickenden

Date: March 23, 1990

For my family

Abstract

The thesis "Perdikkas I to Alexander I: the first ten Temenid kings of Argead Macedonia" is based on documentary evidence pertaining to the first kings in the dynasty of Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great. The evidence is too fragmentary to make it possible to write a complete history of the kings; in fact, the lists of kings provided by ancient historians may simply be a genealogy of one particular branch of the Temenid family rather than dynastic lists. Other particular problems discussed are how succession worked in the Temenid dynasty of Macedonia; why Alexander I seems not to have been punished for murdering Persian envoys but was later used himself as an envoy to the Greeks; and why there were two Macedonian submissions to Persia.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Before *A History of Macedonia*[1] was published, no single work provided an overall history of that nation in antiquity. N.G.L. Hammond's three volumes cover the subjects of geography, archaeology and history in a systematic manner using all of the available sources. A great debt is owed to Hammond for breaking the ground in the study of Macedonia, although some of his conclusions are debatable. *A History of Macedonia* seeks to glue together very fragmentary evidence into a cohesive whole, and therefore some gaps are filled in with the possibilities that appeal most to its author rather than all those that are feasible.

This present study is much smaller in compass - it deals only with written sources on the subject of the royal family of Argead Macedonia from the first Temenid king, Perdikkas I, until the death of Alexander I. The sources on the first Temenid kings of Argead Macedonia include a range from Classical to Christian Greeks as well as Romans. The information contained in most of the sources is anecdotal in nature, with a few lines referring to a Macedonian king to illustrate a point, often a detail of the life of Alexander the Great. No full and reliable ancient accounts of the early history of Macedonia are extant: the

pertinent books of both Diodorus and Strabo exist in fragments while other works occur only as title citations in *FGrH*[2]. Justin's *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*[3] contains a section on the early kings of Argead Macedonia in Book 7, but, when the statements there are compared with those available from other sources, Justin appears to be riddled with errors and obsessed with assassination plots. Perhaps Trogus' original work cast back the events which occurred during his lifetime into ancient Macedonia. Justin does provide us with two myths, one concerning the foundation of the Temenid line of Argead Macedonia (7.1.7 *ff.*), which may incorporate the oracle written by Euripides in the play *Archelaos*, and the other concerning the extinction of the Temenid line in Macedonia. The second myth is probably a late invention, as it connects the fall of the Macedonian Empire with bones not being interred in the royal cemetery. Thus a literal interpretation of this myth is that the Temenid line was ended because of the theft of the body of Alexander the Great by Ptolemy. The Temenid line did not, however, end with Alexander the Great; it continued until the murders of his half-brother and son. These figures were not popular in Augustan Rome when Trogus wrote his *Historiarum Philippicarum*, as was Alexander the Great[4]. That they were ignored in Justin's extinction myth of the Temenids may show that it originates in the Roman period.

Of the other sources used in this study, Herodotus provides

both myth and history; Thucydides, Plutarch, Pausanias, Demosthenes and the Scholia Demosthenica provide facts; and Syncellus, Eusebius and Satyros provide genealogies. These sources are uneven in quality: the authors, with the exceptions of Herodotus and Thucydides, are far removed in both time and space from the events that they relate. Even Herodotus and Thucydides are distant from the beginnings of Argead Macedonia, but they could obtain first-hand information about Alexander I at least, and perhaps about Amyntas I. Thus it is not before the last two decades of the sixth century B.C. that Argead Macedonia becomes proto-historical.

The kings of Argead Macedonia do not enter into true history before the life of Philip II, for whom there are fairly firm birth, accession and death dates as well as some information on his life. This is more than can be said of any of his ancestors, although some events in their lives enter into other histories. The bulk of information on Argead Macedonia is concerned with Philip II and Alexander III, kings who attempted to make radical reforms to Macedonian society. Therefore, while a lack of information on the earlier period makes it necessary to use examples from the age of Philip and Alexander, information from their periods should be used only for facts that owe nothing to the viewpoint of the age, or as support for views that are unlikely to have changed by their time.

The picture that can be drawn of early Argead Macedonia is

incomplete. The Macedonians were regarded as barbarians by the Greeks[5], although many modern historians have attempted to prove that the Macedonians spoke a form of Greek[6] and lived life like the Mycenaean Greeks[7]. The few words of Macedonian that remain cannot build a case for or against its Greekness, as they are isolated examples of individual words, and no syntax survives. Very little can be said about whether the Macedonians lived like Mycenaean Greeks, because there is little written material about the Macedonians, and archaeologists have concentrated mainly on the palace complex at Pella and on tumulus graves. The latter tell only about the lifestyles and burial customs of the upper nobility. The last field survey of Macedonia was performed in the late 1930s by Heurtley[8].

Even the form of kingship in Macedonia is disputed: some scholars believe that the king was a constitutional ruler[9] while others think his rule was absolute[10]. The royal succession of Argead Macedonia poses another problem to historians, as there is no explanation of how it functioned. All the kings were from the same family, but sons did not necessarily inherit in a direct line. A brother, nephew or younger son of the king was as likely to inherit the throne as the eldest son.

The present study seeks to answer some of the questions surrounding the Temenid royal family of Argead Macedonia through kings and, where possible, their families is related and examined in a sequential order. No attempt is made to state the number of

years each king reigned: while some events related in the reigns of some kings are dateable, these incidents only show who was king at that particular time and not how long he ruled before or after. Eusebius and Syncellus both provide chronologies of the reigns of Macedonian kings, but these are much later backward extrapolations and, although the list of Syncellus is at least partially based on that of Eusebius, the number of years given to the early kings disagrees in four out of ten cases. Therefore, while events that are dateable are noted in this study, an overall chronology is not given. This thesis attempts to show that there was a logical basis to succession in Argead Macedonia and to examine who the kings of Argead Macedonia were.

Chapter 2

Historians in ancient times related the beginnings of the Argead dynasty in terms of myth, presumably because tradition and history were lacking. Like Rome, Macedonia had two foundation legends which present two separate first kings, Perdikkas and Karanos. The Macedonians do not appear to have tried to make these foundation myths compatible with each other or to date the beginning of their kingdom. One central fact is agreed on in both versions: the first Argead king of Macedonia was a descendant of Herakles through the line of the Argive king Temenos. Whether the Argead rulers came from Argos has been much discussed[1]. The evidence is not conclusive, but the rulers themselves seem to have believed that they were Argives, as did all the ancient historians[2]. The line of the Temenid rulers in Argead Macedonia continued unbroken until the death of the son of Alexander the Great.

The oldest legend concerning the first king of Macedonia appears to be the one that is related by Herodotus (8.137-138). It begins with Perdikkas and his two brothers living in Illyria after the Temenids had been expelled from Argos. When they were sent away as well by the Illyrian king because of an omen, they

moved into Macedonia and began to take it over. The brothers do not receive any further mention by Herodotus, but Perdikkas is presented as the ancestor of the Macedonian king ruling in Herodotus'own time. This legend is important because it tells the name of the first king of Argead Macedonia and gives some idea of the original location of the kingdom. It does not seem likely, as Hammond believes[3], that the story masks an Illyrian-backed takeover of power by force; it is more likely that the creator of the legend is simply using Illyria to refer to an uncivilized place.

Hammond argues that the story indicates that "the three brothers were to become the kings of three peoples - the Macedones proper (the Argeadae Macedones and related tribes), the Elimiotae, and the Lyncestae"[4]. Gauanes may possibly be an eponym for a city in Elimiotis, Aianes, although it could simply derive from the stem γαυ-, meaning "proud"; Aeropus is an eponym for the Lynkestid tribe which appears to have ruled before the Bacchiads gained power, as Hammond plausibly explains[5]. Perdikkas cannot be explained in this way and therefore he is likely to have been a real person, while his brothers' existence as historical figures is less sure. The inclusion of Gauanes and Aeropus in the foundation myth, however, does serve a definite purpose. The story of Perdikkas and his two brothers may be an attempt to establish kinship ties among Macedonian kingdoms. This link could provide a method for coexisting, and

for intermarrying, for the royal houses of the Argeads, Lynkestids and Elimiotids, by making them relatives of one another. This story also implies that the brothers' original settlement in Macedonia was achieved peacefully, although the expansion of the kingdom(s) was by conquest. The brothers fled from the Illyrian king to the gardens of Midas where they settled.

Hammond gives two different theories about the time when the Perdikkas foundation myth came into being. The first, that the myth was invented early to cover up Perdikkas' use of Illyrian aid to come into power, seems somewhat doubtful, as was noted above. Its basis is Herodotus' statement that Perdikkas and his two brothers lived in Illyria and the hints from archaeological evidence that indicate that the Illyrians raided into Macedonia. The Illyrians, however, would be unlikely king-makers, as the formation of a strong central government in Macedonia would make it more difficult to continue raiding there; if they were powerful enough to force a new government on the Macedonians, it is difficult to see why they did not simply incorporate Macedonia into Illyria. The second contention Hammond makes about this myth is that "If the story was told late in the reign of Alexander I or soon after his death, it may reflect a contemporary claim by the Temenid kings to hold sway over Upper Macedonia"[6]. If there was such a claim, it seems more likely that an old story would have been used than a new one

fabricated. In fact this myth could not be used to show that the line of Perdikkas was entitled to predominance anywhere except Argead Macedonia, since that territory was his lot, just as Argos was that of Temenos. It is not stated that the kingdoms which were named from Perdikkas' brothers were at any time under the control of Perdikkas I. In fact, there is no proof that Alexander I took over any territory without the aid of the Persians except for one statement in Thucydides (2.100).

The tales of Karanos present the founding father of the Argead royal family in a more heroic light. He is also of the Temenid line from Argos and appears in genealogies as either the father (Justin, 7.1.7-2.1) or the great-grandfather[7] of Perdikkas I. Karanos, unlike Perdikkas, is a warlord who comes into Macedonia with an armed force to take over the territory by force. In one version of the myth Karanos is presented as a mercenary chief hired by one of the indigenous kings to defeat an army for the reward of half of the kingdom; in another version (Justin 7.1.7 *ff.*) Karanos fulfils an oracle by colonizing a certain spot and defeating the local peoples so as to carve out an empire for himself. The Karanos legends appear to have originated in the fourth century B.C.[8]. This king's name, as Greenwalt[9] states, was on all the official genealogies of the Macedonian royal house by the time of Alexander the Great. Both Hammond and Badian believe that the Karanos legend emerged during the reign of Archelaos; Hammond relates it to the removal of the

capitol from Aegae to Pella, and Badian thinks that it was part of an attempt to form closer ties with Greece. Greenwalt ably rebuts these theories and places the addition of Karanos into the Argead genealogy in the reign of Amyntas II or III, favouring Amyntas III. His argument, however, uses the same logic he has refuted in Hammond and Badian. Greenwalt argues that since the immediate ancestors of Amyntas II and Amyntas III were not kings, their claims to the throne may have been challenged by cousins descended from Perdikkas II.

Greenwalt states "any parallel drawn between the importance of Perdikkas I and Perdikkas II would have threatened the claims of Amyntas II and Amyntas III. If this state of affairs could be altered by interpolating as founder a king with a strong but innocuous name like Caranus, then the priority of Perdikkas II might be challenged effectively without impairing the prestige of the entire family."[10] This argument assumes several points: that there were surviving direct descendants of Perdikkas II after the death of the boy-king Orestes; that the Macedonians could be swayed by the name of Perdikkas in choosing a new king; and that the Macedonian people in the midst of choosing a new king would accept a new foundation legend without question. It seems highly unlikely that any male heirs of Perdikkas II survived when Amyntas II gained the throne at Orestes' death; second, as only two of the nine Macedonian kings up to that point were named Perdikkas, the name was probably not a formula for

success. Greenwalt's third assumption, that a new foundation myth could be invented and quickly accepted also rests on shaky grounds: it is true that Euripides wrote a play for Archelaos[11] which made his namesake the founding father of Macedonia, but no historian added Archelaos into the royal genealogy after Temenos as a result of this creation. Greenwalt's own argument against Hammond's belief "that dynastic revisions became acceptable to the Argeads after Euripides set the fashion, and that later monarchs learned from him how to make political points through manipulation of their heritage"[12] must be turned against Greenwalt. The fact that Amyntas III was the first to put the head of Herakles on coins[13] may show that he was attempting to bolster his claim through genealogy, but it cannot prove that this king was the originator of the Karanos myth.

The various Karanos myths may provide some clues about the date of their origin. As stated above, both Karanos and Perdikkas I are presented as Temenids but, while Perdikkas is a fugitive, Karanos in one version has enough influence to found a colony and, in the other, actually conquers the land at the head of his army. Thus Karanos is presented as a more powerful man than Perdikkas from the beginning of his reign, with ambitions for empire-building from the start. The other striking contrast between the Perdikkas myth and the Karanos myth is that while Perdikkas arrives in Macedonia in the company of his two

brothers, Karanos is alone. This (if the interpretation of the Perdikkas myth as an attempt to form kinship ties with other Macedonian kingdoms is accepted) may show that Karanos appeared after the Argead kingdom was so powerful that it no longer needed to rely on the support of the other Macedonian kingdoms. The depiction of one man starting a kingdom singlehandedly seems more appropriate for a time when empire-building was in the air, rather than when a would-be king was attempting to bolster his claim to the throne. In fact, this myth provides a precedent, and perhaps an incitement, for conquest. It could be seen as propaganda to encourage the Macedonians to expand their territory by force. Thus Karanos may have been an invention of Philip II rather than Archelaos or Amyntas III. If Karanos was installed in the royal genealogy by Philip it would more satisfactorily explain his presence on all of the genealogies in the time of Alexander the Great, as the latter would be more likely to agree with his father's interpretation of history than father's cousin's.

While Karanos may perhaps be discarded as a later invention, Perdikkas I, although surrounded by myth, seems to have been a real person. The historicity of Perdikkas I is supported by his appearance in every genealogy of the Macedonian royal house, although he is not always listed as its founder. The oldest historical source, Herodotus (8.139), calls Perdikkas I the first king of Macedonia. Thucydides (2.100.2) may agree with this

statement as he puts eight kings before Archelaos, a number compatible with Herodotus' list. Thucydides, however, never actually states the names of the first Macedonian kings.

The list of Herodotus (8.139) for the early Argead dynasty gives the lineage of the Macedonian king Alexander I. The male line of the family is as follows: Perdikkas I, Argaeos, Philippos, Aeropos, Alketas, Amyntas and Alexander. The first four of these names are also included on a papyrus containing fragments of Satyros' περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας δήμων from the second century B.C.[14] One fragment, although unfortunately breaking off after Aeropos, is designed to show the genealogy of the Ptolemies all the way back to Dionysus, as well as to Herakles. This fragment, like the other Hellenistic sources, includes Karanos and adds two generations before Perdikkas I, Koinos and Tyrimmas.

The list of Satyros also includes many of the names of the wives of the family, names which were almost all left out by the Greek historian Theophilus when he epitomized the list[15]. The editor of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Turner, notes that "Theophilus begins his genealogy with Διονύσου καὶ Ἀλθαίας τῆς Θεστίου, after which he leaves out the wives' names, which the papyrus inserts capriciously"[16]. In looking at the papyrus, the insertions of women's names by Satyros does not appear to be capricious: the names of wives are included with all of the mythological figures associated with

Greece from Dionysus to Temenos, then they are not mentioned for five generations, and then they are listed from Karanos, excepting the name of Coenus's wife, down to where the papyrus breaks off immediately after Aeropus' name. The women's names are: Lan..., Kleonike, Kleopatra, Prothoe, and Nikonoe.

The insertion of women's names in a Macedonian genealogy is very interesting. It might be argued that women were included in this papyrus because the Ptolemies had taken on some Egyptian attributes during their reign. The *Cambridge Ancient History*, noting that mothers of pharaohs are included on early inscriptions, states "The fact that mothers are mentioned in this manner strongly suggests that the right to the throne was, already at the beginning of Egyptian history, transmitted through the principal queen ..."[17]. Thus the inclusion of women in the royal family tree of Ptolemaic Egypt might be considered as simply following Egyptian tradition and thus the inclusion of Macedonian queens was an invention to bring that part of the lineage into line with the Egyptian family tree. If that were the case, however, it seems likely that all the Macedonian kings would have been provided with wives. Thus the silence on the names of the queens for five generations before Karanos supports the belief that the names of the queens for the later reigns are authentic and not invented.

That the names of the women of the seventh century B.C. were known in the second century B.C. implies that women of the royal

families had some status in Macedonian society; that the names of the queens could be listed for *c.* five hundred years may mean that importance was attached to their lineages as well as to those of the kings. This importance may have been only to establish that the queens were of appropriately noble birth for mothers of kings, but it may have been that they were important in their own right. Further research comparing Macedonian and Near Eastern royal marriage customs might prove very interesting. Both the Elamite and the Ptolemaic dynasties practised a form of brother-sister marriage, an extreme form of the endogamy which appears to have been the practice in the Macedonian royal houses. The custom of brother-sister marriage would be unlikely to be adopted by a people with a Greek culture, as in the law of that society (at least in Attica) an heiress "was to marry her next of kin on the male side"[18] to keep the estate in masculine hands, and women seem to have been regarded as chattels of their fathers or husbands. Thus the idea that power passed down through the female line was alien to the Classical Greeks, although it may not have been alien to the Macedonians and certainly was not to the Ptolemaic dynasty of Egypt. One question that may be pursued is whether the Macedonian dynasty in Egypt was simply following Egyptian practice in brother-sister marriages or whether this type of royal marriage was adopted because of a lack of suitable cousins to marry.

There is other information available which may suggest that female Macedonians, at least those of royal birth, enjoyed a higher status than their counterparts in Greece. Greenwalt[19] has shown that from Philip's reign onward the Argead women were close in age to their husbands and thus more likely to be partners rather than chattels in marriage. Also, Olympias was acceptable to the Macedonian people as regent for the kingdom (Diod. 19.23.2), and Eurydike, daughter of Kynane, was given a military education so that she could avenge the death of her father Amyntas[20]. Little is said of the kings' wives before Philip II, but the lineages of the various Macedonian kingdoms show names from one dynasty being introduced into others. This seems to imply both that interdynastic marriages were occurring and that the queen's power extended at least as far as the ability to name children after someone in her family rather than someone in her husband's family[21]. Some confusion has resulted from the fact that this recurrence of names happens in the female as well as the male line[22]. Macurdy[23] even proposed that Eurydike became a throne name, because it appears several times in the lineages. If, however, the queens' lineage had some bearing on the royal succession, or even if they followed the practice of naming daughters after their grandmothers, the repetition of names in the female line showing that each one was part of a dynasty would not be unusual. This does not prove that only some names were acceptable for queens, or that women changed

their names on becoming queens unless there was some political necessity. Badian provides the example of Philip's Illyrian-named wife Audata who became Eurydike[24]. The recurrence of the same names may show that daughters in Macedonian royal families were named after their grandmothers, just as sons were after their grandfathers (the practice in Greece).

If one does assume that women had some importance in the Macedonian royal succession, some light is shed on an extremely thorny problem in Macedonian history - how succession worked in the Argead royal family. It is well known that sons did not inherit in a direct line; sometimes an uncle or a cousin succeeded to the throne rather than a son of the king. Even in cases where a son inherited the rule from his father, it was not always the eldest son who was the designated heir to the throne. M.B. Hatzopoulos, in an attempt to solve this problem[25], came to the conclusion that the crown prince had to be the first son born to the king after his accession to the throne. In other words, Hatzopoulos sees a modified form of primogeniture in effect for the Argead dynasty. His conclusion on regency, that if the successor to the throne was a minor his closest agnate uncle was appointed to be his guardian, cannot be disputed but his rule for succession must be. Hatzopoulos' early examples show some basis for his claim, but this claim is based on theory as little evidence can be obtained. His use of Philip II and

Alexander III as further support for his argument lacks cogency. To make the succession of Alexander fit into his theory, Hatzopoulos uses the procrustean device of making Philip a regent for the first four years of his reign, so that he was not king when Arridaios was born. Philip's regency is based mainly on a statement of Justin (*Itaque Philippus diu non regem, sed tutorem pupilli egit.* - 6.9) which has been disregarded by most historians[26]. Since Philip dated his succession to 369 B.C., he was king when Arridaios was born and thus Arridaios should have been the crown prince rather than Alexander. Thus the argument that "Direct succession from father to son, birth 'in the purple' and not seniority were the general principles inspiring the customary rules that regulated succession within the Temenid house"[27] is not sustainable. The fact that Arridaios and Alexander were sons of Philip by two different mothers may have been a more important factor in determining which of them should rule than when Philip II began his reign. Arridaios' feeble-mindedness may have played a role in making Alexander the designated heir to the throne; at Alexander's death, however, the Macedonians chose Arridaios as his successor and therefore mental instability was not a bar to kingship.

There could be a very simple reason why the queen was important in the royal succession: the Macedonians were prejudiced against foreigners. This was the case for later Macedonian history, as is shown by Alexander the Great's attempts

to stamp out this prejudice (eg. by forced marriages between his Macedonian Companions and Persian women - Arrian, *Anabasis*, 7.4-8) and by the arguments over the succession of Alexander IV because his mother was Bactrian (Arrian, *Anabasis*, 7.4). Another hint that the Macedonian people expected a purely Macedonian queen may be found in the example of Audata (who, although probably a member of the Temenid line through her father, had an Illyrian name) changing her name to Eurydike.

If one accepts my reading of the Perdikkas I myth, racial prejudice (or more likely, a belief in the existence of a ruling class) would also have been held by the Macedonian royal families, who accepted that they were related for the purpose of marriage and favoured endogamy among themselves. Thus all of the queens of Macedonia should have been of pure Macedonian blue blood. Some evidence for endogamy between the Argead, Lynkestid and Elimiotid royal families in the generations directly following Alexander I can be found by looking at the Argead family tree[28].

Hammond notes that "In northern Greece and the central Balkan area the basic unit of life was the small tribe, and it seems to have maintained its identity by the practice of endogamy"[29], and states "One of the most important achievements of [Macedonian] kings was to abolish the old tribal systems and fuse the people into one group, the Macedones, which was settled over a much wider area of country[30]. There is in fact no evidence

for the abolition of the tribal system; the tribal system simply appears to have been expanded in the case of the royal families of some of these tribes; they chose their marriage partners from the royal families of other tribes than the one to which they belonged. The practise of endogamy was maintained but on the broader base of several Macedonian royal families rather than on individual lines. This endogamy is reflected by the transfer of names across royal houses, as mentioned above. Macedonian society seems to have remained tribal until it fell to Rome[31], although Alexander the Great tried to change from being a tribal leader into being an absolute monarch.

It will be argued that there are cases known where Macedonian princesses married outside the Macedonian royal houses and where non-Macedonian women married Macedonian kings. Gygaea, sister of Alexander I, married the Persian Bubares; Stratonike, sister of Perdikkas II, married the Thracian Seuthes (Thuc. 2.101.5-6); and Philip II married a whole string of non-Macedonian brides. In the first two cases, the marriages were arranged so that friendly contact could be established with people who had conquered or could conquer Macedonia. The marriages of Gygaea and Stratonike were probably outside of regular practice and made because of political necessity. In fact, by marrying their sisters to nonmembers of the Macedonian royal families, both Alexander and Perdikkas could have been protecting themselves against pretenders to their thrones, if the suggestion that

Macedonian princesses could have some bearing on succession is accepted. The marriages of Philip II to foreign women may be seen in the same light: they were designed to cement alliance rather than to produce royal offspring. Philip II had two Macedonian wives, his first (who was childless) and his last. At Philip's wedding with his last wife, Kleopatra, Alexander the Great almost came to blows with one of the wedding guests because that guest suggested that a true heir to the throne might be born from this marriage (Plut. *Alex.*,9.4-5). This suggests that Alexander, whose mother Olympias was Molossian, would have lost his status as crown prince if his father had a son born to a Macedonian queen. Thus it is likely that marriages between Macedonians were preferred over marriages outside of the Macedonian royal houses.

Another problem of early Macedonian history which has never been addressed, probably because of its insolubility, is that it is impossible to discover who the first kings of Macedonia were. Beloch, in his chapter on Macedonian kings, notes that there is no guarantee that the list of kings handed down to us is complete[32]. When one looks at the actual lists, however, the problem is deeper than simple incompleteness. Herodotus' list (8.139) does not purport to be a list of Argead kings: this list is a genealogy of Alexander I. The only two names on the list specifically noted as kings, aside from Alexander I, are Perdikkas I and Amyntas I, Alexander's father. Thucydides, in

writing the number of kings rather than listing their names (2.100.2), may have been sidestepping this issue. Since the number of ancestors named by Herodotus before Alexander agrees with the number of kings stated in Thucydides, it has been assumed that all of Alexander's ancestors were kings. This assumption, however, is dangerous, as is shown by the four rulers immediately succeeding Alexander I. Alexander was succeeded by his son Perdikkas II, who was succeeded by his son Archelaos in a lineal pattern. The next king of Argead Macedonia, however, was the grandson of Alexander through a different son, Menelaos, and the following king was the great-grandson of Alexander whose grandfather had been a third son of Alexander I, Amyntas. Thus a lineal succession between Perdikkas I and Alexander I cannot be taken as a certainty. There is even an outside chance that Perdikkas I had descendants named Karanos, Koinos and Tyrimmas who became kings and were remembered, but, since they were not direct ancestors of Alexander I and Archelaos, they were displaced to a time before Perdikkas I. The problem of providing a genealogy rather than a list of kings is not peculiar to Herodotus, as Satyros (*P. Oxyrhyn.* 2465) and Diodorus (7.15.1-3, and as transmitted by Eusebius *Chronicle*, Schoene Ed., 1, 227) also give genealogies. That these names were accepted as those of the Macedonian kings from the Hellenistic period down to the present may simply be because lineal succession was customary for most kingdoms at the time when the

histories were written.

Hammond did not tackle the problem of the history of the kings between Perdikkas I and Amyntas I[33]. The only possibly reliable information extant on any of these kings is that Argaios is said to have been the first king to build walls (Syncellus, 1.401). Justin 7.2 contains a confused and confusing tale of the descendants of Perdikkas I, who died of old age. Then Argaios ruled, "*moderate et cum amore popularium administrato regno*" (7.2), which follows the traditional order but sounds as if Justin had no information, yet he felt he should write something. Justin has the next king listed as Philip, who murdered the infant Aeropos to obtain that position and had to war with the Illyrians, who objected to his behaviour. The other genealogies agree that Philip was the king after Argaios, but Aeropos was the next king and so could not have been murdered as a baby by Philip, as Justin would have it. Thus, if there actually was a war with Illyria, it was not over the succession to the Macedonian throne. If Syncellus' statement about wall-building is true, then there must have been some military threat to Argead Macedonia during the rule of Argaios which may have continued during the reign of Philip, but what that threat was is uncertain. Justin does not mention the successor to Aeropos, Alketas, at all, but skips over him to Amyntas. Thus, although Justin is virtually the only source on the kings between Perdikkas I and Amyntas I, his omissions and mistakes make him

completely unreliable for this period.

Amyntas I is the first Argead king to whom any specific historical actions are attributable. According to Herodotus (5.17.2), he ruled Argead Macedonia at the time when the Persians were expanding towards Greece, in the late sixth and early fifth centuries B.C. During this expansion Macedonia became a subject state to Persia. It is commonly believed that it was Amyntas who gave earth and water to the Persians as his tokens of submission, although some authors believe that it was Alexander I and not his father who accepted Persian domination[34]. Herodotus is unequivocal on this point, writing that Amyntas' response to the Persian demands was ὁ δε ταῦτα τε ἔδιδου (5.18.1). The fact of the deaths of the Persian envoys on the same night that they received tokens of submission from Amyntas I might tend to make his offer suspect, but Herodotus makes it quite clear that Amyntas was not implicated in the murders. The situation presented by Herodotus is as follows: Amyntas I, after giving earth and water to the Persians, invited the envoys to dinner; the Persians abused Macedonian hospitality by attacking their women, but Amyntas did nothing because of fear of the Persians (5.19). Amyntas did, however, allow his son Alexander the chance for revenge by giving over his duties as host to his son and leaving after giving the advice:

> Ὦ παῖ, σχεδὸν γάρ σευ ἀνακαιομένου
> συνίημι τοὺς λόγους, ὅτι

ἐθέλεις ἐμὲ ἐκπέμψας ποιέειν τι
νεώτερον· ἐγὼ ὦν σευ χρηίζω μηδὲν
νεοχμῶσαι κατ' ἄνδρας τούτους, ἵνα
μὴ ἐξεργάσῃ ἡμέας, ἀλλὰ ἀνέχευ ὀρέων
τὰ ποιεύμενα· ἀμφὶ δὲ ἀποδῷ τῇ ἐμῇ
πείσομαί τοι (5.19.2).

Thus Amyntas I is used as a voice of reason and caution in contrast to his son Alexander's reckless daring. As soon as Amyntas had left, Alexander removed the Macedonian women and replaced them with men in female clothes who murdered the Persians (5.20.1-5), Amyntas I is a backdrop for Alexander I in this anecdote: he provides background for his son, the central character.

As stated above, Errington[35] believes that it was Alexander I, not Amyntas I, who first accepted Persian domination. His argument on this point forms the basis used by all those who agree with him, and therefore will be examined here.

Errington dismisses the entire Persian envoy anecdote in Herodotus as an attempt to whitewash Alexander's reputation after the Greeks defeated the Persians. According to Errington, the only truth in Herodotus' narrative is the marriage of Gygaea to Bubares, and he disagrees about the date Herodotus gives for that marriage. His argument is based on several points: (1) Syncellus (ed. Dindorf) I, 469 says about Alexander I, οὗτος δέδωκε τοῖς Πέρσαις ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν; (2) Errington states that under Megabazus just after 512 B.C. "no

attempt was made at this time to 'conquer' Thrace or to create a formal Thracian satrapy"[36], which implies that the Persians did not reach Macedonia. As support for this view, he quotes Herodotus 6.44.1 (mistakenly cited as 6.43.3) *τοῦτο δὲ τῷ πεζῷ Μακεδόνας πρὸς τοῖσι ὑπάρχουσι δούλους προσεκτήσαντο· τὰ γὰρ ἐντὸς Μακεδόνων ἔθνεα πάντα σφι ἤδη ἦν ὑποχείρια γεγονότα*, which "clearly implies that this was for the first time"[37]; (3) since Alexander is stated to have arranged Gygaea's marriage (5.21.2), he must have been king when she married; (4) "Herodotus knows no name for these envoys and tells us nothing about their families, merely the conventional generalisation that they were *δοκιμώτατοι ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ*; even the number of envoys, seven, is, for the Persians, a conventionally significant one, and (if real) remarkably large for such a marginal errand"[38]; and (5) "Since all Persians were destroyed ... when the alleged search party arrived, the internal logic of the story implies that Darius never actually received his earth and water from Amyntas, and, therefore, that Amyntas never became a vassal of Darius"[39]. Errington, by using these points, concludes that Macedonia and Thrace were first subjected to Persia by Mardonius in 492 B.C. and it is in this context that the marriage between Alexander's sister Gygaea and Bubares took place. After the Persians were defeated in 479, this tale was invented as "self-justification from Alexander"[40].

Herodotus himself provides rebuttals to most of Errington's points aside from the first one. In reply to (2), that there was no attempt to conquer Thrace until 492 B.C., Herodotus states that just after 512 B.C.,

> ἠλαυνε τὸν στρατὸν ὁ Μεγάβαζος διὰ τῆς Θρηίκης, πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ πᾶν ἔθνος τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων ἡμερούμενος βασιλέϊ· ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ ἐνετέταλτο ἐκ Δαρείου, Θρηίκην καταστρέφεσθαι (5.2.2).

Perhaps a formal satrapy of Thrace was not established at that time, but Thrace was conquered and thus Macedonia was within reach of the Persians shortly after 512 B.C. Points (3), that Alexander must have been king to arrange Gygaea's wedding, and (5), that Amyntas never submitted to Darius, should be looked at in the context of explaining (4), Herodotus' not providing information on the envoys. This can be done by looking at a parallel situation narrated by Herodotus.

Herodotus 7.133-137 tells of Persian envoys sent to Athens and Sparta who were also murdered. On those occasions, not only the names but also the number of the envoys are omitted, and those names would surely have been available to Herodotus if his audience was at all interested in hearing about Persians. This simply means that the Greeks were uninterested in Persian names and lineages. What is more interesting about this passage, however, is that it tells about some of the repercussions of

violating the host-guest relationship and of the attempts made to avoid these by the Spartans. The killing of the envoys brought a *geas* on the Spartan people, so that they attempted to remove this curse by having two Spartan citizens give themselves over to the Persian king for killing in return. Xerxes refused the Spartans' attempts at expiation, saying:

> οὐκ ἔφη ὅμοιος ἔσεσθαι
> Λακεδαιμονίοισι· κείνους μὲν γὰρ
> συγχέαι τὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων νόμιμα
> ἀποκτείναντας κήρυκας, αὐτὸς δὲ
> τὰ ἐκείνοισι ἐπιπλήσσει ταῦτα οὐ
> ποιήσειν, οὐδὲ ἀνταποκτείνας
> ἐκείνους ἀπολυσειν Λακεδαιμονίους
> τῆς αἰτίης (7.136.2).

Thus Xerxes' code of honour would not permit him to punish the people who had killed his envoys, as appropriate punishment would put him at the same criminal level as the Spartans. The same code of honour would also apply to Amyntas and Darius when the heralds were killed by Alexander. Therefore Amyntas I would have had to offer his son Alexander to the Persians for punishment, and they would have had to refuse punishment. The Persians, however, would have been impressed by the honour of Amyntas I in offering his crown prince to them for punishment. Perhaps Amyntas I had Alexander offer two alternatives to the Persians: either they could kill him for his crime or they could accept an alliance with the Macedonians, confirmed by a marriage between Gygaea and a Persian noble. This alternative would explain why Alexander was stated as the author of the marriage instead of

Amyntas, who was king at that time. It would also explain why there were two 'enslavements' of Macedonia: shortly after 512 B.C. Amyntas I may have formed an alliance with Persia, possibly confirmed by a marriage and tribute instead of the giving of earth and water to the Persian king and then, in 492 B.C., after the death of Amyntas I, Alexander I had to submit to Persia in the usual manner. Thus, as Syncellus states (1.469), Alexander I would have been the king of Macedonia who gave water and earth to the Persian king. Amyntas I, however, did accept Persian domination, and the customs governing host-guest relationships, using the Spartan analogy, may explain why there was no retribution against the Macedonians for murdering envoys. Amyntas may have even been a satrap for Persia, as it was common practice for the Persians to allow the local government a fair amount of autonomy[41]. That Alexander was not punished may have made him more amenable to Persian rule, as this incident showed that they would not be harsh masters. This interpretation of Herodotus' narration on Amyntas and Alexander and the Persian envoys does not explain why the envoys were killed by men (or boys) in women's clothing, but it seems that this incident is a case where truth is stranger than fiction. This method for murder will be discussed in the next chapter.

The only mention of Amyntas I in any connection other than as father of Alexander I or as the king who accepted Persian domination is found in Herodotus 5.94. In 510 B.C. Amyntas I

offered Hippias of Athens the town of Anthemos to live in, although Hippias did not accept it. Instead Hippias returned to Asia to join the Persians as an adviser for the attack against Athens (Hdt. 5.96.1). Amyntas' offer to Hippias may possibly show how well the Macedonian king could steer among the shoals of diplomacy: if this offer had been accepted, it would have been pleasing to the Persians, as Amyntas would have been showing good will toward a friend of theirs, and to the Athenians, as Hippias would have been occupied with his new possession rather than seeking revenge against Athens. Hammond[42] is possibly correct in saying that it would also have been advantageous to have a friendly, well-connected and wealthy Hippias as a buffer on the east border of Macedonia. Hippias would have been neutralized if he had accepted Anthemos, and perhaps Amyntas was trying to guide events in a middle course between loyalties to his Greek Temenid ancestry and his Persian overlords. Also, Hippias may already have had some connections in the area of Anthemos: during his father's second exile from Athens in *c.* 550/549 B.C., Pisistratos "organized the inhabitants of the neighbourhood of Rhaecelus into some sort of a city-state"[43] and he used the resources of that region to the benefit of Athens after he returned there. This implies that the Pisistratids had personal control over the area of Rhaecelus, the area next to Anthemos, so that Hippias would have been familiar with that region. Thus Hippias may have personally controlled part of the area already.

Hammond states that,

> "Bubares was of the highest rank and, as such, was effectively in charge of Macedonia, perhaps for a decade after *c.* 510, and his relationship with Amyntas and Alexander was stated by Justin 7.4.1 to have produced peace and friendship between the two countries under both Darius and Xerxes. Indeed his period of residence was so important in the Macedonian tradition that the death of Amyntas was dated in relation to the departure of Bubares by Justin 7.5.1, *'post discessum Bubaris Amyntas rex decedit.'* There is no doubt, in view of Justin's statement, that Macedonia was included in the satrapy which the Persians named 'Skudra' ..."[44].

Bubares was indeed a noble Persian and appears three times in Herodotus. The first time he is the head of the search party looking for the seven missing envoys who went to Macedonia (5.21.2), the second time he and another Persian are in charge of the men building a canal for Xerxes' navy by Mount Athos (7.22.2) and the third time he is mentioned as a brother-in-law of Alexander I and father of a son who was in high favour with the Persian king (8.136.1). It is not stated that Bubares was in charge of any particular land or that he stayed in Europe at all: the phrase on Bubares' and Gygaea's son, ἐκ τῆς οἱ ἐγεγόνεε Ἀμύντας ὁ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ, ἔχων τὸ οὔνομα τοῦ μητροπάτορος, τῷ δὴ ἐκ βασιλέος τῆς Φρυγίης ἐδόθη Ἀλάβανδα πόλις μεγάλη νέμεσθαι (Hdt. 8.136.1), may show that Bubares and Gygaea lived in Asia at some time, although it may only mean that they sent their son to Persia. In any

case, the fact that Bubares was with the army in Macedonia does not confirm or deny that he stayed there; he is mentioned only on particular occasions. Hammond's use of Justin to show that Bubares was important in Macedonian tradition is not justified: Justin, in about the third century A.D., wrote an epitome of Pompeius Trogus' work, which dates from *c.* the first century B.C. to the first century A.D. and is now lost[45]. The events related by Justin from Pompeius Trogus, even if stated completely and faithfully, occurred at least four hundred years before Trogus wrote, and there do not appear to have been any written documents from Amyntas' time then extant. Trogus may have relied on oral sources, but we do not know who his sources were. Therefore, even if one could trust that Trogus wrote no more than *'post discessum Bubaris Amyntas rex decedit'* (Justin 7.5.1), which cannot be assumed, since Justin was writing an epitome, no evidence has come down that his sources were Macedonian. Thus this statement cannot be demonstrated as Macedonian tradition. Justin's (or Trogus') statement that Bubares' influence made Persia and Macedonia friendly to each other may be a later analysis of history rather than fact. It seems unlikely that Bubares was head of the Macedonian state, since it was Amyntas and not Bubares who offered Anthemos to Hippias.

On the two occasions that Herodotus mentions Amyntas I (5.17-20; 5.94.1), the Macedonian king is portrayed as cooperating with the Persians, although not necessarily of his

own free will. His policy seems to have been successful, as Amyntas' family continued to rule in Macedonia under the Persians. In fact, under Amyntas I and his son, Alexander I, the territories of the Argead Macedonians were greatly expanded. Hammond believes that "Amyntas inaugurated a new policy. Whereas his predecessors had exterminated or ejected the existing populations of Pieria, Bottiaea, and Almopia, Amyntas incorporated the local populations - apart from the Paeonian rulers - into his enlarged kingdom"[46], basing this statement on Thucydides 2.99.4 and 2.99.6. Thucydides' actual statement, which refers to Αλεξανδρος ο Περδικκου πατηρ και οι προγονοι αυτου (2.99.3) and not specifically to Amyntas, is as follows:

> τῆς δὲ Παιονίας παρὰ τὸν Ἀξιὸν
> ποταμὸν στενήν τινα καθήκουσαν ἄνωθεν μέχρι
> Πέλλης καὶ θαλάσσης ἐκτήσαντο,
> καὶ πέραν Ἀξιοῦ μέχρι Στρυμόνος τὴν
> Μυγδονίαν καλουμένην Ἠδῶνας
> ἐξελάσαντες νέμονται. ἀνέστησαν δὲ
> καὶ ἐκ τῆς νῦν Ἐορδίας
> καλούμενης Ἐορδούς, ὧν οἱ μὲν
> πολλοὶ ἐφθάρησαν, βραχὺ δέ τι αὐτῶν περὶ
> Φύσκαν κατῴκηται, καὶ ἐξ Ἀλμωπίας
> Ἀλμωπας. ἐκράτησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων
> ἐθνῶν οἳ Μακεδόνες οὗτοι, ἃ καὶ νῦν
> ἔτι ἔχουσι, τόν τε Ἀνθεμοῦντα καὶ
> Γρηστωνίαν καὶ Βισαλτίαν καὶ Μακεδόνων αὐτῶν
> πολλήν (2.99.4-6).

The only firm connections between this passage and Amyntas I are that he was a forebear of Alexander I, and that he is known to have possessed Anthemos (Hdt. 5.94.1), although he is not stated to have conquered that city. Only a small portion of Paeonia was

taken over, and its rulers are not mentioned. It is difficult to see why Hammond groups the Almopians with the Pierians and the Bottiaeans when Thucydides places them after Mygdonia and Eordia, two places not mentioned by Hammond that were also depopulated by the Argead Macedonians. It should be noted that the only populations which may possibly have been incorporated in Argead Macedonia (aside from the few Eordians who survived and moved to Mygdonia) were already Macedonians although not Argeads. Thus incorporation of these local peoples was selective and would not have presented many difficulties, as they already shared a fairly homogeneous culture with their conquerors. Their conquest probably did take place under Amyntas I and could explain why Darius sent a party of seven envoys to Amyntas: if Argead Macedonia was vigorously expanding at that time, its submission may not have been "a marginal errand"[47] for the Persians. The Persians rewarded the Argead family's services by allowing them continued control of their region and, after the Persians were defeated by the Greeks, Alexander I was able to maintain control over the enlarged kingdom.

Chapter 3

It is believed that Alexander I became king of Macedonia c. 495 B.C.[1] This belief rests on the fact that Amyntas I drops out of the histories in the last decade of the sixth century. The possibility exists, however, that the rumours of his death were greatly exaggerated. Alexander I is mentioned eleven times by Herodotus[2] and is only called king in the last passage, one which describes events that happened just before the battle of Plataea in 478 B.C. In the earlier passages Alexander is simply called son of Amyntas, with neither of them called king except in 5.18 *ff.* where Amyntas is the king submitting to Persia. There is no mention made of Amyntas' death except for Justin's *'post discessum Bubaris Amyntas rex decedit'* (7.5.1). This statement is of very little help in dating Amyntas' death (even if one ignores the fact that Justin is epitomizing and believes that Amyntas' death followed immediately on Bubares' departure), because one cannot pinpoint exactly when Bubares left Macedonia. Bubares was either still in, or returned to, Macedonia in the late 490s to supervise the building of a canal by Mount Athos for Xerxes (Hdt. 7.22.2). If Hammond's conjecture that Bubares controlled the satrapy of Skudra for approximately ten years after 510 is correct[3], then Amyntas was

alive at least until 500 B.C., which would fit the accepted date of his death. There is, however, no indication that Bubares was recalled at that date and his presence in Macedonia in the 490's implies that he was not recalled. He was probably a fairly young man in *c.* 510 since he was eligible for marriage and, although noble, was not in command of the Persian expedition. He was the son of Megabazos, the commander of the Persians (Hdt. 7.22.2), so that he could not have been very old. Bubares may have stayed in Macedonia in some capacity, although not necessarily as satrap, down into the 480's B.C. The lack of information about Amyntas after *c.* 510 B.C. thus does not confirm that he died soon after that date. If one dates the death of Amyntas by the date of Bubares' departure, as must be done because there is no other information available, Amyntas I probably died between *c.* 492 B.C. and 478 B.C.

Alexander I appears in written history a few more times than any previous Macedonian king, but his dates of birth, accession and death are still not firmly established. He is first mentioned while still a young man in the incident of the envoy-slaying discussed above. He was probably still young when he competed in the foot-race at the Olympic Games (Hdt. 5.22), and possibly some other games[4]. The poetry written in his honour may mean that he was a patron of the arts. During the Persian Wars he acted as a Persian emissary to the Greeks twice (Hdt. 7.173; 8.136 *ff.*) and went on his own as a messenger to

the Greeks once (Hdt. 9.44). At this time he also seems to have expanded his territory (Thuc. 2.99.3-.100) and was made a *proxenos* to Athens (Demosth. 13.24; 23.200; Hdt. 8.136). After the wars he maintained good relations with both Persia (Thuc. 1.137.1) and Greece (Paus. 7.25.6). He had five sons and one known daughter. He is known to history as Alexander the Philhellene, and every episode related about his life (other than the affair of the Persian envoys) is connected to Greece in some way.

Alexander appears to have considered himself Greek, at least for the purpose of athletic competition. When he entered the Olympic Games (Hdt. 5.22) there were objections given on the grounds that he was not a Greek and was therefore ineligible to compete. Alexander provided evidence that his family was Greek, and he was allowed admission into the Olympics. Unfortunately what that evidence was is not stated (one is almost tempted to think of the baby blankets and tokens that were so popular for reinstating lost heirs in New Comedy), but that the Olympic committee accepted it shows that it was either indisputable or that they were susceptible to bribery. Alexander did not win his event at the Olympics, as he appears nowhere on a list of victors[5]. Roos[6] seems to have the most sensible view on what συνεξέπιπτε τῷ πρωτῷ (Hdt. 5.22.2) means: that he ran a dead heat[7] and lost when the race was rerun. Hammond, again using Justin plus a fragment of Pindar[8] as the basis of his argument,

believes that Alexander competed again later and was victorious in the pentathlon[9]. Justin's statement, *etiam Olympio certamine vario ludicrorum genere contenderit* (7.2.14) is so vague that it must be suspected as a generalisation or a statement that Alexander competed in several games of the Olympic sort. The fragment of Pindar is so small that it cannot even be called a victory ode. Turyn places it with encomiums, believing that it is a eulogy of Alexander's rule and not a victory ode at all. Thus, although Alexander may have competed several times in his life, it may not have been at the Olympics all those times, and he may never have won.

Alexander may have spent the first part of the Persian Wars in Macedonia, although he was able to send a message to the Greeks in Thessaly. Herodotus (7.173.3) states,

> ἀπικόμενοι γὰρ ἄγγελοι παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἀμύντεω ἀνδρὸς Μακεδόνος συνεβούλευον σφι ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι μηδὲ μένοντας ἐν τῇ ἐσβολῇ καταπατηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ ἐπιόντος, σημαίνοντες τό πλῆθος τε τῆς στρατιῆς καὶ τὰς νέας.

The Greeks followed Alexander's advice, perhaps because they respected the Macedonian, but more likely, as Herodotus says (7.173.4), because they discovered that there were alternative routes into Thessaly aside from the one they were guarding. One wonders if Alexander's message contained a geography lesson as well as an enumeration of ships and troops. The enumeration of ships may even have been ended by a sales pitch about Macedonian

timber for Greek ship-building. That the son of Amyntas could provide the Greeks with intelligence about the Persians implies that he was in Persian confidence to some extent. The *Cambridge History of Iran*[10] presents Alexander's actions at Tempe as an act of political warfare on behalf of Persia. At a later date, if Alexander needed some favour from the Persians, this message to the Greeks could be interpreted as done for the Persians; on the other hand, if the Greeks were successful in the war, they would feel gratitude to the man who stopped them from tying up troops in a perilous location. The information given to the Greeks would help them more than the Persians, as it allowed Greek troops the chance to deploy in a more defensible position, rather than to be by-passed and rounded up at the Persians' leisure. Whatever the outcome, however, the victors would owe something to Alexander. This message may also have involved some personal revenge against the Persians: it was probably the first occasion available to him to take action against the Persians two years after their second, and more restrictive, invasion into Macedonia.

As discussed previously, Alexander I gave earth and water to the Persians in *c.* 492 B.C., when Mardonius came to Macedonia. Hammond[11] believes that in relating the second submission to Persia, Herodotus (6.44.1) implies that Macedonia had broken away from Persia sometime between 510 and 492 B.C. This implication of Herodotus is disregarded, "for Persia gave

short shrift to rebels, and Xerxes would not have extended the realm of Alexander (Just. 7. 4. I), if Alexander had been a rebel"[12]. Thus Hammond ignores the fact that there was a second submission to Persia, again placing his trust in Justin more than the more contemporary source because of his earlier contention that "The bond between Macedonia and Bubares was underemphasized by Herodotus, probably through his sympathy to Alexander" [13]. A. Gerolymatos[14] seems closer to the mark in stating that both the Macedonian and the Persian kings were different from the ones giving and receiving the original oath, and also that the Greek subject states repeated their oaths of submission in 480 B.C. (Hdt. 7.130-135). He proposes "that the Persians did not trust the new subject states to accept Persian hegemony since the relationship of the Greek states with the Persian Empire had not yet solidified into one of 'vassals' and 'overlord'. As such, it was necessary for the Persians to require of their subject states a demonstration of their loyalty before any major campaign in the region of these states."[15] This argument is sensible, but an even simpler explanation of more than one submission to Persia may be found. Xerxes may have demanded a second show of submission because the first oaths were sworn to Darius personally and therefore were not binding to Xerxes[16]. Therefore, when Xerxes' armies came to Macedonia in 492 and to Greece in 480, they demanded symbols of submission to the new Persian king. It must be noted that the submission of

these states was particularly important as they were then asked to supply troops to the Persians for the attack on Greece.

It appears possible that Alexander was granted *proxenia* to Athens for the message he sent to the Greeks at Tempe in 490 B.C. There is no mention of Alexander being a *proxenos* at Tempe, as would be expected if he already had this status, because it would explain why he gave warning to the Greeks. It has been assumed by some scholars[17] that Alexander I was granted *proxenia* because he provided timber to the Athenians during the Persian Wars. The provision of timber, however, was a commercial transaction, which would benefit Alexander as much as Athens and thus would probably not have made the Athenians grant the Macedonian king special favours. Alexander's warning to the Greeks would be more likely to bring him honours than would the trade in timber. Gerolymatos[18] would place Alexander's *proxenia* between 486 and 484 B.C. because at that time Xerxes was too embroiled in rebellions and difficulties attendent on succession to pay attention to the timber trade of the Macedonian king at that time. These dates are a possibility for the *proxenia* of Alexander I but, if as suggested above, Alexander had already shown his willingness to sell timber in 490, both honour and mercantilism would have been involved in giving him *proxenia*. Therefore the earlier date seems more likely.

The *proxenia* of Alexander I has caused difficulties for scholars, as Demosthenes (13.24; 23.200) states that Perdikkas

was given either *atelia* or *politaia* for his help to the Athenians during the Persian Wars. Cole[19] defines the difficulties with the two passages in Demosthenes: they are not consistent in what was awarded, they talk of an incident which is not backed by literary evidence, and they say that the award was granted to Perdikkas and not to Alexander[20]. There was no Perdikkas to give aid to the Athenians during the Persian Wars so that it has been assumed that Demosthenes gave the wrong name to either the king or the war. It is unlikely that Demosthenes was so ignorant of history and seems more probable that he was referring to both Perdikkas II and Alexander I, both recipients of Athenian *proxenia* for aid in war, using the name of the later king and the time of the earlier one for the sake of rhetorical brevity. His audience would be knowledgeable enough to expand the name and situation referred to by Demosthenes into two separate incidents. The incident Demosthenes refers to is the harassing of the Persians in their final retreat from Greece. According to a source more contemporary with the Persian Wars, it was the Thracians who attacked the Persians during their retreat through Thessaly and Macedonia (Hdt. 9.89.4). It is possible that the Thracians were in Macedonia with the consent of Alexander, but his later friendly relations with Persia imply that he was not actively supporting their attackers. Demosthenes may have changed the circumstances of Alexander's aid to make a more dramatic climax for his passage - aid at the beginning of

the war might seem less important than putting the finishing touches on ridding Europe of the Persians. Alternatively, Demosthenes may have been speaking of Alexander's capture of Nine Ways from the Persians, which Hammond places between 478 and 476/5[21]. The capture of Nine Ways by Alexander is based on another passage of Demosthenes (*The Letter of Philip*, 12.21) and, although this event took place after the Persian Wars proper, it could still be seen as harassing the Persians on their retreat from Europe. With the evidence available, it is not possible to prove if Alexander and Perdikkas were granted *atelia* (Demosth. 13.24) or *politaia* or whether one was granted *atelia* and the other *politaia*, but we may take Herodotus' word that Alexander had *proxenia* to Athens (8.136). It may also have been on the occasion of this grant that Alexander put up his statue at Delphi (Hdt. 8.121).

Soon after the battle of Artemision in *c.* 480 B.C. Alexander provided aid to another Greek state, Boeotia (Hdt. 8.34). The Macedonian king prevented the Persians from plundering this state by providing the Macedonian army as a guard for it when the Boeotians agreed to submit to Persia. Alexander may have been asked to negotiate terms between the Boeotians and Xerxes, as he was friendly to both parties. The protection of Boeotia also shows that Alexander I was still capable of action independent from the Persians: he had Macedonian troops at his command, who opposed the Persians ravaging their way into

Greece. If Alexander was responsible for the peaceful submission of Boeotia to Persia, this may be why the Persians sent him to negotiate with the Athenians. Alexander I was a faithful servant to Persia, but he was also a protector of the rights of the subdued.

Alexander's protection of the Boeotians shows that he probably had a personal relationship with some of the people of Boeotia. We do not know with which Boeotians Alexander was friendly, but it is interesting to note that Alexander's ploy for killing the Persian envoys was replicated about one hundred and thirty years later in a Boeotian city, Thebes. In 379 B.C., when Sparta had taken control of the government of Thebes, some young democrats infiltrated a dinner party, dressed as dancing girls, and murdered the Spartan officials[22]. This incident, like Alexander's envoy-slaying, has often been dismissed[23], perhaps unjustly. Both incidents involve young men, probably with little fighting experience, in an attack on seasoned warriors. Guile would therefore have a better chance for success than force in both of these cases. If Alexander negotiated with the Boeotians for their surrender to Persia, it is likely that he would have told the Boeotians about his early encounters with the Persians. He would probably have recounted the story of his murder of the Persian envoys, especially since it showed that the Persians were not vengeful masters. Thus the ruse of female impersonation for the purpose of assassination would have been known in Thebes and

may have been used in a desperate situation in later times. The fact that these two events were both recorded within two generations of their occurrence (by Herodotus for the Macedonians and by Xenophon for the Thebans), well within living memory, makes me believe that they should be regarded as truth, not folk-tale.

In 479 B.C. Alexander I visited the Athenians to discuss terms for their surrender to Persia (Hdt. 8.136, 140-144.1; Paus. 7.25.6). His speech to the Athenians (Hdt. 8.140-141) shows good will towards them but a fatalistic view of the outcome of the war. Alexander urged the Athenians to submit to Persia rather than be crushed by Xerxes. His mission was unsuccessful, but he was not killed like the earlier Persian envoys, and his presence in Athens motivated the Spartans to provide more aid to the Athenians. Thus Alexander I could be seen as one of the authors of the Greek victory.

Alexander I acted as a messenger to the Greeks again in 478 B.C., just before the battle of Plataea, but this time he acted on his own behalf (Hdt. 9.44-46; Plut. *Aristides* 15.2-5) and was called king of the Macedonians for the first time. He told the Greeks that the Persians were short of supplies and planned to attack the next day, then he rode back to his assigned position in the Persian army. Both Herodotus and Plutarch place Alexander on horseback. His army's position on the far right flank of the Athenians, along with a contingent of Thessalians,

who are separate from the contingent of Thessalians who fought beside the Boeotians, Locrians, Malians and Phocians (Hdt. 9.31.5), suggests that these two groups may have been cavalry, although Hammond believes that they were light-armed skirmishers[24]. How the Macedonians fought and what their successes were is not described, which suggests that they were faithful to their Persian masters. Perhaps the Macedonians were assigned to harry the Athenians, possibly explaining why they were not attacked although Ἀθηναίοι δε κάτω τράφθεντες ἐς τὸ πεδίον (Hdt. 9.56.2), the perfect place for a cavalry attack.

As was stated at the end of the last chapter, Alexander I was able to maintain control of an enlarged kingdom when the Persians retreated from Macedonia. It seems likely that he did this by simply continuing to use the mechanisms put into place by the Persians during their rule, as Alexander was probably the official in charge of Macedonia on behalf of the Persians.[25] Goukowsky agrees with this theory, adding "C'est sans doute pourquoi la collecte de l'impôt, le recouvrement des taxes, l'exploitation des mines et des richesses naturelles, ainsi que la frappe des monnaies, demeurèrent privilège royal"[26]. It is true that later kings owned the natural resources of Macedonia, but the ownership of these resources before Alexander's time is unknown and therefore it cannot be stated that Alexander I initiated this practice.

Alexander I made some reforms to the military just after the Persian Wars[27], organizing his army into cavalry and infantry divisions and creating the πεζέταιροι. Goukowsky believes that Alexander modelled his army on that of Persia[28] and that the infantry was created as "contrebalancerant la trop influente aristocratie"[29], the cavalry. Momigliano agrees that the infantry was created to counterbalance the aristocratic cavalry, but he believes that the change was "riformandone la constituzione su imitazione di modello greco"[30]. Both the Persian and the Greek armies consisted of infantry and cavalry arms, and Alexander I had a first-hand opportunity to see both armies in action. Therefore, Alexander I may have copied the military organization of either Persia or Greece, or (as seems more likely for the king of a state which was defeated by both foreign nations) modified his military organization so that it included the strong points of both the Persian and the Greek armies as far as was possible with the resources available to Macedonia. This reorganization of the army should not be considered as a simple copying of foreign armies, but as a defense against future invasions of Macedonia.

Both Goukowsky and Momigliano believe that the military reform of Alexander I was also a constitutional change, designed to give the Macedonian king a broad power base of common people (the infantry) to counteract noble (cavalry) rebellion. The idea that military reform was constitutional reform is based on the

premise that only members of the standing army were enfranchized in Macedonia. This premise [illegible]ved from individual, and perhaps extraordinary, occasions written about in later Macedonian history[30]. Goukowsky takes the extreme position that "Ceux qui ne contribuaient pas furent en revanche exclus du service actif et par-là même de l'assemblée"[32]. According to this view, each soldier on demobilization or retirement and each landowner who provided money rather than serve would lose his voice in the government. It seems reasonable to suppose some military service was a requirement for Macedonian citizenship, as was the case in most Greek states, but that the reward for the completion of military service was not likely to be disenfranchisement. Macedonian citizens were probably those who had served, or were serving, in the army.

The idea that the foot-companions were created as a check against a too-powerful nobility does not have a firm basis in fact. If Alexander was already in charge of all the political, financial and military instruments of Macedonia by the end of the Persian Wars, it is unlikely that the nobles posed a serious threat to his rule. It could be argued that the majority of the army was composed of nobles, so that they could have instituted a military junta. Carney's study[33], however, shows that while some members of the Macedonian aristocracy in later times joined in conspiracies against the throne, they did so for personal reasons and "did not appear to wish to seize the throne for

themselves and often seem to desire only the removal of the present king and nothing further"[34]. Thus it appears that the Macedonian nobility believed that only members of the Temenid family could rule. As Alexander I seems to have been the only male Temenid surviving at that time, his position as king would have been secure. Alexander may have created the foot-companions simply to fulfil a need for maintaining advisors on infantry warfare. Changes in the army and the government of Macedonia both arose as a result of the Persian Wars, rather than the change in the army imposing a change in government, although the reform to the army probably had constitutional repercussions.

After the Persian Wars there are only a few scraps of information about Alexander I. He resettled over half of the population of Mycenae in Macedonia after the Argives sacked that city in 468 (Paus. 7.25.6), and therefore Alexander was the first Macedonian king to incorporate non-Macedonians into his kingdom. He controlled a silver mine by Lake Prasias which yielded a talent a day to his treasury (Hdt. 5.17.2) and briefly had possession of Nine Ways (Demosth. *Letter of Philip*, 12.21) although he lost it to the Eordians, who possessed it when the Athenians colonized there in 465 (Thuc. 1.100.3). Hammond[35] may be correct in saying that the Strymon Valley was a point of contention between Alexander I and Athens, but one can argue as Hammond does in the case of Amyntas I, Hippias and Anthemos[36], that the Macedonian king would be pleased to have a wealthy and

powerful state in possession of border lands as a buffer against enemies. There is no evidence that Alexander I protested against the foundation of the Athenian colony at Nine Ways. The only action Alexander condoned that may have been offensive to Athens after the Persian Wars was that one of his cities, Pydna, gave shelter to Themistokles on his way to Persia (Thuc. 1.137.1). Cole[37] speculates that Themistokles and Alexander I knew each other, based on the two men's closeness in age, similarity of styles, and mutual interests in timber. It is possible that these men were acquainted but, aside from the historically unreliable *Letters of Themistocles* 5 and 20, no evidence can be found.

There are some pieces of evidence for the 470's and 460's B.C. that show that Athens had ideas for expansion into the northwest. Kimon, son of Miltiades, in 476/5 took Eion on the Strymon River from the Persians who were still occupying this territory for the Athenians (Thuc. 1.98; Plut. *Kimon* 7). After the Athenian troops supposedly guarding the colony at Nine Ways made an incursion into Thrace and were defeated at Drabescus in 465 B.C., the colony was dissolved (Thuc. 1.100.3). These troops are likely to have been in Thrace to invade more territory rather than simply to have acted as a garrison for Nine Ways. Also in 465 B.C., Kimon and his troops conquered Thasos and all of that island's mainland possessions. Three years later Kimon was prosecuted by the Athenians for not using Thasos as a base to

attack Macedonia because he had been bribed by Alexander (Plut. *Kimon* 14.1). Kimon was acquitted but the incidents mentioned above show Athens' progression from being a protector against the Persians for a power seeking possession for herself.

The *Scholia Demosthenica*[38] presents a novel view of why there were problems between Alexander and Athens: *Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ τοῦ Φιλελλήνος τοῦ γενόμενου ἐπὶ τῶν Μηδικῶν δύο παῖδες, Περδίκκας καὶ Φιλίππος. ἐπολέμησαν οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.* This statement may be a projection back from the time of the reign of Perdikkas II, when two heirs-apparent could be played against each other for the benefit of Athens. Alexander appears to have been the only son of Amyntas I, and therefore such tactics could not be employed with him. The statement implies that by the time of the *Scholia* it was believed that if Alexander had not had any heirs Athens would have inherited his kingdom. The *Scholia* may be presenting a later interpretation of history but they may also state the fifth-century Athenian attitude to Macedonia.

Some conjectures have been made concerning the date of the death of Alexander I. He must have died in the mid-fifth century B.C. as, according to Plutarch (*Kimon* 14.1), Alexander was still ruling in 465 B.C. and, according to Thucydides (1.56.2), his son Perdikkas II was king of Macedonia in 432, after a long struggle for that position. No account of his death appears in extant writings, although some authors may have done violence to

Curtius (6.11.26) to make his statement "*Quis proavis huius Archelaum, quis deinde Alexandrum, quis Perdiccan occisos ultus est?*" refer to Alexander I[39]. Tripodi[40] states that all the manuscripts are consistent in giving Archelaos, Alexander and Perdikkas in that order, and Curtius' use of "*l'avverbio temporale deinde ... definisce il rapporto di successione cronologica dei tre personaggi*"[41]. Therefore the kings Curtius refers to are Archelaos, Alexander II and Perdikkas III. Tripodi also makes the point that Alexander would have been close to eighty years old by the mid-fifth century B.C.[42] and it is therefore highly unlikely that anyone would have felt the need to assassinate him at his advanced age. This idea seems plausible but, in fact, the manuscripts are not consistent in the order of the names of the three kings, and both the Teubner and the Loeb editions give the order as Alexander, Archelaos and Perdikkas.

Hammond thinks that Alexander died in the mid-fifth century, choosing 452 B.C., because it makes sense of what the later Greek chronographers wrote on a 44 or 43 year reign[43] and fits with his theory of when Amyntas died. It has been argued above that the oldest sources call neither Alexander I nor Amyntas king between c. 510 B.C. and 478 B.C.: the title may not have been used during that period. Alexander, however, probably dated his accession back to the time when Amyntas was deposed (as Philip II possibly dated his accession from when he became regent) whether he was actually crowned then or not. Thus he

would include the years the Macedonians were under a form of Persian rule in his regnal years even if he was not king so that the Argead succession would appear to be unbroken. Hammond's final reason for his dating of Alexander's death is: "This is compatible with the giving in marriage of a daughter of Alexander, Stratonice, to Seuthes in 429 (Thuc. 2. 101. 6); for she should not have been beyond her middle twenties."[44] This is a valid point, but not definitive. Thus a date for the death of Alexander cannot be established more exactly than that it occurred between 465 and the mid-430s B.C. in unknown circumstances.

Conclusions

The conclusions reached in this research must be regarded as tentative because of the lack of solid information available. The first ten generations of the Temenid line of Argead Macedonia are, at best, proto-historical rather than historical. As has been shown, no one can be certain that the genealogies presented by the sources are in fact a list of the kings of Argead Macedonia rather than a list of one or another particular branch of the royal family. The only members of that branch of the Temenid family who lived in Argead Macedonia who were definitely kings are Perdikkas I, Amyntas I, Alexander I, and perhaps Argaios. As stated previously, Karanos, Koinos and Tyrimmas may have been kings from a collateral branch of the Temenid family, but were displaced to a time before the first Temenid kings as they did not fit into the direct line from Perdikkas I to Alexander I. There may also have been some kings from other branches of the family who were completely forgotten by the sources. Thus it is to no avail to try to date the beginning of the reign of Perdikkas I.

No evidence has been found to prove that the introduction of Greek rulers changed the tribal basis of Argead Macedonian society. It appears more likely that the Temenid royal family

became acculturated to Macedonian society than that their arrival made the Macedonians more Greek. Friendly cross-cultural contacts seem to have been restricted to the royal family of Argead Macedonia. These contacts imply that the Temenids had interests in the world outside of Macedonia but says nothing about the rest of that country's population. The problems of royal succession that appear in the generations subsequent to Alexander I, especially in the age of Perdikkas II, when part of the population supports his claim to the throne while another faction supports his brother Philip to be king (Thuc. 1.57.2-3), seem to imply a tribal chieftainship rather than a duly constituted orderly succession.

One thing that has emerged fairly clearly in some of the ancient sources is that the role played by women in the Macedonian royal families may have been more important than it was previously seen to be. If, as I have argued, the favoured heir to the Macedonian throne was the son born to parents who were both from Macedonian royal families, it would explain both how Macedonian succession worked and why royal Macedonian women seem to have had higher status than Greek women. It might even explain how a Greek dynasty achieved the Macedonian throne: if the sole heir was a woman when Perdikkas I arrived in Macedonia, he could have gained kingship over that country peacefully by marriage.

Footnotes - Introduction

1 Hammond, N.G., *A History of Macedonia*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1972, 1979, 1985). Hereafter this work will be referred to as Hammond, *HM*.

2 FGrH provides the following examples of lost histories: Duris of Samos, Μακεδονίκα (76 F 1-15); Anaximenes of Lampsacus, Φιλιππίκα (72 F 4-14); Kallisthenes of Olynthus, Μακεδονικα (124 F 57); Marsyas of Pella, Μακεδονίκα (135 F 1); Marsyas of Philippi, Μακεδονίκα (136 F 8); Herakleitos of Lesbos, Ἱστορία Μακεδονίκη (167)

3 Seel, O. (Ed.), *M. Iuniani Iustini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi* (Teubner, 1972).

4 On the admiration for Alexander in late Republican and early Imperial Rome, see Dio Cassius 37.2; 51.3.6; 51.16.4-5; and Suetonius *Div. Aug.* 18, 50 and 94.

5 Thuc. 4.124.1; Demosthenes, *Olynthics* 3.16; 24.24; *De falsa legatione* 308.

6 Προμπονας, I., "Μακεδονικα καὶ Ὁμέρικα γλώσσικα" in *Ancient Macedonia* 2 (1977) 397-407 (Articles from *Ancient Macedonia* will be cited as *AM* with the appropriate volume number following); Daskalakis, A., *The Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians* (Thessalonike, 1965) 59-95; Hoffman, O., *Die Makedonen, Ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum* (Gottingen, 1906).

7 Marinatos, S., "Mycenaean Elements within the Royal Houses of Macedonia" in *AM* 1 (1970) 45-52.

8 Heurtley published the results of this survey in *Prehistoric Macedonia* (Cambridge, 1939).

9 Mooren, L., "On the Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy" in Van't Dack, E., P. van Dessel & W. van Gucht (Eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World* (Leuven, 1983) 205-240; Aymard, "Sur l'Assemblee Macedonienne" in *REA* 52 (1950) 115-137; Briant, *Antigone le Borgne* (Paris, 1973) 279-350; Hampl, F., *Der Konig der Makedonen* (Diss.: Weida, 1934).

[10] Errington, R., "The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy" in *Chiron* 8 (1978) 77-133; Errington, "The Historiographical Origins of Macedonian *Staatsrecht*" in *AM* 3 (1983) 89-101; Lock, R., "The Macedonian Army Assembly in the time of Alexander the Great" in *CPh* 72 (1977) 91-107.

Footnotes - Chapter 2

[1] To cite a few examples, Daskalakis, "L'origine de la maison royale de Macedoine et les legendes relatives de l'antiquité" in *Ancient Macedonia* 1 (1970) 156-161; Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen* (1974); Hammond, *A History of Macedonia* 2 (1979) 1-2; Kelly, *A History of Argos to 500 B.C. (1976) 105-106*.

[2] *cf*. Schol. Demosth., *Olynth*. III, 86.

[3] Hammond, *HM* 2, 10-11 looks at the myth of Perdikkas as an aetiological one, but he grasps at individual words in it rather than treating the organic whole.

[4] *Ibid*., 30.

[5] *Ibid*.

[6] *Ibid*.

[7] Satyros, *P. Oxy*. 2465; Diod. 7.15 incorporated into Eusebius, *Chronicle*, Schoene Ed. 227; Syncellus 373-374, 499.

[8] Greenwalt, "Caranus in the Argead King List" in *GRBS* 26 (1985) 43-49; Hammond, *HM* 2, 4; Badian, "Greeks and Macedonians" in Barr-Sharrar and Borza (Eds.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (1982) 33-51.

[9] Greenwalt (see above, *n.* 8) 44.

[10] *Ibid.*, 48-49.

[11] *Archelaos*, *P. Oxy.* 419.

[12] Greenwalt (see above, *n.* 8) 45.

[13] *Ibid.*, 49 *n.*.

[14] *P. Oxy.* 2465.

[15] Muller, *FHG*, 164.

[16] *P. Oxy. 2465.* commentary, 123.

[17] *CAH* 1^2 (1970) 36.

[18] Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (1968) 139.

[19] "The Marriageability Age at the Argead Court" in *Classical World* 82 (1988) 96.

[20] Polyaen. 8.60; Arrian *succ. Alex.* 1.31-33; Diod. 18.39.2-4, 19.11.1; Justin 14.5.1-4.

[21] Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 17-22 discusses the appearance of the same names across different dynasties.

[22] This topic is dealt with in Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens* (1932) 25; Badian, "Eurydice" in Adams & Borza (Eds.), *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (1982) 99-110; Heckel, "Polyxena, the Mother of Alexander the Great" in *Chiron* 11 (1981) 79-86.

[23] Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens*, 25.

[24] Badian, "Eurydice", 105-10[illegible].

[25] Hatzopoulos, "Succession and Regency in Classical Macedonia" in *AM* 4 (1986) 279-292.

[26] See, for example, Ellis, "The Security of the Macedonian Throne Under Philip II", *AM* 1 (1970) 68-75; Ellis, "Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great" in *JHS* 91 (1971)

15-25; Hammond *HM* 2 (1979) 208-209; Hogarth, *Philip and Alexander of Macedon* (1897) 79-86.

27 Hatzopoulos (see above, n. 24) 291.

28 See, for example, Hatzopoulos & Loukopoulos (Eds.), *Philip of Macedon* (Athens, 1980) 22-23.

29 Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 22.

30 *Ibid.*, 28.

31 Samuel, "Philip and Alexander as Kings" in *AHR* 93 (1988) 1270-1286.

32 *GG* 3^2 (1913) 52.

33 Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 4.

34 Errington, "Alexander the Philhellene and Persia" in *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (1981) 39-143; Macan, *Herodotus: The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books* (1895) 5.17.12; How and Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (1912) 5.17-22.

[35] Errington (see above, *n.* 31).

[36] *Ibid.*, 139.

[37] *Ibid.*, 140.

[38] *Ibid*, 142.

[39] Ibid., 140.

[40] *Ibid.*, 143.

[41] Gershevitch (Ed.), *CAH Iran* 2^3 (1985) 272.

[42] Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 59.

[43] Bury & Meiggs, *A History of Greece*^{4} (1975; reprinted and revised 1984) 128.

[44] Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 59.

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] Hammond & Scullard *OCD*^{2} (1970) 571 for Justin, 1096-1097 for Trogus.

[47] Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 59.

[48] Errington (see above, n. 30) 142.

Footnotes - Chapter 3

1 Hammond and Scullard, *OCD*^{2} (1970) 39.

2 Hdt. 5.17, 19-22; 7.173.3, 175; 8.34, 121, 136-137; 9.1, 4, 8, and 9.44-46.

3 Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 59.

4 Turyn, *Pindari Carmini cum Fragmenti* (1948) 322-323.

5 Hammond, in *HM* 2, 60, places Alexander's victory at the pentathlon in the mid-490's, but before he was king; Alexander, however, is not attested to have either competed or won in this event. In *OCD*^{2} (1970) 39, Hammond placed Alexander's Olympics after Tempe, thus after 490. Daskalakis suggests 496 in *The Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians* (1965) 158-159. Roos, "Alexander I in Olympia" in *Eranos* 83 (1985) 167 "would like to suggest some of the earlier games". The *Sextus Julius Africanus Olympionicarum Fasti*, which seems to be fairly complete as far as the footraces go for period concerned, does not mention the name of Alexander. No consensus can be reached on the evidence available.

6 Roos, "Alexander I in Olympia", *Eranos* 83 (1985) 162-168.

7 Roos, *Ibid.*, 165-167 concurs with How and Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (1912) on 5.22.

8 Turyn (see above, *n.* 3).

9 Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 60.

10 Gershevitch (Ed.), *CAH Iran* 2^3 *(1985) 272.*

11 *Hammond, HM* 2 (1979) 99.

12 *Ibid.*

13 *Ibid.*, 59.

14 Gerolymatos, "The Proxenia of Alexandros I", *LCM* 11.5 (1986) 75-76.

15 *Ibid.*, 75.

16 In this I agree with Borza, ("Timber and Politics in the Ancient World", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical*

Society 131 (1987) 47 *n.* 69), who says "Macedonian treaties were meant to remain in force only for the life of the king, except when stated otherwise".

17 Cole, "Alexander Philhellene and Themistocles", *L'Antiquite Classique* 47 (1978) 37-49; Hammond, *HM* II 69; Gerolymatos (see above, n.12); Wallace, "Early Greek *proxenoi*", *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 199-200; Walbank, *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1978) 66; Borza (see above, *n.* 15) 42.

18 Gerolymatos (see above *n.* 13) 76.

19 Cole, "Not Alexander but Perdikkas (Dem. 23.200 and 13.24)", *GRBS* 18 (1977) 25-32.

20 *Ibid.*, 25.

21 Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 102.

22 Plutarch, *Pelopidas* 11, *Moralia* 594E-597; Xenophon, *Hellenika* 5.4-8; Polyainos, *Stratagems of War* 2.3.1; Nepos, *Pelopidas* 2-4. All of these sources except Nepos have some or all of the Theban men in women's clothing, and the account of Nepos shares enough elements with those of

Plutarch and Xenophon that it is either based on these or uses the same original source.

[23] Buckler, *The Theban Hegemony* (1980) 17, for example, glosses over this ploy by saying "On the following evening they struck down Leontidas and others of his company". Although he cites the ancient references, he does not tell what they say.

[24] Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 99.

[25] See p. 31 and *n.* above.

[26] Goukowsky, P., *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre* 1 (Nancy, 1978) 11.

[27] Anaximenes of Lampsacus (*FGrH* 72, F 4).

[28] Goukowsky (see above, *n.* 25) 11-12.

[29] *Ibid.*, 12.

[30] Momigliano, A., "Re e Popolo in Macedonia primo di Alessandro Magno" in *Athenaeum* 13 (1935) 8.

[31] For detailed discussion on the ancient sources, and their modern interpretations, see: Briant, P., *Antigone le Borgne* (Paris, 1973) 279-350; Aymard, A., "Sur l'assemblee Macedonienne" in *REA* 52 (1950) 115-137; Adams, W., "Macedonian Kingship and the Right of Petition" in *AM* 4 (Thessalonike, 1986) 43-52; Momigliano (see above, *n.* 29) 3-21; Errington, R., "The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy" in *Chiron* 8 (1978) 78-133. I agree with Errington and Momigliano that the assembly, if this was in fact a formally constituted body, was not used as an instrument of political power. If the assembly (whether army or citizen) was involved in both choosing the king and trying capital cases, rather than simply acclaiming the royal will, it is odd that there was never any action taken when one of the heirs-apparent killed his competition.

[32] Goukowsky (see above, *n.* 25) 12.

[33] Carney, E., "Regicide in Macedonia" in *Parola del Passato* 38 (1983) 260-273.

[34] *Ibid.*, 261.

[35] Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 102-103.

[36] *Ibid.*, 59.

[37] Cole (see above *n.* 14).

[38] Dilts (Ed.), *Scolia Demosthenica*, 2 vols. (Teubner, 1983), in vol. 1, 97.

[39] Bardon, *Quinte Curce, Histoires*^{2} (1961) 210; Hammond, *HM* 2 (1979) 103.

[40] Tripodi, "Sulla morte di Alessandro I di Macedonia", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 14 (1984) 1263-1268.

[41] *Ibid.*, 1264-1265.

[42] *Ibid.*, 1267.

[43] *HM* 2 (1979) 104.

[44] *Ibid.*

Bibliography

Adams, W.L. & E.Borza. *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*. Washington D.C., 1982.

Adams, W.L. & E. Borza. *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and early Hellenistic Times*. Washington D.C., 1982.

Africanus, Sextus Julius. *Olympionicarum Fasti*. I. Rutgers, Ed. Chicago, 1980.

Anson, E. "Macedonia's Alleged Constitutionalism". *Classical Journal* 80 (1985) 303-316.

Arrian. *Alexandri Anabasis*. A. Roos, Ed. *Flavii Arriani Quae Extant Omnia*, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1967.

Aymard, A. "Sur l'Assemblee Macedonienne". *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 52 (1950) 115-137.

Aymard, A. "Βασιλέυς Μακεδόνων (Melanges Visscher)". *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquite* 4 (1950) 61-97.

Badian, E. "Eurydice". W.L. Adams & E. Borza, Eds. *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*. Washington D.C., 1982. 99-110.

Beloch, K.J. *Griechische Geschichte*^{2}, vol. 3. 1 and 2. Leipzig, 1922-1923.

Borza, E.N. "Timber and Politics in the Ancient World". *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 131:1(1987) 32-52.

Briant, P. *Antigone le Borgne: Les Debuts de sa Carriere et les Problemes de l'Assemblée Macedonienne*. Paris, 1973.

Buckler, J. *The Theban Hegemony*. Cambridge Mass., 1980.

Bury, J.B. & R. Meiggs. *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*^{4}. London, 1984.

Carney, E. "Regicide in Macedonia". *Parola del Passato* 38 (1983) 260-272.

Cole, J.W. "Not Alexander but Perdikkas (Dem. 23.200 and 13.24)". *Greek, Roman & Byzantine Studies* 18 (1977) 25-32.

Cole, J.W. "Alexander Philhellene and Themistocles". *L'Antiquite Classique* 47 (1978) 37-49.

Curtius Rufus, Quintus. *Quinte Curte, Histoires*^{2}. H. Bardon, Ed. Paris, 1961.

Curtius Rufus, Quintus. *Historia Alexandri Magni*. M. Croiset, Ed. Paris, 1885.

Curtius Rufus, Quintus. *Q. Curti Rufi Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis*. E. Hedicke, Ed. Leipzig, 1908.

Curtius Rufus, Quintus. *Quintus Curtius: History of Alexander*. J. Rolfe, Ed. London, 1946.

Daskalakis, A. "L'origine de la maison royale de Macedoine et les legendes relatives de l'antiquite". B. Laourdas & C. Makaronas, Eds. *Ancient Macedonia: Papers Read at the First International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, 26-29 August, 1968*. Thessaloniki, 1970. 156-161.

Daskalakis, A. *The Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians*. Thessaloniki, 1965.

Demosthenes. *De Corona and de Falsa Legatione. Olynthiacs, Philippics, Leptines and Minor Speeches*, 2 vols. with an English translation by Vince. London, 1926.

Dilts, M.R., Ed. *Scholia Demosthenica*, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1983.

Dio Cassius. *Dio's Roman History*, 9 vols. with an English translation by E. Cary. London, 1914.

Diodorus Siculus. *Diodorus of Sicily*, 12 vols. with an English translation by C.H. Oldfather. London, 1933.

Ellis, J.R. "Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great". *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 91 (1971) 15-24.

Errington, R.M. "The Historiographical Origins of Macedonian *Staatsrecht*. Institute for Balkan Studies. *Ancient Macedonia III: Papers Read at the Third International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, September 21-25, 1977*. Thessaloniki, 1983. 89-101.

Errington, R.M. "Alexander the Philhellene and Persia". *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*. Thessaloniki, 1981.

Errington, R.M. "The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy". *Chiron* 8 (1978) 77-134.

Eusebius. *Eusebii Chonicorum*, 2 vols. A. Schoene, Ed. Dublin, 1967.

Gerolymatos, A. "The Proxenia of Alexandros I". *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 11 (1986) 75-76.

Gershevitch, I., Ed. *The Cambridge History of Iran*, 7 vols. Cambridge, 1985.

Goukowsky, P. *Essai sur les Origines du mythe d'Alexandre*, 2 vols. Nancy, 1978.

Greenwalt, W. "The Marriageability Age at the Argead Court 360-317 B.C." *Classical World* 82 (1988) 93-97.

Greenwalt, W. "The Introduction of Caranus into the Argead King List". *Greek, Roman & Byzantine Studies* 26 (1985) 43-49.

Hammond, N.G.L. *A History of Macedonia*, 3 vols. Oxford, 1972, 1979, 1988.

Hammond, N.G.L. & H.H. Scullard. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*[2]. Oxford, 1970.

Hampl, F. *Der Konig der Makedonen*. Weida, Leipzig Diss., 1934.

Hatzopoulos, M.B. "Succession and Regency in Classical Macedonia". Institute for Balkan Studies. *Ancient Macedonia IV: Papers Read at the Fourth International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, September 21-25, 1983*. Thessaloniki, 1986. 279-292.

Hatzopoulos, M.B. & Loukopoulos (Eds.). *Philip of Macedon*. Athens, 1980.

Heckel, W. "Polyxena, the Mother of Alexander the Great". *Chiron* 11 (1981). 79-86.

Herodotus. *Herodoti Historiae*[3], 2 vols. Edited and with annotations by C. Hude. Oxford, 1908: reprint 1954.

Heurtley, W.A. *Prehistoric Macedonia*. Cambridge, 1939.

Hoffman, O. *Die Makedonen, Ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum*. Gottingen, 1906: reprint Olms, 1974.

Hogarth, D.G. *Philip and Alexander of Macedon: Two essays in Biography*. London, 1897.

How, W.W. & J. Wells. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. Oxford, 1912.

Institute for Balkan Studies. *Ancient Macedonia II: Papers Read at the Second International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, 19-24 August 1973*. Thessaloniki, 19[illegible].

Institute for Balkan Studies. *Ancient Macedonia III: Papers Read at the Third International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, September 21-25, 1977*. Thessaloniki, 1983.

Institute for Balkan Studies. *Ancient Macedonia IV: Papers Read at the Fourth International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, September 21-25, 1983*. Thessaloniki, 1986.

Jacoby, F. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, 13 vols. Berlin, 1926.

Justin. *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*. O. Seel, Ed. Leipzig, 1972.

Kelly, T. *A History of Argos to 500 B.C.* Minneapolis, 1976.

Lacey, W.K. *The Family in Classical Greece.* London, 1968.

Laourdas, B. & C. Makaronas, Eds. *Ancient Macedonia: Papers Read at the First International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, 26-29 August 1968.* Thessaloniki, 1970.

Lock, R. "The Macedonian Army Assembly in the Time of Alexander the Great". *Classical Philology* 72 (1977) 91-107.

Macan, R.W. *Herodotus: The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books.* New York, 1895: reprint 1973.

Macurdy, G. *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt.* Baltimore, 1932.

Marinatos, S. "Mycenaean Elements within the Royal Houses of Macedonia. B. Laourdas & C. Makaronas, Eds. *Ancient Macedonia: Papers Read at the First International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, 26-29 August 1968.* Thessaloniki, 1970. 45-52.

Momigliano, A. "Re e popolo in Macedonia primo di Alessandro Magno". *Athenaeum* 13 (1935) 3-21.

Mooren, L. "The Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy". E. Van't Dack, P. van Dessel & W. van Gucht, Eds. *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven - 24-26 May 1982.* Leuven, 1983. 205-240.

Muller, K., Ed. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum.* Paris, 1870-1878.

Nepos, Cornelius. *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae, cum Fragmentis.* P. K. Marshall, Ed. Leipzig, 1977.

Plutarch. *Vitae Parallelae.* C. Lindsckog & K.J. Furchtegott, Eds. Leipzig, 1964.

Plutarch. *Moralia.* Hubert *et al.*, Eds. Leipzig, 1925.

Polyainos. *Polyaeni Strategematon Libri Octo*. E. Woelfflin & I. Melber, Eds. Leipzig, 1887.

Promponas, I. "Μακεδονίκα καὶ Ὁμέρικα γλώσσικα". Institute for Balkan Studies. *Ancient Macedonia II: Papers Read at the Second International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, 19-24 August, 1973*. Thessaloniki, 1977. 396-407.

Roos, P. "Alexander I in Olympia". *Eranos* 83 (1985) 162-168.

Samuel, A. "Philip and [illegible] Kings: Macedonian Monarchy and Merovingian Parallels". *American Historical Review* 93 (1988) 1270-1286.

Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo*, 8 vols. with an English translation by H.L. Jones. T.E. Page, E. Capps, W.D. Rouse, L.A. Post, E.H. Warmingdon, Eds. London, 1924: reprint, 1961.

Sturtevant, E. "Centaurs and Macedonian Kings". *Classical Philology* 21 (1926) 235-249.

Suetonius. *Divus Augustus*. E.S. Shuckburgh, Ed. Cambridge, 1896.

Syncellus, George. *Georgii Syncelli: Ecloga Chronographica*. A.A. Mosshammer, Ed. Leipzig, 1984.

Thucydides. *Historiae*, 2 vols. H. S. Jones, Ed. Oxford, 1902: reprint with emended and augmented critical apparatus by J. Powell, 1942, 1988.

Turner, E.G., J. Rea, L. Koenen & J. Ma Fernandez Pomar, Eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XXVII*. London, 1962.

Tripodi, B. "Sulla Morte di Alessandro I di Macedonia: Nota a Curt. 6,11,26". *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Cl. di Lettere e Filosofia* 14 (1984) 1263-1268.

Turyn. *Pindari Carmini cum Fragmenti*. Oxford, 1952.

Walbank, M.B. *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century B.C.* Toronto, 1978.

Wallace, M.B. "Early Greek Proxenoi". *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 189-208.

Xenophon. *Hellenica*, 2 vols with an English Translation by Brownson. London, 1918.